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We are living at an important and fruitful moment now, for it is clear to men that the images of adult manhood given by the popular culture are worn out; a man can no longer depend on them. By the time a man is thirty-five he knows that the images of the right man, the tough man, the true man which he received in high school do not work in life. Such a man is open to new visions of what a man is or could be. (Bly ix)

We have a unique opportunity today, the chance to stand up, be counted, and give men who have chosen a different road an alternative before it’s too late. . . . Christian men all over our nation and around the world are suffering because they feel they are on a losing streak and they can’t break the pattern. The Adversary has us where he wants us—feeling defeated. It need not be that way. (McCartney 11–13)

Austen, the Late-Millennial Moment, and the Modern Man

Mythopoeticism and the Promise Keepers responded to what they announced as a critical time for men. The leaders of these late-millennial men’s movements, Robert Bly and Bill McCartney, delineated the difficulties ostensibly experienced by American males of the 1990s, and outlined strategies to reaffirm masculine identity as stable, integral to larger hegemonic social structures, and vital to the security of the nation. These groups indicted the transformation of the American family, the proliferation of working women, and the atrophy of traditional male social and sexual roles for what they dubbed a crisis of masculinity. Bly’s and McCartney’s visions for rejuvenated maleness differed, but both advocated the practice of homosocial rituals in which men gathered with other men—and removed from women—to remind each other of proper male identity and activity. The success of these popular men’s movements coincided with Jane Austen’s mid-1990s cultural revival, in which films, television series, cookbooks, calendars, and other oddities helped to reenergize Austen’s enduring appeal—an appeal that has received considerable attention from Austen critics, fans, and devotees. While Bly and the Promise Keepers responded to what they saw as a crisis
moment for men by encouraging homosocial practices designed to reestablish strong hegemonic structures, Austen’s late-millennial vogue showed how the cultural authority of heterosexual men could be maintained without evangelical meetings or Iron John ceremonies. Indeed, the late-twentieth-century revisions of Austen’s work showcased the model of modern masculinity that emerged alongside the development of the Western nation in the years following the French Revolution; and the filmic updates of Austen’s narratives depicted such men as attractive and romantic individuals.

The reappearance and lure of Austen’s men in the wake of the crisis announced by the late-twentieth-century men’s movements suggests the value of her fictional world, and specifically her male characters and their model of masculinity, to the amelioration of social concerns about men. Her men are not the virile wild men imagined by Bly, nor are they the devoted family men who attended McCartney’s large Promise Keepers’ gatherings. My project aims to study the masculinity modeled by the men of Austen’s novels—men who attempt to achieve sexual and social security amid the insecurity of the post-Revolutionary period. The men of her tales respond to diverse and conflicting cultural standards for male identity and behavior generated by England’s volatile discursive response to the Revolution. They are well-managed men who are capable of becoming active members of the modern English nation because they monitor their desires. Despite the romantic draw of the men in the late-millennial filmic versions of Austen’s tales, my readings of her novels will demonstrate that her men are appealing and effective modern men precisely because they regulate their susceptibility to amorous emotions. Devoney Looser, in her assessment of Austen’s relevance to mid-1990s men’s movements, questions: “Are Austen’s heroes appealing because they are in some sense ‘new’ to us; because they harken back to older versions of masculinity; or because they are—like her women—some sort of hybrid of the two?” (164). I will argue that Austen’s men are attractive to late-millennial American culture because they embody a well-disciplined masculinity that allows them to maintain their participation in hegemonic and heterosexual social structures, such as marriage and family, without isolating themselves from women.

Men’s collectives such as Bly’s Mythopoeticism and the Promise Keepers attempted to rebuild such hegemonic and heterosexual social structures by reminding men of their supposedly distinct sexual and social responsibilities. These movements charged that contemporary men had lost their cultural identity, function, and direction; Bly and the Promise Keepers, like many other pundits and critics of masculinity, offered plans for repairing men that required what Michael A. Messner describes as “spiritually based homosocial
rituals through which [men] can collectively recapture a lost or strayed ‘true manhood’” (17). These men’s groups wanted to stabilize sex-based identity and function as fixed and oppositional, and this project generated a vast cultural following. Michael Kimmel and Michael Kaufman note that “millions of men have been forced to grapple with what it means to be a man,” and they conclude that these “men are searching, looking for a new sense of meaning” that movements such as Mythopoeticism and the Promise Keepers were ready to provide (283). Bly’s *Iron John: A Book About Men* (1990) encouraged men to embrace their intrinsic manliness—in opposition to intrinsic womanliness—and to dismiss diluted or complicated models of masculinity that might subdue male potency; the Promise Keepers, likewise, urged confused or troubled men to recall the gender stability inherent in what Messner calls “biblical essentialism.” Messner explains that the “Promise Keepers’ discourse relies on little or no scientific justification or basis for its essentialist beliefs”; rather, biblical essentialism is “based on faith” and “allows Promise Keepers’ discourse about women to be couched in terms of ‘respect’ for women (in their proper places as mothers, wives, and emotional caretakers of house and home)” (30). The 1990s men’s movements insisted that men are fundamentally different from women, and they charged men to embrace such differences as vital to their sexual identities and social functions.

While these men’s movements reacted to what they saw as a crisis in masculinity, the updates of Austen’s narratives reminded us that crises of masculinity are nothing new, and the successful period-piece films provided American culture with an efficient strategy for easing anxieties about contemporary men without banishing them from women. The long-standing appeal of Austen’s narratives has been due to the charm of her characters, their manners, and their society; more specifically, Austen’s tales have remained attractive because they supposedly show us men and women who engage in romantic relationships devoid of angst or crisis in a world free of conflict, controversy, and uncertainty. Henry Grunwald wrote of the several Austen films:

Many teenagers say that they are attracted by the elegant houses and what they believe to have been a gentler and more humane way of life. Other observers argue that these films convey a controlled passion that is more sensuous than the crass sexual exhibitions of so many current movies. . . . As for me, watching each of the Austen productions, I was struck by the good manners and the correct English—language representing manners of the mind. The contrast with the vulgarity of most other films and much of daily life brought me a sense of relief, of being in an oasis. (A16)
Grunwald’s comments on the 1990s Austen films illustrate the millennial conception of the novelist’s work as a repository of a well-organized society clearly distinct from the present. The organization of her characters was also observed by late-twentieth-century American audiences. Ellen Goodman explored America’s obsession with Austen’s men and women and concluded “that what makes the characters appealing and exotic to us is that they are so full of restraints and/or constraints” (A23). The self-regulation of Austen’s men and women mirrors their ostensibly structured society that critics admire. And it is noteworthy that the sexual restraint and social stability that Goodman and Grunwald value in the Austen recreations is quite similar to the stability—both social and sexual—that Bly and the Promise Keepers attempted to provide men through their manifestoes. American culture of the 1990s was enamored of both the discipline of Austen’s heterosexual romances and the sex-based dichotomy of the men’s movements: both appeared to offer a return to hegemonic social and sexual structures as a simple strategy for ridding modernity of its complexity. Ultimately, the social/sexual subjectivity modeled by Austen’s men is at once more attractive and more useful to society; her men do not need homosexual rites to amend their insecurities, and their relations with women promote the biological and cultural reproduction of the nation.

I am not suggesting that the Austen vogue of the late twentieth century responds to, corrects, or perpetuates the men’s movements of the same period; I believe that Austen’s late-millennial reappearance helped American culture to recall a model of masculinity that was vital to the resolution of a previous social and sexual crisis. The men of Austen’s novels become contributing members of English society in the years following the French Revolution, the era in which the emerging modern nation develops its organizing civic structures. These male figures of Austen’s corpus are examples of what have become a prototype of modern masculinity and a vital component of the heterosexual hegemony that the late-millennial men’s movements sought to preserve. Kimmel and Kaufman explain that the men’s movements of the 1990s vocalized “the cry of anguish of privileged American men, men who [felt] lost in a world in which the ideologies of individualism and manly virtue are out of sync with the realities of urban, industrialized, secular society” (263). The late-twentieth-century man, according to Kimmel and Kaufman, was no longer able to make sense of his sexuality in an altered world, and the men’s movements gave such uncertainty a voice and a home. Austen’s corpus, however, offers uncertain modern men a solution; her works show how post-Revolutionary men resolved their insecurities and gained access to the modern nation and its social structures by placating cul-
tural desires for proper masculinity and managing their desires. The filmic updates of Austen depicted attractive heterosexual men who did not need to retreat from women to be functional social and sexual subjects. The Austen films portrayed men who were at once pleasant and safe; in addition, these men upheld the hegemonic quality of patriarchal structures such as family and marriage without appearing separatist or tyrannical. My study invites us to reconsider the simultaneity of the popular men’s movements and Austen’s late-millennial vogue as a way of assessing the social value of her men, but my book is fundamentally a reading of Austen’s novels. My goal is to demonstrate the enduring cultural utility of Austen’s men, and I am specifically interested in how the disciplined masculinity modeled by her men helps to resolve social and sexual crises and promote social order.
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In Henry Tilney’s charge to Catharine Morland, he implies that this land and
time are safe and ordered. In Emma Woodhouse’s expression of disgust with
the behavior of Frank Churchill, she identifies his actions as unmanly. Her
aversion, likewise, presumes that there is a proper way for a man to act in
society that all males ought to know. These comments of Austen’s characters
remind us of her concern with the identity of the English nation and its men.
Austen’s corpus dramatizes England’s transformation into a modern nation,
and an integral element of this process is the modernization of English men.
She depicts men who achieve the social and sexual propriety referenced by
Emma Woodhouse despite the cultural turmoil engendered by England’s
response to the French Revolution—turmoil that Henry Tilney does not
acknowledge. Austen’s men respond to a variety of cultural directives for
proper masculinity, and they acclimate themselves to the needs of a changing
society, but they must carefully regulate their proclivity to sexual desires to
ensure their prolonged stability.

Austen’s novels do not portray a society attempting to forbid men from
engaging in sexual activity; rather, Austen’s tales present a modernizing
nation that attempts to regulate how its men stylize and fashion themselves
as sexualized subjects. Michel Foucault points out that “sexual behavior is
not, as is too often assumed, a superimposition of, on the one hand, desires

Remember the country and the age in which we live. Remember that we are English,
that we are Christians. Consult your own understanding, your own sense of the proba-
ble, your own observation of what is passing around you. (Henry Tilney, in Northanger
Abbey 159)

So unlike what a man should be!—None of that upright integrity, that strict adherence
to truth and principle, that disdain of trick and littleness, which a man should display
in every transaction of his life. (Emma Woodhouse, in Emma 360)
that derive from natural instincts, and, on the other hand, of permissive or restrictive laws that tell us what we should or shouldn’t do.” He concludes that “sexual behavior is more than that. It is also the consciousness one has of what one is doing, what one makes of the experience, and the value one attaches to it” (“Sexual Choice, Social Act” 141–42). I will treat the issues of sexuality, sexual desire, and love within Austen’s texts not as natural instincts that must be either satisfied or repressed, but as matters of social conduct and cultural consciousness that are crafted, maintained, and adjusted. Austen repeatedly represents men who monitor their sexualities as part of their larger civic duty, and their self-management allows them to participate more fully in a modernizing culture.

As I discuss in my opening chapter, the English society that emerged in the years following the French Revolution specifically instructed men how to prevent emotion from endangering their civic identities. Early-nineteenth-century England actively sought strategies to curb the passionate behavior of men associated with the radical experiment in France, and England was especially nervous about men’s susceptibility to love and sexual desire. Austen’s works consistently illustrate this important dialectic between the individual’s sexuality and the security of the national community. Austen specifically notes the social complications and consequences involved in sexual desire, love relations, and marriage, and she likewise demonstrates how civic duties affect the pursuit of desire and romance. Throughout my argument, I will use the term social/sexual subjectivity to denote this complex interrelation between the social statuses and sexualities of Austen’s men. I want to emphasize how the late-eighteenth-century cultural discourses that I discuss in my first chapter were concerned with both the construction of a modern English nation and the formation of a disciplined modern man.

Austen’s corpus is a useful cultural site to study how men of a modernizing nation respond to cultural anxieties about masculinity. Her narratives depict men who monitor their amorous emotions while maintaining romantic relationships with women; these relationships, however, are inevitably marked by the order amenable to a society in transition rather than the volatile unpredictability of love. Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari provocatively inquire, “What does it mean to love somebody,” and they conclude:

It is always to seize that person in a mass, extract him or her from a group, however small, in which he or she participates, whether it be through the family only or through something else; then to find that person’s own packs, the multiplicities he or she encloses within himself or herself which may be of an entirely different nature. To join them to mine, to make them penetrate mine, and for me to penetrate the other person’s. Heavenly nuptials, multi-
plicities of multiplicities. Every love is an exercise in depersonalization. . . .

(Thousand Plateaus 35)

For Deleuze and Guattari, love destroys the singularity and security of the individual and compels each lover to embrace the diversity and complexity in both the self and the other; love engenders lines of flight or new kinds of relationships between the diverse and mobile packs that constitute the lovers. Such love prevents men and women from embracing the specific and singular roles that both the post-Revolutionary English nation and the late-millennial men’s movements assigned to citizens to establish gender clarity and ordered civilizations. For Deleuze and Guattari, “being-lover” and “being-loved” allow individuals to pursue fluid emotion, pleasurable sensation, and subjectivities marked by flexibility. They ultimately announce that we should “use love and consciousness to abolish subjectification”; they see the potential of love to subvert the ordering forces of modern civilization that subject us/make us subject to disciplined modes of sexuality (Thousand Plateaus 134).¹ The male figures of Austen’s corpus are, however, strongly urged to become regulated social/sexual subjects in order to provide the civic and cultural leadership required to stabilize the modern English nation. The literary and political discourses of the 1790s establish distinct desires for appropriate English maleness, and each of these models requires the proper man to maintain a singular, static, and well-managed sexuality that does not entail self-banishment from women; Austen’s work offers us portraits of men who relinquish the “heavenly nuptials” and powerful desire theorized by Deleuze and Guattari in favor of a disciplined model of modern love endorsed by post-Revolutionary England.² This modern love solidifies stable individual identities for men and women, and, by ensuring strict gender polarity, it ultimately helps to justify and maintain hegemonic structures that support modern patriarchy.

Austen, Love, and Marriage

The issues of love, sexuality, and marriage have, of course, received considerable attention in Austen scholarship, and the centrality of these features in her work has helped to promote her enduring appeal.³ Austen’s late-twentieth-century revival illustrated how her supposed documentation of gender and social propriety has remained extremely attractive to American consumers. Austen’s ostensible authority on gender, marriage, and love, however, has historically focused upon women. Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, in a later manifestation of her infamous 1989 MLA conference presentation, noted that
“Austen criticism is notable mostly, not just for its timidity and banality, but for its unresting exaction of the spectacle of a Girl Being Taught a Lesson” (“Jane Austen and the Masturbating Girl” 315). Sedgwick’s characterization of Austen scholarship as a practice in disciplining vivacious young women reflects a lengthy tradition of “marriage” criticism that Claudia Johnson discusses in her influential essay, “Austen Cults and Cultures.” Austen criticism continues to insist upon the educational value of her corpus for young women, and the late-millennial Austen craze reminded us of this reputed applicability of the writer’s stories. Natalie Tyler, in her wonderfully entertaining handbook The Friendly Jane Austen (1999), reveals the longevity of this cultural belief in Austen’s panoramic authority on both women’s lives and their progression toward marriage. Tyler presents Austen as an advisor who offers helpful counsel to troubled individuals, and she specifically upholds the valuable marital advice in Austen’s works. Tyler adds that “the marriage plot compels Austen's heroines to learn how to read human character. . . . Hence it is also an education plot” (59). This popular conception of her tales as guidebooks for young women’s effective marriage preparation has prompted numerous critics in the years following Austen’s Hollywood successes to explore the role of the writer and her tales in expounding the cultural narrative of heteronormativity. And her contemporary cultural clout as a heterosexual romance advisor has encouraged scholars to sustain both the “Girl-Being-Taught-A-Lesson” model of criticism and the focus on the narratives’ marriage plots; however, Austen criticism remains notably silent on the sexuality and behavior of the heterosexual male lover.

Instead, the critical penchant to view Austen’s corpus as a marital training ground for young women has led to a scholarly focus on the female subject. Important feminist and female-centered treatments of Austen throughout the 1980s—including Sandra M. Gilbert and Susan Gubar’s The Madwoman in the Attic (1979), LeRoy W. Smith’s Jane Austen and the Drama of Woman (1983), Margaret Kirkham’s Jane Austen, Feminism and Fiction (1983), Mary Poovey’s The Proper Lady and the Woman Writer (1984), and John Hardy’s Jane Austen’s Heroines: Intimacy in Human Relationships (1984)—established a vital new arena in Austen criticism by advancing sophisticated arguments about the depiction of women and femininity in the six novels. These early feminist critics provided detailed explorations of femininity and women’s social lives in Austen’s texts. Their works, nonetheless, often isolated Austen’s representations of female characters, effectively disregarding the symbiotic and complex processes of gender formation in Austen’s narratives; moreover, this concentration on her portrayal of the heroine has traditionally theorized (either implicitly or explicitly) a simple and static man who is the opposite
and/or oppressor of women. The critical emphasis on Austen's marriage plots has thus encouraged many to read her corpus as a collection of tales documenting a woman's search not for love or a lover, but for a stable and stabilizing husband.

The young woman's marital quest, according to this standard approach of Austen criticism, involves various lessons the heroine must learn as she matures and accepts her own social/sexual limitations. This critical supposition depends upon a conception of masculinity as fixed and static; the ideal man for each heroine is presumably somewhere within the narrative, and if she learns the requisite lessons, she will find her man—who is simply waiting to be found. Laura Tracy claims that Austen portrays exactly such autonomous and self-determining men; she argues that “one of Austen's sub-themes about men in her work [is] that they cannot be changed by women”; she concludes that “Austen implied that men in Western culture are created to be independent subjects—heroes of their own lives” (157). This traditional reading of Austen, which casts each woman's idealized man as a secure and independent figure, is strongly rooted in Freudian notions of Oedipal development that presuppose the masculine subject as an always-already complete and fully formed sexual subject. In *Sexuality and the Psychology of Love*, Freud outlines the different challenges faced by men and women throughout their Oedipal developments. He theorizes that men must successfully progress beyond these trials to achieve sexual and social maturity, but he bemoans that “the majority of men are . . . far behind the masculine ideal” (193). Freud’s notion of a “masculine ideal” that men supposedly seek has remained important to the field of masculinity studies and integral to the success of the late-millennial popular men’s movements. Kaja Silverman’s widely anthologized study, *Male Subjectivity at the Margins* (1992), may have epitomized this Freudian influence as she explored the struggles and failures of modern men to reach the apex of masculinity—the same struggles and failures that prompted many men’s interest in Bly’s mythopoetic manifesto and Promise Keepers’ gatherings. This Freudian theory of masculinity effectively bifurcates men—that is, each man is either an ideal male sexual subject, or he is lacking.

