

Educating the Female Orphan: Didactical Discourses in Mid-eighteenth- century Cross-channel Literature.



Samuel Wale. *A perspective View of the Foundling Hospital, with emblematic figures*, by Wale; engraved by Grignion and Canot.

Inscription:

*These Mansions rais'd by Patrons kind and great,
Where Babes deserted find a safe Retreat.
Tho' Frenchmen sneer; Their boasted first Design,
British Benevolence shall far outshine.*

Josje Siemensma

4054792

Dr. M. Corporaal – Prof. A. Montoya

Research Master Literary Studies

Research Master Thesis HLCS

27 June 2016

Table of Contents

The Ubiquitous Orphan: The Orphan in Eighteenth-Century British and French Literature.	5
Liminal Ambiguous Children: The Perception of the Orphan and its Education in Eighteenth-Century British and French Society	20
Let Me Tell You My History: Narrating the Orphan’s Pedagogical Journey in Marivaux’s <i>La Vie de Marianne</i> and Mary Collyer’s <i>The Virtuous Orphan</i>	33
From Foundling to Orphan: Social Status and Agency in Haywood’s <i>The Fortunate Foundlings</i> , Crébillon’s <i>Les Heureux Orphelins</i> , and Kimber’s <i>The Happy Orphans</i>	64
Transcending National Boundaries: The Transnational Female Orphan Narrative Template and Education in Eighteenth-Century Cross-Channel Novels	119
Works Cited.....	127

The Ubiquitous Orphan: The Orphan in Eighteenth-Century British and French Literature.

Could I but say I was descended from honest, tho' mean parents, I would not murmur at my fate, but I have none, - none to own me; - I am nothing, - a kind of reptile in humanity, and have been shewn in a genteel way of life only to make my native misery more conspicuous. (Eliza Haywood, *The Fortunate Foundlings* 177-178)

Lamenting her fate, Louisa, the female protagonist in Eliza Haywood's *The Fortunate Foundlings* (1744), locates the root of her ambivalent social position in the nature of the training she received during her childhood, which appears to be incompatible with her status as a foundling. Indeed, Louisa's position demonstrates the precarious and ambiguous nature of the orphan in eighteenth-century literature and, by extension, society. Her excellent education, provided for her by her generous and loving foster-father proves to be the source of her struggles and difficulties in society rather than a secure route to social stability. Thus, Haywood's novel raises a few questions: Is such a privileged education beneficial at all, if it worsens the orphan's social position and opportunities for self-sufficiency? Or should Louisa's education have been more mindful of her precarious and marginal social position, instead of allowing her to grow up in a wealthy environment as a penniless and abandoned child? The position of the orphan in both eighteenth-century society and literature was ambiguous and wrought with anxiety. This study will examine how in the eighteenth-century French and British novel the female orphan's education is portrayed and to what extent these representations reflect the educational practices and instructions implemented to control and care for the numerous abandoned children in eighteenth-century Europe.

The orphan, who became an ubiquitous character in literature, also featured prominently in social debates, as numerous abandoned children roamed the streets of eighteenth-century Paris and London. In the novel the orphan's estrangement from familial structures and relationship is dramatised, while simultaneously these works express the desire and necessity of assimilating these liminal individuals into the, preferably original, family. The orphan's complete lack of any form of kinship was depicted as a problematic and complicating phenomenon, which Eva König in her monograph *The Orphan in Eighteenth-Century Fiction* describes as follows:

The worst that can befall a character is the loss of his or her origins, and the work of the text is to find the missing link and heal the trouble in the family that has caused the orphaning before reintegrating the orphan in to the family. (1)

With this drive to discover the ancestry of the abandoned character, the novel emphasises the character's potential for mobility and lack of stability which enables authors to explore the structures of various familial circles and social institutions. Nevertheless, to perceive the orphan solely as a

vessel for authors through which they examined social structures and ideologies, is lopsided. The eighteenth-century orphan character is by definition a product of its historical, cultural, and social context shaped and influenced by contemporary discourses on orphanhood and foundling care. The fictional orphan's access to multiple social classes and communities allow various perspectives on pedagogical practices and standards in connection to orphanhood to enter the narration. Which of these forms of education are deemed preferable for the fictional female orphan in eighteenth-century novels? And to what extent were these representations of the female orphan's education affected by social discourses and ideologies on foundling care and education in eighteenth-century France and Britain?

The orphan as a literary figure and as an eighteenth-century individual has been examined numerous times (Robert, 1972; König, 2014; Zunshine, 2005, Nixon, 2011; Herman, 2009; Seth, 2009 and 2012). These studies examine the orphans from various perspectives ranging from physiological (Robert), Lacanian analyses (König), to new historical approaches, comparing literary representations of orphanhood with their depiction in judicial documents (Nixon) or national discourses on illegitimacy (Zunshine) or orphanhood (Seth). Although these studies mention educational practices to varying degrees, none actually address the position of the orphan in the eighteenth-century educational debate and the representation of this issue in eighteenth-century novels in both France and Britain. The prominence of the orphan in an emerging genre which associated itself with pedagogical discourses and practices should not be neglected in the analysis of this literary figure. The eighteenth-century novel has for a long time been perceived and examined as a national product, as several scholars produced accounts of the novel and its history which analysed this phenomenon in a predominantly national context (see Watt, 1960; McKeon, 1987; DeJean, 1991; Ballaster, 1992; Spacks, 2006; May, 1963; Coulet, 1968; Huet, 1975; DiPiero, 1992; Mander, 1999)¹. Yet in recent years scholars have started to challenge this perception, and instead argued that the novel found its origin in a fertile and expansive cross-cultural European network (see McMurrin, 2010 ; Frail, 2007; ; Mander, 2007; Cohen & Dever, 2002; Moretti, 2006 and 2007; Casanova, 2004; Hayes, 2009).

Indeed, the pervasiveness of the orphan character in eighteenth-century French and British fiction and the discussion of the orphan's problematic social position in numerous pamphlets, essays, and other writings indicate that the orphan, both real and fictional, stimulated the eighteenth-century imagination and anxieties, while crossing national borders in its fictional depiction. However, to which extent is the depiction of this literary character affected by national or transnational ideologies and anxieties? Is the narrative template of the female orphan in relation to her education and its depiction in the eighteenth-century novel intrinsically national or transnational? In this study, literary exchange between France and Britain will be examined through applying translation and cultural transfer

¹ This is but a small selection of the numerous monographs and collections written on the development of the novel genre in both French and English literary criticism. These studies examine the emergence, historical, and social position of the novel from various perspectives and literary theories. Furthermore, some scholars comment on the particularly nationalistic perspective adopted in previous studies, yet few address the cross-cultural network affecting the reception and perception of the novel in eighteenth-century European society.

studies. These theories will be used to compare originals and translations of two eighteenth-century orphan novels in order to answer the following research question:

Is the depiction of the education of the female orphan in cross-channel novels from 1740-1760 affected by nation-specific cultural and pedagogical differences and preferences? Or can we rather speak of transnational perspective in the novel?

The pedagogical nature and elements of the novel will be addressed in this comparative research by adopting a New-Historicist method to examine eighteenth-century perspectives, theories on, and practices of orphan education in France and Britain expressed in pamphlets, essays, and other literary genres and how these are reflected in the novels and their translations. This comparative study will focus on the similarities between the fictional and non-fictional representation of the orphan in eighteenth-century literary works. It will focus, in particular on cross-channel novels, which are French or British literary texts that crossed the British channel, in either their original or, more commonly, in a translated version which were sometimes widely read and popular in both countries². This research intends, by focusing on these elements, to contribute an innovative perspective to this debate. It will combine narratological analysis with a New-Historicist approach by reading the fictional depiction of the female orphan's education along contemporary educational treatises.

The Eighteenth-Century Orphan: An Ambiguous Individual

Eighteenth-century Paris and London encountered the problem of numerous homeless orphans; children who were forsaken by parents who were neither able or willing to care for them, were dead, or desired to hide the result of their, sometimes adulterous, affairs. In the ever-expanding French and British empires, the parentless orphans evoked anxieties for various reasons: it was feared that these children undermined social stability, in that they would be unacquainted with or unwilling to adhere to existing hierarchies and institutions. The blatant disregard for propriety and social structures are cited in the *Ladies Pamphlet* (1735), written by Thomas Coram, the Foundling Hospital's founder, as one of the incentives to establish a hospital for orphans in London. In this pamphlet, the circumstances of and care for these children as described as follows:

² Cross-channel literature and cultural transfer practices related to this phenomenon are discussed in various works, amongst which are; Jenny Mander's *Remapping the Rise of the European Novel* (2007); Stephanie Stockhorst's *Cultural Transfer through Translation: The Circulation of Enlightened Thought in Europe by Means of Translation* (2010); Anne Thomson, Simon Burrows, and Edmond Dziembowski's. *Cultural Transfers: France and Britain in the long Eighteenth-Century* (2010); Margaret Cohen and Carolyn Dever's *The Literary Channel: The International Invention of the Novel* (2002); Lise Andries, Frédéric Ogée, John Dunkley, and Darach Safey's *Intellectual Journeys: The Translation of Ideas in Enlightenment England, France, and Ireland* (2013); Mary Helen McMurrin's *The Spread of Novels; Translation and Prose Fiction in The Eighteenth-Century* (2010); Pascale Casanova's *The World Republic of Letters* (2004) or *La république mondiale des lettres* (1999); and Franco Moretti's *The Novel* (2006). All these works address various aspects of the expansive translation and exchange culture thriving in eighteenth-century Europe and particular in France and England.

Or if permitted to live [by their wet nurses], either turn [the children] into the streets to beg or steal, or hire them out too loose persons, by whom they are trained up in that infamous way of living, and sometimes are blinded, or maimed and distorted in their limbs, in order to move pity and compassion, and thereby become fitter instruments of gain, to those vile merciless wretches. (qtd in Hanway, 17-18)

This excerpt suggests that the orphaned children become acquainted with vice and corruption at a young age, and subsequently start to adopt these practices themselves, thus completing their transformation from an innocent, vulnerable child into a corrupted adolescent, or adult. Furthermore, the prevalence of orphans left to survive on the city streets testified to the failures of Christian charity. Proper education was perceived as instrumental in the upbringing of these marginal children and influential in preventing them from becoming immoral and irresponsible members of society. The idea that instruction could transform these children into law-abiding and contributing citizens, is reflected in the pamphlet *An Account of the Foundation and the Government of the Hospital for Foundlings in Paris* (1739), written at the behest of Queen Caroline:

In a religious view, the prevention of murder is a thing which morality and the principles of the Christian religion ought to induce us to lay to heart: and, as the strength of a country depends very much on the number of hands which it has to support it, in a civil view such hospitals must be of great advantage to a nation. (Preface, i)

Pamphlets, imbued with discourses of religious duty and the advantages for the country's growing empire, called for the establishment of institutions such as the foundling hospital to operate as shelter and school for the abandoned children. The French situation mirrored British concerns; although this country had a longer tradition of foundling care in the form of charity houses and hospitals, concerns about increases in the number of foundlings and the establishments that could care for this vulnerable group resonated through Parisian society.

Yet not all contributors to this debate were sympathetic towards the establishment of foundling hospitals in Britain and France, and, furthermore, questioned the intentions of the founders of these institutions or their financial, intellectual, and moral supporters and advocates. Instead, they argued, the supporters and patrons of these establishments were so adamant about sponsoring the hospitals, hôpitaux, or convents, which provided shelter and care for the country's foundlings and orphans, as they would offer space for their own bastards. In fact, this was the case for the, later, renowned mathematician and philosopher Jean le Rond d'Alembert and prominent salonnière Jeanne Julie Éléonore de Lespinasse in France. Similarly to the illegitimate children of the British noble families who were either well-married, Maria Walpole was successively married to the second Earl of Waldegrave and Prince William Henry Duke of Gloucester and Edinburgh, the king's brother, or attained high positions in society, as the illegitimate son of the tenth Earl of Pembroke who became an

admiral. These prominent individuals in society seemed to reinforce the notion of the elite circles and promiscuity.

Discourses on orphanhood and foundling care became infused with anxiety and repulsion as the perception of these philanthropic institutions and protection became slightly muddled with the impression of them as potential hideaways for illegitimate children. As the protagonist of *L'enfant trouvé, ou L'histoire de chevalier de Repert. Écrite par lui-même* (1738) states:

Qu'ils soient bâtard ou légitimes, on ne s'informe jamais d'où ils [the foundlings] viennent. Grande ressource pour les pauvres! Mais commodité bien plus grande pour cacher les fruits impures d'un amour clandestin! (qtd. in Seth 8)

The possibility of sheltering 'les fruits impures' was also a critique recurrently voiced with regard to the foundling hospital in London. Its reliance on benefactors, patrons, and charitable gifts combined with the assumption that the majority of the abandoned children were illegitimate resulted in controversy. The author 'Porcupinus Pelagius' in his satirical verse sneered at Thomas Coram, the founder of London's Foundling Hospital, and his charity, questioning his virtuous and philanthropic intention:

The Hospital Foundling came out of thy Brains.
To encourage the progress of vulgar amours,
The breeding of rogues and th'increasing of whores,
While the children of honest good husbands and wives
Stand expos'd to oppression and want all their lives. (23)

The assertions made by Pelagius and the protagonist of *L'enfant trouvé* demonstrate the complex social position of foundlings in eighteenth-century British and French society. Conflicting perceptions of orphans as either offspring of liaisons or helpless children requiring protection and care incited by Christian philanthropy were not restricted to social critique or satire in pamphlets, essays, or verse, but were similarly addressed in the new literary format of the eighteenth-century novel. Emerging in French and British novels and their translations, the literary character of the ambiguous orphan transcended national boundaries. However, the pervasiveness of the orphan character in eighteenth-century cross-channel literature does not suggest a similarity in its depiction and reception; rather, it indicates a possibility of national distinctions in the orphan's depiction in British and French novels which could be influenced by different discourses on orphanhood. Indeed, if the orphan's literary character and anxieties regarding this individual in society transcend national boundaries, can we speak of a national or transnational tradition with regard to the portrayal of the orphan in the eighteenth-century novel? Does the orphan narrative's widespread transmission through and appearance in various European, but especially British and French, literary communities indicate that it is shaped by transnational ideologies and anxieties, or does it predominantly comply with specific

national concerns about this potentially wayward individual? To which degree does the orphan narrative transcend national boundaries and is it affected by national discourses and ideologies on foundling care, education, and orphanhood? These questions will be central to my research.

Fundamental to this research are eighteenth-century understandings of the terms orphan and foundling, as they influenced the cultural perceptions of and ideologies on orphanhood. Furthermore, French and British societies differentiated between various forms of orphanhood. The term orphan indicated a child severed from his or her biological parents, through death or a form of fosterage; while a foundling denoted a child abandoned by his or her biological parents. Whereas a foundling was perceived as a child who was forsaken due to dire circumstances, an orphan was often believed to have illegitimate origins. However, the term orphan simultaneously encompassed a myriad of definitions, ranging from a child orphaned through the death of its biological parents, to fosterage or adoption, neglect, or illegitimacy (Nixon 4). The multiple definitions and ambiguous distinctions between different types of orphanhood suggests that fluidity was ingrained in this term. This ambivalence affected the perception of this individual and hints towards the problematic position it held in eighteenth-century society. Indeed, do these multiple, often equivocal, interpretations affect the portrayal of the eighteenth-century fictional orphan, and to which extent do French and British perspectives differ?

Why does this study focus on the female orphan in particular? Gender, in the eighteenth-century, had a pivotal role in determining the social position of individuals, especially the orphan. Although there were numerous male and female orphans in eighteenth-century Britain and France, the position of the female orphan was complicated by her gender. The male orphan was assumed to have the potential to become assimilated into the work force, or the army, as the author of the *Fog Journal* notes: “from such [foundling] hospitals erected in all parts of Great-Britain, we might soon draw Men to recruit our army” (558). Female orphans, by contrast, posed a complex issue for eighteenth-century philanthropic society: lacking the protection of paternal kinship, they were exposed to threats to their virtue, vulnerable to lewd amorous advances, and even prostitution. These female orphans possessed the potential to subvert society’s concepts of women as gentle, obedient, and chaste wives or maidens. To prevent the corruption of innocent children and to ensure their engagement in, assimilation into, and comprehension of society’s hierarchies, education was used as the instrument to transform these luckless children into upright citizens.

The writings of various philosophers and intellectuals of the early eighteenth century, such as Mary Astell, John Locke, Mary Chudleigh, and René Descartes, increasingly portrayed women as important agents in household management and the early instruction of their children (Popiel 4; Hilton, 46). This role required women capable of instructing their children, while problematising the absence of a maternal figure in the female orphan’s education, which could affect her own future capability of raising her own offspring according to society’s standards. The education of the female orphan was therefore designed to acquaint her with feminine duties, to give her a basic education, and

to prepare her for her maternal role. Sarah Scott's novel *A Description of Millenium Hall and the Country Adjacent* (1762) narrates the establishment of a female utopia, Millenium Hall, by gentry women who renounce marriage, often fleeing from their own bad experiences. This self-proficient and self-regulating community pursues the ideals of women's intellectual, artistic, cultural, and religious development on an estate which is designed for charitable work and the protection of vulnerable women. Included in this group of women are "the daughters of persons in office, or other life-incomes, who, by their parents' death, were left destitute of provision" and who all possess "an uncommon genius" (160). The ladies of Millenium Hall provide a society that encourages the education of these orphan girls, stating that "they are educated in such a manner as will render them acceptable where accomplished women of a humble rank and behaviour are wanted, either for the care of a house or children" (160).

Although this description of female orphan education is fictional, it does share common themes with eighteenth-century conduct literature. It, most notably, echoes the ideals expressed by Mary Astell for a Christian female community in *A Serious Proposal to the Ladies*. Moreover, it also reiterates the traditional female role and underlying purpose of female education, namely that of preparing women for their duties as wives, mothers, and managers of the household. As Hester Mulso Chapone expressed in her *Letters on the Improvement of the Mind* (1773): "With the circle of her own family and dependents lies her sphere of action – the scene of almost all those tasks and trials, which must determine her character, and her fate, here and hereafter." (2: 5). The French conduct book author Anne-Thérèse de Lambert emphasised the importance of the home in cultivating female accomplishments and duties in *Avis d'une mère à sa fille* (1724):

Les vertus des femmes sont difficiles, parce que la gloire n'aide pas à pratiquer. Vivre chez soi, ne régler qui soi et sa famille, être simple, juste et modeste; vertus penibles, parce qu'elles sont obscures. Il faut avoir bien de mérite pour fuir l'éclat, et bien du courage pour consentir à n'être vertueuse qu'à ses propres yeux. La grandeur et la réputation sont des soutiens à notre faiblesse: c'en est un que de vouloir se distinguer et s'élever. (17)

The relegation of women into the domestic sphere is also mentioned in *A Short Account of the Present State of the Working-School at Hoxton* (1761), which describes the girls' employment "in sewing and knitting, and in such domestic affairs as they are fit for" (1). In other words, in both eighteenth-century fiction and conduct literature, women's education was structured around the concept of women's integral role in the domestic sphere, as a future maternal or instructive figure, such as a governess, in society.

The continuous emphasis on the domestic element in women's education is not restricted to publications on female or orphan education. Indeed, the eighteenth-century novel also took an interest in the domestic sphere and the orphan's role within this environment. Furthermore, as Cheryl Nixon observes, representations of the female orphan in eighteenth-century literary and legal narratives

assigned her “a position central to family, wealth, and desire”, which granted an insider perspective of these institutions and emotions through an exploration of the conferring of “social, familial, and individual value” and knowledge (8). In the novel, the female orphan character exhibits intellectual maturity and decisive prowess in her actions, yet these abilities and her precarious position as a social outsider still require guidance or personal worldly experience for her to comprehend the rules of reason, propriety, and feminine accomplishments. The female orphan embodied a convergence point of two discourses which affected her curriculum. On the one hand, the discourse of the marginal orphan who required pedagogical preparation for her social role; and, on the other, the discourse of female duties and roles in society.

The Literary Orphan: A Ubiquitous Character

An ubiquitous character in eighteenth-century European literature, the orphan’s predicament was narrated in pamphlets, articles, and various British and French fictional narratives, such as Frances Burney’s *Evelina, or, the History of a Young Lady’s Entrance into the World* (1778), Henry Fielding’s *The History of Tom Jones: A Foundling* (1749), Pierre Carlet de Marivaux’s *Le paysan parvenu* (1735), and Madame de Villedieu’s *Mémoires de la vie de Henriette-Sylvie de Molière* (1672-1674). The orphan’s numerous appearances in literary genres have led some scholars to suggest that the character operated as a cipher, allowing authors to address being and becoming an individual in eighteenth-century society while examining its structures from an insider’s perspective (König 3; Nixon 8). However, as a protagonist in a literary genre which increasingly aligned itself with contemporary pedagogical aims, the portrayal of the orphan’s education should not be neglected in literary analysis. Several mid-eighteenth-century authors, such as Samuel Richardson, Henry Fielding, Charlotte Lennox, Jeanne-Marie Leprince de Beaumont, and Jean-Jacques Rousseau advertised their works’ educational nature and intentions. Indeed, Richardson surmises his intention “to divert and entertain, and at the same time to instruct and improve the minds of the youth” (ix) in his preface to *Pamela, or, Virtue Rewarded* (1740). The explicit need for proper education rose to prominence during the century which saw many authors proclaiming the educational and instructional merits of their novels in prefaces or essays. Furthermore, education is a primary concern in eighteenth-century discourses about orphans, which is mirrored in the novel’s examination of its orphan or foundling protagonist’s upbringing and educational development. Although the orphan’s marginality in the fictional family circle allows her the ability to examine both the self within and social structures in general, the effect of cultural and social discourse on orphanhood and its pedagogical elements on these fictional orphan narratives should not be neglected.

After all, the eighteenth century witnessed an alteration in the perspectives on and comprehension of pedagogical practices and traditions, influenced by philosophers such as John Locke, René Descartes, and Jean-Jacques Rousseau, who all propounded an experienced-based education in favour of the traditional rote-learning system. As Rousseau formulates in his novel come

educational treatise *Émile, ou De l'éducation* (1762): “Il n’y a qu’une longue expérience qui nous apprene à tirer parti de nous-mêmes, et cette expérience est la véritable étude à laquelle on ne peut trop tôt nous appliquer” (159). True knowledge acquisition through personal worldly experience could, as novelists claimed, also be substituted by the experiences of the novel’s protagonist. The myriad of orphan characters and the prominence of the novel’s didactical nature does raise questions to what extent the orphan’s education, as the fictional representation of a marginal individual, could be perceived as exemplary for its readership. Concurrently, the family sphere became pivotal in the novel and was prominently featured in educational treatises as the community in which children would receive their initial education and intellectual development. Both marginal and essential, the female orphan was neither separated nor part of this domestic community. However, the stages of the female orphan’s education are still depicted and discussed in novels. Yet is the female orphan’s education affected by her marginality in kinship structures and is this addressed differently in French and British fiction? Moreover, are distinctions made between the upbringing of orphans and legitimate children? Or is education an equalising and assimilating instrument?

Multiple scholars have commented on the structure of eighteenth-century orphan, foundling, or bastard narratives by addressing the narrations’ intentions of reuniting the orphan with his or her biological family and, subsequently, the smooth transition from orphanhood into a member of society and a family (Robert 1972; Nixon 2011; Zunshine 2005; König 2014). These narrative structures, whether fictional or genuine, composed according to similar plot structures and themes suggest the existence of what James Wertsch terms a ‘narrative template’, which indicates a schematic abstract template operating according to general elements that are part of particular “cultural narrative traditions” (57). Indeed, Marthe Robert, in her influential work *Romans des origines et origines du roman* (1972), states that two narratives were common in the eighteenth-century novel: the foundling narrative and the bastard narrative (37). These narratives are prevalent not only in British or French eighteenth-century fiction but throughout all eighteenth-century European literary traditions. These narratives chronicling the orphan’s life had a transnational circulation crossing national boundaries with ease in both original form and translations, thus introducing new narratives of this familiar figure to a large readership (Herman 4).

This research will analyse two instances of this cross-Channel circulation of translated novels to examine to what extent the representation of the female orphan and her education are bound to national literary and social customs and traditions, or whether there are indications of a transnational outlook on orphanhood in the novel. These two case-studies of mid-eighteenth-century British and French novels, and their translations featuring the female orphan as its protagonist, have been chosen on the basis of their, often, interesting translation history. These case-studies include Pierre Marivaux’s *La Vie de Marianne* (1731-1745) and Mary Collyer’s translation *The Virtuous Orphan, or The Life of Marianne* (1743); and Eliza Haywood’s *The Fortunate Foundlings* (1744), Claude De Crébillon’s translation *Les Heureux Orphelins* (1754), and Edward Kimber’s *The Happy Orphans*

(1759), an English translation of De Crébillon. These case-studies will compare the original with its translations and, in particular, consider the methods of education, the instructions given to, and educational experiences of the female orphan protagonists. By analysing the original's representation of these elements and comparing it with the corresponding elements in its translation, this research examines to which extent the literary representation of the female orphan's education reflects contemporary social practices and whether there are indications that a transnational 'narrative template' concerning the orphan character exists. In other words, the present study will contribute to the growing interest in the orphan in eighteenth-century studies from a neglected and innovative perspective, namely education.

Methodology

To examine the differences and similarities between the depiction of the female orphan and her education in British and French novels and their translations, this research will adopt a tripartite methodology consisting of translation studies, cultural transfer, and Wertsch' theory of narrative templates. Studies on translation and cultural transfer have been chosen to analyse the cultural and literary exchange between France and Britain during the mid-eighteenth century through various literary genres, most notably the novel. Wertsch's concept of narrative templates, on the other hand, will facilitate a narratological examination of the structures of the novels. By combining these methods, this research will address eighteenth-century comprehensions of and attitudes towards translation practices, cultural transfer and their effects on literature, and the structuring of literary narratives in relation to recurring templates in contemporary discourses.

The term cultural transfer was introduced by Michel Espagne and Michael Werner in 1988 to examine the effects of French culture on the development of German culture and vice versa, and has since proven to be influential in the discussion of cultural exchange. Cultural transfer addresses the activities and reciprocal role of one culture in relation to another, as well as studies the interaction between two cultures within the constraints of literary, philosophical, political, or scientific works which function as channels for transfer and appropriation of foreign cultural aspects (Thomson et al 2010). This method of transfer culminates in a new intermediate form which negotiates between and combines cultural elements of the original and receptive cultural community which results in a culturally hybrid literary work. This literary hybrid is a work of an ambiguous nature belonging to neither national literary tradition, but is a product of both. Translation assumes an important role in the exchange of knowledge in cultural transfer practices, since cultural transfer is understood by Espagne and Werner as a translation method which enables the transition of cultural elements from one culture to another (1969). This translation practice is fraught with ambiguity since the combination of cultural elements in the end product is influenced not only by national ideologies but also by individual decisions concerning the structure and contents of the literary work. Indeed, the transfer process between cultures could affect the content of fictional works such as novels while novelists still

claimed that their work is a faithful translation of the original. Blurring the lines between original and translation, eighteenth-century translation practices indicate the transnational origins of the novel, but simultaneously challenge an easy identification of novels as original, adaptations, or translations, due to the, sometimes, multitude of alterations made to translations, or the practice of publishing translations as originals or vice versa.

Translated works assumed a central position in the intellectual and literary exchange between nations during the seventeenth and eighteenth century. This literary exchange eventually led to the development and unification of various prose fiction forms into a new literary format: the novel. Instead of reflecting the national perception of the academic debate, the complex history of the novel resembles the eighteenth-century perspective on this innovative literary format, as Mary Helen McMurrin argues in her book *The Spread of Novels: Translation and Prose Fiction in the Eighteenth Century* (2010):

The identification of novels more closely with a national origin and character, now circulating across languages in translation, particularized novels, and then in a necessary reversal, both internationali[s]ed and universali[s]ed the novel. This complex process of transnationali[s]ation constituted the form of the novel – its allegiance to a single language and location, and its emergence as a genre with indefinite boundaries. (McMurrin, 20)

The novel can thus be regarded as a literary format influenced by the cultural specifics of a single nation with a transnational appeal and therefore easily crossed national boundaries, while conforming to national cultural traditions and preferences. The transnational origins of the novel in the eighteenth century, the continued complex cultural and societal interaction, and the reciprocal literary relationship between Britain and France complicates the various attempts to clarify the novel's origins, either from a French or British perspective. Indeed, Margaret Cohen and Carolyn Dever observe in their introduction to the edited collection *The Literary Channel*, that this literary exchange contradicts the seemingly national characteristics of the novel, thwarting attempts to align the novel with either a British or French historical context (6-7). In the fertile literary environment, translation played an intrinsic role as it allowed the public easy access to foreign novels and other literary genres, inspiring authors to contribute to or challenge certain genres. In addition to its fundamental contribution to the novel's origins, translation had been a literary practice for centuries. However, eighteenth-century attitudes to and understandings of translation changed.

Translation had been an integral part of literary tradition and language acquisition, yet towards the end of the seventeenth century a shift occurred in translation practices as translators, especially the libertine translators, rejected the premodern methods of imitative writing, preferring a more poetic or literary approach in translation (McMurrin 14). This approach favoured an adherence to the original author's sense or spirit, rather than following the word of the original, and in this manner the translators acknowledged that their work read more as an original, but simultaneously argued that it functioned as a translation since the spirit of the work was translated into this new publication. Aphra

Behn in her treatise *An Essay on Translated Prose* (1688) enumerates the linguistic difference between French and English and observes that, besides grammatical and phonological differences, the French

confound their own language with needless repetitions and tautologies; and by a certain rhetorical figure, peculiar to themselves, imply twenty lines, to express what an English man would say, with more ease and sense in five; and this is the great misfortune of translating French into English. (317)

Behn adds that she neither condemns the French or lauds the English language, but ascribes these difference to cultural and societal tastes. Hidden beneath this elaborate explanation on the distinctions between the French and English language is a logical reason why authors could, and should, deviate from the original's structure. What is considered normal in one language, can seem unreadable and forced in another. Moreover, Behn in this treatise, attached to her translation of Bernard le Bovier de Fontenelle's *Entrentiens sur pluralité des mondes* as *A Discovery of New Worlds*, defends and disguises her alterations as necessary additions or changes or "otherwise the Book could not have been understood" (317). Although translating an astronomical text, Behn's defence of alterations and, at times, the necessity of changing the original, indicates a greater acceptance and practice of this manner of translation.

This method affected the perception of translation and translation practices during the long eighteenth century as translation was not perceived as a "simple conversion" from one vernacular into the other, but as a combination of translation and novelistic techniques which many authors acknowledged (McMurrin "National or Transnational", 51). Several eighteenth-century novelists continued to combine the activities of novel-writing and translation, often being intentionally ambiguous about the origin of their fictional work, or publishing works as both author and translator and through these practices complicating "nationally based studies of the novel" (Cohen & Dever 7). Indeed, Eliza Haywood's career reflects the fluidity of genre boundaries in the early eighteenth century, as she both published a translation of Edmé Boursault's *Treize Lettres amoureuses d'une dame à un cavalier* (1700) as *Letters from a Lady of Quality to a Chevalier* (1720), on the one hand acknowledging "the liberty [she has] taken, in many Places, of adding, and in others of diminishing" (iv) the original. On the other hand, she framed her original novel *The Adventures of Eovaii* (1736) as a translation, anonymously adding to the multitude of texts satirizing Sir Robert Walpole. The frequent references to integrating two seemingly different literary processes in one written work provokes questions about originality and adaptation with regard to translation. Indeed, should an eighteenth-century translation always be classified as a translation or adaptation; or is it preferable to refer to certain translations as originals or imitations? In this research this question will be addressed in each case-study, as differences in narrative templates and structures will be compared while contemplating what exactly constitutes an original or translation.

Methods of translation adopted by eighteenth-century translators can roughly be summarised by John Dryden's three types of translation, which he termed: metaphrase, paraphrase, and imitation. Representing different stages in translation, Dryden briefly defines these methods: Metaphrase refers to a literal, word by word translation; paraphrase is interpreted by Dryden as "translation with latitude" (114) in which the author's sense is respected and maintained by the translator; whereas imitation is the most liberal of all translation practices as the translator "assumes the liberty not only to vary from the words and sense, but to forsake them both as he sees occasion: and taking only some general hints from the original, to run division on the ground-work, as he pleases" (114-115). This last method was the most common one adopted by translators of classical and modern works. Dryden's contemporary Anne Dacier in her preface to *L'Iliade d'Homere* (1716) described her own approach to translating as follows:

Quand je parle d'une traduction en prose, je ne veux point parler d'une traduction servile; je parle d'une traduction genereuse & noble, qui en s'attachant fortment aux idées de son original, cherche les beauties de sa linge, & rend ses images sans compter les mots. La premiere, par une fidelité trop scrupuleuse, deviant très-infidele: car pour conserver la lettre, elle ruine l'esprit, ce qui est l'ouvrage d'un froid & sterile genie; au lieu que l'autre, en ne s'attachant principalement qu'à conserver l'esprit, ne laisse pas, dans ses plus grandes libertés, de conserver aussi la lettre; & par ses triats hardis, mais toujours vrais, elle deviant non-seulement la fidelle copie de son original, mais un second original meme. Ce qui ne puet être execute que par un genie solide, noble & fecond. (10)

This excerpt from Dacier's preface touches upon the two extremities in translation practice identified by Dryden as metaphrase and imitation, and argues in favour of the latter, as this is more faithful to the original's 'esprit' which will result in a "second original". Indeed, the liberty of manipulating the respective original into a translation, or rather adaptation, seemed to be a translation method frequently adopted in the eighteenth-century literary field. This method is extolled by Samuel Johnson in *The Idler* as he states that by applying this freedom when translating the result was "made more easy to the writer, and more delightful to the reader" (191); therefore, the translator who is capable of comprising the author's sense and spirit "deserves the highest praise" (192).

French translation theories and practices reflected the juxtaposition between literal, metaphrase, translation and imitation. Jean le Rond d'Alembert stressed the impossibility of translating certain linguistic structures from one language into another in his 1759 essay *Observations sur l'art de traduire en général*, refuting the assertion of many theorists, such as René Descartes and Nicolas Beauzée "that every language could be translated into any other language" (Stockhorst, 10). A similar debate on distinguishing between faithful and free translations of, primarily classical texts, surfaces during the late seventeenth century in France. Anne Dacier advocated a certain faithfulness to the original in which the translator functions as a copier who follows the original author's spirit without being restricted by the original's structure. By contrast, other translators, such as Nicolas

Perrot d'Ablancourt, preferred an imitation-like approach to translation, disregarding the original elements of the literary work in favour of an aesthetic and *bienséance* approach, which endeavours to make the work match the standards of propriety, thereby resulting in a more tasteful work than the original. This new method in translation was termed 'belles infidèles', referring to the infidelity of the translator to the original to achieve a beautiful translation. Nevertheless, to achieve this pleasing translation the translators frequently diverged strongly from the original text, leading to criticism by intellectuals and readers. This practice continued until the mid eighteenth century when a movement arose which valued and preferred a "new exactitude in translation theory" (Stockhorst 11). Proponents of this new course in French translation methods were Voltaire, Diderot, and le Chateaubriand.

The existence of orphan narratives in both French and British literary traditions and translations indicate that, while alterations were deemed necessary by the translator, these narrative structures exceeded national boundaries; thus, suggesting the existence of a transnational orphan narrative template. This concept of narrative templates, developed by James Wertsch, states that narratives are schematic and structured according to generalised and abstract functions, thus reiterating settings, themes, events, characters, inherent to that particular narrative. This repetition creates a narrative template that becomes recognizable and thus linked to certain protagonists. However, these narrative templates are not universal in nature. Wertsch argues that the templates' structure and content are temporally and culturally dependent and influenced by particular, national, narrative traditions (Wertsch in Seixas, 57; Wertsch 55-62). Nevertheless, this research is using Wertsch's culturally bound concept to address the narrative template of a literary figure that transcended national boundaries. In fact, this study will argue that although details of the female orphan's narrative template are affected by temporal, sometimes national, discourses on orphanhood and pedagogy, its basic structure is transnational. This transnational foundation allows the orphan novel to easily align itself with foreign literary traditions and enter their literary markets due to similar narrative structures and elements. Nonetheless, this conversion from one language into another often included a translation approach based on an imitative perspective, thus resulting in alterations being made to the original which were influenced by temporal and cultural discourses of the receptive nation. Wertsch's narratological theory will be used in this research to compare the structures of the originals and their translations to examine the alterations to the original's narrative structure. Furthermore, this theory will also be applied to determine to what extent the depiction of the female orphan's education that is part of this template is influenced by national ideologies which, as Wertsch argues, complement the transnational foundation of these narrative templates.

The research's approach will provide new insights into the construction of narrative structures regarding the female orphan character in the eighteenth-century novel. Indeed, it will argue that this character transcends national boundaries in her literary manifestation but is simultaneously affected by national traditions and perceptions on orphanhood and education, thus resulting in similar yet different depictions of the female orphan in the original and translated novel. Simultaneously, this research will

address the complexity of translation methods and the difficulty to distinguish between original and translation, or imitation, in the eighteenth-century literary field, arguing that a reconsideration of the term ‘original’, ‘translation’, and ‘adaptation’ in relation to the eighteenth-century novel is required.

Structure

In order to examine the representation of the female orphan and her education in eighteenth-century novels and their translations, this study has been divided into three chapters which address the historical context and the analyses of the two case-studies. The first chapter of this thesis comprises the socio-historical and didactic context of eighteenth-century orphanhood, as it will concurrently examine the social endeavour to define this marginal individual and its social position in both French and British society. Furthermore, this chapter will also address the pedagogical practices in Britain and France in general, and in particular in relation to the female orphan. This section will particularly draw on the educational pamphlets, essays, and conduct and advice literature written during the eighteenth century in both Britain and France. These sections will support the subsequent analyses of the depiction of the type(s) of orphanhood and the didactic structures and methods portrayed in the novels and their translations in chapters two and three.

The second chapter will comprise the case-study of Pierre Carlet de Marivaux’s *La Vie de Marianne* and its translation *The Virtuous Orphan* by Mary Collyer. In addition to examining the depiction of Marianne’s orphanhood and education, this chapter will also concentrate on the autobiographical aspect of Marianne’s correspondence narrative, the role of the paternal and maternal figures and communities in Marianne’s upbringing, and Collyer’s endeavours to transform Marivaux’s original into a pedagogical novel. Despite the length of the examination of all three novels of the second case-study, which comprises Haywood’s, Crébillon’s, and Kimber’s novels, they will be discussed in one chapter, in order to demonstrate the similarities between the three texts and provide a coherent analysis of the text’s translation history and transformation by two translators. Chapter three, will, therefore, start with examining Haywood’s *The Fortunate Foundlings* and, in particular, the representation of the female orphan’s education, agency, and self-development. The subsequent sections will contain the analyses of the translations by Crébillon and Kimber. In addition to addressing the depiction of the female orphan and her education, this chapter will also discuss the major alterations made by the authors to their respective translations and the implications these have for the narrative template about the female orphan and the concept of translation as a whole. The conclusion will summarise the similarities and differences between the narrative templates of female orphanhood in the individual novels and discuss whether the depiction of education and pedagogical methods are embedded in national discourses or whether they incorporate transnational elements as well.

Liminal Ambiguous Children: The Perception of the Orphan and its Education in Eighteenth-Century British and French Society

The anxiety about orphanhood and the abandoned children on the city and town streets during the eighteenth century was not restricted to specific nations or social institutions. Instead, this concern was transnational, since it arose in various European countries, but was approached through nation-specific attitudes. The fate of the orphan, or *enfant trouvé*, was addressed in social discussion and philanthropic endeavours, as ideologies on how to provide for this marginal yet vulnerable individual concurred within cultural communities and between nations. Nonetheless, this chapter will also demonstrate that the national perspectives on the orphan did simultaneously exhibit minor differences with regard to defining the care, education, and social position of these children in society. Before examining the two case-studies, this first chapter will address the historical context of abandoned children in British and French society, especially in London and Paris. An emphasis will be placed on the social standing of the orphans, the effect of the orphan's gender on the social perception of him or her, and the various discourses about and, often charitable, endeavours to educate the orphan. This chapter will address the socio-historical, pedagogical, and cultural context of the eighteenth-century orphan, concentrating on how society and charitable institutions attempted to understand and place this enigmatic and marginal individual. The social position of the orphan in British and French society will be addressed first by examining the various definitions of the terms foundling and orphan in the eighteenth century. This will give an insight into the social and cultural perception of this marginal individual. Subsequently, this chapter will elaborate on the pedagogical institutions established, educational perspectives voiced, and practices adopted for foundlings and orphans. This New-Historicist approach will be developed by examining and consulting eighteenth-century articles, essays, pamphlets, educational treatises, and conduct literature which will give some insights into contemporary opinions and practices.

The orphan and British society

I shall mention a piece of charity which has not been yet exerted among us, and which deserves our attention the more, because it is practised by most of the nations about us. I mean a provision for foundlings, or for those children who through want of such a provision are exposed to the barbarity of cruel and unnatural parents. (*The Guardian*, no. 105, 11 July 1713; 109-110)

Voicing his opinion on the current state of orphanages, Joseph Addison observes a discrepancy between charity schools, the care for foundlings, and potential long-term effects of a continuous neglect of this vulnerable group in society. Addison continues his article by enumerating methods of child-neglect, murder, or even abortion to illustrate the extreme, inhuman, and “unnatural” practices these parent(s) resort to. He states that these atrocities can be avoided by offering parents possibilities which have been made available throughout Europe, but not in England, in the form of foundling hospitals (110). These hospitals would give parents, for whichever reason, the opportunity to anonymously leave their child with an establishment which would provide for its education, shelter, and nourishment. Despite Addison’s appeal for a provision for orphans, these institutes were not unfamiliar to the eighteenth-century public. Similar institutions had been established during the reign of Edward VI for the housing of legitimate orphans in Christ College, the converted Bridewell Palace, and St. Thomas monastery (Pinchbeck and Hewitt 127-134).

Nonetheless, the capacity of these hospitals was limited, hence, only orphans born from wedlock were admitted. Although Addison’s call did not result in the immediate establishment of foundling hospitals similar to the Saint-Esprit and Trinité in Paris, La Pietà in Venice, or the Waisenhäuser in the German principalities, it expressed the social concern about the numerous orphans and foundlings in the urban spaces and how to provide proper education and care for these children (Jacobi 55, 64; Arnold n.p.). Nevertheless, towards the later part of the seventeenth century, the regulations established from Edward VI’s reign onward for the philanthropic movements supporting poor children and orphans were affected by the Civil War and the Puritan regime which infused a “Puritan emphasis on work and thrift” (Jacobi 64). Furthermore, this altered attitude towards parish care for the poor and abandoned children was put under strain as the system “struggle[d] to cope with the demands made on it” (Pugh n.p.), indicating the restrictions of the parish relief system. This contributed to the removal of the foundling care from the parishes, as had traditionally been the case; instead, as Jonas Hanway, a governor of the Foundling Hospital, recorded, during Queen Anne’s reign “several merchants proposed to open a subscription, and to solicit for a charter, with a view to erect an hospital for the reception of such infants, as the misfortunes, or inhumanity of their parents, should leave destitute of support” (16). In fact, the number of philanthropic undertakings rose during the eighteenth century, as Gillian Pugh observes. Five hospitals were founded “and dozens of charity schools and other philanthropic enterprises” within a few years (n.p.) The, comparatively late, philanthropic activities in Britain, which led to the establishment of many orphanages during the eighteenth century, arose from a growing concern about increasing infanticide in London and Britain as a whole.

