1

Micro-D

National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Canadian Theses Service

Services des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

CANADIAN THESES

THÈSES CANADIENNES

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30.

**THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED**

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30.

**LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE**

ARTICULATIONS OF THE TEXT: REWRITING FRANCES BURNEY

by

CHRISTINE L. THORPE, B.A.

A thesis submitted to
the faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

Department of English

Carleton University

Ottawa, Ontario

October 31, 1986

© copyright

1986, Christine L. Thorpe

Permission has been granted to the National Library of Canada to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author (copyright owner) has reserved other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her written permission.

L'autorisation a été accordée à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur (titulaire du droit d'auteur) se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation écrite.

ISBN 0-315-35836-X

The undersigned recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies

and Research acceptance of the thesis

"ARTICULATIONS OF THE TEXT: REWRITING FRANCES BURNEY"

submitted by Christine L. Thorpe, B.A.

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for

the degree of Master of Arts

Thesis Supervisor

Chairman, Department of English

Carleton University

November , 1986

Abstract

The text articulates; we listen to what it says. The text is an articulation; we attend to the one(s) by whom it is spoken. But the text is also an articulated creature, a jointed thing. In these articulations, these joints, at these boundaries are found the primary sources of power for the text.

Chapter One focusses on internal sources of power, and rewrites Evelina in terms of its singular joint-work. In Chapter Two the focus broadens to include the other, and Evelina is seen to be generated in the presence of one to another. This focus is maintained in Chapter Three, where a portion of Burney's journals complementary to Evelina is rewritten according to the articulations of the one and the other. Chapter Four focusses on the boundary at which text and author meet, while rewriting both Evelina and journals as articulations of their author.

Grateful acknowledgement is made to Professor Ben Jones
for thoughtful supervision, advice and encouragement.

Table of Contents

Abstract	iii
Introduction	1
Chapter One: Configurations	8
Chapter Two: Alterities	36
Chapter Three: In the Eyes of the Other	61
Chapter Four: Author Speaking	85
Appendix: Some Terms	109
Works Cited	111

Introduction

A seductively simple approach to the journals of Frances Burney is to read them as a powerful rendition of her niche in history. Through the many volumes of these journals, which span the years 1768 to 1840, we learn about the gifted Burney family, encounter the London intelligentsia of the late eighteenth century, enter private scenes in the court of King George III, travel to France at the time of the Napoleonic wars, and explore the countryside and select families of England. Minute details and transcriptions of witty conversations, coupled with Burney's succinct and penetrating interpretive comments provide a lively and comprehensive reading of the historical period. Samuel Crisp--to whom many of the early journal-letters are addressed--says of the "scene of glory" Burney describes: "Your representation of it comes the nearest to the reality, and puts one in mind of one of those delicious dreams, that give one in sleep what is not to be attained in waking" (Early Diary, 2: 128). By reading the journals today, we are able to transport ourselves back over two hundred years of history into the society inhabited by Frances Burney.

Although this naive approach to the journals is possible, no astute reader will value the journals primarily as a historical transcript. Burney's rendition is more dramatic than historical and, as such, is an artistic representation rather than a transcription of events, people and places. Most commentators make this very observation but fail to examine the implications for readings of the journals

as literature. Even though they accept the non-identity of historical and represented worlds, they continue, paradoxically, to judge one by the standards of the other, allowing the two worlds to interpenetrate indiscriminately. A new critical perspective is required, one which can maintain the boundary between historical and represented worlds and also listen for the interaction which occurs at this boundary. When the represented world is held apart from its historical counterpart in this way, we will be able to savour its texture and discover the sources of its representational power.

Our project will be to dismantle some traditional critical approaches to Burney's journals as well as her novel, Evelina, and to substitute methods which will expose sources of power for the texts other than those commonly found. There are three generative sources most commonly cited. First, the social and historical context is seen as providing either a model for representation or a source of conflicts for the text to work out. Second, the author is considered to be the creative genius simultaneously behind and yet present in the text. Third, in the case of the novel, the subjective nature of the characters is seen as the source of the story and even the novel as a whole. Although the critical organization of the texts about these proposed sources permits a significant amount to be said, it also results in a great deal of confusion. Not only do historical and textual worlds become muddled, but the historical Burney who wrote long ago becomes confused with the textualized Burney who is represented in the journals. The similar journalizing propensities of Burney and Evelina further complicate matters by encouraging hasty identifications between Evelina and the two Burneys.

Furthermore, the subjective nature we attribute to Evelina can be placed at the generative centre of the novel, discouraging us from searching out the deeper sources of power to which Evelina's subjective nature is superficial.

In order to obviate this confusion and reach the deeper generative sources of the texts, we will rewrite Evelina and/or a manageable section of the earlier journals three times. Each rewriting will depend on the delineation of those features which are muddled together by one of the three common critical perspectives. To rewrite a text is perhaps audacious, but in this case no more so than to apply the techniques of more reverential commentary. Rewriting, in its fullest sense, implies a willingness to work against the intent of the text, where this direction promises revelations. Even the sort of commentary which claims to follow closely the intent of the text is a species of rewriting, for it inevitably changes values and emphasis, thereby altering the text. For example, Thomas Macaulay's strong rewriting of the Diary and Letters of Madame D'Arblay (in 1843, after publication began) manages to undermine Burney's intent and amplify the subtle intent of the journals. Burney intentionally represents herself as a dutiful, grateful and loving daughter, and Dr. Burney as a gifted musician who, although extremely busy, is an attentive father who has her best interests at heart. Nevertheless, what she represents as Dr. Burney's fond indulgence can easily be interpreted as parental negligence instead. The ease with which the reader makes this alternate interpretation is an effect of the text's intent, which is, in part, to accuse Dr. Burney of his faults as a father. Burney's intent is to laud her father, the text's to indict him.

In the course of recording the grief she feels at leaving her home and entering a life of servitude at court, Burney has only praise for her father, and never once blames him for causing this unhappy change. However, her dramatic rendering of this episode in her life firmly indicts Dr. Burney in the reader's mind as thoughtless, if not actually cruel. Macaulay amplifies the text's accusing voice as he rewrites the episode:

It is not strange indeed that an invitation to court should have caused a fluttering in the bosom of an inexperienced young woman. But it was the duty of the parent to watch over the child, and to show her that on one side were only infantine vanities and chimerical hopes, on the other liberty, peace of mind, affluence, social enjoyments, honorable distinctions. Strange to say, the only hesitation was on the part of Frances. Dr. Burney was transported out of himself with delight. Not such are the raptures of a Circassian father who has sold his pretty daughter well to a Turkish slave-merchant. Yet Dr. Burney was an amiable man, a man of good abilities, a man who had seen much of the world. But he seems to have thought that going to court was like going to heaven; that to see princes and princesses was a kind of beatific vision; that the exquisite felicity enjoyed by royal persons was not confined to themselves, but was communicated by some mysterious efflux or reflection to all who were suffered to stand at their toilettes, or to bear their trains. He overruled all his daughter's objections, and himself escorted her to her prison. The door closed. The key was turned. She, looking back with tender regret on all that she had left, and forward with anxiety and terror to the new life on which she was entering, was unable to speak or stand; and he went on his way homeward rejoicing in her marvellous prosperity. (361)

In rewriting, Macaulay preserves the circumstances but alters the values. He represents Dr. Burney as a villain, thereby undermining Burney's reverential intent.

If Macaulay did not stay as close as he does to the evidence provided by the text, his version would not be convincing, and we would suspect him of misinterpreting. As it is, his rewriting of this episode liberates the text from its author's intentions.

Mácaulay's success in thus serving the text is not uniform, for he is inclined to rewrite as much according to his own prejudice and the exercise of his wit, as according to the sources of power within the text. In other words, he often substitutes for the author's intent, his own dominating inclinations. Our task is to remain entirely at the service of the text. Although our rewriting will have occasion to contradict the intent of the texts as well as that of their author, it will be guided solely by conformity to the sources of generative power which it reveals.

In the first chapter we will rewrite Evelina according to the power generated by configurations of actants. In order to clear the way for this rewriting, we will purge the characters of pretensions to subjectivity, emphasize the textual world over its historical counterpart, and deny Burney's authorial presence entirely. The novelistic world can be conceived of as populated with textualized actants rather than life-like beings. The present use of the term "actant" differs from Greimas'. Here an actant is a discursive cluster, a proper name associated with a group of signifiers, which is the textual foundation, or framework of a character.

A further rewriting of Evelina will comprise the second chapter. Here the actants will be fleshed out into characters, and the guiding source of power will be confrontations with the other. The critical perspective will widen to focus on the boundaries at which characters, discourses and worlds come into dialogic interaction (in Bakhtin's sense of the term). The third chapter will rewrite four volumes of journals in the same way, with the Burney under consideration being the textualized version rather than the historical woman.

"Otherness," because of its pejorative sense, is not the most appropriate term for the critical parameter common to these chapters. We will use, instead, the term "alterity" which is borrowed from translators of Bakhtin.¹ In alterity, one comes into the presence of the other. To be in alterity is to balance in this presence between two states. The first state is that in which the other is perceived as an object in a world of one's own constituting. The second state is that in which one becomes an object in a world constituted by the other. To balance in alterity is to alternate between these two extremes, never overbalancing so far into either that consciousness of the potential of the opposite state to reassert itself is lost. Alterity may be a dangerous or uncomfortable position, but it is the only position from which effective inter-subjective contact takes place. Bakhtin uses the term in a rather more genial sense, associating it more closely with friendship than with altercation. Here it will be most closely associated with social exigency.

Finally, in the fourth chapter, the historical Burney will be considered as an author. Both Evelina and the journals will be rewritten as products of Burney's creative authorship. After vigorously excluding this generative source from consideration in previous chapters, we will turn to focus on it here. This rewriting will provide a critical re-assessment of Burney's creative power in the light of the demonstrated fact that the texts have other generative

¹ Katerina Clark and Michael Holquist, in Mikhail Bakhtin, translate the Russian drugost' by "alterity." See Appendix.

sources which may enable us to rewrite them more satisfactorily.

At this point, some justification for the choice of texts to be rewritten needs to be made. The four volumes of journals, hereafter referred to as "Journals," include the two volume Early Diary of Frances Burney (ED), and the first two volumes of the Diary and Letters of Madame D'Arblay (DL). The Journals spans the years 1768 to 1786, taking Burney from the age of sixteen through the writing and publishing of two novels, and to her immurement at court at age thirty-four. The structural similarities between the Journals and Evelina are very close. Both consist of lengthy journal-letters interspaced with shorter replies from the recipients of these letters. Even the stories they tell are similar. Evelina and Burney both emerge from childhood and obscurity into fashionable society. Evelina becomes known for her beauty and feminine virtue, while Burney becomes famous for writing Evelina and Cecilia. However, both "heroines" are guided in every particular by considerations of virtue, propriety and filial devotion. Both texts end with the heroine's social advancement by marriage: for the novel, Evelina's happy union with a lord, and for the Journals, the forced marriage in terms of which Burney describes her appointment to court. Nevertheless, neither ending is truly final. In later journals Burney escapes from her miserable imprisonment into a felicitous marriage. Moreover, although Evelina cannot be projected beyond the novel, we will have occasion to destabilize the happy ending by rewriting it. Even our rewriting is not an attempt to pronounce the last word on these texts. And so, we may now begin reopening Evelina to commentary.

Chapter One: Configurations

Evelina has been variously described as a product of Frances Burney's imagination, of Evelina's subjective nature and of the society it mirrors. These descriptions frequently denigrate this novel, for they are imported critical parameters which are unequal to the task of rewriting Evelina. Rather than specifying a new set of external parameters by which to measure Evelina, this chapter aims to search out the generative centres of the text, and to describe the ways in which it is self-productive. This new description will begin to rewrite Evelina in terms of the internal sources of power which generate it. Before the search is pursued, some misleading remnants of the old descriptions need to be cleared away.

I

The ghostly presence of Frances Burney hovers over Evelina, manifesting itself in the title, subtitle and preface, spooking the reader before s/he has a chance to establish direct contact with the text. This presence cannot be ignored. It must be actively denied, exorcised, in order that Evelina may be set free from Burney's posthumous grip. Only when we recognize and refuse the presence that would establish a reading of the text--in effect read it for us--can we truly read Evelina ourselves. To begin with, consider this hypothetical reading of the title and subtitle: "this text is about Evelina, who will neither bore you by being a mature woman, nor offend you by being improper; it is a novel, and yet is as true

to the world as history" (iii). In case the message is not perfectly clear, the preface specifies how the text is to be read:

To draw characters from nature, though not from life, and to mark the manners of the times, is the attempted plan of the following letters. For this purpose, a young female, educated in the most secluded retirement, makes, at the age of seventeen, her first appearance upon the great and busy stage of life; with a virtuous mind, a cultivated understanding, and a feeling heart, her ignorance of the forms, and inexperience in the manners, of the world, occasion all the little incidents which these volumes record, and which form the natural progression of the life of a young woman of obscure birth, but conspicuous beauty, for the first six months after her Entrance into the World. (7-8)

In other words, the "characters" are representatives of human nature, and the text is "a portrait of society, marking the "manners of the times." Furthermore, the narrative is guided by the "natural progression" of events. In this preface, Burney claims to identify the source of power in her novel, and that is its conformity to nature. As Toby Olshin documents:

Most studies of Evelina have tended to take Burney at her word and have elaborated on certain aspects of the work described in her statement: again and again, "the manners of the world" as they are portrayed in Evelina have been considered to be of major thematic importance. (29)

In his own study of the novel, Olshin locates Evelina's "obscure birth" rather than her "ignorance" and "inexperience" at the generative centre of the text. This centre is, nevertheless, also derived from Burney's description of her novel. He claims that "Evelina's search for her proper and ultimate family propels the book along" (30), and he traces her movement from one family to another until the proper context is found. This way of reading Evelina is certainly promising, but Olshin does not manage to deny Burney's presence entirely, and begins to measure the characters by their conformity

to nature. He ends by criticizing Evelina for her "lack of "emotional maturation" and moral development, as though she is indeed a subjective being with possibilities beyond the text (39). Let us avoid this trap and dispense entirely with Burney's presence in order to develop a reading of Evelina that searches out the actual sources of power which generate the text.

The temptation, when dealing with Evelina, is to train the critical beam on Evelina herself. As a result, Evelina separates from the text and takes on the aspect of a historical being, while other characters are relegated to a shadowy existence. Concomitantly, the plot becomes a contrived vehicle which carries Evelina from a father's protection to a husband's custody. The first move in this chapter is to step back from Evelina so that the critical light can play over the whole text. From this critical distance, the characters appear less as real people and more as actants gathered in various configurations on a field. No single arrangement subsumes the others; different patterns assemble and disintegrate. Our project is to study these patterns, to observe the ways in which actants are deployed in configurations which serve as the basic structure of the novel. Since there is no dominant configuration which controls deployment on the textual field, the search is not for an overall pattern in the text, but rather for the play of forces generated by each separate configuration.

II

Evelina holds the pivotal position in each configuration, and other positions are defined by their relationships to her,

usually familial relationships. On this basis, only one configuration seems possible, for a person has a single set of relatives. But Evelina the actant has various fathers, three distinct mothers, and a lover who is alternately brother and father. The actants exchange and even share positions on the field of deployment, thereby creating various configurations.

Initially, Evelina appears to be alone in the world. Her father, Sir John Belmont, refuses to acknowledge his paternity as well as his marriage to Evelina's mother, Caroline Evelyn. Caroline died of shame and grief at the time of Evelina's birth, after entrusting her baby to the care of her own foster-father, the saintly Reverend Villars. Evelina was brought up to be a gentlewoman, but to have expectations of neither wealth nor position. When we first meet her, she is seventeen and has seen nothing of the world other than Villars' country home, Berry Hill, and Lady Howard's country estate. In every respect but the biological, Villars is Evelina's father, therefore at least the paternal position is filled in the familial configuration. Evelina calls Villars her "more than father" (130), and dutifully treats him with all manner of filial love. Villars, unable to give Evelina his own name as a father would, gave her the closely related name of Anville. Now that he has educated and cherished her as his own, his one remaining wish is "to bestow her upon some worthy man" (127). This onerous transfer of ownership constitutes the text's narrative surface or plot. Originally owned (in both senses of the word) by Villars and disowned by Belmont, Evelina is eventually owned by this "real" father and given by both of them to Lord Orville.

Superficially, Belmont is the real father, Villars the surrogate father, and Orville the lover. But, as we have already seen, Villars fully occupies the position of father on a structural level, and Belmont's only fatherly act is to appear at Evelina's wedding. So the configuration now consists of Evelina standing between father and lover. Closer inspection reveals a more potent configuration, one in which the positions of father and lover converge and Evelina is torn between two men, each striving to be everything to her. The potency derives from a blurring of the father/lover distinction. Society insists that the positions of father and lover be mutually exclusive, and regards any trespassing of one into the other with horror and disgust. Therefore, any fading of the line dividing the two positions creates reaction, interest, power.

How are Villars and Orville brought into this ambiguous locus? The primary force is that of discourse: the two men speak the same language. Whether declaring their devotion to Evelina, or speaking formally to her in the third person, they sound identical. Countless speeches, when isolated from their contexts, are easily attributed to either man. Their elevated discourse is readily identifiable throughout the text. Evelina's verbal replies to Villars and Orville are also a part of this discourse. She speaks to Orville in the same language she uses when being formally respectful to Villars. Her declarations of love and longing are addressed solely to Villars (properly or improperly, we may ask), but since they belong to this same elevated discourse, similar declarations lurk potentially in her interchanges with Orville.

Orville's proprietary interest in Evelina has much of the

paternal in it. Indeed, Evelina describes Orville as a youthful version of Villars:

I sometimes imagine, that, when his youth is flown, his vivacity abated, and his life is devoted to retirement, he will, perhaps, resemble him whom I most love and honour. His present sweetness, politeness, and diffidence, seem to promise in future the same benevolence, dignity, and goodness. (72)

O Sir!--was there ever such another man as Lord Orville?
--Yes, one other now resides at Berry Hill! (320)

Whereas Orville, out of propriety, must restrain his passion for Evelina, Villars, as a father, is permitted to express himself in passionate speeches. He repeatedly indulges the fantasy of "closing these joy-streaming eyes in her presence, and breathing my last faint sighs in her arms," sounding much more like lover than father. With respect to Orville, Villars commands Evelina: "You must quit him!--his sight is baneful to your repose, his society is death to your future tranquility" (309). Evelina vacillates between the two men, directing her devotion either to one or to the other. When she temporarily renounces Orville, she writes to Villars:

But I will leave this place,--leave Lord Orville,--leave him, perhaps, for ever!--no matter; your counsel, your goodness, may teach me how to recover the peace and the serenity of which my unguarded folly has beguiled me. To you alone do I trust,--in you alone confide for every future hope I may form. (322)

Most fittingly, Villars is at the point of death when Evelina and Orville marry; there is a strong sense that Evelina is bequeathed by a father who leaves no space for a lover, to a husband who will be as much father as lover. The father/lover position is vacated by Villars and subsequently occupied by Orville. Therefore the configuration is not changed by Evelina's final letter to the dying Villars:

All is over, my dearest Sir, and the fate of your Evelina is decided! This morning with fearful joy, and trembling gratitude, she united herself for ever with the object of her dearest, her eternal affection!

