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In this piece, I aim to outline a constellation of related approaches to teaching some of the intertexts of Charlotte Lennox’s *The Female Quixote* (1752): the romance (or “heroic novel”), *Clélie*, with its notorious “Carte de Tendre,” and selected *conversations* of Madeleine de Scudéry (1607-1701), one of the luminaries of seventeenth-century salon culture. Eager to convey the exciting possibilities of Scudéry’s work while navigating its limitations in the undergraduate classroom, this piece uses specific points of entry, such as *Clélie*’s “Carte de Tendre,” to frame Scudéry’s influence in the context of an upper-division History of the Novel Survey for English majors. These strategies would also be effective in other novel-themed courses, depending on sub-genre (for example, amatory fiction, domestic fiction, or satire), as well as courses devoted to women writers or to Lennox herself. Through points of entry such as the “Carte de Tendre,” I help students to recapture the revolutionary origins of Arabella’s *inclination*, a term that distinguishes her as a virtuous yet desiring heroine in line with earlier romance precedents. Together, we explore the ways in which Lennox leverages the feminocentric authority of the seventeenth-century salon—via the form of the *conversation*, a central feature of Scudéry’s romances and later works—in constructing Arabella’s chaste yet properly passionate model of female heroism.

A major force in early modern prose fiction, especially via her influence on the Restoration drama and the early novel, Scudéry is Arabella’s primary interlocutor in the romance tradition, although both Scudéry and her contemporary, La Calprenède, furnish models for Arabella’s heroic conduct. In particular, *Clélie, histoire romaine* (1654-60), drew the ire of male critics, such as Nicolas Boileau, thanks to the infamous “Carte de Tendre,” or “Map of Tenderness,” devised by *Clélie* in order to instruct admirers on the way to her heart. In the pages that follow, I describe how I introduce students to Scudéry through the powerful image of the “Carte de Tendre.” As an index to the rich, feminocentric, imaginative culture of the seventeenth-century salon, the “Map of Tenderness” helps to frame the stakes associated with recovering Arabella’s vanishing romance precedents. With the “Carte de Tendre” as our starting point, we then explore the role of salon culture and the particular authority it extends to women in the form of the *conversation*; here, I focus on two examples, represented by Arabella’s celebrated speeches on raillery and indifference, and invite students to consider their source texts in Scudéry’s *Clélie*, as well as in *Artamène, ou le Grand Cyrus* (1649-53), another romance that features prominently in Arabella’s library. At the same time, I consider their apotheosis in Scudéry’s *Conversations sur divers sujets* (1680), in which she continued to perfect her rhetorical form.
A note on texts

Despite the significance of Scudéry’s oeuvre and influence, the absence of available English editions presents barriers to access. However, databases such as Early English Books Online (EEBO) make it possible to assign representative selections from Scudéry alongside Lennox’s novel. When teaching Scudéry with Lennox, I thus rely primarily on digital editions available through EEBO; at the same time, I also supplement these readings, as desirable or practicable, with related excerpts from Donawerth and Strongson’s 2004 edition of Scudéry’s Selected Letters, Orations, and Rhetorical Dialogues. Published by the University of Chicago Press as part of the series, “The Other Voice in Early Modern Europe,” this volume joins selections from Scudéry’s The Story of Sapho (trans. and ed. Karen Newman, 2003). More recently, there is now (as of April 2022) a third resource available for instructors interested in assigning selections from Clélie: Sharon Diane Nell’Lucrece and Brutus: Glory in the Land of Tender includes important selections from Lucretia’s narrative as well as a variety of contexts and resources for properly interpreting Scudéry’s romance. Given the exhilarating yet intimidating volume of Scudéry’s work and the complexity of its reception, I also find Mark Bannister’s overview of the heroic novel Privileged Mortals: The French Heroic Novel, 1630-1660 to be an indispensable part of any teaching kit.

