Eighteenth-Century Fiction

Volume 24 | Issue 3 Article 4

March 2012

Rewriting Radicalism: Wollstonecraft in Burney's *The Wanderer*

Tara Wallace
The George Washington University

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.mcmaster.ca/ecf

Recommended Citation
Wallace, Tara (2012) "Rewriting Radicalism: Wollstonecraft in Burney's *The Wanderer*," *Eighteenth-Century Fiction*: Vol. 24: Iss. 3, Article 4.
Available at: http://digitalcommons.mcmaster.ca/ecf/vol24/iss3/4

Copyright ©2014 by Eighteenth-Century Fiction, McMaster University. This Article is brought to you by DigitalCommons@McMaster. It has been accepted for inclusion in Eighteenth-Century Fiction by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@McMaster. For more information, please contact scom@mcmaster.ca.

Rewriting Radicalism: Wollstonecraft in Burney's *The Wanderer*

Abstract
This article reconsiders the connection between Mary Wollstonecraft's *Maria, or The Wrongs of Woman* and Frances Burney's *The Wanderer*, arguing that reading the two texts in tandem reveals close affinities as well as strategic (as opposed to ideological) differences. While *The Wanderer* rather crudely parodies Wollstonecraft's revolutionary fervour in the character of Elinor Joddrel, it also thematizes and advances, in subterranean ways, the specific feminist agenda proposed in Wollstonecraft's posthumous novel. The anti-heroine embodies Wollstonecraft's scandalous life and opinions, and the social critique articulated in her novel weaves through the heroine's trajectory, replicated and revised so that the wrongs inflicted upon the problematic Maria re-emerge as the difficulties endured by the estimable Juliet. Fracturing Wollstonecraft into historical persona and text, *The Wanderer* enacts a strategy of domesticating and assimilating into genteel society the progressive ideology of this difficult and polarizing icon of revolutionary romanticism. Locating Juliet's travails within the historical context of the French Revolution, Burney's depiction of a woman almost literally "Bastilled" by marriage aims to demonstrate that oppressive patriarchal practices contravene an English sense of justice.

Keywords
Mary Wollstonecraft, Frances Burney, Maria or The Wrongs of Woman, The Wanderer, revolution, Romanticism, radicalism, rewriting, novels, eighteenth-century literature

This article is available in Eighteenth-Century Fiction: http://digitalcommons.mcmaster.ca/ecf/vol24/iss3/4

Rewriting Radicalism: Wollstonecraft in Burney's *The Wanderer*

Tara Ghoshal Wallace

abstract

This article reconsiders the connection between Mary Wollstonecraft's *Maria, or The Wrongs of Woman* and Frances Burney's *The Wanderer*, arguing that reading the two texts in tandem reveals close affinities as well as strategic (as opposed to ideological) differences. While *The Wanderer* rather crudely parodies Wollstonecraft's revolutionary fervour in the character of Elinor Joddrel, it also thematizes and advances, in subterranean ways, the specific feminist agenda proposed in Wollstonecraft's posthumous novel. The anti-heroine embodies Wollstonecraft's scandalous life and opinions, and the social critique articulated in her novel weaves through the heroine's trajectory, replicated and revised so that the wrongs inflicted upon the problematic Maria re-emerge as the difficulties endured by the estimable Juliet. Fracturing Wollstonecraft into historical persona and text, *The Wanderer* enacts a strategy of domesticating and assimilating into genteel society the progressive ideology of this difficult and polarizing icon of revolutionary romanticism. Locating Juliet's travails within the historical context of the French Revolution, Burney's depiction of a woman almost literally "Bastilled" by marriage aims to demonstrate that oppressive patriarchal practices contravene an English sense of justice.

THE SPIRIT of Mary Wollstonecraft inhabits Frances Burney's *The Wanderer*. In extended analyses or in glancing references, critics connect Elinor Joddrel's outspoken feminism and revolutionary fervour to the author who vindicates the rights of Man and Woman. Deborah Kennedy, for example, argues that the text's conservatism is "complicated by its ... portrayal of the character Elinor Joddrel, who is modeled on Wollstonecraft," and Karen R. Lawrence notes that "the figure of Mary Wollstonecraft as a mediator between French ideas and British society haunts the representation of Elinor"; others acknowledge the parallel by almost casually applying the modifier "Wollstonecraftian" when discussing Elinor.[1] Margaret Anne Doody locates a specific and

[1] Deborah Kennedy, "Responding to the French Revolution: Williams's *Julia* and Burney's *The Wanderer*," in *Jane Austen and Mary Shelley and Their Sisters*, ed. Laura Dabunto (Lanham: University Press of America, 2000), 9. Karen R. Lawrence, *Penelope Voyages: Women and Travel in the British Literary Tradition* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994), 66. Among those who use the adjective "Wollstonecraftian" are Cathrine Frank, "Wandering Narratives

Eighteenth-Century Fiction 24, no. 3 (Spring 2012) © 2012
ECF ISSN 0840-6286 | E-ISSN 1911-0243 | DOI: 10.3138/ecf.24.3.487

substantive link when she observes that "Burney seems to be taking a hint from *The Wrongs of Woman*" in depicting "a cross-section of economic life in England as seen from the woman's point of view," a project that Claudia Johnson deems a failure or even an act of bad faith: "As if it were possible to rewrite Wollstonecraft's *The Wrongs of Woman* from within the values of dominant culture, *The Wanderer* exhibits FEMALE DIFFICULTIES in all their specificity up and down the social ladder" but "ends up blaming women for everything."[2] In this article, I reconsider the connection between the two texts, arguing that reading them in tandem reveals close affinities as well as strategic (as opposed to ideological) differences. While *The Wanderer* rather crudely parodies Wollstonecraft's revolutionary fervour in the character of Elinor Joddrel, it also thematizes and advances, in subterranean ways, the specific feminist agenda proposed in Wollstonecraft's posthumous novel.[3] Fracturing Wollstonecraft into historical

and Wavering Conclusions: Irreconciliation in Frances Burney's *The Wanderer* and Walter Scott's *Waverley*," *European Romantic Review* 12, no. 4 (2001): 440; Jocelyn Harris, "Frances Burney's *The Wanderer*, Jane Austen's *Persuasion*, and the Cancelled Chapters," *Persuasions* 31 (2009): 131; Victoria Kortes-Papp, "Madness as Shelter for Feminist Ideas: Elinor's Role in Frances Burney's *The Wanderer*," *Lumen* 18 (1999): 100; Christopher Nagle, "The Epistolary Passions of Sympathy: Feeling Letters in *Persuasion* and Burney's *The Wanderer*," *Persuasions* 27 (2005): 93; Suzie Park, "Resisting Demands for Depth in *The Wanderer*," *European Romantic Review* 15, no. 2 (2004): 308; Pam Perkins, "Private Man and Public Woman: Social Criticism in Fanny Burney's *The Wanderer*," *Essays in Literature* 23, no. 1 (1996): 70; and Sara Salih, "'Her Blacks, Her Whites, and Her Double Face!': Altering Alterity in *The Wanderer*," *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 11, no. 3 (1999): 305.