I have time for no more; the chaise now waits which is to conduct me to dear Berry Hill, and to the arms of the best of men. (406)

Orville and Villars have struggled over the father/lover position, and the younger man has prevailed. Evelina and Orville take up their stations at Berry Hill, from whence Villars is ousted.

This configuration operates paradigmatically in the text, so insistence on its conformity with the syntagmatic rationale for the plot is either useless or damaging to an understanding of its power within the text. Mary Poovey notes the fatherly characteristics of Orville and the potential conflict between these two "fathers":

Evelina rarely discusses Orville's appeal--partly because for much of the novel she remains unaware of her growing affection for him and partly because most of her letters are written to the very man who most dreads losing his "daughter," Reverend Villars. (45)

But Poovey avoids our configuration, perhaps because she succumbs to the imperatives of Burney's presence. These imperatives insist on the basic "life-like" propriety of the story. A fatherly lover is therefore acceptable, but the inverse is unthinkable. According to the configurational paradigms of the text, Evelina does not gush over Orville to Villars because she can desire only one of them at a time; she must belong totally to one or the other. Poovey concludes that Evelina finally "seems only to have expanded her array of fathers" (46). This "neat resolution," as Poovey calls it, is not a deep structure of the text, but rather a camouflage of propriety for the energetic configurations that are at work.

Thus, although the syntagmatic dimension of the text makes the heart-warming claim that Villars, Belmont and Orville all eventually own Evelina, the paradigmatic impetus insists that, in the end, she belongs solely to Orville. We have already noticed that Belmont, who figures largely in the happy ending, is peripheral to this particular configuration. Even his name excludes him from the symmetry of Villars/Anville/Orville.

III

Belmont plays a more significant role in another configuration, one in which Evelina appears as little Evelyn, standing in for her dead mother. Caroline Evelyn was the offspring of an unsuitable marriage between gentlemanly Mr. Evelyn and a common, vulgar woman. Shortly after Caroline's birth, Mr. Evelyn died, leaving her in his former tutor's, Reverend Villars', care. Both Caroline and Evelina spent their childhood years in the felicitous environment of Berry Hill, with Villars as a father. When Caroline was eighteen, her mother, by this time Madame Duval, sent for her to Paris and tried to force her daughter into marriage with M. Duval's nephew. Caroline's response was to elope with the libertine Sir John Belmont. Since their marriage had been private, Belmont was able to destroy all evidence of it when his expectations of a fortune were disappointed. Caroline returned to Berry Hill, where she left the newborn Evelina and a letter addressed to Belmont.

This history is recounted in the early pages of the novel so that we are able to see Evelina's life repeating that of Caroline, step by step. Evelina leaves Berry Hill for a short visit to London

with the Mirvans of Howard Grove. Here she meets Madame Duval who has come to England to claim her. Neither in London nor at Howard Grove is Evelina able to escape this grandmother who repels her by a vulgar and insensitive nature, yet compels her filial obedience. Villars and the Mirvans are powerless to help Evelina; she must confront Madame Duval alone. So far Evelina's history is identical to Caroline's. Madame Duval even tries to force Evelina to marry her nephew. Moreover, the ardent Willoughby moves into Belmont's position as he waits for the opportunity to snatch Evelina away. Appropriately, both Willoughby and Belmont are baronets, and furthermore, Clement Willoughby's name suggests that he will be as inconstant to Evelina as Belmont was to Caroline. At this point, Evelina breaks with the pattern set by her mother: untempted by the wiles of scheming Willoughby, she triumphs over Madame Duval and returns to Berry Hill with her innocence intact and her name untarnished.

For several reasons, Evelina cannot remain at Berry Hill, but the novel openly admits only one reason: she needs to revive her declining health, which has been damaged along with her high esteem for Orville. Underneath this superficial explanation, the powers of each familial deployment work to move Evelina back into the world. In fact, the various configurations intersect and seem to align their forces at this Berry Hill interlude. In the case of the first deployment we considered, Evelina must leave Berry Hill because she cannot succeed in her struggle to cast the lover, Orville, out of her heart and replace him with the father, Villars; the father/lover locus is no longer satisfied with Villars, and seeks another occupant. In the case of the present configuration,

Evelina emerges from the necessity of repeating her mother's life, and must now leave in order to begin redeeming it.

So Evelina travels to Bristol Hotwells (and Clifton) where she eventually confronts Belmont. Villars makes it very clear to Evelina that Belmont's admission of paternity is not enough; Belmont must also acknowledge his marriage to Caroline:

No, my dear child, no; I will not quietly suffer the ashes of your mother to be treated with ignominy. Her spotless character shall be justified to the world,-- her marriage shall be acknowledged, and her child shall bear the name to which she is lawfully entitled. (337)

Thus the positions of mother and daughter are brought together. If Caroline and Evelina are not acknowledged together, Evelina's birth will be marked with the stigma of illegitimacy and she will fall below her former status as Anville. This fall would end her ability to redeem Caroline, for the one who redeems must be tried and found spotless.

When Belmont is first confronted by Evelina, he exclaims, "'My God! does Caroline Evelyn still live!'" (372). In their next interview he refers to her as the "'representative of my departed wife,'" (385) and various similar appellations which serve to bring mother and daughter into the same position. Belmont and Evelina are deployed so that the confrontation is actually one between Belmont and Caroline: "'I see, I see thou art her child! she lives --she breathes--she is present to my view!--Oh God, that she indeed lived!'" (372). Belmont swears he "'would crawl upon the earth . . . [if he could] by such submission, obtain the forgiveness of the representative of the most injured of women!'" (384). This forgiveness is explicit in Caroline's letter, which Evelina hands

to, and opens for, Belmont. Evelina, who carries Caroline's form in her countenance and Caroline's word in her hand, thus becomes Caroline. In this way, Caroline can be acknowledged, redeemed, and then can bestow her forgiveness. Mary Poovey also marks the way in which Evelina represents Caroline:

Speaking in the "name" and with the face of her mother, Evelina momentarily resolves the triangular relationship of father/mother/daughter into a simpler configuration. . . . Evelina is never so vividly presented as an autonomous, powerful individual as in this moment when--through no design of her own--she stands in for her wronged mother. (46-47)

When Evelina steps into Caroline's configurational position, she is invested with redemptive power which extends to Belmont as well as Caroline through the latter's posthumous forgiveness. As little (Caroline) Evelyn, Evelina resolves the unproductive triangle into a straight line of communication between dead Caroline and repentant Belmont. In this case, the linear configuration is the effective one.

IV

"Evelina" is also a diminutive of "Eve." This observation indicates a third configuration, one which draws upon Paradise Lost (PL), with Berry Hill appearing as the Garden. Here is Milton's Adam giving Eve reluctant permission to leave his side and venture out alone:

Seek not temptation then, which to avoid
Were better, and most likely if from mee
Thou sever not: Trial will come unsought.
.....
But if thou think, trial unsought may find
Us both securer than thus warn'd thou seem'st
Go; for thy stay, not free, absents thee more;
Go in thy native innocence, rely

On what thou hast of virtue, ~~summon~~ all,
 For God towards thee hath done his part, do thine.
 (PL, 9: 364-75)

As she leaves him, "Oft he to her his charge of quick return /
 Repeated, shee to him as oft engag'd / To be return'd by Noon
 . . ."(PL, 9: 399-401). Now, here is Villars' letter grudgingly
 permitting Evelina to travel to London:

To resist the urgency of entreaty, is a power which I
 have not yet acquired: I aim not at an authority which
 deprives you of liberty, yet I would fain guide myself
 by a prudence which should save me the pangs of repentance.
 Your impatience to fly to a place which your imagination
 has painted to you in colours so attractive, surprises
 me not; I have only to hope that the liveliness of your
 fancy may not deceive you: to refuse, would be to raise
 it still higher. To see my Evelina happy, is to see myself
 without a wish: go then, my child, and may that Heaven
 which alone can, direct, preserve, and strengthen you!
 To That, my love, will I daily offer prayers for your
 felicity; O may it guard, watch over you! defend you
 from danger, save you from distress, and keep vice as
 distant from your person as from your heart! And to Me,
 may it grant the ultimate blessing of closing these aged
 eyes in the arms of one so dear--so deservedly beloved!
 (25)

Villars and Evelina are re-enacting the scene of original
 differentiation, and it is from this scene that the configuration
 is energized. All the power of its primordial ancestor and of Milton's
 language are at its service. Villars, in Adam's position, is bound
 to give his consent to the separation, for that separation has
 already occurred with Eve(lina)'s desire. Therefore the consent
 is actually a sorrowful acknowledgment that the Adam/Eve unit is
 fragmenting, that the original differentiated state is no longer
 possible. Villars goes as far as linking the separation from Evelina
 with death (the threat of death hovers over Adam and Eve also):
 "she does not, even for a moment, quit my sight, without exciting
 apprehensions and terrors which almost overpower ~~me~~ But

she is the only tie I have upon earth . . ." (16).

There is a necessity propelling Evelina to London which requires anatomizing. On the most superficial level, we can say that if she did not leave there would be no story, but to say that is really to say nothing at all. Alternatively, we can reason as Villars does: first, refusal will only increase her desire, and second, his authority, being a derivative of God's authority, does not contradict liberty (free will). But there is a more powerful necessity at work which is generated by the Adam/Eve/Paradise configuration. Evelina must leave Berry Hill because Eve went to work in a separate part of the Garden, because Pandora was left alone with the box, because every one of Bluebeard's wives held the key to the forbidden door. She is propelled into a position where her virtue will be tested, the scene of temptation. Like Eve, she will have to trust in her "native innocence," or, as Villars puts it, in the "unsullied whiteness of [her] soul" (55).

Evelina actually leaves Villars in two stages, to each of which he must give his reluctant assent. Initially she goes to visit Howard Grove, a quiet country estate peopled with friends. We are given no evidence that Evelina has the least wish to leave Berry Hill. Her desire is as yet non-existent. But once at Howard Grove, she is tempted by an invitation to accompany the Mirvans to London. In the process of writing to Villars for his permission, she generates and excites her own desire by describing the imagined delights of the city. Thus her desire originates at Howard Grove. By Howard Grove's temporal placement between Berry Hill and London, the perfection of the original state is upheld: while safe with

Villars at Berry Hill, Evelina is uncontaminated by the desire that later infects her at Howard Grove.

At this point we must pause to justify talking of Evelina's desire while remaining true to our project of viewing her as an actant and not a subjective being. Innocence, artlessness, virtue and desire are all textual characteristics, that is, they are "named" in conjunction with "Evelina." The actual words are linked together. As long as we do not argue from this discursive cluster to possibilities for Evelina which reach beyond the text, Evelina is still securely an actant. She escapes from the text into subjectivity if we make claims like Mary Poovey's, that Evelina is "unaware of her growing affection" for Orville (45). There is no discourse in the text even capable of linking unconscious feelings with Evelina. Nevertheless, Poovey's statement does sound valid. The ring of truth is caused by imagining Evelina as a real person in the position of the actant Evelina. This process of fleshing out actants into subjects is part of the pleasure of reading, and is instigated by the text itself in ways that we will discuss in Chapter Two.

Now we can follow Evelina to the scene of temptation. The most fitting candidate for the position of serpent is Evelina's would-be seducer, Sir Clement Willoughby. Like Milton's serpent, he is on the spot when Eve(lina) is at her weakest, drawing her away from her companions, using no force other than his persuasive tongue. When Evelina is desperate to get away from her vulgar relations and join the Mirvans in the crowd, Willoughby appears at her side enquiring, "'Will you allow me the honour of conducting you?'" (94). Once he has isolated her from either party, he says, "'you

can have no objection to permitting me to see you safe home'" (95). She hesitates until her relatives are about to humiliate her by reclaiming her, and at this point Willoughby takes his opportunity. Evelina recounts the critical decision: "'Well,' cried I, hastily, 'if I must go--' I stopt, but Sir Clement immediately handed me into his chariot, called out 'Queen-Ann-street,' and then jumped in himself" (97). In similar fashion Eve is led away:

To whom the wily Adder, Blithe and glad.

 if thou accept
 My conduct, I can bring thee thither soon.
 Lead then, said Eve. Hee leading swiftly roll'd
 In tangles, and made intricate seem straight,
 To mischief swift. (PL, 9: 625-33)

Both innocent and credulous, Eve(lina) heeds the words of her tempter and is led into mischief. But whereas Eve becomes convinced by his further arguments, Evelina resists them: Willoughby's persuasive powers are wasted on her, and he kindles her anger instead of her desire. Her credulity leads her to temptation, but her virtue is proof against his flattering wiles. Nevertheless, she finds herself, on subsequent occasions, being rescued from awkward situations by Willoughby who thereupon resumes his presumptuous attentions, to the increasing resentment of the incorruptible Evelina.

Evelina returns to Villars in what ought to be triumph, but is actually despondency. Unknown to herself and to the reader, the serpent's poison is working in her, destroying her health, her peace of mind and her intimacy with Villars. She carries this infection in the form of an impertinent letter which is ascribed to Orville, but is actually the work of Willoughby. Paradoxically, her avoidance of Eve's error is not sufficient to afford her a

return to Paradise. Perhaps the Adam/Eve differentiation, with its beginning in desire, is unavoidable in any case. Even though Evelina eventually confesses her receipt of this letter to Villars and they are able to comfort one another somewhat, her health continues to decline and she is forced out into the world once more. The structure of Eve's return to Adam, her confession and their rapprochement underpins this Berry Hill episode. This structure establishes, on the level of the present configuration, the necessity of Evelina's banishment from her edenic home.

On this occasion Evelina goes but, not to the field of temptation, but to that of redemption. In the previous configuration she took Caroline's position in order to redeem her mother and father. Here she takes the position of a second Eve, tried yet unfallen, who will put an end to the misery brought on men by the "inabstinence of Eve" (PL, 11: 476). From this locus she redeems Orville by discovering his innocence of the festering letter. She also brings about a happy (or at least just) ending for the novel, an ending in which all the actants are distributed to satisfactory positions by the power of their relationships to her. Madame Duval and Willoughby leave for the Continent because they are excluded from any continuing relationship with Evelina: she has effectively vanquished them. The harmless Branghtons remain in their greasy quarters in an area of London to which Evelina will never again have to descend. Orville replaces Villars as Evelina's consort. Macartney becomes Evelina's brother, and is rewarded for his sufferings by a union with the gently disenfranchised Catherine who thereby becomes Evelina's sister. Louisa Larpent is recompensed for the loss of her brother's attention

by attaining the position of sister to Evelina. In sum, the whole world appears redeemed by Eve(lina)'s triumphant virtue and preserved innocence. Finally she returns to Berry Hill with Orville, thereby eliminating the division between Berry Hill and the world. In this way the configuration generates a satisfactory "happy ending."

V

Toby Olshin reads Evelina as the search for a suitable family context. Mary Poovey reads it as a story about fathers and daughters, and Catherine Parke reads it as a journey from Evelina's "I" to her "Name." Evelina could just as well be read as the search for a mother, with Mrs. Mirvan, Madame Duval and Mrs. Selwyn being the representative mothers. The problem with reading Evelina (or any text for that matter) as "the story of . . ." or "the search for . . ." is that the reading becomes another story laid over the original. This secondary story often generates enough energy from its own sources of power that it overrules the primary text. Parke's article is a good example of rewriting which takes off from Evelina with such energy that only tenuous contact is preserved by the end. The story is, according to Parke, one of Evelina's movement from her "I," which is described as "her life without the possibility for reflection, self-consciousness, and historically accurate self-knowledge," to her "Name," where she becomes "reflexively visible and audible" to herself (165-66). This story does, to a large extent, both coincide with and illuminate the text, but it is such a powerful story in its own right that it renders a new Evelina, an Evelina who learns an "esthetic paradigm for interpreting

her experience and translating that interpretation into coherent principles for action . . ." (169). In other words, Parke creates an Evelina who accomplishes the task set her by Villars: "you must learn not only to judge but to act for yourself" (Evelina 149). But Evelina is as socially awkward as ever at the end of the novel: she attends several dances and at all but one of them gets into a muddle over accepting and refusing dance partners. On the final occasion she simply refuses to dance at all. Her innocence continues to create problems for her: she feels impelled to talk with Macartney and yet is unable to arrange either a meeting or correspondence with any propriety. Thus, although Parke's story reads convincingly, it leads us away from Evelina.

Rather than imposing on the text a model of the search for a mother, we can study the four basic configurations in which the mother position is filled. In this way if, for example, the actants are at one point deployed in a pattern reminiscent of the Cinderella story, we will be able to perceive the energy generated from the points of contact without feeling obliged to rewrite Evelina as the Cinderella story it obviously is not. Initially Evelina is not motherless; she has a dead mother. She occupies the position of orphaned fairy tale princess whom the prince will bring to life. But, according to Jennifer Waelti-Walters, this life lasts only as long as the wedding: "To find out what role is in store for our little princess afterwards we must read the story again. We find her right at the beginning; she is the dead mother of the next heroine . . ." (80). Waelti-Walters identifies the dead mother as a model for female weakness, being "deprived of herself, . . .

victim of psychic execution" (81). As a result of this initial configuration, the fate of the dead mother hangs over Evelina. The physically dead Caroline provides a locus for the psychically dead mothers who have lost the power to create and define themselves. This locus is the destination of Louisa Larpent, who prides herself on being "'a sad weak creature'" (361). Her appreciative suitor replies:

'your Ladyship is merely delicate,--and devil take me if ever I had the least passion for an Amazon.'

'I have the honour to be quite of your Lordship's opinion,' said Mr. Lovel, looking maliciously at Mrs. Selwyn, 'for I have an insuperable aversion to strength, either of body or mind, in a female.'

'Faith, and so have I,' said Mr. Coverley; 'for ~~dead~~ I'd as soon see a woman chop wood, as hear her chop logic.'

'So would every man in his senses,' said Lord Merton; 'for a woman wants nothing to recommend her but beauty and good-nature; in every thing else she is either impertinent or unnatural. For my part, deuce take me if I ever wish to hear a word of sense from a woman as long as I live!' (361)

This dead mother locus is like a gaping pit in Evelina's path. Not only would the men of fashion tumble every woman into it, Villars himself locates Evelina there in his final blessing: 'And may'st thou, when thy glass is run, be sweetly but not bitterly mourned, by some remaining darling of thy affections,--some yet surviving Evelina!' (405).

When Evelina first travels to Howard Grove, she encounters a family which supplies the deficiencies of her own. The harmonious trio of Maria, Mrs. Mirvan and Lady Howard contrasts with the arrangement of Evelina, Caroline and Madame Duval. The Howard Grove family seems more appropriate to Evelina than her own. But this doubled trio configuration operates only superficially in the text. On

closer examination, it gives way to an arrangement in which Evelina is deployed between two mothers. These two are Mrs. Mirvan, who counts Maria and Evelina as her "two children" (23), and Madame Duval who, upon discovering Evelina, cries, "'Let me not lose my poor daughter a second time!'" (53). Mrs. Mirvan stands in the position of ideal mother and wife. She is kind, generous and decorous. She stays with Evelina in London to protect her from Madame Duval. When Evelina bursts into tears of embarrassment she cries, "'What is the matter, my dearest love?' . . . with the kindest concern" (47). Furthermore, her "principal study seems to be healing those wounds which her husband inflicts" (53). Opposite to "mamma Mirvan," stands Madame Duval, in the position of the evil god-mother who, in the fairy-tale, was not invited to the Christening and comes to plague the little girl. Her stance is a parody of the fairy god-mother's, as Evelina recounts:

she sent for me to her room, and said, with a look of great satisfaction, 'Come here, child, I've got some very good news to tell you: something that will surprise you, I'll give you my word, for you ha'n't no notion of it.'

