

Technologies of the Novel

Quantitative Data and the Evolution of
Literary Systems

Nicholas D. Paige



Technologies of the Novel

Based on a systematic sampling of nearly 2000 French and English novels from 1601 to 1830, this book's foremost aim is to ask precisely how the novel evolved. Instead of simply 'rising', as scholars have been saying for some sixty years, the novel is in fact a system in constant flux, made up of artifacts – formally distinct novel types – that themselves rise, only to inevitably fall. Nicholas D. Paige argues that these artifacts are technologies, each with traceable origins, each needing time for adoption (at the expense of already developed technologies) and also for abandonment. Like technological waves in more physical domains, the rises and falls of novelistic technologies don't happen automatically: writers invent and adopt literary artifacts for many diverse reasons. However, looking not at individual works but at the novel as a patterned system provides a startlingly persuasive new way of understanding the history and evolution of artforms.

NICHOLAS D. PAIGE, Professor of French at the University of California–Berkeley, is the author of *Before Fiction: The Ancien Régime of the Novel* (2011), awarded the 2013 ASECS Gottschalk prize, and *Being Interior: Autobiography and the Contradictions of Modernity* (2001). *Technologies of the Novel* was supported by a Guggenheim Fellowship.

Technologies of the Novel

Quantitative Data and the Evolution of Literary Systems

NICHOLAS D. PAIGE

University of California



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom

One Liberty Plaza, 20th Floor, New York, NY 10006, USA

477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia

314–321, 3rd Floor, Plot 3, Splendor Forum, Jasola District Centre, New Delhi – 110025, India

79 Anson Road, #06-04/06, Singapore 079906

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning, and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781108835503

DOI: [10.1017/9781108890861](https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108890861)

© Nicholas Paige 2021

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2021

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Paige, Nicholas D., 1966- author.

Title: Technologies of the novel: quantitative data and the evolution of literary systems / Nicholas D. Paige.

Description: New York: Cambridge University Press, 2020. | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2020024228 (print) | LCCN 2020024229 (ebook) | ISBN 9781108835503 (hardback) |

ISBN 9781108812849 (paperback) | ISBN 9781108890861 (ebook)

Subjects: LCSH: Fiction--History and criticism--Data processing. | French fiction--Research--Data processing. | English fiction--Research--Data processing.

Classification: LCC PN3331 .P33 2020 (print) | LCC PN3331 (ebook) | DDC 808.3--dc23

LC record available at <https://lccn.loc.gov/2020024228>

LC ebook record available at <https://lccn.loc.gov/2020024229a>

ISBN 978-1-108-83550-3 Hardback

ISBN 978-1-108-81284-9 Paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

*I dedicate this book to its most indefatigable supporters –
Becky Curry, for whom it may have seemed like a lifetime
coming; and Wyatt Paige, for whom it really has been.*

The segmentation of history is still an arbitrary and conventional matter, governed by no verifiable conception of historical entities and their durations. Now and in the past, most of the time the majority of people live by borrowed ideas and upon traditional accumulations, yet at every moment the fabric is being undone and a new one is woven to replace the old, while from time to time the whole pattern shakes and quivers, settling into new shapes and figures. These processes of change are all mysterious uncharted regions where the traveler soon loses direction and stumbles in darkness.

George Kubler, *The Shape of Time: Remarks on the History of Things* (1962)

Contents

List of Figures [page x]

Acknowledgments [xv]

Introduction [1]

PART I [15]

1 Truth Postures in the Novel of the Long Eighteenth Century [17]

2 The Rise and Fall of the Aristotelian Novel [41]

PART II [61]

3 Novel v. Romance I: Heliodorian Insetting [63]

4 Novel v. Romance II: The Fortunes of a Subtitle [79]

5 Novel v. Romance III: Measuring *Romans* and *Nouvelles* [91]

6 Documenticity I: Memoir Novels (and Other First Persons) [109]

7 Documenticity II: The Two Rises of the Epistolary Novel [125]

8 A “New” Third-Person Novel [138]

9 The Novel System in England, 1701–1810 [158]

PART III [175]

10 The Evolution of Narrative Technologies [177]

Annex: Premises and Protocols [203]

A Glossary of Novel Types [212]

Notes [215]

Bibliography [257]

Index [269]