Freud’s conception of men and masculinity is reductive, and it is specifically ineffective for studying Austen’s fictional representation of gendered identity. The men of Austen’s corpus, rather than attempting to imitate a single and stable paragon of masculinity, must negotiate numerous intertwined and contradictory standards for proper maleness that are always inflected by national concerns and perpetually debated and revised. Claudia L. Johnson accurately expresses the complexity of Austen’s male characters
when she announces that “we will miss what is distinctive about Austen’s achievement if we assume that masculine self-definitions were givens rather than qualities under reconstruction” (Equivocal Beings 199). The developing English nation does not offer Austen’s men a single and static system for male sexual development à la Freud; the literary and political discourses of the 1790s debate various models of masculinity and male social identity. Deleuze and Guattari, in their response to Freud, take up precisely this point, explaining that modern societies “make a habit of feeding on the contradictions they give rise to, on the crises they provoke, on the anxieties they engender” (Anti-Oedipus 151). The post-Revolutionary cultural disorder creates such a contradictory situation for England’s men, and Freud’s prominent theory of sexuality cannot negotiate this complexity. Angus McLaren points out that “Freud’s famous question ‘What do women want?’ has garnered a good deal of indignant attention,” but as McLaren reminds us, “few have observed that he did not ask ‘What do men want?’ the assumption being that everyone knew” (3). My treatment of Austen allows for a reexamination of the emergent model of Western masculinity, and I demonstrate that post-Revolutionary men’s desires—and perhaps more importantly, post-Revolutionary society’s desires for men—were neither certain nor static.

Modern Man and the Aesthetic of Existence

Austen’s corpus provides us with a unique opportunity to study masculinity and male sexual development for three primary reasons: (1) it coincides with profound historical changes in Western conceptions of men and maleness; (2) it demonstrates the important dialectical process of gender formation; and (3) it portrays men who have become cultural icons of masculinity. Joseph A. Kestner rightly notes that “the formation of modern ideologies of masculinity occurred precisely at the time of Austen’s formation as a novelist” (147). Austen’s texts depict modern men who attempt to achieve new and changing standards for proper male sexual identity, and she emphasizes how this process is affected by numerous discourses and events, including the transformation of English society, the reconfiguration of its class structure, and the social/sexual formation of women. To consider the complexity of these various cultural concerns to which Austen’s men respond, I employ Foucault’s notion of the aesthetic of existence that he develops in the second and third volumes of The History of Sexuality. Foucault’s work offers a flexible understanding of sexualized subjectivity that allows me to theorize the impact of diverse socially produced qualifications for appropriate maleness
without neglecting the individual’s interaction with these cultural forces. Foucault indicates that the deployment and regulation of sexuality involves an ethics or aesthetics of existence that he discusses as an “elaboration of a form of relation to self that enables an individual to fashion himself into a subject of ethical conduct” (Use of Pleasure 251). He explains that the subject’s ethics involve “the kind of relationship you ought to have with yourself . . . which determines how the individual is supposed to constitute himself as a moral subject of his own actions” (“On the Genealogy” 263). England’s cultural debates of the 1790s delineate various and conflicting standards for proper masculinity that the men of Austen’s fiction must negotiate as they fashion themselves as sexual and national subjects; Austen’s tales reveal that these men’s efforts repeatedly compel them to relinquish their identities as lovers and discipline their sexual desire. While Freud’s theory of an idealized masculinity invites critics to read Austen’s corpus as a manual for young women in quest of Mr. Right, Foucault’s theory of the aesthetic of existence allows us to examine—within the context of England’s late-eighteenth-century discussions—how and why Austen’s male characters form their social/sexual subjectivities.

Austen’s men craft disciplined social/sexual identities that enable them to satisfy a variety of cultural desires for proper masculinity, and this model of male sexuality is integral to the development of the modern English nation throughout the nineteenth century. Austen’s men learn to become stable subjects who are then able to participate in hegemonic heterosexual structures like marriage and family; moreover, the regulation of their desires masks their complexity and prevents any destabilizations. Austen’s novels illustrate an efficient model of love and desire that serves the state and its systems of cultural reproduction. Her portrayal of the heterosexual romance narrative is undeniably marked by such concerns of national stability and social rehabilitation, and her corpus offers us multiple portraits of men who opt to pursue the ordered rationality of secure/securing love rather than the messiness and complications of sexual desire. This strategy for male sexual formation has become the dominant model of Western masculinity that is reinforced whenever the hackneyed “crisis of masculinity” resurfaces.

In Deleuze’s brilliant “Letter to a Harsh Critic,” he explains that “non-oedipal love is pretty hard work,” and he points out that the majority of modern lovers are hesitant to expose themselves “to love and desire” and instead revert to “the whining need to be loved that leads everyone to the psychoanalyst” (10). This “whining need” fueled the successes of the mid-1990s men’s movements, and it likely helped to entice moviegoers to the filmic adaptations of Austen’s tales in search of a simpler time when love
supposedly “worked.” The propinquity of the late-millennial men’s movements and the Austen cultural revival, however, ultimately reminds us of the incipience of our efficient and effective model of disciplined modern love. Non-Oedipal love, as Deleuze notes, is risky and even arduous, and Austen’s novels illustrate that as the modern English nation recovers from the radical tumult of the French Revolution, it could not allow its men to assume such perilous and laborious tasks that might distract them from the business of ordering the state.

**Austen Criticism and Masculinity**

Despite Freud’s sustained influence in the study of sexual development, theorists of masculinity finally succeeded in questioning and destabilizing the long-standing assumption of a fixed and natural male figure during the same mid-1990s period that experienced Austen’s Hollywood vogue and the rise of popular men’s movements. R. W. Connell’s *Masculinities* (1995), Robyn Wiegman’s *American Anatomies: Theorizing Race and Gender* (1995), and Michael Kimmel’s *Manhood in America: A Cultural History* (1996) all challenged the cultural and critical expectation of a static man by examining the histories of different masculinities and exploring the various processes of men’s social formations; moreover, these and other theorists of masculinity emphasized the intellectual and political synergy between feminist scholarship and masculinity studies. Wiegman explained that the deconstruction or “‘unmaking,’ if you will, of the category of men importantly remakes masculinity as pertinent to if not constitutive of female subjectivity, thereby rendering complex feminism’s ability to negotiate the distinctions and interconnections between sex, sexuality, and gender” (“Unmaking” 33). Connell likewise insisted that “no masculinity arises except in a system of gender relations.” Connell added that “rather than attempting to define masculinity as an object (a natural character type, a behavioural average, a norm), we need to focus on the processes and relationships through which men and women conduct gendered lives” (71). The work of Connell, Wiegman, and Kimmel helped to initiate new theoretical strategies for studying the formation of masculinity as a dialectical process informed by historical contexts and individual men’s desires.

Although Alfred P. Ollivier wrote a master’s thesis on Austen’s men in 1950, Austen scholars did not begin to directly address her men until this critical reconfiguration of masculinity. The theme of the 1996 meeting of the Jane Austen Society of North America (JASNA) was “Jane Austen and Her Men,” and the subsequent 1996 volume of *Persuasions* collected much
of the convention attendees’ work on the subject. During this same mid-1990s period, scholars began to treat Austen’s men as part of larger critical projects. Roger Sales’s *Jane Austen and Representations of Regency England* (1994) offered an impressive reading of Austen’s later works within the context of regency scandals, including the indecorous activity of prominent men such as the Prince of Wales. Sales’s criticism has been particularly important in identifying new ways to historicize gender identity in Austen’s tales by rethinking the relationship between her narratives and the regency crises. Johnson’s *Equivocal Beings: Politics, Gender, and Sentimentality in the 1790s* (1995) provided an innovative reading of gender in the late eighteenth century, but she devoted only her Afterword to Austen. Johnson read *Emma*’s Knightley as an impressive male figure capable of rehearsing earlier models of chivalric masculinity while simultaneously performing modern male duties. She argued that Knightley’s humane model of masculinity “[diminished] the authority of male sentimentality, and [reimmasculated] men and women alike with a high sense of national purpose” (191). Johnson suggested that Knightley initiated a new type of English maleness that is neither anachronistic nor overly progressive; this model of masculinity, according to Johnson, “desentimentalizes and deheterosexualizes virtue, and in the process makes it accessible to women as well [as men]” (199). The critical work of Sales and Johnson demonstrated the importance of Austen’s men to our larger understanding of post-Revolutionary England, and specifically illustrated the emergence of modern men alongside the development of the modern nation.

Tim Fulford’s *Romanticism and Masculinity: Gender, Politics and Poetics in the Writings of Burke, Coleridge, Cobbett, Wordsworth, De Quincey and Hazlitt* (1999) has likewise been a vital contribution to the study of masculinity in early-nineteenth-century literature. Fulford added to Johnson’s work by evaluating the national responses to the French Revolution and the subsequent reconfigurations of England’s cultural conception of proper masculinity. Fulford argued that throughout the Romantic period, “Chivalric manhood did not die”; he asserted “it was relocated in the middle classes,” and he traced this thesis through the writings of many major male writers of the period (*Romanticism and Masculinity* 9). His work encouraged a reconsideration of both the Romantic(ized) male subject and the literary representation of men in the period, and his more recent treatments of Austen’s novels have been especially informative to my investigation of masculinity in her corpus. And yet, this critical energy has not generated sustained critical study of Austen’s male characters; rather, this interest in Austen’s men seems to have culminated with the publication of Audrey Hawkridge’s *Jane and Her Gentlemen: Jane Austen and the Men in Her Life and Novels* (2000).
Hawkridge’s work provided a comprehensive but uncritical and ahistorical assessment of the male figures in Austen’s family and fiction. While this book did offer interesting speculations on the representation of maleness in Austen’s texts, Hawkridge’s goal was simply to demonstrate the artistry of Austen’s characterization by documenting the impact of the men in her life on the men of her stories. Hawkridge made clear that her “particular examination of Jane’s world looks at the men in her family and her social circle, what she thought of them and how they affected her life. They cast their own light on the men in her works, most of whom she presents so roundly that we feel they are old friends, to admire or smile at as she intended but never to hate” (7). Hawkridge’s fond appreciation for Austen’s men may have concluded what appeared to be a promising new area of Austen studies. Despite the accomplishments of masculinity theorists and the work of scholars such as Sales, Johnson, and Fulford, Austen’s men have not yet received the critical study necessary to delineate the cultural efficacy of her novelistic project’s conceptions of masculinity.

Men, Love, and the Modern Nation

I treat Austen’s novels as a collection of cultural documents that exposes both a social anxiety about masculinity and a social response to this anxiety. My focus throughout is to evaluate the social discipline of the male lover that Austen’s work dramatizes. Austen’s works have been influential in crafting Western notions of the idealized man, but it is a critical misreading to assume that Austen’s tales advocate or uphold either a disciplined model of masculinity or any other ideal of maleness. Instead, in my discussions of the individual novels, I consider various men’s attempts to develop social/sexual subjectivities that will allow them to participate in the civic community and its hegemonic structures, and I explore the ramifications of such attempts on the men’s identities as lovers. I make no effort to take up every man in Austen’s corpus, and prominent figures such as Mr. Darcy, Edward Ferrars, and Henry Crawford receive only brief mention. I concentrate on men whose social/sexual subjectivities reveal important shifts in the modernizing nation’s expectations for men.

England’s ambitions for the modernizing nation and its men are the principal topics of my first chapter, and I briefly frame my discussion of the late-eighteenth-century discourses on nation and masculinity by considering the influence of prominent eighteenth-century courtesy books upon such public debates. The turbulent decade of the 1790s has proved fecund ground for studies of Austen, and yet treatments of her novels have
largely ignored the various prescriptions of ideal manliness that emerged throughout this period. These models of maleness are produced by a nexus of literary and political texts that focused on and responded to the national crisis engendered by the French Revolution, the rising feminist movement in England and Europe, the continuing Enlightenment tradition, and the sentimental rhetoric of the late eighteenth century. The post-Revolutionary cultural documents I investigate explored plans for the future of the nation and debate the worthiness of proposals for far-reaching social reform. England’s ideal of masculinity was a recurring component of these discourses, and I will specifically treat three discourses that structured the public dialogue about masculinity: the contemporary relevance of a chivalric social system, the volatile relation between the Enlightenment doctrine of rationality and the sentimental tradition, and the appropriate relations between the sexes. My goal in this chapter is to establish the historical and textual context out of which Austen’s depictions of masculinity emerged. I organize my discussion of the late-eighteenth-century cultural debates around the works of Edmund Burke and Mary Wollstonecraft; I concentrate on the political and philosophical texts in the initial chapter, and I consider relevant literary works within my discussions of Austen’s novels.

I then provide a selective treatment of Austen’s juvenilia, and while I do not concern myself with the impact of the post-Revolutionary discourses on the male lovers of these short tales, I do note a burgeoning cultural anxiety about young men, their neglect of courtesy book guidelines, and their susceptibility to the dangers of love and sexual desire. I argue that the social/sexual subjectivity of *Northanger Abbey*’s Henry Tilney serves as Austen’s fictional response to this growing concern about England’s young men. Tilney’s strong adherence to the doctrine of rationality protects him from the potentially overwhelming powers of love. Henry models a masculinity rooted in Jacobin principles of reason and industry; he will not allow the irrational or sublime to affect his behavior, and even his climactic decision to disobey the authority of his father and travel to the Morlands’ home is based upon reason. And yet, Henry’s restraint reveals his knowledge of other cultural debates on nation and masculinity, including the discourses of chivalry and Enlightenment feminism. He is a disciplined man whose structured behavior protects him against the snares of romance that entangle the young lovers of Austen’s juvenilia.

The suitors of Marianne Dashwood show us more extensive examples of the dangers of love and desire. Austen casts Brandon and Willoughby as men of sensation who are schooled in the appreciation of sensory perceptions, respectful of sentiment, and liable to uncontrollable emotional outbursts. The narrator portrays these men as lovers, and she notes the
severe consequences of such behavior; Brandon has taught himself to regulate his senses and manage his sensitivity, and the narrative dramatizes Willoughby’s training in modern love. The long-standing reading of *Sense and Sensibility* as Marianne’s epiphany that Brandon is the truly right man for her implies that there is some outstanding difference between her suitors, but I argue that Willoughby and the Colonel are essentially committed to the same model of male behavior. Brandon has simply already learned what Willoughby learns by the end of the novel: that to become a trusted and responsible figure in the modern national community, men of sensation must discipline their sensitivity.

*Pride and Prejudice* offers us an important glimpse of the cultural reconceptualization of masculinity that accompanies England’s modernization. I treat Darcy as an exemplar of a vanishing type of man; he is a resplendent figure who is at once chivalric, rational, and romantic, and I argue that his status as an ostensibly impeccable man highlights his uniqueness. The aristocratic tradition that Darcy embodies and Pemberley institutionalizes is waning, and while it is still greatly admired in the novel, its representatives are dwindling. The novel indicates that as the esteemed nobleman and his accompanying mythology become less common in the modern nation, England must now establish new models of male social identity and begin training non-aristocratic men to assume greater civic responsibilities. I focus on the development and improvement of Mr. Bingley and Mr. Gardiner. Both of these men have benefited from the successes of the trade class in the early nineteenth century, and each receives important guidance in proper masculinity from Darcy; moreover, the special attention that Darcy devotes to Bingley, whose family has risen from the trade industry, suggests that landed men are concerned enough about the future of the nation’s masculinity to mentor men of new money.

While *Pride and Prejudice* shows us a society preparing for the transition to a new nation and a new kind of man, *Mansfield Park* dramatizes a society in denial of this transition. The various crises of the Bertram household anticipate the impending collapse of the aristocratic tradition that we see in *Persuasion*. Edmund’s sincere effort to re-solidify his family serves as Austen’s final fictional attempt to preserve this decaying lifestyle and its model of masculinity. I present Edmund as the last bastion of the declining aristocratic community; the hero’s social/sexual subjectivity specifically tries to merge the qualities of manliness—the gentleman and the clergyman—that Burke outlines in his *Reflections on the Revolution in France* (1790). Edmund invests great importance in both identities, and he virulently defends the importance of the ecclesiastical profession against the charges of the sensually stimulating Mary Crawford. The hero’s infatuation
with Mary tempts him to abandon the discipline of Burke’s archaic mode of socially responsible maleness in favor of the pleasures of modernity, but Edmund ultimately anesthetizes his sensitivity to amorous desires. The hero’s marriage to his cousin slows the deterioration of his aristocratic family, preserves the integrity of the Bertram line, and perpetuates endangered models of masculinity, but the atavistic quality of this union also reveals the desperation of the aristocracy to reproduce itself.

In *Emma*, the atrophying aristocracy and its model of masculinity become comic. Mr. Woodhouse is a ridiculous male figure who maintains only ceremonial responsibilities in his community. The tradition that Edmund Bertram endeavors to save now appears to have dissipated with little regret. I treat Knightley as an embodiment of what Foucault theorizes as the modern subject whose social/sexual identity is marked by finitude. I agree with Johnson that Knightley is an important figure in the history of masculinity because of his adaptability; he values the agricultural heritage of Donwell Abbey and serves as a pastoral caretaker for the downtrodden of Highbury, but he also rebukes Frank Churchill’s excessive gallantry and willingly pursues the company of the rising trade class. Knightley is truly an impressive man who has loaded his finite social/sexual subjectivity with all the masculine characteristics desired by the post-Revolutionary discursive community. He is an extremely well-ordered individual like Henry Tilney, but unlike the hero of *Northanger Abbey*, Knightley is not committed to one model of male sexuality; his is a flexible masculinity, and he has learned to adjust his social/sexual identity to a modern nation. Knightley, moreover, shows how modern men can preserve social/sexual identity, maintain a vital civic role, and keep the company of women by carefully regulating any amorous desire or sexual passion.

