Distribution Agreement

In presenting this thesis as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for a degree from Emory University, I hereby grant to Emory University and its agents the non-exclusive license to archive, make accessible, and display my thesis in whole or in part in all forms of media, now or hereafter now, including display on the World Wide Web. I understand that I may select some access restrictions as part of the online submission of this thesis. I retain all ownership rights to the copyright of the thesis. I also retain the right to use in future works (such as articles or books) all or part of this thesis.

Colleen Carroll April 8, 2021

Gender, Heroines, and Society in *Pride and Prejudice* and *The Mysteries of Udolpho*

by

Colleen Carroll

Dr. Paul Kelleher
Adviser

Department of English

Dr. Paul Kelleher
Adviser

Dr. Judith Miller
Committee Member

Dr. Patricia Cahill
Committee Member

2021

Gender, Heroines, and Society in *Pride and Prejudice* and *The Mysteries of Udolpho*

By

Colleen Carroll

Dr. Paul Kelleher
Adviser

An abstract of
a thesis submitted to the Faculty of Emory College of Arts and Sciences
of Emory University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements of the degree of
Bachelor of Arts with Honors

Department of English

2021

Abstract

Gender, Heroines, and Society in *Pride and Prejudice* and *The Mysteries of Udolpho*

By Colleen Carroll

For centuries, historical narratives have focused on men. While interest in and scholarship on women in history has grown in the past few decades, the gap has yet to have been filled. Even though there is distinctly less historical documentation of women throughout time, there are still ways in which modern scholars can dig deeper into the experience of womanhood in the past. This honors thesis explores the ways in which the novel, particularly the late-Georgian British novel, serves as a crucial source of evidence for historians studying women and the construction of gender.

The central texts I consider in this thesis are Ann Radcliffe's *The Mysteries of Udolpho*, Jane Austen's *Pride and Prejudice*, and Hester Thrale Piozzi's *Thraliana*. I argue that Austen's and Radcliffe's novels, by rendering depictions of women's thoughts and feelings, document aspects of women's experiences that too often are excluded from the historical record. The *Thraliana*, Piozzi's diary that spans the years between 1776 and 1809, confirms and amplifies many of the insights into women's lives that we find in Radcliffe's and Austen's novels. My arguments are in conversation with scholars such Ian Watt, Claudia L. Johnson, Nancy Armstrong, and Julia Epstein. Moreover, I situate my analyses of Radcliffe, Austen, and Piozzi in their historical context through discussions of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century newspapers, periodicals, and advertisements.

In chapter one, I demonstrate how the interconnections between social convention and literary convention shaped understandings of gender during the period; further, I argue that the emphasis placed on the everyday in the era's novels makes these fictional texts revealing

portraits of familiar, everyday women. In chapter two, I discuss how Radcliffe's and Austen's heroines transgress various gender norms and yet still engage an approving readership. Chapter three considers the novel form's unique ability to minimize the distance between a reader and the fictional heroine; accordingly, I suggest how readers are invited to internalize a desire to question the conventions of gender. Finally, I conclude my thesis by exploring some of the broader implications of using literature as a way to illuminate the history of gender.

Gender, Heroines, and Society in *Pride and Prejudice* and *The Mysteries of Udolpho*

By

Colleen Carroll

Dr. Paul Kelleher
Adviser

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Emory College of Arts and Sciences
of Emory University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements of the degree of
Bachelor of Arts with Honors

Department of English

2021

Acknowledgements

Thank you to Dr. Paul Kelleher for signing on to serve as my adviser all those months ago and for helping me navigate my way to a completed thesis. Every meeting with you helped clarify my ideas and encouraged me to continue to pursue this ambitious project. Thank you to Dr. Patricia Cahill and Dr. Judith Miller for agreeing to serve on my committee when I sent a desperate plea out a week before the committee deadline. Your willingness to join this project at a moment's notice not only saved my frayed nerves but reminded me of how lucky I am to be at an institution with professors who believe and support their students wholeheartedly. Thank you to Dr. Laura Otis for all that I learned in ENG490W and for helping me shape those first fifteen pages. Thank you to Dr. Judith Evans Grubbs for your many years of support as my history advisor and for your interest in my thesis despite over a millennium separating your era of study and that of this thesis. Thank you to Dr. Martine Brownley who first introduced me to the works of Hester Thrale Piozzi. Thank you to each and every professor I have had at Emory who in their own unique way helped me reach this point.

