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Abstract

Frances Burney’s novel *Cecilia*, travels through England geographically and through numerous modes of transport. It explores the concept of national identity in an England that is still determining its own. William Hogarth’s rules for determining the beauty of the Serpentine s in *The Analysis of Beauty* offer a model for the type of natural and beautiful travel around England that Burney attempts to construct, determining the most beautiful moral values of such an identity. Both the social implications and the modes of travel consider how this sense of beauty emerges throughout the novel, as Cecilia’s own subjective growth travels in tandem with her physical motion. Burney offers a model for travel that challenges the masculine Grand Tour, a type of travel that worked to divide that nation. Cecilia’s tour, in contrast, through England serves to promote social inclusivity and cohesion.
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Introduction

“Travelling the domestic”: A Study of Cecilia.

Frances Burney’s novel Cecilia travels through the domestic spaces of a small part of the South of England to examine the impact that the growth and development of England had on its people. Kathleen Wilson notes that the growth of the English empire was instrumental in determining the conscience of the English people. She writes, “attending to the circuitry of empire in the eighteenth century also reveals the cultural intermixing that was, paradoxically, an instrument of national self-fashioning and definition” (17). The cultural intermixing in Frances Burney’s novel Cecilia helps to expose the systems of government and rule that promoted cultural separation between the people of England. As a novel that travels mostly through the domestic space of England, and a very small and isolated area of Southern England, it promotes a new type of national identity, one that is socially inclusive. Through the protagonist’s physical journey through British spaces, Cecilia addresses questions of how to travel through a country socially, geographically, and physically. Through each of these types of travel, Burney argues for the way in which a new collective national identity might emerge. Demonstrating that both the past and present systems of rule fail to encourage unity, Burney offers a new alternative. She presents the two existing types of government in the minor characters that surround Cecilia: that of the ancient feudal, archaic ideology and the new culture of capitalism. Delvile Senior represents the first; his is a world which harks back to the past feudal system of government and rule in England, and one in which
family lineage is all-important. The second, a newly emerging type of rule, points to a future in which capitalism begins to take on growing importance. To highlight this point further, not one but two characters rule their households through its principles: Briggs and Mr. Harrel. The doubling of the number of characters ruling by capitalism as opposed to feudalism demonstrates the move of the country towards a new system of rule, and the rapidity of its growth through England. Despite displaying conflicting attitudes to money and wealth, Harrel and Briggs immerse themselves in a world where the pursuit of finance determines their mode of living. However, different systems of government that Delvile, Briggs, and Harrel choose to follow, each divide the national conscience, causing pain and misery to every part of society they encounter. Although these are competing forms of rule, each prevents a unity within the nation as a whole forming, one in which all ranks of society are able to live in tandem with the others.

It is Cecilia’s journey, I argue, that enables her psychological development, and from which new ideas about formations of national identity emerge, leading her to question what determines feelings of belonging to a nation, of feeling English. In order to consider Burney’s novel as one that in some way conforms to the rules of eighteenth century travel narrative, as travelling through a country, I shall first examine the purpose of “travel writing”. The concept of a British nationality created by the geographical boundaries of the landscape leads this thesis to pose further questions; do these boundaries change the notion of Cecilia’s national identity from town to city, and from city to country? This raises the question of what constitutes a boundary, and just how they are constructed and deconstructed in the text: are they spatial boundaries or psychological
ones, or more interestingly, are the two related? Also prominent to my argument will be a consideration of how these boundaries allow one to feel either “inside” or “outside”, of either belonging to or rejecting a national identity, and how an alternative type of national identity develops. In order to consider Burney’s ideas on concepts of nationality, I will look closely at her personal letters and correspondence, which describes her travels in Europe, particularly France. Through her own travel, Burney is able to comment on Britain as a site of its own, and how travel outside of it forms different notions of identity to those that construct Cecilia’s own ideas. I argue that Cecilia’s type of travel through England offered a more beautiful Hogarthian experience of touring a country and its people than the male Grand Tour of the eighteenth century.

**Outline**

Chapter one explores the ways that *Cecilia* works to consider how social order was constructed during the eighteenth century, and how the novel proposes an alternative. Through Cecilia’s travels around England, she also travels through the people of England; the combined experience of the two constructs a competing type of travel experience for the protagonist, one that challenges the movements of the Grand Tour. The domestic travel of the novel educates Cecilia about her own country and people, leading to a more beautiful type of subjective growth. In comparison, the circular nature of the foreign tour promotes a type of travel only available to a small amount of young men in a small privileged circle, separating them from both women and a unified national identity with their fellow fellow citizens. The repetition of Cecilia’s movements through England
and its people work to do the opposite. Her travel allows her to develop a type of identity that unites her with those of all levels of society in England, creating in her a greater understanding of the problems people of all levels of society face. This type of travel informs Cecilia, enabling her to develop her own construction of Britishness, in direct contrast to the instructive education of the Grand Tour. Through the repetition of her movements, Cecilia navigates through feelings of being an insider or outsider, and belonging to her country and not, developing her national conscience. Raymond Williams’ *The Country and the City* considers how similar divisions in national consciousness worked to create national division. He argues that “it is part of a crucial history in the development of the novel, in which the knowable community – the extended and emphatic world of an actual rural and then industrial England – comes to be known primarily as a problem of ambivalent relationship: of how the separated individual, with a divided consciousness of belonging and not belonging, makes his own moral history” (174). Cecilia’s own divided consciousness, one that is evolving throughout the novel, helps determine her own national and moral future and development. Showing a Britain that can be “travelled”, and one that can also be travelled through, demonstrates how feelings of belonging and not belonging work simultaneously, as her sense of identity alters continuously through the changing experiences of travel. This chapter will examine the types of people permitted to travel in the novel in order to ascertain how it is possible for Cecilia herself to engage in these types of journeys. The limits of travel through material, conceptual, and class boundaries, depict that conflicting
ideas of national identity occur because of social segregation, rather than the geographic segregation of localized areas.

The second chapter of my thesis will focus on examining how the characters in the novel travel, and the types of travel that are available to them. The recent work of Sara Landreth offers a model to consider how carriage travel acts as a space for emotional development, with that of Olivia Murphy who discusses how pedestrianism in Jane Austen’s work acts to consider the links between travel and cognitive movement. Murphy connects the relationship to rambling in Romantic-era plots, to “larger Romantic themes of individual agency and the pursuit of freedom at any cost” (142). My own analysis will attempt to determine how alternate modes of travel work to address the question of how a country can be “travelled”, and both the social and gendered implications of that travel. At the beginning of the novel Cecilia begins her travels by carriage from Bury to London; frightened by the thought of an unfamiliar city with that of the distress of her journey she acknowledges: “If I felt no more sorrow in quitting my friends, then I feel terror in venturing to London, with how light a heart should I make the journey!” (14). Connecting her travel with her emotional state from the beginning, the physicality of her travel reflects her own subjective awakening, the two continue to work in tandem as she becomes accustomed to the city, and begins to travel it in different ways as her own social and national conscience develops. The novel transforms Cecilia’s relationship to carriages and other modes of transport, in ways that indicate parallel transformations in her character.
The third chapter considers the novel in its relation to other examples of travel literature, placing *Cecilia* in the context of a wider genre of British travel fiction, including work by Montagu, Smollett, Defoe, and Swift. The last, written by Daniel Defoe, also raises questions about how a nation views itself and how others looked back to it. Charlotte Sussman argues that travel literature, such as Defoe’s, acted as a means to discuss and critique British society, enabling writers to consider “exotic locations for the opportunity it afforded of looking back on Britain with a critical eye” (205). Foreign countries, she argues, “could serve as experimental spaces to imagine new possibilities for society or the self” (205). Sussman identifies a genre of literature concerned with the depiction of foreign travel, yet her analysis of Tobias Smollett’s *The Expedition of Humphry Clinker* acknowledges that it addresses similar questions of society and the self while travelling through Great Britain. As such, Smollett’s work also fits into the traditions of travel writing, suggesting that it is the themes rather than the site that constitutes the genre; a travel narrative need not only be concerned with foreign travel, but can also consider domestic travel. Most importantly, the novel, she argues, demonstrates the mapping of the psychological onto the spatial. Jonathan Swift’s *Gulliver’s Travels* depicts four very different landscapes, similar to the way in which Burney’s novel shows the different sites of Southern England. Although his sites of travel are foreign and imagined, the ideas of each of the lands relate directly back to British society, satirizing British institutions, politics, and practices. Whilst each work differs in form, they retain a common central purpose: examining British notions of nationality, and considering how these ideas are constructed and deconstructed through travel literature.
I shall discuss *Cecilia* primarily in relation to two other travel narratives that address national identity: those of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu and Tobias Smollett. Montagu’s *The Turkish Embassy Letters* describes a journey outside of Great Britain, but reflects its themes back onto British ideas of identity. The depiction of travel outside of Britain, from the perspective of an aristocratic English lady written in the form of letters, differs vastly from Burney’s own. Burney addresses many of the same thematic issues, considering them from the female perspective to comment on the work of male travel writers. As a work concerned with how women travel differently from men, Montagu’s *Letters* established a model for “female” travel, specifically by travelling “incognito”. Her work influenced later representations of how women move through cities, countries, and other bodies of social space, questions that I argue are central to Burney’s novel. Similarly to Montagu, Tobias Smollett narrates *The Expedition of Humphry Clinker* through a series of letters, his however are fictional. The letters portray the perceptions of a number of different characters in contrast to Montagu’s narrative of personal letters. As such, the two texts allow for a useful contrast for considering the singular perspective of *Cecilia*, but also the subtle way Burney attempts to include the narratives of those around her through that perspective.
Chapter 1

Social Segregation and Subjective Journey: Cecilia’s Serpentine Tour

It is also evident that the painter’s eye may not be a bit better fitted to receive these new impressions, who is in like manner too much captivated with the works of art; for he also is apt to pursue the shadow, and drop the substance. This mistake happens chiefly to those who go to Rome for the accomplishment of their studies, as they naturally will, without the utmost care, take the infectious turn of the connoisseur, instead of the painter: and in proportion as they turn by those means bad proficients in their own arts, they become the more considerable in that of a connoisseur. (Hogarth 4-5)

William Hogarth claimed in *The Analysis of Beauty* that the line of most grace and beauty followed the S shape that he labeled the Serpentine curve. He argued that the flowing line of the S followed natures curve, creating the most beautiful line in existence. *The Analysis of Beauty* lays out the six principles of this line: Fitness, Variety, Uniformity, Simplicity, Intricacy, and Quantity. Hogarth suggests that the Grand Tour of European cities such as Rome created a type of engagement with art and nature that educated its student; the Tour however, educated through duplicating ideas and knowledge of beauty, rather than developing a unique understanding of what beauty is to the individual. This type of education led to a division in knowledge and experience of those that had travelled in such a way with those who could not. Conversely to this restrictive mode of travelling through education, Cecilia’s Hogarthian S motion of travel allows for an experience that encourages a more unifying type of national identity and consciousness to emerge in her. Cecilia’s adherence to Hogarth’s principles leads to her sinuous tour through parts of England, enabling a more beautiful alternative to the foreign Grand Tour of the eighteenth century. Charles Batten argues, "while travels and journey
carry no specific connotations, [...] tour almost always narrates a trip during which the traveler completes a circuit, returning to the point from which he originally departed" (38). Burney contrasts the circular motion of the tour with Cecilia’s serpentine travel as she moves repeatedly through the same houses and areas of England. While the circular motion of the Grand Tour restricted rather than promoted personal growth, Cecilia’s travels allow her to develop subjectively and morally, educating her in the way a more inclusive type of national identity can exist. The circular motion of the Tour prevented the education of the people of their own nation, informing and instructing instead on objects and foreign lands. Students on a cultural tour of Europe learnt to imitate rather than to question and develop their own attitudes and ideas. In commenting on the Grand Tour by offering both a critique and an alternative to it, Cecilia adopts Hogarth’s principles; refraining from offering a circular finality to the text the protagonist instead develops a movement that weaves back and forth mirroring the S shape, and in consequence portrays a more beautiful and natural type of travel. The S shaped movement of Cecilia’s journey moves through a small part of England as she travels from Bury in Somerset to London, weaving between the homes of a small group of friends and guardians. This repeated motion allows her to develop her own sense of identity as she moves back and forth from country to town, educating her in the particular ways of how each region sees its own Britishness. The different spatial areas allow her to view contradicting notions of national identity in both the city and the country. Cecilia’s exposure to areas and ideas aids her final cognitive and subjective development, alongside her ideas about national identity. As she considers what determines belonging to a country and nation, she begins to
challenge the construction of Britishness proposed by other characters. The novel offers a number of alternative views of what it is to be British, and it is Cecilia’s travels around the country that allow her to form her own opinions of the type of national identity she wants to adopt. She demonstrates that national identity is a performed identity, one that each individual can, and should question and choose.

Karen O’Brien explains that the rise of urban histories in the eighteenth–century “clearly reflected the growth of urban audiences outside London, and provincial publishing, as well as of internal tourism in England” (cited in Rivers 127). Cecilia’s own internal tourism highlights the social implications of travel inside of England; travelling domestically remained a type of travel that was not available to all levels of society. Just as a small privileged group of people, comprised almost solely of wealthy young men, were able to partake in the Grand Tour, most of the travel taken in Burney’s novel is by the wealthy or those of status. Cecilia’s ability to travel so freely was due to her inclusion in a privileged set of people, a group for who travel was accessible. Despite working towards a united national conscience and inclusivity, Britain works as a landscape through which some of the characters can travel, both male and female attempting to de-gender travel; it remains, however as a site in which the liberty of travel is still dependent on social position. The novel paints a vivid picture of the regions that Cecilia visits in England through its people, whose colloquial voices reflect national diversity and even divisiveness. Cecilia’s travels enable her to witness the existing divisive modes of nationality, and in turn, to question and challenge them with her own more unifying ideas. However, Burney not only shows a country divided regionally, but also one divided
socially, and even more complexly, one additionally still ordered by gender. Despite travel remaining the privilege of the wealthy few, the novel does depict a number of different types of people that do move in some form; these differing types are important when considering the travel of Cecilia, and particularly the way her travel differs from theirs. Cecilia’s own set constantly move through and around certain isolated parts of England, while the poorer characters Henrietta Belfield and her brother also travel. The destitution of Mrs. Hill restricts her, and her movements are the most limited of all the characters with travel between her own home and that of Mr. Harrel and Cecilia only. These alternative types of restricted travel help to consider how a country can be travelled, and the implications of that travel, suggesting a type of travel without restrictions was limited to a very small group of people. Travel in the novel then is a complex movement, and one dependent on gender and social position. Although Cecilia appears more “free” according to some of these paradigms, money, ultimately, affords her some forms of privilege and mobility but her gender and minority also limit her, and compromise the powers of her fortune.

A challenge to the circular

Hogarth proposed another type of education to the Grand Tour. He writes,

to those, then, whose judgements are unprejudiced [...] they are in a much fairer way, ladies, as well as gentlemen, of gaining a perfect knowledge of the elegant and beautiful in artificial, as well as natural forms, by considering them in a systematical, but at the same time familiar way, than those who have been prepossess’d by dogmatic rules, taken from the performances of art only. (Hogarth 3)
Suggesting that the Tour presented a system of rules that educated through duplicating the same knowledge to each of its students, his *Analysis of Beauty* offers a similar perspective to travelling as *Cecilia*. Both Burney and Hogarth found that in order to create a more beautiful form of education, one that would create individual thinking students capable of understanding the beauty in nature, art, people, and morality, an alternative motion than that of the circular tour was necessary. The repetition of Cecilia’s movements, moving back and forth between her three guardians, allows for a motion that subtly comments on the way the circular narrative of the Grand Tour allowed only a certain kind of person (wealthy and male) to learn about the world beyond England, at the expense of learning anything about the diversity of society within England.