Figures

- 1.1 Editorial pretense in Richardson and Rousseau [page 18]
- 1.2 Categories and subcategories of novels [22]
- 1.3 Novel types, 1681–1830 [26]
- 1.4 Nobody novels and somebody novels, 1681–1830 [27]
- 1.5 Truth status of nobody novels [28]
- 1.6 Truth status of real-world novels, 1681–1830 [29]
- 1.7 Temporal setting versus protagonist type [30]
- 1.8 Truth posture versus temporal setting in nobody novels (I) [31]
- 1.9 Truth posture versus temporal setting in nobody novels (II) [32]
- 1.10 Truth posture versus temporal setting in nobody novels (III) [32]
- 1.11 Nobody novels by narration type [33]
- 1.12 Pseudofactuality rates by narration type (I) [34]
- 1.13 Pseudofactuality rates by narration type (II) [35]
- 1.14 Invention rates by narration type (I) [36]
- 1.15 Invention rates by narration type (II) [36]
- 1.16 Pseudofactual variants [37]
- 2.1 Truth status of real-world novels, 1601–1750 [42]
- 2.2 Nobody novels and somebody novels, 1601–1750 [43]
- 2.3 Aristotelian novels by temporal setting (I) [44]
- 2.4 The temporality of Aristotelian historical novels [44]
- 2.5 Aristotelian novels by temporal setting (II) [45]
- 2.6 Aristotelian historical novels by protagonist type [46]
- 2.7 Historical novels [47]
- 2.8 The historicity of the French novel [48]
- 2.9 Truth postures of nobody novels (I) [49]
- 2.10 Temporal settings of nobody novels [50]
- 2.11 Truth claims in the nobody novel [51]
- 2.12 Truth postures of nobody novels (II) [52]
- 2.13 Temporal settings in the French novel [52]
- 2.14 Yearly novel production, 1601–1750 (estimates) [56]
- 3.1 Novels containing inset narratives [66]
- 3.2 Inset novel types [68]
- 3.3 Titled insets in Type 1 novels [71]

- 3.4 Inset novel types (breakdown I) [71]
- 3.5 Inset novel types (breakdown II) [72]
- 3.6 Inset novel types (breakdown III) [73]
- 3.7 Length of real-world novels (I) [76]
- 3.8 Length of real-world novels (II) [77]
- 3.9 Length of real-world novels (III) [78]
- 4.1 Novels subtitled *nouvelle* [82]
- 4.2 Novels titled or subtitled *roman* [83]
- 4.3 Novels subtitled *histoire* [85]
- 4.4 Median lengths of novels by subtitle [85]
- 4.5 Length of subtitled novels, standard deviation [86]
- 4.6 Inset novels by subtitle [87]
- 4.7 Variations of *nouvelle* [89]
- 4.8 Subtitle uniformity [89]
- 5.1 Distribution of novels by length, 1601–1750 [92]
- 5.2 *Romans* and *nouvelles* (I): criteria of length, inseting, and truth [95]
- 5.3 *Romans* and *nouvelles* (II): inseting and truth criteria only [96]
- 5.4 *Romans* and *nouvelles* (III): length and inseting criteria only [97]
- 5.5 *Romans* and *nouvelles* (IV): length and truth criteria only [98]
- 5.6 Counting *nouvelles* (I) [99]
- 5.7 Subtitled *nouvelles* by inset type, 1651–1750 [100]
- 5.8 Counting *nouvelles* (II) [101]
- 5.9 Subtitled *nouvelles* corresponding to formal criteria [102]
- 5.10 *Romans* and *nouvelles* [103]
- 5.11 US production of music albums, 1976–2000 [103]
- 6.1 Document novels (one calculation) [110]
- 6.2 Forms of first-person novels [111]
- 6.3 Varieties of document novels [113]
- 6.4 *Nouvelles* and documents [114]
- 6.5 Cumulative market share of *nouvelles* and document novels [115]
- 6.6 Document novels and the production of all novels [116]
- 6.7 Documenticity and the first-person novel [118]
- 6.8 Documenticity of the memoir novel [119]
- 6.9 Narrative person of inset narratives [121]
- 6.10 Real-world inset novels by narrative person, Types 1 and 2 combined (subsamples) [122]
- 6.11 First-person narration in the novel (estimates) [123]
- 7.1 Epistolary novels, 1601–1750 (permissive count) [126]
- 7.2 Epistolary novels, 1701–1830 [128]

