The Burney Journal

Volume 10 (2010) Article 3

Male Ambitions and Female Difficulties in 1814: *Waverley*, *Patronage*, *Mansfield Park*, and *The Wanderer*

Elaine Bander, Dawson College

Recommended Citation
Bander, Elaine. "Male Ambitions and Female Difficulties in 1814: *Waverley*, *Patronage*, *Mansfield Park*, and *The Wanderer*." *The Burney Journal*, vol. 10, 2010, pp. 29-47, https://www.mcgill.ca/burneycentre/burney-society/burney-journal/vol10/3.

THE BURNEY JOURNAL

Male Ambitions and Female Difficulties in 1814: *Waverley, Patronage, Mansfield Park,* and *The Wanderer*[1]

ELAINE BANDER

In 1814, English novelists, like the statesmen at Vienna, were considering how to construct a post-war world. Four milestone novels appeared that year—Walter Scott's first novel, *Waverley*; Maria Edgeworth's most ambitious novel, *Patronage*; Jane Austen's most challenging novel, *Mansfield Park*; and Frances Burney's final novel, *The Wanderer*. Not surprisingly, each dramatizes a clash of values: Jacobites versus Hanoverians, Jacobins versus anti-Jacobins, urban fashion versus rural virtue, advancement through patronage and privilege versus advancement through professional merit.

Their common publication year, however, is more contingent than essential since each novel was begun some time before 1814. Scott had drafted an early version of *Waverley* in 1805, Edgeworth described her plan for *Patronage* as early as 1809, and Austen had written enough of *Mansfield Park* by January 1813 to joke about Mrs. Grant's round table.[2] Burney, the eldest of the four, had been at work the longest, for she had started work on *The Wanderer* before her decade-long exile in Paris began in 1802. Nevertheless, each of these novels is essentially post-war, showing a society in transition from one set of values to another.

Yet while all of these novels question how men and women should reconcile worldly ambition with ethical values—questions made more pertinent by historical events in 1814—*The Wanderer* alone reverses traditional gender roles as it demonstrates how Old Régime patriarchal ideals of chivalry and charity were not only eroded and corrupt but also impotent to aid an unprotected woman of principle.

Despite its radical agenda, *The Wanderer*, epic in scope but conventional in manner, appeared old-fashioned to post-war readers.[3] By the time Burney's novel was published in 1814, "the dire reign of the terrific

Robespierre" had been over for twenty years while the repressive reign of the despotic Bonaparte, under which Burney had lived for a decade, was about to be swept away by the Allied victory. But Bonaparte's final defeat could not unmake all of the effects of the Revolution. The world had changed, and so had the English novel. Scott, Edgeworth and Austen, while indebted to Burney's earlier work, were writing novels with more natural dialogue and plotting and less gothicism and sentimentality.

Scott documents this change in taste in the opening passage of *Waverley* when he declares that his title is "uncontaminated" by "the hackneyed titles of sentimental novels: the chivalrous epithets of Howard, Mordaunt, Mortimer, or Stanley, or . . . the softer and more sentimental sounds of Belmour, Belville, Belfield and Belgrave" (*Waverley* 3)—names familiar to readers of novels by Burney and Edgeworth—will have no place in Scott's novel. He continues:

> if I had rather chosen to call my work a "Sentimental Tale," would it not have been a sufficient presage of a heroine with a profusion of auburn hair, and a harp, the soft solace of her solitary hours, which she fortunately finds always the means of transporting from castle to cottage, although she herself be sometimes obliged to jump out of a two-pair-of-stairs window, and is more than once bewildered on her journey, alone and on foot, without any guide but a blowzy peasant girl, whose jargon she can hardly understand? (*Waverley* 4)

Scott's harp-strumming heroine could almost be a burlesque of Juliet Granville, the heroine of *The Wanderer*, who is not only a virtuoso harp player but also, by the end of Volume IV, has escaped from Arundel Castle to a cottage in the New Forest with only "a blowzy peasant girl" for a guide.[†] To Scott, Burney's last novel must have seemed like an artifact of the old century.

And indeed, *The Wanderer* was not only begun in the eighteenth century but is also set early in that century's final decade. Moreover, its heroine resembles those of Burney's earlier novels. Like Evelina, Juliet is introduced to the hazards of English society without the protection of a name or family. Like Cecilia, she is betrayed by false patrons, mentors,

and monitors. And like Camilla, her principled behavior is under constant, hostile surveillance. Juliet Granville is a paradigmatic Burney heroine: lovely, accomplished, refined, sensitive, articulate, and punctilious. Although none of her female difficulties are of her own making, she endures them with philosophy, piety, courage, energy, and ingenuity. In short, she is exemplary. Yet conventional Juliet, beset by history, patriarchy, and gentility as well as the gothic and sentimental perils of seduction and calumny, also struggles to earn her keep, a struggle experienced by no previous Burney heroine and, indeed, by no genteel female character in the other landmark novels of 1814.[5] In this respect, Burney's novel was revolutionary.[6]

The Wanderer, *Patronage*, *Mansfield Park*, and *Waverley* all contain characters who work for a living and who seek patronage—that is, professional advancement through the preference of the privileged. In 1775, Johnson had defined "patronage" as "Donation of a benefice," and "patron," notoriously, as "One who countenances, supports, or protects. Commonly a wretch who supports with insolence, and is paid with flattery," reflecting an ambivalence about patronage that began long before the age of revolution. These novels examine that ambivalence.

