



Frances Burney
Camilla

OXFORD WORLD'S CLASSICS

OXFORD WORLD'S CLASSICS



FR

30809070

Camilla

OR

A Picture of Youth



Edited with an Introduction and Notes by

EDWARD A. BLOOM

and

LILLIAN D. BLOOM



OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

07000802

OXFORD

UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford OX2 6DP

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,
and education by publishing worldwide in

Oxford New York

Athens Auckland Bangkok Bogotá Buenos Aires Calcutta
Cape Town Chennai Dar es Salaam Delhi Florence Hong Kong Istanbul
Karachi Kuala Lumpur Madrid Melbourne Mexico City Mumbai
Nairobi Paris São Paulo Singapore Taipei Tokyo Toronto Warsaw
with associated companies in Berlin Ibadan

Oxford is a registered trade mark of Oxford University Press
in the UK and in certain other countries

Published in the United States
by Oxford University Press Inc., New York

Introduction, Notes, Bibliography, Chronology © Oxford University Press 1972, 1983

The moral rights of the author have been asserted
Database right Oxford University Press (maker)

First published by Oxford University Press 1972
First issued as a World's Classics paperback 1983
Reissued as an Oxford World's Classics paperback 1999
Reissued 2009

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced,
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means,
without the prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press,
or as expressly permitted by law, or under terms agreed with the appropriate
reprographics rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction
outside the scope of the above should be sent to the Rights Department,
Oxford University Press, at the address above

You must not circulate this book in any other binding or cover
and you must impose this same condition on any acquirer

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
Data available

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication Data

Burney, Fanny, 1752–1840.
Camilla. (Oxford world's classics)

Bibliography: p.

I. Bloom, Edward Allan, 1914– . II. Bloom, Lillian D.

III. Title. IV. Title: Camilla.
PR3316.A4C3 1983 823'.6 83–2423

ISBN 978-0-19-955574-1

3

Printed in Great Britain by
Clays Ltd, St Ives plc

OXFORD WORLD'S CLASSICS

CAMILLA

FRANCES (FANNY) BURNEY was born at King's Lynn, Norfolk, in 1752, the daughter of Dr Charles Burney, the historian of music. She lived during her youth in the midst of that literary society which included Samuel Johnson and Edmund Burke. *Evelina*, her first novel, immediately made her famous. In 1786 she became second keeper of the robes to Queen Charlotte and in 1793 she married General D'Arblay, a French émigré. From 1802 to 1812 she was interned by Napoleon and lived in France. All her life she kept a diary, and a vast number of her vivid and colourful letters have also survived. She died in London in 1840 and was buried in Bath near her husband and son.

EDWARD A. BLOOM is Professor of English at Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island.

LILLIAN D. BLOOM is Professor of English at Rhode Island College. She is co-author, with her husband, of *Joseph Addison's Sociable Animal* and *Satire's Persuasive Voice*, and co-editor of *The Piozzi Letters*.

LILLIAN D. BLOOM

OXFORD

OXFORD WORLD'S CLASSICS

For over 100 years Oxford World's Classics have brought readers closer to the world's great literature. Now with over 700 titles—from the 4,000-year-old myths of Mesopotamia to the twentieth century's greatest novels—the series makes available lesser-known as well as celebrated writing.

The pocket-sized hardbacks of the early years contained introductions by Virginia Woolf, T. S. Eliot, Graham Greene, and other literary figures which enriched the experience of reading.

Today the series is recognized for its fine scholarship and reliability in texts that span world literature, drama and poetry, religion, philosophy and politics. Each edition includes perceptive commentary and essential background information to meet the changing needs of readers.

INTRODUCTION

I

ON 17 July 1786 Fanny Burney became second keeper of the robes to Queen Charlotte. For five years thereafter, in the ceremonial surroundings of the royal household, she felt herself isolated from normal human relationships, and especially from the intimacies of family life. But her unhappiness welled up from more than a sense of alienation. She questioned her strength to confront those responsibilities set for her by Madame Schwellenberg, dresser to Her Majesty, and even by the queen, whose indecisiveness was as exacting as the other's jealousy. During these anxious years, when Fanny Burney was often threatened by loss of self-control, she forced herself to write as a source of discipline. Understandably, her creative attention focused on the tragic. In the late autumn of 1788 the blank verse tragedy *Edwy and Elgiva* was begun, and two years later it was carelessly finished, along with three others that differed from their prototype in heightened melodrama and declamation. By 1791 the novelist, whom Dr. Johnson had once urged to 'fly at the eagle', could no longer find release in composition. She capitulated to a prolonged and undefined illness whose symptoms were eased only when she left the queen's service on 7 July 1791.

