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This thesis examines two translations of a French novel, *La Paysanne Parvenue ou les Memoires de Madame la Marquise de L.V.*, by Charles de Fieux, Le Chevalier de Mouhy, published in instalments between 1735-38. The first translation, *The Fortunate Country Maid. Being the Entertaining Memoirs of the Present Celebrated Marchioness of L-V*: who from a cottage, through a great variety of diverting adventures, became a Lady of the first quality in the Court of France, apparently seems a literal translation by an anonymous writer, and was published in London in 1740. The second, *The Virtuous Villager, or The Virgin’s Victory; Being Memoirs of a very great Lady at the Court of France, Written by Herself…translated from the original by the Author of “La Belle Assemblée”,* published in 1742 is by the novelist, critic, dramatist and translator, Eliza Haywood. Haywood knew the earlier, anonymous translation but she was not at all satisfied with it. According to her Preface, it was too literal and did not do justice to the spirit of the original:

> a work where all-alike is dull and spiritless…without any considerations of the different idioms of languages, or any endeavour, or perhaps capacity of entering into the soul of the author, a slavish adherence to the letter only is observed. (de Mouhy, page x)

The final aim of this thesis is to test that claim. This I shall do in my concluding chapter IV with the help of the tools of translation analysis comparing the two texts with the source text and with each other. But before doing any close analysis, we need some context. In the eighteenth century a two way traffic, which is often ignored in studies of the two specific cultures. We begin therefore with a chapter (I), on de Mouhy and his novels, paying special attention to *La Paysanne Parvenue*. Of its first translator we know nothing, but Haywood’s career will be the subject of chapter III. Between the novel and the translations, however, we broaden the context with a consideration, chapter II, of the “media event” (Warner, 176) instrumental in bringing de Mouhy into Haywood’s life. The publication by Samuel Richardson of *Pamela* in November 1740 set off a controversy which divided England and was quickly exported into France. It was
no doubt the success and the notoriety of Richardson’s story of a servant who
marries her gentleman-master that revived memories of de Mouhy’s story of a
peasant girl who, after many vicissitudes at the French court, marries a Marquis
who loves her as much for her virtue as her beauty. The fortunes of La Paysanne
Parvenue and its two translations in the space of two years, therefore, constitute
an interesting episode in the history of cultural exchange between France and
England. The sequence text is complicated, however, so we will begin with a
chronological table of the main novels and translations cited.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>AUTHOR</th>
<th>TRANSLATOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1731-42</td>
<td><em>La Vie de Marianne</em> ou les Aventures de Madame la Comtesse de *** de Marivaux</td>
<td>Pierre Carlet de Chamblain de Marivaux</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1734-5</td>
<td><em>Le Paysan Parvenu</em> ou les Memoires de M***</td>
<td>Pierre Carlet de Chamblain de Marivaux</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1735-8</td>
<td><em>La Paysanne Parvenue</em> ou les Memoires de Madame la Marquise de L.V.</td>
<td>Charles de Fieux Le Chevalier de Mouhy</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740</td>
<td><em>The Fortunate Country Maid</em> ; or, Memoirs of the Marchioness L.V.*</td>
<td>Charles de Fieux Le Chevalier de Mouhy</td>
<td>anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740</td>
<td><em>Pamela</em> ; or, Virtue Rewarded</td>
<td>Samuel Richardson</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1741</td>
<td><em>Anti-Pamela</em> ; or, Feign'd Innocence Detected</td>
<td>Eliza Haywood</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1742</td>
<td><em>Pamela ou la Vertu Récompensée</em></td>
<td>Samuel Richardson Antoine François Prévost</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1742</td>
<td><em>Anti-Pamela ou les Mémoires de M.D.</em></td>
<td>Claude Villaret</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1742</td>
<td><em>The Virtuous Villager or Virgin's Victory</em></td>
<td>Charles de Fieux Le Chevalier de Mouhy</td>
<td>Eliza Haywood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1743</td>
<td><em>L'Anti-Pamela ou la Fausse Innocence Découverte</em></td>
<td>Eliza Haywood Eléazar Mauvillon</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 1 : CHARLES DE MOUHY

1.1 Charles de Fieux, Chevalier de Mouhy

Charles de Fieux, Chevalier de Mouhy, was born in Metz in 1701 into a Burgundian family which had been ennobled in the seventeenth century but never became rich. When he was nineteen his ambition and romantic ideas about society and the capital led him to Paris, where he received protection from a relative of his, M. de Longepierre, who was preceptor of the Regent-to-be, Duke de Chartres. De Longepierre, however, died after only one year, and from 1720 until 1735 de Mouhy was dependent on the remittances from his father, a captain, then lieutenant colonel in the d’Harcourt dragoon regiment (Herman and Pelckmans, 9). After this he was, as we shall see, able to make a poor living from his pen. His economic circumstances, never flourishing, became even worse after his wedding to a girl who had no fortune, and with whom he had five children. He is said to have lived in indigent circumstances, and often turned to "dubious methods" (Shaw, 114) in order to support his large family. Novelist, journalist, literary correspondent, historian of theatre, de Mouhy also acted as spy, police and government informer, who continued to provide him with a means of subsistence during the last years of his life. He died in obscurity aged 81, in 1784, and was quickly forgotten by literary and cultural history.

During his most prolific period, however, de Mouhy was a tireless and prolix writer. Universally acknowledged to be "l'auteur le plus fecond du siècle" (Herman and Pelckmans, 207), he published about eighty volumes of novels between 1735 and 1780. Of himself he declared that he was literally assailed by ideas:

j'ai une si grande multitude d'idées que lorsque malheureusement je m'arrête à une, je ne ferme pas l'œil de la nuit; mon secret est d'épier le moment où toutes les différentes idées se croisent; je saisir cette incertitude, cet embarras du choix, et je m'endors (quoted in Herman and Pelckmans, 207)
In his efforts to assert himself as professional novelist in the team of his publisher, Prault, de Mouhy would begin many novels at once. While writing *La Paysanne Parvenue* for example, he was also working on *Les Mémoires du Marquis de Fieux* (1735), *Le Mentor à la Mode* (1735-6), *La Mouche ou les Aventures etc. de Bigand* (1736), and another of which we do not know the title (Green, 228). In a single year, 1747, he produced three works: *Les Memoires d’une fille de qualité* (1747), *Les Memoires de la Marquise de Villenemours* (1747) and *Le Masque de Fer* (1747).

In France the eighteenth century was the century of censorship. Raymond Birn in the introduction to his book said "c’est la monarchie française qui mit en place les structures *les plus élaborées* de prévention et de répression" (Messaoudi, 446). Voltaire said that anyone who wanted to spread his ideas during the Ancien Régime clashed to the censorship (Messaoudi, 447). Censorship was an arbitrary or doctrinal restriction of the freedom of expression. Indeed a text was examined by a censor who had to evaluate if it was in accordance with the religious, economic principles or those of the State. Books, journals, newsletters, pieces of theatre, films had to be approved before being distributed to the public. Every article had first to be authorized by the government before its publication. One hundred and sixty professional readers had the task of rereading the texts and, if the works did not pass, the journals could be suspended and the books confiscated. In 1699-1715 there were 6017 requests to publicists and 11.5% were rejected. Censorship spared neither philosophers nor men of letters, nor publishers, nor street traders, who all risked imprisonment or jail for “délit d'expression” (Mirgain, p 1), as happened to Voltaire in 1717 at La Bastille or to l’Abbé Morellet.

In eighteenth-century France the novel was seen as a dangerous genre, and was subject to systematic state censorship. In the words of the abbé Desfontaines "la multitude des romans était devenue dangereuse aux lettres et insupportable aux gens de bon gout" (quoted in Herman and Pelckmans, 26). The greatest danger lays, however, in the personal and political applications of novels. Novels
published in instalments were not exempt. The first six parts of de Mouhy’s *La Paysanne Parvenue* (1736-37), for instance, were authorized, but the seventh was forbidden. His unauthorized publication of *Les Milles et une faveurs* in 1740 cost de Mouhy not only the protection of the Duc d’Orléans but also some days in the Bastille; according to the censors, this licentious novel described habits at the court of Louis XV too minutely, and was “un ouvrage contraire à la religion et aux bonnes mœurs à la tête duquel est son portrait” (Herman and Pelckmans, 12). Censorship obliged many French novelists, among them Marivaux and Prévost, to turn to foreign printers and publishers, use false addresses and resort to underground publishing (Herman and Pelckmans, 224). De Mouhy too published several of his works, including *Les Memoires de Mademoiselle de Moras* (1739) and *Les Milles et une faveurs*, clandestinely in France, while other publications, such as the final instalment of *La Paysanne Parvenue*, and three complete novels, *Le Mentor* (1735), *Les Memoires d'une fille de qualité* (1747), *Le Masque de fer* (1747), carried Dutch imprints.

Though now forgotten by literary history, de Mouhy was well known and widely read in his time, especially in the first years of his career. Several of his novels, among them *La Paysanne Parvenue* (1735-38), *Lamekis* (1735), and *Le Masque de Fer* (1747) achieved multiple editions. They evidently conformed to the taste of the public, at times exploiting the success of previous works. *Le Masque de Fer*, for instance, was constructed around the plot created by Dumas (Green, 236), while the title of *La Paysanne Parvenue* reminded the public of Marivaux’s *Le Paysan Parvenu* of 1734. De Mouhy usually respected *vraisemblance* (Green, 228), and as narrated by him, “the most trifling episodes acquired an engrossing interest” (Green, 233). As we shall see in analysing *La Paysanne Parvenue*, his plots turn around adventures and misunderstandings. Rivara describes de Mouhy as having created anecdotes and mingled them with great ideas (Rivara, 8). According to Ugo Dionne his novels were "plus solide qu’on ne pourrait le penser, même si son talent est moins celui du maçon que celui de l’orfèvre" (quoted in Herman and Pelckmans, 235). De Mouhy’s novels play on the curiosity of the reader, presenting reality as something that has to be spied out, suggested, disclosed step by step to the reader while the characters remain
ignorant of what is in fact happening around them. De Mouhy’s novels were, however, not appreciated by the critics of his time, who insulted him and made unpleasant epigrams which portrayed him as an example of self-satisfied mediocrity (Rivara, II), scorned for prolixity and for his careless style. This harsh treatment by the critics, to whom he responded in *Un Essai pour répondre à la critique des romans* of 1753, may have eventually led him to renounce his role of novelist. After 1755 he wrote no more prose fiction.

Le chevalier de Mouhy had other resources, however. He wrote memoirs, autobiographies and satires, and like many writers of his time was also a journalist, even going so far as to open a newspaper of his own (d’Estré, 196). Around 1735 he began to write a gazette, *Le Répertoire*, which he sold in Paris and in the provinces. His work as an authorized journalist did not last long however; competition was intense and provincial customers did not find his gazette so pungent. De Mouhy also published a newsletter on court and on foreign affairs. In one issue, however, he revealed that Mme de Polignac frequented Mme de la Pommeraye, who loved women, and as a result he was imprisoned in the Bastille for about a month (Bertaut, 307). There he had a meeting with Marville, the chief of the judicial police, who, in May 1742, took him on as secret agent and informer. In this role de Mouhy supplied the police with news of intrigues at court and in the theatrical world, delineating the "nervosité parisienne" (Lynch and Clancy, par 13). In 1744, however, he began selling gossip collected for the authorities to the newly-founded commercial news-sheet, *Le Mercure*. When this commercial relationship was unveiled in February 1745, de Mouhy was conducted to the Bastille, where he stayed a month before being exiled to Rouen for six months. In 1746 he left France for the Hague, where he founded a successful periodical gazette, *Le Papillon ou Lettres Parisiennes*, which he directed from 1746 to 1751, with an interruption of eighteen months during which he collaborated with another gazette of the same genre, *La Bigarrure*. Bored by Holland, de Mouhy eventually came back to Paris where, in 1758, the marshal Duc de Belle-Isle, Minister for War, chose him to conduct the “affaires secrètes” (Lynch and Clancy, par 6) of this department. After de Belle-Isle’s death, de
Mouhy went back to work for the chief of the judicial police. It seems that he began writing for the literary market again; indeed he wrote a history of the theatre, *L'Abrégé de l'histoire du théâtre français*, which was published in 1781, three years before his death.
LA PAYSANNE PARVENUE,
OU
LES MEMOIRES
DE
Madame la Marquise de L. V.
Par M. Le Chevalier de Morny,
QUATRIEME PARTIE.
Le Prix est de 24 sols.

A PARIS,
Chez Prault, Fils, Quay de
Conty, vis-à-vis la descente du
Pont-Neuf, à la Charité.

M. DCC. XXXVI,
Avec Approbation & Privilege du Roy.
1.2 La Paysanne Parvenue

La Paysanne Parvenue ou les Memoires de Madame la Marquise de L.V. is one of the first of de Mouhy’s novels, preceded only by Le Marquis de Fieux (1735) and Lamékis (1735). A successful novel, which received the “approbation et privilège du Roi”, reissued many times (Herman and Pelckmans, 14), it was first published in instalments between 1735 and 1738. The first eight parts were published in Paris by Prault fils; the first and the second in 1735, parts 3-7 in 1736, and the eighth in 1737. As for the other instalments, de Mouhy was obliged to publish them in Holland because of the proscription of novels which came into force in 1738 obliging him to resort to what Georges May called « publication en exil » (Herman and Pelckmans, 42). His Dutch editions were mainly issued by either Pieter or Pierre de Hondt and Jean Néaulme, both publishers of La Haye. La Paysanne Parvenue quickly became well known abroad; indeed at the same time they were published in Amsterdam, Liège, London and Avignon (Coulet, 24). Later editions of La Paysanne Parvenue were published in 1739 and 1740 by Jean Néaulme in La Haye and Arstkée et Merkus libraires in Amsterdam and Leipzig and by Prault fils in Paris in 1756.

The title of La Paysanne Parvenue recalls a successful work by Pierre Carlet de Chamblain de Marivaux, Le Paysan Parvenu (1734-5). This was a strategy on the part of de Mouhy in order to draw readers’ attention. It was not the only one. The main character of La Paysanne Parvenue, Jeannette, reminds readers of another well-known main character of Marivaux’s, Marianne (1731-42): both women are paragons of virtue. Unlike Jeannette, however, Marianne has high social origins, although she does not know it. This novel was successful among its contemporaries, who adored the evolution of Marianne from the condition of a young orphan of poor family who must overcome many trials before achieving high social status and fortune. La Paysanne Parvenue has in common with Le Paysan Parvenu a path of learning and a social climbing. The titles themselves imply the theme of upward social mobility. The main character, Jacob, is of humble origins, but has social ambitions. To this end he uses his appeal to older women, whose influence allows him to advance in the world. In de
Mouhy’s novel, on the other hand, the protagonist owes her social rise to her attractiveness, but it is represented as an innocent attraction founded on her virtue.

De Mouhy dedicated all his novels to people with whom he had personal relationships. *La Paysanne Parvenue* is dedicated to a chaplain, l’abbé Oppède. L’abbé Oppède had helped de Mouhy when he was hurt in a fall from a post horse and l’Abbé made room for him in his chaise. By dedicating to a chaplain, de Mouhy is perhaps signalling that this is not a work where vice has the best over the virtue and that, as a consequence, it is not a corrupting work.

*La Paysanne Parvenue*, about four hundred pages long, is made up of twelve parts. The plot is extremely complicated, as the following outline illustrates.

**THE STRUCTURE OF *LA PAYSANNE PARVENUE***

- Dedication to Monsieur l'abbé Oppède, chaplain to the King and general vicar of the archbishopric of Paris, a “disinterested benefactor”.

- Preface: The author explains that La Marquise de L.V. has asked him to write and to publish her memoirs.

- PART I: A young peasant, Jeannette, meets the young Marquis de L.V., his sister, and hears the story of Charlotte
  The Chevalier d'Elbieux tries to rape Jeannette; the young Marquis saves her.

- PART II: The wedding arranged for Jeannette with Monsieur Gripart, a bourgeois, is delayed.
  The young Marquis implores her not to marry him.

- PART III: Jeannette retires to a monastery, where she meets Saint-Agnes, and learns of her love for Mélïcourt.
  In a fight with the young Marquis, the Chevalier d'Elbieux is wounded.

- PART IV: The Chevalier d'Elbieux repents and asks to see Jeannette.
  The cousin of the young Marquis, Saint-Fal, kidnaps her on instructions from the old Marquis, who sees her as a danger to his son.

- PART V: Jeannette meets a pilgrim, Lindamine, and learns her story.
-PART VI: The old Marquis meets and is impressed by Jeannette without realising who she is.
   Jeannette and Saint-Fal continue to Versailles.

-PART VII: At Versailles the young Marquis hears Saint-Fal declaring his love to Jeannette and leaves.
   Jeannette assumes the name Countess des Roches and meets the old Marquis again.

-PART VIII: Jeannette sets out to take a letter to the young Marquis, but goes by mistake to the house of his father.

-PART IX: The old Marquis finds out the real identity of Jeannette.

-PART X: Jeannette confesses to old Marquis that the young Marquis and she are in love.

-PART XI: The old Marquis proposes marriage to her.
   Jeannette retires to her village and meets the young Marquis again.

-PART XII: The old Marquis pretends to be ill and as his last wish desires to marry Jeannette, but this is revealed to be only a test in order to discover whether she and his son really love each other.
   The young Marquis and Jeannette marry.