I begged her to explain herself; and then, in terms which I cannot repeat, she said she had been considering what a shame it was, to see me such a poor country, shame-faced thing, when I ought to be a fine lady; and that she had long, and upon several occasions, blushed for me, though she must own the fault was none of mine: for nothing better could be expected from a girl who had been so immured. However, she assured me she had, at length, hit upon a plan, which would make quite another creature of me. (121)

Tender Evelina is terrified of this foreign, vigorously uncouth, vociferous mother who threatens to curse her with her "blessings."

These two mothers are flanked by supporting family members.

Maria Mirvan is the friend of Evelina's heart, who consoles and

and sympathizes with her. Captain Mirvan may be rough-hewn, but he is a relatively harmless fellow when his whims are indulged. At least he is properly defined as an Englishman, a husband and a father, unlike M. Du Bois who is Madame Duval's companion. Evelina finds it very odd that Madame Duval and M. Du Bois "should be so constantly together," and Captain Mirvan calls M. Du Bois her "grandmamma's beau" (73): in this way gentle allegations of impropriety are directed at Madame Duval, while Mrs. Mirvan appears a paragon. The rest of Madame Duval's family group is composed of the Branghtons, with whom Evelina cannot bear to be associated, they are so impossibly low-bred and vulgar. The two quarrelsome sisters, Biddy and Polly Branghton, take up positions in a subsidiary configuration where Madame Duval is their mother and Evelina their lovely step-sister. In this configuration Evelina endures the trials of Cinderella: she never manages to satisfy the demands of her wicked step-mother, Madame Duval, she is compared unfavourably by the family to her step-sisters, and she is plagued by the jealous attentions of these vulgar sisters to whom she is preferred by the suitors. Here is Madame Duval at her wickedest:

Her face was the colour of scarlet, and her eyes sparkled with fury. She came up to me with a hasty step, saying, 'So, Miss, you refuses to come to me, do you? And pray who are you, to dare to disobey me?' . . . 'I order you to follow me this moment, or else I'll make you repent it all your life.' (85-6)

This deployment calls for the addition of a handsome prince to carry Evelina away, and, sure enough, Lord Orville falls in love with her at the ball.

In this way, orphaned Evelina is expelled from paradise, then torn from an appropriate family group by her wicked step-mother,

and rescued in future by the princely Orville. The complementary configurations generate narrative strength, giving the story depth, by reference to ancestral arrangements, as well as a sense of necessary, purposeful direction. Thus the syntagmatic aspect of the narrative is supported by strong narrative paradigms. But there are disruptive as well as supportive paradigms at work. The configuration in which Evelina is torn between ideal mother and wicked step(god)-mother is actually subverted by a powerful, yet camouflaged, deployment. This subversion has repercussions throughout the novel.

To expose the configuration, let us begin by focussing on Mrs. Mirvan. She acts like the ideal mother, but she is totally ineffectual: she cannot solve Evelina's social predicament at the dance; in trying to soothe Madame Duval, she facilitates rather than pacifies her quarrels with the Captain; she tries and fails to protect Evelina from the incursions of Madame Duval. Mrs. Mirvan is utterly powerless to mother Evelina, as powerless as Caroline is. In fact, both women occupy the locus of dead mother, which we defined earlier as a model for female weakness. Mrs. Mirvan and Caroline are victims of the men they married. Madame Duval is, in this subversive arrangement, still deployed opposite to Mrs. Mirvan, this time in the position of tormented witch whose fate is to be persecuted and punished. Waelti-Walters defines the tormented witch:

The witch is dangerous; she has the will and the power to change her surroundings and all who find themselves within her realm. She is, therefore, to be feared because she is knowledgeable--like Circe she can turn men into animals--hence sexually knowledgeable, thus, by man's decree, depraved, and depravity is madness. Any woman, then, who speaks out, who thus has control over her situation and over her children's lives, who makes choices and

carries them out with authority, who recognises and fulfills her own desires, is almost certain to be found inconvenient by the men around her, and runs a great risk of being labelled eccentric or mad by them, as they attempt to diminish her sphere of influence, undermine her strength and confidence and prevent her speech from being heard. Return to the fairy tale: do not believe the witch, she will tell you lies or cast a spell on you. Her language is taboo. (81)

Can Madame Duval turn men into animals? She certainly seems to have this effect on Captain Mirvan, who takes up a position in this configuration as her tormentor. The contrast between the attitudes of Mrs. Mirvan and Madame Duval toward the Captain--the former placating and the latter confrontational--strengthens the polarization of the positions of dead mother and tormented witch.

The primary characteristic of the witch's power is sexually charged volition, of which Madame Duval possesses an abundance. Although a grandmother, she is tall, "dresses very gaily, paints very high, and the traces of former beauty are still very visible in her face" (53). M. Du Bois, the object of her desire, dances attendance on her and is even discovered breakfasting in her bedroom. Madame Duval never hesitates to take matters into her own hands. She intends, Evelina reports, to "have nothing to do with any round-about ways, but go openly and instantly to law, in order to prove my birth, real name, and title to the estate of my ancestors" (122). She knows what she wants and acts on her desires without hesitation. When crossed, she is not mildly forgiving, but instantly vengeful. This termagant's will is teamed with both resilience and pugnacity. Her gown may be spoiled by a soaking, but, according to the Captain, she herself is "weather-proof" (62). When Willoughby confronts her on her own territory he is unceremoniously ousted,

in Evelina's words:

I fancy he will not be very eager to repeat his visits, for I should imagine he has rarely, if ever, been before in a situation so awkward and disagreeable.

Madame Duval has been all spirits and exultation ever since he went, and only wishes Captain Mirvan would call, that she might do the same by him. (212)

There is nothing meek about Madame Duval; she is a perpetual source of vociferous energy.

The text attempts to silence Madame Duval by relegating her to the position of tormented witch. Both her discourse and her configurational locus are thereby devalued. Villars, the voice of patriarchal authority, passes judgement on her:

. . . what arguments, what persuasions can I make use of, with any prospect of success, to such a woman as Madame Duval? Her character, and the violence of her disposition, intimidate me from making the attempt: she is too ignorant for instruction, too obstinate for entreaty, and too weak for reason.

I will not, therefore, enter into a contest from which I have nothing to expect but altercation and impertinence. As soon would I discuss the effect of sound with the deaf, or the nature of colours with the blind, as aim at illuminating with conviction a mind so warped by prejudice, so much the slave of unwholy and illiberal passions. Unused as she is to controul, persuasion would but harden, and opposition incense her. (127)

In Villars' discourse, her knowledge becomes ignorance, her will, obstinacy, and her strength, weakness. Nevertheless, in the subversive economy, "this ungovernable woman" (163), is valued over Villars who must submit to her demands, her will. The only match for Madame Duval is the equally ungovernable Captain Mirvan, who persecutes her unmercifully, even physically abuses her. This persecution and abuse is presented in a humorous context, and even Evelina can hardly resist laughing at her grandmother's humiliations. We, as readers, are encouraged to laugh at Madame Duval, and the text

thereby suppresses her power. We laugh at her sexual energy because it is coupled with age and labelled unnatural. We laugh at her speech because it is impure. Finally, Madame Duval is an image of the tormented witch's madness:

She was sobbing, nay, almost roaring, and in the utmost agony of rage and terror. . . . Almost bursting with passion, she pointed to her feet, and with frightful violence, she actually beat the ground with her hands. (147)

Thus the text both generates and restrains the powers of Madame Duval. The subversive economy values her energy, while the dominating economy silences her voice. The configuration in which Madame Duval occupies the positive pole and Mrs. Mirvan the negative pole is simultaneously dominated by and subversive to its polar opposite. In the former, Evelina is attached to a vigorous mother, but the latter turns this mother into a social pariah who is useless, if not actually dangerous, to Evelina.

Nevertheless, the power generated by the subversive configuration is not wasted, rather it is channeled into Evelina's next family arrangement, that in which Mrs. Selwyn takes up the post of mother. Here is Evelina's initial assessment:

She is extremely clever; her understanding, indeed, may be called masculine; but, unfortunately, her manners deserve the same epithet; for, in studying to acquire the knowledge of the other sex, she has lost all the softness of her own. In regard to myself, however, as I have neither courage nor inclination to argue with her, I have never been personally hurt at her want of gentleness. . . . She is not a favourite with Mr. Villars, who has often been disgusted at her unmerciful propensity to satire: but his anxiety that I should try the effect of the Bristol waters, overcame his dislike of committing me to her care. (269)

Evelina is less than pleased with Mrs. Selwyn and repeatedly wishes to be with Mrs. Mirvan instead. Mrs. Selwyn enjoys herself with

the company and lets poor Evelina stand neglected. At other times she teases Evelina so unmercifully that Evelina avoids talking to her. In short, she discomfits Evelina. Still, Mrs. Selwyn protects Evelina much better than either Mrs. Mirvan or Villars is able to. She scatters the impertinent young men with her sharp tongue, and, for all her seeming neglect, arrives on the spot whenever Evelina requires a chaperone. Evelina cannot keep one secret from Mrs. Selwyn's penetration, and soon this lady takes upon herself the task of presenting Evelina to Sir John Belmont. This she accomplishes directly with excellent results. Her single sentence letter to Belmont, in which she announces her intention of waiting on him contrasts with Lady Howard's elegant missive which brings only a curt refusal. Mrs. Selwyn is even more direct in her approach to Belmont than Madame Duval planned to be: she simply confronts him with Evelina. In every respect Mrs. Selwyn is the effective mother: she shields Evelina only from real dangers; she is powerful, astute and worldly-wise; she takes Evelina in hand and facilitates the resolution of all her difficulties.

Mrs. Selwyn occupies an intermediary locus between the poles of dead mother and tormented witch. She has all the potentially positive qualities of the latter, along with the insight and social position of the former. She provides a locus for female power which is neither invaded by madness nor cut off from social reception. Waelti-Walters' description of the potential witch and the response she evokes precisely describes Mrs. Selwyn and the men's response to her. A lesser woman would, as the result of such treatment, either dwindle to a safely dead mother like Mrs. Mirvan or be turned

into a mad witch like Madame Duval. Lord Merton sums up the masculine assessment of the powerful mother: "'Whoever she is, I wish she would mind her own affairs: I don't know what the devil a woman lives for after thirty: she is only in other folks way'" (275).

This Evelina/Mrs. Selwyn configuration generates within the text an unacknowledged alternative to the fate that closure designs for Evelina. Closure puts Evelina into the locus of ideal(ly dead) mother, thereby sealing the happy ending. But Mrs. Selwyn attends the wedding: her presence will not be denied. Appropriately, Clement Willoughby is a great favourite with Mrs. Selwyn. He may be a nuisance to Evelina, but is no longer a serious threat in the latter part of the novel, the part in which Mrs. Selwyn takes over as Evelina's mother. Although closure insists on his removal from Evelina's newly redeemed world, there lingers a sense that Mrs. Selwyn's world, the world of the powerful mother, would have a place for him. Thus Mrs. Selwyn offers her daughter Evelina an alternative locus to that offered by Caroline and Mrs. Mirvan, a destiny which makes the "married happily ever after" position of closure seem anticlimactic. Closure does not entirely silence the powerful mother.

Of the configurations we have considered, which provides the generative centre of the text? There is no single generative centre, for the sources of power are distributed among the paradigmatic structures or configurations which underlie the text's surface. These structures include several we have not even touched upon, for example, the set of configurations in which Evelina is paired with a brother. In this set, Macartney moves from the position of Catherine's lover to that of her brother, and finally ends up

as her lover again after establishing himself as Evelina's brother. Meanwhile, Orville suspects Macartney of being Evelina's lover, and proceeds to claim for himself the position of her brother. This spot he precariously maintains until he is assured that Macartney is actually Evelina's brother, whereupon he advances to the position of lover. The brother/lover interplay serves much the same function as that between father and lover. Some configurations complement one another, while others are openly contradictory, even to the point of contradicting the syntagmatic logic of the narrative. These contradictions are best accepted, rather than denied or smoothed over. Attempting to align the configurations into an overall pattern would be seeking to create a new story to tell the story of Evelina, and would necessarily exclude any sources of power which did not conform to the new story. The present rewriting of Evelina is not such a new story. This rewriting will remain open to additions and modifications in order that it may be corrected for any deviation from service to Evelina.

Chapter Two: Alterities

We have been concentrating on Evelina as a product of the power generated by configurations of actants. Generative as this power may be, it leaves the characters as discursive clusters which very little resemble our reading experience of them. Evelina more closely resembles the representation of a living person than a fully textualized actant. From what source does she derive this character? Evelina the subjective being is generated from Evelina the discursive cluster by the power of alterity. This power of alterity distributes to each actant its measure of subjectivity and, perhaps more significantly, also serves as a substrate for discourses and their interaction. Alterity is the state of one consciousness being present to another, either visually or verbally. Outside alterity, silence pervades, for the source of discourse is the effort of one making himself or herself present to another, presenting and representing. The text (Evelina) is a discursive event which represents discursive events (letters). These, in turn, represent the discursive events (conversations) which engage the discursive cluster (Evelina). The state of alterity which generates the various levels of discursive events also presents to us, as readers, a speaking, writing, engaging subject, Evelina.

I

At the beginning of the text, Evelina is, in a sense, unborn. She is undifferentiated from Villars in the womb of his property,

Berry Hill. Naturally, Evelina does not speak. Villars tells her story, represents her as he presents her to Lady Howard. Once at Howard Grove, Evelina is a differentiated being and her opening word, her first letter to Villars, is at the same time a statement of difference and an attempt to bridge that difference. She acknowledges her desire for a week's stay in London, but worries over the independence of her desire from Villars'. She asks him, "ought I to form a wish that has not your sanction?" (24). Knowing that Villars abhors the idea of the proposed trip, Evelina nevertheless persists in her petition and in her contradictory assurances that she will "cheerfully acquiesce" (24) to his desire. Evelina is manifestly torn between her emergent desire which implies a difference from Villars, and the secure comfort of her former undifferentiated state: "a petition implies a want,--and have you left me one? No, indeed" (23). Once she leaves Berry Hill, Evelina enters into alterity with respect to Villars and her former unborn self. Over eighty percent of the novel is composed of her letters to Villars--her journal to her former self--by means of which she strives to annul the difference, stem the desire which floods into the gap. She longs to return to her original state, mistakenly assuming that physical distance is all that separates her from Villars. She frequently complains that she cannot tell what to wish and hope for, or how to act and judge without his counsel. But her return to Berry Hill is not a return to the womb, for she is permanently differentiated from Villars. During this episode Evelina and Villars must learn to communicate, to speak to one another. The learning process is agonizing to both of them, nevertheless Villars is eventually able

to ask Evelina her secret, and she is able to confide in him. Because they are unavoidably separate and their closest approximation to intimacy is in alterity, they must speak. To be enveloped in one another's arms--the state they both repeatedly envision--is no longer possible, for the gap between them persists. Even though they manage to establish confidence verbally, Evelina's desire continues to well up between them, and she must turn out again to the world to satisfy what she cannot stem.

Alterity is the primal source of discourse. The word arises in the gap which is the failure of the presence of one consciousness to another to produce identity. Discourse sounds across presence from one to another. It is cognizant of others, other words, other meanings, other discourses. It is constantly aware of and communicating with another. This other is encountered both as an atmosphere of alien words surrounding the signified, and as the anticipated response from an alien belief system. In both cases, the other--encountered in alterity--generates and shapes discourse. Each world view or ideology or belief system is articulated in a certain discourse which patrols the borders of its system with other systems, constantly defending and explaining, interacting with the other border-guarding discourses to which it is present. If the definition of alterity is extended to include the presence of discourses to one another, alterity can be thought of as the specific ground of novelistic discourse. The novel is an orchestration of discourses and their associated belief systems brought into alterity so that they may speak to one another. Their speaking is novelistic discourse.

Character speech is not to be naively identified with the discourses which "speak" ideologies. A certain actant may be aligned with a specific discourse or ideological position, but more commonly the speech given to actants blends several, perhaps conflicting, discourses. Once an actant is coupled with one or more discourses, s/he obtains a belief system, and in so doing comes more fully to represent a living being. If the discourse is single, the resultant character will be a predictable object. A character who speaks from various discursive positions, however, will attain the semblance of subjectivity and possibilities beyond the text.

Lovel, for instance, is a caricature, an object of our derision. His speech derives wholly from the discourse of fashion, and he can be summed up in the word "fop." When we ask, "what would Lovel do if . . . ?", we answer without hesitation: Lovel is entirely predictable. He has no possibilities beyond the text. Evelina, on the other hand, does seem to have possibilities. She seldom knows how to act, what to think or what to want. In none of these things is she predictable. At times she uses the rapturous voice of amazement, which belongs to the discourse of natural innocence, to describe London. But after disagreeable adventures she speaks out of the puritanical discourse, in which London is the home of vice and varity. When Willoughby treats Evelina with offensive impropriety, she inveighs against his wickedness, nevertheless, she is glad to see him at Howard Grove where she describes his visit as enlivening the house and diverting her otherwise fearful thoughts. We are never quite sure from which of these two discursive positions Evelina will react to him. In the puritanical discourse

Willoughby is a reprobate; in the discourse of natural innocence he is an amusing and clever young man. By virtue of her different discursive positions, Evelina's speech and character gain complexity. In this way she appears to obtain a measure of subjectivity and possibilities beyond the text.

Various discourses thread through the novel and are spoken by a variety of characters. The sheer multiplicity of discourse is less interesting, however, than the interaction between discourses. The altercation between puritanical and fashionable discourses provides an example in which the value-modifying effects of opposed discursive positions are particularly clear. The puritanical discourse is most forcefully spoken by Villars, who pronounces London "the general harbour of fraud and of folly, of duplicity and of impertinence" (116). It is in an exaggeration of this discourse that Captain Mirvan scorns the entertainments of London and announces that "he won't stay here to be smoked with filth any longer" (39). As for the fashionable inhabitants, "the men, as they call themselves, are no better than monkeys; and as to the women, why they are mere dolls" (113). In Villars' use of the puritanical discourse, Evelina's beauty is a dangerous thing, for it will bring her improper attentions. To the Captain, her beauty is of even less value: "she's good white and red, to be sure; but what of that?--I'll warrant she'll moulder away as fast as her neighbours'" (112). This puritanical discourse which (in less exaggerated form) is often appropriated by Evelina and Mrs. Selwyn, finds its partner in alterity in the discourse of fashion. Feminine beauty and the public amusements of London are highly valued in the fashionable discourse: to Lord

Merton, Ranelagh is "'the divinest place under heaven'" (110), while Evelina is a "'lovely creature'" among the other women who are also "'heavenly living objects'" (106-07). The two discourses argue with one another from the beginning to the end of the novel, as they pass through the speech of various characters.