- 7.3 Subject matter of pre-1751 epistolary novels (some permissive criteria) [129]
- 7.4 The rise and fall of the observational epistolary novel [130]
- 7.5 Epistolary novels of love [131]
- 7.6 Epistolary novels by subject matter [132]
- 7.7 Number of correspondents [133]
- 7.8 Epistolary novels by subject and correspondent type [134]
- 7.9 Documenticity of the epistolary novel [136]
- 7.10 Documenticity of memoir and epistolary novels [137]
- 8.1 Truth posture and narrative person [139]
- 8.2 Median length of nobody novels [140]
- 8.3 Median length of nobody novels by narrative type [140]
- 8.4 Major types of segmentation [142]
- 8.5 Chapterized novels by type [143]
- 8.6 Chapter title types [144]
- 8.7 Median length of third-person nobody novels [144]
- 8.8 Incipits of third-person novels [146]
- 8.9 Scene use in presentation of main action [148]
- 8.10 Third-person novels containing preliminaries [149]
- 8.11 Scene types (incipit position only) [149]
- 8.12 Three trends in third-person novels [150]
- 8.13 “Old” and “new” third-person novels (one scenario each) [151]
- 8.14 “Old” and “new” third-person novels (ten scenarios each) [152]
- 8.15 *Nouvelles* and “old” third-person novels [154]
- 8.16 Truth postures of third-person nobody novels by novel type, 1761–1800 [156]
- 8.17 Truth postures of third-person nobody novels by novel type, 1801–1830 [156]
- 9.1 Truth status of nobody novels (England) [159]
- 9.2 Major generic subtitles (England) [159]
- 9.3 Nonepistolary first-person forms (England) [161]
- 9.4 Epistolary novels (England and France) [162]
- 9.5 Truth postures of epistolary novels (England) [163]
- 9.6 Chapterized novels (England) [164]
- 9.7 Median length of real-world third-person novels (England and France) [165]
- 9.8 Scenes (incipit position only, England) [166]
- 9.9 “Old” and “new” third-person novels (England) [167]
- 9.10 “Old” and “new” third-person novels (averaged scenarios, England and France) [167]

- 9.11 Truth postures of third-person novels by novel type, 1751–1810 (England) [169]
- 9.12 Yearly novel production (estimated, England and France) [171]
- 9.13 Yearly novel production in words (estimated, logarithmic scale; England and France) [172]
- 10.1 *Nouvelles*, Aristotelian versus nobody (“new loosest scenario”) [189]
- 10.2 Aristotelian novels by period of subject matter [189]
- 10.3 Aristotelian novels by inset type [190]
- 10.4 Truth status of “unspecified” novels [192]
- 10.5 “Unspecified” and Aristotelian novels [192]
- 10.6 The major novelistic artifacts [193]
- A.1 Items retained and reasons for exclusions (1601–1700 and 1751–1800) [207]
- A.2 Composition of sample (France) [208]
- A.3 Composition of sample (England) [209]
- A.4 Market penetration of French epistolary novels (two estimates) [210]

Acknowledgments

The “monograph”: theoretically it is a book on one subject, but to me the word always suggests the solitary toil of much humanities scholarship. While this was again the case here, I had a more-than-usual number (for me) of helpers. Many were undergraduates as well as graduates from my home institution (UC Berkeley), willing to learn the project’s tagging protocols; having to subsequently verify their work didn’t subtract a bit from the pleasure and profit of working with them. Many thanks, then, to the students of French 24 (Fall 2016) and French 245 (Fall 2015). An additional shout-out is due to a series of undergraduate research apprentices from 2012 and 2013 who were involved in an abortive attempt to tag for free indirect discourse; of these, Marisa Mito agreed to dedicate some of her time abroad after graduation to learning far more about the novels of 1828 than anyone should really have to. Additional tagging assistance was provided by Ty Blakeney, Lauren Dixon, Jonathan Haddad, David Rafoni, Trevor Sanders, and Travis Wilds. In Lausanne, Timothée Lécho expertly retrieved the necessary data from the one-of-a-kind works housed in the Bibliothèque du Château d’Oron. A number of interlocutors from Berkeley’s D-Lab helped me convince myself that my project wasn’t hopelessly misconceived from a “digital” and statistical point of view: thanks especially to Chris Hench, Scott McGinnis, Tom Piazza, and Claudia von Vacano. I also extend my deep gratitude to a number of scholars who have supported the project in different ways, often by making me sharpen my points. These include Oliver Arnold, David Bates, John Bender, Mathilde Bombart, the late Ross Chambers, Margaret Cohen, Melanie Conroy, Paul Dawson, Monika Fludernik, Elaine Freedgood, Alexandre Gefen, Benjamin Gittel, Marie-Hélène Huet, Vicky Kahn, Joshua Landy, Françoise Lavocat, Mairi McLaughlin, Franco Moretti, Brad Pasanek, Adrien Paschoud, Guillaume Peureux, Jonathan Sheehan, Rebecca Spang, Philip Stewart, James Grantham Turner, and Geoffrey Turnovsky. And Simon DeDeo provided a reference I don’t know how I would have been able to do without. A fellowship from the John Simon Guggenheim foundation bought crucial time away from other professional responsibilities.