The narrative is divided in such a way that each part concludes an episode, but keeps something in the main plot in suspense. For instance the first part ends with having Jeannette run away from Le Chevalier d'Elbieux but still wandering in the wood. At the end of Part IV Jeannette has been taken away by Saint-Fal.

This work is made up of adventures and passionate scenes and the ending, as well as the destinies of its characters, is the synthesis of anecdotes and stories. The action as a whole turns around love intrigues, unexpected events and fortuitous meetings. The young Marquis falls in love with Jeannette, but so do Le Chevalier d'Elbieux and the Old Marquis, so that Jeannette is in a constant state of apprehension and fear. De Mouhy further complicates the narrative by inserting "stories within", such as those of Saint-Agnès or Lindamine, who tell Jeannette their adventures and offer her chances to reflect on what happens in her life and how to behave. Distance also complicates everything, and Jeannette and the young Marquis have many separations and misunderstandings. Unexpected events
make things even worse; for instance the Countess of G, unbeknown to Jeannette, plans an advantageous marriage for the heroine, who feels obliged to accept this wedding out of gratitude towards the Countess and obedience to her parents. But this is followed by another unexpected event: the arrival of the young Marquis, who begs Jeannette to renounce the wedding. Something always happens to upset Jeannette’s life, sometimes for the better, sometimes quite abruptly and violently. When she is kidnapped by Saint-Fal, for instance, Jeannette runs into several bad people but also good ones. The sister of Le Chevalier d'Elbieux complicates her life and discredits her; the Countess of G, a good and virtuous woman, helps her to run away from le Chevalier d'Elbieux. Saint-Fal himself at first appears to be an enemy, but then turns accomplice.

What really complicates events in *La Paysanne Parvenue*, however, is social difference. If Jeannette had not been a peasant, the sister of le Chevalier d'Elbieux would presumably not have behaved as she does. Moreover if she had belonged to the same social class as the young Marquis, the old Marquis would not have seen her as a social climber and Saint-Fal would have not kidnapped her. Jeannette wishes to better herself and this wish in itself arouses hostility among the villagers. When she pretends to be a lady, her borrowed name gets her into trouble. Moreover social difference keeps her away from her aunt and her parents, with whom she is obliged to pretend as well. In the end, however, virtue triumphs over social difference, enabling her to marry her beloved and become a marchioness.

Jeannette is the most important character in *La Paysanne Parvenue*. She is a peasant from a village near the forest of Fontainbleau. Obedient, Christian, virtuous but also beautiful, she is educated by her mother, *femme de chambre* to the Countess de N, who teaches her “la retenue de celles de son sexe” (Coulet, 36) and, most importantly, virtue, a synonym for chastity, honour and reputation. Jeannette has also close ties with her family, and is her mother's favourite, which costs her the envy of her siblings. To this she never reacts because she does not want to hurt them. Jeannette is above all wide-eyed, innocent, honest, humble, insecure, sensitive and she believes everything she is told. When she sees the
King she exclaims "oui oui, c’est le roi, repris-je avec transport ; mon Dieu, qu’il est beau !" (37). When looking forward to seeing the young Marquis, she “au moindre bruit il me semblait qu’il arrivait; un rouge innocent me montait alors au visage, le battement de cœur me prenait, et je ne me connaissais plus moi-même” (39). She is captivated by the manner of the young Marquis – "il entra dans l’église avec un air qui m’enchanta" (39) – but also by his words: "j’écoutais Colin avec une attention infinie, je le faisais souvent répéter; je le sentais un plaisir jusqu’alors inconnu" (43). He will eventually bring her happiness, but in the meantime sadness, fear and despair: “amour cruel! fatale passion!” (329). She learns also the tricks of ladies, although she often falls in many traps because of her ignorance, her innocence and her inexperience of the world of the court. For instance, she leans on her balcony in déshabillé while the court parades in the street and greets the King with a bow as would a peasant: “je lui fis une très grande révérence” (250).

Jeannette, however, also has her faults. She is often threatened by vanity. For instance from the age of thirteen she admits, "j’avais de la vanité" "j’étais la mieux mise du village, et je faisais la malade pour ne pas sortir quand il manquait quelque chose à mon ajustement" (43). Her behaviour becomes more patronizing towards her villagers and friends "je vous prie, continuai-je aigrement, de ne me tenir jamais de pareils discours, et de me laisser aller, vous n’avez aucune autorité" (73). After her illness she worries about "je me troublais […] que j’eusse perdu ma beauté" (448). Jeannette is also at times jealous and insecure. When thinking about the young Marquis meeting the Countess de N, for example, she confesses that

son diné chez la comtesse de N. ma marraine, me donnait de la défiance. Elle était aimable… elle pouvait encore très bien faire la passion d’un jeune cavalier, du moins je le pensais ainsi (40).

She is indeed so jealous on this occasion that she falls ill.

As to her humble origins, she is realistic: "pourquoi vous attacher à une fille de ma sorte ?" she asks the young Marquis: "je sais bien que je ne suis pas
votre semblable; mais j’ose ajouter que tout gros seigneur que vous êtes, vous ne me ferez jamais manquer de sagesse" (58). Jeannette always feels in the grip of events which she cannot control and of which she is terrified. She is frequently on the verge of falling from virtue but always saves herself just in time. On one occasion, for instance, Jeannette risks losing her virtue with Monsieur de G and implores a virtuous dressmaker to send a note to Madame de G in which she asks her to save her from disaster.

De Mouhy's male protagonist, throughout the novel known only as "le jeune marquis", is the son of Jeannette's godfather, the Marquis de L.V., who is a friend of the Countess de N. It is while passing through the forest of Fontainbleau with the court and the King that the young "seigneur" first meets Jeannette. He is described as charming in features, kind, honest and sensitive. Although impressed by Jeannette's beauty, he is especially impressed by her simplicity and behaves respectfully to her: “Qu’elle est aimable, s’écria-t-il; que cette simplicité est adorable! je la préfère à l’art de toutes nos femmes” (37). He does not want to change her: "je trouve cette belle fille très bien; il lui faut peu de chose pour la mettre au point où vous la désirez" (53). He is solicitous and worries about Jeannette, warning her against the dangers of young men: “il faut savoir distinguer vos vrais amis" (54). He is a decisive person and somewhat jealous: "si vous les écoutez, vous me perdrez pour jamais" (55). At the same time he is sensitive and often overwhelmed by his emotions: "je vous cacherais en vain, leur dit-il, la cause de mon chagrin; si cette fille meurt je perdrai la vie" (65).

Like Jeannette, the young Marquis has his faults. He is impulsive and so jealous that he runs away from his beloved thinking that he has been betrayed: “Jeannette ne m’aime plus, elle m’a préféré le duc de..” (368). When his father falls ill he is divided between his love for Jeanette and his affection for his father: “je suis au désespoir, mon adorable Jeannette…je vous perds pour jamais” (430).

The young Marquis and Jeannette meet with many obstacles to their love, but two in particular: Le Chevalier d’Elbieux and the Old Marquis. Le Chevalier
d’Elbieux is a passionate man: “je lui plu dès le premier instant” (57). He has polite but haughty manners and he treats Jeannette with an air of superiority: "il était emporté dans ses passions, et comme sa sœur, d’une hauteur insupportable" (57) and "les siens, quoique polis, étaient altiers, et ressentaient un air de supériorité" (61). His belonging to a higher class makes him free in his behaviour towards her. He is pressing and, after meeting with various refusals, “la rage peinte dans les yeux” (64), he tries to rape her. He is almost obsessed by Jeannette, who is “la proie est dans mes filets” (85). His passion is so insane that, blinded with rage, he kills a man he thinks to be his rival. Furious, he also tries to kill the young Marquis, who wounds him gravely. This fight turns out to be a blessing for Le Chevalier d’Elbieux, who asks Jeannette’s forgiveness and decides to become a priest. Later, however, he sees Jeannette in church at mass and his passion for her returns.

The second antagonist, the old Marquis, does not come into the scene at the beginning of the novel; instead we first hear about him and his feelings from other characters. The servant Christine reports that

c’est lui, non seulement qui vous a nommée, mais qui a demandé que vous soyez arrêtée…et soupçonnant Madame de G..de vous prêter la main, il lui a écrit une lettre fulminante à votre sujet, par laquelle il se plaint fortement […] il demande avec instance que vous lui soyez sacrifiée (169).

The old Marquis wants to send Jeannette to a monastery in order to protect his son because he thinks that she is a social climber. This is confirmed by Madame de G: "M le marquis de L.V. me presse de vous remettre entre ses mains; je ne sais quel parti prendre à tout cela” (169).

When, finally, Jeannette sees by chance the old Marquis for the first time, he seems to her a respectable “seigneur”:

un grand homme dont l’air me parut âgé et respectable; le nombre de gens qui l’accompagnaient, me fit conjecturer qu’il devait être de grande qualité…le regard de cet homme m’avait paru doux, et il ne m’avait pas été difficile de démêler que ma vue ne lui avait point déplu (220).
Without knowing her identity, the old Marquis is so charmed by her beauty and by her behaviour that he wants to spend as much time as possible with her. He is kind to her: "vous vous serviez de cette chaise, voici la mienne qui vous reconduira à votre demeure, vous serez plus convenablement" (283). While they talk for the first time he tells her about a country maid who is “haute, altière” (224) without knowing that that country-maid is in front of him in that moment. He has a bad opinion of this peasant: "d’ailleurs on m’a tant conté de tours et de manèges de cette petite fille, que je ne puis m’empêcher de craindre quelque nouvel artifice de sa part" (226), while he is impressed by the mysterious Jeannette: "Vous inspirez trop de respect, et la vertu qu’annonce votre physionomie impose assez pour réprimer la pétulance des désires" (222). The Marquis de L.V. is a man who acts impetuously and in a contradictory manner. He is attentive towards Jeannette and defends her against Monsieur des Roches and when he finds out who she is, he does not initially care about it: “j’ai trouvé dans vous, ma chère Jeannette, cette vertu, ces sentiments, cette probité que j’adore” (391). Nevertheless he doubts her good faith when his servant delineates her as a vicious woman who has a secret love and who wants to get rich at the expense of his son. He pretends to be ill in order to discover the true feelings:

je voulais connaître par une expérience qui prit sa source dans le cœur de mon fils, s’il était digne que j’oubliasse mon rang et le public pour le satisfaire, et si j’en étais assez aimé pour me céder tout ce qu’il avait de plus cher dans le monde; si je reconnais dans mon fils, me dis-je, en imaginant les moyens qui devaient me convaincre, qu’il m’aime assez pour renoncer à ce qu’il aime, il mérite que je consente à le rendre heureux (459)

This, however, is nothing but a means in order to discover her love for his son, so that virtue and the real love have the best over social class difference: “sa vertu et ses grandes qualités la mettent fort au-dessus d’une vaine naissance” (461).

As for the setting of La Paysanne Parvenue, the novel shows Jeannette less often in her village than at the court. She first stays with the Countess of N, then with the Chevalier d’Elbieux, with the Countess of G, with the old Marquess, with Saint-Fal. Her clothes and her lifestyle are those of a lady. She lives first in
the house of Madame de G and she dresses in elegant clothing of high social status Lady “l’on m’avait donné une robe de satin” (91). The particulars delineate the environment: "j’étais appuyée tristement sur une balustrade qui règne autour de cette terrasse" (109). Then she moves from the comfort of a great house to the poor environment of the monastery: "un grand crucifix de bois, au bas duquel était une tête de mort" (119) and "un tableau de l’enfer" (119). At Versailles we find her again in the luxury of the court: "les glaces, les dorures, les tableaux ne m’offraient que des images séduisantes" (241). Jeannette at one point comes across

un cabinet vitré qui était à coté de ma chambre; il était meublé comme l’appartement d’un damas cramoisi, avec un liseré d’or à petite frange; une douzaine de tableaux placés avec symétrie entre plusieurs glaces, représentants des jeux d’enfants, avec les plus jolis paysages rendaient ce lieu très agréable…..une bibliothèque placée dans le fond, remplie de tous les livres de musique les plus modernes (245).

The appartments are richly furnished "superbe et magnifique: l’or, les glaces, et les riches tableaux, y brillaient de toutes parts" (438). Jeannette is given all the accessories of a Lady: "la garde-robe...les carrés étaient remplis de bracelets, de gants, et de toutes les pretintailles modernes, le tout d’un goû et d’un choix délicat" and "j’ouvris les armoires, de la quantité de linge et d’effets qui s’offrit à ma vue" (245).

But we have also a description of her countryside. Delineated as the garden of Eden, a perfect and idyllic place out of the populated world. We can feel the purity of this place, “un ruisseau d’une eau plus pure que le cristal serpentait à la lisière”, it is peaceful «les oiseaux à la fin du jour » and everything is perfect, even the branches of the trees «leur ramage était si doux et si attrayant » (425). We have few things but they are natural. The environment of the court is in that period synonym for artificiality and luxury while the one she comes from, the village, although a humble place, is virtuous, innocent and guileless.

The style of de Mouhy is simple and clear. It is a conversational style where the descriptions are given little space and impressions and feelings have the
best. Except for few details, we know and distinguish the characters for their interior and moral qualities and not physical ones. Most of the action is narrated from the subjective point of view of the main character. When Jeannette speaks early in the novel the register is low, as when she says to the young Marquis “Montrez-moi le Roi, lui dis-je, Monsieur, en m’écriant, je ne l’ai jamais vu” (37). When people of high rank talk, on the other hand, the language is more formal. For instance the young Marquis asks “voulez-vous bien que je vous y aille voir ?” (37) or "je voudrais que vous pussiez vous imaginer ce que j’ai souffert depuis que je suis privé de cet avantage” (54). The language of Jeannette alters during the course of novel as she comes into the upper social class environment and she learns its modes of expression. For instance she asks

Je vous demande en grâce, continuai-je sur le même ton, de m’écouter, de ne point m’interrompre; et, puisqu’il est vrai que je puis compter sur votre cœur, de suivre de point en point tout ce que je vous dirai, je recevrai cette marque d’attention comme une preuve des sentiments que vous avez pour moi (116)

Jeannette’s language also alters according to her mood. When she is afraid or is angry her sentences become shorter and more direct, often stringing one question after another; “Où suis-je? Où dois-je aller? Comment échapper au sort qui me poursuit?” (70).

In La Paysanne Parvenue de Mouhy shows an interest in the lower classes, which was unusual for his time. The main character, although of humble origins, does not take advantage of the interest of upper class men in her; above all she fears them. Jeannette is human and realistic; we empathize with her feelings and learn her lessons. Jeannette has indeed to overcome many obstacles, but at last she marries the upper class man she loves. Unforeseen events, adventures, one after another, make the plot more enthralling. Suspense plays an important role in a work published in instalments. At the same time the novel is not without a didactic intention which reminds us of another figure, Richardson’s Pamela. Before analysing the translations therefore we need to take a look at the context in which they were made, that of the “Pamela Controversy” (Keymer and
Sabor, 2005, 7), a “media event” (Warner, 176) which was much more international than English critics often recognize.
CHAPTER 2: THE PAMELA CONTROVERSY

The eighteenth century is commonly perceived as a period in which mass-market book production first becomes a possibility in England (Ballaster, 35). In 1695 the legal restraints on printing were loosened and in the early eighteenth century a publishing industry grew as an urban middle-class emerged and the urban population of servants increased. London was the centre of the book trade as well as the hub of economic, political and intellectual life (Richetti, 23). The British market for print grew in the course of the century (Richetti, 6), which saw the birth of what we call “mass-media” in the sense that marketable cultural goods began to be produced for a substantial buying public (Ballaster, 36). It was in the context of this highly competitive literary marketplace that the novels I will discuss in my thesis came into print constituting important elements of the so-called ‘Pamela Controversy’ (Keymer and Sabor, 2005, 7).

The publication of Samuel Richardson’s *Pamela, or Virtue Rewarded* in 1740 altered eighteenth-century conceptions of the novel. This work became a best-seller: within a year of its appearance, it went through five editions. Moreover, it was pirated, so that real sales must have been higher than those we know of. The popularity of *Pamela* was not confined to Britain. It became known throughout most of Europe, being translated into many languages: French, Italian, Dutch, German, Swedish, Russian, Spanish and Portuguese. It was also imitated, parodied, and adapted for the theatre; both Voltaire and Goldoni wrote plays based on its plot.

*Pamela* was, however, a controversial work in content and form, and became a real “site of contestation” (Keymer and Sabor, 2005, 10). Its main character, a servant of humble social origins, is presented as virtuous young girl who overcomes many obstacles and achieves social elevation by marrying her employer, Mr B. Such lower class people had not previously been considered worthy of being the main characters of moral works, and Pamela’s social transformation was almost unthinkable in the period. Many thought society
threatened by the message it sent out, especially the message it could send to youth. A moralistic story about a servant girl who defended her sexual virtue and was rewarded by a genteel marriage, *Pamela* was interpreted as an affront to hierarchical assumptions (Keymer and Sabor, 2005, 6). Others praised Richardson for offering an example of Christian and domestic virtue in the person of Pamela herself and the redemptive power of virtue that brings Mr B to his conversion.