Both discourses are equally subject to comic exaggeration, yet the puritanical is favoured over the fashionable at every turn of their argument simply because of its appropriation by Reverend Villars. As a character, Villars is rarely in alterity. He is largely conscious of another as an apprehended object rather than as a responsive consciousness. He thinks of others, but is regardless of their views of himself. To Villars, Madame Duval is thoroughly objectified as a vulgar and ungovernable woman. "In regard to her opinion of me, [he proclaims] I am more sorry than surprised at her determined blindness" (55): he does not feel the need to defend himself against her execrations. Villars stands to one side of the action, making judgements and thereby rendering the people Evelina describes mere objects in a world constituted through his evaluating gaze. Even with respect to Evelina, Villars is seldom in alterity. She is an object of his attention, and he rarely admits her returning gaze. As the result of this removal from alterity, Villars' speech becomes authoritative. The world carries on, and Villars passes judgement on it. Removal from alterity has much the same effect on discourse in general: when the potentially reactive presence of another, whether it be consciousness or discourse, is denied, alterity vanishes and discourse becomes the final word. In this case, however, only Villars' speech is lifted out of alterity,

not the whole of every discourse he articulates. Villars' speech, being authoritative, cannot be answered. Therefore, when he shares a particular discursive position with other actants, the speech of these actants is validated or lent authority, at least for the time they share this position.

Such is the case with Captain Mirvan's participation in the puritanical discourse. The bit of authority he gains from this source, combined with the effects of diversity in discourse, save him from Lovel's fate of becoming a mere laughing-stock. The comparison made between Evelina's characters and those in Congreve's Love for Love is very apt. Captain Mirvan indirectly identifies Lovel with Mr. Tattle, and Lovel responds by pairing the Captain with Ben. Mr. Tattle is a standard stage fop, single-voiced, and entirely objectified as is Lovel. Ben, on the other hand, is an innovation. He is a strange hybrid consisting of nine parts seafaring lout--close cousin to the country lout--and one part sensible fellow. The one part derives, as in the case of Captain Mirvan, from his occasional participation in a discourse "approved" by the text.

Authoritative as it is, Villars' voice is not identical with the voice of closure, which is the text's final word. In Evelina, the discourse of closure seems to arise in the alterity of subordinate discourses rather than to be imposed by an external authority. This discourse can best be described as an aesthetic which declares art to be the meeting-place of beauty, utility, morality and nature. Orville is the spokesman of this aesthetic, and Evelina is its embodiment. When she visits Cox's clockwork museum, Evelina declares it to be "'very fine, and very ingenious . . . and yet--I don't

know how it is,--but I seem to miss something'" (76). Orville is able to find the words to express her feeling:

'The mechanism . . . is wonderfully ingenious: I am sorry it is turned to no better account; but its purport is so frivolous, so very remote from all aim at instruction or utility, that the sight of so fine a shew, only leaves a regret on the mind, that so much work, and so much ingenuity, should not be better bestowed.' (110)

The debate over the worth of Cox's museum is entered into by six characters speaking in a least three different discourses. Orville's word is final, not only because it argues its case most persuasively, but because the other views on the subject are devalued by comic exaggeration. For example, Captain Mirvan also disapproves of the museum, but on grossly utilitarian grounds: he can see no use for pineapples he cannot eat. Of course Madame Duval is delighted with the clockwork display: "'I declare, in all my travels, I never see nothing eleganter'" (77).

All the amusements of London are rated according to how well they conform to the prevailing aesthetic. They must be beautiful, instructive (useful and moral) and take the shape of nature. Evelina describes Vauxhall in these words:

The garden is very pretty, but too formal; I should have been better pleased, had it consisted less of straight walks, where

Grove nods at grove, each alley has its brother. (193)

That this appeal to nature leans for authority on Pope is significant, for Pope is the celebrated eighteenth-century exponent of this aesthetic. Perhaps the discourse of closure owes its victory over its opponents in part to external authority, after all. The necessity of morality's inclusion in the aesthetic is emphasized by the suggestions made by several characters for the basis of a contest between Merton

and Coverley. Ought they to compete in bowing, by drawing straws, over who can repeat the longest Horace ode, or follow Evelina's advice and compose extempore couplets? The latter seems to provide the most aesthetic basis, for it is the production of art. But Orville's suggestion transcends all the others by virtue of its moral force: he would have the winner of the prize money be the man who brings "the worthiest object with whom to share it!" (292). Thus Pope's aesthetic is completed with the conjunction of art and morality. This example demonstrates concisely the way in which the discourse of closure is generated in alterity, in the confrontation between contradictory discourses. Notice that the aesthetic is completed in neither Evelina's nor Orville's speech alone, but rather in their combination.

Although Evelina's speech frequently partakes of this aesthetic discourse, she is more fully its object than its mouthpiece. Beauty and nature are perfectly harmonized in her person. She is the object and Orville the connoisseur. Her natural beauty is highlighted by comparison with the artifice of a painted Madame Duval and the affectation of a languid Lady Louisa. Evelina's utility is not as apparent as her natural beauty. She is certainly useful in her rescue of Macartney from suicide and then penury, but she repeatedly wishes to be of more use to him. This wish is fulfilled by the end of the novel, but it requires the conjoined efforts of Evelina and Orville. The constraints of propriety prevent Evelina from acting alone on her generous impulse to be useful to others. So Evelina's ability to be a moral agent is limited. Her closest approach to moral agency is in her redemption of Belmont, but even here

she is supported until the very last moment by Mrs. Selwyn, and then the forgiveness she bestows is more Caroline's than her own. Although beauty, nature, utility and morality are harmonized in Evelina, the last two are hedged about by propriety and will presumably be released into action when Evelina is united with Orville. Evelina has the impulse to become a moral agent, and Orville provides her with the means.

As Evelina is the focus of the aesthetic discourse, so is Evelina itself. Being a work of art, it conforms to the standards of beauty and nature. As an ambitious work of art--according to the standards of its discourse of closure--it is also useful and moral, for it instructs young ladies in social decorum and provides a model of virtue in action. The discourse of closure is omnipresent in Evelina. We have seen how it is generated in alterity, but also how it is a privileged discourse from the start. Its opponents are objectified and trivialized in comic exaggeration. It is supported by authority from within the novel (Villars') and from outside the novel (Pope's). In triumphing over other discourses, this aesthetic simultaneously becomes the voice of closure and severs itself from alterity. Closure is all that remains for a text when alterity no longer obtains. Fortunately, closure is as impossible an ideal as silence and the end of alterity. The supposedly defeated discourses altercate endlessly despite the efforts of closure. They may pass through the text and be appropriated by it, but they have neither their origins nor their ends in it. The text is ultimately powerless to silence the altercation of discourses or to resolve the differences of ideologies.

II

We have been considering the generation of characters, of discourse and of the novel itself in alterity. Evelina is not singular in these respects. Nevertheless, one striking feature of Evelina is the wealth of images of alterity it contains. If we look closely at this abundance we will see that the novel does not so much contain images of alterity, but that it is formed or controlled by its representation of alterity. When Evelina first goes to London, she enters into alterity with the world as well as with Villars and her former self. Throughout the novel she meets, defeats, appropriates, or is appropriated by the other. This struggle in alterity is a source of power for the novel.

Evelina confidently sets out to observe the world, but to her confusion she discovers that the world is observing her. She fancies a London willing to be an object in her world, but finds herself becoming an object in the world of others. Her letters to Villars are her defense against the other, for in them she reasserts her assaulted ability to observe, to place others in a world of her own making. She takes the words of others and represents these words in her own, thereby gaining power over them. When Evelina speaks--or writes--she is a world-constituting subject; when she is silent, she is an object in the other's world. In London Evelina's first reaction to alterity, to consciousness of another's gaze, is speechless embarrassment. If she could only say who she is or to whom she belongs, she could deflect the curiosity of others. But there she is, a lovely marriageable girl, with no apparent

social status. The others do not know how she ought to be treated, and she is powerless to tell them.

Alterity is a dangerous state for Evelina to be in because of the others who would appropriate her both verbally and physically into their worlds. Madame Duval is Evelina's first serious opponent. That Madame Duval considers Evelina her property is evident from the start: Villars "may send it [Evelina] to Paris, where she will 'properly provide for it'" (12, emphasis added). Madame Duval later forms a plan to abduct Evelina, and announces her intentions to Mr. Branghton in front of Evelina, completely ignoring Evelina's presence. She speaks as though she plans to take a piece of furniture to Paris, not her grand-daughter. Her attempts at appropriation are verbal as well as physical. She describes Evelina as "a poor country, shame-faced thing" (121), a description which Evelina must reject in order to save herself from becoming an object in Madame Duval's world.

Evelina has little difficulty in fending off this adversary in alterity, even though she does not engage verbally with her. Open altercation is precluded by propriety, which insists that she be polite and obedient to her grandmother. Evelina soon notices, however, that Madame Duval never really listens to her. Although Evelina is initially in alterity with respect to Madame Duval, the alterity is strictly one-sided: Evelina is conscious of both Madame Duval's world-constituting power and herself as a potential object in the alien world thus constituted; but Madame Duval is conscious of Evelina only as a mute, powerless object with no potential to be otherwise. Because Evelina is merely an object

to her, Madame Duval cannot be in alterity with respect to her grand-daughter. Evelina's defense is to objectify Madame Duval by rendering her ridiculous in her letters. Madame Duval's words, which once served her own intention, thereby come to serve Evelina's intention instead, under Evelina's representation. Her defense is effective, even though it is indirect, and Madame Duval is soon an object in Evelina's world. Of course, Madame Duval, never having encountered Evelina in alterity, is entirely unaware of her own object-ness.

A more serious threat to Evelina's subjectivity comes from Willoughby's efforts to appropriate her. His verbal efforts are very flattering: he offers Evelina the position of his "'dearest angel'" (98) and his "'dearest creature'" (197), while inviting her to step into the charming description he creates for her. His "fine speeches" (97) initially silence Evelina, but she soon recognizes her danger and sharply interrupts him. After several encounters of this sort with Willoughby, Evelina is able to verbally repulse him with ease and even some wit: when he demands "'one word, one look of approbation'" from Evelina in return for a favour, she replies, "with half a laugh, 'You know so well, Sir Clement, the value of the favours you confer, that it would be superfluous for me to point it out'" (156). In this way she refuses to be appropriated into his world either verbally or physically--Willoughby's persuasion usually has a physical component. Nevertheless, Evelina does not reduce Willoughby to an object in her world. Her journalizing may enable her to objectify him temporarily as she fixes him in her own speech, but she resumes her consciousness of his opinion

of her at every meeting. Each of these meetings is a meeting in alterity for Evelina, and finally Willoughby is drawn in so that the alterity becomes reciprocal. Between Evelina and Madame Duval the one-sided alterity is cancelled when Evelina objectifies her opponent. Between Evelina and Willoughby, however, the struggle continues until Willoughby is forced to allow Evelina more than object, status, to acknowledge her presence in alterity. His parting letter to her demonstrates his desire to appear well in her eyes, and admits Evelina's subjective power to constitute a world in which he is an object of her apprehension (387-88).

Evelina's vulnerability is intensified by her undefined social status. The others are free to make of her what they will, while she remains silent about, but conscious of, her noble parentage. For this reason, how she appears to others is of particular consequence to Evelina. Her ignorance of London social life leads her to appear variously as arrogant (in laughing at Lovel), presumptuous (in borrowing Orville's carriage), wanton (in taking the long way home in Willoughby's company), affected (in her rapid attention to the opera) and foolish (in confusion and silence). Her social context further compromises her appearance. With the Mirvans she appears as a country parson's daughter, then sinks by degrees as she is seen to belong to Madame Duval, the Branghtons, Mr. Smith and finally the two prostitutes who march her around Marybone Gardens. Evelina encounters the other--before whom she appears--as a mirror. In this way she is conscious of her various appearances and, to a certain extent, able to make corrections. At some facets of the other she simply directs her gaze, penetrating the mirror,

and discerning the object behind it. She treats all her vulgar relations in this way, ceasing to care how she appears to them. More worthy facets of the other alternate between mirror and transparency: such is Willoughby's state. The most worthy other is Orville, whom Evelina encounters most frequently as a mirror.

To survive in alterity, Evelina must choose carefully which facets of the other to accept as mirrors and which to render transparent by her returning gaze. At the same time, she must accept no facet as absolutely either mirror or transparency. This balancing act is the essence of Evelina's interactions with the world. One of Evelina's first mistakes is to err on the side of transparency when she first encounters Lovel. His appearance is so ridiculous and affected that she laughs in his face, never considering his opinion of her. As she reflects later, "I had much better have cried then" (33), for Lovel persecutes her maliciously and gives her "the mortifying appellation" of "'toad-eater'" in revenge (294-95). A safer choice for transparency are the Branghtons, for they are neither as fashionable nor as influential as Lovel is. Nevertheless, Evelina is wise enough to retain her gravity before them. When they turn their objectifying gaze on her, she does not contradict the verbal image they present to her. Instead, she uses their own words against them and shatters the image by means of the irony with which she represents it in her journal:

This ceremony over [deciding who is the tallest], the young ladies began, very freely, to examine my dress, and to interrogate me concerning it. 'This apron's your own work, I suppose, Miss? but these sprigs a'n't in fashion now. Pray, if it is not impertinent, what might you give a yard for this lutestring?--Do you make your own caps, Miss?--' and many other questions equally interesting and well-bred. (69)

Henceforth the contempt of the Branghtons is merely diverting to Evelina, for she rejects their capacity to mirror. They create a contemptuous image of her, and she responds, not by mirroring back to them their vulgarity, but by treating them respectfully while representing their vulgarity on paper.

Evelina's response to Lord Orville is quite the opposite. He is so predominantly a mirror to Evelina, that she is incapacitated with self-consciousness before him. She sees herself as an object, becoming reduced to corporeality in his gaze. She is scarcely able to represent him in her letters, so silencing is his influence. Only insofar as she can answer him or represent him does she retain her position in alterity with respect to Orville. He joins her in alterity, but on the occasions when they simultaneously accept each other as mirrors, the overpowering self-consciousness renders communication virtually impossible. They stammer and stop, then try again to speak. Actually, they are trying to re-enter the alterity from which the mirror images are separating them. Eventually they achieve easy communication, a sort of equilibrium in alterity, a compromise between mirror and transparency.

Confrontations in alterity are so abundant in Evelina that the novel can be rewritten as a series of these altercations. Sometimes the battle is won upon the mere appearance of the victor: for example, Willoughby's triumph over the previously assertive Mr. Smith,

who no sooner saw me [Evelina] addressed by Sir Clement, than, retreating aloof from the company, he seemed to lose at once all his happy self-sufficiency and conceit; looking now at the baronet, now at himself, surveying, with sorrowful eyes, his dress, struck with his air, his gestures, his easy gaiety; he gazed at him with envious admiration, and seemed himself, with conscious inferiority, to shrink into nothing. (201-02)

Mr. Smith tries "to recover his consequence" verbally, and is at once "sensibly mortified" by Willoughby's ironical remarks (203): a visual is succeeded by a verbal skirmish. Often the altercations are entirely verbal and the victories less swift and complete. Willoughby loses an extended match with Madame Duval, but cannot bear to be the object of the witnesses' laughter:

having no answer ready for Madame Duval, he hastily stalked towards Mr. Smith and young Branghton, and sternly demanded what they laughed at?

Struck by the air of importance which he assumed, and alarmed at the angry tone of voice, their merriment ceased, as instantaneously as if it had been directed by clock-work, and they stared foolishly, now at him, now at each other, without making any answer but a simple 'Nothing, Sir!' (211-12)

Characters in the novel seem to be continually assessing their appearance in the eyes of the other, and attempting to rise in the other's estimation or defend their positions by engaging in these verbal altercations. When Evelina is rewritten in these terms, a seething aggression becomes evident beneath the polite forms of verbal interaction. The Branghtons--vulgar tradespeople--are kept in their social slot by the superior verbal powers of their "betters." The social climbers venture into alterity, but are forced back into object-ness when they encounter in their opponents a mirror which they cannot penetrate. Willoughby forces on Mr. Smith and the Branghtons his image of them, and they "shrink into nothing."

The elaborate confrontations of Captain Mirvan with Madame Duval are of rather a different sort. The Captain never comes close to entering alterity. He objectifies every being he confronts, and is not interested in anyone's view of himself. Of course, not every being accepts the position of object in his world, but they

refuse his gaze privately, for there is no hope of prevailing upon the Captain to accept even a moment of object-ness. No one is a mirror to Captain Mirvan, especially not Madame Duval. This lady conducts herself in a parody of balancing in alterity. Her vision is so warped that she is unable to recognize herself in the mirroring other, and her gaze is inadequate to the task of penetrating others. She courts the opinion of others, and considers herself a success when she is actually a failure. As a result, there is no putting her in her place. She looks into the mirror of the other, where she exists as an object of ridicule, and sees a fine lady. She is pleased with her public execution of a minuet, but Evelina reports that her grandmother "danced in a style so uncommon; her age, her showy dress, and an unusual quantity of rouge, drew upon her the eyes, and, I fear, the derision of the whole company" (222).

When Madame Duval directs her gaze at others, she objectifies them to her own satisfaction, but the world she constitutes with this cock-eyed power bears little relationship to that constituted by others. Her interpretation of appearances is often perfectly absurd. She would marry young Branghton to Evelina, and herself to M. Du Bois, contrary to the inclinations of her intended victims. She miscasts the virtuous Reverend Villars as a villain, Evelina as a grateful dependent and the two prostitutes who terrorize Evelina as fine ladies. This lack of penetration renders Madame Duval powerless to make others accept the places she assigns them in her world. Madame Duval eagerly advances into what she considers to be the presence of Captain Mirvan. She is determined to make him see her as a fine lady, but remains totally unaware that the Captain has

so totally objectified her in his view, that she has no chance of impressing him in any way.

As a gentleman of means, the Captain has no need of alterity. He can afford to behave exactly as he pleases, regardless of others. If his womenfolk think "ill of him . . . they have too much prudence to make it known" (38). His position is unassailable. This refusal to regard the other as mirror is not tenable for any woman. She must exist in alterity, forever conscious of the power of others to reduce her to mere corporeality. As Villars cautions, "nothing is so delicate as the reputation of a woman: it is, at once, the most beautiful and most brittle of all human things" (164). After Evelina's unpleasant experiences in alterity in London, we might think she would be content to be ignored during her stay at Clifton, but she complains, "flattered as I am by the attention of Lord Orville, it is not very comfortable to be neglected by every body else" (293-94).

Since I, as Mr. Lovel says, am Nobody, I seated myself quietly at a window, and not very near to any body: Lord Merton, Mr. Coverley, and Mr. Lovel, severally passed me without notice, and surrounded the chair of Lady Louisa Larpen. I must own, I was rather piqued at the behaviour of Mr. Lovel, as he had formerly known me. It is true, I most sincerely despise his foppery, yet I should be grieved to meet with contempt from any body I felt extremely uncomfortable in finding myself considered in a light very inferior to the rest of the company. (289)

The fashionable set who stared so at Evelina in London have decided she is an ignorant country miss, unworthy of their regard. Her witty and ironic constructions in her letters may render her a worthy subject to her readers, but her awkward silences and social gaucherie have not improved her ambiguous social status in the

eyes of the world. After Evelina promises Villars that she will refuse Orville's attentions, she sits, "disregarded, silent, and melancholy, . . . like a cypher, whom to nobody belonging, by nobody was noticed" (340).

Despite her complaints, Evelina is not so much disregarded, as the object of improper attentions. On one occasion, Orville must rescue her from Merton's clutches, but this directly physical threat is less serious than those which compromise her appearance in the eyes of others. Willoughby arrives at Clifton, and assiduously courts Evelina's presence so that she may appear as his own. Macartney, whose intentions are wholly honourable, also compromises Evelina by seeming to make assignations with her. He then draws the eyes of all to her by circulating a poem in which she is represented as the fairest of the ladies. Evelina is simply not surviving in alterity. She may be able to push back the object-ness to which she is reduced in the eyes of others by re-creating her subjectivity on paper, but she is singularly unable to represent herself directly in alterity. She is supported by Orville through her troubles, but even he is made uneasy by the light in which she sometimes appears.