Introduction

This book is about the evolution of French and to a lesser degree English novels – by which I mean French- and English-language novels – from 1601 to 1830. And while *evolution* is very much at the center of my preoccupations, I do not offer a “story” about that evolution. There is no plot, as we might want if we thought of the novel moving forward, perhaps from birth, episode by episode, toward a resolution, some happy state of stability – as if, in other words, the novel’s own history could be made into a kind of novel. Accordingly, there are no characters, either: no starring roles or cameo appearances for individual novels or novelists, lending a hand to the genre on its long journey. In fact, for reasons I will explain, I even doubt that there exists an entity, “the novel,” that evolves. So when I say “the novel” or “the French (or English) novel,” I do so not ontologically (as if this abstraction somehow had a kind of being) but pragmatically: the novel is a set of diverse practices grouped together based on shared traits, uses, and functions. So it’s important to keep in mind that there is no one “thing” out there whose story we can (but really shouldn’t) tell, because the novel is better thought of as a *system* of things: a system of literary artifacts.

In lieu of a story, *Technologies of the Novel* offers a quantitative account of the ceaseless yet patterned flux of the novel system over these twenty-three decades. But to give this brief description meaning, to explain why the whole project is not merely an inevitable consequence of enthusiasm for all things quantitative and digital, I need to give a brief account of my dissatisfaction – which is a methodological dissatisfaction – with previous histories of the novel. For the purposes of this introduction, I will for the most part keep accusations general: specific disagreements with scholars of the novel will become clear enough in the rest of the book. I propose, rather, a kind of caricature – hopefully recognizable – designed to highlight features of the historiography of the novel that I believe we have naturalized.¹

The novel, we’re often told, is the modern genre par excellence. Little wonder, then, that histories of the novel in England and France almost inevitably amount to modernity stories: they retrace not only the birth of a “new species of writing” (to use the language of more than one

early observer) but also, and more crucially, the homologous process by which purportedly traditional worldviews – identities, subjectivities, epistemologies, governmentalities – were replaced by our own. The history of the novel is the history of how Then became Now, of Them becoming Us. Oft-told, the tale is also, therefore, two-poled – with, in between, a rich “period of transition,” corresponding to the novel’s proverbial rise over the course of the long eighteenth century.

Modernity narratives such as this do not and cannot recognize the manifest complexity of the cultural archive. Rather, they want to make it go away, to convert the diversity of practices – a diversity that is synchronic as well as diachronic – into epiphenomenal noise. That noise is said to mask the profound cohesion characterizing a given epoch, ruled by what Michel Foucault famously called an “episteme”: a kind of template that organizes all knowledge production over a certain period of time. Whence the widespread idiom, also associated with Foucault, according to which such-and-such concretely observable discursive phenomenon is said to be *made possible* (or *thinkable*) by the invisible but all-powerful cause that is the episteme. Furthermore, and to more marvelous effect, this type of analysis reveals that discourses which to the untrained eye might appear unrelated or even at odds are in fact profoundly connected. And the more unexpected the connection, the more marvelous the effect.

Too often in histories of the novel, then, the cultural archive is not a disparate mass of stuff made by a variety of human actors operating under divergent and ever-changing constraints and motivations. Rather, it’s a kind of text whose individual parts are all there for a reason – much like high schoolers are still taught, via trickle-down New Criticism, that no element of a poem or novel is insignificant. Everything fits together, provided you know how to read the signs. And indeed, rise-of-the-novel studies take individual cultural products like novels as signs. In this critical idiom, novels are now no longer autonomous signifying systems (like the New Critical poem was) but have become parts of the much larger signifying system that is Culture. (Thus, the implication of Stephen Greenblatt’s preferred name for New Historicism, “Cultural Poetics”: all discourse has in effect become a huge poem. New Historicism is a New Criticism writ very large.²) Culture can be grasped through the work, but not in the banal sense that the work might be said to be a particularly fine example of a period’s or place’s preoccupations. Instead of being the visible part of a visible whole – shorthand or synecdoche – the work functions much more mysteriously as a clue to an *invisible* wholeness (a wholeness traversed, like that of the New Critical poem, by tensions and paradox).

Modernity is the common name for the invisible wholeness. In rise-of-the-novel studies, individual novels clue us in on a process of change: the slow revolution, not necessarily grasped consciously by the writer, that turns the foreign wholeness of the premodern into the familiar wholeness of now. The fact that modernity is often viewed critically – things were better before! – makes no difference: busters and boosters share the same methodological premises. And canonicity itself isn't my beef: unless we change our premises, it won't help to study more novels, or novels by the Others of literary history. The reason so many historians of the rise of the novel are content with just a few texts isn't merely habit and convenience. Rather, a few texts are all you need if those texts just happen to be *magical* – magical, because they are privileged links with the world of true causes. The job of such critics is to follow the wormholes threading between the objects of the phenomenal world and the world beyond. That's amazing: who wouldn't want to be part of such a critical journey? And it's comforting: we can rest again, no longer in the hands of God but now in the bosom of Culture, which, even if we hate it, at least makes sense.