As a slow and sustained continuous motion that winds back and forth through houses and spaces, Cecilia’s travel follows the rules of Hogarth’s “line of beauty”, a serpentine S shape. In *The Analysis of Beauty* Hogarth comments that this shape “gives play to the imagination, and delights the eye, on that account; but informs it likewise of the quantity and variety of the contents” (52), and one that “admit[s] of grace and elegance” (52). In creating the same sense of movement in the novel, a similar motion that lilts back and forth, Cecilia’s movements act in each of the same ways as Hogarth proposed. It helps to inform her of her nation and its people, developing her ideas of grace and elegance in her treatment of others. The repetitive cyclical rotation through the same few homes creates a development of the spatial and emotional movements of her physical and mental motion that is slow and sustained, but one that does indeed develop Cecilia’s
subjectivity through the course of the narrative. Through travelling through these houses, she also travels through different types of people, broadening her views of identity and people outside of her own social group. The serpentine narrative allows her to return to these houses and see new layers of construction of the character of its owner on each revolution. Each return allows her to view another facet of the person, which enables the story and her ideas to develop slowly but steadily. Cecilia’s travel and movements work to oppose the movements of the Grand Tour, this motion acts as a type of travel that lacks the kind of repetition (as a result of more severe social circumscription) of Cecilia’s movements. Even though her movements are more restricted, they are ultimately more elegant and informative, allowing her to discover England in a more intimate manner than her male companions who travel outside of England.

**Localized identity**

Cecilia’s travel through city and country reflects both the diversity and unity of an England that was fluctuating and in motion itself during the eighteenth century due to the emergence of trade and the inevitable consumer culture. The Grand Tour helped to promote its own version of trade as its travelers brought home objects and artifacts from their time abroad. It prevented, however, an interest in exploring the areas of England in the same manner, travel becoming something foreign and not domestic. It also restricted an interest in thinking about the people of any country, either abroad or at home, as the tour focused on the exploration of objects rather than people. Hogarth commented, “I hope it appears that those, who have no bias of any kind, either from their own practice,
or the lessons of others, are fittest to examine into the truth of the principles laid down” (Hogarth 6). As Cecilia’s travel around England exposes her to its people, her ideas and judgment of the people of England develop, and it is her ability to judge by moral worth rather than social or financial considerations which enable her Hogarthian experience. Allowing her to travel through her own country in such a way, Burney proposes it as something restorative in developing Cecilia’s own knowledge of the people of her country. Its contrast to the destructive and divisive type of travel of the Grand Tour, which created a separation between those that travelled and those to whom it was not possible to visit foreign countries, is evident in way Cecilia’s travel heals relations between her and those she meets. The masculine equivalent, which worked to ostracize the traveler from their fellow countrymen and women further in allowing them experiences not open to the masses, created a deeper sense of division in the unity of the nation as a whole. Beginning her adventure and narrative in Bury, Somerset deep in the heart of the countryside, Cecilia claims an emotional connection to the place she grew up. Leaving her home “she kissed her hand at the last glimpse a friendly hill afforded of her native town, and made an effort to forget the regret with which she lost sight of it” (3). The use of the word “native” suggests not only a link with her childhood, but one that goes further back, offering it as a place of heritage and lineage. Opening the novel in Bury, and returning Cecilia to it repeatedly, Burney demonstrates its importance in developing Cecilia’s emotional and compassionate qualities. In her journal Burney reiterates her recuperative belief of the country writing, “[…] Mrs. Thrale was quite violently urgent, and assured my Father my Health might depend upon my returning again
to spend some Time in the Country, for that, after such an illness, London might half kill me” (95). The novel also links London with trade and illness through Cecilia, Mr. Harrel, Mr. Briggs, and Mrs. Delvile. As a tour predominantly of cities, neglecting travel through the countryside, the Grand Tour teaches only the lessons of the cities of Europe. Cecilia’s travel proposes that movement through both city and country are necessary for a healthy and educating type of travel. Opening the novel with a prayer, paying respect to Cecilia’s deceased parents, locates them solely with Bury: “Peace to the spirits of my honoured parents, respected be their remains, and immortalized their virtues! may time, while it moulders their frail relics to dust, commit to tradition the record of their goodness! and, oh, may their orphan descendant be influenced through life by the remembrance of their purity, and in death be solaced, that by her it was unsullied!” (1). Situating this paragraph at the very beginning of the novel as Cecilia prepares to leave Bury, connects them to the countryside of Somerset. As a reminder of her childhood, the countryside offers consolation to Cecilia by enabling her to continue a connection to her parents. Despite this connection, it is not simply a site of consolation and comfort. The changes that were happening in England are reflected in the countryside. As people migrated to the cities due to shortages of work in the country, its agricultural role and importance began to dissolve as trade emerged as the new financial means of supporting the country. It evolves in the novel in a similar way, moving from a site of parental love and stability to one of Mr. Monckton’s controlling influence and his cruel wife. The new concept of identity that Cecilia associates with Bury is not her own, but one contrived for her by Monckton, as he plots to ensnare her into marriage with him. In linking him with the
countryside of Cecilia’s youth, a place of innocence in which she felt safe in the
guardianship of her uncle, Burney destabilizes Cecilia’s new identity from the outset. The
countryside represents a link with her past and her parents and uncle: “such was the secret
prayer with which the only survivor of the Beverley family quitted the abode of her
youth, and residence of her forefathers; while tears of recollecting sorrow filled her eyes,
and obstructed the last view of her native town which had excited them” (1). While this
“link” to the past makes Cecilia sentimental at her departure, her escape and subsequent
returns to Bury allow her to remain connected with a part of her heritage while also
escaping from its, and Mr. Monckton’s, total control. The Grand Tour, in contrast,
steeped in traditions of who travelled, how they travelled, and where that travel took them
to, comparatively upholds and perpetuates hierarchies of lineage and privilege. Cecilia’s
tour offers her both a link with the past, but also an opportunity to engage in new types of
experiences and people.

In moving away from the country and the controlling presence of Mr. Monckton
in it, Cecilia moves from one dominating form of rule to another, representing the
transitional stage through which England was also moving. This was a slow but steady
growth of the cities, mostly of London, in which people of all ranks moved from country
to city to find work and a higher standard of living. Cecilia herself follows the trend
moving away from the country to explore life outside of its boundaries; her agitation at
travelling through London, and her failure of moving through it safely reflects the
evolution of England, a country moving away from the traditions of the past and into a
new future. The unfamiliarity and constant change also helped to open travel up in a way that had never before been possible. Burney’s choice to engage with this transitional state of the country offers a more personal experience of the effects of travel than the listing of places viewed, leading to a more natural and Hogarthian beauty through the discussion of travel within the state of the country. Discussing it in the context of the period, the shifts and changes of the nation, moves towards a more natural experience for Cecilia, one that reflected the lived experiences of many English men and women. This natural conversation through the novel promotes the natural movement of Hogarth’s serpentine movement, aiding Cecilia’s subjective and moral development of beauty. Both country and city pose dangers to Cecilia in the fluctuating new England. As residents mostly of London in the novel, Mr. Harrel and Mr. Briggs are associated with an obsession for money, the Harrels with spending and Briggs with saving it, but as part of the obsession with consumer culture that emerged in this period, both pose a threat to her. As part of this new desire for collecting money and objects, they are associated with the trading of the Grand Tour. As Linda Colley notes during the tour, young men “rarely travelled in or purchased from foreign states out of any strong sense of identification with their culture or politics, so much as out of a desire to assert and confirm the prejudices and position that they themselves already held” (166). Both Briggs and Harrel use their pursuit of wealth and desire for money to assert privilege and control over others, linking money with greed and dangerous manipulation.
Cecilia associates Mr. Briggs with the city and corruption, finding that she cannot speak to him in the Delvile’s country house, a place of escape from the excesses of the city for her. She directly equates the city with currency and money, and the country with an alternative to its greed and vice. Her first abode in London with Mr. Harrel and his wife allows Cecilia to witness a life formed upon the fashion for credit-based consumption. D. Grant Campbell argues that, “as denizens of fashionable society and conspicuous consumption founded upon credit, the Harrels in Cecilia reflect both the economic climate in England and a complex of prevalent ideological response to that climate” (133). Their only interest in her, and in others, is a purely selfish one in which people are a means of creating a life of luxury, reinforcing the notion of hierarchical privilege that the Grand Tour helps to cultivate in its travelers. Miranda Burgess notes that Burney’s suspicion of commerce stems from a type of credit that promoted greed and placed importance on the individual rather than the greater national good (142), suggesting that failed “credit” impacted most significantly on those at the bottom of society such as Mrs Hill. In much the same way, the impact of the Tour was divisive, emphasising the differences, socially, culturally, and educationally, that developed between those who travelled and those who did not. The society of the city dwellers is equally corrupt and as damaging as that of Monckton, and it is part of Cecilia’s education to navigate through both. Linda Colley argues that it is not only the wealthy such as the Harrels, but also the British elite that were implicated in this regime: “It was, as we have seen a working, capitalist elite, actively supportive of commerce and in love with every form of economic modernisation that might enrich it” (154). If not part of the elite, Harrel
and Briggs are part of a privileged group in the city associated through their connections to commerce and trade, separating their lives from those of poverty. Colley notes that it was “the British government’s huge investment in the navy, together with the imperial reach that this increasingly made possible, that allowed overseas trade to grow in the way that it did, and with the speed that it did. In this sense, it was actually trade that was parasitic on the resources of the nation state” (68). By linking Harrel and Briggs with trade, Burney establishes the connection to the dangers they pose. Each threatens her financially, upsetting her independence and future security, Harrel by spending her money, and Briggs by preventing her control over her wealth. Her moral vulnerability also develops through her connection with the two men as Harrel exposes her to the dangers of money lending and Briggs isolates her socially, attempting to destroy her reputation. Removing her from the masquerade scene, he at once both embarrasses and isolates her from those who offer any protection. Threatening her in such a way, their pursuit of money through damaging means creates the same vulnerability for Cecilia as it does for the nation. The corrupting nature and culture of the city damages not only them, but also those associated with them in the same way that the Grand Tour damaged relations between the people of Great Britain. In travelling through England rather than outside of it, Burney offers a new concept of a unified national conscience that did not isolate any one group of people from developing a combined national identity.

A Nation at War.
The exposure of Cecilia to the city also allows her to encounter and travel through the people of England outside of her immediate society. Her encroaching sense of fear of the mass numbers of people she encounters suggests a city very much socially divided, with the privilege fearing the masses, much like the social and cultural separation caused by the Grand Tour. Williams argues that this fear of the mob was one that was prevalent at the time: “the 'mob' was often violent, unpredictable, capable of being used for reaction” (144). John Trusler’s pamphlet of 1786 suggests that Cecilia’s fears of the city, and particularly of the crowd, were very real fears of the time, particularly for anyone foreign to the largeness and crowds of London. He suggests those new to the city should “never stop in a crowd in the streets, to see what occasions it: if you do, it is two to one but you either lose your watch or your pocket-handkerchief. There are fellows who create disturbances for this purpose” (147). In a period dominated by war with the French, the mob posed a similar danger to the foreign ‘Other’, an unpredictable force that threatened the rules and systems of government of the day, and the safety of England. Burney reinforces this association with Cecilia’s first view of the ‘mob’ in which “the people were assembling to see some malefactors pass by in their way to Tyburn” (169). The footnote suggests that it is fact a procession of criminals on their way to hang, claiming that it is possibly, “the last notice in a standard book of the movement of the hangman’s procession from Newgate along the Tyburn Road” (169). This note subtly transforms the scene from one that at first seems to depict simply Cecilia’s fear of the poor, to one that shows the evolution of Britain. The eradication of the tradition of hanging criminals promised a more humanistic approach to the law of the future of England. Cecilia, thus,
bears witness to the end of a brutal law, one that committed criminals to death, and exposes her to the vulnerability of others: the experiences of both the criminals and the people of the mob. Despite her fear of the crowd, exposure to it enables encounter with its people challenging her preconceived ideas about the dangers of such a group. Once encircled by the group, Cecilia becomes at once part of a wider group of people. Forcing her to integrate with those outside her rank, losing the privilege and safety that rank affords, she becomes merely one of the many others who make up the masses of London city life, uniting them as simply part of one group of people. Murphy notes the link between walking and social position arguing, “in a society that continued to employ the term ‘carriage-folk’ as shorthand for genteel status, walking, however energetically, maintained for many its associations with poverty” (127), and Celeste Langan argues that the walker is associated with vagrancy (132). The movement from carriage to walk removes her from the distance to the people that her wealth affords her, allowing an emotional connection and understanding of the experiences of those in the mob.

The walk places her into a position of danger and vulnerability, but also enables an experience that exposes her to new freedoms, freedom from the carriage and from the

---

1 In Charlotte Bronte’s novel *Jane Eyre*, the protagonist escapes from the society of Mr. Rochester, walking away from the marriage and security it promises, instead sleeping on the side of the road. She is associated with vagrancy at this point in the novel, evident by her disheveled looks.
restrictions of her wealth. The return of her chair, and a return to the safety of distance it affords her from the mob, also situates her back into her life of constraint and social rules, away from the possibility of a new kind of freedom the mob represents. The reversal of the mode of travel, from chair to pedestrianism and back to chair, engages her with those foreign to her, forcing a new understanding of the experiences of these people. Further uniting the separate parts of society, Cecilia feels the same vulnerability within her own set too as she again becomes part of a group. The constant visiting elicits similar feelings of imprisonment that walking does in the street scene: “It seemed to her impossible that any one who had the power to be encircled with company, could by choice spend a second afternoon alone” (97). The repetition of the word “encircled” forces a comparison between the two scenes, made more forcefully as Cecilia confesses, “she was weary of eternal visiting, and sick of living always in a crowd” (97). The connection between the people of the street and the elite of society challenges the right to a certain privilege for those with wealth and position, forging a connection instead between the disparate social groups of people. In her first novel, Evelina Burney situates her protagonist’s harassment in the same location as Mr. Harrel’s suicide. Vauxhall, a public place and pleasure garden in London that poses dangers to both women and men alike, helping Burney to de-gender the site and unite the sexes. The travel to Vauxhall depicts a sort of shared experience of fear between the two genders, one that works to offer a similar experience of travel between the sexes and reduce the separation caused by the Grand Tour that only moved the experiences of the two further away from the other.
Types of Britishness

Hogarth argued that, “forms of most grace have least of the straight line in them” (38). The contrasting representations of Britishness through the characters Cecilia encounters, depicts similar types of people that follow a restrictive and straight line of thought. These characters lack the moral beauty of Cecilia who challenges and evolves her own ideas of people and places throughout her travel. The competing versions of Britishness depict the struggle in national identity between the ideas of the old and established, and new vision; visiting and travelling through each of them in repetitive waves teaches Cecilia about the version of a national conscience she wishes to cultivate. Wilson investigates “how particular articulations of national belonging and character become predicated upon notions of community and identity that were both labile and difficult, if not impossible, to acquire or naturalize” (14). Delville Senior’s rank and heritage are so central to his notion of his own importance that it reflects every part of his character. Even his home characterizes his attitudes: “Delville Castle was situated in a large and woody park, and surrounded by a moat. A draw-bridge which fronted the entrance was every night, by order of Mr. Delvile, with the same care as if still necessary for the preservation of the family, regularly drawn up” (447). The house symbolically acts as his fortress, protecting him from anyone outside of his society, and allowing him absolute rule over who enters, in the same way that he rules his tenants and lands. The castle is a place for the preservation of his lineage, with no consideration for the aesthetical look or comfort to its inhabitants. Despite following the constricting and limiting traditions of a feudal castle, Delville Senior also abides by the principles of a
system that governs good tenanting, conducting his business with those he rules fairly and promptly. Showing both the positive and negative elements of such a system of rule, the new type of England that Cecilia hopes to cultivate in her own home is one that unites those parts of the past that help to establish a community that functions as a whole, one that works in unison with every other part. The depiction of Delvile’s feudal rule sits in direct opposition to that of Mr. Harrel’s new type of capitalist rule over his tenants, one that is dishonest and abusive. His system of management develops a new type of hierarchy in which those at the top are dependent on wealth and borrowing alone, and not title or lineage. They govern without concern or fair payment for those who work for them, mirroring the imperialist role of Britain abroad. Williams notes, that "for the majority of men it was the substitution of one form of domination for another: the mystified feudal order replaced by a mystified agrarian capitalist order with just enough continuity, in titles and in symbols of authority, in successive compositions of a 'natural order', to confuse and control" (39). In replacing old with new in such a manner, the two characters offer competing views of the types of rule of past and future, equally damaging to the unity of the nation. Cecilia’s recognition and acknowledgment of the faults in both systems of government, and experience of them, allows her to develop a new and more liberal humanistic approach, treating her tenants fairly and with kindness. Despite this noble effort, her charitableness also leads to her undoing, and her most successful pursuits occur as she allows those she helps to live independently of her. Moving through the homes of each of the two men charts not only Cecilia’s emotional development, but also the journey through the social change and historical rule of England, demonstrating
feudalism, imperialism, and capitalism. It is through her exposure to each of the ideas that enables her to attempt to find a more constructive answer to the limits of each. Her treatment and hospitality of people develop in tandem with her travel through the social groups of England, developing her empathy with the different situations of each. While each system of rule has its limits, they also offer possibilities for change. In experiencing conflicting types of rule that follow such narrow trajectories, Cecilia’s experience of the Hogarthian “straight” and unbending type of person, and thinking, demonstrates to her an alternative type of thinking. Through her adoption of parts of each system, Cecilia is able to transcend any one type of rule and evolve them into something more beautiful and sustainable.