Finally Mrs. Selwyn, who has teased all Evelina's secrets from her, takes the situation in hand. She explains Evelina's delicate situation to Orville (Evelina could never have represented herself so fully to him), thrusts her into Belmont's presence, and sees that Evelina speedily discards "Xville" and "Belmont" for "Orville." On the surface it may seem that Evelina's innocence incapacitates her for defending herself in alterity. If innocence were the source

of this deficiency, surely she would be equally unable to reconstitute her world through her journalizing. Actually, propriety, more than innocence, is Evelina's downfall. The observance of propriety prevents her from representing herself to others. Propriety forbids self-assertion, therefore Evelina cannot teach the world to know who she is (as Madame Duval would say) with any propriety. No amount of worldly knowledge could have eased Evelina's transition from Anville to Orville.

Mrs. Selwyn's place in the novel is not confined to providing the appropriate solution to Evelina's dilemma: she speaks on her own behalf. If we examine her verbal encounters in terms of alterity, we will find that she represents a sort of alter-ideal to that of Evelina/Orville. Unlike the latter, Mrs. Selwyn is not aesthetically pleasing: while Evelina and Orville will live to please others, Mrs. Selwyn will please herself. She gives herself great pleasure as she flays her verbal opponents with satirical wit. Her speech holds up a mirror to all the world and, after stripping away pretensions, petrifies whoever ventures an encounter. Unlike Captain Mirvan, Mrs. Selwyn is perfectly aware of what others think of her, and this awareness keeps her in alterity, enabling her to act effectively. Evelina/Orville pales before this image of vigour. Mrs. Selwyn is a thread which threatens to unravel closure. The discourse of closure is epitomized by the conjunction of Evelina and Orville, the perfect harmony of beauty and utility, nature and morality. But this conjunction is predicated upon the presence of Mrs. Selwyn.

III

The novel ends when Evelina marries Orville, when she has no further need for journalizing (letter-writing), when she returns to her original silence. Her adventures in alterity are over, and hereafter the name of "Orville" will confront the world for her. Evelina, who lacks a surname, and Orville, who lacks a Christian name, become one Evelina Orville. They are no longer in alterity with one another because their mutual presence has collapsed into identity. We are now left with the question of how Evelina confronts a world of readers. Even this meeting can be interpreted as a meeting in alterity. The text is, on one hand, a transparency through which the reader sees an amusing, well-wrought artifact. In this sense the novel is an object of apprehension. When we considered Evelina as a product of the configurations of its actants, we were objectifying the novel by rejecting the text's mirroring power in favour of textual transparency. But, on the other hand, the moment we allow the actants to be characters which represent some measure of subjectivity, we begin to glimpse the text as a mirror. We, as readers, then accept that we have something in common with the characters, and, by extension, that the text has the power to reflect back to us an image of ourselves. To the extent that this image is strange and unfamiliar, it has power to make us see ourselves anew, to defamiliarize the everyday world and make visible that which was obscured by common usage. Of course, we do not want to regard the text entirely as a mirror, for that would be to surrender ourselves as objects in the mirror-world generated--or represented--by the

text. The ideal way of meeting the text is in alterity. In this way the represented world of the text becomes present to (as opposed to identified with) the everyday world. Through alterity--this presence--the two worlds speak to one another, and this speech is the discourse which is the text. When the text becomes purely transparent, the world it generates does not articulate with the everyday world, and the text falls silent. When it becomes solely a mirror, the world it generates is identified with the everyday world and, for lack of presence, the text again falls silent.

We are now in a position to consider how existing commentaries manage to encounter Evelina. Toby Olshin considers Evelina to be morally shallow (38), and Eva Figes finds her "attitude, priggish and snobbish" (37). Both critics are here encountering the text as a mirror which reflects an inadequate image of female perfection. They are judging this image (Evelina) by the standards of the everyday world, not the governing structures of the novel's world. Evelina would, in our world, be insufferable, but she is not and never was in any but Evelina's world. Olshin's analysis of Evelina is divided into two parts: the first he calls "interpretation," and the second, "evaluation." The interpretation penetrates the text, rendering it transparent, and enabling us to apprehend the novel as Evelina's search for an appropriate social context. The evaluation, however, looks into the textual mirror and disapproves of the lack of identification between the artistic image and the everyday world. The necessity for disapproval is removed when we remember that Evelina is not a simple image of the everyday world, but rather a discourse which arises from the non-identity of represented and

everyday worlds, their presence to one another across which they speak.

In "Vision and Revision," Catherine Parke meets Evelina in alterity, preserving a balance between transparent text and mirror text. She appreciates the unfolding of the novel from its own deep structure, while listening to the dialogic interaction between everyday and represented worlds. Evelina thereby becomes a parable about the journey from exclusive awareness of others, to reflexive awareness of self: "Seeing our images reflected in the mirror of our fellows, hearing our voices resonate in the interspace of conversation, we become reflexively visible and audible to ourselves. This activity of reappearance affords us paradoxically the first and only original view of ourselves" (165). Thus Evelina represents not only a world apart from our world, but a world which speaks to our world, Evelina is about Evelina, and simultaneously about us. A parable is encountered in alterity, for it makes us reappear to ourselves. Mary Poovey's reading of Evelina as the enactment of a "psychological paradigm" is also an encounter in alterity, for she brings out the dialogic relationship between the deep structures of the text and of the mind (53).

The readers of 1778 certainly saw their world mirrored in Evelina. According to Mrs. Thrale, "'it is a sweet book, and the great beauty of it is that it reflects back all our own ideas and observations; for everybody must have met with some thing similar to almost all the incidents'" (DL, 1: 98). Here, anticipating our move to Burney's Journals in the next chapter, is her sister Susan's rendition of the response of some of Evelina's earliest readers:

As we came from the millener's they took notice how dismal London began to look.

"Aye," cried Lady Hales, "Poor Evelina!--No--Lord Orvilles now!"

After tea we went in the Coach to Jones's shop on Holborn Hill--in the way Marianne found out a queer coarse looking man to be Captain Mirvan--Miss Coussmaker a much worse to be Mr. Branghton--As we went thro' Holborn--

"Only think" cried Miss Coussmaker "of that elegant girl Evelina to lodge in such a place as this--and to be good neighbours to such wretches as the Branghtons!"

Then she looked out for Mr. Branghton's silversmith's shop--

"But you know it's on Snow Hill," cried Lady Hales.

"Well then, that's it" said Miss Coussmaker as we stopt at Jones's--"and there on the first floor lives Mr. Smith, that odious vulgar creature, who means to be fine and quite the thing--and upstairs is that sweet Evelina, with Miss Polly and Miss Biddy Branghton--and higher is poor Mr. Macartney." (ED, 2: 227)

The novel not only reflects, but transforms London for its readers, making them aware of aspects to which they were formerly blind.

The characters in Evelina are not life-like, they are distortions and exaggerations which are decidedly alien or other. Because of the balance between relatedness and otherness, Evelina is encountered in alterity, thereby giving readers a fresh perspective on themselves and their world.

Chapter Three: In the Eyes of the Other

When reading a journal or collection of personal letters, we may be tempted to treat this text as a simple reflection of the life and times of its author. Burney's journals and letters have been mined for autobiographical details, and for the record they provide of such famous people as Samuel Johnson, Joshua Reynolds, David Garrick and Elizabeth Montagu. Through these journals we are introduced to the intelligentsia of London, life at the court of George III, and the tumults of the Napoleonic wars. Although many have recovered a wealth of fascinating details, few have paused to consider Burney's journals as a literary text. In order to correct the balance a little, let us take the Journals (the earliest four volumes of the published journals, see Introduction p. 7) as our text, and attempt to meet it in alterity. For the time being, we will leave aside the thorny question of how the Burney textualized in the Journals corresponds to the historical Frances Burney, and allow the latter to exist in this chapter only insofar as she neither contradicts nor complicates the former. Nor will we discuss until later the question of by whose authority Burney's journals and letters are transformed into their published form.

We will begin by examining how Burney positions herself in alterity with the intended readers of her journals, and then proceed to consider the Journals as a representation of various people, among them Frances Burney, struggling to preserve their balance in alterity within their social context. Finally, we will consider

the inhabitants of the Journals as creatures of appearances who exist at the social interface. An entry made when Burney is seventeen suggests an opening for our examination of the Journals:

There is an earnestness, a spirit in the conversation of very superior men which makes them absolutely forget every body and every thing about them, and which, when one knows not the subject which engages them, appears ridiculous to spectators; to hearers the appearance is different--I was only a spectator, and could not possibly help laughing heartily to see them capering about all the time they talked as if they were bewildered. (ED. 1: 66)

This passage presents the essence of an encounter in alterity. If we see the text simply as a reflection of historical events and people, we are like the men absorbed in their subject and unaware of all else. If we treat the text as an alien artifact, we are like the "spectator." But if we become "hearers" who can alternate between these two extremes, we may encounter the text in alterity.

1

The Journals actually invite readers to become "hearers," to become partners in alterity with the text. This invitation is issued by Burney to her addressee--the internal reader--whether it be her sister Susan, her "daddy Crisp," or "Nobody." By extension, we, the external readers, receive the invitation also. The Journals open with an overt invitation to Nobody:

To have some account of my thoughts, manners, acquaintance and actions, when the hour arrives in which time is more nimble than memory, is the reason which induces me to keep a Journal. A Journal in which I must confess my every thought, must open my whole heart! But a thing of this kind ought to be addressed to somebody--I must imagine myself to be talking--talking to the most intimate of friends--to one in whom I should take delight in confiding, and remorse in concealment!--But who must this friend be? to make choice of one in whom I can but half rely, would be to frustrate entirely the intention of my plan.

The only one I could wholly, totally confide in, lives in the same house with me, and not only never has, but never will, leave me one secret to tell her. To whom, then, must I dedicate my wonderful, surprising and interesting Adventures?--to whom can I reveal my private opinion of my nearest relations? my secret thoughts of my dearest friends? my own hopes, fears, reflections, and dislikes? ----Nobody!

To Nobody, then, will I write my Journal! since to Nobody can I be wholly unreserved--to Nobody can I reveal every thought, every wish of my heart, with the most unlimited confidence, the most unremitting sincerity to the end of my life! For what chance, what accident can end my connections with Nobody? No secret can I conceal from Nobody, and to Nobody can I be ever unreserved. Disagreement cannot stop our affection, Time itself has no power to end our friendship. The love, the esteem I entertain for Nobody, Nobody's self has not power to destroy. From Nobody I have nothing to fear, the secrets sacred to friendship Nobody will not reveal when the affair is doubtful, Nobody will not look towards the side least favourable. (ED, 1: 5-6)

In other words, the function of the journal is to make Burney visible to herself. The one who is too close to afford this view is rejected as a partner in this endeavour, as are others who may act as spectators by looking "towards the side least favourable." Nobody is the ideal partner to whom Burney can be fully present. In this way, Burney's position in alterity with respect to Nobody is the source of discourse: Burney speaks and Nobody hears.

The journal entries of 1768 and 1769, addressed to Nobody, are frequently concerned with the possibility of becoming a spectacle in the eyes of another. This concern exerts a silencing effect which makes Burney consider writing no more. Once she is committed to paper, Burney runs the risk of being read by an unwelcome opponent who has none of the qualities of Nobody. To this opponent, she would then be a helpless object on the page of her journal, unable to so much as reply. Thoughts of how she would appear to this spectator threaten to stifle her in self-consciousness. The spectator rises

in her imagination as a mirror replacing the transparent Nobody:

"How truly does this Journal contain my real and undisguised thoughts!

--I always write in it according to the humour I am in, and if any stranger was accidentally reading it, how capricious--inconsistent and whimsical I must appear!" (ED, 1: 46). In later years, Burney remains wary of letting her writing fall under the gaze of any but a very select group of readers who are sure to be friendly "hearers" and not hostile "spectators." She scolds Mr. Crisp for reading aloud to his sisters her letters, is horrified when a letter of hers is passed around the Thrale dinner table as a specimen of handwriting, and writes and anonymously publishes Evelina without showing it to anyone (except perhaps her brother and sisters).

When readers object to the brutal nature of Captain Mirvan, Burney writes, "I quite rejoice I showed the book to no one ere printed, lest I should have been prevailed upon to soften his character" (D 1: 375). She knows her vulnerability to the gaze of others, and therefore chooses with care those to whom she will be present in alterity, those to whom she will present herself on paper.

Burney's first choice for a recipient of her journal-letters is Mr. Crisp, her second "daddy." They repeatedly swear to one another that they will be perfectly spontaneous and sincere. Mr. Crisp fills all the requirements of his predecessor, Nobody, and adds another dimension to the partnership--reciprocity. But Burney's ideal partner in alterity, the person whose presence is most eloquently courted by her pen, is Susan. When they are separated during holidays, Burney keeps a journal for Susan, and when Susan is married, she receives large monthly journal-letters which now form a large part

of the Diary and Letters. When she has nothing unfamiliar to report to Susan, she proceeds to defamiliarize the most commonplace activities:

Mais, hélas! scarce have I wandered over half a meadow, ere the bleak winds whistle round my head; off flies my faithless hat; my perfidious cloak endeavours to follow, --even though it clings with well-acted fondness to my neck; my apron, my gown, all my habiliments, with rebellious emotion, wage a civil war with the Mother country! though there is not an individual among them, but has been indebted to me for the very existence, by which they so treacherously betray me! My shoes too, though they cannot, like the rest, brave me to my teeth, are equally false and worthless; for far from aiding me by springing forward, with the generous zéa! they owe me for having rescued them from the dark and dusty warehouse in which they were pent, --they fail me in the very moment I require their assistance, sink me in bogs, pop me into the mud, and attaching themselves rather to the mire than to the feet which guide them, threaten me perpetually with desertion; and I shall not be much surprised, if some day when I least think of it, they should give me the slip, and settle themselves by the way. (ED, 2: 150)

Even when she is in no mood for journalizing, Burney writes to Susan in order to lighten her heart (DL, 1: 444). There is yet another person to whom the Journals is addressed, and that is the Frances Burney of years to come, who will "receive great pleasure from reviewing and almost renewing" her younger self (ED, 1: 46). In this way her journal becomes a device which affords a perspective on herself, a time-lapse mirror which keeps Burney eternally present to herself.

II

The world represented in the Journals is characterized, as is Evelina's world, by a succession of verbal skirmishes, by means of which opponents gain or lose status in the eyes of others. The episode in which Mr. Turner makes a sally on the supercilious Mr.

Bruce, provides a straightforward example:

A very strange Advertisement had been put in the papers the evening before, which said that Mr. Bruce was dying or dead. My father who knew he was well, wafered the paragraph upon a sheet of paper, and sent it to his lodgings. My mother asked him if he had seen it? . . . "Yes; I saw it and read my death with great composure." Then turning himself to me, he added, "was you not sorry, Miss Burney, to read of my death?"

These immense-sized men speak to little women, as if they were children. I answered, that, as my father had seen him the day before, I was not much alarmed. Mr. Turner, then gathering courage, said, "Well, Sir, I think, as times go, it is very well that when they killed you, they said no ill of you."

"I know of no reason they had to do otherwise," answered Mr. Bruce so haughtily, that Mr. Turner, failing in his first attempt, never afterwards spoke to him, or indeed hardly opened his mouth. (ED, 2: 16)

In this exchange Mr. Bruce wields the world-constituting power. He invites Burney to speak, and she obliges him by confining herself to the position he has allotted her. Her reply is devoid of any objectifying power: it reflects solely on her own feelings and not at all on Mr. Bruce. Mr. Turner's uninvited quip does, however, possess objectifying power. ~~It~~ is, in effect, a sally on the world constituted by Mr. Bruce. If Mr. Bruce were to condescend to smile at the quip--and by extension at himself--he would momentarily meet Mr. Turner in alterity by accepting the latter's power to place him as an object in a Turner-made world. But Mr. Bruce is not about to concede his opponent an instant of subjective power. Therefore he rudely silences Mr. Turner, who has not the courage to make a second attempt at recovering a bit of world from Mr. Bruce.

The Journals abound in characters who are unable to balance in alterity. Burney is much perplexed by a Miss W. at whom everyone laughs openly, yet who is so easily persuaded she is not the comic

butt, that she invariably joins in the laughter. If Miss W. were able to enter alterity, she would see herself in the mirror of the other as a ridiculous figure, and correct her appearance. But, as it is, she cannot recognize the laughable object as herself. Burney's response to Miss W. quickly changes from pity to amusement, as she joins the others in relegating Miss W. to the status of ridiculous object incapable of either insight or resentment (ED, 2: 202-10). The callous way in which Burney diverts herself at Miss W.'s expense, reveals the same aggression beneath the polite forms of behaviour which we noticed in Evelina. Miss W. is fair prey to verbal abuse because she poses no threat to her tormentors.

The ability to balance in alterity is a prerequisite to a successful social life. Those who are vulnerable to the penetrating objectifying powers of others, such as Mr. Turner, are not the only losers. The ones who indiscriminately reduce their opponents to objects of apprehension overbalance the delicate scale on the opposite side. Such is often the case for Dr. Johnson:

He is almost constantly omitted, either from too much respect or too much fear. I am sorry for it, as he hates being alone, and as, though he scolds the others, he is well enough satisfied himself; and, having given vent to all his own occasional anger or ill-humour, he is ready to begin again, and is never aware that those who have so been "downed" by him, never can much covet so triumphant a visitor. In contests of wit, the victor is as ill off in future consequences as the vanquished in present ridicule. (DL, 2: 113)

To balance in alterity is even more difficult for a woman than for a man. She must somehow refuse to be merely an object in the world of others, while seeming to accept the position. The dictates of propriety insist that the woman appear as an object, as someone's property. She must be self-effacing, deferential and

silent (using another's voice if she does speak). The woman who does advance into alterity with the other, frequently does it privately or only with respect to proven friends, as Evelina does. Burney herself never violates the rules of propriety, but she manages to exist in alterity with grace and wit, when writing in her journal or when in the presence of her friends and family. For example, she deftly but sweetly refuses to accept the position Mr. Garrick offers her in his perception, when he comments on Dr. Burney's good fortune in having the company of Frances and Susan:

"And so they prattle,--and you rest your understanding?"
This was monstrous!

