

“Reflection and Revision in the Novels of Frances Burney”

Hilary Havens

Department of English

McGill University, Montreal

August 2012

A thesis submitted to McGill University in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

© Hilary Havens 2012

Table of Contents

Abstract	2
Acknowledgements	4
Introduction	7
Chapter 1 – <i>Evelina</i>: Reflections on “faultless Monsters” and Faulty Mentors	31
Chapter 2 – <i>Cecilia</i>: From “<i>unhuman happiness</i>” to “cheerfullest resignation”	62
Chapter 3 – <i>Camilla</i>: Revising the “prose Epic”	94
Chapter 4 – <i>The Wanderer</i>: Reviews and Revisions	143
Chapter 5 – <i>Caleb Williams</i> and <i>Persuasion</i>: Revised Endings and Dangerous Reflections	179
Afterword: Beyond Burney	212
Appendix: Frances Burney’s Novel Manuscripts, Proofs, and Later Revisions and their Locations	215
Bibliography	216

Abstract

“Reflection and Revision in the Novels of Frances Burney” constitutes the only comprehensive portrait of this major author as novelist at work (active 1778-1832), incorporating analysis of her revisions in manuscripts, proofs, and subsequent editions. Burney’s *Evelina*, *Cecilia*, and *Camilla* are among a very small number of eighteenth-century novels with surviving manuscript drafts. The term “revision” is thus essential for my study, and I use it to describe Burney’s process of composition, which is closely connected to the other key term in my study, “reflection.” Reflection, a reflexive act often synonymous with self-awareness, is an important characteristic of the novel of development, or *Bildungsroman*, and Burney is mindful of the term’s philosophical roots. In chapters devoted to each of Burney’s four novels, I trace the tropes of revision and reflection, which often indicate the necessary process of repentance and reform that Burney’s heroines must undergo before the end of her novels. Burney’s eponymous heroines are transformed between the different editions of her novels: *Evelina* becomes slightly more mature; *Cecilia* loses some of her hasty sarcasm; *Camilla*, remarkably, becomes more thoughtful; and Burney’s mysterious heroine from *The Wanderer* becomes less secretive. The final chapter of my dissertation goes beyond Burney to discuss the drafts and later editions of William Godwin’s *Caleb Williams* and Jane Austen’s *Persuasion*, as my archival and contextual work on Burney’s novels opens up a new interpretive framework through which late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century novelists with surviving manuscripts, proof drafts, and published revisions can be understood.

Abrégé

« Réflexion et révision dans les romans de Frances Burney » constitue le seul tableau complet de cette importante auteure (productive de 1778 à 1832). Je présente une analyse de ses révisions dans les manuscrits, les épreuves, et les éditions subséquentes. Ses romans, *Evelina*, *Cecilia*, et *Camilla*, sont parmi un très petit nombre de romans du dix-huitième siècle dont le manuscrit existe encore. Le mot « révision » est donc essentiel pour mon étude, et je l'utilise pour décrire le processus d'écriture de Burney. Ce mot est étroitement associé avec l'autre mot important de mon étude, soit « réflexion. » Réflexion, défini comme étant un acte réfléchi, est souvent synonyme de connaissance de soi. C'est une importante caractéristique du roman de formation ou *Bildungsroman*. Burney est attentive aux origines philosophiques de ce mot. Dans les chapitres consacrés à chacun des romans de Burney, je poursuis les thèmes de révision et de réflexion, qui indiquent souvent le processus de repentance et de réforme suivi par les héroïnes de Burney avant la conclusion du roman. Les héroïnes éponymes sont transformées au cours des différentes éditions de ses romans : Evelina devient plus mûre; Cecilia perd de son sarcasme précipité; Camilla, remarquablement, devient plus pensive; et l'héroïne mystérieuse de *The Wanderer* devient moins secrète. Le dernier chapitre de ma thèse va au-delà de Burney pour discuter des manuscrits et des éditions de *Caleb Williams*, par William Godwin, et de *Persuasion*, par Jane Austen. Ma technique d'analyse des romans de Burney, qui incorpore des recherches documentaires au contexte littéraire, ouvre une nouvelle base interprétative qui permet une meilleure compréhension des romanciers des dix-huitième et dix-neuvième siècles dont les manuscrits, épreuves et éditions révisées existent encore.

Acknowledgements

My dissertation has been a project in the making ever since I took Lynn Festa's "Women in the Novel to Jane Austen" class in the fall of 2004. James Engell and Eric Iidsvoog from Harvard University and Freya Johnston from Oxford University have been excellent mentors in my early studies of Burney and the eighteenth century.

I refer to a large amount of archival material in my dissertation, and I am indebted to a number of librarians and libraries across the world for their aid in finding materials. The special collections and manuscripts librarians at the British Library and the Houghton Library have been very helpful. I'd like to acknowledge in particular Anne Garner, Stephen Crook, and Rebecca Filner, who were nothing but kind and generous during my many visits to the Berg Collection at the New York Public Library.

I would like to thank the librarians at McGill University, especially Ann-Marie Holland in the rare books department and the whole Interlibrary Loans staff. I'd also like to extend a special thanks to Allan Hepburn, for coming to the rescue with the only identified Canadian copy of a little-known, but important article.

McGill University has been a wonderful place to study eighteenth-century British literature and Frances Burney. I have been fortunate to belong to the English department, home to some of the nicest and brightest professors, graduate students, and undergraduates in the world. I am fortunate, as well, to have had a work space in the Burney Centre, located in the McLennan Library.

I have nothing but gratitude for my colleagues at the Burney Centre over the past four years: Elaine Bander, Laura Cameron, Stefanie Cardarelli, Noelle Gallagher, Katie Gemmill, Joanne Holland, Anna Lewton-Brain, Holly Luhning, Sarah Skoronski, and

Laurence Williams. I'd also like to particularly acknowledge Stewart Cooke, my desk neighbor, who is always on hand to answer questions about Burney's life and share pleasant conversation. This is one of the best places in the world to study the eighteenth century.

I am also indebted to various conversations I have shared with other Burneyites, including Elaine Bander, Louise Curran, Jan Fergus, Marilyn Francus, Fiona Ritchie, Betty Schellenberg, and members and participants at the Burney Society conferences and ASECS Burney panels.

Two of my committee members, David Hensley and Tom Mole, generously read and commented on sections of my dissertation shortly before initial submission. My great friend and colleague, Sarah Skoronski, read a couple of my chapters as well and provided invaluable feedback. I'd also like to thank Emily Carson for answering some small philosophical queries. My committee, composed of Professors Hensley, Mole, Carson, Ned Schantz, and especially Jane Spencer from the University of Exeter, provided invaluable suggestions for revisions.

Je veux remercier mon équipe de traducteurs formidables, Marie Legroulx, ma belle-mère Camille Marcotte et André Marcotte.

Above all, I am grateful to my supervisor Peter Sabor for his generosity and patience over the past four years. Little did he suspect that his answer to an email of 30 September 2005 from a young, keen American undergraduate would lead to so much work. He has fearlessly guided me through the dissertation process and continually pushes me to improve and polish my writing. I could not have had a better supervisor, mentor, and friend.

My family and friends have been very supportive throughout this whole process. I'd like to thank the "ladies who brunch" – Emily Essert, Karen Oberer, Jennifer Pangman, and Sarah Skoronski – for the many pleasant Sunday afternoons I've spent in their company while at McGill.

I've had tremendous love and support from Joe and Lanie Havens, the "authors of my being," and my two brilliant sisters, Jackie and Steffi, who have been brave enough to read both *Evelina* and *Cecilia*. Thanks are due as well to the wonderful aunts, uncles, cousins, and grandparents of the Havens and Kulczycki families.

In particular, I'd like to thank my fiancé, André Marcotte, who has now learned more about the eighteenth-century than he has ever wanted to know, though I haven't sold him yet on Burney and *Evelina*. He is the most kind and loving partner a gal could have, and I am thankful to have him in my life.

Lastly, I would like to dedicate this to the memory of my grandfather Anthony Kulczycki, who passed away earlier this month. He was an intrepid WWII bombardier, a brilliant engineer, and one of the first firm believers in the importance of women's education. Were it not for his support, I would not have been able to go to McGill for graduate school. Это для тебя, дед – я тебя люблю.

Introduction

I first discovered Frances Burney in 2004, during my sophomore year of college. I remember my instant admiration for her witty first novel *Evelina* (1778); my astonishment, that such a talented author could remain obscure, was even stronger. Burney has never been obscure to literary scholars, who, for some time, have considered her to be one of the most important novelists of the eighteenth century.¹ Her novels, which bridge the gap between the work of Samuel Richardson and Jane Austen, feature characters of remarkable psychological depth. Burney's prose is by turns elegant and satiric, and she pioneers virtuosic prose techniques, such as idiolect and free-indirect discourse. Her first two novels, *Evelina* and *Cecilia* (1782), were frequently reprinted, translated, and adapted. Burney published her third novel, *Camilla* (1796), by subscription, and it was generally well regarded, though not as enthusiastically received as her first two novels. Her final novel, *The Wanderer* (1814), was published to great expectations, but negative reviews deterred many readers, until its recovery by feminist scholarship late in the twentieth century.² Burney's novels attracted more imitators than any others in the later decades of the eighteenth century,³ and her work was admired by

¹ She is one of only six eighteenth-century novelists to receive a discrete entry in the recent Oxford Bibliographies Online series. The others are Daniel Defoe, Henry Fielding, Samuel Johnson, Samuel Richardson, and Laurence Sterne.

² See St Clair 584-85.

³ James Raven notes, in his introduction to the first volume of the seminal *The English Novel 1770-1829*,

A still more remarkable feature of the following listings is the rediscovery of a flock of imitators of Frances Burney. *Harcourt: A Sentimental Novel* (1780: 3) was falsely claimed to be 'by the authoress of *Evelina*'. The *Critical*'s reviewer identified *Oswald Castle* (1788: 25) as 'a production of the *Cecilia* school'. Other Burneyana for the season included Anne Hughes's *Henry and Isabella* (1788: 59) and Anna Maria Mackenzie's *Retribution* (1788: 63). A year later, the anonymous *Self-Tormentor* (1789: 26) was marked out as of the Burney-school

many famous writers of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, including Samuel Johnson and Jane Austen.

In addition to her novels, Burney is known for her dramatic writing and her journals and letters. Since 1972, a large editorial project devoted to publishing a complete edition of her journals and letters has been underway. In 1995, Pickering & Chatto published an annotated critical edition of her eight plays, which have been the subject of several recent articles and a monograph by Barbara Darby. My concern is exclusively with Burney as a novelist. Current critical energy on Burney's novels has been very specialized, as evidenced by the two newest monographs, Francesca Saggini's *Backstage in the Novel: Frances Burney and the Theater Arts* (2012) and Catherine M. Parisian's *Frances Burney's Cecilia: A Publishing History* (2012). Saggini exclusively focuses on theatrical elements within Burney's prose. With chapters on *Evelina*, *The Witlings*, *Cecilia*, and *The Wanderer*, she covers only some of Burney's novels and plays, though she provides a valuable appendix on the actors and the theatrical and musical performances mentioned in Burney's writings between 1768 and 1804. Parisian's illustrated book on the publishing history of *Cecilia* surveys fifty-three editions and translations of Burney's second novel from 1782 to the present. Erudite and revelatory concerning reader reception and print history, Parisian's work nonetheless has a very narrow focus. While both of their studies are useful, neither Saggini nor Parisian provides a comprehensive approach to Burney as a novelist.

and in *Darnley Vale* (1789: 34) even Mrs Bonhote, according to her *Critical* reviewer, 'steps too nearly in the steps of Cecilia'. The wanderings of Anna Maria Mackenzie's *Calista* (1789: 53) were compared to *Cecilia*, and the anonymous *Matilda Fitz-Aubin* (1792: 20) was said to resemble both Burney and Charlotte Smith. (Raven 34-35)

Enduring critical work on Burney's novels was written from the mid-1980s, long before I first read *Evelina*. Kristina Straub's *Divided Fictions: Fanny Burney and Feminine Strategy* (1987), Julia Epstein's *The Iron Pen: Frances Burney and the Politics of Women's Writing* (1989), and Margaret Anne Doody's *Frances Burney: The Life in the Works* (1988) are the three prominent studies, all heavily influenced by feminism. Straub's *Divided Fictions* focuses on Burney's entrance into the literary world and hence on her first two novels; chapters on *Evelina* occupy more than half of the book. Straub uses a feminist framework to explore the alienating experience of public authorship on the private, female self. Epstein's *The Iron Pen* takes a larger focus: it is a feminist reading of all of Burney's novels that connects them to her journals and various aspects of her life. Epstein suggests that implicit and explicit "reservoirs of rage" in Burney's writings are linked to the constricted situation of women towards the end of the eighteenth century. Epstein unveils the anger embedded in Burney's novels, paving the way for Barbara Zonitch's *Familiar Violence: Gender and Social Upheaval in the Novels of Frances Burney* (1997), which interprets Burney's preoccupation with violence as her response to the "death of aristocratic social domination"; without the protection of paternalism, women are subjected to the "escalating violence of the modern world" (Zonitch 14). Besides Joyce Hemlow's groundbreaking *The History of Fanny Burney* (1958), the most influential study of Burney and her novels remains Margaret Anne Doody's *Frances Burney: The Life in the Works*. While Doody's claims, at times, are tenuous because she steadfastly adheres to a feminist interpretive framework, her monograph contains extensive and sophisticated analyses of all of Burney's published

works, as well as Burney's journals and letters. Doody's study is elegantly written and generally persuasive: it continues to inspire scholars to this day.

Though feminist interpretations of Burney's novels have dominated the critical landscape for more than twenty-five years, other aspects of her prose continue to fascinate scholars. With this work, I intend to join the ranks of critics of Burney's style, genre, and form, both the most traditional and the most innovative type of Burney criticism. The earliest of these works is Eugene White's *Fanny Burney, Novelist* (1960), a dated and somewhat superficial analysis that nevertheless pays close, formal attention to Burney's literary techniques and contends that these contain a high level of sophistication. White's chapters are divided into fictional components: plot, characterization, manner of presentation, style, and tonal impression. Studies of Burney's stylistic technique resurfaced in the 1980s with J. N. Waddell's two articles on Burney's neologisms and contributions to the English language. These were followed by Tracy Edgar Daugherty's *Narrative Techniques in the Novels of Fanny Burney* (1989), which studies the formal characteristics (point of view, plot structure, tempo, and characterization) of Burney's novels. Each of the novels is the subject of a chapter, and Daugherty's analysis is generous, though largely evaluative. Stylistic studies of Burney's writing, however, have tended to neglect the fact that her fiction was the product of constant revisions and that her role as editor is inextricably linked to her role as author. One of the objectives of my study is to pay close attention to Burney's revisions of her novels, which have not received the same amount of attention as her revisions of her journals and letters.

Burney and Revision

Burney's revisions in her life-writing have been scrutinized by the editors of the nineteen standard volumes of her journals and letters (with six more to come). The three major editors of Burney's correspondence, Joyce Hemlow, general editor of *The Journals and Letters of Fanny Burney*, Lars Troide, general editor of *The Early Journals and Letters of Fanny Burney*, and Peter Sabor, general editor of *The Court Journals and Letters of Frances Burney* and the in-progress *Additional Journals and Letters of Frances Burney*, all discuss Burney's editing of her journals and letters: she cut pages, obliterated text, and inserted misleading paste-overs. Hemlow, the first of Burney's editors, was also the first to reveal the extent of Burney's revisions: "The vigour and industry with which Madame d'Arblay applied herself to writing were in later years expended as well in editing. For over twenty years (roughly 1817-38) she worked intermittently on the manuscripts at her disposal, her immediate end in view being a selection of journals and letters that could be read with profit and enjoyment at her son's 'Fire-side Rectory'" (*JL* 1: xxxvi). Among the material that Burney suppressed were embarrassing anecdotes, harmful comments, secrets, and anything related to money (*JL* 1: xxxvii). Though Hemlow attempted to recover some of the material that Burney deleted, or obliterated, she does not find significant value in such recovery efforts: "Within these brackets the reader will not find, when all is said and done, much world-shaking matter" (*JL* 1: xl).

Burney's two later editors, however, have been much more involved in tracing and undoing her numerous revisions. Troide took up the mantle from Hemlow and, as the editor of Burney's "'juvenile journals' (her own term) of 1768-77," had to confront a mutilated and incomplete text: "The entire journal for 1776 and half or more of 1772 and 1777 have been destroyed totally. The pages remaining from these years, about 800,

contain 4,000 lines heavily obliterated by Madame d'Arblay" (*EJL* 1: xxv). Troide undertakes more substantial recovery work and, unlike Hemlow, finds such work to be essential: "The newly recovered obliterations in this first volume constitute about twenty per cent of the total text. There are no major discoveries in them, but much valuable material has been restored" (*EJL* 1: xxx). Sabor has improved upon Troide's techniques by using modern imaging technology, such as Adobe Photoshop, and has been able "to decipher almost all of the obliterated material" (*CJL* 1: xxxi). Among the material uncovered are passages "that might be considered offensive to her royal employers"; passages that "revealed her profound depression" during her service at court; and passages that discussed her stepmother, Elizabeth Allen Burney, usually in unflattering terms (*CJL* 1: xxvii).

Besides the detailed prefaces provided by Burney's editors, there have been a few studies that focus on Burney's revisions of her journals and letters. Ingrid Tieken-Boon van Ostade's article extrapolates from Hemlow and especially Troide, as she discusses the layers of editorial work – by Charlotte Barrett, Burney's niece and first editor, and by the aged Madame D'Arblay herself – which obscure Burney's original text (Tieken-Boon van Ostade 146-47). Lorna Clark's more recent article gives an account of Burney's journal-writing at court and reveals that Burney's chronicling of events was, at times, up to eighteen months behind. The temporal distance, Clark argues, allowed Burney to foreshadow and revise her own story (Clark 126), and in this light, Clark's final, provocative sentence is utterly convincing: "In the *Court Journals and Letters of Frances Burney*, Burney has created her most powerful—and enduring—fiction" (Clark 135).

In contrast with the journals and letters, there has as yet been very little work done on Burney's revisions to her novels. Burney is a special case because she is one of a small number of eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century novelists whose fiction manuscript drafts survive, since it was common practice for printing houses to divide and destroy manuscripts during the book-making process.⁴ Burney's novel manuscripts and revisions are at the heart of this study.⁵ I am mindful and appreciative of the recovery work done by my predecessors: Hemlow's *History of Fanny Burney* briefly discusses the surviving manuscripts to Burney's first two novels, which are in the Berg Collection, and Doody's *Frances Burney: The Life in the Works* focuses on the early *Camilla* draft in the British Library in order to study Burney's process of composition, depicting her as a conscious artist and emphasizing the range and power of her work. Proof corrections for *Cecilia* and notes for a subsequent edition of *The Wanderer* survive, and the 1802 second edition of *Camilla* is radically altered. Janice Ferrar Thaddeus's article examines the proof revisions to *Cecilia*; Lillian D. Bloom compares the "shortened" second edition of *Camilla* with the original published novel, and Robert L. Mack reviews Burney's interleaved notes for a third edition of *The Wanderer*. Their studies evince the need for a cohesive work on Burney, as an editor of her own fiction.

My discussion of Burney's revisions, whether in manuscripts, proofs, or subsequent editions, constitutes the first complete examination of Burney as novelist at

⁴ See Gaskell 40-41. Other novelists with surviving manuscripts include Jane Austen, William Godwin, Sir Walter Scott, and Mary Shelley. See also Sutherland 157-58.

⁵ Manuscript symbols used here correspond with those used in modern editions of Burney's journals and letters. < > indicate uncertain readings. <xxxxx 4-6 words> indicates material that has been crossed-out and not recovered, in this instance, 4-6 words. { } indicates editorial insertions used to supply inadvertent omissions by Burney.

work. The term “revision” is thus essential for my study, and I use it to describe Burney’s process of composition, as she moves from manuscript to published novel, incorporating her corrections to proofs and later editions.⁶ Burney’s sustained revision work is closely connected to the other key term in this study, “reflection.” Reflection, a reflexive act often synonymous with self-awareness, is an important characteristic of the novel of development, or *Bildungsroman*. Her editorial revisions can be interpreted as the fruit of reflection, though the terms can occasionally be synonymous. The tropes of revision and reflection are interwoven into all of Burney’s novels, often indicating the process of repentance and reform that Burney’s heroines must undergo before the end of her novels. Burney’s revisions to her novels, as she refined her characterization and language, were particularly tied to character development and reflection. Evelina becomes slightly more mature; Cecilia loses some of her hasty sarcasm; Camilla, remarkably, becomes more thoughtful; and Juliet from *The Wanderer* becomes less secretive. There are also numerous other characters that Burney fleshes out, and she spends time improving and polishing her style. Reflection is thus associated with many of Burney’s revisions, and Burney is mindful of the term’s philosophical roots.

Eighteenth-Century Conceptions of Reflection

The concept of reflection had been evolving since the end of the seventeenth century as philosophical theories of thought and consciousness began to proliferate. Reflection was a concept “central to fundamental philosophical discussion in the eighteenth century,” and the idea that one could relate to the self through reflection was

⁶ I use the Oxford editions of the novels of Frances Burney as my standard texts since, especially in the case of her later novels, they are the only scholarly editions based on the first edition texts.

inextricably tied to eighteenth-century theories of consciousness (Thiel, “Self-Consciousness” 286, 288). Reflection, as it came to be defined by the end of the eighteenth century, is “an individual’s relation to him- or herself *qua* individual. Individual reflection is a reference to one’s own mental states or operations, experiencing, observing or considering them” (Thiel, “Hume’s Notion” 85). Most of the thinkers who participated in debates on consciousness were men, but their ideas were often discussed by intellectual women, like the Bluestockings (O’Brien 3), a few of whom were Burney’s acquaintances.

Seventeenth-century Cartesian philosophers, who viewed the mind or spirit as something entirely separate from the corporeal body, did not distinguish between reflection and other types of thought. René Descartes, the originator of Cartesian methods, appears to account for reflective acts in his *Principles of Philosophy* (1644): “By the term ‘thought’, I understand everything which we are aware of as happening within us, in so far as we have awareness of it. Hence, *thinking* is to be identified here not merely with understanding, willing and imagining, but also with sensory awareness” (Descartes 1: 195). Reflection is implicitly contained in the categories of “understanding, willing and imagining...[and] sensory awareness.” Yet in Descartes’s “Seventh set of Objections with the Author’s Replies” to his *Meditations on First Philosophy* (1641), he denies the possibility that reflection is something separate from consciousness, calling such a notion “deluded”:

My critic says that to enable a substance to be superior to matter and wholly spiritual..., it is not sufficient for it to think: it is further required that it should think that it is thinking, by means of a reflexive act, or that it should have

awareness of its own thought....this kind of pondering or reflecting is not required...The initial thought by means of which we become aware of something does not differ from the second thought by means of which we become aware that we were aware of it, any more than this second thought differs from the third thought by means of which we become aware that we were aware that we were aware. (Descartes 2: 382)

That Descartes does not differentiate an initial thought from subsequent reflexive thoughts on that initial thought (the “second” and the “third” thoughts) confirms that he does not consider the act of reflection to be distinct from other acts of consciousness.

Nicolas Malebranche, a follower of Descartes who infused his Cartesian theories with religious language, also did not believe that reflection and consciousness were distinct acts. In his seminal *The Search After Truth* (1674-75), Malebranche initially divides the understanding, or the powers of the mind, into three parts, “a simple perception, a judgment, and an inference” (Malebranche § I.ii.1). The latter two terms, “judgment” and “inference,” appear to encompass the act of reflection. Yet like his predecessor, Malebranche inevitably conflates all three terms: “the understanding by a simple perception perceives a simple thing without any relation to anything else whatsoever, that in judgments it perceives the relations between two or more things, and that in inferences it perceives the relations among the relations of things. Consequently, all the *operations* of the understanding are nothing but *pure perceptions*” (Malebranche § I.ii.1). Though he differentiates between the degrees of perception and deduction required for each of the three acts, Malebranche posits that they are “nothing but *pure perceptions*,” a description that connotes immediate sensation and hence signals an act

that is the reverse of reflection. The absence of reflection in Malebranche's theories is confirmed by his later claim that "thought is known only through inner sensation or *consciousness*" (Malebranche § III.i.1.1). In the late seventeenth century, there was no equivalent in French of the English word "consciousness," so Malebranche's standard translators have chosen to translate the French word "conscience" as "consciousness," though many of their predecessors have left the word as "conscience" in English. Malebranche, after all, was very devout and his conception of the human will was linked to a religious interpretation of conscience.⁷ Malebranche's most famous English disciple was John Norris, whose *Essay Towards the Theory of the Ideal or Intelligible World* (1701, 1704) also does not make provisions for a separate act of reflection. Again, Norris's terminology is initially promising as he differentiates between formal thought, as "Thought of the Act, or as it signifies the very Act of Thinking," and objective thought, akin to sensation, which is related to the "immediate Object" (Norris § II.iii.1.3). Yet in his explication of formal thought, Norris posits that "it will comprehend not only Understanding or Perception, but willing, desiring, loving, hating, hoping, fearing, and all the Passions, nay, even *Sensation* it self," which implies that "formal Thought is chiefly to be understood of Perception, that being the principal Act of it" (Norris § II.iii.1.7). According to Norris, perception is actually a type of formal thought, and a few pages later the terms become perfectly equivalent (Norris § II.iii.1.10).

⁷ Critics are divided over whether Malebranche's "conscience" is equivalent to the "consciousness" of Locke and later thinkers. Christopher Fox notices that "Malebranche never uses *conscience* in conjunction with personal identity. Nor do his earlier English translators, in rendering the work, change *conscience* into 'consciousness'" (Fox 13). Catherine Glyn Davies counters by declaring that "the new content of the word was determined by the Cartesian philosophy, which soon spread itself abroad in the second half of the seventeenth century," though she concedes that the English "consciousness" is much more clear and precise than the French "conscience" (Glyn Davies 4).

As one of Malebranche's disciples, Norris vehemently opposed the theories of the empiricist John Locke, one of the first philosophers to conceive a discrete notion of reflection. Locke's *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (1690) describes the two means by which ideas can be created and terms them "sensation" and "reflection." Reflection is linked to

the *Perception of the Operations of our own Minds* within us, as it is employed about the *Ideas* it has got; which Operations, when the Soul comes to reflect on, and consider, do furnish the Understanding with another set of *Ideas*, which could not be had from things without: and such are, *Perception, Thinking, Doubting, Believing, Reasoning, Knowing, Willing*, and all the different actings of our own Minds; which we being conscious of, and observing in our selves, do from these receive into our Understandings, as distinct *Ideas*, as we do from Bodies affecting our Senses. (Locke § II.i.4)

While Locke explicitly distinguishes between reflection and sensation, or ideas inspired by external objects, his definition of reflection is not precise: it also encompasses immediate perception and more general aspects of thinking. Nevertheless, he at least conceives of reflection as a self-reflexive act: "the Mind comes to reflect on its own *Operations*, about the *Ideas* got by *Sensation*, and thereby stores it self with a new set of *Ideas*, which I call *Ideas of Reflection*" (Locke § II.i.24).

David Hume differentiates further between consciousness and reflection in *An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding* (1748).⁸ Hume, like Locke, distinguishes reflection from sensation: "Every one will readily allow, that there is a considerable

⁸ Thiel affirms that "there is an implicit *distinction* in Hume between consciousness and reflection" (Thiel, "Hume's Notion" 78).

difference between the perceptions of the mind, when a man feels the pain of excessive heat, or the pleasure of moderate warmth, and when he afterwards recalls to his memory this sensation, or anticipates it by his imagination” (Hume § II.i-iv). Hume diverges from Locke by clearly separating the act of reflection from other acts of consciousness:

It may be said, that we are every moment conscious of internal power; while we feel, that, by the simple command of our will, we can move the organs of our body, or direct the faculties of our mind. An act of volition produces motion in our limbs, or raises a new idea in our imagination. This influence of the will we know by consciousness. Hence we acquire the idea of power or energy; and are certain, that we ourselves and all other intelligent beings are possessed of power. This idea, then, is an idea of reflection, since it arises from reflecting on the operations of our own mind, and on the command which is exercised by will, both over the organs of the body and faculties of the soul. (Hume § VII.i.9)

Hume describes consciousness as the result of the “influence of the will,” which impels basic operations such as motion and simple thought. Reflection for Hume is the mind’s meditation on its own operations and the will. While Hume’s definition of reflection appears to be limited to conscious self-awareness, it is nonetheless comprised of self-reflexive acts.

Thomas Reid, a contemporary of Hume’s, gives the clearest distinction between reflection and consciousness in his *Essays on the Intellectual Powers of Man* (1785), and his definition of reflection is employed by later eighteenth-century novelists. Complaining that earlier thinkers, such as Locke, have “confounded reflection with consciousness,” Reid argues that the two “are different powers, and appear at very

different periods of life” (Reid § VI.i). He delineates reflection as an intellectual power and points out that many acts of consciousness, such as involuntary operations and reflexes, occur without the aid of reflection. Hence Reid interprets reflection as a product of the mature mind: “It is in our power, however, when we come to the years of understanding, to give attention to our own thoughts and passions, and the various operations of our minds. And when we make these the objects of our attention, either while they are present, or when they are recent and fresh in our memory, this act of the mind is called *reflection*” (Reid § I.ii). Reflection is something developed at the “years of understanding” and is, moreover, “a voluntary act; it requires an active exertion to begin and to continue it; and it may be continued as long as we will; but consciousness is involuntary and of no continuance, changing with every thought” (Reid § I.v). Building upon his crucial emendations to Locke and Hume, Reid’s definition is the first that completely segregates reflection from regular consciousness: it is self-reflexive, voluntary, and something only achieved after years of mental development. Reflection, as Reid defines it, is the quality that protagonists of the *Bildungsroman* must possess so that they can develop and mature.

Reflection in the Eighteenth-Century Novel

The act of reflection underwent a transformation in the eighteenth-century novel that paralleled its trajectory in Enlightenment thought. Just as Cartesian philosophers, especially Malebranche, blurred the line between thought and conscience, early eighteenth-century novelists often cast the act of reflection as a type of repentance. Reflection is especially significant in Daniel Defoe’s *Robinson Crusoe* (1719). Every time Defoe’s eponymous protagonist is caught in a moment of reflection, it is framed as

an act of repentance. During some of his early meditations on the deserted island, Crusoe deliberates, “But how just has it been, and how should all Men reflect, that when they compare their present Conditions with others that are worse, Heaven may oblige them to make the Exchange, and be convinc’d of their former Felicity, by their Experience” (Defoe 83). Defoe casts reflection as a type of religious meditation, though it is nonetheless a self-reflexive act. Later in the novel when Crusoe becomes ill, his thoughts take a frenzied turn as he meditates on the origin and purpose of life. His contemplations are transformed into a dialogue with his conscience:

My Conscience presently check’d me in that Enquiry, as if I had blasphem’d, and methought it spoke to me like a Voice; *WRETCH! dost thou ask what thou hast done!* look back upon a dreadful mis-spent Life, and ask thy self *what thou hast not done?*...

I was struck dumb with these reflections, as one astonish’d, and had not a Word to say, no not to answer to my self... (Defoe 125-26)

The association of conscience with reflection in this passage harkens back to Cartesian interpretations of consciousness. While reflection may be a distinct cognitive act for Crusoe, it is nonetheless colored by Defoe’s piety.

Later novels of the eighteenth century also feature a type of reflection that is akin to repentance. Arabella, the protagonist of Charlotte Lennox’s *The Female Quixote* (1752), is addicted to seventeenth-century romances and spends most of the novel believing that they are true histories and accurate depictions of life. She is finally converted to reason by a Johnsonian doctor in the penultimate chapter of the novel, “in the Author’s Opinion, the best Chapter in this History” (368). When faced with the

follies of her past actions, “*Arabella* struck with inconceivable Confusion...desired to be left alone, and continued for near two Hours afterwards wholly absorb’d in the most disagreeable Reflections on the Absurdity of her past Behaviour, and the Contempt and Ridicule to which she now saw plainly she had exposed herself” (383). While Arabella’s reflections are not necessarily religious, they do indicate her strong feelings of remorse for her “absurd” past behavior. Published more than fifty years later, Hannah More’s heavily didactic *Cœlebs in Search of a Wife* (1809) also links reflection with repentance. Lady Melbury, one of the many minor characters that Cœlebs encounters during his travels, is a flighty, spendthrift socialite. After seeing the mischief caused by her careless repayment of debt, Lady Melbury begins to amend her conduct. At the root of Lady Melbury’s bad behavior is her complete lack of reflection – “I am led to believe that the incessant whirl in which I have lived, my total want of leisure for reflection, my excessive vanity, and complete inconsiderateness, are of themselves causes adequate to any effects which the grossest vices would have produced” (More 391) – which is cured as she increasingly spends time with her pious aunt Lady Jane.

The congruence between reflection and religious repentance began to diminish in novels published after the mid-century. New fictional modes emerged alongside the growth of experimental philosophical texts. The genre of the philosophical novel, which Samuel Johnson pioneers in his *Rasselas* (1759), came into prominence. Johnson’s novel depicts the eponymous hero’s fruitless search for happiness together with philosophical debate about what constitutes such happiness. Reflection, in Johnson’s novel, is the source of discontent for Rasselas, “who, in the twenty-sixth year of his age, began to withdraw himself from their pastimes and assemblies, and to delight in solitary walks and

silent meditation” (Johnson, *Rasselas* 12). Rasselas is presented in stark contrast to his fellow countrymen from the “Happy Valley,” who lead thoughtless, carefree lives:

the sons and daughters of Abissinia lived only to know the soft vicissitudes of pleasure and repose, attended by all that were skilful to delight, and gratified with whatever the senses can enjoy....Every art was practised to make them pleased with their own condition....To heighten their opinion of their own felicity, they were daily entertained with songs, the subject of which was the Happy Valley. Their appetites were excited by frequent enumerations of different enjoyments, and revelry and merriment was the business of every hour from the dawn of morning to the close of even. (Johnson, *Rasselas* 11-12)

The inhabitants of the Happy Valley are presented as brainless hedonists: gluttoned with pleasure, they have never developed the ability to reflect. Rasselas may be burdened with knowledge, but his knowledge is preferable to the perpetual ignorance of his compatriots.

Sarah Fielding and Jane Collier’s *The Cry* (1754) is a variation of the burgeoning philosophical novel genre. Their novel is advertised as a dramatic fable: much of it is a debate on female virtues and behavior between the heroine Portia and the Cry, which represent the vices of mankind. Una, Spenser’s corporeal version of truth, serves as arbitrator. The discussions are often digressive and philosophically grounded in questions of good conduct, and thus the whole novel can be interpreted as a series of reflections. In the preface, Fielding and Collier “beg to inform our readers, that our intention in the following pages, is not to amuse them with a number of surprising incidents and adventures, but rather to paint the inward mind” (Fielding and Collier 1: 11). The sustained focus on the “inward mind” emphasizes the importance of reflection

in this text. Like *The Cry*, Laurence Sterne's novels *The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy, Gentleman* (1759-67) and *A Sentimental Journey Through France and Italy* (1768) take an unconventional approach to philosophical ideas and reflection. *Tristram Shandy*, ostensibly the life story of the eponymous hero, is so comically rife with digressions that Tristram is not born until volume three. Tristram's digressions mirror the workings of his inner mind and anticipate the narrator Yorick's unfiltered consciousness in *A Sentimental Journey*, a point of view that anticipates in turn the work of twentieth-century modernists. Within Sterne's second novel, Yorick's thoughts are separated by dashes, and the text is subdivided under the headings of objects that attract Yorick's thoughts, such as "The Snuff-Box," another device that Sterne uses to mimic the way the mind quickly turns from one subject to another.

While Johnson, Fielding and Collier, Sterne, and other writers merged philosophical notions of reflection with the novel, many of their contemporaries emphasized the mental act itself, which led to the development of the psychological novel. The greatest early example of the psychological novel in the English language is Samuel Richardson's *Clarissa* (1747-48). The plot of the novel can be summarized in a sentence: Clarissa absconds with the libertine Lovelace to avoid marrying the odious suitor chosen by her family; Lovelace rapes her, and she dies. The rest of the million-word novel contains the characters' deliberations and reflections; that it continues to be so compelling attests to its genius. The novel is epistolary and thus unveils many of the characters' motivations, such as Clarissa's deliberations concerning her grandfather's dairy:

These were some of my reflections at the time: And I have no doubt, but that in the same situation I should do the very same thing; and that upon the maturest deliberation. Who can command or foresee events? To act up to our best judgments at the time, is all we can do. If I have erred, 'tis to worldly wisdom only that I have erred. If we suffer by an act of duty, or even by an act of generosity, is it not pleasurable on reflection, that the fault is in others, rather than in ourselves? – I had much rather have reason to think others unkind, than that they should have any to think me undutiful. (Richardson 1: 125)

Clarissa's reasoned decision to renounce her grandfather's contested dairy farm displays her mature reflective abilities, and their self-reflexivity is highlighted in her use of the letter form. Yet her brother James, harshly, though not inappropriately, calls her a "little reflecting fool" in one of his letters, as he urges her to marry the loathsome Solmes (Richardson 2: 35). Indeed, the entire novel can be interpreted through reflective acts: Clarissa schemes to deny Solmes; Lovelace plots to seduce and be forgiven by Clarissa; and Clarissa plans to obtain her family's forgiveness. The novel is reflection in its purest form.

The connection between psychological development and reflection is an aspect of the *Bildungsroman*. In particular, I am concerned with female *Bildungsromane*, which began to emerge after the mid-century. One of the earliest female novels of development is Eliza Haywood's *The History of Miss Betsy Thoughtless* (1751). At the beginning of the novel, the heroine Betsy possesses "a great deal of wit, but was too volatile for reflection, and as a ship, without sufficient ballast, is tossed about at the pleasure of every wind that blows, so was she hurried thro' the ocean of life, just as each predominant

passion directed” (Haywood 31-32). Betsy’s thoughtlessness, emphasized in her name, is confirmed by her inability to reflect maturely. Before she can marry the worthy Truworth, Betsy must learn how to deliberate and judge for herself: “Enemy as she was by nature to serious reflection, on any account, much more on that of marriage, every thing now contributed to compel her to it; she could not avoid seeing and confessing within herself, that if ever she became a wife, the title could not be attended with more felicity, than when conferred on her by a person of Mr. Truworth’s fortune, character, and disposition” (216). This trope is famously employed in Jane Austen’s *Pride and Prejudice* (1813). When Austen’s heroine Elizabeth Bennet receives a letter from her suitor Fitzwilliam Darcy, in which he criticizes her family’s vulgarity and reveals the insinuating George Wickham’s treachery, she initially treats it with scorn. Once she revises her first negative opinion of the letter, “she read, and re-read with the closest attention” and begins to repent her previous wrongheadedness (Austen, *Pride and Prejudice* 227). Darcy’s letter serves as the catalyst for Elizabeth’s changed behavior, and Elizabeth’s realization of her former metaphorical blindness is evinced by her famous remark, “Till this moment, I never knew myself” (Austen, *Pride and Prejudice* 230).

It should come as no surprise that Burney, one of the greatest practitioners of the eighteenth-century female *Bildungsroman*, frequently incorporates notions of reflection into her novels. My study will examine chronologically the tropes of reflection and revision within Burney’s four novels. The starting point of the first chapter is a reading of Burney’s *Evelina* as a revision of her earliest, destroyed fiction “The History of Caroline Evelyn.” *Evelina* is also indebted to earlier eighteenth-century novels, which

can be seen in the allusive and multivalent qualities of Burney's language, especially in her innovative use of idiolect. The rest of the chapter will be devoted to Evelina's character development, as she begins to sharpen her reflective capacities. The Evelina of Burney's published novel is, however, far different from the Evelina of her early manuscript draft. While Burney contends in the preface to *Evelina* that her heroine is a realistic characterization, the published Evelina has been considerably polished in comparison to her sulky, small-minded predecessor of the early manuscript. In both the manuscript and the published text, Lord Orville belies Burney's claim that her novel contains no perfect characters; through his uniformity of manner, he serves as the exemplar whom the eponymous heroine admires and strives to emulate.

Burney wrote and published her second novel *Cecilia* to capitalize on the acclaim surrounding *Evelina*. Although *Cecilia* is significantly longer than *Evelina* and uses the third-person voice, it is nonetheless a revision of Burney's first novel. My chapter discusses earlier versions of the novel, extant in an early manuscript and a corrected proof copy, which show Burney at work revising her characters, softening their heavy sarcasm and making them even more distinct. *Cecilia* is Burney's most linguistically virtuosic novel, and hence language – the change in narrative voice, Burney's increased concern with style and idiolect, and free-indirect discourse – is an important focus in this chapter, which borrows from Mikhail Bakhtin's formalist terminology to describe some of Burney's techniques. The philosophical language that pervades *Cecilia*, the most intellectual and Johnsonian of Burney's novels, is one of its most important stylistic features. Philosophical tropes infiltrate Burney's characterization: two of the principal

protagonists, Cecilia and Belfield, have varying degrees of success as they revise and reflect upon their behavior.

Camilla is a departure from *Evelina* and *Cecilia*: for her third novel, Burney set out to write a “prose epic,” something on a much grander scale than her previous novels. But Burney’s “epic” agenda is complicated by her various revisions to *Camilla*, which are more radical than her surviving corrections for *Evelina* and *Cecilia*, and can be traced as *Camilla* is transformed from early manuscript to published novel, from second edition to third edition draft. Unlike her revisions for *Evelina* and *Cecilia*, Burney’s changes to *Camilla* were often extensive and were not always improvements. Throughout her revisions, Burney concentrates more on the heroine and major characters of *Camilla*, progressively discarding secondary plot strands and reducing the characterization of minor figures. Burney thus distanced herself from “*the prose Epic style*” and instead re-embraced the *Bildungsroman* form she employed in *Evelina* and *Cecilia*. Like Burney’s previous novels, *Camilla* contains innovative linguistic devices and textual and thematic allusions, but as it is, more than any of her novels, a continued revision, it is perhaps most fitting that character reflection is at the root of the major conflicts in the novel. *Camilla* is Burney’s most thoughtless heroine, and she must revise her conduct and learn how to judge for herself before she is worthy to marry her suitor Edgar.

The Wanderer, Burney’s final novel, was her least popular during her lifetime, mostly because of the negative, occasionally vitriolic, and blatantly misogynistic critical response it received shortly after its publication. More than with any of her other novels, the reviews shaped Burney’s revising process. *The Wanderer* is also Burney’s only novel for which a manuscript version does not exist. There is, however, an interleaved copy of

The Wanderer that contains Burney's notes for a substantially revised edition that never took shape. Since Burney's editorial intentions for *The Wanderer* are made transparent in the interleaved copy, this chapter will look at her projected acts of revision, the results of her reflections on the first edition, and it will contrast these corrections with Burney's opaque heroine Juliet, whose thought processes are hidden from the other characters and the reader for most of the novel. Above all, Burney's planned revisions to her final novel are even more ambitious than her changes to the second and projected third editions of *Camilla*.

The final chapter of this study goes beyond Burney. My work on her novels suggests a new interpretive framework through which late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century novelists with surviving manuscripts, proof drafts, and published revisions can be studied. William Godwin and Jane Austen, who emerged as novelists in the latter half of Burney's literary career, serve here as two specific examples, enriching my treatment of Burney as a test case and demonstrating a larger application of reflection and revision in the novel. Godwin's *Caleb Williams* (1794) and Austen's *Persuasion* (1817), like Burney's first three novels, have surviving manuscript variants, which in Godwin's and Austen's novels include radically different draft endings. Both Godwin and Austen were familiar with Burney's novels; Burney's novels undeniably influenced Austen's, and there is much in *The Wanderer* that is reminiscent of *Caleb Williams*. Godwin and Austen share similar editorial priorities since the manuscript drafts and, in the case of *Caleb Williams*, the four revised editions emphasize and warn against the function of the protagonists as reflective, philosophical beings. The concluding focus on Godwin and Austen anticipates novel-writing practices of the nineteenth century: more

authors preserved their manuscripts, as the evolution of a literary text and an author's reflective and revisionary processes became ever more important.

Chapter 1

***Evelina*: Reflections on “faultless Monsters” and Faulty Mentors**

Evelina (1778) was Frances Burney’s first published novel, but not her first work of fiction. Burney had immolated its precursor, “The History of Caroline Evelyn,” nearly ten years before, along with her entire store of juvenile writings.¹ Many years later, in her *Memoirs of Dr. Burney* (1832), Burney would write that, though it had been reduced to ashes, “Caroline Evelyn” had never been forgotten:

the History of Caroline Evelyn, the Mother of *Evelina*, left, upon the mind of the writer, so animated an impression of the singular situations to which that Caroline’s infant daughter, – from the unequal birth by which she hung suspended between the elegant connexions of her mother, and the vulgar ones of her grandmother, – might be exposed; and presented contrasts and mixtures of society so unusual, yet, thus circumstanced, so natural, that irresistibly and almost unconsciously, the whole of *A Young Lady’s Entrance into the World*, was pent up in the inventor’s memory, ere a paragraph was committed to paper. (*Memoirs* 2: 125-26)

Burney’s retrospective account confirms that “The History of Caroline Evelyn” is the ur-*Evelina* and hints that the chronological distance between the two texts might be very small. A few of the sheets containing the early draft of the *Evelina* manuscript are dated shortly after Burney’s destruction of “The History of Caroline Evelyn.”² Caroline

¹ Lars Troide dates “The History of Caroline Evelyn” to about 1767 (*EJL* 2: 213). See *Memoirs* 2: 125.