In Selected Letters, Orations, and Rhetorical Dialogues, Donawerth and Strongson approach Scudéry’s oeuvre through three sections organized by genre: “Model Letters from ‘Amorous Letters’ (1641),” “Fictional Orations from ‘Famous Women’ (1665),” and “Rhetorical Dialogues,” which features selections from Conversations on Diverse Subjects (1680) as well as New Conversations on Diverse Subjects (1684). The fictional orations, selected from Les Femmes illustres; ou les Harangues héroïques (1642), include “Mariam to Herod,” “Sophonisba to Masinissa,” “Zenobia to her Daughters,” and “Sappho to Erinna.” Although, in teaching The Female Quixote, instructors may wish to source narratives of other heroines not included in Donawerth and Strongson, this list is representative of Scudéry’s approach to the theme of the “famous woman” and is therefore suitable for illustrative purposes as well as for more focused discussions of individual heroines. The Conversations include “On Conversation,” “On Speaking Too Much or Too Little, and How to Speak Well,” and “On Wit”; and New Conversations is represented by the selection, “Conversation on the Manner of Writing Letters.” All the Conversations are instructive in evaluating Arabella’s rhetorical prowess; however, Scudéry’s dialogue, “On Speaking Too Much or Too Little, and How to Speak Well,” (105-117), is an especially helpful starting point,
as described below. Additionally, Arabella’s speech against raillery (“On Wit,” 117-139) is one of the most important in *The Female Quixote.*

**Figure 1.** The “Carte de Tendre.” From *Clélia: an excellent new romance: the whole work in five parts, dedicated to Mademoiselle de Longueville. The first part. Written in French by the exquisite pen of Monsieur de Scudéry, governoeur of Nostredame de la Garde* (London: Printed and are to be sold by H. Herringman, et al., 1678), RB 230001, The Huntington Library, San Marino, California.

**Teaching Clélie’s “Inclination” and the “Carte de Tendre”**

As a point of entry into Scudéry’s work, I begin by introducing one of the most intriguing—and controversial—maps ever created: the “Carte de Tendre” or “Map of Tenderness,” first published in Scudéry’s *Clélie.* After introducing Scudéry and the hostile critical reception to *Clélie,* my chief goal is to capture students’ imaginations through the puzzling allegorical landscape of the map, an arresting image whose geographical features evoke the female reproductive
system. Through our engagement with the “Carte de Tendre,” we explore how Clélie foregrounds the importance of correctly interpreting, as well as dynamically responding to, the cartography of female desire, establishing a vital precedent for Arabella’s insistence on “inclination” in The Female Quixote. The challenging image of the “Carte,” from its lofty spiritual implications to its earthly sexual pun, implies that inclination, as a synonym for female sexual desire, is essential to heroic virtue.

Clélie’s sustained focus on the “Carte de Tendre” makes it possible to frame the image at various levels of depth and complexity. Because time is a constraining factor in a History of the Novel Survey, I prefer to focus exclusively on the map itself (vs. Clélie’s narrative). I begin by defining the concept of “allegorical cartography” and describe the map’s origins as briefly as possible, reminding students that the “Carte de Tendre” was a particular object of ridicule because of the vital role it plays in determining Clélie’s amorous agency. I then invite students to spend some time (about five minutes) quietly observing the image before we reconvene: What kind of a map is this? I ask. We then spend a few minutes identifying some of the immediately observable differences between the “Carte de Tendre” and other more familiar forms of cartography. Because the map “borrows all of its basic visual features from a language of contemporaneous cartographic practice,” students immediately recognize certain familiar conventions, only to be estranged by others, as Jeffrey N. Peters explains in Mapping Discord: “the ‘Carte de Tendre’ maps time as well as space; it measures quality as well as quantity; and distances are charted not in terms of movement through real topography, but of emotional or affective intensity. Placenames correspond not to physical sites, but to activities, procedures, and states of mind” (84). Thus, given the abstract nature of the “Carte de Tendre,” I also like to keep its materiality as a physical object—an actual map—in view. To this end, I encourage students to imagine themselves in the position of Clélie’s often confused companions, and the initial excitement fueled by the “Carte de Tendre” soon dissipates into bewilderment as students wonder about its use. According to this map, I ask, what steps would you take to win Clélie’s heart? What does it mean to make use of a map of this kind?