Thank you to my friends and family who have tolerated me talking about this thesis for months on end. A particular thank you to Delaney Sheldon for not only being a tremendous roommate, friend, and classmate, but for commiserating on a daily (if not hourly) basis on the trials of writing a thesis in the midst of a global pandemic. Getting to hear your project take shape has been a great joy this year. Thank you to our two other roommates, Maedot Admassu and Alisa Yan, for tolerating our "boring conversations" between episodes of *The Great British Baking Show*. I never would have guessed when we met the first week of college how much the three of you would shape my years at Emory for the better.

Thank you to my mom, Dr. Caroline DuPont, for chatting with me about eighteenth-century women on our quarantine walks, for instilling in me a love of stories from my earliest years, and for ensuring that I knew women could do anything. Thank you to my dad, Paul Carroll, for answering my many phone calls during the great computer fiasco and for your endless love and support. Thank you to my dear sister, Catherine Carroll, for your unwavering belief in me and for being my lifelong friend. Finally, thank you with all of my heart to my grandparents, Helen and Bob DuPont, for your generous and constant support of my education. As a lover of learning, this gift has been the greatest one you could ever give me.

Table of Contents

Introduction

> *I now wish to proceed to examples, which will be brief since I have avoided the fatigue of reading every history book available, knowing that their authors, being men and jealous of women's noble deeds, have not recounted women's most worthy actions but have remained silent about them. I cite the words of the historians themselves, and I warn my readers that there may be many errors in their language, since they were not very careful with their words*
>
> – Lucrezia Marinella, *The Nobility and Excellence of Women*, 81

This quote from the seventeenth-century Italian writer Lucrezia Marinella stunned me as I read *The Nobility and Excellence of Women*. In the space of a brief moment, I felt an intense bond form between me and this woman who lived and wrote four hundred years ago. Why did I feel this connection? I believe it was because Marinella expressed a sentiment that I myself had felt repeatedly throughout my study of history, that women's stories throughout time have been neglected or misrepresented. With this thesis on late-Georgian[1] British women I hope to play my part in breaking this cycle of ignoring the worthiness of women of the past.

From my earliest years I remember searching for the women in virtually everything around me. As I got older and reflected on this tendency, I often cringed at my habit to fixate on gender, particularly as I learned more about the gender spectrum and the harmfulness of presenting gender as a strict binary. Why did I fall for the 'boys versus girls' mentality so completely? I can easily blame the media and marketing companies of my youth who constantly stressed the difference. Everything was gendered: from *The Dangerous Book for Boys* and *The Daring Book for Girls*, to the "boy's toy" and "girl's toy" from McDonalds, and so many other parts of my early life.

[1] For the sake of this research, the late Georgian period will be considered to be the period between 1750 and 1850, as many of the social and literary norms that appeared in the late eighteenth century continued to impact Britain well into the nineteenth century.

If I take away my immediate feelings of guilt for my obsession with gender in my early years, I am left with a different answer completely. I was hunting, like so many children do, for figures to identify with. This is not a new idea, Rudine Sims Bishop's work on children's literature using the metaphor of mirrors and windows explained this need long ago. According to Sims Bishop, in literature a window occurs when a book presents readers with a perspective, "imagined or real, familiar or new, panoramic or narrow," which can allow readers to "…walk through in imagination to become a part of whatever world has been created or re-created in the book…" (Sims Bishop 11). In turn, mirrors are when the experiences of the reader are reflected by the book back at the reader (Sims Bishop 11). My interest in finding women in the media around me stemmed from a desire to find windows that I both wanted to walk through, and which mirrored my identity. This urge never really left me. I wish I could feign adult superiority and say I have outgrown this tendency to wish to place myself in the shoes of women in fiction and history, but I have not. Perhaps I can blame my past in theatre because if "[a]ll the world's a stage" then every character, whether historical or fictional, is a potential role (Shakespeare 2.7.140). Or, perhaps, it is just one of my innate qualities. Either way, this urge found considerable pushback as I grew older and began studying history more in depth.

If the traditional history book were a play, men would get all the best parts. While famous historical women certainly exist, Cleopatra, Queen Elizabeth I, Marie Curie, Dolly Madison, in comparison to the number of men represented in history, women are comparatively absent. Men get to be Alexander the Great, George Washington, Percy Shelley, Albert Einstein, Socrates, Emperor Constantine, William Shakespeare, Brutus, Oscar Wilde, Aaron Burr, Richard III, King Tutankhamun, Abraham Lincoln, Napoleon Bonaparte, F. Scott Fitzgerald, and many other complex cultural or political figures. These male figures were dynamic; some were heroes, some

villains, and others were morally ambiguous. Some figures were known to be smart, witty, or crafty, while others emerge as the fool. And while many were revered, just as many seemed to be despised in the annals of history. In the standard accounts, women tend to lack nuance. More than just being one-dimensional, women appear to only be remembered as either saintly, villainous, or hyper-sexual. While I do not wish to fault the women who fall into these categories, as they are certainly worthy of study, having these be the only options available to study has felt, and continues to feel, unsatisfying.