**Moral Worth**

It is no wonder this subject should have so long been thought inexplicable, since the nature of many parts of it cannot possibly come within the reach of mere men of letters; otherwise those ingenious gentlemen who have lately published treaties upon it (and who have written much more learnedly than can be expected from one who never took up the pen before) would not so soon have been bewilder’d in their accounts of it, and obliged so suddenly to turn into the broad, and more beaten path of moral beauty. (Hogarth, Preface to The Analysis of Beauty iiv-iv)

Hogarth’s “turn” to questions of moral beauty, and his discussion about its importance to both philosophers and authors, helps to develop a format for a type of literature that promoted moral worth above all else. Whilst Cecilia’s travel helps develop her moral beauty, Mr. Harrel travels as a means to escape his creditors and debt (355). For those lacking Cecilia’s natural moral worth, travel fails to serve as a beautiful experience, instead offering punishment. As a type of exile for Mr. and Mrs. Harrel, it
removes them from the excesses and vices of the city that constitute their pleasure. Exile to the country and abroad poses the same punishment to each of them, as they desire to remain in the corrupted city of London. Mr. Harrel’s threat to his wife, in which he “declared that if she did not get the money, she would only be served as she merited by starving in a foreign gaol, which he swore would be the fate of them both” (371), is the cruelest form of punishment. Proposing the restorative nature of the countryside might help to restore Mrs. Harrel’s moral health, Cecilia suggests that “a short time spent in solitude and economy, might enable her to return to her native land with recovered happiness” (372). Inevitably, the Harrels lack the moral worth to consider travel away from the city. Punishing them with exile allows for the promise of their return and the continued vulnerability of Cecilia and the country. To destroy any promise of this, Mr. Harrel’s suicide offers the only possible outcome for him and the vice of a world ordered by money and trade alone.

For Belfield, travel offers the promise of a new life and the chance to evolve. Mrs. Belfield’s cry that her son’s travel to “foreign parts” (306) will result in him “drowned in going beyond seas” (308), reflects a national fear of travel and life outside of England, a fear of the foreign “Other”. However, England offers Belfield few possibilities, leaving him in a cyclical procession of movement through jobs and places, preventing his happiness. Life abroad offers him his only chance to improve himself morally and financially away from the social codes of England that restrict him. Delvile proposes that his friend should leave England, to serve as a governor “in making the tour of Europe”
(340). To tour as a servant, rather than as a gentleman offers the development of his own humility and destruction of his character based on the performed identity he constructs in the city. Ultimately, Belfield’s inherent instability and flightiness results in his exile from his home. In his final scene at the end of the novel, “he consented to accept his good offices in again entering the army; and, being fortunately ordered out upon foreign service, his hopes were revived by ambition, and his prospects were brightened by a view of future honour” (918). As a person of no single status in England, his career with the army offers him the stability, position, and importance not available to him in England; as a person with no static social position, he must remain in constant movement geographically.

Delvile proposes that foreign travel is his only means of escape from Cecilia at her refusal to marry him, and can act as restorative to his emotional health. Heartbroken he comments, “a few weeks only could I fill up in any tour so near home, and hither in a few weeks to return would be folly and madness: in an absence so brief, what thought but that of the approaching meeting would occupy men” (507). It is, however, also a form of self-punishment: “neither my temper nor my constitution will endure such another shock, one parting shall suffice, and the fortitude with which I will lengthen my self-exile, shall atone to myself for the weakness which makes it requisite!” (507), a punishment he inflicts on himself for his weakness in refusing to offer her a respectable marriage. Through the discussion of foreign travel in the characters of Mr. Harrel, Belfield, and Delvile, it becomes a model for punishment and for restoration.
Charitable Pursuits

Through her charitable pursuits, Cecilia develops an understanding of the problems of those who lack her wealth, integrating social inclusion into a society built upon separation. Although *Cecilia* is primarily concerned with just one group of people: the wealthy and elite of society, the introduction and concerns of charity enable depictions of poorer characters and a little of their own narratives. Challenging the social boundaries that limit Cecilia’s connection to Mrs. Hill and Henrietta Belfield exposes Cecilia to the vulnerabilities of those poorer than herself. It also works to develop a connection between people of differing regions, gender, and social position. It is not simply a means of policing social boundaries, but a theme through which Cecilia’s exposure to their vulnerabilities develops her sympathies and emotional development.

Sharon Damoff finds that in Burney’s first novel, “Evelina’s firmness in her charitable course of action and Orville’s voluntary and equally charitable subordination of his judgement to hers mark the point at which these two people become equals” (233). Developing the theme in *Cecilia*, the protagonist’s charitable actions towards Belfield result in dangerous repercussions for her; her concern for his health leads to accusations of impropriety between the two, causing an emotional distance between her and Delvile.

The theme of charity presents the way in which it offers wealthy women the chance to educate and develop social consciousness, but also its limits through dangers to the virtue of women. Cecilia’s knowledge of the way that it can work in creating social cohesion rather than division develops through the novel, particularly through her implication in
Mr. Harrel’s downfall. Her complicity in his guilt through her continued loans of money, continue his lifestyle of greed and borrowing. In consequence of this, his spending disrupts the social order, enabling him to believe he sits above all moral obligations in paying his workers, and outside of the rules of law.

Addressing the issue of charity through a number of conflicting voices challenges and develops Cecilia’s understanding of the ways in which she can manipulate its purpose for good and not bad. However, for much of the novel the poor remain almost voiceless expressing only the experiences of the rich. Limiting their narratives to voices such as that of Mrs. Hill, addresses the social problems of the individual and not the poor as a whole, offering a view of a world organized by the figure of the individual subject makes that individual the measure of that world. Despite the novel’s discussion of ideas of social upheaval and change in England, the narrative subtly interweaves a number of voices through Cecilia’s friends, acquaintances, and those she helps, presenting dialogue and speech from a number of characters. It narrates the journeys and experiences of the wealthy, but also those who work for them. Mrs. Hill and Henrietta Belfield represent two of the most moral of all the characters in the novel despite their poverty, developing feelings of empathy and at times pure sympathy for them, an emotion difficult to feel for any of the others, including Cecilia herself at times. In creating an empathetic tone for the poor and abused, Burney moves her narrative away from traditional representations of the rich, and offers a new type of society that is more socially aware, demonstrating that moral worth is not dependent on wealth or status.
A performance of Englishness.

Despite the stagnant and formulaic ideas of Englishness presented through characters such as Delvile Senior, much of this identity is false, a performed identity. In examining the way language works, as both indicative and non-indicative of regional and social status, Cecilia contests the rigid rules of social rhetoric. Charles Batten notes the words of the Critical Review: “in terms of style, travel accounts aim at ‘a kind of middle rank between the solidity of studied discourse and the freedom of colloquial conversation’” (44). The variety of dialogues in Cecilia, both colloquial and not, seem to demonstrate the social diversity and hierarchal structure of England during the eighteenth-century. Christina Davidson, however, acknowledges that this was Burney’s desire to make her language accurate writing, “in the last two decades, socio–and historical–linguistic studies have cast the period’s initiatives to standardize the English language as an effort to forge national identity”, which created “a main-stream identity which was regionally and socially exclusive” (278). Language and speech is no measure of national identity, instead it is something that connects the rich with the poor. Despite their very different social positions, both Mrs. Hill and Miss Larolles use contractions to break the linguistic boundary between their ranks through their speech. Mr. Briggs, as Cecilia’s guardian and in a position of authority in the novel, uses the same short clipped language as his social opposite Miss Leeson, and, like her, lacks the courtesy in his conversations with those he considers social inferiors. Upon Cecilia’s first meeting with Mr. Briggs, his limited use of words breaks down the construction and syntax of the
sentence: “been looking for my shaving-rag. Going out of town; never use such a thing at home, paper does as well”” (90). Miss Leeson’s language is even more limited, remaining voluntarily silent, and speaking only to those inside her own group. Cecilia’s confusion at Miss Leeson’s lack of conversation reflects her lack of connection to women in her society. Listening to other young women of her own social position at the opera confuses her in a similar manner. Confused at by their language, which she at first fails to comprehend, she slowly begins to understand through listening: “but when, somewhat more used to their dialect and manner, she began better to comprehend their discourse” (130). Cecilia’s isolation from these wealthy women depicts the differing attitudes in their interests to her own. Concerned with fashion and social station, it is their lack of moral worth that isolates Cecilia from them, while the connection between Cecilia and Henrietta Belfield grows. The formation of Cecilia’s strongest friendship is due to the equality of morality in the two women, not the importance or lack of Henrietta’s wealth.

Language also represents the moral worth of the male characters. Region of birth or location does not reflect the morality of a character; the novel represents people of different areas with similar accents. Monckton and Belfield are each well-spoken and educated, but it is simply a façade; their speech is merely a construction of their equally constructed characters. Belfield’s purpose is to break through the limits of social boundaries that determine a person’s position by their speech, in order to rise socially. His language, in comparison with that of his mother, highlights the performance of his speech. Monckton does not perform or construct his speech in the same way, but
language also serves to hide his manipulative nature. While Belfield’s performance ultimately destabilizes his mental state, leaving him in a state of denial and confusion about his position, Monckton’s poses a threat to Cecilia’s subjectivity. While the use of colloquial language often suggests an immediate distinction between people of a privileged circle and those who work to earn a living, it does not indicate such a social separation in *Cecilia*. Instead, accent and dialect merely represent the diverse regional areas of the nation, uniting them through the representations of each in both rich and poor. Language, then, is not an indicator of regional heritage, despite Belfield’s movement from town to country and from poor to rich; his language never changes and he remains well spoken throughout. The multiple voices, accents and dialogues suggest how communication across different social categories might work in order to form cohesion in such a diverse nation.

**Glorifying the past**

O’Brien notes the link between a preoccupation of historical representations of England during the period and an emerging sense of Englishness. She argues,

> this corresponded with a general increase in the demand for works of ‘polite’ literature, but it also reflected public support for history as a genre: more than other kinds of literature, history was perceived to be bound up with national prestige, and an increasingly prestige-conscious English public was eager to foster internationally famous English historical productions. (cited in Rivers 106)

The importance of history remains a central theme through the novel through the character of Delvile Senior. At Cecilia’s request that he intercede on her behalf with Mr. Briggs in order to allow her the money to pay her debts, and finding that she spoke first to
Briggs before himself, his answer demonstrates his self-importance and obsession with lineage. Speaking of the differences between his own ancestry and that of the other man to Cecilia, he comments, “if of me, and of my rank in life, you judge by Mr. Briggs or by Mr. Harrel, I may be subject to proposals such as these every day; suffer me, therefore, for your better information, to hint to you, that the head of an ancient and honourable house, is apt to think himself somewhat superior to people but just rising from dust and obscurity” (180). Unlike Briggs and Harrel, who he connects as part of the same rank, his family exist outside of all other species of human: they are a race of their own. Burney narrates: “his son was not only the first object of his affection, but the chief idol of his pride, and he did not merely cherish but reverence him as his successor, the only support of his ancient name and family, without whose life and health the whole race would be extinct” (452). His use of the word “race”, works to undo his meaning. Presenting himself as the ultimate Englishman, using the word creates division between him and people of his own nation. Unlike the modern moneyed world of Briggs and Harrel, he lives in the past, despite preferring to isolate himself in his ancient castle and retaining the preservation of his family name.

Travel accounts of the period also commented on the importance of history. George Beaumont’s account of his travels around England reinforces the importance placed on history. Visiting cities, boroughs, market towns, counties and villages, he repeatedly describes the houses and lands he views, but makes only one reference to the rural people: “some Workmen were digging in a Meadow near this Town, discovered a
Piece of Roman Antiquity” (p 3 Image 5). The interest of the author quickly moves from those who found the artifact to the object itself, which he describes in detailed precision, noting the facts, figures, and statistics of the remains. His narrative does not describe the people, but the architecture and objects that make up the history of the land. As such, his account is reminiscent of Delvile Senior’s approach to life; although he repeatedly speaks about his tenants, they are invisible in the narrative. His own family does not present the possibility for a shift in looking forward to new generations, but one with which to continue his obsession with the past through the continuation of the family name through his son. Despite finding that Delvile Senior lives up to his snobbish reputation, Cecilia does not limit his son or wife to the same prejudices. Acting in a conflicting manner to her future father in law, her refusal to limit anyone by their heritage or actions of their parents, she judges by individual character and moral worth alone. The Harrels also continue to look to the past to create status and reputation for themselves; their “Temple” at Violet-Bank (70), harks back to an earlier golden era, which they attempt to imitate. In their insistence to look back in order to move forward, by creating a new identity for themselves, they exist in both past and future, something that Wilson addresses. She points out, “by the mid eighteenth century, History itself had emerged as a primary vehicle of national self-understanding and identity as well as philosophical reflection, promoting a cosmopolitan perspective and a deeply grounded sense of national specificity” (9). The link between the past and money in the novel demonstrated the changing state of England. It was a state of transition that insisted on noting its links with history through emblems, symbols such as the one Mr. Meadows “had turned from her to
fix his eyes upon the statue of Britannia” (269). In connecting his contradictory and ridiculous character with this emblem of British expansionism, Burney offers a subtle critique of imperialism; the novel presents an England looking forward to imperialist visions of its future, one that promoted trade and the pursuit of wealth for the country but also looking to the lessons of the past.