In *Persuasion*, Austen finally presents us Wentworth—a man who embraces amorous emotions. Wentworth is a lover who experiences first-hand the personal and cultural consequences of such a social/sexual identity. The pain of his truncated early romance with the heroine lingers throughout the tale, but the naval hero ultimately regains a willingness to experience desire and passion. Wentworth and his naval colleagues are distinct from the previous men of Austen’s corpus and Sir Walter Elliot, who embodies the utter demise of the aristocracy and its model of English masculinity. The Elliots must relinquish their landed estate, and while the narrator highlights the decadence of Sir Walter and his circle, she likewise accentuates the sincerity and compassion of the naval community. Wentworth is a sensitive man whose very body bears the marks of seafaring life, but unlike Willoughby or Brandon, the naval hero does not allow his prior experiences of sensation to curb or anesthetize his sensitivity. He remains open to desire.
and its social, emotional, and romantic ramifications; his social/sexual identity is essentially insecure, and his maritime marriage to Anne prevents his sexuality from becoming stultified or disciplined.

My conclusion briefly considers what I theorize as the cultural response to Anne and Wentworth’s dynamic nautical relationship. I discuss the proliferation of small communities that Sanditon suggests are quickly appearing along the English coast. While Mr. Heywood insists that the vast growth of such oceanside settlements is economically and socially dangerous for the nation, Austen presents Sanditon as a successful capitalistic venture; it is a modernized village whose satirized inhabitants have no interest in experiencing the mobility and volatility of the sea that Anne and Wentworth embrace. Sanditon may be near the water, but the naval community of Persuasion will not be spending much time in this well-regulated coastal locale. Sanditon’s modernity prevents individuals from expressing and experiencing potentially destructuring emotions and desires that might disturb the stability desperately sought by post-Revolutionary England. Sanditon can tolerate only conventional figures whose desires and passions are disciplined, predictable, and easily categorized.

This disciplined model of social/sexual subjectivity has become a crucial component of the modern nation and its men. Austen’s corpus portrays a nation in the process of becoming modern that is nervous about its men. These men of Austen’s tales respond to this anxiety by developing stable social/sexual identities capable of enduring such transformation; they become functional men who help to stabilize the post-Revolutionary nation and its social structures. In Terry Castle’s controversial review of Austen’s letters to her sister, she claims “it is a curious yet arresting phenomenon in the novels that so many of the final happy marriages seem designed not so much to bring about a union between hero and heroine as between the heroine and the hero’s sister” (“Sister-Sister” 3). Castle’s comment frightened many Austen fans and critics because of its suggestion of lesbianism, but Castle actually points to the sibling-like quality of Austen’s marriages. Indeed, she presents several of her marital relationships as close friendships that resemble familial bonds rather than sexual unions. Austen’s popularity as a default-relationship advisor may even stem from the absence of sexual desire in her novels’ concluding marriages. Modern society desperately wants marriage to be cleansed of the messiness of sex and desire, and Austen’s corpus offers us a valuable example of this burgeoning cultural ambition in the years following the French Revolution. As England becomes a modern nation throughout the nineteenth century, passionate male lovers become liabilities who cannot consistently assume civic responsibilities; such lovers might be able to exist on the seas, but the post-Revolutionary English nation
needs stable men who will not permit love to interrupt their involvement in hegemonic social structures. Austen’s novels may offer us instructions, but they are rarely instructions for lovers; her texts do, however, teach us how heterosexual men can solidify their involvement in the modern national community by dismissing the role of the lover in favor of a disciplined social/sexual subjectivity.
Austen’s initial portrait of Wentworth highlights his masculine conventionality, but the naval hero’s Deleuzian love for Anne ultimately allows him to accept his own multiplicity as well as the diversity of others. Wentworth is an anomaly in Austen’s fiction, as her other heroes strive to develop aesthetics of existence that are stable and closely regulated. Her male figures navigate the post-Revolutionary discursive field that produces divergent desires for appropriate English masculinity; they attempt to establish themselves as hegemonic national men by negotiating the dictates of Burkean and Enlightenment thinkers. And her men ensure their social/sexual security by eschewing the overwhelming complications engendered by love. Anne and Wentworth, however, disregard the hegemony of early-nineteenth-century domesticity in favor of the dynamism of a nautical existence characterized by compassionate reciprocity, turbulence, and a proximity to the sea. The modern English society desperately attempts to reinstall structure, order, and discipline following the Napoleonic Wars, and correspondingly, the nation promotes fixed yet conflicting versions of organized masculinity to develop a new generation of disciplined and responsible male leaders. Wentworth circumvents such discipline, as he and Anne embark on a maritime journey that is sure to include fluctuations and instability.

The England in which Austen wrote understandably sought to return to a mythical organic community of safety and stability that supposedly existed sometime prior to the turbulence of the French Revolution—and her stories are still upheld as fictional visions of such a culture. She portrays characters who mold themselves as static social/sexual subjects in order to help sustain the unity of the nation, its nexus to the past, and its future prosperity. While criticism has concentrated on the representations of her female characters and their struggles to negotiate various social expectations, she, as we have
seen, also documents the efforts of her men to pursue secure social/sexual identities. Austen’s male figures strive to follow different instructions for crafting masculinities that will reputedly ensure the future prosperity of the English nation, but her narratives also reveal the consequences of such attempts. Her male characters discipline themselves by dismissing the volatile possibilities of love to achieve a stable mode of hegemonic masculinity preferred by the nation, but their suppression of amorous desires also inevitably leaves them mechanized and reterritorialized. *Persuasion* narrates the collapse of England’s ancestral culture, and Austen, rather than positioning Anne and Wentworth in a rebuilt domestic domain, sends her hero and heroine to the sea, where they will accept a new life rooted in movement, malleability, and multiplicity. Wentworth and Anne model a Deleuzian love relationship and embody features of Deleuze and Guattari’s deterritorialized nomad; Austen’s lovers resist the reterritorialization of modern capitalism by embracing the complexity produced by their powerful amorous emotions and avoiding the stasis of a permanent domestic dwelling.

Austen continues her literary journey to the sea in her final work, the unfinished comic tale *Sanditon*. She returns to a maritime setting to relate the strange tale of a prospective resort town that accentuates the exceptional nomadism imagined in *Persuasion*. Sanditon is a coastal settlement, but we should not expect to find naval packs or Anne and Wentworth spending much time in the company of Lady Denham and the Parker family. Austen presents Sanditon as a maritime experiment that has failed to embrace the undulations of the sea; the village has instead become reterritorialized by modernity. Upon Mr. Parker’s return from his failed effort to acquire a surgeon, he rides through the older section of town and announces, “Civilization, Civilization indeed! . . . Look my dear Mary—Look at William Heeley’s windows.—Blue Shoes, and nankin Boots!—Who would have expected such a sight at a Shoemaker’s in old Sanditon!—This is new within the Month. There was no blue Shoe when we passed this way a month ago.—Glorious indeed!” Mr. Parker is thrilled with the economic growth of the community; he revels in this burgeoning mercantilism and reflects, “Well, I think I have done something in my Day. Now, for our Hill, our health-breathing Hill” (339). He takes great pride in the financial maturation and impending future of the town—a great success that is symbolized, according to Mr. Parker, by the arrival of fashionable new shoes. He and his business partner, Lady Denham, are speculators who have invested in Sanditon; rather than allowing their intimacy with the sea to deterritorialize themselves from the regulations and organ(izing) structures of a modern industrializing nation, Parker and Denham desperately hope and scrupulously plan to bring order and commercialism to the sea.
Mr. Parker announces his enduring confidence in the continuing success of Sanditon to Mr. Heywood early in the narrative when he announces that “everybody has heard of Sanditon . . . the favourite spot of all that are to be found along the coast of Sussex” (325). Mr. Heywood acknowledges that he has “heard of Sanditon,” but he is not convinced of the continued prosperity of such communities. He explains that “every five years, one hears of some new place or other starting up by the Sea, and growing the fashion.—How they can half of them be filled, is the wonder! Where people can be found with Money or Time to go to them! Bad things for a Country;—sure to raise the price of Provisions and make the poor good for nothing” (325). This dialogue between Mr. Heywood and Mr. Parker illustrates the emerging popularity of the nomadic maritime lifestyle, but it also suggests the attempts of some to reterritorialize this nautical existence by transferring modern venture capitalism to the coast. And Mr. Heywood is especially concerned about the social viability and utility of such maritime communities that invite individuals to escape the daily routines of England’s industrializing society; he finds these settlements detrimental to the sustenance of the state economy and hazardous to the management and utility of the lower classes. His remarks remind us of England’s burgeoning industrial economy that Adam Smith suggested would require the efficient use and organization of mass human resources. Mr. Heywood is seriously worried that communities like Sanditon are encouraging irresponsible behavior and promoting the decline of the individual’s social utility.

Parker acknowledges the validity of Heywood’s concerns, but the former upholds Sanditon as a valuable asset to the nation. Parker also agrees that the English coast has become overpopulated; indeed, he announces, “our Coast is abundant enough; it demands no more [settlements] . . . . And those good people who are trying to add to the number, are in my opinion excessively absurd, and must soon find themselves the Dupes of their own fallacious Calculations” (325–26). Parker sympathizes with Heywood’s criticism of these sundry seaside communes that he identifies as bad financial ventures, but he presents Sanditon as a necessary complement to a prosperous English state—with just the requisite amount of modernity thrown in to guarantee new commodities, propriety, and discipline. And yet, despite Parker’s and Heywood’s criticism, the nation has, according to Austen’s text, witnessed a proliferation of these colonies on the ocean. This dialogue may occupy only a small section of Austen’s final work, but it suggests the author’s keen knowledge of a growing number of coastal cooperatives—groups of people who have disregarded modern security in favor of the fluctuations and fluidity of the sea. Wentworth and Anne will not be found in the reterritorialized village of Sanditon, but you may spot them in the streets of one of the many
smaller underdeveloped encampments. Austen’s Deleuzian lovers could not remain radically dynamic and malleable in Sanditon, but these smaller communities, viewed by Parker and Heywood as political and economic liabilities, might embrace Anne and Wentworth’s social/sexual flexibility.

Sanditon has tamed the turbulence of the sea and replaced the volatility of a nautical setting with a stagnant elegance reminiscent of Sir Elliot and Mr. Woodhouse. Two of the tale’s male figures, Sir Edward and Arthur Parker, continue the legacy of such a decaying mode of masculinity as they crave convention and stasis. Sir Edward appears fond of the ocean, but the nephew of Lady Denham speaks of the sea and the shore by using “all the usual Phrases employed in praise of their Sublimity, and descriptive of the **undescribable** Emotions they excite in the Mind of Sensibility.—The terrific Grandeur of the Ocean in a Storm, its glassy surface in a calm, its Gulls and its Samphire, and the deep fathoms of its Abysses, its quick vicissitudes” (351). Sir Edward, like Benwick, is a man who “had read more sentimental Novels than agreed with him”; he displays a hackneyed sensibility by mechanically employing conventional Burkean expressions of sublimity (358). He recites an appreciation for the sea, but he is not interested in experiencing its turbulent fluctuations. Likewise, Arthur Parker, a self-proclaimed invalid, insists upon stability while residing in Sanditon—along with plenty of strong cocoa and heavily buttered toast (369). Austen notes that “Mr. Arthur P.’s enjoyments in Invalidism were very different from his sisters—by no means so spiritualized.—A good deal of Earthy Dross hung about him” (370). Arthur may represent the antithesis of Wentworth; the convalescent abhors movement and builds his aesthetic of existence around inactivity. Both Arthur and Sir Edward can manage nicely in Sanditon; they have access to a lending library replete with sentimental novels, and they receive plenty of afternoon refreshments. These men may have gone to the sea, but instead of embracing its fluctuations they have sought out stultifying proprieties to ensure their reterritorialization.

Wentworth ultimately disregards the security or reterritorialization promised by conventional propriety; he organizes his aesthetic of existence around the care of himself and others—allowing him to appreciate the complex flows and lines of flight that enmesh him with his relations and surroundings. His malleable social/sexual subjectivity enables him to remain deterritorialized and explore new ways of stylizing himself and relating to others. He remains outside the disciplinary structures of modern society that Foucault claims limit our possible relational experiences. Foucault explains that in the modern “institutional world . . . the only relations possible are extremely few, extremely simplified, and extremely poor” (158). He adds that
“society and the institutions which frame it have limited the possibility of relationships because a rich relational world would be very complex to manage.” Wentworth and Anne confront the challenges of these modern relational restrictions that Foucault argues regulate individuals; Austen’s lovers, however, refuse to accept such regulation as they pursue potentially revolutionary desires that allow them to “imagine and create a new relational right that permits all possible types of relations to exist” (“The Social Triumph” 158). Wentworth and Anne remain fluid, and this fluidity allows them to embrace a diversity of relations and audition a Deleuzian nomadic lifestyle. Deleuze explains that nomads have the potential to explore new cultural possibilities because they “aren’t part of history; they’re excluded from it, but they transmute and reappear in different, unexpected forms in the lines of flight of some social field” (“On Philosophy” 153). Anne and Wentworth have the capacity to pursue new lines of flight that do not iterate historical conventions but instead facilitate new becomings. And Deleuze shamelessly announces that “men’s only hope lies in a revolutionary becoming” (“Control and Becoming” 171). He theorizes that nomads evade the territorializing effect of regulatory forces that aim to organize our desires by creating our lacks; Austen’s dramatization of Wentworth and Anne’s marriage provides a glimpse of such a nomadism, and her mention of the many smaller coastal settlements in Sanditon indicates that this nomadic ambition is growing.

The new “becoming” sought by Anne, Wentworth, and other aspiring nomads is undoubtedly dangerous, both to the stability of the post-Revolutionary nation and their individual subjectivities, but it also promotes a social/sexual status that enables them to love and be loved. Anne and Wentworth’s expressed amorous emotions are crucial to their nomadic fluidity. Their undisciplined love exposes them to multiple flows of passion and desire; indeed, Deleuze and Guattari conclude that “making love is not just becoming as one, or even two, but becoming as a hundred thousand” (Anti-Oedipus 296). Anne and Wentworth’s amorous sincerity allows them to embrace the unpredictability of the sea, and their maritime existence continually augments the dynamism of their relationship. Austen’s other lovers strive to purge their lives of volatile passions and sensations to create socially secure identities, but her presentation of Anne and Wentworth highlights the potent diversity engendered by their love. And yet, modern civilization invariably prefers sexualities that are regulated and stable; organized culture has little patience for radically fluid nomadic lifestyles and instead encourages responsible social agents who are static and safe. Critics of the mid-1990s Austen craze identified Austen’s novels as a site of such social/sexual security. Laurie Morrow even went so far as to juxtapose Austen to “moral
relativism,” claiming that the early-nineteenth-century author “believes in moral absolutes” (263). Morrow presented Austen as an ethical absolutist who offers us definitive strategies to ensure social progress, cultural stability, and self-improvement.3

The late-millennial Austen vogue, as I noted in my preface, corresponded with the emergence of popular mid-1990s men’s movements that also promised self-improvement and social contentment. While Morrow upheld Austen as a panacea for the ills of (post)modernity and moral decomposition, Bly and the Promise Keepers promoted strict sexual separation and social hegemony as the necessary conditions for strong men and a stable culture. Gary R. Brooks and Glenn E. Good addressed the late-millennial crisis of masculinity announced by Bly and the Promise Keepers in their New Handbook of Psychotherapy and Counseling with Men (2001). Brooks and Good note that “everywhere we look we see signs of deeply dissatisfied contemporary men” (3). They add that “for many, the past few decades have ushered in a period that has eroded traditional male values and damaged the image of masculinity itself” (4). Bly and the Promise Keepers offered various strategies for recovering traditional notions of masculinity and manliness, and the central tenet of both movements was the strict social and sexual separation of men and women. This fundamental step was designed to eradicate the problems that Brooks and Good note; male values were to be defined in opposition to female values, and the image of masculinity was to be codified in opposition to femininity. The mid-1990s men’s movements proposed to reestablish sexual certainty and stability as the initial step in reordering a confused culture.

Despite the successes of these men’s movements, the late-twentieth-century Austen vogue offered a more amenable plan for maintaining the sexual security of men and the social security of the nation. The updates of Austen’s narratives showed us attractive men who lived with women in endearing relationships. The modern men of Austen’s works did not need to exclude themselves from women because they disciplined their susceptibility to desire. While Bly and the Promise Keepers urged confused men to let loose their emotions amongst other men, the late-millennial revisions of Austen’s stories reminded us how men and women could comfortably coexist if men regulated their emotions. The men and masculinity envisaged by Austen’s tales are at once more appealing and more socially productive than Bly’s Wild Man or the Promise Keepers’ Christian husband. Austen’s men do not need to remove themselves from women to preserve their social/sexual stability, and their relations with women ensure the biological and cultural reproduction of the nation. The late twentieth century, like the post-Revolutionary...
tionary years, was a time of turbulent cultural uncertainty, and masculinity was just one of many social markers in doubt. But as Abigail Solomon-Godeau concludes, “masculinity, however defined, is, like capitalism, always in crisis. And the real question is how both manage to restructure, refurbish, and resurrect themselves for the next historical turn” (70). Austen’s men serve as useful early examples of our ongoing modern attempt to manage a disciplined masculinity that is sexually safe and socially useful. Her men are neither feeble nor inefficacious, but they are also not emotionally overbearing figures; they are well-managed social/sexual subjects whose hegemonic identities promote both the order of sexual relations and the organization of the modernizing nation.
Notes to Preface

1. American society has long been fond of Austen and her works; ever since the 1870 publication of James Edward Austen-Leigh's *A Memoir of Jane Austen*, the novelist has remained popular in America. Ian Watt, however, argues that it is in the mid-twentieth century when American literary criticism became particularly interested in Austen and her novels. The American academy, not coincidentally, developed this interest in Austen following a time in which the American public was fascinated with the early-nineteenth-century author. While Americans endured the many cultural, economic, and personal tragedies of World War II, Austen enjoyed great popular appeal through the Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer (MGM) production of *Pride and Prejudice*. This film, as Kenneth Turan points out, was accompanied by a conscious attempt to “sell” Austen to the American public, leading MGM to “launch its greatest book promotion in years, with no less than five popular-priced editions of the book getting into print as a result of the film” (“Pride and Prejudice” 142). The American press did not ignore this promotion of the early-nineteenth-century novelist.