In Scott's *Waverley*, the naive, idealistic hero's adventures dramatize his divided heritage of both political patronage and feudal privilege, for Edward Waverley's father, defecting from the family's traditional Jacobite loyalties, has risen in public life through the patronage of Tory Hanoverians while his uncle, bachelor baronet Sir Everard Waverley, recognizing Edward's "hereditary title to his family, affection, and patronage" (10), has adopted him as heir to his estate and ideology. His father's influence launches young Waverley's career with a commission in the Hanoverian army while his uncle's friendship introduces him to the Scottish Baron Bradwardine and, through him, to the Highland laird Fergus Mac-Ivor, both of whom exercise an ancient, tribal form of patronage. In the Highlands, Edward loses his heart, temporarily, to the lovely, accomplished Flora Mac-Ivor, who, in contrast to sentimental Edward, has no time for courtship, fiercely committed as she is to the Jacobin cause. After Culloden, when romance yields to history, Edward, who has gone astray by abandoning his professional duty, receives his pardon through the patronage of the Hanoverians and wins his

conventional bride, Rose Bradwardine, through the agency of feudal loyalties. In contrast, Flora's honor-driven, unwomanly political "career" ends in acknowledged catastrophe for herself and her nation.

Patronage and *Mansfield Park* have more in common with each other than either has with *Waverley*, but like Scott, both Edgeworth and Austen show the triumph of traditionally modest female virtue over more ambitious and public female "careers" on the marriage market. As well, both novels contrast sets of male cousins who seek professional advancement through skill or patronage. In *Mansfield Park* Edmund depends upon his father's livings for preferment while William Price is "made" only through the patronage of venal Admiral Crawford.

Patronage, more schematic and panoramic than *Mansfield Park*, is also more didactic, demonstrating how men ought to pursue professional success through honest endeavor rather than through patronage. A Grandisonian sub-theme advocates the superiority of private over public life. Thus, the Percys, who early in the novel lose their great estate, live privately and modestly while their three sons struggle to advance in the army, the law, and medicine respectively. In contrast, their more worldly cousins, the three Falconer brothers (whose name suggests their predatory nature), are "pushed up" by their ambitious father, Commissioner Falconer, who ingratiates himself with great public persons like the Prime Minister, Lord Oldborough, an austere, Pitt-like figure. Commissioner Falconer, endlessly plotting to curry favor, exacts patronage for services rendered. His worthless sons advance rapidly through subterfuge and favoritism, only to be exposed in time as incompetent or corrupt even as their Percy cousins rise professionally through diligence and merit. Edgeworth follows each Percy son's steady professional advancement, providing a rare glimpse of middle-class professional working conditions. Eventually, the Percys' estate and fortune are restored while the Falconers suffer well-deserved disgrace and ruin.

Patronage, like *Mansfield Park*, specifically questions motives and methods for advancement in the Church, reflecting the Evangelical influence that was slowly transforming the profession. The Commissioner's oldest son, clever, good-natured Buckhurst, is similar in some respects to Austen's Henry Crawford. Early in the novel, his father orders him to prepare for a valuable "church benefice," which he first attempts to refuse:

> "To be frank with you, Sir, I have no taste for the church."
>
> "No taste for nine-hundred a year, Buckhurst? No desire for a fortune, Mr. Philosopher?"
>
> "Pardon me, a very strong taste for that, Sir—Not a bit of a philosopher—As much in love with fortune as any man, young or old—is there no way to fortune but through the church?"—
>
> "None for you so sure and so easy. . . . I have planned and settled it, and you have nothing to do but to get yourself ordained as soon as possible. . . ."
>
> "Let me beg, father, that you will not be so precipitate.—Upon my word, sir, I cannot go into orders.—I am not . . . fit for the church."
>
> The father stared with an expression, between anger and astonishment.
>
> "Have you not gone through the University?—"Yes, Sir . . . but . . . but I am scarcely sober, and *staid*, and moral enough for the church. . . . Such a wild fellow as I am . . . I really could not in conscience. . . . You know that I am no puritan—but really on this point I have some conscience, and I beg you not to press me farther." (32-33)

Poor Buckhurst knows himself only too well. His father's will prevails, but as his worldly fortunes rise, Buckhurst's moral state deteriorates. He becomes a fashionable London preacher (just as Henry Crawford wishes he could be), and we hear no more of his conscience.[7] In this and other ways, Edgeworth's novel systematically discredits professional advancement through the patronage of hereditary wealth and privilege, the traditional pathway to a successful career in the church, army, navy, and government, in favor of honest, independent effort and ability: the modern, merit-based approach that was beginning to take hold in the new century.