² In her journals, Burney mentions that much of the novel was written over a period of time in bouts of “*Nocturnal scribbling*” or, when she was writing at a more moderate pace, “half a page in a Day” (*EJL* 2: 232). Margaret Anne Doody also observes, “If after

Evelyn's posthumous letter to her husband, Sir John Belmont, a pivotal moment in the third volume of *Evelina*, appears to have been written at a different time than the rest of the manuscript draft. Caroline's letter is transcribed on the back of an actual letter from M. A. Olivier to Charles Burney. The letter from Olivier is dated 10 November 1770, which is nearly eight years before *Evelina* was published and predates, by a few years, the other recycled material used in the manuscript. In addition, the pages are torn (unlike the rest of the manuscript); the ink is thicker and lighter; the paper is almost transparent; and it is one of only two sections of the novel to be written on a folio sheet (*Evelina*, Berg 3: 22).³ While some critics have argued that Burney's destruction of "Caroline Evelyn" and publication of *Evelina* signal a conscious break from the sentimental narratives that pervaded the earlier half of the century,⁴ this surviving physical evidence confirms the importance of reading *Evelina* as an intertext.

My discussion of *Evelina* alongside its influential predecessors will serve as the starting point of this chapter. Burney's indebtedness to earlier fictions is reflected in the allusive and multivalent qualities of her language and is enhanced through her innovative use of idiolect. The rest of the chapter will be devoted to *Evelina*'s self-revisioning, as

the destruction of this first novel Frances went on almost at once with *Evelina*, writing and rewriting the new novel occupied her for years" (Doody 38). Doody's interpretation of *Evelina* also considers the lost "Caroline Evelyn" manuscript (40).

³ The letter from Caroline Evelyn is located on pages 338-40 of the Oxford edition. The only other episode in the manuscript written on a worn folio sheet is *Evelina*'s reunion with Madame Duval. The text begins: "I almost fainted in her arms, she burst into tears, and said, 'Let me not lose my poor daughter a second time!' This unexpected humanity softened me extremely; but she very soon excited my warmest indignation, by the ungrateful mention she made of the best of men, my dear, and most generous benefactor" (*Evelina* 54).

⁴ Vivian Jones argues that Burney's conscious decision to burn "Caroline Evelyn" is a confirmation of her intention of "producing a post-Richardsonian narrative for and about a younger generation of women" (x).

she matures, which is tied to her development of Reidian reflective capacities. Evelina must amend her initial interpretation of the world after adopting a considered, judicious approach. Compared to the draft version of her heroine, who frequently mopes and whines, the published version of Evelina has been substantially improved, though she still is, as Burney claims, a realistic character. Evelina's future husband, Lord Orville, is not: his uniform politeness and unwavering goodness guide Evelina's moral development and belie Burney's claim that her novel contains no perfect characters.

Influences and Linguistic Techniques

Evelina contains many elements confirming that it was shaped and affected by its predecessor. At the beginning of the novel, Mr. Villars briefly summarizes the plot of "Caroline Evelyn" in a letter to his friend Lady Howard (*Evelina* 15-17). Mr. Villars had been the guardian of Evelina's mother and now serves as Evelina's protector.⁵ The women have similar physical features; Evelina is often described as "the lovely resemblance of her lovely mother" (133). One of the novel's climactic moments – Evelina's face-to-face meeting with her father, Sir John Belmont – is affected by this resemblance. Her father's first words to her are "My God! does Caroline Evelyn still live!" But Evelina's likeness to her mother is both a unifying and a disruptive force. During their initial meeting, Sir John's reaction quickly changes: "take her away, Madam, – I cannot bear to look at her!...she has set my brain on fire, and I can see her no more!" (372). It is impossible that Evelina and her biological father will have a close, loving relationship; the rupture between father and child evokes the tragic ending of "Caroline Evelyn," though Evelina's story should be interpreted largely as a happy

⁵ Spencer slyly observes: "Mr. Villars has something of a habit of keeping babies from their natural relations" ("*Evelina* and *Cecilia*" 27).

revision of her mother's. Mr. Villars's guardianship of Evelina is more successful, and Evelina easily escapes Madame Duval's plan to marry her off to an undesirable partner. Evelina is not as friendless as her mother was, and the nobleman she chooses for her husband, Lord Orville, is more honorable and less mercenary than Sir John Belmont.

In addition to "Caroline Evelyn," *Evelina* was influenced by a number of earlier eighteenth-century novels. Burney lists "Rousseau, Johnson, Marivaux, Fielding, Richardson, and Smollet" as exemplary authors in her preface (9).⁶ All six authors are also mentioned in her early journals. Interestingly, Rousseau's *Julie, ou la nouvelle Héloïse* (1761) (the novel specified by Burney in her footnote) was not approved by Burney's father, the famous musicologist Charles Burney. His response, on hearing that a friend's sister had read the book, was that "I hope she Read the Preface, — & then flung it away" (*EJL* 2: 21). By the time *Evelina* was published, either Charles Burney had changed his mind or Frances Burney had read *Julie* without his approval. In her very early journals, Burney mentions Johnson's *Rasselas*, admiring its story and author, but not its depressing conclusion (*EJL* 1: 15-16). Burney praises Marivaux's *La Vie de Marianne* and *Le Paysan Parvenu* a couple of times in her early journals (*EJL* 1: 47, 2: 209). She freely alludes to Fielding and Richardson throughout her life-writings,⁷ and of Smollett, she declares "he shines in Ferdinand Fathom and Roderick Random" (*EJL* 1: 135). But Burney's influences are not limited to these male authors. There are a number of novels by women that, like *Evelina*, are indebted to Richardson, but also depart from the Richardsonian style.

⁶ This is also a way of placing herself "within a literary tradition" (Spencer, *Literary Relations* 51).

⁷ For example, see *EJL* 2: 164 and *EJL* 1: 47.

Though none of them are listed in Burney's preface to *Evelina*, practitioners of the female *Bildungsroman* like Frances Brooke (1763) and Sarah Fielding were arguably the greatest influences on Burney's first novel. Brooke's *Lady Julia Mandeville* (1763) shares many similarities with *Evelina*.⁸ *Evelina* strongly resembles Brooke's eponymous heroine: like *Evelina*, Lady Julia is noble and her last name is Belmont, and because of her naiveté, she is invoked as "the amiable ignorant" (Brooke 1: 130), an epithet that could be used to describe *Evelina*. Within the novel, three happy marriages are thwarted when Julia's suitor, Henry Mandeville, challenges Lord Melvin to a duel, erroneously thinking that Melvin is Julia's favored suitor. The subsequent deaths of Harry and Julia moderate the happiness of the remaining two pairs. Harry's death, an effect of his extreme reserve since he believes himself an unworthy suitor of Lady Julia, is often read as a critique of the over-nicety espoused in Richardson's novels.

Of its predecessors, Sarah Fielding's *History of Ophelia* (1760) is most comparable to *Evelina*. Both heroines were raised in an isolated environment. Like *Evelina*, *Ophelia* is suddenly immersed in eighteenth-century city life and culture; she is taken to London by her abductor, the dashing Lord Dorchester. After a series of adventures, *Ophelia* eagerly marries her noble captor. *Ophelia*'s unawareness of city customs and her witty relation of her adventures anticipate Burney's *Evelina*. As with *Evelina*, *Ophelia*'s ignorance of dancing protocol is highlighted in her refusal of an undesirable partner and improper later acceptance of another (Fielding 219-20). In *Ophelia*, this leads to a duel, while in *Evelina*, it merely leads to a heated exchange of

⁸ Burney occasionally mentions Frances Brooke in her journals. When Burney and Brooke first met, Burney commented on Brooke's "Agreeable Ugliness" (*EJL* 2: 4). See also *EJL* 1: 152-53.

words. *Ophelia* and *Evelina* also have comic scenes involving smelling salts. *Ophelia* gives smelling salts to a languishing woman who fakes her appreciation of the opera (117). This is both a satiric commentary on affectation and perhaps an inspiration for the scene in *Evelina* where Captain Mirvan shocks Madame Duval with smelling salts.⁹

The similarities between *Ophelia* and *Evelina* emphasize, above all, that satire is an essential element of Burney's prose. In Burney's novel, *Evelina*'s satire is condoned because it is voiced only in her private letters to Mr. Villars and not in public. London, its people, and their customs are most often the targets of *Evelina*'s satire, and, as a stranger, her critique is unbiased. *Evelina*'s description of the city's male milliners is particularly humorous: "we were more frequently served by men than by women; and such men! so finical, so affected! they seemed to understand every part of a woman's dress better than we do ourselves; and they recommended caps and ribbands with an air of so much importance, that I wished to ask them how long they had left off wearing them!" (29). *Evelina*'s comical feminizing of the salesmen is excused and permitted because of her naiveté. Satire is also a tool by which *Evelina* can reveal her perceptive readings of other characters. Soon after meeting the affected Mr. Smith, she writes: "It was easy for me to discover, that this man, with all his parade of *conformity*, objects to every thing that is not proposed by himself: but he is so much admired, by this family, for his *gentility*, that he thinks himself a complete fine gentleman!" (192). *Evelina*'s satire can also serve a didactic purpose, as with her comments on Madame Duval's vanity: "Indeed, had I not been present, I should have thought it impossible for a woman at her

⁹ Peter Sabor, in his introduction to *Ophelia*, notes both of these parallels (28-29).

time of life to be so very difficult in regard to dress. What she may have in view, I cannot imagine, but the labour of the toilette seems the chief business of her life” (157).

Evelina is not the only satiric mouthpiece in Burney’s text, although her critiques are the ones most frequently endorsed by the narrative. Mrs. Selwyn, Evelina’s guardian during the third volume, is characterized by her scintillating, but excessive satire. Because of her over-use of satire, Mrs. Selwyn is unsexed and considered to be “masculine” by several figures throughout the novel, including the misogynistic Lord Merton and Jack Coverley and even Evelina herself. Captain Mirvan, though often presented as a rude and violent character, is another satiric mouthpiece. Often his tricks are represented as cruel and violent, but the Captain occasionally gets things right, as with his criticisms of the corruption inherent in city life: “to cut the matter short, the men, as they call themselves, are no better than monkeys; and as to the women, why they are mere dolls” (114).¹⁰ Not all of the satire presented in the novel is condoned by Evelina; many satiric interludes are presented ambiguously. Lord Merton’s prejudice against older women is neither completely endorsed nor entirely condemned by the narrative: “I don’t know what the devil a woman lives for after thirty: she is only in other folks way” (275). While Lord Merton’s colloquial language contributes to the humorous and shocking nature of his declaration, his inveterate misogyny and ageism are disturbing.

Satire is one of many comic devices in *Evelina*: Burney also generates humor through her frequent use of idiolect, an individual’s idiosyncratic or characteristic

¹⁰ Deborah Ross observes, “Though a satirist, Burney was not essentially an ironist; her satiric characters, with their single vision and simple, truthful expressions, merely expose the doubleness of hypocrisy of self-ignorance in others” (Ross 113).

speech.¹¹ Often, when Evelina reports dialect (or when Burney reports it in her journals), the strange speech is presented in italics to differentiate it visually from the writer's regular speech. In one of her initial meetings with Captain Mirvan, Evelina uses italics to distinguish his unique sea-dialect from her elegant prose: "On Monday we go to a *ridotto*, and on Wednesday we return to Howard Grove. The Captain says he won't stay here to be *smoked with filth* any longer; but, having been seven years *smoked with a burning sun*, he will retire to the country, and sink into a *fair-weather chap*" (40). Captain Mirvan is not the only major character with a markedly different speech type. His nemesis Madame Duval speaks heavily-accented English even though she was born and raised in England. Her speech is peppered with malapropisms and poor grammar, including the double negative: "'O,' cried she, 'I never go no-where without him [M. Du Bois]'" (58).

Burney's close attention to individual character speech is only one facet of her almost scientific fascination with dialect. On the verso of one of her manuscript pages (*Evelina*, Berg 1: 65), Burney has copied a study of English pronunciation dating from Anglo-Saxon times:

It seems, therefore, as if the pronunciation of *th* was of much higher antiquity in the Island of great Britain than the Invasion of the Saxons; since the Welsh not only pronounce *th* but *dd* as the English do *th* in *this that & then*. However, though these Letters have no such power among the modern Saxons, yet the Anglo-Saxons had two Characters that were equivalent to *th*: as þ, ð, both different from the hard t and Ben Johnson observes, in his English Grammar, that

¹¹ In her introduction, Jones observes, "Burney manifested a striking early talent for mimicry and a sharp ear for spoken idiom" (ix).

“the greatest difficulty of the English Alphabet & Pronunciation consists in the double & doubtful sound of the Letters *th*, since “the Saxon Characters *ð* & *þ* are lost, that distinguished *thee those, thine*, from *thick, thin & thrive*”: the first three of these words were written *ðee, ðou, ðine*, the last *þick, þin, & þrive*.

At present, the English seem to be only people in Europe who do not confound the Greek *Theta* with the *Tau*. They give likewise a sound to the vowel *I* in some words, as *time, prime, climb*, which is wholly peculiar to themselves but <they have distinguished> the guttural pronunciation <of *ch*, and *g*, which is so difficult> to describe, & to learn...

The above is a nearly exact transcription of a passage added to the second edition (1775) of her father’s *Present History of Music in Germany* (Charles Burney 1: 65-66). Frances Burney often worked as her father’s amanuensis, but it is oddly fitting that this particular page from her father’s revised edition was recycled in her own work. It highlights that Burney’s work on pronunciation and dialect is more than a casual interest: these linguistic descriptions are rigorous and may have contributed to her pioneering work in idiolect. Burney’s linguistic craftsmanship also appears in the early, first-person form of free-indirect discourse that appears in *Evelina*. Occasionally, *Evelina*’s descriptions of other characters are infused with her imaginings of their subjectivities: “Sir Clement, pretending equal eagerness with the Captain, caught my hand, and repeatedly detained me, to ask some frivolous question, to the answer of which he must be totally indifferent” (*Evelina* 144). *Evelina*’s description of Sir Clement Willoughby’s possible thought-process – “he must be totally indifferent” – anticipates the merging of perspectives characteristic of free-indirect discourse.

Burney's writings, not excepting *Evelina*, are also rife with allusive phrases, which form links between her novels and her journals and letters. The phrase, "the die is thrown" or "the die is cast," the statement Caesar made after crossing the Rubicon to invade Italy,¹² appears twice in *Evelina*: once after the first letter about Evelina is sent to Sir John Belmont and again after Evelina agrees to stay with Madame Duval in London (131, 166). The phrase reappears in *Cecilia* when Mortimer Delville decides to relinquish his last name and marry Cecilia: "With respect therefore to myself, the die is finally cast, and the conflict between felicity and family pride is deliberately over" (*Cecilia* 563). Burney later uses the phrase in a letter to her sister Susan of 26 December 1786. In the letter, Burney resigns herself to a lifetime in servitude at Court: "The die is cast, – & That struggle is no more" (*CJL* 1: 309). Burney also frequently alludes to the Ghost's words in *Hamlet*: "And each particular hair to stand on end / Like quills upon the fretful porcupine" (1.5.19-20). Madame Duval uses this phrase when she recounts her violent abduction by the disguised Captain Mirvan: "As to the particulars, I'm sure they'd make your hair stand an end to hear them; however the beginning of it all was thro' the fault of M. Du Bois" (*Evelina* 168). This phrase is repeated again in *Camilla*, when Camilla's brother Lionel exposes their cousin Clermont's staggering debts: "Well! what do you think was the next news? It's enough to make a man's hair stand on end, to see what a spite fortune has taken to me! Do you know he [Clermont] has got debts of his own, of one sort or another, that poor unky has never heard of, to the amount of upwards of a thousand pounds?" (*Camilla* 736). Burney also uses this phrase in her own journalizing. After the royal family requests to see Charles Burney's *German Tour*, Frances Burney

¹² Cf. "Iacta alea est" (Suetonius 1: 76, 77).

writes to her father: “I have now, Dearest Sir, an adventure for you that – if it serves you as it served me, will make you start indeed, – & ‘each particular Hair to stand an end’ – ! – ” (*CJL* 1: 214).

Revising Evelina

Burney’s novel-writing agenda, shaped by her interpretation of *Rasselas*, is also highly allusive. In her novels, Burney adopts an optimistic pragmatism and appears to distance herself from Johnson’s depressing morality: “how dreadful, how terrible is it to be told by a man of his genius and knowledge, in so affectingly probable a manner, that true, real happiness is ever unattainable in this world!” (*EJL* 1: 15). Yet Burney’s alternative is not much more comforting:

those who wander in the world avowedly & purposely in search of happiness, who view every scene of present Joy with an Eye to what may succeed, certainly are more liable to disappointment, misfortune & unhappiness, than those who give up their fate to chance ^land take the goods & evils of fortune as they come, without making happiness their study, or misery their foresight (*EJL* 1: 16).

Burney’s fatalistic pragmatism informs her novel-writing: her acceptance of both “the goods & evils of fortune” is confirmed particularly in *Cecilia* and *Camilla*. She also anticipates her method of characterization in an entry from her early journals: “For my own part, I cannot be much pleased without an appearance of truth; at least of possibility — I wish the ^hhistory ⁿto be natural tho’ the sentiments are refined; & the Characters to be probable, tho’ their behaviour is excelling” (*EJL* 1: 8). This statement reveals Burney’s desire to create realistic plots and people in her fictions; even though her characters may appear exemplary, they still commit human errors. Burney makes a

similar claim in her preface to *Evelina*, warning readers that “*The heroine of these memoirs, young, artless, and inexperienced, is ‘No faultless Monster, that the World ne’er saw,’ but the offspring of Nature, and of Nature in her simplest attire*” (10). It is undeniable that *Evelina*, tainted by snobbery and naiveté, is a realistic “offspring of Nature.”¹³ And Burney’s manuscript version of *Evelina* is even farther from perfection than her published counterpart.

At first glance, the most significant difference between the manuscript and the published text of *Evelina* is the former’s disorganized physical form.¹⁴ An early testament to Burney’s “writing mania,” the manuscript corroborates Burney’s claim that she appropriated “every scrap of white paper that could be seized upon without question or notice” during her extended writing process (*Memoirs* 2: 123, 124). The types of paper used in Burney’s manuscript vary, though most of the text is written on quarto sheets. Different types of ink – thick, thin, dark, light – are used within the manuscript. Burney’s writing changes as well through the course of the manuscript; some of the text is large and some is small, but most of it is larger and more hurried than the text in her journals. Some sheets are more torn and worn than others, and a number of them are recycled. One of these scraps is the page from Charles Burney’s *Present State of Music in Germany*. Another recycled sheet uses the verso of a paper discussing madrigals and Italian composers. An introduction to Mrs. Selwyn appears on the back of a playbill

¹³ Joyce Hemlow agrees that this is one of the largest strengths of Burney’s first novel: “By associating with youth errors and shortcomings natural to youth, Fanny Burney created a character at once convincing and sympathetic; and in depicting a heroine lifelike in her imperfection the new realist surpassed even her four great predecessors, who tended to draw paragons for that role” (96-97).

¹⁴ Hemlow is the only previous critic to have discussed this manuscript at length. Her observations mostly discuss Burney’s pruning of colloquialisms (79-80).

featuring an aria from Christoph Willibald Gluck's *Orfeo ed Euridice* along with some lesser-known works of eighteenth-century Italian opera performed by "Signor Manzoletto" and "Signora Agujari," two contemporary singers. Like the letter from M. A. Olivier, some of the recycled papers are old letters. Occasionally the manuscript pages are cut off abruptly; replacements are stuck in place with a pin, and sometimes additions are sewn or pasted on. Sir Clement's letter impersonating Lord Orville contains cut-out additions that are pasted onto pages in the manuscript; these additions reveal the large amount of time that Burney had spent polishing this significant part of the text.

Besides its striking physical appearance, the *Evelina* manuscript contains a markedly different version of Burney's eponymous heroine. Burney's early Evelina is more fixated on Lord Orville and is more selfish. This can be seen early in the novel when Evelina, taking a break from the bustle of city life, decides to stay home one day and misses an encounter with Lord Orville. In the published version of the scene, Evelina writes:

I thought I had done wrong! Mrs. Mirvan and Maria have been half the town over, and so entertained! – while I, like a fool, stayed at home to do nothing. And, at an auction in Pall-Mall, who should they meet but Lord Orville! He sat next to Mrs. Mirvan, and they talked a great deal together: but she gave me no account of the conversation.

I may never have such another opportunity of seeing London; I am quite sorry that I was not of the party; but I deserve this mortification, for having indulged my ill-humour.

Thursday night.

We are just returned from the play, which was King Lear, and has made me very sad. We did not see any body we knew. (*Evelina* 39)

Burney's draft version of this scene is similar, but it contains some significant discrepancies in the narrative voice that illuminate the differences between the two versions of her eponymous heroine:

I am always to do wrong! Mrs. Mirvan & Maria have been all the Town over – & so entertain'd! – while I, like a Fool, was moping at Home. And, at an Auction in Pall Mall – who sh^d. they meet, but Lord Orville! – he sat next to Mrs. Mirvan, & talked a great deal to her – but she gave me no account of their conversation – either he did not recollect with whom he had seen her – or did not think or – I suppose, care about it – but he never enquired after me. – & Maria, who sat on the other side of her Mother, he did not seem to know.

But I shall never again have an opportunity of seeing London – how could I be such a Fool! – but I was rightly served for indulging my ill-humour. – well I do think I never will again – I shall certainly be the happier for always combatting my spleen. –

Thursday Night

Just returned from the Play – & within a few Boxes of us, sat Lord Orville – but he did not see us the whole Evening. – Well – adieu – it is too late to write more – (*Evelina*, Berg 1: 108-9).

Right away we notice a shift in the tone: in the published text, *Evelina*'s momentary pique at missing Lord Orville – “I thought I had done wrong” – has been downgraded from her severe self-reproach in the manuscript – “I am always to do wrong.” The tone

shift is also apparent in the different descriptions of Evelina's activities: the published version of Evelina "stayed at home to do nothing," while her more self-critical predecessor "was moping at Home." In the manuscript version, Evelina gives a longer and a more unfavorable interpretation of the conversation Lord Orville had with Mrs. Mirvan. Where the published version simply stops after Evelina reports that Mrs. Mirvan could give "no account" of the conversation, in the manuscript, Evelina supplies her own pessimistic conjectures about its content: "either he did not recollect with whom he had seen her – or did not think or – I suppose, care about it – but he never enquired after me. – & Maria, who sat on the other side of her Mother, he did not seem to know." This extended interpretation reveals Evelina's anxious fixation on Lord Orville, which affects her self-esteem. Both Evelinas resolve to improve their behavior after this incident, but in the manuscript, the heroine's language is much bitterer. The different versions also diverge during the following night's theater-outing. The manuscript version of Evelina again fails to catch Lord Orville's attention, this time at the play, lamenting that he "did not see us the whole Evening." In the published version, Evelina simply reports going to a play and seeing no one, a deletion that obviates her disappointment in the manuscript.¹⁵

Most of the discrepancies between the manuscript version and the published text of *Evelina* are, as Hemlow claims, stylistic improvements. In the close of one of Evelina's early letters to Villars, the difference between the published and manuscript versions is a matter of style. The manuscript version is wordy – "Adieu, my dearest Sir; pray excuse the wretched stuff I send you. You charged me to write freely, & without

¹⁵ While these passages are discussed briefly in Hemlow's *History of Fanny Burney*, she focuses on stylistic improvements, though noting "[i]n the final draft of Evelina's letters the artless and feckless remarks of the schoolgirl were in some measure restrained" (Hemlow 83).

constraint or disguise. Perhaps I may improve by being in London, & then I will write better” (*Evelina*, Berg 1: 6) – while the published version is concise and polished – “Adieu, my dear Sir; pray excuse the wretched stuff I write, perhaps I may improve by being in this town, and then my letters will be less unworthy your reading” (*Evelina* 29).¹⁶ But as we have seen in the differing accounts of Evelina’s missed encounter with Lord Orville, these differences are not always stylistic.

When the characterization of Evelina in the manuscript diverges from that in the published text, the discrepancy is often related to Burney’s more negative depiction of Evelina in the manuscript. One of these significant textual divergences occurs after the Mirvans and Madame Duval have a carriage accident and Captain Mirvan furtively shoves Madame Duval into a puddle. The published version gives a brief account of their return and Evelina’s plans to call on the shaken Madame Duval:

We were obliged to wait in this disagreeable situation near an hour, ere a hackney-coach could be found; and then we were disposed in the same manner as before our accident.

I am going this morning to see poor Madame Duval, and to enquire after her health, which I think must have suffered by her last night’s misfortunes; though, indeed, she seems to be naturally strong and hearty. (*Evelina* 68)

In the manuscript version of this scene, Evelina’s attitude towards the injured Madame Duval is cold and even disrespectful:

¹⁶ Hemlow enumerates several similar instances of improvement of language from Burney’s manuscript to the final novel (Hemlow 84-85).

We waited in this uncomfortable place for near an Hour before a Coach could be had, which at last came from Picadilly. Our ride Home was very gloomy, & the company were disposed as before our accident.

I am going this Morn^g. to wait on M^e. Duval, she has, however, to my great surprise, accepted an invitation from Mrs. Mirvan to Drink Tea here. I wonder she will Daily expose herself to those Abusive disputes: but I believe she does not know what to do with herself, or how to bear being alone. I am infinitely obliged to Mrs. Mirvan, who saves me the necessity of making long visits to *her*, even to enquire after her Health. (*Evelina*, Berg 1: 12-13)

The language in the published version of this section is more elegant and economical, like many of Burney's revisions, but the reduction of wordiness is not the most significant difference between these parallel passages. The excerpts confirm that Burney's manuscript version of *Evelina* is consistently sulky. Correspondingly, Burney's early description of the carriage ride and Evelina's potential visit is more darkly delineated: the "ride Home was very gloomy," which is not mentioned in the published version at all. The second paragraph is slightly longer in the manuscript – Evelina's amazement that Madame Duval wants to visit the Captain's home is expressed later in the published novel (104) – but Evelina's extreme repugnance at visiting Madame Duval – "I am infinitely obliged to Mrs. Mirvan, who saves me the necessity of making long visits to *her*, even to enquire after her Health" – never surfaces in the published version. These words appear particularly heartless because they have been written shortly after Captain Mirvan's initial assault on Madame Duval. Thus, Burney's revision of this sentence,

which adds Evelina's concern for "poor Madame Duval," is much more than a stylistic improvement.

In the preface to the published novel, Burney claims that her characterization of Evelina is lifelike, but in the manuscript, Evelina has many selfish behavioral traits that were excised prior to publication. Undeniably, Evelina is a more sympathetic character in the published novel, but she still has many realistic traits, including her naiveté. In fact, one of the strongest motivations for Villars to send Evelina to London is to help her develop her reflective capacities: "When young people are too rigidly sequestered from it, their lively and romantic imaginations paint it to them as a paradise of which they have been beguiled; but when they are shown it properly, and in due time, they see it such as it really is, equally shared by pain and pleasure, hope and disappointment" (19). Early in the novel, Evelina's natural artlessness prevents her from reflecting and thinking rationally. Despite her resolution to be prudent, Evelina betrays herself and impulsively asks for Villars's permission to go to London: "I believe I am bewitched! I made a resolution when I began, that I would not be urgent; but my pen – or rather my thoughts, will not suffer me to keep it – for I acknowledge, I must acknowledge, I cannot help wishing for your permission" (26). Evelina also has a tendency to hide information from her readers: the unreliable nature of her narrative is revealed in a letter to Villars as she insinuates that her correspondence with Miss Mirvan (which does not often appear) is more complete:¹⁷ "Will you forgive me, if I own that I have *first* written an account of this transaction to Miss Mirvan? – and that I even thought of *concealing* it from you?"

¹⁷ Julia Epstein further differentiates Evelina's letters to Maria Mirvan and Villars, "The letters to Maria, unlike those to Villars, are direct, their style colloquial and forthright, their tone unstudied" (Epstein 101).

(249). She is thoughtless and unreliable; before she can become Lord Orville's wife, she still must revise and amend her conduct.

Perfecting Lord Orville

While Evelina's lack of perspective is realistic, Lord Orville, the novel's hero, has no comparable flaws. In fact, he is the "faultless Monster" that Burney claims to exclude in her preface to the novel (*Evelina* 10).¹⁸ Above all, Lord Orville resembles the brave eponymous hero of Richardson's novel *The History of Sir Charles Grandison* (1753-54). In a conversation with Mr. Seaton, an early admirer of her elder sister Esther, Burney defends her belief that nearly perfect gentlemen like Sir Charles Grandison can exist in real life:

'And what are you studying here? said he — O ho, "Marianne?" And did you ever Read "le paysan parvenu?" There are the two best novels that ever were wrote, for they are pictures of nature, and therefore excell your Clarissas & Grandison's far away. Now Sir Charles Grandison is all perfection, & consequently, the last Character we find in real Life. In truth there's no such thing.

F. 'Indeed! do you really think a Sir Charles Grandison *never* existed?'

Mr S. 'Certainly not. He's too perfect for human Nature.

F. 'It quite hurts me to hear any body declare a really & th{o}roughly good man never Lived. It is so *much* to the disgrace of mankind.' (*EJL* 1: 47)

Lord Orville is Burney's "really & th{o}roughly good man," destined to be the husband of Evelina. Of course, Lord Orville is attractive and appealing: in her first impression of

¹⁸ See also Erin Mackie 171 and Barbara Zonitch 54. Some feminist critics, however, such as Doody (44) and Susan Fraiman (48-50), not only believe that Lord Orville is an imperfect character, but also believe that he is "of the [bad male] fraternity," because of certain similarities he shares with Sir Clement and Lord Merton (Fraiman 50).

him, Evelina writes that he “seemed about six-and-twenty years old, gayly, but not foppishly, dressed, and indeed extremely handsome, with an air of mixed politeness and gallantry” (31). Lord Orville in this scene is defined by superficial characteristics: his good looks and his small talk, the latter stimulated by his resolve “to try whether or not [Evelina] was capable of talking upon *any* subject” during their dance (34). And his overheard first impression of Evelina, as a “poor weak girl” (37), initially tricks the reader into believing that Lord Orville is not attracted to her.

There is very little change between the Lord Orville of the early draft and the Lord Orville of the published novel. In the draft, Orville is two years younger: twenty-four instead of twenty-six (*Evelina*, Berg 1: 8). Burney’s alterations to Lord Orville’s character between the manuscript and published novel are inconsistent: sometimes she makes his feelings for Evelina more explicit, and at others, she takes great care to hide them. One of Burney’s later revisions gives a reason for Lord Orville’s silence: “Afterwards, in the course of the Evening, we met him several Times – but he never spoke to us – though whenever he chanced to meet my Eyes, he condescended to Bow” (*Evelina*, Berg 1: 107) becomes, in the published text, “Afterwards, in the course of the evening, we met him several times, but he was always with some party, and never spoke to us, tho’ whenever he chanced to meet my eyes, he condescended to bow” (*Evelina* 39). Another of Burney’s revisions removes Lord Orville’s flattering style of speech, “This Compliment from Lord Orville – & the manner in which it was made – so surprised me – that I could not speak” (*Evelina*, Berg 1: 18), to become, “This compliment, – from Lord Orville, – so surprised me, that I could not speak” (*Evelina* 73). Burney also excises Lord Orville’s romantic language to Evelina shortly before the proposal scene to prolong

the reader's suspense. Just as Evelina is about to leave Clifton, Lord Orville laments, ““So suddenly, cried he, so unexpectedly, must I lose you? – & at the very moment of being restored to the hope of y^r. favour? – what a deserted, what a comfortless place will Clifton seem”” (*Evelina*, Berg 3: 25). The published novel reduces these lines to the simple, ““So suddenly, so unexpectedly must I lose you?”” (*Evelina* 351).

Admittedly, not very much can be gleaned from Burney's changes to Lord Orville's character between the early draft and the published text, yet in the manuscript, Evelina's perception of Lord Orville is visibly altered. At Clifton, Evelina begins to open up to Lord Orville around the time that he drives her and Mrs. Selwyn in his carriage. In the published text, Evelina describes the moment thus: “I supported no part in the conversation, but Mrs. Selwyn extremely well supplied the place of two. Lord Orville himself did not speak much, but the excellent sense and refined good-breeding which accompany every word he utters, give a zest to whatever he says.” (*Evelina* 283). The corresponding passage in the manuscript, however, transpires before Evelina has warmed to Lord Orville, though some of the language is the same:

L^d. Orville did not much exert himself; yet the good sense that dictates, & the good breeding that accompanies every word he utters, give a sort of *zest* to whatever he says: &, to own the truth, the idea that his gravity was only the consequence of mine, entirely reconciled me to his want of spirits: for I sh^d. have been hurt indeed had so great an alteration in my behavior been unnoticed.

(*Evelina*, Berg 3: 11v)

Evelina's description of Lord Orville's behavior is unchanged, but her added interpretation in the manuscript imparts a selfish hue to her character. The phrases “his

gravity was only the consequence of mine” and “I sh^d. have been hurt indeed had so great an alteration in my behavior been unnoticed” confirm that Burney’s earlier version of *Evelina* is self-centered and demanding. *Evelina*’s reflections also explicitly reveal her attachment to Lord Orville.

In the published version of the novel, *Evelina*’s romantic feelings for Lord Orville are initially imperceptible. *Evelina*’s comparison between Lord Orville and her benevolent guardian Villars is the first hint of the true state of her affections: “I sometimes imagine, that, when his youth is flown, his vivacity abated, and his life is devoted to retirement, he will, perhaps, resemble him whom I most love and honour. His present sweetness, politeness, and diffidence, seem to promise in future the same benevolence, dignity, and goodness” (*Evelina* 74). Orville’s resemblance to “him whom I most love and honour” reveals that *Evelina* considers him an exemplary figure. Of all of his excellent traits, *Evelina* admires Lord Orville most for his universal liberality: “Lord Orville, with a politeness which knows no intermission, and makes no distinction, is as unassuming and modest, as if he had never mixed with the great, and was totally ignorant of every qualification he possesses” (114-15). *Evelina* supplies many examples of his good breeding, especially his reaction when he sees her in company with the uncouth Branghtons and Madame Duval; Lord Orville, “whatever might be his doubts and suspicions, far from suffering them to influence his behaviour, he spoke, he looked, with the same politeness and attention with which he had always honoured me when countenanced by Mrs. Mirvan” (239). And when *Evelina* stays at Clifton, the home of the rank-obsessed Mrs. Beaumont, Lord Orville is the only one who behaves kindly to her. While the other members of the house treat *Evelina* as a nonentity,

O how different was his [Lord Orville's] address! how superior did he look and move, to all about him! Having paid his respects to Mrs. Beaumont, and then to Mrs. Selwyn, he came up to me, and said, "I hope Miss Anville has not suffered from the fatigue of Monday morning!" Then, turning to Lady Louisa, who seemed rather surprised at his speaking to me, he added, "Give me leave, sister, to introduce Miss Anville to you." (286)

Lord Orville's ever-present graciousness, when joined to an explanation for his negative first impression of Evelina – "every succeeding time he saw me, I appeared to something less and less disadvantage" (389) – confirms his station in the novel as a model of perfection.

Lord Orville's exemplary status is perceived especially in comparisons with other characters who are intolerant towards those with unfamiliar customs. Captain Mirvan is clearly one of these individuals. The sole motivation behind his dislike for Madame Duval is ostensibly his xenophobia: "he soon convinced us, that he was determined she should not be too much obliged to him, for he seemed absolutely bent upon quarrelling with her: for which strange inhospitality, I can assign no other reason, than that she appeared to be a foreigner" (51).¹⁹ Though Evelina later finds reasons to dislike Madame Duval, she still criticizes Captain Mirvan throughout for his behavior towards her grandmother, much of which goes far beyond "strange inhospitality." Even the otherwise obtuse Madame Duval perceives and denounces Captain Mirvan's bigotry: "why they

¹⁹ Burney emphasizes the Captain's insular behavior in her letter to the publisher Lowndes where she describes her novel: "The characters of the Sea Captain, and *would be* French woman, are intended to draw out each the other; and the ignorance of the former, in regard to modern customs, and fashionable modes, assists in marking their absurdity and extravagance" (*EJL* 2: 215).

may very well not like what they don't know" (62). Another character who, like Captain Mirvan, is disparaged for his narrow-mindedness is Mr. Branghton. In her first impressions of him, Evelina writes that "He does not seem to want a common understanding, though he is very contracted and prejudiced: he has spent his whole time in the city, and I believe feels a great contempt for all who reside elsewhere" (69). Like Captain Mirvan, Mr. Branghton is an intolerant individual whose behavior is criticized and contrasted with Lord Orville's exemplary politeness.

Lord Orville's sole imperfection is the insulting letter he ostensibly sends to Evelina, which is later revealed as a forgery by Sir Clement Willoughby. From his first appearance, Sir Clement Willoughby functions as a foil for Lord Orville. Like Lord Orville, he has a title, though as a baronet he is not a member of the aristocracy; he has a similarly attractive appearance since he is "a very fashionable, gay-looking man, who seemed about 30 years of age" (41), and he also strongly admires Evelina. Here the similarities end. Sir Clement's eccentric and bombastic language disgusts Evelina, who often links it with his insolent behavior: "I am both unused, and averse to your language and your manners" (43). Not only is Sir Clement selfish, he is also hedonistic: "If, then, I cannot be so happy as to oblige *you*, Miss Anville, you must not be surprised, should I seek to oblige myself" (158). In addition to his forgery, Sir Clement perjures himself in Evelina's presence and assaults her, with the intention of raping her (98-101). Despite his inexcusable behavior, Evelina cannot help but value his opinion; when Sir Clement sees her with Madame Duval and the Branghtons, Evelina disappointedly anticipates his lowered opinion of her: "As to myself, I must acknowledge, nothing could be more disagreeable to me, than being seen by Sir Clement Willoughby with a party at once so

vulgar in themselves, and so familiar to me” (208). And it is not until the moment when Sir Clement is revealed as the true author of “Lord Orville’s” letter that Evelina can finally disdain his behavior and truly bid him farewell, with the remark, “I earnestly hope I shall see him no more” (358).

Evelina and Reflection

Along with her approval, or at least acceptance, of Sir Clement, some aspects of Evelina’s behavior need to change before she can be a worthy mate for Lord Orville. Unlike Lord Orville, Evelina is occasionally judgmental and snobbish. These traits are rooted in her sequestered upbringing by Villars: “the artless openness, the ingenuous simplicity of her nature...that her guileless and innocent soul fancied all the world to be pure and disinterested as herself, and that her heart was open to every impression with which love, pity, or art might assail it” (*Evelina* 127). Though Villars’s description of Evelina’s innocence is intended as praise, it foreshadows her narrow-mindedness. That Evelina imagines “all the world to be pure and disinterested as herself” implies that she may be intolerant of other views. And while her heart can be touched with love or pity, it can also be influenced by art and specious reasoning. These two side effects to Evelina’s naiveté – snobbishness and misinformation – are often on display in the novel and show Evelina in a negative light. Influenced by the company of Sir Clement, Evelina ridicules the hilariously affected Mr. Smith for mistaking a figure of Neptune for a general (204). Evelina’s snobbishness is manifested in her mockery of the mistakes of others that she herself committed earlier. Recently unacquainted with the opera, but cultured after a few months in London, Evelina scorns the Branghtons’ “ignorance of whatever belongs to an opera” (90). And even though, in her confusion at the pleasure gardens of “Marybone”

(Marylebone), Evelina mistakes two prostitutes for ladies, hypocritically, she laughs at Madame Duval for later making the same error: “As to Madame Duval, she was really for some time so strangely imposed upon, that she thought they were two real fine ladies. Indeed it is wonderful to see how easily and how frequently she is deceived” (237). The most troubling consequence of Evelina’s pretension is that it leads her to accept a private carriage ride with Sir Clement to avoid being seen in company with the Branghtons: as a result, Sir Clement nearly violates her (96-101).²⁰

Evelina’s artlessness and thoughtlessness have other distressing consequences. Only vaguely aware of established protocol at her second dance in London, Evelina lies that she is pre-engaged in an attempt to avoid dancing with Sir Clement but to also keep herself available should Lord Orville appear and ask her again to dance (47). Indeed, Joanne Cutting-Gray observes, “If Evelina’s inexperience causes her embarrassment and real anguish, so does pretending to an experience that would conceal her genuine lack of worldly tempering” (Cutting-Gray 14). Evelina’s misappropriation of her knowledge is punished, as she is forced to dance with Sir Clement anyway and is later embarrassed in front of Lord Orville. Even Villars is disappointed with her behavior: “I am sure I need not say, how much more I was pleased with the mistakes of your inexperience at the private ball, than with the attempted adoption of more fashionable manners at the *ridotto*. But your confusion and mortifications were such as to entirely silence all reproofs on my part” (*Evelina* 57). Though Evelina’s cultural education has contributed to her snobbishness, it eventually enables her to navigate more easily through

²⁰ Zonitch also remarks on the danger of shame in this scene: “In this case, Evelina is ashamed that Sir Clement has found her in an improper situation: embarrassment restricts and silences her, permitting him to lead her into a whole new set of ‘dark alleys’” (Zonitch 41).

complicated London customs. Indeed, the next time she is asked to dance by an unsavory partner, she uses her social training to devise a way to avoid him: “Mr. Smith teased me till I was weary of resistance; and I should at last have been obliged to submit, had I not fortunately recollected the affair of Mr. Lovel, and told my persecuter, that it was impossible I should dance with him, even if I wished it, as I had refused several persons in his absence” (224-25). Evelina’s behavior towards Mr. Smith reveals her ability to bend the rules of society successfully to suit her own preferences.

By the time Evelina returns to London with Madame Duval and without any suitable guide, she has internalized London customs. Evelina’s second London visit is, in a sense, a revision of her first – but this time, instead of being guided by the examples of her companions, she is forced to make her own decisions. Villars warns her: “you must learn not only to *judge* but to *act* for yourself: if any schemes are started, any engagements made, which your understanding represents to you as improper, exert yourself resolutely in avoiding them, and do not, by a too passive facility, risk the censure of the world, or your own future regret” (*Evelina* 166). Yet Villars himself, by urging the unwilling Evelina to accompany Madame Duval, does not provide a palatable example: “we are the slaves of custom, the dupes of prejudice, and dare not stem the torrent of an opposing world, even though our judgments condemn our compliance!” (166). While Evelina’s potential inheritance from Madame Duval is his declared motivation behind his change of heart, Villars’s too ready adherence to custom shows that he is not a flawless monitor.²¹

²¹ Epstein also confirms this: “And we read in the version of this explanation sent to Lady Howard that Villars has, in fact, obeyed custom rather than conscience, and been motivated by a concern for wealth over righteous behavior” (Epstein 104).

After many trials and negative examples, Evelina finally learns to reflect and act for herself. Occasionally we can see this learning process at work in her letters as she describes her impressions to the moment. The most detailed example of Evelina's reflection and self-revising is her reaction to "Lord Orville's" letter, which was triggered by a short apologetic letter of her own. Her initial pleasure is swiftly succeeded by embarrassment and remorse – she does not need Villars to correct her this time – and Evelina describes the progress of her reactions:

The moment the letter was delivered to me, I retired to my own room to read it, and so eager was my first perusal, that, – I am ashamed to own it gave me no sensation but of delight. Unsuspicious of any impropriety from Lord Orville, I perceived not immediately the impertinence it implied, – I only marked the expressions of his own regard; and I was so much surprised, that I was unable, for some time, to compose myself, or read it again, – I could only walk up and down the room, repeating to myself, "Good God, is it possible? – am I, then, loved by Lord Orville?"

But this dream was soon over, and I awoke to far different feelings; upon a second reading, I thought every word changed, – it did not seem the same letter, – I could not find one sentence that I could look at without blushing; my astonishment was extreme, and it was succeeded by the utmost indignation. (258)

Evelina's initial sensation of "delight" she is now "ashamed to own." Her first reading of the letter is akin to the mistakes she makes early in the novel; her response is "Unsuspicious" and solely reliant upon her emotions. Her impression after her second reading, however, is entirely different. Evelina's subsequent, more critical reading of the

letter – in which “it did not seem the same” – allows her to reach the correct conclusion: the letter is not flattering – instead, it is wholly inappropriate. Evelina even revises her characteristic idealism after realizing the true purport of the letter: “Yet I cannot but lament to find myself in a world so deceitful, where we must suspect what we see, distrust what we hear, and doubt even what we feel!” (259). Even Mr. Villars is pleased with Evelina’s considered response; he only adds that Lord Orville’s letter should have been returned immediately (267-68).

Evelina’s improvement continues to the point where she can rightly begin to question Villars’s commands and make her own decisions. After she betrays her love for Lord Orville to Villars, he counsels her to avoid all contact with Lord Orville while they are both vacationing in Clifton.²² Evelina initially follows his advice, but starts to question her conduct after seeing the negative effect it has on her relationship with Lord Orville: “Tell me, my dearest Sir, if you possibly can, tell me that you approve my change of conduct, – tell me that my altered behaviour to Lord Orville is right, – that my flying his society, and avoiding his civilities, are actions which *you* would have dictated” (335). She goes on to lament that she has irrevocably lost Lord Orville’s friendship: “Oh Sir, I have slighted, have rejected, – have thrown it away! – No matter, it was an honour I merited not to preserve, and I now see, – that my mind was unequal to sustaining it without danger” (336). Shortly afterwards, without Villars’s consent, Evelina begins to revise her behavior, claiming that Villars’s original instructions, though well-intended, were too harsh: “I begin to think, my dear Sir, that the sudden alteration in my behaviour was ill-judged and improper; for, as I had received no offence, as the cause of the change

²² Critics, like Ruth Yeazell, also read this specific exchange of letters as the prolonged moment when Evelina discovers that she is in love (Yeazell 124-25).

was upon *my* account, not *his*, I should not have assumed, so abruptly, a reserve for which I dared assign no reason, – nor have shunned his presence so obviously, without considering the strange appearance of such a conduct” (341).²³ Evelina is subsequently rewarded with an offer of marriage from Lord Orville, whom she accepts while still believing that he has written the offensive letter, while Mr. Villars’s instructions – though pragmatic in his belief that a peer would never marry an unknown woman – truly would have been disastrous had they been followed.