The orphan’s plight motivated individuals such as Thomas Coram to plead for their cause, but, as Rhian Harris observes in her article “The Foundling Hospital”, simultaneously an increasing emphasis in religion on benevolence and charity, and in philosophical writing on the utility of virtue, affected society’s attitudes towards orphans and their care. The long petitioning for, and eventual

establishment of Thomas Coram's Foundling Hospital, which received a Royal Charter in 1739 and opened its doors in 1741 in London, was the result of his personal drive combined with the growing philanthropic atmosphere in early eighteenth-century Britain (Wagner 136, 144). The strenuous situations of the abandoned children and the necessity of philanthropic efforts are stressed in a pamphlet written at the behest of Queen Caroline and posthumously published as *An Account of the Foundation and the Government of the Hospital for Foundlings in Paris* (1739):

The frequent murders of bastard children, and the many foundlings who lose their lives by being expos'd, have put men upon thinking of a proper way to prevent these evils: which design, if it could be effectually executed, seems to promise more real advantage to this nation than any other that has been set on foot of late years. (2)

Besides reiterating the cruel treatment of foundlings, orphans, or bastards on the city streets, the author emphasises the positive impact of these charitable institutions, as they create, through careful nurturing and education, productive and upright citizens; thus, successfully reclaiming the once forgotten and marginal individual as a full member of British society. The philanthropic movement behind the establishment of the foundling hospitals employed notions of hope, benevolence, and the potential of an auspicious future in their discourses on orphans and foundlings. Indeed, the discourses of these publications and correspondences are imbued with themes of philanthropy and optimistic perspectives on the orphans' futures, when raised in an institutional environment. These discourses were applied by Frances Brooke, whose author-persona, Mary Singleton, described and defended the Foundling Hospital in issue no 13 (7 February 1756) of Brooke's periodical *The Old Maid* (1755-56). In fact, Singleton commended the efforts made by Coram and his associates by emphasising the positive effects of this hospital through a juxtaposition of neglected children on the street and the orphans in the orphanage:

that of a number of unfortunate innocents saved from an untimely death, or what is worse, from being trained up in abandoned principles and under profligate examples; to lead a wretched and pernicious life, proceeding in pain and misery, and ending in infamy and horror; but are here educated in a manner the most proper to their condition and birth, and put into the way to be happy themselves, and useful to society. (99)

Furthermore, Singleton laments the dearth of donations for this evidently deserving cause, which in turn affects the number of children that can be helped, and she finds it grievous that "so necessary a foundation, should be left to the chance of private and uncertain donations, the consequence of which is that three parts in four of those who are brought there to be provided for are rejected" (99). The rest of the letter is used by Singleton to laud the endeavours of the governors and to deplore the lack of societal support. Although this issue of *The Old Maid* was published a few decades after Coram's endeavours to establish the hospital, the same rhetoric was adopted by him in his first petition for the

Foundling Hospital, which is known as the Ladies Petition due to the twenty-one ladies who signed the document, Singleton formulated the motivation of providing for these children as follows:

For a beginning to redress so deplorable a grievance, and to prevent as well the effusion of so much innocent blood ... and to enable them, by an early and effectual care of their education to become useful members of the commonwealth, [...] ... and for the better producing good and faithful servants amongst the poor and miserable cast off children or foundlings (qtd. in Pugh – n.p.)

This excerpt from Coram's petition exhibits the recurring themes of the orphan's vulnerability and the usefulness of this individual for society in servitude and employment. Both concepts of Christian philanthropy and aiding the growth and structure of the empire were essential in the discourses on orphanhood in the eighteenth century, particularly in relation to the establishment of shelter and care for the young orphans, bastards, and foundlings.

Paramount in the discourses on abandoned children in eighteenth-century British society were the differentiations made between various forms of child abandonment. In the eyes of society, the terms orphan, foundling, and bastard all indicated distinct types of child neglect with specific connotations regarding their birth and legitimacy. In his *A Dictionary of the English Language*, Samuel Johnson included entries on the three words, which all give succinct definitions for these terms. The orphan is defined by Johnson as a "a child who has lost father or mother, or both"(321, V2) or is "bereft of parents", while the foundling is specified as "a child exposed to chance; a child without any parent or owner" (1041 ,V1), and the bastard is described as " a person born of a woman out of wedlock, or not married; so that, according to the order of law, his father is not known" and "begotten out of wedlock, illegitimate" (255, V1). This plethora of definitions indicate small distinctions between the forms of child abandonment in British society. Although all of Johnson's interpretations are grounded in the loss of an unidentified parent, the degree of knowledge about these parents is essential for the social perception of the abandoned child. Whereas an orphan knew his or her parents' identity and has lost either one or both, the foundling, on the other hand, is unaware of his parents and ancestry, while the bastard perhaps only knows the identity of his or her mother.

Regardless of the accurate differentiation between these terms, the use of them and perception in society differed greatly and was dependent on the individual's intentions, class status, and geographical location. The term foundling, as understood by Coram and his patrons, referred to a specific type of orphanhood; the unwanted, neglected children who were left behind by their biological parents often for reasons of poverty or illegitimacy. These abandoned children are seen as the future inhabitants of the Foundling Hospital, as is described in the *Ladies Petition* (1735):

no expedient has yet been found out for preventing the frequent murders of poor miserable infants at their birth; or for suppressing the inhuman custom of exposing new-born infants to

perish in the streets, or putting out such unhappy foundlings to wicked and barbarous nurses, who, undertaking to bring them up for a small and trifling sum of money, do often suffer them to starve for want of due sustenance or care;... (qtd. in Hanway, 17)

This excerpt indicates that the initial intention of the hospital's patrons was to provide shelter for the vulnerable infants in society. Furthermore, the multiplicity of interpretations of 'orphan' and the struggle in its specification is reflected in eighteenth-century British discourses. Lisa Zunshine in her monograph *Bastards and Foundlings: Illegitimacy in Eighteenth-century England* expounds on the diversity of social perspectives on orphans and foundlings, whose legitimate status becomes integral to the discussion of actual and depiction of literary orphans. However, although the terms orphan and foundling often implied illegitimacy and bastardy, the toleration of these children was highly dependent on the child's geographical location and the class status of its mother (2-5). Illegitimate children in rural areas or of wealthy parents fared better than the offspring of serving women in London, who were targeted by Coram and his supporters. As Cheryl Nixon observes, children were considered orphans upon their father's death, regardless of their mother still being alive (1). Although the terms orphan, foundling, and bastard were perceived to define distinct forms of orphanhood, they were used concurrently, and sometimes as almost synonyms.

Even gender affected the fate of the eighteenth-century orphan, as, apart from the numerous vices the foundlings were exposed to in the city, their fate, if admitted to foundling hospitals, was influenced by society's perspectives on gender. After the foundation of an extra wing in 1752, boys and girls were separated in the Foundling Hospital. This separation, despite the equal and basic educational programme, continued in the future prospects and employment of these children which reflect gender ideologies as girls were expected to become servants, maids, or enter female businesses, whereas boys were apprenticed to become soldiers or traders. Notwithstanding the separation of male and female orphans, their education was structured in such a manner as to facilitate their entrance into society and its hierarchies. To elevate the anxiety whether educating poor children "would make them unwilling to perform their servile tasks" (Pugh n.p.) and thereby threaten the British social hierarchies, the Foundling Hospital's governors ensured that after their basic education, which included subjects such as reading, writing, and religious instruction, the boys would be apprenticed and spend part of the day working, while girls were taught knitting, needlework, and catechism. All these instructions were intended to "prepare them to be useful servants" (Pugh, n.p.) In spite of these intentions, social anxieties about the orphan and his or her lack of ancestry endured. For example, in the *Fog Journal's* weekly essay, the author of the contribution of 26 October 1734, titled 'The Political Projector', addresses the issues of education and social status. According to this writer, the male orphan could be recruited into the army, whereas "the girls, the officers and soldiers might be obliged to take them for wives, by which those Gentlemen would be prevented from contracting any alliance by marriage" (558). Regardless of the charitable or critical perspective on the Foundling Hospital and its governors,

both supporters and opponents agreed on developing organisations or institutions to regulate and provide the care for London's, and British, abandoned children.

The Orphan in France

Similarly to Britain, in eighteenth-century France the orphaned child provoked a myriad of complex and at times contradictory responses. Struggling to define this marginal individual in a society where the family became increasingly perceived as the locus of social change and improvement (Popiel 4), French society exhibited a similar need to define and understand the orphan figure, who was removed from this scene of improvement and education. The definition of the “orphelin”, by Louis Chevalier de Jaucourt, in the *Encyclopédie ou dictionnaire raisonné des sciences des arts et des métiers* (1765), emphasised the loss of biological parents and described him or her as “un enfant mineur qui a perdu son pere et sa mere”(11: 662). Furthermore, de Jaucourt's entry summarises the foundling care practices in : Ancient Greece which emphasised the notion of the male child repaying his debt to the state who has functioned as his parent through military service. Interestingly, de Jaucourt does not specify how girls should compensate the care they had received from the state. The entry ends on a wistful note, as de Jaucourt briefly criticises contemporary French practices in orphan care, stating that “on n'a point imité dans nos gouvernemens modernes de si nobles institutions politique” (11: 662). De Jaucourt seems to imply that a similar system should be implemented in France; that is, the orphans should be raised in either state-owned institutions or in families who are supported by the state, and the orphans should, subsequently, reimburse their indebtedness by serving the state. De Jaucourt shares, to some extent, the views of the *Fog Journal*, who similarly states that orphans are obliged to serve their country to repay their debts. The resemblance between the opinions of de Jaucourt and the anonymous author of the *Fog Journal* entry already indicate that French and British distinctions and definitions of the various types of orphanhood are remarkably similar. In particular the differentiations made by Coram and his supporters between foundling, orphan, and bastard circulated in French society as well. The *Encyclopédie ou dictionnaire raisonné des sciences des arts et des métiers* included another two entries on the enfant exposé and the enfant batard, both written by Antoine-Gaspard Boucher d'Argis. In the former entry on the enfant exposé, also vulgarly called enfant trouvé, d'Agris defines the child as:

Enfant exposé, ou comme on l'appelle vulgairement, un enfant trouvé, est un enfant nouveau - né ou en très - bas âge & hors d'état de se conduire, que ses parens ont exposé hors de chez eux, soit pour ôter au public la connoissance qu'il leur appartient, soit pour se débarrasser de la nourriture, entretien & éducation de cet enfant. (5: 655)

In other words, the foundling is a child abandoned by its parents, an act which is generated by dire need, and therefore dependent on society's charity. Interestingly, d'Agris endeavours to minimise the connotation of illegitimacy regarding orphans, specifically foundlings, stating that: “Les enfans

exposés ne sont point réputés bâtards; & comme il y en a souvent de légitimes qui sont ainsi exposés, témoin l'exemple de Moïse, on présume dans le doute pour ce qui est de plus favorable. (5: 655). However, d'Argis's acerbic tone in the last line suggests that the connotations of shame and illegitimacy hovered around the figure of the orphan in eighteenth-century France, regardless of its history and especially if the heritage of the child was unknown. Notwithstanding, d'Argis attempts to dispel implications of illegitimacy and bastardy, seemingly inherent in both the French and British concept of the orphan.

Although de Jaucourt deplors the practices of orphan care in eighteenth-century France and prefers a system based on the ancient Greek example, France, similar to Britain, tried to provide for the many orphans found in the urban communities. Britain had a relatively young tradition of foundling hospitals and institutions providing for the care of the foundling or abandoned child, which was often relegated to the parish. By contrast, France had a longer tradition of foundling hospitals: the first orphanage to be established in Paris was the Saint-Esprit which was founded by “the confraternity of St. Esprit” at the place de Grève (Gager, 106). This care was augmented by general hospitals providing care for children of deceased patients, such as Hôtel-Dieu, many of which were transformed into orphanages, such as Hôpital de la Trinité in 1545, which took on the name of Hospice des Enfants-Blue (Jacobi 59-60; Robin 439-440; Robin-Romero 19; Dinan 96). Isabella Robin-Romero observes in *Les Orphelins de Paris: Enfants et assistance aux XVIe-XVIIIe siècles* (2007) that distinctions were made between hospitals for the sick and for the poor. However, as she notes, these lists did not include other forms of orphan care outside these institutions, one of which is the “maisons pour orphelins” (20). One of these houses of Charity (Maisons de Charité) was founded by Nicolas Houel who sought King Henri III's permission in 1576 to found “a charitable institution for poor orphan children” called *Maisons de la Charité chrétienne* (Elliot 151). Although Houel's motives for the establishment of this charitable institution are unknown, he did set a precedent for successors to follow. Indeed, the seventeenth century also saw the establishment of institutions of assistance for the poor and unfortunate, including orphan or abandoned children. One of these hospitals was established by Vincent de Paul and Louise de Marillac: Les filles de la Charité ou Soeurs de Vincent de Paul in 1633 which eventually replaced the state foundling hospital Maison de la Couche, which was renowned for its poor care with a high death rate at the end of the seventeenth century (Dinan 96; Gager 112, 122).

Despite its longer tradition of charitable institutions for orphans, the definition and acceptance of orphans in eighteenth-century France depended on their legal position. Regardless of D'Argis' attempts to diminish the association of illegitimacy with foundlings, Susan Dinan observes “to the modern eye, foundlings were a source of pity and shame” (95). Their destitute and vulnerable state evoked pity, yet the potential of being a product of illegitimacy and moral depravity thwarted any structural actions to care for the foundlings. Many of the aforementioned French hospitals only

accepted orphans from legitimate marriages while the children of, presumably, adulterous affairs were excluded, as Isabelle Robin-Romero surmises:

Dans l'histoire de l'assistance, les orphelins sont souvent éclipsés par d'autres enfants malheureux: les enfants abandonnés.[...]En tant qu'orphelins, ils sont légitimes, mais surtout, les administrations d'assistance et les enfants eux-mêmes connaissent leurs origines et leur parenté. Ceci est d'autant plus important que les contemporains font une grande différence entre les abandonnés, qu'il regardent comme les enfants de vice ou du moins aux origines douteuses, et les orphelins qu'ils considèrent comme des enfants du malheur. (8)

This distinction between enfants abandonnés, enfants trouvés, and orphelins influenced the care given to these children and their social acceptance. La Couche, in Paris, was established to provide care for the foundlings thought to be illegitimate, yet the standard of care was significantly lower than in those institutions which took in legal orphans (Dinan 96). In its *Encyclopédie* entry on the enfant exposé, D'Agrès addresses the broad admission practices of the hôpitaux, reporting on the varied background of these children:

Dans les endroits où il y a des hôpitaux établis pour les enfants trouvés ou exposés, on y reçoit non seulement ceux qui sont exposés, mais aussi tous enfants de pauvres gens quoiqu'ils aient leurs père & mère vivants; à Paris on n'en reçoit guère au-dessus de quatre ans.

It seems that most of the hôpitaux or maisons de la charité preferred to err on the side of caution when admitting and accepting children into their care. Rather, the admittance of all children, including those of poor parents, was common practice. Indeed, the distinction between poor children and foundlings was not often made by hospitals as Robin-Romero observes: "Que ce soit par manque de renseignements sur leur famille ou parce qu'ils sont admis dans des hôpitaux généraux qui se soucient peu de séparer les gens, sinon selon les sexes, les orphelins font partie de la masse des pauvres secourus par les institutions d'assistance" (20). This neglect is commented upon by lawyer and administrator of the Lyon l'hôpital de la Charité who describes the bewilderment arising in hospitals about these separate types of orphanhood:

En général, les hôpitaux reçoivent et confondent l'enfant trouvé, réputé bâtard jusqu'à ce que le père se fasse reconnoître, l'enfant abandonné, dont les parents connus ont disparu, et l'orphelin que laissent en mourant ses père et mère (qtd. in Robin-Romero 26-27)

These distinctions between various types of orphanhood are written with the intention to remove the confusion about the temporally abandoned child and the orphan whose parents are dead. Furthermore, as Catriona Seth discusses (11-13), the practice of accepting children of poor parents for brief periods indicate that the population was more diverse than represented in literature aimed at criticising these institutions. Rather, these publications represented the hospitals as institutions which were

predominantly erected for the housing of bastards, hence mirroring social perceptions of the British Foundlings Hospitals in British society. Indeed, French and British society were equally conflicted about managing the ambiguous orphan with its need for shelter and care who could be of illegitimate origins and harboured the potential to deviate from social norms. Education was perceived as one of the methods through which the orphan could be moulded into an abiding citizen. Yet how do educational practices and discourses portray the orphan's education in regard to him or her acquiring or aspiring to a respected position in society, and are there distinctions between the French and British cases?

Education and Reform: Reconsidering Pedagogical Practices

Educational theories and methods were constantly scrutinized and readdressed during the eighteenth century resulting in a myriad of publications on the subject of pedagogical practices, content, environment, and strategies on both sides of the Channel, with many works crisscrossing the borders and influencing philosophers of the other nation. The perception of education shifted towards the end of the seventeenth century, when John Locke published his influential work *Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (1690) in which he refuted the traditional pedagogical practices of rote-learning and memorising. According to Locke, humans acquired knowledge through worldly experience, which, combined with encouragement and careful guidance to an appropriate path of education, rather than forcing a child in a mould, would result in a well-educated and self-sufficient individual (Popiel 31). Locke describes the infant's mind as a tabula rasa, stating:

If we will attentively consider new-born children, we shall have little reason to think that they bring many ideas into the world with them. [...] One may perceive how, by degrees, afterwards, ideas come into their minds; and that they get no more, nor other, than what experience, and the observation of things that come in their way, furnish them with... (I, iii, 92-93)

The centrality of experience in Locke's theories took root in eighteenth-century philosophical and educational works, which, in response to Locke's suggestion that the human mind is not innately good or bad but malleable, turned attention to the early stages of childhood and youth where the essential formation of an individual takes place. Education in the eighteenth century, both in France and Britain, became, as Natasha Gill terms it, "an intellectual laboratory" (1). The experimental nature that education acquired during the eighteenth century is reflected in the emergence of the educational treatise during this century. In this innovative prose format, authors would translate their theory into methods and practical applications while continuously relating it to prominent philosophical debates about equality, freedom, society, and the individual (Gill 1).

The concerns raised in these pedagogical works did also affect the content and structure of female education in the eighteenth century. Although Locke did not explicitly distinguish between

male and female education and capability, his successors increasingly differentiated between male and female instruction (Popiel 8). Instead of refuting the female intellect as inferior, it was perceived as different, and women's education had to reflect these "notions of complementary gender-specific attributes" such as taste, wit, and practical reasoning (Peruga, 190). Mary Astell tirelessly advocated the advancement of women's education, as she argues in *A Serious Proposal for Ladies* (1694): "for since God has given women as well as men intelligent souls, why should they be forbidden to improve them? Since he has not denied us the faculty of thinking, why should we not (at least in gratitude to him) employ our thoughts on himself their noblest object" (47). Her contemporaries Judith Drake, Mary Chudleigh, as well as Mme Scudéry, and Mme de Lambert, amongst others, in France, echoed the importance of and the necessary alterations in women's education, citing women's central role in the family and household as requiring a thorough and practical education. Despite the fact that women became increasingly confined to the domestic sphere in their role as mothers and wives, these educational treatises attributed intellectual capacities to and argued for intellectual values in women, while creating a space for agency within the confines of the familial sphere. However, as the female orphan lacked this maternal protection and care in the familial circles, how could these be substituted and replaced in a society that valued the educational worth of the initial maternal pedagogical instructions?

While petitioning for the establishment of his Foundling Hospital, Thomas Coram had his petition signed by twenty-one ladies of quality, including the Duchess of Somerset, the Duchess of Bolton, the Duchess of Richmond, the Duchess of Bedford, the Duchess of Manchester, to name a few (Wagner, 87-90)³. Besides actively recruiting the support of these aristocratic women, Coram indirectly gathered the backing of their husbands, who subsequently supported the charity as donors or governors. The support of these prominent persons did lend some force to Coram's intention of establishing an hospital to prevent infanticide and provide foundling care (Zunshine, 146). Furthermore, the public support of these noblewomen imparted a maternal element and incentive to the establishment of London's Foundling Hospital. This aspect was magnified in later years, as Coram attributed the establishment of the hospital completely to the ladies' ventures, simultaneously emphasising the central position of women in both the foundation of this institution and in childrearing.

The maternal duty of instruction and rearing children was not restricted to Coram's representation of the Foundling Hospital's foundation. This perception also emerged in the hospital's educational program. The pedagogical practices of the Foundling Hospital followed the century's shifting views on education. The initial basic education programme designed by its governors included basic reading skill and an understanding of "[the children's] subordinate place", which was expanded with arithmetic, needle work for the girls, and writing (Pugh n.p.). Thomas Coram, however, was

³ For a complete enumeration of the twenty-one ladies who signed the petition, see Gillian Wagner's *Thomas Coram, Gent., 1688-1751*.

progressive in his views on female education, as he observed in a letter to Benjamin Colman in 1737 that girls should receive a similar education as boys, since this would prepare them for instructing their future offspring: “giving girls a virtuous education is a vast advantage to their posterity as well as the publick” (Coram). Coram echoes the opinions of various philosophers and educationalists, such as Astell, Locke, and Chapone who advocated women’s education due to her essential agency in childrearing and household management. Hester Mulso Chapone, proposed a conflation of women’s sphere of action with their role as mothers and housewives, stating in *Letters on the Improvement of the Mind* (1774) that “the principle virtue or vices of a woman must be of a private and domestic kind. – Within the circle of her own family and dependants lies her sphere of action- “ (6,V2). As Chapone’s excerpt indicates, women’s primary role in life was linked to either working within the domestic sphere, as servant or maid, or managing it as mistress and wife, which, in turn, required women to receive the appropriate education to prepare them for their duties. By assigned subjects, such as arithmetic, needle work, writing, and reading, Coram intended to cultivate a sound basis for the girls’ employment and apprenticeships in predominantly domestic service (Pugh n.p.). In other words, The Foundling Hospital’s didactic practices focused on providing the children with a sound rudimentary education before sending them off to be apprenticed, yet this egalitarian pedagogical approach was ultimately adopted to create citizens who would assume an appropriate position within the social gender hierarchy.

The French foundlings housed in the numerous Parisian foundling hospitals received a similar basic education as the British orphans. Indeed, the subjects included reading, writing, arithmetic, and religious instruction which was highly emphasised in these establishments (Robin-Romero 171; Robin, 444; Fuchs, 16). However, scholars have observed that the extent of education given in foundling hospitals and similar institutions to orphaned children differed greatly. Robin-Romero, in her account, states that it would provide these children with skills: “De même, on espère qu'ils deviendront utiles” (171). Whereas Fuchs, in her account of the Salpêtrière, an asylum for mentally ill women and orphanage, observes that when most girls left at the age of twenty-five they were “untrained for a job” (16). Similar to Britain, the orphan girls, just as regular women, were seen as essential in educating the younger generations the rules of propriety and virtuous conduct as Robin-Romero notes “Les orphelins, et tout particulièrement les filles, ont leur place dans le processus de diffusion des préceptes chrétiens d'humilité, d'obéissance, et d'encouragement du peuple au travail. Éviter la mendicité, c'est dégoûter les enfants de l'oisiveté” (172). The French foundling hospitals also sought to provide their pupils with apprenticeships. However, both British and French practices of apprenticeships were criticised by employers and masters who complained about the foundling’s disobedience and described them as ill-suited for entering the working classes. Complaints were reported at the *Bureau des Enfants-Trouvés* about children who displayed “overly distracted” (qtd in Robin 443) conduct, while the anonymous author of the British pamphlet *Some Objections to the Foundling Hospital Considered by a Person in the Country to Whom They were Sent* (1761)

propounded to raise the foundlings “in such a manner as will fit them to bear any hardship”(qtd. in Zunshine 14). On the whole, it seems that despite the efforts of the foundling hospitals to educate and raise these children as contributing citizens in society, in both Britain and France, the reclusive nature of the foundling hospitals was seen as detrimental to the children’s engagement with and understanding of society and its customs.

Although the success rate of the pedagogical practices applied in the Parisian foundling hospitals differed, the hospitals adhered to the same principles of education despite varying in application of these precepts. Regardless of the problematic position of the foundling hospital and its inhabitants in French society, it did have an avid, yet surprising, supporter in the figure of Jean-Jacques Rousseau. Despite being perceived as the father of education in French, Rousseau left his own children in various foundling hospitals. The revelation of these actions shocked the French supporters of Rousseau’s educational philosophy⁴. However, Rousseau defended his actions and position regarding placing his children in foundling hospitals. In fact, he described the depraved attitudes of the elite, fashionable circle, where he often visited, stating that, in particular in the circle at Madame de Selle, the person “who had contributed most to the population of the Foundling Hospital was always the most applauded” (333). Furthermore, his partner Thérèse Levasseur was easily persuaded by him and her mother to consider the consequences of raising a bastard for her reputation (333). Nevertheless, Rousseau’s perspective of the foundling hospitals was not completely affected by this notion of the foundling hospital as hideaways for the aristocracy’s and nobility’s bastards. Instead, he represents the foundling hospital as a good and stable alternative for rearing children which otherwise would suffer from poor upbringing by their near relatives. Describing his partner Thérèse Levasseur’s family as a bad influence, Rousseau in his *Confessions* (1782) revealed his true reasoning: “I trembled at the thought of intrusting [the children] to a family ill brought up, to be still worse educated. The risk of education of the foundling hospital was much less” (404). Rousseau represented the foundling hospital as the better option for children of poor, financially struggling, or morally questionable families, than entrusting the relatives with the education of the country’s next generation. Although Rousseau’s opinion was not widely shared in both Britain and France, it does indicate the efforts being made by the institutions to provide their orphans with proper education and aid with their integration into the society, with varying success, by reflecting the contemporary opinions and ideologies on education.

Conclusion

Defining the ambiguous orphan proved difficult for eighteenth-century society, yet was integral to the perception of and responses towards these children in France and England. Eighteenth-century publications on orphans and orphanhood in France express similar concerns as British texts about the

⁴ See Mary Seidman Trouille’s *Sexual Politics in the Enlightenment: Women Writers Read Rousseau* (1997), for the reaction of contemporary female authors, and their salons, to this revelation.

necessity of and actions required to reclaim this figure into the social hierarchy. Furthermore, the anxieties about the legitimacy of the orphan child and the distinctions made between various forms of orphanhood infuse writings on the orphan and influence the tone of these works. In both France and Britain these concerns are raised and dictate the content and structure of publications on foundlings, orphans, or their care. The recurrent use of these tropes demonstrate that there is a certain discourse which addresses similar aspects of this suffering child. This discourse contains themes addressing the necessity of care for this child, the inhumanity and barbarity of their life on the streets, the form this care should take, the benefit for the child and society by providing care and education, and the question of its heritage and legitimacy. In both countries the consensus seemed to be the desire to educate these abandoned and destitute children and turn them into productive societal members who could contribute to and support the ever-growing nation.

To transform the orphans and foundlings into obedient citizens, education was perceived to be the instrument through which this transformation could be achieved; and, more specifically, education with a curriculum and structure that was suited for their social status and future employment, in servitude or trade. Eighteenth-century discourses and debates on education did affect the structure, content, and perception of education provided in both the French and the British Foundling Hospitals. The increasing importance and emphasis on woman's maternal role did affect the education of foundling girls in particular, as proper education in virtue and propriety could only be beneficial for their behaviour while in domestic service and subsequently as mothers. Although the Hospitals' endeavours to prepare the children for their social position and work through education and apprenticeships, their practices were still criticised; in particular, their reclusive character was seen as having an adverse effect on the children, who would be unacquainted with society's rules and customs.

Moreover, the pedagogical and nurturing endeavours of the Hospital governors and patrons did not allay the social anxiety about the standard of education given by these institutions. Indeed, in literature a similar concern was expressed regarding the education of the next generation. Although pamphlets and essays appear to have been either supporting or condemning the practices of these establishments, the number of fictional narratives with an orphan protagonist increased during the eighteenth century. These texts, similarly, touched upon the issue of education of its foundling or orphan protagonists, who, despite rarely being raised in a foundling hospital, orphanage, or convent, are confronted with the dilemma of determining and receiving proper education. Various novels thus examined the pedagogical practices and theories through fictional experimentation and exemplification which often featured an orphan protagonist. In the next two chapters, the representation of the pedagogical journey and methods in two mid-eighteenth-century novels and their translations will be examined to determine to what extent the fictional depiction reflects social practice, and whether resemblances can be found in portrayal of the orphan's education in the translations.

Let Me Tell You My History: Narrating the Orphan's Pedagogical Journey in Marivaux's *La Vie de Marianne* and Mary Collyer's *The Virtuous Orphan*

Il y a quinze ans je ne saivois pas encore, si le sang d'où je sortois étoit noble ou on, si j'étois batarde ou legitime. Ce debut paroît annoncer un roman, ce n'en est pourtant pas un que je raconte; je dis la verité comme je l'ai apprise de ceux qui m'ont élevée. (*La Vie de Marianne* 1: 15-16)

Starting her autobiographical narration, the elder Marianne describes to her friend the situation of her early life while succinctly summarising the ambiguity inherent to the orphan's origins and identity that poses a threat to society's structures. Indicating that she owes her knowledge of her early years to her foster parents, Marianne reveals her dependence upon others for this information and interpretation of her roots. This passage signifies the centrality of her orphan status to the narrative, frequently referencing her orphanhood in relation to her understanding of her identity. This fundamental aspect in the narrative is reinforced by illustrations included in the 1736 edition of Marivaux's novel *La Vie de Marianne* (1731-1742) and the 1784 edition of Collyer's translation *The Virtuous Orphan* (1743). Indeed, the first illustrations in these editions portray how Marianne becomes an orphan even if they do so by means of a different focus. Jakob van der Schley's illustration (figure 1) for the 1736 edition of the original novel depicts the murder of Marianne's parents and servants and the direct aftermath



during which bystanders find Marianne alive in the carriage.

Figure 1: Jakob van der Schley – *L'attaque du carrosse* in Pierre Marivaux's *La Vie de Marianne* (1736)

By contrast, Thomas Stothard's engraving for the 1784 translation portrays the discovery of Marianne by the cavalry (figure 2). Despite the slight difference in focus, both illustrations concentrate on the moment of rupture in the orphan's life, highlighting the orphan's lack of kinship and her vulnerability in society.



Figure 2 -Thomas Stothard – *The Saving of the Orphan* in Mary Collyer's *The Virtuous Orphan* (1784)

Nevertheless, the figure of the literary orphan in both works has received minimal attention from scholars who, though briefly commenting on Marianne's orphan status, have approached the novels from other theoretical and sociohistorical vantage points. The psychological, sentimental, and narratological aspects in Marianne's story have received much attention and have been examined from various perspectives, from influential psychological analyses by Leo Spitzer (1953), René Girard

(1963), and Georges Poulet (1952) in the middle of the last century, to recent studies that are rooted in feminism, narratology, reconnaissance, structuralism, kinship relations, and comparative analysis.⁵

Although scholars have examined Marianne's lack of and search for a family, they have not addressed her qualities as a literary orphan from a historical perspective, and have concentrated on discussing the intuitive aspects of Marianne's 'feminine' intellect in relation to pride and vanity. Thus, they have neglected to examine the pedagogical elements, contents, and methods portrayed in the novel in relation to contemporary practices in orphan care and education in general. These elements, however, are integral to and influence Marianne's self-knowledge and self-representation through her letters.

This chapter, therefore, will offer a new perspective on the portrayal of education in *La Vie de Marianne* and its translation *The Virtuous Orphan*, by specifically examining the depiction of Marianne's education and instruction and comparing it with contemporary accounts on orphan education and female education in general. Furthermore, it will also offer a comparative analysis of both texts which has rarely been done by previous scholars. First, this chapter will briefly address the publication, translation, and reception history of both novels and the national opinions on Marivaux's literary career which influenced the responses to his works in Britain and France, in order to shed light on the popular yet complex position of the work and its author in the eighteenth-century literary field. The two novels will be analysed successively, which enables a better comparison of the narrative templates, alterations made in the translation, and the representation of pedagogical practices in both works. These sections will have a similar structure, as they will first address the intrusive, autobiographical narrative style of the elderly Marianne, since this narrative style affects her self-representation and depiction of orphanhood in her epistolary autobiographical account. Subsequently, the educational practices, methods, and instructions will be analysed and compared with contemporary educational treatises and conduct literature, and, in Collyer's case, with the original. Lastly, these sections will examine other female orphans in the narrative to determine to what extent these characters, their social status, and education function as alternatives or foils to Marianne's character. This chapter will conclude with a reflection on the similarities and differences between the two novels, their relation to orphan care and education in general. This section will explore whether there are similarities between the portrayal of the pedagogical methods and orphanhood in the French and British text, thus, indicating or challenging the existence of a transnational orphan narrative template.

The Reception and History of La Vie de Marianne and The Virtuous Orphan

⁵ See, amongst others; Patrick Brady, *Structuralist Perspectives in Criticism of Fiction: Essays on Manon Lescaut and La Vie de Marianne* (1978); Annie Rivara, *Les Soeurs de Marianne: suites, imitations, variations 1731-1761* (1991); Patrick Coleman, *Anger, Gratitude, and the Enlightenment Writer* (2011); Nancy K. Miller, *The Heroine's Text. Readings in the French and English Novel 1722-1782* (1980); Béatrice Didier, *La Voix de Marianne: Essai sur Marivaux* (1987); Aurora Wolfgang, *Gender and Voice in the French Novel, 1730-1782* (2004); Jan Herman, *Le Récit génétique au XVIIIe siècle* (2009); Christophe Martin, *Mémoires d'une inconnue: Étude de La Vie de Marianne de Marivaux* (2014).

The first volume of *La Vie de Marianne, ou Les Aventures de Madame la Comtesse d***** was published in 1731; its eleventh, and last, volume in 1745, and the novel was left unfinished. The reception of this monumental project in eighteenth-century France was ambivalent.⁶: while some contemporaries praised Marivaux's innovations and his more psychological approach to love, as literary critic Jean-François de La Harpe saw *La Vie de Marianne* as an important French novel, as he stated in his *Lycee, ou course literature* (1789-1804): "Marianne est un des meilleurs roman français, et l'un de ceux don't les étrangers font le plus de cas" (243) ; others criticised Marivaux's non-conformity to French literary tradition and ridiculed his feminine writing style, which is reflected in Voltaire's disdain for Marivaux's style and work, as he has been recorded saying "C'est un homme qui sait tout les sentiers du coeur humain, mais qui n'en connaît pas la grande route" (150)⁷. Indeed, as Aurora Wolfgang points out, Marivaux incorporates a "refined and witty use of language" (68), which became known as *marivaudage* and adopts the female art of "conversational brilliance" in Marianne's writing style (67). In French literary circles, Marivaux's literary style and writer's persona were quickly identified with the feminine narrator of Marianne and despite *La Vie de Marianne*'s initial success, both author and work faded into obscurity in the French literary field, losing their place to new favourites of the readers. The late-eighteenth-century response towards Marivaux is aptly described by Elena Russo, in her book chapter "A Faded Coquet: Marivaux and the Philosophes":

Toward the end of the century, a time that worshipped grand spectacles, vigorously outlined plots, and the display of enthusiasm and masculine energy, Marivaux was shelved away, [...] among the superfluties of the *petit genre* (sic). In appraising his work his contemporaries did not know what to make of it and often resorted to a paradoxical mixture of admiration and dismissiveness. When they acknowledged his talent, it was to confine it to the realm of the detail, the miniscule, the ephemeral. (50)

The reception of Marivaux's work, and *La Vie de Marianne*, was diverse in its admiration and critique throughout the eighteenth century, yet this duality eventually tipped towards a rejection of Marivaux's literary contributions due to the changing literary tastes of the French society.

In Great Britain, however, the reception of Marivaux's novel and works was very different⁸.

Generally well-received, Marivaux's works were lauded as novels demonstrating a great refinement

⁶ For a discussion of the French reception of *La Vie de Marianne* see Roger Kempf, *Diderot et le roman, ou Le démon de la présence* (1963). Elena Russo, in her book chapter "A Faded Coquet: Marivaux and the Philosophes" (2007), offers a lengthy examination of Marivaux's literary reputation throughout the eighteenth century.

⁷ Voltaire's opinion about Marivaux has been recorded by eighteenth-century contemporaries, rather than written by the philosophe himself. This particular quote is recorded in an essay on Marivaux by Arsène Houssaye. The rivalry between Marivaux and Voltaire is examined by Christophe Cave in "Marivaux revu par Voltaire: L'image de Marivaux dans la *Correspondance* de Voltaire" in *Marivaux et les Lumières: L'homme de theatre et son temps* (1996).

⁸ Robert James Merret's book chapter "Marivaux Translated and Naturalized: Systemic Contraries in Eighteenth-Century British Fiction" provides a detailed account of Marivaux's status and literary reception in Britain, while examining the dynamic between Marivaux's style and the British literary field.

and “hav[ing] the advantages of highly polished language and sentiment” (Reeve, 129), but they were also condemned as “unintelligible to his readers” according to Lord Chesterfield (qtd. in Merrett, 231). Nevertheless, three English translations of diverse quality of *La Vie de Marianne* were published in the 1730s and 1740s. The first translation called *The Life of Marianne, or the Adventures of the Countess of ... by M. de Marivaux* by an anonymous author appeared in parts from 1736 till 1742, but was considered by Clara Reeve, in *The Progress of Romance*, as “a very poor literal translation [but] read by every body with avidity” (129). A second translation, which Reeve deemed to have been “made by a still worse hand”, was published in 1743 and titled *The Life and Adventures of Indiana, the Virtuous Orphan*. The last translation, called *The Virtuous Orphan, or the Life of Marianne Countess of *****, which appeared in the same year, with a second and third edition in 1747 and 1784 (Hughes 111), was by Mary Collyer and is perceived by modern scholarship as the most readable, as she retains the eleven volumes “essentially intact” (McBurney and Shurgue xi).

However, this does not suggest that Collyer did not make any additions or alterations to Marivaux’s original text. In her 1784 translator’s preface to *The Virtuous Orphan*, Mary Collyer voiced her perspectives on Marivaux’s original, her objectives in translating the text, and a defence of the alterations she made to the text. Collyer classified Marivaux’s novel as a history that “deserves to be considered as a useful piece of instruction; a lesson of nature; “a true and lively picture of the human heart” (1: iv). In her preface, Collyer thus points to the emerging tendency to use fiction, especially novels, as instruments of instruction and guidance⁹. The identification of the text as a novel of education emphasises the pedagogical intentions of the author, or in this case the translator, but also raises questions about the method of instruction depicted and the guidance given in these novels. Do these novels exhibit similar ideas or preferences about modes of education? What are the distinctions between educational novels aimed at women and men aside from educational content? Furthermore, the abundance of female orphans in the eighteenth-century French and British novel and in contemporary society suggests that the discourses on educational practices for orphans could have influenced the fictional portrayal of these individuals, despite the claims of suitability of these works for a broad audience. Indeed, in Collyer’s translation, instruction through fiction is represented as essential to her translation of Marivaux’s novel. Collyer summarises the suitability of the novel as an

⁹ In eighteenth-century Britain and France, the novel became classified as an instrument in a child’s education. However, female reading had an ambivalent position in eighteenth-century society. It was simultaneously seen as a pedagogical instrument which allowed women to exercise their reason, intellect, and morality, but reading could also introduce them to rebellious and immoral concepts. This concern is reflected in various eighteenth-century education manuals or conduct books who endeavour to guide their reader’s choices. The novel’s characters and the struggles and challenges they face during the narration was perceived as the method to provide, predominantly, female readers with examples of virtue and conduct, since the characters would provide the female audience with indirect experiences, which, in the perspective of the authors, supplants real-life experience for especially the more dangerous events. See Jacqueline Pearson’s *Women’s Reading in Britain 1750-1835: A Dangerous Recreation* (1999), Nancy Armstrong’s *Desire and Domestic Fiction: A Political History of the Novel* (1987) Suellen Diaconoff’s *Through the Reading Glass: Women, Books, and Sex in the French Enlightenment* (2006), among others.

instrument of education and considered the narration of historical events related to the manners and human life as especially suitable for instruction, but she rejects heroic narratives:

But when the history is reduced to our own level, and applicable to our real circumstances in life, much extensive and lasting benefit may accrue from the perusal of it; for, in the right discharge of the common duties of humanity, and in a proper conduct, either in affluent or in embarrassed and difficult circumstances, every one has an immediate and important concern... (1: iii)

Instruction, according to Collyer, is only beneficial when it is communicated through life histories or narratives of equals rather than superiors. Although Collyer presents Marivaux's *La Vie de Marianne* as a suitable history for instilling virtues into her readership, she downplays the few changes she made in her translation. Even in her discussion of her translation, Collyer attributes a sense of virtue and modesty to the French original:

When I read the original, I thought it would admit of an English dress, that might do justice to the fine spirit that reigns throughout: with this view, and to give my female readers especially a piece so worthy of their attention entire, and in some measure perfect, I immediately set about it. (1: v)

Notwithstanding Collyer's praise for the original, in her brief motivation for translating *La Vie de Marianne*, Collyer makes two interesting suggestions. First, that the spirit captured by Marivaux in *La Vie de Marianne* would benefit from an English context and, perhaps, be more appropriate for an British audience. Indeed, she implies that Marivaux's novels contain some germs of British refinement, and thus insinuates that his novel and writing style is perhaps better suited for an British audience than the French literary marketplace. Secondly, Collyer hints that Marivaux's work was not completely up to standard in her view, as she writes that the text was "in some measure perfect" (v), suggesting that she perfected his novel by making alterations to the original. As will be demonstrated below, Collyer in particular enhanced the pedagogical nature of the novel by elaborating Marianne's account of her childhood education, and writing an ending to Marivaux's unfinished original which narrates the discovery of Marianne's identity and family; her inheritance from Mme Miran, her adoptive mother; and her marriage to Valville. To accommodate this ending, Collyer simultaneously shortened Marivaux's text, most notably the nun Trevire's story. If the original was already identified by Collyer as an appropriate history for instruction, what alterations did she make to transform, as McBurney and Shugrue observe, "Marivaux's psychological comedy into an edifying didactic novel" (xxix)? Furthermore, to what extent do these changes affect the depiction of the orphan's education; and, moreover, are these changes typically British alterations from an educational perspective? In order to analyse Collyer's didactic alterations in her translation, the representation of orphanhood and Marianne's education in *La Vie de Marianne* need to be examined first.