The results of those five years were not entirely negative. She developed a lasting affection for the queen and the princesses that was reciprocated; she was granted an annual pension of £100 for the rest of her life; and she brought away 'the skeleton' of *Camilla*, which 'was formed [at Windsor], but nothing was completed'.¹ How the skeleton was fleshed must remain speculative. But it may well have been that as Fanny Burney performed her chores at the royal residences, she recollected an idea tenta-

¹ To her father Dr. Charles Burney (5-6 July 1796), in *The Journals and Letters of Fanny Burney (Madame D'Arblay), 1791-1840* (Oxford, 1972-), iii. L. 196. For full citation of this multi-volume work, hereafter designated *JL*, see Select Bibliography.

tively expressed in the earlier *Cecilia*. In her second novel she had written of the eternal disjunction between the generations: 'the young are rash, and the aged are mercenary; their deliberations are never in concert, their views are scarce ever blended; one vanquishes, and the other submits.'¹

Whether this idea was part of conscious thought or not, she began at odd times between 1786 and 1791 to rough out a related theme, a few episodes, some dialogue, and character sketches for what might some day become a novel. There was nothing systematic about her method. On a scrap of paper she wrote, for example: 'It is a mistake to suppose the intellect weak in youth, because the judgment is erroneous.' At another time in a more detached mood, she scribbled that 'Precaution is not natural to youth, whose greatest [danger] because greatest weakness is confidence in its first impulse, which is commonly pleasant because kind. To be just requires more reflexion; to have foresight, demands more experience.'² Whatever she would write—if indeed she wrote at all—the 'work' was to delineate the conflict between youth and age, between the vacillation of innocence and the purposefulness of mature conduct.

As she took hold of the concept with progressive interest and firmness, Fanny Burney advanced from thematic abstraction, through scenic particularity, to the concreteness of plot. She would write of a family and of the way its members—young and old—reacted to crisis. For example:

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

Sudden affluence comes to them—

They are exhilarated

Some exult—some are even—some gallop on to profusion

A Sermon on equanimity

Some grow indolent & insolent

Suddenly all is lost.

Reduced to poverty.

Some humbly sad—some outrageously repining:—some haughtily hardy—some pettishly impatient—one cheerfully submissive

¹ *Cecilia*, ed. Annie Raine Ellis (London, 1882), ii. 42.

² Marked 37b, 40b, in a portfolio of fifty-nine scraps of paper containing suggestions for dialogue, etc. for *Camilla* in the Berg Collection of the New York Public Library. Hereafter these papers will be designated as (Berg) *Scraps*.

A sermon on disappointments.

What of shifts & cramping before seemed nothing, now appear hardships and sorrow.¹

This is not the precise plot of *Camilla*. But it is one which, when enhanced by the imaginative process, animates the Tyrold family, gives realistic substance to their altering circumstances, and even provides the moral centres—as in the two sermons—for their problems.

Any fictional narrative demands characterization. Fanny Burney had to select the people who moved through the pages of her work, especially those who created tension and conflict. Again, on the blank side of a torn and discarded letter, she sketched a type figure who would emerge finally as one of the antagonists in the novel. For the present he is only Mr. Jocosó, of significant name:

A perpetual joker; saying good and amusing things but never waiting for times & seasons: & therefore, though a man of good Intellect, more wearisome than a fool; by always using every occasion to say a good thing, without attending to anxiety, without listening to Facts, without weighing arguments, without consoling affliction, without caring about reason, & without the smallest attention to the human character, or situations of his Hearers, whom, without meaning it he either wounds or offends at every other word.