Patronage also compares the courtship strategies and values of the Percy and Falconer daughters. While the Falconers scheme to marry their two daughters to rich, powerful men, following the older "prudent" marriage motive, the Percys encourage their accomplished,

principled daughters to choose their own husbands, trusting them to love only worthy men. Mrs. Falconer, like her husband an astute politician, contrives to show off her daughters, hoping to snare a wealthy, well-born husband for each. The family goes deeply into debt to gain "the patronage of fashion" (296), but the prize catch, foreign diplomat Count Altenberg, falls in love instead with their cousin, lovely, modest Caroline Percy. Caroline remains as ignorant of the Count's admiration as Fanny Price was of Henry Crawford's—indeed, Caroline assures her younger sister, "'I cannot forget, that the delicacy, honor, pride, prudence of our sex, forbid a woman to think any man, as a lover, till he gives her reason to believe, that he feels love for her'" (211)—a sentimental formula that the feistier Fanny indignantly rejects in *Mansfield Park* (408). Later, Caroline enjoys a season under the social patronage of her fashionable aunt, Lady Jane Granville (perhaps a distant connection of Juliet Granville?), but when Caroline gently discourages the advances of a highly eligible suitor, her aunt, like Sir Thomas Bertram, furiously brands her niece ungrateful and vows never to forgive her (*Patronage* 498). Eventually, Caroline marries the noble Count for love, while her fashionable cousins fail to marry at all. In Edgeworth's *Patronage*, men must work while women must wait, but good girls get rich, loving husbands, and good men get rich.

Austen's *Mansfield Park* provides a more nuanced view of church patronage. After learning that Edmund is to take orders, Mary Crawford scorns him for choosing a profession in which his advancement is guaranteed regardless of effort or talent:

> "It is fortunate that your inclination and your father's convenience should accord so well. There is a very good living kept for you, I understand, hereabouts."
>
> "Which you suppose has biassed me."
>
> "But *that* I am sure it has not," cried Fanny.
>
> "Thank you for your good word, Fanny, but it is more than I would affirm myself. On the contrary, the knowing there was such a provision for me, probably did bias me. Nor can I think it wrong that it should. There was no natural disinclination to be overcome, and I see no reason why a man should make a worse clergyman for knowing that he will

> have a competence early in life. . . ."
>
> "It is the same sort of thing," said Fanny, after a short pause, "as for the son of an admiral to go into the navy, or the son of a general to be in the army, and nobody sees any thing wrong in that. Nobody wonders that they should prefer the line where their friends can serve them best, or suspects them to be less in earnest in it than they appear." (127)

Fanny and Edmund defend patronage as inherently natural insofar as it is exercised responsibly. Sir Thomas has kept a living for his younger son, but unlike Commissioner Falconer, he expects his son to do the job properly: "'. . . I should have been deeply mortified, if any son of mine could reconcile himself to doing less'" than live in his parish, he assures Crawford: "'He knows that human nature needs more lessons than a weekly sermon can convey, and that if he does not live among his parishioners and prove himself by constant attention their well-wisher and friend, he does very little either for their good or his own'" (288).

Henry briefly envies Edmund his profession: "'I never listened to a distinguished preacher in my life, without a sort of envy. But then, I must have a London audience'" (395). In other words, he would be another Buckhurst Falconer. Henry possesses what Austen calls "moral taste" to admire the active professional lives of Edmund and William as well as Fanny's qualities (174), but he prefers to be a self-indulgent, admired man of fashion. Just as he would rather marry virtue than practice it, so too he prefers to bestow patronage rather than strive to deserve it.

In contrast, William Price, like the Percy sons, pursues his profession with skill, courage, and dedication. Sir Thomas, who encourages William to talk about his professional experiences, "listened to his clear, simple, spirited details with full satisfaction—seeing in them, the proof of good principles, professional knowledge, energy, courage, and cheerfulness—every thing that could deserve or promise well" (236). To Henry, however, those tales

> gave a different feeling. He longed to have been at sea, and seen, and done and suffered as much. . . . The glory of

> heroism, of usefulness, of exertion, of endurance, made his own habits of selfish indulgence appear in shameful contrast; and he wished he had been a William Price, distinguishing himself and working his way to fortune and consequence with so much self-respect and happy ardour, instead of what he was!
>
> The wish was rather eager than lasting . . . and he found it was as well to be a man of fortune at once with horses and grooms at his command. (275-76)

When heroic William laments to his sister, "'I begin to think I shall never be a lieutenant, Fanny. Every body gets made but me'" (290), Henry decides to become William's patron.