I am Marianne and this is my history: Pierre Carlet de Marivaux's La Vie de Marianne

By starting her epistolary discourse with a lengthy description of her orphaning and subsequent difficulties and social interaction, Marianne makes her mysterious and ambivalent origins an inherent element of her self-representation and orphanhood throughout the novel. In fact, Marianne and various other characters continuously reiterate and emphasise the probability of her being of noble descent while simultaneously lamenting her lack of knowledge about these assertions. Despite her declaration of not knowing her heritage – “je ne saivois pas encore, si le sang d’où je sortois étoit noble ou on, si j’étois batarde ou legitime” (1: 15) –, Marianne is adamant about her aristocratic ancestry throughout her epistolary correspondence. Throughout her adventures and narrations she suggests that she has superior sentiments and knowledge which indicate her genteel origins. Her conviction that she has noble blood is based on a seeming resemblance between the young Marianne and the murdered lady in the carriage. Although Marianne seems certain about the accuracy of this attribution, no information on the identities of the murdered travellers can be acquired. For this information, Marianne relies on the veracity of eyewitnesses of the murder scene as she writes:

Si l'une des deux étoit ma mere; il y avoit plus d'apparence que c'étoit la jeune et la mieux mise, parce qu'on prétend que je lui ressemblois un peu, du moins à ce que disoient ceux qui la virent morte, et qui me virent aussi; et que j'étois vêtuë d'une maniere trop distinguée pour n'être que la fille d'une femme de chambre. (1: 8)

Her appearance, these witnesses declare, is too genteel, so it would be wrong to consider her as a child of a servant.

It is this statement that fuels Marianne’s proclamations of gentility, which are supported by her displays of innate sensibility. When given the opportunity to engage with Parisian society on her own terms after the death of her foster mother, the curé’s sister, Marianne pleads her case and vulnerability before the benevolent Mr. de Climal, an affluent and well-known philanthropist who becomes Marianne’s first guardian in Paris. Indeed, Marianne exhibits an increasing awareness of the power she can exert through her affective displays of virtue, sensibility, and orphan vulnerability¹⁰. During her interview with Climal about her future prospects, Marianne cannot restrain her anguish: “Je lui respondis cela d’une maniere fort triste, après quoi versant quelques larmes.” (1: 44). Moreover, Marianne gets a second opportunity to demonstrate her sensibility when she appeals for protection in a convent. This time the group she addresses consists of women, and, similarly to her interview with Climal, Marianne uses her knowledge about the power of appearances and her modesty to influence the opinions of the women. More specifically, she associates the merit of her appearance with the ability to elicit support from her audience. The more pleasing your appearance, the easier it is to evoke compassion:

¹⁰ See Tracy LeAnn Rutler’s dissertation *Family Remains: The Politics of Legacy in Eighteenth-Century France* (2014) for a more extensive analysis of Marianne’s affective displays in relation to her adopted kinship status.

Il est bon en pareille occasion de plaire un peu aux yeux, ils vous recommandent au coeur; êtes-vous malheureux et mal vêtu, ou vous échappez aux meilleurs coeurs du monde, ou ils ne prennent pour vous qu'un intérêt fort tiède; vous n'avez pas l'attrait qui gagne leur vanité, et rien ne nous aide tant à être généreux envers le gens, rien ne nous fait tant goûter l'honneur et le plaisir de l'être, que de leur voir un air distingué. (3: 103)

This affective and premeditated display is effective, as it secures Marianne a position as a boarder in the convent with the financial support of her adoptive mother, the generous Mme de Miran. Marianne, throughout the novel, cites her successful performances of her sensibility and orphan vulnerability as evidence for her noble descent. In fact, these scenes confirm her assertions of vulnerability and, simultaneously, her delicate and refined tastes and sentiments. In spite of these affirmations of her nobility, Marianne merges a probable ancestry with her social position as an orphan to create a singular type of orphanhood, diverging from the more standard types of the orphan described in contemporary discourses. Rather, Marianne combines her orphan origins, with its innate connotations of ambiguity and vulnerability, with elements of the coquette, who, as Elaine McGirr defines, “exaggerates her feminine charms in order to please men and draw their admiration” (n.p.), and, hence, personifies a distinct form of orphanhood, the orphan coquette. In other words, Marianne uses her orphanhood to gain attention and empathy from both men and women, while using her feminine charms and intellect to gain their admiration. Nevertheless, as will be demonstrated below, this performance of orphanhood is dangerous for the kinless orphan, and Marianne must learn this while simultaneously receiving protection from her guardians.

Notwithstanding Marianne's superior sensibility, as an orphan character she is continuously marginalised throughout the novel: she resides at the edges of fashionable society or in slum dwellings. Indeed, the accommodation of Marianne in the circles of high society is temporary and emphasises her ‘otherness’ as an orphan. When it is discovered that Marianne and Valville, Mme de Miran's son, intend to marry with Mme de Miran's consent, Marianne is kidnapped by de Miran's relatives who hide her in a different convent until she is led before an assembly of concerned family members, friends, and acquaintances of Valville and Miran. In this meeting, Marianne's intentions and origins are questioned by the assembled members; moreover, she is reminded of her social position as an orphan as the prime-minister, and relative of Valville, informs her: “Vous n'avex ni pere ni mere, et ne savez qui vous êtes. me dit-il après; Cela est vrai, Monseigneur lui répondis-je; eh bien! ajouta-t'il, faites vous donc justice, et ne songez plus à ce mariage là.” (5:119). The notion that the orphan, especially one without any knowledge about her family's history, should not mingle with the upper classes is expressed repeatedly by members of Valville's family, such as Mme Fare. Even relatives who admire Marianne's intellect and virtue, are aware that she must be kept from this society until she is certain about her ancestry. Marianne continues to live in the convent after her adoption by Mme de Miran and only visits Miran's close friend Mme de Dorsin and the family's country estate. Similarly,

when under Climal's protection, Marianne is kept at the margins of Parisian elite society. Marianne's insistence on and desire for independence through menial work rather than servitude compels Climal to secure employment for her at Mme Dutour's, a linen draper. As a result, Marianne is situated at the edge of fashionable society. Since Marivaux left the novel unfinished, it is difficult to address Marianne's rise to aristocracy, as the title identifies her as comtesse de ***. It suggests that Marianne either must have married Valville at some point, or, perchance, discovered her biological family, who were, as she so adamantly maintains, noble. Yet in the published novel, she remains the vulnerable foundling who is marginal, ambivalent, and challenges society's customs.

In addition to Marianne's ambiguous heritage, the novel is written by a problematic narrator, the elderly Marianne, who recounts her history for the entertainment of a friend while interpreting and potentially manipulating the narration of these events. The elder Marianne is a fickle and ambiguous letter writer. She starts her first letter with the claim that her feminine conversational style might not be suitable for letter writing:

“Au reste, je parlois tout-à-l'heure de style, je ne sais pas seulement ce que c'est; comment fait-on pour en avoir un? celui que je vois dans les livres, est-ce le bon? pourquoi donc est-ce qu'il me déplait tant le plus souvent? Celui de mes lettres vous paroît-il passable? j'écrirai ceci de meme.”(1: 6)

However, this hesitation about her writing quickly disappears in Marianne's letters, and, instead, she adopts a confident style throughout her correspondence. Indeed, in her second letter Marianne defends her topic and succinctly states the message reiterated in Collyer's preface, namely, that heroic scenes and characters are perhaps preferred, but not to be found in everyday life:

Il y a des gens, dont la vanité se mêle de tout ce qu'ils font, même de leurs lectures. Donnez-leur l'histoire du coeur humain dans les grandes conditions, ce deviant-là pour eux un objet important; mais ne leur parlez pas des Etats mediocre... (2: 2).

Throughout her letters, Marianne uses the epistle's beginnings and endings to defend her narrative style and the events and characters discussed. Thus, at the start of the fourth letter, Marianne writes: “et avant que de continuer mon recit, venons au portrait de ma bienfaitrice que je vou ai promis, avec celui de la dame qu'elle a amenée,” (4: 5). However, she also postpones the promised history of her friend the nun Trevire, (“l'histoire d'une religieuse” (4: 126)), which is eventually related in the last three parts of Marivaux's novel, in which the nun Treviere's narration is mediated by Marianne in her correspondence, as she writes “que c'est la Religieuse qui parle” (9: 2). Despite being presented as an epistolary novel and despite Marianne's light-hearted approach towards corresponding, an educational element runs throughout Marianne's letters for she frequently adopts a pedagogical tone or mentions that the letters could be and are being used for educational purposes. Indeed, she is forthright in

identifying the didactical benefits of certain scenes or event. As Marianne writes about her letters being read in public in her fifth letter:

Cette petite aventure que j'ai crû assez instructive pour les jeunes personnes à qui vous pourriés donner ceci à lire, fit que je redoublai de politesse et de modestie avec mes compagnes; ce qui fit qu'à leur tour elle redoublerent d'amitié pour moi. Reprenons à present le cours de mon histoire. (5: 49)

Despite requesting secrecy and anonymity from her correspondent, Marianne clearly intends this work to be known to a larger audience, potentially relying on the eighteenth-century practice of reading letters aloud in company (Goodman 137)¹¹. This pedagogical purpose is an integral element of Marianne's narrative style. Although she purports to have written these letters in order to relate her history to her correspondent, Marianne repeatedly interrupts her narrative to elaborate on the events, or to voice her opinions on these situations or other characters.

The intrusive style adopted by Marianne challenges the straightforward intention of relating her story. Instead, it suggests that she is aware of how her experiences can function as examples for others, and she designs her letters in such a manner to function as such. Despite her status as a marginal orphan, Marianne implies that her education can be exemplary for the young female audience to whom her letters are read by Marianne's correspondent. In specific, Marianne seems to suggest that the distinctions between orphan education and general didactic practices are minimal, regardless of the orphan's liminal social position. The next section will examine to what extent the education of Marianne, as depicted in the novel, corresponds with eighteenth-century educational theories and methods as described in conduct literature for women, or rather, whether it resembles eighteenth-century orphan educational practices in orphanages and foundling hospitals.

The Education of a Foundling: Instructing Marianne

Regardless of Marianne's claims that she is of noble descent, she receives a traditional education from her foster parents, the curé and his sister, which intends to prepare her for future employment in servitude, trade, or life as a wife and mother. Marianne succinctly summarises her childhood upbringing by stating:

Je passe tout le tem[p]s de mon education dans mon bas-âge, pendant lequel j'appris à faire je ne [sais] combine de petites nippes de femme, industrie qui m'a bien servi dans la suite. (1: 16)

¹¹ Dena Goodman addresses the role of correspondence and letters in the French Enlightenment in her book *The Republic of Letters: A Cultural History of the French Enlightenment* (1994); in particular, in her chapter "Into Writing: Epistolary Commerce in the Republic of Letters"

Although Marianne restricts herself to listing sewing as the feminine skill that she learned during her childhood, and does not specify any further tasks she was trained for, she does represent her education as gender-specific by emphasising its focus on feminine accomplishments. This almost generic description relies on the reader's familiarity with this term, for indeed female skills were consistently addressed in contemporary educational treatises and conduct literature. However, these works could list diverging topics and skills as suitable for women. For instance, Anne-Thérèse de Lambert identifies in her *Avis d'une mère à sa fille* (1728) religion as an important element in female education, while Pierre-Joseph Boudier de Villemert observes in his *L'Ami des femmes, our morale du sexe* (1758) that "La physique [et] l'histoire peuvent elles seules fournir aux femmes un agreeable genre d'étude" (30). Besides, history and science, or natural philosophy, de Villemert also includes a less superficial knowledge – "qu'il seroit bon que les femems connussent un peu moins superficiellement" (33) – about arts. However, this broad spectrum of topics suitable for female education reflected two objectives of female instruction, namely that of preparing girls for their domestic roles and enhancing their grace, as de Villemert declares: "Il faut aux femmes un sçavoir moins hérissé, qui soit plus d'accord avec leurs traits. Les connoissances qu'elle prennent, doivent être d'un usage agréable pour la vie" (29). Indeed, the usefulness of the women's education is a recurring theme in conduct literature in general, and proficiency in needlework is perceived as part of a female's domestic skills.

Regardless of being deemed by her educators, and especially by Marianne, as a skill worthy of mentioning and essential in acquiring independence and employment, needlework receives no further attention throughout Marianne's correspondence. However, it is not surprising to have this ability mentioned in relation to the curriculum of orphan education and in particular the curriculum of foundling hospitals. As Isabelle Robin observes, in the Trinté and Saint-Esprit Hospitals in Paris young girls were taught to sew, in addition to other skills, as preparation for their future roles as either head of the household or domestic servants. Moreover, proficiency in needlework contributed to finding the foundling girls apprenticeships as seamstresses, or employment as maids; positions which would provide the girls with additional training by their mistress or their boss (448-449). Apprenticeship was an integral element of orphan education in French foundling hospitals and orphanages: Kristin Gager describes the fosterage practices of the larger Parisian hôpitaux which "entailed the child laboring in the household in exchange for the learning of a trade" (143). These children, however, would already be in their adolescence when they were employed in these households. This employment is part of the future prospects envisioned by Marianne's foster parents, as Marianne acknowledges their intention to either find her a suitable husband or trade: "de me metre chés une marchande" (1: 43).

Despite being seemingly viable future prospects for Marianne, and corresponding with contemporary feminine and orphan educational practices, Marianne rejects the initially commended feminine ability, not for its part in female education, but as restrictive to her social and intellectual capacity and role. In fact, this discrepancy between society's perceptions of Marianne's future

prospects as an orphan and the suggestion of her noble descent suggests that Marianne was taught needlework because it is a respected female accomplishment, both for elite and genteel women, and not because it would be the primary means of supporting herself. Yet the precariousness of Marianne's social standing and her ardent desire to support herself require her to, temporarily, apply her cultivated knowledge in menial employment, which simultaneously stresses her unsuitability for these situations. In fact, despite her intent to support herself through finding employment and lodging at linen draper Mme Du Tour's shop, Marianne describes the vulgarity and unsuitability, according to her, of these surroundings and inhabitants:

Quelquefois je m'encourageois jusqu'à dire, vous avés bien de la bonté; mais en verité, j'étois déplacée, et je n'étois pas faite pour être là. Je sentoís dans la franchise de cette femme là, quelque chose de grossier qui me rebutait. (1: 52-53)

Mme Du Tour's establishment is therefore an inappropriate environment for Marianne to live and suggests that it might corrupt Marianne's virtue and previous education. Furthermore, it emphasises the incongruity between Marianne's character and her social standing as an orphan. Marianne's education therefore has dual objectives, providing her with training suitable for her assumed noble heritage while simultaneously cultivating skills that allow her to support herself in society. The processes used to cultivate this knowledge and abilities in Marianne are described by her at length, and, in particular, display the differences between the methods adopted by the maternal and paternal educators in Marianne's life.

Throughout her interaction with both paternal and maternal figures and communities in her narrative, Marianne repeatedly stresses her superior and feminine intellect which seems to contrast starkly with the description of her childhood upbringing. Educated by the curé and his sister, Marianne describes the sister as "une personne pleine de raison, [et] de politesse, qui joignoit à cela beaucoup de vertu" (1: 15). While thus hinting towards the good maternal figure the sister would be, she refrains from elaborating on the curé's involvement in her upbringing. In fact, she glosses over the curé's advice when she leaves for Paris, stating that "je ne vous rapporterai point tout ce qu'il me dit encore avant que nous partissions" (1: 19), and only emphasising his gentile ancestry. Indeed, despite the limited information on her childhood education, Marianne's seems to represent the curé and his sister, as model, albeit not biological, paternal and maternal figures who have provided her with the training to achieve a genteel social standing. In fact, both the curé and especially his sister become paragons of virtuous behaviour and education in Marianne's perspective, as she repeatedly refers to their exemplary conduct, as she states when receiving Climal's, one of her future guardians, declarations of passion: "Cependant j'étois bien honteuse de ses vûës; ma chere amie la soeur du Curé me revenoit dans l'esprit" (1: 68). Furthermore, Marianne's descriptions of her childhood upbringing emphasise the importance of the maternal figure in a young girl's education; though the paternal involvement is

mentioned, it is not deemed essential to the content and representation of Marianne's childhood upbringing. sparse description of her childhood educators, however, are in stark contrast with Marianne's discussion of the various maternal and paternal figures she encounters in Paris, who, subsequently, force her to contemplate about her social position and its corresponding set of values.

In Paris, after the death of her foster mother and presumed death of her foster-father, Marianne is forced to rely either on charity or her own labour for her sustenance. Nonetheless, she is introduced, under various circumstances, to three individuals who all assume, to some extent, a parental role in Marianne's life. Entrusted on Monsieur de Climal's charity, Marianne envisions him as a paternal figure who offers her protection and employment. However, contradictory to his initial avowal of guardianship and support, Climal is rapidly enamoured by Marianne's sensibility, beauty, and virtue. Marianne initially interprets his gifts and support as originating from his benevolent nature, but discovers his less than honourable passions, as he confesses more than friendship for her:

je ne dis pas mon amitié, je parle de ma tendresse. Quoi, dis-je, n'est-ce pas la même chose? Non Marianne, me répondit-il en me regardant d'une manière à m'en prouver la différence, non chère fille, ce n'est pas la même chose, [et] je voudrais bien que l'une vous parût plus douce que l'autre. (1: 72)

In fact, he avows his devotion to and love for Marianne, instead of acting as a paternal figure. Furthermore, as a lover, Climal wants to improve Marianne's education by offering her the possibility to receive instructions in dance, music, and the harpiscord and: "Maîtres que je vous donnerai, Maîtres de Danse, de Musique, de Clavessin, comme il vous plaira" (3: 32), thereby giving her a secure place in society under the guise as his orphaned relative. Notwithstanding Climal's offers of protection and a more secure social position, Marianne is disgusted by his suggestions of love and care as she articulates:

Il étoit pourtant vrai que M. de Climal étoit amoureux de moi, mais je [savais] bien aussi que je ne voulois rien faire de son amour; et si malgré cet amour, que je connoissois, j'avois reçu ses presens, c'étoit par un petit raisonnement que mes besoins, et ma vanité m'avoient dicté, et qui n'avoit rien pris sur la pureté de mes intentions: mon raisonnement étoit sans doute une erreur, mais non pas un crime. (1: 80-81)

Throughout her correspondence, Marianne reflects upon and explains her previous actions. In this instance she argues that her acceptance of Climal's gifts was driven by her vanity and her impoverished circumstances. As a paternal figure, de Climal is blinded by his own passion which affects his competence as an educator, since throughout their relationship as benefactor-beneficiary, de Climal is more concerned with Marianne's appearance and housing, than her education. This attention to Marianne's appearance is not entirely surprising, since, upon meeting Climal for the first time, Marianne relies on her appearance to convey her sensibility by the performance of her distress, in an

appropriate feminine fashion. Nevertheless, it does affect the instruction she receives from de Climal which is predominantly focused on enhancing her physical appearance to align with his perception of her intended place in society, as his mistress. Although Marianne does engage in these practices, she simultaneously shows an awareness of their immorality, and as a narrator retrospectively condemns her actions, thereby indicating her naiveté and need for further instruction. Simultaneously, the interaction with Climal functions as a learning moment for Marianne, as these experiences provide her with first-hand knowledge about the precariousness of male-female relationships in society.

Marianne's reaction to Climal's offers and protection leave her once again isolated and vulnerable in society, which forces her to search for a different form of protection in Paris. Marianne encounters her new guardian, Mme de Miran, in a church where Marianne seeks comfort. Mme de Miran is particularly affected by Marianne's second performance of vulnerability:

Il est bon en pareille occasion de plaire un peu aux yeux, ils vous recommandent au coeur; [...] et rien ne nous aide tant à être genereux envers les gens, rien ne nous fait tant goûter l'honneur et le plaisir de l'être, que de leur voir un air distingué (3: 103)

Thus, a distinguished manner of displaying vulnerability triggers heartfelt pity or compassion. This new guardian, Mme de Miran, is depicted by Marianne as the virtuous maternal counterpart to Climal's failure as a paternal figure. This is exemplified by the instantaneous mother-child relationship that develops between Marianne and Mme de Miran, which surpasses the previous benefactor-beneficiary interaction between Climal and Marianne. This suggests that parental ties, whether biological or based on mutual respect and admiration, are more suited in relation to the cultivation of a young woman. This confidence in Marianne's modesty and honesty is expressed by Miran, after Marianne's confession about her budding courtship with Miran's son Valville. Miran voices her approbation of Marianne's honesty and conduct by stating "oui, c'est ma fille plus que jamais" (4: 41), and insisting that she is now family "Ah-ça, Marianne [...] qu'il ne vous arrive donc plus, tant que je vivrai, de dire que vous êtes orpheline, entendez-vous." (4: 41-42). In her role as Marianne's adoptive mother, Miran finances Marianne's stay at a convent, while cultivating Marianne's knowledge regarding social conduct.

By assuming the maternal role in Marianne's life, Miran shows the importance of the maternal role in education that was also emphasised in conduct literature. These works criticise the tradition of aristocratic mothers who assign their children's education to governesses, and, instead, promote the positive effects of maternal involvement in their children's upbringing. More specifically, these texts are especially vocal about the possibility of governesses raising their charges incorrectly and exposing children to vulgar culture. Indeed, Anne-Thérèse de Lambert denounces these practices in her conduct book *Avis d'une mère à sa fille* (1728):

Puisque dès l'enfance on les abandonne elles-mêmes à des gouvernantes, qui, étant prises ordinairement dans le peuple, leur inspirent des sentiments bas, qui réveillent toutes les passions timides [...] Il fallait bien plutôt penser à rendre héréditaires certaines vertus, en les faisant passer de la mère aux enfants, qu'à y conserver les biens par des substitutions. (18)

Instead, de Lambert recommends the involvement of a mother figure in a girl's education; a role which Miran is more than willing to fulfil in Marianne's motherless life. Moreover, de Lambert distinguishes between base and refined modes of education: the former is given by the despised gouvernantes who introduce their charges to superstition and vulgar sentiments; the latter by mothers.

This distinction by de Lambert is reflected by Marianne's experiences in Paris, where she is introduced to another maternal figure before Mme de Miran enters into her life; Madame Du Tour, a linen draper. Introduced to Du Tour by Climal as her lodger and employer, Marianne describes her as "une veuve qui je pense n'avoit pas plus de trente ans; une grosse rejoüie, qui à vuë d'oeil paroissoit la meilleure femme de monde, aussi étoit-t-elle" (1: 51). Although Dutour appears to be a kind woman with good intentions, Marianne is repulsed by her vulgarity and coarseness. From Dutour's perspective, Climal's protection and support of Marianne is a philanthropic action, however corrupted his morals may be:

Vous voilà grande et bien faite, et puis Dieu est le pere de ceux qui n'en ont point, Charité n'est pas morte. Par exemple, n'est-ce pas une Providence que ce Monsieur de Climal? Il est vrai qu'il ne va pas droit dans ce qu'il fait pour vous, mais qu'importe, Dieu mene tout à bien; si l'homme n'en vaut rien, l'argent en est bon, et encore meilleur que d'un bon chrétien qui ne donneroit pas la moitié tant. (2: 97)

Financial security, in Dutour's viewpoint, is deemed more important than reputation or virtue, which Marianne values. Hence Marianne is revolted by Dutour's well-meant but inappropriate advice, and she voices her repulsion and relief at the disruption of these lessons: "elle en étoit là de ses leçons: dont elle ne se lassoit pas, et dont une partie me scandalisoit plus que ses brusqueries quand on frappe à la porte" (2: 98). By rejecting Dutour as a maternal advisor, Marianne dismisses a potential future. Tracy LeAnn Rutler observes that in her endeavours to find a substitute family Marianne "proceeds to try on two equally disparate mothers: Mme Dutour and Mme de Miran" who embody "potential futures (or rather alternate pasts) for this orphan of ambiguous origins" (180). Whereas Dutour's vulgar but well-intentioned advice only serves to highlight Marianne's superior origins, sensibility, and virtue, Miran functions as an example for Marianne to emulate. Rather, Miran acknowledges Marianne's innate intellects, as she states "Quelque novice et quelque ignorant que je fusse en cette occasion-ci comme l'avoit dit Madame de Miran, j'étois née pour avoir du goût" (4: 115), and endeavours to refine this intellect to prepare her for her entrance into and interaction with elite society. The novel, hence, provides various futures and modes of educational support for Marianne, which simultaneously reflect the ambiguity regarding her origin. An apprenticeship and employment at Mme

Dutour echoes the employment prospects for orphan girls educated at the Parisian hôpitaux. However, the novel suggest that Marianne's innate nobility makes her unsuited for this coarse work; instead, she should be instructed in the conduct expected in genteel Parisian society, which Miran offers.

For this reason, Miran approaches Marianne's education from an aristocratic perspective and applies a traditional method of instruction for young aristocratic girls. Although it is Marianne's intention to seek shelter in the convent, Miran, after 'adopting' Marianne, chooses to support her, both financially and morally. In addition to providing Marianne with an environment which prepares her for a higher social status, the convent also protects the still orphaned Marianne until a legal form of kinship can be identified or made in the form of marriage. Besides, convents were essential institutions in female education in eighteenth-century France: as Mita Choudhury notes "teaching orders" such as the Filles de Notre-Dame or Ursulines added pedagogy to their vocation and became "responsible for reshaping the female convent into an arena of female education as well as devotion" (130). One of these convents, le Maison royale de Saint-Louis, also known as Saint Cyr, provided education for daughters of the poor nobility or girls orphaned by the death of their parents. More particularly, these girls were educated to spread piety in both sexes, that is as a pious woman who would balance and steer her husband, or brother, away from vice and temptation,: "vous contribuerez à établir le vray regne de Dieu dans les deux sexes pour tous les états et pour toutes les conditions" (19). Moreover, as Dominique Picco specifies, the demoiselles "elles bénéficient d'une éducation complète et conforme sous bien des aspects à ce qui se faisait à l'époque dans les couvents féminins : instruction religieuse et morale, lecture, écriture, calcul et travaux d'aiguille" (n.p.). That is, the demoiselles would receive a complete education which included subjects such as reading, writing, religious and moral instruction, arithmetic, and needlework. These subjects display similarities with the curriculum of the London Foundling Hospital¹², and therefore demonstrate the transnational concern about providing solid training for the abandoned and poor members of society. Nevertheless, the quality of the education and the future prospects between the students of the French and British foundling hospitals and the French convents differed greatly. The former intended to raise unwanted children to become contributing members of society, as Coram expresses in the Ladies Petition: "and for the better producing good and faithful servants amongst the poor and miserable cast off children or foundlings" (qtd in Pugh, n.p.). The latter, by contrast, cultivated mothers and wives, rather than labourers. This similar distinction is made in Marianne's educational curve throughout the novel.

The convent is the ideal environment for Marianne to refine her education by learning the genteel feminine accomplishments, just like "education in the convent became a mandatory stage in the life of a young girl from the elite, the first step in her transformation into a virtuous Christian woman" (Choudhury 130). However, as Choudhury observes, convent education was scrutinized during the eighteenth century by society and writers questioned the capability of convents to instruct

¹² See Chapter 1, on page 24 -28, for the discussion of the curriculums in both French and British foundling hospitals or other institutions charged with the care for orphans or foundlings.

girls in “themes of social utility, secular morality, and female virtue” (133) and their development into a ‘natural woman’¹³. For instance, Madeleine d’Arsant de Puisieux in her advice book *Conseils à une amie* (1751) condemns the convent education given to girls, as the Maîtres “la plupart de tem[p]s ne lui ont rien appris” (2). This negligence of education and particularly worldly experience and knowledge is what de Puisieux wants to address in her work. Indeed, through this book she offers the addressee, a young girl about to leave the convent, through this book advice on societal conduct:

J’ai joint à quelque usage du monde un peu d’expérience: vous avez souhaité d’apprendre comment on se conduisoit avec ceux que vous allez pratiquer; je vais tâcher, par mes conseils, de vous éclairer sur les fautes que vous pourriez commettre, [et] sur les dangers qu’on ne peut éviter quand on ne les connoît pas. (1-2)

De Puisieux’s work is, thus, intended to modify the reclusive convent education by explaining the social position of and expectations for women. That is, the pedagogical methods in convents are inadequate in instructing the dangers of French society, such as corruption, depravity, and immoral temptations, to the girls; aspects which are essential to be aware of when navigating genteel French society.

Furthermore, de Puisieux criticises mothers’ neglect of their daughters’ education, as the mothers often prefer pleasure over their maternal duties: “Les soins qu’elles sacrifieroient à leur éducation leur couteroient un tems qui leur est trop cher; elles le doivent au plaisir, [et] elles n’en ont point de reste.” (2-3). In *La Vie de Marianne*, however, this absence in Marianne’s convent education is solved by Miran, who as Rutler notes, “invites Marianne to follow her actions,” thus not formally instructing her, but leading by example. Indeed, Miran visits Marianne numerous times while providing advice about Marianne’s conduct in her courtship with Valville, as she chastises Marianne’s visible tenderness for Valville, in particular when Marianne’s demeanour reveals her disappointment at the absence of Valville when meeting Miran: “tu baisses leus yeux toi, [...] mais je t’en veux aussi; je t’ai vû tantôt pâler de ce qu’il n’étoit pas avec moi; ce n’étoit pas assex de votre mere, Mademoiselle” (5: 54). Moreover, the differences between genteel and convent education is emphasised by the incompatible, almost otherworldly, opinion of the convent’s mother superior. Whereas Miran perceives areas in Marianne’s education which have not been cultivated properly, the mother superior praises Marianne’s education as refined and completed: “sur tout avec un fille aussi bien née que vous l’êtes, et qui ne peut assurément venir que de très-bon lieu” (5: 47). This indicates that a convent upbringing does not prepare girls for their social role and position; a form of instruction which should be given by her mother or another female relative.

¹³ Mita Choudhury’s book *Convents and Nuns in Eighteenth-Century French Politics and Culture* (2004) addresses the structure of the French convent education in length in the chapter “School of Virtue, School of Vice: The Debate on Convent Education, 1740-1789”.

Marianne's experiences in Parisian society incorporate elements of French orphan education. However, most of these subjects could also be found in the curriculum of well-to-do French girls. In fact, the novel depicts concerns which are discussed in French conduct literature for women, in particular the issue of the maternal role in female education. Indeed, the two paternal figures in Marianne's life are either incompetent or overlooked, whereas the maternal roles are elaborately discussed and either praised or rejected as suitable examples. Moreover, the novel depicts three opportunities for Marianne to determine her future role in society. She is given brief moments to experience the role of employee at Mme Dutour, that of mistress of Mr de Climal, and of 'daughter' to Mme de Miran, who prepares Marianne for her future role as wife to Valville, while Marianne is also lured into joining the convent's congregation. These occasions allow her to observe and collect information on these social positions which she subsequently compares to her childhood knowledge about virtuous behaviour and her own social standing. Marianne's pedagogical experiences in Paris allow her to differentiate between potential futures for her, not only through her own experiences and guidance by parental figures and her moral compass, but also through observing the social position of other female orphans she meets in Paris.

Glimpses of Potential Futures: The Doubling of the Orphan

Although Marianne is the novel's protagonist, throughout her adventures she meets three other young female orphans, according to the eighteenth-century definition of the word. These women also try to find their place in Parisian society and function as foils which represent alternatives of eighteenth-century female orphanhood to Marianne as the orphan coquette. The first female orphan Marianne meets in Paris is Toinon, Dutour's assistant, who embodies and verbalises the vulgarity and indecency suggested by Dutour in her well-meant advice. Toinon's orphan status, however, is not as ambiguous as Marianne's, since her parents are still alive and well. Nevertheless, as Toinon is lodged by and apprenticed to Dutour, she does fall under the eighteenth-century definition of orphanhood, as she is separated from her parents. Toinon is described by Marianne as "qui étoit une grande fille qui se redressait toujours, et qui manioit sa toile avec tout le jugement et tout la décence possible, elle y étoit toute entiere, et son esprit ne passait pas son aune" (1: 54-55). Although Toinon's personality might not be as agreeable, she is an adept linen draper, as Marianne observes, which is in great contrast with Marianne's clumsiness: her being "plus maladroit" (1: 55). This juxtaposition, hence, serves to emphasise Marianne's unsuitability for employment in comparison with Toinon. This contrast is enhanced by Toinon's reactions to Climal's gifts and propositions, as she comments on the silken clothes he has given to Marianne: "Diantre, il n'y arien de tel que d'être orpheline. Et la pauvre fille, ce n'étoit Presque que pour figurer dans l'avanture qu'elle disoit cela, et tout sage qu'elle étoit, quiconque lui en eut donné autant l'auroit renduë stupide de reconnaissance" (1: 80). Toinon, instead of being affronted by Climal's passionate gestures, rather interprets his gifts and care as advantageous opportunities which offer Marianne the possibility to escape from her low social status as an orphan.

Her willingness to accept Climal's gifts and their implications demonstrates Toinon's vulgarity and low moral standards, which are in stark contrast with Marianne's reaction to Climal's gestures, as she perceives them to affront her honour and self-knowledge as a person of potential noble origins. Toinon thus represents one potential future for Marianne, namely as a labourer and possible mistress, which would entail a weakening of her morals.

The second double of Marianne is Miss Varthon, a new boarder at the convent who attracts Valville's attentions. Despite initially being friendly towards Marianne and of similar intellect, Varthon quickly proves to be her rival for Valville's affections. Introduced as the daughter of British exiled parents, Valville and Marianne meet Varthon when she faints in the convent's courtyard upon taking her leave from her mother (7: 81). Since her father is deceased and her mother is travelling to England, Varthon is left under the protection of the nuns as a boarder and effectively orphaned. However, Varthon is assured of her honourable heritage and her British descent is depicted in a favourable light. This historiographic narrative is situated in the seventeenth century, which connects Varthon's parentage with the exiles following either Charles II or James II to France; the novel, however, refrains from identifying the king, describing him as "roi", and Varthon's father as the loyal servant: "qu'à l'exemple de beaucoup d'autres son zèle [et] sa fidélité pour son Roi, avoient obligé de sortir de son Pays" (7: 82). This reference to the exiled Stuart monarchy and their Jacobite supporters during the late seventeenth century is not limited to this brief mention in Marivaux's novel; in fact, Eliza Haywood's *The Fortunate Foundlings*, and as a consequence the translations of her work, is also situated during the dynastic struggles of the Stuart family, as the novel starts in the year 1688. Although these two references to the Jacobite cause do not suggest an inherent link between orphanhood and the Jacobites, it does indicate and emphasise the historic setting of the novels.

Regardless of this positive representation of Englishness, Marianne's description of Varthon is ambiguous. Marianne initially depicts Varthon in a favourable light; nevertheless, Varthon's confession of her adulterous courtship with Valville affects Marianne's perception of Varthon's modesty and virtue. While an untimely illness forces Marianne to keep to her bed, Valville becomes enamoured by Varthon. Though she initially endeavours to repress her attraction to him, she eventually confesses to Marianne: "Moi! vous avoir trahie, me répondit-elle; Eh! ma chère Marianne, vous [avouerais]-je que je l'aime, si je n'avois pas moi-même été surprise, et ne vais-je pas être la victime de tout ceci?" (7: 136). Although she claims not to have known of Valville's engagement with Marianne until later in their interaction, Varthon's integrity is damaged by her conduct. The end of this lengthy confession by Varthon marks her last appearance in Marivaux's original. Nevertheless, Varthon exemplifies what could have happened when Marianne had accepted Climal's offers or Valville's suggestions of keeping their relationship a secret. In other words, Varthon's immoral example validates Marianne's virtuous conduct and actions throughout her interaction with both Climal and Valville, while simultaneously teaching Marianne that immoral behaviour is not restricted to lower classes of mean education, but can also occur in genteel or elite circles.

The last orphan that Marianne encounters, the nun Treviere, resembles her most in intellect and morality, yet the nun is less assertive about her noble heritage, of which she is certain, and she lacks Marianne's self-defensive stance about her social position. This eventually results in Treviere being forced to take the veil. Whereas the other doubles of Marianne are allotted a, relatively, small part of the narrative to communicate their history and interact with Marianne, Treviere's history, by contrast, is narrated in the last three parts of Marivaux's novel. Moreover, Treviere's education follows a similar trajectory to Marianne's. To be precise, Treviere's father dies when she is an infant and upon her mother's remarriage, the latter starts to neglect her maternal duties; instead, Treviere is first adopted by her maternal grandmother, and after her death, she is lodged at Mr. Villot, a local gentleman farmer. Throughout her narrative, Treviere functions as an alternative to Marianne's noble orphan heritage. Being familiar with her ancestry, she is, despite her countryside education, forced to choose between the veil and a forced marriage, similar to Marianne's adventures in which her courtship with Valville is marked by similar challenges. In contrast to Marianne's self-assurance and self-representation, Treviere's adolescence is characterised by a continuous string of bad luck as she loses her protectors, either family members or acquaintances, through death or misunderstandings, thus leaving her eventually poor and dependent on the charity of her half-brother. The scene when Treviere confronts her brother with his ill-treatment of their mother and herself emphasises the difference between Marianne and Treviere. Instead of evoking similar emotions of compassion, admiration, and respect, as Marianne does when confronted by Valville's family, Treviere is ignored by her relatives and the attending acquaintances, when she opposes her sister-in-law. The nun Treviere, in contrast to Marianne, shocks the fine sensibilities of her audience through her speech, rather than evoking compassion, when she formulates her and her mother's need for charity which:

et effectivement vous ne sauriez croire tout l'effet que ce mot produisit fur ceux qui étoient présents, et ce mot qui les remua tant, peut-être auroit-il blesse leurs oreilles délicates, et leur auroit-il paru ignoble et de mauvais goût, (11: 204-205)

Treviere's straightforwardness and lack of sentimental display, in combination with her sister-in-law's proud character, consequently result in the backfiring of her intentions. Marivaux ends his narrative at this point. However, Collyer completes Treviere's narrative in which she summarises her opinion on both the outside world and the monastic community; although taking the veil at first seems to be a tranquil and safe refuge from the world "full of monsters of deceit and ingratitude", it soon turns out to reflect society's intrigues and scheming with "little intrigues, and all the ill-humours which spring from strong passions restrained by violence" (274). Treviere's character has a double purpose in Marianne's narrative. First, she functions as a didactic example to prevent Marianne from taking the veil, and also to emphasise the importance of a sense of identity and self for a person's self-representation in society. Moreover, Treviere also functions as a foil to emphasise the results of

Marianne's cultivation and experiences. Due to her foster parents and guardians, Marianne was guided, protected, and supported, whereas Treviere demonstrates what could have happened to Marianne if she had not received that support and instruction. As such, the narrative endorses the importance of parental figures, guidance, and education in an orphan's youth.

Throughout the novel, Marianne's orphanhood remains central to her experiences and interactions, as it either impedes her engagement with communities or comprises her social standing. Rather, her interaction with her three parental figures allows Marianne to observe and familiarise herself with the morality and customs, which Climal, Dutour, and Miran instruct and guide her in. Yet the novel simultaneously emphasises the importance of childhood education through its continuous references to Marianne's strong moral compass, which is the result of the curé and his sister's instructions. Nevertheless, Marianne's childhood education is a mixture of the genteel standard, the common curriculum for young girls, and knowledge that will allow her to find a profession in French society, most notably through needlework. However, it is difficult to assess the results of Marianne's careful childhood education and the experience of and instruction received in Parisian society as Marivaux left his novel unfinished. Collyer, on the other hand, did conclude the narrative in her translation. The next section will address the alterations made by Collyer to Marivaux's novel and to what extent her conclusion affects the depiction of education and orphanhood in her translation.

Didactical Alterations: Mary Collyer's translation The Virtuous Orphan

Publishing her translation shortly after the publication of the eleventh part of Marivaux's novel, Collyer intended to provide the British audience with this "useful piece of instruction" (iv). In the preface of her translation, Collyer praises Marivaux's style in this work, in particular Marianne's reflections as natural and "the language of the heart". In fact, she thinks that "it is a production that reflects glory on the French nation" (1: iv). As mentioned above, Collyer's translation was considered as the most readable and intact translation of *La Vie de Marianne* to appear on the British market in the eighteenth century. Although Collyer downplays the extent of alterations she made to her translation, as the abovementioned McBurney and Shugrue note, Collyer did make, what they term, "an edifying didactical novel" (xxix) from Marivaux's original. To what extent, then, has Collyer made changes and additions to Marivaux's original novel to turn it into her pedagogical cultivating novel? This section will examine Collyer's translation to determine which revisions she has made and how they affect the representation of Marianne and her orphanhood education. Moreover, it will examine whether these changes transform the depiction of orphanhood and its education into a particular 'British' representation of these aspects.

The novel's narrator, the elderly Marianne, retains her coquettish and intellectual charm, while remaining unpredictable and ambivalent in her narration of the events. Furthermore, Collyer's Marianne continues to stress the importance of her orphanhood in her self-representation, as this part of the novel resembles Marivaux's original. Indeed, Collyer's Marianne expresses her precarious

social position in the exact translation of Marianne's concise description of her early life: "Fifteen years ago I was absolutely unacquainted with every circumstance of my birth, and had never been informed whether I was of noble or mean extraction; a bastard or legitimate." (1: 7). Collyer, throughout her translation, retains much of Marivaux's narrotological structure, characters, and content. Besides, in her 1784 preface to the second publication of her novel, Collyer apologises for the vulgarity and coarseness of some characters, while simultaneously explaining the necessity of retaining them in the novel, because of their didactical value as

the avoiding of vice is the first natural step we take in pursuing virtue; and unless the difficulties and obstacles that arise from headstrong passion and corrupt habits are removed at our setting out, we shall never make the least progress towards the height of virtue we aspire after. (1: iv-v)

According to Collyer, these characters will provide examples for readers to either evade vice or mend their immoral ways and return to virtue, as she elaborates: "persons of this depraved taste can only be shamed out of a habit so mean and contemptible; which cannot be better done than by representing it in it's (sic) own light" (1: v). Collyer's educational objectives are thus distinctly voiced in her preface, an element which is demonstrated in her version of Marianne's childhood upbringing.

Collyer's heroine is likewise adopted and raised by a brother and sister, which have been given the names Mr. and Mrs. de Rosland by Collyer, and they have the same roles in Marianne's education. Mrs de Rosland is the virtuous and maternal figure described by Marivaux, as Marianne expresses her admiration for her 'mother': "[Mrs. de Rosland] was polite and virtuous; her behaviour was free and easy" (1: 11). Indeed, in Collyer's novel, the example of the virtuous, modest woman set by Mrs. de Rosland is represented by Marianne, both in her discourse and correspondence, as essential to her self-representation and comprehension of virtue. Marianne, accordingly, identifies Mrs. de Rosland as the example to aspire to when confronted by Mons. de Climal's unwanted and degenerate advances, as Marianne is "resolved it shall be my study to imitate [Mrs de Rosland]" (1: 55) her behaviour. Whereas Marivaux during this scene concentrates on Marianne's performance of her sensibility and orphan vulnerability, through a physical display of agony and modesty by crying and bashfulness, Collyer emphasises Marianne's virtuous childhood upbringing. In this manner, Collyer includes a complete explanation by Marianne about her education, as a way to exemplify her genteel and virtuous knowledge: "From her and her brother I have received an education that makes such discourses quite unintelligible to me" (1: 55). This sentence, then, simultaneously illustrates Marianne's perception of her childhood upbringing, but also hints towards the changes Collyer's made in her translation. That is, it indicates that Collyer reduced parts on Marianne's coquettish behaviour, in favour of increasing the role of virtue and religion in Marianne's self-representation and education. Which, in turn, suggests that Collyer's perception of the readers' tastes, despite her appreciation for the "fine spirit" of the original, her endeavour to "admit [the novel] of an English dress" (1: v),

translates into lessening the coquettish elements in favour of a more didactical and religious strain in her translation.