My experience with English classes has been slightly different. Literature has often proved to be a refuge for me when history feels too male-dominated. In my middle school and high school curriculums I had *Anne of Green Gables*, *Jane Eyre,* Scout from *To Kill a Mockingbird*, or even Beatrice from *Much Ado About Nothing* to consider. While gender disparity certainly appears in literature, particularly as one goes back in time, I was able to find engaging women in my study of literature.

At Emory University I decided to pursue a joint-major in English and History. I had a ready response for anyone who asked me why I chose this major: “I think one can’t really study the history of an era without studying what the people were reading at the time and if you do not study the historical context of a book you will miss out on key facets of the work.” While I believed this statement wholeheartedly, and still do, it perhaps overly intellectualized my choice while downplaying my emotional investments. I love stories and people. History and English were two majors in which I could immerse myself in what I enjoy. While periodically my two majors did intersect during my college career, in most classes my study of history and my study of literature remained quite separate. I tended to take history classes that ranged from 700 BCE to 1700 CE, while my English classes were rooted firmly in the eighteenth, nineteenth, and

twentieth centuries. I could not seem to pull myself out of this time period in my literature studies. While the Emory English department clearly offered classes on medieval and renaissance literature, I remained resolutely stuck in the post-English Restoration literary world. In retrospect, I think it was my devotion to the novel that primarily kept me enthralled with the more modern classes. The novel form offered me the personal narratives which I was unwilling to give up.

My history classes, while focusing on the eras prior to that which will be discussed in this paper, tended to have a common trait of their own, gender. While I have taken my fair share of general survey European history courses, when it comes to my electives, I am consistent in everything but time and place. My transcript is full of classes such as, "Women in Roman Law & Society," "Love & Sex Renaissance Europe," "Gender, History & Culture." This senior honors thesis is the combination of my two academic identities, blending my interest in gender in history with my passion for the novel form and its narrative voice. It turns out that, just as I had originally claimed when justifying my decision to pursue a joint major in English and History, the study of one has infinitely benefited from the other.

The argument I will develop in this thesis is as follows: in the late Georgian period, fictional heroines provide important insight into the experiences of familiar, everyday women in British society. I will argue that novels, although fictional, can be understood as compelling historical evidence both due to their ability to reflect the society in which they were written and due to the popularity and structure of the era's novels. I argue that fictional heroines of the time both conform to and transgress gender norms without repercussions. With this literary insight, the complexity and inconsistency of gender expectations of this era is revealed as novels effectively play around with norms in a way not necessarily apparent in standard accounts. I will

use two novels as the foundation of this exploration. Ann Radcliffe's 1794 gothic masterpiece, *The Mysteries of Udolpho* and the timeless 1813 classic, *Pride and Prejudice,* by the incomparable Jane Austen.

This time period affords us a great gift in its focus on the novel. Due to the growing popularity of the novel form and the number of women becoming novelists during the time, we have unique access to the women of this era. While fiction and fact must never be confused, novels provide keen insight into the society in which they were written and in which they were consumed. Popular works of the time are particularly useful as it means that the behaviors and portrayals found in novels were tolerated by contemporary readers often without comment. There are two separate ways in which I assert that literature can contribute to historical thought. The first method is that literature reflects the society in which it was written and therefore can give insight into the era. Sims Bishop points out a phenomenon of literature that affirms this idea:

> [o]ne of the reasons literature exists is to transform human experience, and reflect it back to us so that we can better understand it. Through the mirror of literature we can see our own lives and experiences as part of the larger human experience. Reading then, becomes a means of self-affirmation, or reaffirming our place in the world and our society (Sims Bishop 11).

While Sims Bishops works primarily with twentieth century children's literature, the fundamental quality of literature holds true, literature interacts with the experiences of the everyday writer and reader. This phenomenon becomes even more compelling, in terms of the study of the past, when it is understood that readers of this period expected a degree of realism in their novels, as will be discussed at length in chapter one.