The introduction of the Belfield family demonstrates that the unconscious formation of identity of Delvile Senior exists in both rich and poor alike. Wilson notes that heritage and birth are not the only means of constructing identity, but that it can also be one that is performed: “personal identity could seem for some to be as much a product of choice as of birth” (2). Belfield and his parents do not construct his identity through the past, but by a denial of it; his ascension into society occurs through their manipulation of the capitalist system of commerce to buy him position and friends. The construction of an elevated social identity leaves him existing in a state of “double consciousness”; his is not a racialized form of the meaning as in W. E. Du Bois’ understanding, but a social one. Du Bois writes that it is a “sense of always looking at one’s self through the eyes of others, of measuring one’s soul by the tape of a world that looks on in amused contempt and pity” (38). Belfield’s double-consciousness, simultaneously moving between two groups of people, leaves him belonging to no specific group of society, and isolating him from both. As a result, he is devoid of any static social position in an England that demands adherence to a single status; remaining wandering from one role to another, and from place to place, he is constantly engaged in a circular of despondence. In placing such
emphasis on the traditions of the past through unlikeable characters such as Mr. Harrel and Delvile Senior, the development of a new national identity through a new system of governing must evolve. A type of rule that lacks the hierarchal divisiveness of past systems that follow the rules of feudalism, but also one that lacks the destructive traits of a system that places commerce at its center; one that remembers its past, but also looks to building a new type of England not based on rules of status and wealth alone. Britons are at a cultural crossroads where different kinds of privilege interact and frustrate one another.
Chapter 2

Vehicle of travel

Hogarth argued, “for the greatest grace and life that a picture can have, is, that is expresse Motion: which the painters call the Spirit of a picture” (Hogarth, preface vi). Throughout Cecilia, the protagonist is in constant motion, a motion that completes her emotional growth, transforming her into a more compassionate character. Her movement and “motion” forms her subjective and moral beauty, enabling her own spirit to form; this movement takes a number of forms. In one sense, it is the physical motion of travelling through the landscape of England, a journey that involves thinking about what being a part of that nation means. It is also a movement through her own thoughts about people through travel, constantly oscillating between an ordered and a disordered state of mind. It is only through this fluctuating subjective existence that Cecilia ultimately recognizes and develops her own understanding of her connection to her nation. As travelling helps to determine and shape her subjective growth, the novel acts as a type of travel literature that charts both her physical movements through the geographical regions of England, and her emotional growth and development. The novel travels in many ways, including through ideas about landscape, nationality, and interiority. In order to consider how travel works in the novel in each of these ways, it is first important to examine how each of the characters in the novel travel, and the types of travel available to them. Through travelling and movement, the novel depicts a country at once both divided and unified, portraying a country still determining its own national identity, and one that is still questioning the
form that identity should take. The novel depicts a number of different forms of travel: by foot–carriage– and horse. Each mode of travel depicts how movement was still subject to the boundaries of gender in the eighteenth–century, a period in which travel helped determine boundaries of personal and private space. Cecilia’s development and movement through these ideas reflects and determines her own subjectivity, one that develops through the novel in conjunction with her travel. Landreth discusses how vehicular narratives questioned whether the motion of travel also affected the soul, finding that “questions about motion and inquiries about emotion were ultimately inseparable from each other” (98). Burney addresses these ideas through the character of Cecilia, but also through other major and minor figures. The link between Cecilia’s geographical journey and her emotional development develops in tandem with her movement; her physical movement frames her emotional growth and allows the development of her own thinking and ideas. Through moving and circulating repeatedly through landscapes and people, Cecilia develops her own subjective thinking, feminine limits and liberties, and her thoughts about national identity. Her emotional development happens in tandem with each of her journeys, circulating through places and people a number of times in order to discover the depth and complexities of their character and her own.

Factors such as social position and gender often limited the mode of transport to users. Murphy argues, “the Romantic vogue for walking needs to be understood in the context of the late eighteenth-century British transport revolution, which, by making non-
pedestrian travel cheaper, quicker, and more widely available, enabled walking to be seen as a pleasurable alternative to other modes of travel rather than as merely an arduous and hazardous necessity” (124). Although Murphy’s concerns address a later period in British writing, the development and importance of transport is also evident in Burney’s work. Characters travel by foot, horse, and carriage, with the novel emphasizing the variety of ways that both Cecilia and the other characters travel through the region. Men use each of the three modes of travel freely with no, or very few, restrictions, while women are far more limited. Both male and female characters travel by carriage and chair, challenging the limits of gender that the tour promotes. In defiance of these gendered rules, Burney makes repeated reference to the “Grand Tour” throughout the novel, commenting on a tour through which young men of a certain status educated themselves culturally in the arts through tours of Europe. Cecilia’s tour of England challenges the importance of the Grand Tour, although she does not travel as widely geographically, she travels more in terms of subjective experience. As an experience of physical travel through her nation, it serves many of the same purposes as that of a gentleman’s Grand Tour, whilst offering a more beautiful experience of the ways in which to travel.

**Hunt by Horse**

A limited numbers of characters in the novel travel by horse, presenting it as a male form of travel, and commenting on the limitations of private travel for women. Few women in reality rode themselves for private transportation, viewing it instead as a sport, for hunting and for rural exercise. In her letters, Burney demonstrates the problematic
nature of the respectability of horse riding for women, recalling a discussion between Miss Lidderdale wearing a riding habit, and Omiah of whether it was suitable or safe for women to ride (65). In the novel, it represents an activity for the privileged male; as a means of travel, it is never equated with enjoyment. As such, riding shares a connection with the Tour, a type of experience limited by gender, wealth, and position, posing a threat to the rest of society at odds with the small number of people permitted to travel in such ways. The dangerous character of Sir Robert Floyer is one of the few in the novel to ride. When asked, “do you come on horseback through the streets, Sir Robert?” he replies, “Sometimes; when I am lazy” (46-47). The association of laziness with horse riding situates it as a negative form of travel. Floyer’s horse is purely an object of function that demonstrates his lack of emotional connection with anything else in the novel. His association with the horse also serves to highlight his predatory nature and the dangers he presents to Cecilia; the physical deformity of the horse, lame and flawed, suggest that he is as damaged as his animal. Sir Robert comments: “But what the d-l is the matter with him I don’t know; he has started at everything. I suspect there has been some foul play with him” (46-47). Riding remains a flawed mode of travel through its gender limitations; as such, it poses similar restrictions to the masculine Grand Tour.

As a leisure activity associated with hunting and pursuit, horse riding serves to point out the dangers of the men who ride to Cecilia, who, like the vulnerable prey of the hunt, is at threat from the destructive men who pursue her for marriage. Despite their ancient aristocratic claims and connections to the land, neither of the Delvile men joins in
the activities of the squirearchy; they do not hunt like Austen’s Willoughby. Just as Sir Robert controls his horse, Cecilia is prey to a similar danger through his pursuit of her for marriage. The lack of association between horse riding and exercise or leisure suggests that it cannot serve as a means to promote health or happiness; the horse exists solely for use and transportation. Despite posing possibly the greatest danger to Cecilia, Sir Robert is not the only male character to ride. Mr. Monckton equates Mr. Harrel’s dangerous temperament with a horse. Attributing “his flightiness” to the fact that “he galloped along it, thoughtless of being thrown when he came to the bottom, and sufficiently gratified in showing his horsemanship by the way” (425), he aligns the horse with Harrel’s world of commerce culture and danger. Delvile also rides in three episodes: the first when Cecilia suspects him of harbouring an attachment to Henrietta Belfield, later as he brings news of his mother’s illness and lastly in his plans to marry in secret. In each instance, his choice or need to ride coincides with the moments that he also poses a danger to Cecilia’s happiness.

**The Way to Walk**

Commenting on walking, Hogarth writes, “the eye hath this sort of enjoyment in winding walks, and serpentine rivers, and all sorts of objects, whose forms, as we shall see hereafter, are composed principally of what, I call, the *waving* and *serpentine* lines” (25). The novel complicates his principle by depicting a walk as something that offers beauty and liberation from the structured rules of the eighteenth-century, but also as a mode of travel that offers its own dangers for Cecilia. The gendered depictions of travel
continue into the discussion of walking in the novel; contrary to riding, both women and men walk. Periodicals of the time codified how both the sexes could walk through London safely and assimilate with “Londoners”. They suggest that strict adherence to their rules of how to walk through a city, led to a safe walk through the streets; that there was an art to walking through London (O’Bryne 100). In her journal, Burney negotiates this very art of walking, albeit in a more rural setting, by addressing both the limitations and freedoms she associated with walking. She writes:

*We Walk:* The brightness of the sun, invites us abroad,— the tranquility of the scene, promises all the pleasures of philosophic contemplation, which, *ever studious of rural amusement,* I eagerly pursue, mais, helas! 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, — all my habiliments, with rebellious emotion, wage a Civil War with the *mother Country!* (69-70)

Her walk, which began so serenely, takes a dramatic turn for the worse as she considers how her shoes fail her by preventing the comfort of her walk. They assert a will in opposition to hers and act against her desire for a united nation. The rest of this interesting passage continues:

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 zeal 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 required 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. (69-70)

The two passages, in which Burney moves seamlessly from the pleasure of the walk into a connection with the wars with the British colonies, gives agency to the items
of clothing that emerged from these colonies. The cloth of the material she wears asserts its own independence over her body, fighting back just as the colonies attempted to react to the British as Imperial oppressors. It also notes the way in which dress genders the act of walking, as women’s clothing of the eighteenth century was mostly unsuitable to these kinds of walk. In Austen’s novel *Pride and Prejudice*, in which she makes direct reference to the works of Burney, she depicts her protagonist Elizabeth Bennet as an “excellent walker” (45). Her appearance draws contrasting comments; her change in countenance due to her muddy walk results in her mockery by women, and admiration from men. Austen seems to be suggesting that even a walk generates a gendered division in opinion. Delvile also acknowledges that “Miss Beverley is an excellent walker” (582), and it is this mode of walking, with his dog that allows her to escape from the grief of his departure. Forcing a constant connection to Fidel, the dog allows her to attempt to grieve for his loss, whilst also offering her respite from the confines of her interior pain. His presence offers her the justification to isolate herself in Fidel’s company, escaping from the questions of others. His return to Delvile also offers consolation: “her first effort, in this work of mental reformation, was to part with Fidel, whom hitherto she had almost involuntarily guarded, but whom she only could see to revive the most dangerous recollections” (774). By returning him, she attempts to begin to return to her healthier and happier state. Belfield also acknowledges the restorative power of walking; he comments, “committing my route to chance, strolled on into the country, without knowing or caring which way” (648). His walk into the peaceful countryside away from the hazards of the city helps alleviate the burdens of town life and gluttony, but also frees his mind of its
troubles. It is the mode of walking that offers such a soothing effect: “my slow method of travelling that gave me time for reflection, and reflection showed me the error of this notion” (648). It is at once a time for seclusion and isolation from a society that has led to his downfall and ruin, and a return to a simpler more rural way of life that allows him to witness, if only temporarily, an alternative type of lifestyle.

If horse riding is not available to women and walking offers its own aesthetic dangers, that carriage riding, the most frequent form of travel for all the characters in the novel, is the safest and most respectable form of transport for women. In a society that insisted on ladies maintaining a neat and tidy appearance, a carriage could serve as protection from the dangers of the weather to the wearer and her dress. It also served as a practical mode of transportation that protected against the more general dangers of travel, such as the fear of thieves and gypsies, and provided the most comfortable means of travel available. Men also used it as a method of protection from the same dangers, and often accompanied women both to protect against possible hazards, and to preserve the respectability of those women. Most of Cecilia’s travel happens by carriage, a privately owned vehicle that seated a number of people. Not owning one, Cecilia moves by borrowing those of her friends and guardians. This poses its own dangers; it leaves her vulnerable to their desires, and renders her dependent on others in order to move. In order to liberate her from such restriction, Burney offers her two alternatives: the chaise and the hackney coach. The former prevents any other person from travelling with her as the compact space inside carried a single person. Cecilia also travels frequently by hackney
coach, a hired form of communal transportation. Both men and women use each type of vehicle in the novel, its de−gendered state, offers women a means to travel almost as widely and as freely as men could. It concealed the traveler from the view of other, and offered a veil of secrecy that meant it was difficult to determine the gender of the person inside; it made travel around England equally possible, and the safest form for men and women alike. Dr. John Trusler writing in the London Adviser and Guide in 1786 advised strangers to London, both male and female, how to move through the city in order to remain safe. In it, he offered a detailed description of each of the type of modes of transport available to the city traveller: the chair, hackney coach, horse and carriage, stagecoach, and pedestrianism. Each of the entries lists the cost of the travel and rules for those owning and travelling by each type of transport. He suggests his pamphlet will offer, “that necessary information to Strangers coming to reside in London, which they are always in want of, nor any pointing out those easy and salutary remedies which the inhabitants of the metropolis may have recourse to, to protect them from the arts and villainies of those who prey upon the ignorant and uncautious” (Image 4). His use of the term “strangers” unifies the genders through a shared foreignness to the city, by suggesting that they are equally at danger from the threats of the city.

Although these rules promoted the safety of travel by carriage, the coach was still an unpredictable mode of travel; frequent accounts of the carriage falling and harming passengers demonstrate the lack of stability and safety that it offered to its passengers. Burney describes one such encounter in her diary:
We found ourselves suddenly mounting on one side-Mama, who is soon alarmed, cried out ‘We are going! We are going!’ I sat quite quiet, thinking it a false alarm: but presently the Coach was entirely overturned, and we came side ways on the Ground. Stupefied between surprise and fright, I fell without moving a finger, and laid quite silent- the Glass at my side was fortunately down, and the Blind up, which saved my Temples from the Pavement, but the Glass above me broke, and the pieces fell on me. (16)

Falling carriages not only posed physical dangers but also emotionally frightening experiences: “We stayed very late, to avoid the Crowd. When we went down, we got with difficulty to our Coach; but, after the usual perils and dangers, we were driven out of the Haymarket, and into Suffolk Street. Here we concluded we were safe,- but, as we afterwards found, there had been left a load of Gravel in the street, which the shade (being moonlight) hid from the Coach man” (Burney 16). This similar experience of the danger of the carriage ride depicts the fear for both women and men of the interiority of the carriage. Burney describes her “fear” at this happening. Attempting to use the carriage to escape the mob of the city, she finds a new mob created by its overturning. She writes,

He beg’d me to go with him to his sisters, who were close by, that I might get out of the mob, and promised to take care of me:- but I was now terrified for Mama and Susan, and could not leave the Place, as, though we were all separated by different Assistants, I heard the former call out that her arm was broken! I quite wrung my Hands with horror- This Gentleman took hold of me, and almost used violence to make me come away. (17)

A similar incident occurs in the novel as the carriage of Miss Larolles overturns, placing her, and Cecilia in danger. The former cries: “I was never so rejoiced in my life as when I found I was not killed. I’ve been so squeezed you’ve no notion. I thought for a full hour I had broke both my arms” (579). Events such as these were not uncommon: carriage riding could be smooth or jolting, with many depictions in eighteenth century writing of
carriages breaking, wheels falling off, or passengers attacked. It was a dangerous form of travel as it exposed the wealth of its inhabitants, despite its attempt to protect them from the undesirable masses of the poor. The coach presents the same dangers to Cecilia as the people who claim to protect her, people like the Harrels and Mr. Monckton; she acknowledges her belief in the carriage’s power to conceal her: “I am sure she could not see me” (579). Despite her report of feeling safe from the visibility of the crowd in her carriage, it fails to protect Cecilia from view. Upon finding Miss Larolles’s carriage overturned, Cecilia uses the carriage as protection from discovery to shield her face from sight in order to avoid detection; although protected by the carriage during her ride to meet Delvile; her discovery removes her veil of secrecy. Ultimately, it is not the failure of the carriage that exposes her, but the failure of a man to allow her privacy. Morrice acknowledges his complicity: “‘O, I told her,’ [Miss Larrolles] answered Morrice, with a nod of self−approbation for what he had done, ‘I told her it was you, for I knew I could soon overtake you’” (579). Riding on horseback still presents the most dangerous mode of transport to Cecilia, as it overtakes her carriage. Despite travelling through the open space of the road, the privacy of the carriage allows it to become almost an extension of the home, but an even more private one that restricts entry. As a previously private intimate space, the carriage becomes a jail, trapping Cecilia inside. The coach presents the same dangers to Cecilia as the people who claim to protect her, people like the Harrels and Mr. Monckton. Miss Larolles fairs better than her friend, she survives the fall intact and unharmed but her dog’s leg is broken. Finding the neglected animal Burney notes, “the poor little animal, forgotten by its mistress, and disregarded by all others, was now
discovered by its yelping; and soon found to have been the most material sufferer by the
overturn, one of its fore legs being broken” (581). The animal is as vulnerable as Cecilia
is in this moment, Mr. Morrice’s protection of it, by carrying it on his horse, serves only
to allow the animal to fall again, breaking another leg. The symmetry of the scene argues
that the chaise and the gentlemen, as ostensible guardians, pose the same threat. Miss
Larolles and her dog act as a mirror to Cecilia’s danger, and her vulnerability to men that
claim to protect her.