In *The Virtuous Orphan*, Marianne's narration about her education has expanded significantly in regard to the curate's involvement in her upbringing. Although she maintains the original's emphasis on the female curriculum and elements of Marianne's education, Collyer inserts a lengthy discussion about religion, thus, elaborating on Marianne's minimal discussion of the curé's participation in her education in Marivaux's original. This episode, however, only serves to expand on the details of Marianne's religious and moral instruction by curate de Rosland, rather than incorporating a new element in or depicting a broader curriculum for Marianne. After Mr. and Mrs de Rosland have decided to raise Marianne, Collyer inserts a long explanation about the scenery and a long monologue by Mr. de Rosland about the significance of religion for a rational being:

This worthy gentleman began early to shew his zeal for my happiness, by establishing in my mind the nicest sentiments of virtue and honour: he represented religion in an amiable light which made it appear all amiable and lovely, and as the highest happiness of a rational being; he painted the substantial pleasures of a conscious innocence, the exquisite happiness of a mind that can survey itself with tranquillity and self-approbation, in such pleasing colours as perfectly charmed me. (1: -11)

The primary aim of Mr. de Rosland is to cultivate Marianne's comprehension of honour and virtue which "gave [her] a habit of thinking, which served as counterbalance to my natural sprightliness and gaiety: they improved and entertained me" (1: 11) as Marianne reminisces. By inserting Mr. de Rosland's spiritual and didactical speech, Collyer uses de Rosland to counterbalance and assert the distinction between good religious men and women, such as the nun Treviere, in contrast to Marianne's encounters with the Parisian monk and dubious abbess.

The importance of religion and virtue in regard to women's conduct is reiterated throughout eighteenth-century advice books in both France and England, for as Mme Anne Thérèse de Lambert writes: "Quel sera le principe de ces sentiments? la religion. Quand elle sera grave dans notre coeur, alors toutes les vertus couleront de cette source, tous les devoirs se rangeront chacun dans leur ordre" (19). Whereas both Marivaux's and Collyer's narrator acknowledge her vivacious and lively character, Collyer's Marianne articulates the necessity of curbing these intuitive characteristics, which is achieved through education, thereby echoing Lambert's importance of religion. The necessity of religious education is also expressed in British conduct literature; for instance, as Wilkes Wetenhall states in his *A Letter of Genteel Advice* (1740): "The principles of Religion exalt our Virtues and adjust their Measure infinitely better than any human Institutions were ever able to do" (44). The centrality of religion in relation to female conduct and reputation is reiterated in a contemporary British advice book *The Young Lady's* (1740), as the author writes in the preface: "the utmost Attention ought to be given to the Formation of young Females to Religion and Virtue; because

thereon depends not only their own future Happiness,, but the Honour and Felicity of whole Families” (n.p.). The importance of proper religious instruction is thus a recurring theme in mid-eighteenth-century literature, and it is therefore not surprising that Collyer incorporates and emphasises this element in Marianne’s education.

Furthermore, the expansion of Mr. de Rosland’s role in Marianne’s education serves to juxtapose this with Marianne’s interaction with the only other paternal figure in her adolescence, Mr de Climal. The addition of this paternal role echoes other paternal figures in the eighteenth-century British novel, such as Formator in Mary Davys’ *The Reform’d Coquet* (1724), Mr. Villars in Frances Burney’s *Evelina* (1778), or Arabella’s father in *The Female Quixote* (1752). Including these two father figures, allows Collyer to distinguish between the good, religious fatherly advice given by de Rosland and the secular and urban instruction given by de Climal, which eventually is revealed to serve his own corrupted and immoral intentions. This contrast indicates the differences between and preference for a wholesome countryside education instead of the nefarious activities of Parisian society. This distinction is strengthened by the support and understanding of Climal’s actions and generous offers by Marianne’s employer and the Parisian monk. Marianne’s initial encounter with Parisian society and practices, hence, give her a taste of and allow her to experience corrupted standards. Throughout Marivaux’s original novel, Marianne exhibits coquettish behaviour, which seemingly contradicts her insistence on her virtue and suggest her own moral corruption. However, as many scholars, such as Wolfgang, Russo, and Miller, have since noted, Marianne’s appropriation of coquettish elements is part of her feminine intellect and charm, as understood by Marivaux. Although Collyer maintains many of Marianne’s coquettish traits, she does tone down the level of Marianne’s coquettish activities. Accordingly, in an effort to “increase the moral tone” (xxxii) as McBurney and Shurgue term it, Collyer shortens a few scenes of heightened physical and emotional display. As McBurney and Shurgue enumerate, Collyer made alterations to the lengthy, coquettish, church scene where Marianne slowly exhibits her hands, hair, and eyes in a favourable light, shortened the scene where Valville examined Marianne’s injured foot, and removes the mention of Varthon’s unlaced stays (xxxii)¹⁴. Indeed, Collyer seems to shift the attention from Marianne’s more inherent feminine intellect and style that are favoured by Marivaux to a rationality which is more religiously and morally grounded.

The increase of religious emphasis and theological contemplation is evident when looking at the confrontation between Marianne, Monsieur de Climal, and the Parisian monk. After discovering de Climal’s intentions to make her into his mistress, Marianne returns to the monk, a relative of the Roslands, who introduced de Climal to Marianne as her guardian. After having voiced her concerns and being dismissed by the monk, Marianne leaves, feeling bewildered and subsequently lost, as is described in Marivaux’s novel:

¹⁴ For a more detailed discussion of Collyer’s alterations to Marivaux’s novel see McBurney and Shurgue’s introduction to the 1965 Publication of *The Virtuous Orphan*.

Je le saluai sans pouvoir prononcer un seul mot, et je partis pour le moins aussi triste que je l'avois été en arrivant chez lui: les saintes et pieuses consolations qu'il vennoit de me donner, me rendoient mon état encore plus effrayant qu'il ne me l'avoit paru; c'est que je n'étois pas assez devote, et qu'une ame de dix-huit ans croit tot perdu, tout désespéré, quand on lui dit en pareil cas qu'il n'y a plus que Dieu qui lui reste: c'est une idée grave et serieuse qui effarouche s petite confiance; à cet âge, on ne se fie guere qu'à ce qu'on voit, on ne connoît guere que les choses de la terre. (3: 99-100)

During this contemplation, Marianne primarily concentrates on her confused emotions and describes them for her reader. In Collyer's translation, however, this paragraph is expanded as she included a extended religious reflection by Marianne on, interestingly, the effect of religious advices on young and merry individuals:

It is a grave and serious idea, that disturbs and alarms her confidence in all human assistance; for our minds are generally too much attached to the objects of our senses to dare to rise above them: this makes us too often fly from ourselves, and dread the dull moments of serious thoughts and pious contemplation. – O Religion, how much do we wrong thy native amiableness! How do we despise the glorious privilege of being reasonable and immortal! Nor is it strange, since religion, the honour, the happiness of all intelligent minds, is almost every where represented to the young and sprightly, as an enemy to all their joys: as inconsistent with gaiety and delight: and thus, our fancies having cloathed her in all the dreary pomp of horror, we shun and fly from the imagined spectre. (1: 70-1)

Although Marivaux acknowledges the gravity of Marianne's loss of hope and increasing despair, Collyer uses this moment to have Marianne reflect upon the juxtaposition of the assurances of divine assistance through devoutness and modesty and the incapability of a young mind to believe that God can relieve her. Moreover, at this stage Collyer emphasises why religious instruction of the young is important; namely, to strengthen their faith in divine guidance and protection.

Despite making alterations to the paternal figures in Marianne's lives, Collyer left the maternal characters and their guidance predominantly intact. Indeed, Collyer's changes in these relationships are mostly restricted to additions or changes in dialogue. For instance, in the abovementioned scene when Mme de Miran chastises Marianne's visible affection for Vaville and her disappointment at not finding him with her, Collyer adds to Miran's admonition the sentence "I shall teach you manners" (2: 110). By this addition, Collyer stresses Miran's intentions to instruction Marianne and the maternal role she assumes in Marianne's life. Even though Collyer follows Marivaux's original closely in this section of the novel, she not only seems to emphasise the effects of the pedagogical practices on Marianne's conduct, but also the didactical intentions of the novel. Instead of lauding the innate origins of Marianne's feminine intellect, although retaining these elements in the novel, Collyer inserts small comments about Marianne's education in the speech of other characters, reminding that education consists partly of instruction, partly of talent, and partly experience. Yet, Mme de Miran is

not the only aristocratic maternal figure in Marianne's life, as she becomes acquainted with Mme Dorsin simultaneously. Nevertheless, Dorsin's maternal role in *Marivaux* is limited to advising both Miran and Marianne in their conduct and interaction, whereas her role in Collyer's novels expands. Mme de Miran's death leaves Marianne, once again, orphaned, and despite her impending marriage and financial stability, due to inheritances from Climal and Miran, Marianne is anxious about embarking on this position in her life. It is in this moment that Dorsin offers Marianne her advice, when no other maternal figures remain, on her approaching marriage and her subsequent conduct as a wife, which will be discussed below. In Collyer's translation, similar to *Marivaux's* novel, Marianne retains her selective nature when deciding which advices to follow and reject, again, only adopting the guidance that resonates with Marianne's perception of her own nobility.

The alterations made by Collyer which affect the representation of orphan education in *The Virtuous Orphan* are located at the end of the novel. Since *Marivaux* left the novel unfinished, Collyer, instead of leaving the translation unfinished as the original, writes an ending which emphasises her pedagogical perspective and aims. The nun Treviere's history, which had been narrated in the last three parts of *Marivaux's* novel, is shortened by Collyer, but is still given a substantial and larger part than the tales of the other orphans. This shortening allows Collyer to attach her ending to the novel without increasing its length too much. In addition to the alterations to Treviere's history, Collyer also makes changes to the narration of Varthon's relationship with Valville. Whereas *Marivaux's* novel limits Varthon's history to the exploration of the Marianne, Valville, and Varthon love triangle, Collyer, on the other hand, expands this narrative as she has a repentant Valville visit his mother's deathbed and return to Marianne. In fact, Collyer transforms Varthon into the true coquette in contrast to Marianne's previous coquettish behaviour when being protected by de Climal. Simultaneously, Collyer uses Valville's remorse and repentance about mistreating and deserting Marianne to rekindle their relationship. Varthon's cold reception of Marianne's generous consent to Valville's and Varthon's impending marriage repulses Valville who confesses that "[Varthon] commended [Marianne's] generosity; but it was with a very cold and indolent air" (3:212). Similarly to *Toinon*, in *Marivaux's* original novel and her translation, Collyer uses Varthon to juxtapose Marianne's superior education, sensibility, and conduct with an orphan figure who is corrupted, but also to demonstrate the effects of education on persons with similar social situations. That is, Varthon and Marianne are depicted as equals, both socially and intellectually, the only differentiation being Marianne's unknown origins.

Regardless of their similarities, Varthon's coquettishness proves to be her undoing and her questionable morals, and, furthermore, demonstrates to Marianne how coquettish behaviour can lead to social and moral depravity. Simultaneously, this episode stresses the importance of a maternal figure in an adolescent woman's education, as Varthon's coquettish behaviour surfaces after her mother has left, while Marianne's is curbed, slightly, by Miran's instructions. In Collyer's translation, Varthon retains her English nationality, which, in regard of her changes to Varthon's character,

suggests that perhaps these nefarious acts by Varhton are related to her English heritage, yet Collyer never verifies the origins of Varhton's depraved actions. Nevertheless, this episode exemplifies how influential the maternal figure is in the life of a coquettish young girl, and in particular in guiding her through fashionable society.

The most significant addition by Collyer with regard to the pedagogical nature of her translation is the reappearance of curate de Rosland and his reunification with Marianne. In the last part of Collyer's translation, the curate returns to effectively laud Marianne's conduct in and navigation of eighteenth-century Parisian society, as he proclaims joyously: "Thou has not disgraced the education I have given thee" (4:287). In fact, Marianne's acquaintances depict Marianne's future prosperity and happiness in marriage as results of her behaviour throughout her narration which was cultivated by de Rosland during her infancy. Her recently discovered uncle expresses his sincere gratitude and admiration for Mr. de Rosland's involvement in and the results of his diligent application to Marianne's education:

but this worthy man has made that being a blessing to her, by embellishing her mind with all that is great, noble, and generous. Without his care, my niece would either have perished, or wanted those improvements which now make us rejoice in her alliance (4:287-288)

The notion that a well-educated woman is a great addition to a family is not an isolated idea in both this translation and eighteenth-century literature in general. Rather, this aspect of good housewifery and as a wife is reiterated throughout eighteenth-century literature, both conduct literature as novels, and even in correspondences. Lady Mary Wortley Montague touches on the notion of education as preparation for cultivating a good wife in a letter to her daughter, countess of Bute, in October 1752. Although she is generally dismissive of the marriage state, she remembers her daughter that education plays an integral role in the preparation for this position: "The ultimate end of your education was to make you a good wife (and I have the comfort to hear you are one): hers [Lady Bute's daughter] ought to be, to make her happy in a virgin state. I will not say it is happier; but it is undoubtedly safer than any marriage" (228). Similarly, Marianne is instructed in detail, how to remain a good wife and, more importantly, still interesting and engaging for her husband, by Mrs Dorsin:

As all your happiness depends on the tenderness of your husband, to preserve that is a care worthy of your highest ambition; for this you should still dress, and make yourself appear as lovely as possible, that he may still approve his choice. Some of our ladies are no sooner married, than they lay aside all attempts to please at home: if they dress, it is not for their husbands; as if they would appear to all besides gay and lovely, to him alone disagreeable. They behave as if they thought their point was gained, and all attempts to appear in a graceful light to him were now unnecessary. This shocks his natural delicacy: and it is no wonder that she, who once appeared almost divinely charming to the admiring lover, sinks in his esteem when she thus degrades herself; for the transition is too great to fall at once from angel to a slattern. In the marriage-stat there are a thousand nameless decencies to be observed; these

will even render your wit more pleasing, give a grace to your ordinary behaviour, and make the most trivial actions appear lovely. [...] But this, my dear, [...] is not all: as he has justly a very high opinion of your wit and fine sense, you should take great care to preserve that too; you must read, in order to retain a fund of pleasing and judicious ideas. (4: 311-312)

In the marriage-state, Marianne, according to Mrs. Dorsin, should be attentive to both her physical attractiveness to her husband, and to retain her intellectual spirit through keeping up with social and literary developments. This instruction is the last education Marianne receives before she marries Valville, and it completes the journey and transition from a liminal ambiguous orphan girl to a married, aristocratic lady. In addition, this ending seems to indicate that Marianne's separation from Mr de Rosland was necessary for her, as it allowed her to strengthen her education by actually experiencing Parisian society, both as an orphan lodged at Mme Du Tour and as adopted daughter of Mme Miran, and to be instructed in the rules of and conduct expected in Parisian society.

To sum up, Collyer's alterations to Marivaux' original particularly concentrate on strengthening the religious and moral aspects of *La Vie de Marianne*, while reducing Marianne's coquettish characteristics a minimum as she only retains this behaviour in central scenes and even shortens these. These changes support McBurney and Shurgue's statement that Collyer's intention was to enhance the moral spirit of Marivaux's original. Marianne's orphanhood, however, remains predominantly unchanged, although she becomes less of a foundling coquette due to the cuts made by Collyer. Nevertheless, these alterations provide a stronger contrast between Marianne and the three orphan girls who function as foils to her, as it enhances the distinction between the corruption, embodied by Toinon and Varthon, or the meekness personified by Treviere, and Marianne's virtue and social acumen. Yet the biggest alteration to Marivaux's work by Collyer is that she created an ending for the hitherto unfinished novel. Finishing Marivaux's original allowed Collyer to once more assert the didactical intentions of her translation. In the final part of the novel, Collyer completes Marianne's pedagogical journey by reuniting her with her childhood educator who, in concurrence with her acquaintances, applauds her conduct in Parisian society. Furthermore, this section also includes new advice for Marianne for the next part of her life; that of a wife and mother, thereby, completing her transformation and journey from a kinless orphan to a married, noble, wife whose heritage is known.

Conclusion

It is not surprising that, when reading Collyer's praise of Marivaux's original novel, the two texts exhibit many similarities in their depiction of the female orphan's narrative. In fact, these similarities indicate that the fictional representation of female orphanhood transcended national boundaries. In both texts, orphanhood is connected to recurring themes of ambiguity, vulnerability, marginality, and potential defiance of social customs and hierarchies. This pattern of female orphanhood as represented by Marianne, is mirrored by the three orphan doubles throughout the narration, who either combine all or some of these elements in their versions of female orphanhood. Central to all these narratives of

female orphanhood is the lack of familial ties, either through death or separation, and thus of familial protection, leaving the female orphan to fend for herself or secluded within the walls of a convent. Although these components are fundamental to the representation of orphanhood in both novels, education is a key feature in the female orphan's self-representation and comprehension of her social position.

Notwithstanding the comparable status of education in both texts, the pedagogical methods and content in both texts differ in emphasis, due to Collyer's endeavour to adjust Marivaux's novel to the taste and style of a British literary work. This intention, however, is diametrically opposed to Collyer's preceding praise for Marivaux's novel and indicates that, despite Marivaux's outstanding original work, the text was found to be unsuited in its original form for British audiences. Collyer keeps the bulk of Marivaux's narrative framework structurally and substantially intact, which underlines her approval of the novel's subject matter. This method of translation adopted by Collyer is termed *amplificatio*, which "include[s] any sort of expansion of the original within or even at the borders of the text." (McMurrin 76). This can be seen in Collyer's major alterations which are related to the pedagogical structure, and in particular, content of Marianne's upbringing and experiences. That is, Collyer increases the religious and moral component in Marianne's education and diminishes the lengthy coquettish scenes in Marivaux's novel in favour of self-reflection and religious contemplation.

However, to counterbalance Marianne's increased modest behaviour in her translation, Collyer adapted the roles of the three female orphan foils to contrast more starkly with Marianne's social navigation and conduct. That is, Collyer transforms Varthon into a true coquette, which allows her to compare the virtuous education of Marianne with Varthon's corrupted intellect, and slightly expands on Treviere's function in the narrative. Treviere retains her position as pedagogical objective to Marianne, yet Collyer adds Marianne's response to the narrative of the nun's experiences and in particular her advice, which allows her to strengthen the pedagogical role of this orphan. Nevertheless, a distinction can be made between these two orphans. Although they have a lot in common with regard to their social interactions and position, Treviere actually knows her, elite, heritage which makes her an orphan in the true sense of the eighteenth-century definition of this term, whereas Marianne assumes her own noble origins based on the accounts of those who witnessed her parents' murder scene.

The uncertainty of Marianne's heritage does become an obstacle in her social interactions as this forces Marianne to the margins of society, while she is repeatedly reminded of this lack of information. Yet this ignorance and its accompanying anxiety is counterbalanced with the admiration expressed by her paternal guardians for her gentility and nobility which is seen as a sign of her noble ancestry. Her innate inclination towards a genteel life with its understanding of virtue is inextricably connected to Marianne's understanding of her self, and thus affects her social interaction, yet this does not alter Marianne's initial incapability of navigating French society. Although both Marivaux and Collyer depict Marianne as capable of engaging with Parisian society during her first encounters

with it, they simultaneously accentuate her ignorance of propriety in these communities through Marianne's coquettish behaviour. Yet Marianne's coquettish behaviour, in Marivaux's text, is more an inherent part of her character, whereas Collyer tones this down. Nevertheless, in both works Marianne's coquettish conduct needs to be curbed which happens through the help of guardians. Marianne's childhood educators are unqualified for instructing her navigation of Parisian society, having little knowledge of it themselves. Marianne's subsequent guardians, Climal and DuTour, on the other hand, want to exploit and develop her coquettish behaviour into full impropriety. Marianne's last guardian, and eventual adoptive mother, Mme Miran, by contrast, is fully capable of introducing Marianne to French elite society, while simultaneously balancing her adoptive daughter's ambiguous identity due to her orphanhood. In other words, Marianne's experiences in Paris, in combination with the careful guidance of Mme Miran, allow her to cultivate a social awareness and composure which complements her childhood education and accomplishments. Marianne, thus, is educated through both personal experience, traditional learning methods in her childhood, and through advice from both her adoptive mother and the nun Treviere.

The culmination of Marianne's pedagogical journey is absent from Marivaux's text as he left his work unfinished. Although the contrasts between Treviere's history and Marianne's narrative demonstrate the advantage of Marianne's upbringing and characteristic boldness in comparison with Treviere's timidity and misfortunes, Marivaux's *La Vie de Marianne* does not disclose how Marianne became the countess alluded to in the subtitle, *Les Aventures de Madame la Comtesse d*****. Instead, Marivaux leaves the fate of this orphan uncertain and undiscussed, offering no completion to the female orphan narrative template. This open ending, consequently, leaves the possibilities for Marianne's future unresolved, as it suggests that any of the potential futures depicted in the novel are still viable. The narrative template of the female orphan, as used by Marivaux thus indicates that the orphan remains an individual that inspires anxiety in society, due to his or her unrestricted agency. Indeed, this agency is only expanded by the orphan's character and more particular by the values instilled by education.

In contrast to Marivaux's indefinite conclusion to his novel, Collyer did provide her novel with an ending which emphasises the pedagogical intentions of her work. In fact, in this part Collyer reinforces the notion of Marianne as a virtuous orphan. In addition to having received an inheritance from Mme de Miran and discovering her ancestry, Marianne makes preparations for her marriage when she is reunited with her foster-father Mr. Rosland. This meeting reinforces the didactic nature of this novel, as she is praised by her first guardian for her exemplary conduct and, in addition, her pedagogical experiences, from childhood until the reunion, are seen by Marianne's acquaintances as preparation for her impending nuptials and her role as wife and mother. The female orphan narrative template, as applied by Collyer, shares many similarities with Marivaux's template, yet she inserts the transformation of Marianne from a marginal vulnerable orphan to a married noble lady. This metamorphosis from a found child to a prominent and admired member of society, indicates that

orphans whose parentage are known can become contributing and highly valued members of society. Yet this potential future can only be achieved through good and virtuous supervision of the orphan's childhood education, which is essential for the establishment of her values and morals, and attentive guidance and discussion of her experience during her adolescence.

From Foundling to Orphan: Social Status and Agency in Haywood's *The Fortunate Foundlings*, Crébillon's *Les Heureux Orphelins*, and Kimber's *The Happy Orphans*

So many excellencies as you possess, could never be derived from vulgar blood. Education may give the appearance of virtue, but, in effect, only disguises native vices, and renders them more dangerous to society. Nature in forming you, left but little more to be done, and you owe yourself, as you are, to her kindness, and not my care of you. You owe nothing [...] to Rutland (*sic*). (*The Happy Orphans*, Edward Kimber, 39)

When Lucy, the female protagonist of *The Happy Orphans*, articulates her concerns regarding her obscure, ambivalent, and probably lower-class origins, her foster-father Lord Rutland diminishes her misgivings in this passionate assertion about her innate qualities rather than cultivated skills.

Abandoned on Rutland's estate, Lucy and her twin brother Edward were found by Rutland with nothing more than a note informing the finder of their names and "honourable character" (28), which convinces Rutland of their noble heritage. His faith in the veracity of this information is at variance with Lucy's and Edward's perceptions of their social marginality and their difficulties with fully being accepted in society's communities. Furthermore, the social interaction of Lucy and Edward is dictated by a certain extent of social caution and restraint which derives from the twins' unclear ancestry. That is, their kinlessness makes it difficult to allocate a definite social position to the twins which is exacerbated by their genteel and cultivated dispositions.

Notwithstanding the social constraints and the twins' perspective of their own social standing, Rutland continuously distinguishes between their unhappy fate and their intellectual aptitude, which according to him corroborates the declaration of noble birth made in the foundling letter. In fact, Rutland's defence of Lucy's qualities, both on an intellectual and emotional level, alludes to an intriguing distinction between the strength of natural aptitude on the one hand and pedagogical cultivation of similar talents on the other. In other words, Rutland differentiates between natural development of the children's talents and interests opposed to the traditional memorisation methods. Rutland's understanding of the influence of nature and art, or artfulness, in educational methods are part of a larger movement within eighteenth-century pedagogical discussions¹⁵ Yet, if pedagogical

¹⁵ The differentiation between a regulated, artificial, and natural approach to a child's education and development are extensively developed in various eighteenth-century essays, books, educational manuals, or conduct literature. See for example, the works of Jean-Jacques Rousseau, most notably *Émile, ou de l'éducation* (1762), and *Pamela, or Virtue Rewarded* (1740) and *Clarissa* (1742) by Samuel Richardson. See Jean Blouch's *Rousseauism and Education in Eighteenth-Century France* (1995); Helen M. Jewell's *Education in Early Modern England* (1998), Peter Gay's *John Locke on Education* (1964); Richard A. Barney's *Plots of Enlightenment: Education and the Novel in Eighteenth-century England* (1999); Jennifer Popiel's *Rousseau's Daughters: Domesticity, Education, and Authonomy in Modern France* (2008); Natasha Gill's *Educational Philosophy in the French Enlightenment: From Nature to Second Nature* (2010), amongst others, for a discussion of the expansive field and diverse ideologies and philosophies on pedagogical practices in eighteenth-century France and England.

instructions and natural disposition are, as Rutland assumes, two distinct influences in the cultivation of a person's character and intellect, to what extent are these pedagogies reflected in the upbringing of these twins? Does society concur with this distinction between education and natural merit?

Additionally, how does this perception affect the social navigation and position of the twins, and in particular Lucy? Furthermore, is this distinction also found in the description of the twins' education in the original novel by Eliza Haywood and its French translation by Crébillon-fils? If not, how is the education of these orphans depicted in these novels?

This chapter will address the complex representation of the female foundling's education in specific, and foundlings in general, in the three novels, in connection to their social standing in contemporary French and British society. Before examining the novels, this chapter will first address the publication, translation, and reception history of these texts, to outline the incentives behind Crébillon's translation of Haywood's *The Fortunate Foundlings*, Kimber's subsequent translation of Crébillon's work, and the reception of these foundling novels. The second part of this chapter will examine the representation of education in Haywood's original novel, while the final section will summarise and reflect on the depiction of the female orphan's education. Crébillon and Kimber's novels will be analysed in the subsequent sections which will also include an overall conclusion in which the three analyses will be compared to determine to which extent the representation of the female foundling's education has altered or remained similar and whether they reflect changes in pedagogical practices and theories, either nationally or transnationally.

Published in 1759, Edward Kimber's *The Happy Orphans* is part of an interesting tripartite translation history of Eliza Haywood's *The Fortunate Foundlings* (1744). Signifying a break from the amatory works written during the early part of her career, Haywood now started to produce novels, magazines, and conduct literature with a moral and pedagogical tone. This change proved to be successful as her conduct periodical *The Female Spectator*, written in the same period, was well received, as was *The Fortunate Foundlings*. Although little is known about its reception, this novel by Haywood was reprinted at least five times during printer Thomas Gardner's life time, with its last publication dating from 1761 (Spedding, 93)¹⁶. This indicates that the novel was successful with English audiences, and makes it even likely that Edward Kimber may have known of the novel while he published his translation of Claude Prosper Joylot de Crébillon's novel *Les Heureux Orphelins* (1754). Although Haywood's novel was not published in France in the decade after its publication, Crébillon did choose to translate this novel, while pretending that it was his original work. Crébillon's familiarity with Haywood's novel probably originated in 1753 when his wife, Henrietta Marie Stafford, received a copy from the countess of Denbigh. In a letter to the comtesse dated February 1753, she thanks the countess for the gift: "j'ai reçu hier les memoires du colonel Manners; comment vous remercier Madame d'une attention aussi obligeante" (qtd in Stewart and Ebel-Davenport 217).

¹⁶ Spedding's article "Thomas Gardner's Ornament Stock: A Checklist" provides more detailed information on Thomas Gardner's publishing practices and his use of ornaments in the works he published.

The reference to the memoirs of colonel Manners alludes to the subtitle of Haywood's novel which reads *The Fortunate Foundlings: being the genuine history of Colonel M—rs, and his sister Madame du P—y, the issue of the Hon. Ch—es M—rs, son of the late Duke of R—l—d.*

However, the long periods of time between the respective translations and original does raise questions about the extent to which these translations were influenced by changing attitudes towards and alterations in pedagogical practices and translation methods. The translation approaches adopted by the translators, and in particular the effects on their works, have often been commented upon by scholars, such as Jan Herman, Beatrijs Vanacker, Antoinette Sol, and Corinne Fourny¹⁷, who have noted remarkable similarities between the novels' beginnings, after which the translators made significant alterations in their version of the narrative. These changes range from shifting the balance between the twins' narratives with a focus on Lucie's (i.e. Louisa's) fate, to deviations from Haywood's original by introducing elaborate narratives recounting the life and courtship of the Duchess of Suffolk and Lord Durham, later Lord Chester. This addition to the narrative supplants a large section of Lucie's and Edouard's story, who are called Louisa and Horatio in Crébillon's translation. Kimber's translation of Crébillon's work, consequently, retained some of these additional elements, yet as Crébillon left his novel unfinished, Kimber had the opportunity to make changes of his own, most notably to the ending. To what extent do these supplements and modifications made by the translations affect the representation of education and of the female orphan's education in particular? Can Rutland's comprehension of the roles of nature and art in pedagogical practices be found in Haywood's and Crébillon's preceding novels? If not, can the shifting educational emphasis and methods be attributed to the long time spans between the moments of translation? Furthermore, if national distinctions can be identified between Haywood's, Crébillon's and Kimber's novels, to what extent do the French and British methods of orphan education resemble each other, or are there striking differences?

Double Translation: The Translation and Reception History of The Fortunate Foundlings, Les Heureux Orphelins, and The Happy Orphans

In 1744, with the publication of *The Fortunate Foundlings*, Eliza Haywood embarked on a new path in her literary career. Known for her amatory and scandalous fiction published during the early part of her career, Haywood, after a decade of relative silence, started publishing new works with moral and

¹⁷ See the introduction of Jan Herman and Beatrijs Vanacker's to republication of Edward Kimber's *The Happy Orphans* (2015), Beatrijs Vanacker's article "Discours libertine et argument national dans le triptyque (Haywood, Crébillon-fils et Kimber) des heureux orphelins." in *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 24.4 (Summer 2012), Antoinette Sol's chapter "Lost in Translation. Crébillon-fils' *Les heureux orphelins* and Haywood's *The Fortunate Foundlings*." in *Altered Narratives. Female eighteenth-century French authors reinterpreted* (1997), Corinne Fourny's chapter "Foreign Reflections: Adapting the image of the other in Haywood's *Fortunate Foundlings* and Crébillon's *Les Heureux orphelins*." In *Interfaces artistiques et littéraires dans l'Europe des Lumières/Artistic and Literary Exchange and Relations in Enlightenment Europe* (2000), and Bernadette Fort "Les *Heureux Orphelins* de Crébillon: de l'adaptation à la création romanesque." in *Revue d'Histoire littéraire de la France* 80.4 (1980).

pedagogical tones, seemingly rejecting her early romances. *The Fortunate Foundlings* was one of the first new novels to be published by Eliza Haywood and attests to the changes in Haywood's authorial intentions from the 1740s onwards. In the preface to this work, Haywood formulates the pedagogical aims of this novel, which is described as a history "not so long passed" and "collected from original letters, private memorandums, and the accounts" (np) of the principal characters of the novel. This emphasised veracity and reality of the narrative add to the pedagogical motive of this work, as it suggests the notion that the readers can learn from experiences, whether their own or someone else's. Indeed, Haywood writes in her preface:

the motive of their [the adventures'] publication being only to encourage virtue in both sexes, by shewing the amiableness of it in real characters. And if it be true (as it certainly it is) that example has more efficacy than precept, we may be bold to say there are few fairer, or more imitation. (np)

This positive incentive to follow the example given by the protagonists is not entirely new to Haywood's oeuvre. In fact, her earlier works also hint towards the didactic undercurrents of these narratives, which explore multiple plots and trails of female passion and can be regarded as giving the audience examples of how to cope with these passions and the inevitable social constraints. These histories written by Haywood suggest a rather obscure didactic aim of her novels and novellas. For example, in the introductory paragraphs of her second novel *The British Recluse* (1722), Haywood expresses her pedagogical intentions by identifying the work as an example for her readers, yet she refrains from forming a clear educational intent:

But, the following little History (which I can affirm for Truth, having it from the mouths of those chiefly concern'd in it) is a sad example of what miseries may attend a woman, who has not other foundation for belief in what her lover says to her, than the good opinion her passion has made her conceive of him. (2)

This excerpt indicates that Haywood incorporated pedagogical elements in her works long before her publications in the 1740s, yet these aspects were further foregrounded in Haywood's novels of education.

The varying levels of didacticism in Haywood's oeuvre, which spans from 1720 until her death in 1756, have led scholars to discuss the didactic intentions of her works. Paula R. Backscheider in her chapter "The Story of Eliza Haywood's Novels Caveats and Questions" examines the distinction often made between Haywood's amatory and more didactical phases in her career. She asserts that Haywood's oeuvre is proliferated with didactical intent: "From the beginning of her career, Haywood claims what will become a ubiquitous justification for the novel, and especially women's novels, throughout the century: that her novels offered experience and education without the consequences of real-life missteps" (35). Haywood's novels of the latter part of her career were

generally well-received by the public, as was *The Fortunate Foundlings*. Republished five times during the printer's lifetime, *The Fortunate Foundlings* was included by Clara Reeve in her work of literary criticism, *The Progress of Romance* (1785). She was presumably the first to distinguish between Haywood's literary productions, when she stated that Haywood "devoted the remainder of her life to the service of virtue" and that "none of [Haywood's] latter works are destitute of merit" (214-5). Although Haywood's novel was retrospectively termed "a farrago of adventures" (174) in the review of Kimber's *The Happy Orphans*, the frequent republications indicate that the overall reception of Haywood's novel was positive.

Although Crébillon's reasons for translating Haywood's novel remain unknown, he did choose, upon publication of his work, not to identify his new novel as a translation; rather, he endeavoured to pass off this work as his own. The critics were, however, unconvinced as they found it "difficult to reconcile its inconsistencies in plot and style with Crébillon's other more polished works" (16), as Antoinette Sol summarises. The critic Grimm stated that this novel was "ni son genre, ni son style" (qtd. in Kent 326), while Reynal commented that although unworthy of Crébillon's genius, the novel was identifiably his: "quoiqu'ils ne soient pas tout à fait dignes de lui, ils sont dans son genre et on reconnaît la main à chaque pas" (qtd. in Sol 36). As John P. Kent observed, contemporary critics repeatedly attempted to find explanations for Crébillon's authorship of this problematic work in his oeuvre. Suggestions were made "that it was a 'retouched piece of juvenilia'" (Sol, 36), or a text written by Crébillon's wife Henrietta Maria Stafford Howard, who was the daughter of Jacobite emigrés¹⁸. These inconsistencies originated from the novel's structure, as Crébillon's translation adhered closely to Haywood's text before diverging from the original narrative. The combination of the distinct literary genres of translation and original narrative by Crébillon, thus, resulted in a novel which might be considered a new story which employs similar characters and themes. Nevertheless, Crébillon's claims of originality and authenticity were undermined by the publication of his work with the subtitle *histoire imitée de l'anglois*, but the lack of reference to Haywood's original in the criticism indicates that her work was not well-known in eighteenth-century France. The absence of any reference to Haywood suggests that Crébillon's novel was perceived as an original work disguised as a translated or imitated history, a common phenomenon in eighteenth-century novel writing in both France and England (McMurrin, 49). Despite his assertion and claim of authenticity regarding *Les Heureux Orphelins*, Crébillon was affected by the bad reception of his novel and the critics' condemnation of his work and thus refrained from completing his work after the publication of the first two volumes.

The unfinished status of Crébillon's novels did not deter Edward Kimber from choosing this novel from Crébillon's oeuvre to translate. In the subtitle to this novel *The Happy Orphans* (1759), Kimber advertised his novel as "translated and improved from the French original" (6), which

¹⁸ See Phillip Stewart and Miriam Ebel-Daveport's article "Dossier Claude Crébillon – Henriette Marie Stafford" (2001) for more information of Crébillon's wife, her English heritage and connections, and their relationship.

immediately reveals the translator's stance and methods practiced in the process of novel writing. Indeed, Kimber suggests that he remained faithful to Crébillon's novel, while simultaneously declaring that he improved the original narrative. Since Crébillon's novel remained unfinished, it is not surprising that Kimber completed the narrative. What is interesting, as Jan Herman and Beatrijs Vanacker have observed, is Kimber's knowledge and application of thematic elements and narrative structures used in Haywood's *The Fortunate Foundlings*. Furthermore, this indebtedness to Haywood's narrative structure is intriguing, as Kimber neglects to acknowledge the existence of Haywood's novel and its relation to his work. Although Crébillon's alterations to the narrative plot of *The Fortunate Foundlings* in his translation created a narrative that initially adheres but suddenly deviates from the original plot structure, Kimber's reintegration of elements from Haywood's original created a, what Herman and Vanacker term "tronc commun narrative" (1) which retains certain core elements of the narrative, while allowing Crébillon and Kimber to be "a-chronical" (7) and merge their own style with the narrative.

Regardless of Kimber's neglect in mentioning Haywood's original work, his contemporaries, however, were quick to make the link between *The Happy Orphans* and *The Fortunate Foundlings*. Despite the limited critical attention given to Kimber's novel, critics were ambivalent about the novel's originality. The *Monthly Review* of December 1758 observed the similarity between the works and refuted Kimber's claim of translation, as the reviewer writes "from [*The Fortunate Foundlings*] the *Happy Orphans* appears to be taken, about verbatim [...] Transformed from the English would, we apprehended, have been nearer the truth" (580). The *Critical Review*, on the other hand, disagreed with the criticism expressed in the *Monthly Review*. Although it also acknowledges the link between Kimber's and Haywood's novel, this reviewer attributes more merit to Kimber's work, stating "[t]he conduct, manners, and intervening adventures are almost as dissimilar as light and darkness" (174) and commending Kimber's endeavours "to mingle the profitable with the pleasant" (174). Indeed, this reviewer accepts Kimber's claim of translation as he does observe some distinctions between Haywood's and Kimber's novel which could be traced back to its French original. Helen Sard Hughes, in her article "Notes on Eighteenth-Century Fictional Translations", comments on this interrelationship between the three works and the emergence of Kimber's novel as a mixture of Haywood's narrative structure which retains some of Crébillon's additions while making it "far more moralistic than either" (227). The complex and intriguing mixture of originality and faithful translation in this triptych raises questions regarding the portrayal of the orphan's education in the novels. If Kimber's is considered the most moralistic version of this story, how is this reflected in the narrative itself? Additionally, if experience is central to Haywood's conception of education and her depiction of the pedagogical adventures of her protagonists, to what extent are these retained in the translations by Crébillon and Kimber? Besides, does the time difference, ten and fifteen years, between the translations and original affect the representation of the orphan's education in the three novels, and if

so, to what extent? To answer these questions this chapter will first examine the original novel by Haywood.

My Experiences Shape Me: The Orphan's Education through Engagement with Multiple Communities

Published in 1744, Eliza Haywood's *The Fortunate Foundlings* narrates the childhood and adolescence of the fraternal twins Horatio and Louisa, whose origins are mysterious and ambivalent. Found by Dorilaus, their guardian, on his estate, he decides to place the children with local women while supervising the upbringing of the twins. It is not until the children "arrived at an age capable of entertaining him with their innocent prattle" (5), that Dorilaus becomes attached to them. Subsequently, he provides Horatio and Louisa with the finest education which the region and afterwards higher education can offer, which is described as follows:

Having given them the first rudiments of education in the best schools those parts afforded, [Dorilaus] placed Louisa with a gentlewoman, who deservedly had the reputation of being an excellent governess of youth, and brought Horatio in his own chariot up to London, where he put him to Westminster school. (6)

Notwithstanding their unknown and mysterious ancestry at the novel's beginning, Dorilaus, similar to Rutland in *The Happy Orphans*, believes the enigmatic acknowledgement, communicated through the foundling letter, that the twins are "of a blood not unworthy the protection they stand in need of" (3). Dorilaus' conviction of the letter's veracity is reflected in the pedagogical methods selected by him for the twins' education which echoes the practices and patterns found in advice literature regarding genteel education. Because they lack a maternal figure, an individual deemed essential in raising young children, Dorilaus places the twins with local women, whom he supervises, until the twins are old enough to be sent to school.

The early stages of Louisa's and Horatio's education seems to suggest the existence of a standard pedagogical format for most children's development, as it is glossed over quickly by the novel's narrator. In fact, besides emphasising the quality of this early education, the narrator mainly elaborates on their subsequent formation which indicates the genteel quality of their upbringing. After lauding Dorilaus's charity, the narrator concentrates on describing the outlines of Dorilaus' pedagogical plans for the siblings. Louisa's education is depicted as including "all the accomplishments that became a maid of quality to be mistress of" (6). However, the narrator does not specify the nature and content of these accomplishments, but alludes to them throughout the novel. In fact, Louisa's education, as planned by Dorilaus, is intended to prepare her for marriage, as Dorilaus at one point confides in her: "the care I have taken of you would not be complete unless I saw you well settled in the world" (17). Horatio, on the other hand, has "gone thro' all the learning of the school [...] [and] was to go to Oxford, in order to finish his studies in the character of a gentleman-commoner" (6-

7). In spite of the succinct description of Louisa's and Horatio's instruction, the narrator is adamant to indicate that they have received a sophisticated education.

However, the substance of this sophisticated upbringing remains ambiguous throughout the novel and, moreover, contemporary conduct works reflect this ambivalent perception of early childhood education. Gender, in particular, influenced the content and structure of childhood education. Michèle Cohen discusses the conflicting views on male and female education, specifically the place and content of children's education. As she notes, boys were often publically educated at school, to prepare them for their public roles, whereas girls received their education in the domestic family sphere, which was supervised by either mothers or governesses and intended to prepare them for their duties as a housewife and mother (226-230). This distinction is reflected in the structuring of the twins' pedagogical experiences. The didactical content of the twins' education, besides covering the elementary arithmetic, reading, and religious instructions, is reflected in Dorilaus' perceptions of the twins' future employment and social standing. Dorilaus's plans for Horatio to become a gentleman-commoner is demonstrated in the pedagogical plan that is constructed for Horatio. The young man first attends a private boarding school in Westminster, with the intention of subsequently studying at Oxford university. Louisa's upbringing, on the other hand, reflects the familial, and to some extent, decorative duties of women. This becomes clear when one looks at the description of woman's roles in contemporary conduct literature aimed at young women and girls. For instance, the author, a 'person of quality', of *The Young Lady's Companion; or, beauty's Looking-Glass* (1740) remarks that "the government of your house, family, and children; which since it is the province allotted to your sex, and that discharging it well, will, for that reason, be expected from you" (31). To achieve this conduct, the author states that "the utmost attention ought to be given to the formation of young females to religion and virtue; because thereon depends not only their own future happiness, but the honour and felicity of whole families" (n.p.). This gender-specific approach to education in relation to the students' social position as adults is reflected in the twins' pedagogies. Indeed, Horatio's education clearly prepares him for a public employment. Louisa, on the other hand, receives training in feminine and domestic accomplishments in preparation for her role as wife and mother.