A second way in which fiction may provide historical perspective is with its ability to portray the aspirations or desires of a society. While not every aspect of a piece of literature may exactly replicate life, whatever portrayal appears must reflect something about the person writing it. Novels can be understood as repositories of the inner thoughts of individuals, particularly of thoughts that may not be reflected in other nonfictional sources of an era. Unconventional and groundbreaking ideas may not always be freely shared, but fiction provides a comforting distance that allows writers to explore their contemplations about society.[2] Therefore, the ideas portrayed in fiction can contribute to a general conclusion on the beliefs floating about in a particular period.

Again, one must be careful not to conflate fiction with fact. Fiction cannot be used as a one-for-one replacement for historical documentation. But, with care and supplemental research, literature can contribute to a historical understanding. An argument could easily be made that fictional portrayals do not necessarily indicate the writer or reader's aspirations as they may just signify what ideas were considered entertaining. There is absolutely merit to this argument; however, art always carries power. The novel's ability to contribute to the study of history becomes particularly clear when patterns appear across various works. An idea shared once may be a novelty and hold little impact, but an idea shared repeatedly has impacted society in some way. Using literature to aid historical conclusions must not be done with reckless abandon, but still can be done effectively. Throughout this thesis I will endeavor to use care when utilizing these two novels to contribute to my argument.

[2] Ronald Paulson in "Gothic Fiction and the French Revolution" supports this position as he argues that the gothic genre was used as a space to process certain thoughts and ideas, "[t]he Gothic did in fact serve as a metaphor with which some contemporaries in England tried to come to terms with what was happening across the Channel in the 1790s" (Paulson 534)

This thesis balances analysis of fictional works of literature and historical accounts. Because of this melding together of sources some language norms must be set. I will be using the term “fiction” or “fictional” to refer to those events found in novels. In turn, I will be using words such as “everyday,” “quotidian,” “common,” “routine,” and “familiar” to refer to circumstances outside the bounds of fiction. I have chosen to use this sort of language rather than words like “reality,” “real,” or “truth” as having an understanding of the reality of historical events or time periods is impossible. Even if a source directly outlines an event, scholars can never know for sure that this description is accurate or unbiased. Similarly, the thoughts or beliefs of a single historical figure likely does not reflect the thoughts of the general population. The historical sources I will be using throughout this paper to better understand the everyday lives of late-Georgian women provide the probable or common experiences of women, rather than the real experiences.

My placing these two novels side by side may come as a surprise to some. While less than two decades separate the publication of *The Mysteries of Udolpho* and *Pride and Prejudice*, they are not often associated, given the first is a gothic thriller and the second a novel of manners. Connections are more often drawn between *The Mysteries of Udolpho* and Austen’s *Northanger Abbey*, not least because *Northanger Abbey* parodies the gothic genre and directly references *The Mysteries of Udolpho*. My choice to use these two particular novels, however, was not accidental.

Pride and Prejudice is not only a personal favorite, but the novel to this day remains a staple of literature classes and popular culture. Modern-day readers with their modern standards continue to appreciate the novel’s heroine, Elizabeth Bennet. This enduring interest in *Pride and Prejudice* helps make this study more relevant to contemporary thought. *The Mysteries of*

Udolpho is a slightly less obvious choice on my part. Modern society has largely forgotten Radcliffe's novel. Today, it is remembered and read mostly by gothic fiction buffs, eighteenth-century literature experts, and *Northanger Abbey* fanatics. However, the popularity of gothic fiction in its own time cannot be overstated. In the years following *The Mysteries of Udolpho*'s publication, a slew of books emerged trying to mimic the quintessential Radcliffian style and tone ("Biographical Chronicle" 332). Both works were immensely well-regarded in the time in and around their publishing; therefore, they are useful for this particular study as many works of literature that followed Austen and Radcliffe were influenced by their stylistic choices. I am considering these two novels as representative of larger literary trends. Perhaps more importantly, the popularity of *The Mysteries of Udolpho*, and to a lesser degree *Pride and Prejudice*, in its own time means that the ideas portrayed reached many readers. This far reach potentially gave a book power, a perspective that will be discussed at length in chapter three.