By the end of the novel, Evelina has revised her naïve, thoughtless, and occasionally selfish behavior, balancing her own observations and reflections with Mr. Villars’s rational teachings. This is ultimately apparent in her treatment of Lady Louisa, Lord Orville’s supercilious sister. Lady Louisa has continually slighted Evelina, but once she finds out that Evelina is the acknowledged daughter of Sir John Belmont, she alters her conduct:

...when I would have gone up stairs, instead of suffering me, as usual, to pass disregarded, she called after me, with an affected surprise, “Miss Anville, don’t you walk with us?”

There seemed something so little-minded in this sudden change of conduct, that, from an involuntary emotion of contempt, I thanked her, with a coldness like her own, and declined her offer. Yet, observing that she blushed extremely at my refusal, and recollecting she was sister to Lord Orville, my indignation subsided, and upon Mrs. Beaumont’s repeating the invitation, I accepted it. (380)

²³ Cutting-Gray’s interpretation also emphasizes Evelina’s growing confidence in her own judgment: “In rejecting the false letter as a misrepresentation of Orville, Evelina acts from the stronger conviction that she knows him through a broader context of experience – character, regard, comportment” (Cutting-Gray 22).

Evelina's initial reaction – an “involuntary...contempt” – is entirely justified in light of Lady Louisa's previous dismissive behavior. Evelina's first reaction is a rational response. Yet Evelina revises her answer after viewing Lady Louisa's embarrassment and after “recollecting” or reflecting that Lady Louisa will be her sister-in-law. By eventually accepting Lady Louisa's olive branch, Evelina demonstrates her newly gained emotional maturity as she begins to adhere to a liberal “Orvillian” mode of conduct.

Evelina's improvement during the course of the novel has often caused it to be interpreted as a *Bildungsroman*.²⁴ Her successful education also seems to be presented as an example for readers who need to reflect and revise their behavior. In the midst of her difficulties adjusting to London customs, Evelina mentions her desire for “a book, of the laws and customs *à-la-mode*, presented to all young people, upon their first introduction into public company” (84). *Evelina* can, indeed, be read as such a conduct book: by the end of the novel, the heroine learns “not only to *judge* but to *act* for [herself]” (166). Evelina's characterization and progress through the novel paves the way for Burney's later heroines, particularly Cecilia, Burney's next heroine, the beautiful orphan who must also adjust to the dizzying perils of city life.

²⁴ See Doody 45, Spencer, “*Evelina* and *Cecilia*” 29-30, and Zonitch 53.

Chapter 2

Cecilia: From “*unhuman happiness*” to “*cheerfullest resignation*”

Cecilia (1782) is a darker, more menacing recasting of *Evelina*, and the early, partial draft of Frances Burney’s second novel, located in the Berg Collection, is darker still. In the surviving manuscript, the heaviest deletions appear in the masquerade scene. The expurgated sections comprise a long episode describing the satanic rites of Mr. Monckton, Cecilia’s hypocritical friend, who, though already married, covets her fortune and hand in marriage.¹ Monckton’s satanic motions are confined to a single sentence in the published text: “Waving this wand as he advanced towards Cecilia, he cleared a semi-circular space before her chair, thrice with the most profound reverence bowed to her, thrice turned himself around with sundry grimaces, and then fiercely planted himself at her side” (*Cecilia* 107). This description has been distilled from nearly a page of text in the early draft, from which the following text can be discerned: “Waving this Wand as he advanced towards <Albina>,² he pretended to <xxxxxx 1 word> around her a Ring <which>, <xxxxxx 1 word> & with a <xxxxxx 2 words> repeating during the Motion...Without, however, paying any attention to the <musick>, he continued to perform his rites” (*Cecilia*, Berg 1: 214-15). Burney’s heavy deletions obscure most of the text, the largest obliterated portion of the early manuscript. Her revision and deletion

¹ Thaddeus discusses the state of these manuscript pages, though she does not attempt to read the obliterations:

...in the scene at the masquerade, when Mr. Monckton dressed as the devil is approaching Cecilia for the first time, Burney took up her blunt pen, dipped it often, and with heavy, black, joined-together w’s excised about half a page. Also in that scene, she simply removed a whole page. This is the only page, however, that she removed entire; the other excisions, though frequent, usually leave behind something of the original sheet. (Thaddeus, “Sharpening *Cecilia*” 41)

² “Albina” was Burney’s initial name for the heroine. See below, 74.

of this blacker version of the masquerade signal the nature of her other excisions and serve as a starting point for a discussion of reflection and revision in Burney's second novel.

Cecilia and Evelina

Cecilia, rife with internal revision, such as the doubly-attempted marriage of Cecilia and Mortimer Delvile, has often been read as an expanded version of *Evelina*.³ Though the novels share many similarities, *Cecilia* was conceived under far different circumstances. From her "fear of Discovery, or of suspicion in the House", Burney was obliged to "sit up the greatest part of many Nights" to complete the manuscript of *Evelina* (*EJL* 2: 232-33). Between the publications of the two novels, however, Burney had become a celebrated novelist and had received the admiration of Hester Thrale, Elizabeth Montagu, and Samuel Johnson. As the acknowledged author of *Evelina*, Burney no longer needed to continue her private and "nocturnal scribbling" with her second work; instead her family and some of her close friends read and commented on the novel-in-progress. In a letter of 15 August [1781], Burney responds to an earlier letter from her second "daddy" Samuel Crisp about the progress of *Cecilia*:

You enquire about your favourite Ugly Girl, – O that Ugliness should ever find *you* it's Favourer! – but alack I have never once thought of her since I presented her to you! – & as to the *Beauty*, – you will be scandalised to hear that *not one word* did she get forward from February, when I left Chesington, till *July*! – I have her now in Hand, & hope, by *assisting at her Toilette*, to enable her in due

³ Both Kristina Straub and Catherine Gallagher agree that the groundwork of the plot of *Cecilia* is very similar to that of *Evelina* (Straub 112, Gallagher 234).

Time to appear, tolerably Cloathed if not adorned, to the World: but when indeed
I kn[ow] not. (*EJL* 4: 432-33)

Samuel Crisp was evidently familiar with Burney's proposed characters, "the *Beauty*", who would later become Cecilia, and the "Ugly Girl", who was ultimately deferred until *Camilla*. Before Burney had submitted the novel to the press, Crisp expressed his disappointment with its bittersweet ending. Burney vigorously defended her original ending: "I think the Book, in its present conclusion, somewhat *original*, for the Hero & Heroine are neither plunged in the depths of misery, nor exalted to *unhuman happiness*, — Is not such a middle state more natural? more according to real life, & less resembling every other Book of Fiction?" (*EJL* 5: 44). Burney's unwillingness to revise the mixed happiness of Cecilia and give her heroine an entirely blissful fate like that of Evelina foreshadows the theme of contemplative moderation that permeates her second novel.

Despite their different endings, there are many strong similarities between *Cecilia* and *Evelina*. The physical text of the two manuscripts is comparable. As with the surviving *Evelina* manuscript, some of the pages in the *Cecilia* manuscript are sewn together as pasteovers. Part of book four, chapter six "A Man of the Ton" is written on the recto of a letter in a different hand from Burney's, and another page in the manuscript recycles a scrap of a letter to Charles Burney from a fellow organist. Both novels recount the story of a young girl suddenly forced from her country home into the glittering and dizzying London metropolis. Once there, Evelina has no mentor to whom she can turn, though her absent guardian Villars tries to advise her through his letters. Cecilia has three guardians that reside in London, but they are all deeply flawed. Evelina makes many social mistakes, not from any type of personal awkwardness, but from her

unfamiliarity with town customs. Cecilia makes fewer gaffes, though she is also inexperienced. While navigating within a sea of unacceptable suitors, Evelina meets Lord Orville, a young man of quality, falls in love, and after a number of difficulties revolving around her surname, marries him. Cecilia's courtship with Delvile is, in some ways, an expanded version of Evelina's. So far, indeed, the two novels are alike. However, the third-person narrative of *Cecilia*, which contrasts with the epistolary form of *Evelina*, does much to separate the two novels. The worldlier and wiser Cecilia lacks Evelina's naivety. Cecilia is already an heiress before she appears in town and is courted by scores of fortune-hunters, while Evelina must spend nearly the entire novel in anonymity before claiming her rights and inheritance. *Cecilia* is more than twice as long as *Evelina*: this added length enables Burney to expand the precipitous movement of a young and desirable woman through society. Style and length aside, *Cecilia* is clearly a development of the same theme as *Evelina*, the pre-marital social education of a young woman.

In addition to *Evelina*, a number of female *Bildungsromane* influenced Burney's *Cecilia*. Eliza Haywood's *The History of Miss Betsy Thoughtless* (1751) and Charlotte Lennox's *The Female Quixote* (1752) contain the most significant parallels. Haywood's Betsy, Lennox's Arabella, and Burney's Cecilia are all heiresses without effective guardians who must discard many unworthy suitors before adjusting to societal norms and marrying happily. All three are the objects of duels: Cecilia tries to stop the duel she inspires; Arabella and Betsy are instead pleased that their suitors are willing to duel and die for them (Lennox 357, Haywood 184). Arabella and Cecilia are restricted by ancestral wills: Cecilia won't get her uncle's inheritance unless her husband adopts her

surname, and Glanville, Arabella's cousin, gets a third of Arabella's estate if she doesn't marry him (Lennox 64). The trope of children being controlled by wills is common in eighteenth-century fiction and harkens back to Samuel Richardson's *Clarissa*.⁴ Perhaps the most significant parallel among the three novels occurs when Betsy and Cecilia reveal their affections to their respective lovers. In *Betsy Thoughtless*, Truworth discovers Betsy's love for him by surprising her as she tenderly addresses a stolen miniature of him (Haywood 606-10). Mortimer Delvile finds out Cecilia's inclinations in a very similar manner: he surprises her as she is sweetly caressing his stolen dog (Burney 546-48), echoing Haywood's eavesdropping scene. Both these episodes have important functions within their respective novels, as socially permissible means through which the heroine can reveal her true feelings to the hero.

Despite these multiple plot similarities, the novels employ vastly different means of characterization.⁵ Haywood's introduction of her eponymous heroine is succinct and simple: "Miss Betsy...had a great deal of good-nature, and [was] somewhat extremely engaging in her manner of behaviour" (Haywood 28). Lennox's introduction of her heroine Arabella is slightly more descriptive, but her diction is also unadorned: "Nature had indeed given her a most charming Face, a Shape easy and delicate, a sweet and insinuating Voice, and an Air so full of Dignity and Grace, as drew the Admiration of all that saw her" (Lennox 6-7). In *Cecilia*, the narrator's prose is characterized by its rich

⁴ For an illuminating and detailed comparison of *Clarissa* and *The Female Quixote*, see Bartolomeo 90-122.

⁵ Jane Spencer also suggests that *The Female Quixote* and *Betsy Thoughtless* can be read as intertexts for *Cecilia*: "In particular, *Cecilia* appears to be influenced by the ironic yet fundamentally sympathetic narrative presentation of the heroine in Haywood's *The History of Betsy Thoughtless* and Lennox's *The Female Quixote*" (Spencer, "Evelina and Cecilia" 35).

diction and its inclusion of satiric and philosophical elements. When Cecilia first appears, the language used to describe her is far more elaborate: “her form was elegant, her heart was liberal; her countenance announced the intelligence of her mind, her complexion varied with every emotion of her soul, and her eyes, the heralds of her speech, now beamed with understanding and now glistened with sensibility” (*Cecilia* 6). Burney uses personification in the phrase “her countenance announced the intelligence of her mind;” and the description of Cecilia’s eyes as “the heralds of her speech” is metaphorical. The difference between these introductory descriptions demonstrates that Burney’s narrator uses more elevated and varied prose, which is linked to an increased complexity in her characterization.

Satire, Characterization, and the Manuscript

Many of the characterizations in *Cecilia* are shaped through satire, especially satire voiced by the narrator. This is a departure from *Evelina*, in which much of the satire appears in the heroine’s innocently critical letters or later in the voice of the irreverent Mrs. Selwyn. Many of the narrator’s criticisms surface with the appearance of minor characters, such as the voluble Miss Larolles. During her first meeting with Cecilia, “Cecilia, not prepared for an invitation so abrupt, bowed without speaking, and Miss Larolles, too happy in talking herself to be offended at the silence of another, continued her narration” (25). The narrator’s ostensible compliment to Miss Larolles as a woman “too happy in talking herself to be offended at the silence of another” is in fact a trenchant criticism of her volubility; the gentle tone is a ruse, which only slightly conceals its biting satire.

Characters are only occasionally permitted to voice satire in Burney's novel. *Cecilia*'s Mr. Gosport plays a similar role to *Evelina*'s Mrs. Selwyn, except that his satire, used mostly to guide Cecilia in her introduction to city life, is generally condoned, and characters such as Mrs. Delvile, Mortimer Delvile, and even Cecilia herself are permitted to use occasional bursts of sarcasm. Yet character satire has been pared down in the published version of the novel; Burney's early draft contains more cynical versions of Gosport and Cecilia. Cecilia, in response to concerns regarding her friendlessness voiced early in the novel by Mr. Arnott and Mr. Gosport, declares: "'You are very good...but at present I find no want of any defender'" (*Cecilia* 26). In the manuscript counterpart to this passage, the word "defender" was originally the word "Assistant," and the passage continues thus: "Assistant, because I have nothing to do, I believe, too, I have none of an Advocate for I hear nobody advising me, & I am sure I have none of a Companion while in a Room full of Company" (*Cecilia*, Berg 1: 50). The original text is wordier than its replacement, but it also paints a different picture of the heroine. The remark "I am sure I have none of a Companion while in a Room full of Company" is somewhat tongue-in-cheek for a Burney heroine, which is perhaps the reason why it was excised in the final revisions.

Even more than with *Cecilia*, Burney vigorously revised Gosport's satire for the first-edition text. At a dinner party early in the novel, Gosport laments the worthless nature of most social gatherings: "'I have often wished...that when large parties are collected, as here, without any possible reason why they might not as well be separated, something could be proposed in which each person might innocently take a share'" (*Cecilia* 27). Gosport elaborates slightly, but his criticism of social gatherings is brief.

Not so in the manuscript, where he is prompted by Arnott to give his opinion of the current party:

“Do you think then, said Mr. Arnott, that the Company now present would be better employed by Children’s Games, than by their own Conversation?”

“Undoubtedly, he replied, for their own Conversation if it tends to any thing, tends to mischief, but there are no Children’s Games in which some little skill may not be shewn. Thread the Needle may teach them grace, Hunt the Slipper dexterity, <xxxxxx I word> all agility, & Blind Man’s Buff penetration, while Hide & Seek calls for more address, perseverance & ingenuity than will be either displayed or required in such an Assembly as this for a Year & an half.” (*Cecilia*, Berg 1: 53-54)

Gosport’s recommendation of children’s games not only to amuse, but to teach the company is patronizing. His sharpest barb appears in the last phrase, where he argues that the current company would neither display nor require the “address, perseverance & ingenuity” of hide and seek “for a Year & an half.” Other mitigations of Gosport’s satire appear in Burney’s corrections to the proof copy of *Cecilia*, housed at the Houghton Library.⁶ In a scene later in the novel, as Cecilia is preparing for her initial, secret marriage attempt with Delvile, she encounters several of her acquaintances, and the group is accidentally intercepted by Delvile. Gosport witnesses the whole and makes several suggestive remarks. The proof copy version reads thus: “‘I saw plainly,’ said Mr. Gosport, looking maliciously at Cecilia, ‘that he was feloniously inclined, though I must confess I took him not for a dog stealer’” (*Cecilia*, Houghton 4: 145). The narrator’s

⁶ The existence of this proof copy was first mentioned by Janice Ferrar Thaddeus in her article “Sharpening *Cecilia*,” 36-37.

observation becomes the more benign “looking significantly at Cecilia” in the published novel (*Cecilia* 608).

Monckton, like Gosport and Cecilia, has been significantly altered between the different versions of the text: his designs on Cecilia are less carefully guarded in the early manuscript than they are in the novel. There is a long interchange between Monckton and Cecilia in the manuscript that reveals his aversion towards the Delviles:

The look, however, with which she [Cecilia] listened to their Names [her presumed suitors] was alone sufficient to satisfy him [Monckton] of their ill success: & losing, therefore, that object of solicitude, his anxious mind, quick in the pursuit of its own misery, enquired next when the Harrels proposed leaving Town for the Summer; Joined to which he looked forward with the utmost dread, as a Barrier to all chance of his seeing her for many Months. And when in this he rec^d. a reprieve longer than he had any reason to expect, by her answering that they sh^d. not remove till the end of the present month, June, his restless inquietude of apprehension led him, from talking of her Guardians in general, to glide, as if by accident, into a discussions of the Albanys [Delviles] in particular.

And here, as usual, he s^d. whatever severity & ill will c^d. dictate of all the Family, avoiding however, any individual censure, but lavishly bestowing the appellations of pride and arrogance upon the whole race collectively, declaring those to have been hereditary qualities in all who had borne their names for many Generations. (*Cecilia*, Berg 3: 84v)

This passage has a close, but not exact counterpart in the published edition:

In the midst of this conversation, a note was delivered to her [Cecilia] from Mr. Delvile senior, acquainting her with his return to town, and begging the favour of her to call in St. James's Square the next morning, as he wished to speak to her upon some business of importance.

The eager manner in which Cecilia accepted this invitation, and her repeated and earnest exclamation of wonder at what Mr. Delvile could have to say, past not unnoticed by Mr. Monckton; he instantly turned the discourse from the Belfields, the Harrels, and the Baronet, to enquire how she had spent her time during her visit in St. James's Square, and what was her opinion of the family after her late opportunities of intimacy? (*Cecilia* 255)

There are two sharp differences between the passages, which depict the first conversation Monckton and Cecilia have about the Delviles. The means by which the Delviles become the subject of their conversation is the first discrepancy. In the early draft, Monckton steers the conversation towards them "as if by accident," while in the published version, Monckton can use Mr. Delvile's invitation to Cecilia as a legitimate reason to enquire about them. Monckton, in the early version, does not wait to hear Cecilia's opinion of the family before roundly castigating them: "he s^d. [said] whatever severity & ill will c^d. [could] dictate." His character is much more insidious in the published version; instead of giving his opinion right away, he asks for hers – "how she had spent her time during her visit in St. James's Square, and what was her opinion of the family after her late opportunities of intimacy?" After hearing her response, he is able to shape his negative opinions into a convincing counterargument to overturn Cecilia's more favorable views.

Subtlety and satire are not the only tools Burney uses in her character differentiation; she is one of the great early practitioners of idiolect. Burney's predecessors, Haywood and Lennox, also use idiolect, but not to the extent that Burney does. In Haywood's *Betsy Thoughtless*, varied character language appears only in the speech of Betsy's undesirable suitors. One of Betsy's early suitors, the vulgar sea-captain, uses language peppered with nautical terms: "I spoke to your guardian yesterday, for I love to be aboveboard; but he seemed to lour, or, as we say at sea, to be a little hazy on the matter" (Haywood 129). And the fulsome, overblown speech of another suitor, the pretended Sir Frederick Fineer, – "such sparkling eyes, – such a complexion, – such a mouth; – in your shape you are a Helen of Troy" (324) – is used to reveal his true character and social standing, that of a disguised, conniving servant. In Lennox's *The Female Quixote*, the only character who has an idiolect is Arabella herself, and her idiolect is mainly an appropriation of her beloved seventeenth-century romances: "if this Stranger be weak enough to entertain any Sentiments more than indifferent for me; I charge you, upon Pain of my Displeasure, do not be accessory to the Conveying his presumptuous Thoughts to me either by Letters or Messages" (Lennox 11). The diversity of Burney's characterization, on the other hand, exceeds both Lennox's and Haywood's and arguably that of all her contemporaries. Samuel Johnson said as much in his comparison of *Cecilia* with the work of Henry Fielding; he declares that *Cecilia* is "far superior" because Burney's "Characters are nicer discriminated, and less prominent, Fielding could describe a Horse or an Ass, but he never reached to a Mule" (Thrale 1: 555).

Burney's "Characters are nicer discriminated," in large part, through their idiolects. Burney uses foul and repetitive language to characterize the offensive indolence of Cecilia's suitor Sir Robert Floyer: "O, hang it, 'tis not from *ton*; no, it's merely from laziness. Who the d–l will fatigue himself with dancing attendance upon the women, when keeping them at a distance makes them dance attendance upon us?" (*Cecilia* 39-40). The vulgarity and stinginess of Cecilia's guardian Mr. Briggs is emphasized through his odious slang: "Come, shall I pop you? – A good place for naughty girls; in, I say, poke in! – cram you up the chimney" (117). Captain Aresby, the jargonist, creates his characteristically absurd speech with a smattering of French words: "He is a most petrifying wretch, I assure you...I am *obsédé* by him *partout*" (66). Aresby's ridiculous language was one of the very few changes to diction that Burney undertook in the *Cecilia* proof copy. All of her proof copy changes to Aresby's speech replace the word "honour" with jargon. Aresby's "O, I have had the honour of questions of that sort from him *san fin*" is changed to "O, I have had the *horreur* of questions..." (*Cecilia*, Houghton 2: 210; cf. *Cecilia* 290); his "I really have not the honour to comprehend your allusion" is revised as "I am quite *assommé* that I cannot comprehend your allusion" (*Cecilia*, Houghton 3: 155; cf. *Cecilia* 408); and his "Give me leave to own I have the honour to be in a state the most *accablent* in the world" has become "Give me leave to own I am *parfaitment* in a state..." (*Cecilia*, Houghton 4: 138; cf. *Cecilia* 605). Other small changes to character diction from the proof copy include the insertion of italics to create emphasis. The word "supercilious" in Cecilia's speech about Miss Leeson – "but for your explanatory observations, how much would the sudden loquacity of this supercilious lady, whom I had imagined all but dumb, have perplexed me!"

(*Cecilia*, Houghton 3: 6; cf. *Cecilia* 323) – is italicized in Burney’s proof copy corrections, probably because the word “supercilious” is repeatedly and inextricably tied to Miss Leeson throughout the novel.

Idiolect in *Cecilia* can even create characterization within a very short span of words. The disparity between two minor characters, Mr. Hobson and Mr. Simkins, both attempting to collect debts from Cecilia’s spendthrift guardian Mr. Harrel, is made apparent in the space of one page. After Harrel invites them to join his supper party, Hobson’s forwardness is seen immediately: “I’ve supped this hour and more, and had my glass too, for I’m as willing to spend my money as another man...however, as to drinking another glass, or such a matter as that, I’ll do it with all the pleasure in life” (*Cecilia* 402). The phrase “I’m as willing to spend my money as another man” reveals Hobson’s pompous impertinence and hints at his belief in money as a class-leveler, which appears more explicitly later in the novel. Simkins, on the other hand, is sycophantic and highly deferential to those of higher social standing; his response to Harrel displays these traits immediately: “I can’t upon no account think of taking the liberty; but if I may just stand without, I’ll make bold to go so far as just for to drink my humble duty to the ladies in a cup of cyder” (402). Simkins’ diction is servile, confirmed by phrases such as “I can’t upon no account think of taking the liberty,” “if I may,” and “my humble duty.” The vast difference between the speeches of Hobson and Simkins shows that though these characters occupy nearly an identical role in *Cecilia*, they display distinct personalities through Burney’s expert use of varied character language.

Naming, like idiolect, is one of the methods by which Burney diversifies her characters within *Cecilia*. Earlier critics have observed that many of the character names

were changed during Burney's writing process. In early drafts of the novel, Cecilia was called Albina⁷ and the Delviles were the Albanys. Margaret Anne Doody links Cecilia's initial name to Hannah Cowley's heroine in *Albina, Countess Raimond* (1779) (Doody 120). Albina in Cowley's play is a virtuous, though somewhat peripheral and passive figure: she is completely guided by her father in her first and second marriages. Because of her passivity and docility, she does not seem an appropriate namesake for Burney's independent and energetic heroine. More interesting is the significance these early names give to the charitable, remorseful, and slightly insane character Albany, who never rises above the status of a minor figure within the novel. One substitution that has not been previously noted is Mandeville for Belfield in the draft (*Cecilia*, Berg 3: 74), perhaps in homage to the worthy, but unthinking hero of Frances Brooke's *The History of Lady Julia Mandeville*. Like Belfield, Henry Mandeville is quixotic – he frequently loans money to his impoverished tenants, even though he only has £700 per annum – and his recklessness concerning affairs of the heart is fatal.⁸

Hybridized Language

Burney's allusive naming and, especially, her pioneering work with idiolect are tied to the innovative hybridized discourse that appears in *Cecilia*, a blend of her complex narration and individual character voices. Three forms of this mixture are present: the

⁷ Cecilia was the name of the rich orphan heroine in Burney's unperformed play *The Witlings*. As in *Cecilia*, the heroine loses her inheritance, though her loss occurs before, not because, she becomes married.

⁸ Naming is the limit of Margaret Anne Doody's and her predecessor Joyce Hemlow's interest in the *Cecilia* manuscript. Hemlow observes, "Apart from the changes in names (Albina Wyerly to Cecilia Beverley, Mr. Vaughan to Mr. Briggs, *et al.*), the revisions are usually curtailments of the text or attempts to avoid circumlocution" (Hemlow 149). Hemlow is right about the nature of many of Burney's revisions; she does not, however, analyze any of the numerous discrepancies that reveal so much about Burney's process of characterization.

narrator's mimicry of character diction, the circulation of key phrases between characters and the narrator, and an early version of free-indirect discourse. My ensuing readings of these stylistic devices are informed by the work of Mikhail Bakhtin and his term "heteroglossia," which he uses to explain "distinctive links and interrelationships between utterances and languages, this movement of the theme through different languages and speech types."⁹ Ultimately, Bakhtin argues that heteroglossia, the presence of many voices in a work, "is the basic distinguishing feature of the stylistics of the novel" (Bakhtin, "Discourse in the Novel" 263). In his later "Problem of Speech Genres," Bakhtin goes further and posits that this multitude of voices necessarily implies that "Our speech, that is, all our utterances (including creative works), is filled with others' words... These words of others carry with them their own expression, their own evaluative tone, which we assimilate, rework, and re-accentuate" (Bakhtin, "The Problem of Speech Genres" 89).¹⁰ Thus, speech is often multi-voiced, carrying the intentions of the current and all previous speakers. Bakhtin's conception of double-voiced discourse is essential to understanding the movement of language among the characters in *Cecilia* and even its movement towards the narrator.

The initial level of hybridized discourse in Burney's *Cecilia* appears in the narrator's appropriation of different character idiolects within third-person descriptive segments. Haywood does this occasionally in *Betsy Thoughtless*, as when her narrator

⁹ The only other study that links Bakhtin's heteroglossia with Burney's *Cecilia* is Julia Epstein's *The Iron Pen*. Epstein, however, makes this connection very briefly in reference to the Harrels' chaotic home life (Epstein 162-63), while it is used here as a theoretical basis for analysis.

¹⁰ Bakhtin also states that "Language is not a neutral medium that passes freely and easily into the private property of the speaker's intentions; it is populated – overpopulated – with the intentions of others" (Bakhtin, "Discourse in the Novel" 294).

uses Betsy's voice to describe Betsy's reaction to a new suitor: "This young lady was full of meditations on her new conquest, and the manner in which she should receive the victim" (Haywood 94). Lennox's narrator similarly adopts Arabella's language – she "seemed, in the Language of Romance, to accuse the Gods for subjecting her to so cruel an Indignity" (Lennox 32) – but the narrator's self-conscious allusion makes this act much more prominent. In *Cecilia*, the device appears through a larger array of character voices and with much greater frequency. One of these moments occurs when Monckton is described by the narrator in a style evoking Monckton's own: "he had long looked upon her [Cecilia] as his future property; as such he had indulged his admiration, and as such he had already appropriated her estate, though he had not more vigilantly inspected into her sentiments, than he had guarded his own from a similar scrutiny" (Burney, *Cecilia* 9). The phrase "future property," used here by the narrator, reflects Monckton's sentiments toward Cecilia and the language he would use to express them. The words "vigilantly," "guarded," and "scrutiny" are also frequently used by Monckton in his own speech or his clearly marked thoughts.

Monckton is one of several distinctive minor characters linked to hybridized diction in *Cecilia*. Mortimer's father, Mr. Delvile, is another. When Cecilia and the Delviles visit Delvile Castle, the narrator appropriates Delvile's language:

Even the imperious Mr. Delvile was more supportable here than in London: secure in his own castle, he looked around him with a pride of power and of possession which softened while it swelled him. His superiority was undisputed...no rivalry disturbed his peace, no equality mortified his greatness;

all he saw were either vassals of his power, or guests bending to his pleasure.
(*Cecilia* 458)

The narrator's diction here is quite distinctive: it is elevated through the use of words connoting power and rank. Phrases like "pride of power," "no equality mortified his greatness," and "vassals of his power" evoke the pompous diction of the man they describe. Through this appropriation of Delvile's language, the narrator applies his arrogant linguistic lens to satiric effect, which is easily apparent here since Delvile's character is very pronounced. Both the Monckton and the Delvile passages demonstrate the effect of hybridized discourse; the narrator's presence becomes more invisible as the linguistic distinction between the narrator and the characters blurs.

Another means by which Burney employs hybridized language and obscures character distinctions is through her use of circulating language: phrases that travel through the novel either from character to character or from character to narrator. (Sometimes both paths are employed in the case of novelistic leitmotifs.) Michael Warner, in his *Publics and Counterpublics*, introduces the term "feedback loop" during an extended study of Bakhtin's speech genres. Warner's conclusion – that through its circulation, a phrase can acquire meaning related to its very movement – is an important consequence of Bakhtin's theory of heteroglossia (Warner 101). Warner's "feedback loop" enables new readings of certain types of double-voiced speech in Burney's *Cecilia*. Within *Cecilia*, I term these circulating phrases "echoed language." This language most frequently is transferred from character to character.¹¹ Often this movement of language

¹¹ Echoed language is similar to, yet distinct from, the allusive phrases Burney uses in *Evelina*. See above, 39-40. Here the language has an internal, rather than an external, origin.

is also linked to a movement of ideas. This happens when Monckton criticizes the behavior of the Delvilles and their supposed mercenary intentions to marry Cecilia to their son Mortimer. After detailing this hypothetical marriage, Monckton informs Cecilia that she “will be constantly held down as the disgrace of their alliance” (*Cecilia* 257). Cecilia is skeptical of Monckton’s warning, but during an abortive attempt to transfer her wardship to Mr. Delvile, senior, she remembers Monckton’s words during Delvile’s haughty harangue: “Ah! thought Cecilia, how infallible is Mr. Monckton! and how inevitably, in a family of which Mr. Delvile is the head, should I be cruelly *held down, as the disgrace of their alliance!*” (259). Cecilia’s use of echoed language implies that her views towards the Delvilles have aligned with Monckton’s.

Not all echoed language suggests an emotional agreement; sometimes such language can be manipulative. Repeated language is used to this effect during the scene in which Cecilia inadvertently reveals her love to Mortimer Delvile. As she is planning to return his stolen dog, she declares: “Go, then, dear Fidel...carry back to your master all that nourishes his remembrance! Bid him not love you the less for having some time belonged to Cecilia; but never may his proud heart be fed with the vain glory, of knowing how fondly for his sake she has cherished you!” (546). Mortimer has been eavesdropping, and he surprises her before she can finish her speech. As Cecilia attempts to fly from him, Mortimer grasps her hand and in language evoking her unintended love declaration, he says: “Come, *dear Fidel!*...come and plead for your master! come and ask in his name who *now* has a proud heart, whose pride *now* is invincible!” (548). Mortimer’s intentional repetition of Cecilia’s plea reveals his illicit eavesdropping,

establishing the power he now holds over her. Echoed language is used here as a weapon against Cecilia, as a means to make her accountable for her veiled emotions.

The second kind of echoed language in *Cecilia* is that which is passed from the characters to the narrator. This type of language can be interpreted through a double lens; the narrator's repetition of character language, as with hybridized discourse, can either have an ironizing intent or a universal application. The repeated phrase "married man" takes on a sarcastic function when applied to Monckton, especially when it is voiced by the narrator. The first use of this phrase occurs when the impudent Morrice tries to usurp Monckton's seat next to Cecilia. Morrice justifies his action by declaring: "Come, come, what have you married men to do with young ladies?" (83). Morrice's words are repeated in two similar scenes when Cecilia's suitors dismiss the married Monckton as a potential romantic threat. The first occurs when "Lord Ernolf, concluding Cecilia still disengaged from seeing her only discourse with Mr. Gosport and Mr. Monckton, one of whom was old enough to be her father, and the other was a *married man*," believes that his son Lord Derford will be her favored suitor (328). A little later in the novel, Delvile is happy to leave Cecilia alone with Mr. Monckton in a tête-à-tête "for her long acquaintance with that gentleman, his being a *married man*, and her neighbour in the country, were circumstances well known to him" (432). In both cases, the words "married man" are italicized to signal their origin in Morrice's vocabulary. However, the narrator uses Morrice's words ironically: even though Mr. Monckton is married, he is a real threat because he manipulates other characters in an effort to secure Cecilia as his own in anticipation of his aged wife's death. Thus, the repetition of the phrase "married man" demonstrates how the narrator appropriates character speech for satiric effect.

Echoed language that is passed from character to narrator is not always ironic; sometimes it assumes the form of universal truth. Probably the most important of these philosophical echoes in *Cecilia* is “the only one of the many internal quotations in *Cecilia* for which Burney provides a page reference, perhaps because of its Johnsonian ring” (1000, n. 2 to 790). The internal quotation identified in the footnote first appears in Mortimer Delvile’s courtship letter in which he states his belief that his family will eventually accept his change of name after he marries Cecilia: “Inevitable evils are ever best supported. It is suspense, it is hope that make the food of misery; certainty is always endured, because known to be past amendment, and felt to give defiance to struggling” (573). The phrase later recurs to Cecilia after their failed marriage attempt. She recalls Mortimer’s earlier utterance: “Her calamities had saddened, but not weakened her mind, and the words of Delvile in speaking of his mother occurred to her now with all the conviction of experience, that ‘evils inevitable are always best supported, because known to be past amendment, and felt to give defiance to struggling’” (790). Cecilia’s recollection of this phrase, “with all the conviction of experience,” hints at its philosophical function. The final sentence of the novel, in which the narrator recounts Cecilia’s acceptance of her status as an impoverished heiress, echoes the phrase: “Rationally, however, she surveyed the world at large, and finding that of the few who had any happiness, there were none without some misery, she checked the rising sigh of repining mortality, and, grateful with general felicity, bore partial evil with chearfullest resignation” (941). The narrator rewrites the sentence slightly, but its concise appearance – “bore partial evil with chearfullest resignation” – does not obscure its allusion to the

earlier phrases. Burney's philosophical end to her novel emphasizes her use of linguistic leitmotif.

The final sentence of the novel also reveals the narrator's ambiguous borrowing of character language. Seemingly written from the viewpoint of Cecilia, the last sentence contains philosophical import which the narrator also could have voiced. Julia Kristeva identifies this Bakhtinian act: when "the writer can use another's word, giving it a new meaning while retaining the meaning it already had. The result is a word with two significations: it becomes *ambivalent*" (Kristeva 43-44). This ambivalent double signification is an extension from Bakhtin's theories because, even though both the narrator's and Cecilia's voices are present, the true speaker of the passage is ambiguous. Jane Spencer observes that this ambiguous language in *Cecilia* can be seen as an early form of free-indirect discourse: "This style, in which the third-person narrative takes on a colouring from the character's idiom and consciousness, can be used in the representation of speech, but in *Cecilia* is more often used to indicate a character's thoughts, generally the heroine's" (Spencer, "*Evelina* and *Cecilia*" 35).¹² Free-indirect discourse is employed during specific moments in the novel when the origin of such language – either in third-person narration or descriptive thought – is ambiguous.¹³

¹² I am concerned with what Monica Fludernik terms the "fairly standard, almost typical case of free indirect discourse – we shift from external to internal perspective, from one mind to another, from thought to speech and perception." It is "a 'literary' 'device', whose purposes prominently include automatic gear shifting between narration and characters' minds, usually in the interests of empathy and narratorial inconspicuousness" (Fludernik 73).

¹³ Spencer defines this device in her *Literary Relations*: "It is characteristic of free indirect style that it can be difficult to distinguish between narrator's objective comment and character's subjective thought" (Spencer, *Literary Relations* 220).

Free-indirect discourse emerges almost immediately in *Cecilia* in statements that appear as general assumptions that could be voiced either by a character or the narrator. One of the finest examples of this device occurs early in the novel, when Monckton is considering the possibility of Cecilia being courted by many men while in London:

...he dreaded her residing in London, where he foresaw that numerous rivals, equal to himself in talents and in riches, would speedily surround her; rivals, too, youthful and sanguine, not shackled by present ties, but at liberty to solicit her immediate acceptance. Beauty and independence, rarely found together, would attract a crowd of suitors at once brilliant and assiduous. (*Cecilia* 10)

The beginning of the phrase clearly presents Monckton's thoughts as he is envisioning Cecilia's courtship by numerous eligible suitors. But the voicing of the final sentence – "Beauty and independence, rarely found together, would attract a crowd of suitors at once brilliant and assiduous" – is ambiguous. It may be a summation of Monckton's anxiety over Cecilia's departure, but it may also be the narrator's general wisdom regarding rich and attractive women. In any event, we cannot determine whether this is Monckton's speech or the narrator's, which makes this passage a particularly striking piece of free-indirect discourse. Burney's use of free-indirect discourse in this paragraph is even more apparent in her manuscript draft. There the final sentence reads: "Beauty & Independence, rarely found together <must> attract a crowd of suitors at once brilliant & assiduous" (*Cecilia*, Berg 1: 14). In the original version, "must" takes the place of "would"; the use of "must" gives a greater sense of urgency and anxiety to the passage. Burney's revision is consistent with her subtle alterations to Monckton's character. Linguistically, the substitution creates a greater ambiguity about the function of the

sentence as a description of Monckton's unease or as a universal truth. These mixed linguistic forms are ultimately Burney's means of grappling with what Michael Prince terms "the inevitable contamination of universals by historical and psychological circumstances" (Prince 228).

Philosophy in *Cecilia*

In *Cecilia* more than any of her other novels, philosophical elements make up an essential portion of Burney's prose. Burney was among several eighteenth-century novelists aware that "'the chit-chat of daily life' ... could become the stuff of the most elevated philosophical fictions" (Prince 228). Indeed, Burney frequently employs philosophical discourse throughout *Cecilia*, generally in reference to domestic or romantic concerns. Cecilia uses philosophical language in an attempt to cure her infatuation for Mortimer Delville, after hearing that their marriage is forbidden by his parents: "Nor was her task so difficult as she had feared; resolution, in such cases, may act the office of time, and anticipate by reason and self-denial, what that, much less nobly, effects through forgetfulness and inconstancy" (*Cecilia* 538). Burney signals the beginning of her philosophical segment by seguing into abstract terms; the second independent clause takes "resolution" as its subject and uses other immaterial values such as "time," "reason," and "forgetfulness" as its secondary subjects and objects. These abstract terms and their distance from the narrative reveal Burney's philosophical proclivities.

Burney's philosophical diction throughout *Cecilia* evokes Johnson's *Rasselas*. The third-person omniscient and intrusive narration of *Cecilia* is a significant shift from the epistolary style of *Evelina*. The narrator's language is generally elevated and

formal.¹⁴ As for the plot, Kristina Straub is one of many critics to observe that “Cecilia’s attempts to arrange and control her life are certainly reminiscent of Rasselas’ search for a course in life” (Straub 110). Such a “reading of *Cecilia* in light of the dynamics of Burney’s mentoring encounter with Samuel Johnson,” contends Anthony Lee, would find that “both feature young protagonists raised without parental supervision in a sequestered environment whose entrance into the world, facilitated by mentoring guardians, is inflated by great hopes and expectations that are rapidly deflated after a series of encounters with a sadly fallen reality” (Lee 251, 273).

Part of *Cecilia* centers on the fruitless search for happiness; Cecilia, like Johnson’s eponymous hero, spends much of the novel asking herself, “What, at last...is human felicity, who has tasted, and where is it to be found?” (*Cecilia* 54). Indeed, the transience of happiness is a significant theme within the novel and often appears in situations centering upon Cecilia and Mortimer Delvile’s marriage dilemma: should he forfeit his ancient family name or should she forfeit her large inheritance? After Cecilia reveals the difficulties surrounding her relationship with Delvile to her friend Henrietta Belfield, “She [Cecilia] communicated briefly to Henrietta, who looked her earnest curiosity, the continuance of her suspense; and to her own fate Henrietta became somewhat more reconciled, when she saw that no station in life rendered happiness certain or permanent” (816). This motif of incomplete happiness, significantly, informs the final sentence of the novel: “Rationally, however, she surveyed the world at large,

¹⁴ Stylistically, *Cecilia* is the most Johnsonian of Burney’s novels; according to Cutting-Gray, “In *Cecilia*, Burney purportedly imitates Johnson in relying upon a style built on Latinate nominalizations. Nominalizations turn verbs, action, the dynamics of process, into essences, nouns; they stop movement, they create the passive voice, they fix passages” (Cutting-Gray 52).

and finding that of the few who had any happiness, there were none without some misery, she checked the rising sigh of repining mortality, and, grateful with general felicity, bore partial evil with chearfullest resignation” (941). Burney also directly refers to Johnson on several occasions in her novel. During one of Belfield’s self-admonitions, he says: “I respected the voice of wisdom and experience in the first of moralists, and most enlightened of men” (663). Burney herself provides a rare gloss to this passage, identifying this “most enlightened of men” as “Dr. Johnson.”

Besides its philosophic diction, *Cecilia* features actual philosophic debates between characters. The idea of originality versus universal or “eternal precepts” is canvassed twice in the novel, even though the issue is never settled between the two disputants, Monckton and Belfield. Monckton condones occasional outbursts of originality: “when they proceed from genius, [they] are not merely pardonable, but admirable...but so little genius as there is in the world, you must surely grant that pleas of this sort are very rarely to be urged” (15). But Monckton finds “deviations from common rules” to be generally harmful. Belfield conversely and empirically opposes all “general rules,” “appropriated customs,” and “settled forms” (15). In particular, Belfield posits that every man must “act for himself, if neither worldly views, contracted prejudices, eternal precepts, nor compulsive examples, swayed his better reason and impelled his conduct, how noble indeed would he be! *how infinite in faculties! in apprehension how like a God!*” (15). Belfield’s impassioned speech advocating originality is undermined by its near-exact appropriation of a speech by Shakespeare’s Hamlet (2.2.273-76). Belfield’s unoriginal defense of originality confirms the impracticality of a world where “imitation [is] abolished” (16).

The second debate between Monckton and Belfield is similar, as Monckton's distrust of unalloyed independence is again privileged. At the time of their second argument, Belfield has worked at a series of jobs: formerly a day-laborer, he is currently a writer. Each new position alters Belfield's conception of independence. As a writer, Belfield revises the definition of "independence" he conceived during his employment as a laborer. Belfield now concedes that a man who relies on another for food can still be independent: "may he not claim the freedom of his own thoughts? may not that claim be extended to the liberty of speaking, and the power of being governed by them? and when thoughts, words, and actions are exempt from controul, will you brand him with dependency merely because the Grazier feeds his meat, and the Baker kneads his bread?" (*Cecilia* 735). Belfield also makes concessions with respect to "matters of ceremony" (735). He admits that the "settled forms" which he vehemently opposed earlier (15), can coexist with his revised version of independence: "The bow is to the coat, the attention is to the rank, and the fear of offending ought to extend to all mankind. Homage such as this infringes not our sincerity, since it is as much a matter of course as the dress that we wear" (735). Out of necessity, Belfield revises his conception of independence: his freedom is bound by customs and needs, barely resembling his earlier vision. Belfield's capricious versions of autonomy confirm the impracticality of his ideals and the need for balance through the use of reflection and revision.

Monckton's counterarguments also reveal the uselessness of Belfield's utopian, self-sufficient lifestyle. The hypocritical Monckton is not a moral center, but his cynical arguments are nonetheless practical. Monckton calls Belfield's independence "a mere idle dream of romance and enthusiasm; without existence in nature, without possibility in

life” (734). He continues to describe the necessarily dependent nature of human communities: “one part of a community must inevitably hang upon another, and ’tis a farce to call either independent, when to break the chain by which they are linked would prove destruction to both” (734). By asserting that humans must follow given forms, Monckton even opposes Belfield’s initial claim that men must pursue free thought and free speech: “But who is there in the whole world...extensive as it is, and dissimilar as are its inhabitants that can pretend to assert, his thoughts, words, and actions, are exempt from controul?” (735). When Monckton finally presses Belfield for his exact definition of independence, Belfield advocates universal equality and equity: “I hold that man...to be independent, who treats the Great as the Little, and the Little as the Great, who neither exults in riches nor blushes in poverty, who owes no man a groat, and who spends not a shilling he has not earned” (735-36). Belfield’s response now seems to celebrate the “eternal sameness of manner and appearance which at present runs through all ranks of men” that he formerly despised (16). But it is Monckton’s final question that truly exposes the weakness of Belfield’s precepts: “but is it possible you imagine you can live by such notions?” (736). The answer – readily apparent from Belfield’s mercurial actions and haphazard employment – is a resounding, though unspoken, negative.