Now, William is as worthy of advancement as his cousin Edmund, but accidents of birth, not worth, determine who advances and who does not: William's uncle Sir Thomas has no influence at the Admiralty, but Henry's uncle the Admiral does. William is, therefore, "made" not because of his own professional talents, as were the Percys, nor because of his own family's hereditary privilege, as was Edmund, but because Henry wishes to win Fanny's love. The letters that Henry shows Fanny reveal the workings of such patronage:

> The first was from the Admiral to inform his nephew, in a few words, of his having succeeded in the object he had undertaken, the promotion of young Price, and inclosing two more, one from the Secretary of the First Lord to a friend, whom the Admiral had set to work in the business, the other from that friend to himself, by which it appeared that his Lordship had the very great happiness of attending to the recommendation of Sir Charles, that Sir Charles was much delighted in having an opportunity of proving his regard for Admiral Crawford, and that the circumstance of Mr. William Price's commission as second Lieutenant of H. M. sloop Thrush, being made out, was spreading general joy through a wide circle of great people. (345-46)

Austen's ironic tone implicitly criticizes the Old Régime patronage system for rewarding William not on account of his demonstrated merit but because of the privileged influence of Henry's dissolute uncle.

Mansfield Park, the first novel of Austen's maturity, is also the first in which she departs from the template of Burney's first three novels. The heroes of Austen's early novels are gentleman of leisure who decorate ballrooms and drawing-rooms, very much like Lord Orville, Mortimer Delvile, and even Edgar Mandlebert. Although Henry Tilney in *Northanger Abbey* does refer to his parish duties, we never see him performing them: his profession is incidental, not essential, to the plot. Edward Ferrars longs for a profession in *Sense and Sensibility*, but he does not achieve one until the novel's end. Darcy, improbably, spends most of his time in *Pride and Prejudice* being bored in other people's houses. In *Mansfield Park*, however, both Edmund Bertram and William Price, like Scott's Waverley and Edgeworth's Percys, are defined by their professions. Furthermore, in these 1814 novels, the modest, private heroines—Fanny Price, Caroline Percy, Rose Bradwardine—triumph over more ambitious, worldly, or public women like Mary Crawford, Georgiana Falconer, and Flora Mac-Ivor. Among the gentry in these novels, good men work while good women wait at home to be courted.

Burney, however, reverses this gendered pattern in *The Wanderer*. The normal female career of marriage is closed to Juliet for reasons that she cannot reveal until late in the novel, so while she is as modest as Fanny Price, Caroline Percy, or Rose Bradwardine, she must seek either patronage or paid labor in order to survive. Meanwhile, the men who surround her, court her, support her, importune her, and betray her are all gentlemen of leisure. Rather than work at professions like the heroes of *Patronage*, *Mansfield Park*, and *Waverley*, they have no call upon their time save to admire, attack, entertain, hector, seduce, or rescue Juliet.

In *The Wanderer*, none of the English gentlemen have active professions.[8] Even the worthy old Admiral is retired although clearly his life of service has rendered him more honest and compassionate than most of his fellow passengers in the boat that brings these characters home to England. Harleigh and his various acquaintances among the gentry, including two bad baronets, apparently exist merely to be fashionable, expending their enterprise and wealth upon their friendly

or hostile pursuit of Juliet. Among the gently reared, only the two unprotected females, Juliet and Gabriella, labor for their bread. Their travails dramatize the dangers of both patronage and independence for unprotected women.

From the opening lines of the novel, Juliet seeks patronage. Her first speech in the novel is a cry for help, rendered in French, the language of the enemy from whom her fellow passengers are fleeing: "'O hear me! . . . for the love of Heaven, hear me! . . . Oh leave me not to be massacred!'" (11). Juliet's pleas are rebuffed by the pilot, who "gruffly swore" and muttered, "'Who's to pay for your safety?' . . . . 'I will,'" cries Harleigh. "'I pledge myself for the cost and the consequence! . . . Take her in, pilot, at my demand, and my charge!'" (11). Harleigh thus becomes Juliet's first English patron, the first of many and the most disinterested, since he makes his offer before he can see her, when she is nothing but a disembodied, French voice. His offer is seconded by the authority of the Admiral, motivated, like Harleigh, by disinterested charity and chivalry: "'Nay, since she is but a woman, and in distress, save her, pilot, in God's name!'" (12). And so, "With trembling eagerness, she sprang into the vessel," thanking God for her deliverance. She believes, "'ah! if I once reach that shore,—that blessed shore! shall I have a sorrow left?'" (22).