Mr. Jocosó becomes a split personality, foreshadowing certain traits of Sir Sedley, who cultivates a merry glibness as he does foppishness. But more importantly, Mr. Jocosó sits for the fully realized portrait of Lionel. Like his stereotype, Lionel is irresponsible, driven on by a naïve need for laughter that

seemed not merely the bent of his humour, but the necessity of his existence: he pursued it at all seasons, he indulged it upon all occasions. With excellent natural parts, he trifled away all improvements; without any ill temper, he spared no one's feelings. Yet, though not radically vicious, nor deliberately malevolent, the egotism which urged him to make his own amusement his first pursuit, sacrificed his best friends and first duties, if they stood in its way.²

These were some of the scraps that Fanny Burney carried away from Windsor on 7 July 1791. She felt no urgency to begin shaping them into a novel; with little compunction she apparently

¹ Marked 26b, in (Berg) *Scraps*.

² Marked 6b, in (Berg) *Scraps; Camilla*, p. 79.

put them out of sight and out of mind. Within two years, on 28 July 1793, she married Alexandre d'Arblay, an emigré who had found temporary refuge at Juniper Hall in Surrey. She was happier now than she had been for a long time. If she worried at all, it was about a scarcity of money. General d'Arblay had none; she had only her pension—and her talent. Yet she must have remembered what her sister Susan advised her even before the marriage took place. 'For my own part I can only say, & solicit, & urge to my Fanny to *print, print, print!*—Here is a ressource—a certainty of removing present difficulties.'¹

Fanny Burney's was a practical courage that forced her—even against inclination—to take on the Muses, 'the most skittish ladies living'—the one who pursues 'with Bowls & Daggers' and the other who 'escapes' concealed by a mask. By the time her son Alex was born in December 1794, she had not only disinterred the skeleton but had already begun to think of it as a work of fiction, to give it coherent incidents, a variety of characters, and tonal nuances, all those parts that make for a novel's life and vitality. As early as 10 August, she had reported to her father: 'You spirited me on in all ways, for this week past I have taken *tightly* to the *grand ouvrage*.' She wrote quickly and the number of manuscript pages increased so visibly that she could joke: 'If I go on so a little longer, I doubt not but M. d'Arblay will begin settling where to have a new shelf for arranging it.'²

Despite devotion to her husband and later to her child, despite bouts of illness, she was from that first week in August once again the committed novelist. She would work late at night, writing as many as fourteen pages at one sitting. She never considered her effort drudgery; on the contrary, she found it 'delicious to stride on', to create that which would contribute to the well-being of her family. When, after the completion of *Camilla*, she was asked by George III how much time she had given to it, she answered: '*All* my time, sir!—from the period I planned publishing it, I devoted myself to it wholly;—I had no Episode—but a little baby!—My subject grew upon me.'³

¹ By Susan Phillips, with a postscript by M. d'Arblay, *JL* (9 June 1793), ii. L. 101.

² To Dr. Burney, *JL* (17 May 1793), ii. L. 87; (10 August 1794), iii. L. 149.

³ To M. d'Arblay, *JL* (3 February 1796), iii. L. 187. For FB's comment to the king, see n. 1.

For all her fluency, she wrote too fast as she near-sightedly peered at the scraps of paper laid out before her, those random jottings written when she did not have to attend the queen. She soon turned out a rough draft of which forty-six folio pages are extant today.¹ They reveal the author's tentative movement through her materials. But what she formulated, she ordered, giving book and chapter numbers to her scribble. In a short time, however, she admitted to herself that she had made a false start, or at least had taken many wrong steps. None of the scenes in the extant portion of the early draft, except the play-acting scene, appear in the printed novel. Ruthlessly she cast them out although she kept the characters whole as she moved them from draft to draft and finally to the published text.

In this early version, probably written late in 1794—just before the birth of Alex—her characterizations are fully formed; only their names undergo change in the next year and a half. There is, for instance, the romantic idealist, a Mr. Ginniston, infatuated with a young lady representative of mindless vanity. Like the later Mr. Melmond, he could not in perceptive moments 'still a secret voice that began whispering: "I fear . . . I fear—I have tied myself for life to a mere beautiful machine!"' While she, retreating in deep resentment that she had been exposed, disdainfully muttered "I might just as well have engaged myself to a parish clerk".² Another seminal character is an unnamed Ensign as impetuous as Macdersey and as much addicted to childish rant about honour and duels. Comparably a Miss Hasty will be translated into Miss Dennel, laughter-driven Tybalt into Lionel, Mrs. Lintot (with her 'pharoah' table and Grosvenor Square mansion) into Mrs. Berlinton.