Modern critics see the various interpretations as inherent in the conflicted character of the text. Ian A. Bell, for instance, writes that “readers are left to impose coherence on the text by selecting from it the particular emphasis that suits their reading appetite best” (quoted in Keymer and Sabor, 2005, 14). Richardson’s contemporaries, however, simplified the issues, dividing into two parties: those who praised *Pamela* and Richardson as an original genius, the Pamelists, and those – the anti-Pamelists, who dismissed him as “an uneducated boor producing freakish works in ignorance” (Doody, 14). The novel thus became the focus of what William B. Warner has called a “media event” (Warner, 178). Thus, in little more than a year after its initial publication, nearly two-dozen pamphlets, continuations, translations and parodies appeared along with Richardson’s six editions of the text (Ingrassia, 13). The “*Pamela Controversy*” has been defined as “a clash of multiple, mutually competitive adversaries” (Keymer and Sabor, 2005, 1) between those who defended Richardson and his opponents. Among latter the best known was the dramatist and future novelist, Henry Fielding, but among both allies and rivals of Richardson were numerous journalists, artists, dramatists, novelists, professionals, pirates and hacks.

The Pamelist side took the field first. On December 13 1740, Edward Cave, the editor of the *Gentleman’s Magazine* proclaimed the success of *Pamela*. He said that “If you have not read *Pamela* you are without a curiosity, a deficiency that only the reading of *Pamela* will repair” (Warner, 178). This was a contrived promotion, for Cave was a friend of Richardson. Proclaimed by Aaron Hill as “the soul of religion” (Batten, 1), and by Knightley Chetwood as the book next to the Bible, the novel was within two months of its initial printing
recommended to be placed in the hands of children by the London clergyman, Benjamin Slocock, from his pulpit of St. Saviour's in Southwark (Ingrassia, 17). This attracted widespread attention (Keymer and Sabor, 2005, 23). According to the physician George Cheyne, Pope approved the work, charging Cheyne “to tell you (Richardson) that he had read *Pamela* with great approbation and pleasure, and wanted a night’s rest in finishing it, and says it will do more good than a great many of the new sermons” (Ingrassia, 17). Leake, proprietor of an elegant bookshop and circulating library on Terrace Walk in Bath, reported the same statement. This media event gave rise also to repetitions and simulations, some of which remain closely tied to Richardson’s original in theme or approach, while others use *Pamela* as a saleable pretext.

On the anti-Pamelist side, for example, Henry Fielding, through the persona of a fictional editor, Parson Oliver, thought that *Pamela* celebrated a “massive disruption” of the social hierarchy, and wrote that Richardson had turned politeness into “poluteness” (Keymer and Sabor, xxvi). One of the questions debated concerned Pamela’s body: was it innocent (Warner, 212)? When Rousselin writes “the virtuous, the sublime Pamela”, it was with sarcasm (Feilla, 49). While the Pamelists accepted Richardson’s heroine as genuinely virtuous, the Anti-Pamelists thought she was only pretending to be so; she was a hypocritical social climber who aimed only to get an offer of marriage from Mr B.

This view generated a number of parodies. The first, cleverest and most famous of these, Henry Fielding’s *Shamela* (1741), was to exert a strong influence on those that followed (Keymer and Sabor, xxx). As J. Paul Hunter has suggested, *Shamela* is “the best book report of 1740”; it draws “a revealing miniature of the character of his times” (quoted in Ingrassia, 23) and is more concerned with issues of literary hierarchy rather than a desire for didacticism or realism (Ingrassia, 26). Paulson suggests that *Shamela* is “a humanization of Pamela” (quoted in Ingrassia, 27); Fielding exaggerated interests that Pamela just alludes to, obliging the reader to reassess Pamela as character (quoted in Ingrassia, 27). Though Pamela resists the sexual advances of Mr B, she occasionally betrays her
attraction to him with comments on his appearance, concerns for his health or her admission “I cannot hate him” (Ingrassia, 28). By contrast, Shamela has an intense sexual appetite; though feigning virtue, she enthusiastically continues her affair with Williams, which had previously resulted in an illegitimate child (Ingrassia, 28).

*Pamela Censured*, anonymously published only three weeks after *Shamela* (Keymer and Sabor, x), lacked Fielding’s wit and has been almost forgotten. Charles Batten defined it “a much more serious attack than *Shamela*” (Keymer and Sabor, xiii), while Eaves and Kimpel see it as “earnest”, “a less frivolous attack” than Fielding’s (Keymer and Sabor, 2005, 34). *Pamela Censured* has been seen on the one hand as a moralizing attack on Pamela’s eroticism in which the writer denounces the novel’s corrupting power, on the other as an opportunistic work of pornography which lifted the veil of moral denunciation or a promotion of the novel (Keymer and Sabor, xv). One further possibility is that *Pamela Censured* was a bookseller’s contrivance for recommending the purchase of *Pamela* as a book destined “to excite Lasciviousness” (Batten, 5).

On 28 May 1741, a month after the publication of *Pamela Censured*, John Kelly’s *Pamela’s Conduct in High Life* was published without the consent or even knowledge of the author of *Pamela; or Virtue Rewarded*. The supposed editor, one “BW”, claimed that the author of *Pamela Censured* has seen more in *Pamela* than it in fact contained (Warner, 217).

Shortly afterwards this, on 16 June 1741, came Eliza Haywood’s *The Anti-Pamela; or Feign’d Innocence Detected, in a Series of Syrena's Adventures: A Narrative which has really its Foundation in Truth and Nature … Publish’d as a necessary Caution to all young Gentlemen*, anonymously published at 2s by J. Huggonson (Keymer and Sabor, xxiii). Haywood was already an experienced author with more than fifty-four publications. She had quickly recognized the marketability of a response to *Pamela* (Ingrassia, 10), producing her parody only eight months after *Pamela* and two after *Shamela*. As the title indicates, Anti-
Pamela tried to devalue Richardson’s success, but it also criticized Pamela by means of an ingenious rewriting of Haywood’s own early novels of amorous intrigue. Anti-Pamela suggests that women as well as men may ensnare and seduce and that modest femininity can be a canny performance (Warner, 218). Indeed Haywood’s protagonist, Syrena, is placed in the same situations as is Pamela, but plays an active role and not the passive one adopted by Pamela. This work also taught masters how to resist such advances (Ingrassia, 111). It was among the most substantial publications that the Pamela vogue engendered and the only one in English known to be by a woman writer. It was popular in Europe, with French and Dutch translations appearing in 1743, and a German translation in 1743-4 (Keymer and Sabor, 2005, 93). In England, by contrast, despite the All-alive and Merry serialization, an illegal half-sheet, selling for a farthing daily (Keymer and Sabor, xvii), sales of Haywood’s Anti-Pamela were sluggish (Keymer and Sabor, xxiv). Although intended to provide instruction by means of negative examples and anticipatory of other didactic texts, in a decree of 15 April 1744 Anti-Pamela (as well as Pamela itself) was placed on the Vatican’s Index Librorum Prohibitorum (Index of Prohibited Books); a decree of 22 May 1745 added the respective French translations (Keymer and Sabor, xxiv).

Charles Povey, Anti-Pamelist author of The Virgin in Eden (1741), a tale of exemplary spiritual progresses, denounced the hypocrisy, confusion and contradiction that he found in Pamela by offering an alternative narrative written to let readers decide “which of the two essays they recommend to succeeding Ages, as most worthy and useful to cultivate Virtue in the minds of youth” (Keymer and Sabor, xviii). It was not so successful until a publisher revived it as The Virgin in Eden; or, Pilgrim’s Progress (1767).

In the theatrical field there were many adaptations. Henry Giffard’s Pamela. A comedy (1741) was the most popular of the plays. It went through eighteen performances at the Goodman’s Fields Theatre, London in the 1741-2 season, and was also produced at the Smock-Alley Theatre, Dublin (Keymer and Sabor, vii). Giffard aimed not only to criticize Pamela but to exploit it for his own
commercial ends. *Pamela; or, Virtue Triumphant* (1741) was advertised by the bookseller, Samuel Lyne, as “the original Pamela”, but its author has remained clouded in obscurity. An anonymous *Mock-Pamela* (1750) was produced at Smock Alley in May and then at the Richmond Theatre, Surrey, in August, reflects the dwindling force of the *Pamela* controversy during those years (Keymer and Sabor, xix).

By this time, however, Richardson had become immensely successful on the Italian stage. Carlo Goldoni’s comedy *Pamela. A Comedy*, was first produced at Mantua in the spring of 1750 (Keymer and Sabor, vii). It was the most popular of plays. In adapting *Pamela* for the Italian stage, he made changes to both plot and characterization (Keymer and Sabor, 2005, 140). If an Italian noble married a commoner, he would lose his title, a problem Goldoni solved by making Pamela a nobleman’s daughter. Before the secret of Pamela’s birth is revealed, however, two of Goldoni’s characters attack the prejudices of their class-bound society. It became part of Goldoni’s famous season of sixteen new comedies, all produced in Venice in 1750-1 (Keymer and Sabor, xxiii). In his *Memoirs*, Goldoni describes it as the most popular of his plays to that date (Keymer and Sabor, 2005, 137). It was first published in Italian in editions by two different publishers in 1753, and reprinted on numerous occasions during Goldoni’s lifetime (Keymer and Sabor, 2005, 137). It is the most significant of the European dramatizations of *Pamela* and the one that was first translated into English. Subsequently Goldoni provided both a sequel to the comedy, *Pamela maritata* (1760), and librettos for two operatic versions with music by Piccini, *La buona figliuola* (1760) and *La buona figliuola maritata* (1761) (Keymer and Sabor, 2005, 138).

In France Richardson had enjoyed popularity but also notoriety ever since the appearance of the first translation into French of *Pamela*, that of Antoine François Prévost in 1742. In the same year there appeared an anonymous novel, *Anti-Pamela ou mémoires de M.D* (1742), ‘translated’ by Claude Villaret (1715-1766) and claiming to have been published in London (actually in Paris). The author of *Anti-Pamela* invented a heroine completely different in nature and in
destiny from Richardson’s. The following year there appeared, L’Anti-Pamela ou la fausse innocence découverte, a work claiming to be a translation by Eléazar Mauvillon of Haywood’s parody, but in fact three times longer. Thus Pamela arrived on the Continent contemporaneously with two Anti-Pamelas, and the Pamela phenomenon was from the first interconnected to “the Pamela Controversy” (Keymer and Sabor, 2005, 7). This had a deeply negative effect on the reception of Richardson’s novel, rendering Pamela in France a “figure sacrifiée, defigurée” in the novels and in the satirical comedies, and “mutilée” in the dramatic adaptations (François de Neufchâteau, 58).

In 1742, there appeared Lettre sur Pamela, a pamphlet, or better a sardonic commentary on Richardson’s novel (Keymer and Sabor, xix) which ridiculed Pamela’s determination to finish embroidering her master’s waistcoat when she should be leaving his house at all possible speed (Keymer and Sabor, 2001, xxi).

Another loose adaptation of Pamela was Voltaire’s sentimental play, Nanine, ou le préjugé vaincu (1749). Nanine was immediately popular, revived and translated into many languages, with an English translation first published in 1763. Voltaire then extended his work into a five-act play. The initial reception of Nanine at the Comédie Française in June 1749 was disappointing, and the production closed after twelve performances, but in the long term Nanine became the most popular of his comedies. Voltaire’s strategy was not to preserve the cross-class marriage but to set the play in France (Keymer and Sabor, 2005, 139). Louis de Boissy’s Pamela en France, ou la vertu mieux éprouvée opened at the Théâtre Italien on 4 March 1743 and lasted for thirteen performances. De Boissy found an ingenious way of avoiding the class-crossing marriage, making Pamela a genteel figure adapted to polite French society (Keymer and Sabor, 2005, 134). In the spring of 1750, less than a year after Nanine’s première in Paris, a French version of Goldoni’s adaptation of Pamela was staged (Keymer and Sabor, 2005, 137).
In the summer of 1793 *Pamela* become the centre of an affair of State: when dramatic adaptation by the statesman and poet Nicolas-Louis François de Neufchâteau, *Paméla ou la vertu récompensée* (1788/93), took the stage at the Comédie Française. Despite its success, it was attacked for its ending; indeed as in Goldoni Pamela was made the daughter of a count, rendering this play a work “filled with ancient prejudices” which did not support the “moral aim” of the Revolution in that it is birth and not virtue that is rewarded in the end (Feilla, 286). Thus the cast was jailed by Robespierre’s Committee for Public Safety for “lack of civic virtue” and “insulting the patriots of the Republic” (Feilla, 286). This charge was made by a spectator in the theatre the night of the première, a soldier named Jullien de Carentan who read in the monologue of the play on the virtues of religious tolerance a veiled plea for political moderatism (Feilla, 286). The Committee ordered the author to cut several passages, especially those in the third and fourth acts about Pamela’s aristocratic birth. Three weeks later de Neufchâteau read a 55-page apology to the National Convention in which he defended himself against the claims of “incivisme” (Feilla, 286). He also identified himself in the role of his main character, the “persecuted innocent”, defending the purity of his heart and the virtue of his play and claiming that it was “a play of which I can say: mothers will recommend its reading to their daughters” (Feilla, 286). Nevertheless he and his actors were imprisoned for eleven months.
CHAPTER 3: ELIZA HAYWOOD

3.1 Life and Career

Controversial writer and translator of the eighteenth-century, Eliza Haywood spent a life as controversial as her career. About her life we know little because she made a promise to all her friends and intimate before her death to say nothing about her life. She may have been born in London between 1689 and 1693, daughter of a small shopkeeper named Fowler and brought up in the middle-class environment. Even her origins are uncertain; Christine Blouch has suggested that she may have been a Fowler of Harnage Grange in Shropshire because in a manuscript she claimed to be “nearly related to Sir Richard of the Grange” (Beasley, x), and a daughter of these Fowlers, Sir Richard’s sister Elizabeth, was christened at the family parish church in Shropshire on 12 January 1692-3 (Beasley, x). Her middle-class origins and her belonging to a baronet’s family would have allowed her to get access to a more liberal education, as she claimed in The Female Spectator, where she said she had had an education “more liberal than is ordinary allowed to persons of my sex” (Blouch, 537). She was certainly a learned woman who knew the classics, although not in their original language; in her works she reveals a deep knowledge of ancient and modern history, of English and continental literature, and of the theatrical tradition.

According to the Register of St Mary Aldermary she married on 3 December 1711, but a recent edition of Blouch moves her marriage to 1706, a clergyman named Valentine Haywood, who was about fifteen years older than her (Whicher, 4). About their marriage we know little, and less about their break up; she may have become a widow in 1721. She labelled her marriage as “unfortunate” (Backscheider, xiv) and the cause that forced her to live by her pen; as she wrote in 1728 to a potential subscriber, “an unfortunate marriage that reduced her to the melancholy necessity of depending on my pen for the support of myself and two children, the eldest of whom is no more than seven years of age” (Saxton and Bocchicchio, 6). She added also that “by the sudden deaths of both a father, and a husband, at an age when I was little prepared to stem the tide
of ill fortune” (Richetti, vii). Nevertheless she was clever and sophisticated. Steele defined her a “lively and unconventional matron of seventeen or eighteen years old” (Whicher, 3) and her independence of mind may have been the cause of her break with her husband, an “arbitrary and orthodox” clergyman (Whicher, 4). Indeed in her works Haywood talks very much about the martial unhappiness and her enemies made many suppositions about it. She faced the world and all the prejudices by spending a life outside marriage and opting to make her living by a stage career, although it was infamous for that time. In Dublin 1715 she made her debut on the stage as Eliza Haywood in the leading role of Chloe in Timon of Athens; or, the Man-Hater. From 1714 to 1717 she continued to work with the Theatre Royal Company at the Smock Alley Theatre, where she was exposed to the judgements of the audience and to the limitation of her talent (Ingrassia, 81). In pursuing her career as actress she went against her family (Pettit, Croskery & Patchias, 11). We know that in 1717 she moved to London in order to bolster her fortunes on the stage (Pettit, Croskery & Patchias, 11). We do not know if she had any connections in London theatres, but if she had had any, after breaking with her husband she did not have them anymore. For the following two years she supported herself by touring the provinces in local theatre companies (Blouch, 9), then became a regular performer in plays at Lincoln’s Inn Fields.

Eliza Haywood’s early stage career was not successful and she turned briefly to writing plays. One of the most famous producers of the time, John Rich, asked Haywood to rewrite a script by Captain Robert Hurst. The result was her first play, titled The Fair Captive (1721), of which Haywood complained that it lacked the “embellishments of poetry, which the little improvements my sex receives from education, allowed me not the power to adorn it with” (Ingrassia, 85). It was performed three times at Lincoln's Inn Fields and soon after it was set in print.

Haywood also appeared in A Wife to be Lett: A Comedy (1723), performed at Drury Lane in 1723, which was partly successful only because of the curiosity of the public who wanted to see the author (Rudolph, xiii) “who by reason of the
indisposition of an actress performed in person the part of the wife, Mrs. Graspall” (Whicher, 7). The plot was too complex, as a consequence the reader’s attention was taxed. Much later, in 1781 and again in 1792, it was revived at the Haymarket Theatre, and in 1802 Ann Minton published a two-act adaptation *The Comedy of a Wife to be Lett, or, the Miser Cured, compressed into Two Acts* (1802). If neither *The Fair Captive* nor *A Wife to be Lett: A Comedy* (1723) succeeded, nor did her third play, *Frederick, Duke of Brunswick-Lunenburgh* (1729). It was acted only three times at Lincoln’s Inn Fields, on 4, 6 and 8 March 1729, and was never revived. It was however set in print with a dedication to Frederick Lewis, Prince of Wales constituting a “bid for royal patronage” (Whicher, 8). Haywood was neither a prolific dramatist nor a popular one. The common point of all these plays, with the exception of *A Wife to be Lett: A Comedy*, was that they had a political edge (Rudolph, xxii). Indeed they criticized the ministry of Sir Robert Walpole and contributed to the controversial political climate that generated much of the better dramatic satire of the 1730s, especially at the Haymarket (Rudolph, xxiii). Haywood soon became part of the Haymarket theatre circle, which became a hotbed of Walpole opposition in 1737 (Backscheider, XXV).