In a sense, Juliet never does leave that boat. It is a fitting image for the England to which it is conveying her: a claustrophobic society in which suspicion and self-regard trump charity and delicacy. Her "female difficulties" keep her on the move, but wherever her wanderings take her—Dover, London, Brighthelmstone, Arundel Castle, the New Forest, Wilton, even Stonehenge—she keeps bumping up against those same ill-sorted, ill-tempered fellow passengers.

Her second patron, once safely landed at Dover, is the Admiral, who pays for her lodging and a place on the London stage. "'Fie upon me,' she cried, 'to be in England and surprised at generosity!'" (23). Juliet quickly learns, however, that charity does not necessarily begin at home. Stranded like a foreigner on her native shore, she appeals to fellow passengers for transportation and lodging in return for whatever useful services she might render. Her alter-ego Elinor, socially secure and financially independent, offers patronage until jealousy over Harleigh diverts her into own public "career" of heroic love and theatrical suicide—although,

as Craft-Fairchild points out, Elinor's apparently Wollstonecraft-like rebellion, focused as it is on winning Harleigh's love, "is inscribed within the patriarchal system she apparently defies . . . " (136). Generous Lady Aurora, controlled by her elders, has the will but lacks the independence to act. Ireful Mrs. Ireton, nasty Aunt-Norris-like Mrs. Maple, and awful Miss Arbe, "the unprotecting patroness" (319), who declares, "'I can't pretend to be responsible for the credit of every body that solicits my patronage'" (295)—one by one Juliet finds her female patrons unreliable or unworthy.

The gentlemen prove not much better. Lord Melbury's incestuous infatuation lends a Gothic frisson to Juliet's practical difficulties, highlighting yet another moral peril for unprotected, unacknowledged women. Sir Lyell treats her, as he does all unprotected women, as an object of prey. Ireton propositions her. Cynical Riley hunts her down for sport.

Harleigh's urgent declarations of love only intensify Juliet's misery, and his attempts to help either damage her or fail to materialize. Doody calls him "the last and least attractive of a series of Burney heroes," adding that he "resembles only too much the other blighted and cranky bachelors who populate Burney's Sussex; he is correct, nervous, and anxious." While Juliet, defying class and gender, struggles to earn her living, "Harleigh himself is parodically ladylike" (xxiii). Doody identifies Harleigh as a "literary descendant and namesake of Henry Mackenzie's Harley, the original Man of Feeling" (xxv), a figure of intense feminine delicacy but little "masculine" initiative. Indeed, there exists a considerable body of critical commentary upon the feminization of the eighteenth-century hero, of which the blushing Harleigh is a late example.[9] As the object of the proud, passionate, and very public love of Elinor, Harleigh often appears more like a conventionally reactive heroine than an active hero. As a hero, moreover, he is singularly ineffective; he compromises Juliet more than he helps her. His gifts of banknotes haunt her as a source of anxiety and guilt. Even at the novel's final crisis, when Harleigh prepares to make a dashing, heroic journey to France in order to buy Juliet's freedom from the commissary, his *beau geste* is forestalled by news of the villain's death.

Good Mr. Giles Arbe also intends well, but when he chides Juliet for her debts and asks permission to pay them, Juliet must refuse his

patronage, as she has tried to refuse Harleigh's, Sir Jaspar's and Lord Melbury's, because it would compromise her to be supported by a man (280-81). He fails at the one task she asks of him: to carry a note to his cousin urging Miss Arbe to encourage her creditors to pay her (290). Despite his benevolence, he also fails to collect those debts himself from her wealthy creditors (298-300). He conveys Lady Aurora's offer to pay her debts for her, but since the drafts must be upon Lord Melbury, Juliet must again refuse the offer (302). Mr. Giles Arbe can shame her, but he cannot help her as long as she must resist the patronage of a gentleman (303).

Understandably, Juliet prefers independent labor to compromising patronage, so she attempts to support herself by marketing her talents: "The hope of self-dependence, ever cheering to an upright mind, sweetened the rest of Ellis in her mean little apartment . . ." (220). Unfortunately, self-dependence appears even harder to achieve than reliable patronage. Juliet's most marketable asset proves unprofitable when she sets up as a music teacher because her wealthy patrons do not pay her. As a solution to the problems that they have created, her patrons urge her to perform professionally. Juliet wishes to reject Miss Arbe's offensive patronage, but "a little reflection taught her, that, in a situation so defenceless, pride must give way to prudence; and nicer feelings must submit to necessity" (224). Despite the hectoring of good Mr. Arbe and the encouragement of Elinor, Juliet resists becoming a professional performer lest she forfeit her gentility. When, forced by circumstance and the Arbes, she does make the attempt, she is up-staged by one of Elinor's theatrical suicide attempts, which has the unintended consequence of rescuing Juliet from the taint of public performance.