Belfield is a self-proclaimed philosopher, at best, erratic and quixotic. Indeed, Burney makes several references to Miguel de Cervantes’s *Don Quixote* (1605, 1615) in *Cecilia*, and in all of these allusions, Belfield is aligned with Don Quixote himself. When Monckton comments on Belfield’s intention to turn “Knight-errant to the Book sellers,” Belfield, conscious of Monckton’s Cervantean allusion, replies in kind: “’Tis a Knight-errantry...which, however ludicrous it may seem to you, requires more soul and more

brains than any other. Our giants may, indeed, be only windmills, but they must be attacked with as much spirit, and conquered with as much bravery, as any fort or any town” (*Cecilia* 736). Belfield’s connection with Don Quixote is even more transparent earlier in the novel when Belfield adopts the persona for the Harrels’ masquerade. Burney’s narrator emphasizes the accuracy and the appropriateness of Belfield’s costume. Not only is Belfield’s shape “tall and thin,” like Don Quixote’s, Burney’s “Don Quixote was accoutered with tolerable exactness according to the description of the admirable Cervantes; his armour was rusty, his helmet was a barber’s bason, his shield, a pewter dish, and his lance, an old sword fastened to a slim cane” (108). Belfield even adopts Don Quixote’s romantic and high-flown diction as he addresses the distressed Cecilia during the masquerade scene: “Report, O most fair and unmatchable virgin! daringly affirmeth, that a certain discourteous person, who calleth himself the devil, even now, and in thwart of your fair inclinations, keepeth and detaineth your irradiant frame in hostile thralldom” (*Cecilia* 109, cf. Cervantes 621).

Belfield’s similarity to Don Quixote should be an essential facet of any interpretation of his character. Previous critics have argued that Belfield’s difficulties result from the discrepancy between his education and talents and his social standing.¹⁵ But his difficulties stem rather from his idealistic quest for a complete, but elusive independence. Destined for trade, the young Belfield entered the army and studied at the Temple to be a lawyer (*Cecilia* 11-12). Though he shows early promise by his “quickness of parts and vigour of imagination,” his talents are “associated with fickleness and caprice” (12). During his legal training, Belfield neglected his studies in favor of

¹⁵ See especially Doody 131.

entertainment: “the law grew more and more fatiguing, pleasure became more and more alluring, and, by degrees, he had not a day unappropriated to some party or amusement” (216). Belfield’s unreflecting and dissipated life of pleasure unravels after he is injured in a duel. Upon his recovery, Mortimer Delvile gets him a post as a tutor, but conscious of his inferiority of rank, Belfield leaves his post and becomes a laborer in his search for the “great secret of happiness,” which he now believes to be “Labour with Independence” (659). Belfield’s rapid transition from dissipation to hard labor reveals the fickle nature of his quest. His capriciousness continues throughout the rest of the novel; not long after Cecilia discovers Belfield as a laborer, she sees him as a writer. Every time he adopts a new career, he is equally enthusiastic: “writing is no labour to me; on the contrary, it is the first delight of my life, and therefore, and not for dirty pelf, I wish to make it my profession” (722). Soon after he becomes a writer, Belfield is transformed into a bookkeeper (881). By the end of the novel, Belfield is back in the army, as “his hopes were revived by ambition, and his prospects were brightened by a view of future honour” (940). Yet the completed cycle of his employment (one of his earliest occupations was in the army) signals the continuation of Belfield’s difficulties rather than their end. It is Belfield’s “fickleness and caprice” that restrict him rather than his aspirations for social mobility. Belfield’s inability to maintain a profession shows that his plan of life, with its unalloyed independence and quixotic originality, is untenable.

Cecilia, the other character in Burney’s novel who must situate herself in society, serves as Belfield’s foil. She originally begins her quest for independence and happiness in much the same way as Belfield. Disgusted with the Harrels’ way of living, which is “exactly like every body else that mixes at all with the world” (30), Cecilia resolves on a

way of living completely different and independent from that of others. “She purposed, for the basis of her plan, to become mistress of her own time, and with this view, to drop all idle and uninteresting acquaintance” (55). By sifting through society so that “she might have all the leisure she could desire for the pursuit of her favourite studies, music and reading,” Cecilia concocts an alluring plan of life (55). Like Belfield’s schemes, hers are guided by independence and originality. But while Belfield’s plans are largely selfish, “A strong sense of DUTY, a fervent desire to ACT RIGHT, were the ruling characteristics of her [Cecilia’s] mind: her affluence she therefore considered as a debt contracted with the poor, and her independence, as a tie upon her liberality to pay it with interest” (55). Because of their altruistic roots, Cecilia’s idealistic designs seem more destined to succeed than Belfield’s.

Cecilia, however, cannot maintain her independent ideal. Soon discovering “the error into which her ardour of reformation had hurried her” (131) – that her abandonment of undesirable social ties and her devotion to studies has resulted in “a rigid seclusion from company” – “she resolved to soften her plan, and by mingling amusement with benevolence, to try, at least, to approach that golden mean” (131). Cecilia’s recognition and revision of her unalloyed zeal allow her to discover that happiness may be achieved through tempered, sober living:

Here, therefore, Cecilia experienced that happiness she so long had coveted in vain: her life was neither public nor private, her amusements were neither dissipated nor retired; the company she saw were either people of high rank or strong parts, and their visits were neither frequent nor long. The situation she quitted gave a zest to that into which she entered, for she was now no longer

shocked by extravagance or levity, no longer tormented with addresses which disgusted her, nor mortified by the ingratitude of the friend she had endeavoured to serve. All was smooth and serene, yet lively and interesting. (238-39)

Cecilia's way of life is characterized by moderation. She sees a large variety of people, but the mixture of rank and talent in their abilities permits her to experience a life that is "smooth and serene, yet lively and interesting." The maxim that guides Cecilia's behavior is one of reflective moderation, a quality which Belfield can never achieve.

The few instances of Cecilia's unthinking idealism within the novel are punished. After giving massive sums of money to Harrel to quell his menaces of bankruptcy and suicide, Cecilia loses her entire inheritance and still does not prevent his death. Her unquestioning reliance on Monckton leads to her distrust of the Delvilles and culminates in her first, aborted wedding attempt with Delvile. The failure of Cecilia's initial wedding shows that she cannot have it all: she does not get to keep both her money and her man. Before the first ceremony, Cecilia anticipates future evils because of "the disgraceful secrecy of her conduct, the expected reproaches of Mrs. Delvile, and the boldness and indelicacy of the step she was about to take" (624). At the crucial moment, the wedding ceremony is interrupted by a mysterious objector hired by Monckton. After a long separation, Cecilia and Delvile attempt to marry again; the second effort is different because Cecilia agrees to relinquish her inheritance so that Delvile can keep his last name and receive his mother's blessing (830). The second ceremony, a moneyless,

and hence bittersweet, revision of the first, is successful.¹⁶ Cecilia and Delvile must moderate their behavior before they can wed successfully; the tribulations they experience anticipate the continual courtship revisions Edgar and Camilla must undergo in Burney's next novel, *Camilla*.

¹⁶ The two marriage attempts are located in book eight, chapter two, "An Event" (623-33), and book nine, chapter eleven, "An Enterprise" (825-32).

Chapter 3

Camilla: Revising the “prose Epic”

While Burney made minimal revisions to *Evelina* and *Cecilia* after their initial publication, she could not stop writing *Camilla* (1796), the third and longest of her four novels. Multiple manuscript drafts of the novel exist: initial notes scattered between the British Library and the Berg Collection of the New York Public Library, two lengthy drafts in the Berg Collection (an early, incomplete version and an almost fair copy transcribed by Burney’s husband Alexandre d’Arblay, with a few corrections in Burney’s hand), forty-six double-sided sheets of deleted scenes at the British Library, and a manuscript leaf at the Houghton Library. The wealth of extant manuscript material for *Camilla* is unprecedented among Burney’s novels and is supplemented by Burney’s post-publication revisions. *Camilla* is the only novel that Burney heavily revised for a second edition (1802), and not long after the publication of her final novel, *The Wanderer* (1814), Burney began working on a third. In a letter of 4 November 1835 to publisher Richard Bentley, Burney communicated her intention to amend the 1802 edition: “I have long since employed myself, occasionally, in revising *Camilla*, as it has been out of print for many years, & has been demanded of me; though, as it is not ready, I have hitherto declined entering into any species of negociation about it” (*JL* 12: 881). Regrettably, Burney died before she could publish or even write out a manuscript draft incorporating her latest corrections. Only her third-edition revisions to the fifth volume of *Camilla* survive, contained inside her incomplete *Camilla* holograph at the Berg Collection.¹

¹ Scraps containing Burney’s corrections to the second edition can be dated from 1819 to 1836.

Burney's recurring and nearly-obsessive revisions to *Camilla*, which span half a lifetime, form the basis of this chapter.

Burney first mentioned her plan for *Camilla* less than a month after the publication of *Cecilia* on 12 July 1782. In a letter of 5 August to family friend Samuel Crisp, Burney revealed that she had "another [work] already planned & begun." She intimated scant details of the plot: "I entreat you, meantime, not to whisper to any mortal my *ugly scheme*, as I mean to go on with it, as soon as my mind, memory & faculties can expel their present possessors [the characters of *Cecilia*], & will find they have again free play" (*EJL* 5: 92). Burney's "ugly scheme" eventually developed into the story of Eugenia, one of the heroines of *Camilla*.² An early version of Burney's "ugly scheme" is buried among hundreds of *Camilla* scrap notes housed in the Berg Collection. Entitled "an amiable Laide,"³ this heretofore unpublished leaf contains a brief outline of a novel with notes on plot and characterization:

[excellence of character] [cultivation of understanding] [sensibility of Heart]
[<Deformity>] [abused when elegantly Duped] [contracted unseen] [taken at 1st
sight by her Lover for a maid] [plainness of Dress][adventure with <Buck's>
disappointment & insolence][her sisters airs][her humanity][deeply in love][her
misery][Riches][Poverty][Conversation with a simple Girl concern^g. her Love, &
her blunt naiveté][generosity of temper][great fortune][courted only by misers &
spendthrifts][Letters][has a simple good maid her Foster sister][taken for a maid

² Burney makes this connection explicitly in a later annotation to her letter: "This ugly plan became, afterwards, a part only, of The Picture of Youth, or Camilla; under the character of Eugenia" (*EJL* 5: 93 n. 8).

³ I.e., an ugly woman (French). The title is preceded by various female names: "Sophia Marianne Lucy / Heads of a History of Louisa / Henrietta." The name "Louisa" is often used as a substitute for "Eugenia" in the *Camilla* manuscripts.

kept by way of foil][affronted at the Play House][insulted in
Walking][impertinence of some young Beauties][her good natured
allowance][addressed by a gay young man][his careless ease &
consciousness][his deliberation][accident at Ranelagh, disregarded & hurt][at an
assembly slighted & ridiculed][2^d. time Courted][admired & followed at a
Masquerade][a visitor's distress between the Beauty & the amiable][both reduced
to labour – general pity for the Beauty – & neglect of the Laide][adventures in a
Stage Coach] Discourse with the Beauty after the Masquerade⁴ (*Camilla*, Berg)

Several of these nascent plot points are retained and broadened in the published novel, including Eugenia's fortune, her deformity, her generous temper, and her suitor-cousin Clermont's scornful treatment of her. Eugenia's sisters, mentioned cursorily here, are much more prominent in the published version, especially the eponymous Camilla. In the approximately fourteen years that separate this brief outline from the published novel, Burney revised her plan for *Camilla*, expanding and then later contracting it for her work on the second and projected third editions.

Burney produced many scraps during the long gestation of *Camilla*,⁵ some of which reveal her intention to widen the scope of the novel beyond that of a single character. One of these early scraps contains a plan of a novel centered upon a family:

A Family brought up in a plain, æconomical, industrious way, all happy,
contented, vigourous & affectionate.

Sudden affluence comes to them –

⁴ This phrase was written at a later date. The brackets used throughout the passage were also later insertions by Burney.

⁵ According to Burney, she developed the “skeleton” of *Camilla* during her service as Keeper of the Robes to Queen Charlotte from 1786 to 1791. See *JL* 3: 176.

They are exhilarated

Some exult – some are even – some <break> out – some gallop on to
profusion

A sermon on equanimity

Some grow indolent & insolent

Suddenly all is lost

Reduced to Penury

Some humbly sad – some <xxxxxx *I word*> respiring: – some haughtily hardy
– some pettishly impatient – one <charmingly> submissive.

A sermon on Disappointments

What of Riffs⁶ & cramping before seemed nothing, & of course, now appear
hardships & sorrow – (*Camilla*, Berg)

This plan is broader in scope and vaguer in content than the outline of Burney's "amiable Laide." The family's sudden twists of fortune prefigure the financial tribulations of the Tyrold family, the central family in *Camilla*. Burney's shift in focus from a single heroine to a large family group foreshadows the consciously expansive style of her third novel: "it *is* of the same species as *Evelina* & *Cecilia*: new *modified*, in being more multifarious in the Characters it brings into action, — but all *wove* into *one*, with a one *Heroine* shining conspicuous through the Group, & that in what Mr. Twining so flatteringly calls *the prose Epic Style*" (*JL* 3: 128-29).⁷ The time frame of *Camilla* has

⁶ According to the *OED*, riffs are "Any of various diseases (of humans or animals) which make the skin itchy or scaly."

⁷ Austin contextualizes the term "prose epic": "The term was associated at the time primarily with Cervantes and Henry Fielding, and her choice of it may have partly been an attempt to lay claim to their presumed artistic disinterestedness as 'classic' novel-

also expanded: it spans several years, covering the early childhoods through the young adulthoods of the youthful members of the Tyrold family, while *Evelina* and *Cecilia* occupy a couple years at the most.

But Burney's "epic" agenda is complicated by her various revisions, which can be seen as *Camilla* is transformed from early manuscript to published novel, from second edition to projected third edition. Burney's changes to *Camilla* were often radical in scope and were not always improvements. Throughout her revisions, Burney concentrated more on the heroine and major characters, progressively discarding secondary plot strands, reducing the characterization of minor figures, and distancing herself from the aims of "*the prose Epic style*." With each layer of Burney's revisions, *Camilla* progressively moved towards the *Bildungsroman* form of *Evelina* and *Cecilia*. As with Burney's previous novels, *Camilla* contains innovative linguistic devices and textual and thematic allusions, but as it is, more than any of her novels, a continued revision, it is perhaps most fitting that character reflection is at the root of the major conflicts in the novel.⁸

Alternate Names and Rejected Plot Strands

At first glance, the most noticeable features of Burney's early *Camilla* manuscripts are her small, intermittent deletions, which generally indicate changed

writers in the newly established canon. But Burney seems also to have been quite interested in the formal qualities of the prose epic, "...large scope and unity" (Austin, "'All Wove into One'" 277).

⁸ George Justice has identified the significance of the term "reflection" in *Camilla*, since "Burney uses the word repeatedly to signal moments in which careful contemplation would prevent the protagonist's suffering." Justice, however, also uses the term to emphasize the didactic function of Burney's novel: "Such reflection becomes both the subject matter and the intended aim of the novel as a genre" (Justice, *Manufacturers of Literature* 224).

character names. Naming, as in *Cecilia*, is very important. Braving the disapproval of her brother Charles, Burney defended her selection of “Camilla” as the name of her heroine: “I must leave it for the present untouched, for the force of the name attached by the idea of the Character, in the author’s mind, is such, that I should not know how to sustain it by any other for a long while. In *Cecilia & Evelina* ’twas the same: the Names of all the personages annexed with me all the ideas I put in motion with them” (*JL* 3: 143). Burney’s statement belies the fact that Camilla is variously named Ariella and Clarinda in her manuscript drafts, and many of the other characters have alternate names. Eugenia is, at times, Louisa, a name mentioned in Burney’s “amiable Laide” outline. Lavinia, elder sister to Camilla and Eugenia, is also named Stella.⁹ Their brother Lionel is called Tybalt, a probable allusion to the hot-tempered antagonist of Shakespeare’s *Romeo and Juliet*. Their cousin Indiana is also called Cleora, a name that sonically resembles Camilla. The last name of the central family is initially “Ireton,” a family name recycled in *The Wanderer* for one of the heroine’s choleric patronesses. Burney’s most fascinating name-change is her gender-bending transformation of Mrs. Arlbery into Mr. Solmes, a reference to the distasteful suitor in Samuel Richardson’s *Clarissa*.

It logically follows, from Burney’s declaration that “the Names of all the personages annexed with me all the ideas I put in motion with them,” that cancelled character names populate many of her deleted manuscript fragments. Two large plot deletions form the bulk of the *Camilla* manuscript housed at the British Library. The first canceled episode involves the characters staging a play, Sir John Vanbrugh and Colley

⁹ Burney’s final choices of “Camilla” and “Lavinia” might confirm her epic aims. Both of these names allude to *The Aeneid*. Lavinia is the name of Aeneas’s betrothed, and Camilla is the warrior-maiden who fought against Aeneas and the Trojans. See Kraft 40.

Cibber's *The Provok'd Husband* (1728), a scene that was later resurrected in Burney's *The Wanderer*.¹⁰ In Burney's manuscript draft, the play scene serves to contrast Camilla's impulsiveness with Edgar's displeasure and highlight their seeming incompatibility. After Ariella (Camilla) is assigned the role of the saucy Miss Jenny, her suitor Cyrill (Edgar) "felt hurt & indignant; & secretly determined that if Ariella, after his intended remonstrance, persisted to degrade herself by consenting to such a performance, he would think of her no more" (*Camilla*, BL 35r).¹¹ The play scene also reveals Camilla's natural acting abilities, which foreshadow those of Juliet in *The Wanderer*: "She next took her part, which she read, for the first time, with a desire to render interesting; & she soon found, both in that & in herself, powers of which she had formed no idea. She studied every speech attentively, tried various modes both of delivery & of action, & gave effect to every word" (41v).

A second, larger discarded plan from Burney's *Camilla* involves the heroine's potential mercenary marriage to an aged nobleman. In an unpublished scrap entitled "*Dial. After Elopem^t.*," or "Dialogue After Elopement," the female protagonist, here named Budna, has actually gone through with the loathsome marriage:

¹⁰ *Camilla*, BL 33r-36v contains most of the playacting scenes, but these continue through 42r. See *The Wanderer*, Appendix VI 901-5. It was not uncommon for Burney to recycle her discarded ideas. *Camilla*'s "ugly scheme", after all, was formed while Burney was composing *Cecilia*. In her letter of 15 August [1781] to Crisp, Burney gives an update on the progress of *Cecilia* and reveals her original "ugly scheme": "You enquire about your favourite Ugly Girl, – O that Ugliness should ever find *you* it's Favourer! – but alack I have never once thought of her since I presented her to you!" (*EJL* 4: 432-33). See above, 62-63.

¹¹ Interestingly, neither Camilla nor Juliet is assigned the role of the proper and perfect Lady Grace in their respective stagings. Miss Jenny Wronghead – the pert, immature country girl whose head is turned after a little flattery – magnifies some of Camilla's venial flaws, and Lady Townly – the praise-seeking wife, who follows a schedule of pleasure independent from that of her husband – contains some interesting parallels with the unhappily married Juliet.

For him I feel no remorse – were he not the meanest of men, cd. he have coveted marry^g. a woman in whose esteem he had no share?

He was no better, no more disinterested than myself – if I accepted him for his fortune, he sought me from an inclination in wh{i}ch he knew I had no participation – he consulted my Heart, my happiness as little as I consulted his..

O mad that I am, what is it I have done? to avoid poverty & trouble, I consented to marry – & now – married as I am, what else is my portion? (*Camilla*, BL 43r)

The remorseful Budna places most of the blame for her miserable marriage on her husband. Her language is stilted and didactic, and her fate is much darker than that of Burney's previous heroines. This early marriage is not present in the published version of *Camilla*, but, as with the recycled play scene, the idea of a heroine's initial, undesirable marriage is reused in *The Wanderer*, though, for Juliet, the marriage is neither mercenary nor even sanctioned. The creation of a sympathetic heroine willingly married to an undesirable and unsuitable partner would have been a daring leap for Burney, one she unfortunately never took.

A later, fuller draft of *Camilla*'s initial marriage attempt, fleshed out in the British Library manuscript,¹² has been discussed by a few critics, especially Margaret Anne Doody, who summarizes it in *Frances Burney: The Life in the Works* (209-13). The difference between the longer manuscript draft and the "Dialogue After Elopement" is that, in the former, the marriage is averted at the last minute. Despite the heroine's

¹² *Camilla*, BL 44r-73r.

confessed “rooted, fixed abhorrence” to the groom (*Camilla*, BL 44r), “she wished herself rather at the Altar, than Tête à Tête with her Father” (47r). Camilla believes the “Tête à Tête” will lead to the revelation of her extensive debts, the reason she had consented to a mercenary marriage in the first place.¹³ Her sister Lavinia plays a large role in the manuscript as her confidant, and although the married Eugenia and Mrs. Tyrold are not physically present, their cautionary letters cause Camilla to question her decision (52v-56r). The moment of Camilla’s reversal can be pinpointed to the last-minute conference she has with her father, just before she embarks in a carriage to the church. Camilla’s unwillingness to marry Lord Winstow is revealed through her father’s sequence of penetrating questions regarding the marriage state:

“Can you take this man to your wedded Husband, in chearful confidence you take him, after the holy ordinance of marriage, with no sinister view, no mere lurking egotism, but for the bond of mutual happiness, society, & comfort? --- Answer! Clarinda, answer!”

“O my Father!” she falteringly articulated, but could not utter another word.

“Will you obey him?”

She bowed her head with readiness.

“Will you serve him?...”

Again, though with less alacrity, her head marked assent.

¹³ In the published version of the novel, Camilla’s unwillingness to reveal her substantial debts has similarly disastrous results: her father is sent to a debtor’s prison, and her uncle’s residence at Cleves is temporarily shut down (823-24, 849-55).

“Reflect a little first. This is no subject for precipitance. Know you what the services may be he will exact? Are you informed of his moral character? his natural disposition? his private conduct? Answer!”

“Alas --- no!”

{“} By what criterion, then, do you judge to what this contract may expose you? And, without knowing these circumstances, upon what is your union built?”

Trembling{,} abashed, & wretched, again she hid her face; but he drew from it her hand, with a look that quietly, but decisively, demanded to see it during his interrogatories.

“You make me no reply? – Here, then, you find yourself, in your very first setting out, a Bankrupt. Let us go further. Can you...love him?”

Her Face was now no longer pale; the blood of her whole person seemed to mount into it, while, gasping again from breath, confounded, & looking down, she said “Spare me, my Father!”

“My poor Girl! cried he, sighing, why so little sparest thou thyself? – But let us go on. Know all thy obligation, & proceed by thy power of fulfilling it. Can you Honour him?”

The remembrance of their first interview darted now into her mind, with her first opinion of his ill intentions & immorality, & leaning against her Father’s shoulder, “O Heaven! she ejaculated, what will become of me!” (62v-63v)

Mr. Tyrold’s series of questions to Camilla perverts the customary vows of an Anglican wedding service into an interrogation. His language and tone regress from happy formality to terse urgency by the end of the conversation. In fact, Mr. Tyrold’s

uncharacteristic harshness in this part of the draft is a welcome departure from his normally unflappable geniality in the published novel, which is unvarying despite his son's criminal actions and his own sojourn in debtor's prison. As for Camilla, her emotional response – she trembles, sighs, and gasps for breath – is privileged over her direct speech. After this meeting, Mr. Tyrold prevents the marriage and himself delivers “so ignominious a confession” of the rationale behind the breach to Lord Winstow since Camilla's “youth & sex pointed impropriety in such a scene” (65v). Camilla's betrothed, Lord Winstow, is probably an earlier incarnation of Lord Valhurst. In this case, Camilla's “first opinion of his ill intentions & immorality” would be “the dishonourable views of his offered services” to escort her home after she has been mistaken, with Mrs. Mittin, as a shoplifter. Camilla's first impression of Lord Valhurst is clearly one of “horror” (*Camilla* 615). Later in the published novel, Lord Valhurst wants to marry Camilla, though this plan never comes to fruition: “in a very few days, notwithstanding their disproportion in age, his embarrassed though large estates, and the little or no fortune which she had in view, he determined to marry her: for when a man of rank and riches resolves to propose himself to a woman who has neither, he conceives his acceptance not a matter of doubt” (684).

An early form of Mrs. Arlbery, surprisingly, has a hand in Camilla's mercenary marriage. In the draft manuscript, darker aspects of her personality are brought to light. She is Camilla's go-between in dealings with Lord Winstow, and she urges Camilla towards the marriage, even attempting to prevent Camilla from seeing her father in the last minutes before the marriage is solemnized. In later corrections to the manuscript, her name is changed to “Mr. Solmes,” an apt choice for an advocate of a pressured,

mercenary marriage.¹⁴ Yet Mrs. Arlbery, ever a mixture of benevolence and mischief, is never entirely evil. Even though she is disappointed at the aborted marriage, she manages to pardon Camilla:

“Well, if you [Mr. Tyrold], whom all the World pretends to call a Pattern of perfection, can forgive this little Coquet trick, I, to be sure, who, if the whim had struck me, should have performed just such another, must not affect to be too sublime for it. The fact, I believe, is, I am jealous of her caprices. They are precisely my own passion; yet I never had courage – or at least opportunity – to carry them so gloriously high. Everything ready, House, Jewels, Equipage, Friends, Relations, Servants, & Bridegroom, all obsequiously assembled, for no purpose mortal man can find out, save to be told they are not wanted.” (*Camilla*, BL 68r)

Mrs. Arlbery’s empathy – “I...should have performed just such another” – is nearly obscured by her sarcastic catalogue of the wasted preparations for Camilla’s marriage: “House, Jewels, Equipage, Friends, Relations, Servants, & Bridegroom.” This inventory might imply that Mrs. Arlbery harbors bitter feelings, but the language throughout – “gloriously high”, “no purpose mortal man can find out” – reveals that her tone is characteristically playful.

As with Mrs. Arlbery, other secondary characters in the draft are given more complexity through their reactions to Camilla’s cancelled wedding. Mrs. Berlinton (here Mrs. Lintot), the beautiful sister of Eugenia’s beloved Melmond, is now clearly presented as Camilla’s foil. In the published novel, Camilla and Mrs. Berlinton become instant and

¹⁴ Burney’s name and gender change of Mrs. Arlbery was half-hearted at best, since all of the pronouns linked to her character in the draft were left feminine.

fast friends. They are both impulsive and thoughtless, but Camilla's near-mercenary marriage in the draft creates another connection between them: Mrs. Berlinton "heard with the most pathetic regret, that, for her, no such Parent had interfered. 'My friends, cried she, saw nothing but the first splendour of the alliance...And I, the unhappy victim, was too inexperienced to know the sacrifice they exacted! Alas! within less than a year – how cruelly have I learnt its appreciation!'" (72r-v). Had the mercenary match taken place, Camilla would have become a second Mrs. Berlinton. Two other expanded minor characters are Indiana and Miss Margland (Cleora and Miss Austen in the manuscript). Their mean-spirited behavior is emphasized in their reactions to Camilla's aborted marriage: "They joined, however, so little in the sentiments of Mrs. Lintot, that they both secretly doubted the truth of the history, & believed either that Lord {Winstow} had never seriously meant the marriage, or that he had himself repented & retreated" (73r). The ill-will of Indiana and Miss Margland is documented throughout the published novel, and this allegation is similar to their earlier claim that Camilla shamelessly pursued Edgar.¹⁵ Both are attempts to tarnish Camilla's reputation. By retaining Camilla's initial acquisitive marriage, or at the very least the marriage attempt, Burney would have created a fundamentally different heroine, and she would have given needed depth to some of her minor characters, especially Mr. Tyrold.¹⁶

¹⁵ Miss Margland had previously accused Camilla of trying to alienate Edgar from his supposed fiancée, Indiana (164-69).

¹⁶ Camilla is able to avoid a mercenary wedding and emerges untainted in the published novel, just as Burney was able to escape her harsh "marriage" to Court life. Doody writes of the cancelled marriage scene: "It is easy to see in this sequence Frances Burney's vivid recollection of the ill-fated morning of 17 July 1786 that saw her entry on her father's arm along the walk at Windsor and into the Queen's Lodge" (Doody 212). Burney's own language confirms her analogy of Court life to marriage. In the first journal-letter that she sent her sister Susan from court, she wrote: "I am *married*, my

Thematic Reductions and Minor Character Deletions

While Burney's most drastic changes to *Camilla* are her deleted manuscript subplots, she also made various abridgments between the first and second editions. Most of Burney's corrections to the first edition remove wordy or unclear phrasing. In particular, the narrator's dense philosophical musings have been substantially pared down for the second edition. The most significant of these changes is Burney's deletion of the entire first paragraph of the novel:

The historian of human life finds less of difficulty and of intricacy to develop, in its accidents and adventures, than the investigator of the human heart in its feelings and its changes. In vain may Fortune wave her many-coloured banner, alternately regaling and dismaying, with hues that seem glowing with all the creation's felicities, or with tints that appear stained with ingredients of unmixed horrors; her most rapid vicissitudes, her most unassimilating eccentricities, are mocked, laughed at, and distanced by the wilder wonders of the Heart of man...

(*Camilla* 7)

Rife with convoluted phrasing, the opening paragraph of *Camilla* was savaged and parodied by Burney's contemporaries.¹⁷ The second edition begins with the first and following chapter; the opening sentence is still philosophical, but the phrasing is much

dearest Susan,—I look upon it in that light,—I was averse to forming the union, & I endeavoured to escape it; but my friends interfered,—they prevailed—& the knot is tied. What, then, now remains, but to make the best Wife in my power?" (*CJL* 1: 8). See also Thaddeus, *Frances Burney* 121. Joyce Hemlow has an alternate interpretation of this scene: "Camilla's rejection of a suitor (to be read at length in discarded pages of the work) is a feverish, highly-wrought, nightmarish version of the attitude of Fanny herself and her family towards Mr. Barlow," who was Burney's declared suitor several years earlier (Hemlow 253).

¹⁷ William Beckford parodies this paragraph in the "Exordium Extraordinary" to his *Azemias* (1797). See Gemmett xx-xxi.

clearer: “Repose is not more welcome to the worn and to the aged, to the sick and to the unhappy, than danger, difficulty, and toil to the young and adventurous” (*Camilla*, 2nd ed. 1: 1). Wordy philosophical diction is also excised from the end of the novel. While both editions end with the musings of Edgar’s tutor, Dr. Marchmont, the two final sentences of the first edition reveal Dr. Marchmont’s regret at his narrow-minded interpretations of Camilla’s behavior:

And Dr. Marchmont, as he saw the pure innocence, open frankness, and spotless honour of her heart, found her virtues, her errors, her facility, or her desperation, but A PICTURE OF YOUTH; and regretting the false light given by the spirit of comparison, in the hypothesis which he had formed from individual experience, acknowledged its injustice, its narrowness, and its arrogance. What, at last, so diversified as man? what so little to be judged by his fellow? (*Camilla* 913)

The second edition ends with the phrase “A PICTURE OF YOUTH” (*Camilla*, 2nd ed. 5: 329), leaving out the explicit mention of Dr. Marchmont’s remorse, character development that was implied in the previous clause, and also Burney’s repetitious and didactic strictures on the necessity of informed judgment.

The major deletions in the second edition go beyond linguistic reductions; a number of them are tied to the themes of debt and money. Much has been made of the importance of money in Burney’s novels, especially *Camilla*, in which the heroine is tormented by a trifling debt.¹⁸ From the beginning of the second edition, Burney reduces the specificity of monetary transactions. In the first edition, Sir Hugh’s instructions regarding his will are quite detailed: “he would provide handsomely, he said, for Indiana

¹⁸ Katherine Binhammer’s claim “that the unity of *Camilla*’s plot comes from her debt” is belied by the nature of many of Burney’s cuts to the first edition (12).

and Clermont, by settling a thousand pounds a year between them; and he would bequeath capital legacies amongst the rest of his nephews and nieces: but as to the bulk of his fortune, it should all go to Camilla” (*Camilla* 16). The second edition gives a much vaguer inheritance scheme: “he would provide handsomely, he said, for Indiana and Clermont, but as to the bulk of his fortune, it should all go to Camilla” (*Camilla*, 2nd ed. 1: 17). Likewise, in the fifth volume, when Camilla is lamenting the desolation at Cleves, her regrets about Edgar are linked to her debt: “‘Ah Edgar!’ she cried, ‘had I trusted you as I ought, from the moment of your generous declaration – had my confidence been as firm in your kindness as in your honour, what misery had I been saved! – from this connexion – from my debts – from every wide-spreading mischief! – I could then have erred no more, for I should have thought but of your approbance!’” (*Camilla* 847-48). The mention of debt is gone in the second edition, and the statement is abridged: “‘Ah Edgar!’ she cried, ‘had I trusted you as I ought, from the moment of your generous declaration – had my confidence been, as firm in your kindness as in your honour, what misery had I been saved!’” (*Camilla*, 2nd ed. 5: 201). The focus of Camilla’s statement is more squarely upon Edgar than upon her debts.

Burney’s second-edition deletions regarding her heroine’s debt are often linked to Camilla’s interactions with Mrs. Mittin, a vulgar secondary character.¹⁹ One of the largest of these is a page-long passage in the first edition (783-84) that is completely excised in the second. The passage reveals Mrs. Arlbery’s awareness that “Camilla had

¹⁹ Lillian D. Bloom, author of the only full-length article on the second edition of *Camilla*, posits that “The 1802 edition also reveals an extraordinary pruning of the dialogue of secondary characters” (Bloom 378). Bloom notes that Burney’s changes to the second edition include her removal of superfluous and redundant character speeches (374, 375); her shortening of harsh dialogue about Eugenia’s deformity (381); and her correction of blatant grammatical errors (384-85).

private debts, to the amount of one hundred and eighteen pounds.” Camilla then realizes that she has been betrayed by Mrs. Mittin, and Mrs. Arlbery promises to silence the latter by “represent[ing], that her own ruin would be the consequence of divulging this affair, from the general opinion which would prevail, that she had seduced a young lady under age, to having dealings with a usurer” (*Camilla* 783-84; cf. *Camilla*, 2nd ed. 5: 85).

Gone, too, from the second edition are the opening paragraphs of book six, chapter ten, “Strictures upon the Ton” (*Camilla* 462-63), which detail Camilla’s extravagant preparations for the master of ceremonies’ ball, where she mistakenly thinks she will reconcile with Edgar. The passage relates Camilla’s transactions with Mrs. Mittin as she obtains a turban, “made up from a pattern of one prepared for Mrs. Berlinton,” and other sundry articles (*Camilla* 463). Camilla’s implicit trust in Mrs. Mittin’s sartorial expertise, described here, lays the groundwork for the latter’s future betrayal. In the second edition, this passage is shortened simply to: “The next day was appointed for the master of the ceremonies’ ball; which, proved a general rendezvous of all parties, and almost all classes of company” (*Camilla*, 2nd ed. 3: 165). Mrs. Mittin’s upwardly-mobile male counterpart, Mr. Dubster, also falls victim to Burney’s editorial pen. Nearly all dialogue between Dubster and Mrs. Mittin is excised in the second edition. Many of Dubster’s long speeches and all of his references to his friend, head-waiter Tom Hicks, are removed. During his first meeting with Camilla, after a missing glove delays his dancing plans, Dubster seeks the help of his absent friend: “And as to Tom Hicks, where he can be hid, I can’t tell, unless he has hanged himself; for I can’t find him no more than my glove” (*Camilla* 71). While his misplaced glove is still mentioned in the second edition, his reference to Tom Hicks, which accentuates his comic idiolect, is gone

(*Camilla*, 2nd ed. 1: 127). Later references to Hicks are eliminated, and Dubster's several short harangues about him in book two, chapter four, "A Public Breakfast" (*Camilla* 85, 90), are deleted entirely. Even though Mrs. Mittin and Dubster are only peripheral characters, they are cast as *Camilla*'s antagonists in a number of contretemps, which are characteristic features of Burney's novels.

By abridging Mrs. Mittin and Dubster in the second edition, Burney also reduces the most distinctive examples of her large range of character idiolect. Mrs. Mittin's speech combines poor grammar with grasping servility, which can be seen in her explanation of her new association with Mrs. Berlinton: "she [Mrs. Berlinton] said she would do any thing to give you pleasure; so then I made free to ask her to give me a night's lodging, till I could find out some friend to be at; for I'd a vast mind to come to Southampton, as I could do it so reasonable, for I like to go every where" (*Camilla* 606). This phrase encapsulates two of Mrs. Mittin's key character traits; the words "I made free" signal her social encroachment, and the words "I could do it so reasonable" confirm her self-styling as a bargain-hunter. In comparison, Dubster's language is more openly offensive, both grammatically and socially: "So I see, ma'am...you've brought that limping little body with you again? Tom Hicks had like to have took me in finely about her!" (85). His cruel comments about Eugenia are amplified by his crude diction. Idiolect, however, is not restricted to members of lower social standing. Sir Sedley Clarendel, a good-hearted version of *Evelina*'s Sir Clement Willoughby, mimics the latter's extravagant language. After *Camilla* protests against his romantic hand-holding, he declares: "No...fair torturer! it is now my prisoner, and must be punished for its inhuman sins, in the congealing and unmerciful lines it has portrayed for me" (559),

hyperbolic language rife with images of imprisonment and punishment.²⁰ On the opposite end of the linguistic spectrum, the kind and honest Mr. Westwyn has a formal, but direct and simple way of speaking. His response to Camilla's defense of his son's seemingly erratic behavior is charmingly frank: "she says I may be proud of my son! and I dare say she knows why, for she's a charming girl, as ever I saw; so I will be proud of my son! Poor dear Hal! thou hast got a good friend, I can tell thee, in that young lady! and she's niece to the best man I ever knew; and I value her good opinion more than any body's" (50). Sir Sedley's and Westwyn's idiolects are largely preserved in the second edition, probably because they are much more refined than the off-putting language of Dubster and Mrs. Mittin.

Before she "pruned" Mrs. Mittin and Dubster for the second edition, Burney had condensed a number of other minor characters in her manuscript revisions. This is especially striking in the case of Lavinia, Camilla's older sister, who is surprisingly absent throughout the published novel even though she is sister to Camilla and Eugenia and of marriageable age. In the British Library *Camilla* manuscript, Lavinia serves as Camilla's confidante during her aborted marriage attempt. In the fragment of *Camilla* at the Berg, Lavinia is also given a larger role, and Sir Sedley Clarendel, astonishingly, is the object of her affections. Lavinia's romantic preference is revealed in several conversations. When Camilla first discloses the dilemma caused by her coquetting with Sir Sedley, Lavinia defends the facetious suitor as "Tears again rolled down her soft Cheeks": "'Could you, indeed, believe him invulnerable?' cried Lavinia, with a gentle

²⁰ Christina Davidson links character language with morality, in this case Sir Sedley's language with his capricious nature: "Clarendel's speech mirrors his dichotomous nature. His more private and natural idiolect is courteous and correct, but *in public* he uses a rich tapestry of idioms and literary allusions" (Davidson 294).

sigh, could you believe that a mind so generous could be wanting in sensibility? Ah, my Sister! - - - you must <pay> the forfeit of your error! you must not stain your own rectitude with <getting> a wil{1}ful conquest! Such a Man, however, will soon reconcile you to your fate; do not, then, make him unhappy –” (*Camilla*, Berg 4: 3v). Lavinia’s advice is removed from the published version, and it is Eugenia who advises her to marry the baronet, but in much less passionate and pleading words (*Camilla* 522). Shortly thereafter in the Berg manuscript, Lavinia becomes conscious of her own feelings for Sir Sedley: “But Lavinia <xxxxx 1 word> give her [Camilla] neither [counsel nor succour]. Now first conscious of the too strong sense she entertained of the perfections she attributed to Sir Sedley, she feared her judgment might be partial, & declined to give it, or impelled by the <purity> of her disinterested nature, thought her <xxxxx 3-4 words> constantly to the acceptance of the Baronet” (*Camilla*, Berg 4: 4r). Lavinia’s rumination on “the perfections she attributed to Sir Sedley” and her cognizance of her own impartial judgment confirm her affections in this tantalizing deleted scene (522).

The scene continues as Lionel inadvertently detects Lavinia’s liking for Sir Sedley. After Lionel urges Lavinia to “be of great help” in getting Camilla to accept Sir Sedley’s proposal, Lavinia’s response is revealing:

All that Lavinia could urge was vain; yet she continued the most pathetic supplications, till he [Lionel] accused her of having a secret design upon the young Baronet herself, & a sneaking kindness for him. She was then silenced: he had made a random shot, without meaning at the <moment>, or reflecting upon it afterwards; but there was a consciousness in Lavinia too delicate for self-evasion,

& what she knew <might> be possible, she feared might be true. She blushed, & returned to the Summer House. (*Camilla*, Berg 4: 4v)

Even though Lionel's accusation is a mere "random shot," Lavinia's "consciousness" accepts its truth, and she evades him after this self-recognition. Lavinia's reaction is similar to Camilla's first painful detection of her feelings for Edgar and is, again, absent in the published version of the novel (*Camilla* 191). Although Lionel does counsel Lavinia to speak to Camilla about Sir Sedley in the published novel, the dialogue between the sisters is omitted. The published edition eschews the Camilla-Sir Sedley-Lavinia love triangle entirely by transferring Lavinia's mentoring role to Eugenia: "Lavinia, affrighted, ran to the house for Eugenia" to seek guidance "of her superior wisdom" (*Camilla* 527-28). It is possible that Burney dismantled the love triangle so that the virgin-hearted Lavinia could replace her sister as Hal Westwyn's intended bride: "The visit of the Westwyns to Sir Hugh shewed Lavinia in so favourable a light, that nothing less than the strong prepossession already conceived for Camilla could have guarded the heart of the son" (784). Lavinia and Hal do marry by the end of the novel, and instead of pining over the gallant, but mercurial baronet, Lavinia becomes the wife of the simple, moral Hal. However, Burney's original plan for Lavinia, hitherto unmentioned in Burney criticism, would have increased the coherence and the balance of the novel; it is puzzling, after all, that the good-hearted Lavinia, who marries by the end of the novel, should lack a fully-developed love story, while the romantic dalliances of her superficial cousin Indiana are given so much prominence.²¹

²¹ Several critics, including Doody, lament the fact that "Poor Lavinia Tyrold is given no love story of her own" (Doody 240).

A few other minor characters, such as Miss Dannel, Mrs. Berlinton, and Ensign Macdersey, are also fleshed out more fully in Burney's various manuscript drafts. Miss Dannel's romantic preferences are revealed in the single sheet of the *Camilla* manuscript that survives at the Houghton Library:

"Dear la, I wish I could tell who I should marry! It's very disagreeable not to know. I dare say it will be some new Acquaintance....Because I don't know any body I've seen that I think it will be, except it's Colonel Andover, or Major Cerwood; & it can't be him, because he's in love with you. Or else Sir Sedley Clarendel, or else Mr. Mandlebert, for I've never spoke to any body else, since I left school. Unless it's your Brother.²² And he's very agreeable. Only perhaps he's engaged?" (*Camilla*, Houghton)

Throughout the novel, Miss Dannel is depicted as a silly school-girl who is too ignorant to understand the ramifications of marriage. Her desire to be a wife is fueled by her longing to be independent of her father's control. Here this desire is given an uncharacteristically romantic hue as Miss Dannel assesses her tender feelings for the men of her acquaintance. Her verbal cataloguing culminates in an alternate romantic pairing: Miss Dannel and Lionel. This pairing is only briefly suggested in the published novel, when Lionel facetiously devises a series of plans to extricate himself from his debts: "Unless, indeed, I marry little Miss Dannel, which I have once or twice thought of; for she's a monstrous fool. But then she is very rich. How should you like her for a sister?" (*Camilla* 738). Even though Miss Dannel is transformed by the end of the novel, perhaps more fittingly, into the wife of the despotic Mr. Lissin and her prospective beau Lionel is

²² An earlier version of this sentence can be discerned: "Unless it <should be> your Brother."

entangled in debt and mischief, this pairing would have contributed to a very different *Camilla*. While Miss Denzel's miserable fate might have been similar – she would merely be replacing an old tyrant with a flighty, youthful criminal – Lionel would have been punished doubly, by both his consanguineal and his conjugal families.

Mrs. Berlinton is also portrayed in more depth in Burney's manuscript drafts. In the British Library manuscript, Burney traces Mrs. Berlinton's progress from reclusive innocent to calculated coquette:

Mrs. <Lintot> now resumed the experiment, ... she called forth those smiles by design, which hitherto, more inartificially, had waited occasion... Her conversation was no more upon some subject she wished to investigate for her improvement, or some Book she wished to discuss for her entertainment; these, she had discovered, though the means to gain her an admiring audience, dismissed as many as they invited, & confined her to but a few: her present spirit of emulation hid from her that those few alone were honourable; <& she chatted with no aim but to pass for gay, which she knew to be alluring,> & <to look from object to object, in light talk, till, one by one, every object looked only at her.>

(*Camilla*, BL 32v)

The motivation for Mrs. Berlinton's evolution is her general desire to be admired, which she enacts through the gradual alteration of her physical and mental appearance. Her smiles are now artificial, "called forth...by design," and instead of cultivating her intellect, she talks now "with no aim but to pass for gay." The narrator's wistful tone – "her present spirit of emulation hid from her that those few alone were honourable" –

reveals compassion for Mrs. Berlinton that is rarely perceptible in the published novel.²³

As with Mrs. Berlinton, Burney also expands the character of Ensign Macdersey in the British Library manuscript, giving his character some much-needed complexity. In the cancelled play-scene, the ensign initially complains about his assigned role as the adventurer Count Basset. While the ensign is uniformly represented as a hotheaded, unthinking young man in the published novel, in the manuscript, Burney injects him with some self-conscious wit. This appears in his justification of dueling: “a man who has an objection to a little tilting loses half the enjoyment of life....Because, Sir, people are apt to think there’s a particular reason for it; & if once a man is thought shy, nobody scruples to affront him” (*Camilla*, BL 38v). Here his pugilistic tendencies are defended logically, though they are still excessive, and his droll speech adds a charming layer to his otherwise unsympathetic character. This humorous dialogue is disappointingly omitted in the published novel.