2 Margaret Anne Doody, *Frances Burney: The Life in the Works* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1988), 349–50; Claudia Johnson, *Equivocal Beings: Politics, Gender, and Sentimentality in the 1790s: Wollstonecraft, Radcliffe, Burney, and Austen* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), 171. See also Justine Crump, who points to a "similar conflation of feminist defiance, 'French principles,' and female madness" in the two texts, in "'Turning the World Upside Down': Madness, Moral Management, and Frances Burney's *The Wanderer*," *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 10, no. 3 (1998): 337.

3 *Maria* was first published posthumously in William Godwin's edition of Wollstonecraft's works in 1798. There is no direct evidence that Burney had read *Maria*, but she was familiar enough with Wollstonecraft's work to jokingly complain, in 1817, that her son subscribed "to the maxims & manners of the day, which uphold not alone the Rights of Man, & the Rights of Woman, but the Rights of Children — & will, ere long, in all probability, include the Rights of Cats, Dogs, & Mice." The same letter refers to young Alexander as "the poor Wanderer." *The Journals and Letters of Fanny Burney (Madame D'Arblay)*, 10 vols., *Vol. 9: Bath 1815–1817*, ed. Warren Derry (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), 305. References are to this edition.

persona and text, *The Wanderer* enacts a strategy for domesticating and assimilating into genteel society the progressive ideology of this difficult and polarizing icon of revolutionary romanticism.

Burney had good reasons for avoiding transparent identification with Wollstonecraft. William Godwin's *Memoirs*, published in 1798 when Burney was embarking on her last novel, had nudged Wollstonecraft from literary and political notoriety into the realm of personal scandal. As Catherine Craft-Fairchild notes, the "initially favorable reception of *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman* was replaced by outrage" when Godwin divulged biographical details about her sexual transgressions and suicide attempts.[4] The *Anti-Jacobin Review*, for example, pounced on biographical information to trace "the formation of such visionary theories and pernicious doctrines."[5] The more sympathetic *New Annual Register* regretted that "a woman of undoubted talents and genius ... seems never to have had those good principles instilled into her mind, which would have enabled her to controul and govern her passions."[6] Both *New Annual Register* and *Monthly Review* chastised Godwin for confirming what "was considered by some persons as calumny"—that is, her suicide attempt in the wake of betrayal by Gilbert Imlay.[7] Burney, who had painfully

[4] Catherine Craft-Fairchild, *Masquerade and Gender: Disguise and Female Identity in Eighteenth-Century Fictions by Women* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1993), 161. Angela Monsam suggests that some of the furor caused by the memoirs came from those who "may have read Godwin's extreme candour in discussing both her sexuality and physical illness as violations." Monsam, "Biography as Autopsy in William Godwin's *Memoirs of the Author of 'A Vindication of the Rights of Woman,'* " *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 21, no. 1 (2008): 129. See also Cynthia Richards, "The Body of her Work, the Work of Her Body: Accounting for the Life and Death of Mary Wollstonecraft," *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 21, no. 4 (2009): 564–92. Both Monsam and Richards argue that Godwin reverts to scientific discourse in order to manage the emotional trauma of his wife's death.

[5] Review of *Maria, or the Wrongs of Woman*, by Mary Wollstonecraft Godwin, Art. VI., in *Anti-Jacobin Review and Magazine ... July to December, (Inclusive,) 1798*, vol. 1 (London, 1799), 94.

[6] Review of *Memoirs of the Author of A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*, by William Godwin, in *New Annual Register, or, General Repository of History, Politics, and Literature, for the Year 1798* (London: G.G. and J. Robinson, 1799), 271.

[7] William Godwin, *Memoirs of the Author of A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*, ed. Pamela Clemit and Gina Luria Walker (Peterborough: Broadview Press, 2001), 43, 173, 182, 179. References are to this edition. R.N. Janes notes that "for those opposed to her politics, the *Memoirs* and *Maria* served up a delicious evidence of the consequences of Jacobin principles in

(and perhaps culpably) abandoned her friendship with Germaine de Staël because of her adulterous liaison with Narbonne, would hardly celebrate the scandalous Mrs Godwin's life or principles, however much she may have sympathized with her travails and her ideals. As Mascha Gemmeke says, "Burney would have refused to meet Wollstonecraft once she found out about the younger woman's illegitimate child, but she might have felt a kind of admiration for the writer nevertheless."[8]

To differentiate her own feminist and progressive agenda from Wollstonecraft's revolutionary and personal excesses, Burney constructs a parodic double for Wollstonecraft and sets her against the decorous suffering of the right-thinking heroine. As Johnson describes the dichotomy, "Ellis/Juliet never swerves from the path of female rectitude, and certainly never concurs in the radical social criticism of the Wollstonecraftean anti-heroine, Elinor Joddrel."[9] Elinor's hyperbolic liberational

action." Janes, "On the Reception of Mary Wollstonecraft's *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 39, no. 2 (1978): 298.

8 Mascha Gemmeke, *Frances Burney and the Female Bildungsroman: An Interpretation of "The Wanderer: or, Female Difficulties"* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2003), 284. Doody observes that the narrative of Wollstonecraft's obsessive passion and pain resonated for Burney, who "must have been struck by the resemblances between herself and Wollstonecraft" (342); Doody refers to Burney's disappointed love for George Owen Cambridge. In 1817, Burney seems quite casual about a scandal tangentially connected to Wollstonecraft. She writes of meeting a daughter of Lord Kingston, "who had so singular a Trial & spontaneous acquittal" after killing Colonel Henry Gerard Fitzgerald, who had eloped with his daughter Mary Elizabeth King (*Journals*, 10:506). Another daughter, Margaret Jane King, had a long adulterous relationship with George William Tighe. Wollstonecraft was the beloved governess of the King sisters from 1786 to 1787.