The heroine is at times called Clarinda and at others Ariella. She is as loving and rash as Camilla, given to 'faint screams' and to the delirious sighting of a mysterious 'Form'. Devoted to her parents, she is ever loyal to Leontine, occasionally named Edgar. Before him she would willingly efface herself, if to no avail. 'Yet inferior as I was to him, with what patience, what sweetness did he bear with me! With what delicacy instruct, what softness conciliate, what pain remonstrate! And what might he not have done, had he more fully known his power? To what would I not

¹ (British Museum), Barrett, Egerton 3696.

have consented that he had recommended & desired? . . . He was all honour, all truth, all nobleness.'

This early draft suffers from an uncertainty obvious in the excessive use of exclamation marks and rhetorical questions, of monologues and asides more expository than dramatic. Nevertheless, it allowed Fanny Burney to test the technical direction of her novel and, as significantly, to estimate its sales potential. Because she was aesthetically pleased with her first two novels and understood their commercial value, she declined innovation for her third. She became, in effect, self-imitative. Unaware of the artistic trap she was manufacturing for herself and contrary to Burke's earlier advice that her fictional people were 'too numerous', she reported that her 'NEW WORK [was to be] of the same species as *Evelina* & *Cecilia*: new *modified*, in being more multifarious in the Characters it brings into action,—but all *wove* into *one*, with a one *Heroine* shining conspicuous through the Group, & that in . . . *the prose Epic style*.' Its over-all design was clear to her from the beginning. She always meant it to be, as she once asserted, '*sketches of Characters & morals, put in action, not a Romance*'.¹

When she created the major figures in *Evelina* and *Cecilia*, she devised a method of portraiture inseparable from a credible poetics of fiction. Her characters, despite their idealized names, had to meet the requirements of a 'natural and probable human existence', had indeed to dramatize 'the lessons of experience'. They had, in short, to be decent or admirable people who were defective in some quality of thought or behaviour. With reference to *Cecilia*, for example, the novelist wrote: 'I meant in Mrs. Delville to draw a great, but not a perfect character; I meant, on the contrary, to blend upon paper, as I have frequently seen blended in life, noble and rare qualities with striking and incurable defects.'² The portrait of Mrs. Delville is unusually grim; for she is denied the ultimate redemption towards which Fanny Burney's significant characters worked and presumably attained.

¹ To Dr. Burney, *JL* (6 July 1795), iii. L.175; (18 June 1795), iii. L. 171. For Burke's concern over the number of characters created by FB, see *The Diary and Letters of Madame D'Arblay*, ed. Charlotte Barrett, with Preface and Notes by Austin Dobson (London, 1904), ii. 92 ff.

² For her theory of characterization, see the 'Introduction' to *The Wanderer* (1814); for her intention concerning Mrs. Delville, see *Diary and Letters*, ii. 72.

In her third novel she wanted a heroine who through suffering could discipline indiscriminate goodness with 'precaution'. She wanted a hero cast in the mould of a tutor-husband—like Evelina's Orville—but only after he had learned to temper doubt with trust and affection. She wanted her guardian figures, in this case Mr. and Mrs. Tyrold, to achieve the grace of self-awareness and to acknowledge their own flaws: the first one admitting to parental indulgence and the other to hyper-righteousness. So in 1794 she conceived her major characters, all of whom had been tried and proved earlier. But in the same year she attempted a controlled number of new types—the likeable scapegrace, the spiteful spinster-governess, the villain. These figures made her uneasy and she could only despatch them, whether through exile or death, once they played out their roles as antagonists.