Softened Character Behavior

Burney’s revisions to *Camilla* between the manuscript and the first published edition and, on a smaller scale, between the first and second editions often remove complex characterizations of minor figures, such as Mr. Tyrold, Lavinia, Mrs. Berlinton, and Ensign Macdersey. Burney’s systematic eliminations of secondary character development and plot strands are at odds with her purported aim to create a “prose Epic.” Some of these corrections not only abridge the range of plot and characterization in *Camilla*, but also the range of character behavior; to be precise, Burney largely

²³ Compare this description with its blunter and less sympathetic counterpart in the published novel (809-10), which ends with the phrase, “mortified by Bellamy, she resolved to mortify others, and in proportion as her smiles grew softer her heart became harder” (810).

diminishes the cruelty displayed by her characters, especially Lionel and Clermont. The latter is a minor figure significant only because of his tremendous debts and his ostentatiously obscure taste. After Westwyn mocks Clermont's contradictory and gourmet eating habits (*Camilla* 702), Clermont vents his rage in a passage existing only in the Berg manuscript. His vitriol appears in the shape of a personal attack on Eugenia, his rejected bride-to-be, and is directed towards Melmond, who had "pretensions to Eugenia...which extremely <incensed> him; for he had flattered himself, when he refused her, she would at least die an old maid, & that the fortune of Sir Hugh might ultimately devolve to his heirs" (*Camilla*, Berg 5: 16r-v). In order to attract Melmond's attention, Clermont begins to refer to Eugenia in offensive terms, initially as "that little squab," "A newly-hatched, unfledged, or very young bird" (*OED*), which can be figuratively applied to an underdeveloped person, and then, more contemptuously as "that little queer shrimp there, with the hump" (*Camilla*, Berg 5: 16v), alluding to Eugenia's small hunchback. Clermont then boasts to Melmond that he was fortunately able to discard Eugenia, in spite of pressure from his family: "'Do you know there's a queer old Dog of an uncle of mine that wants me to marry her! What do you think such a fellow as that deserves to be done to <xxxxx I word> <nothing's> too good for him. What would you take yourself to swallow such a pill? <All> the thousands of Peru should not gild it for me, faith!'" (5: 16v-17). Clermont's last reference, to "the thousands of Peru," implies that Eugenia is too revolting even for a mercenary marriage, which is a jab at Melmond's intentions. Continuing, Clermont emphasizes that it is Eugenia's erudition, not her ugliness, that is her worst feature: first, "'She's learned, too! Ha! Ha! that's the best joke of all! Did you ever hear of such an old dotard as my

precious uncle must be? What could a man get by <such> a wife? I should look for Cobwebs over my dishes, & see spiders boiled in my soup” (5: 17); then, “’Tis impossible she should ever get off! unless her own old Greek & Latin Doctor – I never can think of his Name, ’tis so duced crabbed – will take pity on her himself. No other human being could put up with such <a> Scare-Crow, by the Lord!” (5: 17). By varying his insults, Clermont elicits the desired response. During the one-sided conversation, Melmond visibly becomes more and more embarrassed: he “coloured” and then “looked utterly confounded” (5: 16v, 17), and his initial desertion of Eugenia for her beautiful cousin Indiana is given better justification.

Lionel, like Clermont, behaves slightly better in the published novel: he extorts money from his infirm uncle Mr. Relvil; he coerces Camilla into accepting money for him from different sources to cover up his debts; and he traps Camilla and Eugenia in a loft, exposing the latter to painful ridicule. While these scenes are retained in both published editions of the novel, Burney removed Lionel’s malicious treatment of Miss Margland, which appears only in the Berg manuscript. The scene in question occurs towards the beginning of the novel, right before a walking party, mostly composed of members of the Tyrold family, encounters a mad bull. Lionel is assigned the care of Miss Margland, “it being always right for the young to help people a little stricken” (*Camilla* 130). In the novel, the antics of Lionel, who balks at his charge, are limited: “he strided up to Miss Margland with hasty steps, and dropping on one knee, in the dust, seized and kissed her hand; but precipitately rising, and shaking himself, called out: ‘My dear ma’am, have you never a little cloaths-brush in your pocket? I can’t kneel again else!’” (*Camilla* 130). In the manuscript, this scene is longer, and the origin of Miss Margland’s

disdain for Lionel – she “wrathfully turned from him” (*Camilla* 130) – is clear. After they are paired, “Lionel, with a thousand grimaces, offered his hand to Miss Margland, who with no little fear accepted it; but just as she step{t} one foot forward, he abruptly snatched it away professing to be seized with a sudden fit of the cramp in his stomach; and, in the writ{h}ing of his affected pain, made her tread into the midst of the kennel” (*Camilla*, Berg 1: 8v). Lionel’s ploy causes Miss Margland to step into a gutter where waste was thrown (*OED*); in the manuscript, she is “immeasurably, not unjustly incensed,” a reaction much more consistent with her desire to avoid Lionel’s further assistance (*Camilla*, Berg 1: 8v).

One of the most interesting aspects of this scene is that Burney continued to tinker with it even after the publication of the first edition. Lionel’s kennel joke was removed from the published novel, and his mock-kneeling and request of the “cloaths-brush” were similarly excised from the second edition. In their place, before “The party proceeded to a small gate,” is the single sentence, “Indiana smiled with triumph; but Miss Margland, firing with anger, declared she wanted no help, and would accept none” (*Camilla*, 2nd ed. 1: 242). This sentence is no longer preceded by any of Lionel’s antics, save his obvious desire to “change partners.” Miss Margland’s reaction, “firing with anger,” appears excessive now that Lionel’s mean-spirited pranks have been removed. The narrator, like Lionel, is also more charitable towards Miss Margland in the second edition. One of the most prominent examples is the narrator’s deleted criticism of Miss Margland’s appearance: “Miss Margland, always happy to be of consequence, was hastening to Sir Hugh, to put him upon his guard; when a respectful offer from Bellamy to assist her down the steps, induced her to remit her design to a future opportunity. Any attentions

from a young man were now so new to her as to seem a call upon her gratitude; nor had her charms ever been so attractive as to render them common” (*Camilla* 126). The caustic second sentence, especially its second clause, euphemistically reveals Miss Margland’s ugliness, a piece of humor regrettably deleted from the second edition (*Camilla*, 2nd ed. 1: 235).

Perhaps fittingly, Miss Margland’s behavior, which is consistently unpleasant, is also softened between the first and second editions. Miss Margland’s nastiness appears most strongly in her encouragement of Indiana’s relationship with Edgar and in her response to Camilla’s perceived encroachment. Shortly after Camilla hears the happy news that Edgar is not engaged to Indiana, Miss Margland interprets the information in a way that moderates Camilla’s joy:

Upon their return to the company, Miss Margland chose to relate the history herself. Mr. Mandlebert, she said, had not only thought proper to acknowledge his utter insensibility to Miss Lynmere, but had declared his indifference for every woman under the sun, and protested he held them all cheap alike. “So I would advise nobody,” she continued, “to flatter themselves with making a conquest of him, for they may take my word for it, he won't be caught very easily.” (*Camilla* 271-72)

Mrs. Margland’s quip heralds the start of a long dialogue lasting two pages in the first edition. In the dialogue, Miss Margland and Indiana insinuate that Melmond, who is Indiana’s preferred suitor, was deterred from proposing to her because of her rumored engagement to Edgar. By praising Melmond, Indiana openly disdains Edgar and insinuates that she is aware of Camilla’s affections for the latter: “any body is welcome

to him for me; – my cousin, or any body else” (272). Within the conversation, Camilla unsuccessfully tries to glean information from Miss Margland regarding Edgar’s feelings for her, enquiring whether ““it is very likely he should have mentioned any thing good or bad – with regard to his care for me”” (273). She is kept in suspense for some time until Miss Margland utters the sentence: ““He said, in so many words, that he thought no more of you than of your cousin, and was going abroad to divert and amuse himself, better than by entering into marriage with either one or other of you; or with any body else”” (273). This sentence is the only part of the dialogue remaining in the second edition; in fact, it replaces the entire painful conversation (*Camilla*, 2nd ed. 2: 162). The isolated sentence in the second edition appears cruel and explicit, but within the context of the first edition, the effect is even harsher since the sentence is there the culmination of an agonizing and escalating conversation. The reduced range of acceptable character behavior in later versions of *Camilla*, as evidenced by Miss Margland’s, Lionel’s, and Clermont’s diminished maliciousness, is itself another attenuation of Burney’s “epic” aims.

Character Reflection and Imagination

One aspect of character behavior that Burney continues to emphasize within the various editions of *Camilla* is the act of reflection. More than in *Evelina* and *Cecilia*, reflection is a central theme in *Camilla*. It drives the repetitious courtship of Camilla and Edgar: Camilla’s unthinking behavior, juxtaposed with Edgar’s tendency to overanalyze her conduct, delays and complicates their inevitable marriage. Reflection can be read, then, as the main impetus of the plot. The trope also influences Burney’s characterization. Most of the marriageable characters in the novel can be divided into

two groups: those who reflect, such as Edgar and Eugenia, and those who do not, such as Camilla, Lionel, and Mrs. Berlinton.

Lionel's transgressions and mischievous conduct can be read as consequences of his inability to reflect. In one of the descriptive passages introducing Lionel, the narrator openly declares that his lack of reflection is related to his behavioral problems: "A stranger to reflection, and incapable of care, laughter seemed not merely the bent of his humour, but the necessity of his existence: he pursued it at all seasons, he indulged it upon all occasions....the egotism which urged him to make his own amusement his first pursuit, sacrificed his best friends and first duties, if they stood in its way" (*Camilla* 79). His inability to reflect is subsequently identified as the source of his flaws: "his defects...had their rise in a total aversion to reflection, a wish to distinguish himself from his retired, and, he thought, unfashionable relations, and an unfortunate coalition with some unprincipled young men" (239). Later in the novel, readers are given a darker explanation for Lionel's "total aversion to reflection." After he has been exposed as the blackmailer of his uncle Relvil, he eschews reflection, which, for him, takes the form of suicidal self-condemnation: "you think I have no feeling, because I am not always crying. However, shall I tell you the truth? I hate myself! and so completely hate myself at this moment, that I dare not be grave! dare not suffer reflection to take hold of me, lest it should make life too odious for me to bear it" (739). Since he cannot bear judgment either by himself or others, Lionel's only alternative is to abscond to the continent in order to avoid prosecution for his criminal actions. By the end of the novel, he is able to return from his banishment "rather as if condemned, than forgiven"; and he has developed enough perception to realize the depravity of his past life and wish to start

anew: “he procured an appointment that carried him abroad, where his friends induced him to remain, till his bad habits, as well as bad connections, were forgotten, and time aided adversity in forming him a new character” (909). Lionel’s lack of judgment and reflection is so well established that, in order to be reclaimed, he must develop a completely “new character.”

Mrs. Berlinton, like Lionel, is unaccustomed to reflection. Her unthinking behavior has less to do with her natural propensities and more to do with her peculiar, romantic upbringing. She was brought up, like a female Quixote, “to think all things the most unusual and extraordinary, were merely common and of course.” Such an education is incompatible with rational behavior and reflection: “Nothing steady or rational had been instilled into her mind by others; and she was too young, and too fanciful to have formed her own principles with any depth of reflection, or study of propriety.” Mrs. Berlinton’s only maxims are her self-imposed chastity and her belief that her heart “was still wholly at liberty to be disposed of by its own propensities, without reproach and without scruple,” since she was forced into a mercenary marriage (488). Her naïveté and lack of judgment lead to the escalating series of poor choices she makes throughout the novel: her avoidance of her husband, her encouragement of Bellamy, her gambling addiction, and her alienation of Bellamy from his wife Eugenia. Mrs. Berlinton, like Lionel, is also tormented by remorse by the end of the novel, as she realizes the weighty consequences of her unthinking actions. Plagued with debts and overwhelmed with repentance regarding her treatment of Eugenia, she adopts her aunt’s religious fanaticism: “repulsed from passion, and sickened of dissipation, though too illiberally instructed for chearful and rational piety, she was happily snatched from utter

ruin by protecting, though excentric enthusiasm” (911-12). Again like Lionel, Mrs. Berlinton is converted from her dangerous, unthinking behavior, but her reclamation, enacted by fanatical religion rather than constructive introspection, cannot be complete.

Melmond, brother to Mrs. Berlinton, exhibits a different sort of thoughtlessness. While Lionel and Mrs. Berlinton act without rational thought or judgment, Melmond’s cognitive abilities are clouded by his overactive imagination. Nowhere is this clearer than in his courtship of the beautiful, mechanical Indiana Lynmere. In the beginning of their courtship, Melmond compensates for Indiana’s vapidty by using his imagination: “Her person charmed his eye, but his own imagination framed her mind, and while his enchanted faculties were the mere slaves of her beauty, they persuaded themselves they were vanquished by every other perfection” (769). After they become engaged and both parties slide into complacency, Melmond begins to perceive Indiana’s true character. In the *Camilla* manuscript at the British Library, there is a deleted scene involving Grimston (Melmond) reading a sermon to the unwilling Cleora (Indiana) (*Camilla*, BL 27r-31v). After his fruitless efforts to teach Cleora, Grimston explicitly voices his dismay about her empty mind: “I fear...I fear – I have tied myself for life to a mere beautiful machine! without soul, & without Brains!” (*Camilla*, BL 30r, Burney’s ellipsis). In the published novel, Melmond only notices Indiana’s vacuity after reflecting deeply on the nature of their relationship – “His passion had lost its novelty, and her eyes lost their beaming pleasure in listening to it” (812). Indiana’s loss of interest is a catalyst for Melmond’s own, as he regrets his rejection of the more considerate Eugenia. Only through the act of reflection can Melmond realize the delusive power of his initial imaginative impulses: “Those eyes, thought he, which I have gazed at whole days with such unreflecting

admiration; ... I meet them – but to deplore their vacancy of the soul’s intelligence – I fondly – vainly seek!” (813).

Camilla, the eponymous heroine, combines the dangerous tendencies of Lionel, Mrs. Berlinton, and Melmond. Like the former two, she acts impulsively, without reflection,²⁴ and as with Melmond, what little judgment she does possess is often overshadowed by her overactive imagination. Mrs. Tyrold worries about her “sweet, open, generous, inconsiderate girl, whose feelings are all virtues, but whose impulses have no restraints: I have not a fear for her, when she can act with deliberation; but fear is almost all I have left, when I consider her as led by the start of the moment” (120). Mrs. Tyrold’s description reveals that Camilla does have the capacity to act rationally, but her impulsive behavior often overwhelms her better judgment. Later in the novel, the narrator explicitly reveals the tension between Camilla’s ability to reflect and her proclivity to imagine: “when reflection came to her aid, her conduct was as exemplary as her wishes. But the ardour of her imagination, acted upon by every passing idea, shook her Judgment from its yet unsteady seat, and left her at the mercy of wayward Sensibility” (679-80). Reflection in Camilla’s case is placed in opposition to imagination, which is the locus of her impulsive urges. Camilla’s struggle between these two competing forces creates some of the greatest complications in Burney’s novel.

Camilla’s initial heedlessness and lack of reflection prevent her from examining the nature of her relationship with Edgar until she has incontrovertibly fallen in love with him. After she overhears the (false) news that the nuptials of Edgar and Indiana will be

²⁴ Other critics, like Kraft, make similar remarks: “Camilla’s most notable characteristic is her impulsiveness. She is quick, like her namesake, to act, and her behavior often strikes the reader as well as the other characters in the novel as rash, capricious, and ill-considered” (Kraft 41-42).

celebrated imminently, “A deep sigh escaped Camilla at such publicity in the report and belief of the engagement of Edgar with her cousin, and brought with it a consciousness too strong for any further self-disguise” (191). Camilla’s involuntary physical reaction forces her to acknowledge her deep-seated feelings and reflect upon her future course of action. Edgar does eventually begin courting her, but their mutually unacknowledged feelings are a source of tension. Camilla’s natural thoughtlessness often jeopardizes their relationship; on one occasion she declares: ““I have lost him!...by my own unreflecting precipitance; I have lost him, perhaps, for ever!”” (589). Her dangerous impulsiveness combines with her overactive imagination to create the worst of her problems: her debt. Shortly after Edgar breaks off their engagement, Camilla wastes money preparing for a lavish ball, deluding herself that her extravagant appearance will make Edgar fall in love with her again:

At this ball, and this supper, Camilla painted Edgar completely restored to her; she was certain he would dance with her; she was sure he would sit by no one else during the repast; the many days since they had met would endear to him every moment they could now spend together, and her active imagination soon worked up scenes so important from this evening, that she next persuaded her belief that all chance of reconciliation hung wholly upon the meeting it offered. (691)

Camilla’s preparations are all for naught: Edgar does not appear at the ball, and her orgy of expense eventually leads to her father’s incarceration for her debts.

Camilla’s progress towards reflection and maturity within the novel is, at best, uneven and, ultimately, indecisive. Some of her worst behavior has its origins in Mrs. Arlbery’s coquetting advice, which she heedlessly follows. Though she captivates the

capricious Sir Sedley and the lecherous Lord Valhurst, Camilla “perceive[s] her own error” only after she ensnares the decent Hal Westwyn (680). Camilla’s reckless financial decisions also haunt her throughout the novel. Her continuous and often frivolous expenses soon add up to a considerable amount; overwhelmed with shame, instead of confessing her mistakes to her father, Camilla prolongs her inevitable disgrace by employing a usurer: “she felt lifted into paradise by the escape of this expedient, and lost sight of every possible future difficulty, in the relief of avoiding so severe a present penalty” (744). Ironically, it is the usurer’s demand for payment that leads to the worst consequence of all: Mr. Tyrold’s imprisonment. While Camilla’s debts and coquetry are overshadowed by her illness at the end of the novel, there are never any clear indications that she has matured. She does experience a moment of self-realization during her reunion with Edgar at the end of the novel, as she stammers, “‘Forgiveness?...Have I any thing to forgive? I thought all apology – all explanation, rested on my part? and that my imprudencies – my rashness – my so often-erring judgment – and so apparently, almost even culpable conduct’” (900). This reconciliation and Camilla’s contrition are misleading: the characters reunite not because they have overcome their prohibitive character flaws, but because Camilla’s parents, who are also Edgar’s guardians, intervene (896).²⁵ This conclusion shows that, unlike *Cecilia* and especially *Evelina*, *Camilla* can be truly termed “a *bildungsroman* without visible growth” (Gruner 19).

Camilla’s younger sister Eugenia and her suitor Edgar are on the opposite end of the reflective spectrum: they are highly contemplative individuals. Eugenia’s capacity

²⁵ Gruner likewise terms the ending “a qualified happiness,” elaborating that “Camilla still recognizes that he [Edgar] has been guilty of ‘continual misconstruction’ – and we may therefore fear for her happiness” (Gruner 32).

for rational judgment is shown throughout the novel in a largely positive light. In general, her abilities to reflect and think rationally help her overcome her physical deformities. Towards the beginning of the novel, Eugenia is characterized by her “early reflecting mind” (89), which mitigates the neglect she suffers at her first ball. And when Eugenia is finally aware of the extent of her ugliness, instead of wallowing in sorrow, she plunges “deep in reflection” to consider her father’s lessons on the superficiality of beauty (306). Eugenia’s thoughtfulness ultimately makes her a more attractive marital prospect for Melmond than Indiana, since she is a valuable “companion delighting in all [Melmond’s] favourite pursuits” (912). Edgar’s pensiveness, on the other hand, is not as beneficial as Eugenia’s since he is much more careful and deliberate. While Eugenia’s reflective personality often manifests itself in her philosophical optimism, Edgar’s contributes to his growing sense of distrust. His maxim during his courtship with Camilla epitomizes this personality trait: “I will investigate her sentiments, and know what are my chances for her regard...I will postpone all explanation...and devote the probationary interval, to an examination which shall obviate all danger of either deceiving my own reason, or of beguiling her inconsiderate acceptance” (180).

Unfortunately for Edgar and Camilla, they are given conflicting pieces of advice about how they should proceed in their courtship. Dr. Marchmont advises Edgar to avoid showing his true feelings to Camilla until he can be certain of hers: “forbear to declare yourself, make no overtures to her relations, raise no expectations even in her own breast, and let not rumour surmise your passion to the world, till her heart is better known to you” (158). Mr. Tyrold similarly advises Camilla to avoid revealing her true feelings to Edgar until she can be certain of his: “Dry up your tears then, my Camilla, and command

your best strength to conceal for ever their source, and, most especially...from its cause” (345, Burney’s ellipsis). With these opposing dictates, it would be nearly impossible for the lovers to discover the other’s affections: “how may I inquire into the state of her affections, without acknowledging her mistress of mine?” (159). This problem, coupled with Edgar’s caution and Camilla’s caprice, is the source of all the romantic misunderstandings in the novel.²⁶

Numerous miscommunications ensue, then, through Edgar’s and Camilla’s adherence to their respective dictates.²⁷ These begin immediately after they are given relationship advice from their mentors: Camilla tries to avoid showing her love for Edgar – she “did every thing with an air of negligence, that, while it covered absence and anxiety, displayed a studied avoidance of his notice” – while Edgar interprets her behavior as a confirmation of her ingrained inconstancy – “where may I look for singleness of mind, for nobleness of simplicity, if caprice, mere girlish, unmeaning caprice, dwell there!” (198). When Camilla departs Cleves to avoid Edgar’s detection of her love, Edgar again adversely interprets her behavior: “That she could leave Cleves at the very moment he was reinstated in its society, seemed conviction to him of her indifference; and that she could leave it in the present state of the affairs of Eugenia, made him conclude her so great a slave to the love of pleasure, that every duty and all propriety were to be sacrificed to its pursuit” (354). Only when Camilla acts out of concern for Edgar’s well-being, inadvertently disregarding her father’s dictates, does he

²⁶ Cutting-Gray confirms this in her description of the novel’s trajectory: “the essential tension in the novel arises when a character of ‘melting sensibility’ who rejects the rational falls in love with a ‘watcher’ without trust” (Cutting-Gray 54).

²⁷ Doody provides an astute reading of these romantic conflicts in her monograph (Doody 246-47).

begin to suspect Camilla's true sentiments: "Edgar, for the first time, saw her avoidance without suspecting that it flowed from repugnance" (541). Burney is careful here to use the phrase "for the first time" to emphasize the initial, late appearance of Edgar's empathy. Soon afterwards, the two lovers finally come to an understanding; it is Edgar's turn to lose "his self-control, and taking her reluctant hand, said: 'O Camilla! torture me no longer!'" (543-44). This declaration leads to their first, short engagement.

Had Mr. Tyrold's dictates been the sole courtship advice given to Camilla, the romantic complications between Camilla and Edgar would have ended with Edgar's first, emotional acknowledgment of his love. Mrs. Arlbery, however, has also given Camilla guidance, which disrupts the tenuous bond between the two lovers. Some of Mrs. Arlbery's advice is apropos: "'he [Edgar] is calculated to make you wretched. He is a watcher; and a watcher, restless and perturbed himself, infests all he pursues with uneasiness. He is without trust, and therefore without either courage or consistency. To-day he may be persuaded you will make all his happiness; to-morrow, he may fear you will give him nothing but misery'" (482). Indeed, Edgar's cowardice and inconsistency are confirmed many times throughout the novel. Often a smile or a few kind words from Camilla will precipitate a reversal in his thoughts: "his disappointment concerning the raffle was immediately forgotten" (95); "all displeasure at her flight, even from Thomson's scene of conjugal felicity, was erased from his mind" (104); "Softened by this apparent earnestness for his good opinion, all his interest and all his tenderness for her returned" (267). Edgar's frequent, almost-amnesiac reversals of opinion continually frustrate Camilla: "'I must be convinced of his unaltered love...if he hesitates – let him go!'" (582).

Although Mrs. Arlbery correctly perceives Edgar's inconsistencies, her corresponding advice to Camilla – to flirt with other men in order to secure his unaltered regard – is misguided. Initially, Mrs. Arlbery's coquetting advice is given vaguely, "There is but one single method to make a man of his ruminating class know his own mind: give him cause to fear he will lose you. Animate, inspirit, inspire him with doubt" (455). Mrs. Arlbery counsels the desired end, but does not reveal the means. Soon afterwards, in another conversation with Camilla, Mrs. Arlbery explicitly tells her to encourage the affections of other men, even though she is in love with Edgar: "If there is any way...of animating him for a moment out of himself, it can only be by giving him a dread of some other" (483). But Edgar is already jealous, even before Camilla puts her coquetting scheme into practice. He is often threatened by Major Cerwood's tenacious pursuit of Camilla, expecting to "find the Major favoured" by her (292). Camilla's encouragement of the Major, though, is unconsciously given, spurred in part by her father's advice to avoid showing her emotions to Edgar. The Major does propose, but he is quickly repulsed by Camilla's refusal and, even more, by Sir Hugh's profession that he has "not [left] her a shilling" (533). Camilla enacts Mrs. Arlbery's coquetting plan soon afterwards: she becomes increasingly intimate with Sir Sedley (559) and trifles with Hal Westwyn (670-71), both of which cause Edgar intense pain. Though guilty of flirtation, Camilla diverts some of the blame for their failed relationship to the hypercritical Edgar: "I am aware of many errors...but where, and what is the talisman which can erase from my own remembrance that you have thought me unworthy?" (641). Were it not for the Tyrols' intervention at the end of the novel, this moment, in which Camilla articulates

her unhappiness about Edgar's distrustfulness, could have signaled the end of their miserable, agonizing courtship.

Language and Genre

The longest and most repetitive sections of *Camilla* are those that depict Camilla and Edgar's courtship. Surprisingly, few of these scenes are excised in Burney's second edition. One of her significant deletions involves an early scene where Camilla and Eugenia discuss the former's feelings for Edgar and Indiana's prior claims. Both editions contain Eugenia's logical argument: "that to please or to displease Edgar Mandlebert can be a matter of no moment to you, when compared with its importance to Indiana" (*Camilla* 177; *Camilla*, 2nd ed. 1: 334). While both editions similarly end with Camilla noticing "the flutter of her heart," the first edition also contains Eugenia's rational defense of Indiana's behavior – "if you had received, however causelessly, any alarm for the affection of the man you meant to marry, and that man were as amiable as Edgar, you would have been equally disturbed" – and Camilla's impassioned longing for Edgar's good opinion, which "is a thousand and a thousand, a million and a million times more important to me, than it can ever be to her!" These lines display an important, rare sympathetic view of Indiana and some early verbal evidence of Camilla's feelings.

It is unusual for Camilla's and Edgar's interactions to be shortened between editions, although the romantic tension they share is slightly reduced in the second edition. When Edgar speaks to Camilla about her suitor, Major Cerwood, both versions describe their mutual confusion: Edgar, "Involved in expressions he knew not how to clear or to finish," and Camilla, who "looked at him with astonishment" (*Camilla* 298; *Camilla*, 2nd ed. 2: 211). In the first edition, Edgar goes on briefly to extend the Quixote

metaphor that pervades his language to reveal that he is acting, not as “a principal,” but merely as “an agent.” Camilla’s suspense dissipates, and in both editions, Edgar’s inquiries about a “certain gentleman” are given in indirect speech. The second edition removes this unnecessary prolongation of confused meanings, which had already occupied more than a full page.

Even though both editions are much wordier than Burney’s witty *Evelina* or her elegant *Cecilia*, *Camilla* still displays Burney’s mastery of innovative linguistic devices, including free-indirect discourse and allusive language. *Camilla*, a continuation of the third-person narrative Burney employed in *Cecilia*, is predictably rife with free-indirect discourse. As with *Cecilia*, most of the passages containing free-indirect discourse concern the two protagonists. This is especially appropriate in *Camilla* since the equivocal nature of free-indirect discourse evokes that of the protagonists’ vexed romantic relationship. Edgar’s uncertain interpretations of Camilla’s sentiments, especially towards Sir Sedley, are full of ambiguous descriptions:

His desire to unravel so much mystery he thought now so legitimated by his peculiar situation, that he was frequently upon the point of soliciting for information... Should he now, then, make her deem him exacting, and tenacious of prerogative? no; it might shackle the freedom of her mind in their future intercourse. He would quietly, therefore, wait her own time, and submit to her own inclination. She could not doubt his impatience; he would not compel her generosity. (555)

The first sentence of the passage is clearly marked as Edgar’s thoughts, but the succeeding sentences, particularly after the question mark, are voiced ambiguously. The

phrase “She could not doubt his impatience” is the most apparent example of free-indirect discourse. There are no linguistic ties to Edgar’s speech or thoughts, yet the language used and the expectations raised match his own.

Burney also employs free-indirect discourse in Camilla’s own interactions with Sir Sedley after Lionel has borrowed a large sum of money from him: “What could she say the next day to Sir Sedley? How account for so sudden, so gross an acceptance of pecuniary obligation? What inference might he not draw? And how could she undeceive him while retaining so improper a mark of his dependence upon her favour?” (506).²⁸

Free-indirect discourse appears in the second and the third questions. Again, they contain no textual marker signifying that they are part of Camilla’s speech or thoughts, but their appropriation of Camilla’s language and opinions – “so sudden, so gross” – confirms that they are equivocally voiced. As in *Cecilia*, minor characters in *Camilla* are occasionally given free-indirect passages. Mrs. Tyrold’s reaction to Sir Hugh’s educational ambitions is one of these: “She [Mrs. Tyrold] allowed no palliation for a measure of which the abortive end was glaring; to hearken to it displeased her, as a false indulgence of childish vanity; and her understanding felt shocked that Mr. Tyrold would deign to humour his brother in an enterprise which must inevitably terminate in a fruitless consumption of time” (35). The description of Sir Hugh’s scholarly endeavors as “an enterprise which must inevitably terminate in a fruitless consumption of time” carries a disapproving tone

²⁸ In his chapter discussing free-indirect “thought” and its connections to empathy, Joe Bray focuses on this passage, noting “Throughout the passage then the character’s and narrator’s perspectives are hard to untangle, perhaps reflecting the fact that the style is still in its early stages of development in the late-eighteenth-century novel, and not yet being commonly used for the extended representation of a character’s thoughts” (Bray 62). See also Park, “Pains and Pleasure” 29, 31-32.

matching Mrs. Tyrold's, though without an explicit textual identifier, the voicing is again ambiguous.

Like *Evelina* and *Cecilia*, *Camilla* is a highly allusive text that draws heavily upon its literary predecessors. Burney glosses seven of her allusions: to Dryden (*Camilla* 402, 473), Jonson (418), Milton (718), Shakespeare (817, 841), and Young (883). Interestingly, none of these authors are novelists. There are also numerous other allusions throughout the novel that Burney does not explicitly identify. Mr. Tyrold alludes to *Macbeth* during his lesson to Eugenia about the ephemeral nature of beauty: "we look at it [a fine picture] with an internal security, that such as it appears to us to-day, it will appear again to-morrow, and to-morrow, and to-morrow" (307). More fittingly, the sarcastic Mrs. Arlbery alludes to Charlotte Lennox's *Female Quixote* in her description of the romantic Mrs. Berlinton: "Married, my lord? my fair female Quixote assured me she was single" (417). Along with these textual allusions, *Camilla* also borrows a few thematic conventions and situations from Burney's earlier novels. As in *Evelina* and *Cecilia*, the main focus of *Camilla* is the romantic education of the female protagonist, though the scope of *Camilla*, Burney's "prose Epic," is considerably vaster. Camilla's first, uncomfortable ball, in which she is forced to dance with Dubster (69-70), harkens back to *Evelina*'s awkward interactions with Mr. Lovel. In addition to the numerous female *Bildungsromane* that inspired *Evelina* and *Cecilia*, *Camilla* also draws upon Laurence Sterne's *A Sentimental Journey* (1768). Camilla's rescue, via Sir Sedley, of the abused singing bird (492-94) evokes Yorick's purchase of the starling who continually repeats "I can't get out" (Sterne, *Sentimental Journey* 100-1). And Mr.

Tyrolde's beautiful deranged woman (*Camilla* 308-10) has her counterpart in Yorick's and Tristram's mad Maria (Sterne, *Sentimental Journey* 156-61).²⁹

The text that arguably had the greatest impact on *Camilla* was Ann Radcliffe's *The Mysteries of Udolpho* (1794). Burney's indebtedness to Radcliffe's novel is made explicit in her letter to her father of 15 June 1795, which asks, "Why should not I have my mystery, as well as Udolpho?" (*JL* 3: 117). The mood towards the end of *Camilla*, particularly the scene of desolation at Cleves (850-53), is markedly gothic. The most obvious textual parallel between the two novels is Camilla's glimpse of Bellamy's corpse (868), which echoes Emily St. Aubert's view of the mysterious body in *The Mysteries of Udolpho* (Radcliffe 329-30).³⁰ Burney's appropriations of the gothic genre are heightened in her projected third-edition revisions to the fifth volume of *Camilla*.³¹ During her visit to her uncle's empty estate, Camilla, in the projected third edition, falls into a trance: "In a state of <mental> vacancy, she now, for some minutes, remained immovable" (*Camilla*, Berg 5: 403 (1)). Shortly afterwards, Camilla is startled by the approach of a visitor in both versions. In the first-edition, Camilla's fear is minimized, "It advanced rapidly; she trembled; it was surely, she thought, her Mother" (*Camilla* 852). Burney's third-edition notes, however, are far more suspenseful and terrifying:

The sound approach{e}d rapidly.

²⁹ Claudia Johnson avers that "*Sentimental Journey* is an intertextual presence throughout the novel," though her connections between Mr. Tyrolde and Sterne's Yorick are somewhat tenuous (Johnson, *Equivocal Beings* 153, 153-55).

³⁰ See Johnson, *Equivocal Beings* 159. In general, Johnson argues that "*Camilla*...rewrites Radcliffe's *Mysteries of Udolpho*" (Johnson, *Equivocal Beings* 145); similarly, Epstein identifies the "'Udolphish' mass and inclusion of elements of Gothic terror" in *Camilla* (Epstein 125).

³¹ Only Burney's corrections to the fifth volume survive. Her revisions for the projected third edition are tellingly based on the first-edition text.

She trembled; it was surely, she thought, her Mother! & with instructive terror, she locked & bolted the door. (*Camilla*, Berg 5: 403 (2-3))

Burney's fearful diction is continued throughout the third-edition version of the passage: "she heard the house-bell ring...the bell was impatiently re-rung" (*Camilla* 852), becomes in the third edition notes, "The house Bell was now violently rung" (*Camilla*, Berg 5: 403 (3)). When Sir Hugh's trusty servant Jacob appears, the editions merge, as the gothic threatening dissipates.

Burney also makes alterations to the scene in which Camilla discovers Bellamy's corpse. The most marked revisions occur as Camilla "impelled herself towards the table" in the inn where the corpse lay, deciding whether to remove the "cloth [that] covered the face." (*Camilla* 870). In the first edition, "she stood still, hesitating if she had power to remove it: but she thought it a call to her own self-examination; and though mentally recoiling, advanced. When close to the table, she stood still, violently trembling. Yet she would not allow herself to retreat. She now put forth her hand; but it shook suspended over the linen, without courage to draw it aside" (870-71). Burney's first attempted revision for the projected third edition contains some similar language, but it also darkly hints at Camilla's mental state: "She stood <suspense> seemed to her a call to self examination, & tho' mentally recoiling, she again advanced: but when close to the table, again she stood still, violently shaking. But she w^d. not allow herself to retreat. She wished to urge herself to look, calmly & consciously, at what she was so <incessantly> praying to be rescued" (*Camilla*, Berg 5: 449 (1)). Burney's second attempt clarifies what Camilla needs to be "rescued" from: "She now impelled herself towards the table. A cloth covered the face. She stood suspended between instinctive horror, & an

impulsive self-call to look calmly & consciously at what she was so incessantly praying to become. But she had not the force” (*Camilla*, Berg 5: 449 (2)). That the dead Bellamy is “what she was so incessantly praying to become” is a more explicit indication of Camilla’s suicidal urges than any passage in either of the two previously published texts.

Similarly, Camilla’s convalescence, which precipitates the novel’s conclusion, is given gothic shadings in the third edition notes. As she drifts in and out of delirium, Camilla sees a figure resembling her mother, though in the first edition, the figure is comforting, not terrifying:

The form glided away; but with motion so palpable, she could no longer believe herself played upon by imagination. Awe-imprest, and wonder-struck, she softly opened her side curtain to look after it. It had stopt by a high chest of drawers, against which, leaning its head upon its arm, it stood erect, but seemed weeping. She could not discern the face; but the whole figure had the same sacred resemblance. (*Camilla* 881)

In the projected third edition, Burney’s language is, as usual, much more thrilling:

The flush again revisited the white complexion of Camilla as she now ventured to open the side of the curtain herself,

But colourless again it became, as dimly, from her fever faded Eyes, she obscur{e}ly caught a glimpse of a Female Form, gliding slowly away: a form such as in all her visions had been most prominent, a Form of all the most wished, yet most dreaded to behold – that of her Mother.

her Eyes with both her hands to clear her sight but the Figure, still visible, seemed <retiring> from her glimmering view like a phantasmagon.

Profoundly sighing, from horrific incertitude whether she were sleeping or waking, Doubt, dread, & Hope again covered her head in harassed anguish, though with an eagerness...& she believed herself in some nameless unheard of trance. (*Camilla*, Berg 5: 474 (5-8))

This scene – and hence its suspense – is extended and heightened in Burney’s revision. Burney also continues to use gothic diction; as the passage goes on, Burney’s terrifying language escalates from “gliding,” “form,” and “dreaded” to “phantasmagon,” “horrific incertitude,” “Doubt, dread, & Hope,” and “nameless unheard of trance.” Burney’s major changes to the fifth volume of her projected third edition thus emphasize the importance of the gothic mode and the strong influence Radcliffe’s novels had upon *Camilla*.

Radcliffe’s *Mysteries of Udolpho* was not just one of *Camilla*’s literary influences. Well before her avowed desire to have a “mystery” like Radcliffe, Burney wrote in a letter to her father of 9 May [1794] that she was “very glad for Mrs. Radcliffe & her £500” (*JL* 3: 63), alluding to the exceptional payment Radcliffe received from her publishers for *The Mysteries of Udolpho*. By 1794, Burney had published her first two novels, for which she had been notoriously underpaid, considering their success. She received twenty guineas for *Evelina*, fair perhaps for an unknown writer, but only ten more on the publication of the third edition. For her second novel *Cecilia*, she negotiated £200 for the first edition and £50 if there was a second. However, the publishers shrewdly quadrupled the size of the first edition (2000 copies instead of the normal 500). While the second edition of *Cecilia* was eventually printed, Burney’s payment of the £50 was delayed, and she was upset by the booksellers’ blatant profiteering. Burney’s

allusion to Radcliffe's large payment signals her wiser perception of the value of her labor and foreshadows her switch to subscription publication for *Camilla*, which was potentially more profitable.³² Publishing by subscription was a risk, but "if the success [of *Camilla*] resembles that of its predecessors, it will answer well in the course of a few years" (*JL* 3: 117). One of the main incentives for this means of publication was that the author would receive a greater share of the profits, while the booksellers, inversely, would receive less. Burney ultimately was paid £2000 for *Camilla*, £1000 for the subscription sales and another £1000 for the sale of the copyright to the publishers. The large payment that Burney was able to command for her third novel enabled her to support her husband and son and build "Camilla Cottage," their family home. It also augured well for Burney's negotiations with the publishers for her final novel, *The Wanderer*, for which she would also receive about £2000.

Camilla was thus Burney's greatest and most profitable work, though her reduction of secondary characterization, softening of character behavior, and removal of non-essential plot between the various editions reveal her progressive attempts to abridge the novel. During a conversation about the novel with King George III, soon after the publication of the first edition, Burney addressed its massive length: "The work is longer by the whole fifth Volume than I had first planned: — & I am almost ashamed to look at its size! — & afraid my Readers would have been more obliged to me if I had left so much out — than for putting so much in!" (*JL* 3: 177). Burney's preparation of the second edition, which, according to Burney's editors Edward A. Bloom and Lillian D.

³² In her article, Emma Pink discusses Burney's decision to publish *Camilla* by subscription, which "speak[s] to not only her expertise as a cultural producer but also her increasing ownership of the material production of her work" (Pink 51).

Bloom, “is over 500 pages shorter than the original,” seems to remedy these anxieties (*Camilla* 915). Yet a comparison of the texts shows that the large majority of these changes are word substitutions and syntactical inversions; Burney occasionally removed and occasionally added wordy language and reduced minor characterization. In a brief essay comparing the different editions, George Justice emends the Blooms’ claim, taking into account the different number of lines on each page to calculate that only 145 pages were cut from the first edition. This would explain why the second edition does not seem shorter than the first: it is only 6.3% smaller.³³ Much of the repetitive plot – including Camilla and Edgar’s troubled courtship – remains unchanged as Burney’s cuts between the editions and, for that matter, her cuts between the manuscript and published novel increased the focus on the main characters, though some of her notes for the third edition broaden the modes, if not the scope, of the novel. Burney’s reduction of characterization and her removal of early, promising plot strands are rarely improvements. The small, tantalizing scraps available in manuscript form hint not only at the sprawling, epic potential of *Camilla*, but also show Burney’s unrealized new and courageous experiments with plot and character. Although Burney progressively reduced the expansiveness of *Camilla*, her third novel would always remain distinct from her two previous *Bildungsromane* as her closest approximation of a “prose Epic,” though she would return to the *Bildungsroman* genre for her fourth and final novel, *The Wanderer*.

³³ Justice calculates that “the edition of 1802 weighs in at 1720 pages over five volumes as opposed to the 2278 pages in five volumes of the first edition. However, because each page in the later edition contained 31 lines of text as opposed to the 25 lines per page of the first edition, the equivalent of only approximately 145 pages of the first edition’s total of 2278 were excised in the revision” (Justice, “Frances Burney’s Revision” 368).

Chapter 4

The Wanderer: Reviews and Revisions

The title of Frances Burney's fourth and final novel, *The Wanderer* (1814), does not fit the mellifluous pattern she created with her earlier three: *Evelina*, *Cecilia*, and *Camilla*. Burney's heroine is still eponymous, which is confirmed early in the novel, when she is referred to as "'a Wanderer, – without even a name!'" (*The Wanderer* 33).¹ The opening of *The Wanderer* is also strikingly different from those of Burney's previous novels: it begins in Robespierre's France, as a small group of English nationals prepare to depart surreptitiously across the English Channel; their journey is interrupted by the voice of a female wanderer, who seeks passage on the ship. The dark-skinned and heavily bandaged wanderer looks indigent, though her comportment hints at her aristocratic origins. Once the travelers arrive in England, the setting for the rest of the novel, *The Wanderer* begins to resemble Burney's previous narratives: the heroine is revealed to be beautiful; her marriage to the corresponding hero can be predicted from the first volume (*The Wanderer* 192); and the novel is populated by a large cast of distinct, though slightly familiar, minor characters.²

Despite, or perhaps because of, these similarities, *The Wanderer* was savaged by critics for its "comparative faintness of effect" (*Critical Review* 410). John Wilson

¹ The title was a last-minute change, and Burney anticipated her husband's opposition in a letter of 13 January 1814: "J'ai changé le titre, et j'espère que vous n'en serez pas mécontent: c'est actuellement *The Wanderer*. Le 2^e titre, *Female Difficulties*, reste" (*JL* 7: 230).

² Burney recycled several of her minor character types, which include the thoughtless and impatient bride Selina (*The Wanderer* 53), who evokes *Camilla*'s Miss Dennel, and the enthusiastic philanthropist Giles Arbe, who, like *Cecilia*'s Albany, "has quite ruined himself by serving poor people in distress. He is so generous, he can never pronounce a refusal" (518).

Croker, Burney's most damning critic, condemns the repetitiveness of her novels in the *Quarterly Review*: "In each, the plot is a tissue of teasing distresses all of the same class, and in each, are repeated, almost to weariness, portraits of the same forms of fashionable frivolity and of vulgar middle life" (Croker 124-25). He memorably describes *The Wanderer* as "Evelina grown old" (Croker 125). The negative and occasionally vitriolic reviews by Croker and his colleagues influenced Burney's revisions of the novel. While no manuscript version exists, there is an interleaved copy of *The Wanderer* in the Berg collection that contains Burney's notes for a radically revised edition that never took shape.³ Surprisingly, her corrections are only occasionally guided by the reviewers' comments. Since the interleaved text makes Burney's editorial intentions for *The Wanderer* transparent, this chapter will examine her projected acts of revision, the fruits of her reflections on the first edition and the responses it provoked, and will contrast these with the opaque characterization of her heroine Juliet, whose reflections are hidden from the other characters and the reader for the bulk of the novel.

Composition History

The Wanderer is Burney's only novel, besides *Evelina*, to include a preface, and it immediately invites comparisons between the two novels: "The earliest pride of my heart was to inscribe to my much-loved Father the first public effort of my pen" (*The Wanderer* 3).⁴ Unlike her shrewdly calculated plea to the critics in *Evelina*, Burney's

³ Burney's corrected copy of *The Wanderer* is rare, but not unique among eighteenth-century novels. There is a first-edition copy of Jonathan Swift's *Gulliver's Travels* (1726) at the Armagh Public Library in Northern Ireland, containing amendments and markings in Swift's own handwriting.