**Travel's Dominance**

Cecilia’s growing independence throughout the course of the novel transforms her
from a young naive girl fearful to undertake a journey by herself, into an heiress who
asserts her right to choose how, and when, to travel by the end. Discussing the healing
power of the walk in Romantic poetry generally, and specifically in that of Coleridge’s
work, Langan points to “the practice or therapy of walking advocated in *The Excursion.*”
Which “appears as an antidote, a cure for the defaulted, or ‘passive’ citizen” (230).
Cecilia evolves from a passive citizen into an active one through her own walks. As the
urgency of her walk through the streets of London to find Delvile magnifies, Cecilia’s
sense of desperation gathers speed in tandem with the pace of her movement. The
connection between the speed of her motion and the speed of thought stress how the two
work together. Susan Greenfield notes the link between European mockery of a type of
Englishness that resulted in madness and suicide (52) with England’s imperial expansion.
Cecilia’s physical and mental movements distance her physically and emotionally from
the control of people who use a type of expansionist ideology to dominate her, such as Monckton who attempts to control her the way England controlled its colonies—through fear and manipulation. Her mental instability and vulnerability to him ultimately enables her emergence out of the madness into a new and active citizen. Colley argues that becoming an active citizen meant giving, but also receiving charity; Cecilia’s madness towards the end of the novel forces an acceptance of hospitality from strangers. Her emergence after her period of mental illness sees the birth of a new Cecilia: a stronger, braver, independent and unstoppable force. It is her vulnerability and dependence on others that forges a connection with people.

Her choice of travel also reflects the change in her character; throughout the novel Cecilia’s subjectivity develops, culminating in the madness scene. Her first mode of vehicle is the carriage, one that offers security but also confines her physically replicating Monckton’s own control of her mind. It is a small, protected space that keeps her locked inside. Her decision to walk and move out of the carriage suggests an attempt to move outside of her world of protection and imprisonment; by choosing how to travel, she determines where she moves. Her return to the safety of the carriage in the middle of the book coincides with the development of her madness and instability, demonstrating the limits of her subjective growth at this point in the novel. Although she begins to establish some of her own independent thinking, she is not independent or confident enough to break away from the paternal guardianship that the carriage represents, or from Monckton’s control. The very language of the carriage scenes depicts Cecilia’s subjective
growth. At the beginning of the novel, Cecilia relies on others to “put” her into the chair, but the language develops in tandem with her mental state. Once at Delvile Castle and away from Monckton’s strict hold on her, Delvile simply “attended her to the coach” (235). As Cecilia moves between a passive and a more active role, her mode of vehicle also continues to oscillate between chair, coach, and foot. The rotation between each links her developing consciousness with the type of emerging beauty that Hogarth proposed. In the clutches of Monckton, her chair carried her directly into the hall. It conceals her from the outer world in the same way his actions hope to conceal her from any society that may lay claim on her for marriage. The chair and Monckton act in the same manner, to convey her safely into the house, but also to imprison her from the sight of others. Ultimately, it is Cecilia’s reversal of her role as vulnerable and in need of protection to that of protector, which forges a belief in her own ability to govern her fortune and ideas. The growing dependence of Henrietta Belfield enables her decisive action to visit Mrs. Delvile against the advice of Monckton; in revolt of his advice, she asserts control by directing the carriage that transports her. The language reflects this change; where previously others directed her into and out of the carriage, the tone shifts to suggest that it is Cecilia who will “set down” Henrietta in defiance of Monckton’s wishes.

Cecilia’s use of a carriage is limited to the kindness of her friends and guardians: “she borrowed one of the carriages, and gave orders to be driven into the city, to the house of Mr. Briggs” (89). Through each carriage that she borrows, the subjectivity of the owner transfers into her own unconscious, as the carriage begins to take hold of her
development. It also serves to help aid her eventual escape from such ideas through the introduction to more vulnerable and moral characters. Upon noticing Cecilia’s carriage at the door, Mrs Hill tells her, “‘I was sadly afraid you would be angry, but I saw the carriage at the door, and I thought I would try; for I could be no worse; and distress, madam, makes very bold’” (69). The carriage asserts its own agency through contributing to the introduction of Cecilia to both Mrs. Hill and her plight; as such, it becomes its own character in the novel. Although this scene would seem to suggest that the carriage threatens early on to be the dominant character, by developing subjective complexity and independent mobility, Cecilia remains the main character of her own story. At the beginning of the novel, Burney describes Cecilia’s “unhackneyed observation” (102), suggesting a subjectivity formed not only through people, but also through the very type of vehicle that transports her. This description implies that her developing consciousness is actually one not formed by the carriage. Although forced to borrow from her friends, her own subjectivity remains unrentable, and completely her own.

**Sexual dangers and freedoms**

Judith Butler notes that the body acts as a site of vulnerability, she argues, “this means that each of us is constituted politically in part by virtue of the social vulnerability of our bodies—as a site of desire and physical vulnerability, as a site of a publicity at once assertive and exposed” (20). Travel also exposed the body to the vulnerability of view as it imposed a different kind of danger to women; the carriage and walk offered another space for male sexual aggression. Miss Larolles notes the dangers of riding in a carriage
and its part in acting as a dangerous mode of transportation, commenting, “I wish I was safe in my chair” (282). Even such a simplistic character acknowledges the sexual dangers it poses. Landreth points out that the carriage worked in the same way as the veil for its passengers: “even once inside the coach, passengers tend to ‘veil’ themselves with assumed personae” (112). The use of the chaise in Burney’s novel works in a number of ways: it is simultaneously limiting and liberating for Cecilia. Kathleen Wilson argues that it also offered other social and cosmopolitan opportunities for travelers not based on gender divisions; the “close encounters on the road had occasioned more concrete forms of protosociological musing in British narrative writing. The arbitrary mingling of travelers in hired vehicles, where a range of differences including gender, rank, religion, profession, or nationality might have to be navigated, well nigh demanded such investigation” (244). She notes, “coach conversation achieves an unprecedented coherence, optimism, and figurative significance in Sterne's hands, however, shoring up the novel's projection of its own international public: an entirely approachable sphere in which an English parson might chat as breezily with a French Duke as with a chamber maid” (244). It is at once both an intimate and private space that offered the protection of secrecy, but also served as a public arena from which to view others inside the carriage, and from where Cecilia is on display to others.

In the crowd scene of Vauxhall, Campbell suggests, “Burney portrays a society which, far from heading towards an end in ruin, seems condemned to an endlessness of petty disasters” (140); it is a voiceless society walking towards nothing. Whilst the mob
reflects every part of society, it is both the rich and privileged in London and the poor in the streets, it is always representative of the city associated with trade and the abuses of commerce culture. Smollett depicts it as its own specific group of people; it is neither the very superior of society or the common or the urban masses, but rather a distinct and newly emerging group. Susan L. Jacobson calls this group the newly wealthy (75), and Matthew Bramble repeatedly refers to the group as “the monster... a monster I never could abide” (35). Explaining his hatred for them, he comments: “I detest the whole of it, as a mass of ignorance, presumption, malice, and brutality; and in this term of reprobation, I include, without respect of rank, station, or quality, all those of both sexes, who affect its manners, and court its society” (35). As a group of people who attempt to imitate the manners and role of the gentry, they do so through the acquirement of wealth, and not through their claims to heritage. In a similar vein to *Cecilia*, his use of the same name for the people of London to those in Bath links the conspicuous consumption of the later with the world of commerce in the capital.

The Oxford English Dictionary offers a definition of the word “Hackney” as something for hire, suggesting a link between a coach and prostitution. In his fables to women, Thomas Marryat noted the dangers of women riding in a carriage by themselves: “In vain for bliss will matrons roam, / Their joys are all coinn’d to home: / Wife and fireside, as join’d by tether, Should always take their tour together” (Fable XXV, p. 193 Image 207). This rhyme suggests that touring in general poses a great threat to women, promoting the domestic safety of the marriage home as the only space in which women can remain beyond reproach of illicit behavior. Indeed, many of the writers of the
eighteenth century noted the sexual dangers of carriage riding; recently, Landreth argued for the “erotic possibilities of voyeuristic access to intimate spaces” (96). In Austen’s *Emma*, Mr. Elton takes advantage of his solitary ride with the protagonist in order to profess his love for her. Her reproach and disgust at his sentiments leaves them uncomfortably trapped together: “in this state of swelling resentment, and mutually deep mortification, they had to continue together a few minutes longer, for the fears of Mr. Woodhouse had confined them to a foot-pace” (105). Austen’s unification of the two types of travel, carriage riding and walking, challenges the benefits of travelling by coach. Instead of a place of safety, it becomes a literal trap, allowing for a type of intimacy between the sexes from which it is impossible to escape. The slow walking speed that her father has insisted on also positions Emma as the victim of paternal male attention as it is his care for her safety that offers Mr. Elton the time to attack. The carriage, which should speedily and safely convey her out of this predicament, fails her. Danielle Bobker explains the construction of the inside of the carriage: “around the time of the Restoration, the coach took an inward turn: the barge-like structure was superseded by a more compact one in which travelers faced one another” (245). This, she argues, created a more intimate space that forced travellers to sit looking directly into the face of their companions whether they wanted to or not; refraining from eye contact would have made for an uncomfortable atmosphere. Mr. Monckton uses the construction of the carriage to act as a mirror, reflecting his thoughts and attitudes onto the jailed Cecilia, and attempting to control her thoughts when alone with her in the carriage. The uncomfortable sociability that the restrictive space of the carriage enforces results in the same tension as evidenced
in *Emma*; the carriage becomes an uncomfortable space. However, Austen also allows it to create a type of sexual liberation for her female characters. For Marianne Dashwood in *Sense and Sensibility*, both walking and carriage riding possess an element of danger, allowing her to be alone with Willoughby (51). Bobker notes the connection between the speed of the travel and the movement of the mind to thoughts of a lover in Lawrence Sterne’s novel *A Sentimental Journey*. She suggests that there is a link between “movement and communication. As if keeping time with the carriage, he imagines a warm and wide-ranging conversation with his lover” (244). In both Sterne’s and Austen’s novels it is the speed of movement that creates a dangerous possibility, offering an escape from the rigid confines of social rules. Even though coach riding does offer some protection and freedom for women, Burney’s novel still makes it evident that they were not wholly safe to travel alone by coach; despite its possibilities to act as an intimate space safe from male exploitation, it is merely a temporary privacy.

The carriage also offers a means of escape for Cecilia from the male predators, offering her a place of safety. At Sir Robert’s intrusion, Cecilia, “casting her eyes around, saw that he was followed by Sir Robert Floyer. Full of displeasure both at this introduction and at his presence, she turned hastily to Mr. Arnott, and entreated him to enquire if the carriage was not yet ready” (135). The entrance of the carriage offers her a chance to escape Sir Robert Floyer and his attempt to entrap her in public conversation. Its return is a moment of relief for her as “Mr. Arnott then brought intelligence that the carriage was ready. Cecilia, glad to be gone, instantly hastened to it; and, as she was
conducted by Mr. Monckton, most earnestly entreated him to take an active part in endeavouring to prevent the fatal consequences with which the quarrel seemed likely to terminate” (137). As a place of safety and enclosure for her away from predators such as Floyer, the carriage offers refuge, as a private space off-limits to those outside her acquaintance and thus it is a protective space. It was also a space of sociability, one that helped create an intimate space that allowed for the formation of new connections and friendships. The intimate spaces of the carriage ride were also evident in the walk in the novel, as at times, both become erotic places of intimacy that could be threatening and liberating. Alison O’Byrne argues that walking emphasizes, “encounter, confrontation, and encroachment on personal space” (95), and in this way it is no different from coach travel. In performing this type of activity, Cecilia is in danger of intimate contact with men from which she cannot escape. Yet, for the same reasons, walking enables a type of privacy that allows for the possibility of marriage proposals to be made and accepted. Cecilia and Delvile mutually claim their love for each other during their walk through the countryside, resulting in her eventual happiness.

**Spectatorship and Spatial Separation**

Hogarth commented that “the ordinary undulating motion of the body in common walking (as may be plainly seen by the waving line, which the shadow a man’s head makes against a wall as he is walking between it and the afternoon sun) is augmented in dancing into a larger quantity of waving by means of the minuet-step” (Hogarth 147). Questions of the limits of gender inequality lead to a consideration of the possibilities of
spectatorship that both walking and carriage riding allowed: for men to watch women and women to watch men. This created a new space for a type of sexual liberation, but also created its own dangers and limits. The carriage becomes a domestic space for intimate conversation between women. It offers protection from the glare of those of lower position and wealth, and men in general, providing a type of sanctuary and safety from the visibility of others. Finding herself finally alone with Mrs. Harrel, the two women talk openly: “as they went together to the house of that lady, in Mrs. Harrel’s vis-à-vis, Cecilia, not doubting but their opinions concerning the Baronet would accord, instantly and openly declared her disapprobation of everything he had uttered” (31). The dictionary offers the definition of the vis-a-vis from the literal translation of the French as “face to face”. The use of the term at this vital moment in the novel seems deliberate as the more frequent term “carriage” is used frequently elsewhere. The arrangement of seating in the vis-à-vis positioned the women in a way that allowed it to become a space for intimacy between women, and one in which they were able to share their private opinions about others they were not able to express in more public spaces. Even in the intimacy of the Harrels’ home, Cecilia fails to communicate to her friend her real feelings. Bobker notes, “if coaches participate in the expansion of infrastructures that increase and speed up the circulation of people and of things (including Sterne's own novels) through Britain, Europe, and beyond, they also offer a pleasing contraction or concentration of interpersonal experience, momentarily dissolving boundaries between self and other which elsewhere prove unyielding” (260). Yet it also forces an intimacy that was not always a space of privacy between women alone. Cecilia also becomes trapped in the
carriage with Mr. Morrice: “the two ladies were then handed to Mrs. Harrel’s vis-à-vis; and the gentlemen, joined them without further ceremony by Mr. Morrice, followed them to the Haymarket” (57). The hidden inner space of the carriage and vis-à-vis, which allowed protection from the glare of those outside of it, could provide a type of safety. Conversely, its shelter also allowed people to shed any persona or construction of personality that they were able to perform in public spaces, exposing those around them to new dangers by revealing the real personalities of those inside.