Haywood also wrote many short tales of passion in which she experimented both in the form of letter and essay, writing with extraordinary rapidity (Whicher, 13). In one year, 1724, she published no fewer than ten original romances. In 1720 Chetwood brought out Haywood’s first novel *Love in Excess: or, the Fatal Enquiry;* the first three parts "mett a Better Reception then they Deservd" (Ingrassia, 80) and the whole, the work was successful enough to run through six separate editions before its inclusion in her "Secret Histories, Novels and Poems" in 1725 (Whicher, 11). Haywood is much appreciated for the skill with which she displays the operations of passion dominating a young and innocent heart (Whicher, 42). She makes an accurate choice of words, of details and of expressions. We can see it in *The City Jilt* where she uses metaphors and commonplaces, for instance “heaven of pleasure”, and a specific language of love “ardour” “languishment” (Haywood, 85). She plays also on the punctuation and
its effect on readers. For instance her use of dashes expresses immediate emotions, as does her fragmentary language. Indeed she often uses exclamations, for instance “how barbarous has been your usage of me”, “no more to be retrieved” and “tormenting thought!” (Haywood, 91). Although as a woman she was excluded from "Learning's base Monopoly" (Whicher, 15), she had an intuitive knowledge of passions and she had the power to "command the throbbing Breast and watry Eye" (Whicher, 14). She told their stories in a clear and lively way and she could describe the ecstasies and agonies of passion in a natural and convincing way (Whicher, 14). Her novels often concluded with dramatic dénouements, for instance involving the chief characters in a trial for their lives (Whicher, 59). The Force of Nature: or, the Lucky Disappointment (1725) ends with a just-prevented catastrophe, while The Injur'd Husband: or, the Mistaken Resentment (1723) is crowded with crimes. French models supplied Haywood with romantic plots, situations and characters that she used to construct images of exalted virtue and tremendous vice (Whicher, 26). Some of her novels were simply structured while others included little stories which were only loosely connected to the main plot (Whicher, 24). Haywood preferred the novel of intrigue and passion in which the characters run through a maze of amatory adventures (Whicher, 60). One of her novels was entitled The Agreeable Caledonian: or, Memoirs of Signiora di Morella, a Roman Lady, Who made her Escape from a Monastery at Viterbo, for the Love of a Scots Nobleman. Intermixed with many other Entertaining little Histories and Adventures which presented themselves to her in the Course of her Travels. Other brief, direct tales include The Fruitless Enquiry. Being a Collection of several Entertaining Histories and Occurrences, which Fell under the Observation of a Lady in her Search after Happiness (1727). There were also letters of love in which jealousy explodes at the slightest provocation (Whicher, 24). Haywood used letters in order to add emotional intensity to the plot. The plays, translations and thirty-eight original works she wrote between 1720 and 1730 found a ready sale.

This may have caused Haywood to come to the notice of Alexander Pope. The Dunciad (1728) was composed in order to attack those writers of "abusive
falsehoods and scurrilities" (Whicher, 99) who "had aspersed almost all the great characters of the age; and this with impunity, their own persons and names being utterly secret and obscure" (Whicher, 99). Pope aimed to “detect and to drag into light these common enemies of mankind” (Whicher, 99), attacking the “licentiousness” of scribblers who in libellous memoirs and novels reveal the faults and misfortunes of both sexes, to the ruin of public fame, or disturbance of private happiness (Saxton and Bocchicchio, 230). Pope showed particular contempt for Haywood, who was reputed to be the author of a scandalous fiction attacking court ladies, among them Pope’s friend Mrs Howard. Haywood appears as a mother (Saxton and Bocchicchio, 150) of two illegitimate children with “two babes of love close clinging to her waste” (Saxton and Bocchicchio, 229). Her promiscuous scribbling (the reference is to her two scandal fictions of the 1720s) is equated with her pursuit of sexual liaisons outside of the formal legitimating structures of marriage which guarantee lineage (Saxton and Bocchicchio, 150). Pope condemns Haywood’s “profligate licentiousness” and “scandalous books” defining her as one of those “shameless scribblers” (Saxton and Bocchicchio, 7).

*The Dunciad* seems to have seriously damaged Haywood’s literary reputation (Whicher, 17), which may partly explain her turning to other genres. French biographies gave her new materials; fifteen or sixteen French biographies of Mary Queen of Scots, for instance, provided Haywood with material for a work of two hundred and forty pages entitled *Mary Stuart, Queen of Scots: Being the Secret History of her Life, and the Real Causes of all Her Misfortunes. Containing a Relation of many particular Transactions in her Reign; never yet Published in any Collection* (1725). To her source Haywood added many episodes of burning passion. This work is significant because it tried to incorporate imaginative love scenes with historical facts (Whicher, 83). A French source is also claimed for *The Life of Madam De Villesache. Written by a Lady, who was an Eye-witness of the greatest part of her Adventures, and faithfully Translated from her French Manuscript. By Mrs. Eliza Haywood* (1727). The original of this story, however, never came to light so we can assume that the French manuscript was a fabrication on the part of the author (Whicher, 46).
In the 1730s Haywood came back to stage, perhaps as a result of meeting Henry Fielding. Haywood became a member of the Little Haymarket company and acted in many of Fielding’s productions. While creating a new role of herself as actress and dramatist she retained associations with her previous literary experience (Ingrassia, 106). Indeed, suggests John Elwood, Haywood made “use of her reputation as a writer to interest the public in her stage appearances” (Ingrassia, 106). While trying to reinvent herself she at the same time depended upon the person she was before. In many of her parts she played those passionate characters that she had represented in her novels. From 1729 to 1737 she acted in at least six plays. At the Little Theatre in the Haymarket, best known as the theatrical centre of Fielding’s anti-Walpole dramatic satires, she played in April 1730 in The Rival Father, or the Death of Achilles written by her lover friend, actor and playwright William Hatchett, which lasted for only two nights. Despite this failure, three years later she achieved success with Hatchett in The Opera of Operas” (1733). An adaptation of Fielding’s Tragedy of Tragedies, or the Life and Death of Tom Thumb the Great made by Haywood, William Hatchett and composer Thomas A. Arne, it was close to the original, though omissions and condensations (Whicher, 9) softened Fielding’s satire, and thirty-three songs were added. The Opera of Operas opened in 1733 and ran for eleven performances; there followed the publication of the text, which shows how successful was the work. This play also received royal support, and was performed later at Drury Lane.

This was to be Haywood’s last play. In 1736, thanks to Fielding, manager of the theatre, she appeared at the Little Haymarket as Mrs Arden in George Lillo’s tragedy, Arden of Feversham. In the cast list she was named as “Mrs Eliza Haywood, the author” (Oakleaf, 9). A few months later, at a benefit night staged for her, she was on the same stage in both Fielding’s The Historical Register For The Year 1736, where she played Mrs Screen, and the afterpiece Eurydice Hisd, where she played the muse (Beasley, xxi). These were her last performances as actress and Fielding’s last production as theatre manager. Indeed on the preceding Friday Walpole had presented to the House of Commons a Licensing Act (1737)
which imposed governmental control on a political stage (Blouch, 11) by giving the Lord Chamberlain the right of approval over any new dramas, a measure intended to silence Fielding among other dramatists, and that closed the London theatres. This brought to an end both Haywood’s stage career and her theatrical writing.

Eliza Haywood was now about forty-four years old, a single mother with two children to support. In order to be published Haywood began to turn towards subjects which conformed more closely to the changing moral climate of the time, a change made more evident by the huge success of Richardson’s Pamela. By the 1740s the heated style of Haywood’s first works and their overt sexuality were no longer tolerable. Trying to move towards new fields, she wrote letters, essays and conduct books, all anonymously, though their authorship was probably known to the curious (Whicher, 125). The Virtuous Villager (1742), her translation of the Chevalier de Mouhy’s La Paysanne Parvenue, was part of this move to renew her literary career, as had been her parody Anti-Pamela, or Feign’d Innocence detected (1741). Basing on the texts I have read I can suppose that Haywood was against Richardson because in all of them she portrays vicious women or women that have a penchant for vice, although they are apparently virtuous. Moreover she exploited the Pamela Controversy in order to earn money. More ambitious and successful was a new novel published in 1744, The Fortunate Foundlings. This double story with two heroes obliged her to repeatedly interrupt one narration in order to go on with the other one.

But Haywood’s real works of maturity were letters or periodical essays such as Epistles for the Ladies (1749) and The Female Spectator. In The Female Spectator the portrait of the writer showed the essayist as conscious of the faults of her youth and wanting to capitalize on them (Whicher, 18):

I shall also acknowledge that I have run through as many Scenes of Vanity and Folly as the greatest Coquet of them all.—Dress, Equipage, and Flattery were the Idols of my Heart…..My Life, for some Years, was a continued Round of what I then called Pleasure, and my whole Time
engross’d by a Hurry of promiscuous Diversions  
(Haywood, 8)

*The Female Spectator* began in April 1744 and continued in monthly instalments till May 1746. Haywood’s technique consisted in relating anecdotes which were examples of life. Encouraged by its success Haywood attempted to combine the periodical essay moralizing on life and manners with the newsletter (Whicher, 120). But this experiment failed: *The Parrot, with a Compendium of the Times* ran only from 2 August to 4 October 1746.

In the early 1740s Haywood is believed to have run her own bookshop in the area of Covent Garden, The Sign of Fame. This was an attempt to control the means of her own production and to make a profit (Keymer and Sabor, 2005, 93), but lasted no more than few months. She did however make profits by writing a series of manuals or conduct books on social behaviour. *A Present for a Servant-Maid Or, the Sure Means of Gaining Love and Esteem*, appeared in 1743, was reprinted several times in London and Dublin during 1743-4 and in a revised edition as late as 1772. The *Monthly Review* defined it a "well-designed and valuable tract" (Whicher, 120). It is “a compendium of instructions for possible Pamela” (Whicher, 120) which taught maidens the domestic works and how to preserve their virtue, but also the rules for correct behaviour.

Haywood also wrote conduct books of other sorts and which have been read as manifesting her desire to do penance for the amorous intrigues of her earlier works. One, *The Wife, by Mira, One of the Authors of the Female Spectator, and Epistles for Ladies* (1756), was written to promote the happiness of the mistress of the family (Whicher, 123). It contained pieces of advice to married women on how to behave towards their husbands in every situation, even in cases of separation from the husband (Whicher, 123). It aimed to analyse the bad moments of married life. In the same year another conduct book, *The Husband, in Answer to the Wife* (1756), instructed a married man how to behave towards the maidens of his family. In the *Biographia Dramatica* (1764) Haywood was described as "in mature age, remarkable for the most rigid and scrupulous
decorum, delicacy, and prudence, both with respect to her conduct and conversation" and given the title of —"the most voluminous female writer this kingdom ever produced" (Whicher, 12-13).

Other late novels include *The History of Jemmy and Jenny Jessamy* (1753) and *The Invisible Spy* (1755), but her most ambitious was *The History of Miss Betsy Thoughtless* (1751) (Whicher, 18). The last contains the best developed of her characters, the most extensive plot, and most nearly realistic setting (Whicher, 142). As Austin Dobson has pointed out, it is remarkable for its many allusions to actual places and people (Whicher, 131). This novel has a spirit which is completely different from her earlier and briefer romances (Whicher, 132). If Haywood appears wiser so do her characters, now too sophisticated to be moved by the style of love-making that had warmed the hearts of her first characters (Whicher, 132).

Haywood continued to publish until the end. She died on 25 February 1756 “after an illness of three months” with two novels ready for the press (Rudolph, xxi). Her importance as writer of novels is now recognized, but not her role of translator, which has been largely ignored.

### 3.2 Haywood as translator

Many women translators were writing and publishing in eighteenth century England. Most of them focused on contemporary French authors, especially French fiction, which was attractive to an Anglophone reading public for its tales of heroism and amorous intrigue (Gillespie and Hopkins, 328). Some wrote only for the amusement of their circle, but many for financial motives, translating offering a convenient way to add their incomes, though they were not well rewarded. At the same time they could expand their knowledge of literary possibilities such as plot structures, presentation of characters and prose style, for translators were first of all writers. Most of the best-known women translators
spent some or all of their lives in London, and played an active role in the capital’s literary world (Gillespie and Hopkins, 111).

A knowledge of French was one of the few skills that eighteenth-century English girls were encouraged to acquire in the little education they were given. Haywood’s knowledge was fluent (Ballaster, 41). Like Aphra Behn, she contributed to the flood of translations from the French on the market (Ballaster, 41), especially after her early theatrical period: “the stage not answering my expectation, and the averseness of my relations to it, has made me turn my genius another way” (Richetti, viii). From a 1720 letter we learn that “the aspiring authoress never found in dramatic writing a medium suitable to her genius and even less was she attracted by a stage career” (Whicher, 9). She saw that print had a better reception, thus she “have now Ventur'd on a Translation to be done by Subscription” (Whicher, 10). Eliza Haywood became one of the most prolific and influential translators of prose fiction of her time. She published no few than eleven translations of French novels, most of them done in the early stage of her career when she was also writing much of her popular amatory fiction (McMurran, 83).

The translations Haywood published in 1720s and 1730s were mostly of French sources that dated from the later years of the seventeenth century (McMurran, 76). Her translations of French novels lay between translation and adaptation, deviating significantly in some passages, but rendering faithfully in others, usually retaining much of the overall shape of the original (McMurran, 83). In 1726 she translated La Belle Assemblée by Mme Madeleine Poisson de Gomez, a combination of romantic tales and anecdotes (Gillespie and Hopkins, 112) about the society of the first quality of France. Generally her translations of Gomez followed the original with exactness (McMurran, 83), but her other French translations were much freer focalizing on passions by means of the technique of amplification. Unlike others, Haywood emphasized her presence as female mediator over the original author (McMurran, 88).
Haywood’s first translation was Edmé Boursault’s *Treize Lettres d’une Dame à un Cavalier* (1699), *Letters from a Lady of Quality to a Chevalier* (1720) (Whicher, 8). It was her only text sold by subscription during the nearly forty years of her career (Ingrassia, 80), appearing ten months after the final part of *Love in Excess*, in 1720. One of the imitations of *Les Lettres Portugaises*, it was published in 1720 by William Rufus Chetwood. It emphasized the teaching of *Les Lettres Portugaises* and bore traces of Haywood’s familiarity with the theatre (Whicher, 17). In the preface Haywood wrote that people of “unquestionable judgment...encouraged her to undertake the translation of the following sheets” (quoted in Wilputte, 55). Hill was one of the 309 subscribers (Muse, 23) and, as Spedding notes, this “may be some reflection of his importance” to Haywood at this time (quoted in Wilputte, 55). This translation might be called a paraphrase rather than a translation (Gillespie and Hopkins, 344). Indeed Haywood wrote that it was necessary to take liberty “in many places, of adding, and in other of diminishing (where I thought so doing would render the whole more entertaining)” (quoted in McMurrnan, 83). By the mid-eighteenth century, these strategies aimed to develop the feelings in order to arise readers’ interest and make a text more entertaining.

Many translations of Haywood helped spread knowledge of French novels. For instance her translation of *La Belle Assemblée* by Mme de Gomez allowed de Gomez to win popularity. Clara Reeve thought that Haywood’s version was “a very unexceptionable and entertaining work” and she declared that it was very popular, indeed her most popular one (Bloom, 50). In 1727 Haywood translated a collection of novels published under the title *Love in its Variety*, advertised as “Written in Spanish by Signor Michel Bandello; made English by Mrs. Eliza Haywood”, a translation probably made from a French version of the work by Bandello (Whicher, 155). She also made another translation, *The Life of Madame De Villesache written by a Lady; who was an Eye-witness of the greatest part of her Adventures, and faithfully translated from the French Manuscript* (1727) in which she presented herself as the mediator of a female character (McMurran, 89). She translated also *L’Illustre Parisienne, Histoire Galante et Veritable*
(1733), *The Disguis'd Prince: or, the Beautiful Parisian* (1728), which she reduced so much that it was published in only two volumes as opposed to the original four. In 1741 she published another translation, *The Busy-Body; or Successful Spy*, and in 1742 *The Sofa: A Moral Tale*, a collaboration with her lover William Hatchett.
CHAPTER 4: TRANSLATING LA PAYSANNE PARVENUE

4.1 The “Cross-Channel Core”

In the eighteenth-century Europe we can see a constant literary exchange between two countries: France and England. This zone has been baptised the “cross-Channel core” (McMurran, 35). Raleigh makes the connection between English novels and Continental ones (quoted in McMurran, 35). Works were translated and spread from one country to another one, so that the English novel developed not in isolation but it was interspersed with “non English counterparts”, resulting in real transcultural adaptations (McMurran, 35).

In the eighteenth century “to translate”, according to Samuel Johnson’s Dictionary, meant “to transport; to remove” (McMurran, 44). The majority of novels were translated not from the manuscripts but from published books available on the international market (McMurran, 44). In this period translators worked independently, taking much of the financial risk of a publication (McMurran, 44). The Grub Street translator is delineated as one whose work was done hastily and therefore poorly, and that s(he) worked only for a low wage (McMurran, 56). There were also kinds of translators who worked at their leisure in order to improve their language skills and to enrich their imaginations. Among them was Robert Loveday who, being asked why it is worth to translate a French book, said “I shall make it serve to beguile Melancholy, check idleness, and better my knowledge in the language” (McMurran, 57). Translators could work under contract to booksellers and the sums paid were one pound, eleven shillings per sheet (McMurran, 59).