As students contemplate the potential significances of Clélie’s “Carte,” I pose some additional questions for small-group discussion in order to deepen our understanding. Bordered by “The Sea of Enmity” to the west and punctuated by the enormous “Lake of Indifference” to the east, the towns of Tenderness are divided by the north-south orientation of “The River of Inclination.” I thus invite students to reflect on the features of Tenderness. What do various characteristics of the terrain suggest about friendships and romantic relationships? About the
construction of the self in relation to others? About female desire, in particular? Why might such a map, so organized, be controversial? While engaging these questions, it isn’t long before students start to note the map’s visual allusions to female anatomy. At the same time, our deepening discussion of the image also helps students to perceive how the obvious humor of the allusion belies the map’s complexity: the “Carte de Tendre” may be making a not-so-sly sex joke (as I explain), but it is completely in earnest about the immaterial, metaphysical value of human relationships and Clélie’s central prerogative in determining her relational fate.

In framing the “Carte de Tendre’s” visual allusion to female sexuality in this way, I emphasize that proper conceptualization of the “Carte” is vital for Clélie’s personal—and, by extension, social—contentment and wellbeing. Although, as I explain to students, the map is not arbitrary, Clélie is, nonetheless, its arbiter. The most direct route, via the central “River of Inclination,” foregrounds the crucial union of sexual and spiritual desire required to win Clélie’s heart. In this way, and because “inclination” is an amatory term that powerfully links Arabella’s example to Clélie’s, the unmistakable importance of the “River of Inclination” provides an ideal opportunity to foreground the afterlife of this term in The Female Quixote. From the beginning of the text, Arabella fears a “Force upon her Inclinations,” turning to her romances as “Examples of heroic Disobedience” that centralize female agency (Lennox 27). Thus, as we transition from the “Carte de Tendre” to Lennox’s novel, I spend some time contextualizing the radically innovative nature of Clélie’s desire, especially for a heroine like Arabella and for a culture negotiating the shift to companionate marriage.4

Because the term “inclination” is generally uncontroversial for modern readers, I begin by providing students with a definition using Joan DeJean’s analysis of Clélie in Tender Geographies (71-93). Inclination, as DeJean explains, “may be translated as ‘penchant’ or ‘propensity,’ and is clearly related to, but not to be confused with, love at first sight” (87), which “strikes both partners simultaneously” (88). DeJean emphasizes that “inclination is consistently described from the woman’s perspective as the force that makes her lean in the direction of one suitor over all others” (88). In helping students to recognize this force, I seek to help them understand the fundamentally radical and disruptive nature of women’s desire in this period. DeJean reminds us that inclination, more than a matter of personal preference, has far-reaching consequences for the entire social order: “[i]t is defined as a force of attraction that works against prearranged marriages and encourages women to rebel against the authority and the values of the patriarchal system” (88). Reconceptualizing Arabella’s insistence on inclination in this way, I ask students: How do Arabella’s romances empower her
inclinations in a world that repeatedly seeks to govern them? Indeed, how, at a further remove, does the very lexicon of “inclination” make available a multidimensional portrait of chaste yet desiring female virtue in Lennox’s heroine?

Here, too, I take advantage of DeJean’s insights into the usage history of “inclination” to remind students that Arabella’s insistence on this term marks an important development in the history of the novel. By the time we begin *The Female Quixote*, students are already familiar with trends in amatory fiction that increasingly suggest the impossibility of expressing female desire. However, even as the language of desire enshrined in amatory fiction gradually disappears in the first part of the century, romances like *Clélie* continue to make available a canon of female worthies that legitimates Arabella’s active self-expression as a heroine. Indeed, as the allegorizing of Clélie’s reproductive anatomy to the “River of Inclination” suggests, an “inclined” heroine is sexual yet chaste, desiring yet virtuous. From this perspective, I suggest to students that Lennox thus follows other contemporary novelists, such as Henry Fielding, in her implicit corrective to the influential redefinition of female virtue represented by Samuel Richardson’s *Pamela* (1740).