Burney, of course, knew all about the plight of the professional musician in society, just as she knew the humiliations of patronage, the trials of living with bad-tempered women, and the difficulty of returning to England after prolonged exile. Burney managed to achieve something like independence with her pen. Juliet, recoiling from a public career as actor or musician, attempts more humble labor with her needle. Once again, however, her fashionable patrons who solicit and receive her tasteful handiwork neglect to pay for it—and so "concluded her fruitless effort to attain a self-dependence which, however subject to toil, might

be free, at least, from controul" (425). Defeated, she seeks employment in Miss Matson's millinery shop, "hoping to gain in security all that she lost in liberty" (425).

Juliet finds no more charity and integrity among working women than she had among ladies of fashion. Entering this community of working women much as Waverley goes among the Highland Scots, she observes how "their notions of probity were as lax as those of their customers were of justice" (427). The "selfish" rich and the "cringing" poor equally disgust her (429-30). While she strives to save silly, vain, self-willed Flora Pierson from seduction by Sir Lyell Sycamore, her fellow workers reject any responsibility to look out for young Flora and resent Juliet's interference since each "had some similar secret, or correspondent hope of her own; and found it convenient to reject, as treachery, an appeal against a sister work-woman . . . " (434).

Only Mrs. Hart, the mantua-maker, shares Juliet's concern for Flora. Consequently, Juliet quits the fancy work of the millinery shop to do tedious sewing for Mrs. Hart, where her new co-workers resent her industry. But contracting her labor is no better than working for regular wages. When her services are no longer required, "The pleasure with which she had considered herself free, because engaged but by the day, was changed into the alarm of finding herself, from that very circumstance, without employment or home" (455). After experiencing these dangers of "unprotected poverty," Juliet submits once again to the "slavery" of Mrs. Ireton's sadistic patronage (474).

Her brief interlude with Gabriella in their Soho haberdashery is an idyll despite their humble situation because their labor renders them the means of surviving independent of privilege and patronage: "laborious as might seem this existence to those who had known 'other times,' Juliet, by the side of Gabriella, thought every employment delightful . . ." (624). They have learned, Gabriella tells Sir Jaspar, "'that self-exertion can alone mark nobility of soul; and that self-dependence can only sustain honour in adversity'" (639). But this idyll too comes to an end, when Juliet's former shipmate Riley recognizes her. She flees again, this time to Salisbury and the New Forest, where she finds temporary shelter among humble working folk, some of whom affront or frighten her by their rough manners, poaching, and smuggling, while others of whom,

preoccupied with their own necessary labors, accept her as she is without the malevolent curiosity that had so plagued her among the gentry. Best of all, instead of being compromised by patronage, she has the means to purchase their simple hospitality.

Eventually, her French pursuers run her to ground, coincidently at the same inn where she encounters Harleigh, who "cast his arms around her, exclaiming, 'Place yourself under my protection! and no violence, no power upon earth shall tear you away!'" (728). But he cannot offer protection to a woman who considers herself married: "To rescue, to protect her, Harleigh now thought was all that could render life desirable; but, while adoring her almost to madness, he respected her situation and her fame . . ." and so lets her go (732). While Harleigh looks on, however, she is rescued from the commissary's clutches, first, by a peace officer come to arrest the commissary, then by the most effective of her many patrons: ironically, the feeble, venial Sir Jaspar Herrington.

Three of Juliet's well-intentioned patrons, Lady Aurora, Lord Melbury, and Admiral Powel, are eventually discovered to be her close relations, perhaps explaining why they, unlike most of the gentry, offer true charity, but Sir Jaspar's motives are more complex. He enters the novel as "a gouty old gentleman" (407), apparently the conventional Bad Baron out to seduce an unprotected beauty, much like Sir Lyell Sycamore. From the beginning, however, he responds in kind to Juliet's own delicacy, successfully offering her practical support. Like Harleigh, he has the intelligence to recognize Juliet's worth and the courage to show her public respect, but he is more effective than Harleigh at giving her cash. Like the chivalrous Admiral (810-11), he twice offers Juliet a chair when haughty female patrons would leave her standing (416, 514). The least virile of the leisured gentlemen turns out to be Juliet's best patron.

On the other hand, he is slow to relinquish his sexual designs, and, suggestively, penetrates her gown with his crutches (502, 547). Readers see what Juliet cannot: his self-serving, manipulative motives. Throughout the novel, his ambivalent behavior is a reaction to her own ambiguity, for Juliet is single but not-single, impoverished but refined, foreign but English, friendless but well-connected. An acute psychologist, Sir Jaspar reads and rereads her character, adjusting his motives accordingly from predatory, to patronizing, to respectful.[10] Thus, while he begins by

impersonating charity, he ends by embodying it. He even offers Juliet the honest protection of a marriage to his nephew or to himself—which, as Doody points out, is more than Harleigh ever does (xxv).