In the eighteenth century a translation, according to Lawrence Venuti, an American translation theorist, “acknowledged a translation to be an independent work” (quoted in McMurran, 68). Indeed the work of translator was not different from that of an author in that the product was original and, as a consequence, the translator was an original author. Eighteenth-century translators often mocked
literal translation as “pedantic” (McMurran, 73) but opinions differed. Indeed, some translators followed their sources faithfully while others made many omissions and amplifications. On the one hand, translators from both English and French abbreviated or omitted in order to concentrate feelings and make scenes lively (McMurran, 79). French translators in particular reduced repetitions of the same thoughts by omitting passages or “de les deguiser par le changement des termes” (McMurran, 79). Many English translators believed that French originals needs reduction. For instance they took out subordinate clauses, omitted descriptions, reduced the events in the plot (McMurran, 79). On the other hand, translators amplified their source texts. The rhetorical figure amplificatio includes any sort of expansion of the original within or even at the borders of the text (McMurran, 76). By lengthening certain passages and adding material not found in the source text, for instance new chapters or sections, they tried to capture the readers’ attention. Indeed amplification was seen as a means of intensifying rather than merely expanding the original (McMurran, 77). Haywood also used these practices.

Prose fiction translation was a vigorous business in the eighteenth-century cross-Channel zone (McMurran, 70). The number of translations was high, indeed in the early decades in Britain as 30 to 35 percent of the market were translations, mostly from French prose fiction (McMurran, 46). This percentage levelled off near the middle of the century, dropping to 15 to 20 percent in the second half of the century (McMurran, 46). Moreover, some French novelists were the most popular novelists in Britain in the middle of the century (McMurran, 46). In France translations from English for the entire eighteenth century represented 10 percent of the French market. In the first half of the century there were more or less thirty translations of English novels; in the second half translations accounted for 15 percent of the market (McMurran, 46). As a result, if in England there was an abundance of translations from French before the middle of the century, in France they were in short supply because French production was high and English novels were rare and often imitative of French ones (McMurran, 46). When more English novels were written, the French began translating them (McMurran, 46).
The French novel thus dominated the novel market in the “cross-Channel zone” until the rise of the English novel in the middle of the century (McMurran, 46). Then France and England exchanged literary material through the translation market. But, in that period, bibliographer James Raven points out, it was difficult to verify if a translation was really a translation: “bogus translations..are at least as numerous as the genuine translations” (quoted in McMurran, 47). A title page could be misleading and the author’s name was often not given. But if fake translations lay in bookshelves, many unrecognized translations also can lay there. Indeed if a novel is not labelled as a translation, we assume it is an original work when it might be an unacknowledged or loose translation, or a partial translation of a foreign source (McMurran, 47). Moreover many French novels printed in London were none other than English novels in French translation; an example is the Mémoires et avantures de Madlle Moll Flanders (1761). Many novels were also not written in the author’s first language (McMurran, 48).

If so many novels were translated into English from French versions it was because many Anglophones could read and therefore translate French, and because the French book trade was more favourably situated to provide access to their books (McMurran, 49). But as A. G. Cross explains, many English novels were translated also into other languages, such as Russian. Defoe, Swift, Fielding, Richardson, Sterne became known through Russian translations from French translations (McMurran, 50). Access to foreign-language books in the eighteenth century was not rare, especially in urban markets (McMurran, 51). Translation tended to be concentrated in metropolitan areas such as London and Amsterdam because there were in such cities a higher concentration of foreign-language speakers and it was easier to get foreign publications (McMurran, 49). French imports to British territories were continuous throughout the eighteenth century (McMurran, 52). Readers had access to the foreign-language books not only directly from booksellers, but also by frequenting circulating libraries such as those of Samuel Fancourt, William Bathoe, John Noble, Bell and, Hookham (McMurran, 52).
Is it possible that Richardson took inspiration from de Mouhy’s *La Paysanne Parvenue*? Indeed we have the same kind of character, a virtuous girl who has to face many vicissitudes but preserves her virtue and is rewarded for it. Richardson did not know French, and when he started writing *Pamela* in 1737 the first translation of this work, *The Fortunate Country Maid*, had not been published. He could nevertheless have read and taken inspiration from de Mouhy’s sources: Marivaux’s *Le Paysan Parvenu* and from his *Marianne*. In 1735 a translation of *Le Paysan Parvenu* was done *Le Paysan Parvenu; or, The Fortunate Peasant. Being Memoirs of the Life of Mr.----. Translated from the French of M. de Marivaux*. Marianne in particular aroused interest and was quickly and several times translated into English (as well as into German, Dutch and Italian; Chaplin, 924). An anonymous writer translated the first four parts of this work under the title, *The Life of Marianne; or, the Adventures of the Countess of --- By M. de Marivaux. Translated from the French Original*, the first three parts appeared in 1736 and the fourth in 1737. The French literary critic, Frédéric Deloffre, described it in his Classiques Garnier edition (1959) “a very literal translation” (Chaplin, 924). According to Hughes, however, the version Richardson read was that entitled *The Life of Marianne with the continuation of MmeRiccoboni*, which appeared in three volumes in 1736 (Hughes, 109). Of this translation he could have only read the first six parts, which appeared by January 1737, before he started writing *Pamela* (Hughes, 109). In these same years it seems that yet another, less literal, translation appeared under the title *The Virtuous Orphan; or, The Life of Marianne*. As a consequence, Richardson had more than one translation from which to draw inspiration.

In England translation was seen by some as a corrupting influence and translations from French in particular seen as a symptom of national degradation (Brewer, 102). A common fear in England was that luxury and refinement were weakening the morals of the nation (Brewer, 82). Samuel Foote, in one of his popular anti-French plays of the 1750s, expressed a common fear:

> whilst you retain your ancient roughness, they have recourse to these minions, who would first, by unmanly means, sap and soften all your native spirit, and then deliver you an easy prey to their employers (Brewer, 82)
Some Englishmen feared a real invasion of a country weakened by French refinement, culture and civilization. In particular it was thought that “effeminacy sapped the patriotism and public-spiritedness that protected the rights of Englishmen” (Brewer, 83). Moreover aristocrats were thought to have a penchant for all things French. For most of the century they had to read and speak French and have a knowledge of French literature. French painting and the literature shaped British criticism and aesthetics, French writers in particular had a great success, both in their language and in translation and these writers influenced British ones (Brewer, 78). Despite the efforts made to suppress or deny the French influence, it was useless: cosmopolitanism, which was felt by Britain like a foreign invasion, did not help these endeavours.

In the preface to his Dictionary, Samuel Johnson aired the view that “translations from French not only were a bad habit, but contaminated the English language” (McMurran, 102). The scholar Gerald Newman confirms further that mid-eighteenth-century foreign influences, primarily French, were likely to be described as contaminating and corrupting (quoted in McMurran, 103). French novels in particular were perceived as a threat to the English, leading to widespread paranoia (McMurran, 103). Newman explains the consequences of the English obsession “to be truly English was to live up to a stereotype generated in anti-Frenchness” (quoted in McMurran, 103). Frances Acomb explained decades ago that French nationalism of the revolutionary era was “a reaction against admiration of English institutions and English ideas, against English imperialism, and against the national character of Englishmen” (quoted in McMurran, 103). Nevertheless the historian Robin Eagles notes the production of seventy-one plays on London stages in the second half of the eighteenth century which were translated or imitated from French, or had French subject matter (McMurran, 104). In France angloomania spread in the mid-century in novels and stories that pretended to be from, by or about the English.
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4.2 THE FORTUNATE COUNTRY MAID

The Fortunate Country Maid. Being the Entertaining Memoirs of the Present Celebrated Marchioness of L-V:- who from a cottage, through a great variety of diverting adventures, became a Lady of the first quality in the Court of France (1740) is the first translation of de Mouhy’s La Paysanne Parvenue, made by an anonymous writer. It plays an important role in the Pamela Controversy because the contents are moralistic and they turn around the concept of virtue. Published in London in 1740 by F. Needham, it was followed by other London editions: in 1782 and in the following year, 1783, editions by Harrison & Co, in 1789 by that of J.F. and C. Rivington, and in 1792 by another by Harrison & Co. It is on the whole a faithful translation as to content and in language, except for some additions. Stylistically the translator made some slight changes, making the text more explicit (Herman and Pelckmans, 101).

The title, we can notice, is different from the original. Indeed the English title emphasizes the concept of fortune, “fortunate” in the sense of encouraged by the fate. Then it underlines the heroine’s original social condition, her belonging to the countryside, and her maiden status “maid”. The original title on the other hand emphasizes the heroine’s social rise from that of a peasant, a “paysanne”, to that of “parvenue”, a term which could be interpreted as pejorative. We can also notice that the English title page underlines that this is a real story “memoirs”, which is printed in large typeface. It also underlines the obstacles she had to overcome, the “diverting adventures”, in particular the “artifices employed by men of intrigue” and her achievement in “a Lady of the first quality in the Court of France” because she adhered to the principles of “virtue and honour”. The English title page also underlines that the work contains reflections, as a consequence it could be read also as a conduct-book, an instruction book for women. The epigraph “example draws, where precept fails; and sermons are less read than tales” reiterates the notion that a story is more effective than theoretical precepts. Indeed before the dedication we find a statement from M. Huet, bishop of Auranches, which underlines that it is an instructive and not dangerous work:
it is far from being dangerous, that it is in some sort necessary for young persons to be acquainted with the passion of love, that they may be able to shut their ears against it when it is criminal, and know how to conduct themselves in it when innocent and honourable (de Mouhy, 2).

The translator dedicated the book to Mrs Felton Harvey but also s(he) translated literally de Mouhy’s original dedication. The preface, which is translated quite literally, also emphasizes that this work is “of service for the instruction of my own sex (Madame la Marquise de L.V.’s)” (de Mouhy, 3), as its supposed author aimed “to instruct her own sex, to place virtue in its proper light, and to engage those who write, not to deprive their works of so beautiful an ornament” (de Mouhy, 4). The preface claims that the Marchioness de LV. trusted in the reputation of de Mouhy in order to publish her memoir (Herman and Pelckmans, 49), for de Mouhy had worked for the Marchioness de L.V, helping her to put her work together: “je me mis dès le meme soir à travailler à son ouvrage” (de Mouhy, 34). Moreover he had worked also on other memoirs, thus it was some sort of advertising space (Herman and Pelckmans, 50).

The parts of The Fortunate Country Maid are twelve, as in La Paysanne Parvenue, and the division of parts is almost identical. Nevertheless they end before the original version and the remaining content is moved in the following part. Indeed in Part VII the translator anticipates the disappearance of Jeannette’s letters and the departure of the young Marquis, which in the original version are at the beginning of Part VIII. In Part IX both works finish in the same way, but the translator adds a story, that of Mademoiselle d’Elbieux.

This is not the only addition. In Part VII The Fortunate Country Maid adds the story of the young Marquis. In Paris, after having supped, Jeannette was advised by Saint-Fal to read many books. Among the titles of books listed the translator adds those of Le Paysan Parvenu and La Belle Assemblée by Eliza Haywood, and among the writers s(he) adds Messieurs de Crebillon and de Marivaux. At the end of Part IX the anonymous translator, as already mentioned,
adds the story of Madamoiselle D’Elbieux, and comes back to this in part XI. At the beginning of the following part, the Part XII, s(he) adds the story of Saint-Agnès. S(he) also adds the secondary stories of Monsieur de G and Julia.

In other respects, The Fortunate Country Maid preserves de Mouhy’s plot, characters and setting. It is faithful to the original version in structure, division of parts and the translator does not make losses in translation. Now we move to the second translation of de Mouhy’s work, at the height of the Pamela Controversy, Eliza Haywood’s The Virtuous Villager.
THE VIRTUOUS VILLAGER,
OR
VIRGIN'S VICTORY:
BEING
The MEMOIRS of a very GREAT LADY at the Court of France.

Written by Herself.

In which the Artifices of designing Men are fully detected and exposed; and the Calamities they bring on credulous believing Woman, are particularly related.

Translated from the Original, by the Author of
La Belle Assemblée.

In TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. I.

In vain are musty Morals taught in Schools,
By rigid Teachers, and as rigid Rules,
Where Virtue with a frowning Aspect stands,
And frights the Pupil from her rough Commands.
But charming Woman can true Convert's make,
We love the Precept for the Teacher's sake;
Virtue in them appears so bright, so gay,
We bear with Transport, and with Pride obey.

LONDON;
Printed for Francis Cogan, at the Middle-Temple-Gates.

MDCXLII.
4.3 The Virtuous Villager

Despite the fact that a translation already existed, Haywood decided to risk and she made another one. *The Virtuous Villager* renewed Eliza Haywood’s literary career. The earliest and the only translation to bear her signature, this work inculcates the principles of virtue, influenced by the previously successful *Pamela* (Whicher, 71). The artifices of men are detected and exposed; and the calamities they bring on credulous believed women are particularly related (Dow, 66). Haywood’s adaptation, *The Virtuous Villager*, tried to distinguishing itself from *The Fortunate Country Maid* and sought to distance itself from *Pamela*. Indeed its title page refers to the “calamities” (Dow, 66) suffered by “credulous believing woman” (Dow, 66) and its heroine depicts her own account as “a kind of mirror, wherein my sex might view themselves, and perceive by what swift degree errors, if not timely repelled, gain entrance into the heart” (Keymer and Sabor, 2005, 94). Haywood implies that Richardson’s heroine is among the ranks of credulous women, unaware, like her author, of her own frailty (Keymer and Sabor, 2005, 94).

The source of *The Virtuous Villager* was written long time before. Indeed in the preface Haywood talks about the existence of a mysterious manuscript written by “the Marchioness de L.V.” (Dow, 57) which is the starting point of her translation. In the eighteenth century the ‘lost manuscript’ source was often used as a strategy in order to make the text more appealing to readers. Moreover she takes advantage of the success of the first translation, *The Fortunate Country Maid*, and its moralistic contents which gave her a guaranteed success.

As for de Mouhy’s *La Paysanne Parvenue*, Haywood’s preface denigrates it as implausible and full of omissions due to the fact that during the editing process, he lost pieces of the story, whole events and entire letters. The Marchioness was not in Paris at the time, so in order to make up the gaps, Haywood claims, de Mouhy tried to reconstruct the whole from memory, opting for invention where necessary. Although he did his best, his work does not
correspond to the original; as according to Haywood “in many places there is a wide difference between she (the Marchioness) intended for the world, and what he (de Mouhy) has presented to it” (de Mouhy, 8).

If de Mouhy’s version had already in part ruined the original, the translation issued as *The Fortunate Country Maid* was worse than ever, Haywood claims. It betrays, she stated, “the characters of those noble persons” (Dow, 57), in particular “their elegance of stile, as well as sentiments, wit and spirit” (de Mouhy, 10). Haywood insists that she had started her translation long before the advertisement for *The Fortunate Country Maid* appeared, but had to lay the task aside because of “a severe indisposition” (de Mouhy, 9). She, Haywood, claims to have worked from a copy of the original manuscript obtained by an “English Lady of quality, at that time in Paris” (de Mouhy, 9) from Madame de Mélicourt, an important character in the story and in the life of Jeannette. In passing on the copy Madame de Mélicourt hopes that whoever translates it will do justice “both to the spirit and expression” (de Mouhy, 9). Haywood herself aims to improve on the work of de Mouhy and claims to have tried to enter into the soul of the author, analysing and translating the idioms (de Mouhy, x). She introduces her own logic and order of episodes, moves the breaks among the parts of the second volume, and aims at narrative and stylistic revival (Herman and Pelckmans, 102). Haywood sums up what she thought insignificant or repetitive, she moves or enriches events that she judged too concise in order to understand an episode or a character (Herman and Pelckmans, 103). She adds interruptions and exclamations in order to add liveliness to the conversations. She also alters them on the syntactic level, often lengthening sentences, and she does not always respect register and tone (Herman and Pelckmans, 103). On the other hand, the translator of *The Fortunate Country Maid* merely made a word-by-word translation in a “dull and spiritless” manner (de Mouhy, 10); her own version will, on the contrary, be faithful to a deeper concept of “truth” and aim to transmit the real message intended by the Marchioness (de Mouhy, 10).

Haywood’s *The Virtuous Villager* is made up of short stories that are autonomous in that each has an introduction, which delineates the situation of the
heroine, and an ending which is richer than de Mouhy’s (Herman and Pelckmans, 104). In particular in the story of Charlotte Haywood adds repercussions that highlight the cynicism and the doubleness of the Duke and of his servant by means of dialogues which show his force of persuasion (Herman and Pelckmans, 104). Haywood tends to amplify the moral and pedagogical dimension of the novel, as we can see it in the title, the subtitle and in the whole first paragraph (Herman and Pelckmans, 105). She amplified also other aspects; for instance the heroines of most of the added stories are not responsible for their adventures because of their naivety. We can perceive also a form of feminism in Haywood’s translation because she suppresses the considerations of de Mouhy about the vanity and levity of women (Herman and Pelckmans, 109). Despite these endeavours on the part of Haywood to improve the novel of de Mouhy, her translation was not so successful as The Fortunate Country Maid.