Just as social codes determined how to walk through a city, there were also rules codifying how to walk through the countryside. John Gregory advised:

I would particularly recommend to you those exercises that oblige you to be much abroad in the open air, such as walking, and riding on horse-back. This will give vigour to your constitutions, and a bloom to your complexions. If you accustom yourselves to go abroad always in chairs and carriages, you will soon become so enervated as to be unable to go out of doors without them. They are like most articles of luxury, useful and agreeable when judiciously used; but when made habitual, they become both insipid and pernicious. (134)

Rules that codified how to walk through the countryside limited the very freedom associated with it. As an interior mode of travelling, walking isolated the individual in their own consciousness, or with a small number of characters, isolating the walker or walkers from everyone else. The novel demonstrates the distinction between public walking, which was a means through which to display oneself for the marriage market, and private walking through gardens that allowed characters to reflect on their own interiority and subjectivity. Murphy notes, “public promenades and gardens ranked with the theatre, opera, and court as settings for fashionable public life” (132). Walking in
gardens also offered its own limitations. The garden, as an enclosed space, offered the only space suitable for walking to Austen’s Miss Bingley. Its spatial restrictions limit the walker physically, in the same way as the social rules for marriage prevent Elizabeth Bennett’s betrothal to Mr. Darcy, and the rules of hierarchy situate Miss Bingley above the Bennett sisters. The walk around the house serves to place Miss Bingley as an object for male spectatorship, a role she indulges but one that Cecilia deliberately attempts to escape. For the later, walking threatens to transform her into such an object against her will, enabling men to pursue her. During her walk with Monckton, she notes her surprise “when suddenly from behind a thick laurel bush jump up Mr. Morrice; who had run out of the house by a shorter cut, and planted himself there to surprise them” (523). Believing herself to be alone with Delvile and free from the observation of those constantly wanting to attach her to each of the men she walks with, the intrusion of Morrice is another reminder of how much danger is constantly present. Sir Robert alters the role of spectator and spectacle when he suggests a walk. He comments, “‘I could propose a much better scheme than that’ suggesting, ‘what if you all walk to Harley-street, and give me your notions of a house I am about there?’” (79). The objective of his walk is not to display the human body as object for spectatorship, but to flaunt his wealth and stature through the exhibition of the house.

**Traveling the soul**

Hogarth notes that the “kinds of softnings and modulations of the rays of light which are said to fall upon the eye from every object it sees, and to cause those more or
less-pleasing vibrations of the optic nerves, which serve to inform the mind concerning every different shape or figure that presents itself” (95). His observation connects the everyday motions and objects with the mind to show the relation between the two is inseparable. Critics and philosophers have continued to debate the way spatial movement affects the soul for centuries. In An Essay Concerning Human Understanding, John Locke wrote, “I ... attribute change of place to all finite Spirits... For my Soul being a Real Being...[it] is capable of motion...No one can imagine, that his Soul can think, or move a Body at Oxford, whilst he is at London; and cannot but know that being united” (307 [2.23.20]). He indicates the relationship between travel and the spirit that is so prominent throughout Burney’s novel. Landreth’s work investigates the period’s interest in these ideas, posing the questions: “do the motions of the mind/soul obey the same laws as physical bodies? Is the mind/soul self-moving, or is it—like other spatiotemporal things—moved by outside forces?” (97). As she matures throughout the novel, Cecilia cultivates an individual and conscious subjectivity that changes dramatically after each visit to a new part of the country and friends. As she travels physically, she also develops emotionally relying more on her own thoughts, rather than depending on those of others. Travel through London and the country allows her contact with numerous ways of thinking, allowing her to gauge how each method alters her own views and develops her opinions. In this way, her emotional development is more extensive than her spatial movement; it is the motion of travelling through a country that allows her to travel through her ideas, changing and developing her own perceptions of how she chooses to
live. Therefore, while her emotional growth is dependent on travel, she ultimately covers more ground subjectively than physically.

At the beginning of her journey while still in Bury, Cecilia allows Mr. Monckton to govern and indeed form her ideas of herself and others. The latter's control over her at the beginning of the novel is evident as she undertakes her first journey; conducting Cecilia into the carriage his behavior highlights the influence and control he holds over her body and consciousness. By placing her directly into the carriage, he controls her physical movement, which in turn allows him to control both her psychological state and her physical motion into the carriage. Through this he enables his thoughts to permeate her own: “Mrs. Harrel arose now to depart, and Cecilia, no more tired of the beginning of the evening that entertained with its conclusion, was handed to the carriage by Mr. Arnott” (42). In her first journey in a carriage in the novel, Monckton literally controls her body; through her passivity at allowing him to place her inside and control her movement, Cecilia submissively allows him to control her physical movement. Burney clearly demonstrates the link between travel and the spirit here as she suggests that by controlling Cecilia’s movement he also controls her thoughts. Easily influenced by him she admits: "Mr. Monckton was so positive in his assertions, and so significant in his insinuations to their discredit, that she was at length persuaded she had judged too hastily, and, after thanking him for his counsel, promised not to take any measures towards a removal without his advice" (162). She submits entirely to his will; he not only controls her opinions of people but also keeps her imprisoned geographically where he wants in
Surrey, whilst also confining her in the carriage. Yet, her move away from Monckton’s hold on her is clear later in the novel. As her own decisiveness develops, she asserts her own will: “the next morning she arose early, and, attended by her servant, set out for the house of Mr. Briggs, purposing, as the weather was clear and frosty, to walk through Oxford-Road, and then put herself into a chair” (168). Choosing to walk, and when to walk or take her chair, she asserts her own will through the type of transport she chooses.

Walking enables Cecilia to engage with her own conscious decisions rather than following those set out for her by others. Murphy finds that rambling in Romantic-era plots relates to “larger Romantic themes of individual agency and the pursuit of freedom at any cost” (142). Her choice of the liberty of a walk rather than the protection of the carriage to move around London demonstrates the growth of Cecilia’s independence. By abandoning a life organized and structured for her, one that is almost performed for her by others, she orders her own life: “[Cecilia] purposing, as the weather was clear and frosty, to walk through Oxford-Road, and then put herself into a chair” (168). Landreth, considering how travel and emotional movement are connected, suggests that “movement through space must also move the emotions; at some invisible moment of contact, spatial change becomes cognitive change” (115). It is in moments while walking that awakens some of Cecilia’s strongest emotions of fear and pleasure, and the constant fluctuation between an independent and dependent state works in tandem with the S shape of her travel to determine her happiness at the end of the novel. Her fluctuating perspective results in her subsequent vulnerability, a vulnerability which ultimately proves liberating,
allowing new ideas and modes of travel to enter her consciousness. As the novel progresses, her independent thoughts emerge in tandem with her choice to walk. Robin Jarvis points out the link between pedestrianism in Romantic writing and “independence and freedom of movement” (30). Through her independence and isolation in the walk, Cecilia’s subjective growth awakens. Murphy points out that although pedestrianism is prevalent in Romantic writing, its origins come from earlier eighteenth century depictions of walking and an interest in the picturesque and pastoral literature (125). It is only through Cecilia’s exposure to new and frightening modes of travel, and her subsequent vulnerability, that Cecilia can move towards liberty and freedom.

Writing on the way grief theory works, Judith Butler’s argues, “[grief is] the moments in which one undergoes something outside one’s control and finds that one is beside oneself, not at one with oneself” (28). Moments of grief for Cecilia, such as the experience of walking through the mob, enable her emotional growth and realization of a world outside of her own. Jeffrey Robinson explains: “walking highlights the drama of confrontation between an inner world and an outer world, worlds that exist in relation to each other in varying degrees of compatibility” (7). In the depiction of her walk through the mob, Cecilia becomes a living statue jostled by the crowds, losing the ability to control her own body; her lack of ability to move out of the crowd signals a crisis and mental deterioration that continues in moments of fear. Deirdre Lynch notes that in much of Burney’s work, “to enter into the world is to be confounded with the body’s representations—with what one looks like from outside” (166). Surrounded by the crowd
Cecilia becomes a type of still life, held by an entry into a world she fails to understand, and completely vulnerable to the crowd, and it is at this moment that she begins to see herself. It is, however, a necessary moment for her as it enables her to engage with the mob of the people in order to develop her social conscience.

Butler argues that rather than privatizing or isolating Cecilia from the people who encircle her, the moment of panic caused by the situation helps to instill a sense of shared community in her. The scene “furnishes a sense of political community of a complex order, and it does this first of all by bringing to the fore the relational ties that have implications for theorizing fundamental dependency and ethical responsibility” (Butler 22). It is in the moments of fear that forces Cecilia’s subsequent healing. By sharing in the experience of the mob and moving through them, the group offers an escape from the constraints of the rich obsessed with money and wealth. Susan Greenfield argues, “to the extent that Cecilia’s madness is driven by her economic ruin, she appears to fall prey to the ‘English Malady’ that is the price of financial, commercial and urban excess and has reached epidemic proportions, infecting Albany, Mr. Belfield, Mr. Harrel, Mrs., Delvile, and Mortimer himself” (59). Cecilia, Belfield, Mr. Harrel and Mrs. Delvile all unravel mentally in the city. Greenfield explains that this link is deliberate: “those who go mad in Cecilia regularly do so in London (Cecilia goes mad among an urban mob) and are to varying extents debilitated by luxury and wealth or their loss” (59). Cecilia’s own moment of madness occurs at the loss of Delvile; desperately roaming around the streets of London, she becomes lost in a crowd. Her madness episode enables the expulsion of
the old ideas ingrained in her by Monckton, Harrel, and Delvile Senior, replacing them with new inclusive ideas of a social harmony. Encircling her in its people rather than in the objects and historic sites of the Grand Tour enables her to emerge from the madness of old ideas and develop a more unified notion of compassion for those outside of her position. In doing so, Burney offers a more beautiful way to travel through a country; by travelling through its people and landscape a new type of inclusivity emerges at the end of the novel.

In her journal, Burney notes the eighteenth century’s close associations between walking and madness. She writes, “the Conversation during supper turned upon madness, a subject which the Strangers are very full of, as a lady of their intimate acquaintance left their House but on Friday in that terrible disorder. [...] Mrs Strange said that the beginning of her Wandering that Evening, was, by coming up to her, and asking her if she could make Faces? (41). Burney’s recollection of the conversation highlights her interest in the subject, one that she later depicts in the novel through the connection of Cecilia’s own madness and walking. Murphy suggests that, “walking equates with freedom of choice” (136); it is through her walks that Cecilia engages with her own ideas, learning to construct her own thoughts. Cecilia’s incoherent behaviour grows in tandem with her desire to walk randomly, as she searches desperately for Delvile. Her movements link directly with her cognitive behaviour: as her speed increases, so does the space she covers alongside the deterioration of her mental state. Ultimately, it is her madness and desperation to walk that offer restoration and a return to health. These in turn create a
type of liberation: “the frantic Cecilia escaped both pursuit and insult by the velocity of her own motion” (875). Her descent into hysteria ultimately allows her to escape from the confines and constraints of man and carriage.

Through her representations of the modes of travel, Burney demonstrates that those undertaken in the Grand Tour are also possible in England, and create a far greater and more complex sense of subjective complexity and independent mobility than its foreign counterpart. Although equally dangerous sexually and physically, they also offer a liberation and education to Cecilia. The circular nature of the Grand Tour, which, by necessity consists of travel by boat, chair or foot, and a return to the sea, limits young men. Cecilia’s movement between the different modes of travel enables a type of experience that moves between spaces rather than just as a means to travel abroad they offer a more beautiful conclusion to her education.
Chapter 3
In Conversation with other Travel Writing

Set mostly in a small part of England, *Cecilia* also comments on travel outside of the British Isles, and the foreign “Other”, as well as exploring travel through England. Introducing the possibility of the extension of Cecilia’s travel outside of England to France, offers a critique of the limits of the Grand Tour, a journey that also travelled through Europe. Cecilia’s journey abroad occurs only once she has travelled through her own country and people, and become a morally educated individual. The novel opens with a reference to Cecilia as “this fair traveller” (1); labelling her as such on the first page instantly positions the novel as one that will explore the implications of travel. It also connects Cecilia’s experience with the types of journey that other travel writers of the period recorded. Discussing it in relation to other texts that consider travel will demonstrate the way in which Burney’s Hogarthian serpentine curve emerges in Cecilia’s foreign journey, portraying her more beautiful experience. It is not only travel abroad, but also travel through foreigners, that the novel discusses, with the references to the Irish, Turkish, and Spanish. Lady Mary Wortley Montagu’s record of her experience touring Europe and the East in *The Turkish Embassy Letters* establishes a model for “female” travel; her journeys through Turkish cities in carriages allow her to travel “incognito”. Montagu was the first, and arguably, most influential travel writer of the period, portraying for the first time her personal female experience of travel and life abroad, reflecting her experiences abroad back onto British notions of identity. These aspects of
her letters, I argue, inform later representations of how women move through cities, countries, and other bodies of social space within England, including Burney’s depictions of Cecilia’s travels by coach. Alongside these two texts, Tobias Smollett’s *The Expedition of Humphry Clinker* offers a version of travel around Great Britain. Venturing further around the nation than *Cecilia*, it discusses how a national identity that encompasses England, Scotland, and Wales might function, but also the problems that arise from that union. Narrated mostly through Matthew Bramble, it offers a male perspective of travel such as the Grand Tour gave, while travelling domestically. The inclusion of a number of perspectives from different characters allows for a useful contrast to considering the singular perspective of *Cecilia*. The female perspective of Bramble’s sister and her maid promote a narrative of gender equality in contrast to Burney’s or Montagu’s works; as a fictional narrative, it does not record lived experience such as Montagu’s but an imagined one, as in *Cecilia*. Both Smollett’s novel and *The Turkish Embassy Letters* narrate the experiences of travel through a series of letters, while Burney also includes correspondence as the novel concludes at the end of most of Cecilia’s travel around England. Burney’s reference to *Gulliver’s Travels*, allows her to use Swift’s novel to comment on her characters, and the lack of knowledge about governing and ordering a country. Defoe’s work, *Robinson Crusoe*, comments repeatedly on the theme of providence, a theme that also appears regularly in Smollett’s novel. Crusoe’s construction of a state on his island, and his rule of his “people” are both issues that help define his concept of an island race.

**Intertextuality**
The collected work of Kathleen Rivers helps to demonstrate the prevalence of intertextuality during the eighteenth century, and its importance in creating the definition of travel literature. She argues that the genres of history, biographies, review journals and poetic miscellanies all helped to develop the genre during the eighteenth century; each type of genre helped add something new to travel writing and structure its formation. Karen O’Brien’s analysis of the publication of the history of England through maps shows how the form of literature that preceded it helped to cultivate what later evolved into travel literature. O’Brien notes this trend in the transformation of the history. She argues that Smollett’s “choice to write in both forms, the history and the travel narrative, shows the close interchangability and connection between the two forms of writing. Each hoped to chart an England based on historical representations of a by gone golden era and interspersed these reflections onto the modern day society”. She continues: “history’s growing generic approximation to the novel in the later eighteenth century attracted more and more female readers; inexorable, linear narratives were diversified or replaced by shorter formats, epistolary forms and biographical vignettes” (cited in Rivers 126). The move from historical to travel narratives led to a growth in female readers, but also female authors as women wanted work that represented their opinions.