⁴ Burney had also drafted an introduction to *Cecilia*, which was never published. While her preface to *Evelina* calls for leniency from her reviewers and her preface to *The Wanderer* is interlaced with autobiographical elements, her unpublished preface to her

preface to *The Wanderer* is a longer, biographical exegesis, containing Burney's first reference to the existence and early destruction of "Caroline Evelyn," the precursor to *Evelina* (8).⁵ Burney also roughly dates the beginning of her work on *The Wanderer* "before the end of the last century!" (4), which, when compared with her journal entries, marks the inception of *The Wanderer* between February and December 1800.⁶ Burney thus spent nearly fourteen years writing *The Wanderer*, the same amount of time that she devoted to the first edition of *Camilla*, from the early scraps to the published version.⁷

The Wanderer, like the bulk of *Camilla*, was composed after Burney's marriage, and it traversed the English Channel twice. The preface describes one of Burney's channel crossings with the manuscript, which is given in much more detail in Burney's retrospective journal account (c. 1825). The manuscript had to be sent separately, and Burney's husband, Alexandre d'Arblay, was tasked with getting clearance from the French customs officials by guaranteeing, "upon his Honour, that the Work had nothing in it political, nor even National, nor possibly offensive to the Government [of France]" (JL 6: 716). Given the setting and the content of *The Wanderer*, d'Arblay's statement was rather disingenuous. While Burney's earlier novels are almost entirely free of political context, the first sentence of *The Wanderer* situates the novel during the "dire

second and most philosophical novel is a meditation on authorship and genius, fittingly rife with abstract language (*Cecilia*, Appendix I 943-46).

⁵ See above, 30.

⁶ In a letter of 11 February 1800, Burney had declared her intentions to write and stage a comedy (*Love and Fashion*) instead of another novel, or long "work" (JL 6: 395). Burney was well aware that the year 1800 belonged to the eighteenth century (CJL 1: 221-22).

⁷ See above, 93-94. Burney probably spent more time writing *The Wanderer*, since she worked nearly continuously on the novel from 1800 to 1814, and other than a few rough sketches and outlines, she completed very little of *Camilla* until she returned from her sojourn at Court in 1791. Counting later editions, however, Burney undoubtedly spent the most time writing and revising *Camilla*.

reign of the terrific Robespierre” (*The Wanderer* 11), and the novel is rife with commentary on the French Revolution. Burney’s political leanings are generally balanced – she sympathizes with the French populace, while abhorring radical activity – and at several points in the novel she criticizes insular British attitudes regarding the crisis in France. Members of the agrarian class in *The Wanderer*, typified by minor characters such as Young Gooch and his father, remain in complete denial: “You know how you’ve always stood to it, that you would not believe a word about all those battles, and guillotines, and the like, of Mounseer Robert Speer, in foreign parts; though I told you, over and over, that I had it from our club? Well! here’s a person now here, in your own grounds, that’s seen it all with her own eyes!” (465). Burney’s attack on British narrow-mindedness is not an indication of her support for French radicalism; on the contrary, the French Revolution is portrayed solely as a destructive force within *The Wanderer*. The rampaging “populace” burns the residence of the marchioness, the heroine Juliet’s protectress; Lord Denmeath’s promissory-note, the only piece of evidence affirming Juliet’s birth and family, is also immolated (646). Juliet is forced to marry a corrupt commissary of Robespierre’s government, trading her sizable dowry for the safety of her guardian, the bishop (740). These misfortunes, effects of the French Revolution, form the impetus of the plot: they lead to miserable, repetitive delays and difficulties that prolong Juliet’s inevitable happy ending.

Burney experienced delays and difficulties of her own as she retrieved the *Wanderer* manuscript that d’Arblay had sent from France. When the manuscript arrived at the customs office in Dunkirk, the supervising officer “began a rant of indignation & amazement, at a sight so unexpected & prohibited”; fortunately, an English merchant

vouched for Burney and her writings, else “this Fourth Child of [her] Brain had undoubtedly been destroyed ere it was Born” (*JL* 6: 716, 717). In her retrospective account, Burney discusses the physical manuscript of *The Wanderer* in far more detail than she discusses any of her other novels within her copious journals and letters, yet *The Wanderer* is ironically Burney’s only novel that does not exist, at least partially, in manuscript form. There is only a single page in her memorandum book for 1806 entitled “*SCRIBLERATION*,” which details her monthly progress on *The Wanderer* (*JL* 6: 785). Burney’s work in January of that year, “Intro: of Sir Jasper — — Needle Work for Ladies,” is chapter forty-three in the published novel, which falls within book five of volume three, roughly the midpoint of the ten-book novel. Her last recorded writing for the year was in October, for the “Toad Eating” section, in which Juliet serves as a “toad eater,” or humble companion, for the irascible Mrs. Ireton. The “Toad Eating” section is large, so by October, Burney had definitely completed volume three, through chapter fifty-nine, and also might have written part of volume four, up to chapter sixty-six. Thus, in 1806, Burney had drafted at least sixteen chapters of *The Wanderer*; the novel has ninety-two chapters, so at this rate, Burney could have completed it within six years.

We will never know exactly when Burney completed most of the novel since there is no manuscript to date her progress, though her interleaved copy of *The Wanderer* reveals many aspects of her composition process that generally would not be apparent in a draft manuscript. She probably began work on it shortly after her letter of 30 August 1817 to her publishers Longman & Company, in which she reveals her plans “to prepare a corrected & revised Copy for some future — though perhaps posthumous Impression”

(*JL* 10: 632).⁸ The only work to discuss the interleaved copy is a little-known article by Robert L. Mack, which provides a brief, general overview, highlighting “some representative examples of [Burney’s] commentary” (Mack 17). My chapter will contain a more extensive discussion of Burney’s annotations, the majority of which are not discussed by Mack, to provide insight into her editorial process. Burney’s intended changes to Juliet and minor characters in the novel emphasize the act of reflection: Juliet is already mature and cultivated, but many of her hidden thoughts are revealed in Burney’s revisions.

Burney’s Opaque Heroine

Besides her initial dark skin and bandages, Juliet is, in several ways, a bold departure from Burney’s earlier heroines. Though Burney doesn’t give her age, Juliet is wiser and more experienced than Cecilia and especially than Evelina and Camilla.⁹ Even at the beginning of the novel, Juliet possesses a considerable amount of *savoir faire*, as she seamlessly navigates through the social obstacles that confound her sister-heroines. Juliet is easily able to avoid the pitfalls of snobbery, unlike Burney’s first heroine. Ashamed of being seen with her vulgar relatives, Evelina unwisely puts herself into the power of libertine Sir Clement Willoughby and is nearly raped.¹⁰ When Juliet is faced with a similar choice between rude protection and dangerous civility, she refuses the escort of Sir Lyell Sycamore, a duller version of *Evelina*’s Sir Clement Willoughby, preferring the safe company of the uncouth steward Mr. Stubbs (*The Wanderer* 271). Juliet likewise extricates herself from misunderstandings between her two “suitors.” She

⁸ See the “Note on the Text” to the novel (*The Wanderer* xxxix).

⁹ See Austin, “Between Women” 262, Epstein 181, and Johnson, *Equivocal Beings* 167.

¹⁰ See above, 53.

manages to mollify both Harleigh and Lord Melbury, who have “each surmized something clandestine of the other,” by simply affirming her own good intentions: “suffer me, my lord, to hope, that by the opinion I have formed of the honour of your own character, you will judge, – though at present in the dark, – of the integrity of mine!” (*The Wanderer* 600, 601). Camilla similarly is torn between Edgar Mandlebert and Sir Sedley Clarendel, but she is unable to proclaim her innocence, which is continually undermined by the rascally schemes of her brother Lionel (*Camilla* 504-5).

Until the final pages of *The Wanderer*, Juliet’s experience and wisdom can only be observed in her actions and behavior. Her thoughts, unlike those of Burney’s previous heroines, are almost entirely concealed from the reader.¹¹ Burney refuses to employ dramatic irony, so the reader, like the other characters of *The Wanderer*, must wait to be enlightened from Juliet herself. Juliet’s early plea to the admiral – “Ah, Sir! think well of me, then! – let your benevolence be as liberal as it is kind, and try, for once, to judge favourably of a stranger upon trust!” (*The Wanderer* 38) – can also be read as a plea to the reader for sympathy despite the heroine’s air of mystery and impenetrability. Consequently, descriptions of Juliet’s troubles and expectations are generally given in vague terms: “To be left, then, alone was not to be left to unbroken slumbers. She had no dependence, nor hope, but in an expected second letter, yet had devised no means to secure its immediate reception, even if its quick arrival corresponded with her wishes” (70). The reader cannot, as yet, conjecture Juliet’s “wishes” or the contents of the

¹¹ Deidre Lynch argues that Burney conceals Juliet’s agenda to create a “bravura demonstration of the lengths to which readers will go to ‘identify’ with a faceless nobody” (Lynch 206). See also Doody 319 and Gemmeke 51. Suzie Asha Park, on the other hand, reads Burney’s portrayal of Juliet as a criticism of Romantic convention, as interiority cannot be “fully accounted for” (Park, “All Agog” 130, 139).

expected letter. There are, from time to time, rare insights into Juliet's thoughts, but these are only connected to known events. Juliet's brief concern about the changed demeanor of Lord Melbury and Lady Aurora appears in connection with Mrs. Howell's banishment: "Have they told what they know of my circumstances? And has that been sufficient to deprive me of all consideration? to require even avoidance? And is Lord Melbury thus easily changed? And have I lost you – even you! Lady Aurora?" (126). And her burgeoning romantic feelings for Harleigh are presented only in the context of her departure from Mrs. Maple's house: "For some minutes she gazed pensively down the stair-case; slowly, then, she shut her door, internally uttering 'all is over: – he is gone, and will pursue me no more.' Then casting up her eyes, which filled with tears, 'may he,' she added, 'be happy!'" (206). These insights are revealed to the reader because they are presented in Juliet's direct speech and are unconnected to her mysterious secrets. The reflections of other characters are largely unrestricted. Harleigh's thoughts, especially his sympathetic feelings for Juliet, are often discernible: "To him, her language, her air, and her manner, pervading every disadvantage of apparel, poverty, and subjection, had announced her, from the first, to have received the education, and to have lived the life of a gentlewoman" (75). The narrator presents Harleigh's ruminations in indirect language, demonstrating omniscient knowledge of his thoughts, by confessing that they had been present "from the first."

Juliet acknowledges her secretive nature throughout the novel. In a rejoinder to one of her many interrogators, she declares, "'Disguise...you may charge me with; but not deceit! I give no false colouring. I am only not open'" (340). As with her earlier plea to the admiral (38), this statement is a justification of her opacity to the other characters

and to the reader. Even Burney's narrator emphasizes Juliet's hidden interiority: "The rest of the day was passed free from outward disturbance to Ellis; and what she might experience internally was undivulged" (355). As details of Juliet's history slowly emerge, the reader gets increased access to her thoughts. That her actual name is Juliet is revealed in chapter forty-one, and the narrator highlights this revelation: "the borrowed name of Ellis will now be dropt" (389). The first unrestricted glimpse into Juliet's thoughts occurs in the fifth and final volume:

Her situation appeared to her now to be as extraordinary, as it was sad and difficult. Entitled to an ample fortune, yet pennyless; indebted for her sole preservation from insult and from famine, to pecuniary obligations from accidental acquaintances, and those acquaintances, men! pursued, with documents of legal right, by one whom she shuddered to behold, and to whom she was so irreligiously tied, that she could not, even if she wished it, regard herself as his lawful wife; though so entangled, that her fetters seemed to be linked with duty and honour; unacknowledged, – perhaps disowned by her family; and, though born to a noble and yet untouched fortune, consigned to disguise, to debt, to indigence, and to flight! (816)

Once the causes of Juliet's difficulties have been revealed – her forced marriage and her inability to claim her legal rights and noble birth – her thoughts on those subjects may be divulged to readers. Juliet's troubles evoke those of Geraldine Verney, the heroine of Charlotte Smith's *Desmond* (1792). Also set during the French Revolution, *Desmond* relates the eponymous hero's travels to France to forget his love, the unhappily married Geraldine. Smith's novel is sympathetic to the French revolutionaries, and Mr. Verney's

death allows the two lovers to be united at the end of the novel, just as Juliet and Harleigh can easily marry after the commissary is executed offstage in France. Juliet's domestic woes are not as severe as Geraldine's: that they remain so long untold indicates a flaw in Burney's plot development, one that she tries to remedy in her corrections.

Burney's notes in the interleaved copy of *The Wanderer* reveal her intention to correct inconsistencies in Juliet's characterization. After Juliet, provoked by the suicidal Elinor Joddrel and the affectionate Harleigh, secretly departs from Mrs. Ireton's service, she becomes suddenly and strangely happy at the beginning of the next chapter. Burney, in her revisions, notices the contradiction in Juliet's behavior and remarks "Unnatural this cheering," which she fixes by removing the offending first paragraph of chapter sixty-seven to create a more logical emotional arc (*The Wanderer*, Berg 4: 143; cf. *The Wanderer* 621). In chapter sixty-seven, Juliet arrives at her best friend Gabriella's haberdasher shop and helps relieve her friend's debts and lessen her workload. The chapter also reveals Juliet's unexpected reticence toward Gabriella. Burney notices this inconsistency in plotting and resolves to remedy it in the later corrected edition: "Why this reserve to Gabriella Change or expound of an Haberdasher mention this in the Letters previous to the Journey" (*The Wanderer*, Berg 4: 145; cf. *The Wanderer* 622). Later in the novel, while Gabriella is telling Juliet's history to Sir Jasper Herrington, Juliet interrupts the recital and confirms that there are two large secrets she is still keeping from Gabriella (and the reader), which we later learn are her forced marriage and the danger that threatens Gabriella's uncle, the bishop. Although Juliet's extended silence prolongs the novel's mystery, Burney's critical commentary – "*Why this? Why?*" (*The Wanderer*,

Berg 4: 213; cf. *The Wanderer* 649) – implies that her projected revisions could fundamentally alter the form of the novel.

While Burney attempted to moderate Juliet's impenetrable air of mystery, she refused to tinker with, in Harleigh's words, Juliet's "cooler judgment" (*The Wanderer* 166), or in Elinor's, Juliet's "cold caution, and selfish prudence" (181). All of Juliet's decisions are tempered by her rational philosophy. Juliet can still be precipitate; when she considers repaying Miss Bydel's loan with Harleigh's borrowed money, "a moment's reflection pointed out, that, joined to the impropriety of such a measure with respect to Harleigh himself, it would be liable, more than any other, to give her the air of an impostor" (421). The other young women in the novel, however, are generally impulsive and thoughtless. Selina Joddrel, Elinor's younger sister, "one amongst the many in whom reflection never precedes speech" (107), and her fiancé Mr. Ireton, who "had not...reflected deeply" because "he did not know how!" (149), are two minor characters repeatedly characterized by their unthinking behavior. Elinor, the other female protagonist, adopts revolutionary female philosophies based on inclination rather than reflection: "Her own creed is settled – not by investigation into its merits, not by reflection upon its justice, but by an impulsive preference, in the persuasion that such a creed leaves her mistress of her destiny" (590). Elinor's adherence to revolutionary principles confirms that "her intellects are under the controul of her feelings, – and judgment has no guide so dangerous" (203). Despite her self-absorption, Elinor still performs good deeds, such as her donation of £50 to Juliet for her needlework venture with Gabriella (401). Even the more sensible characters in the novel have momentary bouts of recklessness. Chief among them is Lord Melbury, who, after his failed

seduction of Juliet, laments, ““I have been led on by rash precipitance, and – and want of thought!”” (141). The examples of Juliet, Elinor, and Lord Melbury demonstrate that, in *The Wanderer*, a character’s ability to reflect is often linked to that character’s index of morality.

Philosophical Language and Idiolect

Juliet’s reflective capacities are deficient only in her lack of experience, which she gradually develops over the course of the novel. The failures that arise from her lack of experience are often stimulated by her overly-optimistic expectations. Her first naïve miscalculation appears in her behavior towards Mrs. Howell. Believing her to be as good-natured and enlightened as her two charges, Lady Aurora and Lord Melville, Juliet is intensely shocked when Mrs. Howell accuses her of being an adventurer, intending to ensnare the young, noble pair:

But the experience of Ellis had not yet taught her, how distinct is the politeness of manner, formed by the habits of high life, to that which springs spontaneously from benevolence of mind. The first, the product of studied combinations, is laid aside, like whatever is factitious, where there is no object for acting a part: the second, the child of sympathy, instructs us how to treat others, by suggesting the treatment we desire for ourselves; and this, as its feelings are personal, though its exertions are external, demands no effort, waits no call, and is never failingly at hand. (134)

Juliet’s inability to distinguish between real and assumed goodness is treated in a philosophical manner by the narrator. The narrator’s language in this didactic interlude is unusually elevated to match the weighty subject matter. As with *Cecilia* and *Camilla*,

there is a considerable amount of philosophical narration in *The Wanderer*, notably the introduction to the fifth and final volume: “The final purposes for which man is ordained to move in this nether sphere, will for ever remain disputable, while the doubts to which it gives rise can be answered only by fellow-doubters: but that the basis of his social comfort is confidence, is an axiom that waits no revelation, requires no logic, and dispenses with mathematical accuracy for proof” (711). Much of the philosophical diction in *The Wanderer*, however, is linked to Juliet’s lack of experience.

On returning to Mrs. Maple’s residence shortly after her encounter with Mrs. Howell, Juliet realizes that Mrs. Maple’s roof is equally inhospitable. Again the narrator presents a philosophical view of Juliet’s dilemma, but this time the passage is complicated by the use of free-indirect discourse:

Grievously Ellis felt tormented with the prospect of what her reception might be from Mrs. Maple, after such a blight. The buoyant spirit of her first escape, which she had believed no after misfortune could subdue, had now so frequently been repressed, that it was nearly borne down to the common standard of mortal condition, whence we receive our daily fare of good and of evil, with the joy or the grief that they separately excite; independently of that wonderful power, believed in by the youthful and inexperienced, of hoarding up the felicity of our happy moments, as a counterpoise to future sorrows and disappointments. The past may revisit our hearts with renewed sufferings, or our spirits with gay recollections; but the interest of the time present, even upon points the most passing and trivial, will ever, from the pressure of our wants and our feelings, predominate. (137)

The philosophical language in this passage, instead of serving a purely didactic function, as with Juliet's fraught encounter with Mrs. Howell, begins to reflect Juliet's growing experience. This is the most significant discrepancy between the two passages. By using free-indirect discourse, Burney blurs the demarcation between the narrator's voice and Juliet's thoughts and seems to anticipate the period when such philosophical reflection, grounded in experience, will be performed by Juliet herself.

Later in the novel, during her employment at the milliners' shop, Juliet appropriates the narrator's philosophical diction, as she reflects upon her swift ascent into favor at her employment and even swifter decline into displeasure because of her initial, unsustainably heavy work pace: "with what upright intentions may we be injudicious! I have thrown away the power of obliging, by too precipitate an eagerness to oblige!" (453).¹² The narrator afterwards refers to Juliet as "the silent moralist," as she rationally considers Sir Jasper's public neglect (515) and develops enough confidence to publicly contradict Mrs. Ireton's ill-natured insinuations about her relationship with her nephew Mr. Ireton.¹³ Juliet's fully-formed cognitive capabilities enable her to appropriate the narrator's role as philosophical commentator throughout the rest of the novel. The significance of Juliet's later, overt philosophical role can be seen in chapter seventy-five, in Burney's opinion "The Best Chapter in the Work" (*The Wanderer*, Berg 4: 339), which contains a short philosophical meditation debunking the utopian conception of a rustic

¹² In her revision notes, Burney criticizes these milliners' shop musings for their "sameness of phrase." Her comment tempers, but does not remove the significance of Juliet's philosophical diction here (*The Wanderer*, Berg 3: 174; cf. *The Wanderer* 453-4).

¹³ Much of Juliet's understanding and judgment are developed as she navigates scenes of "Conflict and indeterminacy," which allow her to form not a "set of rules that everyone can follow, but...what answers for her" (Cutting-Gray 100).

life, ending with an affirmation of life after death, which is Juliet's response to Elinor's philosophical dilemma.

The philosophical language represented silently in Juliet's thoughts is given voice throughout the novel by the outspoken, revolutionary Elinor. Elinor, in this sense, satisfies readings of her as "Juliet's alter ego: the vivacious, demanding, dramatic alter ego of a lively, intelligent, passionate woman who has to repress these sides of her character to please society and propriety" (Gemmeke 85). Some of Elinor's radical principles are appealing, such as her argument for allowing talented and virtuous women to perform publicly: "You are amongst the cold, the heartless, the ungifted, who, to discredit talents, and render them dangerous, leave their exercise to vice, by making virtue fear to exert, or even patronize them" (*The Wanderer* 398). In general, Elinor's principles have a faulty foundation, according to Harleigh, who criticizes Elinor's sudden and complete adoption of revolutionary ideologies without interrogating their root principles: "'If you give Homer before the Primer, do you think that you shall make a man of learning?'" (19). Harleigh's question highlights the importance of building on established and tested precepts, shaped by the reflections of past thinkers, instead of impulsively appropriating abstract and unproven conclusions as Elinor does. Although Elinor values the abstract over the concrete – "I am never so happy as in ranging without a guide" (68) – her philosophy has its basis, not in revolutionary ideals after all, but in her own personal preference: "I see every thing to urge, and nothing to oppose my following the bent of my own humour; or, in other words, throwing off the trammels of unmeaning custom, and acting, as well as thinking, for myself" (151). Elinor's hedonistic mode of action is proven dangerous; she is ostracized for her open declaration of love for

Harleigh, which leads to her multiple suicide attempts and culminates in her philosophical debate with Harleigh about life after death. The prolonged philosophical discussion between Harleigh and Elinor, probably the most extended philosophical scene in any Burney novel (780-94), ends disappointingly, though predictably with Elinor's capitulation.¹⁴ In her later comments, Burney planned to pare down this scene, though she called it "very clever: but <<going>> too far from the story in this argument" (*The Wanderer*, Berg 5: 196, cf. *The Wanderer* 791).

Critics of *The Wanderer* were strongly divided over Burney's portrayal of Elinor. *The Critical Review* praised her as "the most original and spirited" of the characters in *The Wanderer* (*Critical Review* 420). Croker's hostility towards Burney's prose and plotting, however, extended to her anti-heroine: he calls Elinor "monstrous" and facetiously alludes to "the practice, to which she [Elinor] was greatly addicted, of cutting her own throat" (Croker 129).¹⁵ Burney's depiction of Elinor was the most striking and divisive aspect of her characterization; her characters and her related stylistic devices generally earned plaudits from reviewers. *The Critical Review* remarks that Burney's style has "always eminently distinguished [her] from every other writer in the same

¹⁴ Claudia Johnson terms this scene "excruciating... because its gestures towards intensity...miscarry" (Johnson, *Equivocal Beings* 187), while Justine Crump reads Elinor's actions as her attempt to "educat[e] Harleigh into a better appreciation of her actions and of the revolutionary principles that motivate them" (Crump 338).

¹⁵ Burney's true opinion of Elinor has famously divided critics. Her centrality to the plot is undeniable, and she is significantly the final focus of the novel (*The Wanderer* 872-73), which Burney marks as "stet" even in her revision notes (*The Wanderer*, Berg 5: 394-5). Based on Burney's corrections, Mack emphasizes Burney's approval of Elinor, whose speeches "are of 'deep interest' and are '[on] the whole ex[cellent],' and that they are, of all things in the novel, 'altogether the best'" (Mack 45). Mack's conclusion is somewhat tenuous since Burney's comments – particularly the "All together *the Best*" (*The Wanderer*, Berg 1: 357) – are part of Burney's usual end-of-chapter evaluations, which, unless explicitly noted, do not specifically refer to single characters or scenes.

walk” (*Critical Review* 422). Even Joyce Hemlow, a detractor of *The Wanderer*, concedes, “When...she was placing her characters in action and reproducing speech, she wrote with her old skill” (Hemlow 339). Burney surpasses herself with the novel’s arresting opening sentence: “During the dire reign of the terrific Robespierre, and in the dead of night, braving the cold, the darkness and the damps of December, some English passengers, in a small vessel, were preparing to glide silently from the coast of France, when a voice of keen distress resounded from the shore, imploring, in the French language, pity and admission” (*The Wanderer* 11).¹⁶ Not only does this sentence immediately situate the reader within the French revolutionary context, but the circumstances of the escaping English passengers are exciting, while the unknown wanderer introduces an air of mystery. Bafflingly, Burney planned to change the sentence in the second edition, removing the reference to Robespierre, while noting the need for a “more <striking> opening & abrupt <transposition>” (*The Wanderer*, Berg 1: 1). By removing the perilous historical context, Burney might have increased the mystery, but would have had to omit the gripping suspense.¹⁷

While *The Wanderer*, in contrast to Burney’s other novels, generates mystery and suspense, it still contains representative examples of Burney’s virtuosic idiolect and free-indirect discourse. As in Burney’s other novels, it is generally the low and nosy characters that are given distinct speech-types. The grocer Mr. Tedman’s vulgar accent is skillfully approximated in Burney’s prose: “Why I’d never sate eyes upon Miss a

¹⁶ Thaddeus also praises the brilliant opening: “This is riveting. And it raises expectations that Burney teases us with, and refuses to satisfy” (Thaddeus 162).

¹⁷ On the other hand, Mack argues that Burney’s emendation “would only have deepened the mystery of the novel’s action even further; indeed, such a change plunges us further into the darkness of narrative speculation and modestly increases the generic status of the novel *as* mystery” (Mack 34).

fortnight ago! But she's music-learner to my darter. And they tell me she's one of the best; which I think like enough to be true, for she tudles upon them wires the prettiest of any thing I ever heard" (*The Wanderer* 260). Mr. Riley's idiolect, on the other hand, aptly reflects his carefree and insouciant manner: "O, faith, if you expect a reply from the Demoiselle, except she's in a talking humour, you'll find yourself confoundedly out in your reckoning! You will, faith! Unless you light upon something that happens to hit her taste, you may sail from the north pole to the south, and return home by a voyage round the world, before she'll have been moved to squeeze out a syllable" (261). The mercurial Sir Jaspar Herrington's idiosyncratic language is tinged with his Rosicrucian fancies and allusions to "those little aerial beings": "sometimes, I dream while wide awake, and fancy I see them; and feel myself at the mercy of their antic corrections; or receive courteous presents, or wholesome advice" (409).

Burney's construction of character speech in *The Wanderer* contains a sustained imitation of the Hampshire dialect during Juliet's travels to Salisbury and the New Forest. Dame Fairfield is Juliet's first friend in the New Forest, and her speech is almost inscrutable, though seemingly accurate, as she vents her anxiety about her husband's illegal deer-hunting operation: "But I would no' ha' un come to be honged or transported, if so be a was as onkoind agen! I would sooner go with un to prison; thof it be but a dismal life to be shut up by dark walls, and iron bars for to see out of! but I'd do it for sure and sure, not to forsake un, poor mon! in his need; if so be I could get wherewithal to keep my little dearys." (715). Dame Fairfield's distinctive dialect is also appropriated by the narrator in a type of hybridized discourse. Upon Juliet's first meeting with Dame Fairfield, after Juliet has saved the dame's son, "the boy related that he had been

drowned, but that the *dood ady* (good lady) had come and saved his life” (658). The narrator’s use of parenthesis, as a sort of translation, highlights this act of linguistic borrowing. *The Wanderer* also, unlike Burney’s other novels, contains an extensive amount of French, a logical move considering that France is the novel’s initial setting, the place where Juliet spent her childhood, and the source of Juliet’s slight accent.¹⁸ The two biggest mysteries of the plot, Juliet’s real name (387) and Juliet’s marriage (727), are first unveiled in French. Yet Burney’s bilingual experiment was not well-received. For Hemlow, “the influence of the French language” was one of the key factors that rendered *The Wanderer* “intolerable” to contemporary readers (Hemlow 339). Hemlow is referring also to the “phrasal genitive,” a grammatical construction in which the preposition “of” and a possessive appear together, which could more elegantly be replaced with a simple possessive. Reviewers also criticized Burney’s overuse of this device in *Camilla*, though she corrected it in the second edition.

Burney’s use of distinct character language is connected, as in her previous novels, with her use of free-indirect discourse. In *The Wanderer*, since Juliet’s voice is often indistinguishable from the narrator’s, much of the free-indirect discourse appears in relation to important, though minor characters, such as the “three furies” (Mrs. Ireton, Mrs. Howell, and Mrs. Maple). When Mrs. Ireton takes Juliet to London in exchange for Juliet’s service as her companion, she expects her to be awed at the sight of her house. The narrator appropriates Mrs. Ireton’s language: “Mrs. Ireton turned exultingly to the stranger: but her glance met no gratification. The young woman, instead of admiring the

¹⁸ Even though Madame Duval and Monsieur Du Bois do speak some French in *Evelina*, their French conversations are usually brief and isolated, nothing like the lengthy French paragraphs within *The Wanderer*.

house, and counting the number of steps that led to the vestibule, or of windows that commanded a view of the square, only cast her eyes upwards, as if penetrated with thankfulness that her journey was ended” (47). By enumerating the decadent features of the house in the haughty language of Mrs. Ireton, the narrator subtly criticizes Mrs. Ireton’s arrogance. Similarly, Mrs. Maple’s agitation at Juliet’s popularity among her aristocratic acquaintance is presented in her own language: “she could only quiet her conscience, for having been accessory, though so unintentionally, to procuring this favour and popularity for such an adventurer, by devoutly resolving, that no entreaties, and no representation, should ever in future, dupe her out of her own good sense, into other people’s fantastical conceits of charity” (212). Phrases like “other people’s fantastical conceits of charity” and “adventurer,” which originate in Mrs. Maple’s vocabulary, are given ambiguous voicing in the narrative.

Expanded and Deleted Characterization

Like her accomplished use of idiolect and other stylistic devices, Burney’s portrayal of secondary characters was commended in contemporary reviews. William Taylor liberally praises Burney’s skill with characterization: “the author has imparted to her characters a strict consistency, a dramatic distinctness, an ample variety, an appropriate talk, and a living *naturalness*, (if we may make such a word,) that give them all a hold on the memory and on the sympathy” (Taylor 415). Certain characters are consistently singled out for praise by reviewers. The *Critical Review* was lavish in its praise of Mrs. Ireton: “The conduct and manners of a lady to whom Juliet is recommended as a companion, supply an amusing picture of that minor diabolism which delights in the torture-ordinary of every thing in its power” (*Critical Review* 416).

Hazlitt, too, finds the characters of Mrs. Ireton, Sir Jasper Herrington, and Mr. Giles Arbe to be exemplars of Burney's enduring talent for characterization (Hazlitt 338). And again, William Taylor, in *The Monthly Review* admires Sir Jasper and Mrs. Ireton:

Among the more admirable drawn episodical characters of this agreeable intricate and busy novel, may especially be noticed Sir Jaspar Herrington and Mrs. Ireton; the former a most benevolent and the latter a most malevolent personage. In the arts of ingeniously serving, and ingeniously tormenting, each is respectively a proficient: while both display in their conversation the resources of wit and genius. (Taylor 415)

Burney appears to have taken these critical opinions to heart: her editorial comment at the beginning of volume three reminds her to "Keep S^r Jaspar Flora Old Gooch Mrs. Ireton Gabriella," all strong examples of her expert characterization.

Sir Jaspar, Burney's "ancient and gouty Strephon" (*Critical Review* 420), whose speech is peppered with literary allusions, especially to Shakespeare (*The Wanderer* 626-27),¹⁹ is almost entirely unchanged in Burney's revisions. Burney singles him out even from his earliest appearance in chapter forty-three: "Sir Jasper stet²⁰ otherwise point & omit" (*The Wanderer*, Berg 3: 68), and his mischievous maneuvers with Sir Lyell in chapter forty-six are marked as "Altogether very amusing & Stet" (3: 153). Sir Jaspar has comical unrequited feelings for Juliet; his bachelorhood is the product of a suspicious youth, the same fate that threatens to befall *Camilla*'s Edgar Mandlebert: "We pay, by our aged facility and good humour, for our youthful severity and impertinence! and, after having wasted our early life in conceiving that no one is good enough for us, we consume

¹⁹ See Thaddeus, *Frances Burney* 167.

²⁰ Circled.

our latter days in envy of every married man!” (*The Wanderer* 632). The interlude in which Sir Jaspar flirts with Juliet, relates his history, and proposes is highly commended by Burney: “All S^r Jaspar’s History Stet Stet Stet” (*The Wanderer*, Berg 4: 176). Besides his distinctive fantastical language, which is highly allusive and colored by Rosicrucian mythology, Sir Jaspar manages to bring about most of the key events in the novel. He convinces Gabrielle, Juliet’s childhood friend, and then Juliet herself to disclose the latter’s true history (*The Wanderer* 641, 738). Sir Jaspar, unlike the impotent Harleigh, singly removes the menace of Juliet’s illegal first husband when he “decided...to denounce the criminal to justice; and then to take every possible measure, to have him either imprisoned for trial, or sent out of the country, by the alien-bill, before he should overtake the fair fugitive” (756). Sir Jaspar also facilitates Juliet’s reunion with her half-siblings by first revealing to Lady Aurora that Juliet is her sister (818), and he is the force behind the strange and sublime Stonehenge scene, a brief, romantic respite from the danger Juliet faces towards the end of the novel (765). It is not surprising, then, that Burney decides to soften the rougher parts of Sir Jaspar’s behavior and make him universally appealing. She writes, “<Oler> Sr Jaspar’s ill humour unless afterwards *Requisite*” (*The Wanderer*, Berg 3: 289; cf. *The Wanderer* 501), “oler” apparently code for “remove” or “omit.” Similarly, Burney intends chapter fifty-six, in which Sir Jaspar ignores Juliet in public, to be “Quite omitted if possible mawkish & tiresome & repetition” (*The Wanderer*, Berg 3: 350).

Mrs. Ireton and Giles Arbe do not, like Sir Jaspar, escape Burney's editorial pen despite the almost complete approbation they received from critics and readers.²¹ Mrs. Ireton, skilled "in the *art of ingeniously tormenting*" (*The Wanderer* 486), an obvious allusion to Jane Collier's book (1753), is one of Juliet's chief nemeses, while Mr. Arbe is likably absent-minded. Mack notes that "It is highly significant, therefore, that Burney seems deliberately to fly in the face of such responses when she indicates her desire in any future edition of the novel to diminish the role of precisely these same characters" (Mack 46). Mack is partially correct: Burney praises the bulk of Mrs. Ireton's featured chapters in her notes, but does generally decide to reduce them. For example, Burney indicates that chapter fifty-three, which describes Mrs. Ireton and her nephew and their cruel treatment of Juliet, should be "Altered & Abridged yet generally retained" (*The Wanderer*, Berg 3: 276); later in the third volume, as Mrs. Ireton and Miss Bydel scandalously gossip about Juliet and Sir Jaspar, Burney indicates that these incidents are "Too long by more than half" (3: 406). Especially in the fifth volume, Burney intends to excise Mrs. Ireton's redundantly vitriolic behavior to Juliet: "Oler Mrs. Ireton" (*The Wanderer*, Berg 5: 122; cf. *The Wanderer* 761). Occasionally Burney plans to preserve completely Juliet's scenes with Mrs. Ireton; these are marked "Stet All"²² (*The Wanderer*, Berg 3: 246). Those scenes include Juliet's introduction into Mrs. Ireton's house as a humble dependent and Juliet's situation among Mrs. Ireton's other servants; Mrs. Ireton's initial harsh treatment of Juliet, who was then her maid, is also exempt from the "General <versyfing> & other Dullness of prolixity" that Burney criticized within

²¹ Mack notes that "almost all [of the critics] praised the satiric portraits of Mrs. Ireton and of Mr. Giles Arbe" (Mack 46).

²² Both words circled.

the third chapter (1: 74). Giles Arbe, on the other hand, receives short shrift. Burney's notes regarding the introduction of Arbe in chapter twenty-eight at the end of book three reveal her ambiguous stance towards his character: "shorten much yet retain much of Arbe" (2: 215). The subsequent chapters, which prominently feature Arbe, are uniformly abridged: chapter thirty will be "Generally omitted almost in *Toto*" (2: 251); chapter thirty-one will be "shorten[ed] immensely" (2: 270); and as for chapter thirty-three, "This whole Chapter except to keep up the Chain to be omitted" (2: 321).

Besides Sir Jaspar, Mrs. Ireton, and Giles Arbe, Burney planned to minimize the rest of the secondary characters in *The Wanderer*. Perhaps she was influenced by Hazlitt's criticism about the sameness of her characterization: "Her characters, which are all caricatures, are no doubt distinctly marked, and perfectly kept up; but they are somewhat superficial, and exceedingly uniform. Her heroes and heroines, almost all of them, depend on the stock of a single phrase or sentiment" (Hazlitt 336).²³ Burney's revisions to the fickle Selina Joddrel, who alternately aids and ignores Juliet depending on the behavior of other fashionable people, were probably influenced by Hazlitt's comments: she writes, "too much of Selina's silly Cutting" (*The Wanderer*, Berg 3: 428). Burney's adjustments to Mr. Ireton, Selina's fiancé, are almost antithetical. Burney works to emphasize the fundamentally egotistical aspects of his personality in her changes: "NB Ireton more marked – as Egoist *necessary* to be kept for the incitement to

²³ William Taylor's critique of Burney's repetitive secondary characters is similar: "When a new edition of this novel is undertaken, we should recommend something of abridgment, especially of the comic portions; and of those dialogues which continue indeed a consistent behaviour of the inferior characters, but which add no new traits to an individuality that is sufficiently peculiarized on their first introduction." (Taylor 419). Mack also confirms that some of Burney's comments "suggest that Burney planned entirely to trim the novel of possible repetition and superfluities, and bring her comic cast of characters into sharper focus" (Mack 37).

Melbury” (1: 4), though at times she has conflicting views on his character. Early in the novel, she writes “omit all of Ireton not indispensable” (1: 126), though in her comments on chapter fifty-five, which also features Ireton’s aggressive personality, she writes: “Ireton comic & amusing stet²⁴” (3: 316). Burney’s treatment of Juliet’s uncle, the admiral, is similar to her treatment of Sir Jaspar, though the admiral is a more minor figure. Most of the admiral’s scenes are preserved and approved: “All Admiral the Discovery Stet all his history Stet only shorten the finishing & comments” (5: 323). However, Burney indicates a thorough softening of his character. In her notes to the early English Channel scenes, she writes, “Keep only what is quite Best of Admiral” (1: 67), and in the fifth volume, she marks the admiral’s distinctive sea-jargon, such as “Avast” and “flummery” (*The Wanderer* 830), as “Rude & Coarse” (*The Wanderer*, Berg 5: 291). Burney also plans to soften the language and manner of Mr. Riley, another older man with distinctive diction, in her revision of the novel: “the intercourse of Riley & Surley naturalized & Riley made more natural” (4: 224).

Plot and Linguistic Revisions

Mr. Riley, a very minor character in *The Wanderer*, bridges the connection between Burney’s changes to character and her changes to plot. Early in the fifth volume, Burney’s notes alight on a significant plot hole – the fact that the pilot of the ship featured in the novel’s opening scene helps both the heroes (Sir Jaspar) and the villains (Juliet’s husband and Riley, to a certain extent) – “How can the Pilot have aided the villain & the Bart²⁵ at the same time? & Riley? Ha Ha – what stuff” (5: 112). The last phrase is a rare, playful example of Burney’s attitude towards her own writing, and it

²⁴ Circled.

²⁵ I.e., the baronet, Sir Jaspar.

believes the serious and substantial nature of many of the changes that she planned to undertake. Burney's character revisions are generally minor in comparison to some of the sweeping revisions she indicated for the plot. As with her observation about the pilot, many of Burney's projected plot revisions add subtle meaning to the novel. When Juliet is persecuted by Mrs. Maple early in the novel, Burney indicates that Mrs. Maple's threat to Juliet to make "the landlord to take notice" should be exacerbated, so that the landlord would now "send word to the police" (1: 37). The change here, as Mack observes, is "profound": "Having effected such a revision, the novelist would have underscored the danger in which her heroine was now placed of being confronted not merely with the personal and arbitrary authority of the innkeeper, but rather with the official and rather more consequential power of established officers of the law" (Mack 31). Juliet's increased apprehension about Lady Aurora's sudden coolness forms another understated plot alteration. In the published novel, Juliet's suspicions are given tentatively: "And is it thus, she cried, that all I thought so ingenuous in goodness, so open in benevolence, so sincere in partiality, subsides into neglect, perhaps forgetfulness?" (*The Wanderer* 130). In her annotations to this passage, Burney adds the phrase, "perhaps disdain?" (*The Wanderer*, Berg 1: 292). The addition intensifies Juliet's negative, though erroneous interpretation of Lady Aurora's actions.

Many of Burney's changes to the plot of *The Wanderer* are enacted through subtle shifts in language, which generally remove subtlety and create emphasis. A few of these are straightforward linguistic additions, such as the specification of Juliet's "scheme with Miss Matson," as the word "with" is replaced by "to work as a Journeywoman for" (3: 103). Sir Jaspar's unfinished speech, which implicitly criticizes the supposed mercenary

motives of Lady Aurora and Lord Melbury, “When a boy like Lord Melbury, a young girl such as Lady Aurora –” is unnecessarily completed in the revision with the added phrase, “disown such a sister to benefit by her fortune –” (4: 212). As with Sir Jaspar’s speech, Juliet’s hidden thoughts are more often given utterance in the revisions, as when she receives “The ‘enclosed trifle’... a banknote of twenty pounds” from Lady Aurora. In the published novel, Juliet’s gratitude is implied, but in Burney’s revisions, Juliet overtly acknowledges her thankfulness: “How did she rejoice that no promise had been extorted by Mrs. Howard to force her resistance of this only relief she could wish to accept” (1: 326). Besides her plans to add explanatory language, Burney identified a number of “tame” phrases to be excised. When Juliet is fleeing her husband in the New Forest, she meets Dame Fairfield, whose own husband is an illegal smuggler. Juliet witnesses the dame’s reunion with her husband – “The dame went forth to meet him; and Juliet spent nearly half an hour in the most cruel suspense” – which Burney marks as “too tame” (*The Wanderer*, Berg 5: 23; cf. *The Wanderer* 720), because during this scene, Juliet is absolutely terrified. When Juliet is similarly in distress, as her hateful commissary “husband” claims her as his wife, “Harleigh hesitated whether to follow; but it was only for a moment: the next, a shriek of agony reached his ears, and, hastily rushing forth...” (*The Wanderer* 726). Burney criticized her hero’s reaction as “too tame,” using as a more immediate substitute for “hastily rushing forth,” the phrase “Harleigh dashed forward” (*The Wanderer*, Berg 5: 38). The word “tame” is also used in Burney’s annotations to the love scenes between Harleigh and Juliet. Harleigh’s first sanctioned declaration of love is prefaced by the statement, “Will not Miss Granville be more gracious than Miss Ellis has been? Miss Granville can have no tie but what is voluntary:

no hovering doubts, no chilling scruples, no fancied engagements –” (*The Wanderer*, Berg 5: 364; cf. *The Wanderer* 860). Burney unsurprisingly judges Harleigh’s repetitive and high-flown language to be “quaint & tame.”

Indeed, Burney criticizes many of the romantic scenes between Juliet and Harleigh, especially those that occur in the fifth volume of the novel, as worse than “tame.” Burney finds Harleigh’s open declaration and Juliet’s response, precipitated by “the blush which had visited, flown, and re-visited her face, had fixed itself in the deepest tint upon her cheek” (*The Wanderer*, Berg 5: 365; cf. *The Wanderer* 860), to be “Bombastic.” Juliet’s subsequent “indulgence of sentiments so long and so imperiously curbed” (*The Wanderer* 863) is termed “mawkish” (*The Wanderer*, Berg 5: 372).

Although Burney finds Juliet and Harleigh’s *éclaircissement* to be the most offensively maudlin scene in the novel, it is not the only part of *The Wanderer* that she derides for its excess sentimentality. Juliet’s escape from her husband through the assistance of Sir Jaspar is another such scene. Burney’s overall response was lukewarm – “Much Stet much change” – but she criticized the “*over done* exaggeration & Bathos” (*The Wanderer*, Berg 5: 67). Burney saves her most scathing comments for the scene in which Juliet is reunited with her acknowledged half-sister Lady Aurora: “This Chap. 88 very long languid, manqué to be curtailed or new written better meet L^y. Aurora more auspiciously & markedly if possible Tis even mawksh from disappointg expectation” (5: 255). The reunion is indeed maudlin, as can be seen in a representative specimen: “Juliet could only shed tears, though tears so delicious, that it was luxury to shed them. Lady Aurora would have kissed them from her cheeks; but her own mingled with them so copiously, that it was not possible” (*The Wanderer* 818). In the following chapter,

Juliet's false belief that she must go back to France to save her guardian, the Bishop, is also criticized as being "manqué false set" (*The Wanderer*, Berg 5: 288).

Beyond her pruning of excessive and redundant emotional language, Burney also attempted to eliminate a number of superfluities from her text. According to Mack, Burney "did indeed intended [sic], should the opportunity have presented itself, to make some sweeping cuts to the novel and so...to 'shorten' and 'curtail' her narrative material wherever she thought it possible to do so" (Mack 45). Extra characters are often removed. Burney marks chapter twenty-four, the chapter which introduces and discusses Juliet's music students, for deletion: "Perhaps omit this wholly – otherwise concentrate all that is <xxxxx 1-2 words> for merely varying the details" (*The Wanderer*, Berg 2: 110). Burney also planned to exclude Juliet's short encounter with some hospitable cottagers during her adventures in the New Forest: "Shorten or wholly omit These Cottagers" (*The Wanderer*, Berg 4: 299; cf. *The Wanderer* 685-86). In addition to removing superfluous characterization, Burney also aimed to shorten repetitive situations within the novel. The final rehearsal scene for the private theatricals, in which Juliet is forced to be the prompter, repeats material from the company's earlier rehearsals, which is why Burney, in her notes, writes "Curtailed if not omit to come plump to the Play" (*The Wanderer*, Berg 1: 176). Also Juliet's solutions to repay her creditors, which include working for Miss Matson as a needlewoman and performing in public, merely repeat her previous pecuniary difficulties. Here Burney writes: "All shortened not quite olé" (2: 233).