The literary analysis of this thesis primarily aims to provide insight on the society in which the two novels were written. These novels prove to be particularly useful for this exploration as they were written during a period of geopolitical conflict. The tension of the years before, during, and after the French Revolution sent shockwaves through English society. In general, there was an awareness that the events occurring across the channel could impact life at home. Particularly those in the upper English classes must have recognized that it was their French equivalents who were falling from grace. With an understanding of this perspective, it is unsurprising that English novels from this era placed focus on presenting their own lives and society in literature. The traditional ways of life for elite English society did not feel guaranteed or secure in the late-Georgian period as life was changing on both sides of the channel; therefore, glorifying their lives for the masses by way of the novel likely felt more important than ever

before. This understanding of the introspective nature of late-Georgian English society further supports the usage of *The Mysteries of Udolpho* in this thesis. This text proves to be useful, despite the story taking place in sixteenth century France, as Radcliffe probably, if inadvertently, allowed English convention to seep within her novel in keeping with the tradition of the time.

Readers familiar with these two novels may wonder about the role of genre within the scope of this thesis exploration. Genre divisions will largely be ignored throughout this thesis. Traditional studies of these two works often focus closely on genre. While I recognize the benefits of this perspective, a too rigid understanding of genre can lead to interesting arguments and explorations being lost. More importantly, I feel that, in regard to these two books, the boundaries of genre are already blurred.

The Mysteries of Udolpho is quintessentially gothic in its style, in fact many tropes of the genre originated in Radcliffe's work. In contrast, *Pride and Prejudice* is classified as a novel of manners as it focuses more on the quotidian. This thesis will pinpoint a number of shared qualities between the heroines of these two novels, but these novels resemble each other in ways beyond their heroines. As modern readers it is hard to imagine the experience of reading *Pride and Prejudice* for the first time with no preconceived notions. I believe that *Pride and Prejudice* would feel more precarious and unsettling to a first-time reader if one did not know that Darcy and Elizabeth find happiness together in the end. In fact, there are numerous points in the novel where it appears that circumstances may go devastatingly awry. Examples of these perilous moments include when Elizabeth rejects Mr. Collins and her family loses out on their chance to maintain their familial estate, when Bingley vanishes from Jane's life, and the horrific moment when an unmarried Lydia goes missing with a known scoundrel. First-time readers of *Pride and Prejudice* in the late-Georgian period, particularly those reading the novel in its early years of

publication, would likely have been terrified for these characters at these pivotal moments. It seems quite possible that a contemporary reader's response to these quotidian terrors may have been as dramatic as when they read the intense exploits of Emily. Therefore, while I do not comment at length on genre throughout this thesis, it does seem that genre does not completely separate *Pride and Prejudice* and *The Mysteries of Udolpho*.

While this study focuses on the past, my research questions remain pertinent. I mentioned above that in terms of women's rights much has changed since the late Georgian period. While the veracity of this statement is not in question, the struggle for women's rights is far from over. Women today still fight for their rights across the globe. Too often women must justify occupying space and asserting their opinion in current society. When faced with these ongoing struggles, I believe it is intellectually illuminating and empowering to have an understanding of the complexity of women's lives in what is often understood as the dawn of modernity in Britain (that is, post-Restoration, Enlightenment-era Britain). The woman who demands a place at the table is not a different breed or species than those women who navigated life during this time. Women have always been complex and fully realized beings.

I am hopeful that others will be interested in my pursuit of using literature to better understand women of the past and the society in which they lived. I am heartened to see the popularity of the new Netflix show *Bridgerton*, an adaptation of Julia Quinn's Regency-era romance novel series of the same name. While *Bridgerton* unabashedly fictionalizes and dramatizes this period, it seems to me that a considerable amount of effort has been made to stress to audiences that women in this era were very similar to modern women: strong, smart, and keen to pursue their hopes and desires. These are all traits and qualities that directly appear in late-Georgian heroines and are supported by historical evidence. Perhaps some of the over

eighty-two million *Bridgerton* enthusiasts who watched the series in the first month will be interested to hear that the spectacular early nineteenth century depicted on the small screen bears at least a bit more resemblance to the historical everyday life than they may have originally thought (Gonzales).

This thesis is organized into three chapters. Following this introduction, chapter one addresses the novel form and the historical understanding of the role of gender in both literary society and society at large. With this socio-historical perspective, I hope that readers will better grasp why this particular era and why literature prove to be particularly fruitful for students of women's history. In chapter two, I focus on the two heroines of these novels, Emily St Aubert and Elizabeth Bennet, and pinpoint the striking similarities between the two: specifically, I identify the gender conventions that, in public, Emily and Elizabeth either conform to or break. Readers should finish this chapter firmly understanding how both heroines appear to be, according to the gender ideology of the era, a mixture of the "ideal" woman and a socially defiant woman. Chapter three continues to explore the traits shared between the two heroines, but this time highlighting those which lay beneath the surface of their public exterior. As I will argue, the novel's capacity to represent inner ideas makes it a crucial repository of women's experience, especially of those kinds of experience that either are absent from the archive or are overlooked by "official" histories. I will then close with a brief conclusion featuring a summary of my argument, some meditations on questions left unanswered, and a discussion of related topics that have the potential for further research.