9 Johnson, 167. James Thompson echoes Johnson when he observes that "Juliet's reticence, her restraint and control ... are set against Elinor's self-indulgence and resistance to restraint." Thompson, *Models of Value: Eighteenth-Century Political Economy and the Novel* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1996), 170. Thompson contextualizes the contrast within *The Wanderer*'s "conservative program of validating the aristocratic body" (168). Others who address the text's two-heroine strategy include Kate Chisholm, who points to Elinor "as the model of a free-thinking female ... the antithesis of Juliet's common sense," in *Fanny Burney: Her Life, 1752–1840* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1998), 232; and Frank, who establishes an analogy between *The Wanderer* and Walter Scott's *Waverley*, arguing that both novels depict contrasting pairs of women: "One is fired by revolutionary sentiment and the other aspires more or less to conservative models of domestic harmony" (430).

discourse, whether about the French Revolution, women's rights, or her own obsessive pursuit of Harleigh, constitutes a kind of caricature of Wollstonecraft's views on political and gender equality. Elinor ascribes her political awakening to the ideas propelling the French Revolution, declaring that "I owe to them that I dare hold myself intellectually, as well as personally, an equal member of the community; not a poor, degraded, however necessary appendant to it ... I owe to them the precious privilege, so shamefully new to mankind, of daring to think for myself."[10] Echoing Godwin, who in *Memoirs* characterizes the Revolution as a "fundamental shock to the human intellect through every region of the globe" (72),[11] Elinor describes a cosmic psychic upheaval as "the sublimity of Revolution [that] has given a greater shake to the minds of men, than to the kingdoms of the earth" (398). But unlike Godwin or Wollstonecraft, Elinor lacks the intellectual capacity to theorize this seismic shift. Where Wollstonecraft analyzes the pernicious effect of the "artful chain of despotism," of "hereditary possessions," and "moss-covered opinions,"[12] Elinor can only parade revolutionary sloganeering: "I hold no one thing in the world worth living for but liberty! And liberty, you know, has but two occupations, —plucking up and pulling down" (110). Elinor's facile and unreasoned version of revolutionary ideology serves not only to cancel her own claims to authority, but also to undermine revolutionary feminism itself.

Elinor's under-processed reflections on the French Revolution and her narcissistic appropriation of feminist ideology come close

10 Frances Burney, *The Wanderer; or, Female Difficulties*, ed. Margaret Anne Doody, Robert L. Mack, and Peter Sabor (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 173. References are to this edition.

11 Jan Wellington suggests that "her arguments concerning nationality and gender feed and reinforce each other: France's struggle to throw off its effeminate character inspired her to urge women to do the same." Wellington, "Blurring the Borders of Nation and Gender: Mary Wollstonecraft's Character (R)evolution," in *Rebellious Hearts: British Women Writers and the French Revolution*, ed. Adriana Craciun and Kari E. Lokke (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2001), 34. Joanne Cutting-Gray makes the same point about Elinor, whose "revolutionary ideas are based on a shift in the understanding of human nature and culture that arises from the French Revolution." Cutting-Gray, *Woman as "Nobody" and the Novels of Fanny Burney* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1992), 104.

12 Mary Wollstonecraft, *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*, ed. Carol H. Poston (New York: W.W. Norton, 1988), 56, 64, 113. Critiquing the connection between property and class wars, Wollstonecraft insists that "there must be more equality established in society, or morality will never gain ground" (141).

to what Cutting-Gray calls a "perversion" of Wollstonecraft.[13] Immediately after invoking Wollstonecraft and the "rights of human nature; to which the sexes equally and unalienably belong," Elinor abandons philosophy for autobiography: "I must spend my remaining moments in egotism; for all that I have time to attempt is my personal vindication" (175). Elinor interprets liberty as licence for unbridled desire and self-gratifying behaviour. At the same time that she credits political convulsions for freeing her from a loveless match—"But for the late glorious revolutionary shake given to the universe, I should, at this very moment, from mere cowardly conformity, be the wife of Dennis!" (154)—she imprisons herself in a single-minded pursuit of Harleigh. Just as Wollstonecraft "gave a loose to all the sensibilities of her nature" in wooing an increasingly evasive Imlay, as Godwin describes in *Memoirs* (89), Elinor glories in proclaiming her passion in hyperbolic language that can be punctuated only with a series of exclamation points: "Harleigh! dearest Harleigh! you are master of my soul! you are sovereign of my esteem, my admiration, my every feeling of tenderness, and every idea of perfection! —Accept, then, the warm homage of glowing heart, that beats but for you; and that, beating in vain, will beat no more!" (175). Elinor's speeches to Harleigh resemble Wollstonecraft's letters to Imlay not only in their unrestrained avowal of love and pain but also in their insistence that death is the only alternative to requited love. Her very first declaration, carefully stage-managed for maximum effect on both Harleigh and Juliet, includes as a crucial prop the dagger in its "shagrin case" (169; we note, of course, the pun on chagrin), a weapon she threatens to turn on herself until Juliet, carefully equivocal even under intense stress, swears "Ellis will never be his!" (183). Elinor's second suicide attempt, fully in the public gaze, is even more theatricalized and echoes, in her violent rejection of medical treatment, Wollstonecraft's fear that "my poor body will be insulted by an endeavour to recall my hated existence."[14] The suicide attempts that were perhaps the most scandalous part of Godwin's *Memoirs* are here recast, in exaggerated form, as the almost natural and inevitable consequence of Revolutionary Romanticism.[15]

13 Cutting-Gray, 106.

14 *The Works of Mary Wollstonecraft*, ed. Janet Todd and Marilyn Butler, 7 vols. (New York: New York University Press, 1989), 6:431.

15 Doody notes that "the suicide threat is a testimonial to Elinor's allegiance to heroic dogma and Romantic modernism. In her suicide attempt she is very

Of course, traces remain of Wollstonecraft's more intellectual and theorized analysis of the revolutionary agenda, even in the attenuated and discredited version embraced by Elinor. When she notes the crippling effects of custom on even those who have rejected its tyranny, when she passionately objects to a system that denies women the right to "[deliberate] upon the safety of the state of which she is a member, and the utility of the laws by which she must be governed" (174–77), Elinor speaks in the reasoned cadences of enlightened feminism.[16] But Elinor's political views remain hopelessly compromised by her somatic response to emotional stress. We remember that the conflict produced by her initial attraction to Harleigh while engaged to his brother had "threatened to cast her into a consumption," thus necessitating the journey into a France in the throes of "glorious confusion, and mad wonders" (155), much as Wollstonecraft had travelled to Paris in 1792, as Godwin notes, "to heal her distempered mind" following her infatuation with Fuseli (83). Disengaging from narrative identification with the passionate and rebellious heroines favoured by Wollstonecraft and Hays, Burney turns to a more circuitous strategy to encode Wollstonecraft's feminist agenda. While Wollstonecraft's scandalous life and opinions are embodied in the anti-heroine, the social critique articulated in her posthumous novel weaves through the heroine's trajectory, replicated and revised so that the wrongs inflicted upon the problematic Maria re-emerge as the difficulties endured by the estimable Juliet.[17]

visibly a disciple of Mary Wollstonecraft" (341). Johnson, too, finds that "in casting Elinor as a would-be suicide to unrequited love, Burney ... is both fictionalizing Wollstonecraft's self-immolating passion for Imlay as Godwin had divulged it in the *Memoirs* and emphasizing the inherence of prejudices about gender within the body itself" (183). Lawrence echoes these views when she says that Elinor's "melodramatic and suicidal nature evoke the more personal aspects of Wollstonecraft" (66).