Of course, all histories of the novel don't operate *precisely* like this, even when they are indeed modernity stories: sometimes, after all, it's held that people – great writers and thinkers – are actively responsible for bringing modernity into existence. It's a particularly common view of cultural evolution, of course. Great individuals drive things forward with their great works. They break the mold, disrupt the status quo, change the paradigm: with X, the novel is born; with Y, the novel becomes truly modern; after Z, the novel will never be the same again. The individual creates, and other individuals, now all drones or epigones, imitate. Until by some miracle someone again emerges from the crowd to shake us out of our collective torpor, our enslavement to genre or tradition. This position appears staid than the idea that literary works are surface effects of an invisible cause, and in a way the conceptions are incompatible. Yet in practice the two get along just fine, because the greatness of individual writers is simply rewritten as their uncanny sensitivity to the subterranean cultural transformations of the moment. Hence, we manage to have our cake and eat it too, making deep Culture our subject while staying within the comfort zone delimited by a few fetishized, often taught figures.

Technologies of the Novel is designed to break completely with the assumptions I've just caricatured. It is not a modernity tale: as I said at the outset, this book offers no characters, no plot leading to Now. Nor is it an antimodernity tale, claiming, as some have, that we supposed moderns are just going through the archetypal motions.³ *Technologies of the Novel* is,

instead, an a-modern study: a study of the novel that simply puts aside the category of the modern. Not of *novelty*: novelty exists. But unlike modernity, it does not arrive just once. It is constantly being generated by our innovative species. We are always creating new artifacts, among which are novels. The novel, I will ultimately argue, can be profitably compared to the engine, the telephone, or the toilet: it's not one "thing" that is constantly changing, it's actually an array of discrete artifacts made into a family not because they share DNA but by dint of a shared function within a given culture.

Novels, then, are artifacts created by human beings. The proposition's banality stands in stark contrast to the rhetoric adopted by typical histories of the genre, where the novel invariably does a lot of heavy, world-historical lifting. I'm not, of course, denying the global impact of certain successful artifacts: the gun, the shipping container, the noodle, among the hundreds we can choose from – including, arguably, the novel itself. But acknowledging this is quite different from claiming that novels – or guns, noodles, and shipping containers – are of a piece with a more massive and all-pervasive transformation that is the advent of modernity. In common parlance, or maybe just the idiom popularized by Fredric Jameson, we speak of the "logic" of cultural phenomena, that is, of the way that they are profoundly imbricated with one another and with the realm of true causes (usually, Capitalism).⁴ But looking for the hidden "logic" comes down to noting patterns and resemblances, which sometimes mean something, but more often don't. Don Quixote, according to the Foucault of *The Order of Things*, was the last representative of the Renaissance episteme, still stuck in a world of analogy and resemblance – "a diligent pilgrim," Foucault describes him, "breaking his journey before all the marks of similitude."⁵ But how can Quixote's adventures put an end to "the old interplay between resemblance and signs" when we still have literary historians? Rise-of-the-novel studies sees giants – Modernity, Capitalism, the Individual – where by a more sober reckoning there are just windmills: technological artifacts.

This is a taunt, but it's also a proposition about how we could start to think about the novel. What would a technological understanding of literary evolution look like? For starters, and as I've hinted, it would speak of "the novel" only as shorthand for a system of objects serving roughly the same purpose. Those objects themselves would be seen as formal artifacts that are not historically stable. First, because they need to be invented: they cannot simply arise in sympathy with the "logic" of their historical moment. And invention is in fact a process, since successful artifacts cannot emerge fully formed from the head of their inventor. Just as the internal combustion engine, say, is still going through considerable refinements, various novelistic

artifacts – say, the epistolary novel – actually need to be “worked on” by their users: tinkered with, adapted, sometimes repurposed. And just as the windmill, once abandoned by the industrialized West, can stage a comeback as a “green” electricity generator, novelistic artifacts can also be exhumed and made to do new things. When I speak of the evolution of “the novel,” then, I really mean the evolution of all these types of novels – a systemic evolution. Thus, we really have two different sorts of evolution, which, as I will eventually argue, may be evolutionary in a different way: one occurs at the level of the artifact (the windmill), another at the level of the system of artifacts (power production).

If the comparison between novels and windmills is useful – I’ll raise much later the question of whether it is merely an analogy – then “the novel” is indeed a system of discrete and evolving artifacts. The epistolary novel, the memoir novel, the third-person “omniscient” novel we associate with the realist nineteenth century: these are some of the novel’s many technologies that compete with and relay one another over the course of its history. Technologies, not genres. Whereas genres are usually thought of in terms of their contents, technologies are formal arrangements. “Genre” suggests a segmentation of a logical whole, or distinct pieces of the puzzle that is literature; technologies can be adapted for many various and sometimes contradictory purposes – moral uplift, but also pornography. Genres may be something close to Northrop Frye’s archetypal modes or else the mere generational blips described by Franco Moretti;⁶ technologies need time to develop and spread, as well as to fall into disuse, which they almost always do.