As Americans tired of the misery and mud of the battles overseas, Harold Hobson and others “advertised” Austen as a peaceful and sanguine author of educational tales. Hobson announces that “Jane Austen took little account of war. No one would guess from her novels that she lived through the most perilous time Great Britain endured until 1940 brought a new and more dangerous enemy even than Napoleon.” Hobson adds that “Miss Austen neglected war; and, in return, war has passed her by. Not only are her homes unharmed, but the very streets through which her characters moved on their morning walks are little touched” (6). Hobson’s romanticized view of a safe Austen is echoed by Henry Seidel Canby, an associate editor of *The Saturday Review of Literature*. Canby claims that “the greatest novels (in English at least) written in wartime are unquestionably Jane Austen’s”; and yet, Canby declares that throughout Austen’s tales, “the war, if we remember correctly, is never mentioned except in the last” (26). Even as late as 1959, an anonymous review in *Time* suggests that “Jane Austen grew up in the world of the French and American Revolutions, and showed no trace of interest in either. The world of her six novels is simply and finally that of genteel young women gunning for husbands” (“Jane Extended”). The mid-twentieth-century American media capitalized upon Austen’s
established cultural popularity and (re)constructed her as the proprietor of a safe domes-
tic world that served as a relief from the horrors of war. America’s love affair with Austen,
however, did not end with the fall of Hitler. For a lengthy discussion of the significance
of Austen-Leigh’s Memoir, see B. C. Southam’s introduction to Jane Austen: The Critical
Heritage, Vol. 2, 1–12. For a further consideration of the American reception of Austen
in the nineteenth century, see John Halperin, “Jane Austen’s Nineteenth-Century Critics:
Walter Scott to Henry James.” See Ian Watt’s discussion of the rise of American liter-
ary criticism on Austen in his introductory essay to Jane Austen: A Collection of Critical
Essays.

2. Bly, for example, addresses a loss of heroic models and myths; he claims that we
must listen again to “the old myths,” in which we hear “of Zeus’ energy, that positive
leadership energy in men.” Bly explains that “from King Arthur we learn the value of the
male mentor in the lives of young men; we hear from the Iron John story the importance
of moving from the mother’s realm; and from all initiation stories we learn how essential
it is to leave our parental expectations entirely and find a second father or ‘second King’”
(ix–x). Bly calls on men to recall ancient models of masculinity that once served to order
Western civilization. And both Bly and the Promise Keepers echo the 1790s concern with
social transformation. Messner notes that Bly’s movement “[believes] that industrial
society has trapped men into straitjackets of rationality, thus blunting the powerful emo-
tional communion and collective spiritual transcendence that they believe men in tribal
societies typically enjoyed” (20). The Promise Keepers blame the growth of this modern
society and its social movements for the demise of the traditional family and its stable
gender roles. Messner explains that “Promise Keepers is more apt [than Bly] to blame
feminism, gay liberation, sexual liberation, and the ‘breakdown of the family’ for men’s
problems” (17). These 1990s movements, like the post-Revolutionary discourses of the
late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth century, offer explanations (or at least justifications)
for the respective crises of masculinity, and their plans to repair fragile or vulnerable men
inevitably involve a clear conceptual and physical separation of men from women.

3. John Gray’s Men Are from Mars, Women Are from Venus (1992) and Anne and Bill
Moir’s Why Men Don’t Iron: The Fascinating and Unalterable Differences Between Men and
Women (1999) attempted to outline intrinsic differences between the sexes that help to
justify the ostensibly redemptive male-only gatherings and hegemonic social systems that
depend upon a clear cultural distinction between the sexes.

4. Laurie Morrow, for example, upholds Austen’s fiction because it “provides an
escape from an unattractive present” (262). Morrow insists that Austen’s narratives “hold
the promise that bad behavior can be limited and provide hope that the world can be a
better place” (263). Morrow invests Austen’s work with the salutary ability of improving
culture by improving individual behavior; and Morrow specifically credits Austen with
documenting the pleasures and comforts of a hegemonic society based upon a strictly
divided system of gendered identity. She writes: “Austen presents favorably intelligent
women who seek traditional roles and who are content in them and respected; she does
not portray such women as witless, helpless victims, yearning to discover themselves.
She doesn’t ridicule them as stay-at-home cookie-bakers. Austen plays to a desire for
domesticity today’s women often feel but dare not admit, sometimes even to themselves”
(262–63). Austen, according to Morrow, shows us a pleasant, well-mannered, and ordered
culture in which women eagerly accept domestic regulations; and late-twentieth-century
America clearly saw Austen as a champion of security and stability.
Notes to Introduction

1. Deleuze and Guattari believe that “sexuality is the production of a thousand sexes, which are so many uncontrollable becomings” (Thousand Plateaus 278). A sexual subject, according to Deleuze and Guattari, has the potential to experience a vast diversity of sexes, sexualities, and sexual sensations.

2. Deleuze theorizes that “To love is to try to explicate, to develop these unknown worlds which remain enveloped within the beloved” (Proust and Signs 7). For a further discussion of Deleuze's theory of love and the subject, see Ronald Bogue, Deleuze and Guattari (1989), 43.

3. As I have suggested elsewhere, American society has specifically credited Austen with the ability to teach men and women proper gendered behavior. See specifically Kramp, “The Potency of Jane, or the Disciplinary Function of Austen in America,” 19–32. This popular conception of Austen, moreover, derives from a long-standing scholarly tradition that emphasizes Austen's assent with her own culture's conceptions of gender propriety. Philip Mason effectively illustrates the critical basis for this popular perception of Austen. While he admits that “it is as novels that miss Austen's books should be read,” he claims “they are social history too.” He continues: “They are minute and exact sketches . . . of the way her people thought about marriage, property, social differences, and the kind of behaviour which was proper for ladies and gentlemen” (70–71). Mason’s argument has more recently been echoed by Penelope Joan Fritzer who, in Jane Austen and Eighteenth-Century Courtesy Books (1997), suggests that Austen's novels dramatize proper behavior for men and women as outlined in eighteenth-century courtesy books. See especially 3–9.

4. Johnson traces this obsession with educating young women through the works of F. R. Leavis, D. W. Harding, and Wayne Booth; she specifically indicates that Austen scholars in the 1960s began to highlight the heroines’ premarital training by presenting the marriage plots as the “telos towards which the narrative[s] . . . moved since the first page” (“Austen Cults and Cultures” 221). She concludes that “critics as diverse as Mark Schorer, Lionel Trilling, Ian Watt, Arnold Kettle, Marilyn Butler, Tony Tanner, Patricia P. Brown, and Mary Poovey” view such premarital regulation of women as a vital component of both their character development and their preparation for marriage (222). See also, Johnson’s “The Divine Miss Jane: Jane Austen, Janeites and the Discipline of Novel Studies.”

5. Tyler declares that “Jane Austen has taught me how to read the world and has given me more guidelines and examples on how to behave than the combined efforts of Emily Post, psychoanalysis, and a lengthy stay at the Betty Ford Clinic possibly could” (xvii–xviii). Tyler’s comments are, of course, reminiscent of the long tradition of Janeitism that has transformed Austen into an angelic figure who is simultaneously salutary and omniscient.

6. The work of Sedgwick has been extremely influential in identifying this heteronormalizing strand in Austen criticism. Sedgwick announced that “[a] lot of Austen criticism sounds hilariously like the leering school prospectuses or governess manifestoes brandished like so many birch rods in Victorian S-M pornography” (“Jane Austen” 315). Clara Tuite has recently observed that the canonical authority of Austen rests upon an unquestioned “heterosexual investment” in the novelist’s works as manuals for proper romantic love; Tuite, moreover, explains that “the heterosexual investment in the natural-
ness of these marriage endings underwrites Austen’s canonicity” (17). This heterosexist investment and the emphasis on Austen’s authority as a marriage/love advisor is clearly apparent in Tyler’s work; she insists that “in all of Austen’s novels the lovers face a challenge and in every case the lessons of maturity, correct conduct, and rational thought are mastered;” she concludes that “in every case the novel ends happily as eventually the declaration and offer are made and accepted” (61; 58).

7. While there have been few critical discussions of heterosexual men in Austen’s corpus, there is a rich scholarly tradition within Austen studies that considers the importance of the novelist to historical and contemporary queer cultures. Johnson points out that “one of the biggest open secrets of the literate world, after all, is that Austen is a cult author for many gays and lesbians” (Editorial Response 4). For further discussion of this tradition, see such important recent works as D. A. Miller’s Jane Austen, or The Secret of Style (2003) and Clara Tuite’s Romantic Austen: Sexual Politics and the Literary Canon (2002).

8. Virginia Woolf’s famous comments on Austen, which certainly aided the writer’s entrance into the literary canon, may also have institutionalized this scholarly practice that has sharply focused Austen scholarship. Woolf announced in 1925 that Austen was “the most perfect artist among women, the writer whose books are immortal” (206). Woolf upholds the creative and imaginative genius of the novelist, but she also specifically identifies Austen as the elite female artist. Woolf’s proclamation undoubtedly elevated Austen’s position in the academic study of English literature, and it likely helped to generate numerous important feminist discussions of the nineteenth-century author throughout the 1980s.

9. Such works directed our attention to the personal, familial, and national importance of the maturation, marriage, and sexuality of Austen’s young women. These studies enhanced our knowledge of English women’s social experiences in the years following the French Revolution; this critical trend to focus on the stories and depictions of women in Austen’s corpus culminated with the publication of Deborah Kaplan’s Jane Austen among Women (1992). Kaplan shifted the focus of traditional Austen criticism from the disciplinary approach that Sedgwick identified and instead insisted the novelist’s texts were marked distinctively by a women’s culture. Kaplan still emphasized the primacy of the heroines in the novels, but she also firmly asserted that “Austen found crucial support for her writing career not from her sister alone but also from the women’s culture that Austen’s female friends made.” Kaplan employs her concept of a “women’s culture” to theorize the presence of “an independent, self-assertive female” in Austen’s texts (Jane Austen 3–4). She claims that, unlike “feminist and nonfeminist postmodern literary critics [who] deconstruct the subject, the concepts of women’s culture . . . grant selfhood to women” (5). Kaplan’s project positions Austen as a significant progenitor of a feminist theory of subjectivity that conceptualizes the female as an independent entity who emerges from an integral women’s culture. In addition, Kaplan’s criticism aligned Austen with the objectives of second-wave literary feminism, specifically the goal to concentrate on the fictional representation of women.

10. Gerald I. Fogel offers a helpful summary of Freud’s theory of male sexual development. Fogel explains:

Freud’s view of male sexuality is often summarized in a few sentences. The recognition of the differences between the sexes is one of the crucial events that accompanies and influences the phallic-oedipal phase, which is characterized in
the boy by a wish to obtain exclusive sexual possession of the mother by defeating and eliminating the father. Under the threat of castration by his powerful, forbidding rival, the little boy renounces his incestuous infantile claims and solves his dilemma by identifying with his father, who is internalized as the psychic agency of the superego. Castration anxiety and the importance of the relation to the father is central. Successful oedipal resolution correlates with a strong, healthy sexual identity and the consolidation of a more mature, autonomous psychic structure. (6–7)

11. Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari announce that “[p]sychoanalysis is like the Russian Revolution; we don’t know when it started going bad. We have to keep going back further” (Anti-Oedipus 55).

12. Deleuze’s theory of the folded subject, like Foucault’s concept of the aesthetic of existence, involves the subject’s efforts to craft a unique space of identity within and through powerful social forces. Deleuze theorizes that human subjects construct a fold to function effectively in society, explaining that “subjectivation is created by folding” (Foucault 104). Individuals, for both Foucault and Deleuze, must negotiate the discourses and demands of culture as they create modes of existence. Deleuze employs the metaphor of the fold to explain this process in which the subject navigates and records multiple social desires for her/his “self,” and as Deleuze notes, “the multiple is not only what has many parts but also what is folded in many ways” (The Fold 3). For a further discussion of Deleuze’s theory of the fold, see Alain Badiou’s “Gilles Deleuze, The Fold: Leibniz and the Baroque” and Constantin V. Boundas, “Deleuze: Serialization and Subject-Formation.” Boundas, in his analysis of Deleuze, indicates that “the subject is the individual who, through practice and discipline, has become the site of a bent force, that is, the folded inside of an outside” (115).

13. This participation of the individual in discursive power relations is key to Foucault’s understanding of ethical behavior and the subject. He explains that he “wanted to try to show . . . how the subject constituted itself.” He “had to reject a priori theories of the subject in order to analyze the relationships that may exist between the constitution of the subject or different forms of the subject and games of truth, practices of power, and so on” (“Ethics” 290).


15. Olliver’s thesis, “Jane Austen’s Male Characters” has not garnered significant critical attention. The 1996 JASNA meeting, however, produced an important issue of Persuasions. In Looser’s contribution to the conference (and later the journal), she refers to “the groundbreaking recent work interrogating masculinities in Austen’s writings” (161). This work, like Joseph A. Kestner’s “Jane Austen: Revolutionizing Masculinities” and Joseph Litvak’s “Charming Men, Charming History,” offers intelligent readings of Austen novels that encouraged scholars to pursue critical book-length studies of her men. This has not happened; instead, scholars have tended either to follow Kestner’s model of focusing on
the latter novels’ depictions of masculinity or pursue uncritical and ahistorical readings of Austen’s men. Feminist scholars, including the writers I have previously mentioned, have consistently and effectively addressed Austen’s men in critical assessments of the novelist’s women; I will discuss specific critics in my treatments of the individual novels. This scholarship, like much feminist scholarship, opened the possibility of studying gender relations and gender identity in Austen’s corpus.

16. Fulford’s recent articles have been extremely helpful to my work on Austen’s men. See especially “Romanticizing the Empire: The Naval Heroes of Southey, Coleridge, Austen, and Marryat” and “Sighing for a Soldier: Jane Austen and Military Pride and Prejudice.”

17. Many of these well-managed male figures, including Mr. Darcy and Mr. Knightley, have long-enjoyed popular appeal. The mid-1990s Austen movies solidified and perhaps advanced the lure of such men as romantic figures; as Deborah Kaplan points out, “the casting of the film’s heroes was instrumental in achieving the on-screen-romance-ification of Austen’s work” (“Mass Marketing” 174). See also Lisa Hopkins, “Mr. Darcy’s Body: Privileging the Female Gaze,” which explores the presentation of Colin Firth’s body in the BBC television production of Pride and Prejudice.

18. As I mentioned earlier, Fulford’s work has been especially helpful in explaining new cultural developments engendered by the glorious return of the military from the Napoleonic Wars; Fulford specifically notes that Persuasion ushers in a new model for the gentry based upon professionalism. He explains: “Austen’s navy redefined gentility in terms of professional activity and discipline” (“Romanticizing the Empire” 188).

Notes to Chapter 1

1. The late eighteenth century has long served as a convenient marker for the emergence of European nationalism, and this period specifically demonstrates the importance of textual dissemination to the creation of a national culture. Scholars of nationalism have traditionally pointed to the post-Revolutionary years as the age in which the modern European nation develops. Ernest Renan announces that “France can claim the glory for having, through the French Revolution, proclaimed that a nation exists of itself” (46). Benedict Anderson theorizes the nation as “an imagined political community” and argues that “print-language is what invents nationalism” (6; 134). In the decade following the French Revolution, English writers produced numerous texts that created alternative visions of imagined national communities. These works constructed England’s modern national identity through a dialogic process, both likening itself to and differentiating itself from France. Seamus Deane explains that “France . . . provided a useful contrast in highlighting what was distinctive about England’s experience and its constitutional and cultural forms” (2). England’s discussions about the Revolution throughout the 1790s questioned the validity and justness of the French experiment while they simultaneously established the principles and parameters for the various envisioned future English states. Prasenjit Duara argues that “nationalism is best seen as a relational identity” (163). A nation secures its status as unique and sovereign by isolating itself from other states, but a national culture, as Paul Gilroy notes, is “conceived along ethnically absolute lines, not as something intrinsically fluid, changing, unstable, and dynamic, but as a fixed property of social groups rather than a relational field” (355). The method for creating a modern nation is dialectical and relies upon the juxtaposition with an “other” state, but the end
product is assumed to be independent and unique.

2. Although Austen did not publish her novels until the second decade of the nineteenth century, many critics have effectively demonstrated the importance of the 1790s to her tales. See, for example, Claudia Johnson’s *Jane Austen: Women, Politics, and the Novel* (1988) and Marilyn Butler’s *Jane Austen and the War of Ideas* (1975).

3. Gary Kelly agrees with Kadish’s claim. Kelly examines the turbulent post-Revolutionary period and notes that “in this conflict of loyalties, identities and distinctions, gender difference was increasingly important and complex” (*Revolutionary Feminism* 5).

4. This presumed certainty regarding gender was particularly important in this period because of the cultural uncertainty surrounding knowledge and identity that scholars such as Foucault identify in this period. Foucault explains that “[t]he last years of the eighteenth century are broken by a discontinuity similar to that which destroyed Renaissance thought at the beginning of the seventeenth; then, the great circular forms in which similitude was enclosed were dislocated and opened so that the table of identities could be unfolded; and that table is now about to be destroyed in turn, while knowledge takes up residence in a new space” (*Order of Things* 217).

5. Linda Colley notes that “defeat in America, revolution in France, and war with both, together with the expanding volume and diversity of domestic and imperial government, imposed a massive strain on the lives, nerves and confidence of the British élite.” Colley points out that “in all, nineteen Members of Parliament are known to have committed suicide between 1790 and 1820; more than twenty lapsed into what seemed like insanity, as did their monarch George III” (151–52). Colley adds that this stress was compounded by the lack of aristocratic heirs; she explains that “many landowners did not marry,” and “for nearly a century, landed families were thus not reproducing themselves” (156).


7. This process should not be surprising, but important scholarship such as Nancy Armstrong’s *Desire and Domestic Fiction* (1987) has failed to account for the role of the domestic sphere in the construction of post-Revolutionary English middle-class male subjectivity. While Armstrong treats the domestic sphere as a new power for “the domestic woman . . . through her dominance over all those objects and practices we associate with private life,” I emphasize the role of the domestic sphere in establishing both sexually and politically powerful men and the modern hegemonic structures that perpetuate such power (3). Finally, I believe it is important that such men seek sexual stability and the subsequent membership in the national citizenry as the traditionally dominant male aristocracy atrophies.

8. I treat the various texts of this public discussion as part of what Foucault identifies as “a steady proliferation of discourses concerned with sex” that he describes as “a discursive ferment that gathered momentum from the eighteenth century onward” (*History of Sexuality, Vol. 1* 18). Foucault’s work has been instrumental in the study of the deployment of sexuality from the late eighteenth to the end of the nineteenth century; indeed, his assertion that “the history of sexuality—that is, the history of what functioned in the nineteenth century as a specific field of truth—must first be written from the
viewpoint of a history of discourses” invites us to re-read England’s textual responses to the Revolution in terms of their commentaries on the nation’s conception of proper male sexual identity (69). Foucault adds that “it is not simply in terms of a continual extension that we must speak of this discursive growth; it should be seen rather as a dispersion of centers from which discourses emanated” (34). The discourses of the 1790s are diverse and complex. They are not simply extensions of one another but divergent disseminations that develop “a complex machinery for producing true discourses on sex” (68). Foucault’s use of the term *sexuality* incorporates much more than sexual organs, sexual preference, or gender identification. Armstrong explains that for Foucault “sexuality includes not only all those representations of sex that appear to be sex itself—in modern culture, for example, the gendered body—but also those myriad representations that are meaningful in relation to sex” (11).