16 Even her more irrational enthusiasms can appeal to readers. Julia Epstein argues that our "sympathy goes to Elinor Joddrel, who courageously envisions the Utopian possibilities embodied in a politics of equality and renewal." Epstein, *The Iron Pen: Frances Burney and the Politics of Women's Writing* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1989), 191. Gemmeke observes that "to give feminist speeches to a faulty character was a wonderful device to disarm critics ... and at the same time to ensure that these speeches would be attended to" (86–87). Janet Todd writes that "the feminism of Elinor provides an apt diagnosis of the miseries of the unprotected and ultimately impotent heroine." Todd, *The Sign of Angellica: Women, Writing, and Fiction, 1660–1800* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1989), 282.

17 Janes's account of attitudes towards Wollstonecraft is an apt description of readers' responses to Elinor: "The range of attitudes has remained much the

Both Maria and Juliet enter the text as they attempt to flee from appalling husbands who have married them for their money. George Venables, grasping at Maria's £5000, may be more duplicitous, but he is no less mercenary than the Commissary who baldly declares his motives, "swearing that, if six thousand pounds were to be got by marrying, he would marry without delay" (740). Moreover, having made an initial break for freedom, both women discover the impossibility of eluding hideous husbands, who have on their side not only law and social conventions, but also the power of the press, which can turn teeming London or provincial Salisbury into neighbourhoods of voluntary spies. In *Maria, or The Wrongs of Woman*, the eponymous heroine slips away from Venables after he offers to sell her sexual favours to a creditor, only to be thwarted in her bid for freedom by the array of social forces set against her.[18] The haberdasher who initially shelters her in recompense for past favours evicts her when she learns, in a newspaper advertisement, that "Maria Venables had, without any assignable cause, absconded from her husband; and any person harbouring her, was menaced with the utmost severity of the law" (1:159). The advertisement not only isolates Maria by threatening those who might be inclined to aid her, but also makes her a figure of scandal, exposing her domestic privacies to public scrutiny. Juliet, similarly proclaimed as having "ELOPED from her HUSBAND" (756), recoils from the disgrace of publicity, "nearly sinking under the horrour of pursuit, and the shame of eluding it. To find herself advertised in a newspaper! ... Perhaps to be described! —perhaps, named!" (663).[19]

same from the beginning of the nineteenth century to the last quarter of the twentieth. The most obvious shift has been the replacement of moral disapproval by psychological disapproval: the lady was not evil, but certainly very odd, and not to be imitated" (299).

18 Wollstonecraft, *Maria, or The Wrongs of Woman* (1798), in *Works of Mary Wollstonecraft*, vol. 1. References are to this edition.

19 The practice of publicizing errant wives was common enough by 1710 that Joseph Addison, in a send-up of the expanding genre of newspaper advertising, refers to wives among commodities hawked in print: "If a man would recover a wife or a Horse that is stolen or strayed; if he wants new Sermons, Electuaries, Asses Milk, or any Thing else, either for his body or his Mind, this is the Place to look for them in" (*Selections from the Tatler and the Spectator*, ed. Angus Ross [London: Penguin Books, 1988], 173). In *History of Advertising from the Earliest Times, Illustrated by Anecdotes, Curious Specimens*

Abandoning her refuge with Dame Goss in the wake of this discovery, she finds another temporary home, only to learn that "all the coachmen and postilions and inn-keepers were looking out for her; a handsome reward being offered, for sending tidings where she might be met with, to an attorney in London" (673). Like Godwin's Caleb Williams, the eloped wives become public fugitives marked by social stigma and targeted by bounty hunters. For Maria and Juliet, improved technologies of communication serve to trap and humiliate, exposing them to public notice and private mortification.

In both novels, the informal networks of social surveillance collude with legal institutions to criminalize women who are themselves victims of manifestly criminal husbands. The English society that enables these men to mark their wives as felons overlooks Venables's fraudulent financial practices and the Commissary's war crimes. These men are free to pursue and persecute their wives because, despite their own transgressions, they have legal title to the women's bodies. In a scene reminiscent of Lovelace's invasion of Clarissa's retreat at Hampstead, Venables enters Maria's place of refuge to take possession of his property. Like Lovelace, he enlists the sympathy of the landlady by performing the role of a much-wronged and patient husband, so that the landlady urges Maria "to go home with my husband, poor gentleman! to whom I had already occasioned sufficient vexation" (1:162). Both law and custom endorse Venables's plot to reclaim a wayward wife and to prosecute "with the utmost rigour" (1:163) anyone foolish enough to shelter her. As the landlady tells Maria, "you must not be angry if I am afraid to run any risk, when I know so well, that women have always the worst of it, when law is to decide" (1:165). While both *Maria* and *The Wanderer* address the

and Biographical Notes (London: Chatto and Windus, 1874; reprint, Gale Research, 1974), Henry Sampson quotes a "recent writer" who rails against irregular marriages in mid-eighteenth-century Britain: "The easy way in which the marriage bond was worn and broken through, is clearly indicated by the advertisements which absolutely crowd the public journals, from the accession of the house of Brunswick up to the time of the third George, of husbands warning the public not to trust their runaway wives" (177). Andrea Henderson points out that Juliet "functions as an analog of the commodity," so that "like well-advertised consumer goods (tellingly enough, at the end of the novel she is advertised in newspapers), she seems to bear an enormous potential." Henderson, "Burney's *The Wanderer* and Early-Nineteenth-Century Commodity Fetishism," *Nineteenth-Century Literature* 57, no. 1 (2002): 15, 20.

legal impotence of wives run to ground by proprietary husbands, the discrepancy in their heroines' responses points to a crucial difference in novelistic strategy. Unlike Maria, who vehemently resists her husband's rights, "declaring that no power on earth should force me back to his house" (1:162), Juliet loses both verbal and physical volition when confronted by the Commissary. Confident of his power, the Commissary repeatedly (in both French and English) challenges Juliet to deny his claim: "*Oses tu nier mes droits?* .... Dare you assert, I demand, that you are not my wife? Speak! Dare you?" Juliet does not dare and is rendered "mute ... prostrate ... in speechless agony ... bloodless with despair ... utterly silent ... a seeming spectre" (726–32). Whereas Maria rails against the system that would cancel her autonomy, legal patriarchal power erases Juliet's corporal materiality so that she becomes a voiceless, bloodless wraith.