Furthermore, this gendered approach to education affects the twins' position as foundlings and their agency in changing their social identity and position. Whereas Horatio has, and is given, the ability to enter the army and construct a new individual identity for himself, Louisa remains dependent on Dorilaus' support. Upon his return from Westminster school, Horatio is unwilling to continue his education at Oxford. Revealing his sentiments to Dorilaus, Horatio adopts a discourse that is laced with elements of gratitude and ambitious intentions of self-development. Despite refuting Dorilaus' pedagogical plan, Horatio acknowledges his indebtedness to Dorilaus' generosity by stating that "I know all that I am is yours – That I am the creature of your bounty" (7) and subsequently describes his:

desire [...] of doing something of myself which may repair the obscurity of my birth, and prove to the world that heaven has endued this foundling with a courage and resolution capable of undertaking the greatest actions (7)

Horatio's speech demonstrates his awareness of his social marginality as an orphan. That is, Horatio hopes to negate "the obscurity of [his] birth" through his own actions, and identifies a military career as the opportunity to acquire renown and prove his worth. Although this conscious decision for enlisting signifies a lower profession than the one of "gentleman-commoner" (7) intended for him by Dorilaus, Horatio chooses this employment because it offers him the opportunity to create his own identity disconnected from Dorilaus. Yet, ironically, it is a combination of his own youth, equipage, "and the letters sent by Dorilaus to several of the principal officers in his favour" (52) that secure a desirable reception into the army. Horatio, thus, to some extent remains dependent on Dorilaus's support. Nevertheless, Horatio's own air, youthfulness, and merits quickly secure the colonels' and duke of Malborough's regards. Indeed, Horatio, in his discussion with Dorilaus, argues that his natural inclinations and passions are more suited for a military profession, since:

my genius inclines me to the army. – Of all the accomplishments you have caused me to be instructed in, geography, fortification, and fencing, have been my darling studies. – Of what use, sir, will they be to me in an idle life? (8)

Horatio combines his natural talents with the education provided by Dorilaus to support his case for enlisting. Despite Dorilaus' initial misgivings and multiple arguments to discourage Horatio, he ultimately gives his approbation after Horatio's ceaseless counterarguments. Instead, he now fully supports his foster-son in achieving his ambition, even providing Horatio with equipage and clothes.

Horatio's desire to create his own name through a military career, recalls the recommendation of de Jaucourt and the author of the *Fog Journal* who suggest orphaned boys are obliged to repay their debts to the state, who took care of them, by joining the military¹⁹. Although Horatio enlists from his own volition and with different intentions, the concept of joining the army, as a vocation that contributes to the good of the nation, is a recurring subject in eighteenth-century educational discourse. However, to serve the kingdom well in the military, the proper basis education was essential, as Lewis Lochée, master of the Military Academy in Little Chelsea, argued in *An Essay on Military Education* (1776). In this work Lochée discusses proper male education which would "render [men] most serviceable in the support of the government under which they are born" (9). Horatio's education, until that point, is a quintessential example of the training of the ideal soldier. Horatio has received a genteel education and demonstrates an inclination for the military profession. It is this aptitude and his ambition to prove himself independent and demonstrate his own worth that drives

¹⁹ For the discussion of de Jaucourt and the *Fog Journal* see Chapter 1 on page 21 and 22.

Horatio to pursue his dream, while Dorilaus acknowledges these seemingly innate dispositions by supporting and financing Horatio's preparations.

Horatio demonstrates involvement and concern in his own education and future, despite Dorilaus' support of his ventures. Louisa, by contrast, exhibits a more passive role in her own education, as she is continuously made dependent on the protection or support of others. Her relationship with Dorilaus becomes particularly ambiguous when he expresses his passion for her and intends to marry her. This confession conflicts with Louisa's comprehension of honour and virtue, as she does not return his affections, which eventually leads her to renounce her dependence on Dorilaus' protection. Furthermore, this action also raises questions regarding Louisa's autonomy in making her own decisions, or whether she is pressured to make these choices to adhere to society's perceptions of feminine virtue and honour. Even though Dorilaus assumes the same paternal position in Louisa's life as in Horatio's, their relationship becomes problematic upon Louisa's return to the family home. Having boarded at her governess' boarding-school, Louisa's cultivated accomplishments are represented by the narrator as of the highest level:

there was such an engaging and sweet cheerfulness in her conversation, added to many personal perfections, [...] She had also an excellent voice, and played well on the bass viol and harpsicord... (11)

These charms beguile Dorilaus who develops an infatuation for her which gradually grows into passion. Nevertheless, he initially refrains from acting on his desires and instead sends Louisa "again to the boarding-school [...] that you may perfect yourself in such things as you may not yet be mistress of" (13). This suggests that Louisa's education is unfinished, although this remark and subsequent action is dubious in nature. Does Dorilaus say this to refrain himself from acting upon his feelings, to encourage Louisa in her development, or both?

The description regarding Louisa's upbringing in comparison with that of her brother is succinct. Whereas Horatio's subjects, intentions, and ambitions are extensively discussed, the description of Louisa's education is limited to the results of these instructions in that they have enhanced her accomplishments and natural charm. Louisa's studies seem to be restricted to refining her "personal perfections" (11) and developing her accomplishments. In fact, the novel's information on these accomplishments is limited to descriptions of the cultivation in specific subjects such as discourse, music, and needlework. This absence of specificity in regard to Louisa's pedagogical subjects suggests that either the term accomplishments on its own sufficed to convey to the audience the contents of the pedagogical plan developed for Louisa by Dorilaus; or that the contents were not important, or essential enough, to the narrative to be specified. This distinction in focus in the description of the twins' education is intriguing, as it demonstrates different intended futures. Horatio is allowed a more active participation in determining his education and vocation, whereas Louisa's

involvement in regulating her education's course and contents appear to be insignificant. Nevertheless, Louisa is forced to switch from a passive and compliant role to an active position when she rejects and flees from Dorilaus' marriage propositions.

Interacting with Communities: Acceptance, Rejection, and Pedagogical Experiences

On her own in the world, Louisa has to engage with social customs and hierarchies to secure employment for which she has to depend on these cultivated feminine accomplishments. Furthermore, Louisa's domestic upbringing – she has been raised either in the neighbourhood of Dorilaus' estate or at the governess's house – has left her ignorant about social customs. This inexperience makes Louisa particularly vulnerable when placed in depraved society; a vulnerability which is exacerbated by her position as a female foundling. Indeed, in this position Louisa is forced to rely on the recommendation of others while being unprotected by any relation. Upon arriving in town, Louisa lets the lodge owners know that “she was come to town in order to get a service, and till she heard of one to her own liking, would be glad to do any needle-work she should be employed in” (28). This intention exemplifies Louisa's perception of her own social status. Regardless of the suggestion of genteel birth in the foundling letter, Louisa is doubtful of her noble birth. This opinion affects her assessment of her place in the social hierarchy and the value of her skills and accomplishments. Although she attains a position at a milliner's with relative ease, Louisa breeding shows in her needlework, as “the milliner easily saw she had not been accustomed to do it for bread” (29). In fact, Louisa's upbringing makes her ill-qualified for this job. The novel suggests that the female foundling can find suitable employment in eighteenth-century society by implementing her taught skills to her advantage. However, as Louisa is raised in a well-to-do environment and has received a corresponding education, the accomplishments she cultivated were taught with a different intention in mind, not as a way to provide her with means of income but as the adornment and proof of her suitability as a potential wife. More specifically, it is not Louisa's orphanhood that sets her apart, although it does leave her vulnerable. Rather, it is her genteel education that has made her unsuitable for this form of employment.

Although she is capable of completing her work, Louisa is confronted with her employer's depraved morals, as the milliner's “house was a kind of rendezvous, where all the young and gay of both sexes daily resorted” (29). Louisa's charms are noticed by the young and merry visitors, and she subsequently receives unwanted advances. Nevertheless, this new environment and corrupted society serves as a brief learning period for Louisa who gains invaluable knowledge about society and some of its immoral customs, while simultaneously enabling the narrator to emphasise her virtuous character which is attributed to her childhood cultivation:

The adventures she was witness of made her, indeed, more knowing of the world, but were far from corrupting those excellent morals she had received from nature, and had been so well

improved by a strict education, that she not only loved virtue for its own sake, but despised and hated vice, tho' disguised under the most specious pretences. (31)

Louisa, thus, through experiencing the world, learns about particular customs and behaviour, which she deems depraved and which therefore should be avoided. Indeed, it is Louisa's reverence for virtue, instilled in her through her education, that guides her actions throughout the novel. She initially rejects Dorilaus's marriage proposal, citing that she is both emotionally as intellectually incapable of accepting this proposal:

besides, sir, the education you have vouchsafed to give me has been such, as informs me a person of my sex makes but an odd figure while in the power of one of yours possessed of the sentiments you are. (27)

This explanation demonstrates Louisa's cultivated understanding of social hierarchies and her own position within them. Subsequently, Louisa's excellent morality sees her rejecting the advances of both the visitors of the milliner's and Count Bellfleur, and, furthermore, aids in her reluctance to gullibly believe the assertions made by the nuns in the convent where she boards, who persuade her to take the veil. Louisa's education, thus, contributes to her navigation of British and European societies and communities since it aids in her in the development and growth of her already refined moral compass.

Louisa's experiences and pedagogical growth are mirrored in *The Fortunate Foundlings* by her male twin Horatio. Nevertheless, the juxtaposing of the twins' educational tracts and social experiences indicate similarities and distinctions that cannot solely be ascribed to their gender difference, which influences their agency in eighteenth-century society. Horatio, similar to Louisa, is forced to meet the world on his own merit after having been taken captive by the French army at the battle of the Danube, despite his valour and natural aptitude for the martial vocation, and eventually he is taken to France. As a prisoner of war, Horatio is treated with the utmost respect; a treatment which is influenced by his captors "being extremely taken with his person and behaviour" and subsequently "treated [Horatio] in the politest manner" (55). That is, his genteel education, similar to Louisa, is evident in his comportment which affects the responses of others, and guides the twins' behaviour in unfamiliar surroundings and situations. Horatio's travels, similar to Louisa's, take him to foreign and unfamiliar communities and societies, effectively forcing him to learn how to conduct himself within these surroundings.

As a prisoner of war in France, Horatio is taken to the court of the exiled Chevalier St. George, James Stuart 'The Old Pretender', at St. Germaine, by his captor, the baron de la Valiere. In contrast to Louisa, who chooses to apply her knowledge in securing a profession, Horatio, instead of deploring his capture and loss of the opportunity to fulfill his ambition as a soldier, perceives his circumstances as a pedagogical opportunity. The twins thus adopt a different attitudes towards their

social vulnerability and isolation. According to the narrator, Horatio is intrigued and curious about this nation “he heard so much commended”(55). Moreover, he also identifies this as the moment to improve his knowledge of and proficiency in the French language. In fact, he intends to make himself a “master of the language, which, tho’ he understood, spoke but imperfectly” (55). The exiled English court in France provides Horatio with surroundings which are simultaneously familiar and foreign and introduce him “to the best company” (57). This environment distinctly differs from Louisa’s initial experiences with society. That is, Louisa’s surroundings are characterised by vulgar and immoral company, from various social stations, in a milliner’s shop, whereas Horatio is welcomed in elite French, and exiled English societal circles, which, despite exhibiting some elements of immorality, are more virtuous and initially welcoming to strangers. This difference in the twins experiences with society at large seems to be influenced by their understanding of their own social position. Whereas Horatio is convinced of his noble social standing, which is evident in his cultivated knowledge and behaviour, Louisa experiences the results of her ill-judged perception of her social position. Her unsuitability for employment is emphasised by her refined education and intellect, while the same qualities in Horatio secure the respect and admiration of the new elite social circle in French society.

However, Louisa’s perception of the disparity between her education and her comprehension of her social standing contradicts with society’s quick acceptance of and praise for Louisa’s refined accomplishments and morality. Despite Louisa’s confidence about finding a position or employment, either as a companion or milliner, she quickly discovers that her abilities, though being adequate, make her unsuitable for the level and pace required by the job. This realisation combined with the work environment and factors described as “the continual agitations of her mind joined to want of air, a quite different way of life, and perhaps sitting more closely to work than she has been accustomed” (36), affect Louisa’s health and disposition, to such an extent that she has to go to the countryside to recover, and leave the milliner’s debauched shop environment. While recuperating in Windsor, Louisa manages to attract the attentions from lady Melanthe by, subconsciously, displaying her accomplishments. Lady Melanthe happens to observe Louisa playing the harpsichord and singing for the woman of the boarding house, and comments to the house lady later on: “She [Louisa] has had an excellent education, I am certain [...] for in my life I never heard any body play or sing better” (38). In both situations Louisa is able to secure employment through her cultivated accomplishments; her needlework and her musical abilities.

Although Louisa’s refined understanding of virtue and her competence in needlework made her unsuitable for the vocation of a seamstress, they are capable of securing her a position as a lady’s companion, visiting, among others, the Viennese court, and an Italian convent. Indeed, Louisa’s superior level of accomplishments aid her in obtaining a position as a lady’s companion, as Melanthe asks Louisa whether “she would live with her” (38). When travelling with Melanthe, Louisa’s accomplishments do not remain unnoticed by the communities of the places they visit. Melanthe’s status and her treatment of Louisa as a young lady allow her to have “an opportunity of shewing the

skill she had in dancing, singing, music, and all the accomplishments that a woman born and educated to the best expectations, is usually instructed in” (49). Subsequently, when dismissed by Melanthe and seeking protection in a convent, due to the unsolicited advances of Melanthe’s love interest Count Bellfleur, it is Louisa’s accomplishments which warm the nuns towards her. In fact, they also laud her musical competence as she demonstrates “a very pretty genius to poetry, and great skill in music, both which talents she now exercised in such works as suited the place and company she was in” which leads to her being “spoke of as a prodigy of wit and devotion” (297). During her travels, Louisa’s natural, but cultivated, talents facilitate her acceptance by the communities that she visits.

This seemingly effortless acceptance of Louisa by these circles seem to negate her misgivings about her education as she believes “I am nothing – a kind of reptile in humanity, and have been shewn a genteel way of life only to make my native misery more conspicuous” (177-178). Contradictorily, it is Louisa’s education that strengthens her natural inclinations and secures her a place in the genteel life she belongs to. The “native misery” Louisa refers to evolves not from her comprehension of and familiarity with genteel life, although this does contribute to it. Rather, it emerges from the communities’ standpoint towards her orphanhood. It is this perception that Louisa does not yet comprehend at the beginning of the novel and that she is required to cultivate throughout her travels. The novel represents Louisa’s education as unfinished, as she continues to learn about the predicament of the female foundling in eighteenth-century society. In fact, it suggests that this knowledge can only be cultivated through experience rather than education, while simultaneously contrasting the plight of the female orphan with the more unrestricted agency of Horatio.

Horatio, to some extent, mirrors Louisa’s development in experiencing society as a male orphan. However, the narration of Horatio’s learning progress in French society seems to be primarily concentrated on his cultivation of the French language and the refinement of his gallant social behaviour. Indeed, Horatio’s incentive to learn and develop himself out of curiosity for and captivation by the French transforms into what the narrator describes as, a “powerful motive [...] to [never] see his native country again” (57). He becomes enamoured with the French heiress Charlotta de Palsoy, a companion of the exiled English princess Louisa, who exhibited “a genius above what is ordinarily found in her sex” (58). Charlotta’s character and intellect is described by the narrator as nearly perfect; in fact, education barely could contribute to the cultivation of Charlotta’s genius, as “nature lost nothing for want of the improvements of art” (58). Both Horatio and Charlotta are new to the exiled English court and to some degree incompetent in respectively the French and English language, which contributes to the start of their relationship as they decide to instruct each other: “he should only speak to her in French, and she should answer him in English” (59). This mutually beneficial relationship, which quickly blossoms into courtship, illustrates the value of well-educated women as argued by various conduct literature authors. Pierre Josph de Villemert in his *L’Ami des femmes ou La Morale du sexe* (1758) commented on the mutually beneficial relationship of women and men in conversational situations. That is, he advocates female education, limited to proper feminine subjects,

to make women capable of pleasing men by their conversation as: “c'est cet ennui, causé par la disette d'idées chez quelques femmes, qui est le principe de l'inconstance dont elle nous accusent si souvent” (48). Although the intent of Villemert's pedagogical arguments is restricted to cultivating women's intellect to make them more appealing to men, it does allude to the position of educated French salonnieres of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries²⁰. Indeed, the influence of Charlotta on Horatio reflects this interaction, as Carol Stewart remarks: “[Horatio] is awed by her moral pronouncements, and completely taken up with admiring the justness of her sentiments; in true salon style, the woman educates the man” (62-3). Simultaneously Horatio and Charlotta's interaction educate Horatio to distinguish between moral uprightness, embodied by Charlotta, and the flighty armours of other ladies, in this social circle. This environment thus augments Horatio's knowledge about appropriate social behaviour, while emphasising the reciprocal intellectual relationship between men and women in these communities.

The temporal accommodation of Louisa in the society circle she frequents is reflected in Horatio's experiences in the French communities. Notwithstanding the favourable reception by the exiled English court and the French courtiers, Horatio's orphan status eventually becomes too problematic when he, similar to Louisa, receives unsolicited advances from ladies, a complicated position which is exacerbated by his prisoner of war status. Horatio's precarious social standing at the French court obstructs the progress of his courtship with Charlotta. More specifically, their intention to become engaged is thwarted by her father's explicit doubts concerning Horatio's lack of parentage. Despite his merit and marital prowess, Horatio's suit is rejected by baron de Palsoy on grounds of his ambiguous ancestry, as the baron articulates:

I own your merits: - I also am indebted to you for my life: - but you are a foreigner, your family unknown, - your fortune precarious: - I could wish it were otherwise; - believe, I find in myself an irresistible impulse to love you, and I know nothing would give me greater pleasure than to convince of it. (135-136)

The baron distinguishes between Horatio's personal achievements, qualities, and honour and his unknown heritage which forms the biggest obstacle in Horatio's suit for Charlotta's hand. Although Haywood cautions against youthful rashness and inexperience regarding declarations of passion in *The Female Spectator*, she additionally deplors the, sometimes, detrimental, albeit well-meant, effects of paternal involvement: “methinks it would be hard to charge the blame of indiscreet marriages on the young ladies themselves: parents are sometimes, by an overcaution, guilty of forcing them into things,

²⁰ For more information of French salonnieres, such as Mme de Lespinasse, Mme du Deffand, Mme de Geoffrin, amongst others, and the French salon culture in general see Dena Goodman's *The Republic of Letters: A Cultural History of the French Enlightenment* (1996), Steven Kale's *French Salons: High Society and Political Sociability from the Old Regime to the Revolution of 1848* (2006), Benedetta Craveri's *L'âge de la conversation* (2002), and Antoine Lilti's article “Sociabilité et mondanité: Les hommes de lettres dans les salons parisiens au XVIIe siècle” (2005).

which, otherwise, would be far distant from their thoughts” (1: 23). Baron de Palsoy displays this cautious behaviour in *The Fortunate Foundlings* when he separates Charlotta and Horatio by ordering Charlotta to come home and reminding her that “you have had an education which ought to inform you that persons of your sex and age are never to act in any material point of themselves – but courts are places where this lesson is seldom practiced” (98). Despite being well-intentioned, this action and brief support for another alliance by marriage for Charlotta, indicate Baron de Palsoy’s concerns with Horatio’s reputation and social standing as an orphan. In spite of being aware and concerned about Horatio’s social standing, Charlotta values his merit more than his reputation. However, society is unable to accommodate the nameless orphan for an extensive period of time, regardless of his merit.

To remedy this lack of name, Horatio enlists in the French army, once again perceiving this vocation as the means to acquire renown, identity, wealth, elements which hopefully allow him to receive Charlotta’s hand in marriage. Horatio’s second enlistment mirrors his first, albeit his motives have altered, in that he receives letters of recommendations from his friend “which might assure him of a reception equal to the most ambitious aim of his aspiring soul” (139). Even though the choice to leave this community is made out of Horatio’s own volition, to further his endeavours to create a name and financial security, the exiled English court, and even Baron de Palsoy, extol his worth. This is in stark contrast to Louisa’s departures from her communities, as she unobtrusively or through scheming leaves these circles, either to flee from these surroundings or due to dismissal. The difference between the twins’ methods of departure indicate a disparity in the agency attributed to the twins based on their gender. Whereas Horatio is able to move freely between situations and places of his own will, Louisa’s agency is reduced to a bare minimum. In fact, her departures are either forced, related to illness or to conflicting morality. Louisa only leaves out of her own volition when she determines to flee from the convent. The female foundling is, thus, more restricted in her social navigation, especially if she wants to retain some decorum and modesty, although both male and female foundlings face continuous rejection by communities due to their ambiguous origins.

These periods of education during the foundlings’ temporary stays in specific social circles is reflected in Louisa’s journey through Europe. Although these communities receive and accept Louisa on the basis of her accomplishments, they simultaneously serve as opportunities for Louisa to learn through experience and observation. Whereas the pedagogical methods in Louisa’s youth are barely discussed, the narrator abundantly describes the experiences of Louisa abroad and her multiple reflections on her life and childhood education. This disparate amount of description of the childhood education in relation to adolescent experience throughout the novel attributes more importance to these educative experiences and indicates the value that is attributed to this acquired knowledge rather than the standard methods of their childhood education. Besides, both Melanthe and the abbess who function as her instructors in these communities, perceive Louisa’s knowledge to be flawed in certain areas. Louisa’s unfamiliarity with high-society circles and their customs is mended when travelling with Lady Melanthe, who enjoys having numerous visitors. Thus, the previously sheltered Louisa is

compelled to navigate these crowds and to learn their rules and manners. The narrator depicts Louisa's ignorance of polite address as the only flaw in her education, while noting that this experience can only be gained through experience and connection with courtly or worldly communities:

by this means acquired the knowledge of almost the only thing she before was ignorant in, how to receive a multiplicity of company, yet to behave so as each should imagining themselves most welcome [...] to use all decent freedoms with the men, yet not encourage the least from then, and to seem to make a friend of every woman she conversed with, without putting trust in any; - and in fine, all the little policies which make up the art of what is called a polite address, and which is not to be attained without an acquaintance with the court and great world. (50-51)

In other words, Louisa is instructed in how to be the perfect society hostess. Furthermore, the narrator is adamant in emphasising the sturdiness of Dorilaus's pedagogical intentions and methods, as she "yet retained the same sincerity of mind, love of virtue, and detestation of vice, she brought with her from the house of Dorilaus" (51).

Indeed, elite society was frequently perceived in conduct literature as a hazardous place for virtuous women, as they could be introduced to vice and immorality. Education, especially through instruction, was consequently seen as the means to inform young women about these dangers, and about how to recognize the air assumed by their admirers in these circles. In *The Female Spectator* (1744-1746), one of the conduct works which were published in the same period, Eliza Haywood sets out to instruct young ladies about various topics ranging from marriage, reading, conduct, and dress. Combining advice with short novel-like narratives, Haywood intends to instruct her intended audience, which, as Lynn Marie Wright and Donald J. Newman note, comprises both "The Ladies" and "Youths of both Sexes" (14-16), about various social and moral concerns. A recurring subject in her periodical, in various forms, is the potential of young people to be corrupted by vice, due to its pervasiveness in society. Consequently she surmises the effects of vice as follows:

A depravity of taste, and a mean dejection of mind, are the snares from which proceed most of the evil things we see practiced: - the first misguides our choice, and gives it a wrong propensity; and the second renders us unable to assert the dignity of our reason in rejecting, with the utmost disdain, whatever is repugnant to it. (300, 12, V2)

In addition to lamenting the temptations of vice for youths, Haywood emphasises how impressionable they are, as "so yielding, alas! are we to what others, do that every one seems to have no judgement of his own: [...] we are solely swayed by those above us" (2: 300). Nevertheless, when capable people are entrusted with the role of educator, their influence can inspire a love for propriety and virtue. For instance, Haywood stresses the importance of appointing capable governors and governesses, since

Their example ought to be such as should enforce their precepts [of sobriety, morality, and good conduct] and by shewing the beauty of a regular life in themselves, make their pupils fall in love with it, and endeavour an imitation (1: 160)

Louisa appears to be the personification of Haywood's advice as her natural disposition and love for virtue are augmented by her governess's instructions and her foster-father's preference for these qualities. Nevertheless, society provides a learning environment for Louisa, which is contrasted by the solitude and reclusiveness of the third community she resides in: the convent.

Similar to the fashionable circles, the Italian convent, where Louisa resides, becomes a place of learning for Louisa, as she rapidly acquires a high proficiency in Italian, while developing and applying her poetical and musical skills in the composition of hymns. Furthermore, the convent environment is extremely suited for Louisa to reflect on her current position in society. Estranged from her foster-father, ignorant of her brother's whereabouts, and cut off from her lover du Plessis, who provided her with protection from Bellfleur and recommended her residence in the convent, Louisa, in this all-female environment, can contemplate her experiences in society as a vulnerable foundling, and, reflect upon what her future actions will be. Reflection and solitude are also recommended by Eliza Haywood in *The Female Spectator*, especially in relation to "young persons of both sexes" (1: 167), as moments of self-inspection and improvement. Concluding her book on reflection, in connection to society and in particular theatre, Haywood states that

It is therefore the business of every one, who would make a shining figure in life, avoid and inconveniencies, reap any benefits, enjoy any permanent felicity themselves, or bestow it on others, to gain as perfect an acquaintance as in them lies, by thought and application, both with what they are, and what they ought to attempt to be (1: 215)

Despite referring to solitude in relation to theatre, masquerades, and various other social enjoyments, Haywood's description of reflection and retirement can also be applied to Louisa's forced retreat from society. However, Louisa's brief period of reflection is affected by the abbess's continuous persuasions to take the veil. Initially indecisive about her answer, perceiving the convent as "the only asylum left to shield her from the wants and insults of the world" (301), Louisa remains steadfast in her observation of the similarities between the worldly and cloistered communities. As the narrator observes: "[Louisa] was of a different way of thinking; and tho' she knew the world had its temptations, having experienced them in very great degree, yet she was convinced within herself, that a person of virtuous principles might be no less innocent out of a cloister than in one" (298). Instead, this period of reflection allows Louisa to realise, after her discovery of the nuns' scheming, that she remains vulnerable as a foundling in both society and seclusion, and consequently she assumes a more active role in deciding her own future. That is, she dares to venture into society on her own. In fact, the two communities offer Louisa distinct experiences and skills; one in which she is surrounded by

crowds, while the other provides her with moments of solitude and reflection. Both communities allow Louisa to develop new skills, moments of reflection, which will aid in her capability of navigating these societies.

Moreover, in addition to his ventures in the army and his time at the exiled English court, Horatio also experiences a period of reflection, similar to Louisa. Yet, whereas she was left no choice but to join a convent for her own protection and safety, Horatio is captured by the Russians and imprisoned. During this imprisonment, Horatio reflects on his previous actions, and in particular his zeal for military endeavours: “A thousand times he reproached himself for pursuing the dictates of a glory which now seemed so tyrannic” (266). This forced separation from society does have a lasting effect on Horatio, as he gradually loses his appetite for the profession in favour of being reunited with his loved ones. Coincidentally, when returning to Paris, where, as Horatio has been informed, Dorilaus now resides, Horatio is told about his ancestry and thus can finally marry his Charlotta.

Louisa’s marginality as an orphan has proved to be problematic in her attempts to interact with communities. Despite being accepted by the different communities on the basis of her excellent abilities and modest behaviour, it is her foundling status and corresponding lack of familial protection which affect her social position. During her time with Melanthe, unwanted passionate declarations compromise Louisa’s position as Melanthe’s travel companion, who believes that she is intentionally stealing Count Bellfleur’s attentions from her. For this reason, Melanthe makes Louisa’s unknown ancestry public in an outburst of jealousy, which are driven by Bellfleur’s deceitful assertions of Louisa’s affirmation of a great affection for him: “[S]o minx, she said to her, [...] you ape women of fashion exceedingly well, as you imagine; but hereafter know yourself, and keep the distance that becomes you” (185). In this excerpt, Melanthe refers to the societal perception of Louisa’s ancestry, namely one of insecurity and liminality, which she implies to be the rightful place for a foundling in society. In fact, Louisa concurs with Melanthe’s depiction of her social position, even tracing her awkward social interactions and misfortunes back to her foundling heritage as she laments: “how cruelly capricious is my fate [...] which never presents me with a good but to be productive of an adequate evil” (187). This, unintentional, evil eventually results in Melanthe expelling Louisa from her lodgings and society, thus forcing Louisa to face Venetian society alone. Travelling to a nearby inn as an unchaperoned woman, Louisa sticks out and potentially places herself in harm’s way. In this inn, Louisa is threatened by Count Bellfleur, who gains access to her chamber under the pretence of being her husband, and forces himself on her. Yet, Louisa defends herself by grabbing Bellfleur’s sword and brandishing it against him. Forced to live at the margins of society, Louisa is not reluctant to defend herself by briefly challenging female roles in society in order to defend her virtue and modesty.

Moreover, Louisa, while boarding at the convent, is confronted with the manipulative actions of the abbess, who is adamant in convincing Louisa to join their congregation. Even within this cloistered community, Louisa feels marginalised, due to the growing pressure exercised by the nuns to take the veil. To achieve this aim, the abbess and some senior nuns have been keeping the letters sent

to Louisa by her lover du Plessis. Louisa, despite initially being open to these suggestions, after being told of this scheme by an amicable nun, concocts a ruse to leave the convent. Additionally, the nuns use Louisa's foundling status to their advantage as they exploit her solitariness and emphasise her kinlessness. That is, Louisa's communication is limited to du Plessis, hence, making it easier for the nuns to sever Louisa from any worldly connections, and, consequently, making her feel isolated and marginalised. That is, they endeavour to portray the convent as the only safe and reliable place for an orphan, in particular Louisa, to reside. At this moment, Louisa applies her recently acquired knowledge and experience about solitary travels and interaction with the world. Indeed, she openly avows a newfound religious zeal which allows her to gain the nuns' trust and to garb herself in a pilgrim's costume. This guise allows Louisa to travel freely through society, as it offers her God's protection which undermines the requirement of a companion or protector. Rather, "her pilgrim's habit was not only a defence against any insults from persons she met on the road, but also attracted the respect, and engaged the civilities of every one" (311). Louisa's experiences at the milliner's shop in London and the inn in the neighbourhood of Venice have taught her the dangers of traversing through society alone, and consequently she uses her experiences to inform her decisions.

Nevertheless, these short stints in the elite communities of Europe allow both foundlings to experience and observe the customs of these circles, while their moral compass, cultivated during their childhood, in combination with instruction by their employers or captors, allows them to develop an understanding of how to navigate society. Horatio, while at the English court, even attains employment as one of the gentleman of the bedchamber to the Chevalier St. George. This position allows Horatio to become better acquainted with the workings of the court in St. Germain, and furthermore, this court is also infused with a melancholic atmosphere due to the losses suffered by the exiled Stuart family. The combination of these factors affect Horatio's character and intellect: "This way of living, and the company he was now associated with, gave Horatio a manly way of think much sooner than otherwise perhaps he might have had, yet did not rob him of his vivacity" (65). Although the narrator neglects to specify what exactly constitutes this 'manly' manner of thinking, it indicates the effects of this environment on Horatio's conduct. Nonetheless, this brief period of learning does not prevent society from eventually rejecting him, as it is unable to accommodate this kinless individual for a long period.

Louisa is confronted with similar predicaments. She is admired when first accepted and accommodated in Melanthe's circle and the convent, where all praise her accomplishments and modesty. However, her circumstances are complicated by several unwanted advances, which are enhanced by her vulnerability and kinlessness as a female orphan. In fact, Louisa's marginality as a foundling problematise her position in the communities, either through recalling her liminal position or by using this marginality to their advantage. Nevertheless, these actions have the same effects; Louisa is continuously reminded of her vulnerable and dependent social position. These communities simultaneously function as pedagogical moments for both Horatio and Louisa, as during their

temporary accommodation in these circles the twins can improve their knowledge about these social gatherings and interactions through experiences. Yet their marginal status remains until the mystery about their ancestry is revealed. Only after Dorilaus is discovered to be the twins' father can Louisa and Horatio marry, but their social position remains ambivalent as they were born out of wedlock. However, this does not impede the social acceptance of the twins, as their and their father's merit are highly ranked.

A shift in social position: from Foundling to Orphan in French Translation

Ten years after Haywood's original, Crébillon published the novel *Les Heureux Orphelins*. Crébillon's text challenges the perception of translation as faithful to the original work. Instead, it seems more reminiscent of the method of translation described by John Dryden and Anne Dacier as imitation of the original work. Scholars and critics have noted that Crébillon faithfully translated the first four chapters of Haywood's original, almost word for word. Antoinette Sol comments that "the fourth chapter [is] the last recognizable point at which the English and French text coincide. It is apparent that Crébillon, from this point on, writes a very different novel" (19). Crébillon, and subsequently Kimber, retain Haywood's introduction, which Beatrijs Vanacker terms " 'souche commune' des trois versions", and allows the readers to become acquainted with the narrative's protagonists: "le lecteur fait la connaissance des protagonistes initiaux de l'histoire, les 'heureux orphelins'." (658). These chapters include Haywood's description of the twins' education and decisions regarding their occupation and social position, whether voluntary or forced. Yet to what extent is Crébillon faithful to these pedagogical descriptions or does he alter the course of Lucie's and Édouard's, as Louisa and Horatio are called, pedagogies?

The similarities between the depiction of the twins in Haywood and Crébillon are, as suggested by the critics, abundant. Rutland, as Dorilaus is called in *Les Heureux Orphelins*, discovers in a similar manner, that the twins are of noble blood: "d'une sang qui les rend dignes des bienfaits que leur état exige de vous" (7). The parallels between Dorilaus's and Rutland's actions and pedagogical intentions are extensive. Both employ local women, wet nurses, to care for the babes, until they form attachments to the children when they begin to interact and show signs of character. Although Crébillon retained Haywood's brief description of the twin's childhood education, he did make slight alterations or additions to the pedagogical instructions given to these children. Lucie's didactic trajectory remains the same in Crébillon's version. Crébillon, nevertheless, found it necessary to include some information about the British arrangements for the education of noble, or well-to-do, girls and women. As he elaborates:

Il mit donc Lucie dans une de ces Maisons qui, en Angleterre tiennent lieu de Couvents, où les filles de la première qualité, sont élevées sous les yeux, et par les soins de filles qui sont, elles-mêmes d'extraction noble, et qui par leur sentiments et l'éducation qui les a cultivés, sont en

état de donner l'une, et d'inspirer les autres, à l'illustre jeunesse, dont leur confie les premiers années (9).

This brief explanation of the British pedagogical methods indicates the differences between the French and British method for female education in general. Whereas convents in France were places where young noble girls could enjoy a suitable education, in England, these girls had to be sent to governesses. Although convent education was controversial and condemned by some contemporary conduct book authors, as the discussion of de Puisieux and the examination of convent education in the previous chapters revealed²¹, Crébillon neither condemns one nor lauds the other form of education. In fact, he elaborates on the information given about Lucie's English education. This additional information demonstrates the differences between the British and French system of female education in the eighteenth century with regard to institutions, without favouring a particular method. Crébillon merely offers some background information for his audience. However, this elaboration is limited to describing the quality of education made accessible for Lucie and her ensuing and increasing gratitude for her benefactor Rutland:

Aucun secours étranger ne fut refusé à Lucie: les meilleurs et les plus habiles Maîtres lui furent prodigués: aussi profita-t-elle d'un bonheur si rare, dans une situation aussi cruelle que l'étoit la sienne. Sa tendre reconnaissance pour le Chevalier, et qui sembloit croître avec elle, lui donnoit un désir si vis de se perfectionner en tout, que quand elle n'auroit pas reçu de la nature les plus heureuses dispositions, elle auroit pu les emprunter de ce sentiment. (9-10)

The absence of detailed information on the genteel education given to the female orphan in both Haywood and Crébillon suggests that the content of this form of education was familiar to the readers of the novel and, thus, did not require specification. French and British female education, thus, is to some extent similar with regard to content, but, as Crébillon's elaboration indicates, differs in approach or method.

By contrast, Lucie's accomplishments are not specified when Rutland's educational plans for her are unveiled. Instead, they are defined when she returns to the family circle to take her leave of Edouard, who is joining the army. Lucie's reunification with her foster-father and brother prompts the narrator to relate Rutland's contemplations on the improvements and charms of Lucie which were cultivated during her time at a governess. More precisely, the results of Lucie's education are described in two separate sections. Firstly, the narrator describes Lucy's genteel womanly charms which were cultivated during her childhood:

Rutland qui partageoit les tendres caresses, dont il étoit le témoin, ne put voir sans une joie, mêlée d'admiration, les progrès qu'avaient fait, la taille, et la beauté de cette jeune personne. Rien de si aimable ne s'étoit encore offert à ses yeux. La régularité des traits se joignoit en elle à un air spirituel et fin; rien ne pouvoit égaler l'éclat et la fraîcheur de son tein. Des graces sans

²¹ See the analysis of Madeleine de Puisieux's stance on convent education in the previous chapter on page 44-45 and the discussion of convent education on page 26-27 in Chapter 1.

aprêt, libres; et tout à la fois modestes; un air noble, et ingénu; ce je ne [sais] quoi, enfin, qui se sent si bien, et se définit si mal, achevaient de rendre Lucie, la personne du monde la séduisante. (16-17)

However, the description ends with the note that, although these graces make Lucie more charming and interesting, they simultaneously make her into an object of seduction. This upbringing with its subjects thus becomes a double-edged sword for women, as it cultivates the female qualities esteemed in genteel society, but simultaneously makes them more enchanting and vulnerable to unwanted advances. Subsequently, a distinction is made between Lucie's natural charm and the improvement of these talents through education. Her virtue and musical skills, in particular, are mentioned:

Le Chevalier fut aussi content de son esprit, qu'il l'étoit de sa figure; il le trouva naturel, et orné; son coeur lui parut, comme il l'étoit effectivement, droit et rempli de tous les principes, et de toutes les vertue qu'il lui pouvoit désirer; et lorsqu'il voulut éprouver ses talents, il lui trouva, avec une voix charmante, tout ce que la connoissance de la Musique, et le goût du chant, peuvent ajouter à ce don naturel. Il y avoit même peu d'instruments, de ceux qu'il semble que l'usage ait permis à son sexe, qu'elle ne touchât avec le plus grand succès (17).

Rutland's reflections on Lucie's development and talents are overall positive. The representation of Lucie's education in Crébillon's novel is more elaborate than Haywood's description of Louisa's upbringing. Although the content and method of instruction is not altered by Crébillon, he provides more detail about the accomplishments cultivated in Lucie while residing at the governesses, thereby offering more insight into Rutland's perception of the social standing of the foundling twins and their future. Yet the description that Crébillon provides is a summary of the accomplishment described by Haywood throughout Louisa's narrative, moreover, the compiled subjects, such as music, modesty, religion, and graces, were element of female education that transcended national boundaries.²² However, intimations are made that this particular educative plan centred on strengthening or developing female adornments and charms can make the woman particularly vulnerable in genteel society. Indeed, the suggestions that Lucie has, simultaneously, assimilated skills which can be interpreted as seductive during her education, indicates that Lucie's engagement with genteel society can become problematic and that her education is far from finished. Rather, she needs to be made aware of the double nature of her abilities and the associated social threats, or at least find protection in the form of a guardian or parent.

Rutland's pedagogical plan for Edouard resembles Dorilaus' aims to raise Horatio as a common-gentleman. Similar to Lucie, Edouard receives his education from a renowned teacher called

²² For a more elaborate discussion of eighteenth-century female pedagogical practices see both Chapter 1 and Mary Hilton's *Women and the Shaping of the Nation's Young: Education and Public Doctrine in Britain, 1750-1850* (2007); Mary Hilton's and Jill Shefrin's *Educating the Child in Enlightenment Britain, Beliefs, Cultures, Practices* (2009); and Natasha Gill's *Educational Philosophy in the French Enlightenment: From Nature to Second Nature* (2010).

Docteur Busby. Whereas Horatio is sent to a school in London, Edouard is boarded with his educator in London as well. Nevertheless, the intention behind this plan of education remains the same. Indeed, Docteur Busby is lauded for his

talens singuliers qu'il avoit pour élever la jeune noblesse, de laquelle il travailloit encore plus à former le coeur que l'esprit, quoiqu'il ne négligeât rien de ce qui peut contribuer à orner de le dernier. (10)

This professor, according to this description, is qualified in strengthening the innate qualities of young nobility, in particular the heart ("le coeur"), without disregarding the cultivation of characteristics that can adorn the mind ("l'esprit") and, as a result, the individual. The subsequent step in Edouard's education, after he has picked up the basic elements is to develop the basics of sciences in a place dedicated to the perusal of these subjects: "ne lui laissaient plus rien à apprendre dans une maison consacrée à ne donner que les premiers éléments des sciences" (10). To finish Edouard's schooling, he is sent, by Rutland, to Oxford where "[Edouard] lui fit faire en même-temps ses exercices" (11). Rutland, when Edouard has come to the family estate, even parts with some advice concerning Edouard's study habits. In particular, Rutland is troubled about the strong academic penchant Edouard is developing for the Humanities, and Rutland therefore desires to warn Edouard against cultivating this un-English characteristic:

je vois avec beaucoup de plaisir, et vous ne pouvez pas en douter, le goût que vous avez pris à Oxford pour les Lettres; mais je voudrois, s'il étoit possible, que vous vous y livrassiez avec moins de fureur, et que vous pussiez, sur-tout éviter cette forte de pédanterie, que nous autres Anglois, ne prenons que trop ordinairement dans nos Universités, et dont l'âge, le commerce du monde, son usage, les plus grandes places, ne nous défont pas toujours. Cultivez les Lettres, amis gardez-vous de vous livrer à l'étude, de façon à ne vous pas laisser le tems de réfléchir, et peut-être à vous en ôter le moyen. Il faut, il est vrai, former l'esprit, mais il ne faut pas se l'accabler (12)

Instead, he advises caution when cultivating the Letters, and encourages Edouard to find a balance between education and social engagements to better prepare him for the commercial world.

Interestingly, this correlation between Humanities and commercial society is typified as British, thus suggesting that this distinction is perhaps not as absolute in France. Moreover, this cautionary advice given to Edouard emphasizes the importance of attaining a proper education to prepare him for his role in society, and can be connected to the shift in orphan status made by Crébillon. Whereas Horatio is a foundling, which has the connotation of bastardy and illegitimacy, Edouard is defined as an orphan in the title of Crébillon's work; a term which suggests legitimacy and a more secure and stable perspective of employment. Indeed, the notion of tailored education, in particular for the working classes, were being advocated as necessary additions or changes to the current educational system in the eighteenth-century in both France and England as is demonstrated below.