9. Catharine Macaulay also speaks of the polarization of British politics following the French Revolution. She indicates in 1790 that “two parties are already formed in this country, who behold the French Revolution with a very opposite temper: to the one, it inspires the sentiments of exultation and rapture; and to the other, indignation and scorn” (*On Burke’s Reflections* 6). This dialectic, of course, involved much manipulation, as the individual participants in the debates of the late eighteenth century exaggerated both their limited knowledge of the Revolution and the arguments of their counterparts. Hedva Ben-Israel Kidron investigates how English historians respond to the Revolution; she points out that “[i]n England, knowledge of the events could not be so readily assumed as in France” and concludes that “the story, therefore, had to be told” (5). English writers’ strategic retelling of the history of the French Revolution solidified a polarized political landscape in England that helped to delineate distinct visions of the future nation and its man.

10. Burke’s discourse of the chivalric male is both prevalent and powerful throughout the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century. L. G. Mitchell points out that Burke’s *Reflections* was “an immediate best seller” and suggests that “never has a book been so widely read and so widely spurned” (vii–viii).

11. The English writers of the 1790s soon discovered that their respective narratives of the activity in France were particularly important because “the Revolution had created a wider reading public for political affairs and that there was a need to control the subject” (Kidron 5). England’s respondents to the Revolution such as Burke and Wollstonecraft, encouraged by this new audience for political texts, attempted both to support their plans for a revised nation and its man while simultaneously denigrating the proposals of their opponents. They read and responded to each others work, creating a complex and tumultuous debate in which the initial arguments quickly become lost and perverted in favor of rhetorical attempts to sway public opinion.

12. Foucault explains that such writings did not prohibit sex; rather, sex was “managed, inserted into systems of utility, regulated for the greater good of all, made to function according to an optimum” (*History of Sexuality, Vol. 1* 24). This production of a true concept of sex leads Foucault to conclude that “sexuality must not be thought of as a kind of natural given which power tries to hold in check, or as an obscure domain which knowledge tries gradually to uncover. It is the name that can be given to a historical construct” (105).

13. Richard Price’s *A Discourse on the Love of Our Country* (1789) initiates this tempestuous dialogue by calling for a prominent reconfiguration of English duty. Price insists that he must explain to men “the duty we owe to our country, and the nature, foundation,
and proper expressions of that love to it which we ought to cultivate” (1–2). Price’s call for national love creates a desire for men to maintain strong amorous feelings for their country, but his text actually precipitates additional socially produced desires throughout the late eighteenth century that limit English men’s ability to love. He conceptualizes amorous patriotism as essential to the liberty enjoyed by a nation and its residents, and he denounces monarchy and ancestral descent as impediments to this pursuit.

14. Although I will talk about Burke as the leading voice of the conservative camp in this debate, his ideas on revolution are far more complex than many Jacobin writers suggest. While Burke was clearly opposed to the French Revolution and actively spoke out against this event, he was not simply a conservative thinker who disavowed all revolutionary activity. As he makes clear in his *Reflections*, Burke supported the Glorious Revolution and the American Revolution. For an extended discussion of Burke’s ideas on revolutionary activity, see Peter J. Stanlis, *Edmund Burke: The Enlightenment and Revolution*, 195–215. Stanlis points out that “in social and political affairs, Burke was not a determinist and insisted that man is, to a great extent, a creature of his own making, and when made as he ought to be made, is destined to hold no trivial place in the universe” (196). Burke supports revolutionary action that helps men arrive at their “proper” place, but he does not believe the French Revolution pursued this end.

15. Gillian Skinner adds that “[i]n Burke’s view, absolute equality was not only unattainable but also undesirable; inequality was part of the natural order of things” (160).

16. Susan Khin Zaw indicates that “Burke sees the state in the image of the family: much as subordinate members of a household must love, honour and obey its head if there is to be peace, security and prosperity within the family, so the lower orders must love, honour and obey their rulers if there is to be peace, security and prosperity within the state” (128).

17. This romantic remembrance involves class demarcations, even though these markers are becoming less clear. Stephen K. White indicates that Burke was primarily addressing “the aristocracy and gentry of England,” and “the appeal to chivalry was aimed at the ‘second nature’ of these classes” (67). Burke speaks to the socially powerful and elite and incites their fears of potential rebellion.

18. She added later that “nature has given woman a weaker frame than man” and concluded that “bodily strength seems to give man a natural superiority over woman” (*Vindication of the Rights of Woman* 97–98; 108).


20. Van Sant discusses how the very concept of sensibility or proper feeling was “related to immediate moral and aesthetic responsiveness” (5). Indeed, both conservative and radical writers will uphold their perspectives on emotion as moral concerns.


22. Saprio points out that in *Reflections*, “Burke relayed his moral and political message as a nightmare teller would: not merely through a chronological story or a logical argument but by invoking the horror of it all through tone and imagery” (189). Burke’s rhetoric attempts to evoke fear in his readers, consequently encouraging them to dismiss nightmarish revolutionary passions.

23. Thomas Paine is perhaps the most ardent supporter of a strict devotion to rationality as a means of improving the English nation and its men. Paine, in the first part of his *Rights of Man* (1791), outlines a historical process that moves from the “government
of priestcraft” to the time of “conquerors,” and finally to the reign of reason, which he understands to pursue “the common interests of society, and the common rights of man” (120–21). Eleanor Ty explains that “[Paine’s] own work [emphasized] fact and common sense, using a ‘vulgar’ and plain rather than a decorous and refined style, [appealing] to a great mass of the common people” (9). Paine distinguishes his envisioned nation from the English aristocratically ordered community of Burke by imagining a pseudo-egalitarian civilization of rational men.

Virginia Sapiro claims that for Wollstonecraft, “[t]he powers of reason and understanding must be developed for virtuous social relations to exist—and vice versa. This was the basis of her vision of history” (225).

24. Barker-Benfield points out that Wollstonecraft “criticizes [Burke] throughout for affecting sensibility rather than being genuinely a man of feeling” (107).

25. Zaw relates that “Wollstonecraft believes that someone who, like Burke, merely feels and does not reason cannot be virtuous. But she also believes that someone who reasons without feeling cannot be good. Her solution to this conundrum is her concept of feeling informed by reason” (135).

26. For an extensive discussion of Burke’s chivalric gender system, see Johnson, Equivocal Beings, 1–19; see also Zaw 123–30.

Notes to Chapter 2

1. Austen’s juvenile writings, like her novels, are comedies, and she works with/in the conventions of this literary genre. To this extent, the vast majority of her youthful tales end in marriages, albeit often quite humorous and absurd marital unions. For a lengthy consideration of Austen’s use and manipulation of literary conventions within her juvenile writings, see Lois A. Chaber, “Transgressive Youth: Lady Mary, Jane Austen, and the Juvenilia Press,” and Julia Epstein, “Jane Austen’s Juvenilia and the Female Epistolary Tradition.”

2. The frustrations experienced by the men of the juvenilia certainly anticipate the struggles endured by the men of Austen’s mature fictions; and yet, critics have historically disregarded the importance of her juvenile writings. The publication of Jane Austen’s Beginnings: The Juvenilia and Lady Susan (1989), a collection of essays on Austen’s early writings edited by J. David Grey, ostensibly announced the arrival of her juvenile productions within the field of academic literary study. Margaret Drabble explains in her foreword to this anthology that “one does not need a degree in English literature to appreciate [the juvenilia’s] wit and their extraordinary narrative confidence,” but they do “repay study.” Drabble adds that “a good case is made here for both studying and teaching some of the juvenilia” (xiii). While it is now possible to teach Austen’s youthful writings because of two well-edited affordable versions of this literature, Grey’s critical text remains an anomaly in Austen studies as the sole full-length critical work devoted to her early tales, although many scholars have briefly examined Austen’s juvenilia to inform their discussions of the author’s later works. This became a popular trend throughout the 1980s, as numerous writers, especially second-wave feminist critics, looked to the author’s early narratives to frame their readings of Austen’s mature corpus. This critical tendency helped to legitimate the juvenilia as literature that merited scholarly attention.

Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar’s The Madwoman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-Century Literary Imagination (1979) solidified both second-wave
academic feminism within English studies and the place of the juvenilia within Austen studies. Gilbert and Gubar asserted that “it is shocking how persistently Austen demonstrates her discomfort with her cultural inheritance, specifically her dissatisfaction with the tight place assigned women in patriarchy and her analysis of the economics of sexual exploitation” (112). Gilbert and Gubar insist that Austen is continually concerned with the position of women in society and argue that throughout her juvenile writings she critiques and parodies societal conventions that “have inalterably shaped women’s lives” (114). Gilbert and Gubar identify women and women’s issues as the primary subject of Austen’s work and the appropriate subject of Austen criticism, leading to numerous feminist studies of her corpus throughout the 1980s. The Madwoman in the Attic also revealed the importance of the juvenilia to the critical approach of second-wave feminist scholars—a critical approach that neglected the depiction of Austen’s masculine figures. LeRoy W. Smith followed the lead of Gilbert and Gubar, suggesting that in the world of the juvenile writings “the female’s life is much more difficult than the males.” Smith concludes that in these works “Austen already understood how individuals are affected by patriarchal values” (49). Deborah J. Knuth likewise dismisses the prominent struggles experienced by Austen’s male characters throughout her early fictions and believes that these tales offer a “logical point of departure for a study of Jane Austen’s women’s relationships” (66). And Claudia Johnson, in her essay, “‘The Kingdom at Sixes and Sevens’: Politics and the Juvenilia,” indicates that “Austen was well aware of the way in which her presentation of female characters in the juvenilia was politically coded” (52–53). These critics accurately highlight the importance of the female subject within Austen’s juvenilia, but these tales ultimately dramatize various tensions of the English gender system in the post–French Revolutionary years, including a cultural anxiety about the insecure young man. For an extensive discussion of the relative critical neglect of Austen’s juvenilia, see Margaret Anne Doody’s Introduction to Catharine and Other Writings.

3. Joseph Litvak argues that ‘men like Henry Tilney become increasingly troubling for their ‘perverse’ combination of cockiness with complaisance’ (“Charming Men” 269). Litvak’s comment recalls the strange composite quality of Henry’s subjectivity and sexuality, but I will argue that the hero’s “troubling” appearance is ultimately the result of his rational efforts to fulfill his society’s distinct yet specific expectations for proper masculinity. He seems cocky to many readers because of his ability to satiate the desire-producing machine; moreover, he seems complaisant because his subjectivity is extremely well organized and will not allow the development of any irrational sensation or experience. This incongruous permutation of accomplishment and ambivalence is essential to the comic quality of Austen’s depiction of Henry.

4. He is a superior man, reminiscent of Samuel Richardson’s famous hero, Sir Charles Grandison. Margaret Anne Doody argues that “behind this Charles Adams—a most un-fallen son of Adam (in his own opinion)—we can see not only Richardson’s Sir Charles, but whole sets of Enlightenment concepts of self-improvement and self-approval” (xxviii). Like Grandison, Adams is a grand and beloved male character who continually tries to ameliorate himself.

5. Frances Beer argues that “Jack and Alice” ridicules the “slippery equivocation” of women like Lady Williams, a character described as a “[study] in corruption” (11).

6. “Three Sisters,” another pithy novel included in the initial volume of Austen’s juvenilia, traces the trials of Mr. Watts, who, unlike Adams, maintains no pretensions about either his perfection or his future spouse. Watts actively pursues a wife throughout this tale, and he focuses his energy on a family of three sisters. He initially proposes mar-
riage to Mary Stanhope who proclaims: “I do not intend to accept it. . . . He is quite an old Man, about two and thirty, very plain so plain that I cannot bear to look at him. He is extremely disagreeable and I hate him more than any body else in the world” (55). When the letters of Miss Georgiana Stanhope assume narrative control of the novel, Watts remains a notably anxious and unattractive figure uninterested in amorous emotions. Georgiana describes Watts as “rather plain to be sure” and questions, “but then what is Beauty in a Man; if he has but a genteel figure and a sensible looking Face it is quite sufficient. . . . Mr. Watts’s figure is unfortunately extremely vulgar and his Countenance is very heavy” (59). Georgiana’s reflections remind us of Watts’s deplorable appearance; but her remarks also imply that male beauty is unnecessary if a man is genteel. Watts is not a comely man, but like Charles Adams he displays little ability to pursue effectively romantic relations with women. He is an obnoxiously authoritative figure, who, as Mary Stanhope relates, “talks a great deal of Women’s always Staying at home and such stuff” (56). Watts upholds a patriarchal gender system that requires separate sexualized spheres, and he believes he must marry a woman whom he can control and detain at home. He is not picky about who this woman may be, and Mary understands that if she does not accept his proposal, he will extend his offer to her sisters, but “he won’t be kept in suspense” (57). Watts’s behavior suggests his realization that he needs a domesticated woman to be a socially proper man, but he has no desire for a particular woman.

When Mary and Watts begin discussions about their “desired” marriage, both attempt to exercise control. Mary demands a new blue and silver chaise, but she reports that “the old fool wants to have his new Chaise just the colour of the old one, and hung as low too.” Watts will not tolerate the ubiquitous prenuptial demands of a woman, and he tells Mary, “as I am by no means guided by a particular preference to you above your Sisters it is equally the same to me which I marry of the three” (61). His honest statement certainly affects Mary, who agrees to marry the stubborn man. She then proceeds to list her various “needs” as his wife, including jewels, balls, a greenhouse, travel, and a private theatre; and Mary informs her future husband that all he can expect from his acts of generosity is “to have me pleased” (62). Watts is not at all interested in this masculine role, and when Mary’s sister Sophia iterates these standards for her future husband, Watts asserts: “These are very odd Ideas truly, young Lady. You had better discard them before you marry, or you will be obliged to do it afterwards” (63). Watts will not tolerate such requests, and he is perfectly willing to sacrifice any personal romantic desires for the benefit of an easily placated domestic partner. He is still concerned that he ought to marry, but he will not, and perhaps cannot, play the role of the emotionally overwhelmed lover who succumbs to the excessive demands of a “beloved.”

Austen concludes her short novel in a comically mundane manner. After agreeing to a compromise regarding the colors and height of the new chaise, Mr. Watts actively affects the persona of a lover before Mary. He announces: “I am come a courting in a true Lover like Manner” (66). Watts’s overt proclamation of his altered status emphasizes the artifice involved in this new identity. His artificial amorous behavior, however, ironically leads to troubling consequences, as he is now offended by Mary’s comments concerning Mr. Brudenell, an attractive man who appears near the story’s close. Mary expounds: “Watts is such a Fool! I hope I shall never see him again. . . . Why only because I told him that I had seen a Man much handsomer than he was this Morning, he flew into a great Passion and called me a Vixen” (67). Watts is unable to handle the undisciplined passions of a love relationship. While he had earlier insisted upon his unattachment to any specific woman, now that he has become a “lover,” he will not allow his wife to express desires or
even admiration for any man except himself. Like many gothic villains, he becomes a jealous man who must control his domesticated female partner. Mary’s mother intervenes to calm the frustrated lover; he now “met Mary with all his accustomed Civility, and except one touch at the Phaeton and another at the Greenhouse, the Evening went off with a great Harmony and Cordiality” (67). He appears to abandon his role as a lover, reverting to the safe masculine identity that guarantees him a wife, the necessary domestic machinery, and the ubiquitous domestic squabble. Austen presents Watts as a humorous male figure who is perfectly capable of acquiring a female counterpart and achieving a secure aesthetic of existence. His accomplishment comically allays a social anxiety about unmarried men, but Austen’s juvenile text also illustrates the inability of young men to express and embrace sincere amorous emotions that might destabilize their sexual subjectivities.

7. Austen draws immediate attention to Stanley’s exposure to French fashion and culture, experiences that inform his character throughout the story as he remains extremely conscious of his dress and his social activity. He is reported to be “as handsome as a Prince,” and he is appropriately forthcoming (206).

8. Despite this great length of time that he devotes to his toilet, Stanley emerges and announces, “have not I been very quick? I never hurried so much in my Life before” (209).

9. Stanley continues to rehearse earlier models of appropriate masculinity when he escorts Kitty to the ball. Upon arriving at the social event, Austen relates that he, “forcibly seizing [Kitty’s] arm within his, overpowered her voice with the rapidity of his own” (211). He now reverts to a ridiculous form of chivalry that parodies “gallant” male behavior. It is at the ball, moreover, when we learn from Stanley’s family about his other personal traits and ambitions. His sister Camilla, who is also the confidant of Kitty, informs the heroine that her brother has returned from France because “his favourite Hunter . . . was turned out in the park on his going abroad, [or] somehow or other fell ill” (213). Stanley’s fondness for hunting, like his concern with his personal appearance, has tremendous influence on his activity, and except for these two overwhelming undertakings, we discover the young man is still relatively uncommitted. Unlike his politically active father, the younger Stanley “was so far from being really of any party, that he had scarcely a fixed opinion on the Subject. He could therefore always take either side, and always argue with temper” (221). He seems to be committed to nothing but his toilet and horse, and the elder Stanley also reports that his son is “by no means disposed to marry” (219). Edward knows how to dress and hunt, but he is still a young man who remains uninterested in either political stances or long-term love relationships. John Halperin describes Edward Stanley as possessing a “peculiar combination of gallantry toward women and egregious self-absorption” (39). Austen highlights Stanley’s “peculiar combination” of masculine attributes, and this odd synthesis demonstrates the insecure status of the (new) modern young men of England.

10. LeRoy Smith argues that “Stanley’s abrupt departure brings an embarrassing recognition that a young woman should not expect seriousness from a socially privileged young man” (48).

11. See John Davie’s explanatory note on this sentence for an extended discussion of Austen’s use of the word “nice” (383).