The husbands who exert this power manifest overpowering, even grotesque corporality. After their marriage, Venables quickly degenerates into a drunken sot reminiscent of the squalid Strephon in the poem "The Gentleman's Study," physically repulsive to the fastidious Maria: "I think I now see him lolling in an arm-chair, in a dirty powdering gown, soiled linen, ungartered stockings, and tangled hair, yawning and stretching himself" (1:140). When Venables tracks her to her lodgings, she relates that "I shrunk from his touch, with an involuntary start, as I should have done from a noisome reptile, with more disgust than terror" (1:162). The Commissary's physical grossness fittingly signals brutality rather than degradation; he appears at the inn "dressed with disgusting negligence, and of an hideous countenance, yet wearing an air of ferocious authority" (726). Whereas Venables evokes reptilian cunning, the Commissary, arrested at the moment of his triumph over Juliet, transmogrifies into a rabid beast, "storming, raging, and swearing, his face distorted with fury, his under-jaw dropt, and his mouth foaming" (734). The husbands' bestiality serves to underscore the plight of wives who, as Maria passionately argues, must submit to "the rigid laws which enslave women" to these monsters (1:178).[20]

[20] Kristina Straub remarks of *The Wanderer* that "the sexual vulnerability and economic powerless imposed on the heroine by a forced marriage take on the nightmare quality of a recurrent horror." Straub, *Divided Fictions: Fanny Burney and Feminine Strategy* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1987), 185.

Burney's narrative about hunted wife and predatory husband links domestic and political tyranny, emphasizing the vulnerability of women to forces beyond their control.[21] The very fact of the Commissary's political affiliation dehumanizes him—he is, after all, an "agent of the inhuman Robespierre" (739)—and locates Juliet's personal travails within a historical context. Juliet is multiply victimized, by the Revolutionary upheaval that destroys documentary proof of her heritage and forces her to choose between a horrific marriage and her guardian's life, and by a conservative ideology that ties her to a monstrous man and a hateful identity—note that when the Commissary first confronts her in the inn, he confers on her the title "citoyenne" (726), thereby transforming (perhaps even obliterating) both her nationality and her rank. The marriage, for Juliet, represents not only a personal and sexual prison, but also the loss of the institutional markers that constitute her essential identity as English noblewoman. Burney's narrative construes Juliet's flight from a brutal husband as an escape from a regime responsible for the violent overthrow of a hierarchy that England holds dear. Ironically, that very hierarchy spurns and persecutes the heroine, thereby aligning itself with the political enemy across the Channel. When Lord Denmeath colludes with the Frenchman to capture Juliet, he betrays not only his niece, but also the values of his nation and class. Other guardians of English values may not be guilty of selling Juliet's body to Revolutionary France, but they validate both the Commissary and the political system he represents when they decline to rescue Juliet from her marital prison. Admiral Powel, despite his reflexive Francophobia, urges Juliet to return to France because "God forbid I should uphold a wife in running away from her lawful spouse, even though he be a Frenchman!," merely ensuring, as does Maria's uncle, that the unsavoury husband cannot appropriate her fortune (842–43). Harleigh, though "convinced that she must be the victim of a forced marriage," and insisting that Juliet remember that "no

21 Virginia Sapiro compares Maria's flight to that of Caleb Williams, noting that Wollstonecraft "has extended her political analysis very clearly into the family, identifying it as an extension of the state and the husband not just the patriarch in the little commonwealth, but its police as well." Sapiro, "Wollstonecraft, Feminism, and Democracy: 'Being Bastilled,'" in *Feminist Interpretations of Mary Wollstonecraft*, ed. Marie J. Falco (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1996), 41.

church ritual has ever sanctioned the sacrilegious violence," still feels "every sentiment of honour ... rise to oppose all violation of a rite, that, once performed, must be held sacred" (731, 778). Juliet's marriage vows, compromised by being extorted, secular, and in French, can be cancelled only by the convenient death of the Commissary.

These tacit endorsements of the Commissary's proprietary rights may be read as a reification of conservative gender ideology, but I suggest that Burney hints at a more radical feminist statement.[22] The superfluity of reasons to repudiate the marriage underscores the culpability of a system that criminalizes Juliet's attempts to escape it. If Maria's open disavowal of a repugnant marriage does not suffice to revaluate the strangling ties of matrimony, Juliet's desperate struggle to reclaim her body and identity from a multiply dishonourable alliance may urge a more sympathetic response to wronged wives. If the defiance of a woman who voluntarily entered a marriage because she "thought more of obtaining my freedom [from an uncongenial family], than of my lover" and who "acted with deliberation" when she became Darnford's mistress (1:134, 180) can be dismissed or condemned as sociopathic, perhaps the suffering of a female who remains resolutely chaste despite a coerced and possibly illegitimate marriage may soften hard hearts and inflexible institutions. Perhaps, unlike the judge who rejects Maria's justifications, society would become less opposed to "all innovation" and cease punishing the few "for the good of the whole" (1:181).[23] Burney's depiction of a woman almost literally "Bastilled" in marriage aims to persuade even those fearful of the consequences of Revolutionary liberationalism that virtuous women must be freed from the chains binding them to marriages that contravene an English sense of justice.

22 Johnson points out that "this surplus of explanation only confirms what the novel elsewhere challenges: a husband's right over the person of his wife," and reads this as further evidence that *The Wanderer* partakes of "the conservative design to discredit Wollstonecraftean arguments about women" (169, 171). Frank notes that "Juliet's husband is meticulously removed from the text so that she can marry Harleigh; however, having effaced his presence, Burney does nothing to remove the fact of the ongoing French Revolution that produced him" (429).

23 Maria Jerinic argues that Juliet "does not in any way benefit from her English identity or her existence on English soil" and that this "depiction of female suffering in England would have touched ... a nerve; it eroded a conception of Englishness forged over years of war." Jerinic, "Challenging Englishness: Frances Burney's *The Wanderer*," in *Rebellious Hearts*, 65, 69.

In constructing a plot about oppressive laws governing marriage, Burney replicates Wollstonecraft's representation of a woman enslaved by institutionalized patriarchy; by depicting a woman who patiently suffers under its constraints, Burney strategically offers social conservatism a way to sympathize with the wrongs of woman. Yet her narrative remains subject to the charge of cynical anti-feminism, in part because she does not offer an ameliorative possibility of feminine solidarity. Burney has been faulted for failing, either in conception or execution, to imagine the community of women that Wollstonecraft envisions in *Maria*, a community that transcends social boundaries and provides an alternative to the oppressive gender and class relations that victimize all women. As Susan Sniader Lanser and Syndy McMillen Conger have suggested, respectively, *Maria* "struggles to deconstruct the ideology that attaches women more firmly to men of their class than to one another across class boundaries" and looks towards "transforming mutual sympathy into a redemptive sisterhood so committed that it occasionally leads to civil disobedience and changing the declamation of sentimental self-absorption into the rhetoric of radical social protest."[24] *The Wanderer*, on the other hand, offers up a dystopian portrait of a bitterly fractured cohort of narcissistic women who "pretend to aid Juliet merely in order to call attention to themselves, to impress others, and to gain social advantage ... each one of these women in her self-indulgent isolation practices a form of rule that defies community."[25]

[24] Susan Sniader Lanser, *Fictions of Authority: Women Writers and Narrative Voice* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992), 231. Syndy McMillen Conger, *Mary Wollstonecraft and the Language of Sensibility* (Rutherford: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1994), 161. Carol H. Poston states that "at the end Jemima and Maria unite as sisters in a true womanly paradigm of community." Poston, "Mary Wollstonecraft and 'The Body Politic,'" in *Feminist Interpretations of Mary Wollstonecraft*, 102. See also Andrew McCann: "Wollstonecraft's last novel attempts to rework heterosentimental structures in order to displace them and ironically reveal their mystificatory character before a new notion of community; a space and a discursive praxis oriented to the interactive articulation of the experiential content of women's lives in the over-determined patriarchy of the period." McCann, *Cultural Politics in the 1790s: Literature, Radicalism and the Public Sphere* (Houndmills: Macmillan Press, 1999), 165.