In the first part of The Virtuous Villager the order follows de Mouhy, except for the story of Charlotte, one of the secondary stories in the main plot, which in the translation is anticipated to before Jeannette meets the young Marquis in the church. Then we have to move to the end of Part V, where the dislocations are more evident and also significant. Indeed the fact that Jeannette receives a letter from a servant of Saint-Fal is moved from the end of Part V to the beginning of Part VI. The dislocations multiply and they are more substantial in Part VII. The disappearance of Jeannette’s letters, her seeing the king at mass, her running into the old Marquis and her reception of a letter from Saint Agnes are moved at the beginning of the following part, Part VIII. Haywood also anticipates events. What happens at the end of Part VIII in The Virtuous Villager was at the beginning of Part IX in La Paysanne Parvenue: she anticipates the visit of the old Marquess to Jeannette, followed later by Mélicourt and the arrival of Saint-Fal, who leaves the kitchen and is mistaken by a servant for a thief, and her despair when she reads the letter of the young Marquis. In Part X Haywood anticipates the arrival of Monsieur des Roches, the reception of the letters from Mélicourt and the young Marquess, the dinner of Jeannette with the old Marquess and his proposal, and the arrival of Mélicourt few hours before her flight, which in La Paysanne Parvenue are at the beginning of Part XI. In Part XI she anticipates the
arrival of the young Marquis, their discovery that an officer has betrayed the young Marquis, and his departure. As a consequence in Part VII, VIII, IX, X and XI of The Virtuous Villager we have a progressive anticipation of events.

Haywood also effects losses in translation. In Part VIII she omits the fact that Dubois writes nothing fearing to be examined; instead she has him left for Paris. Then, in the same Part, she does not say that the King commands the Duke to his box and that the old Marquess appears at the box. Haywood omits de Mouhy’s narration of the Duke reaching Jeannette at home and getting rid of him. In Part X Haywood omits the night the Duke comes to her door and in Part XII, the last part, the fact that a servant of the young Marquess comes to Jeannette with a letter from Mélicourt. These are particulars which do not influence the development of the plot.

But Haywood also made additions. In Part VIII we see the figure of the valet of the Duke who arrives in order to know how Jeannette has rested after her indisposition. In Part IX we can see many additions. We see Jeannette writing to Saint-Fal and desiring that he comes to her immediately. In this same Part, as the anonymous translator did, Haywood adds the title of La Belle Assemblée, one of her works, and the names of the writers Messieurs de Crebillon and de Marivaux. In Part IX she adds also the story of Madamoiselle d’Elbieux. This is not the only story, indeed in Part XI she adds the story of Madame d’Elbieux. In this same Part she adds the letter from Mélicourt to Saint-Agnès, the story of Saint Agnès and that of Mademoiselle de Renneville, this last is a secondary story. In the last Part Haywood adds the letter from the young Marquess to Jeannette to which she answers by the hand of Saint-Fal; another event added by Haywood is the visit of the old Marquess to his son. In Part XII she also adds other two secondary stories: those of Monsieur de G and of Julia.

Since the beginning of her writing career, Haywood had played with punctuation and its effect on readers. Indeed she made an abundant use of dashes between sentences or parts of the sentences. Her sentences are long but they are
intermixed with comma, semicolon and dashes- and some exclamations among them. The dash is a typographical feature which has the visual effect of breaking the smooth prose exposition into sentence fragments (McMurran, 86). It allowed Haywood to emphasize a concept adding a pause or to add a concept or a word after another which make a concept more specific. It is an informal punctuation mark which gives spontaneity to the text, a thought spontaneity and an apparent lack of control. This form of punctuation above all adds the passion that characterizes her first works. She thrusts the reader to emotional high points through amplification, then arrests her at the apex as the text drops off into the dash, making a space where feeling becomes ineffable (McMurran, 86). Every pause has a specific meaning in the context because it emphasizes the passion and what is going on.

As a result, Haywood reworks the division of parts, anticipating parts which in the original version are present in the following parts. Then, she makes many additions and many omissions. Now we can see more clearly on lexical, syntactic and punctuation levels the changes made by the two translators of the original novel by analysing in detail two extracts. In blue we can see the changes made by the anonymous translator while in yellow we can see those made by Eliza Haywood.
**La Paysanne Parvenue (page 37-38)**

1. Un jour que je revenais de la forêt, où j’étais allée porter à gouter à mon père, je vis une troupe de gens à cheval qui arrivait de mon côté; je me retins sur les bords du chemin, dans l’intention de les voir passer.  
2. J’avais entendu souvent parler du Roi, je ne l’avais jamais vu comme si je le savais dans ce quartiers, je voulus profiter de cette occasion.  
3. Je m’en était fait une idée charmante; je me persuadais qu’il devait être fait autrement qu’un autre, et que je devais le reconnaître au milieu de sa cour.  
4. J’en était déjà à la portée, mes yeux avides et curieux le cherchaient de loin.  
5. Cette troupe était composée de gens si bien faits et si bien mis, que mon idée qui me suggérait que le Roi devait être tout d’or, me manqua.  
6. La cour était près de moi, et allait passer sans que j’eusse eu la satisfaction que je m’étais proposée, lorsque je me mis à courir avec précipitation vers un de ceux de cette brillante troupe: Montrez-moi le Roi, lui dis-je, Monsieur, en m’écriant, je ne l’ai jamais vu.  
7. Oui d’à ma belle fille, reprit le

---

**The Fortunate Country Maid (page 4-5)**

Returning from the forest one day, whither I had carried some refreshment to my father, I perceived a company of horsemen coming towards me. I drew off to the roadside, the better to observe them as they passed. I had never seen the King, but had heard great talk of him, and as I knew he was in the neighbourhood, I was now in hopes of satisfying my curiosity. The idea I had formed of his person, represented him altogether charming, and so far distinguishable from the rest of mankind, that he might be singled out at first sight from all his attendants. When they came near me, I looked for the King with great earnestness: but the whole company being of the greatest distinction both as to their persons and dress, I was at a loss; imagining the King, to be sure, must be covered with Gold from head to foot. They were almost past me, yet I had not found what I so earnestly sought. Upon this I ran hastily up to one of the company, crying aloud, “Sir, shew me the King, I never saw him in my life. With all my heart pretty

---

**The Virtuous Villager (page 6-7)**

As I was returning from the Forest where I had carried some refreshment to my father, I perceived a company of horsemen coming towards me, to drew off to the roadside, the better to observe them as they passed. I had never seen the King, but had heard great talk of him, and as I knew he was in those parts, was in hopes he was among this troop, and I might satisfy my curiosity. The picture I had drawn of him in my mind, from the admiration and love with which I had always heard him mentioned, was all shining like the sun, and so far distinguishable from the rest of mankind that I doubted not but I should know him in the midst of his attendants—when they came near, I looked earnestly for such as figure as my fancy had formed; but the whole company being all of the most grand appearance, I found I had deceived myself, and growing quite impatient, seeing most of them were past, I ran hastily up to one of them, crying aloud, Sir, I beseech you shew me the King—I never saw him in my life—That I will, my pretty Maid, answered the person I
La Paysanne Parvenue (page 37-38)
seigneur auquel je m’étais adressée, le voilà.
Où, Monsieur? interrompis-je. Où, Monsieur, replied he, rejoined he and pointing with it, there, said he, is the King on the white horse—Yes, yes, cried I again, that is the King for certain—Good God, how charming he is! How happy should I be, if he did not ride so fast! O dear, he is gone already—He could not help smiling at my exclamations, but as I afterwards found had all this time been considering me with the utmost attention. How lovely, said he, is this simplicity, how preferable to all the arts our court-ladies put in practice—Where do you live, my little dear, cried he?—in that village, Sir, replied I, pointing to it. Will you give me leave to come and see you there? Resumed he—if it depended on me, Sir, answered I, your visit would not be unwelcome; but I am not my own mistress— as for that, said he, leave it to me—I shall contrive means without occasioning you any blame. He had scarce ended these words, when another fine gentleman comes galloping back to him, crying, the King calls for you Marquis—his majesty must know.
La Paysanne Parvenue (page 37-38)
qu’un autre seigneur arriva au grand galop: Le Roi te demande, marquis, dit-il à celui qui me parlait, il veut savoir ce que tu voulais cette jeune fille et le sujet de la surprise qu’elle a marquée si plaisamment; son air naïf a intéressé toute la cour.  

Le Roi te demande, marquis, dit-il à celui qui me parlait, il veut savoir ce que tu voulais cette jeune fille et le sujet de la surprise qu’elle a marquée si plaisamment; son air naïf a intéressé toute la cour.

25 Je n’en suis pas étonné, répliqua le marquis, tu vois combien elle est aimable; elle mérite assurément que notre maitre lui accorde quelque chose et ce ne sera pas ma faute si cela n’arrive pas.  

26 Ni la mienne non plus, reprit l’autre seigneur, qui me considérait pendant ce discours. Il faut savoir d’où est cette enfant; elle est très jolie, et je l’aime très fort.  

28 En disant ces paroles, il me tendit la main, je n’osais lui donner la mienne.  

29 Il voulut mettre pied à terre; j’en eus une si grande frayeur, que je me sauvai de toute ma force vers le hameau.  

30 Arretez, me cria le marquis, arrêtez, belle enfant! on ne veut point vous faire de mal; je ne vis plus qu’un cavalier qui était encore à la même place, et je sus bientôt après que

The Fortunate Country Maid (page 4-5)
company comes galloping back to him crying out, “the King calls for you, Marquess; his Majesty must know what this girl has been enquiring of you about, and the occasion of her surprise, which she betrayed in such an agreeable manner; the whole court is mightily taken with the simplicity of her behaviour. I don’t wonder at, replied the Marquess; you see what a lovely creature it is; our Master ought to give her a gratification; at least I’ll do what I can to promote it. So will I, added the other, looking at me very attentively.

Where does she live? she is exceeding handsome; I am desperately in love with her”. Saying this, he offered me his hand, but as I would not take any notice of it, he prepared to alight. This put me into such a consternation, that I took to my heels towards the village. “Stay, stay pretty Maid, cried the marquis, nobody designs you any harm.---I am surprizingly beautiful---I am desperately in love with her”. Saying this, he offered me his hand, but as I would not take any notice of it, he prepared to alight.

The Virtuous Villager (page 6-7)
what business this pretty maid has with you; and what was the motive of that surprise she testified in so pleasant a manner, as we passed by—her beauty and innocence have interested the whole court. I do not wonder at it, said the marquis, you see how handsome she is—her native loveliness exceeds any thing I ever saw—for my part I think, she not only merits the notice our royal Master has taken of her, but also that he should confer greater favours on her, and it shall not be my fault, if she has not reason to think this adventure very fortuate for her. Nor mine, rejoined the other, looking on me in a fashion which I then was far from comprehending, where does she live?—she is surprizingly beautiful—I am desperately in love with her. At these words he offered to alight, which put me into such a consternation, that without taking any leave, or thanking the Marquis for his civilities, I ran as fast as I could toward our village.
almost at our own door. I then turned about, and saw only one Chevalier at the Place I ran from, which I soon after distinguished to be the Marquis, the other I suppose being gone back after the King.
4.4.1 From *La Paysanne Parvenue* to *The Fortunate Country Maid*

This section will discuss some of the syntactic, lexical and punctuation strategies used by the translator responsible for *The Fortunate Country Maid*. In particular we will see if the translation is as faithful to de Mouhy’s *La Paysanne Parvenue* as it seems at first appearance. In my analysis I shall be drawing on Newmark Peter, Baker Mona, Ulrych Margherita, Bell Roger and Katan David. The first passage chosen to analyse comes from the Part I and describes the first meeting of Jeannette and the young Marquis.

In the translation process a syntactic structure can be rendered as in the original version or in another form (Bell, 272). In sentence 1, for instance, the anonymous translator keeps the original structure, but in sentence 2, a parataxis or coordinate clause- “J’avais entendu souvent parler du Roi” is rendered as a hypotaxis or subordinate clause “Though I had never seen the King”, while in sentence 3 the sense of a hypotaxis --, “qu’il devait être fait autrement qu’un autre” -- is rendered in paratactic form: “and so far distinguishable from the rest of mankind”.

Translation choices often involve re-working word order and the order of clauses. A subordinate clause may keep the place occupied in the source text or it may be moved to an earlier position. Known as “left dislocation” or “fronting”, which indicates anticipated identification and it makes the moved part a marked theme (Ulrych, 156). According to Greenbaum and Quirk, fronting involves “the achievement of marked theme by moving into initial position an item which is otherwise unusual there” (quoted in Baker, 132). The translator of *The Fortunate Country-Maid* frequently re-positions parts of sentences. In sentence 6, for instance, “Montrez-moi le Roi, lui dis-je, Monsieur, en m’écriant, je ne l’ai jamais vu” the equivalent of “Monsieur”, “Sir” is put in the first position, while the equivalent of “en m’ecriant”, “crying aloud” is left shifted right to the beginning of the sentence: “crying aloud, Sir, shew me the King, I never saw him in my life.” Another instance of this is: “s’il n’allait pas si vite, que je serais heureuse!” which is translated as: “How happy should I be, if he did not go so fast!”.
Subordinate clauses often begin with conjunctions, function words which relate sentences, clauses and paragraphs to each other, as is the case with the “though” clause in sentence 2 (Baker, 190). Parts of the clauses, for instance “sans que” can also be rendered with a negative structure, as happens in sentence 6: “yet I had not found what I so earnestly sought”. The negative structure is also used in order to effect modulation, namely a reversal of point of view, as in this case of “et je sus bientôt”, rendered here as “it was not long.” It also happens that a form explicitly expressed in the source text is omitted in the target text (Bell, 156). An example of such ellipsis is to be found in sentence 23, where “je trouverai les moyens que cela soit sans que vous en ayez du chagrin” is translated as “you shall have no blame”.

The translator of *The Fortunate Country Maid* often, however, uses complementary English forms as in this case of “reconnaissiez-le à son grand air, et au cheval blanc qu’il monte” in sentence 9, where “reconnaissiez-le” is translated as “that is” “That is he who makes so grand an appearance on the white horse”. Similarly the French “combien” is reproduced with “what” in the case of “tu vois combien elle est aimable/you see what a lovely creature it is”, and “que” in “mon Dieu, qu’il est beau!” is rendered by the English structure “how+ adjective” “Good God how handsome he is!”. In similar fashion “si” is rendered by “such” in the case of “j’en eus une si grande frayeur/This put me into such a consternation”.

Another strategy used by our translator is to use the passive form, to avoid specifying the agent of an action and give an impression of objectivity (Baker, 106). In sentence 3, for instance, “je devais le reconnaître” is rendered as “he might be singled out”. Another example is “son air naïf a intéressé toute la cour” which *The Fortunate Country Maid* renders as “the whole court is mightily taken with the simplicity of her behaviour”. In such cases in the target text the object becomes subject and is moved in the initial position, as in the case of “Il se mit à sourire de mes exclamations”, translated as “My exclamations made him smile”. Object also becomes subject in the rendering of “J’en était déjà à la portée” as “When they came near me”. In such cases the translator redirects the attention of
the reader towards what s(he) considers important, the distortion functioning as a zoom lens allowing the reader to focus on certain aspects rather than others (Katan, 138). In this case s(he) shifts our attention from Jeannette, who is talking in the first person singular “je” (“que je devais le reconnaître au milieu de sa cour”) to the object “he” (“that he might be singled out at first sight from all his attendants”). In another instance the focus moves from an action to the result of the action, as with “your visit would not be disagreeable”, The Fortunate Country Maid’s rendering of “je ne vous en empecherais pas”. Other instances of focus shift come in the questions. The original “Où, Monsieur ?”, for instance, focus is on the place where the object of interest is while in the target text, “Which” focuses on which of the people present is the King. Another instance is “Voulez-vous bien que je vous y aille voir?”, where the focus is on what Jeannette wants, while the target version – “Will you give me leave to come and see you:” --- is an indirect question which asks in a more respectful way for permission to visit.

On lexical level The Fortunate Country Maid, like any translation, suffers from several kinds of semantic loss. In our episode de Mouhy’s “le Roi devait être tout d’or”, which suggests that the King is made of gold, is figurative and stronger than our translator’s rendering which states only that the King “must be covered with Gold”. In his/her choice of modal verbs, s(he) translates the modal “devais”, which means “had to”, with the weaker one “might”, which implies that there is a strong possibility that the action or event will not, or did not, take place (he might go, he might have gone) (Katan, 95), thus modifying the expression of an attitude of the speaker towards a reality (Katan, 101). Elsewhere (s)he does the opposite, using more specific words; for instance s(he) translates the generic “faire” with “contrive”, “reconnaitre” with “to single out” and “quelque chose” with “gratification”. And in “il veut savoir ce que te voulait cette jeune fille” / “his Majesty must know what this girl has been enquiring of you about” s(he) renders “veut” with a stronger verb, “must”.

Another strategy resorted to is the use of the general hyponym or the more specific hyperonym for the original word (Ulrych, 259). For instance s(he)
translates “un autre” in “etre fait autrement qu’un autre” with the more general hyponym “mankind” in “distinguishable from the rest of mankind”. Another instance is when the translator renders “seigneur”, a word which implies a high social status, with the more general “one of the company”. But s/he also moves from the general to the specific rendering “cour”, which defines not the place but the people who attend it, with the hyperonym “attendants”. S(h)e also uses meronymy, which refers to a part-whole relation (Bell, 259) as with “mes yeux avides et curieux”, where focus is shifted from parts of the body (the eyes) to the whole person, a superordinate, “I”.