12. Austen’s early works do include the occasional romantically inclined man who takes great pride in disregarding parental authority. Edward Lindsay, the hero of “Love and Friendship,” is an amusing male character who is perhaps the most memorable lover
of Austen's juvenile writings. Indeed, Lindsay may be the most amorously eloquent and expressive man in Austen's entire corpus. He is initially described as "the most beauteous and amiable Youth," and Laura, the narrator of the tale, indicates that she "felt that on him the happiness or Misery of [her] future Life must depend" (Catharine 78, 79). He is a physically attractive man on whom are placed extremely high expectations, but Lindsay is also a comically rebellious figure who has acted against his father's plans for his future wife. Lindsay explains: "My Father, seduced by the false glare of Fortune and the Deluding Pomp of Title, insisted on my giving my hand to Lady Dorothea. No never exclaimed I. Lady Dorothea is lovely and Engaging; I prefer no woman to her; but Know Sir, that I scorn to marry her in compliance with your Wishes. No! Never shall it be said that I obliged my Father" (79). Lindsay's abrupt stance in opposition to his father demonstrates the hero's ridiculous sense of independence. He openly admits to his strong feelings for Lady Dorothea, but he resists a potential marital union with her because it would accord with his father's wishes. Austen's early characterization of Lindsay highlights both his nubile appearance and his fierce obstinacy toward his father. He is a radical beauty, and he is determined to express and act upon his ideas concerning love.

Lindsay proposes to Laura after relating his history with much romantic sensibility. He asks: "[M]y Adorable Laura . . . when may I hope to receive that reward of all the painful sufferers I have undergone during the course of my Attachment to you, to which I have ever aspired? Oh! when will you reward me with Yourself?" (80). He is a very effective rhetorician who knows how to express both a dramatic story and amorous emotions. And he is also successful, as Laura informs us that they "were immediately united by [her] Father, who tho' he had never taken orders had been bred to the Church" (80). Austen's comic wit suggests the ridiculous quality of Lindsay's romantic language. He believes in the potency of love, and he appears content to live on and through his passion, even if his marriage is not official. Lindsay chides his sister: "[D]id you then never feel the pleasing Pangs of Love. . . . Does it appear impossible to your vile and corrupted Palate, to exist on Love? Can you not conceive the Luxury of living in every Distress that Poverty can inflict, with the object of your tenderest Affection?" (82). Lindsay is committed to his amorous emotions and takes great pleasure in the sensations promoted by his love relationship with Laura. He is a man of great sensibility and sensitivity who remains extremely resistant to the regulatory measures of paternal authority.

When Lindsay later encounters his father, he proclaims that it is his "greatest boast that I have incurred the Displeasure of my Father!" and describes his words and actions as manifestations of "his undaunted Bravery" (83). Lindsay constructs himself as a rebel who is apparently uninterested in both his family's and his society's concern about his future marital plans. While he briefly fashions himself as a courageous and stern man, his actions upon the surprising reunion with his old friend, Augustus, reveal a notably different sensibility. When Lindsay encounters his old companion, he declares, "My Life! my Soul!"; Augustus responds, "My Adorable Angel!" and Austen reports that these passionate men then "flew into each other's arms" (82). Lindsay and Augustus certainly appear comic, but Austen's depiction of their emotional display also emphasizes their powerful passions. They are important anomalies in Austen's corpus: male characters who are able and willing to express feelings and sensations. After Augustus is forced into debtor's prison for his indulgent postmarital lifestyle, Lindsay follows his friend to offer his assistance and comfort, and the men return to the action of the narrative only to die in a fatal phaeton accident. Lindsay manages to survive the crash for a moment, and his wife "was overjoyed to find him yet sensible" (97). He is sensitive and committed to love.
until his death; he disregards the authority and anxieties of his society in favor of his own passionate desires, including his amorous interests. He denounces the disciplinary measures of his own culture, choosing instead to pursue his sensations and amorous emotions. The post-Revolutionary English nation, however, cannot tolerate such men, and Austen depicts Lindsay’s efforts to pursue a life lived on love as frustrated, ridiculous, and tragic.


14. He tells his sister, Mrs. Vernon, that Lady Susan has disturbed the peace of multiple households through her scandalous activity. Reginald respects the cultural importance of the domestic realm, and he views Lady Susan as a threat to this vital domain. Reginald reports to his sister: “By [Lady Susan’s] behaviour to Mr. Manwaring, she gave jealousy and wretchedness to his wife, and by her attentions to a young man previously attached to Mr. Manwaring’s sister, deprived an amiable girl of her Lover” (211).

15. Lady Susan adds: “[Reginald] is lively and seems clever, and when I have inspired him with greater respect for me than his sister’s kind offices have implanted, he may be an agreeable Flirt” (217).

16. Reginald attempts to alleviate his father’s fears about the seductive powers of Lady Susan, reporting that he “can have no view in remaining with Lady Susan than to enjoy for a short time . . . the conversation of a Woman of high mental powers.” While he does believe that “the World has most grossly injured that Lady, by supposing the worst,” Reginald assures his father that he maintains only trivial interests in the elder woman (226). Reginald presents himself as a free-spirited man who is simply enjoying the company of Lady Susan.

17. Reginald’s sentimentality is not isolated to his “love” for Lady Susan, as he is also susceptible to Frederica, the heroine’s daughter. Frederica appeals directly to the passionate man, requesting his assistance in her efforts to avoid her mother’s authority. While Reginald does act on behalf of Frederica, asking Lady Susan to relinquish her plans for the marriage of her daughter to Sir James, he is quickly again enamored of the older woman, declaring that he had “entirely misunderstood Lady Susan” (247). Mrs. Vernon advises her mother that her son is once more under the controls of Lady Susan, warning, “Prepare my dear Madam, for the worst. The probability of their marrying is surely heightened. He is more securely her’s [sic] than ever” (251). Mrs. Vernon’s reflections highlight the familial concern over the marital plans of Reginald. Austen also suggests an anxiety about his insecure sexual and social subjectivity. Reginald seems conscious of the powerful desires produced for his masculinity, but he is also very nervous. Lady Susan describes him as “a Man whose passions were so violent and resentful,” and following their discussion about Frederica’s potential marriage to Sir James, she adds that it was easy “to see [in Reginald] the struggle between returning Tenderness and the remains of Displeasure.” While Lady Susan finds “something agreeable in feelings so easily worked on,” Reginald’s turbulent emotions demonstrate his personal instability, as he remains susceptible to Lady Susan’s charms and unable to revert to a stable masculine sexuality (252–53).

18. Imlay’s novel shares many of the Enlightenment sentiments voiced by William Godwin’s Enquiry Concerning Political Justice (1793), published the same year as The Emigrants. Godwin argues that “the actions and dispositions of men are not the offspring of any original bias that they bring into the world in favour of one sentiment or character
rather than another, but flow entirely from the operation of circumstances and events acting upon a faculty of receiving sensible impressions” (I: 26–27). Godwin adds that “the enquirer that has no other object than truth, that refuses to be misled, and is determined to proceed only upon just and sufficient evidence, will find little reason to be satisfied with dogmas which rest upon no other foundation, than a pretended necessity impelling the human mind to yield its assent” (I: 29).

19. Lok’s influence on Waldorf, the hero of the novel, is significant; nevertheless, King closes her novel by documenting Waldorf’s realization that “the true philosopher seeks the good of mankind; he foregoes his own interests to promote their good, and never hurts them willingly” (II: 61).

20. Hamilton presents Delmond as her hero, who considers honor to be “the inspiring motive of the great and noble” and cherishes “the sentiments of honour” that he learned reading childhood romances of the “lives of those illustrious heroes” (I: 150; 124).

21. Claudia Johnson argues that “Henry categorically denies the gothic any legitimately mimetic provenance” (Jane Austen 35).

22. Maria Jerinic argues that “[t]he object of Austen’s parody and the real threat to women, however, is not the gothic novel but it is men, particularly men who wish to dictate to women what they should and should not read. Austen does not want to reshape or reform men, but her text does insist that women be allowed the same opportunities as men to choose what they read” (138). Henry, of course, fancies himself an expert critic on literary texts and certainly participates in the authoritative stance described by Jerinic.

23. Henry’s commitment to Enlightenment reason specifically affects his attitudes about language. When Catherine refers to Radcliffe’s Mysteries of Udolpho as a “nice” book, Henry responds: “The nicest;—by which I suppose you mean the neatest. That must depend upon the binding” (83). Henry is a student of Samuel Johnson’s Dictionary of the English Language, and thus he is convinced that words have definitive meanings that can be ascertained and protected. Eleanor tells Catherine that Henry “is for ever finding fault with me, for some incorrectness of language, and now he is taking the same liberty with you. The word ‘nicest,’ as you used it, did not suit him; and you had better change it as soon as you can, or we shall be overpowered with Johnson and Blair” (83). Eleanor describes her brother as a man obsessed with the proper and fixed meanings of words, and while Henry’s fondness for Johnson and Blair may not appear to demonstrate his commitment to rationalism, his desire to demarcate appropriate definitions illustrates his participation in the Enlightenment project to delineate and enforce specific categories of knowledge and experience. Henry explains that “originally perhaps [‘nice’] was applied only to express neatness, propriety, delicacy, or refinement;—people were nice in their dress, in their sentiments, or their choice. But now every commendation on every subject is comprised in that one word” (84). He is very frustrated that words are no longer used in the “correct” manner, and his attitude implies that they indeed have a proper usage. By calling for specified semantics, our hero demonstrates his commitment to a dichotomous understanding of language and thought as either reasonable or unreasonable. Johnson argues that “because Henry dictates the parameters of words, the kind of control he exercises extends to thought itself” (Jane Austen 38). For a further consideration of this scene, see Johnson, Jane Austen, 39. For a more extensive discussion of Henry’s attitudes on language, see Tara Ghoshal Wallace, “Northanger Abbey and the Limits of Parody,” 264.

24. For more discussion on the General’s interests in domesticity, see Hoeveler, 129–30.
25. General Tilney uses his gallantry to exercise authority and control, but he eventually acts in a notably nongallant manner when he turns Catherine from Northanger “without any reason that could justify, any apology that could atone for the abruptness, the rudeness, nay, the insolence of it” (183). See Tanner 65 for a consideration of the General’s gallantry.

26. Austen introduces Henry as “a very gentlemanlike young man” who was “rather tall, had a pleasing countenance, a very intelligent and lively eye, and, if not quite handsome, was very near it” (11). The narrator’s initial description announces the hero to be a gentleman, but her qualifying statements immediately draw attention to the construction of such a chivalric man of gentility.

27. For further consideration of this frequently discussed conversation, see Diane Hoeveler’s “Vindicating Northanger Abbey,” 125–26 and David Monaghan, *Jane Austen: Structure and Social Vision*, 20–21.

28. For an extensive consideration of the implications involved in Henry’s comments on marriage, see Johnson, *Jane Austen*, 38, and Tanner 63.

29. Austen quickly invites us to laugh at such social propriety, however, as Henry informs Catherine: “Take care, or you will forget to be tired of [Bath] at the proper time.—You ought to be tired at the end of six weeks” (58). The narrator again displays Henry’s awareness of the irrational conventions associated with “proper” chivalric social activity, allowing us to laugh at the knowledge and performance of the impressive hero.

30. Marvin Mudrick offers a compelling reading of John Thorpe. Mudrick claims that Thorpe is “importunate and unscrupulous enough to carry the Gothic role; but there is nothing sinister about him. He is simply exasperating, vulgar, rude, and foolish” (46). Mudrick concludes that that Thorpe does not “[abduct] or [torture] Catherine when she declines his attentions; he does not even connive with her father at marrying her against her will. His world and his talent are too limited for spectacular achievements; but he does as much mischief as he can” (47).

31. Henry’s comments are ironic not only because of the General’s later tyrannical activities, but also because of the country and the age in which this novel was written. Austen’s language reminds readers of the Napoleonic Wars and the larger post-Revolutionary turmoil that racked the English nation. Tony Tanner points out that “Henry tries to evoke an England which is a kind of phantasm of peaceful life from which the possibility of horror and violence has been eradicated” (71). Johnson’s work has been instrumental in drawing attention to the political overtones of Austen’s language. For a consideration of the language employed by Henry in this scene, see *Jane Austen* 40.


33. Henry’s rationality also guides his attitude and behavior toward women; he appears conscious of the social debates about women’s intellectual abilities, but he is also aware of hackneyed conceptions of the young female. For example, Henry announces his fear to Catherine that he “shall make but a poor figure in your journal tomorrow;” demonstrating his knowledge of women’s supposedly compulsory habit (12). He explains: “My dear madam, I am not so ignorant of young ladies’ ways as you wish to believe me; it is this delightful habit of journalizing which largely contributed to form the easy style of writing for which ladies are so generally celebrated. Every body allows that the talent of writing agreeable letters is peculiarly female. Nature may have done something, but I am sure it must be essentially assisted by the practice of keeping a journal” (13).
Henry’s comment is both humorous and presumptuous, as he presumes that Catherine must keep such a daily account. He is also aware of the trends and maintenance of female attire, and he informs Mrs. Allen that he purchased a gown for his sister “the other day, and it was pronounced to be a prodigious bargain by every lady who saw it.” Henry is an apparent expert in women’s clothing and can even spot a deal. He can purchase fashionable clothing, locate economical garments, and even evaluate the durability of fabric. When Mrs. Allen asks him about Catherine’s gown, Henry replies: “It is very pretty, madam . . . but I do not think it will wash well; I am afraid it will fray” (14). He is comfortable and confident demonstrating his knowledge of women’s dresses so long as he restricts himself to rational remarks. For a discussion of Henry’s skill as a tailor, see Hardy, *Jane Austen’s Heroines*, 3–6 and Morgan, *In the Meantime*, 67.

Many critics have drawn attention to Henry’s condescending attitude toward women. See especially Jerinic 144; Johnson, *Jane Austen*, 37–38; Cohen 222–24; and Litvak 267.

Castle adds that “Henry does not so much tell Catherine what to think as show her that she can think” (Introduction xxiii). Henry appears to know Wollstonecraft’s *Vindication*, but as Johnson argues, he often behaves as “a self-proclaimed expert on matters feminine, from epistolary style to muslin” who “simply believes that he knows women’s minds better than they do” (*Jane Austen* 37). Johnson’s criticism recalls the perception of Henry as an arrogant individual. He is a confident man who can participate in many discussions and perform various masculine roles, and he is even willing to instruct women in matters “feminine.” Henry is a performer, and he can play a variety of parts, but he is also exposed as a self-conscious comic character who is aware of the artifice involved in his composite masculine social/sexual subjectivity.

Mark Loveridge, for example, argues that “Henry is sophisticated,” and “has his own, rather unnerving, analytical attitude to the world, to Catherine, and to the idea of character” (6). And Mudrick points out that “Henry prides himself on his worldliness and his lack of sentimentality” (43). Loveridge, Mudrick, and others are correct to emphasize our hero’s sophisticated analytic approach, but the report of his brother’s impending marriage and the corresponding collapse of James Morland’s engagement threaten to shatter Henry’s worldview and his understanding of love. He cannot comprehend these events, and Johnson’s *Dictionary* is unable to explain them clearly. Various critics have linked Henry’s sophistication to the novelist’s own sophisticated persona. For a discussion of this interesting topic, see Mudrick 43 and Wallace, “Northanger Abbey and the Limits of Parody,” 262.

Henry’s immediate response to this moment of personal instability is to leave Northanger. He announces to Catherine and Eleanor: “I am come, young ladies, in a very moralizing strain, to observe that our pleasures in this world are always to be paid for, and that we often purchase them at a great disadvantage, giving ready-monied happiness for a draft on the future, that may not be honoured” (170). As he prepares to leave for his other home at Woodston, he reflects upon the sacrifices he has and must make. Austen again emphasizes her hero’s self-consciousness, allowing her hero to invoke an edifying tone and adopt the discourse of Dr. Johnson. Henry seems aware of the consequences he has had to accept because of his efforts to develop a complete masculine subjectivity and sexuality. His duties at Woodston force him to leave Northanger and the heroine, but before he departs he offers Catherine a “gratified look on being told that her stay was determined” (178). This is the most overt expression of affection that Austen allows Henry in the novel.
38. Susan Morgan claims that Henry, “in the finest spirit of romance, defies his father for the sake of true love” (68). Margaret Kirkham echoes Morgan, suggesting that Henry “learns to see in Catherine's unaffected character qualities which inspire true affection” (88). And LeRoy Smith argues that “the qualities that have attracted Henry Tilney to Catherine from the first—spontaneity of feeling and expression, honesty and openness, natural taste—are unchanged by her disillusioning experience. They move Henry to propose in spite of his father’s objections” (59). These critics neglect Austen’s self-consciousness as a novelist and ignore the absence of any indication that Henry “loves” Catherine. He does rehearse certain aspects of the romantic male role, but his dogmatic rationality prevents him from expressing sincere amorous emotions. His esteem stems from an assurance of Catherine’s affection, and even the narrator does not attempt to define this union as a love relationship.

39. Austen discusses the hero’s complex story about the General’s misunderstanding of Catherine’s potential wealth and announces: “I leave it to my reader’s sagacity to determine how much of all this it was possible for Henry to communicate at this time to Catherine” (201). Austen again openly acknowledges her own narrative artifice, and she also elaborates on the self-consciously rebellious activity of Henry.

40. Austen’s depiction of the General recalls the behavior of Radcliffe’s Marquis of Mazzini, the villain of A Sicilian Romance (1790). Radcliffe’s novel details how the Marquis loses his rational faculties and becomes “successively the slave of alternate passions” (184). Late in the story, the narrator notes that the Marquis’s “head grew dizzy, and a sudden faintness overcame him . . . [he] found himself unable to stand” (189). General Tilney is likewise overcome by the emotions engendered by his daughter’s marriage and loses control of his rational faculties.

Notes to Chapter 3

1. Foucault’s late work on the ancients has received much criticism and insufficient serious consideration in terms of his overall project on the history of sexuality. For an extensive consideration of Foucault’s writing on Greek and Roman cultural and sexual practices, see Paul Veyne, “The Final Foucault and His Ethics,” and Foucault’s own essay, “Writing the Self,” both in Foucault and his Interlocutors, edited by Arnold I. Davidson.

2. As Foucault later explains, “Moderation was quite regularly represented among the qualities that belonged—or at least should belong—not just to anyone but particularly to those who had rank, status, and responsibility” (History of Sexuality, Vol. 2: The Use of Pleasure 61). Foucault explains that the man who was able to curtail his sensations was able to “[derive] pleasure from the moderation [he displayed]” (65).

3. LeRoy Smith claims that Willoughby is “the most sexually attractive of Austen’s males” (77).

4. The youthful heroine insists that “Mr. Willoughby . . . is the only person who can have a right to shew that house,” and hesitatingly remarks that the grounds “will one day be Mr. Willoughby’s” (58–59). Marianne has already planned her marriage to the man whom she considers the eventual owner of the Allenham estate.