[25] Cutting-Gray, 93. Johnson, citing Croker's and Hazlitt's attacks on *The Wanderer*, writes, "what is so peculiar about *The Wanderer* is that it is

I want here to complicate the dichotomy by rereading Wollstonecraft's female community so as to propose a closer alignment of the two texts. Certainly, *Maria* creates an ideological commonality by showing how women at all levels of society are vulnerable to male tyranny, but the novel also attests to the consequent corruption of women's characters and their concomitant collusion with a system that devalues women.[26] Maria's mother, married above her station to a man who "took care to remind her of the obligation, when she dared, in the slightest instance, to question his absolute authority," becomes complicit in the patriarchal system by idolizing her oldest son while devaluing her daughters; she also develops "an indolence of character, which prevented her paying much attention to our education," and eventually dies from the shock her "weakened mind" suffers from the darling son's neglect (1:124, 132). Maria's mother prefigures both Jane Austen's Lady Bertram, who abdicates all domestic responsibility after having "had the good luck to captivate Sir Thomas Bertram," and Charlotte Brontë's Mrs Reed, who dies of an "apoplectic attack" brought on by the suicide of the worthless son she has worshipped.[27] Other women whom Maria encounters manifest the same pattern of oppression and degradation of character. Jemima, whose narrative constitutes the most original and riveting portion of the novel, visits upon another poor and pregnant woman exactly the inhuman punishment she herself had suffered. Embittered

implicated in the same misogyny that damned it" (170). Both Doody and Tamara S. Wagner point to Elinor's anti-social and anti-feminist radicalism. According to Doody, Elinor is "not really democratic, for she expresses contempt for the common herd" (348). Wagner considers Elinor "deeply tainted by her eccentric and ... inherently selfish appropriation of such sympathies with the suppressed." Wagner, *Longing: Narratives of Nostalgia in the British Novel, 1740–1890* (Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 2004), 83. See also Straub, who argues that "Elinor's blind absorption in her acting also suggests, like the male-oriented behaviour of *Evelina*'s Mrs. Selwyn, the missed opportunity to refocus feminine energies on helping other women" (218).

26 The degradation of women's characters is a favourite theme in *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*. See, for example, Wollstonecraft's characterization of passive women: "After surveying the history of woman, I cannot help, agreeing with the severest satirist, considering the sex as the weakest as well as the most oppressed half of the species" (35).

27 Jane Austen, *Mansfield Park*, ed. R.W. Chapman (London: Oxford University Press, 1934), 3. Charlotte Brontë, *Jane Eyre*, ed. Q.D. Leavis (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1966), 252.

by the unremitting injustice that she endures, she becomes "a thief from principle" and ultimately takes the position of warden "though the condition of shutting my eyes and hardening my heart was annexed to it" (1:118–19). In Jemima's story, women are victimized by other women even more than by the men who seduce and abandon them, from the "virtuous mistress" who evicts Jemima's mother "in her very pangs of labour" (1:107), to the wicked stepmother who banishes her, to the wife of her seducer, who "scratched, kicked, and buffeted me, till she had exhausted her strength" (1:111). Even minor characters in the novel, like the maid who drugs Maria and kidnaps her child, posit a world in which women mistrust and abuse each other even while they are collectively oppressed by men. Maria herself, in the course of her charitable project to help Venables's illegitimate daughter, demonizes the object of her compassion—that "squalid object ... her eyes inflamed, with an indescribable look of cunning" (1:142). In the frequent episodes in which women wound each other, we see a version of the intra-gender oppression that Gemmeke cites when she says that the "furies" (Mrs Maple, Mrs Howel, and Mrs Ireton) in *The Wanderer* "make sure that Juliet's fate is even worse than their own, and that those who are dependent on them—Elinor, Selina, and Lady Aurora—fare no better than themselves."[28]

The Wanderer teems with women who persecute the heroine. The egregious sadism of Mrs Ireton and Mrs Howel shades into multiple registers of tyranny and exploitation as Juliet endeavours, again and again, to find refuge and support within feminine company. Her attempts to find security as a dependent among upper-class women expose her to insult and intimidation. Her brief venture into the relatively genteel occupation of music

[28] Gemmeke, 89. Johnson finds that Burney "treats women as scapegoats for men, and as a result averts radical social criticism ... the institutional power of patriarchy is spared direct criticism despite its ultimate responsibility" (178). James Thompson notes that "much of her [Juliet's] victimization occurs at the hands of jealous and competitive female characters" (173). Daniella Mallinik makes a similar point about the fragments pointing towards Wollstonecraft's conclusion that "while the projection of feminine community has frequently been viewed as the most viable, the novel persistently depicts women's security as threatened by predatory men (or even by other, predatory women)." Mallinik, "Sublime Heroism and *The Wrongs of Woman*: Passion, Reason, Agency," *European Romantic Review* 18, no. 1 (2007): 19.

instructor to other ladies turns into economic and social catastrophe as her pupils neglect to pay her and then desert her, "with cast-up eyes and hands ... as if contagion were in her vicinity" (254), when the mischievous Riley publicizes her mysterious past. Juliet's descent into lower-class professions such as milliner and mantua-maker brings her neither independence nor a community of fellow labourers; far from developing an empathic connection to the world of working women, Juliet "found that their notions of probity were as lax as those of their customers were of justice ... it soon became difficult to decide, which was the least congenial to the upright mind and pure morality ... the insolent, vain, unfeeling buyer, or the subtle, plausible, over-reaching seller" (427–28). Even the New Forest houses its own virago: the farmer's wife, incensed that Juliet has presented her daughter with the sluttish Debby Dyson's bonnet, expels her from her cottage home, "roughly refusing to hearken to any sort of explanation from Juliet," who must go forth "again ... a Wanderer" (702–3).[29]

Burney's narrative expands and fleshes out Wollstonecraft's representation of a world in which women must beware women