Yet another strategy consists of transposition, in which parts of speech are interchanged. An example of this is nominalization, the transformation of verbs, attributes and circumstances into things or rather nouns (Downing and Locke, quoted in Katan, 113), as where the pair of adjectives “avides et curieux” are rendered as a noun “with great earnestness”. In another type of transposition the noun “avec transport” is rendered with the verb “transported”.

We may also notice the translator looking for connotative meanings rather than simple equivalents, as where in this episode “oui” is translated in English as “with all my heart” “O ciel!” rendered as “Oh dear” and “chère enfant” translated as “my pretty dear”. Similarly “dans ce quartiers” is rendered as “in the neighbourhood”, “à la portée” is translated as “near me” and “Le voilà” rendered in English as “that is he”. The translator aims to send the message despite the literal referent. Similarly the sense of the fixed form “je voulus profiter de cette occasion” is conveyed with the expression “I was now in hopes of satisfying my curiosity”.

Punctuation is another important aspect of a text because it gives a semantic indication of the relationships between sentences and clauses (Newmark, 58). The translator of The Fortunate Country Maid sometimes uses a comma, which is the tiniest of pauses (McKane,126), instead of a semicolon, which is a longer pause but separates activities which are not isolated or important enough to be punctuated by a full stop (Newmark, 58). This is the case with “je vis une
troupe de gens à cheval qui arrivait de mon coté; je me retirai sur les bords du chemin”. Elsewhere, instead of a colon, whose mainly aim is to explain, s(he) uses a full stop, introducing a stronger pause, as in the case of “je ne l’avais jamais vu : comme si je le savais dans ce quartiers”. In other cases a comma, a weaker pauses, is used where de Mouhy uses the stronger semicolon: “Je m’en était fait une idée charmante je me persuadais qu’il devait etre fait autrement qu’un autre”. In another instance a full stop is rendered as a colon. A colon, usually used to introduce a statement, may be rendered with a mere comma: “disant reconnaissez-le”. Occasionally two sentences are joined into one by replacing a full stop with a comma, as in this case: “Il se mit à sourire de mes exclamations Il s’était arreté”. But a full stop is also replaced with a semicolon, as in “et il me regardait avec beaucoup d’attention Qu’elle”. As a result, the style becomes breathless because in the first part of the extract the rhythm of the reading was made quicker by replacing a semicolon and a colon with commas, then the rest of the extract is interpolated with dashes and, in particular in the speech, a statement was immediately followed by another one.

In conclusion, on close examination *The Fortunate Country Maid* is not as faithful to *La Paysanne Parvenue* as at first seems. Indeed the translator makes many changes at the levels of syntax, lexis and punctuation, transposing parts of sentences, modifying punctuation and connotations: apparently slight changes which alter de Mouhy’s work. For instance s(he) moves the focus from an action to an effect in “your visit would not be disagreeable”. Or we can perceive the formal way in which young Marquis asks to visit her, and also his high social position.
4.4.2 From La Paysanne Parvenue to The Virtuous Villager

This section will discuss Eliza Haywood’s translation of the passage from La Paysanne Parvenue discussed above, showing which strategies she uses in translation, ranging from word-for-word to free adaptation.

On a syntactic level we see Eliza Haywood rendering a main clause ("Un jour que je revenais de la forest") with a subordinate one ("As I was returning from the Forest"). Another instance is "J'avais entendu souvent parler du Roi", which in the target text becomes a dependent clause preceded by the conjunction "but", and is moved into second position: "but had heard great talk of him". Again in "s’il n’allait pas si vite, que je serais heureuse!", rendered as "How happy should I be, if he did not ride so fast!", Haywood moves an initial clause into second place. She sometimes left shifts phrases, such as "crying aloud, Sir", which in de Mouhy occupies a later position: "Montrez-moi le Roi, lui dis-je, Monsieur, en m’écritiant, je ne l’ai jamais vu”.

In translating idiomatic French structures Haywood usually uses an English complementary, as in rendering the common “que” structure with the English “how+adjective”: “qu’il est beau!” for instance is translated as “how charming he is!” and “Qu’elle est aimable” with “How lovely”. The French expressions “combien” are similarly translated with the English structure “how+adjective”, as in “tu vois combien elle est aimable”, rendered as “you see how handsome she is”. Structures “si” are translated as “such as”, as in this case of “which put me into such a consternation”, Haywood’s equivalent for “j’en eus une si grande frayeur”. Moving further away from the original, Haywood translates “assurément” with the structure “not only….but also” in “elle mérite assurément que notre maitre lui accorde quelque chose, et ce ne sera pas ma faute si cela n’arrive pas”, rendered in The Virtuous Villager as “she not only merits the notice our royal Master has taken of her, but also that he should confer greater favours on her”.
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As we have seen above, in the translation process attention sometimes moves from one element of a text to another, as the translator aims to direct the attention of the reader towards what he considers important (Katan, 138). For instance in the clause “je ne vous en empêcherais pas” de Mouhy’s subject is Jeannette, while in the target text “your visit would not be unwelcome” our attention moves to the visit of the young Marquis. Another instance is “Où, Monsieur ?” which in the target text focuses the attention on which person in the group “which” “which, Sir, cryed I?” Haywood also sometimes exchanges subjects: the first person subject of “J’en était déjà à la portée” is replaced by a third person in the clause “when they came near”. Another instance is “but as I afterwards found had all this time been considering me with the utmost attention”, where Jeannette takes over as subject from the original one, the young Marquis: “il me regardait avec beaucoup d’attention”. Elsewhere Haywood re-formulates the sentence completely, changing the tenor, an abstract term for the relationships between the people taking part in the discourse (Baker, 16). “Montrez-moi le Roi”, for instance, is direct and imperative while the translation “I beseech you shew me the King” is formal, polite and respectful. In another, similar, instance the original version “Voulez-vous bien que je vous y aille voir ?” is more direct while the target version “Will you give me leave to come and see you there?” is phrased by the young Marquis in a kinder, more formal and respectful way. On the other hand, the phrase “Donnez-moi votre main” which de Mouhy puts into the mouth of the young Marquis, is respectful, as his high social class condition demands, while Haywood’s version “Give me your hand” uses the more direct imperative form. Another instance of this is “reconnaissiez-le à son grand air, et au cheval blanc qu’il monte”, which is translated by Haywood with the more direct form “is the King on the white horse”.

In the translation process Haywood makes free use of transposition, or interchange of parts of speech. This is the case, for instance, with “Je la préfère à l’art de toutes nos femmes” where the verb “préférer” in the source text is translated with the adjective “preferable” in the target text: “how preferable to all the arts our court-ladies put in practice!”. In another instance the pair of adjectives “yeux avides et curieux” are rendered with a single adverb “earnestly”, while “air
" naïf” is translated as “her beauty and innocence”, an operation which involves splitting the original concept and adding “beauty”: “son air naïf a intéressé toute la cour” this becomes “her beauty and innocence have interested the whole court”.

At the lexical level Haywood does not translate faithfully. For instance she translates the verb “voir” with “perceive”, which has a different connotation. She also uses hypernym, as with the noun “quartiers”, which is translated with the more generic “parts”, and “un autre”, which is translated with the more general “mankind”. She also moves the subject from a part of the body, the eyes “yeux”, which are meronymys, to the whole person “I”, a superordinate. She also renders “un de ceux de cette brillante troupe” with a more general “one of them”. Another instance is “seigneur” which is translated by the more generalized, less connoted “person”. Later she translates “un autre seigneur” with the less specific “one of the company”. On occasions, however, she also moves from the generic to the specific, as when she renders the generic noun “cour” with the hyperonym “attendants”. Another instance is “femmes”, which is rendered with a more specific and high-level concept “court-ladies”.

Haywood sometimes clarifies the meaning of a sentence using an implicature, namely rendering what the writer means or implies rather than what s/he literally says (Baker, 223). For instance de Mouhy’s “il se servit d’elle” is translated with the more specific verb “to point” in “pointing with it”. Then again, Haywood translates “ce que te voulait cette jeune fille” with the more specific “what business this pretty maid has with you”. She explains the meaning of “considérait” in “looking on me in a fashion which I then was far from comprehending”. Haywood is also attentive in the choice of the words, for instance she uses the verb “to ride” in order to delineate he is on horse: “if he did not ride so fast!”. Another instance is in this case “Laissez-moi faire/ Let me alone to contrive it” where the verb “to contrive” is rendered more specific than that of the original version “faire”.

As for figures of speech, Haywood translates the fixed expression “je voulus profiter de cette occasion” as “I might satisfy my curiosity”. Then she renders the concept of “le Roi devait être tout d’or” with “all shining like the sun”.

As regards punctuation, Haywood often translates de Mouhy’s semicolons with commas, thus weakening the pause. This is the case with “qui arrivait de mon coté, je me retirai sur les bords”, rendered by Haywood as “coming towards me, to drew off to the roadside”. Like the anonymous translator of The Fortunate Country Maid, she renders the colon, which introduces an explanation, with a comma, as in “je ne l’avais jamais vu comme si je le savais”. Unlike her predecessor, however, Haywood often translates commas and even the strong pause of the full stop with a dash. This is the case with “et que je devais le reconnaître au milieu de sa cour”, and “mes yeux avides et curieux le cherchaient de loin”, as well as "Montrez-moi le Roi, lui dis-je, Monsieur, en m’écriant, je ne l’ai jamais vu," and also the semicolon “repris-je avec transport; mon Dieu". The dash, often used after an exclamation mark ("je serais heureuse! O ciel!") or in conjunction with a question mark, makes the style breathless.

In conclusion, we may say that The Virtuous Villager is in many ways less faithful to its original than The Fortunate Country Maid. More frequently than the anonymous translator, Haywood transposes syntactic constructions, makes lexical choices with very different connotations from those of the source text, and alters the manner in which characters express themselves in dialogue. Last but not least, she introduces many innovations in punctuation, especially in her abundant use of dashes. Now we move on to analyse the second episode. In this analysis I am going to proceed to compare the two translations directly, not separately.
La Paysanne Parvenue (page 55-56)

1 Je ne sais, lui dis-je, ce que c’est que l’amour j’ai vécu jusqu’à présent dans la paix, et je n’ai été sensible qu’aux peines de ma mère, et aux chagrins que mon frère et ma sœur me donnaient. 2 Les bontés seules dont vous m’honorez. Ah ! laissez ces bontés, reprit-il, je souffre avec peine que vous nomniez ainsi de faibles marques de la plus tendre amitié. 3 Je ne suis pas encore connu de vous, dès que cela sera, vous verrez que je suis trop heureux d’avoir trouvé cette légère occasion de vous témoigner mon amour. 4 Mon Dieu interrompis-je en souriant, vous me parlez toujours de cet amour ; laissez-le, Monsieur le marquis, jusqu’à ce que vous sachiez qui il est, et s’il convient qu’une fille puisse l’écouter. 5 Je veux vous apprendre à le connaître, reprit-il. Non, non, Monsieur, continua-je ma mère m’a toujours dit qu’il ne fallait point écouter les hommes, et qu’ils cherchaient toujours à nous surprendre et je crois bien que ma marraine pense de même. 6 Gardez-vous bien, reprit le marquis avec empreinte, de lui faire connaître l’amitié que j’ai pour

The Fortunate Country Maid (page 31-32)

I don’t know, answered I, what love is. I have hitherto lived very happily, unacquainted with any uneasiness, but what arose from seeing my mother in affliction, or the peevishness of my brother and sister. There is nothing but your generous behaviour towards me, you are sensible, how happy I am in this small opportunity of shewing how tenderly I love you. Lord! Said I smiling, you are always talking of love. Let it rest till I know what it is, and whether a maid may be allowed to hear of it. I’ll teach you what it is, replied he. No, no, my Lord, I cried. My mother has often charged me never to listen to men, since all they say only tends to impose upon us. I dare say my godmother is of the same opinion. Take care, replied the Marquess very earnestly, that you never mention a word to her concerning my passion. She is of a jealous

The Virtuous Villager (page 39-40)

I know not, said I, what Love is. I have never been acquainted with any trouble but when I saw my Father or Mother in affliction, or my brother and sister were peevish with me—nothing but your generosity towards me could—O! no more, cried he, of my generosity. I cannot bear you should give that name to such trifling marks of my ever faithful Love and Friendship. You know me not as yet. Jeanetta, when you do you will be sensible I can know no Happiness, but in opportunities of testifying how much I love you. Bless me! interrupted I, smiling, you are always talking to me of this same love. I beseech your lordship say no more of it, till I know what it is, and whether a maid ought to listen to it. I will teach you what it is, replied he, no, no, my Lord, said I my mother has always told me, ‘twas dangerous to listen to men on that subject, and that all they said upon it was only to impose upon us. And I dare answer the Countess is of the same mind. Take care, replyd he, eagerly, that you do not let her suspect any thing of the passion I
La Paysanne Parvenue (page 55-56)
9 Elle est jalous e, je vous en dirai quelque jour le sujet ; cela m’empêcherait de vous voir, et je mourrais. 10 Ah ! ah ! ajoutai-je, il y a du apparemment, puisque vous ne voulez pas qu’on le sache. 11 Non, belle Jeannette, il n’y ne a point ; ayez plus de confiance en moi. 12 J’allais encore lui répondre, je me trouvais une facilité à le faire, dont j’étais surprise moi-même. 13 Le marquis ne m’intimidait pas, et je raisonnais avec lui avec la même confiance que j’aurais fait avec une de mes compagnes. 14 J’allais, dis-je, lui demander la raison de la préférence qu’il se donnait, lorsque ma marraine tourna la tête, et m’appella : nous la rejoignîmes. 15 Comment donc, me dit-elle, vous écoutez le marquis ? 16 que vous disait-il ? 17 des douceurs. 18 Apprenez, Jeannette, qu’il faut bien s’en garder ; c’est un poison funeste qui fait mourir. 19 Je ne les connais pas, Madame, répliquai-je. 20 Mon seur, pour s’amuser sans doute, voulait être informé de nos plaisirs champêtres, je lui en rendais compte.

The Fortunate Country Maid (page 31-32)
temper of which more hereafter it may prevent my seeing of you, and upon that my very life depends. Nay then, added I, there must be harm in it, since you are afraid to let it be known. No, my dearest Jenny, there is none; have a better opinion of me? I was about to reply, I found a facility in doing it, that surprised me. I was under no restraint with the Marquess, and if he had been one of my play-fellows, I could not have reasoned with greater freedom. I was about, I say, to enquire why he should give himself this preference, when my godmother turning about, called to me: Upon which we made up to her. “How now, says she to me, what subject is the Marquis entertaining you with? Love to be sure. Remember, Jenny, its poison, and oftentimes fatal. I know nothing of the matter madam, answered I, my Lord, to divert himself. I suppose, has been enquiring after our country amusements, and I have given him the best account I can.

The Virtuous Villager (page 39-40)

have for you---she is a Lady tenacious of her power of pleasing:--but I shall tell you more of that hereafter---this, however, may suffice; she would prevent my seeing you, and on that blessing my life depends Ah! then, cryd I, it must be a crime, or you would not be so careful to conceal it. No, my dearest Jeanetta, I assure you it is far from being so, answered he, have more confidence in me—you never will have reason to repent it. I was about to reply, when the Countess turning about and seeing us together, calld to me upon our coming up to her. How now, Jeanetta, said she, what subject is the Marquis entertaining you with?---Not love, I hope!---Remember you must set a guard upon your ears whenever the word is mentioned, it carries with it a kind of poison that is sometimes fatal. I assure your Ladyship, answered I, I am entirely ignorant of any such thing. My Lord Marquis has been diverting himself, with enquiring how we of the village amuse ourselves, when we are not at work, and I have given him the best account I can.
4.5.1 Analysis of Episode 2: comparison between *The Fortunate Country Maid* and *The Virtuous Villager*

The second passage chosen to analyse comes from Part I of *La Paysanne Parvenue* and consists of a conversation about love between Jeannet and the young Marquis. As in the previous episode, we can see the changes Haywood made at the stylistic level. This section will discuss the use of negation and its role in the translation on lexical and syntactic levels. Then we move on to analysis of verb tenses and their use, and the structure of sentences. Following that, we will analyse the use of lexis and the message it sends, in particular semantic aspects of verbs and modals. In my analysis I shall be drawing on Newmark Peter, Baker Mona, Ulrych Margherita, Bell Roger and Katan David.

Negation and denial play an important role in this episode. First of all a denial can be translated in a more formal way, as with “I don’t know” in *The Fortunate Country Maid*, or as “I know not” in *The Virtuous Villager*. But negation can also make explicit a concept, as happens in “jusqu’à présent” which is rendered literally in *The Fortunate Country Maid* as “hitherto”, but in *The Virtuous Villager* with “never”. Another instance is the translation of “la paix” in *The Virtuous Villager*, where Haywood uses the structure “never…any trouble”. A negative structure can also be lost in the translation process, as happens with the French restrictive negation “ne que” which is rendered in *The Fortunate Country Maid* with a verb + a conjunction (“unacquainted…but”), and in *The Virtuous Villager* with the conjunction “but”. Negation can also be added in the translation process, as in the case of “et je raisonnais avec lui avec la meme confiance que j’aurais fait avec une de mes compagnes”, which in the anonymous translator’s version reads “and if he had been one of my play-fellows, I could not have reasoned with greater freedom”; this makes explicit the concept of “confiance”, rendering it as “freedom”. Denials can also be made stronger, as in “Je ne les connais pas” which rendered in *The Fortunate Country Maid* as “I know nothing of the matter”, a solution which has a stronger effect on the reader than the “ne..pas”. In *The Virtuous Villager*, on the other hand, this is translated as “I assure your Ladyship,….. I am entirely ignorant of any such thing”, a solution
which is less forceful. Similarly the presence of “never” in The Country Maid’s “that you never mention a word to her concerning my passion” carries a stronger effect on the readers than the weak form “not...anything” in The Virtuous Villager.