"Quite the contrary," cried I, "my father exerts his understanding to keep pace with us!"--He understood me, and getting up in a violent hurry, he came to the table where I was making tea; and with a thousand whimsical gestures, he cried, "O! you quite mistake me;--I meant to make you the greatest compliment in the world! I could not make you a greater!--what I meant was--to say that --that when you were all about him, he could then most delightfully"---- (ED, 1: 227)

Burney here asserts her own perception of herself, but does not attempt to objectify Mr. Garrick to his face. Instead, she laughs at him privately, as she fixes him in her journal. In this way she manages to retain her subjective world-view while continuing to appear a proper lady. To achieve this balance is the constant care of the female inhabitants of the Journals. After issuing some nearly plain-spoken advice to Burney, Mrs. Thrale continues her letter: "What hurts me most is lest you should like me the less for this letter. Yet I will be true to my own sentiments and send it; if you will think me coarse and indelicate, I can't help it" (DL, 1: 159):

The Burney of the Early Diary is largely an observer of the fashionable and intellectual life in which her family participates. The liveliest passages in these volumes are descriptions of others in relation to whom Burney is "Q in a corner" (ED, 1: 66). These sketches demonstrate such a keenly penetrating gaze that it is difficult to unite their creator with her representation of herself as timid and self-effacing. As her authorship of Evelina is becoming known, Burney finds herself present to--as opposed to simply in the presence of--the intellectual circle which meets at Streatham, home of the Thrales. (The Early Diary ends and Diary and Letters begins with the publication of Evelina.) Although she is used to observing the fashionable and famous, Burney is unaccustomed to attracting their attention. She reacts with embarrassment and fear, as her formerly penetrating gaze is turned back, deflected by the mirror of the other. Instead of seeing through the other, she sees herself in the other's eyes and retreats into self-conscious silence:

I could sit still no longer; there was something so awkward, so uncommon, so strange in my then situation, that I wished myself a hundred miles off; and, indeed, I had almost choked myself with the bisquit, for I could not for my life swallow it; and so I got up, and, as Mr. Fort went to the table to look for Evelina, I left the room, and was forced to call for water to wash down the bisquit, which literally stuck in my throat. . . . When we returned, to my great joy, they were talking of other subjects, yet I could not sufficiently recover myself the whole evening to speak one word but in answer. . . . (DL, 1: 94-96)

Burney never comes to the point where she can feel comfortable when either she or her books are the object of discussion, and she is prohibited by propriety from activating her penetrating gaze or ironic wit in the presence of others. The numerous anecdotes she records of the ability of her male acquaintances to deflect

unwanted attentions indicate a fascination with, if not a desire for, this ability. Perhaps she secretly wishes to be able to reply to praise in the manner of Dr. Johnson to Hannah More: "'Madam, before you flatter a man so grossly to his face, you should consider whether or not your flattery is worth his having'" (DL, 1: 100). As it is, she reacts quite otherwise to flattering speeches, by trembling at "the idea of disgracing so many people" with a second literary effort (DL, 1: 205).

According to the model of alterity, this absence of self-assertion on Burney's part, her blushing humility in the face of others, ought to render her an object of little consequence who is shoved aside in the social jostle. Instead, she is rescued from this fate by the reaction of the others to Evelina. These others see themselves objectified in the novel, and their world commandeered by Burney for her own literary purposes. Mrs. Thrale teases, "'if this rogue is like her book, how will she trim all of us by and by! Now, she dainties us up with all the meekness in the world; but when we are away, I suppose she pays us off finely'" (DL, 1: 178). "In short [Burney says], the joke is, the people speak as if they were afraid of me, instead of my being afraid of them" (DL, 1: 109). This is an odd sort of meeting in alterity, with Burney split in two between her proper speaking self and her assertive writing. One half looks into the mirroring other in fear, and the other half renders the mirror transparent with a penetrating gaze. In this way Evelina--and by extension, the Journals--becomes a powerful double for the propriety-weakened Burney. The others whom she faces in alterity accept her mirroring power, and see themselves as potential

characters in her writing. They are self-conscious objects before "so penetrating, so discriminating an eye" (DL, 2: 85) "that sees all things and people right" (DL, 2: 9). Mrs. Thrale tells Burney of Mr. Murphy's reaction to the manuscript of her first play: "he calls you a sly designing body, and says you look all the people through most wickedly; he watches you, and vows he has caught you in the fact. Nobody and nothing, he says, escapes you, and you keep looking round for characters all day long" (DL, 1: 244). Burney is alternately capable of perceiving herself in the other, and looking the other through, even though the former is more often achieved face to face, and the latter in writing. This delicate balance in alterity produces yet more discourse for, although Burney remains properly quiet in company, she writes volumes.

III

The world represented in the Journals is not as static as it may seem from this sample of verbal skirmishes. Through the four volumes, Burney develops from "Q in a corner" into a socially adept woman. She learns the necessity of being noticed, how to avoid appearing to court attention, ways to repel impetinent stares, and also the importance of reserving herself from too much of even the most flattering attention. In short, she learns how to control her appearance in the eyes of others without overstepping the bounds of propriety. Before she attracts any attention herself, Burney draws, with disapproval, sketches of others who appear to seek attention. For example, "what principally banished him [Mr. Keate] from my good graces was, the conceited manner in which he introduced,

a discourse upon his own writings" (ED, 1: 315). She also notices that those who already have a great deal of attention are apt to be arrogant. Mr. Bruce, dubbed "His Abyssinian Majesty" (ED, 2: 21), has "so large a share of good opinion of himself, as to have nothing left for the rest of the world but contempt" (ED, 1: 322). As the desire for attention may lead to conceit, so its attainment may result in arrogance.

Nevertheless, since one only regards oneself with accuracy by assessing one's appearance to others, the state of being noticed is a social necessity. (Both Madame Duval and poor Miss W. fail to balance in alterity because they are unable to assess themselves accurately in the mirroring other.) So Burney's problem--a problem shared by countless other female characters--is how to attract attention without appearing either conceited in the effort or arrogant in the attainment. In fact, receiving any attention at all (from an esteemed source) is better than being totally ignored. In consequence, when Burney suspects her adored Mr. Crisp of treating her with "silent resentment," she responds, "I would rather receive from you the severest lecture you could pen, because while I might flatter myself with even meriting your notice I should indulge hopes of regaining your kindness" (ED, 1: 281). To silence, there is no reply, for if Mr. Crisp refuses to reflect back his perception of her, Burney cannot correct her appearance. Her letter to Crisp, to which the above quote belongs, is seductive enough to draw a reply from any but the most heartless of men. She asks if his intent is to mortify her, or whether he is tired of her. Then she remarks that men are necessarily "capricious and fickle." After promising

to "kiss the rod" if he should think fit to "punish" her, she vows that she will not "further pester" him lest he only reply "out of compliment or compassion." If she has not managed to reinstate herself as a desirable correspondent, she has certainly succeeded in presenting Mr. Crisp with a most unflattering portrait of himself should he persevere in his silence. He must reply, must condescend to notice her, even if only to correct his appearance in her eyes. This submissive letter of Burney's shows her quite capable of attracting attention from her friends without seeming to assert herself at all (ED, 1: 281).

As the Journals progress, we see Burney attracting a tremendous amount of attention from readers of the highly successful Evelina. Gradually, she learns not to run out of the room in embarrassed confusion, but bravely to adjust her appearance in the other's eyes. Mr. Crisp points out to her the necessity of capitalizing on all the attention she is receiving, rather than trying to deflect it:

You are now young, lively, gay. You please, and the world smiles upon you--this is your time. Years and wrinkles in their due season (perhaps attended with want of health and spirits) will succeed. You will then be no longer the same Fanny of 1778, feasted, caressed, admired, with all the soothing circumstances of your present situation. (DL, 1: 138)

She must, he says, write enough while she is in this situation to earn her independence. The implication of this remark is that financial independence will rescue her from the necessity of forever presenting a pleasing appearance to others. Furthermore, the warning implies that an aged Burney will no longer be able to "please" and attract "smiles" no matter what her literary output. Mr. Crisp

recognizes, perhaps more than Burney, the importance of attracting favourable attention.

Burney's social status is enhanced by the attentions of various famous men such as James Bruce, Dr. Johnson and Sir Joshua Reynolds. She encounters Mr. Bruce before Evelina's publication, and therefore before she is used to being noticed. When he very openly gives his entire attention to her, she is overcome with embarrassment over the imagined stares of the company (ED, 2: 20). This sort of delicacy disappears in time, and she is well pleased with the affection publicly shown her by other famous men. She even comes to recognize the social value of their regard: "Dr. Johnson . . . gave me almost all his attention, which made me of no little consequence to the Burgoynes, who all stared amain when they saw him make up to me the moment I entered the room . . ." (DL, 2: 26-27). Nevertheless, she is careful not to be isolated by the literary men from the other company, for she knows she must preserve the good will of the ladies as well: "The conversation . . . grew so very bookish, I was ashamed of being one in it, and not without reason, as everybody, out of that party, told me afterwards, "they had been afraid of approaching me, I was so well engaged"" (DL, 2: 107).

Ever aware of her appearance before others, Burney becomes adept at making adjustments before the mirror. When Burney's never appearing book in hand causes Dr. Johnson to suspect that she does not love reading as she professes, she instantly corrects this impression, saying, "'I am always afraid of being caught reading, lest I should pass for being studious or affected, and therefore instead of making a display of books, I always try to hide them . . .'"

(DL, 1: 135-36). In support of her speech, she produces a book from under her gloves, behind her back. On another occasion, after Burney has run away from the spectacle of a dog being beaten in punishment, Captain Fuller teases her about her behaviour. Her reaction is as follows:

I instantly found he thought me guilty of affectation; and the drollery of his manner made it impossible to be affronted with his accusation; therefore I took the trouble to try to clear myself, but know not how I succeeded. I assured him that if my staying could have answered any purpose, I would have compelled myself to hear the screams, and witness the correction, of the offending animal; but that as that was not the case, I saw no necessity for giving myself pain officiously. (DL, 1: 235)

Captain Fuller, on the surface of his words, merely teases Burney about her delicacy. Nevertheless, Burney hears the implied charge of affectation in his teasing, and it is against this implied criticism that she must defend herself. Delicacy is permitted, but affectation --which is a form of calling attention to oneself--is ruled out by propriety. Since there is no open charge of affectation, Burney must defend herself against the superficial charge of delicacy, instead. Accordingly, she presents an image of herself as reasonable and practical rather than overly delicate, thereby indirectly clearing herself of the imputed affectation. Captain Fuller then chooses to escalate the argument by asserting that women in general are worse than helpless in an emergency, being apt to "scream and faint and get out of the way; when . . . they might be of some service" (DL, 1: 236). Burney has the last word when she declares herself to be unlike these women, and quite capable of binding wounds.

If she must act, as propriety dictates, the part of object in an man's world, Burney carefully controls what sort of object

she is to be. When Captain Fuller holds up a mirror to her, Burney disapproves of her reflection and takes pains to alter it to her satisfaction. He says, in effect, "you are like this," and she replies, "no, I am like that." This control over her appearance in the eyes of another is all the power allowed her by propriety. A more self-assertive--but improper--response to Captain Fuller would be to comment on his behaviour, thereby reducing him to an object in her world. Even to reply directly to the charge of affectation would be to give the Captain an objectifying glance, for it would be bold enough to interpret rather than simply accept his meaning. This example is but one of many similar incidents in which Burney asserts herself to the limits of propriety, meeting the other as a mirror and keeping the results of her penetrating gaze to herself.

Along with the favourable attention *Evelina brings her, come the unwelcome stares of less than properly behaved characters. Initially, Burney is at the mercy of these stares, which she bears in awkward silence. Because this sort of attention is undesirable, she does not bother to consider her appearance, endeavouring only to deflect the impertinent stares. Miss Thrale, twelve years Burney's junior, on one occasion gives the "ill-bred" offender "so full, determined, and downing a stare, that whether cured by shame or resentment, she forbore from that time to look at either of us" (DL, 1: 288). Burney never so far asserts herself by means of a stare, but by the time she is the focus of attention for her authorship of Cecilia, we find her capable of deploying a "frigid countenance" (DL, 2: 180), and facing both impertinence and public raptures with "chilling gravity" (DL, 2: 233). Finally, even the proper

and civil attentions of respected acquaintances threaten to overwhelm Burney when she spends her time in a "continual round of visiting" (DL, 2: 155). Since she exists socially in the eyes of others, and only privately reconstitutes her own world, she understandably becomes "heartily sick and fatigued" with "daily engagements." Her resolution is to "restore my own spirit and pleasure by getting more courage in making refusals." Finding that she has been spending too much time as an object of others' apprehension, she feels the necessity of reclaiming herself. Henceforth she will make "company and diversion . . . subservient to convenience . . . taking them in turn with [the] quietness and retirement" she needs to restore herself and her world about her (DL, 2: 155-56).

Dr. Johnson predicts that "Burney will not be spoilt: she knows too well what praise she has a claim to, and what not, to be in any danger of spoiling" (DL, 1: 119). This prediction comes true, but perhaps not for the stated reason. The signs of "spoiling" are conceit and arrogance, both of which Burney castigates in others and avoids in her own appearance. She chooses to conform to the model provided by her father "who never thinks of his authorship and fame at all, but who is respected for both by everybody for claiming no respect from anybody" (DL, 1: 384). Accurate assessment of her literary worth has little to do with Burney's enduring humility: humility is a feature of the face she presents to the world. The Journals suggests that Burney judges her writing by the response of others. Evelina is clever because readers find it so. The Wittings (a play) is suppressed because Dr. Burney and Mr. Crisp do not think it will succeed. She accepts their condemnation of the play.

and subsequently refers to it herself as "witless," "worthless" and "reprehensible" (DL, 1: 256-58). Realizing that the success or failure of her play reflects on the fame of her father, Burney resolves "to have no opinion of my own in regard to what I should thenceforth part with out of my own hands" (DL, 1: 257). Upon hearing "serious praise" of Cecilia from people she respects greatly, Burney interprets their response to the novel as a "solemn sanction to the meaning and intention of my writing" (DL, 2: 201). Once again, her assessment derives from another and not from herself.

Although Burney's humility prevents her ever hearing her work praised with composure, she records in this instance:

Of all the scenes of this sort in which I have been engaged, this has been the least painful to me, from my high respect for the personages, from their own elegance, in looking only at one another while they talked, and from having no witnesses to either watch me or to be wearied themselves: yet I still say only least painful; for pleasant nothing can make a conversation entirely addressed to one who has no means in the world of taking any share in it.
(DL, 2: 201-02)

Here we see Burney receiving exactly the proper sort of attention from the proper sort of people in a most proper fashion. Cecilia is the object under discussion, not its writer, who is allowed here to be nobody. Of course she cannot participate in the conversation because to discuss her own writing would be conceited. Since, as we have seen, Burney asserts herself in her writing rather than in her social existence, high praise of her work is, against all appearances, praise of herself. In this way she can appear a humble and self-effacing object in the other's world while simultaneously foisting a world of her own creating--represented in her writing--onto an accepting other. Thus the power of her gaze is acknowledged.

IV

The Journals gives us a Burney who is, on one hand, obsessed with her own appearance in the eyes of others, and on the other hand, capable of wielding a mighty gaze which penetrates the appearance of others. This gaze is the source of power for her pen as it preserves the uneasy relationship between appearances and whatever it is that lies behind them. Assume for a moment that this "whatever" is an essence. Then the relationship between appearance and essence is parallel to that between signifier and signified. The appearance and the signifier ask to be taken for signs pointing directly to a stable essence and signified, respectively. However, the path between signifier and signified is littered with alien signifiers which direct perception to a multitude of other paths until the original path becomes a maze at the heart of which (if it exists) we hope to find the original signified (if that exists). Similarly, the correspondence between appearance and essence is obstructed with alternate manifestations leading into an interpretive maze which may or may not actually possess an essence.

Instead of simplifying the relationship between appearance and essence by suggesting that the appearance either innocently indicates or fraudulently conceals the essence, the Journals leads us into a maze of appearances which may be all there is to essence. When we see Burney adjusting her appearance in the eyes of others, we are given no evidence to suggest that she is applying a mask behind which lurks an essential self. She is actually looking into the mirroring other and making the necessary adjustments so that

the image she sees there corresponds to her own self-image. But this self-image has itself developed over time out of successive mirror-images, and is, as long as the subject balances in alterity, continually incorporating the other into itself by merely perceiving new mirror-images. Given this state of affairs, we will not be surprised to find Burney's penetrating gaze preoccupied with appearances, whether she is interpreting the manifestations of others or of herself. Apparent being dominates essential being, often to the point where the latter seems phantasmal.

To begin with, let us take an example of the domination by appearances in Burney herself. When Dr. Johnson begins tutoring Burney in Latin, she reflects:

I heartily wish I rejoiced more sincerely in this classical plan. But the truth is, I have more fear of the malignity which will follow its being known, than delight in what advantages it may afford. All my delight, indeed, is that this great and good man should think me worthy his instructions. (DL, 1: 216)

Although she prides herself upon having her lessons prepared, she declares, "I lag more for fear of disgrace than for hope of profit" (DL, 1: 252). The essential advantages of learning Latin are concealed under three layers of appearances: the impropriety of a lady's knowing Latin, the show of gratitude to Dr. Johnson for his attention, and the fear of disgrace over a failure to learn. Under this weight of appearances, any concrete advantages vanish entirely and we may suppose Burney relieved when the lessons are shortly thereafter discontinued. Always pressed for time in which to produce her own writing, and giving high priority to her appearance before others, Burney laments: "To devote so much time to acquire something I shall always dread to have known, is really unpleasant enough,

considering how many things there are I might employ myself in that would have no such drawback" (DL, 1: 252).

The world represented by the Journals is a world of appearances. To the reader who is accustomed to thinking of an external appearance as the frivolous shell covering an all-important essential reality, this world can be disorienting. When Burney encounters a person who appears in no way contradictory, she is pleased, but people who seem at odds with themselves puzzle and disturb her. She directs her penetrating gaze at these people in an effort to interpret the contradictory appearances as she fixes them on the pages of her journal. What her penetration reveals is not a stable essential being who masquerades in contradictory guises, but rather a being of unfathomable manifestations. Early in the Journals (1770, to be precise), Burney encounters the charming Mr. Seaton who flatters her more by engaging her in a serious conversation than with his many compliments. Before long, Burney begins to suspect that his "insinuating air of sincerity" is underlaid by artfulness. Nevertheless, she cannot absolutely confirm her suspicion. Burney concludes: "I have no fixed opinion of him. I know he is agreeable to a superior degree; and I believe he is as artful as agreeable" (ED, 1: 93-94, emphasis added). She thinks Mr. Seaton is artful rather than sincere, but all she can really know of him is that he is invariably agreeable; the essence can only be speculated upon, but the appearance can be known.

The inhabitants of the Journals are thoroughly social beings, and we know them at the surfaces they present to their world. Miss Bowdler is remarked for her defiance of propriety, while the mention

of her essential innocence is buried under the lengthy description of her improper conduct (ED, 1: 231ff.). Mrs. Dobson's "strong and masculine understanding" together with her natural gifts are sunk beneath her manners, which render her "coarse, low-bred, forward, self-sufficient, and flaunting" (DL, 1: 370). Miss Georgiana Shipley is famous for her painting and scholarship, but Burney fixes on her page a "showy" and "disagreeable" woman, writing: "I believe her to have very good parts and much quickness; but she is so full of herself, so earnest to obtain notice, and so happy in her confidence of deserving it, that I have been not less charmed with any young lady I have seen for many a day" (DL, 2: 89). A person whose social appearance is unremarkable is likely to enter the Journals as "a yea and nay man not worth remembering" (ED, 2: 9). The nameless clergyman thus set down is accompanied by "Mr. Pennick, that worthy, and gentle, and pious parson, who knocked down Mr. Colman This man is half a madman; he looks dark and designing and altogether ill-favoured" (ED, 2: 9). With playful irony, Burney lists Mr. Pennick's presumed virtues before she displays him as an apparently violent and sinister character. Once again, the character is as s/he appears.