[29] Elizabeth Heckendorn Cook argues that although the novel "gestures briefly toward an emancipatory reading of the lives of women in the New Forest," the site represents not pastoral harmony but another piece of commercial society. Cook, "Crown Forests and Female Georgic: Frances Burney and the Reconstruction of Britishness," in *The Country and the City Revisited: England and the Politics of Culture, 1550–1850*, ed. Gerald Maclean, Donna Landry, Joseph P. Ward (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 205. Joyce Hemlow notes that "as a fugitive in the New Forest, [Juliet] encountered ... the heartlessness and the characteristic immoralities and vices of the countryside." Hemlow, *The History of Fanny Burney* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958), 341. Epstein notes the expansiveness of Burney's project when she says that the novel "traces and analyzes the lot of women in every class of life, from pampered aristocrat to comfortable bourgeoisie to respectable working woman to starving shopgirl to farmer's wife to rural cottager" (191). Doody points to the political ramifications of such range: "The detailed presentation of the life of the working woman was at the end of the century associated with liberal or radical woman writers ... Burney was, as her contemporaries knew, entering the domain of the radical women and in effect allying herself with them" (351). Jenny Batchelor acknowledges Burney's inclusiveness but finds no progressive ideology; on the contrary, "finding both fashionable and laboring women morally bankrupt, *The Wanderer* ultimately confirms the ideologies of gender and labour Juliet's experience and Arbe's comments might otherwise appear to question." Batchelor, *Dress, Distress and Desire: Clothing and the Female Body in Eighteenth-Century Literature* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 81.

and in which extraordinary obstacles confront a woman who seeks to forge ties based on gender. Yet *Maria* serves a prototype for a feminism based on gender loyalty while *The Wanderer*'s gestures towards feminine community-building are characterized as deeply compromised. How is it that Burney's text so signally fails to overcome the barriers to female solidarity that both novels so painstakingly (and painfully) portray? I suggest that the difference lies in Burney's refusal to provide the kind of moving biographical narratives that propel *The Wrongs of Woman*. Juliet's ordeal in England originates in the resolute silence to which she adheres even in the face of an almost continuous clamour for personal revelations. Everyone, it seems, longs to know her story, whether out of a need to place her in a comprehensible category, or to rationalize passionate attachment, or to satisfy the mere love of gossip. Juliet, of course, persists in her virtuous (or stubborn, depending on one's point of view) silence, thus effectively depriving herself of the kind of empathic bonding attained by Maria in Wollstonecraft's text. (Only Gabriella occupies the necessary position of confidante, but that female bond is familial and historical rather than produced by shared narratives.) Prohibited from soliciting sympathy by the fear of endangering the Bishop's life, Juliet cannot reach for the kind of communal vision constructed through multiple narratives in *Maria*.[30]

In *Maria*, mutual confidence leads to emotional and practical alliances. Jemima moves from stony indifference to "corresponding sympathy" when she sits, "every moment she could steal

[30] Juliet McMaster argues that Burney's heroines "must withhold explanations of their behavior, even when revelation is crucial to them, in order to shield some third party (always a male, and usually a brother)." McMaster, "The Silent Angel: Impediments to Female Expression in Frances Burney's Novels," *Studies in the Novel* 21, no. 3 (1989): 237. Although McMaster focuses on "the prohibition about expressing their love" (238), her analysis of silent heroines is pertinent to Juliet's failure to find community. Kortes-Papp, discussing Juliet's passivity, notes a paradox: on the one hand, "Juliet would not only have been in greater danger had she been outspoken, but she would not have been a very viable heroine"; on the other, "she is constantly in danger because of the caution she exercises to protect her identity and her precarious reputation" (103–4). Rose Marie Cutting connects reticence to social survival: "*The Wanderer* turns into a powerful study of the paranoia induced in women by the constant suspicion directed against them and the irreparable social "ruin" that confronted the woman who failed to maintain the appearance of perfect virtue." Cutting, "Defiant Women: The Growth of Feminism in Fanny Burney's Novels," *SEL* 17, no. 3 (1977): 529.

from observation, listening to the tale, which Maria was eager to relate with all the persuasive eloquence of grief" (1:87–88), and the tenderness of Maria and Darnford's conversation elicits in Jemima the compulsion to share her own sad tale (1:106). Similarly, the landlady who had begun by endorsing Venables's marital rights not only shifts her allegiance when Maria "raised her indignation, and excited her sympathy, by telling her briefly the truth," but is also impelled to describe her own calamitous marriage to a footman who bankrupts her twice and from whom she is freed only by his (unmourned) death (1:163–65). Maria's story resonates with both women, causing them to form a coalition of wronged women who are united by shared grievances.[31] But Maria herself seems less touched by the narratives offered by these lower-class women than they are by hers. Jemima's excruciating autobiography evokes in Maria a curious blend of individuated sympathy, generalized outrage, and a return to her own woes: "Thinking of Jemima's peculiar fate and her own, she was led to consider the oppressed state of women, and to lament that she had given birth to a daughter. Sleep fled from her eyelids, while she dwelt on the wretchedness of unprotected infancy, till sympathy with Jemima changed to agony, when it seemed probable that her own babe might even now be in the very state she so forcibly described" (1:120). Maria's response to Jemima's miseries verges on the manipulative. Recounting back to Jemima the other woman's

[31] See Conger, who notes that "each of the many interpolated tales of abused women she [Maria] hears drives home the same point — the selfish brutality of men" (166). Eleanor Ty aligns the reader with the auditors of these histories: "Wollstonecraft's last novel confines reader, writer, and narrator in a dungeonlike private madhouse. All three are forced to listen to story after story of injustice and atrocity told by various female voices." Ty, *Unsex'd Revolutionaries: Five Women Novelists of the 1790s* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993), 38. Mallinik extends the connection, suggesting that "sublime heroism takes its effect on the reader ... the example of Maria's or Jemima's moments of recognition regarding their own noble reasoning capacities elicits similar moments of self-awareness in the reader" (15). Janice H. Peritz objects to "a radical feminist reading of *Wrongs*," noting, as I do, that Maria "tends to universalize the resemblances she sees and to deploy them rhetorically to get what she wants"; using the theoretical work of Julia Kristeva and Eva Polowska Ziarek, Peritz proposes instead a discourse of "dissensus" that "exposes the unethical sociosymbolic order at issue in a universalizing and unifying discourse." Peritz, "'Necessarily Various': Body Politics and Discursive Ethics in Wollstonecraft's *The Wrongs of Woman*," *European Romantic Review* 21, no. 2 (2010): 256.