Burney did not intend to abridge the repetitive romantic relationship between Harleigh and Juliet, even though she criticized their "tame" love declarations. Burney's

retention of many of Juliet and Harleigh's courtship scenes evokes her treatment of Edgar and Camilla in her revisions to *Camilla*.²⁶ In her notes to the fourth volume of *The Wanderer*, Burney at least acknowledges the repetitiveness inherent in the relationship of her two protagonists: "Repeti {ti} on Change here or previously" (*The Wanderer*, Berg 4: 137; cf. *The Wanderer* 618). One such tableau occurs as Juliet prepares for her first paid public performance. Aware of the negative connotations associated with female performers, Harleigh tries to dissuade Juliet from performing. Their discussions on this subject extend over a number of scenes, and Burney's responses to them vary. Harleigh's first debate with Juliet on this issue, in chapter thirty-five, is marked, "All this stet stet"²⁷ (*The Wanderer*, Berg 2: 361); Burney even intends to retain Harleigh's repetitious written plea against performance in the following chapter: "Stet"²⁸ to here" (*The Wanderer*, Berg 2: 368; cf. *The Wanderer* 344). Yet the later events of chapter thirty-six, which involve Harleigh's second visit to Juliet and the declaration of his romantic intentions, are similarly redundant, and it seems arbitrary that these are the events that Burney selects to be "Perhaps omitted certainly curtailed" (*The Wanderer*, Berg 2: 380).

In her interleaved notes, Burney indicates changes to the large majority of the chapters in *The Wanderer*, especially those in the middle of the novel. The scenes that Burney most consistently preserves involve the New Forest and Elinor Joddrel. The New Forest serves as the background for Juliet's strange romantic journey and contains, as mentioned above, "The Best Chapter in the Work" (4: 339), Burney's short philosophical meditation on country life. Burney's shift to romanticism is a significant tonal and

²⁶ See above, 132-33.

²⁷ Each stet is circled.

²⁸ Stet is circled.

thematic change, which has been addressed by critics such as Margaret Anne Doody and Deidre Lynch.²⁹ Juliet's journey to Salisbury, near the New Forest, where she saves Dame Fairfield's child from drowning and stays with their family, is marked, "All this ex & nearly but for trifles Stet"³⁰ (4: 246). The next chapter, when Juliet steals the bonnet of promiscuous Deb and begins her peregrinations in the New Forest, Burney marks as "This almost all Stet Stet" (4: 276). The consequences of Juliet's theft – being mistaken for a loose women – and her return to Dame Fairfield's cottage, should be, according to Burney, "Mostly Kept but brevified" (4: 359). The final chapter involving the New Forest, in which Dame Fairfield helps Juliet escape and Juliet runs into Harleigh and her husband at a nearby hotel, is pronounced "Stet Stet or nearly" (5: 55).

Elinor, too, is consistently praised in Burney's emendations. The mad revelation of her love is, according to Burney, "All together *the Best*" (1: 357). Elinor's wild suicide attempts are among Burney's favorites: Elinor's first suicide attempt at Juliet's public concert should be "Nearly Stet unchanged an iota" (2: 414),³¹ the story of Elinor's suicide attempt from her own perspective is one of the few redeeming parts of chapter forty-two: "Change All on the stage & all Elinor *ex* The rest rather languid *Prune & <xxxxx I word>*" (3: 50); and Elinor's plot to bring Juliet and Harleigh to a church, where she orchestrates another suicide attempt, is marked insistently as "This Quite Stet"³²

²⁹ Doody reads Juliet as "a Romantic figure," epitomizing "the romanticism of the second generation" (Doody 363), while Lynch reads Burney's decision to "[abandon] the overcrowded public rooms that are the settings for the novel of manners and [move] the narrative from the town to the rural scene" as a means of displaying Juliet's developing philosophic individuality, "the psychic transformations that transpire when the individual is left alone with majestic nature" (Lynch 202).

³⁰ Circled.

³¹ Stet and iota are both circled.

³² Circled.

Stet³³” (4: 46). In chapters sixty-two and sixty-three, Elinor’s repetitive pleas to Harleigh to engage with her in philosophical debate about the possibility of life after death are annotated respectively as, “This generally Stet³⁴ but shortened from Repetitions” (4: 64), and emphatically, “Stet³⁵ Stet³⁶ Stet³⁷” (4: 84). And Elinor’s troubling and seemingly out of place appearance in the final paragraphs of the novel is expressly marked as “stet” (*The Wanderer*, Berg 5: 394-95; cf. *The Wanderer* 872-73).

Elinor and Female Difficulties

Elinor’s wild conduct and characterization derive from a convention of radical female behavior inspired by the French Revolution. Even though Burney does not overtly allude to other revolutionary heroines, Elinor incorporates many of their mannerisms. Elinor’s reverse courtship of Harleigh invokes Mary Hays’s *Memoirs of Emma Courtney* (1796), which centers on a woman, Emma Courtney, who openly pursues a man, Augustus Harley, who does not reciprocate her affections. Even though “Harley” and “Harleigh” are homonyms and even though the heroes share the same initials – A.H. for Augustus Harley and Albert Harleigh – Augustus really does love Emma, while Harleigh’s feelings for Elinor are merely platonic. Emma and Augustus’s marriage is prevented only because Augustus is already married. Burney’s treatment of Elinor is not, like Courtney’s treatment of Emma, entirely sympathetic. This is why Burney was probably also influenced by Elizabeth Hamilton’s anti-Jacobin *Memoirs of Modern Philosophers* (1800), which ridicules Mary Hays through the character of the

³³ Circled.

³⁴ Circled.

³⁵ Circled.

³⁶ Circled.

³⁷ Circled.

repulsive Bridgetina Botherim, who openly declares her love to her beloved, who does not understand her revolutionary jargon and cannot reciprocate her romantic sentiments. Neither as likable as Emma nor as repulsive as Bridgetina, Elinor is most similar to radical heroines created in the years following the revolutionary 1790s, such as the eponymous heroine of Amelia Opie's *Adeline Mowbray* (1804). Like her "philosophical" mother, Adeline spends much of her free time poring over radical political tracts, but she puts their theories into practice by living virtuously, though unmarried, as the companion of the radical philosopher Glenmurray. After Glenmurray dies, Adeline suffers from her adoption of revolutionary theories, the sole blight on her otherwise spotless character. Adeline's balanced depiction – she is a good-intentioned woman who adopts bad principles – is the closest to Elinor's, and the struggles she undergoes after the death of her companion are a variation on Burney's major theme of "female difficulties."

"Female difficulties," the secondary title of *The Wanderer*, emphasizes the problems that friendless women face in society, especially those who want to work and earn a living. Burney certainly adapted this trope from Charlotte Lennox's *Henrietta* (1758).³⁸ Lennox was one of Burney's favorite authors, and Burney had read *Henrietta*, judging from her letter to her sister Susan of 26 August 1778: "I think *all* her Novels far the best of any *Living* Author" (*EJL* 3: 105). Burney's mention of "*all* [Lennox's] Novels" included *Henrietta*, nearly as popular as *The Female Quixote* (1752) in the eighteenth century. The abrupt start to Lennox's novel, which opens as the solitary heroine requests passage in a carriage to London, *Henrietta's* slightly delayed and

³⁸ Doody observes, "Juliet's life as a paid companion to Mrs. Ireton may owe something to the situation of Lennox's heroine, a paid companion to Mrs. Autumn in *Henrietta* (1754 [sic])" (Doody 350).

mysterious history, and, especially, the troubles she faces as a single, respectable woman looking for work, have clear parallels with Juliet's story.³⁹ Both novels critique the problem of "how little a single woman is allowed to act publicly for herself, without risk of censure" (*The Wanderer* 106). And in Juliet's case, her problems are compounded by the fact that she has no control over her finances. Lady Aurora's gifts get continually misappropriated (317), and though Juliet is rarely, if ever, paid, her own disbursement of her expenses is demanded at all times (332). Yet employed women in *The Wanderer* are not all portrayed in a positive light: they range from the cold, business-like Miss Matson to the flighty, thoughtless Flora. As with her tempered depiction of Elinor, Burney's passionate advocacy for more jobs for respectable working women is moderated by her rejection of radical principles.⁴⁰

Burney experienced "female difficulties" of her own as *The Wanderer* was prepared for press and sent out into the world. In a letter to her friend Mary Ann Waddington of 24 December 1813 she wrote: "I am inconceivably fidgetted about it. Expectation has taken a wrong scent, & must necessarily be disappointed" (*JL* 7: 209). Not long afterwards, she expressed similarly anxious sentiments to d'Arblay in French: "Je tremble de voir l'attente publique sur ce pauvre petit ouvrage!" (*JL* 7: 229). Just after the publication of *The Wanderer*, Burney's anxieties seemed unjustified, as she declared in a celebratory letter of 29 April 1814 to her husband, "The 3d Edition is already printed

³⁹ There is also something Cervantean about Juliet's various travails within *The Wanderer*. See Thaddeus 167.

⁴⁰ Perkins also believes that Burney gives a balanced portrayal of working women: "Burney thus steers a middle course in *The Wanderer*, bitterly insisting that society leaves women at a cruel disadvantage in the all-important world of economics by pretending that they are outside or beyond it, but at the same time implying that so-called radical calls to reshape society are limited by their inability to escape the weaknesses of the culture that produce them" (Perkins 79).

& in sale” (*JL* 7: 327). But the novel’s failure and the negative critical response became apparent during the following year, and Burney vented her frustrations in a letter to her brother James of 10-12 July 1815. In the letter, Burney commends James’s “truly brotherly feelings” of indignation in response to his “friend” Hazlitt’s review (*JL* 8: 316). Burney’s hopes, “that [*The Wanderer*] may share, in a few years, the partiality shewn to its Elder sisters” (*JL* 8: 317), were never achieved in her lifetime, and her statement pleading for “the cool & unbiassed judgement of those who may read it, without thinking of its Critics” (*JL* 8: 318) confirms the substantial damage that the critical reviews had inflicted upon her novel’s reputation. In light of this statement and of Burney’s numerous revisions to the novel, often shaped by specific critical responses, her declaration – “I am myself gifted, happily, with a most impenetrable apathy upon the subject of its criticisers” (*JL* 8: 317) – belies the significant effect that the reviewers had on her revisions to her fourth and final novel.

The wide-ranging scope of Burney’s projected corrections for *The Wanderer* provides a fitting conclusion for my study of her reflections and revisions in her evolution from novice author to master stylist in pursuit of perfection. The manuscripts at the Berg from *Evelina*, *Cecilia*, and *Camilla* progressively reveal more details about Burney’s writing process, as her editorial focus increasingly turns from stylistics to character development. Her notes for a third edition of *Camilla* and a third edition of *The Wanderer*, planned during the final years of her life, confirm her growing reflectiveness and unwillingness to relinquish authorial control. As a counterpart to current scholarship on Burney’s continuous editing of her journals and letters, my work on her novels and

their manuscripts, proof copies, and post-publication revisions provides the only comprehensive perspective of Burney as novelist at work.

Chapter 5

***Caleb Williams* and *Persuasion*: Revised Endings and Dangerous Reflections**

William Godwin and Jane Austen, both familiar with Frances Burney's novels, were in the midst of their respective authorial careers at the time that *The Wanderer* was published. Austen's *Mansfield Park* appeared in the same year, 1814, and Godwin's *Lives of the Phillips*, a history of Milton's two nephews, and his *Letters of Verax*, which expressed his admiration for Napoleon, were published in the following year. Although Godwin and Austen operated in different novelistic modes – Godwin in the political and Austen in the domestic – they are among the very few late eighteenth- and early-nineteenth century novelists whose work survives in manuscript drafts. Godwin's *Caleb Williams* (1794) and Austen's *Persuasion* (1817) both have extant draft endings that vary substantially from those in the published texts; Godwin also considerably revised *Caleb Williams* in four subsequent editions. Just as Burney's heroines are altered between her manuscript drafts, proof copies, and published versions, Caleb Williams and Anne Elliot are transformed between the various editions and endings of their respective tales. Later versions of Caleb and Anne emphasize and warn against their status as reflective beings: Caleb's narration becomes increasingly unreliable, while Anne's added reflections on love and Wentworth are threateningly debilitating.

Caleb Williams

Godwin had long been interested in the work of Burney and her father. He had mentioned Charles Burney favorably in his publications (*JL* 3: 112-13 n. 4), and he was one of a select few to read an advance copy of *The Wanderer* (*JL* 8: 317 and n. 2). Burney, in turn, had probably read *Caleb Williams*. In a letter to her father of 29

November 1796, Burney anticipates reading Godwin's novel, "We have just been lent Caleb Williams, or *Things as They ARE*. Mr. Locke, who says its *design* is execrable, avers that one little word is omitted in its title, which should be thus — or Things as they are *NOT*. —" (*JL* 3: 245). Although Burney seems prejudiced against *Caleb Williams*, her *Wanderer*, published eighteen years after her letter, would similarly offer a critique of "things as they are."

Initially *Caleb Williams* was cast as a third-person narrative, something in "the more usual way," according to Godwin. Increasingly dissatisfied with his work, Godwin, in his accounts, "then assumed the first person, making the hero of my tale his own historian; and in this mode I have persisted in all my subsequent attempts at works of fictions." His primary motive for the shift in narrative voice is linked to his interest in the human mind: "the analysis of the private and internal operations of the mind, employing my metaphysical dissecting knife in tracing and laying bare the involutions of motive, and recording the gradually accumulating impulses, which led the personages I had to describe primarily to adopt the particular way of proceeding in which they afterwards embarked" (Godwin, "Preface" to *Fleetwood* xi). Godwin's increasing interest in depicting psychological minutiae can be seen in his continual revisions to *Caleb Williams*, over a span of almost forty years and five editions. Godwin's changes often augment the range and complexity of Caleb's thoughts, decreasing at the same time the reliability of his narration.

Caleb Williams is an eponymous narrative, but Caleb reveals his name only after half of the novel has elapsed (*Caleb Williams* 137). Caleb's reticence regarding his name is one of many symptoms of his unreliability, but in a book eventually entitled *Caleb*

Williams it is particularly striking. If we consider the evolution of the novel's title, Caleb's reserve takes on new significance. "*Things as They Are; or the Adventures of Caleb Williams* was revised in five different editions, finally changing its title in 1831 into the more overtly bildungsromanesque *Caleb Williams*": many critics interpret the change as Godwin's shift away from "the political critique embedded in 'things as they are' [to center] on the life, rather than 'adventures' of a central male protagonist" (Wallace 37). In a novel entitled *Things as They Are*, Caleb's unobtrusiveness allows him to become a political everyman, yet once the title becomes *Caleb Williams*, the focus is on his life, and his selective reserve calls his veracity into question.¹ Instead of interpreting Godwin's changes to the title and text of *Caleb Williams* – from the manuscript to the first edition and from the first edition through the fifth – as his adoption of "sentimental conventions" and shift away from "social injustice" (Clemit, Introduction xxvii),² I will focus instead on their effect on the narrative and the narrator. Godwin's revisions often increase the reader's access to Caleb's reflections; the revisions subtly incorporate overt philosophical didacticism into Caleb's voice and extend the scope of Caleb's awareness, augmenting elements of unreliability in the narration and making them explicit.

¹ Clifford Siskin views "the move from *things* to *character* as a generic issue" (170). See also Siskin 156.

² Miriam L. Wallace reads Godwin's changes in terms of reader reception and de-politicization: "In part such editorial changes show Godwin's continuing concern with modifying his novel's 'tendency' or readerly reception; others have suggested that they are also related to Godwin's increasing distance from his 1794 radical position" (Wallace 37). Mitzi Myers emphasizes Godwin's lengthy process of composition and hence privileges later versions of his texts: "Godwin's practice of thinking through the fundamental problems of a work during composition, his habit of sending his works to the printer before completion, and his emphasis on the value of continual revisal should make us wary of overemphasizing his original impulses at the expense of the final versions of his works" (Myers 600).

Even in the first edition of *Caleb Williams*, we become increasingly aware of the eponymous narrator's unreliability. Godwin's novel, arguably the first detective novel in the English language, recounts Caleb's detection of his employer Ferdinando Falkland's murder of the tyrannical squire Tyrrel. Once Falkland admits to the crime, the rest of the novel depicts Caleb's attempts to evade the pursuit of Falkland and his agents. Nearly the entire novel is written in the confessional form from a distance of several years, and thus the events of the novel are retrospective. Caleb explicitly confirms this: "I shall upon some occasions annex to appearances an explanation, which I was far from possessing at the time, and was only suggested to me through the medium of subsequent events" (*Caleb Williams* 107). Such "occasions" include his various impressions of Falkland³ and the fate of his unknowing accomplice Mrs. Marney. Indeed, "his tale is a retrospective construction of past events, and sets up the subjective context in which all subsequent events should be viewed" (Clemit, *Godwinian Novel* 57).⁴

In addition to the temporal gap, Caleb often makes reckless or unsubstantiated claims. For instance, when he identifies Falkland as a madman, Caleb only subtly raises the possibility that his perceptions might be incorrect and may not be confirmed by others: "His fits of insanity, for such I must denominate them for want of a distinct appellation, though it is possible they might not fall under the definition that either the faculty or the court of chancery appropriate to that term, became stronger and more durable than ever" (*Caleb Williams* 112). On the other hand, the "false" accusations that

³ See, for example, *Caleb Williams* 118.

⁴ Gerard Barker's article on the narrative mode in *Caleb Williams* focuses on this "dissonant self-narration" ... the distinction between narrating and experiencing selves [that] obtrudes upon us not only from the foreknowledge of the narrating self but also from her presumable maturation during the time interval (the narrative distance) separating her from the experiencing self" (Barker 4-5).

Falkland brings against Caleb have some root in the truth: that Caleb wrenched open his secret chest (149) is confirmed by Caleb's own narrative, though Caleb supposedly never looks inside: "After two or three efforts, in which the energy of uncontrollable passion was added to my bodily strength, the fastenings gave way, the trunk opened, and all that I sought was at once within my reach" (119). Caleb's ability to transform his appearance and speech as he becomes, in succession, an Irish beggar, a farmer, a Jew, and a deformed man, also emphasizes the mutability of his narrative.

Caleb's undeniable unreliability is compounded by Godwin's own explicit political leanings that shape the course of the novel. In his preface to *Caleb Williams*, which was withheld from publication in the first edition, but appeared in all of the subsequent editions,⁵ Godwin openly declares that the purpose of his novel is to warn "persons, whom books of philosophy and science are never likely to reach" of the truth "that the spirit and character of the government intrudes itself into every rank of society" (279). His overt political didacticism adds another layer of unreliability to the text. A year after the publication of *Caleb Williams*, Godwin confirms his didactic intent in a response to a vitriolic letter about the novel in the *British Critic*: "The object...is to expose the evils which arise out of the present system of civilized society; and, having exposed them, to lead the enquiring reader to examine whether they are, or are not, as has commonly been supposed, irremediable; in a word, to disengage the minds of men from prepossession, and launch them upon the sea of moral and political enquiry" ("To the Editor" 94). Here Godwin's focus of critique moves from the government to the

⁵ Godwin's preface is only one of many differences between the various editions, the earliest of which occur in the manuscript.

citizenry. It is the duty of his readers, of individuals, to transform themselves and others into more discerning, knowledgeable citizens.

Godwin's comments on *Caleb Williams* demonstrate his advocacy for social change and are inextricably tied to his seminal philosophical work, *An Enquiry Concerning Political Justice* (1793), first published the year before *Caleb Williams*. Many of the tenets in *Political Justice* have counterparts in *Caleb Williams*, and Caleb's difficulties throughout the novel, especially at the end, can be encapsulated in a phrase from the chapter "On Forms of Government": "It is earnestly to be desired that each man should be wise enough to govern himself, without the intervention of any compulsory restraint; and, since government, even in its best state, is an evil, the object principally to be aimed at is that we should have as little of it as the general peace of human society will permit" (*Political Justice Variants* 120). This phrase initially appeared in the revised edition of 1798, which was released after the publication of *Caleb Williams*. In the first-edition text, Godwin's language is more optimistic, and he does not completely reject all forms of government: "There must in the nature of things be one best form of government, which all intellects, sufficiently roused from the slumber of savage ignorance, will be irresistibly incited to approve" (*Political Justice* 104). The creation of a society founded upon truth is Godwin's ideal solution: "The grand instrument for forwarding the improvement of mind is the publication of truth....The only substantial method for the propagation of truth is discussion, so that the errors of one man may be detected by the acuteness and severe disquisition of his neighbours" (*Political Justice* 106).

Just as Godwin's anarchist revisions to *Political Justice* have ties to the published ending of *Caleb Williams* – in which Caleb casts himself and Falkland as victims of government institutionalism – Godwin's initial belief in truth as the key to social justice is debunked in the early manuscript ending to his novel. Since D. Gilbert Dumas's discovery in 1966 of the original ending to *Caleb Williams*,⁶ the divergence between the manuscript and the published ending has become a popular point of critical enquiry. The first ending, as many critics have noted, explicitly shows the inequalities of the justice system by privileging Falkland, whose "life had been irreproachable" and "uniformly benevolent and honourable," over Caleb, who was "first a thief; then a breaker of prisons; and last a consummate adept in every species of disguise." The question Caleb puts to the reader, "Which of the two would they believe?" (336), is then rhetorical and precipitates the ending of the novel: a dystopian alternative of Godwin's truth-based society. Caleb is incarcerated and drugged by Falkland, and his narrative finishes in confused rambling, alluding to Clarissa's mad scene from Richardson's novel. Initially wary of "wanderings in which the imagination seems to refuse to obey the curb of judgment," Caleb slowly descends into narcotized insanity: "I feel now a benumbing heaviness, that I conceive to have something in it more than natural. I have tried again and again to shake it off," and later, "I am very ill – My head throbs, and my pulses flutter, and yet I am so heavy" (338, 339). Caleb's decline has direct thematic and stylistic parallels to Clarissa's drugging by Lovelace and Mrs. Sinclair: "What you, or Mrs. Sinclair, or somebody (I cannot tell who) have done to my poor head, you best know: But I shall never be what I was. My head is gone. I have wept away all my brain,

⁶ See Dumas 575.

I believe; for I can weep no more. Indeed I have had my full share; so it is no matter” (Richardson 5: 309). The very end of Godwin’s manuscript culminates in Caleb’s total dehumanization: “I sit in a chair in a corner, and never move hand or foot – I am like a log – I know all that very well, but I cannot help it! – I wonder which is the man, I or my chair?” (339).⁷

By “rejecting this ending before publication,” Godwin no longer had “to deal with an imprisoned and eventually insane first-person narrator” (Barker 11), but while Caleb retains his sanity in the published version, his narrative is still tenuous. The published version of the ending replaces Caleb’s incarceration with self-condemnation: “if I had opened my heart to Mr. Falkland, if I had told to him privately the tale that I have now been telling, he could not have resisted my reasonable demand.” (*Caleb Williams* 274).⁸ Caleb’s frankness is effective; Falkland “was penetrated with [his] grief and compunction” (275). Falkland’s subsequent death and Caleb’s ensuing self-reproach provide the novel with its tragic conclusion: “I began these memoirs with the idea of vindicating my own character. I have now no character that I wish to vindicate: but I will finish them that thy story may be fully understood; and that, if those errors of thy life be known which thou so ardently desiredst to conceal, the world may at least not hear and repeat a half-told and mangled tale” (277). While Caleb’s utter devastation is a subtler and more trenchant condemnation of the social institutions that drove him and Falkland

⁷ Caleb’s language here is reminiscent of Clarissa’s from her parable of the woman who tries to domesticate a wild animal (Richardson 5: 304-5).

⁸ “The moral principle of impartiality, which the rewritten ending clearly establishes as being of central thematic importance in *CW*, is one to which Godwin’s adherence never wavers” (Myers 625)

along their destructive course, it is impossible that Caleb's transformation of his memoirs into his enemy's biography could be anything other than a "half-told and mangled tale."

The altered ending does not represent the only discrepancy between manuscript and published text. The nearly complete surviving holograph manuscript of *Things as They Are*, located in the Victoria and Albert Museum library and reproduced in Pamela Clemit's standard edition of the novel, evinces many changes to Godwin's novel. As with the revised ending, many of the lengthier reductions remove explicit (political) material in the work. Caleb's direct references to *Hamlet* become hidden allusions in the published novel (300). The manuscript also contains superfluities that are replaced by implicit cues in the first-edition text: it gently confirms the virtuous behavior of Emily, Tyrrel's ward ("She was unaccustomed to consider any one as her enemy, and this propensity kept up her tranquility upon the present occasion" (292)), and it explicitly states the function of Mr. Collins's narrative: "It will soon be perceived how indispensable Mr Collins's narrative is to the elucidation of my own history" (298). One of the most salient changes between the manuscript and published novel can be seen in Caleb's encounter with Captain Raymond's society of thieves, who ironically form the novel's most positive example of governance. When the group of thieves votes to expel the unethical Jones, who later becomes Caleb's pursuer, the manuscript version of this event clearly designates the thieves' *modus operandi* as ideal:

Nothing could be more absurd than the prevailing opinion, that men who have been urged by necessity or profuseness to the breach of the laws of society are destitute of every virtue, than the treatment I now experienced. These men on the contrary, knowing that they wholly depended upon the mutual goodwill of each

other, and not upon the security of the dead letter of a law, were accustomed to a frankness, an unconstrained benevolence and inclination, which I have seldom seen in any other class of society. (315)

These two overtly didactic sentences are removed in the published version of the novel, in which the reader must interpret the utopian nature of the thieves' society by noticing verbal cues in Raymond's direct speech and democratic call to expel Jones: "A thief is of course a man living among his equals; I do not pretend therefore to assume any authority among you; act as you think proper" (193).

The differences between the manuscript and the published version hint at the rich interpretative potential of Godwin's other revisions to *Caleb Williams*. Godwin's final version of the text, however, has almost universally and unquestioningly been adopted: all of the paperback editions of the novel reproduced the 1831 fifth edition until the publication of Clemit's Oxford edition in 2009. Clemit's edition is the first to reproduce the first-edition text, and while it does not explore in depth the discrepancies between the published editions, it lists the lengthier ones in a helpful appendix to encourage further study.⁹ One of the earliest discrepancies, not listed in Clemit's appendix, is located at the

⁹ John Bender is one of the few critics to discuss discrepancies between the editions, which he also locates in Godwin's changes to Caleb's psychology:

In order to assure the reader's identification with his hero, Godwin establishes in this opening Collins/Caleb narration a paradigm of concentrated plot deployment that structures the balance of the work. He thus authorizes in *Caleb Williams* as a whole a pattern of identification that, in the early segments of the novel, he had used to unveil the awful dynamic of power underlying the sympathetic construction of character. Godwin's revisions show his defensive response to this fact. In the third edition, that of 1797, the interpolated fourth paragraph of Chapter 1 specifies Caleb as a person whose fascination with sequences of cause and effect propagated "an invincible attachment to books of narrative and romance"... This paragraph attempts to reinscribe susceptibility to narrative as a pathological trait of Caleb's (not to mention as a vector of bodily penetration) and

end of the first chapter, as Caleb prepares to relate Falkland's history. In the first and second editions of the novel, Caleb declares that Falkland's story will be a slightly supplemented version of that which was provided to him by Mr. Collins, the administrator of Falkland's estate: "I shall join to Mr. Collins's story various information which I afterwards received from other quarters, that I may give all possible perspicuity to the series of events. To the reader it may appear at first sight as if this detail of the preceding life of Mr. Falkland were foreign to my history" (10). The next chapter inexplicably presents Collins's narrative of Falkland's life in Caleb's voice and Caleb's words. From the third edition onwards, Caleb makes this shift in narrative voice clear with the addition of a single sentence: "To avoid confusion in my narrative, I shall drop the person of Collins, and assume to be myself the historian of our patron" (281). Caleb's explicit intrusion upon the reader at the end of the first chapter is a harbinger of changes to come.

Some of the most pervasive changes between the published editions of *Things as They Are* and *Caleb Williams* begin to appear in Falkland's story, as Caleb claims to have omniscient access to the feelings of other characters in later editions of the novel. When Falkland prepares to go to trial for Tyrrel's murder, in chapter twelve of the first volume, in an added passage, Caleb conjectures "he was sufficiently willing to meet the severest scrutiny, and, if he could not hope to have it forgotten that he had ever been accused, to prove in the most satisfactory manner that the accusation was unjust." (297). Similarly the motivations of members of law enforcement are tentatively explained in later editions: "A trial, under the present circumstances, was scarcely attainable; and it seemed

thus to exempt readers from any taint produced by their own engagement with Godwin's novel. (Bender 269)

to be the wish both of principal and umpires, to give to this transaction all the momentary notoriety and decisiveness of a trial” (297). Midway through the second volume of the novel, Caleb’s interactions with Mr. Forester, Falkland’s older half-brother, are also provided in further detail. In addition to more thorough physical descriptions, Caleb offers Mr. Forester’s perceptions of his own character: “Every thing he had to relate delighted me; while, in return, my sympathy, my eager curiosity, and my unsophisticated passions, rendered me to Mr. Forester a most desirable hearer” (303). These interpretations of Mr. Forester’s regard are not present in the first edition. While Caleb’s dubious access to the internal states of other characters casts doubts on his reliability, he is increasingly able to reflect upon and sympathize with other individuals.

Just as Caleb expands his access to the internal states of other characters, the insertion of Caleb’s suicidal thoughts calls his narration into question. In the first edition, after he learns of Mrs. Marney’s imprisonment – she is one of few people who helps and harbors him while in disguise – Caleb’s thoughts and resolutions to flee the country supplant his regret within a short paragraph: “I instantly saw that London was no place for my abode, at the same time that I apprehended increase of peril in any attempt to withdraw from it...I did not return home, but went instantly to the waterside,” buying the next passage in a boat to Holland (238-39). This scene is greatly lengthened in the second and later editions, where Caleb’s cogitations become more vocal and agitated: “There is no end then...to my persecutors! My unwearied and long-continued labours lead to no termination! Termination! No; the lapse of time, that cures all other things, makes my case more desperate!” (322). Caleb’s thoughts then tend to the suicidal – “I can at least elude my persecutors in death” – after which thought he “hastened to the

Thames to put it in instant execution.” His dash to London Bridge is given in feverish language, but as he comes close to achieving his goal, he writes, “My understanding began to return. The sight of the vessels suggested to me the idea of once more attempting to leave my native country” (322). The later version undeniably contains deeper psychological insight than the first-edition text, but the increased access to Caleb’s reflections reveals his latent psychological instabilities, which threaten the coherence of the narrative.¹⁰

Caleb’s darker reflections are augmented in revisions, which extend beyond character and narrator consciousness to include events. When he finally decides to flee the repressive employment of Falkland, in the third edition and beyond, Falkland hires a shadowy spy to tail him. Caleb initially has a dim awareness of the spy’s intentions: “There was an inquisitiveness in his gesture that I did not like; and, as far as I could discern his figure, I pronounced him an ill-looking man” (307). The constant surveillance “filled” Caleb “with anxiety” (307), and as he sees the man again when he is about to enter the inn yard, he feels “the deepest alarm”: “My first thought was, to betake myself to the fields, and trust to the swiftness of my flight for safety. But this was scarcely practicable; I remarked that my enemy was alone; and I believed that, man to man, I might reasonably hope to get the better of him, either by the firmness of my determination, or the subtlety of my invention” (308). Caleb’s address to the spy, who comes bearing a letter from Falkland, is a firm declaration of independence:

I guess your errand; but it is to no purpose. You come to conduct me back to

Falkland House; but no force shall ever drag me to that place alive. I have not

¹⁰ Caleb’s suicide attempt may have influenced Burney’s characterization of Elinor in *The Wanderer*. See above, 172.

taken my resolution without great consideration and strong reasons; and, having taken it, all the world shall never persuade me to alter. I am an Englishman; and it is the privilege of an Englishman to be sole judge and master of his own actions.

(308)

These words are taken directly from the first-edition text, where they appear instead in Caleb's interactions with his fellow servant Thomas, who was later replaced by the spy. All the menace of the scene is gone, and while Caleb's words now seem melodramatic, the scene, devoid of its dark shadings, is much more realistic. Thomas's response ironically reveals his lack of interest in Caleb's interiority: "Why, master Williams, replied Thomas, to be sure you should know best what you are about. We are all at a stound, as a man may say, to think what you have got in your head. But that is none of my business" (142). It is only in later editions that the anatomy of Caleb's mind becomes more important.

The only key alteration between editions that has been widely discussed by scholars and editors is the insertion of the story of Laura Denison, which is not present in the first and second editions of the novel. Towards the end of the third volume, Caleb seeks refuge from Falkland's intimidations in a village in Wales, where he changes his identity and lives quietly as a watchmaker and an instructor (254). His dealings with the inhabitants are given in broad terms in the first two editions, and once his felonious reputation is known, his shunning is depicted gradually and generally. In later editions, Godwin added the romantic character Laura Denison, daughter of a Neapolitan nobleman, whose "uncommon excellence" Caleb adores (327). Their interactions are often given in sentimental language: "While our familiarity gained in duration, it equally

gained in that subtlety of communication by which it seemed to shoot forth its roots in every direction. There are a thousand little evanescent touches in the development of a growing friendship, that are neither thought of, nor would be understood, between common acquaintances” (327). This is a major shift within the novel, a brief respite from its relentless pace, and a tonal indication that contains the possibility of romance and happiness. This is why, when Laura learns that Caleb is a thief, a prison escapee, and a master of disguise, she refuses to see him again and condemns “the enormous impropriety and guilt with which [he has] conducted [himself] to [her] and [her] family” (329). Laura’s alienation has a much greater psychological impact on Caleb than the gradual, general shunning depicted in the first two editions, yet Laura’s valediction poses the largest threat to Caleb’s narrative and Godwin’s revisions: “Virtue, sir, consists in actions, and not in words....Eloquence may seek to confound it; but it shall be my care to avoid its deceptive influence. I do not wish to have my understanding perverted, and all the differences of things concealed from my apprehension” (330). Laura’s arguments against the specious and perverting capabilities of language undermine Caleb’s projected memoirs. At the beginning of the following chapter in later editions, Caleb specifically names Laura’s displeasure as the “circumstance, more than all the rest, that gradually gorged my heart with abhorrence of Mr. Falkland” (332-33) and the direct reason for him to begin writing his memoirs. Even though Laura’s reaction ostensibly impels Caleb to pen his memoirs, in writing them, Caleb countermands her plea for truth given “in actions, and not in words,” ultimately confirming that in Godwin’s revisions to his novel, the creation of Caleb’s psychological and reflective depth can come only at the cost of narrative credibility.

Persuasion

There is no conclusive evidence that Austen ever read *Caleb Williams*, though she describes her friend Mr. Pickford as a “Disciple of Godwin” in a letter of 21-22 May 1801 to her sister Cassandra. Her editor Deirdre Le Faye infers from this that Austen was “probably acquainted” with Godwin’s novel (Austen, *Letters* 93 and 391 n. 6). Austen’s familiarity with Burney’s novels, on the other hand, was undeniable. The title of her second novel, *Pride and Prejudice* (1813), was inspired by an important passage from *Cecilia*. She was on the subscription list to *Camilla*, “the first of only two works for which Jane Austen is known to have subscribed,” which were “probably the only occasions on which Austen’s name appeared in print during her lifetime” since all of her novels were published anonymously (Sabor, “A kind of Tax” 300). In *Northanger Abbey* (1817), Austen praises *Cecilia* and *Camilla*, along with Maria Edgeworth’s *Belinda*, as works “in which the greatest powers of the mind are displayed, in which the most thorough knowledge of human nature, the happiest delineation of its varieties, the liveliest effusions of wit and humour, are conveyed to the world in the best chosen language” (Austen, *Northanger Abbey* 31). And like her predecessor, Austen left behind numerous fictional manuscripts after her death, most of which contained her juvenilia and early writings. Alongside these, an early version of the final two chapters of Austen’s last complete novel *Persuasion* exists in manuscript form. These thirty-two pages constitute the only remaining manuscript fragment from Austen’s six published novels: they serve as “our only direct evidence for Jane Austen’s method of composition in the

completed novels” (Southam 98), and they, like Godwin’s early *Caleb Williams* manuscripts, perform a similar revelatory function.¹¹

Persuasion has often been read as Austen’s autumnal masterpiece, a meditative farewell in the face of debilitating illness.¹² Like Burney’s *Evelina*,¹³ *Persuasion* is the second half of a story, which begins more than seven years after the heroine Anne Elliot has rejected Frederick Wentworth, the husband of her choice, on the advice of Lady Russell, her surrogate mother and a close family friend. The beginning of the novel finds Anne forgotten by her family as her spendthrift father, Sir Walter Elliot, prepares to retrench his expenses by relocating to Bath and renting his estate, Kellynch Hall, to the *nouveaux riches* Admiral Croft and his wife. Anne’s neglect by her family is mirrored in the narrative, as Anne is not revealed as the heroine until the beginning of chapter four (Austen, *Persuasion* 28). The introduction of Admiral Croft heralds the return of Anne’s former lover, Captain Wentworth, who is the admiral’s brother-in-law. Wentworth initially disregards Anne and courts instead the immature and headstrong Louisa Musgrove, a relation of Anne’s sister Mary. As the novel progresses, Wentworth’s resentment towards Anne subsides, and the former lovers reunite by the conclusion, in a wiser revision of their earlier romantic relationship.¹⁴ That Wentworth is a naval captain and not a land-owning gentleman, like Austen’s previous heroes, indicates a change in Austen’s social agenda, and the characterizations of Mrs. Croft and Anne Elliot confirm the novel’s celebration of women as “rational creatures” (75). Although Anne Elliot is

¹¹ See also Southam 86 and Sutherland 148.

¹² This claim belies the existence of the fragmentary beginnings of Austen’s seventh novel *Sanditon*, which has an ironic and witty tone reminiscent of her earlier works.

¹³ See above, 30-33.

¹⁴ Kathryn Sutherland likewise emphasizes the “thematic concentration on revision – literally seeing again” in the published ending to *Persuasion* (167).

celebrated as a rational heroine, in Austen's revisions to the novel, Anne also serves as a warning against the dangers of too much (romantic) reflection.

Anne is very different from Austen's earlier heroines. She is twenty-seven and approaching old maidhood. Unlike Austen's previous, younger heroines, Anne is reserved and mature, qualities emphasized in an oft-quoted sentence from the novel: "She had been forced into prudence in her youth, she learned romance as she grew older – the natural sequel of an unnatural beginning" (32). Anne's development follows a reverse trajectory to that of the standard romance. She lacks the exuberance, and often the recklessness, of *Northanger Abbey's* Catherine Morland, *Sense and Sensibility's* Marianne Dashwood, *Pride and Prejudice's* Elizabeth Bennet, and *Emma's* eponymous heroine. On the other hand, she is not as naively trusting as *Pride and Prejudice's* Jane Bennet nor as timid and shy as *Mansfield Park's* Fanny Price. Perhaps the only previous Austen heroine who resembles Anne is Elinor Dashwood, though Anne's feelings towards her rival Louisa are far more generous than Elinor's towards Lucy Steele, Edward Ferrars's secret fiancée.

Anne's "unnatural" development is not merely the effect of "prudence." Late in the novel, she decries the general plight of women during the Regency era: "We live at home, quiet, confined, and our feelings prey upon us" (253), a statement which can be applied to Anne's particular situation. Anne has spent much of the large span of time between her two encounters with Wentworth, "More than seven years," deep in reflection: "she had been too dependant on time alone; no aid had been given in change of place, (except in one visit to Bath soon after the rupture,) or in any novelty or enlargement of society. – No one had ever come within the Kellynch circle, who could

bear a comparison with Frederick Wentworth, as he stood in her memory” (30). Anne’s unhealthy fixation on Wentworth is compounded by her enclosure and her isolation, which prevent her from receiving the “only thoroughly natural, happy, and sufficient cure” to her problem: a “second attachment” (30). Anne’s primary difficulty is that Wentworth “as he stood in her memory” remains her benchmark for potential suitors. Her unshakeable attachment to Wentworth is strengthened by her solitude “at home, quiet, [and] confined,” and he is frequently the object of her reflections, which undoubtedly “prey upon [her].” Anne’s state of romantic mourning, present from the beginning of the novel, sets her apart from Austen’s previous heroines, and Austen’s more solemn tone anticipates the narrator’s muted irony towards Anne.

Austen’s trenchant irony emerges most frequently within her fictions in passages containing free-indirect discourse. As in Burney’s *Cecilia* and later novels, free-indirect discourse occurs during moments in the narrative in which narrator and character voices are difficult to distinguish from each other, and in Austen’s free-indirect discourse, according to D. A. Miller, “Narration comes as near to a character’s psychic and linguistic reality as it can get without collapsing into it, and the character does as much of the work of narration as she may without acquiring its authority” (Miller 59).

Persuasion, like Austen’s other novels, relies upon this act of narrative blurring, but Anne is rarely its object. Usually Austen’s heroines, even the beloved Elizabeth Bennet, are “slapped silly by a narration whose constant battering, however satisfying – or terrifying – to readers, its recipient is kept from even noticing.” (Miller 71). This is not, however, the case with Anne, whose self-criticism far exceeds the abuse doled out by

Austen's narrator.¹⁵ We can see Anne's characteristic self-effacing in her thoughts after her first reunion with Wentworth. Her initial reaction is one of "nervous gratitude," as she repeats to herself, "It is over! it is over!...The worst is over!" (64). After recovering from her shock,

she began to reason with herself, and try to be feeling less. Eight years, almost eight years had passed, since all had been given up. How absurd to be resuming the agitation which such an interval had banished into distance and indistinctness! What might not eight years do? Events of every description, changes, alienations, removals, – all, all must be comprised in it; and oblivion of the past – how natural, how certain too! It included nearly a third part of her own life. (64-65)

After the first sentence, the voicing becomes ambiguous. The narrative slips into free-indirect discourse: the language is Anne's, though none of it, after the first phrase, is distinctly marked as her thoughts, feelings, or words. Some of the language is harsh, such as the exclamation, "How absurd to be resuming the agitation which such an interval had banished into distance and indistinctness!" Austen's treatment of Anne contrasts with the portrayal of her earlier heroines: the narrator barely ridicules Anne because Anne's self-deprecation is already so severe. After her reflections, Anne concludes "that to retentive feelings eight years may be little more than nothing," and her thoughts shift immediately to Wentworth: "Now, how were his sentiments to be read? Was this like wishing to avoid her? And the next moment she was hating herself for the folly which asked the question" (65). The cycle repeats itself: Anne's judgment

¹⁵ Miller posits that Anne "disables the ironizing inherent in Austen's narration by having already conscripted it as a function of her own scathing self-intimacy" (Miller 71).

condemns her initial reactions, which indicate her still-present desire for Wentworth, “disabling,” as Miller would say, the narrative’s ironizing intent.

Anne’s reported thoughts are also strikingly meditative. The dour conclusion to Anne’s initial musings on Wentworth – “with all her reasonings, she found, that to retentive feelings eight years may be little more than nothing” (65) – is full of hard-earned wisdom. Her reflective process, which translates her individual experience into general wisdom, manifests itself in her philosophical inclinations. At Lyme, Anne’s intelligence and good judgment are on display in her discussions with the bereaved Captain Benwick about the merits of prose versus poetry. Their conversation moves from the general to the esoteric: “having talked of poetry, the richness of the present age and gone through a brief comparison of opinion as to the first-rate poets, trying to ascertain whether *Marmion* or *The Lady of the Lake* were to be preferred, and how ranked the *Giaour* and *The Bride of Abydos*; and moreover, how the *Giaour* was to be pronounced” (108). Anne can apply her wisdom to her vast knowledge of romantic poetry: “she ventured to hope he did not always read only poetry; and to say, that she thought it was the misfortune of poetry, to be seldom safely enjoyed by those who enjoyed it completely; and that the strong feelings which alone could estimate it truly, were the very feelings which ought to taste it but sparingly” (108). Though Anne’s words are not presented in direct speech, Anne’s comparison of prose and poetry develops into a philosophical discursion on literary genre. The substance of Anne’s speech, in her interactions with Benwick, has a “decidedly Johnsonian ring” (Johnson, *Jane Austen* 148). Anne’s Johnsonian tastes are also evinced by her advocacy of balance, as she wisely counsels the grieving Benwick to “taste [poetry] but sparingly.”

Louisa Musgrove serves as a foil to the thinking, cerebral Anne, especially because she is Captain Wentworth's love interest during the first volume of *Persuasion*. Louisa is characterized by the "darings of heedlessness" rather than "the resolution of a collected mind" (263). Louisa's attractions are at their strongest in the short tête à tête she shares with Wentworth within Anne's hearing. They discuss the influence of Mary Musgrove's snobbery upon Louisa's sister Henrietta. Mary nearly persuades Henrietta to avoid visiting the man she loves, Charles Hayter, because of his lower social status. Louisa's response is indignant: "I have no idea of being so easily persuaded. When I have made up my mind, I have made it" (93-94). Wentworth immediately praises Louisa for her steadfastness, which is an implicit criticism of Anne, someone susceptible to "persuasion." But just as Benwick needs to moderate his poetry consumption, Louisa's obstinacy is dangerous, and it contributes to her fall at the Cobb: "he [Wentworth] reasoned and talked in vain; she [Louisa] smiled and said, 'I am determined I will:' he put out his hands; she was too precipitate by half a second, she fell on the pavement on the Lower Cobb, and was taken up lifeless!" (118). Louisa's near-fatal accident warns against the dangers of an unyielding, unreflective mind.