Sir Jaspar's only "career" has been his successful, lifelong avoidance of marriage, motivated by a horror of a mercenary match. Chastened and softened by his pursuit and patronage of Juliet, he comes to regret his rejection of marriage. Eventually, he is transformed from grotesque seducer into benevolent old bachelor family friend, sexually neutralized by age and infirmity. Yet even Sir Jaspar's effective rescue of Juliet cannot rehabilitate the traditional, patriarchal role of patronage, for throughout *The Wanderer*, as Doody states, "Burney shows why we cannot believe that system of male patronage and protection actually works justly and fairly for women" (xxi).

Juliet has had no lessons to learn about charity and delicacy, for throughout her difficulties she has been exemplary. Although she never does achieve her goal of economic "self-dependence," she has continually exercised firm *moral* independence. Her female difficulties end when she is restored to name, family, fortune, title, and the dubious reward of Harleigh's heart and hand—all the blessings of the Old Régime—but she achieves this happy ending, Burney reminds us at her conclusion, not through the agency of a patron but "by such resources as she could find, independently, in herself" (873).

In *The Wanderer*, Burney demonstrates the faults of complacent English society as articulated by "the guileless and benevolent Mr. Giles Arbe" (871): that the rich are careless of the poor, that they fail to pay laborers for their hire, that *noblesse* does not *oblige*. This flawed world forces Juliet to labor fruitlessly while all of her would-be male protectors enjoy a sterile, feminized leisure. Thus, while *The Wanderer*, *Waverley*, *Patronage*, and *Mansfield Park* each dramatizes what Austen calls "the advantages of early hardship and discipline, and the consciousness of being born to struggle and endure" (473), only in *The Wanderer* is it the heroine rather than the hero who is forced to struggle and endure in the market-place, while the hero, a gentleman of leisure who wishes to protect her, proves singularly ineffective at his job.

NOTES

[1] An earlier version of this essay was read at the Burney Society conference, "Frances Burney and 1814," at Loews Ventana Canyon Resort, Tucson, Arizona, on 26 October 2006. It contains some material also found in Bander, "*Mansfield Park* and the 1814 Novels: *Waverley, The Wanderer, Patronage.*"

[2] See Scott, "General Preface" 352, *Waverley* 4; for Edgeworth's plan for *Patronage*, see Hare 2: 166; for Austen's prepublication comments on *Mansfield Park*, see her letter to Cassandra Austen, 24 January 1813.

[3] See Doody, xxxiii and n. 18.

[4] For other glosses on this passage, see Bander 17, Doody and Sabor 899.

[5] As Doody observes, the heroine of Ann Radcliffe's *The Romance of the Forest*, a likely influence on Burney, is similarly destitute, friendless, and nameless (xv), but while Adeline is dependent upon the kindness of strangers, Juliet actively struggles to support herself.

[6] Salih offers a different reading of the "revolutionary" tendency of *The Wanderer*, arguing that both *The Wanderer* and the earlier *Camilla* "represent social, gender and identity disruptions only to shut them down, to dispel ambiguity and doubt in their conventional, conservative conclusions" (40). On the other hand, commenting on the common theme of theatricals in *Patronage, Mansfield Park*, and *The Wanderer*, Salih suggests parallels between "the temporary conversion of domestic space into theatre" and "the drastic political 'conversions' that were occurring outside the household: Austen's novel mirrors the reassigning of political authority during George III's illness, while *The Wanderer* is clearly inflected by the aftermath of the French Revolution [as] the English characters imaginatively enact their fantasies of violence and despotism in a displacement that permits them to ignore local injustices" (47).

[7] Jocelyn Harris discusses the parallels between Buckhurst Falconer and Henry Crawford, arguing for Edgeworth's direct influence upon Austen. See "Jane Austen" in *The Cambridge Companion to English Novelists* 106-07.

[8] But see Elles Smallegoor, who investigates the "lesser professions" portrayed in *The Wanderer*, arguing that Burney was valorizing professionalism in general but artistic professionals in particular.