**Teaching Scudéry’s conversations in *Clélie, Le Grand Cyrus, and/or Conversations***

Beginning, in this way, with Scudéry’s “Carte de Tendre” and its prioritization of Clélie’s inclination prepares students to engage with the extent to which the heroic novel (in general) and Scudéry’s romances (in particular) furnish a competing source of precedent for Arabella’s authority in Lennox’s novel. Just as the “Carte de Tendre” represents an experiment in alternative or supplementary cartography, Scudéry’s romances, I explain, represent a supplementary canon of legitimacy for Arabella. This legitimacy, inspired (in part) by the feminocentric culture of the salon, in turn derives its power (in no small part) from the conversation. With the rigor of a philosophical dialogue, the conversation, as a form, models a fundamentally collaborative process of refinement that depends on egalitarian modes of sociability for its success. For Arabella, as for Scudéry, rhetorical skill is essential for both heroine and hero (cf. 149-150), making Arabella’s speeches, at once, a vital site for leveraging romance precedents as well as for exploring the vocabulary of virtue available post-Richardson.

A central feature of Scudéry’s romances and later works, the conversation was essential to polite sociability among women and men as well as to women’s
authority as *salonnières*. In *Clélie*, for instance, the “Carte de Tendre” and its toponyms serve as the basis of numerous conversations among the heroine and her companions as they refine, with philosophical precision, the vicissitudes of the human heart. Indeed, even as the heroic novels of old became less popular in the second half of the seventeenth century, Scudéry continued to perfect the form, revisiting and revising the conversations of *Clélie* and *Le Grand Cyrus* in *Conversations sur divers sujets* (1680). In this section, therefore, I describe how I introduce students to Scudéry’s conversations on indifference and raillery in order to complicate our understanding of Arabella’s use of romance precedents. For even as Arabella appears to focus exclusively on Scudéry’s romances elsewhere in the novel, her rhetoric in the speeches on raillery (267-69) and indifference (310-11) may just as reasonably be traced to the afterlives of Scudéry’s heroines, reborn as *salonnières* in the *Conversations*. 

I begin by explaining how, among her contemporaries, Scudéry excelled at the arts of rhetoric and rhetorical instruction. Host of a popular salon known as *les Samedis*, her interests made her a principal theorist of the forms of salon culture, including the vital genre of early modern rhetorical discourse known as the conversation. In order to situate this genre among other forms of sociability practiced in salon culture, I explain that the salon was an important cultural institution, hosted by a prominent woman but frequented by members of both sexes, that featured a variety of activities designed to stimulate interesting conversation. Here, I use the brief description of the salon, with its typical features, in Donawerth and Strongson pages 14-16. As the editors explain, “Participants conversed in small groups and circulated around the room; the clever hostess offered paintings, exotic displays, and new books, as well as games and charades to further conversational interaction” (14). Moreover, “Salon culture included excursions, elegant dinners, surprise visits to friends in the country, scientific experiments, exchange of poems, impromptu games of verse composition, dramatic improvisations, concerts, and impassioned literary debates that made and unmade writers’ careers” (15-16). This is the context, I explain to students, within which Scudéry penned her celebrated romances and honed the art of conversation.

A devoted student of Scudéry, Arabella likewise excels at the art of rhetoric so expertly modeled by heroines such as Clélie and her companions. To frame our inquiry into Arabella’s rhetorical skill as well as her complex relationship to the conversation, we begin with Scudéry’s “On Speaking Too Much or Too Little, and How to Speak Well” in Donawerth and Strongson 105-17. Originally published in *Clélie*, this dialogue establishes the qualities of a “rational woman” whose coherence of heart and mind infuse her speech with particular power.
The concrete list of characteristics associated with effective speaking makes this dialogue an excellent starting point for evaluating Arabella as a speaker. This exercise works well on its own, as the basis of small- or large-group discussion, and is also beneficial when paired with, and applied to, individual conversations.