For her '*grand ouvrage*' she needed, as she admitted, 'multi-farious' characters, a large number of complementary and contrasting personalities. These she hoped to create by perfecting a formula tried first on the Delvilles in *Cecilia*. 'I merely meant to show how differently pride, like every other quality, operates upon different minds, and that, though it is so odious when joined with meanness and incapacity, as in Mr. Delville, it destroys neither respect nor affection when joined with real dignity and generosity of mind, as in Mrs. Delville.'¹ In 1794 she chose not one but a series of specific character traits for contrapuntal development. Whatever the trait, she illustrated its widely ranging manifestations through several types. Long fascinated by that of levity, she had once identified it as a 'hardener of the heart . . . its self-disguises amuse but beguile the fancy till they deaden all sensation.'² Eventually this moral quality would define characters as distinctive from one another as quick Lionel, vapid Indiana, exquisite Sedley, and ill-mannered Clermont. And the fictional utility she attached to levity, Fanny Burney intended for other values that controlled personality, those of calculating selfishness, sentiment, innocence, prudence, and even scholarly dedication.

She also saw her third novel as an amalgam of those themes and tones that she had merged so successfully in the first two. Thus she contemplated scenes of high seriousness 'to make pleasant the path of propriety'. She would ring changes upon them: she

¹ *Diary and Letters*, ii. 154.

² Marked 25a, in (Berg) *Scraps*.

would create tense drama as in the mother-daughter conflict; provide moral parentheses in which, for example, a 'slavering' idiot gyrated to prove the inadequacy of mere physical beauty; expound arguments for prudential behaviour through paternal sermons. All that was weighty and grave she chose to alternate with what was light and entertaining. Her comedy, too, would be highly varied: witty interludes as a fop discourses on indolence or a sophisticate on marriage as an 'establishment'; intellectual farce in which *Othello* is acted in dialect and the audience serves as critic; belly-laugh humour when the performers are drawn in slangy or country idiom from 'low' or 'middle' life; sentimental laughter when the aged but lovable Sir Hugh struggles to master 'the classics'. As in *Evelina* and *Cecilia*, the comic scenes had to contribute to a satiric intention, their dialogue revealing the often aimless snobbery of the upper classes, the vulgar greed of the middle station, and the cruel ignorance of the poor.

From the very beginning of composition, Fanny Burney meant *Camilla* (or *Ariella* as she initially conceived the title) to exploit the pathos of 'the tender sympathy'. Because it was axiomatic that 'a crying volume' brought its author more money 'in six months than a heavy merry thing', she permitted herself few stops. She would have her readers weep in sympathy over the heroine's mistakes, in wonder over Eugenia's resignation, in anger over Mr. Tyrold's unwarranted imprisonment. If *Cecilia* made Mrs. Thrale cry herself 'blind over the conclusion . . . 'tis so excessively pathetic', then the third novel must provoke sobs only intermittently stifled.¹

Finally, Fanny Burney in 1794 intended to manipulate still another reaction—terror. Earlier she had frowned upon Gothicism that makes reason 'an outcast' in fiction; this time, however, she would grasp at its artifices as she wrote her '*Udolphish* volumes'. Fully aware of the selling power of Mrs. Radcliffe's novels, she also wanted to capitalize on fashionable craving for the verbal macabre. She therefore would prolong the description of a bier, its corpse unknown, carried through the sinister woods; she would detail the plight of a heroine seized by near-madness and confronted by spectral 'Forms' at her bedside.

¹ For the financial value of the 'tender sympathy' (*Camilla*, p. 845), see Joyce Hemlow, *The History of Fanny Burney* (Oxford, 1958), p. 97. For Mrs. Thrale's reaction, see *Diary and Letters*, ii. 53-4.

It is almost as if in accepting such Gothic elements for her own work, Fanny Burney felt free to abandon one other aesthetic rule that she formerly professed. In 1782, for example, she defended the realism of *Cecilia*'s ending wherein 'the hero and heroine are neither plunged in the depths of misery, nor exalted to UNhuman happiness'. Were it otherwise, she said, she might as well borrow 'the last page of any novel in Mr. Noble's circulating library . . . since a marriage, a reconciliation, and some sudden expedient for great riches, concludes them all alike.'¹ For *Camilla* she meant to borrow that 'last page'—and did with gusto.