[9] See, for example, Janet Todd's Introduction to *Men by Women*, as well as Katharine M. Rogers's essay in that collection, "Dreams and Nightmares: Male Characters in the Feminine Novel of the Eighteenth Century." Todd observes that eighteenth-century women writers tended to create feminized heroes or, rather, heroes with "qualities usually assumed to be female: gentleness, patience, and sensitivity" (3). See also Jane Spencer, who argues in *Rise of the Woman Novelist* that the "feminine" characteristics of modesty were gradually accepted as desirable for women and well as for men as the century developed: "The true 'man of feeling' was therefore seen as 'feminine'" (77). In *Masquerade and Gender: Disguise and Female Identity in Eighteenth-Century Fictions by Women*, Catherine Craft-Fairchild notes: "For the hero to be 'feminized,' he must be such in relation to some other figure that completes the binary opposition" (13). Therefore, she argues, masculine power is displaced in later eighteenth-century feminine novels from the feminized male lovers onto "the savagery of rivals and, more important, on the patriarchal tyranny of fathers" (13-14). In *The Wanderer*, extraordinarily, these "masculine" qualities, both noble and base, seem displaced upon the women, both heroic and nasty, rather than upon other men. But see also J. Kevin Jordan, who argues that while Albert Harleigh may be a "weak" hero by the standards of sentimental literature, in his very sentimentality he shares many of the qualities that attracted Frances Burney to the courageous and honorable Alexandre d'Arblay.

[10] Sir Jaspar Herrington, throughout his complex, evolving relationship with Juliet Granville, claims to be assailed, pinched, prodded, or rewarded in turn by a "wicked Elf" (409), a "little Imp" (411), "little fairy elves" (440, 541), "envious sprites" (503), "little sylphs" (503), "benevolent sprites" (504), "little imps" (505, 539, 541), "fantastic workers of wonders" (505), "little fairy friends" (546), and finally, "Those little invisible, but active beings, who have taken my conscience in charge, have spurred and goaded me . . . pinched me and jirked me" to rescue Juliet (755), thus whimsically dramatizing for Juliet the morality play of his internal struggles. See the forthcoming *Court Journals and Diaries of Frances Burney*, Vol. 2: 1787, ed. Stewart Cooke (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2011), for Burney's reference to her own "little blue sprites."

WORKS CITED

Austen, Jane. *Jane Austen's Letters.* Ed. Deirdre le Faye. 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1995. Print.

——. *Mansfield Park.* 1814. Ed. John Wiltshire. *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Jane Austen.* Gen. ed. Janet Todd. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2005. Print.

Bander, Elaine. "*Mansfield Park* and the 1814 Novels: *Waverley, The Wanderer, Patronage.*" *Persuasions* 28 (2006): 115-25. Print.

Burney, Frances. *The Wanderer; or, Female Difficulties.* 1814. Ed. Margaret Anne Doody and Peter Sabor. Introd. Margaret Anne Doody. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1991. Print.

Craft-Fairchild, Catherine. *Masquerade and Gender: Disguise and Female Identity in Eighteenth-Century Fictions by Women.* University Park: Penn State UP, 1993. Print.

Doody, Margaret Anne, and Peter Sabor. Appendix V: "Fashionable Amusements." *The Wanderer; or, Female Difficulties.* By Frances Burney. Ed. Margaret Anne Doody and Peter Sabor. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1991. 897-900. Print.

Doody, Margaret Anne. Introd. *The Wanderer; or, Female Difficulties.* By Frances Burney. Ed. Margaret Anne Doody and Peter Sabor. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1991.vii-xxxvii. Print.

Edgeworth, Maria. *Patronage.* 1814. Introd. Eva Figes. London: Pandora, 1986. Print.

Hare, Augustus J. C., ed. *The Life and Letters of Maria Edgeworth.* 2 vols. London: Arnold, 1894. Print.

Harris, Jocelyn. "Jane Austen." *The Cambridge Companion to English Novelists.* Ed. Adrian Poole. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2009. 98-115. Print.

Johnson, Samuel. *A Dictionary of the English Language.* London, 1775. Print.

Jordan, J. Kevin. "Revisiting Stonehenge: Marriage, Masculinity, and Burney's Sentimental Hero in *The Wanderer.*" MA thesis U of Florida, 2003. Print.

Salih, Sara. "*Camilla* and *The Wanderer.*" *The Cambridge Companion to Frances Burney.* Ed. Peter Sabor. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007. 39-53. Print.

Scott, Sir Walter. "General Preface [1829]." *Waverley.* Ed. Claire Lamont. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1986. 349-61. Print.

——. *Waverley; or, 'Tis Sixty Years Since.* 1814. Ed. Claire Lamont. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1986. Print.

Smallegoor, Elles. "'What I may now, perhaps, venture to style my literary career': Frances Burney's *The Wanderer* and the 'Making' of the Professions." Burney Society (UK) Conference. Institut Charles V, Paris. 11 June 2010. Address.

Spencer, Jane. *Rise of the Woman Novelist: From Aphra Behn to Jane Austen.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986. Print.

Todd, Janet, ed. *Men by Women.* New York: Holmes & Meier, 1981. Print.