Rutland's advice touches on the distinction between two distinct ideologies on male education in England which differentiated between the public and private educational methods in early eighteenth-century society. In a series of letters published in *The Spectator* (21 February 1712 and 28 February 1712), Eustace Budgell offers a concept of educational reform in which he argues that a male child's education should be guided by his inborn inclinations while including a consideration about the child's future profession, and even anticipating some form of social mobility. In addition, Budgell distinguishes between the roles of public schools, such as charity schools, and that of parents in his proposed didactic method. Highly favouring the objective position of charity schools, Budgell cites parental over-weening and fondness as having an adverse affect on the natural progression of a child's education and a, potential, subversion of his natural dispositions (Müller 74-81). Moreover, private education by a tutor and public education would result in different 'Men':

In short, a private Education seems the most natural Method for the forming of a virtuous man; a publick education for making a man of business. The first would furnish out a good subject for Plato's Republick, the latter a member for a community over-run with artifice and corruption. (*The Spectator*, No 313, 28 February 1712, 297)

Whereas a private education, according to Budgell, would result in a virtuous man who would perhaps be ignorant of worldly customs, public schooling would expose the child to the vices of society which would be difficult to eliminate. To summarise, Budgell places the child within the framework of class society, and argues that to ensure the future contribution of the citizen that is being raised, the child's education and profession should correlate. This concern regarding the utilitarianism of the education given to children and cautions against overeducating the younger generations were also raised in French Enlightenment society, although these concepts are not restricted to this era (Gill 91-94). Jean-Baptiste-Louis Crevier expressed the necessity of 'useful education' for the poor and the imbalance between upper-class and lower class education in his educational treatise *De l'éducation publique* (1762):

La jeunesse est l'âge d'apprendre; l'Education est le noviciat de la vie; et dans la vie les états sont divers. Pourquoi ne seroit-on pas préparé à servir la société dans tous le emplois? Osera-t-on décider d'avance un sujet dont les talens sont inconnus? Et comment les talens se manifesteront-ils, s'ils n'ont été essayés dans les genres. Sait-on les desseins de la Providence; ou peut-on risquer de s'y opposer? Tous ne peuvent pas être Magistrats, ou Evêques. Il y aura encore moins de Généraux et de Ministres: mais il y aura plus de gens capables de l'être. Et ne faut-il pas des Maîtres qui les forment, et des subalternes qui les aident? Des hommes de génie, qui conçoivent des projets utiles; des grands instruits qui les protègent, et des riches généreux qui tentent de les réaliser? Auroit-on peur qu'il n'y eût trop d'excellens citoyens, ou trop de grands hommes? Le premier moyen d'élever l'ame c'est d'entendre les idées. (x-xii)

In short, both Crevier and Budgell state their anxiety about the effects of a too intellectual and elitist approach to educational methods, curriculums, and subjects, stressing the necessity to provide suited and proper education for the middle and, in particular, the lower classes as well. In fact, these people, when well-educated, could contribute to the state. As Natasha Gill notes: “During the course of the eighteenth century, utility becomes the guiding principle of an educational model based on its role in offering information or skills to individuals strictly in relation to their function in society and according to the needs of the state” (112). The differentiation made by Rutland between the British and French standpoints on commerce in relation to educational practices, is, as Crevier and Budgell indicate, not as severe as is suggested in Crébillon’s text. Nevertheless, the elaboration included by Crébillon hint towards differences in pedagogical ideologies or structures that required explanation. However, this does not affect Rutland’s determination to provide Edouard with a good preparation for his future public role.

Nevertheless, Edouard also declares his desire to join the military upon his return to the estate, in a similar fashion to Horatio. Mingling terms of humility, gratitude, and earnest desire to follow his own choice, Edouard requests his foster-father’s approbation. Throughout his argument, Edouard refers to the tension between his own desires and Rutland’s wishes, yet he is willing to forgo his ambitions, if Rutland disagrees:

Quelque contraire que l’état dans lequel vous m’imposerez de vivre, puisse être à mes idées et à mes vœux, je sacrifierai, sans balancer, et mes répugnances, et mes desirs à vos volontés, et je serai tout ce que vos bontés peuvent exiger de ma reconnaissance, pour m’en rendre digne.
(13-14)

Regardless of his readiness to comply with Rutland’s wishes, Edouard is hopeful about Rutland’s consent, as he states that the basis of Rutland’s intentions is to free Edouard of dependence: “mais puisque vous poussez la générosité jusqu’à m’affranchir d’une si juste dépendance” (14). However, Edouard is mistaken in assuming Rutland’s blind compliance, for the latter attempts to dissuade Edouard from his zeal and enthusiasm for a career in the army. Rutland alludes to the subordinate roles of soldiers in the army, because they are always contributing to others’ glorious deeds, and how Edouard’s ambiguous origins might affect his position in the army:

La certitude presque assurée de rester toujours subalterne, de contribuer sans cesse à la gloire des autres, et de n’en pas acquérir par soi-même, sur-tout, lorsqu’on n’est pas d’une naissance qui puisse étayer les services: toutes ces raisons et beaucoup d’autres surent vainement employées par Rutland. (15)

Rutland’s arguments prove to be uttered in vain, as Edouard remains steadfast in his choice to join the army. It is, however, not Rutland’s intention to order Edouard to resist his desires, but rather to subdue his passionate zeal which might turn into recklessness: “Faites vos réflexions; je les aiderai de

miennes; et si après le plus mûr examen (car mon amitié l'exige de vous) vous persistez dans le choix que vous semblez avoir fait, vous me trouverez aussi prêt à vous y soutenir" (15). Instead, he advises Edouard to reflect maturely on his choices and desires, thus indicating that he values Edouard's natural and cultivated ability to do so. This suggests that Edouard's education was primarily concentrated on improving the natural reflective and rational talents of Edouard, which would aid him during his navigation of society.

Lucie demonstrates the same feelings of gratitude towards Rutland, upon her return to the family estate, having been summoned to take leave of Edouard. Staying to keep a despondent and sombre Rutland company, Lucie is accused by him of being less affected by her brother's departure into the army and war: "Que vous êtes heureuse, [...] d'avoir un coeur si peu capable de recevoir des impressions vives, ou plutôt que vous êtes à plaindre de ne pouvoir pas connaître le bonheur d'aimer!" (20). Lucie, however, counters his reprimand of her cheerful attitude, by distinguishing between the fraternal love for her brother which is outweighed by her attachment to Rutland: "Mon attachement pour vous, pouvoit feul me distraire de regret cruel, que me cause l'absence de mon frère, et l'emporteur sur ma tendresse pour lui." (20). This distinction in affection originates, according to Lucie, in Rutland's role during their childhood. In fact, she believes she and Edouard owe their lives to Rutland's altruistic actions:

Quoi! mon bienfaiteur, celui auquel je dois plus que mon existence, puisque sans lui, je n'aurois existé que pour vivre dans les malheurs les plus affreux, hésite à me croire capable d'un sentiment, dont il est si digne de remplir mon coeur! (21)

Upon Lucie's explicit gratitude and surprise (Qu'ai-je fait, qu'ai-je dit, [...] qui doive vous faire juger si mal (21)) of his judgement of her emotions, Rutland expresses his contentment with Lucie's character and simultaneously indicates the need to complete her education: "préparez vous seulement à retourner dans votre retraite; je me reproche de vous faire perdre ici un tems précieux, et que vous devez employer à perfectionner vos talents:" (21).

Although Rutland is adamant about cultivating Lucie's natural talents, he, similar to Dorilaus, refrains from identifying these characteristics. Interestingly the same distinction between natural disposition and cultural strengthening of these talents is expressed by Rutland as Dorilaus. As Charles Rollin describes this tension between individual freedom and pedagogical influence on nature in the eight volume of his *Traite des Études* (1731) titled "Du gouvernement intérieur des classes et du college":

[Éducation] est une maîtresse douce et insinuante, ennemie de la violence et de la contrainte, qui aime à n'agir que par voie de persuasion, qui s'applique à faire goûter ses instructions en parlant toujours raison et vérité, et qui ne tend qu'à rendre la vertu plus facile en la rendant plus aimable. Ses leçons, qui commencent Presque avec la naissance de l'enfant, croissant et

se fortisient avec lui, jettent avec le temps de profondes racines, passent bientôt de la mémoire et de l'esprit dans le coeur, s'impriment de jour en jour dans ses moeurs par la pratique et l'habitude, deviennent en lui une seconde nature qui ne peut Presque plus changer, et font auprès de lui, dans toute la suite de sa vie, la fonction d'un législateur toujours present, qui dans chaque occasion lui montre son devoir et le lui fait pratiquer. (209)²³

The educator has an integral role in instilling these habits into the children, but as Rollin elaborates further in his *Traité*, the instructor should be guided by the children's natural genius: "Pour parvenir à ce but, le premier soin du maître est de bien étudier et d'approfondir le génie et le caractère des enfants; car c'est sur quoi il doit régler sa conduit" (224). Thus, the differentiation between rote-learning and education guided by the child's talents and adult direction was not limited to England or France, but was prevalent in the eighteenth century.

Nevertheless, Lucie does not completely concur with Rutland's perception of her unfinished education. Rather, she observes a difference in his treatment of her and Edouard during their formation. In fact, she reproaches Rutland for his apparent favouritism with regard to Edouard's presence and Lucie's companionship: "Je ne suis point jalouse de celle que vous avez pour mon frère; mais je ne puis m'empêcher de voir que vous n'aimex que lui, et que ma presence vous est encore plus à charge, que son éloignement, ne vous est douloureux." (22). During her apology, Lucie assumes that she is a burden to Rutland due to her dependent position, whereas Edouard enjoys the ability to freely navigate through society, regardless of his connections with Rutland. She clearly distinguishes between the social positions of the female and male orphan in this excerpt. The male orphan, she states, has more agency, in comparison with the female orphan who is dependent on some form of patronage or protection. Lucie's accusations are rapidly amended by Rutland who claims his love and care for Lucie as his foster-daughter, which Lucie uses to stay longer at the estate. However, aside from a timely interruption, Rutland exercises his parental guidance citing the harm this stay might inflict on her education: "Vous êtes encore bien jeune, et vous ne sentez pas à quel point un plus long séjour icic, pourroit vous être nuisible." (23). This paternal advice suggest that Lucie's education is not quite finished yet, but which subjects need further development are not specified.

Regardless of his paternal concerns about Lucie's upbringing, Rutland is also affected by her growing charms and virtue and thus he mirrors Dorilaus' increasing infatuation for his young female charge. Rutland similarly struggles with his passions as he is reluctant to take advantage of Lucie's

²³ The debate on the individual's free will, or choice, within his or her education is a recurring theme in eighteenth-century educational treatises and definitely not limited to France. Britain had a long tradition of the debate on free will with Thomas Hobbes' *Of Liberty and Necessity* (1654) and John Locke's *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (1690), as well as did the French with René Descartes' *Méditations métaphysiques* (1647) and Claude Adrien Helvétius's *De l'esprit* (1758). Even female author touched on this concept in their conduct literature or correspondence, such as Mary Astell and Émile du Chalet. It is therefore not surprising to see this theme being addresses in the contemporary perceptions of education. See *The Routledge Companion to Eighteenth-Century Philosophy* (2014), James A. Hariss, *Of Liberty and Necessity: The Free Will Debate in Eighteenth-Century British Philosophy* (2004), and Natasha Gill, *Educational Philosophy*.

innocence, while simultaneously damaging the virtues he cultivated in her: “Que veux-je faire, se demanda-t-il, de cette malheureuse passion? Voudrai-je travailler à détruire des vertus, que j’ai moi-même cultivées avec de tant soin? (24). Moreover, Lucie’s ambiguous heritage curbs Rutland’s expressions of his passion, as he expresses: “D’ailleurs cette fille, si noble peut-être! Peut aussi n’être que le fruit de la débauche de quelque vil domestique? Quelle honte pour moi, si de pareils parent venoient un jour de la réclamer!” (25). Rutland’s intentions to act on his desires are restrained by a combination of awe for Lucie’s cultivated virtue and the possibility of her lower-class origins which would reflect meanly on Rutland’s honour. In these scruples, Rutland slightly diverges from Dorilaus’ doubts on his intention to marriage Louisa. Although both men are concerned about her orphaned status and the effects of this social stigma on their own social position, Rutland also expresses unease about the effects of this unsolicited desire on Lucie’s cultivated values and virtues. Furthermore, as Antoinette Sol observes, Rutland, in his considerations, does not touch upon Lucie “being his ‘daughter’”, but rather limits his deliberations “to social concerns” (31). Nonetheless, despite the potential social condemnation of his affections for Lucie, Rutland struggles to subdue them and eventually falls ill due to his repining and separation from Lucie. In addition, the accomplishments which charm Rutland are the result of his educational plan for Lucie, and thus, he has, inadvertently been creating the ideal wife for himself.

Despite the similarities between Rutland’s and Dorilaus’ passions, scholars have noted that Crébillon diverges from Haywood’s portrayal of Louisa’s aversion and repulsion after Dorilaus’ marriage proposal and romantic actions. Crébillon slightly alters the relationship between the guardian and his foster-children. As Jean Dagen asserts, Rutland assumes a more equal and temporary paternal role with regard to his charges: “de tenir lieu de ces parents; à se servir de père” (qtd. in Sol 30)²⁴. The transitory element of Rutland’s guardianship allows Crébillon to alter the confrontation of passion between Rutland and Lucie, by allowing Rutland to cast off his paternal role in favour of that of the lover. Indeed, where Louisa is appalled by Dorilaus’ advances, Lucie, by contrast, “feels nothing” (Sol, 30). Lucie’s unresponsiveness towards Rutland’s declaration of love is defined by the narrator as an example of Lucie’s insensibility: “Il n’était pas possible qu’il [Rutland] ne se fâchât pas quelquefois contre Lucie, du peu d’attention qu’elle faisait à ses sentiments” (41-2). The ignorance on Lucie’s behalf regarding her sensibilities and emotions suggests a flaw in her pedagogical upbringing, and, moreover, that love is an emotion that can be cultivated, rather than a spontaneous attraction between individuals. In fact, the narrator describes that the knowledge of love is simultaneously learned and implanted in the heart:

Ce terme de profond respect qui apprenoit au Chevalier que Lucie n'en étoit encore qu'à l'indifférence, le força de remettre à un tems plus heureux, l'explication qu'il s'étoit flatté

²⁴ See Antoinette Sol’s book chapter “Lost in Translation: Crébillon fils’ *Les heureux orphelins* and Haywood’s *The Fortunate Foundlings* “for a more expansive discussion of Rutland’s paternal role in this translation history.

dávoir avec elle, ce jour-là. Il croyait lui en avoir dit assez pour en être entendu, s'il étoit parvenu à lui inspirer de l'amour, et qu'elle lui auroit en ce cas, répondu bien différemment. La langue de ce sentiment s'apprend au moment même qu'il s'établit dans le coeur et Lucie en ne la parlant pas, ne lui prouvait que trop qu'elle l'ignoroit encore. (38)

Furthermore, this definition of learning about love suggests that this knowledge can only be acquired through experience, rather than through instructions, which is evident in Lucie's inexperience in courtship and appropriate responses.

In other words, the changes that Crébillon made between Rutland and Lucie affect the depiction of education significantly. By contrast, Louisa feels an almost immediate repugnance which suggests a natural, and possibly to some extent cultivated, understanding of courtship and love. By contrast, Lucie's unresponsiveness indicates her unfamiliarity with this kind of address. In fact, her response to Rutland's declaration of love is somewhat indifferent:

[Rutland:]Non, Lucie, un si odieux abus de mes bienfaits, seroit, peut-être encore, plus deshonorant pour moi, que ne l'auroit été la barbarie de vous les refuser: je vous aime! je vous adore! mais, encore une fois, je mourrois de honte, et de douleur si je pouvois penser assez bassement, pour vouloir ne vous pas tenir de vous-même. C'est me condamner, sans doute, à ne vous jamais posséder [...]

[Lucie:] Eh! Monsieur, interrompit-elle vivement, ne vous faites pas, de grace, de si cruelles idées. Je ne sens, je vous le jure, rien dans mon coeur qui les justifie. Pénétrée pour vous d'estime, de reconnoissance, d'amitié, de tendresse même, et je dirois de respect, si ce terme pouvoit ne vous pas blesser dans ma bouche, il ne se peut pas que je vous refuse long-temps le sentiment que vous me demandez.(48-49)

Lucie's reaction to Rutland's declaration emphasises her ignorance in relation to this form of relationship and the lack of instruction given to Lucie regarding courtship and amorous relationships.

Moreover, Lucie's innocence highlights the shortcomings of her education. In fact, the themes of marriage and courtship had an important position in conduct literature in order to prepare and guide female conduct during these periods. In both France and Britain, conduct books were published which were either infused with comments on the importance of marriage in women's lives, or took it for their major subject matter. For example, both Dr. John Gregory in his advice book *A Father's Legacy to his Daughters* (1774) and Chevalier de Cerfvol in *La Gamologie ou l'éducation des filles destinées au mariage: ouvrage dans lequel on traite de l'excellence du mariage, de son utilité politique et de sa fin, et des causes qui le rendent heureux ou malheureux* (1772), primarily or solely dwell on female conduct during marriage and courtship.²⁵ These similarities between French and British advice literature is not so surprising, as both countries attributed much importance and attention to the

²⁵ For a lengthy discussion on the subject of marriage in eighteenth-century conduct books see Nadine Berenguier's chapter "Marriage and its Disillusions" in her book *Conduct Books for Girls in Enlightenment France* (2011).

cultivation of the 'perfect' housewife, wife, and mother. Knowing how to select a husband and conduct yourself during the period of courtship was an essential part of the knowledge that needed to be installed. Lucie's half-hearted, almost neutral, response towards Rutland's admission of love, indicates that her education is lacking in the cultivation of her knowledge and understanding about her role and future as a potential wife. Instead Lucie responds by declaring her filial love and respect for Rutland, stressing the incestuous nature of Rutland's love. However, Lucie eventually acquiesces and accepts Rutland's suit, in contrast to Louisa's constant refusals. Nonetheless, Lucie does eventually flee from Rutland after his assault in the garden. It is only after this incident and reflection that Lucie understands the consequences of this proposed marriage and its incestuous nature: "la suite est l'unique parti qui me reste, puisqu'une malheureuse, mais invincible répugnance ne me permet pas de consentir jamais à la épouser." (61). The incident suggests that Lucie needs to learn about the customs and consequences of courtship, something she is evidently unfamiliar with and that has probably been neglected during her upbringing.

Initially after her departure from Rutland's mansion, Lucie finds protection and safety with the help of Madame Pikring, who helps her when Lucie loses consciousness in a boutique, as she provides employment and lodgings for Lucie in Madame Yielding's shop. Moreover, Madame Pikring presents Lucie's new job in a positive light, namely that of a new learning experience: "il lui avoit paru nécessaire de la metre pout quelque temps chez une Lingere, où elle apprendrait bien des choses, que son nouvel état pourroit lui rendre necessaries" (72). Although Lucie is successful in procuring employment, she initially expresses her concerns about the contrast between her education and current conditions: "Il est vrai répondit Lucie en soupirant, que j'ai été élevée d'une façon peu conforme à l'état auquel La Providence semble me destiner." (67). However, Madame Pikring is optimistic about Lucie's potential and the intrinsic worth of having had an education: "Ce qui vous paroît aujourd'hui un de vos malheurs, répondit Madame Pikring, sera vraisemblablement un jour, et de ce moment même votre plus grande ressource. L'éducation est un bien precieux, qui tient lieu de beaucoup d'autres, et dont aucun ne dédommage." (67). Lucie's upbringing, therefore, is still a valuable aspect which affects her social position and her status on the job market, as Madame Pikring is positive about her potential: "prenez courage, ma chere fille, nous verrons à vous placer auprès de quelque dame de qualité: c'est, je crois, ce qui peut vous convenir le mieux." (70). In fact, Madame Pikring highly values Lucie's virtue, which she deems a reliable guide and judge, which exquisiteness is incomparable:

Que vous êtes heureusement née, ma chere fille, s'écria Madame Pikring; je ne puis, en vous entendant, admirer assez à quel point la vertu seule vous a bien conduit, et de combien sa lumiere est plus sûre, que toutes celles que nous pouvons tenir de l'âge et de l'expérience! (72).

Whereas Lucie regards her social position from the perspective of an abandoned and unprotected orphan in society, Madame Pikring perceives her birth to be a fortunate one, as she is blessed with such a discerning moral compass.

Madame Pikring's laudations, however, contrast the preceding comments by the narrator about Lucie's insensibility regarding courtship and Rutland's passions. This juxtaposition suggests a distinction between innate knowledge and cultivated customs and understanding. Indeed, Lucie is confronted by similar unwanted advances when employed by Madame Yielding. Lucie's new employer introduces her to the libertine and impudent Lord Chester, who is described as "encore plus brillant que son carosse, [...] en entrant, d'un air brusque et insolent, avec noblesse, emporte la Cité, ou la rapproche de la Cour!" (73-4). This libertine quickly endeavours to acquire Lucie's favour through gifts. However, Lucie demonstrates her acquired knowledge about rejecting unwanted advances. Although her refusal of Rutland's advances is lengthy, probably due to their already intimate father-child relationship, Lucie, in her dismissal of Lord Chester's proposals, is more direct and dismissive. She condemns his witty compliments when she tells Yielding that a woman should not be flattered by such offensive remarks: "Ah! s'ecria Lucie, qu'il faut qu'une femme l'ait mauvaise, pour se la laisser tourner par de pareils propos, et des façons si offensantes!" (77). Lucie distinguishes between the customs of the court and bourgeoisie, while emphasising the sensibility of the bourgeois women with regard to these libertine flirtations:

Ce sont ses affaires, répondit Lucie; mais comme toute bourgeoise que je suis, le ton qu'il a pris avec moi ne me convient pas, je vous prierai de trouver bon que je travaille dans ma chambre, afin de n'y plus être exposée. Oh! pour cela non, Mademoiselle, dit la Yielding, d'une air fâche; quand on est jolie, il faut s'accoutumer à se l'entendre dire. Pius (?) on essaye de ces propos-là, moins ils sont d'impression et je le daïs assez par moi-même, pour ne les par craindre pour vous. (72)

Lord Chester's continuous advances eventually move Lucie to denounce his actions which indicate that she is aware of the loathsome nature of his intentions, and thus that she has acquired some awareness of these interactions and in particular which ones to reject.

Moreover, Lucie's actions suggest that she has learned from her experiences and interactions with Rutland's advances, and has now become more vocal and assertive in her rejection of suitors, as she tells Lord Chester:

Mylord, répondit-elle fièrement; et c'est de m'exposer aux discours que vous me tenez, et de me rendre l'objet de vos honteuses libéralités; à ces mots, elle jetta la garniture du côté du Lord, avec un mépris qu'il sentit vivement, et l'étonna beaucoup: car sa vanité qui lui en faisait mériter tant, ne lui permettoit pas de croire qu'il en inspirât. [...] Qu'il agisse donc de façon à se faire respecter, interrompit vivement Lucie, qu'il respecte lui-même la vertu, ou que du moins il la laisse tranquille. (83)

The shift between Lucie's passive agreement with Rutland's proposals and her vehement rejection of Chester's flirtations demonstrate a pedagogical growth which is stimulated by her experiences with courtship, rather than structured didactic methods. Furthermore, Lucie is more vocal in her refusal of Chester in comparison to Louisa's more passive defence while working at the shop. Their reactions to the respective advances by their foster-father and the shops' clientele has been switched around; whereas Louisa is more articulate in rejecting Dorilaus, and evasive in responding to the customers advances, Lucie's passivity is seen when she accepts Rutland, and she is more direct in cutting off Chester's insinuations. This distinction suggests that Louisa's actions and reactions are motivated by her moral compass and cultivated sense of virtue, while Lucie, on the other hand, predominantly relies on her experiences and relationships to her suitors to dictate her responses. The female orphans, thus, rely on a different method of pedagogy to govern their actions. This distinction in method seems to indicate a shift in ideologies about knowledge acquisition, with an increasing preference for cultivation through experience, which is present in Haywood, but to a lesser extent.

Nonetheless, Lucie's actions up until this point are similar to Louisa's decisions. She also flees from the debauched shop environment, yet Madame Yielding does not prevent Chester's advances, but rather downplays Lucie's condemning reactions. With the help from Madame Picking, Lucie finds accommodation in Bristol at the home of Mme Picking's sister Mme Hepenny. While staying at these lodgings, Lucie's activities are affected by her interactions with Chester, for Mme Hepenny observes that she is withdrawn and frightened about encountering him again:

Lucie jugea à propos de partager son temps entre la lecture, et mille petits ouvrages dont elle s'acquittait avec un dextérité merveilleuse. Encore saisie de la peur que lui avoit faite le Lord Chester, à peine osoit-elle regarder par la fenêtre, tant elle craignoit qu'il ne sût qu'elle étoit à Bristol, et qu'il ne sût venu l'y chercher. Mme Hepenny, surprise de voir une fille d'une figure si distinguée, se réduire par choix à une si profonde solitude, conçut pour Lucie un sorte de respect, qui l'engagea à redoubler pour elle d'égards et d'attentions. (102-103)

In addition to observing these solitary tendencies in Lucie's behaviour, Mme Hepenny also detects Lucie's dexterity ("dextérité merveilleuse") in the chores, which remain unspecified, she engages in, which reinforces the description of Lucie's education as exquisite. Yet, she remains unaware of the extent of Lucie's education until Lucie discovers instruments in the house which she starts playing:

Ce fut avec un joie extrême que Lucie y trouva un clavecin, et quelques instruments. Elle ne put se refuser au plaisir d'essayer si ses talents pour la musique étoient encore les mêmes; elle se faisait d'abord d'une guitare, ensuite d'un dessus de viole, et finit par se mettre au clavecin. Elle en jouoit supérieurement. Madame Hepenny, qui ignorait l'éducation que Lucie avoit reçue, étoit si confondue de ce qu'elle voyait, et si occupée du plaisir de l'entendre, que Madame de Suffolk, qui étoit revenue en chaise à porteurs, pour répondre à des lettres qu'on venoit de lui apporter de Londres, entendit ce petit concert pendant plus d'un quart d'heure, sans être aperçue d'aucun des deux. (103-4)

This is the moment which introduces the Duchess of Suffolk, Melanthe in Haywood's narrative, to Lucie. Similar to Louisa and Melanthe, Lucie and Suffolk meet when Lucie is, unintentionally, displaying the extent of accomplishments, which impress the Duchess to such a degree that she invites her to keep her company:

Vous voulez donc, lui répondit la Duchesse, me demander pardon du plaisir que vous m'avez procuré, en me faisant entendre la voix la plus agréable et la plus touchante que j'aye entendue de ma vie. Dites-moi seulement, je vous prie, à quel hasard je dois ce bonheur, et si je puis me flatter que pendant mon séjour ici, vous voudrez bien me le procurer quelquefois. (104-5)

Lucie's accomplishments, thus, secure her a protector and profession as the Duchess' companion, but, simultaneously, this appreciation of Lucie's abilities by Suffolk suggest that they can only truly be valued by the elite circles in society. Indeed, a distinction is made between Mme Hepenny's and Suffolk's recognition of Lucie's accomplishments, which suggests that these qualities can only be truly apprehended by social equals. Lucie's education, which was structured around strengthening her natural talents, thus indirectly solidified her social position in the higher classes of society. This also becomes evident from her interactions while employed by Mme Yielding. Although she is perfectly capable of performing her tasks, Lucie is too refined to constantly refute Lord Chester's advances and correct Mme Yielding's misrepresentations of these rejections. Her distress thus originates from her ambiguous social standing, as an unfortunate orphan while simultaneously being too well-educated and refined to endure this employment and treatment for a prolonged period of time.

The Duchess of Suffolk, however, quickly distinguishes between Lucie's current position, as Lucie informs Suffolk that she is the niece of Mme Hepenny, and the quality of her education. Indeed, in her offer to Lucie to become her companion, Suffolk distinguishes between the role of domestic and friend:

Ne voulez-vous pas bien, demanda-t-elle à Lucie, vous attacher à moi, non en qualité de domestique, car vous n'avez sûrement pas été élevée pour l'être, mais comme une compagne, avec laquelle je me serai un plaisir de vivre? (105)

Although Suffolk is unfamiliar with Lucie's upbringing, she can discern the quality of her accomplishments which indicate a more genteel pedagogical structure than that of a domestic servant. The offered position is therefore much closer to Suffolk's suspected social standing of Lucie, despite her guise of kinship with Mme Hepenny. Suffolk, nevertheless, accepts Lucie's narrative of her 'family' and even suggests they alter her history slightly, by stating she was educated in a Flemish convent, to make her entrance into the Duchess' circle more acceptable and convincing.

Elle [Suffolk?]lui trouva, dans ces conversations particulieres, tant de moeurs, de douceur et d'agrémens, et la prit dans une amitié si vive, qu'elle ne voulut pas différer plus long-temps l'exécution du projet qu'elle avoit formé. Je vais lui dit-elle, paroître vous attendre comme un fille de condition, que l'on me donne pur être auprès de moi; et dans quelques jours vous vous présenterez à moi, comme arrivant d'un Couvent de Flandres: car n'ayant l'accent d'aucune de nos Provinces, je ne saurais supposer que vous en arriviez encore moins de Londres, où l'on ne manqueroit pas de s'informer de vous. (107)

The Duchess's suggestion that Lucie received a convent education indicates the quality and gentility of her upbringing by Rutland and her governess. Indeed, convent education in France, as discussed in Chapter 1²⁶, was both a compulsory stage in a young girl's education while simultaneously being criticized in its ability to cultivate a social awareness in young women. This shortcoming in Lucie's upbringing, however, is rectified by Suffolk who cultivates Lucie's social understanding and awareness, by relating her experiences to Lucie. This assumption about convent education, once again, demonstrates that Lucie, despite her orphan heritage, is perceived by people who are unaware of her ambiguous origins as belonging to the genteel or upper classes, both by natural inclinations and education. Lucie's education therefore plays a central role in her positioning and presenting herself in society.

Nevertheless, at this point Crébillon diverges drastically from Haywood's narrative by deleting the European travels of Horatio and Louisa in favour of chronicling the Duchess of Suffolk's history. Despite his deviation from the original plot structure, Crébillon's addition of the Duchess's life story has the same function as Melanthe's guidance and protection in the elite European circle, but requires a different agency from the orphaned heroine. Whereas Louisa experiences first hand, but by interaction and observation, the customs and rules of genteel social gatherings and communities, Lucie learns about them indirectly through the narration of Suffolk's experiences. This change in didactic approaches also alters the narrative's attitudes towards pedagogies, in particular in relation to the method of experienced-based learning as propounded by Rousseau and Locke, among others. Reading, in combination with careful guidance, was seen by many authors as an essential instrument in women's intellectual improvement. The key was to balance instructive, scientific, and religious works with entertaining texts, as Lady Sarah Pennington summarises in her advice book *An Unfortunate Mother's Advice to her Daughters* (1761): "some of these hours may be very agreeably, and not unusefully, employed by entertaining books; a few of which, together with some of a religious and instructive kind" yet "Novels and Romances never give yourself the Trouble of reading; though many of them contain some few good Morals, they are not worth picking out of the Rubbish intermixed" (38-39). However, authors continued to defend the wholesome intentions of their works, meanwhile rejecting the "rubbish" of other novels. Frances Burney, for example, in her preface to *Evelina* (1778) denounces the immoral effect of novels on "young ladies in general, and boarding-school damsels in

²⁶ See page 26-27.

particular”, but positions her own novel as a possible medicine, or counterweight to the writes: “... surely all attempts to contribute to the number of those which may be read, if not with advantage, at least without injury, ought rather to be encouraged than contemned” (8). A careful selection of fiction could thus contribute to a young lady’s education, as it would provide the reader with knowledge about events and confrontations without having to experience these, at times morifying situations herself. That is, reading fiction could contribute to the young lady’s understanding of society and its customs.

Nonetheless, the replacement of experiences with passive digestion of Suffolk’s recount of her past eliminates Lucie’s process of experience, and instead gives her interpreted second-hand experiences. Suffolk’s past is particularly significant for Lucie, as Suffolk herself is confronted with unwanted advances and is deceived by a libertine lover, Lord Durham. Moreover, Suffolk’s social status as a young widow who recently lost all her relatives mirrors Lucie’s social position as an orphan. This educational method simultaneously shields the vulnerable orphan from immoral advances and the more corrupt communities of society. In both novels the female orphans manage to secure relatively stable employment through their modesty and cultivated graces; however, their relationship with their mistress differs slightly. Although Louisa is first considered an equal by Melanthe, her actual position as an employee is reinforced when Melanthe orders her to leave; Lucie, on the other hand, develops a stronger connection with the Duchess of Suffolk, even awakening maternal sentiments in Suffolk:

Les graces, les talents et la beauté de Lucie avoient inspiré plus d'amitié pour elle, à Madame de Suffolk, qu'elle n'en avoit s/feuti de jalousie. Ce n'étoit pas cependant quoi qu'elle fût de la figure du monde la plus agréable, la plus noble et la plus intéressante, qu'elle pensât d'elle-même assez bien, pour se flatter que Lucie n'eût pas de quoi l'effacer; mais son ame, naturellement noble, ne connoissoit pas la lâche sentiment de l'envie. Elle se faisoit un plaisir délicate et nouveau, d'imaginer que cette jeune personne lui devoit non-seulement son bien-être, mais encore l'estime et la consideration du public, l'amitié de ceux qui paroïtroient ses égaux, et le respect de ceux qui se croiraient ses inférieurs. (108)

Similarly to Louisa, Lucie’s virtues and accomplishments charm the communities of their respective mistresses, yet with different consequences. In contrast to Louisa’s temporal position with Melanthe, as she is dismissed on the accusation of having been flirting with Count Bellfleur, Lucie and Suffolk’s relationship is stronger, for the narrator hints towards a mother-daughter bond forming. Crébillon, by incorporating semi-maternal bond into the narrative, diverges from the ineffective and temporary maternal figures encountered by Louisa in Haywood’s original. The alteration to the maternal figures in Crébillon’s version demonstrates the increasing importance of the maternal role in female education in particular. Where Haywood endeavoured to exhibit this by creating a lack of adequate figures, Crébillon did so by including one competent maternal character.

This maternal bond is evident in the interaction between Lucie and Suffolk. Having returned to London, Lucie is in constant fear of chancing upon Rutland and Lord Chester, and, therefore, isolates herself from society. As the narrator describes: “Au milieu de tant de sujets de joie, Lucie n'étoit cependant pas sans inquietude. Quand elle auroit été sûre que le Lord Chester ne vînt pas à Bristol, comment, logeant chez la Duchesse, qui le connoissoit sans doute, éviter de le rencontrer à Londres?” (109). Nevertheless, Lucie is not the only one who feels indisposed, as the Duchess of Suffolk returns one day, stating that: “Je me trouve mal [...] en entrant, d'une voix foible, que l'on me couche promptement, et qu'on me laisse seule.” (110). In fact, Suffolk describes herself as “la plus malheureuse de toutes les femmes” (110), and reflects upon her former actions and specifically her errors as crimes, while Lucie offers a different interpretation of these incidents from the perspective of an inexperienced person: “Eh! Madame, lui dit Lucie, regardez-vous des erreurs comme des crimes, et pensez-vous que toute jeune, et sans expérience que je suis, je ne veuille donner que de mépris à ce qui ne mérite sans doute que la plus tendre compassion.” (111).

Furthermore, Lucie's consolation, in addition to articulating her support and affection, also indicates the unaffected perception and ignorance of a young woman, whose education is left unfinished. Suffolk is reluctant to share her past with Lucie, as she is afraid of it having a negative influence and, in particular, fears Lucie's contempt and rejection: “J'aurois mille fois préféré la mort, à une châte si peu faite pour moi, qui n'auroit pas même dû flatter la vanité de mon amant, et ne pouvoit m'exposer qu'à son mépris.” (112). Suffolk represents her greatest misfortunes and mistakes to be related to courtship and suitors, which adds to her reluctance to confide in Lucie; however, she adds that she is not corrupted: “non je suis pas de ces femmes méprisables, pour lesquelles tout est tentation, qui travaillent à se déduire elles-mêmes, et qui regardant les principes les plus respectable comme les plus miserables préjugés.” (112). Notwithstanding Suffolk's extensive arguments against disclosing her experiences to Lucie, the manner in which she represents her misfortune suggests that there is some educational merit in imparting her experience to Lucie. Consequently, Lucie succeeds in persuading Suffolk to confide in her: “Daignez donc, Madame, m'ouvrir votre ame, et soyez assurée de trouver dans la mienne, tous les sentiments qui peuvent soulager votre douleur,” (113). The telling of Suffolk's history has thus a dual goal, for it relieves Suffolk's anxiety, while satisfying Lucie's curiosity: “et je crois ne pouvoir pas en entretenir quelqu'un qui veuille bien s'y intéresser autant que vous.” (113). Although this moment allows Lucie to acquire knowledge about social interaction and on courtship, it simultaneously signifies Crébillon's point of departure from Haywood's novel.

Suffolk's history marks the beginning of Crébillon's original writing as the second part predominantly comprises the relation of Suffolk's life and adventures. In fact, the second volume of *Les Heureux Orphelins* does not reintroduce the context of Suffolk's story, but immediately introduces the ancestry and childhood of Suffolk. The Duchess is depicted as the heiress of the count of Surrey who is destined to marry the Duke of Suffolk; a decidedly different origins and destiny than Lucie's prospects. Nevertheless, this seemingly happy future quickly falls apart when Suffolk's parents and

husband die in quick succession. To find some consolation and variety, her sister-in-law takes Suffolk to London, to the court society, where she becomes the favourite of Queen Anne and is love-struck with Lord Duram. During her time at court, Suffolk's passion for Durham grows steadily, which is reflected on by the older Suffolk in disillusioned fashion, due to her acquired knowledge about his libertine nature and actions, while endeavouring to reconcile her actions with her morality. This self-reflective element in Suffolk's narration indicates her awareness of the, at times, inappropriate actions during her courtship, but, additionally, her consciousness of narrating this to young Lucie. It recalls Marianne's awareness, in *La Vie de Marianne*, of her letters being read to a younger audience, thus indicating that Suffolk also distinguished between her own passion-driven actions and their juxtaposition with society's moral standings. In addition, her reflective moments throughout her narration offer Lucie an insight into the process of distinguishing between temporal passions and moral judgement.

However, the consummation of this knowledge by Lucie is passive and depends on Mme de Suffolk's perspectives and interpretation, and, thus, Lucie is denied the possibility to gain first-hand experiences. Furthermore, the focus in this volume is solely on Suffolk's story, Lucie is barely mentioned at all and does have very little input. This suggests that Lucie functions only as a recipient of her story, rather than an engaged participant. Notwithstanding Lucie's passiveness, the Duchess of Suffolk does exhibit some concern about the corrupting influence of Lord Durham's careless and immoral actions. Throughout Suffolk's narrative it is elucidated that Lord Durham has libertine tendencies, as he endeavours to keep his courtship with Suffolk a secret, due to already being engaged to his cousin, and it emerges that Durham is simultaneously paying his address to two other women. When Suffolk gets the opportunity to read the letter by Lord Durham, who inherits the title Lord Chester, the narrator notes that:

“[Suffolk] pria Lucie de la laisser seule. Ce n'étoit pas qu'elle voulût lui rien cacher; mais elle connoissoit le ton de Mylord Chester; et ne doutant pas qu'un écrit, qui ne contenoit vraisemblablement que le récit de ses bonnes fortunes et de ses perfidies, ne sût rempli de faits, et peut-être de détails que l'âge et l'état de Lucie ne lui permettoient pas d'entendre. (229-230)

This consideration indicates that Suffolk is concerned about the effects of Chester's corruption on Lucie's impressionable mind. However, the novel nevertheless incorporates Chester's letters in its narrative; in fact, the two subsequent volumes comprise only Chester's correspondence, without any context, aside from his self-reflection and eventual remorse and desire for redemption. This remainder of the narrative is completely unrelated to the lives and education of the 'heureux orphelins'.

These substantial changes to Haywood's novel, in favour of inserting narratives that revolve around themes such as libertinism and nationalism have significantly altered the plot and eventual structure of Crébillon's work. Crébillon uses the framework of Haywood's novel, in particular the

beginning, but shifts his focus to the lives and adventures of the characters he added, such as the Duchess of Suffolk and Lord Chester, through which he can explore the aforementioned themes he inserted in to the narrative. Various scholars have commented on the disjointed combination of Haywood's beginning and Crébillon's alterations to his translation of the original novel, and the drastic shift from Haywood's narrative to Crébillon's original additions.²⁷ As this research concentrates on the portrayal of the female orphan's education, it is interesting to note that Crébillon abandons Lucie's narrative and character development from the moment Suffolk embarks on chronicling her life, which barely mentions Lucie again. Although Suffolk's story can be perceived as a form of advice and pedagogical instruction for Lucie, while Lord Chester's correspondence has been termed a 'libertine conduct book' by Beatrijs Vanacker (241), the narrative does not specify Lucie's educational benefits of having been given these insights and experiences.

Indeed, the shift from sentimental original to libertine translation affects the depiction of pedagogical methods and ideologies regarding the orphan greatly. To be specific, since the latter three volumes of Crébillon's translation scarcely concern itself with the female orphan, his representation of her education resembles Haywood's plot, but with different emphasises. That is, Crébillon retains the pedagogical method adopted by Dorilaus in Haywood's narrative, but includes explanation about the British educational methods for the French audience. This additional information indicates that didactic practices for both male and female children differed in France and Britian, or at least, were different enough to warrant clarification. Yet as contemporary conduct literature and educational treatises demonstrate, the differences between the two national ideologies on various pedagogical issues were not as distinct as Crébillon's explanations suggests. In fact, the perspection of a commercial outlook in pedagogical method as inherently British is challenged by similar discourses appearing in French educational essays, whereas the distinction between convent and governess boarding-school is one due to religious difference not so much as pedagogical ideologies. Crébillon, however, neither favours one or denounces the other pedagogical system, he presents them as factual differences of the two countries educational systems.

Moreover, as Crébillon's modifications of the narrators in his translated work shift the focus from the orphaned twins to Suffolk and Chester, it also raises the question about the title of the book. Despite the changes and the, eventual, unfinished status of Crébillon's novel (Vanacker 252), he still chose to translate the original title. However, the translated title suggests that the core of the narrative is still revolving around the twin's adventures, while not mentioning the change in focalization from the twins to Suffolk and Chester. Furthermore, Crébillon alters the terminology in Haywood's title.

²⁷ See, Sol, Vanacker, Karen McCloskey's article "Elements of the Libertine Chronotope: Jealousy in Claude Crébillon's *Les Heureux Orphelins*" (2003), Phillippe Laroch's *Petits-mâîtres et roués: Évolution de la notion du libertinage dans le roman français du XVIIIe siècle* (1979), Andrzej Siemeck's *Le Recherche morale et esthétique dans le roman de Crébillon-fils*. (1981) and Collette Cazenobe's *Le Système du libertinage de Crébillon à Laclos* (1991) for a more detailed analysis of the sentimental and libertine elements in Crébillon's translation.

Whereas Haywood termed the twins foundlings, indicating that their origins might probably be based on illegitimacy, Crébillon's twins are identified as orphans, suggesting that their parents are dead, while the legal positions of the twins are transformed from potentially being conceived out of wedlock to issue from a legal union. This shift in judicial and social status has little effect on the depiction and upbringing of the orphans in the beginning of the novel, as their origins are not yet disclosed or identified. Nevertheless, the use of the word "orphans" in the title does attribute a more stable social position to the twins, as it removes the uncertainty of illegitimacy. Moreover, Crébillon's choice to maintain the title juxtaposes with the alteration he made and the progression of the novel, in particular because of the lack of an ending to the narrative. Although it is difficult to surmise Crébillon's motives for leaving *Les Heureux Orphelins* unfinished, the title suggests that he either intended to return to the twin's narratives, or only used Haywood's narrative structure to insert his perspectives on libertinism and sentimentalism. Nevertheless, his translation does demonstrate interesting differences between the French and British attitudes towards feminine education in general and the female orphan's position within this pedagogical structure in particular.