Of all the people thus textualized, Miss Streatfield gives Burney the most trouble. "The S. S.", as Burney denominates her, is known as a Greek scholar, as a great beauty, and for her ability to shed tears at will. The latter quality both fascinates and repels Burney. Initially she interprets the tears as evidence of extreme sensitivity, and is horrified by the way the company laughs at the S. S. (DL, 1: 211). Then she is confused by the perfect composure

the S. S. assumes after her tears. Finally, she decides that the S. S. cries in order to enhance her beauty by a display of affected tenderness (DL, 1: 240). Despite her reasoned disapproval of this penchant for tears, and her subsequent reduction of the S. S. to a character of "education without parts" (DL, 1: 273), Burney is nevertheless seduced into fresh admiration each time she encounters Miss Streatfield:

The fair S. S. is really in higher beauty than I have ever yet seen her; and she was so caressing, so soft, so amiable, that I felt myself insensibly inclining to her with an affectionate regard. "If it was not for that little gush," as Dr. Delap said, I should certainly have taken a very great fancy to her: but tears so ready--oh, they blot out my fair opinion of her! Yet whenever I am with her, I like, nay, almost love her, for her manners are exceedingly captivating; but when I quit her, I do not find that she improves by being thought over--no, nor talked over; for Mrs. Thrane, who is always disposed to half adore her in her presence, can never converse about her without exciting her own contempt by recapitulating what has passed. (DL, 1: 273)

Even though Burney sees, upon reflection, that the S. S. is quite other than what she appears to be, her insight fails her each time the S. S. reappears. The power of appearances can be overwhelming, even to a gaze as penetrating as Burney's.

The overall effect of these character sketches is not the presentation of superficial beings, but rather the textualization of fully social beings in such a way that their essential qualities are moved from a possible inner self to their concrete interface with the world. The alterity model suits these textualized beings so well, precisely because they exist at this social boundary. Their success or failure at balancing in alterity describes the effectiveness of their interactions with the other. When Burney activates her penetrating gaze and reduces social beings to objects

in her world, she manages to do something very special, for her gaze is more revealing than reductive, and the resultant objects need only a hint of help from the reader to expand into lively representations of social beings. Burney's remarkable achievement is the creation of a world which is not the historical southern England of 1769 to 1786, but a textualization of her experience and observations of this historical world. If the world represented by the Journals is a world of appearances, a world in which the inhabitants exist at their boundaries with the other, it is a discursive event which both comes into being in alterity (with Burney and the reader) and is interpreted according to the model of alterity.

Chapter Four: Author Speaking

When we rewrote Evelina as a text generated by the deployment of actants in various configurations, we were focussing on internal, textual sources of power. In developing a model of alterity by which to rewrite both Evelina and the Journals, we moved the focus to textual articulations in order to explore the generative boundaries between one and another, between textual and everyday worlds, as well as those between text and reader. These two methods of rewriting liberate the texts both from the ghostly authorial presence which would establish a reading of the text, and from the external shaping authority of Frances Burney. Although we have dispensed with the ghostly presence, we have merely ignored the historical Burney while concentrating on the Burney textualized in the Journals. Biographers from Macaulay (1843) to Hemlow (1958) have supplied ample evidence of the difference between the writing Burney and the written (or textualized) one. Therefore we cannot simply substitute one for the other. Neither can we continue to ignore the historical woman, for there is no disputing the fact that she originally wrote the texts which we are rewriting; since she wrote them, she is the most obvious generative source. The tendency of most commentary is to rewrite the texts as products of Burney's imagination, and to accept her authority as their primary source of power. As we will see, this tendency diverts attention from the texts to their author. Consequently, Burney's life is rewritten more energetically than the texts she produced, and a freshly textualized Burney emerges

to stand in for the necessarily unrecoverable historical author.

Because we want to rewrite the texts rather than Burney's life, we began by searching out generative sources which are less obvious than, but at least as powerful as, Burney's authorship. This task completed, we can now re-assess Burney as a source of power with less danger of being overwhelmed by either her presence or the authority of existing commentary. This commentary can be put into perspective as an accumulation of rewritings alternative to those we have already established. In the process of achieving this perspective, we will produce yet another rewriting of the texts, this time in terms of the generative interface between author and text. By focussing on this interface we will avoid the temptation to make the texts subservient to the life of their author. If author and text are kept side by side, one cannot subsume the other. Moreover, because the author/text boundary intervenes between the historical Burney and her textual counterpart, attention to this boundary will also remove the temptation to conflate the woman who wrote the text with the woman inscribed therein.

I

The relationships between author and text and, more specifically, between the author and the speaking persons with which s/he populates a novel, are presented by Bakhtin in a synthesis which will help us to establish a new focus. According to this synthesis, language in the novel "serves two speakers at the same time and expresses simultaneously two different intentions: the direct intention of the character who is speaking, and the refracted intention of the

author" (324). Bakhtin argues persuasively the fundamental importance of speaking persons--usually but not necessarily characters--through whose voices discourses sound and ideological positions are spoken. Discourse in the novel is inevitably integrated with the "image of the speaking person" (336). Thus novelistic discourse becomes the artistic representation of a speaking person and his or her discourse. Bakhtin is at pains to distinguish between discourse which is merely transmitted and that which is artistically represented. In fact, he defines "the artistic representation of another's speech . . . [as] the central problem of novelistic prose" (337). Other prose forms may transmit, manipulate and even dialogize the discourse of the other, but novelistic prose reaches to the deepest social and ideological implications of discourse in its uniquely double-voiced language.¹ The singularity of this language derives from the tight interweaving of representing and represented voices, by which discourses and their associated ideological and social implications are held in the close proximity necessary for their interaction at all levels.

Bakhtin grounds his argument in the everyday world, observing that one's speech is inevitably made up of the speech of others. He traces the steps by which one encounters a discourse as persuasive and assimilates it into one's own speech. There it may remain as an internally persuasive discourse which interacts dialogically with previously assimilated languages. Alternately, it may out-persuade

¹ Since Bakhtin draws examples of this novelistic language from texts which do not belong to the genre "novel," we need feel no hesitation about applying Bakhtin's theory to the "novelistic language" of the Journals as well as Evelina.

every encountered language, and harden into an authoritative discourse, thereby ceasing to interact and coming to override. In either case, the persuasiveness of this discourse may eventually be eroded to the point where it is ejected from one's speech altogether. As Bakhtin summarizes: "The ideological becoming of a human being, in this view, is the process of selectively assimilating the words of others" (341).

As we shift our attention from everyday to textual worlds, we see the author engaging in a process of "experimenting by turning persuasive discourse into speaking persons" (348). By means of experimentation, the author can turn a discourse--which s/he has assimilated from another--back into an object. During the experiment, the discourse will be placed in a variety of dialogic relationships with alien discourses so that the author can hear it anew and discover its weaknesses. Thus the struggle between various discourses which occurs in an individual consciousness as well as in society becomes--through the experimental effort of the author--novelistic language. Even if the author has already rejected a formerly persuasive discourse, s/he will be able to re-create the struggle which led to this rejection. The re-creation is also a source of novelistic language. In the process of artistically representing a speaking person, the author either achieves or recollects liberation from a formerly internally persuasive discourse by turning it into an object of apprehension. The author may so thoroughly objectify the discourse as to render it an object of ridicule. "Parodic representation" is the term Bakhtin uses to denote the technique whereby a discourse is completely disarmed and turned into an object of ridicule. Parodic representation,

then, results from the author's suppression of the persuasive power of a discourse. Nevertheless, insofar as ~~the~~ discourse remains at all persuasive, the author may choose to breathe new life into it, causing it to raise its voice in dialogy with other discourses. In other words, the artistically represented discourse which is neither totally parodic nor authoritative is placed in a state of alterity. Here it balances, potentially an object devoid of persuasiveness, but also retaining the potential to become overly persuasive or authoritative. At either of these extremes, language dries and hardens into a thing foreign to novelistic prose. The business of the author is to avoid the extremes and to place the other's discourse in alterity. Bakhtin describes how alterity is fostered:

The words of the author that represent and frame another's speech create a perspective for it; they separate light from shadow, create the situation and conditions necessary for it to sound; finally, they penetrate into the interior of the other's speech, carrying into it their own accents and their own expressions, creating for it a dialogizing background. (358)

In this way the author articulates (with) the speaking persons in the text.

II

When we think of Evelina in terms of Bakhtin's synthesis, we find that an author/text interface is represented in the novel itself. Evelina is the representation of an author, and the letters she writes to Villars (which comprise over eighty percent of the novel) are the image of a text. Accordingly, we may ask what Evelina achieves as she "authors" her "text"? She is in the process of

inscribing an alien world, representing it as the image of speaking persons and their discourses. (Evelina's representation is, of course, nested within Burney's representation, to which we will turn shortly.) Evelina's epistolary activity thus conforms very well to Bakhtin's model of authoring. By representing the speech of others in her letters, she is recreating it so that she may listen to it again at her leisure and, according to its persuasiveness, incorporate or reject it.

In this process of recreation, she puts the speech of others into her own words, provides a context for the speech and places it in a frame consisting of her own judgements. Even passages in which another's speech seems to be directly transcribed are firmly set in a context and framed, as well as surrounded by the same speech represented in Evelina's words. If another's speech sounds ridiculous, Evelina is the one who provides the ridicule. If, for example, we could extricate Mr. Smith's speech from Evelina's and imagine an altered context for it, Mr. Smith may no longer be a ridiculous object. Evelina effectively rejects the persuasiveness of Mr. Smith's speech by setting it in a dialogizing context where it sounds absurd.

Examples of Evelina's objectifying activity in her letters abound, but it is hard to find an instance in which she assimilates the speech of another. She may be said to assimilate Villars' and Crville's speech, but their discourses are essentially hers from the start; they are not the speech of another. Evelina's resistance to assimilating the speech of others (she could profit from an admixture of Mrs. Selwyn) explains the lack of development in her

2 of/de 2

MICRO

character. As Bakhtin says, only through incorporating the discourse of others, does an individual mature into "ideological consciousness" (348). Of course, this lack of development is not a fault in *Evelina* as it would be in a historical being. *Evelina*'s unchanging character is one of her textual virtues.

The fact that *Evelina* is not a historical being reminds us that she is not an author either, but rather the artistic image of an author. At this point we may reinstate Burney--not the "character" textualized in the Journals, but the historical being--as the author of *Evelina*. Burney was scarcely able to own her position as author of the novel. In the first place, she published it anonymously, and second, the very shape it takes as a collection of the letters of others encourages the illusion that no external author exists. Indeed, the preface is written as though by an editor of the letters, strengthening the illusion that *Evelina* and her correspondents are the only authors. Psychological speculations about Burney's motives in writing and publishing *Evelina* are easily made. As a shy and entirely unschooled child within an intellectually accomplished family, she was likely driven to display her own intellectual gifts in order to obtain the attention of a very busy father whom she adored. Burney dedicated her novel to her father, but excluded him from all knowledge of its composition and publication.² By publishing anonymously, she was able to gauge the novel's reception by the reading public before claiming *Evelina* as her own. In this

² The intrigue involving the extortion of the father's unwitting permission to publish, and Burney's eventual gratification at his delight in the novel, are recorded in the entries for 1778 in the second volume of the Early Diary.

way she escaped censure, while retaining the possibility of accepting the laurels. Moreover, aspects of the novel may be accounted for by reference to biographical information lacking in the Journals. In The History of Fanny Burney, Joyce Hemlow provides indisputable evidence that Burney suffered emotionally at the hands of an unreasonable and jealous step-mother. This evidence may indicate Burney's motives for creating the splendid variety of mother images in her novel.

The large amount of biographical information available about the Burney family fosters psychological speculations and encourages commentators to rewrite both Burney's work and life in terms of these speculations. Patricia Spacks goes so far as to identify Burney's unconscious mind as a source of power in Evelina:

Allowing Miss Burney to articulate repressed aspects of her personality, it [Evelina] reminds us of the degree to which her constant professions of fear and her insistent withdrawals represent not true timidity but a socially acceptable device of self-protection. The writing and publishing of novels--a public act--also involves self-protection; no one holds the author personally responsible for Captain Mirvan's sadism or Mrs. Selwyn's ferocious commentary. Through imagining such sadism and such commentary, she permits herself the impermissible. She both declares the high value of her own mode of dealing with the world and compensates for the restrictions of her propriety. (Imagining a Self 181)

Spacks presents the biographical evidence for her psychological speculations so clearly that we are tempted to forget their speculative nature. She effectively rewrites Burney's psyche and then proceeds to rewrite Burney's novels and journals as products of this probable psyche. Although the rewriting of the texts is predicated upon a speculative generative source external to the texts, it pays close attention to the texts and serves them well.

Unfortunately, not all commentators are as sensitive to the texts as Spacks. Most commentary on Evelina, as well as on the other novels and the journals, employs the same source of power for rewriting--Burney's probable psyche. The problem with this pattern of rewriting is that it tends to divert attention from the texts to Burney's life. That the focus should shift to the life is only to be expected, for biographical information is the root source of rewriting in this case: text is rewritten according to psyche, and psyche is rewritten according to life. Following this pattern, Lillian and Edward Bloom confidently rewrite Evelina and Cecilia as "psychodramas" in the production of which, potentially harmful "unconscious matter" that "could have destroyed a soul was ordered into a coherent creative act" (222-23). Of course we want to know all about this dangerous material, and then we want to know where it came from. The Blooms supply all the interesting details, analyzing Burney's supposed psyche and tracing its contents to her family and social contexts. Consequently, the main achievement of the commentary is a re-textualized Burney. The novels become peripheral to Burney's life. After discovering how Evelina and Cecilia (1782) function as psychodramas, we are eager to find out why Camilla (1796) and The Wanderer (1814) do not. The answer, according to the Blooms, is to be found not so much in the novels, as in the radical alterations in Burney's life during the fourteen years which separate the writing of Cecilia and Camilla.

The temptation to rewrite Burney's life and psychology at the expense of the texts can be avoided by directing attention to only those facets of the author which articulate (with) the

text. (To articulate, we remember, means both to enunciate and to form a joint.) Furthermore, Bakhtin's model of the formation of novelistic language supports a rewriting of Evelina as the product of only these articulating facets of its author. Accordingly, we may develop the following sample of such a rewriting by considering the origins of novelistic discourse in Burney's consciousness.

As a young child, Burney played with the neighbouring wig-maker's children and thus, we may suppose, became intimately familiar with the discourse of tradespeople (Hemlow 14). It is only natural to assume that she assimilated this discourse, which then came into dialogic interaction with the socially "superior" discourse of her own family. When the "inferior" discourse lost its persuasiveness, Burney was enabled to objectify it, thereby liberating herself from it. By this theory, Burney's representation of this discourse in the speech of the Branghtons is actually a re-creation of the process by which she achieved her own distancing from it.

If the theory holds, we will not be surprised to find, as Bakhtin would predict, that the Branghtons' speech sometimes nearly escapes from parodic control, "since another's word, having been at an earlier stage internally persuasive, mounts a resistance . . . and frequently begins to sound with no parodic overtones at all" (Bakhtin 348). Such an instance occurs when Mr. Branghton is displaying his ignorance over buying opera tickets:

The young ladies, in some confusion, expressed their surprise that their papa should not know the Opera prices, which, for their parts, they had read in the papers a thousand times.

'The price of stocks,' said he, 'is enough for me to see after; and I took it for granted it was the same thing here as at the play-house.' (90)

Mr. Branghton's speech frequently takes on the aspect of common sense as it speaks dialogically to that of his lazy and affected children. Burney never allows Mr. Branghton's speech to escape her parodic control entirely, but at times it threatens to do so. It is at these moments of near escape that this tradesperson's discourse advances into alterity as it regains a glimmer of its potential persuasiveness. Here then, we have managed to begin with the author and move swiftly to concentrate on the text. This movement is facilitated by considering the author only as she articulates with the text, instead of reconstructing a whole psyche.

III

Although we have avoided the prevalent tendency to rewrite every aspect of Burney's consciousness, we have not made the source of power for rewriting any less speculative. Since the historical Burney is only known through successive textualizations, the speculative nature of our pronouncements about her authority cannot be avoided. Where Burney is concerned, the difficulty of reaching back to a historical author is magnified by two levels of confusion: first, Burney is readily identified with *Evelina*, and second, the Burney textualized in the *Journals* is conflated with the historical author. The sources of the first identification are of particular interest in light of the large amount of commentary to which it has given rise.

From the time of *Evelina*'s publication onward, Burney has been confused with *Evelina*. As a young woman she is playfully,

but nevertheless meaningfully, denominated "Evelina" by admirers. One of these admirers is so flustered in her presence that he approaches her asking, "'Oh! this is Evelina, is it?'" (DL, 1: 157). On this occasion Burney is cruel enough to stare at him and reply in the negative, leaving the poor man to pay for his error in embarrassment. Commentators are often eager to make the same identification. For example, in 1901, W. D. Howells describes Evelina as unconscious "self-portraiture" on Burney's part, asserting that when she created Evelina, "she looked in her glass for her model" (14). When Howells subsequently calls Evelina "the sweetest and dearest goose in all fiction" (23), we wonder whether or not he intends this comment as a reflection on Burney herself.

A more recent example of commentary which is inspired by similarities between Burney and her heroine(s), is provided by Katherine Rogers' 1984 article. Rogers compares Burney's "'private self," as it appears in her journals, and her "published self," as it is indirectly projected in the heroines of her novels' (111). The result of this comparison is twofold: Rogers finds the two selves much alike; but she provides an argument, based on evidence found in the Journals and Letters (which covers Burney's life after the age of thirty-nine), for a "private self" far stronger and assertive than the "published self" of the novels. The argument is strong enough, but it is based on an unverified assumption: Evelina is a projection of Burney's self. Since we have already rewritten Evelina in terms of generative sources (configurations and alterity) for which this assumption is unnecessary, we can question its validity. The source of the assumption, however, is

clear: the tradition of finding Burney in Evelina.

The tendency on the part of post eighteenth-century commentators to identify Burney with Evelina does not stem solely from similarities between author and heroine. Another origin for the identification is found in the strong resemblance of Evelina to the Journals. Formally, Evelina is the author/heroine of the novel, and Burney is the author/heroine of the Journals. In an article marking the centenary of Burney's death, the Times Literary Supplement calls Evelina the "natural extension [of the Early Diary] discharged from the embarrassment of fact" (Jan. 4, 1940: 9). The formal homology between the two texts is immediately evident. They both follow a pattern of lengthy journal-letters punctuated by shorter letters from the recipients of the journal-letters. What is often forgotten, though, is the fact that the Journals achieved this "edited" form through the efforts of Charlotte Barrett (in the case of the Diary and Letters) and Annie Raine Ellis (in the Early Diary). Whether or not these editors had Evelina in mind while they were arranging Burney's papers for publication, we can only guess. The prose styles of the Journals and Evelina are also remarkably similar. The sentimental praises sung to Villars are nearly identical to those offered Dr. Burney in the Journals. The character sketches with which both texts abound, display the same wit and objectifying irony. It is no wonder that Ellis finds Evelina "latent" in the Journals (ED, 2: 210n.).

Both the impression produced by the character sketches and the technique by which it is produced are virtually the same in the novel as in the Journals. Evelina and Cecilia made Burney famous

for drawing characters. Edmund Burke, after reading Cecilia, remarks to Burney: "'Nothing . . . struck me more in reading your book than the admirable skill with which your ingenious characters make themselves known by their own words"' (DL, 2: 140). This remark applies equally well to Evelina and the Journals. Burney's method is the same in both cases: she appears to be recording a transcript of the character's speech, the directness of which distracts the reader from noticing the elaborate frame and context in which the supposed transcript is nested. As far as Evelina is concerned, this technique is highly successful, for it creates the illusion that the characters are immediately present to the reader; when they are actually artistically represented in Burney's own words. The technique is equally successful in the Journals, but here its effects are problematic. Frequently Burney "transcribes" five or six pages of conversation, for which she has been praised for the accuracy of her ear and the powers of her memory. However, given the example of the novel, we must seriously consider the possibility that Burney's imagination contributes as much to these conversations as either her ear or her memory. More than likely, what appear to be transcripts are actually another's speech artistically represented in Burney's own speech. Her self-effacing technique enhances the veracity of her sketches while allowing her to disclaim responsibility for asserting herself so far as to objectify the speaking persons she represents.