When she began the second draft of her 'NEW WORK', the tonal variations, the contrapuntal patterns—if not all the details—of plot and characterization were fixed in her mind.² Again she wrote rapidly and enthusiastically, but this time with critical assurance. She knew she would have to revise, as she had in the past—to alter language and to excise radically—but she now enjoyed a sense of control. Having mastered her materials, she let the words flow. In May 1795, less than a year after she began to write, she told her father that the new book 'will be a great work—I mean in bulk—& very long in hand'. Shortly thereafter, in June and July, she confidently began to think of its publication. The manuscript, its pages mounting in number, represented creative effort, but it was also her '*Brain* work as much fair & individual property, as any other possession in either art or nature'. And she was prepared to fight for what was hers, to secure its maximum value in pounds sterling.³

In consultation with her husband, she determined to print the novel by subscription, thereby guaranteeing that 'its sale becomes almost instantly as quick as general'. She appointed as 'bookkeepers' three friends—the Honourable Mrs. Boscawen, Mrs. Crewe, and Mrs. Locke—whose task was to solicit subscriptions from well-born patrons and to keep the lists. Almost at the same time, Fanny Burney, reminded by others 'not to be again . . . the dupe of Booksellers', appointed her brother Charles to serve as agent, to handle potential publishers with 'promised Jewish callousness', and to sell the manuscript without scruple to the 'highest bidder'. In his established role of negotiator, he agreed to abide by a

¹ *Diary and Letters*, ii. 81.

² The second draft is an incomplete *Camilla* (Berg), c. 47 ff., in FB's hand.

³ L. 175; to Charles Burney, Jr., *JL* (7 July 1795), iii. L. 176.

maxim which he coined and repeated often to his sister. 'What Evelina . . . does now for the Son of Lowndes, & what Cecilia does for the Son of Payne, let your third work do for the Son of its Authour.'¹

The *Morning Chronicle* for 7 July 1795 made the first public announcement: 'PROPOSALS for printing by Subscription a NEW WORK, in Four Volumes, 12 mo. By the AUTHOR of EVELINA and CECILIA: To be delivered on or before the 1st day of July, 1796. The Subscriptions will be one Guinea; to be paid at the time of Subscribing.' Now Fanny Burney was obliged to concede her private commitment was an open avowal that cut off any retreat. She therefore wrote on to meet a self-imposed deadline.

Even prior to the appearance of the advertisement, her task assumed a new complexity as she herself was torn between the demands of artistic integrity and those of profitable bookmaking. On 6 July 1795 she made her father a promise. 'I will make my Work the best I can . . . I will neither be indolent, nor negligent, nor avaricious. I can never half answer the expectations that seem excited! I must try to forget them, or I shall be in a continual quivering.' Yet one day before, after having long insisted that her great work should not be physically restricted by the computations of booksellers, she confessed to Charles: 'I am now going to work, very reluctantly, to *curtail my plan*, & obviate the threats of loss, or small profit.'²

If Fanny Burney could not exorcise the spectre of relentless publishers from her mind, her agent pursued them with practical determination. Early in March 1796 he negotiated successfully with Thomas Payne, at the Mews-Gate, and Cadell and Davies, in the Strand, for the sale of the manuscript. By now his sister had probably finished the second draft of her novel in its entirety. Harassed by the pressure of time, she immediately began her revisions. As she polished and pruned her prose, she turned the completed pages over to General d'Arblay who as an adoring

¹ On decision to print by subscription and advice on booksellers, to Charles Burney, Jr., *JL* (5 July 1795), iii. L. 174; L. 176; *JL* (15 July 1795), iii. L. 178. For mention of bookkeepers, to Mrs. Georgiana Waddington (19 June 1795), iii. L. 173. For maxim, to Dr. Burney (15 July 1795), iii. L. 179.