The Orphan's Lot: Destiny's Role in Depicting the Orphan's Life and Agency

In 1759 Edward Kimber published his improved and translated version of Crébillon's novel. Kimber, in his preface, advertisement, and title page of the novel refers to the changes that he made to the French original text, presenting them as enhancements of the French novel. In his preface, Kimber elucidates on the reason why he altered sections of the novel, as he writes:

We have retained the French Idiom, in this translation, as far as it could be clear to the English reader; and the masters of the French tongue will observe, that we have taken no other liberty than to run, at times, two or three, sentences into one, preserving all the ideas, whilst we less embarrass the sense. The short, starchy sentences which are deemed a beauty by the French, are no very pleasing to an English reader (n.p)

According to this preface, Kimber only reduced or merged sentences to create a grammatically and structurally better English translation. This reference to the grammatical and syntactical differences between French and English in relation to translation recalls Aphra Behn's essay on translating French into English, *An Essay on Translated Prose* (1688), which describes the French language as elaborate and rhetorical in comparison with English, straightforward sentences:

confound their own language with needless repetitions and tautologies; and by a certain rhetorical figure, peculiar to themselves, imply twenty lines, to express what an English man would say, with more ease and sense in five; and this is the great misfortune of translating French into English. (317)

The issue of translating French as described by Behn and acknowledged by Kimber affect his approach to translation which differs starkly from Crébillon's imitation of the original or Collyer's more faithful 'amplificatio' translation of Marivaux's original. More specifically, his translator's voice is strongly present in the novel through his use of footnotes in which he explains or expands on his reasons of altering Crébillon's work or the distinctions between the French and English text or culture.

In fact, Kimber's translator's voice recalls elements of the intrusive narrator, as he disrupts the narrative's progress through his explanations of additions to the body of the text. The voice of the intrusive translator, however, is only limited to the first 55 pages of Kimber's original publication of the translation, as Beatrijs Vanacker observes:

Kimber even makes sure to distinguish this short 'translated' section from the long autonomous part through a wealth of footnotes regarding specific details of his translation. These notes, destined to back his rewording, promptly disappear at the start of the autonomous part, as though Kimber wanted to alert the reader he now took charge of the work. (258)

Although a substantial amount of Kimber's footnotes address the distinctions between the French and English vocabulary and defend Kimber's choices, he also uses this method to offer critique on the 'original' author and his work. In most of his footnotes Kimber adopts a condescending tone regarding Crébillon's knowledge of British customs and places. In one of his footnote Kimber comments on 'the writer's' knowledge about Westminster: "Either this *Frenchman* [sic] has a strange idea of the extent of *Westminster* [sic], or we must suppose the lady wandered a good deal about" (48). While in others he gives explanations of the distinctions between French and British customs, as he describes the social event of supper as follows: "Suppers, in France are meetings for chit-chat, more than eating and drinking; but the *English* [sic] consider them as something of more importance than amusing themselves by way of conversation" (35). The content of Kimber's footnotes resemble the additional information which Crébillon inserted into his narrative; that is, the footnotes give the readers information on the differences between French and British customs of which they might not have been aware.

Besides mirroring Crébillon's cultural clarifications, Kimber also includes information on the French pedagogical contents and systems as depicted in this text. Three footnotes give some commentary on both the male and female education in France. The first footnote is brief and offers a definition of the generic term 'exercises' in relation to male education in the main body of the text, as the intrusive translator explains: "The French denote by the exercises all the ornamental parts of education, dancing, fencing, &c" (30). This comment suggests that these elements were not seen as important in the male British educational system. Nevertheless, the translator also agrees with the concept of not straining the precocious and developing intellect as the text reads; "Improve your natural talents, but, I repeat it, don't overload them" (31); to which the translator adds in a footnote: "Sir William Temple illustrates this maxim by putting sticks on a fire; too few let it go out suddenly,

and too many heaped on are apt to extinguish it gradually” (31). Thus, Kimber reinforces this advice by relating it to the English essayist William Temple. In addition to these pedagogical explanations, Kimber also comments on Lucy’s reaction towards Rutland’s courtship:

We profess ourselves ignorant of what the Lady means in this place, and think the ingenious author has made her, at the same time, too wise and too childish, too quick and too insensible at once. Nonsense is allowable in love, but she is not in love yet. In Rutland nonsense might have been in character. (43)

This specific addition to the narrative in the footnote is intriguing, as it simultaneously criticises Lucy’s character and specifies her flaws while also detailing the mitigating circumstances of courtship. Furthermore, this footnote also suggest that Kimber retained most of the qualities of Lucie which he criticises, which attribute to the illusion of having made a faithful translation. In these footnotes, Kimber assumes a similar role to Crébillon’s narrator in that he offers explanations, or commentary, on the depiction of education or British customs in the ‘original text’, which suggest that, despite Crébillon’s narrative of English characters and surroundings, the portrayal of some elements in the narrative are frenchified.

Nevertheless, as Vanacker indicates, Kimber did make alterations to Crébillon’s text, but these changes are predominantly located in the latter, autonomous, part of the novel. In fact, the beginning of Kimber’s novel is remarkably similar to Haywood’s and Crébillon’s description of the twins who are called Lucy and Edward in Kimber’s novel, and their upbringing. Mirroring the two other novels, Kimber glosses over the twins’ childhood in favour of focusing on the educational methods applied when the children are older. Indeed, the twins, after having been raised by female servants and local women, become only interesting for Rutland when they start to demonstrate signs of affection and interaction. In addition to retaining the same interaction between Rutland and his foster-children, Kimber also preserves Crébillon’s additional information on British educational customs and structures; in specific, the explanation about female academies and the pedantic tendency of the British at university²⁸. Nevertheless, Rutland provides the twins with a genteel education with “the ablest masters”, for Lucy, and at doctor Busby’s Westminster School for Edward. Hence, Kimber’s depiction of pedagogies is similar to Crébillon and Haywood and therefore result mirrors the previous narratives. Edward, despite having been prepared to enrol at Oxford University, expresses the desire to enlist in the army to which Rutland acquiesces. Lucy, likewise, has received the best genteel education from her masters and governess, the result of which is lauded by the narrator as follows:

²⁸ “[Rutland] put Lucy in one of those female academies, which, in England, are in place of our convents, where the young ladies of the first quality are brought up under the eye and care of young women, who are themselves of nobles extractions, and, by the sentiments and education they have imbibed, are able to give the one, and inspire the other, into the minds of the illustrious maids, whose first years are committed to their care” (30)

Nothing so lovely had ever offered to his eyes: her symmetry of features, joined with the finest and most sprightly air, could be equalled by nothing but the freshness and luster of her complexion; her free, and unaffected, and at the same time, modest manners; her look so noble and ingenuous; and, in fine, that, I don't know what in beauty, which is so well felt and so ill described, put the finishing hand to Lucy's charms, and rendered her the most engaging person in the world. (32)

As Kimber remained more or less faithful to Crébillon in the first section of his translation, this section, thus, resembles Crébillon's description of Lucie's accomplishments greatly, aside from some changes in sentences structure. Moreover, Kimber also retains the ambiguity regarding the content of Lucie's education as he does not identify, or claims to be uncertain, about what has contributed to the completion of Lucy's graces. The similarities between the beginning of the three novels by Haywood, Crébillon, and Kimber therefore result in likenesses in the depiction and description of the education of the orphaned twins. As the setting of the novel remains in England, the novelists all describe the pedagogical methods applied in the upbringing of Haywood's Louisa and Horatio, or Crébillon's Lucie and Edouard, or Kimber's Lucy and Edward respectively, with a heavy emphasis on the genteel quality of their education.

Notwithstanding the similarities between the beginnings of these three novels, Kimber does diverge from Crébillon's narrative and rewrites the novel to accommodate it to his autonomous contribution and completion of Crébillon's unfinished translation. The start of this autonomous section can easily be located, as Kimber's footnotes disappear after the initial 55 pages. Furthermore, this departure from the similarities at the beginning of the three narratives is located at the place where Crébillon started to incorporate his original narrative about the Duchess of Suffolk. Thus, Kimber predominantly made his changes to Crébillon's three penultimate volumes, while reincorporating elements which can also be found in Haywood's novel. This reincorporation can, in particular, be seen in the return of Lucy's agency after having been told Suffolk's narrative, and Edward's, albeit shortened, account of his adventures while in army employment. In other words, Kimber reinstates the pedagogical elements and effects of the twins' experiences by writing an ending which concentrates on solving the mystery of their parentage and concluding the pedagogical trajectory for them both. Kimber's divergence from the narrative structure also involves a shift in thematic emphasis throughout the narration. Haywood, predominantly, focuses on female agency and social position, and Crébillon shifts his attention to libertinism and sensibility in favour of sentimentalism. Kimber, on the other hand, chooses to concentrate on the influence of destiny and virtue on the individual's character and future. However, these distinct literary devices are incompatible, as Vanacker observes, which is solved in *The Happy Orphans*, as in other contemporary works, by transferring the narrative's creation from the author while suggesting that the incidents related in the novel are preordained in "a book written in advance, in heaven, by God" (257-263). Yet, to what extent does Kimber's emphasis on destiny and virtue affect the portray of the twins, and in specific Lucy's, pedagogical growth and

process. If their life is preordained by some form of destiny, what is the role of education on their social position and interaction in Kimber's novel.

Although the initial 55 pages of Kimber's work are more or less identical to Haywood's and Crébillon's versions, there are minor distinctions in the depiction of Lucy's education and innate qualities, in particular to the description of her virtue, which is stressed in Kimber's text. In the excerpt quoted at the beginning of this chapter, Rutland alludes to the predestined nature of her character and how virtue is an inherent quality that cannot be cultivated:

Education may give the appearance of virtue, but, in effect, only disguises native vices, and renders them more dangerous to society. Nature, in forming you, left but little more to be done, and you owe yourself, as you are, to her kindness, and not to my care of you. (39)

Rutland surmises that Lucy's natural understanding of virtue did not require the augmentation of instructions or his kind care; rather, this quality was natural given only to be protected and cherished. Kimber's Rutland, therefore, differs in his perspective on education and natural dispositions. Although both Haywood and Crébillon propose an education that is tailored to the genius of the child, Kimber's text suggests that some aspects cannot be taught. Furthermore, in all three novels the twins are portrayed as having a certain innate genius and knowledge pertaining to virtue and proper conduct, which suggests, according to their guardians, a noble heritage. If education is perceived by Rutland as a means to conceal immoral characteristics or interests, and to some extent unnecessary for Lucy, then why does he provide her with the education befitting a girl from genteel origins? Although nobody is born with the ability to sew or play musical instruments, if instruction in virtue, one of the key components to be cultivated in eighteenth-century female education, is deemed redundant by Rutland, he simultaneously suggests that true virtue cannot be cultivated, but is intrinsic.

Although true virtue is thought of by Rutland as inborn rather than taught, education has provided Lucy with the accomplishments appropriate and beneficial in shaping the individual's mind and his or her social position. Mme Pikring, who listens to Lucy complaint that "the manner of my education and bringing up has been unfortunately but little suitable to the state to which providence seems to have destined me" (49), refutes this perception of Lucy's lot, and instead, offers a different interpretation of the benefits of female education, while suggesting that a good education goes beyond rank and fortune. By contrast, it is something that contributes to the individual's persona and position, rather than juxtaposing with destiny and rank:

Education is a precious benefit, which supplies the want of many others, and the want of which nothing else can compensate. If yours have been that of a young lady of quality, you have, doubtless, been inspired with good principles and sentiments, and improved by proper talents and accomplishments; and that, at a certain age, is what neither rank or fortune can bestow. Cease then to bewail your fortune which is so far enviable, and tell me truly your disasters. (49)

Lucy's education, thus, cultivates "principles and sentiments" deemed necessary by society and accomplishments admired in women; however, virtue is not mentioned by Mme Pikring. Consequently, it would seem that the value of an education is not related to the development of virtuous behaviour; rather this is an innate quality that can be feigned by others, but female accomplishments can be cultivated, and form a separate, equally important, part of an individual's advancement in acceptance by society. In fact, virtue is valued highly over the didactic qualities of experience, as Mme Pikring states: "I can't but admire to what a point innate virtue can conduct us, and by how much her maxims, are a better guide, than any we can derive from either age or experience!" In spite of the importance of developing accomplishments and principles through education, nothing can replace the intrinsic qualities of Nature's gift, virtue.

Kimber's first major alteration to Crébillon's translation *Les Heureux Orphelins*, however, is located at the beginning of Crébillon's changes to Haywood's original novel. Whereas Crébillon offers little information or context about the Duchess of Suffolk's embedded narrative in his second volume, Kimber has inserted a paragraph which examines the relationship between Lucy and Lady Suffolk in more detail. Although Crébillon alludes to their close, potentially maternal, bond, Kimber makes this friendly, parental relationship explicit, as Suffolk "had shown her all the kindnesses of a mother or a friend, rather than put on the mistress" (62). Nevertheless, Kimber's descriptions of Lady Suffolk's and Lucy's interactions fluctuates between the roles of companion and mother and daughter. He, in short succession, suggests initially that Lucy had become "the character of a bosom friend" for Suffolk, while a few lines later Kimber hints towards kinship as "[Lucy's and Suffolk's] features had such a resemblance, as inclined everyone to believe that Lucy was nearly related to her ladyship" (62). In addition to these ambiguous descriptions of their relationship, Suffolk during her narrative states to Lucy "call me not your mistress anymore – I am content to be your friend [...] thy virtues, thy graces, that tender heart of thine, have riveted my affections to thee inconceivably" (79), thus strengthening their close bond. Additionally, Suffolk defines her feelings towards Lucie as parental: "I will always continue to consider thee as my own child! Ah! I feel I love thee with somewhat like the affection of a parent." (148). By explicitly suggesting a maternal connection between Lucy and Suffolk, Kimber inserts an explicit maternal figure which was still absent from both Haywood and Crébillon's versions. Although their novels do present the female guide and advisor in, respectively, Melanthe and Suffolk, their relationships with the orphan girl remains on a platonic level with limited suggestions of maternal affection. Kimber's incorporation of the maternal figure, in the guise of a kind and compassionate mistress, continues on a suggestion made by Crébillon which indicates the increasing

importance attributed to mother in specific and women in general in the education of the nation's children²⁹.

The Duchess of Suffolk's embedded narrative retains the dual purpose of relieving Suffolk's anxiety about her meeting with Rutland, who is her former suitor: L'Anglai's half-brother, satisfying Lucy's curiosity while allowing her to express her concern. However, at the end of her narrative, Suffolk reveals a second reason behind her relation of her life. That is, Lucy is to stand proxy for one of the orphaned children, twins, of Suffolk's friend Mademoiselle St. Hermione and fathered by L'Anglai, to convince their grandfather Monsieur St. Hermione to settle "his fortune upon his unknown grandchildren" (147). This new incentive behind Suffolk's narrative signifies the alterations made by Kimber to accommodate his ending for his novel. Although this is a contrivance concocted by Suffolk, the unidentified grandchildren turn out to be Lucy and Edward. Nevertheless, this second aim of this narrative remains unresolved as Lucy feels forced to flee when Rutland arrives in Bristol. This period introduces a new episode of Lucy's endeavours to navigate solitarily through society. Although the pedagogical function of Suffolk's narrative is less pronounced, the effects of having heard Suffolk's story is evident in Lucy's behaviour, thus underscores the educational value of this embedded narrative. Similarly, these episodes mirror each other as Lucy re-encounters the libertine Lord Chester, who is still adamant in his endeavours to charm Lucy. She has to protect herself from Lord Chester by herself in both situations, however, her approach has significantly altered after Lady Suffolk's narrative.

Lucy's three encounters with Lord Chester elicit different responses from her, emphasising her development throughout the narrative. Nevertheless, these responses are all embedded in her comprehension of virtue, with which she challenges Lord Chester's libertine behaviour, which is identified as 'French' by other characters. The classification of libertinism as particularly French indicates the prejudiced perception of the abundance of immoral behaviour in French society and thus easily cultivated in travelling men on their grand tour. However, this contradicts with the libertinism of the late seventeenth century in England which still had its effects on mid-eighteenth-century advice literature and fiction. As Beatrijs Vanacker observes about the dual 'nationalities' of Lord Chester, his English ancestry with his French education create a hybrid national identity: "ne fait pas de doute: parmi les libertins crébillonniers, Milord Chester se distingue par son identité nationale hybride, en ce sens qu'il est un Lord d'origine anglaise, qui a été élevé à l'école française" (661). However, Haywood also includes libertine figures in the characters of Count Bellfleur and Mr. B—n, as Louisa's pursuers, and Henricus, Melanthe's suitor, while Kimber creates L'Anglai who is the love interest of Suffolk. These characters all exhibit to some extent corrupted values, demonstrating that this behaviour is not restricted to France or England, but transnational. This is once more reinforced in Kimber's work

²⁹ See Rebecca Davies' book *Written Maternal Authority and Eighteenth-Century Education in Britain: Educating by the Book* (2014) and Isabelle Brouard-Arends and Marie-Emmanuelle Plagnol-Diéval's book *Femmes éducatrices au siècle des Lumières* (2007), for more information on maternity and enlightenment literature.

during Edward's narration of his adventures, as his love interest repudiates these assumptions after Edward has disclosed his nationality and heritage to her:

Noble minds are the product of no particular clime or nation, I believe, and virtue and wisdom are confined to no single track, but bloom in all alike. Therefore it is a very narrow and partial way of thinking in some people, to suppose that their own country is the repository of everything great or praiseworthy, whilst other regions are denied the blessings they enjoy; and whatever the common people of the two nations are, I have abundant experience that in both *England* and *France* [sic], the superior and more enlightened geniuses are far from differing in the essentials of knowledge, good breeding and humanity. (209)

Maria's passionate declaration refutes the perception of absolute distinctions between the nation's abilities to cultivate "noble minds". Instead, he states that genius is not created, but born, challenging the potential of developing genius through education. Moreover, education, breeding, and humanity are not the only components that are necessary to create these "noble minds," again referring to the integral place of natural genius in the cultivation of children. In addition, this distinction suggests that this licentious behaviour of a libertine is not the consequence of a nation's customs or education, but a natural inclination. Both L'Anglais and Lord Chester in Kimber's narrative are English-born Lords, who either live in or frequently travel to France, and are termed libertines by their acquaintances, while Suffolk, Edward, and Breyfield, who also spent time in France, are not affected by this debauched behaviour. This further emphasises the educational notion of innate disposition towards a certain manner of life.

Lucy first meets Chester when she is working at Mme Yielding's milliner shop, where she immediately attracts his attention. Nevertheless, Lucy is adamant and vocal in her rejections of Chester's advances, as her unfamiliarity with these forms of advances and unease is displayed by her blushes and modesty. Despite the suggestion of her refined virtue Lucy believes she has found her destined social position, as she relates to Chester: "I am, Sir [...] made for the place I am in, and have no ambition for another" (51). Nonetheless, Chester is not deterred by Lucy's apparent social standing, of which he has "no sublime opinion" (56), forcing Lucy to reject his advances; first, by retreating herself to her own room, and subsequently by voicing her disapproval of his libertine ways. In her disdainful reactions, Lucy criticises Chester's lack of honour while ascribe their meeting as an unfortunate result of fate: "I have but one to reproach fortune with, [...] and that is to have exposed me to this language, and rendered me the object of your scandalous liberalities." (54). In addition, Lucy's rejection demonstrate her acquired knowledge about amorous advances. Whereas she first received Rutland's affections with a cold acceptance, Lucy now knows how to recognise these sentiments and how to refuse them. As Chester's advances are of a libertine nature, Lucy has every reason to reject his suite: "Base man! [...] if you are too corrupt to have respect to honour, know, that if it were wanting in

me, my contempt of you would supply the place of it” (56). Lucy’s first encounter with Chester demonstrates she has learned from Rutland’s brief courtship and underscores her natural virtuous nature by contrasting it with Chester’s libertine actions.

In contrast to her assertive stance during her first encounter with Lord Chester, when chancing upon Chester during her flight from Suffolk’s residence, Lucy’s behaviour has altered considerably. That is, she displays a passivity which greatly differs from her earlier agency in protecting herself from Chester’s advances. Although their second encounter is brief, as they meet on the open road, it is intense in purpose and emotionally scaring. Chester sheds all forms of decorum as he exclaims “Yes, by G—d, I have now found my little coy slut” (152), upon recognising Lucy and immediately moves to rape her – “you are performing the mysteries of Venus!” (153). During this struggle, Lucy remains effectively mute, aside from being described as “rend[ing] the air with her shrieks, cries and lamentations” (154). In fact, the only moment that Lucy vocally responds to Chester and his comrades is when she calls upon their honour to stop their abuse of the coachman:

I hope, gentlemen, you have too much honour and humanity to use that honest man [the coachman] with further cruelty? - I s defending the property of employers and resisting you unjust detention of him a crime? Is it not rather a virtue? But I see you are in no honour to hear reason – however, we live, I hope, in a civilized country, where the enormities of this kind will surely meet with proper punishment, let the rank of the offenders be ever so exalted. (154)

This excerpt demonstrates the juxtaposition of Lucy’s virtue with Chester’s libertine intentions, and highlights Lucy’s sensibility. However, it simultaneously contrasts starkly with Lucy’s vocal defence during her time and as a milliner’s apprentice. Nevertheless, their meeting is crucial in Lucy’s life as it introduces her to her new suitor, and eventual husband, Breyfield. Despite this being a brief encounter between Lucy and Chester, the depiction of this event differs greatly from their previous interactions, which were extensively related, whereas this meeting is glossed over, and focuses on describing Chester’s actions. Nevertheless, Lucy’s change in behaviour towards the libertine Chester is continued during their third meeting.

The third instance when Lucy is confronted with Lord Chester and his unwanted advances, she applies her experiences from their previous encounters, and her knowledge about his behaviour to interact with this volatile individual. Lucy’s initial panic is transformed into a resolution to “soothe him with hopes (tho’ it went so much against her) than, by exasperating him with a flat denial, to run the risk of becoming an immediate prey to his brutality.” (177). This indicates the development of Lucy’s understanding of how to interact with unwanted, libertine, advances. In fact, these intentions simultaneously allow the narrator to examine and contrast Chester’s and Lucy’s intellect, and in particular emphasise the superiority of Lucy’s understanding and conduct during this encounter. Lucy’s affected conduct is stressed in the narrative, as it is described that “she forced herself to put on an air of somewhat like ease, tho’ her mind was labouring under perpetual torture and agitation.”

(178). This description juxtaposes Lucy's innate virtue and honour, while underscoring her understanding of how to conduct herself while interacting with this noted libertine. Notwithstanding this indication that Lucy is willing to keep up the suggestion of participating in Chester's intentions, Lucy is unwilling to accept his scathing remarks about religion and virtue. In her defence of these principles, Lucy's superior intellect shows and is stressed:

Her arguments were forcible, on the other side of the question, that, convinced, tho' not reformed, *Chester* was reduced to the necessity of dropping the argument, swearing that 'tho' he had studies at the university, and was reckoned no bad scholar, she beat him at his own weapons. (178)

This excerpt places Lucy's innate qualities and the governess education given to a foundling girl on a par with the university education of a prominent courtier, suggesting that despite the discrepancy between their upbringing and social standing, Lucy's intellect and virtue is superior to the cultivated knowledge and graces of Lord Chester. Furthermore, it demonstrates Lucy's capability of debating and reasoning about religion and virtue on a high level. Indeed, religion and virtue were closely linked in female understanding and navigation of eighteenth-century society, as the anonymous author – 'A Person of Quality' - of *The Young Lady's Companion* (1740) advises:

Let your method [of practicing religion] be a steady course of good life, that may run like a smooth stream, and be a perpetual spring to furnish the continued exercise of virtue. Your devotion may be earnest, but it must be unconstrain'd; and, like other duties, you must make it your pleasure too, or else it will have very little efficacy. (12)

In fact, most of Lucy's actions seem to be guided by her understanding and exercise of virtue. As her brother Edward remarks upon their reunion "from your firm adherence to the sublime principles of virtue and goodness, from the sufferings and hardships you have endured to preserve that purity that adorns your mind and person" (201). Similarly, these qualities enable Lucy to persevere during Chester's cruel treatment and kidnapping of her, while simultaneously inducing sympathy in strangers.

Lucy's pedagogical growth comes to a close at this point in the narrative, yet before concluding the novel, the story does briefly touch on the educational merits of marriage while summarising the didactic history of Lucy. In meeting her future husband Colonel Breyfield when he saves her from Lord Chester's attempted rape, Lucy immediately forms a connection with the man. The two quickly fall in love which leads them to proclaim their willingness to marry. However, Lucy is wary about this development due to her orphan heritage and calls herself "the encumbrance of this unfortunate passion" (168), if she and Breyfield would marry. In fact, Lucy presents herself to Breyfield as a combination of her education, innate qualities, and unfortunate origins, as she tells him:

to consider me as an abandoned orphan, left to the care of an excellent nobleman by chance; as having been educated and provided for by his benevolence; as having neither the tenderness or cares of parents, or the charities of relations to trust to; - as possessed of nothing but what you see about me, nothing but those principles of virtue and religion, and those fruits of a noble education, which you have been pleased to admire in me! Oh! Sir, if you consider this abandoned, wretched orphan, now flying to poverty and retirement, to preserve that virtue which is the most sacred boon heaven has bestowed upon her [...] I shall be ever unhappy; - but gracious powers, could not your goodness have prevented my giving such affliction to this truly noble youth? (168)

Notwithstanding Lucy's bleak representation of her social position and fears, Breyfield rejects her anxieties. Instead, he represents her qualities as the true advantages of her life, instead of those related to birth and fortune, thus preferring her intellect over those of her person and social standing. Similar to Crébillon and Haywood, Kimber attributes an important place to marriage in a young woman's life. Yet he takes it a step further, whereas the other two authors concentrate on courtship and the period before marriage, Kimber includes description of marriage as an educational institution indicating that learning does not stop at wedlock. Instead, the subject and content to study changes and is aimed at learning about your partner, as is argued below.

Furthermore, Breyfield represents marriage as the solution to mend Lucy's unstable social position, as he confides in Lucy: "If my charmer is an abandoned orphan, in me she shall find the parent and the tender friend, if she is an exile and a wanderer, behold this bosom, these arms shall be her asylum" (169). In addition to the prospect of gaining a family and social identity, Breyfield describes marriage as a mutually beneficial relationship with regard to intellectual development:

What mutual improvements of mind, what sweet intercourse of ideas will ensue! What tender study, what assiduity to please, will mutually employ us, whilst all the admiring world shall be witness to our never interrupted bliss and peace, and gain instruction from the lessons of our lives. (169)

Besides, Breyfield's representation of marriage echoes the depiction of this state in various conduct works from the eighteenth century, which frequently stressed the need of equality and friendship in marriage. Indeed, Frances Brooke's narrator Mary Singleton reiterates this notion in her short-lived periodical *The Old Maid*:

Marriage, where the disproportion of rank and fortune is very great, especially if the disadvantage is on the woman's side, seldom turns out happy. [...] Equality is necessary to friendship; and without friendship marriage must be at the best insipid, but oftener a state of perfect misery. (letter 7; 184 qtd. in *Julia Mandeville*)

According to this definition of marriage, however, Breyfield's and Lucy's nuptials should be wrought with difficulties. In spite of this meagre outlook, Breyfield does not perceive the unbalance in social

position to be of consequence in their relationship. Instead he underscores Lucy's intellectual equality in favour of social position:

And if heaven has denied thee the advantages of birth and fortune, it has bestowed upon thee perfections which heaven alone, not birth and fortune can supply. [...] That goodness of heart, that unaffected tenderness, that virtue, that wisdom, which my ruptured soul has so admiringly contemplated, those charms and graces of person, those angelic features, no advantages of fortune could purchase. (169)

Lucy's accomplishments are described by Breyfield as unpurchasable; rather, they are divine gifts which have been cultivated and allowed to bloom in Lucy's character and person. This perception, furthermore, supports the notion of divine influence and fate running through this novel. In fact, the quick pace of Breyfield and Lucy's relationship contributes to the notion of it being preordained by God, as Lucy confesses: "Sure 'tis the work of heaven itself that thus suddenly, in so short a time, I am able – dare to talk thus, in a manner quite strange and unusual to me! – That a mutual flame should be lighted up in our bosoms, which has reached to the height of perfection as soon as it is kindled" (170). Lucy's orphan heritage is thus perceived as no impairment to their nuptials, for, she is seen as Breyfield's equal on the ground of her education and conduct, which is supported by their fast paced destiny.

Kimber, in representing Lucy as willing to marry Breyfield while still a kinless orphan, breaks away from Haywood's depiction of Louisa's unwillingness to marry du Plessis as a foundling who refrains from consenting until she discovers her parentage. Regardless of their similar perception of their socially ambiguous status, Lucy is convinced by Breyfield and her understanding that their relationship and marriage are predestined, and therefore she is willing to accept his suit. Nevertheless, Lucy remains unable to marry Breyfield, due to Chester's kidnapping her, until she is reunited with her brother and foster-father and has been informed about her heritage. This different stance of Lucy and Louisa regarding their suitors is indicative of a large shift in the representation of female agency in Kimber's translation. By allotting a significant part of the events of in the narrative to Providence, which at moments even affects Lucy's actions as she either awaits her fate, or expresses her gratitude to fortune, Kimber minimises Lucy's individual female agency. Instead, he suggests that free will is limited in favour of preordained events.

This depiction of agency contrasts greatly with Haywood's novel in which Louisa gradually gains in agency as she cannot trust anyone else, by applying the knowledge she acquired through her experiences to her convent life and her escape from the convent life. By contrast, Lucy, who initially mirrors Louisa's flights from Rutland and subsequently Suffolk's residence, gradually loses her agency and increasingly becomes dependent on the help of kind strangers to escape the unwanted advances and threats of Lord Chester. In other words, during her second encounter with Chester, Lucy is saved by Breyfield, and by the older gentleman, Mr St. Hermoine, who is actually her grandfather,

when she has been abducted and hidden in a public house by Chester. Furthermore, as the novel comes to a conclusion, the narrative turns to resolve the mystery of the twin's parentage and it simultaneously moves away from Lucy's adventures. In addition to this shift, the description of Lucy's education through experiences and instruction gradually lessens. In fact, as mentioned above, the representation increasingly shifts towards lauding Lucy's virtues and accomplishments in comparison with corrupted libertines. Lucie's pedagogical development is thus demoted in favour of ascribing her accomplishments to an inborn nature. In his novel Kimber balances the notion of education through experiences with innate predispositions. Instead of outright condemning French pedagogical practices, in particular in relation to libertinism, or the corruption of individuals, Kimber suggests that this can only happen when individuals are naturally disposed towards this conduct. This is connected with the concept of preordained life, as it implies that this is destined to happen. Education, as a result, takes on a secondary, yet necessary, role in aiding the cultivation of the female intellect and understanding of social roles and customs.

Conclusion

Louisa's lament "I am nothing" (177) echoes throughout the three texts examined in this chapter. Expressing her apprehension about her social standing, her unknown ancestry, and, according to her, too genteel upbringing, Louisa stresses her confusion about her ambiguous social position. In all three novels she juxtaposes her education and cultivation, provided by her foster-father and governess, with society as she perceives it. In Louisa's, Lucie's, or Lucy's experience, this includes marginality, a vulnerability which is increased by her cultivation, and ambivalence about the capability to challenge social hierarchies and customs. These recurring themes demonstrate the existence of the female orphan narrative template in these three texts; yet, despite these thematic similarities, significant alterations are made to the original, Haywood's representation of the female orphan narrative template highly affects the depiction of this young woman's agency. Furthermore, the changes in the agency of the female protagonists also affect the depiction of pedagogical ideologies and methods, as some are overlooked in favour of new educational perspectives.

Despite the similarities between three novels' opening chapters, and therefore resemblances between the twin's childhood education, the portrayal of the female orphan's educational development during her adolescence has significantly changed. The differences in educational ideology become apparent when Haywood's Louisa, Crébillon's Lucie, and Kimber's Lucy have their first experiences with unsolicited romantic passions and society's customs and structures. Whereas the childhood upbringing of the female protagonist is succinctly described as intended to cultivate female accomplishments, her subsequent experiences are narrated in detail. Moreover, the moment when Louisa is confronted by her foster-father's declaration of love is when the three novels demonstrate their distinct comprehensions of education in relation to natural disposition, innate qualities, and experience. Louisa is appalled and vehemently rejects Dorilaus' proposal; Lucie, on the other hand, is

unemotional in her responses to Rutland's passion, while Lucy mirrors Lucie's reactions. This major shift in responses between these three works indicates a change in the paternal role. Rutland perceives his role as a father as being of a more temporal nature than Dorilaus does. Whereas Haywood's Louisa's repulsion is attributed to her innate, but developed, moral compass, Crébillon's Lucie's experiences suggest that affection can be cultivated, while Kimber's Lucy combines Crébillon's perception of love with Haywood's wariness about this unnatural affection. Crébillon's texts indicate that love can be cultivated, which challenges the immediate understanding between lovers, despite their potential ignorance, as often depicted in eighteenth-century French and British novels and in Haywood's and Kimber's works.

Yet the major alterations made by Crébillon, and consequently Kimber, to Haywood's depiction of the female foundling's education, is the addition of a prominent maternal figure in the female orphan's life. Whereas Louisa is only familiar with a paternal care and has two temporary maternal figures in her life, namely Melanthe and the abbess, Crébillon's Lucie and Kimber's Lucy gain an adoptive mother in the character of the Duchess of Suffolk. Indeed, Louisa's experiences with her maternal instructors is one of eventual rejection or betrayal as they either send her away or intentionally mislead her, thus forcing Louisa to rely on herself. The Duchess of Suffolk, on the other hand, assumes a prominent position in her close friend's life. In fact, their relationship, in particular with the chronicling of her history, resembles the idealised mother-daughter relationships in eighteenth-century conduct literature. This change in female instruction for the orphan protagonist indicates the importance attributed in the eighteenth century to the maternal supervision in a child or adolescent's upbringing. Although Crébillon introduced this element to the narrative, Kimber incorporated it fully into the novel, as his ending stresses the didactic value of Suffolk's narrative. Although both French and English novels started to incorporate maternal figures and advice in their texts, the French were slightly earlier with this addition in literature.³⁰ That is, Lucie's behaviour after having heard this history alters her responses towards her libertine pursuer Lord Chester, from an active vocal rejection, to a passive but increasingly more calculated approach.

Yet this passivity contrasts starkly with Louisa's agency and travels as depicted in Haywood's novel. Louisa, throughout the text, encounters various communities from which she is shunned due to her foundling status and forces her to move to the margins of society. Throughout her adventures, Louisa gains in experience, confidence, and eventually agency; whereas, Lucie's narrative remains unfinished and depicts her at the end as withdrawn from society, just as she fades to margins of the narrative itself; Lucy, on the other hand, becomes more passive and reliant on others during her interaction with society, in particular after her abduction by Chester. This difference in agency can be related to the changes in pedagogical methods throughout the texts. By incorporating the maternal advice narrative in the texts, the necessity of acquiring experience-based knowledge is less urgent for

³⁰ See Brouard-Arends and Plagnol-Diéval and Davies

Crébillon's Lucie and Kimber's Lucy, thus, making them more passive in their absorption of information, whereas Louisa gains this through observation and interacting with society. In other words, Louisa is forced to experience society on her own terms, and gets limited instructions from her guardians, whereas Lucy receives copious examples through Suffolk's narrative, which eliminates the necessity to gain these experiences herself.

Although the extent of agency of the female foundling-orphan differs in the three texts, it is minimal in comparison with the agency and freedom of her twin brother; Haywood's Horatio, Crébillon's Edouard, and Kimber's Edward. Despite the increasing imbalance between the inclusion of the male foundling's narrative in comparison with the female's history, the male equivalent of the female foundling, in Haywood's text, and orphans, in Crébillon and Kimber, have considerably more agency than their counterpart. Moreover, despite having received a similar genteel upbringing, the male orphans Haywood's Horatio, Crébillon's Edouard, and Kimber's Edward had more input in the course of their future and corresponding education than their sisters. Nevertheless, regardless of their education, all three express the wish to enlist in the army and consequently travel to continental Europe to fight, are captured and brought to France. While Horatio describes this episode in his travels as highly educational and expresses fondness for French culture and people, Crébillon has not translated this part of the novel, and Kimber's Edward joins Horatio in his praise for the French society. In fact, Haywood's and Kimber's novel depict British and French society in similar manners. Both societies, or at least the communities the twins frequent, are composed of virtuous, noble, and wise people on the one hand and corrupted, libertine, and promiscuous individuals on the other. This demonstrates that the concerns, so frequently expressed in conduct literature, about the vices in worldly society and their effects on young adults was concurrent in eighteenth-century French and British society.

The most interesting alteration in this translation history is the change made to the title of Haywood's original text. Whereas she identifies her protagonists as foundlings, and implies that they could potentially be illegitimate, which is discovered to be true, Crébillon transforms them into orphans, orphelins, in his title. Yet Crébillon retains the ambivalent and vague foundling letter attached to the twins' clothes when discovered and does not provide a resolution to the mystery of the twins' parentage. However, the suggestions of the twin's noble descent are stronger in Crébillon's than Haywood's text, as he emphasises the natural genius of these children. This notion is continued in Kimber's works where the references to innate nobility and genius are prevalent, and even suggest that education is a mere instrument to learn human customs and conduct, not qualities such as honour and virtue. Moreover, in Kimber's work the twins are discovered to be legitimate as their parents, L'Anglai and Mademoiselle St. Hermoine, were married; however, their mother was initially seduced by L'Anglai and fell pregnant, after which he was forced to marry her. This shift in terminology, nonetheless, does not affect the twins' and society's perception of their social standing, as they constantly question their own social position when interacting with genteel communities and continue

to be marginalised. This indicates that regardless of the distinctions made in terminology in eighteenth-century dictionaries, society was less precise about making these differentiations.

In spite of the different translation techniques used by Crébillon and Kimber, they both combine original writing, with an intrusive translator, either in the text or footnotes. The novels are quite similar in their portrayal of the pedagogical journey of the female orphan and foundling. All three female protagonists need to interact, in differing degrees, with society and experience unsolicited advances and marginalisation before they can engage with society on their own with different effects. Louisa gains in agency and is capable of travelling alone, while Lucie's pedagogical development remains unspecified, and Lucy becomes increasingly dependent on the help of others. The additions made by the novelists, in the form of explanation, indicate the existence of a female orphan narrative template. That is, pedagogical methods are explained rather than altered, suggesting that these elements were considered integral to the female orphan's narrative pattern.

The similarities between the three novels' beginnings suggests the existence of a transnational female orphan narrative template, which is not that surprising as the changes made to this introductory element were minimal by both translators. Nevertheless, this also indicates that the structure of the female orphan in the initial narrative was familiar enough for both the French audience and the British audience fifteen years after the publication of Haywood's original work. In addition to the similarities between the beginnings of the three texts, the narratives also contain the recurring themes of marginality and vulnerability, yet differ in their depiction of female agency and predestined events and occurrences, suggesting that the trail of the female orphan, in Kimber, is preordained and an integral part in her development. To conclude, despite the three texts' differences between the portrayal of maternal figures, or the lack thereof, and female agency, they all concur in the necessity of familiarising the female foundling or orphan with society's customs through experience on the one hand and instruction on the other, as the means to overcome the social challenges relate to their orphanhood.

Transcending National Boundaries: The Transnational Female Orphan Narrative Template and Education in Eighteenth-Century Cross-Channel Novels

The eighteenth-century French and British perception of orphanhood, as presented in the numerous publications on orphans and foundlings, indicates the anxiety of both French and British society to socially assign a place to these children, to nullify the potential threat they posed to the stability of society and its hierarchies and customs, and to provide a solution to these issues. This conundrum is reflected in the essays, articles, pamphlets, and even dictionary entries written in an attempt to provide demarcation for the social and cultural position of these children, and to determine how to care and support the growing number of abandoned children in the streets of the ever expanding cities in eighteenth-century France and Britain.

It is therefore not surprising to see multiple similarities between the representations of the orphan figure in eighteenth-century French and British discourses and literary output such as pamphlets, essays, articles, excerpts in periodicals, and letters. That is, these texts adopt the same themes when discussing the issue of the neglected child in society. These themes include the charitable endeavour to provide for the abandoned children, the attempts to define the various types of child neglect, discourses on how to transform this vulnerable child into a contributing citizen of the state, and, in some cases, the Christian duty to care for these children. Additionally, the discourse of orphanhood was intrinsically intertwined with that of bastardy and illegitimacy in relation to class and social status during the eighteenth-century. This theme became a prominent element in discussions and debates on orphanhood. Although distinctions were made between the types of orphanhood in eighteenth-century dictionaries, as in Samuel Johnson's *A Dictionary of the English Language*, or encyclopaedias, such as Denis Diderot and Jean le Rond d'Alembert's *Encyclopédie, ou dictionnaire raisonné des sciences, des arts et des métiers*, distinctions in society itself were not as clear and precise. The repetition of these tropes within texts on orphanhood and their social status indicates the existences of a narrative template as these works reiterate themes that seem inherently connected with the circumstances of the real eighteenth-century orphan in French and British society.

One integral instrument in the attempt to convert the vulnerable abandoned children on the streets or in the hospitals and convents into productive societal citizens, who could support and the ever-growing state and empire in both France and Britain, was education. Throughout the eighteenth century education was perceived to be vital for the future of the nation, and, as a result, was a widely discussed and debated subject in both French and British society and literature. Moreover, in the eighteenth century the pedagogical system was gradually re-evaluated by philosophers, educators, and intellectuals, which resulted in a large output of educational treatises, conduct literature, and advice

books. Although these works differed in intention, focus, and opinions, there was consensus about the need to alter the rote-learning based traditional educational methods in favour of a system that paid attention to the child's dispositions and talents and was guided by them. Nevertheless, the extent to which the instructors should be guided by these talents, encourage the student to acquire knowledge through experience, or, rather, provide exemplary narratives that would revoke the need to acquire this knowledge firsthand differed per author and changed throughout the century. This differentiation can be seen in the five novels examined in this research, as all, to some extent, mention their female protagonists' natural genius, while they all differ in their depiction of the pedagogical method preferred for the female orphan's education. Nevertheless, similarities can be found in both the depiction of female orphanhood, the portrayal of her education in the curriculum that is designed by her guardians and the methods of teaching which the former adopt. Yet, in spite of these differences and similarities in opinions and methods, a growing position appears to be allocated to the maternal figure in children's education, and in particular, in the cultivation of girls.

Although the institutions assigned with the education of orphaned children endeavoured to prepare their charges for their position and employment in society, some contemporary intellectuals criticised the adopted educational methods of these establishments. They cited the reclusiveness of their upbringing as encouraging an ignorance of worldly proceedings and customs. Moreover, this pattern of ignorance of society's customs and rules is mirrored in the narrative of the two female orphan, or foundling, protagonists analysed in the case-studies. Both Marianne and Louisa are raised in the countryside or family estate, away from worldly society, and as a result are completely unfamiliar with urban society. However, the rural communities in the countryside were not suitable communities for the protagonists to grow up. Marianne, after the novelty and mystery of the new orphaned girl has waned, is treated with indifference and becomes well-aware of her social standing at the margins of society. Louisa's interactions, and consequently Crébillon's Lucie and Kimber's Lucy, with the rural community and her boarding-school environment is sparsely described. Aside from the local nursemaids and servants, Louisa interacts little with the outside world, stressing the reclusiveness of her upbringing and explaining her consequent ignorance. Furthermore, Marianne's and Louisa's unfamiliarity with the urban cities increases their vulnerability within this bustling society and harkens back to the fear of the vulnerable orphan being corrupted by immoral communities within society. This fear threatens to become a fact as both girls are tempted by either their guardian, or by libertine customers to their employer's shop. Besides, their employers encourage this future, as they see it as a secure manner of providing well for oneself. Although both Marianne and Louisa manage to escape from these situations, they do demonstrate the ignorance of the reclusively educated female orphan, and the need for her to acquire knowledge about society's conduct.