Like any technology, the technologies of the novel do not develop on their own, either naturally or in accordance with the internal imperative of “working better” than previous artifactual iterations. “The ‘working’ and ‘nonworking’ of an artifact,” writes one Science and Technology Studies scholar, “are socially constructed assessments, rather than intrinsic properties of the artifact.”⁷ Indeed, modern Science and Technology Studies, with its strongly constructivist bent, has been formulated to counter an earlier history of technology, one that insisted on the implacable necessity of innovation – human inventiveness as driven by the fulfillment of fundamental biological needs, and driving toward the advancement of humanity. But “progress” is a term with only relative meaning: it must be understood, writes George Basalla, “within very restricted technological, temporal, and cultural boundaries and according to a narrowly specified goal.”⁸ Thinking along these lines rids us of the temptation to map formal change in the novel onto deep “shifting paradigms.” Partly, there’s just way too much formal change for that: if each of the successive formal waves

I will be talking about needed a paradigm for a cause, “paradigm” would be stripped of the momentous importance that makes it a popular term to begin with. No, novelistic artifacts are just things invented by humans in accordance with their values – values that themselves are always changing, so that the form that works in 1780 may not work as well in 1820.

Though I’m going to postpone until the last chapter a more detailed exploration of how Science and Technology Studies may relate to literary history, one further “technological” point needs to be made. People ceaselessly produce novel artifacts, but they can’t produce any artifact at any time. That is, the artifacts they produce – in accordance with their perceived needs or possibly just because their culture prizes innovation for its own sake – have to come from somewhere. One novelistic artifact that will figure in this book is third-person, “omniscient” novels about protagonists whose literal existence is a matter of indifference: this is more or less the type of novel one thinks of as “the classic nineteenth-century novel.” One obvious reason people don’t write such novels in the seventeenth century is because their values are different. That is only one reason, however. Another is that third-person omniscient novels with fictional protagonists need to be invented: they evolve from something else that isn’t present in the seventeenth century. Our practices, therefore, are *materially* as well as axiologically constrained. “Whenever we encounter an artifact, no matter what its age or provenance, we can be certain that it was modeled on one or more preexisting artifacts,” writes Basalla, who dubs this change-within-continuity “the stream of made things.”⁹ This, of course, is why it makes sense to speak in terms of evolution and not just plain “change”: evolution is *constrained* change.¹⁰

Material constraints, axiological constraints, but not, I think, epistemological constraints: it’s really to confuse the matter to say that a nineteenth-century artifact is – to return again to the vocabulary popularized by Foucault – “unthinkable” two centuries earlier. People don’t invent this or that form of the novel because the episteme has shifted, or because some new notion of personhood is ascendant or because that novel synchs with the logic of capitalism. Their new practices derive from a ceaseless interaction between their values (conscious and unconscious) and the material constraints placed on them by the old artifacts they have at their disposal; the new artifacts then help to create new values and desires; and so on and so forth. That some of those values involve personhood or capitalism or what counts as knowledge – obviously. But they are just values, not worldviews, *Zeitgeists*, or conceptual orders.

Technologies of the Novel has some broad claims to make about shifts in values over the nearly two hundred and fifty years studied here, along

with lots of little claims about the rises and falls of individual artifacts. And as I've just suggested, it also makes the more general proposal that the evolution of these artifacts is best understood as properly technological. It avoids, however, causal claims: it is a dangerous business, I think, to try to pin specific formal swerves to whatever sociopolitical events happen to occur within their vicinity (the absolutist court, the Revolution), or to link a form to a given socioeconomic group (the military aristocracy in steady eclipse, the ever-rising bourgeoisie), or to explain it as the material symptom of an emerging ideology (the exchange economy, the liberal subject). On the one hand, the sheer historical elasticity of most of these purported "causes" makes for a situation in which they can be wheeled in to explain whatever is in need of explanation. On the other, there is the standard danger of taking correlation for causation. Correlations are everywhere, especially for humans trained as hermeneuts, that is, trained to make meaning out of patterns in artworks. All correlations are not necessarily red herrings, of course. For instance, it may well be true that certain forms of the novel are practiced more in the provinces or abroad than in the capital, or that others are practiced more by male aristocrats than by bourgeois women. Unfortunately, to conscientiously weigh the merits of such associations would require data I have not attempted to gather. This book is by design a largely descriptive account of a cultural system's behavior. Customary histories of the novel have made for a situation in which we really don't know some very basic facts about that history: if novels lengthen or shorten over time, how many of them in the eighteenth century take the form of first-person memoirs, what proportion, in the 1670s, have historical settings – that sort of thing. So just because I don't talk about reasons for formal change doesn't mean that I hold that literature evolves on its own or that writers are writers only and not also social animals turning around and around in the cage that is historical context. Such a position would be ludicrous. I assume that values both literary and extraliterary are behind what people read and write, that those values are ever-changing, and that all people at any given moment don't share the same ones. To the extent that I do ask "why," I focus the question on the patterns discernable in the record of the artifactual evolution of the novel.