² Ll. 175, 174.

suitor had once vowed to be her amanuensis, 'le plus déterminé copiste'.¹

Laboriously he transcribed in the hope that this was the fair copy for Strahan the printer. His hope was delusory, his wife unable to resist the chance to scrawl still further alterations over the meticulously written text.² Dutifully, then, he started a new transcription. This time his fair copy remained fair and was sent off in batches to the impatient printers, even while she worked away at the troublesome fifth volume. By mid-June 1796 she crowed to her agent that 'the rest of the Copy of *Camilla* is dispatched to both the Printers.' Within a few days—on 20 June—she was reading and correcting the first proofs, alphabetizing her subscription lists with a keen eye for protocol and title.³

She suspended her 'own favourite intention & desire' when she acceded to familial urging and sold the copyright of *Camilla* to Payne, Cadell and Davies for £1,000. On 6 July the booksellers recorded their acquisition in the Stationers Register. Within the week the *Morning Chronicle* advertised the publication of *Camilla* 'in five vols. price one guinea, sewed, dedicated by permission to the Queen'. The first edition of the novel was distributed, set up for display in bookstalls and circulating libraries. This, characteristically, was a time of dread for Fanny Burney. She distrusted her idleness, so unnatural after a long and strenuous effort. More particularly, ever since the publication of *Evelina*, she feared the invasion of privacy that came with public notice and the inevitable reviews in which she might well 'be horribly mauled'.⁴

The reviews came swiftly: the first one appeared in the *English Review* for August 1796 and the last one in the *Monthly Magazine and British Register* for January 1797. Despite Dr. Burney's efforts to 'fix' favourable notices of *Camilla*, the reactions of the critics were as mixed as those of private readers. If Jane Austen found the novel worthy, Horace Walpole was figuratively sickened by it.

¹ On novel's sale, written conjointly with M. d'Arblay, to Charles Burney, Jr., *JL* (14 March 1796), iii. L. 190. For M. d'Arblay's vow, to FB (16 June 1793), ii. L. 110.

² An incomplete *Camilla* (Berg) c. 685 ff., in M. d'Arblay's hand.

³ To Charles Burney, Jr., *JL* (17 June 1796), iii. L. 193; to Sarah (Rose) Burney (20 June 1796), iii. L. 194.

⁴ She acknowledged her decision to sell *Camilla*'s copyright to Dr. Burney, L. 179. For FB's fear of reviewers, see (Berg), *Diary MSS.* 647.

'I have not', he told Mary Berry on 16 August, 'recovered of it enough to be loud in its praise. I am glad however to hear that she has realized about £2000—and the worth (no doubt) of as much in honours at Windsor, where she was detained three days and where even Monsieur Darbelay was allowed to dine.'¹

More typical of critical comment was that by the *Monthly Review's* William Enfield and Ralph Griffiths—the latter a close friend of the novelist's father. In their statement they approved the novel's 'highly animated scenes of life and manners' by which the plot was brought forward; 'the rich and varied groups of characters'; and the general structure or 'succession of painful and delightful images', all of which 'must deeply interest the feeling heart'. Not silent about what they found meritorious, the reviewers also denounced the inordinate length of the novel and uncharitably illustrated inconsistencies in characterization, flaws in grammar and diction, redundancies, and even Gallicisms.²

When the elder Charles Burney read their remarks, he felt personally betrayed, suspected their malicious intention, and allowed his fury to erupt. 'J'enrage! Morbleu! . . . there is praise, & now & then handsome praise; but it seems given designedly with a sparing hand; though the strictures are numerous, & often severe and unfair.' His daughter, however, after 'the panic of a first survey', could temper her disappointment with a knowledge of *Camilla's* financial success. 'I have not', she said to a friend, 'any great philosophy to boast in sustaining heroically partial censors, while the Public reception is beyond all possible expectation. The sale has been one of the most rapid ever known for a Guinea Book: it is 4 times that of *Evelina*, & nearly double that of *Cecilia*. Of the First Edition, containing the immense quantity of 4000, 500 only remain: & it has been printed but 3 Months.' Indeed, the number of *Camilla's* sales moved the author to poetize for her father.

Now heed no more what Critics thought 'em
Since this you know—All People bought 'em.

¹ *Jane Austen's Letters to her Sister Cassandra and Others*, ed. R. W. Chapman, 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1952), p. 14; *Horace Walpole's Correspondence*, ed. W. S. Lewis and A. Dayle Wallace (London and New Haven, 1944), xii. 204. For FB's account of her stay at Windsor, see *Windsoriana*, *JL*, iii. especially Ll. 195-99.

² xxi (October 1796), 156-63.