With the conversational ideals of salon culture thus in mind, I find it helpful to contextualize our discussion of Arabella’s rhetorical power by briefly reviewing some of her conversations, and thoughts on conversation, throughout the novel. Here, I begin by reminding students that The Female Quixote positions Arabella as a woman of incredible judgment and understanding, despite her quixotic disposition. We review how, time and again, Arabella exhibits a store of good sense and admirable quickness of wit that would be unusual even in a gentleman of her standing; as Sir Charles explains, “Arabella, when she was out of those Whims, was a very sensible young Lady” (Lennox 314). Thus, Arabella speaks as eloquently of Temple Stanyan’s Grecian History (81-83) as she does of Scudéry’s Clélia or Le Grand Cyrus, despite a predictable preference for the forms of romance. Together, we examine how Arabella is so thoroughly steeped in the subjects and modes of expression celebrated in salon culture that she chafes against the conversational customs of her social milieu. For example, Arabella eschews talk of “Fashions, Assemblies, Cards, or Scandal,” and finds herself “disgusted” by the “insipid Discourse” (Lennox 68, 361) of her companions. Instead, she longs for subjects commensurate with “high and noble Adventures” (Lennox 279), often drawing on Scudéry’s dialogues in her most rhetorically impressive moments, as when Sir Charles likens Arabella to an orator for her speech on raillery (267-69) or to a member of Parliament for her condemnation of indifference (310-11).

In order to help students gain a deeper appreciation for the distinctive, rather than derivative, qualities of Arabella’s dynamic borrowings from Scudéry, I then present them with the relevant excerpts on indifference and raillery from Clélia and Le Grand Cyrus, respectively, as well as from the corresponding conversations, “Against Indifference” and “Of Rallery.” Because of the relatively straightforward relationship among Arabella’s speech against indifference, the original speech in Clélia, and its afterlife in Conversations, we begin with Arabella’s defense of Glanville’s “vehemen[ce]” (vs. indifference) of temper, so unseemly to his sister, Charlotte (Lennox 310). I start by sketching, for students, the relevant background in Clélia (Part 2, Book 1, pp. 172-74). Damo, the “vertuous daughter of Pythagoras” (Clelia 173) and benefactor of Lucius Junius Brutus, makes an impassioned speech against indifference that serves as a near template for Arabella’s in The Female Quixote. Because this speech similarly
marks Damo’s first appearance in *Clélie*, it is also unusually easy to excerpt as Herminius provides a brief overview of Damo’s narrative on pages 173-74 that just happens to include the entirety of her speech against indifference. As Herminius relates, Damo’s condemnation of indifference takes the form a single, fiery speech that is essential to her fame: “she made one expression of Vertue which was very glorious” (*Clelia* 173). By contrast, the reimagined conversation, “Against Indifference,” though often as passionate as Damo’s original speech, nonetheless decentralizes the power of any individual speaker and thus dilutes the force of Damo’s passion; as a broad range of participants refine the central topic at length, it is no longer a question of Damo’s compelling glory. Thus, we explore the ways in which Damo’s speech in *Clélie*, by epitomizing the value of her wise counsel and virtuous political influence on Rome (via Brutus), exemplifies the sort of “glorious” reputation, here fueled by Damo’s passionate rhetoric, that Arabella seeks to cultivate for herself as a heroine. For Arabella, such passion is indistinguishable from notions of “true and heroick Virtue” (*Lennox* 310).

In light of our earlier discussion of the importance of Arabella’s inclination, I also take this opportunity to emphasize how Lennox’s deep investments in the heroic ethos of *Clélie* enable Arabella to embody a passionate femininity that is nonetheless virtuous as she advocates for a union of passion and virtue by championing “true and heroick Virtue” in the most passionate terms. Here, too, I remind students that the quality of chaste yet passionate femininity, also links Arabella with Henry Fielding’s Fanny, another challenge to Richardson’s redefinition of virtue familiar to students from *Joseph Andrews* (1742). To the extent that *Pamela* successfully reduces the complexity of female virtue, the form of the conversation is essential to Lennox’s project of reinvigorating the scope of female virtue post-*Pamela*.