The inclusion of such historical references as O’Brien discusses are subtly interspersed into Cecilia. Borrowing Swift’s term to describe someone of small stature, Burney directly references Swift’s satire. In a conversation between Mr. Gosport and Cecilia the former explains: “Miss Larolles, indeed, is better off, for in talking faster than she thinks, she has but followed the natural bent of her disposition: as to this poor
JARGONIST, he has, I must own, rather a hard task, from the continual restraint of speaking only out of his own Liliputian vocabulary, and denying himself the relief of ever uttering one word by the call of occasion” (273). The reference to Gulliver’s Travels depicts contrasting, but equally ridiculous and narrow, opinions of thought such as Gulliver found in each of his travels to foreign lands. The jargonists view themselves as a race of their own, but by separating themselves as such, they prevent the unity of the nation and the happiness of its people. Hogarth also comments on the novel noting, “their eyes are so quick in discerning the faults of others, at the same time they are so totally blind to their own! Indeed it would be well for us all, if one of Gulliver’s falappers could be placed at our elbows to remind us at every stroke how much prejudice and self-opinion perverts our fight” (Hogarth 6). Kathleen Wilson discusses a similar limited idea about race, as “the accessible, homogenized national identity cultivated by newspapers was in fact a delimiting one that recapitulated the self-representations of the urban upper and middle classes, and especially their male, white and English members”(34). As the characters discussed in this scene are all white, wealthy, and English, they offer a satirical observation of a part of society that poses a threat to Cecilia’s attempt to unify. Wilson continues, “and although such an inscribing of subjectivity was contested by a variety of other practices and genres—from pamphlet writing and novels to dramatic works and women’s periodicals— it tended to be bolstered by related sources, such as travel writing” (34). The scene in Cecilia serves a dual purpose: to satirize, but also to challenge the traditional types of travel narratives that promoted such a type of thinking.
Smollett writes the canon of authors and poets into his own work by introducing Matthew Bramble to an author. This results in a discussion of both past and present authors: “he rejudged the characters of all the principal authors, who had died within a century of the present time; and, in this revision, paid no sort of regard to the reputation they had acquired—Milton was harsh and prosaic; Dryden, languid and verbose; Butler and Swift, without humour; Congreve, without wit; and Pope destitute of any sort of poetical merit” (99). The introduction of the unknown author enables Matthew to comment on the lack of taste and judgement that even the educated and literary in London possess; he condemns the folly and business of the city, but also the folly of its most prestigious literary people. However, Smollett goes further by writing himself and his family into his own story by presenting his poem, an Ode to Scotland. His choice to include the different forms of writing in one novel, the history, the travel narrative, and the ode, shows the close interchangability and connection between the two forms of writing. Each is not mutually exclusive, but can appear in the same text. Just as the novel discusses the limits and advantages of national union, particularly that of England and Scotland, Smollett’s work also unifies the different styles of writing. Through the inclusion of the three forms, he argues that the intertextuality of using each in the same novel creates the most unifying and beautiful form of literature. The mention of the canonical authors and poets unites their work, promoting admiration for each. It also

---

2 O’Brien calls Smollett the “moving spirit” behind the publication of Voltaire’s histories, even going so far as to translate them himself (cited in Rivers 118), noting that he wrote in a number of forms of literature.
presents an interest in combining the past with the future as a way of educating future authors and poets through learning from those that preceded them.

Burney also unites the past with the present, suggesting a similar way of writing history into a novel concerned primarily with looking forward. The past, as it exists through characters such as Delvile Senior and Mr. Harrel, is stagnant, but Cecilia offers a different type of rule to live by which combines both past and present successfully. Cecilia’s estate runs on the feudal rules of fair tenancy and cohesion promotes the happiness of her and those who live around her. The inclusion of these historical rules depicts a system of governing that remembers England’s heritage. Through Montagu’s references to the writing of Jean-Baptiste Tavernier, Jean Dumont, and Ottaviano Bon, she ridicules their depictions of the private women’s spaces that they have never accessed. She writes, “your whole letter is full of mistakes from one end to the other. I see you have taken your ideas of Turkey from that worthy author Dumont, show has writ with equal ignorance and confidence” (148). Instead, she proposes to write a real account of female experience in Turkey, and one that portrays a more honest view of the Turkish harem. The repeated allusions to the classical works helps to establish her literary knowledge and authority to challenge the work of male travel writers through her own letters, but also offers her the space to comment on the restriction of women due to the marriage laws of England. Burney, Smollett, and Montagu each hoped to chart an identity based on historical representations of a past golden era through the inclusion of past references to work that offered progressive ideas.

Site of Travel
Despite travelling through the geographical spaces of the South East of England, Burney’s narrative very rarely depicts the landscape in detail. Instead, she offers a more descriptive account of the people: it is not the landscape of a country that constructs national identity, but the people that construct national consciousness. Both Montagu and Burney focus on depictions of the interior space of the domestic home, and of female subjectivity: the interior spaces of the mind. In contrast with the male form of travel writing which details landscapes, such as Defoe’s depiction of setting and Gulliver’s descriptions of the landscape, Smollett weaves between his multiple narrators to offer different interpretations of the same geographical area. Lydia finds that in Bath, “the air is so pure; the Downs are so agreeable; the furze in full blossom; all the tress bursting into leaves, and the hedges already clothed with their vernal livery” (25). For her, it is a place full of life and society while for Matthew Bramble it is place of disease. His depiction of the same site conflicts completely with the scene of health that Lydia describes. Matthew sees, “a child full of scrophulous ulcers, carried in the arms of one of the guides, under the very noses of the bathers”. It is a scene that poses danger to his own health: “suppose the matter of those ulcers, floating on the water, comes in contact with my skin, when the pores are all open, I would ask you what must be the consequence?” (42). The comedy of the scene reflects the continued disparity and descriptive narrative of geographical settings that add little to the narrative.

Montagu’s letters contain very little attention to the sites and landscapes she travels through, despite moving through vastly different terrain. As she travels “through
the finest plains in the world, as even as if they were paved, and extreme fruitful, but for the most part desert and uncultivated, laid waste by the long war between the Turk and Emperor”, her focus shifts to representations other than the landscape. The narrative moves to comment on “the more cruel civil war occasioned by the barbarous persecution of the Protestant religion by the Emperor Leopold” (89), the narrative concentrates on the politics of the countries she visits. Montagu addresses issues of interiority—describing the domestic and public spaces of the baths and harems. In doing so, she attempts to challenge the traditional view of the barbarity of the people of Turkey, and instead to represent a more enlightened country than many in Europe. She writes, “I look upon the Turkish women as the only free people in the Empire” (115-116); her observations argue that the dress of the Turkish women offers them forms of liberation not accessible to her English counterpart. Heffernan suggests that switching the focus from the veiled body of the Turkish woman to the imprisonment of Montagu’s own body, through her clothing in the hamman scene, allows Montagu to discuss the restrictions of English social order rather than those of the Turkish (211). The narrative comments directly on traditions of the foreign “Other” to consider the rules and limits of women in England. Mary Jo Kietzman argues that “by interacting with the women at the bath, Montagu sees herself more clearly as constrained by her position in English culture, which she regards as relatively uncivil because unable to accommodate difference” (540). The scene of the bath in the work of Smollett and Montagu focuses on different details; Burney continues the gender division in description, through her focus of the domestic spaces of the homes
and gardens she travels through, venturing very little detail about the sights she views while moving.

Each of the texts by Burney, Smollett, and Montagu demonstrates that a new type of identity is available by depicting it as the alternative of already established ideas. The depictions of the foreign “Other” in each of the works offer a more constructive view of how to view foreignness, to demonstrate the differences and similarities between self and other. The Expedition of Humphry Clinker discusses this through travel between Scotland and England, and between the High and Lowlanders. Matthew as older and more private, fears the new commerce culture, while his younger niece and nephew find the world of London, trade, and city exciting. Montagu attempts to show the similarities between women in both England and the East, and the ways in which rich and poor live in tandem happily in Turkey, while actually demonstrating the very different experiences of each. Ignorant of doing so, she writes,

the vulgar Turk is very different from what is spoke at Court or amongst the people of figure, who always mix so much Arabic and Persian in their discourse that it may very well be called another language; and ‘tis as ridiculous to make use of the expressions commonly used in speaking to a great man or a lady as it would be to talk broad Yorkshire or Somersetshire in the drawing room. (129)

Burney also demonstrates the differences between several disparate groups of people: rich and poor, city and country. Through depicting the gendered divisions that divide national consciousness in England, each comments on the importance of the politics of the country.
through which they travel. While the details of description divide the works by gender, the thematic concerns unite the three novels.

**Travel outside of England**

In order to comment on Englishness, Burney considers it in relation to the foreign, subtly interweaving a number of other nationalities into her narrative. The masquerade scene introduces Cecilia to her first experiences of the foreign “Other”. Through the introduction of Spaniards and Turks in the ball scene, Englishmen and women enact foreign identities. Burney links the two notions of foreign identity with performance when appropriated by the Englishmen and women; the facade of their appearance poses a danger to Cecilia who remains unsure of whom to trust. Although the Tour attempts to develop young men into the fully cultivated “Englishman”, this scene argues that, conversely, the appropriation of another culture, and its introduction into England, creates a hybrid version of English identity. The scene depicts a type of temporary confusion that the Tour constructs permanently, as the creation of identity that the Tour fashions is one that adopts some of the cultures and experiences of the foreign lands. It educates through cultural appropriation, and the introduction of foreign customs into the creation of the “English gentlemen”.

The danger of such a construction of “Englishness” is evident in Captain Aresby, and his habit of introducing French words into his dialogue reflects time abroad in the navy. Appropriating the language of a country at war with England and combining it with the English language, his speech reflects his dangerous nature. Wilson explains that his
combination of French and English illustrates how language could be divisive. She argues, “if the discourses of nationality sought to construct homogeneities within the territorial boundaries of the nation–state, they also sought to identity and assert difference, and those differences, however artificial and tenuous, not only distinguished the nation from other nations but also divided the citizens within its own boundaries” (49). It is not only Aresby’s foreign experiences that forge such a division between him and his fellow countrymen, but also his speech that creates the same divisions as the Grand Tour to induce separation between the people of England. In an exchange between Mr. Hobson and Cecilia, the former asks her of the Captain: “Pray, ma’am, if I may be so bold”, “what countryman may that gentleman be?” When Cecilia responds that he is an Englishman, he exclaims “An Englishman, ma’am!” “why I could not understand one word in ten that came out of his mouth” (398). As a Captain, his identity is one created by and performed from, his experience of war; through continuing to use his mixed language in England, he conveys the violence and aggressiveness of war back into the domestic space of England. To do so, Burney suggests, is paramount to bringing a continuation of war to the island and its people, destabilizing and endangering them. No longer able to communicate in his own country, his speech offers a type of national identity that promotes the violence, war, and aggression of the past one hundred years war with France. Aresby not only carries that violence into England, but also perpetuates the aggression of the English to the French in the wars. With the invasion of the French language, he also brings the violence of the republic type of government in France to England. Although republicanism offers an alternative to the social hierarchies of Great
Britain that are destructive in their own ways, the French republic does not offer a peaceful alternative to Burney’s own hopes for English rule; the death of the aristocracy and those of vast wealth is not a viable alternative. Whilst Aresby’s limited knowledge of French divides, Montagu argues that knowledge of languages creates unity between nations. In opposition to Captain Aresby, she learns to communicate better through each language with those she meets, to bridge the divide between nations. Montagu ridicules the small amount of learning of French and Italian that determines the “education” of an English woman (163). She believes the Turkish language offers a more beautiful form for writing, and one that expresses more passion than English (124). Ironically, she continues to translate the foreign language back to her native tongue through the Letters, to share the limited beauty that still exists in her translation. Ultimately, she finds that:

> after having read all that is to be found in the languages I am mistress of, [...] I envy the easy peace of mind of a ruddy milk-maid who, undisturbed by doubt, hears the sermon with humility every Sunday, having not confused the sentiments of natural duty in her head by the vain enquiries of the Schools, who may be more learned, yet after all must remain as ignorant. (213)

Despite her noble motive, combining too many languages poses a danger to her as she finds herself losing her ability to construct sentences in English.

Belfield also exists in a confused state of dual identity. Lady Honoria fails to recognize him as an Englishman, proposing instead that he is Irish. She comments, “Sir Robert, you know, fought one for you in the beginning of the winter, with that Irish fortune-hunter who affronted you at the Opera” (345). Katie Trumpener notes a fear of the Irish “Other” during this period in England. She argues that “English detachment and
disdain toward Ireland conceals a will to domination, motivated both by envy at the cultural vitality of the conquered and by a deep fear of England’s own innate inferiority” (7). By suggesting that Belfield is Irish rather than English or British, Lady Honoria’s comment presents her desire to separate herself from the Irish, and present them as a foreign race. She promotes Sir Robert as Belfield’s superior through his inclusion in a superior race. Cecilia responds to Lady Honoria’s comments, replying, “Irish fortune-hunter!”, “how strangely has that quarrel been misrepresented! In the first place, I never was affronted at the Opera at all, and in the second, if your ladyship means Mr. Belfield, I question if he ever was in Ireland in his life” (346). Labelling him as a fortune hunter, Lady Honoria suggests a lack of morality is inherent in the Irish people, as well as a duplicitious and deceptive nature. To Cecilia she replies, “Well”, “he might come from Scotland, for ought I know, but somewhere he certainly came from” (346). In attempting to assert her authority and dominance over both Belfield and the Irish, she fails to accomplish her task; instead, she highlights her own inferiority of knowledge of the people of Great Britain. Burney links her limited travel of the nation through the novel with her prejudices of the languages of Great Britain and lack of knowledge of its people, contrasting it fiercely with the more enlightened and travelled Cecilia. Lady Honoria links “Englishness” simply with wealth and social position, and her failure to recognize Belfield as English demonstrates a troubling attitude that continues to prevent a unity of identity in the nation as a whole. Cecilia’s immediate rejection and confrontation of ideas such as these, widens her experience, entering her into a discussion of a broader sense of what it is to be British. Through these scenes, the novel considers how to forge a unified
English identity and the more complex questions of how a unified Great Britain might look. Through engaging with ideas outside of her own small geographical travel, an understanding of the differences and similarities of the people of each of its parts begins to emerge in Cecilia.

**Hybrid type of Identity**

Sir Robert and Lady Honoria’s comments demonstrate a type of thinking about nationalism that is divisive and isolating. Burney proposes an alternative through Cecilia, and her representation as a more complex type of hybrid consciousness in which a person may adopt the identities of more than one country or area. Montagu’s travels through Turkey lead her to think about her own dual perspective that develops, taking part of the culture of the East home to England through the introduction of smallpox to the isles. She is not alone in such manners; in Turin she notes, “The Queen entertained me with a world of sweetness and affability and seemed mistress of a great share of good sense. She did not forget to put me in mind of her English blood, and added that she always felt in herself a particular inclination to love the English” (199). Claiming dual heritage, she delights Montagu with her refusal to forget her Englishness. In order to absorb the cultural experiences of public spaces, Burney adopts the dress of the Turkish women to move safely. Her depiction is not one of cultural appropriation, but one of necessity— in order to remain transparent and visit the whole of the city. Kietzman notes the way in which “Montagu represents Fatima the way she will represent herself— as a hybrid, a woman whose complex subjectivity is her own creation” (544). In Montagu’s recollections, each of the women are a hybrid of the two cultures, and Lady Mary finds
many of the Eastern customs offer benefits to its people than the European equivalent. Wearing the veil, she assimilates Eastern practices, permitting her to stipulate, and determine, her own boundaries and limits of foreign countries. Montagu argues that her use of the veil shields and protects her.