5. For an interesting consideration of female authority in the novel, see Tara Ghoshal Wallace, “Sense and Sensibility and the Problem of Feminine Authority” and Phoebe A. Smith’s “Sense and Sensibility and ‘The Lady’s Law’: The Failure of Benevolent Paternalism.”
6. We learn that he has left his card while the Dashwood sisters were out (146). We discover that he received an invitation to attend a small dance sponsored by Sir John but did not attend (148), and we know that he does not return Marianne's letters. His character is certainly altered, and Elinor now relates “her suspicions of Willoughby’s inconstancy” to her mother (149).

7. He retains a strong romantic sensibility for Marianne, and even the coldly rational Elinor realizes “that such a [romantic] regard had formerly existed” between him and her sister (155). The sisters’ reaction to “Willoughby’s” harsh letter provides us with further information concerning both his relationship to Marianne and his efforts to resolve the complex social forces that affect his self and gender. Elinor reacts quite strongly to the epistle. She could not “have supposed Willoughby capable of departing so far from the appearance of every honourable and delicate feeling—so far from the common decorum of a gentleman” (159). Critiquing his dishonorable, ungentleel language, Elinor reconstructs Willoughby through her expectation that he should write and behave as a socially proper gentleman. Marianne shatters her sister’s perspective when she declares that “he is not so unworthy as you believe him” and informs her that “he has broken no faith with me” (161). Adamant that he did once reciprocate her amorous affection, the passionate heroine refuses to accuse Willoughby of conspiring against her. She claims that it is easier to believe that she has been deceived “by all the world, rather than by his own heart” (164). She even questions the potentially manipulative actions of his female companion at the previous evening’s affair (165). Although Marianne’s emotion overwhelms her, she also seems strangely aware of the many forces that have influenced Willoughby’s actions. Wallace examines the multiple figures of feminine control in the novel and suggests that “there are so many women who inscribe their desires on Willoughby, who assert author- ity over him.” Wallace concludes that Willoughby’s “own desire, his very self, becomes muted and blurred” (Sense and Sensibility 157). Mrs. Smith, Elinor, Marianne, and others develop expectations for Willoughby. Paralleling the social discourses of masculinity that inform the construction of his self, he must resolve the requests of these authoritative women and his attraction and repulsion to their desires.

8. The Colonel’s story, coupled with the news of Willoughby’s marriage to Miss Grey, greatly alter the public perception of Brandon and Willoughby. Even though he explains to Elinor that his tale was meant only to alleviate her sister’s suffering and not “to raise myself at the expense of others,” the Colonel does garner a new level of respect after he tells his story (183). Marianne no longer avoids him, and the narrator reports that the romantic heroine “was obliged, or could oblige herself to speak” to the mature and rheumatic man (188). Mr. John Dashwood cautiously approves of Brandon’s “[t]wo thousand a-year” living (195), and the Colonel again demonstrates his artistic sensibility by appreciating Elinor’s screens (205). In addition, public attitudes toward Willoughby have significantly altered. Ultimately, the discourses and narratives that Sir John, the Palmers, and others constructed for a man like Willoughby have all failed. Sir John “could not have thought it possible” that a man “of whom he had always had such reason to think well” could ruthlessly neglect Marianne for another woman. After all, Sir John “did not believe there was a bolder rider in England.” Mrs. Palmer “was determined to drop [Willoughby’s] acquaintance immediately, and she was very thankful that she had never been acquainted with him at all” (187). Members of Willoughby’s society recognize his inability to embrace fully the various demands they have placed upon him and chastise him for this “failure.”

9. When her sickness becomes severe, and the Palmers realize they must vacate Cleveland for the safety of their child, Mrs. Jennings’s cunningly acknowledges the need
for the Colonel to remain near the object of his affection. Mrs. Jennings also declares that “his stay at Cleveland was necessary to herself, that she should want him to play at piquet of an evening” (269). She attempts to reconfigure Brandon as a romantic and sentimental lover, but Mr. Palmer insists that the Colonel is simply a stable and knowledgeable man, “a person so well able to assist or advise Miss Dashwood in any emergence” (270). Mr. Palmer, like Brandon, has abandoned the role of the lover for the safety of a disciplined aesthetic of existence. Mr. Palmer cannot comprehend the Colonel’s romantic reasons for remaining at Cleveland, but he has little difficulty understanding the utility of the mature Brandon in such a dire moment.

10. He adds: “To avoid a comparative poverty, which [Marianne’s] affection and her society would have deprived of all its horrors, I have, by raising myself to affluence, lost every thing that could make it a blessing.” Willoughby broaches his sustained love for Marianne, and the financial urgencies that forced his desperate actions; moreover, he is conscious of the decisions he had to make to limit his emotional sensibility and govern his desires. He can still recall the amorous passions enflamed by his time with Marianne. He admits: “To have resisted such attractions, to have withstood such tenderness!—Is there a man on earth who could have done it!” (281).

11. He tells Elinor not to feel sympathy for his present status, but for “my situation as it was then. . . . my head and heart full of your sister,” when he “was forced to play the happy lover to another woman” (287). His self-consciousness reminds us of his training in the tradition of sensibility, but his remarks also suggest his earlier engagement in amorous emotions. Willoughby, in order to regulate his aesthetic of existence, has had to eschew the behavior of the male lover in favor of a well-disciplined masculinity. Marilyn Butler posits that “Willoughby’s crime proves . . . not to have been rank villainy, but expensive self-indulgence so habitual that he must sacrifice everything, including domestic happiness, to it” (Jane Austen and the War of Ideas 194). Willoughby, indeed, has been self-indulgent. Austen’s tale dramatizes how multiple and contradictory social desires prevent Willoughby from achieving a stable sexuality, but the narrator also emphasizes the causal effects of his decisions. Miss Dashwood listens patiently to the story of Willoughby’s reconfigured masculinity and softened considerably in her attitude toward him, but she harshly reminds him, “You have made your own choice. It was not forced on you” (289). Elinor, through Austen’s novelistic narration, explains the dynamics of his difficult situation:

The world had made him extravagant and vain—Extravagance and vanity had made him cold-hearted and selfish. Vanity, while seeking its own guilty triumph at the expense of another, had involved him in a real attachment, which extravagance, or at least its offspring, necessity, had required to be sacrificed. Each faulty propensity in leading him to evil, had led him likewise to punishment. The attachment, from which against honour, against feeling, against every better interest he had outwardly torn himself, now, when no longer allowable, governed every thought; and the connection, for the sake of which he had, with little scruple, left her sister to misery, was likely to prove a source of unhappiness to himself of a far more incurable nature. (290–91)

Even the sense-saturated Elinor, sounding like a reflective Dr. Johnson, can identify the multilayered complexities of Willoughby’s decisions and actions, and she is alert to the severe consequences that he must now embrace.
12. Alistair Duckworth argues that “Marianne’s marriage to the rheumatic Colonel Brandon is a gross over-compensation for her misguided sensibility” (104).

13. Austen adds additional salt to his wounds by suggesting that “had he behaved with honour towards Marianne,” Mrs. Smith would have offered him financial support, and “he might at once have been happy and rich” (334). The narrator suggests that had Willoughby reverted to chivalric rather than rational masculinity, he might have enjoyed financial security and a love relationship.

Notes to Chapter 4

1. For an interesting consideration of the long-standing popularity of *Pride and Prejudice* and its doting readers, see Joseph Litvak’s “Delicacy and Disgust, Mourning and Melancholia, Privilege and Perversity: *Pride and Prejudice*” and Gene Koppel’s “*Pride and Prejudice*: Conservative or Liberal Novel—Or Both? (A Gadmerian Approach).” Barbara Sherrod describes *Pride and Prejudice* as a “classic love story because it set the pattern for a modern popular love story, the story in which an independent-minded and fascinating woman is loved by a remote, powerful man” (68). For further consideration of the great attractiveness of Darcy, Elizabeth, and this “timeless” love story, see Lisa Hopkins, “Mr. Darcy’s Body: Privileging the Female Gaze,” Cheryl L. Nixon’s “Balancing the Courtship Hero: Masculine Emotional Display in Film Adaptations of Austen’s Novels,” and Norma Rowen’s “Reinscribing Cinderella: Jane Austen and the Fairy Tale.”

2. Darcy is introduced as a “fine, tall person [with] handsome features, [and a] noble mien” and is appreciated for his appearance and “his having ten thousand a year” (7). He is a physically impressive man with many favorable attributes, and the other characters in the novel consistently reflect upon both his great wealth and his extensive accomplishments. When Charlotte Lucas discusses his purported pride with Elizabeth, the heroine’s friend concludes that “his pride . . . does not offend me so much as pride often does, because there is an excuse for it. One cannot wonder that so very fine a young man, with family, fortune, every thing in his favour, should think highly of himself. If I may so express it, he has a right to be proud” (16). Charlotte ties Darcy’s phenomenal individual accomplishments to his familial background and income, which James Heldman notes “is at least 300 times the per capita income in his day” (“How Wealthy” 39). Darcy’s economic supremacy facilitates his personal flexibility and romantic grandeur, and according to Charlotte there is nothing wrong with owning up to your accomplishments. Charlotte’s unnamed younger brother agrees: “If I were as rich as Mr. Darcy . . . I should not care how proud I was. I would keep a pack of foxhounds, and drink a bottle of wine every day” (16). Darcy is perceived as an appropriately confident man who functions as a role model for aspiring English boys.

3. Sherrod explains that Darcy’s “love for Elizabeth makes him a better person [and] brings out the excellence of his character” (68).

4. John McAleer theorizes that Austen imagined a moral society as an effectively organized country estate that must be “administered by a caring landowner.” McAleer adds that “a country estate was an embodiment of the natural moral order” and concludes that “[Austen] asked only that men would so conduct themselves that their behaviour would affirm the existence of a stable order energized by sound moral principles” (72).

5. Austen scholars have often discussed the importance of social class status in *Pride and Prejudice*.
and Prejudice, but these critical treatments tend to revolve around the wealth of Darcy and the financial dilemmas of unmarried women. James Heldman, for example, points out that “[m]oney matters to everyone—to avid readers of Jane Austen as well as to normal people. It certainly mattered to Jane Austen herself. Her novels and her letters are liberally peppered with references to money. Characters are defined by their incomes and fortunes as much as they are by their appearances and their manners” (“How Wealthy” 38). And John McAleer explains that “each character in Pride and Prejudice adds to our knowledge of the workings of the social hierarchy” (74).

6. Austen’s characterization of Bingley and Gardiner reflects this new cultural attitude, and their bourgeois ambition likewise recalls Godwin’s post-Revolutionary critique of ancestral authority in his Enquiry Concerning Political Justice (1793). Godwin argues that “a generous blood, a gallant and fearless spirit, is by no means propagated from father to son” (I: 41). He insists that humans are equal and perfectible beings who maintain “the faculty of being continually made better and receiving perpetual improvement” (I: 92–93). Although neither Bingley nor Gardiner echoes Godwin’s overt criticism of aristocratic heritage, they do embody his advocacy of individual amelioration.

7. Austen’s portrayal of these ambitious male characters reminds us of Godwin’s depiction of Barnabas Tyrrel in Caleb Williams (1794). Like Bingley and Gardiner, Tyrrel is a thriving member of the middle class who has raised himself in the social class system; Godwin even announces that he “might have passed for a true model of the English squire” (16). Bingley and Gardiner attempt to imitate the behavior of such an ersatz gentleman, and while Austen, unlike Godwin, does not allow a villainous aristocrat to murder her aspiring men, she also does not allow her men of trade to assume aristocratic standing.

8. McAleer concludes that to Mr. Bingley “has fallen the task of acquiring a landed estate, the essential move that will establish him as a gentleman” (73).

9. When his sisters laugh at the report that the Bennets have an uncle who resides “somewhere near Cheapside,” Bingley responds, “If they had uncles enough to fill all Cheapside … it would not make them one jot less agreeable” (30). As a man of trade himself, Bingley defends the domestic location of Mr. Gardiner, but Darcy instructs his friend that having relations in this mercantile center “must very materially lessen [the Bennet sisters’] chance of marrying men of any consideration in the world.” Bingley makes “no answer” to Darcy’s explanation, and his silence suggests his inability to understand fully the importance of class to complex social power structures and potential marital unions (31).

10. Juliet McMaster argues that “in Bingley we see the best of social mobility. He is good-humored and charming, and he never stands on ceremony” (“Class” 124). McMaster accurately identifies the attractive qualities of Bingley’s character, but he is still a man in transition, and his social instability prevents him from experiencing utter happiness like Darcy.

11. Dennis Allen claims that “Jane and Bingley are prevented from the consummation of their love by diffidence, which makes each doubt that his or her love is reciprocated, and they are separated by Bingley’s malleability, which makes him excessively dependent on Darcy’s opinion.” Allen concludes that “[t]heir reunion is brought about … by a reversal of Darcy’s machinations, itself evidence that Bingley is still easily influenced” (436). Even at the novel’s close, Darcy retains a definite degree of influence over his friend; Darcy managed to remove Bingley from Jane, and he now maneuvers to bring them together again.
12. For an interesting discussion of the marriage between Jane and Bingley, see Joel Weinsheimer’s “Chance and the Hierarchy of Marriages in *Pride and Prejudice*,” 18–19, Marvin Mudrick, *Jane Austen: Irony as Defense and Discovery* 105, and Bruce Stovel’s “A Contrariety of Emotion’: Jane Austen’s Ambivalent Lovers in *Pride and Prejudice*,” 29.


14. Mrs. Reynolds, in her discussions with the Gardiners, claims that she “never had a cross word from [Darcy] in my life, and I have known him ever since he was four years old. . . . If I was to go through the world, I could not meet with a better.” She speaks of Darcy as “the best landlord, and the best master . . . that ever lived” (218–19). David Monaghan indicates that “Darcy does not expect his employees to be groveling subordinates, but regards them as sensible human beings whose respect must be earned. Neither does he see them simply as instruments of labour, but rather as rational human beings who must be included in the community of the big house and introduced to Pemberley values” (83). Susan Morgan adds that “Darcy is an outstanding member of society, a landowner with both power and responsibility” (80). Mrs. Reynolds’s comments may be the result of many years of intimacy with Darcy, but critics continue to laud the hero as a remarkable man.

15. Gardiner may model many of the masculine traits requested by Burke, but the tradesman also relies upon his reason, and he understands that in a modern post-chivalric nation men are not killed in duels. Moreover, when he joins Mr. Bennet in London, he agrees to assist his brother-in-law in his plan to “enquire at all the principal hotels in town,” even though “Mr. Gardiner himself did not expect any success from this measure, but as his brother was eager in it, he meant to assist him in pursuing it” (260). Mr. Gardiner is a dutiful man who is willing to serve when needed, but he has nothing to prove. He is neither a youth who feels compelled to impress others with his valor and virility, nor a stern man of rigid tradition who must impose a strict procedural policy. He shows no inclination to “correct” idiotic people like Mr. Collins or Mrs. Bennet, and he, like Mr. Bennet, does not believe that the purpose of life is to “make sport for our neighbours, and laugh at them in our turn” (323). Gardiner is not interested in establishing unquestionable authority or raising himself at the expense of others. He is a respectable character because of his mature social affability that enables him to enhance his cultural role.

**Notes to Chapter 5**

1. In the early 1970s, a period that witnessed a severe reconfiguration of Austen as a politically invested writer, Duckworth and Butler turned to *Mansfield Park* to demonstrate Austen’s anxiety about the stability of her society. Duckworth claims that in this novel Austen “is concerned with defining a proper relation between the individual and society” (37). Duckworth explains that such a relationship revolves around the individual’s appreciation for the landed estate; he insists that individuals must discover and embrace their “proper” relation to society to “improve” the estate, cleansing it of modern perversions and returning it to an ancestral status. Duckworth concludes that “an estate is the appropriate home of what Burke terms the ‘collected reason of the ages’ or the ‘wisdom of our ancestors’; and for Jane Austen as for Burke, historical prescription is an important basis for social and moral behavior” (58). Duckworth aligns Austen with Burke, suggesting that
Mansfield Park illustrates an ambition to recreate a nation rooted in ancestral wisdom, historical precedents, and traditional modes of behavior. Butler, likewise, reads the narrative as an explicitly anti-Jacobin text, claiming that “Mansfield Park is the most visibly ideological of Jane Austen's novels. . . . [in which] she can exploit to the full the artistic possibilities of the conservative case” (War of Ideas 219). Butler argues that “the theme of Mansfield Park is the contrast of man-centred or selfish habits of mind, with a temper that is sceptical of self and that refers beyond self to objective values” (Jane Austen and the War of Ideas 247). For Butler, Austen's novel advocates the sacrifice of self-importance for the good of the national community and its “shared” values.

2. Alma Zook investigates what she terms “the one explicitly astronomical reference in all of [Austen’s] novels” and concludes that “Miss Austen gets it right.” Zook indicates that the narrator’s “reporting of the evening sky during this incident is sufficiently accurate and detailed,” and Austen's precise description of this evening’s sky suggests her concern with this event (29). Zook maintains that Austen’s description of the night sky is accurate enough “that one may determine, to a fair degree of precision, the orientation of the drawing room at Mansfield Park in which this conversation takes place” (29).

3. Edmund appears to endorse Burke's revised version of the social contract as a “partnership [in which] all men have equal rights; but not to equal things.” Burke adds that “he that has but five shillings in the partnership, has as good a right to it, as he that has five hundred pound has to his larger proportion” (110). Austen's hero, per Burke's theory, works to ensure that each member of society assumes a stable and efficient role in the nation.

4. Yuval-Davis effectively discusses the tripartite national significance of women, as she analyzes three discourses that “use” women to perpetuate national projects: (1) the people as power; (2) the eugenicist; and (3) the Malthusian. For an extensive discussion of these discourses, see Yuval-Davis 26–38.

5. For a detailed discussion of the Prince Regent's scandalous activity, see Sales 56–83.

6. This early encounter highlights Edmund's role as a supporter and protector of Fanny, and as Laura Mooneyham argues, his first act for his cousin "prepares us for the role Edmund will play in Fanny's education" (71). While we are far removed from his eventual marriage to the heroine, our hero quickly demonstrates his pastoral care for Fanny.

7. Pepper Worthington argues that “we are convinced Edmund Bertram will wear no lace on his shirts, no flowers in his lapels, no gold on his fingers, no make-up on his face.” He maintains that Edmund is “a man of character . . . steady, predictable, the salt of the earth” (73).

8. Oliver MacDonagh notes that Edmund “presents the clergyman as social moulder,” concluding that “it is not precisely social control which Edmund here envisages, but rather a form of social husbandry” (44).