The urge to study literature as a large system is very much associated with certain branches of Digital Humanities: Moretti calls it distant reading; Matthew Jockers, macro-analysis.¹¹ While the scale, in *Technologies of the Novel*, is very much macro and distant, in other respects this study has not been produced with the typical Digital Humanities toolkit – word searches, collocation studies, and the like. Instead, I analyze "metadata" that I myself

have created through the hands-on, passably old-world manner of consulting novels (physically or digitally) that I categorize and measure according to a number of formal features. The many graphs in this book come from these “tags” and measurements: basically, I’m counting, and counting relatively small numbers. The properly *digital* nature of this process can be debated. Arguably, no one thing that I do here couldn’t have been done by analogue means a hundred years ago. On the other hand, digitization of primary sources and above all the invention of the ubiquitous yet still magical spreadsheet have enabled me to undertake a project that otherwise would have required considerably more travel and untold hours of calculation and graphing. Even if the only algorithms I’ve used are the ones most computer-users have gotten used to – the ones running silently in the background of our garden-variety applications – they are just as indispensable and every bit as “digital” as the more exotic tools now also available: Latent Dirichlet Allocation, a topic modeling algorithm; measurements of Kullback–Leibler divergence; the text analysis environments of DocuScope and WordHoard; and the Google Ngram Viewer.¹²

Technologies of the Novel is, then, digital and distant; but it is most certainly not antianalogue or anticlose. All literary interpretation isn’t “magical”; all meaning is not on the surface; individual works can indeed be shown to be representative of wider practices and ideologies; the canon may in many cases be a good proxy for the archive. And quantitative methods are not intrinsically more “scientific” than those of close reading: I want more data about the history of the novel, but how different is this from a scholar directing attention to understudied aspects of *Middlemarch* in the hopes of arriving at a better understanding of George Eliot’s art? Those previously invisible passages are data too. And we want rich data not because at a longed-for level of richness it will reveal the truth to us, or make the humanities truly scientific. More modestly, the richer our data, the more our explanations are *constrained* – thus reducing the risk of critical whimsy – and the more probable and convincing they become. In my opinion, rise-of-the-novel criticism has been data-poor and thus largely unconstrained: it is a relatively simple matter to come up with explanations – even ingenious explanations – when one has only to correlate a few carefully chosen elements.

Most researchers want rich data, but of course there are always practical limits, digital tools or no. *Technologies of the Novel* traces decade-to-decade changes over nearly two and a half centuries of the novel’s so-called rise. Yet while we have excellent or at least serviceable bibliographies covering this considerable span, I have not tagged *all* novels produced during this

period. Rather, I've tagged a sample of each decade's production, according to a procedure I discuss in detail in the Annex. Very briefly, the figures given for a decade are estimates derived from a consultation of all available novels published for the first time in given years of that decade – for example, years 7, 8, and 9. ("Available" means slightly different things for the English novel than for the French; this too is explained in the Annex.) The number of given years varies according to the production since low populations need heavier sampling than larger populations. For most of the span, I have examined more than half of all novels published, sometimes eighty percent or more. The total corpus, English and French, contains approximately two thousand novels. In our era of Big Data, researchers' aspirations often gravitate immediately to huge data sets; yet as a practical matter, sampling can provide nearly as much information as a census.

More important than the sampling procedure itself, however, is the population sampled. In this matter, too, the Annex provides more detailed justifications, but some basic orientation is necessary up front. After all, what is a novel in the first place? How do novels differ from biographies, histories, travel narratives, and so on? It's an unavoidable question, to which I give both a pragmatic answer and an age-old philosophical (more precisely, Aristotelian) answer: a novel is a work classified by previous bibliographers as a novel, and a novel is a plotted narrative. (I use the latter criterion to weed out disparate works included by bibliographers who deliberately sought to cast a very wide net.) More important, perhaps, is a second question: what constitutes the *system* of novels? Those being published for the first time only, thus giving a series in which each point has equal value? Or should we attempt to assay the "footprint" of individual novels – by paying more attention (but how much?) to those being reedited, translated, exported, anthologized, mentioned by other writers, featured in circulating libraries, or published in the cultural center – Paris and London – as opposed to, say, in Nantes and Edinburgh?¹³ And shouldn't foreign novels being translated into French or English be part of the system? Obviously, many choices are possible; equally obviously, some of them are trickier than others to implement. And some are potentially deforming: studying only republished works – works with a history of success – is tantamount to doing a history of innovation using "winners" alone. By contrast, I am interested in losers as well, being mindful that many winners were for a time losers, in the sense that the commercial successes of given forms – say, the memoir novel – were preceded by a lot of mostly anonymous failure. For a form to "work," a series of people need to work on that form. In this account, what loses or wins – or wins and then loses, since formal dominance doesn't last forever – is measured by counting the