Building on the example of her speech against indifference, I turn to Arabella’s critique of raillery in order to open additional, fertile ground for exploring her relationship to the authority of romance precedents and/or her allegiance to the culture of conversation so prevalent in the seventeenth-century salon. Because the original speech on raillery, in *Le Grand Cyrus*, is not so neatly packaged as Damo’s condemnation of indifference in *Clélie*, Arabella’s critique of raillery offers additional exciting opportunities to explore the ways in which Arabella synthesizes and evaluates her source material in order to speak authoritatively in her own milieu. In the context of the speech against indifference, Arabella advocates on Glanville’s behalf from the narrower perspective of an impassioned heroine. In her condemnation of raillery, however, she ascends to the height of instructor, as I explain, and thus demonstrates an even more impressive command...
of Scudéry’s rhetorical project. Arabella’s speech on raillery at once distills, as well as further refines, a much more complicated treatment of the topic that unfolds, in each version, after the manner of a robust philosophical dialogue. In this way, as Arabella corrects “the ill-judged Raillery of the young Beau” and his “very dangerous and unpleasing” “Species of Wit” (Lennox 267), I help students to see how she steps out of the role of heroine and into the role of philosopher/rhetorician best approximated, at a further textual remove, by the salonnière, Scudéry, herself.

Just as she does in her speech against indifference, Arabella borrows extensively in her speech against raillery. This time, she draws on the precepts outlined by Scudéry’s heroine, Euridamia, in Le Grand Cyrus, which Scudéry, in turn, reimagines in the conversation, “Of Rallery.”9 I begin by briefly introducing students to the character of Euridamia in Scudéry’s romance (Part 9, Book 3, pp. 139-143); a “kinswoman unto Solon,” she is a heroine distinguished for her “abundance of wit” and “sweet and pleasing spirit” (139). Urged by her companions Pisistrates, Cerinthe, and Theocrites to explore the subject of raillery, Euridamia advocates a consciously prosocial approach to humor that condemns malice. In order to help students appreciate Arabella’s use of Scudéry in her own critique of raillery, I remind them of the ways in which Euridamia actively models the egalitarian nature of salon culture by graciously indulging her companions while also decentralizing her own authority. Because raillery encompasses such a wide range of phenomena and is so difficult to do well, Pisistrates, joined by Cerinthe, “beseech[es]” Euridamia to follow in the footsteps of her famous father by laying down laws for raillery; however, Euridamia modestly declines because successful conversation is a firmly collaborative enterprise (Artamenes 142). In this way, I use the example of Arabella’s speech against raillery to help students identify the rhetorical strategies that distinguish Arabella from, even as they connect her to, various heroines. For, unlike Euridamia, who actively guides her companions in exploring the subject of raillery, Arabella deftly frames her intervention with the Beau as a necessary corrective from the outset: it requires no additional conversation or debate precisely because it is amply supported by existing romance, philosophical, and/or rhetorical precedent. Thanks to heroines like Euridamia, Arabella may confidently assert a definitive viewpoint that gains authority from Le Grand Cyrus even as she continues to refine and innovate upon her source material.10