1. Forming Late-Georgian Literature: the Novel, Gender, and the Heroine

This chapter, the first of three, endeavors to clarify the benefit of studying the heroine in late-Georgian novels, such as *The Mysteries of Udolpho* and *Pride and Prejudice*. This task will be accomplished by first examining the link between the study of gender in this period and the study of literature. This will shift into considering how the heroine directly related both to the structure of the British novel and to gender in the literary world during the era in question. I will demonstrate how the treatment of ordinary women, the woman novelist, and the fictional heroine were deeply intertwined and mutually reinforcing. Further, I will address the traits of the late-Georgian novel in order to establish the ways in which novels featuring a heroine specifically warrant historical consideration.

To begin, I will remark briefly on the status of the novel[3] at the time in question. During the eighteenth century, according to Nancy Armstrong in her work *Desire and Domestic Fiction*, novels were not necessarily considered literature despite the most revered specimens of the form earning the title of "polite" (Armstrong 37). Ian Watt is his work *The Rise of the Novel* argues that the diminished status of the novel in the eyes of society likely caused this relegation of the novel outside the circle of literature: "[t]he novel was widely regarded as a typical example of the debased kind of writing by which the booksellers pandered to the reading public" (Watt 54). The diminished status of eighteenth-century novels varied from the status held by the novel form

[3] In the late Georgian period, people frequently made a distinguishment between a novel and a romance in a way that we do not today, "[i]n the 17th and 18th centuries [novels] frequently contrasted with a *romance*, as being shorter and having more relation to real life" ("novel, n."). As a twenty-first-century scholar addressing twenty-first-century readers, I have elected to use the words 'novel' and 'literature' with their modern connotations throughout this thesis. Therefore, for the sake of mutual understanding, late-Georgian romances will fall under the category of novels, and novels will be considered a form of literature. This choice has been made, in part, as the term 'romance' carries complex implications in modern society that do not necessarily reflect the genre as it was perceived in the late Georgian period.

today. An understanding of the ways in which late-Georgian individuals perceived the written texts around them can provide insight into how these works of writing functioned in society.

Gender was deeply tied to the period's literary traditions. The popular perception of gender shifted during this era. Contradictions crop up particularly in the relationship between politics and gender at this time. Armstrong argues that by the nineteenth century a psychological understanding of gender solidified the conclusion that men were inherently political and that women were intrinsically domestic (Armstrong 4). With domesticity, it was implied that women were supposed to navigate solely the private world. Martine Brownley's article, "Eighteenth-Century Women's Images and Roles: The Case of Hester Thrale Piozzi," provides an example of this in the description of the expectations placed on Piozzi, a newly married young women of the time. As Brownley observes, "[h]er mother believed that Hester's time should be divided between entertaining her and caring for babies; Henry Thrale saw women's realm as limited to nursery, bedroom, and drawing room" (Brownley 66). Yet Claudia L. Johnson, in her work *Jane Austen: Women, Politics, and the Novel*, discusses how society considered women to be more political than ever before during this time. It would seem that the circumstances across the channel, the French Revolution and its repercussions, highlighted the ways in which politics directly impacted women: "[w]hereas it had before been implicit, it was now unavoidably plain that women's education, their manners, their modesty, their reading, their opinions about personal happiness, their power of choice in matrimony, and their expectations from married life were all matters of increasingly anxious public concern" (Johnson 2-3). Potentially, the period comes across as at odds with itself. With this conflict in mind, any definite conclusions on perceptions of gender during this time must be made cautiously, as opinions appear to have been shifting.

While caution must be used, it is clear that society during this era perceived men and women as drastically different. An 1841 journal article discusses sex in relation to questions of equality of the era. The writer states:

> [t]here has been much useless argument on the question of the equality of the sexes. We might as well attempt to compare the oak and the rose… Though both sexes possess in common the faculties of mind which are enumerated by philosophers, these faculties are doubtless modified by various courses, so that there often spread a marked difference in their mental organization ("Character and Condition of Woman" 87).

Interestingly, the writer perceives men and women as psychologically different. This same understanding separated masculine writing and feminine writing in the eyes of literary critics. While published after the eighteenth century, this article likely remains in keeping with the perception of gender from the larger period in question. Our interest then may turn to the ways in which late-Georgian sentiments towards gender emerged in and interacted with the literary events of the time.