number of individual new products (novels) that incorporate a given formal trait. *Technologies of the Novel* is not, therefore, a study of consumption; but the one-sided nature of my focus is more apparent than real, assuming that over the long term the choices of producers can never be independent of the choices of consumers. The premise, then, is that there must be some sort of (probably imperfect) feedback loop, whereby the reception of artifacts (partially) determines subsequent production. In this study, the population of novels for any decade – which I refer to as “novel production” or “the novel market” – is made up of first-time publications of works originally written in French (or English, in the chapter dealing with cross-Channel developments). This choice, which is pragmatic in addition to being motivated by the intellectual considerations I’ve just laid out, should not be taken to imply that there are not other ways to measure the novel’s production and the success and failure of its forms (and I heartily encourage others to pursue them).

But why should we think that a formal analysis of the novel market would be interesting in the first place? The systemic and quantitative focus of this book derives not from my perception of an abstract “need” for a history of the novel commensurate with our digital moment, but because I had a question that I could not answer otherwise. Scholars started to raise the question about a hundred years ago: why did many novelists in the eighteenth century pretend their novels were literally true? In the last few decades, a number of influential solutions have been put forth (mostly for England), all arguing in one way or another that the modern (English) fictional novel resulted from a conceptual change whose history leads back to eighteenth-century truth pretense. In my last book, I set out to follow in their path and give an account that extended to France the argument about what Catherine Gallagher has famously called “the rise of fictionality.”¹⁴ The writing of that book, however, undid my confidence in the method, which involved the type of magical reading I’ve just critiqued (no doubt with the zeal of the convert). And while I was able, in an eleventh-hour recalibration, to avoid reading my carefully selected base texts as windows onto an invisible conceptual change, the result was that I knew I hadn’t answered the question. For to even approach the question of *why*, we need to know *what* happened (which we didn’t): how far back did the truth pretense go? How were novels written before it? When popular, how many novelists used it and how many didn’t? Did it fade away quickly or was it stubbornly persistent? The only way of answering such first-order questions is by looking at a lot more novels, yes, but more crucially, by looking at them *systematically*, in roughly the manner I have described. Examples and counterexamples, no matter how doggedly we multiply them, can never prove a trend. The whole point of cherry picking

is to get pleasing cherries, not to know just how rare those cherries are. If you want to know what else is in the bin, you have to empty it out.

The ten chapters of this study are split into three parts.

Part I tackles head-on the problem of the truth pretense to which I have just referred. **Chapter 1** covers that pretense over the period in which previous scholarship has repeatedly (albeit vaguely) located its heyday and its eventual decline – the years 1681–1830. And while previous scholarship did at least get the “decline” part right – truth claims more or less disappear over those years – it turns out that a systematic study of the archive reveals crucial complications. On the one hand, the replacement of truth claims with the acknowledgement of what some might label “fiction” simply doesn’t occur on a timetable that would support any of the explanations traditionally offered. On the other, it becomes easy to see that truth claims themselves have a history, and that that history does not at all correspond to the hazy assertion (also made by previous scholars) that the “true story” novel was some sort of dialectical reaction against an earlier fanciful novel, one that frequently goes by the name of romance. **Chapter 2** therefore backtracks to 1601, examining the rise of the truth pretense (which will later fall) as well as an earlier rise (and fall), that of novels with various sorts of historical subject matter. Taken together, the chapters of this section describe, then, a succession of three dominant truth strategies or postures: the Aristotelian novel (which takes known individuals as its subject matter), the pseudofactual novel (which asserts the literal existence of protagonists of whom no one has heard), and the invented – possibly “fictional” – novel (which is indifferent as to the literal existence of its protagonists).

Three truth postures over nearly 250 years: that is relatively slow change, and indeed, the two postures I am able to track completely (the Aristotelian and the pseudofactual) take over one hundred years each to come and go. However distinct I believe these postures to be from one another, that distinction comes from their subject matter rather than their form. An understanding of the evolution at work needs to take in more artifactual dimensions. To give an example: Aristotelian novels can take the form of long third-person novels featuring interlocking first-person inset narratives; or – essentially at a different moment – they can be much shorter third-person narratives with little to no inseting. Such artifactual forms, however, are not chained to a given truth posture: short third-person narratives with little to no inseting are also found with pseudofactual postures. The microchapters of **Part II** describe these artifacts and their cycling, a cycling that only imperfectly overlaps with the truth postures examined in **Part I**. Five major artifacts retain my attention. Two I’ve just mentioned – the short, minimally inset form known as the *nouvelle*, and the long, inset novel