We conclude our discussion by exploring one such example of innovation in which Arabella offers further refinements to Euridamia’s original conceptualizations of raillery in Le Grand Cyrus and “Of Rallery.” Toward the conclusion of her speech, Arabella incorporates a familiar image from Scudéry, in
which Euridamia compares the fire of raillery to shining, but harmless, stars. “I would have Raillery raise the Fancy, and quicken the Imagination,” Arabella declares, “the Fire of its Wit should only enable us to trace its Original, and shine as the Stars do, but not burn” (Lennox 268-69). However, Arabella also exceeds Euridamia’s image, enlarging the scope of Scudéry’s imaginative cosmology. Elaborating the basic simile, Arabella chooses “to pursue [the] Comparison,” declaring that “Persons who possess the true Talent of Raillery, are like Comets; they are seldom seen, and are at once admir’d and fear’d” (Lennox 269). By identifying the “true Talent of Raillery” with “Comets” (not just stars), Arabella celebrates the fame of heroines like herself (and her model, Euridamia), the rarely seen comet with its brightly blazing truth foregrounds the potential for individual glory so important to Arabella elsewhere in the novel. We conclude by exploring how the image of the blazing comet, “seldom seen,” is both a reminder of the difficulty of rallying well (a skill so rare as to produce a simultaneous response of fear and admiration) and a testament to its embodiment and success in Arabella, whose “inchainting Smile” (Lennox 269) invokes the charms of romance as well as the deeper powers of the imagination.

Notes

1 I recommend Donawerth and Strongson’s edition with the following major caveat: as Sharon Diane Nell and Aurora Wolfgang have subsequently indicated, Scudéry is not the author of the “Model Letters from ‘Amorous Letters.’” Instead, these letters belong to Jacques Du Bosc’s Nouveau recueil des lettres des dames de ce temps (1635). See Nell and Wolfgang, “Reclaiming the Works of Early Modern Women: Authorship, Gender, and Interpretation in the Nouveau recueil de lettres des dames de ce temps (1635)” pp. 1-16.

2 The editors translate Scudéry’s conversation, “De la raillerie,” as “On Wit” (117-139). Although “De la raillerie” originally appeared in Les conversations sur divers sujets (Paris, 1680, 2 vols), an earlier version of this dialogue was also published in Scudéry’s Artamène, ou le Grand Cyrus, Part 9, Book 3, pp. 139-43.

3 For an image of the “Carte de Tendre,” see Clelia. The unpaginated “Carte de Tendre” (labeled “Image 6”) is available just prior to the beginning of the narrative proper (Part 1, Book 1, p. 1).

4 As Joan DeJean notes in Tender Geographies, Clélie similarly anticipates the nineteenth-century “marriage d’inclination” (87) in France.

5 For a fuller treatment of this topic, see Nicole Horejsi, Novel Cleopatras: Romance Historiography and the Dido Tradition in English Fiction, 1688-1785, pp. 89-124.

6 Of the source texts, Donawerth and Strongson translate “De la Raillerie” from Conversations sur divers sujets (1680) as “On Wit” (117-139); however, they do not include the relevant excerpt from Le Grand Cyrus. For the dialogue on raillery in Le Grand Cyrus, see Part 9, Book 3, pp. 139-43. For a contemporary seventeenth-century translation of the dialogue on raillery from Conversations sur divers sujets, see “Of Raillery” in Scudéry’s Conversations upon several Subjects, vol. 2, pp. 70-116. For the conversation “Against Indifference,” which is not included in Donawerth and Strongson, see Conversations upon several Subjects, vol. 2, pp. 54-69. For the version originally published in Scudéry’s Clélie, see Clélie, Part 2, Book 1, pp. 172-174.

For a fuller discussion of Arabella’s desire for glory in relation to Clérie, see Horejsi, Novel Cleopatras, especially pp. 113-124.

In Scudéry’s Conversations upon several Subjects, vol. 2, pp. 70-116. In “Of Rallery,” Euridamia remains the principal speaker, but she is now joined by a different group of companions in the expanded dialogue.

Overall, I would argue that Arabella tends to be even more committed to a prosocial view than Scudéry; this, too, is a fascinating subject to explore by comparing and close reading specific excerpts of Arabella’s speech alongside Euridamia’s in Le Grand Cyrus and/or in “Of Rallery.”

Compare to Le Grand Cyrus (Part 9, Book 3, p. 142) and “On Wit” (128) respectively. See also “Of Rallery” in Scudéry’s Conversations upon several Subjects vol. 2, p. 94.
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