own "unmerited sufferings" as well as those of other abandoned girls, "perceiving the effect her conversation produced on the countenance of her guard," she presses her advantage; she vows to raise her daughter to regard Jemima "as her second mother ... as the prop of your age" (1:120), a promise that cannot but thrill a woman who "loved not her fellow-creatures, because she had never been beloved" (1:91). Maria may be genuinely touched by Jemima's narrative of unmitigated misery, but she remains alert to how tales of female suffering can be deployed to her own ends. The landlady in London barely touches Maria's heart. Having won her allegiance and her promise to procure her new lodgings, Maria feels more impatience than empathy in the role of auditor because the landlady "was in a talking mood, and proceeded to inform me how she had been used in the world ... I perceived that she would be very much mortified, were I not to attend to her tale ... though I wished her, as soon as possible, to go out in search of a new abode for me ... After uttering a few more complaints, I prevailed on my landlady to go out in quest of a lodging" (1:164–65). One cannot help but speculate that although Maria and her working-class allies are very thick, she is the thinnest of the two.[32]

I tease out these fault lines in female solidarity not to accuse either Maria or her creator of bad feminist faith, but to point to the ways in which both *The Wanderer* and *Maria* complicate the notion of idealized gender loyalty. If Maria—who has self-consciously divested herself of patriarchal mythologies, has taken the revolutionary position that women's harrowing lives can be attributed to sexual oppression, and has deployed her own history to win the friendship and help of other women—cannot adequately attend to the call for true community because her own needs overwhelm her, then Juliet, doubly disadvantaged by enforced reticence and ambiguous social status, certainly cannot effect the construction of one. Always in the position of disappointing those who want to extract her own story, Juliet is perforce barred from a community built on shared tales of woe.[33] If the ideological fantasy of these novels resides in an

[32] I am, of course, paraphrasing Austen's characterization of her friendship with Miss Fletcher. See *Jane Austen's Letters*, ed. Deirdre Le Faye (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 9.

[33] Anderson, in a discussion of Burney's thwarted dramatic career, writes that "her novels tackle a problem made literal in theatrical performance and implicit in

impossible Utopia of classless gender identification, then both texts articulate the failure of that vision. In *The Wanderer*, Burney shows the price of that failure. Because there is no theoretical or material community of women (except perhaps the convent in which Juliet and Gabriella were educated), women inhabit separate silos of pain—Elinor in her helpless obsession with Harleigh, Gabriella in an unhappy marriage to a man who views their child's death only as a dynastic misfortune, and Juliet herself in a quest for a female sanctuary that never materializes in any solid or stable incarnation.

Juliet does, of course, finally attain the refuge and community that has eluded her for the length of the novel, and critics have berated Burney for locating that community in the very patriarchal structure that has marginalized and tortured Juliet. Elizabeth Heckendorn Cook argues that "the novel's all-pervasive fantasy is that of a return to patriarchal protection," and Claire Harman finds that Juliet's "conventional exit from the world of 'female difficulties' is ... at odds with the implied message that a system which imposes such mental, economic and social restraints on women is a system ripe for change."[34] Juliet's escape from wandering isolation coincides with an aggressive re-establishment of patriarchal networks: she is recognized by a maternal uncle, acknowledged by her paternal relations, and claimed by a husband. *The Wanderer* thus conclusively offers patriarchal systems as the appropriate props for a woman's standing in society. But the novel

the social interaction surrounding a theatrical career: how a woman's feelings could or could not be publicly presented—staged" (630). Helen Thompson, reading *The Wanderer* as "a feminized anteriority of practice unacknowledged by Bourdieu," suggests that Juliet's "lack of depth reflects ... the oppressiveness of the patriarchal constraints that ... prohibit the wanderer from showing any number of feelings." Thompson, "How *The Wanderer* Works: Reading Burney and Bourdieu," *ELH* 68, no. 4 (2001): 967, 971. Crump connects Juliet's reticence to new theories of managing madness (325–30). Harman finds an analogy between Juliet's isolation and Burney's own lonely authorship: "Unlike Austen, Burney never achieved a sense of belonging to a mutually supportive professional 'body.'" Harman, *Fanny Burney, a Biography* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2001), 309. Nagle also contrasts Burney with Austen when he argues that "her real heroine wanders in isolation from the forms of community consistently engaged by Anne Elliot" (94).

34 Cook, 205. Harman, 312.

also asks us to notice how much patriarchy is required to support one woman. It takes the restoration of her patriarchal birthright and fortune, the discomfiture and defeat of Lord Denmeath, the safety of the Bishop, *and* the fortuitous execution of the French husband to bring Juliet to the safe harbour of domestic community. A patriarchal structure that depends on so many simultaneous strokes of good fortune in order to recuperate one of its own seems oddly enfeebled: uncles, brothers, and husbands can provide shelter from female difficulties, but only with great effort and much good luck.

Moreover, the patriarchal Utopia at the end of Juliet's wanderings can be maintained only by exercising strict vigilance against disruption. It is a community defined more by exclusion than by belonging. Although Mr and Mrs Harleigh extend hospitality to all "to whom Juliet had ever owed any good office," even paying an exorbitant price for Dash the dog (who, with canine wisdom, becomes his "new *master*'s inseparable companion" [emphasis added]), Harleigh Hall is closed to those deemed "persons of mind uncongenial to confidence"; so important is it to establish the principle of exclusivity, that the Admiral goes in person to inform the three furies of their pariah status (872). While Jemima, Maria, and Maria's daughter need only space and freedom for their little community to flourish, the complicated patriarchal edifice that Juliet enters when "partaking the name, the mansion, the fortune, and the fate of Harleigh" (870) can endure only by consciously and publicly banishing disruptive elements. Like Elizabeth and Darcy, who prohibit Wickham from entering "all the comfort and elegance of their family party at Pemberley,"[35] Juliet and Harleigh build a gated community. The patriarchal idyll to which Juliet retires can thrive only by policing the boundaries of domesticity and sealing off its treasured values from the historical and social forces raging beyond the pale.

The Wanderer reprises and reanimates Wollstonecraft's fictional attack on a sadistically unjust polity by representing the limits of both revolutionary romanticism and conservative patriarchy. While the narcissistic excesses of Elinor Joddrel distance the

[35] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, ed. R.W. Chapman (London: Oxford University Press, 1932), 384.

text from Wollstonecraft's problematic persona, Wollstonecraft's radical feminist novel accrues revitalized cultural capital when refracted through the grim lens of conservative ideology. Burney's reiteration of the wrongs of woman, articulated as pervasive cruelty visited upon virtuous femininity, makes revolutionary feminism both urgent and palatable to a patriarchal regime plagued by its own sense of futility and eager to construe itself as chivalrous defender of justice.

Tara Ghoshal Wallace is professor of English and Associate Dean for Graduate Studies in Arts and Sciences at The George Washington University. Her most recent book is *Imperial Characters: Home and Periphery in Eighteenth-Century Literature* (2010), and she is currently working on Walter Scott and monarchy.