The pedagogical trajectories depicted in the two case-studies demonstrate similarities between the representation of female orphanhood as well as the didactic content and methods adopted to instruct the ignorant orphan about genteel society in the city. Subsequently, Marianne, Crébillon's Lucie, and

Kimber's Lucy all meet their adoptive mother who is willing to instruct them about the rules, propriety, and conduct in French or British society. Louisa, by contrast, meets Lady Melanthe, who temporally assumes the role of instructor and maternal figure in Louisa's life while travelling through Europe, but who subsequently forces Louisa to leave in a jealous rage. Haywood's divergence from this pattern, however, suggests that the compassionate mother does not always adopt an integral role in the female orphan narrative template. Although further research is required to understand the different paternal roles depicted in orphan narratives in both France and Britain, the unsuccessful or absent mother functions as a device for authors to demonstrate the importance of female involvement in educational practices, as can also be seen in Burney's *Evelina* or Lennox's *Sophia*.

The pedagogical methods adopted by these maternal figures, including Marianne's curé's sister, Mme Du Tour, and Louisa's abbess, differ significantly. Whereas some, Mme de Miran, Melanthe, Dorsin, prefer to act as guardians and instructors who provide advice or guidance while their 'daughter' acquires experience through engagement with society; others solely provide information, either through traditional methods of learning (the curé's sister and Louisa's governess) or pure advice (Mme Du Tour and Louisa's abbess) or through relating their own history and experience (Marianne's nun Treviere and the Duchess of Suffolk in Crébillon's and Kimber's texts). Furthermore, the texts also demonstrate that not every woman, despite her intentions, is innately a good 'mother', but that this also requires cultivation as well. However, regardless of the varying methods adopted by the multiple maternal characters in these novels, the abundance of them in both novels and its translations indicates the increasing importance of the maternal figure in the education of young girls in general, but the female orphan in particular.

Although all five novels agree about the usefulness of a proper education for orphan girls, their depiction of what entails this education differs. Whereas Marivaux, Collyer, and Haywood devise a pedagogical trajectory that exists out of experiences, instruction, and a childhood of learning feminine accomplishments, Crébillon and Kimber depict an education that instead of experiences-based learning, promotes an indirect method of acquiring knowledge, through passively absorbing information through narratives. This distinction in pedagogical methods indicates a difference in perceptions on female education, although this shift might also be attributed to changing social opinions, rather than transnational distinctions. Although it is difficult to determine the effects of the pedagogical methods depicted by Crébillon and Marivaux, as they left their work unfinished, Collyer, Haywood, and Kimber offer an indication of the results of these particular methods of upbringing portrayed in their texts. In Collyer's translation, Marianne's almost flawless conduct, aside from her lingering coquettish inclinations, is lauded by all her acquaintances and is represented as a valuable commodity. Moreover, Collyer's ending suggests that marriage is not the endpoint of learning in a woman's life. As she has Mme Dorsin observe, it is a wife's duty to learn how to please her husband, but also keep cultivating her intellect to retain his interest. Haywood, by contrast, concentrates on Louisa's agency throughout her learning experiences; whereas Louisa is vocal about her rejection of

Dorilaus's proposal, she is passive in taking action until she is forced by his physical advances. Yet, throughout her navigation of society, Louisa has to learn how to assume control over her life and actions, allowing Haywood to promote a larger freedom for women to travel and engage with society. Kimber, on the other hand, gradually minimises Lucy's agency in the novel. In comparison with Louisa's vocal agency, Lucy remains passive and reliant on others during most of her navigation of society. The only moment when she defends herself is during her first rejection of Lord Chester, but this simultaneously demonstrates that Lucy applies her newly acquired experience on how to handle unwanted sexual advance through her experience with Rutland's declaration of passion. Nevertheless, after the conclusion of Suffolk's history, Lucy becomes increasingly passive and the narrative turns from chronicling her didactic experiences to describing other characters' admiration of her virtue and modesty. In fact, Kimber suggests that Lucy has completed her pedagogical development at this point in the text, which reflects the concept of natural genius expressed by Rutland. In other words, Lucy only requires learning about how to conduct herself in society, the knowledge about virtue, modesty, and honesty are inborn. All in all, the endings of the three novels indicate a shift in the role of education in the heroine's life, yet what this exactly entails differs per text; Collyer suggests the subject of education changes; Haywood sees the pedagogical journey as completed, because Louisa has imbibed the knowledge on how to conduct herself in society; and Kimber suggests that the didactical period in Lucy's life is brief, completed, and only concerns acquiring knowledge of society's customs and dangers.

However, the uncompleted status of the two French novels in these case-studies makes it difficult to make a valid comparison between the depiction of the female orphan and her education in both French and British texts. Nonetheless, some distinctions can still be identified between the British and French works, in particular, an alteration in authorial intention in relation to the narrative's dominant themes. The French novels both incorporate elements of libertinism and coquetry, even making them central themes in their texts, whereas the British texts, which preserve some of these elements, emphasise and expand the importance of religion and virtue in the female orphan's life. Yet, Haywood combines elements of both traditions and adds a focus on female agency. Despite this variety of themes within the novels and their translations, they do depict the female orphan's situation, events, surroundings, and characters they encounter in a similar fashion. Indeed, the female orphan template, as depicted in these five works, encompasses themes of marginality, vulnerability, ambiguity, the need of parental, in particular maternal, advice, and potential disobedience to social hierarchies. In other words, the structure of the female orphan narrative template remains in tact throughout the five novels: and while its contents might differ according to national tastes or authorial preferences, the template appears to be transnational in use.

That these elements constitute the female orphan narrative template is reinforced by the recycling of these particular elements in the stories about the orphan foils within these narratives. In Marivaux's and Collyer's work, Toinon, Varthon, and Treviere, to some extent resemble Marianne, as

they all can be considered orphans in the eighteenth-century definitions of that term, but all lack Marianne's self-confidence, self-assertion, and, more importantly, her noble 'genius'. In Haywood's, Crébillon's, and Kimber's text in the second case-study, the comparison between the female foundling and her twin brother's upbringing and conduct indicate that their might even been similarities between the depiction of the male and female orphan. However, more research is necessary to define the eighteenth-century male orphan narrative template and to determine to what extent it shares similarities with its female equivalent. These similarities prove the existence of a female orphan narrative template that revolves around themes of vulnerability, marginality, ambiguity, lack of parental guidance, preferably involving more adults of different social backgrounds that aid the orphan in determining her social position, and the ever present possibility of subverting the social balance. Moreover, all five novels, interestingly enough, suggest that their female orphan protagonists display superiority in their understanding of virtue, modesty, and propriety in comparison with the other female orphan foils. It seems that this nobility of the mind is an indicator of the, yet unknown, ancestry of the female orphan and therefore a reassurance for their guardians and society of their 'true' social identity which has yet to be revealed.

Based on these two case-studies, this research can conclude that a similar female orphan narrative template exists in both French and British literature from 1740 to 1760. The differences in the narratives can be traced back to national literary, cultural, or religious preferences and not to educational distinctions. However, this research only examined two translation histories and five novels, but a small fraction of the immense literary output in eighteenth-century Britain and France. More research is needed to determine the validity of the claim made about the transnational female orphan narrative template. Does this template appear in other eighteenth-century European literary traditions? Can similar templates be found in earlier or later novels, or can a shift in focus be identified? Furthermore, comparisons between the eighteenth-century female, or male, orphan narrative template and its seventeenth-, and nineteenth-century equivalent could be very insightful in helping to understand the changing social comprehension, definition, and position of this literary figure in British and French literature.

Nonetheless, French and British opinions and ideologies on pedagogy for the orphaned children did not differ much, and the five novels echo sentiments expressed in various eighteenth-century works, both British and French, on education, its content, its structure, and its methodology. Instead, the distinctions between the representations of educational elements in the novels are limited to explanations about French or British customs and the equivalent in either Britain or France. The only translator who alters the content of the education in her translation is Collyer, who endeavoured to turn Marivaux's novel into a more didactic English version. By applying the translation method of *amplificatio*, which allowed her to expand within the limits of the texts, Collyer was able to shift the focus from Marianne's coquettish feminine intellect to one of devout feminine intellect and reward Marianne with a conclusion to the mystery of her parentage and a marriage. Although both Crébillon

and Kimber made signification alterations to Haywood's original text, switching between the three methods of translation identified by Dryden, both authors retain the initial description of the twins' education. As a result, both texts resemble Haywood's depiction of Louisa's pedagogy. However, Kimber and Crébillon change the method of education, by limiting the personal experiences of Crébillon's Lucie and Kimber's Lucy in favour of a passive digestion of another character's, of their own creation, experiences. This, however, gives Lucy an advantage as she already knows how to react and therefore does not require exploring and learning about the appropriate response to situations to the same extent as the other female orphans.

The literary female orphan also diverges from its equivalent, the orphan that was represented in the social discourses. Indeed, whereas in pamphlets the future of the orphans or foundlings educated in hospitals, hôpitaux, or convents is generally positively portrayed, the future of the literary female orphan, by contrast, seems at times bleak and hazardous. Both Marianne and Louisa, at different points in their experiences, contemplate their social position, the unwanted advances and constant rejections they face because of it, and even consider life as a nun. Moreover, their experiences with employment seem to echo the difficulties real-life orphans faced, as they are unable to meet the demands of the job and other options for self-sufficiency for these orphans are few. In addition to differing in their representation of the future prospects of the female orphans in real or fictional society, novels differ from other genres in their use of terminology. Whereas part of the social discourses on orphanhood were concerned with attempting to define the particular forms of orphanhood; the orphan, foundling, and bastard, the narrative template that centres on the female orphan does not endeavour to determine which particular form of orphanhood they portray. Marianne only perceives herself as an orphan, although she could be a foundling or bastard as well. In Haywood's narrative Louisa's foundling status matches the definition of the foundling given in Samuel Johnson's dictionary. However, both Crébillon and Kimber's titles identify their protagonists as orphans without altering Haywood's description of orphanhood, thereby indicating that these terms often conflated. It seems that despite the attempts to define kinds of orphanhood, the social perception and simultaneous use of these terms indicate the existence of a narrative template that did not distinguish between these detailed descriptions.

Louisa's lament quoted on the first page of this thesis, "I am nothing – a kind of reptile in humanity" (177) succinctly describes the position of the eighteenth-century female orphan in literature. Marginalised, shunned, continuously vulnerable, and ambivalent, the female foundling is unable to find a secure and safe place in the social circles of society. Yet the second part of this quote, in which Louisa repents her education, "[I] have been shewn in a genteel way of life only to make my native misery more conspicuous" (177-178), is repeatedly refuted by these five novels. Instead, education is seen to be the initiation into understanding genteel society and its customs. Yet, knowledge cultivated in rural isolation is not sufficient enough to engage with society. This knowledge needs to be augmented by experience, either direct or indirect, and instruction or advice

from a parental, preferably maternal, figure. The combination of these two educational methods allows the female orphan to better understand her social position and its precariousness and how to conduct herself towards society without losing her own self-worth. Education is not, as Louisa thinks, an instrument to make an orphan useless in French or British society. Rather, proper education in combination with guidance and instruction during the adolescence of the female orphan provide her with the abilities to secure her a position in society in which she can support the nation in her role as mother, wife, and benefactress, thereby resolving the anxieties about her orphanhood.

Works Cited

- Anonymous. *A Short Account Of The Present State of the Working-School at Hoxton for the Maintenance, Education, and Employment of Orphans and Other Necessitous Children*. N.p. 1761. *Historical Texts Jisc*. PDF File, 14 Sep. 2015.
- Anonymous. *An Account of the Foundation and Government of the Hospital for Foundlings in Paris*. Printed for R. Montagu. 1739. *Historical Text Jisc*. PDF File. 16 May 2015.
- Anonymous. "Fog's Journal. Oct. 26 No. 312." Urban, Sylvanus. *The Gentleman's Magazine: or, Monthly Intelligencer. For the Year 1734. Volume 4*. London: St. John's Gate, 1734. *Google Book Search*. 18 October 2015.
- Anonymous. Rev. of *The Happy Orphans: an Authentic History of Persons in High Life. The Critical Review, Or, Annals of Literature*. Vol. 7. 174-175, n.d. *Google Book Search*. 10 March 2016.
- Anonymous. Rev. of *The Happy Orphans: an Authentic History of Persons in High Life. The Monthly Review, Or, Literary Journal*. Vol. 19. 580, Dec. 1758. *Google Book Search*. 10 March 2016.
- Anonymous. *Règle, l'esprit de l'institut, constitutions et règlements de la maison de Saint-Louis établie à S.-Cir*. Paris: Chez Jean Anisson, 1694. *BnF*. 22 Nov. 2015.
- Anonymous. *The Young Lady's Companion; or, Beauty's Looking Glass*. London: Booksellers of Lords and Westminster, 1740. *ECCO*. 31 July 2015.
- Addison, Joseph. "No. 105. Saturday, July 11, 1713." *The Guardian V2: no. 83-176, June 16. – Oct. 1, 1713*. London: Printed for F.C. and J. Rivington, 1822. *Google Book Search*. 27 Aug. 2015.
- d'Agris, Antoine Gaspard Boucher. "Enfant batard." *Encyclopédie ou dictionnaire raisonné des sciences des arts et des métiers* Vol 5. *ARTFL Ecylopédie Project*. Web. 15 February 2016
- . "Enfant exposé." *Encyclopédie ou dictionnaire raisonné des sciences des arts et des métiers* Vol 11. *ARTFL Ecylopédie Project*. Web. 15 February 2016
- Andries, Lise, Frédéric Ogée, John Dunkley, and Darach Sanfey, eds. *Intellectual Journeys: The Translation of Ideas in Enlightenment England, France, and Ireland*. Oxford: Voltaire Foundation. 2013. Print.
- Armstrong, Nancy. *Desire and Domestic Fiction: A Political History of the Novel*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987. Print.
- Arnold, Dana. *The Spaces of the Hospital: Spatiality and Urban Change in London 1680-1820*. London: Routledge, 2013.
- Astell, Mary. *A Serious Proposal to the Ladies*. London: Printed by J.R. for R. Wilkin, 1701. *Historical Texts Jisc*. 14 Sept. 2014.
- Backschneider, Paula R. "The Story of Eliza Haywood's Novels: Caveats and Questions." *The Passionate Fictions of Eliza Haywood: Essays on Her Life and Work*. Ed. Kirstern T. Saxton

- and Rebecca P. Bocchicchio. Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 2000. *Google Book Search*. 17 April 2016.
- Ballaster, Ros. *Seductive Forms: Women's Amatory Fiction from 1684 to 1740*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992. Print.
- Barney, Richard A. *Plots of Enlightenment: Education and the Novel in Eighteenth-Century England*. Stanford: Stanford UP. 1999. Print.
- Behn, Aprha. "Preface to her translation of Fontenelle's *Entretiens sur la pluralité des mondes*." Eds. Sylvia Bowerbank and Sara Mendelson. *Paper Bodies, A Margaret Cavendish Reader*. Peterborough, Ontario: Broadview Press, 2000, 314.-327. Print.
- Berenguier, Nadine. *Conduct Books for Girls in Enlightenment France*. Farnham: Asghate Publishing, 2011. Print.
- Blouch, Jean. *Rousseauism and Education in Eighteenth-Century France*. Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 1995. Print.
- Boursault, Edmé. *Treize lettres amoureuses d'une dame à un cavalier*. Ed. Bernard A. Bray. Desjonquères: Ann Arbor, 1994. Print.
- Brady, Patrick. *Structuralist Perspectives in Criticism of Fiction: Essays on Manon Lescaut and La Vie de Marianne*. Bern: Peter Lang Pub Incorporated, 1978. Print.
- Brooke, Frances. "From the *Old Maid*, 7 (27 November 1755)." *The History of Julia Mandeville*. ed. Enit Karafili Steiner. Pickering & Chatto: London, 2013. Print.
- . "Numb. 13. Saturday, February 7, 1756." *The Old Maid*. London: A. Miller, 1764. *Google Book Search*. 14 May 2015.
- Brouard-Arends, Isabelle and Marie-Emmanuelle Plagnol-Diéval. *Femmes éducatrices au siècle des Lumières*. Rennes: Presses universitaires de Rennes, 2007. *Google Book Search*. 23 June 2016.
- Budgell, Eustace. "No 313. Thursday, February 28." *The Spectator Volume 4*. Dublin: George Grierson, 1728. *Google Book Search*. 15 June 2016.
- Burney, Frances. *Evelina, Or a Young Lady's Entrance into the World*. London: Penguin Group, (1778) 2012. Print.
- Casanova, Pascale. *La république mondiale des lettres*. Éditions du Seuil: Paris, 1999. Print.
- . *The World Republic of Letters*. Trans. M.B. DeBevoise. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004. Print.
- Cave, Christophe. "Marivaux revu par Voltaire: L'image de Marivaux dans la *Correspondance* de Voltaire." *Marivaux et les Lumières: L'homme de theatre et son temps*. n.p.: Publications de l'Université de Provence, 1996. *Google Book Search*. 26 May 2016.
- Cazenobe, Collette. *Le Système du libertinage de Crébillon à Laclos*. Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 1991. Print.
- Cerfvol, Chevalier de. *La Gamologie, ou l'éducation des filles destinées au mariage: ouvrage dans*

- lequel on traite dans l'excellence du mariage, de son utilité politique et de son fin, et des causes qui le rendent heureux ou malheureux.* Paris: Chez la Veuve Duchesne, 1772. *Google Book Search*. 16 June 2016.
- Chapone, Hester Mulso. *Letters on the Improvement of the Mind, Addressed to a Young Lady*. Vol. 2. London: Printed by H. Hughes for J. Walter, 1773, *Historical Texts Jisc*. PDF file. 14 Sept 2014.
- Choudhury, Mita. *Convents and Nuns in Eighteenth-Century French Politics and Culture*. Ithaca: Cornell University, 2004. Print.
- Cohen, Margaret and Dever, Carolyn, eds. *The Literary Channel: The International Invention of the Novel*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press. 2002. Print.
- Cohen, Michèle. “‘To think, to compare, to combine, to methodise’: Girls’ Education in Enlightenment Britain.” *Women, Gender, and Enlightenment*. eds. Sarah Knott and Barbara Taylor. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. Print.
- Coleman, Patrick. *Anger, Gratitude and the Enlightenment Writer*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011. Print.
- Collyer, Mary. *The Virtuous Orphan: or the Life of Marianne, Countess of ******. London: Vol. 1. Printed for Harrison and Co, 1784. *Historical Texts Jisc*. 22 Feb. 2015.
- . *The Virtuous Orphan: or the Life of Marianne, Countess of ******. London: Vol. 2. Printed for Harrison and Co, 1784. *Historical Texts Jisc*. 22 Feb. 2015.
- . *The Virtuous Orphan: or the Life of Marianne, Countess of ******. London: Vol. 3. Printed for Harrison and Co, 1784. *Historical Texts Jisc*. 22 Feb. 2015.
- . *The Virtuous Orphan: or the Life of Marianne, Countess of ******. London: Vol. 4. Printed for Harrison and Co, 1784. *Historical Texts Jisc*. 22 Feb. 2015.
- Coram, Thomas. “Letter to Benjamin Colman.” 2 March 1737. TS. *Massachusetts Historical Society Digitized Collections*. 27 February 2016.
- Coulet, Henri. *Le roman jusqu'à la Revolution*. 2 vol. Paris: Colin, 1967-1968. Print.
- Craveri, Benedatta. *L'âge de la conversation*. Trans. Éline Deschamps-Pria. Paris: Gallimard, 2002. Print.
- Crébillon, Claude-Prosper Joylot. *Les heureux orphelins, histoire imitée de l'anglois*. Maastricht: Jean-Edme Dufour et Philippe Roux, 1774. *Google Books*. 23 Feb. 2015.
- Crevier, Jean-Baptiste-Louis. *De l'éducation publique*. Amsterdam: n.p., 1762. *Google Book Search*. 15 June 2016.
- Dacier, Anne Le Fevre. “Preface to L'Iliade d'Homere.” Ed. Julie Chandler Hayes. *French Translators 1600-1800: An Online Anthology of Prefaces and Criticism*. Amherst: University of Massachusettes, 2009. 15 aug. 2015.
- Davies, Rebecca. *Written Maternal Authority and Eighteenth-Century Educaiton in Britain: Educating by the Book*. London: Routledge, 2014. Print.

- Davys, Mary. *The Reform'd Coquet, or the Memories of Amoranda*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, (1724) 1999. Print.
- DeJean, Joan. *Tender Geographies: Women and the Origins of the Novel in France*. New York: Columbia University Press. 1991. Print.
- Descartes, René. *Méditations métaphysiques*. 4 Vol. Paris: J. Vrin, (1647) 1976. Print.
- Diaconoff, Suellen. *Through the Reading Glass: Women, Books, and Sex in the French Enlightenment*. New York: State University of New York Press, 2005. Print.
- Didier, Béatrice. *La Voix de Marianne: Essai sur Marivaux*. Paris: José Corti, 1987. Print.
- Dinan, Susan E. *Women and Poor Relief in Seventeenth-Century France: The Early History of the Daughters of Charity*. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2006.
- DiPiero, Thomas. *Dangerous Truths and Criminal Passions: The Evolution of the French Novel 1569-1791*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1992. Print.
- Dryden, John. "Contributions to Ovid's Epistles: Preface." *The Works of John Dryden*. Berkeley: University of California Press. 1956. Print
- Elliot, Lisa Keane. "In Pursuit of Charity: Nicolas Houel and his Maison de Charité chrétienne in late sixteenth-century Paris." Scott, Anne M. *Experiences of Charity 1250-1650*. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2015. 149-170. Print.
- Espagne, Michel and Michael Werner. "La construction d'une référence culturelle allemande en France: genèse et histoire (1750-1914)" *Annales. Économies, Sociétés, Civilisations*. 42.4 (1987): 969-992. *Persee*. 26 Sept 2015.
- Fielding, Henry. *The History of Tom Jones: A Foundling*. London: Penguin Popular Classics, (1749) 1994. Print.
- Fort, Bernadette. "Les Heureux Orphelins de Crébillon. De l'adaptation à la création romanesque." *Revue d'Histoire littéraire de la France* 80.4 (1980): 554-573. Print.
- Fourny, Corinne. "Foreign Reflections: Adapating the Image of the Other in Haywood's *Fortunate Foundlings* and Crébillon's *Les Heureux orphelins*." *Interfaces artistiques et littéraires dans l'Europe des Lumières/ Artistic and Literary Exchange and Relations in Enlightenment Europe*. Ed. Elisabeth Détiis. Montpellier: Université Paul Valéry, 2000. 135-48. Print.
- Frail, Robert J. *A Singular Duality: Literary Relations Between France and England in the Eighteenth Century*. New York: AMS Press, 2007. Print.
- Fuchs, Rachel Ginnis. *Abandoned Children: Foundlings and Child Welfare in Nineteenth-Century France*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1984. *Google Book Search*. 6 April 2016.
- Gager, Kristin Elizabeth. *Blood Ties and Fictive Ties: Adoption and Family Life in Early Modern France*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996. Print.
- Garret, Aaron. *The Routledge Companion to Eighteenth-Century Philosophy*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2014. *Google Book Search*. 23 June 2016.

- Gay, Peter. *John Locke on Education*. New York: Teacher College Press Columbia University, 1964. Print.
- Gill, Natasha. *Educational Philosophy in the French Enlightenment: From Nature to Second Nature*. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Unlimited, 2010. Print.
- Girard, René. "Marivaudage and Hypocrisy." *American Societ Legion of Honor Magazine* 34 (1963): 163-174. Print.
- Goodman, Dena. *The Republic of Letters: A Cultural History of French Enlightenment*. New York: Cornell University Press, 1994. Print.
- Gregory, John Dr. *A Father's Legacy to His Daughters*. London: Printed for Osborne and Griffin, 1789. *Historical Texts Jisc*. PDF file. 6 Nov. 2014.
- Hanway, Jonas. *A Candid Historical Account of the Hospital for the Reception of Exposed and Deserted Young Children; Representing the Present Plan of it as Productive of Many Evils, and not adapted to the Genius and Happiness of this Nation*. London: 1754. *Google Book Search*. 26 Nov. 2015.
- Harris, James A. *Of Liberty and Necessity: The Free Will Debate in Eighteenth-Century British Philosopy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007. *Google Book Search*. 23 June 2016.
- Harris, Rhian. "The Foundling Hospital." *BBC History*. BBC, 5 Oct. 2012. Web. 10 Nov. 2015.
- Hayes, Julie Chandler. *Translation, Subjectivity, and Culture in France and England, 1600-1800*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2009. Print.
- Haywood, Eliza. *Letters from a Lady of Quality to a Chevalier*. London: 1724. *Historical Texts Jisc*. PDF File. 15 Aug. 2015.
- . *The Adventures of Eovaai*. Ed. Earla Willputte. Ontario: Broadview Press, 1999. Print.
- . *The British Recluse: or, The Secret History of Cleomire, Suppos'd Dead. A Novel*. London: D. Brown, 1722. *Google Book Search*. 14 March 2016.
- . *The Female Spectator*. 4 vols. London: T. Gardner, 1750. *Historical Texts Jisc*. 15 June 2015.
- . *The Fortunate Foundlings: Being the Genuine History of Colonel M-rs, and his Sister, Madame de P-y, The Issue of the Hon. Ch-es M-rs, Son of the Late Duke of R-l-D*. London: T. Gardner at Cowley's Head, 1744. 23 Feb. 2015.
- Helvétius, Claude-Adrien. *De l'esprit*. Paris: Fayard. 1988. Print.
- Herman, Jan. *Le récit génétique au XVIIIe siècle*. Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 2009. Print.
- Hilton, Mary. *Women and the Shaping of the Nation's Young: Education and Public Doctrine in Britain, 1750-1850*. Aldershot: Ashgate. 2007. Print.
- Hobbes, Thomas. "Of Liberty and Necessity." *Hobbes and Bramhall on Liberty and Necessity*. Ed. Vere Chappell. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999. 15-42. *Google Book Search*. 23 June 2016.
- Houssaye, Arsène, "Marivaux." *Revue de Paris*. Vol 7. Bruxelles: Adoplhe Wahlen et Compagnie, 1844. 146-155, *Google Book Search*. 1 June 2016.

- Hughes, Helen Sard. "Translations of the 'Vie de Marianne' and their Relation to Contemporary English Fiction." *Modern Philology*. 15.8 (Dec 1917): 491-512. *JSTOR*. 22 Feb. 2015.
- . "Notes on Eighteenth-Century Fictional Translations." *Modern Philology*. 17.4 (Aug 1919): 225-231. *JSTOR*. 1 Nov 2015.
- Huet, Marie-Hélène. *Les Héros et son double: Essai sur le roman d'ascension soical au XVIIIe siècle*. Paris: Librairie José Corti, 1975. Print.
- Jacobi, Juliana. "Between Charity and Education: Orphans and Orphanages in Early Modern Times." *Paedagogica Historia* 45 (2009): 51-66. *Taylor and Francis Journals*. 24 Jul 2015.
- Jaucourt, Louis de. "Orphelin." *Encyclopédie ou dictionnaire raisonné des sciences des arts et des metiers* Vol 11. *ARTFL Ecyelopédie Project*. Web. 15 February 2016
- Jewell, Helen M. *Education in Early Modern England*. London: Macmillan, 1998. *Google Book Search*. 4 June 2016.
- Johnson, Samuel. "No. LXIX Saturday, August 11, 1759." *The Idler by Samuel Johnson*. London: 1758, *Google Book Search*. Web. 9 Sep 2015.
- Johnson, Samuel. *A Dictionary of the English Language*. 2 vols. Dublin: Thomas Ewing, 1775. *Eighteenth-Century Collection Online*. 26 May 2016.
- Kale, Steven. *French Salons: High Society and Political Sociability from the Old Regime to the Revolution of 1848*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2006. Print.
- Kempf, Roger. *Diderot et le roman, ou Le demon de la présence*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil. 1963. Print.
- Kent, John. "Crébillon fils, Mrs. Eliza Haywood and Les Heureux Orphelins: A Problem of Authorship." *Romance Notes* 11 (1969): 326-32. Print.
- Kimber, Edward. *The Happy Orphans: An Authentic History of Persons in High Life*. Eds. Jan Herman and Beatrijs Vanacker. Cambridge: The Modern Humanities Research Association, 2015. Print.
- König, Eva. *The Orphan in Eighteenth-Century Fiction: The Vicissitudes of the Eighteenth-Century Subject*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. 2014. Print.
- La Harpe, Jean-François. *Lycée, ou cours de littérature ancienne et moderne: XVIIIe siècle. éloquence, Histoire, et littérature mêlée*. Vol. 13, Bk 2, Ch. 3. Paris: De l'imprimerie de P. Didot L'Ainé. 1818. *Google Book Search*. 1 June 2016.
- Lambert, Anne-Thérèse de Marguenat de Courcelles de Lambert. *Avis d'une mère à sa fille*. Paris: De l'imprimerie de firmin Didot, 1820. *Google Book Search*. 15 March 2016.
- Laroche, Phillipe. *Petits-mâtres et roués: Évolution de la notion du libertinage dans le roman français du XVIIIe siècle*. Quebec: Presses de l'Université Laval, 1979. Print.
- Lennox, Charlotte. *The Female Quixote: The Adventures of Arabella*. Pandora: London, 1986. Print.
- Lilte, Antoine. "Sociabilité et mondanité: Les hommes des lettres dans les salons parisiens au XVIIe siècle." *French Historical Studies*. 28.3 (2005): 415-445. Print.

- Lochéé, Lewis. *An Essay on Military Education*. London: T. Cadell, 1776. *Google Book Search*. 15 March 2016.
- Locke, John. *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding. Volume 1*. New York: Dover Publications, 1959. Print.
- Mander, Jenny. *Circles of Learning: Narratology and the Eighteenth-Century French Novel*. Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 1999. Print.
- . *Remapping the Rise of the European Novel*. Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 2007. Print.
- Marivaux, Pierre de Carlet. *La paysan parvenu*. Paris: Garnier, (1735) 1959. Print.
- . *La Vie de Marianne: ou Les Aventures de Madame la Comtesse d*****. Vol. 1. Paris: Chez Pierre Prault, 1731. *BnF*. 22 Feb. 2015.
- . *La Vie de Marianne: ou Les Aventures de Madame la Comtesse d*****. Vol. 2. Paris: Chez Prault, 1734. *BnF*. 22 Feb. 2015.
- . *La Vie de Marianne: ou Les Aventures de Madame la Comtesse d*****. Vol. 3. Paris: Chez Prault, 1735. *BnF*. 22 Feb. 2015.
- . *La Vie de Marianne: ou Les Aventures de Madame la Comtesse d*****. Vol. 4. Paris: Chez Prault, 1736. *BnF*. 22 Feb. 2015.
- . *La Vie de Marianne: ou Les Aventures de Madame la Comtesse d*****. Vol. 2. Paris: Chez Prault, 1734. *BnF*. 22 Feb. 2015.
- . *La Vie de Marianne. Par Mr de Marivaux de l'Academie Française, Nouvelle Edition*. Vol. 2, Vol 4-6. Paris; Chez Prault. 1756, *Google Book Search*. 16 Jan. 2016.
- . *La Vie de Marianne. Par Mr de Marivaux de l'Academie Française, Nouvelle Edition*. Vol. 3, Vol 7-9. Paris; Chez Prault. 1756, *Google Book Search*. 16 Jan. 2016.
- . *La Vie de Marianne: ou Les Aventures de Madame la Comtesse d*****. Vol. 8. Paris: Chez Prault, 1737. *BnF*. 22 Feb. 2015.
- . *La Vie de Marianne: ou Les Aventures de Madame la Comtesse d*****. Vol. 11. Paris: Chez Prault, 1741. *BnF*. 22 Feb. 2015.
- Martin, Christophe. *Mémoires d'une inconnue: Étude de la vie de Marianne de Marivaux*. Mont-Saint-Aignan: Presses Universitaires de Rouen et du Havre, 2014. Print.
- May, Georges Claude. *Le Dilemme du roman au XVIIIe siècle: étude sur les rapports du roman et de la critique 1715-1761*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963. Print.
- McBurney, William Harlin, and Micheal Francis Shugrue. "Introduction." *The Virtuous Orphan; Or, the life of Marianne Countess of *****. An Eighteenth-Century English Translation by Mrs. Mary Mitchell Collyer of Marivaux's La Vie de Marianne*. Carbondale & Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 1965. Print.
- McCloskey, Karen "Elements of the Libertine Chronotope: Jealousy in Clause Crébillon's Les Heureux Orphelins." *L'Esprit Créateur*. 43.4 (2003): 39-48. *Project Muse*. 26 Jan. 2015.

- McGirr, Elaine. *Eighteenth-Century Characters: A Guide to the Literature of the Age*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007. *Google Book Search*. 1 Dec. 2015.
- McKean, Michael. *The Origins of the English Novel, 1600-1740*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1987. Print.
- McMurrin, Mary Helen, *The Spread of Novels: Translation and Prose Fiction in the Eighteenth Century*. Princeton: PUP, 2010. Print.
- . "National or Transnational? The Eighteenth-Century Novel." *The Literary Channel*. Eds Margaret Cohen and Carolyn Denver. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002. Print.
- Merrett, Robert James. "Marivaux Translated and Naturalized: Systemic Contraries in Eighteenth-Century British Fiction." *Canadian Review of Comparative Literature* 17.3-4 (Sept – Dec. 1990): 227-254. Print.
- Miller, Nancy K. *The Heroine's Texts. Readings in the French and English Novel 1722-1782*. New York: Columbia University Press. 1980. Print.
- Montague, Mary Wortley. *The Letters and Works of Lady Mary Wortley Montague*. Vol 2. Ed. Lord Wharnccliffe. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011. *Google Book Search*. 27 May 2016.
- Moretti, Franco. *The Novel*. 2 vols. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006. Print.
- Müller, Anja. *Framing Childhood in Eighteenth-Century English Periodicals and Prints, 1689-1789*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2009. *Google Book Search*. 15 June 2016.
- Nixon, Cheryl L. *The Orphan in Eighteenth-Century Law and Literature: Estate, Blood and Body*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2011. Print.
- Pearson, Jacqueline. *Women's Reading in Britain 1750-1835: A Dangerous Recreation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999. *Google Book Search*. Web. 28 June 2016.
- Peruga, Mónica Bolufer. "Gender and the Reasoning Mind - Introduction ." Ed. Sarah Knott and Barbara Taylor. *Women, Gender, and Enlightenment*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007. Print.
- 'Pelagius, Porcupinus.' *The Scandalizade: A Panegyri-Satiri-Serio-Comi-Dramatic Poem*. London: Printed for G. Smith, 1750. *Google Book Search*. Web. 15 Aug 2015.
- Pennington, Sarah. *An Unfortunate Mother's Advice to her Absent Daughters; in a Letter to Miss Pennington*. London: Printed by S. Chandler, 1761. *Historical Texts Jisc*. PDF file. 14 Sept. 2014.
- Picco, Dominique. "Adultes et enfants en la maison royale de Saint-Cyr (fin XVIIe – XVIIIe siècles)." *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome – Italie et Méditerranée modernes et contemporaines* 123.2 (2011): Web. 22 Nov. 2015.
- Pinchbeck, Ivy and Margaret Hewitt. *Children in English Society Volume 1: From Tudor Times to the Eighteenth Century*. London: Routledge, 1969. Print.

- Popiel, Jennifer J. *Rousseau's Daughters: Domesticity, Education and Autonomy in Modern France*. Lebanon, NH: U of New Hampshire P, 2008. Print.
- Poulet, Georges. *Études sur le temps humain: La distance intérieure*. Paris: Plon, 1952. Print.
- Pugh, Gillian. *London's Forgotten Children: Thomas Coram and the Foundling Hospital*. Stroud: The History Press, 2007. *Google Book Search*. 26 Nov. 2015.
- Puisieux, Madeleine d'Arsant de. *Conseils à une amie*. Vol. 1. Londres: 1755, *Google Book Search*. 1 April 2016.
- Reeve, Clara. "The Progress of Romance." *Bluestocking Feminism: Writings of the Bluestocking Circle, 1738-1785*. Ed. Gary Kelly. Vol. 6. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2006. Print.
- Richardson, Samuel. *Clarissa, Or the History of A Young Lady*. Ed. Angus Ross. London: Penguin Books Limited, 1985. Print.
- . *Pamela, or Virtue Rewarded*. London: Penguin Group (1740) 2012. Print.
- Rivara, Annie. *Les soeurs des Marianne: suites, imitations, variations 1731-1761*. Oxford: Voltair Foundation, 1991. Print.
- Robert, Marthe. *Origins of the Novel*. Brighton: The Harvester Press, 1980. Print.
- Robin, Isabelle. "Orphans, apprenticeships, and the world of work." *The History of the Family* 6.3 (2001): 439-453. Print.
- Robin-Romero, Isabelle. *Les Orphelins de Paris: Enfants et Assistance aux XVIe-XVIIIe siècles*. Paris: Presses de l'Université Paris-Sorbonne, 2007. Print.
- Robinson, Douglas. *Western Translation Theory: From Herodotus to Nietzsche*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishers, 2002. Print.
- Rollin, Charles. *Traité des études*. Paris: Libraire de Firmin Didot Frères, 1872. *Google Book Search* 15 June 2016.
- Rousseau, Jean Jacques. *Émile, ou de l'éducation*. Paris: Garnier Frères, 1962. Print.
- . *The Confessions*. London: Wordsworth Editions Limited, 1996. Print.
- Russo, Elena. "A Faded Coquet: Marivaux and the Philosophes." *Styles of Enlightenment: Taste, Politics, and Authorship in Eighteenth-Century France*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 2007. Print.
- Rutler, Tracy LeAnn. "Family Transvestisms: Trying on Kinship in Pierre de Marivaux's *La Vie de Marianne*." *Family Remains: The Politics of Legacy in Eighteenth-Century France*. Diss. U of Minnesota, 2014. Print.
- Schley, Jakob van der. *L'Attaque du carrosse*. 1778. *Utpictura18*. Web. 23 March 2016.
- Scott, Sarah. *A Description of Millenium Hall*. Ed. Gary Kelly. Ontario: Broadview Literary Press, 1995. Print.
- Siemeck, Andrzej. *Le Recherche morale et esthétique dans le roman de Crébillon-fils*. Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 1981. Print.

- Seth, Catriona. "Nobody's Children? Enlightenment Foundlings, Identity and Individual Rights." *Burgerhart Lezing 2012*. Valkenswaard: HolaPress Communicatie, 2012. Print.
- Sol, Antoinette. "Lost in Translation. Crébillon-fils' *Les heureux orphelins* and Haywood's *The Fortunate Foundlings*." *Altered Narratives. Female Eighteenth-Century French Authors Reinterpreted*. Ed. Servanne Woodward. London: Mestengo Press, 1997. 16-40. Print.
- Spitzer, Leo. "À propos de *La Vie de Marianne* (Lettre a M. Georges Poulet)." *Romantic Review* 44.2 (1953): 102-126. Print.
- Spacks, Patricia Meyer. *Novel Beginnings: Experiments in Eighteenth-century English Fiction*. New Haven CT: Yale University Press. 2006. Print.
- Spedding, Patrick. "Thomas Gardner's Ornament Stock: A Checklist." *Script & Print*. 39.2 (2015): 69-111. Print.
- Stewart, Carol. "Eliza Haywood's *The Fortunate Foundlings*: A Jacobite Novel." *Eighteenth-Century Life* 37.1 (2013): 51-71. *Project Muse*. 27 March 2014.
- Stewart, Phillip and Miriam Ebel-Davenport. "Dossier Claude Crébillon – Henriette Marie Stafford." *Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century*. 21 (2001): 199-231. Print.
- Stockhorst, Stefanie, ed. *Cultural Transfer through Translation: The Circulation of Enlightened Thought in Europe by Means of Translation*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2010. Print.
- Stothard, Thomas. *No Title*. 1784. *The Virtuous Orphan: or the Life of Marianne, Countess of ******. London: Vol. 4. Printed for Harrison and Co, *Historical Texts Jisc*. 22 Feb. 2015
- Thomson, Ann, Simon Burrows, and Edmond Dziembowski, eds. *Cultural Transfers: France and Britain in the long Eighteenth Century*. Oxford: Voltaire Foundation. 2010. Print.
- Trouille, Mary Seidman. *Sexual Politics in the Enlightenment: Women Writers Read Rousseau*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1997. Print.
- Vanacker, Beatrijs and Jan Herman eds. "Introduction." *The Happy Orphans*: Oxford: The Modern Humanities Association, 2015. 1-20. Print
- Vanacker, Beatrijs. "Discours libertin et argument national dans le triptyque (Haywood, Crébillon-fils et Kimber) des heureux orphelins." *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 24.4 (2012): 655-685 *Project Muse*, 20 Nov 2014.
- Villedieu, Marie-Catherine de. *Les aventures ou mémoires de la vie de Henriette-Sylvie de Molière*. Amsterdam: Chez Henry Desbordes, 1734. *Google Book Search*. 16 Jan. 2016.-
- Villemert, Pierre-Joseph Boudier de. *L'Ami des femmes, ou morale du sexe*. Hambourg: Chrétien Hérold. 1759. *Google Book Search*. 15 March 2016.
- Wagner, Gillian. *Thomas Coram Gent. 1668-1751*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2004. *Google Book Search*. 22 Nov. 2015.
- Wale, Samuel. *A perspective View of the Foundling Hospital, with emblematic figures, by Wale; engraved by Grignon and Canot*. 1749. Print. British Library, London.

- Watt, Ian. *The Rise of the Novel: Studies in Defoe, Richardson and Fielding*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1960. Print.
- Wertsch, James V. *Voices of Collective Remembering*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. Print.
- . "Specific Narratives and Schematic Narrative Templates." Ed. Peter C. Seixas. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004. *Google Book Search*. 17 June 2015.
- Wilkes, Wetenhall. *A Letter of Genteel and Moral Advice to a Young Lady*. Dublin: Printed for the Author by E. Jones, 1740. *Historical Texts Jisc*. 14 Sept. 2014.
- Wright, Lynn Marie and Donald J. Newman eds. "Introduction." *Fair Philosopher: Eliza Haywood and The Female Spectator*. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 2006. *Google Book Search*. 20 April 2016.
- Wolfgang, Aurora. *Gender and Voice in the French Novel, 1730-1782*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004. Print.
- Zunshine, Lisa. *Bastards and Foundlings: Illegitimacy in Eighteenth-Century England*. Columbus: Ohio State University, 2005. *Google Book Search*. 2 Dec. 2015.
- . "The Gender Dynamics of the Infanticide Prevention Campaign in Eighteenth-Century England and Richardson's *History of Sir Charles Grandison*." *Writing British Infanticide: Child-murder, Gender, and Print, 1722-1859*. Ed. Jennifer Thorn. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2003. *Google Book Search*. 14 Sept. 2015.
- . "The Spectral Hospital: Eighteenth-Century Philanthropy and the Novel." *Eighteenth-Century Life*. 29.1 (2005): 1-22. Print.