In *Humphrey Clinker*, Matthew Bramble refers to himself as both English and Welsh, portraying a lack of identification with any one over the other. He fluctuates between referring to his Welsh homeland and his Englishness; when in Wales he finds that “the same soil affords all the different fruits which England may call her own” (113). Whilst in Scotland he notes, “the Highlanders have no other name for the people of the Low-country, but Sassenagh, or Saxons; a strong presumption, that the Lowland Scots and the English are derived from the same stock—The peasants of these hills strongly resemble those of Wales in their looks, their manners, and habitations; every thing I see, and hear, and fell, seems Welch” (223). Defining the Scots by their customs and considering how these customs represent an association with either England or Wales, he divides both England from Wales, and separates the people of Scotland into two distinct peoples. His confused consciousness aids Smollett in addressing the problems and limitations of a unified Great Britain. Robert Mayer argues that Smollett’s discussion of the merits and failures of both England and Scotland demonstrates his “representation and endorsement within the narrative of a change of great historical significance— the gradual creation of the United Kingdom” (248), a creation that is restorative to all parties. He suggests that “old and new, city and country, Scotland and England are harmonized in the
series of unions that Smollett uses to end *Humphrey Clinker*, valorizing both union-harmonious, moral human society—and the Union in the process” (250). Conversely, Susan Jacobson observes that it offers a divisive approach to unity, and that the new public “has abandoned all respect for the traditional class structure that is inherently English and has replaced it with selfish monetary pursuits. Bramble views the mingling of the classes as the result of uncontrolled self-interest and necessarily a threat to social cohesion” (80). If Bramble connects himself to England and to Wales, the marriage of Tabitha Bramble to Lismahago creates a union between Wales and Scotland, and a unified Great Britain. However, it is a union between people of the same rank; the second marriage that takes place between Tabby and Lismahago represents the limits of the unification. While marriage may be possible between the wealthy, it is not acceptable between the poor in Brambles eyes—both Humphry Clinker and Winifred Jenkins work for the Brambles. Smollett offers a unified United Kingdom defined by a person’s status, one that promotes progressive national unity but restricting overall social integration. While his comments concern Great Britain, Montagu attempts to demonstrate how global unity is possible. Heffernan suggests that eighteenth century travel literature attempted to position the west as a liberated society, one moving away from patriarchy. Through Montagu’s depiction of the “veiled” (205) women of the east, she promotes Turkey as a more liberated country. Heffernan argues that Montagu attempted to challenge this view of the hospitality of the people. Lady Mary’s challenge to preconceived ideas is also evident through her comments on the advanced medical practice of vaccination to prevent smallpox practiced in the East, one that Montagu continued to advocate throughout the
remainder of her life. Lady Mary constructs British national identity by attempting to abolish the cultural divide between East and West, and instead portray the similarities between the two. Cecilia’s hybrid identity is not a combination of foreign and English, or Scottish and English, but a social hybridity.

Degradation of the body

The themes of trade and commerce help to create a sense of a divided national identity in each of the three novels, as the newly emerging trade culture in England and around the world resulted in the growth of commodity culture. In both Burney and Smollett’s novels, exposure to the city, and the trade culture it embodies, leads to the physical degradation of the body, reflecting their concern with the moral decline of the people at the expense of the emerging culture in England. Batten argues that narratives that contained descriptive geographies were concerned with “[the] treatment of such subjects as the physical appearance, customs, commerce, history, and laws of specific areas” (32). Despite not containing descriptive geographies, Burney and Montagu’s work also comment on these factors. The nation’s unhealthiness in each of the three texts derives from various social and political sources, ranging from traditional social and gender hierarchy, to the emergence of modern trade and commerce. Cecilia’s time in the city exposes her to the corruption of Mr. Harrel and the social dangers that Briggs places her in; they are both products of the commerce culture and possess an obsession with money and the display of wealth. Cecilia’s mental decline at the end of the novel reflects an England disrupted and in a disordered state, governed by unhealthy systems and rules.
The disability caused by life in the city leads to Cecilia’s mental decline, Mr. Harrel’s suicide, and a necessary complete separation from Briggs.

To remedy the corruption of the city, Cecilia proposes that Mr. and Mrs. Harrel move abroad, exiling them to France. Despite their objections, she argues that it offers the only means of recuperation for them, and they will only heal when moved away from the city. Smollett’s novel begins with Matthew Bramble’s ill health and gout, and he remains in poor health and spirits during his travels to London and Bath. Matthew’s continued ill–health, and decaying body represent his limited and regressive ideas of the social limitations of the decaying elite. He writes, through the “pride, vanity, and presumption”, of consumerism, “all these absurdities arise from the general tide of luxury, which hath overspread the nation, and swept away all, even the very dregs of the people” (34). Despite visits to the healing waters of Bath, the pretension of the society he meets there leaves him despondent, and his body and temper disintegrate rapidly. Travelling outside of England into Scotland restores his health through the movement and social engagement, transcending the corruption of society. Corruption occurs through the abuse of commerce, but also the abuse of power relations, as Smollett appears to promote the importance of the privileged gentry through Matthew Bramble, his most prominent narrator. Despite balancing his views on hierarchies of power and social prestige with those of other characters, Matthew’s voice remains dominant throughout the novel. Smollett enacts his revenge on his lead narrator through the inclusion of Humphrey Clinker’s swift social rise, allowing him to climb the chain of social prestige. Clinker’s
discovery that he is the illegitimate son and only heir of Matthew causes a reversal in Bramble’s character. His final acceptance of his son demonstrates not only his transformation through travelling both country and people as Cecilia’s does, but rather the transformative nature of blood ties that affect his strong and ancient views of societal positions.

On the brink of death in England, and mistreated by a country and rules that force Mrs. Delvile to surrender to her husband’s will, she exiles herself to France, finding life abroad offers a greater recuperative experience; travelling abroad by choice allows her to have a contrasting experience to the view of Mr. Harrel. The exile that Cecilia proposes is one he is unwilling to consider, and as such, it acts as a punishment for him for his inability to control his greed and vice. The Grand Tour was also one inflicted on young men, and not always partaken of by choice, rather a decision made for them by those who determined the rules of education. Montagu finds her travels through Turkey recuperative to the health of England. The adoption of the Turkish practice of vaccination is one that she hopes will offer a cure for the diseased of England who question its effectiveness. She writes, “I am patriot enough to take pains to bring this useful invention into fashion in England” (126). Preventing the spread of smallpox, she also challenges the traditional views of medicine in England, promoting a more diverse and progressive type of thinking. Montagu also finds travel abroad recuperative for herself, finding that the marriage rules of Turkey forge a more liberating experience for women. Escaping the
strict social codes of England, she, and Mrs. Delvile attempt to move away from laws that define and limit a woman by their position and gender.

*Humphrey Clinker* also calls into question notions of women’s liberty, patriarchal, and social marriage rules. The double wedding not only depicts a new hybrid type of thinking, but also a hybrid type of social family. In Matthew’s eventual permission of Clinker and Wini’s wedding he accepts into his clan both an illegitimate son and daughter of inferior position to his own. At the last moment, Smollett disturbs the strict social rules of English gentry that Matthew previously upheld so rigidly, and offers it as a model for a new type of more socially inclusive family. Its limits remain however, as Matthew has to be coerced into it, and takes the decision grudgingly. It is Matthew’s travel and dislocation from his home that allow his views to alter. Mary Jo Kietzman suggests that in *The Turkish Embassy Letters*, “travel displaces the subject from the determination of a given social location”. She argues, “as Montagu gradually accepted her dislocation and reveled in the dissolution of an identity which had been largely defined by her social place, she was able to reconstruct herself, not by finding a new place, but by discovering the hybrid form as a principle of meaningful order within the apparently confusing and contradictory sense data of an unfamiliar world” (547). She goes on to note that, “Montagu’s encounters with other women made her aware that, instead of playing a role within a given social order, she could construct her own subjectivity through cultural collaboration” (548). Just as the construction of Cecilia and Matthew’s identities occurs through their social collaboration with those outside of their rank and daily life,
Montagu’s acquaintance with the Turkish women also alters her perception of her own identity. The novels depict the social, moral, and physical degradation of the body, arguing that foreign travel broadens the mind to complete the English education of their characters. Foreign travel can only occur, however, once the journey through England is complete. Teresa Heffernan notes the link here to Montagu’s own position as wife of the ambassador which meant her role was to aid her husband’s discussion of British commercial and naval interests, and furthermore to help secure and safeguard them (201). Mary Jo Kietzman further resists the notion that the West was the stronger power: “the West did not clearly dominate the economic and political conversation and, in fact, depended on successful diplomacy to maintain open trade with the Ottomans” (538). Montagu’s depiction of trade with the poor does not fully reflect this view, showing her own biased views on the superiority of the West.

The emphasis on trade culture dominating England and the global market is evident throughout each of the three works. Williams argues, "the emphasis on obligation, on charity, on the open door to the needy neighbour, are contrasted, in a familiar vein of retrospective radicalism, with the capitalist thrust, the utilitarian reduction of all social relationships to a crude moneyed order" (35). Burney allows for one notable exception, offering Mr. Belfield a momentary escape from the capitalism and social construction that destroys him; by transferring him to the country, he finds stability and satisfaction in working the land. However, she demonstrates that in the emerging England, this cannot sustain the country for long and she soon returns him to the city and a desire for a life of
luxury and privilege. It is only in Smollett’s work that the rural working life of Scotland is imagined as an idyllic alternative to the commerce obsessed world of London and England as a whole; however, despite Lismahago’s argument for the superiority of his native land, he ends the narrative living in England. Smollett’s final comment here argues that Great Britain needs to accept all parts of its past and future in order to survive and emerge as the greatest power it could be. Finally, Burney’s admission that trade and commerce are an inevitable part of this new island is subtly interwoven in her protagonist’s own collection of commodities. As Greenfield notes, Cecilia’s collection of books and failure to read or enjoy them as anything other than a collection makes her complicit with a nation that is interested in collecting commodities as luxuries (63). She is also a consumer of luxuries, following the English fashion of consuming other countries and subjects.

In the crowd scene of Vauxhall, Campbell suggests, “Burney portrays a society which, far from heading towards an end in ruin, seems condemned to an endlessness of petty disasters” (140); it is a voiceless society walking towards nothing. While in Cecilia, the mob reflects every part of society, it is both the rich and privileged in London and the poor in the streets, it is always representative of the city and associated with trade and the abuses of commerce culture. Smollett depicts it as its own specific group of people; for him, it is neither the very superior of society or the common or the urban masses, but rather a distinct and newly emerging group. As a group of people that attempt to imitate the manners and role of the gentry, their wealth alone enables them to do so regardless of
lineage. In a similar vein to Cecilia, his use of the same name for the people of London to those in Bath links the conspicuous consumption of the later with the world of commerce in the capital.

Montagu’s narrative comments mostly on the wealthy women of Turkey who offer her hospitality. Her inclusion of their slaves and servants does not portray their own liberation, but that of the women to whom they belong. She considers the treatment of the slave as fair, arguing that women’s bodies are also bought and sold in England. This she finds more problematic than the Turkish slavery culture; in the East women work in the intimate and protected female spaces, while in England men for sex buy them. Burney allows for a similarly sympathetic and admiring discussion of female moral worth; while Cecilia demonstrates morality in the rich, Henrietta shows that the poor also possess it. Her moral equality to Cecilia constructs a type of morality that is nondependent on social position. Henrietta herself constructs Cecilia as the “Other” who lives in a world of harmony and happiness, a supposition that Burney attempts to address by demonstrating that women in the novel share the same concerns of love and money whatever their position. Burney then offers a very different approach than either Montagu or Smollett, suggesting a more unified social national identity, one that is inclusive of all parts of society.
Conclusion

Each of the three works attempts to destroy notions of the “Other”: for Montagu this is a racialized other, for Smollett a national other, and for Cecilia a social other. In her own home, Cecilia proposes an alternative to other methods of governing offered to her throughout the novel; she constructs a system that is mutually beneficial to the whole community of tenants, landlord, and workers, and one in which every part of this community works together for the good of the collective. Smollett also comments on the division between rich and poor, criticizing the luxury that he associated with an English imperialism that aimed to conquer Scotland rather than unite the British Isles as it proposed to do. While foreign travel in the form of the Grand Tour has negative associations for Burney, she does not discredit it as an educating experience for her protagonist. Towards the end of the novel, when Cecilia has developed as part of the English nation through travelling it, she allows her to move outside its boundaries. Offering her a new type of experience outside of England, she argues that it is first essential to learn about one’s own country and people through travelling it before exploring other nations. Only in this way can the most beautiful type of experience occur; one that enables travel abroad that does not appropriate the customs and cultures of other nations, but aims to educate in a more insightful way than the Grand Tour could. By including ideas about foreign travel, she affirms it as an equally educating experience, and necessary for her protagonist’s personal education, but not at the expense of domestic travel. By combining the beautiful and unifying aspects of both foreign travel, as
represented in Montagu's work, and domestic travel wider than the small parts of England that Cecilia shows as in *Humphrey Clinker*. Burney’s union of the two creates the most beautiful Hogarthian experience.

Much attention is once again being paid to Frances Burney’s work, particularly in the light of the interest in the works of Jane Austen which are clearly influenced by her predecessor’s heroines. Austen even makes direct reference to *Cecilia* in the title of her most famous novel, borrowing its title from a passage in *Cecilia*. While Austen is now an integral part of our cultural, academic, and everyday lives, Burney does not share quite the same attention. Although her first novel *Evelina* is widely read in undergraduate work and receives much critical attention, and her last, unfinished novel *The Wanderer* has also caught the attention of scholars, her other novels, *Cecilia* and *Camilla*, remain obscure. This is perhaps due to the sheer length of these works whose numerous volumes can be off putting in a world where we want, and are used to, instant gratification from shorter work. I argue that her long novels also deserve renewed attention, particularly in light of the emerging work on consumer culture that is so prevalent in *Cecilia*. I argue that this novel also deserves attention concerning eighteenth century nation formation, in which the complicated questions of trade relations and the emergence of capitalism sit at the heart. By considering how *Cecilia* travels through questions of national identity in Great Britain, it offers an alternative type of travel literature.

In Hogarth’s *Analysis of Beauty*, he argues that the line that is most found in nature, the S shaped serpentine is therefore the most beautiful. He comments, “those
composed of all the former together with the serpentine line, as the human form, which line hath the power of super−adding grace to beauty” (Hogarth 38). As such, it is the most natural and beautiful line of grace. In attempting to offer a type of travel narrative that moves away from the male, socially divisive circular motion of the Grand Tour, Burney follows Hogarth’s movement. She uses it to depict Cecilia’s attempts to create a more socially inclusive society that challenges traditional limits and boundaries. She demonstrates through following Hogarth’s principles, a new type of travel around Britain that allows Cecilia to engage and learn a more beautiful type of national identity than is offered by the Grand Tour. The masculine tour, as circular, is also insular and omits anything outside of its strict shape. She also depicts Cecilia’s movement through the modes of travel. Her movement through carriage, chaise, coach, and pedestrianism work in the same way as Cecilia’s geographical movement through England.

Burney demonstrates herself to be “master” in the Hogarthian sense of travel and identity writing, which Hogarth offered as “the most proper subject of the study of every one, who desires to imitate the works of nature, as a master should do, or to judge of the performances of others as a real connoisseur ought” (Hogarth 60). He continues:

the serpentine line, by its waving and winding at the same time different ways, leads the eye in a pleasing manner along the continuity of its variety, [...] and which by its twisting so many different ways, may be said to inclose varied contents; and therefore all its variety cannot be express’d on paper by one continued line, without the assistance of the imagination, or the help of a figure. (39)

This rule demonstrates the lack of beauty in the type of travel of the Grand Tour, one rigidly structured by social rules of who could travel, where they could travel to, and how to travel. Considering *Cecilia* in conversation with the work of Smollett and Montagu
allows for a discussion of how travel through England offers a more subjective experience than that of the Grand Tour. Burney follows the principles of Hogarth’s rules in the novel, both through the themes but also in the structure of the novel itself. The four books that comprise the novel split the narrative into four sections, creating another type of serpentine. The reader moves through Cecilia’s physical journey as they move through the chapters, revisiting each chapter in a different book. As the novel progresses through the four sections, Cecilia’s moral beauty unfolds in tandem with her subjective growth.
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