Upon the publication of the first two volumes of Austin Dobson's edition of the Diary and Letters (1904), a review in the Spectator claims, "Madame D'Arblay's Diary is her masterpiece, and it is

no exaggeration to say that it is as good as a novel, for it is composed in all respects like a work of fiction" (Jan. 26, 1905: 141). Furthermore, the previously quoted article in the Times Literary Supplement finds the diary to be "a record not of fact, but of fantasy and wish-fulfilment. . . . It is not that the things she records did not happen, but that she changes their values." This changing of values is at the heart of Burney's method of artistic representation. Consequently, the primary task involved in rewriting the Journals as a product of Burney's authorship, is to account for the means whereby Burney transforms her own world into that of the Journals. Virtually all the commentators agree--although they use different terms--that the Journals, as a text, represent rather than transcribe a world, its speaking inhabitants and a single perceiving consciousness, but few would agree on how to read the Journals. Most end by confusing the historical with the textualized Frances Burney, for there is no defined boundary between the two.

Here we are faced once more with the problem of trying to force the texts to yield the historical Burney. In order to know this Burney, Joyce Hemlow has digested all the available information (published and unpublished) and produced from it a biography. Yet what she creates is a freshly textualized Burney, who differs significantly from the earlier version emerging from the Diary and Letters (first published 1842-46). Charlotte Barrett's energetic editing with scissors and paste contributes much to this earliest version.³ Burney herself went back over her journals, blacking

³ Hemlow describes the editorial work performed on the manuscripts by Barrett and Burney in her introduction to the Journals and Letters.

out sections, discarding masses of letters and adding bits here and there to adjust the impression produced. The extensive notes and preface which Ellis writes for the Early Diary surely must affect the reader's impression. These editors (including Burney herself) rewrite Burney rather than reveal the historical author. Interestingly, whereas Hemlow's tendency in editing the later journals (1741-1840) is to work against Burney's intentions in favour of historical accuracy, Ellis' tendency is to follow Burney's intent and even shore up weak areas.

A good example of these divergent tendencies is found in the representation of Burney's step-mother. Burney seldom mentions her step-mother (in the published journals), and when she does, it is with little or no emotion. This neutral way of setting down Mrs. Burney differs radically from the marked affection with which Burney inscribes her father and siblings. The difference is so obvious that Ellis is impelled to anticipate the natural suspicions of readers about this relationship. Consequently, she includes in her biographical preface a fond letter from Mrs. Burney to her step-daughter as proof that the relationship was actually one of affection and esteem (ED, 1: lxxxi-lxxxiii). Hemlow, in The History of Fanny Burney, chooses instead to expose the relationship as never better than strained, with Mrs. Burney as jealous, suspicious and resentful of the close emotional ties within her step-family (35-39). Perhaps the wisest approach to this editorial explication and confusion is to accept that textualized and historical versions inevitably share a continuum, and to keep in mind the two theoretical poles for this continuum: to one side stands the textualized Frances

Burney in a (perhaps, sanitized) world which fulfills her own intent; to the other side stands the historical woman in her social setting; in between lie the texts available today and the intentions of their editors.

IV

What did the historical Burney achieve by writing her journal? If we are to confront Burney as an author, we must answer this question, trying to discover the reason for and the nature of her journalizing activity. Patricia Spacks writes very persuasively on this question. She calls "journals and collections of letters . . . autobiographies by indirection" ("Reflecting Women" 26), and treats Burney's published journals as an autobiography. This sort of autobiography is indirect because the author is writing his or her life without seeming--to self or to reader--to do so. Burney's journals are actually not particularly indirect in this sense, for Burney carefully edited her mass of personal papers into the semblance of a "life" before Barrett began work on it. Spacks sees the production of autobiography as offering women a way of dealing with the strict limitations imposed on them by society. That way "is simply to write about it: to transform difficult reality into glamorous myth" ("Reflecting Women" 27). In the autobiographies that she considers, including Burney's, Spacks finds a distinctly dual perception whereby the woman writing glamorizes her life and creates for herself a "mythic self-image" while simultaneously displaying "an exactitude, a capacity for minute focussing of attention,

which records the precise nature of actuality and compels the reader to believe in it" ("Reflecting Women" 30). Spacks' reasoning is based on the following theory: "The claim of heroic significance for feminine acceptance of the burden of the trivial reflects a fantasy reaction to the underevaluation, by society and by individuals, of the weight and importance of that burden" ("Reflecting Women" 28). This theory provides an alternative interpretation for the texture of the world represented in the Journals. As a rewriting of this world is possible in terms of alterity, so it is possible in terms of Burney's autobiographical myth-making. This activity results in a change of emphasis and value between everyday and inscribed worlds. The emphasis on appearances and extreme value placed on propriety in the Journals can be interpreted as effects of the myth-making function which transforms one world into another.

We can extend Spacks' argument by using Frank Kermode's distinction between myth and fiction. Myths, Kermode says, are "agents of stability," whereas fictions are "agents of change" (39). In this view, myths are degenerate fictions; they are fictions whose fictive nature has been forgotten (41). Creating her journal, Burney mythologizes her life, producing an authoritative version. By writing this journal she stabilizes herself and her world after the buffeting of experience. In Spacks' words:

Writing . . . declares the possibility of at least retrospective control over experience--that control which women in their lives so often lack. Controlling experience, diarists and autobiographers control also the images of themselves they offer to the world. Their images of virtue, in selfhood and in action, define ways of dealing with fear and vulnerability. ("Women's Stories, Women's Selves" 46)

The control Burney achieves by journalizing provides a stabilizing influence for her everyday life rather than a means by which to change its circumstances. Instead of responding to the constraints of propriety with resentment and rebellion, she creates a textual world which so enhances the value of propriety that she exists there as a heroine by virtue of her conformity. If Burney achieves stability by transforming her world with a myth-making function, does she effect change when she switches to a fiction-generating function? Undoubtedly Evelina radically changed Burney's life. Once she was acknowledged as the author, Burney earned the respect of her father, a place at the Thrale table and the attention of literate London.

In Imagining a Self, Spacks searches out Burney's motives for journalizing and assesses her achievements. She judges Burney entirely successful in creating for herself a consistent identity. The structure of the Journals and the strength of this identity devolve on "her determination to be perceived as good, and her fear of negative judgement" (Imagining a Self 160). In Spacks' argument, Burney manages to convert a "commitment to fear of wrongdoing" into a source of self-actualizing power through her journalizing activity (175). What Burney essentially does, according to Spacks, is imaginatively shape her life by embracing, rather than being defeated by, fear and self-denial. She thus transforms the threats to her self-hood into its guiding principles. Spacks contends that the self-interpreting activity of autobiography affirms the writer's power to dominate experience and rescue a life from confusion. She locates the generative source of the autobiography in the author,

and sees this source producing both a self and a text. We can therefore describe Spacks' commentary as a rewriting of the self (the Burney textualized in the journals) and the text (the journals interpreted as autobiography) as products of their author (the historical Burney).

Spacks' research is so thorough and her arguments so convincing, that she seems to have become the "authority" on Fanny Burney. Commentators writing since the publication of Imagining a Self in 1976 customarily bow to Spacks before launching their own arguments. An exception to this reverence for Spacks' authority is found in an article written by Peter Glassman which is in part a review of Imagining a Self. Although he agrees with Spacks that Burney creates a self in her autobiographical journals, he does not see Burney the author incorporating any of the wholeness of her textualized counterpart. Spacks argues that Burney shapes both her written and writing selves, but Glassman allows Burney power over only her written self. Autobiographers in general, he contends, compensate for their failure to establish a sense of wholeness and genuineness in their everyday lives by creating, in autobiographical words, the selves they are unable to become in the everyday world. In Glassman's view, autobiography is a testament to the autobiographer's defeat by life:

Fanny Burney unwittingly teaches us in her brilliantly evocative discourse how the human subconscious may reach out to surround and devastate one's larger apparatus of life. Her work permits us to observe the actual procedures by which the mind may learn to lay waste its own proffered field, and so to contaminate its being with its terror of being. (143)

It seems to me . . . that autobiographical writing frequently, perhaps normally, operates as a variety of flight from the experience of individuation; as an expression of an author's consignment of his [and her?] undiscovered

particularity to the less visibly evanescent authority of the Other. It seems to me that one "tells one's story" because one doubts the actualness of one's interior identification. The autobiographer implicitly testifies, I believe, to his final acceptance of enclosure. I am, he declares, that which You take me to be; I am more comfortable, more nearly expressed, as I explain myself to You than as I receive myself from within. In my judgement, the literature of autobiography is anything but "optimistic." It seems to me more commonly funereal, a proclamation in adagio of one's acceptance of the Other in lieu of the authentically interior. (145)

Although both Spacks and Glassman would rewrite the Journals as autobiography and designate Burney's authority as its generative source, they differ radically in their assessment of what Burney achieves by journalizing: Spacks sees Burney overcoming the restrictive circumstances of her life, and Glassman sees her being defeated by them; according to Spacks, Burney creatively inscribes a self, but to Glassman, Burney seems rather to circumscribe her self.

Glassman's criticism of Spacks is not as valid as it initially appears to be, for it is based on a model of psychology which is ill-suited to the world of the Journals. To look, as Glassman does, for evidence of "individuation" and "the authentically interior" in the Journals, is to search in vain. These categories are absolutely foreign to the world represented in the Journals, and when they are employed as critical parameters, Burney's work will be measured by its lack (Glassman would say denial or suppression) of these categories. Nevertheless, Glassman's approach does allow him to grasp a prominent feature of the world of the Journals which Spacks' theory of autobiography conceals. That feature is the omnipotence of the other. Since we rewrote the Journals in terms of alterity, this feature is familiar as a source of power within the text. But to Glassman, the power of otherness is negative, destructive.

Here we encounter yet another limitation of rewriting the text as a product of its author. If the generative power is centred in the author, the other is necessarily a limiting, restrictive or destructive power. Glassman's theory of autobiography is pessimistic because it sees the generative power of the self defeated by the destructive power of the other. Spacks' theory is optimistic insofar as it conceals or banishes the other.

The problem to be solved, then, is how to redeem the other while continuing to centre generative power in the author. No amount of shifting attention from the historical Burney to the author/text interface will help here. Nor will the problem be solved by choosing as sources of power only those facets of Burney which articulate with the text. Indeed, this final problem is intrinsic to rewriting in terms of an author. The prejudice against the other in favour of the self is particularly damaging to the Journals, which evokes a world existing most fully in the eyes of the other. Burney never mentions her self (either by inscription or circumscription), seldom writes about herself, but continually focusses on the discourse of the other. She creates a world in which individuals exist most authentically at their boundaries with others. In this world, to engage the other, whether in conciliation or combat, is mandatory. Here any interior self is secondary to the external boundary of the one at which all interactions with the other occur. Consequently, the best means for redeeming the power of the other is to rewrite primarily in terms of alterity. The model of alterity has a place for the author, but no throne.

What then, shall we decide Frances Burney is doing when she writes her journal? She is entering into alterity with her world. More than she inscribes herself, she inscribes her interaction with--her assimilation and/or rejection of--the other. Hence the world of the Journals is a world in which the meeting with the other in alterity is the principle source of power. To be sure, Burney's authorship is an external generative source, but her creative activity owes its being to alterity. Among sources of power in the Journals, alterity is the primal.

As we have seen, the various attempts to rewrite the Journals --and Evelina, for that matter--in terms of Burney's authority are inevitably problematic. These attempts often end up rewriting Burney's life, using the novels and journals for biographical evidence. The fascination for commentators seems to be Burney and the society in which she lived, rather than the literature she produced. As a result of this fascination, the existing commentary seldom pauses long enough to savour the texture of the worlds Burney represents in her writing; instead, it hastily conflates these artistically represented worlds and the society inhabited by the historical Burney. Perhaps the fact that texts of one sort or another provide the only access to this historical world encourages us to treat Burney's texts as doorways. However, rewriting in terms of the deeper generative sources of the text discourages the preoccupation with Burney herself and her society, and reveals the texture of the created worlds. The model of alterity facilitates such rewriting and also leads us on to explore the dialogic interactions between textual and historical worlds and beings.

If we are to conclude by assessing the priority of the sources of power in this way, we must turn once more to the configurations of actants in Evelina. We have examined the emanation of generative power from these configurations and the structuring effect it has within the novel. Nevertheless, we have not specified why it is that the configurations emanate power. The reason lies in the relationships these configurations bear to literature and society. The power derives not so much from the configurations themselves as from their dialogic interaction with related literary and social configurations. Structures from Paradise Lost as well as everyday family structures enter into dialogic with the arrangements of actants in Evelina, creating the polarity through which the power flows. Although this set of dialogic interactions cannot fairly be described in terms of alterity, a certain similarity is evident: the activity in both cases is at an interface. Seen in this way, even internal sources of power (the configurations of actants) depend on the textual boundary. Indeed, the locus of the elemental generative sources of both Evelina and the Journals is the boundary at which one is present to, and in the presence of, the other. At this locus inhere the articulations of the text.

Appendix: Some Terms

This thesis makes use of some terms current in contemporary theoretical and critical discourse. The terms are identified, when appropriate, within the text, but there may be a need to amplify these identifications. We are concerned with four words: "alterity," "other," "actant" and "rewriting."

The present use of "alterity" is inseparable from the word "other." This identification is made explicit in the study of Bakhtin by Clark and Holquist. The following passage clarifies for us the relationship between alterity and other which is so important to our discussion.

The other is in the deepest sense my friend, because it is only from the other that I can get my self. The unusual term drugost' for alterity draws attention to the pervasiveness of the other through its -ost' ending, a grammatical marker indicating abstraction, like -ness in English. The word also hints at the relationship between the words for "friend" (drug) and "other" (drugoj), where -oj is the standard adjectival marker added to the root drug. This shading suggests the positive values of the other in Bakhtin's thinking. (65-66)

By using the term "alterity," we avoid the pejorative sense of "otherness" as the antagonist in the ontology of consciousness.

In similar fashion, the word "actant" is chosen to forestall certain implications of "character." These implications derive from a representational theory of narrative which sees characters primarily as representations of subjective beings. To call the characters "actors" would reinforce rather than avoid these implications, for actors represent people. An actant, however, is merely a

discursive cluster with no pretensions to subjectivity. An actant is related to a character in that the actant is the bare framework of the character. But the actant, aside from this relationship, is a fundamental structural quantity of narrative. As such, actants structure narrative by virtue of their positions within it, not by any reference to subjective motivations. Greimas also uses "actant" in order to avoid the implications of subjectivity which inhere in "character," but he sorts actants into basic categories, which are universal to narrative. We will not adopt this universal property for our actants. Here the actants are peculiar to Evelina.

The term "rewriting" is used in order to avoid the implications of "interpretation." To denominate commentary as "rewriting" rather than "interpretation" is to acknowledge that there is no "true" or "ideal" text, no ultimate "meaning" to be revealed or delivered by the commentary. Rewriting may be audacious with respect to the author and his or her supposed intentions, but it is at the same time profoundly humble with respect to the capacity of commentary to do more than present the text once again, in a new way.

Works Cited

- Bakhtin, M. M. The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M. M. Bakhtin. Trans. Carl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Ed. Michael Holquist. Slavic Series 1. Austin: U of Texas P, 1982.
- Bloom, Lillian D. and Edward A. "Fanny Burney's Novels: The Retreat from Wonder." Novel 12 (1978/79): 215-35.
- Burney, Frances (Madame d'Arblay). Cecilia: or Memoirs of an Heiress. 1782. London: Virago P, 1986.
- . Diary and Letters of Madame D'Arblay, 1778-1840. Ed. Charlotte Barrett. 1842-1846. Preface and notes Austin Dobson. 6vols. London: Macmillan, 1904-1905.
- . The Early Diary of Frances Burney, 1768-1778. Ed. Annie Raine Ellis. 2 vols. 1889. Freeport, New York: Books for Libraries P, 1971.
- . Evelina: Or, The History of a Young Lady's Entrance into the World. 1778. Ed. Edward A. Bloom. London: Oxford UP, 1968. The method of internal quotation in Evelina (single marks) and the Journals (double marks) is preserved.
- . The Journals and Letters of Fanny Burney (Madame d'Arblay). Ed. Joyce Hemlow et. al. 12 vols. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1972-1984.
- Clark, Katerina and Holquist, Michael. Mikhail Bakhtin. Cambridge: Belknap-Harvard UP, 1984.
- Rev. of Diaries (sic) and Letters of Madame D'Arblay, ed. Austin Dobson, vols. 1-2. Spectator 94 (Jan. 28, 1905): 141-142.
- "Fanny Burney (1752-1840): A Life in a World of Fantasy." Times Literary Supplement Jan. 6, 1940: 9.
- Figes, Eva. "Fanny Burney." Sex and Subterfuge: Women Novelists to 1850. London: Macmillan, 1982. 33-56.
- Glassman, Peter. "Acts of Enclosure." Hudson Review 30 (1977): 138-146.
- Hemlow, Joyce. The History of Fanny Burney. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1958.
- Hemlow, Joyce, ed. Introduction. The Journals and Letters of Fanny Burney (Madame d'Arblay). Ed. Hemlow et al. Vol. 1. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1972. xxi-lix. 12 vols. 1972-1984.

- Howells, W. D. "Frances Burney's *Evelina*." Heroines of Fiction. Vol. 1. London: Harper, 1901. 13-23. 2 vols.
- Kermode, Frank. The Sense of an Ending: Studies in the Theory of Fiction. 1966. London: Oxford UP, 1981.
- Macaulay, Thomas Babington. "Diary and Letters of Madame D'Arblay." Critical and Historical Essays. Vol. 3. Boston, Riverside-Houghton, 1900. 331-395. 3vols.
- Milton, John. Paradise Lost. John Milton: Complete Poems and Major Prose. Ed., Merritt Y. Hughes. Indianapolis: Odyssey-Bobbs, 1957. 207-469.
- Olshin, Toby. "'To Whom I Most Belong': The Role of Family in *Evelina*." Eighteenth-Century Life 6.1 (1980): 29-42.
- Parke, Catherine. "Vision and Revision: A Model for Reading the Eighteenth-Century Novel of Education." Eighteenth-Century Studies 16 (Winter 1982/83): 162-174.
- Poovey, Mary. "Fathers and Daughters: The Trauma of Growing Up Female." Women and Letters 2 (1982): 139-158.
- Rogers, Katherine M. "Fanny Burney: The Private Self and the Published Self." International Journal of Women's Studies 7 (1984): 110-117.
- Spacks, Patricia Meyer. "Dynamics of Fear: Fanny Burney." Imagining a Self: Autobiography and Novel in Eighteenth-Century England. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1976. 158-192.
- . "Reflecting Women." Yale Review 63 (1973): 26-42.
- . "Women's Stories, Women's Selves." Hudson Review 30 (1977): 29-46.
- Waelti-Walters, Jennifer. Fairy Tales and the Female Imagination. Montreal: Eden P, 1982.

END

2|3·1 2·|87

FIN