Wentworth, especially in the first volume of the novel, is similarly headstrong. Upon the reader's first introduction to Wentworth, we learn that his decision to marry is undertaken with the same rapid-fire precipitance as a decision made in wartime: "It was now his object to marry. He was rich, and being turned on shore, fully intended to settle as soon as he could be properly tempted; actually looking round, ready to fall in love with all the speed which a clear head and quick taste could allow" (66). Wentworth's interest in the Musgrove daughters develops quickly, though his decision to pursue Louisa is not

made with a “clear head.” His telling conversation with his sister Sophia Croft reveals his impulsive attitude towards romance: “Yes, here I am, Sophia, quite ready to make a foolish match. Any body between fifteen and thirty may have me for asking. A little beauty, and a few smiles, and a few compliments to the navy, and I am a lost man” (66). Wentworth’s tone is unambiguously facetious, but his words are prophetic, as he pursues Louisa, whose only attractions are some beauty, good humor, and a passing interest in the navy. Once Louisa’s irremediable recklessness and unsuitability as his wife are confirmed by her fall at the Cobb, Wentworth begins to repent his rash attachment: “In his preceding attempts to attach himself to Louisa Musgrove (the attempts of angry pride), he protested that he had for ever felt it to be impossible; that he had not cared, could not care for Louisa; though, till that day, till the leisure for reflection which followed it, he had not understood the perfect excellence of the mind with which Louisa’s could so ill bear a comparison” (263). Wentworth can only repent his initial choice once he has had time for “the leisure for reflection,” and when the convalescent Louisa chooses Benwick instead, Wentworth is free to pursue Anne, whose “perfect excellence of the mind” his better judgment approves.

After Captain Wentworth has happily relinquished Louisa and after Louisa is paired with the melancholy Benwick, all that remains in the novel is for the two former lovers to reunite. A manuscript draft of their reunion – in the form of two cancelled chapters (314-25) – unveils Austen’s initial intentions for the two lovers and is the best surviving example of her writing process.¹⁶ The reunion of the lovers in the manuscript

¹⁶ There have been many critical discussions of Austen’s cancelled chapters, the longest of which occupies two chapters in Jocelyn Harris’s recent monograph. Harris performs a careful, sustained comparison of the 1817 published novel with the manuscript drafts and

is orchestrated unintentionally by Admiral Croft, who commissions Wentworth to ask Anne whether she will want to live in Kellynch again once she and her cousin Mr. Elliot marry. Admiral Croft's actions in this scene are out of character since his request to Wentworth demonstrates that he "has not acted with his usual delicacy" (Lascelles 194).¹⁷ The ensuing conversation between Wentworth and Anne performs the necessary *éclaircissement*:

You will acquit *me* of Impertinence, I trust, by considering me as speaking only for another, and speaking by Necessity; – and the Adm^l. is a Man who can never be thought Impertinent by one who knows him as you do–. His Intentions are always the kindest & the Best; – and you will perceive that he is actuated by none other, in the application which I am now with – with very peculiar feelings –

even includes Austen's earlier deletions, emphasizing that "within the abandoned chapters of *Persuasion*, that genuinely first-rate work, Austen may be caught in the act of drudgery as well as of genius" (Harris 38). Sutherland also provides a thorough analysis of these pages, though she contends that "the majority of the changes [between draft ending and published text] do not suggest authorial polish; rather, they indicate the routine readying of manuscript for publication by an external hand," in particular changes to capitalization, external dashes, and underlining (Sutherland 159). Mary Lascelles, one of the earliest critics to discuss the draft chapters, highlights the manuscript's revelatory function: "To study it is – almost – to watch Jane Austen at work, to see her arranging a sentence this way and that, and discovering her own preference" (Lascelles 88). Janet Todd and Antje Blank, editors of the standard edition of *Persuasion*, focus not only on Austen's stylistic development, but also on her novelistic structuring:

The existence of this earlier version can tell us something of Jane Austen's creative process: that she worked through multiple revisions as well as initial inspiration and that a final draft could be startlingly different from a first. The revisions also suggest what Austen thought centrally important about her novel. There is no evidence that the earlier version is careless or inappropriate, but it failed to provide something she wished her book to deliver and she was pleased with the second version. (Todd and Blank lxxviii)

¹⁷ B. C. Southam calls the "circumstances of the reunion" "clumsily devised, in the manner of a stage farce," confirming that the Admiral and his wife "are forced out of character. They behave like a pair of sly matchmakers, although at heart they are unchanged" (Southam 88). See also Harris 43.

obliged to make.” – He stopped – but merely to recover breath; – not seeming to expect any answer. – Anne listened, as if her Life depended on the issue of his Speech. – He proceeded, with a forced alacrity. – “The Adm^l. Madam, was this morning confidently informed that you were – upon my word I am quite at a loss, ashamed – (breathing & speaking quick) – the awkwardness of *giving* Information of this sort to one of the Parties – You can be at no loss to understand me – It was very confidently said that M^r. Elliot – that everything was settled in the family for an Union between M^r. Elliot – & yourself. It was added that you were to live at Kellynch – that Kellynch was to be given up. This, the Admiral knew could not be correct – But it occurred to him that it might be the *wish* of the Parties – And my commission from him, Madam, is to say that if the Family wish is such, his Lease of Kellynch shall be cancel’d, & he & my sister will provide themselves with another home, without imagining themselves to be doing anything which under similar circumstances w^d. not be done for *them*. – This is all, Madam. – A very few words in reply from you will be sufficient. – That *I* should be the person commissioned on this subject is extraordinary! – and beleive me, Madam, it is no less painful, – A very few words however will put an end to the awkwardness & distress we may *both* be feeling.” Anne spoke a word or two, but they were unintelligible – And before she could command herself, he added, – “If you only tell me that the Adm^l. *may* address a Line to Sir Walter, it will be enough. Pronounce only the words, *he may*. – I shall immediately follow him with your message. –” This was spoken with a fortitude which seemed to meet the message. – “No Sir – said Anne – There is no message. – You are misin– the Adm^l. is misinformed. – I

do justice to the kindness of his Intentions, but he is quite mistaken. There is no Truth in any such report.” – He was a moment silent. – She turned her eyes toward him for the first time since his re-entering the room. His colour was varying – & he was looking at her with all the Power & Keenness, which she believed no other eyes than his, possessed. “*No* Truth in any such report! – he repeated. – No Truth in any *part* of it?” – “None.” – He had been standing by a chair – enjoying the relief of leaning on it – or of playing with it; – he now sat down – drew it a little nearer to her – & looked, with an expression which had something more than penetration in it, something softer. – Her Countenance did not discourage. – It was a silent, but a very powerful Dialogue; – on his side, Supplication, on her’s acceptance. – Still, a little nearer – and a hand taken and pressed – and “Anne, my own dear Anne!” – bursting forth in the fullness of exquisite feeling – and all Suspense & Indecision were over. – They were reunited. They were restored to all that had been lost. (317-18)

The encounter begins with Wentworth’s inarticulate address: his language is often repetitious, and his syntax reveals the troubled nature of his thoughts. Wentworth’s speech is full of interruptions – “in the application which I am now with – with very peculiar feelings – obliged to make” – which are signaled by the more frequently appearing dashes, and Austen uses parentheses to indicate his anxious physical reactions: “upon my word I am quite at a loss, ashamed – (breathing & speaking quick) – the awkwardness of *giving* Information of this sort to one of the Parties – You can be at no loss to understand me.” At the beginning of Wentworth’s speech, Anne is entirely

passive: “Anne listened, as if her Life depended on the issue of his Speech.”¹⁸ Once he reveals the motive of his commission – whether Anne and Mr. Elliot will reside in Kellynch Hall – all he asks of her are a “very few words in reply,” which “will put an end to the awkwardness & distress” caused by their meeting. But even this Anne is unable to muster, “Anne spoke a word or two, but they were un-intelligible,” and Wentworth begins talking again “before she could command herself.” He reduces his demand of a “very few words” to merely two: “Pronounce only the words, *he may*.” Anne finally gets the power of speech, which she uses to contradict Wentworth’s surmises: “There is no Truth in any such report.” But even though she is permitted to speak, Anne can only intimate her continuing love for Wentworth by denying her love for another.¹⁹ Language then fails the lovers: Wentworth can only repeat Anne’s denial, which Anne can only confirm. The rest of their courtship is silent, given solely in physical cues: “he now sat down – drew it a little nearer to her – & looked, with an expression which had something more than penetration in it, something softer. – Her Countenance did not discourage. – It was a silent, but a very powerful Dialogue; – on his side, Supplication, on her’s acceptance. – Still, a little nearer – and a hand taken and pressed.” Even here, Anne’s reactions are reactive: in response to Wentworth’s look, “Her Countenance did not discourage.” Anne’s physical response is given in litotes: Austen’s use of understatement is an unmistakably passive means of conveying Anne’s positive preference. While Wentworth has the power of “Supplication,” Anne has only “acceptance.” The final

¹⁸ Harris, among others, affirms that “the manuscript portrays Anne as inarticulate, without agency” (Harris 47).

¹⁹ Penny Gay emphasizes Anne’s passive role: “Anne is nearly silent as Wentworth dutifully conveys this enquiry,” and “All the action here is on Wentworth’s side, which conforms to the traditional male courtship role.” (Gay 67, 68)

reunion – in which “Suspense & Indecision were over. – They were re-united. They were restored to all that had been lost” – is anticlimactic. The romantic physical dialogue is instantly supplanted by a vague and distant narrative voice. Despite Wentworth’s long speeches and the lovers’ silent communication, the reader has been presented with little in Anne’s or Wentworth’s thoughts to confirm that “Suspense & Indecision were over,” which limits much of the potential satisfaction that could have been achieved during this scene.

Austen had drafted the cancelled chapters by 18 July 1816, but she felt dissatisfied, and in less than a month, by 6 August 1816, she had completed her revisions (Todd and Blank xl). In his *Memoir of Jane Austen*, Austen’s nephew James Edward Austen-Leigh describes Austen’s changes to the ending of *Persuasion*:

She thought [the first version] tame and flat, and was desirous of producing something better. This weighed upon her mind, the more so probably on account of the weak state of her health; so that one night she retired to rest in very low spirits. But such depression was little in accordance with her nature, and was soon shaken off. The next morning she awoke to more cheerful views and brighter inspirations: the sense of power revived; and imagination resumed its course. (Austen-Leigh 125)

The final ending to *Persuasion* is certainly “something better” than the “tame and flat” cancelled chapters; it is, as Southam terms it, her “triumph of rethinking won through trial and error” (Southam 86). The two lovers finally “come together with a full understanding of the past,” and the readers can see “their powers of self-determination, their consciousness in every thought, feeling, and act” (Southam 94). The awkward

dialogue between Wentworth and Anne is replaced with a debate between Anne and Wentworth's friend Captain Harville on the strength of men's versus women's love (*Persuasion* 252-56), which "comprise[s] an infinitely richer and more searching examination of the whole problem of communication between man and woman" (Tanner 237), and is followed immediately by Wentworth's epistolary declaration of love for Anne.

The debate between Anne and Harville is caused by Harville's reluctance to reset Captain Benwick's portrait. The miniature of Benwick was originally made for Harville's dead sister Fanny, but it is now to be given to Louisa. Harville criticizes Benwick's fickle affections:

And with a quivering lip he [Harville] wound up the whole by adding, "Poor Fanny! she would not have forgotten him so soon!...It was not in her nature. She doated on him."

"It would not be the nature of any woman who truly loved."

Captain Harville smiled, as much as to say, "Do you claim that for your sex?" and she answered the question, smiling also, "Yes. We certainly do not forget you, so soon as you forget us. It is, perhaps, our fate rather than our merit. We cannot help ourselves. We live at home, quiet, confined, and our feelings prey upon us. You are forced on exertion. You have always a profession, pursuits, business of some sort or other, to take you back into the world immediately, and continual occupation and change soon weaken impressions." (252-53)

Anne is the one who precipitates the philosophical debate, moving from Benwick's situation to the general state of gender relations, by claiming to know "the nature of any

woman who truly loved.” Her eloquent arguments form the focal point of feminist debate about the novel.²⁰ While women “live at home, quiet, confined, and our feelings prey upon [them],” men “have always a profession, pursuits, business of some sort or other, to take [them] back into the world immediately.” Anne’s winning argument embraces traditional notions of female passivity and at the same time critiques the dangers of too much reflection, as women become “prey” to nonreciprocal romantic feelings. She is speaking from experience, applying her individual knowledge to create general maxims: yet it is ironic and dangerous that her eight long years of miserable reflection can be recast as female strength.

Harville’s counter-arguments link the body to the soul: “I believe in a true analogy between our bodily frames and our mental; and that as our bodies are the strongest, so are our feelings; capable of bearing most rough usage, and riding out the heaviest weather” (253). Anne, however, is able to use her superior philosophical reasoning to subvert Harville’s argument: “Your feelings may be the strongest...but the same spirit of analogy will authorise me to assert that ours are the most tender. Man is more robust than woman, but he is not longer-lived” (253). She employs Harville’s own methodologies against him, just as she is able to deflect his later argument that “all histories are against [women], all stories, prose and verse” (254). Again, Anne’s counterargument invites proto-feminist interpretations: “Men have had every advantage of us in telling their own story. Education has been theirs in so much higher a degree; the pen has been in their hands. I will not allow books to prove any thing” (254-55). Instead of celebrating female passivity, Anne clearly takes a stand towards gender equality,

²⁰ See Gay 68.

which is ultimately undercut by the conclusion of the debate. Touched by Harville's tender feelings towards his own wife and family, Anne concedes, "I believe you capable of every thing great and good in your married lives....so long as – if I may be allowed the expression, so long as you have an object. I mean, while the woman you love lives, and lives for you" (256). She claims a victory for women only on the narrowest terms: "All the privilege I claim for my own sex (it is not a very enviable one, you need not covet it) is that of loving longest, when existence or when hope is gone" (256). Anne's seductively eloquent language disguises the dangerous philosophical implications of her winning argument: women, by their nature, are prone to unrequited love, which gives them the dubious "privilege" of "loving longest."

Anne's final argument does serve a more specific purpose: it is in fact an indirect signal to Wentworth of her lingering affections, and her words inspire him to write her a letter affirming his undying love (257-58). After she reads his letter, Anne is prevented from retreating into reflection:

Such a letter was not to be soon recovered from. Half an hour's solitude and reflection might have tranquillized her; but the ten minutes only, which now passed before she was interrupted, with all the restraints of her situation, could do nothing towards tranquillity. Every moment rather brought fresh agitation. It was an overpowering happiness. And before she was beyond the first stage of full sensation, Charles, Mary, and Henrietta all came in. (258)

Eight years of reflection are more than enough for Anne. Here she is forced into action, and as she dizzily takes her leave of the company and makes her way through the streets, accompanied by Charles Musgrove, they run into Wentworth, and almost instantly all

misunderstandings are set right. Austen's revised ending contains an emotional layer that is missing from the draft; Anne is able to devise a way to declare her feelings for Wentworth by using coded language, and the return of Wentworth's love is confirmed by his unforgettably romantic epistle, a fitting end to their revised courtship.

As with *Caleb Williams*, revisions to *Persuasion* emphasize the thinking, reflective protagonist, though both novels also caution against the indulgence of too much reflection. The first-person narrator of *Caleb Williams* becomes more meditative, but correspondingly more unreliable after Godwin's successive alterations, and Austen's new ending to *Persuasion* warns of the debilitating risk of solitary contemplation, especially in women like the heroine, even while celebrating Anne as a "rational creature." Austen, ironically, had less time to reflect on her novel than Godwin did: before *Persuasion* was published, Austen "had been taken away...and all such amusing communications had ceased for ever" (Austen-Leigh 119). The possibility that *Persuasion* had not been completely finished is slight;²¹ Austen mentions in a letter to her niece Fanny Knight of 23-25 March 1817 that she had "another [work] ready for publication" (Austen, *Letters* 350), which was undoubtedly *Persuasion*. Still, Austen never got to complete the final stages of proof editing, and she never saw *Persuasion* (or *Northanger Abbey*) in print. She would never take advantage of the post-publication opportunities for revision, which Godwin and, with her later novels, Burney enjoyed. Like Burney, Godwin and Austen were among the first English novelists to valorize

²¹ See Southam 97. Harris, however, unequivocally claims that "the novel remains unfinished" (Harris 13). Sutherland also posits that "there is still something rushed and unsatisfactory about this truncated novel – a feeling that the plot has been unravelled too hurriedly and characters in consequence short-changed" (Sutherland 168).

manuscript novel drafts, as did Mary Shelley, Sir Walter Scott, and, increasingly, other nineteenth-century novelists.

Afterword: Beyond Burney

Frances Burney, William Godwin, and Jane Austen were joined by Mary Shelley, Sir Walter Scott, and then by later nineteenth-century novelists, as the group of authors with surviving manuscript novel drafts gradually expanded. A remarkable number of Scott's manuscripts are held at the National Library of Scotland, in addition to the bulk of his correspondence: these include the largest extant portion of the autograph manuscript of *Waverley* as well as several of his other novel manuscripts. The National Library also holds the interleaved set of the Waverley Novels, which Scott used to prepare the "Magnum Opus" edition of his novels. The Pierpont Morgan has most of Scott's other novel manuscripts, including *Ivanhoe* and the rest of *Waverley*. Their existence has influenced Scott scholarship since Robert D. Mayo's article in 1948, which uses the manuscripts to confirm a contested point – that Scott's Waverley novels were published in the order that they were composed. There have subsequently been a short essay collection and an introduction and annotations by Iain Gordon Brown on the Scott manuscripts.

Two novels by Mary Shelley, Godwin's daughter and Scott's contemporary, survive in various manuscript forms at the Bodleian Library. They include the early draft and the later manuscript of *Mathilda*, her novel about a father's incestuous love for his daughter: *Mathilda* was suppressed in Shelley's lifetime and remained unpublished until 1959. Shelley's draft and her fair copy of *Frankenstein* are also at the Bodleian. The focus of recent exhibitions, the *Frankenstein* manuscripts have been used to clarify lingering questions about Shelley's process of composition, revealing, once and for all, how much of *Frankenstein* was written by Shelley's husband, Percy Bysshe Shelley.

Mary Shelley's words are easily distinguishable from those of her husband in the handwritten draft of 1816-17, so Charles E. Robinson was recently able to disentangle their voices in his edition of *Frankenstein* based on the surviving manuscript text. Robinson's work on authorial voice in Shelley's most important novel affirms the crucial role that manuscript studies have played within current scholarship.

While it was not common practice for publishers to return an author's manuscript until late in the nineteenth century (Eliot 333), more and more novel manuscripts were preserved in the 1840s and 1850s. Complete autograph manuscripts of Charlotte Brontë's *Jane Eyre*, *Shirley*, and *Villette* are held at the British Library, though these are all fair copies that reveal very little about Brontë's process of composition. Brontë's prolific successor, Charles Dickens, preserved a large number of his novels in manuscript form. Complete manuscript drafts of twelve of his major novels, including *A Tale of Two Cities*, *Bleak House*, *David Copperfield*, and *Oliver Twist*, are held at the Victoria and Albert Museum. The Victoria and Albert collection also has page and galley proofs of *Great Expectations* and *Nicholas Nickleby*, which, like Burney's and Scott's interleaved texts, render Dickens's revising process transparent. The Pierpont Morgan Library has manuscript versions of *Our Mutual Friend* and *A Christmas Carol*. These manuscripts show the development of Dickens's writing over a thirty-three year period and include his last, tantalizingly unfinished work, *The Mystery of Edwin Drood* (1870). In 2011, a facsimile of the original *Great Expectations* manuscript, held at the Wisbech and Fenland Museum, Cambridge, was published.¹ Among the revelations in this manuscript version

¹ The importance of this publication is affirmed by a reviewer in *The Daily Mail*, who argues that it gives "an unparalleled insight into the working mind of one of Britain's greatest writers, Charles Dickens," who "obviously went back and revised and scribbled

are Dickens's endless revisions to the first, famous sentence – "My father's family name being Pirrip, and my christian name Philip, my infant tongue could make of both names nothing longer or more explicit than Pip" (Dickens, *Great Expectations* 3) – and four lines of the original ending in which Pip and Estella meet briefly, but remain divided.

Recent critical work on Scott and especially on Shelley and Dickens reveals the rich, revelatory possibilities of textual excavation in order to uncover an author's reflections and revisions. Robinson's edition of *Frankenstein* and the manuscript facsimile of *Great Expectations* point to new directions in Shelley and Dickens criticism that mirror current research on Austen with The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Jane Austen and Kathryn Sutherland's and Jocelyn Harris's sustained analyses of Austen's draft manuscripts. The introduction of new databases, such as Gale's *British Literary Manuscripts Online*, has opened up manuscript studies to a wider range of scholars than ever before. The final aim of my study, then, is to extend the important close analysis of novel drafts that has been reinvigorating criticism on Scott, Shelley, and Dickens, as well as Godwin and Austen, to their predecessor, Frances Burney.

things out quite frequently. The fact he did have changes of mind, that he scribbled things out, makes him seem more human" ("Greatest of Expectations").

Appendix: Frances Burney's Novel Manuscripts, Proofs, and Later Revisions and their Locations

	Berg Collection, New York Public Library	British Library, Manuscripts Division	Houghton Library, Harvard University
<i>Evelina</i> (1778)	Incomplete holograph n.d. ms. (208 p.)		
<i>Cecilia</i> (1782)	Incomplete holograph, with holograph title-page ms. (547 p.) With one unattached slip.	Draft of an introduction, not printed in the first edition; circ. 1782. Autograph. ff. 1-3. Barrett Collection, Egerton MS 3696.	Corrected proof copy in the author's hand (4 v.). Lowell EC8.Ar173.782ca.
<i>Camilla</i> (1796)	1) Incomplete holograph (portions of v. 1, 4, 5) n.d. ms. (95 p.) Accompanied by 59 scraps of paper containing suggestions for <i>Camilla</i> , and about 220 sheets and slips containing hints and corrections for a later edition; all in 6 brown paper wrappers. 2) Incomplete ms. in the hand of General d'Arblay n.d. ms. (5 v.) With ms. corrections and additions in the hand of the author.	Drafts not printed in the first edition (1796). Autograph. ff. 27-73. Barrett Collection, Egerton MS 3696.	One unpublished leaf from an early MS draft, n.d. ms. MS Hyde 14.
<i>The Wanderer</i> (1814)	Interleaved copy of the first edition (5 v.), with corrections and additions in the hand of the author. Arblay c.1.		

Bibliography

- Austen, Jane. *Jane Austen's Letters*. 1932. Ed. Deirdre Le Faye. 4th ed. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2011. Print.
- . *Northanger Abbey*. 1817. Ed. Barbara M. Benedict and Deirdre Le Faye. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2006. Print.
- . *Persuasion*. 1817. Ed. Janet Todd and Antje Blank. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2006. Print.
- . *Pride and Prejudice*. 1813. Ed. Pat Rogers. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2006. Print.
- Austen-Leigh, J. E. *A Memoir of Jane Austen and Other Family Recollections*. Ed. Kathryn Sutherland. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2002. Print.
- Austin, Andrea. "Between Women: Frances Burney's *The Wanderer*." *English Studies in Canada* 22.3 (1996): 253-66. Print.
- Austin, Sara K. "'All Wove into One': *Camilla*, the Prose Epic, and Family Values." *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture* 29 (2000): 273-98. Print.
- Bakhtin, M. M. "Discourse in the Novel." *The Dialogic Imagination*. Trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Ed. Michael Holquist. Austin, TX: U of Texas P, 1981. 259-422. Print.
- . "The Problem of Speech Genres." *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Trans. Vern W. McGee. Ed. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin, TX: U of Texas P, 1986. 60-102. Print.
- Barker, Gerard A. "The Narrative Mode of *Caleb Williams*: Problems and Resolutions." *Studies in the Novel* 25.1 (1993): 1-15. Print.

- Bartolomeo, Joseph F. *Matched Pairs: Gender and Intertextual Dialogue in Eighteenth-Century Fiction*. Newark, DE: U of Delaware P, 2002. Print.
- Bender, John. "Impersonal Violence: The Penetrating Gaze and the Field of Narration in *Caleb Williams*." *Vision and Textuality*. Ed. Stephen Melville and Bill Readings. Durham, NC: Duke UP, 1995. 256-81. Print.
- Binhammer, Katherine. "The Economics of Plot in Burney's *Camilla*." *Studies in the Novel* 43.1 (2011): 1-20. Print.
- Bloom, Lillian D. "Fanny Burney's *Camilla*: The Author as Editor." *Bulletin of Research in the Humanities* 82 (1979): 367-93. Print.
- Bray, Joe. "The Effects of Free Indirect Discourse: Empathy Revisited." *Contemporary Stylistics*. Ed. Marina Lambrou and Peter Stockwell. London: Continuum, 2007. 56-67. Print.
- Brooke, Frances. *The History of Lady Julia Mandeville*. 2 vols. London, 1763. Print.
- Brown, Iain Gordon, ed. *Scott's Interleaved Waverley Novels (The 'Magnum Opus': National Library of Scotland MSS 23001-41): An Introduction and Commentary*. Oxford: Pergamon; Aberdeen: Aberdeen UP, 1987. Print.
- Burney, Charles. *The Present State of Music in Germany*. 1773. 2nd ed. 2 vols. London, 1775. Print.
- Burney, Frances. *Camilla*. 1796. Ed. Edward A. Bloom and Lillian D. Bloom. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1972. Print.
- . *Camilla* [2nd ed.]. 2nd ed. 5 vols. London: Payne and Cadell, 1802. Print.
- . *Camilla* [Berg]. N.d. MS. Berg MSS Arblay. 3 boxes [vols. 1, 4-5]. New York Public Lib., New York City, NY.

- . *Camilla* [BL]. N.d. MS. Egerton 3696 ff. 27-73. British Lib., London, UK.
- . *Camilla* [Houghton]. N.d. MS. MS Hyde 14. Houghton Lib., Cambridge, MA.
- . *Cecilia*. 1782. Ed. Peter Sabor and Margaret Anne Doody. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1988. Print.
- . *Cecilia* [Berg]. N.d. MS. Berg MSS Arblay. 4 boxes. New York Public Lib., New York City, NY.
- . *Cecilia* [Houghton]. 1782. MS. Lowell EC8.Ar173.782ca. 4 vols. Houghton Lib., Harvard University, Cambridge, MA.
- . *The Court Journals and Letters of Frances Burney* [CJL]. Gen ed. Peter Sabor. 6 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 2011- . Print.
- . *The Early Journals and Letters of Fanny Burney* [EJL]. Ed. Lars E. Troide, Stewart J. Cooke, and Betty Rizzo. 5 vols. Montreal: McGill-Queen's UP, 1987-2012. Print.
- . *Evelina*. 1778. Ed. Edward A. Bloom. Introd. Vivien Jones. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2002. Print.
- . *Evelina* [Berg]. N.d. MS. Berg MSS Arblay. 3 boxes. New York Public Lib., New York City, NY.
- . *The Journals and Letters of Fanny Burney* [JL]. Gen. ed. Joyce Hemlow. 12 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1972-84. Print.
- . *The Memoirs of Doctor Burney*. 3 vols. London: Edward Moxon, 1832. Print.
- . *The Wanderer*. 1814. Ed. Margaret Anne Doody, Robert L. Mack, and Peter Sabor. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1991. Print.
- . *The Wanderer* [Berg]. MS. 5 vols. London, 1814. Arblay c.1. New York Public Lib., New York City, NY.

- Cervantes, Miguel de. *The History and Adventures of the Renowned Don Quixote*. 1605, 1615. Trans. Tobias Smollett. 1755. Ed. Martin C. Battestin. Athens, GA: Georgia UP, 2003. Print. *Works of Tobias Smollett*. Alexander Pettit, gen. ed. 11 vols. 1988- .
- Clark, Lorna J. "Dating the Undated: Layers of Narrative in Frances Burney's Court Journals." *Lifewriting Annual* 3 (2012): 121-42. Print.
- Clemit, Pamela. *The Godwinian Novel: The Rational Fictions of Godwin, Brockden Brown, Mary Shelley*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1993. Print.
- . Introduction. *Caleb Williams*. 1794. Ed. Pamela Clemit. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2009. vii-xxvii. Print.
- Collier, Jane. 1753. *An Essay on the Art of Ingeniously Tormenting*. Ed. Katherine A. Craik. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2006. Print.
- Cowley, Hannah. *Albina, Countess Raimond*. London, 1779. Print.
- [*Critical Review*] Rev. of *The Wanderer*. *The Critical Review* 4th ser. 5 (1814): 405-24. Print.
- Croker, John Wilson. Rev. of *The Wanderer*. *The Quarterly Review* 11 (1814): 123-30. Print.
- Crump, Justine. "'Turning the world upside down': Madness, Moral Management, and Frances Burney's *The Wanderer*." *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 10.3 (1998): 325-40. Print.
- Cutting-Gray, Joanne. *Woman as "Nobody" and the Novels of Fanny Burney*. Gainesville: UP of Florida, 1992. Print.

- Darby, Barbara. *Frances Burney, Dramatist: Gender, Performance, and the Late-Eighteenth-Century Stage*. Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 1997. Print.
- Daugherty, Tracy Edgar. *Narrative Techniques in the Novels of Fanny Burney*. New York: Peter Lang, 1989. Print.
- Davidson, Christina. "Conversations as Signifiers: Characters on the Margins of Morality in the First Three Novels of Frances Burney." *Partial Answers* 8.2 (2010): 277-304. Print.
- Defoe, Daniel. *The Life and Strange Surprising Adventures of Robinson Crusoe*. 1719. Ed. W. R. Owens. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2008. Print. Vol. 1 of *The Novels of Daniel Defoe*. W. R. Owens and P. N. Furbank, gen. eds. 10 vols. 2008-09.
- Descartes, René. *The Philosophical Writings of Descartes*. Trans. John Cottingham, Robert Stoothoff, and Dugald Murdoch. 3 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1985. Print.
- Dickens, Charles. *Great Expectations*. 1861. Ed. Margaret Cardwell. Oxford: Clarendon, 1993. Print.
- . *The Manuscript of Great Expectations: From the Townshend Collection, Wisbech*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2011. Print.
- Doody, Margaret Anne. *Frances Burney: The Life in the Works*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers UP, 1988. Print.
- Dumas, D. Gilbert. "Things as They Were: The Original Ending of *Caleb Williams*." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 6.3 (1966): 575-97. Print.
- Eliot, Simon. "Books and Their Readers – Part 2." In *The Nineteenth-Century Novel: Identities*. Ed. Dennis Walder. New York: Routledge, 2001. 331-58. Print.

- Epstein, Julia. *The Iron Pen: Frances Burney and the Politics of Women's Writing*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1989. Print.
- Fielding, Sarah. *The History of Ophelia*. 1760. Ed. Peter Sabor. Peterborough, ON: Broadview, 2004. Print.
- Fielding, Sarah, and Jane Collier. *The Cry: A New Dramatic Fable*. 3 vols. London, 1754. Print.
- Fludernik, Monica. *The Fictions of Language and the Languages of Fiction: The Linguistic Representation of Speech and Consciousness*. New York: Routledge, 1993. Print.
- Fox, Christopher. *Locke and the Scriblerians: Identity and Consciousness in Early Eighteenth-Century Britain*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1988. Print.
- Fraiman, Susan. *Unbecoming Women: British Women Writers and the Novel of Development*. New York: Columbia UP, 1993. Print.
- Gallagher, Catherine. *Nobody's Story: The Vanishing Acts of Women Writers in the Marketplace, 1670-1820*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1994. Print.
- Gaskell, Philip. *A New Introduction to Bibliography*. 1972. New Castle, DE: Oak Knoll, 1995. Print.
- Gay, Penny. "Emma and Persuasion." *The Cambridge Companion to Jane Austen*. 1997. Ed. Edward Copeland and Juliet McMaster. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2011. 55-71. Print.
- Gemmeke, Mascha. *Frances Burney and the Female Bildungsroman: An Interpretation of The Wanderer: or, Female Difficulties*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2004. Print. Literatur/Münster Monographs on English Literature 28.

- Gemmett, Robert J. Introduction. *Azemias*. By William Beckford. Ed. Robert J. Gemmett. Kansas City: Valancourt, 2010. xi-liv. Print.
- Glyn Davies, Catherine. *Conscience as Consciousness: The Idea of Self-Awareness in French Philosophical Writing from Descartes to Diderot*. Oxford: Voltaire Foundation at the Taylor Institution, 1990. Print. *Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century* 272.
- Godwin, William. *Caleb Williams*. 1794. Ed. Pamela Clemit. London: William Pickering, 1992. Print. Vol. 3 of *Collected Novels and Memoirs of William Godwin*. Mark Philp, gen. ed. 8 vols. 1992.
- . *An Enquiry Concerning Political Justice*. 1793. Ed. Mark Philp. London: William Pickering, 1993. Print. Vol. 3 of *Political and Philosophical Writings of William Godwin*. Mark Philp, gen. ed. 7 vols. 1993.
- . *An Enquiry Concerning Political Justice Variants*. Ed. Mark Philp. London: William Pickering, 1993. Print. Vol. 4 of *Political and Philosophical Writings of William Godwin*. Mark Philp, gen. ed. 7 vols. 1993.
- . "Preface to the Present Edition." *Fleetwood*. London: Bentley, 1832. v-xvi. Print. *Standard Novels* 22.
- . "To the Editor of the *British Critic*." *British Critic* 6 (1795): 94-95. Print.
- "The Greatest of Expectations: How a Reproduction of Charles Dickens' Manuscript has Brought the Writer's Art Back to Life." *Dailymail.co.uk*. Daily Mail, 9 December 2011. Web. 1 August 2012.

- Gruner, Elizabeth Rose. "The Bullfinch and the Brother: Marriage and Family in Frances Burney's *Camilla*." *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 93.1 (1994): 18-34. Print.
- Harris, Jocelyn. *A Revolution Almost beyond Expression: Jane Austen's Persuasion*. Newark: U of Delaware P, 2007. Print.
- Hazlitt, William. Rev. of *The Wanderer*. *The Edinburgh Review* 24 (1815): 320-38. Print.
- Haywood, Eliza. *The History of Miss Betsy Thoughtless*. 1751. Ed. Christine Blouch. Peterborough, ON: Broadview, 1998. Print.
- Hemlow, Joyce. *The History of Fanny Burney*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1958. Print.
- Hume, David. *An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding: A Critical Edition*. 1748. Ed. Tom L. Beauchamp. Oxford: Clarendon, 2000. Print. Vol. 3 of *The Clarendon Edition of the Works of David Hume*. Tom L. Beauchamp, David Fate Norton, and M. A. Stewart, gen. eds. 8 vols.
- Johnson, Claudia L. *Equivocal Beings: Politics, Gender, and Sentimentality in 1790s, Wollstonecraft, Radcliffe, Burney, Austen*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1995. Print.
- . *Jane Austen: Women, Politics and the Novel*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1988. Print.
- Johnson, Samuel. *Rasselas and Other Tales*. Ed. Gwin J. Kolb. New Haven: Yale UP, 1990. Print. Vol. 16 of *The Yale Edition of the Works of Samuel Johnson*. John H. Muddendorf, gen. ed.
- Jones, Vivien. Introduction. *Evelina*. By Frances Burney. 1778. Ed. Edward A. Bloom. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2008. ix-xxxiv. Print.
- Justice, George. "Frances Burney's Revision of *Camilla*." *Notes and Queries* 46.3 (1999): 368-69. Print.

- . *The Manufacturers of Literature: Writing and the Literary Marketplace in Eighteenth-Century England*. Newark: U of Delaware P, 2002. Print.
- Kraft, Elizabeth. "Female Heroic Action in Frances Burney's *Camilla*." *Approaches to the Anglo and American Female Epic, 1621-1982*. Ed. Bernard Schweizer. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2006. 37-54. Print.
- Kristeva, Julia. "Word, Dialogue and Novel." *The Kristeva Reader*. Ed. Toril Moi. New York: Columbia UP, 1986. 34-61. Print.
- Lascelles, Mary. *Jane Austen and Her Art*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1939. Print.
- Lee, Anthony W. "Allegories of Mentoring: Johnson and Frances Burney's *Cecilia*." *Eighteenth-Century Novel* 5 (2006): 249-76. Print.
- Lennox, Charlotte. *The Female Quixote, or The Adventures of Arabella*. 1752. Ed. Margaret Dalziel. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1998. Print.
- Locke, John. *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*. 1690. Ed. Peter H. Nidditch. Oxford: Clarendon, 1975. Print.
- Lynch, Deidre Shauna. *The Economy of Character: Novels, Market Culture, and the Business of Inner Meaning*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1998. Print.
- Mack, Robert L. "The Novelist and the Critics: Frances Burney's Manuscript Corrections and Additions to *The Wanderer; or, Female Difficulties*." *Journal* x 9.1 (2004): 17-51. Print.
- Mackie, Erin. *Rakes, Highwaymen, and Pirates: The Making of the Modern Gentleman in the Eighteenth Century*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins UP, 2009. Print.
- Malebranche, Nicholas. *The Search After Truth*. 1674-75. Trans. Thomas M. Lennon and Paul J. Olscamp. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 1980. Print.

- Mayo, Robert D. "The Chronology of the Waverley Novels: The Evidence of the Manuscripts." *PMLA* 63.3 (1948): 935-49. Print.
- Miller, D. A. *Jane Austen, or The Secret of Style*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 2003. Print.
- More, Hannah. *Cælebs in Search of a Wife*. 1809. Ed. Patricia Demers. Peterborough, ON: Broadview, 2007. Print.
- Myers, Mitzi. "Godwin's Changing Conception of *Caleb Williams*." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 12.4 (1972): 591-628. Print.
- Norris, John. *An Essay Towards the Theory of the Ideal or Intelligible World*. 1701, 1704. 2 vols. Ed. Richard Acworth. Bristol: Thoemmes, 2001. Print. Vols. 6 and 7 of *Philosophical and Theological Writings: John Norris*. Richard Acworth, gen. ed. 8 vols.
- O'Brien, Karen. *Women and Enlightenment in Eighteenth-Century Britain*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2009. Print.
- Oxford English Dictionary [OED]*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2010. Web. 25 August 2012.
- Parisian, Catherine M. *Frances Burney's Cecilia: A Publishing History*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2012. Print.
- Park, Julie. "Pains and Pleasure of the Automaton: Frances Burney's Mechanics of Coming Out." *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 40.1 (2006): 23-49. Print.
- Park, Suzie Asha. "'All Agog to Find Her Out': Compulsory Narration in *The Wanderer*." *Recognizing the Romantic Novel: New Histories of British Fiction*,

- 1780-1830. Ed. Jillian Heydt-Stevenson and Charlotte Sussman. Liverpool: Liverpool UP, 2008. 126-54. Print.
- Perkins, Pam. "Private Men and Public Women: Social Criticism in Fanny Burney's *The Wanderer*." *Essays in Literature* 23.1 (1996): 69-83. Print.
- Pink, Emma E. "Frances Burney's *Camilla*: 'to print my Grand Work...by subscription.'" *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 40.1 (2006): 51-68. Print.
- Prince, Michael. *Philosophical Dialogue in the British Enlightenment: Theology, Aesthetics, and the Novel*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996. Print.
- Radcliffe, Ann. *The Mysteries of Udolpho*. 1794. Ed. Jacqueline Howard. London: Penguin, 2010. Print.
- Raven, James. "Historical Introduction: The Novel Comes of Age." *The English Novel 1770-1829: A Bibliographical Survey of Prose Fiction Published in the British Isles*. Ed. James Raven and Antonia Forster. Vol. 1. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000. 15-121. Print.
- Reid, Thomas. *Essays on the Intellectual Powers of Man: A Critical Edition*. 1785. Ed. Derek R. Brookes. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2002. Print. The Edinburgh Edition of Thomas Reid.
- Richardson, Samuel. *Clarissa. Or, the History of a Young Lady*. 1747-48. 3rd ed. 8 vols. London, 1751. Rpt. as *The Clarissa Project*. Gen. ed. Florian Stuber. New York: AMS, 1990. Print.
- Ross, Deborah. *The Excellence of Falsehood: Romance, Realism, and Women's Contribution to the Novel*. Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 1991. Print.

- Sabor, Peter. Introduction. *The History of Ophelia*. 1760. Ed. Peter Sabor. Peterborough, ON: Broadview, 2004. 7-30. Print.
- . "'A kind of Tax on the Public': The Subscription List to Frances Burney's *Camilla*." *New Windows on a Woman's World: Essays for Jocelyn Harris*. Ed. Colin Gibson and Lisa Marr. Vol. 1. Dunedin, NZ: Department of English, U of Otago, 2005. 299-315. Print.
- Saggini, Francesca. *Backstage in the Novel: Frances Burney and the Theater Arts*. Trans. Laura Kopp. Charlottesville: U of Virginia P, 2012. Print.
- Scott, Walter. *Sir Walter Scott's Magnum Opus and the Pforzheimer Manuscripts*. Edinburgh: National Lib. of Scotland, 1986. Print.
- Shakespeare, William. *The Riverside Shakespeare*. 1974. Ed. G. Blakemore Evans. 2nd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1997. Print.
- Shelley, Mary. *Frankenstein, or, The Modern Prometheus: The Original Two-Volume Novel of 1816-1817 from the Bodleian Library Manuscripts*. Ed. Charles E. Robinson. Oxford: Bodleian Lib., 2008. Print.
- Siskin, Clifford. *The Work of Writing: Literature and Social Change in Britain, 1700-1830*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins UP, 1998. Print.
- Southam, B. C. [Brian]. *Jane Austen's Literary Manuscripts: A Study of the Novelist's Development Through the Surviving Papers*. 1964. New ed. London; New York: Athlone, 2001. Print.
- Spencer, Jane. "Evelina and Cecilia." *The Cambridge Companion to Frances Burney*. Ed. Peter Sabor. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007. 23-38. Print.

- . *Literary Relations: Kinship and the Canon, 1660-1830*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2005. Print.
- St Clair, William. *The Reading Nation in the Romantic Period*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004. Print.
- Sterne, Laurence. *The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy, Gentleman*. 1759-67. Ed. Melvyn New and Joan New. 3 vols. Gainesville: UP of Florida, 1978-84. Print. Vols. 1-3 of *The Florida Edition of the Works of Laurence Sterne*. 8 vols. 1978-2008.
- . *A Sentimental Journey and Continuation of the Bramine's Journal*. Ed. Melvyn New and W. G. Day. Gainesville: UP of Florida, 2002. Print. Vol. 6 of *The Florida Edition of the Works of Laurence Sterne*. 8 vols. 1978-2008.
- Straub, Kristina. *Divided Fictions: Fanny Burney and Feminine Strategy*. Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 1987. Print.
- Suetonius. *Suetonius*. Ed. Jeffrey Henderson. Trans. J. C. Rolfe. 2 vols. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1997-98. Print. The Loeb Classical Library 31.
- Sutherland, Kathryn. *Jane Austen's Textual Lives: From Aeschylus to Bollywood*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2005. Print.
- Tanner, Tony. *Jane Austen*. London: Macmillan, 1986. Print.
- Taylor, William. Rev. of *The Wanderer*. *The Monthly Review* 76 (1815): 412-19. Print.
- Thaddeus, Janice Farrar. *Frances Burney: A Literary Life*. New York: St. Martin's, 2000. Print.
- . "Sharpening *Cecilia*: Frances Burney as Professional Writer." *Burney Journal* 4 (2001): 36-51. Print.

- Thiel, Udo. "Hume's Notions of Consciousness and Reflection in Context." *British Journal for the History of Philosophy* 2.2 (1994): 75-115. Print.
- . "Self-Consciousness and Personal Identity." *The Cambridge History of Eighteenth-Century Philosophy*. Ed. Knud Haakonssen. Vol. 1. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2006. 286-318. Print.
- Thrale, Hester. *Thraliana: The Diary of Mrs. Hester Lynch Thrale*. 1942. Ed. Katharine C. Balderston. 2nd ed. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1951. Print.
- Tieken-Boon van Ostade, Ingrid. "Stripping the Layers: Language and Content of Fanny Burney's Early Journals." *English Studies* 72.2 (1991): 146-59. Print.
- Todd, Janet and Antje Blank. Introduction. *Persuasion*. 1817. By Jane Austen. Ed. Janet Todd and Antje Blank. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2006. xxi-lxxxii. Print.
- Vanbrugh, John and Colley Cibber. *The Provoked Husband*. 1728. Ed. Peter Dixon. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1973. Print.
- Waddell, J.N. "Additions to the *O.E.D.* from the Writings of Fanny Burney." *Notes and Queries* 27.1 (1980): 27-32. Print.
- . "Fanny Burney's Contribution to English Vocabulary." *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 81 (1980): 260-63. Print.
- Wallace, Miriam L. *Revolutionary Subjects in the English "Jacobin" Novel, 1790-1805*. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell UP, 2009. Print.
- Warner, Michael. *Publics and Counterpublics*. New York: Zone, 2002. Print.
- White, Eugene. *Fanny Burney, Novelist; A Study in Technique: Evelina, Cecilia, Camilla, The Wanderer*. Hamden, CT: Shoe String, 1960. Print.

Yeazell, Ruth Bernard. *Fictions of Modesty: Women and Courtship in the English Novel*.

Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1991. Print.

Zonitch, Barbara. *Familiar Violence: Gender and Social Upheaval in the Novels of*

Frances Burney. Newark: U of Delaware P, 1997. Print.