As for Haywood’s choice of verb tenses, she renders “dis” with a past tense “said”. The anonymous translator too changes verb tenses, indeed “reprendre” is rendered as “replyd” in the past tense. Haywood uses the verb “cry”, which is completely different from de Mouhy’s “reprendre”; she also puts it in the past tense and moves it to the left. Another instance of tense change is “reprit” which is rendered in both translations by the past tense “replyd”. The present in both translations is often rendered with a present continuous, which implies that the action (in this case Jeannette talking) is taking place at the very moment. In The Fortunate Country Maid the past tense is rendered with a present perfect continuous in the case of “voulait être informé/ has been enquiring after our country amusements” but with an infinitive clause in The Virtuous Villager: “with enquiring how we of the village amuse ourselves”. Elsewhere the past is translated with a present perfect, as in “je lui en rendais compte/ I have given him the best account I can”.

Sentence structure is very important in translation, above all for Haywood. The structure “ce que c’est que l’amour” is rendered with the English structure “what love is” in both translations, but “je suis trop heureux d’avoir” is rendered with the English structure “how+adjective” (“how happy I am”) in The Fortunate Country Maid, and with the structure “no+noun+but” as in “I can know no Happiness, but” in The Virtuous Villager. In another instance “ayez plus de confiance en moi” is rendered in The Fortunate Country Maid with the English structure “have a better opinion of me”, which makes explicit the concept, while in The Virtuous Villager it is translated with a different, less direct expression: “have more confidence in me”. Another instance of difference between the two translations is “je souffre avec peine que”, rendered in The Fortunate Country Maid with the form “I am in pain”, but in The Virtuous Villager with “I cannot bear”, an expression which strongly emphasizes the sorrow. The structure “s’il
convient qu’une fille puisse l’écouter” rendered literally in *The Fortunate Country Maid* as “and whether a maid may be allowed to hear of it”, in *The Virtuous Villager* is translated as: “and whether a maid ought to listen to it”. In translating “vous nommez” as “you bestow that name” the *Country Maid* chooses a more formal solution compared to Haywood’s more faithful “you should give that name”. A structure can also be translated metaphorically, as in the case of “et je mourrais” rendered in *The Fortunate Country Maid* as “and upon that my very life depends” while *The Virtuous Villager* adds “and on that blessing”. The anonymous translator also re-orders sequences as in the case of “la préférence qu’il se donnait”, which becomes an unmarked declarative sentence “he should give himself this preference”. Elsewhere s(he) also keeps the marked theme, as in translating “c’est un poison funeste qui fait mourir” with “its poison, and oftentimes fatal”, thus keeping “poison”, in the initial marked position as a fronted theme divided from the rest of the sentence by a comma. Both translators can also translate noun phrases with clauses, as happens with “Les bontés seules” which is rendered in *The Fortunate Country Maid* with “there is nothing but” while in *The Virtuous Villager* with the “nothing but your generosity”. A phrase can also be used to translate a verb, as happens in *The Fortunate Country Maid* when “laissons” is rendered with “no more of”.

Both translators also add or use different kinds of clauses. For instance de Mouhy’s “nos plaisirs champêtres” is rendered in *The Virtuous Villager* with a dependent clause: “how we of the village amuse ourselves”, in which the focus is moved to the villagers. A dependent clause in the original “qu’il ne fallait point écouter les hommes” is rendered in *The Fortunate Country Maid* as an infinitive one: “never to listen to men”. The reverse can also take place, as in this infinitive clause “de lui faire connaître l’amitié que j’ai pour vous”, which is translated as a declarative clause in both translations.

As for the punctuation, it is important for the role it plays in the message. For instance the original text’s semicolon, maintained in *The Fortunate Country Maid*, is rendered with a colon in *The Virtuous Villager* “what Love is”, maybe because it explains the previous statement. The full stop is rendered in *The
Virtuous Villager with a dash -. Indeed in The Virtuous Villager many sentences are followed by dashes, and suspension points are also rendered as dashes. The comma is rendered as a colon in The Fortunate Country Maid in order to introduce an explanation, but as a comma in The Virtuous Villager. Elsewhere commas are rendered with dashes -. The semicolon is rendered as colon in The Fortunate Country Maid, where it makes a meaning explicit, but with a comma in The Virtuous Villager. The comma is rendered in both translations with an exclamation mark which underlines the effect. In The Virtuous Villager colons are also rendered with dashes. The comma is rendered in The Fortunate Country Maid with a semi-colon when it introduces a new concept; similarly in The Virtuous Villager. The comma is rendered as a colon in The Fortunate Country Maid when it introduces a statement. In The Virtuous Villager it is rendered as a full stop. The full stop is rendered as a question mark in The Fortunate Country Maid and as a dash in The Virtuous Villager. After the question mark Haywood adds dashes. Her text is full of dashes, which make the rhythm of the text quicker than the original version and the style breathless.

Lexical choice is also important. In this episode the technique of transposition or interchange of parts of speech is used, as when “peines”, a noun, is rendered in the translation process with a verb “from seeing…in affliction” in The Fortunate Country Maid and in “saw..in affliction” in The Virtuous Villager. Another instance is “chagrins”, which is translated with another noun, “peevishness”, in The Fortunate Country Maid and with an adjective, “peevish”; in The Virtuous Villager “qui fait mourir” is translated as the adjective “fatal”.

In the translation process the concept expressed in the original is often be altered by lexical choices. The godmother is translated in The Virtuous Villager as “the Countess”; “belle Jeannette” is rendered in both translations as “my dearest”, a solution which emphasizes the feelings of the speaker rather than aesthetic appreciation. Then again, “des douceurs” is rendered with the general “love” and “cet amour” is rendered in The Fortunate Country Maid with the general “love”, while in The Virtuous Villager with “this same love”. Expressions can also be made explicit, as with “bontés” which is translated as “generous behaviour” and
later with “generosity” in both translations. Similarly in the case of “faibles marques”, which is rendered as “such trifling marks”, or in that of “amitié”, which is rendered with “passion”. Another instance is “témoigner” which is made explicit in *The Fortunate Country Maid*’s “shewing” and *The Virtuous Villager*’s “testifying”. Another instance is “cette légère occasion”, which is explicit in the anonymous translator’s “small opportunity”, but in Haywood’s suffers a loss in translation. The word chosen can also differ as to connotation, as where “compagnes” rendered as “play-fellows”. Another instance is de Mouhy’s “vous verrez que”, whose equivalent “you’ll be sensible” carries different connotations in that it focuses on the feeling. In *The Fortunate Country Maid* “vous ne voulez pas” is rendered as “are afraid”, which makes explicit feelings of the young Marquis. In “vous ne voulez pas qu’on le sache” is rendered as “you would not be so careful to conceal it”. The verb “vouloir”, rendered as “be so careful”, implies an intention, while “savoir” for “conceal” implies the intention to hide. A noun may also be rendered by a clause, as happens with “mon amour”, translated as “how tenderly I love you” in *The Fortunate Country Maid* and as “how much I love you” in *The Virtuous Villager*. Another instance is the exclamation “Mon Dieu”, which is rendered as “Lord” in *The Fortunate Country Maid* and as “bless me!” in *The Virtuous Villager*. Lexical choices can also shift attention from one thing to another one, as where “jalousie” in *The Virtuous Villager* is rendered as “tenacious of her power of pleasing”, which re-focuses attention to the obsession of the godmother to please to all men. Haywood also intensifies the meaning of the original by translating “de la plus tender amitié” as “of my ever faithful Love and Friendship”.

Our translations illustrate the different ways in which French verbs can be translated into English. In *The Fortunate Country Maid* “connaitre” is rendered as “to acquaint”, which is more specific, while in *The Virtuous Villager* it is translated literally with “know”. On the other hand for the participle “informé” both translators choose a specific verb “enquiring”, while “écouter” is rendered in *The Fortunate Country Maid* as “hear” which means to hear by chance, and as “listen”, which means to listen to someone, in *The Virtuous Villager*. The anonymous translator renders “connaitre” with the more specific “mention” which
implies that she tells her godmother about his love for Jeannette. Another example of completely different choices is de Mouhy’s, “continua”, rendered in *The Fortunate Country Maid* as “cried” and in *The Virtuous Villager* as “said”. A partial shift of meaning takes place with de Mouhy’s “torna la tête”, which is translated in both works with the generic “turning about”, which implies a turning of the whole body rather than just the head. Another loss in translation occurs with “interrompis” which in *The Fortunate Country Maid* is rendered as the neutral “said”. A more radical semantic shift is Haywood’s translation of “connaitre” with “let..suspect”, while her choice of “I dare answer” as opposed to the anonymous translator’s “I dare say” for “et je crois bien que” changes the emphasis, conferring a different and a stronger connotation than that carried by the original version. Another instance, “laissons-le” is rendered in an explicit way with “Let it rest” in *The Fortunate Country Maid*, while in *The Virtuous Villager* it is rendered in with the more formal “I beseech your lordship say no more of it”.

The use of modals plays an important role in these translations. In Haywood’s “and whether a maid ought to listen to it.” the modal “ought” implies a possibility. The meaning of “m’empêcherait” is toned down in *The Fortunate Country Maid*’s equivalent, the modal “may”. In *The Virtuous Villager* Haywood adds the modal “should” in “you should give that name”. In *The Fortunate Country Maid* “il y a du mal apparemment” is rendered as “there must be harm in it” where “apparemment” is rendered with the modal “must” which is stronger in the effect compared to the original. *The Virtuous Villager*’s “it must be a crime” has stronger negative connotations than *The Fortunate Country Maid* version. In *The Virtuous Villager* “qu’il faut bien s’engarder” is rendered as “you must set a guard upon your ears whenever the word is mentioned,” where the modal used is not “need” but the stronger “must”.

Other semantic shifts include the rendering of “qu’on le sache” by “to let it be known”, which adds the implication that the speaker does not give permission. “Le marquis ne m’intimidait pas” is rendered as “I was under no restraint with the Marquess” emphasizing that the speaker had been free to express herself. In *The Virtuous Villager* “un poison” is rendered with “a kind of poison”, which implies
that there is more than one. Moreover in *La Paysanne Parvenue* this poison is fatal while in *The Virtuous Villager* it is “sometimes” fatal. In *The Virtuous Villager* Haywood adds “this, however, may suffice;” an exclamation by means of which we can perceive the feelings of young Marquis. Expressive meaning relates to the speaker’s feelings or attitude rather than to what words and utterances refer to (Baker, 13). In both translations exclamation are emphasized, as in this case where “des douceurs” is rendered in *The Fortunate Country Maid* with “love, to be sure”, which implies certitude, and in *The Virtuous Villager* with “Not love, I hope!”, which implies hope. As for conjunctions, which signal the way the author wants the reader to relate what is about to be said to what has been said before, our translators agree in rendering the additive conjunction “et” with “or”, thus moving quite markedly away from the source (Baker, 190). In another free rendering, Haywood adds to de Mouhy’s “ma mère” the figure of the father “but when I saw *my Father* or Mother in affliction”.

In conclusion, both translations are quite free, the most significant liberties being taken at the lexical level, where the connotations are often different and, as a consequence, emphasize or make clear to the reader one or another aspect of the original referent. Occasionally they take greater liberties, as in Haywood’s addition of the father, with “a kind of poison”, and in emphasizing the Countess’s certitude, according to the anonymous translator, or her hope, according to Haywood.
CONCLUSIONS

This thesis first of all can be considered original because it talks about subjects which are little discussed. First of all the role of Haywood as translator has been largely ignored by critics and literary historians. There are studies of translation in France as well as in England, but few deal with the two-way traffic in this international exchange. In my thesis I analysed the context and the translations of *La Paysanne Parvenue*. We are in the mid-eighteenth century, a period which saw the explosion of the *Pamela* phenomenon. After the publication of Richardson’s novel the demand for a more moralistic type of fiction than that which had dominated the 1720s and 1730s led to deep and long term changes in the literary markets. Moreover, this phenomenon was exported to the European Continent by means of translations, imitations, parodies and theatrical works.

It is in this context that *The Virtuous Villager* came to be written by Eliza Haywood. It is not an original work but a translation of *La Paysanne Parvenue*, a French work written by Le Chevalier de Mouhy in 1735-8. It seems likely that Haywood’s choice was at least in part motivated by a desire to cash in on the success of *Pamela* with a translation that conformed to the principles of morality and virtue then being disseminated by Richardson and his admirers. Her official purpose however was to give back to this work the spirit which had been betrayed by an earlier, bad translation, entitled *The Fortunate Country Maid*, published anonymously in 1740 a few months before the appearance of *Pamela*. We do not know how the anonymous translator came across the French novel but what we know, or what Haywood wants her readers to believe, is that she was given it by Madame Mélicourt, or better known in the story as Saint-Agnès, the nun friend of Jeannette, who implored her to save the spirit of the work and to translate it.

The aim of this thesis is to ascertain whether Haywood did in fact do justice to the spirit of *La Paysanne Parvenue*, hence the shift of focus in the central chapters from literary context to translation analysis. As we hinted in this period translation was in turmoil. In particular in the so-called “Cross-Channel
core” (McMurran, 35) we can see an extraordinary literary exchange between France and England. Works of fiction were translated in their hundreds, sold well and inspired original works in their turn. Thus, we have not only literary circulation but also literary development.

Eighteenth-century translation is not what we consider translation today. Translations of that period are what we would define today as adaptations, texts which make additions, reorderings, omissions and substitutions with respect to the original. As a result neither the anonymous translation nor that of Haywood are faithful to the source novel. Analysing practically the works, we decided to take out two episodes and to analyse them with respect to the many changes they introduced in terms of lexis, syntax, meaning and punctuation levels.

As regards the *Fortunate Country Maid* we can see that anonymous translator plays on syntactic structure emphasizing the effect on readers. We can notice that s(he) prefers the use of the passive form and often uses complementary target forms. But we can also notice the opposite: indeed s(he) sometimes chooses more general words, while in other cases s(he) opts for more specific words. According to the situation, s(he) sometimes uses stronger forms, for instance playing on modals, at other times using weaker forms. For instance, at the syntactic level, she prefers normal declarative structures. The translator also makes changes in punctuation, for instance preferring weaker punctuation marks such as commas to de Mouhy’s stronger semicolons. And last but not least s(he) makes explicit not only the contextual meaning but also the feelings of the characters.

As for structure, *The Fortunate Country Maid* keeps the division of parts of de Mouhy’s *La Paysanne Parvenue* and makes no additions in terms of characters, plot or episodes. The anonymous translator’s changes can therefore be perceived only through attentive reading and comparison with the original. In my opinion, the anonymous translator’s version is more faithful than Haywood’s because s(he) does not stress either themes or events: the style is, on the other
hand, somewhat pedestrian in that it is perhaps too closely linked to de Mouhy’s
text.

*The Virtuous Villager*, on the other hand, makes many important changes
with respect to *La Paysanne Parvenue*. First of all Haywood amplifies the
moralistic potential of de Mouhy’s story, and draws readers’ attention to the bad
consequences that follow from transgressions. At the textual level, she emphasizes
moments of climax by means of lexis, structure, punctuation and also semantic
techniques. Indeed she chooses more specific words, structures which emphasize
particular parts of sentences or particular contexts. Haywood often breaks
sentences in order to highlight a concept or an emotion, resorting to innumerable
dashes. But she also speeds up the rhythm by choosing other punctuation marks.
She sometimes adds sentences or phrases which specify how the main character
feels or what is happening. She also refocuses the reader’s attention from one
aspect to another one, and sometimes talks directly to the reader, allowing us to
hear her voice directly rather than through the characters.

On the structural level, as we have seen, Haywood moves parts of an
instalment to the next one in order to keep up the suspense. But she also makes
modifications within instalments, omitting parts she may have felt to be
superfluous and anticipating others to gain in effectiveness or clarity. Haywood
also lengthens certain passages and some of the secondary characters’ stories,
adding new didactic episodes of secondary characters. And, last but not least, she
gives equal parental power to both parents of her heroine, Jeannette (Dow, 61).

With these exceptions *The Virtuous Villager* respects the plot of de
Mouhy’s novel, but in stylistic terms it is highly characteristic of Haywood.
Indeed de Mouhy is much less explicit and does not focus on the passions, while
Haywood emphasizes both the passions and vanities of her characters and also the
bad consequences of giving way to them. In this respect *The Virtuous Villager*
contains features of both the old Haywood of the 1720s novels of amorous
intrigue and the new, post-*Pamela* Haywood that was to offer the moralistic
advice offered in *The Female Spectator*. As for the spirit of de Mouhy’s novel, she does justice to it while adding her personal mark.

As a result we have on one hand an Eliza Haywood who, in my opinion, highlights the message de Mouhy wanted to send to his readers and, while making many changes and putting her personal mark on the text, achieved her aim. On the other hand we have an anonymous translator who, apparently more respectful in keeping closer to the original, produces a version which is less effective than Haywood’s and lacks the power to transmit the message of the original.
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