Gender and the novel were linked during this era, as is apparent from the study of the woman reader of the late Georgian period.[4] Women who read occupied a niche in literary society. Many literary figures, including early-eighteenth-century essayist Joseph Addison, perceived women as appropriating the literary field due to their access to more leisure time (Watt 43). Women did have access to increasing amounts of leisure time due to economic circumstances changing during the eighteenth century (Watt 45). Yet, to conclude that women and men readers functioned entirely separately during this time span would be an

[4] Readership in general was thought to be on the rise in the eighteenth-century and access to novels was increasing due to the emergence of the circulating library (Watts 35, 43).

oversimplification. Discussions of the literary coteries of the time, such as those of Piozzi, provide examples of men and women enjoying literature together, rather than sequestered. As members of literary society were often deeply invested in examining and contemplating the society in which they lived, it is unsurprising that late-Georgian intellectuals would have held opinions on gender. Literary society did not just think about gender in an intellectual manner, but rather literature was directly influenced by the shifts in gender norms in the period.

This influx of women readership meant increased power available to women within the literary world, as they could influence publishers. Watt's understanding of eighteenth-century publishers supports this conclusion:

> [t]he fact that literature in the eighteenth century was addressed to an ever-widening audience must have weakened the relative importance of those readers with enough education and leisure to take a professional or semi-professional interest in classical and modern letters; and in return it must have increased the relative importance of those who desired an easier form of literary entertainment, even if it had little prestige among the literati (Watt 48)

During this period, publishers based their decisions on what would attract readers; therefore, the increased regard for the novel meant the printing of more novels. The increasing number of novels being published likely inspired more to be written. The magnitude of this shift can be comprehended with the additional information that even book publishers represented a shift from the more traditional method of writers partnering with patrons to craft a work (Watt 59). The late Georgian period was a critical moment for the history of the British novel and a critical period for the woman reader to exert her control. But these drastic shifts in British society did not emerge without growing pains.

Society appeared to respond negatively to women's position in the literary field. As discussed by Rachel M. Brownstein's chapter, "Why We Read Jane Austen," debates raged during this period on the implications of the woman reader, particularly the young woman reader (Brownstein 26). Young women were even shamed for their interest in reading, according to nineteenth-century accounts, by being called "a blue stocking" ("Character and Condition of Woman" 88). This nickname referenced the looked-down-upon group of women comprised of Mrs. Montague,[5] a writer, and her literary coterie peers ("Character and Condition of Woman" 88). This name-calling had dramatic effects from its inception according to this same source:

> …[the name] terrified many a timid girl from the cultivation of a literary taste. To be called a *blue stocking!* this would be horrid, and certainly frighten away all the beaux of one's acquaintance! … it has doubtless done more towards discouraging female talents than volumes of serious arguments against their capacity, or the propriety of their pursuing the higher paths of learning ("Character and Condition of Woman" 88).

It would seem that individual companions of young women attempted to dissuade their reading habits alongside institutionalized criticisms of such behavior. Once again, literature appears to be interacting and influencing society which in turn tries to interact with the literary culture by limiting women's access to the intellectual realm. A cycle emerges in which literature influences culture which, in turn, influences literature. As historians, knowing that literature was influencing and was being molded by society encourages the usage of the literature as a historical source. This same cycle can be seen when we turn our attention to the woman author.

[5] Within "Character and Condition of Woman" this is how her name is spelled; however, I believe this work is referencing the prominent writer Elizabeth Montagu who will be mentioned later in this thesis.

Any discussion of the late-Georgian novel would be incomplete without an inclusion of women authors.[6] The sheer number of women writing at the time should convince any literary historian of the necessity of their inclusion. It is estimated that anywhere between 450 to potentially 2000 women were writing and being published between 1660 and 1800 (McCarthy 101). As I continue to discuss the woman novelist, I will endeavor to remember that such a large group of individuals would include varying and conflicting positions. Characterizing the group and their place in society uniformly would be impossible. With this understanding of the scale and complexity of the population of late-Georgian women authors, it is interesting to turn to their connection with the novel form on the basis of gender.