9. Gary Kelly suggests that while “Mary Crawford . . . can only see the church as a field of play for the individual and the individualist,” Edmund defends “the church as an important moral and therefore an important social institution . . . [echoing] the greatest British attacker of individualism and defender of traditional social institutions, that other Edmund, one of the greatest public speakers of the age, Edmund Burke” (“Reading Aloud” 133, 135). Tony Tanner maintains that Austen “clearly considered the role of the clergyman as being of special importance—less for the saving of souls . . . and more for the saving of society” (170).
10. For a specific discussion of the history of Lovers’ Vows, see Pedley 311–12. Edmund’s initial concerns with converting his father’s house into a private theatre and allowing women to act are particularly important to Pedley’s consideration of the scandalous dramatic production. Pedley specifically investigates the social opprobrium of female actors.

11. Duckworth notes that “despite all his reasoning, his agreement to act in the play marks his surrender to Mary Crawford’s sexual attraction” (63). Mary later remembers his struggle to resist participating in the histrionic activities and proclaims, “His sturdy spirit to bend as it did! Oh! it was sweet beyond expression” (325). Depicting Edmund as a fallen hero in a sinister manner, Mary invokes the discourse of the heroic male reminiscent of Burke’s writings but also notes her ability to tempt the “hero” into dangerous detours. She seems aware of Edmund’s simultaneous attraction and repulsion to her and the opportunities she offers.

12. Following Edmund’s disappointing evening at the ball, he departs for a week to Peterborough. Anticipating his son’s eventual occupancy at Thornton Lacey, Sir Thomas informs Fanny that “As to Edmund, we must learn to do without him. This will be the last winter of his belonging to us, as he has done” (257). Predicting Edmund’s permanent move from Mansfield, Sir Thomas presents his son as an adolescent male on the verge of manhood.

13. Sir Thomas’s behavior is reminiscent of Imlay’s Lord B—, who maintains that “the tranquility of society depended upon the tyranny which should be continually exercised over [women], otherwise a female empire would destroy every thing that was beautiful, and which the talents of ages had accumulated” (106).

14. For an impressive discussion of Edmund’s strange feelings for Fanny at this point in the novel, see Claudia Johnson, Jane Austen: Women, Politics, and the Novel, 117.

15. We learn that Sir Thomas has proclaimed that his younger son “must be for ever divided from Miss Crawford” (413).

16. Austen uses the subjunctive mood to relate the alteration in her hero’s attitude, revealing that this shift remains contrary to reality.

17. Critics, not surprisingly, have diverse views on the closing marriage of Mansfield Park. Laura Mooneyham notes the “relative passivity” that permeates the “scope allowed Edmund’s and Fanny’s romantic resolution.” Mooneyham maintains that “Austen no doubt considered a love scene between Fanny and Edmund an unnecessary effusion” (105–6). Julia Prewitt Brown, on the other hand, claims that “the marriage of Fanny and Edmund is consciously invested with hope” (98). John Skinner reminds us that the strange marital union “further undermines expectations of orderly dénouement” (139). Austen tells us of “the joyful consent which met Edmund’s application” for marriage (430), but Masami Usui correctly asserts that the “ending of Fanny’s happy marriage . . . cannot be judged by the conventional value of marriage” (21). Moira Ferguson astutely mentions that when Edmund “decides [Fanny] will make him an appropriate wife, her parents’ response is not mentioned. We assume they are neither told nor invited to the wedding” (125).

Notes to Chapter 6

1. Mary Evans places Austen’s work in the context of England’s post–French Revolution modernization and indicates that its “transformation . . . into an industrial capitalist
society involved the thorough integration of all aspects of social and material life into a form of order compatible with the demands of a society geared to the maximization of profit” (3). In this newly developing world, states must organize and employ any and all social resources, including their populations, effectively and strategically. Although the community of Highbury is not yet industrialized, *Emma* prefigures significant modifications in England’s ancestral economic system, such as the rise of the trade class and the optimism of the yeomanry.

2. Austen dedicated the work to the Prince Regent, and it received the rave reviews of Walter Scott, England’s most prolific and best-known author of the day. For a specific discussion of Austen’s dedication and Scott’s review, see B. C. Southam’s Introduction to *Jane Austen: The Critical Heritage, Vol. I*. In the twentieth century, Trilling dubbed the novel’s representation of England as “idyllic” (59), and Susan Morgan hailed it as “the great English novel of the early nineteenth century” (50).

3. Duckworth reads Austen’s corpus as a body of conservative Tory texts that advocate social improvement via the improvement of the manor estate in her novels. He uses *Mansfield Park* as the basis for this argument and claims that *Emma* is also extremely concerned with improving the estate; however, he claims *Persuasion* is a failure because the estate is abandoned. It is worth noting that when Frank brings Harriet back to Hartfield after the encounter with the gypsies, Austen tells us that Emma quickly gave “notice of there being such a set of people in the neighbourhood to Mr. Knightley” (301).

4. The heroine’s description of Donwell may have inspired Trilling’s idyllic account of the world of *Emma*. He asserts that “there appears in *Emma* a tendency to conceive of a specifically English ideal of life” (53). He adds that “we cannot help feeling that ‘English verdure, English culture, English comfort, seen under a sun bright without being oppressive’ make an England perceived—if but for a moment—as an idyll” (57).

5. Foucault continues by pointing out that this modern individual is one “who lives, speaks, and works in accordance with the laws of an economics, a philology, and a biology . . . a being whose nature (that which determines it, contains it, and has traversed it from the beginning of time) is to know nature, and itself, in consequence, as a natural being” (*Order of Things* 310).

6. Foucault explains that “to man’s experience a body has been given, a body which is his body—a fragment of ambiguous space, whose peculiar and irreducible spatiality is nevertheless articulated upon the space of things” (*Order of Things* 314).

7. It is interesting that while Knightley is tremendously critical of Frank throughout the story, our hero also envies his youthful counterpart. Late in the novel, Knightley informs Emma that “Frank Churchill is, indeed, the favourite of fortune. Every thing turns out for his good.—He meets with a young woman at a watering-place, gains her affection, cannot even weary her by negligent treatment—and had he and all his family sought round the world for a perfect wife for him, they could not have found her superior.—His aunt is in the way.—His aunt dies.—He has only to speak.—His friends are eager to promote his happiness.—He has used every body ill—and they are all delighted to forgive him.—He is a fortunate man indeed!” (388).

8. Johnson argues that “in moving to Hartfield, Knightley is sharing [Emma’s] home, and in placing himself within her domain, Knightley gives his blessing to her rule” (*Jane Austen* 143).

9. Mrs. Arlbery later adds that in such a marriage, “The balance is always just, where
force is not used. The man has his reasons for chusing you; you have your reasons for suffering yourself to be chosen. What his are, you have no business to enquire; nor has he the smallest right to investigate yours” (780).

10. Knightley adds later that Mr. Martin was bitterly distressed by the rejection of his proposal, claiming that “a man cannot be more so” (90).

11. Mrs. Weston, interestingly enough, later directly confronts Mr. Knightley about his inexperience regarding intimate companions, reminding him that he is “so much used to [living] alone” that he “[does] not know the value of a companion” (32).

12. Although he refers to Harriet as a potential “silly wife” early in the novel, he later reports on her education and social development, announcing to Emma that she has become “an artless, amiable girl, with very good notions, very seriously good principles . . . placing her happiness in the affections and utility of domestic life” (431). Knightley discusses earlier signs of Harriet’s social improvement. See specifically 293–95 and 298.

13. Prior to leaving for London, Knightley asks Emma if she has “any thing to send or say, besides the ‘love,’ which nobody carries” (348). While his comment is certainly conventional, it also suggests the hero’s conception of love.

14. Knightley has made earlier mention of his knowledge of and intimacy with Emma from an early age. He tells Mrs. Weston that “Emma is spoiled by being the cleverest of her family. At ten years old, she had the misfortune of being able to answer questions which puzzled her sister at seventeen” (32).

Notes to Chapter 7

1. Nina Auerbach’s groundbreaking essay, “O Brave New World: Evolution and Revolution in *Persuasion,*” ushered in a new wave of criticism on this final completed Austen novel. Auerbach argued that *Persuasion* develops a new world that will be “guided by emotion and vision” and “governed by nature and by human desire.” The men and women of the old landed interests “who cannot accommodate themselves to these laws . . . are threatened and deprived of power” by “the representatives of nature and feeling” (117). Many critics have followed Auerbach’s lead in discussing how the novel imagines both the death of an old world and the development of a new world. Tony Tanner argues that “in this novel . . . institutions and codes and related values have undergone a radical transformation or devaluation. There are values, but many of them are new; and they are relocated or resisted” (216). Charles J. Rzepka returns specifically to Auerbach’s articles and claims that “in *Persuasion,* the highest type of self-realization, for women as for men, seems to be comprised in the notion of active contribution, not in claims to individual rights and privileges, nor to freedom or self-assertion and self-expression, all of which can more aptly be said to characterize the values of Sir Walter and Elizabeth . . . than of Anne Elliot and Frederick Wentworth” (108). See also Timothy Fulford’s “Romanticizing the Empire: The Naval Heroes of Southey, Coleridge, Austen, and Marryat.”

2. Wentworth’s naval background is very important to the maritime marriage that ends this novel. Tanner notes that “even though Anne and Wentworth are models of emotional stability and constancy, the emotions are by nature inherently potentially unstable” (246). Prewitt Brown adds that “Anne and Wentworth inherit the England of *Persuasion,* if only because they see it, and will experience it, as it really is: fragmented and uncertain. For the first time in Jane Austen, the future is not linked with the land” (146).

3. Roger Sales refers to Sir Walter as “an ageing dandy who spends a lot of time
admiring his face and figure in large looking-glasses. The family portraits watch him watching himself” (172).

4. Interestingly, he had earlier attempted to “free” himself from the Elliot tradition by marrying without the authorization of Sir Walter. Austen relates that “instead of pushing his fortune in the line marked out for the heir of the house of Elliot, he had purchased independence by uniting himself to a rich woman of inferior birth” (14).

5. Many critics have discussed this stubborn quality of Wentworth. Johnson claims that the hero’s “steadfastness to the point of inflexibility actually aligns him with Sir Walter, and he must mitigate his self-will before reconciliation is possible” (Jane Austen 157). Michael Williams indicates that Wentworth “has a large and not unjustified self-confidence; he is always in search of sweeping and decisive action, always impatient of mere convention. He will where necessary defy authority, and he has an understanding that is as quick, emotionally, as it is in every other way” (163). LeRoy W. Smith simply dubs Wentworth “the most headstrong of Austen’s heroes” (158). Smith adds that “Wentworth is not a fool or a hypocrite, but he is trapped by circumstances, sexual bias and masculine egotism. Before he can discover his own full nature or what a woman is, he must, like the female, exorcise the internalised patriarchal presence” (160).

6. Austen’s novel is very much concerned with the financial successes of the navy during the Napoleonic Wars. For a detailed discussion of the financial prosperity enjoyed by many members of the British naval force, see Peter Smith’s “Jane Austen’s Persuasion and the Secret Conspiracy” and Monica F. Cohen’s “Persuading the Navy Home: Austen and Married Women’s Professional Property.”

7. Austen carefully constructs Benwick’s character. She relates that after the death of Fanny Harville, Benwick “considered his disposition as of the sort which must suffer heavily, uniting very strong feelings with quiet, serious, and retiring manners, and a decided taste for reading, and sedentary pursuits” (94–95). Austen also aligns Benwick with Byron and Scott through his tastes in poetry (98).

8. Prior to arriving in Bath, Wentworth travels “to see his brother in Shropshire,” and we do not hear about Wentworth until Anne accidentally encounters Admiral Croft in Bath (128). Anne and the Admiral discuss the surprising news from Lyme that the melancholic Benwick and the recovering Louisa plan to marry. The Admiral attempts to explain Wentworth’s response to this happening, suggesting that “Frederick is not a man to whine and complain; he has too much spirit for that. If the girl likes another man better, it is very fit she should have him” (163). Admiral Croft speaks of his brother-in-law as both a spirited and a rational man—one who will recover from this “disappointment” and one who apparently understands the rationale for Louisa’s change of heart. The Admiral describes Wentworth as a strong individual who will overcome this setback, but we discover that the news of Benwick’s relationship with Louisa actually fosters the hero’s active pursuit of his desires for Anne.

9. Deleuze and Guattari believe that “sexuality is the production of a thousand sexes, which are so many uncontrollable becomings” (Thousand Plateaus 278). A sexual subject, according to Deleuze and Guattari, has the potential to experience a vast diversity of sexes, sexualities, and sexual sensations. The male figures of Austen’s corpus are strongly discouraged from pursuing such profound multiplicity; in the decades following the unrest in France, the English nation requires sturdy and regulated men who can reestablish order.

10. He openly discusses the turmoil and pain of their recent trip to Lyme, concluding that “the day has produced some effects however—has had some consequences which
must be considered as the very reverse of frightful” (172). Wentworth’s comment suggests his emerging understanding of the need to embrace unexpected events and surprising emotions. He is beginning to realize the significance of dynamic desires and malleability, and Anne reflects upon the alteration in Wentworth’s behavior.

11. Austen relates how during this coastal expedition, “Captain Wentworth [had] looked round at [Anne] instantly in a way which shewed his noticing of it. He gave her a momentary glance,—a glance of brightness, which seemed to say, ‘That man [Mr. Elliot] is struck with you,—and even I, at this moment, see something like Anne Elliot again’” (101).

12. Following the concert, Wentworth continues to struggle with his envy of Mr. Elliot, and when he encounters Anne in the company of the Harvilles and Musgroves she observes that “the same unfortunate persuasion, which had hastened him away from the concert room, still governed. He did not seem to want to be near enough for conversation.” Wentworth remains apprehensive; he is frightened to reveal his powerful feelings for the heroine that could expose the latent multiplicity of his self and the potential malleability of his masculinity. When Anne discusses the travel plans of Mr. Elliot, “she felt that Captain Wentworth was looking at her; the consciousness of which vexed and embarrassed her, and made her regret that she had said so much” (209).

13. Anne charges that men are quicker to forget amorous emotions than women, instructing Harville that men “have always a profession, pursuits, business of some sort or other, to take you back into the world immediately, and continual occupation and change soon weaken impressions” (219). While Anne maintains a rather traditional view that women live a private life while men engage the public realm, Harville attempts to counter Anne’s argument by employing a naval image. He declares, “if I could but make you comprehend what a man suffers when he takes a last look at his wife and children, and watches the boat that he has sent them off in, as long as it is in sight, and then turns away and says, ‘God knows whether we ever meet again!’” (221). Harville’s response reminds us of the transitory nautical existence that both he and Wentworth have lived over the past eight years and helps us imagine the emotion experienced by Wentworth during his time in the navy. We soon discover that Wentworth’s various movements have not lessened his affection for the heroine.

14. Austen, on the final page of the story, specifically addresses Wentworth’s compassionate assistance of Mrs. Smith “by putting her in the way of recovering her husband’s property in the West Indies; by writing for her, acting for her, and seeing her through all the petty difficulties of the case, with the activity and exertion of a fearless man and a determined friend” (237).

Notes to Conclusion

1. Smith explained that “the annual labour of every nation is the fund which originally supplies it with all the necessaries and conveniences of life which it annually consumes, and which consist always, either in the immediate produce of that labour, or in what is purchased with that produce from other nations” (8). Smith adds that “the greatest improvement in the productive powers of labour, and the greater part of the skill, dexterity, and judgment with which it is any where directed, or applied, seem to have been the effects of the division of labour” (11).

2. I have argued elsewhere that America has historically turned to Austen as a potent
disciplinary force who has the power in both popular and academic culture to enforce conservative norms of heterosexuality. For a further discussion of this topic, see my article “The Potency of Jane, or the Disciplinary Function of Austen in America.” Patricia Rozema’s filmic adaptation of Mansfield Park (1999), the last of the Austen films released in the 1990s, posed a clear challenge to Morrow’s conception of Austen. Jay Carr pronounced that Rozema’s version of the fall of the Bertram family “continues Jane Austen’s winning streak on film,” and Kristine Huntley predicted that “yet another wave of Jane Austen mania is about to hit,” but Rozema’s film presented American popular culture with a notably distinct “Austen.” The “Austen” of Rozema’s Mansfield Park showed little inclination to inform us how to behave as stable socially proper sexualized subjects, and the movie left Americans wondering what happened to “Dear Aunt Jane.” Eleanor Ringel Gillespie angrily asserted that Rozema revised the tale by giving it “a dash of lesbianism, a pinch of feminism and a dollop of social conscience.” Desson Howe was also upset with this recent “perversion” of Austen’s genteel world; Howe argued that “Rozema pushes the subtle Austen off the cliff of discretion. And discretion is the very essence of Austen’s writing.” Howe and Gillespie’s comments reveal their expectation for an Austen who values the predictable simplicity of a mythical prior culture; like Morrow, Howe and Gillespie present Austen’s stories as models of safety, manners, and propriety. Gillespie even concludes that “Rozema’s at-arm’s-length contemporary agenda may work as an intellectual exercise, but it robs the movie of any sense of anything being at stake.”

And yet, Rozema’s film actually heightens the social significance of Austen’s corpus. The filmic adaptation captures the social complexity, sexual dynamism, and cultural instability of post-Revolutionary England, but as Johnson notes, these are features of Austen’s corpus that admirers prefer to ignore. Johnson explains that “Rozema’s movie is controversial because a powerful nostalgia motivates many assumptions about Austen, who is imagined to have celebrated a life that unfolded before the advent of the ills of modernity—such as doubt, war and, more recently, feminism and multiculturalism” (“This Is a Mansfield Park”). Although Austen’s texts capture a moment of severe crisis in the history of the modern English nation, contemporary American culture continues to maintain an anachronistic view of Austen as a wise counselor who can provide us with guidelines for living a civilized and well-mannered life, replete with sexual regulations and gendered propriety. Rozema’s film awakens American society to the reality that Austen never sought to offer an instruction manual for social/sexual stability. Austen’s works do not provide us with characters who serve as paragons of the appropriate male and female subject; nor do her tales necessarily inform us how to live as stable and singular sexualized creatures. Austen’s novels detail the responses of men and women to post-Revolutionary society’s desires for their sexualities, and her narratives document how men and women curtail and manage their desires to ensure both their individual security and their involvement in the modern nation. Austen never attempts to draw us a map to a promised land of social stability; her works, indeed, suggest that such a sphere does not exist. She does, however, point the way to the sea, and while the sea holds no promises of security, it allows individuals the opportunity to embrace their own diversity as well as the complexity of others. It is at the sea where men and women can transcend the limits of their modern finitude and explore new desires without becoming reterritorialized.
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