The novel did function, in part, as a genderless space during this period. This quality makes it the perfect literary form to analyze in order to discuss gender, as it came to be very popular with women who wrote. As Johnson explains, "…the novel had proved especially attractive to eighteenth-century women writers precisely because it was not already the territory of men" and that "[r]eview magazines of the 1790s treat female and male writers as menaces or allies of comparable magnitude" (Johnson xiv). A review of *Shirley*—now known to be written by Charlotte Brontë, but initially attributed to the male pseudonym Currer Bell—demonstrates how this propensity not to distinguish the man author from the woman author appeared in the late 1840s. The review by the *Globe* reads as follows: "[t]here is something in it of kin to Jane Austen's books, or Maria Edgeworth's, or Walter Scott's. There is human life as it is in England, in the thoughtful and toiling classes, with the women and clergy thereto appurtenant" ("Advertisement" 1260).[7] Within this review, Brontë faces comparison to both men and women

[6] Despite what previous literary historians, such as Watt, have endeavored to claim.
[7] This review mentions two other classic traits of the novel that will soon be discussed. The mentioning of its resemblance to everyday life, as well as the use of an eponymous character, should be noted.

authors without comment. The omission of such a remark seems to indicate that works were not immediately or universally gendered from a critic's perspective. Novels were a space in which women could make a name for themselves due to the novel being a new form in British literary society.

While the novel form afforded women authors an attractive space to write free of men's historical claim, gender still proved to be a limiting factor. Even by the 1770s, as pointed out by Julia Epstein in *The Iron Pen: Frances Burney and the Politics of Women's Writing*, women had yet to entirely solidify their place in the literary world, despite numerous successful women authors in the decades prior (Epstein 5). While women authors gained recognition, the literary field remained dominated by men. The same 1849 issue of *The Athenaeum* mentioned previously provides a list of authors within the advertised work, *A Second Gallery of Literary Portraits* written by George Gilfillan ("Advertisement" 1260). Of the twenty-five included authors, ranging from John Milton in the seventeenth century all the way to the contemporaries of the era, only three are women.[8] The work groups these women, Mrs. Hemans, Mrs. Elizabeth Barrett Browning, and Mrs. Shelley,[9] together. Society recognized the accomplishments of women in literature, but only the women who were considered exemplary examples of their sex. It appears they were likely relegated to their own space within the literary field, as they were not dispersed throughout the lineup. The genderlessness of the late-Georgian novel did not represent a societal shift to grant women full status in literary society.[10] When using literature to contribute to a

[8] The authors featured in this published work were: John Milton, Lord Byron, George Crabbe, John Foster, Thomas Hood, Thomas Macaulay, Dr. George Croly, Sir Edward Bulwer Lytton, Ralph Waldo Emerson, George Dawson, Alfred Tennyson, Professor Nichol, Mrs. Hemans, Mrs. Elizabeth Barrett Browning, Mrs. Shelley, William Cobbett, James Montgomery, Sidney Smith, William Anderson, Leigh Hunt, Thomas Moore, Isaac Taylor, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, Philip James Bailey, and John Sterling ("Advertisement" 1260).

[9] This is how the primary source refers to these women. Today we would refer to them as simply: Felicia Hemans, Elizabeth Barrett Browning, and Mary Shelley.

[10] Further confirmation of this notion appears in a statement by Johnson, "…starting from as early as around 1815, reviewers insisted on a fairly rigid distinction between the 'male' and the 'female' novel" (Johnson xiv).

historical understanding of the period it is important to be aware of society's complexities, as will next be discussed. Just because women could be successful authors did not mean that society completely accepted these women.

Becoming an author was a consequential social decision for a young woman at the time. Therefore, the idealistic vision of the novel being a free space for women to exert their literary prowess appears just that: an ideal. Epstein in her work describes prominent female writer Frances Burney's relationship to the cultural weight of writing: "…writing for Burney represented a challenge to received notions of feminine behavior that included modesty, artlessness, submissiveness, passivity, and silence on the list of feminine virtues…" (Epstein 24). If voicelessness figured as an expected quality of women, the usage of authorial voice in the writing of a book was subversive for women during this era.[11] Here we see how society and the culture of late-Georgian literature come into conflict.

Despite the obstacles, women carved out a place in literature for themselves with their work on the novel. The primary sources I have studied support the position that women authors successfully laid claim to the novel form. In 1841 an article described how "[t]he last century exhibited a galaxy of female writers… whose names history has garned up among her choicest treasures" ("Character and Condition of Woman" 88). An article in *The Foreign Quarterly Review* from 1844 claims Austen to be the perfect novelist: "[t]here are three points of view from which the novelist may be regarded: as a Moralist, an Artist, and an Entertaining Writer…The three combined makes the perfect novelist; and perhaps there is no better specimen of this combination that the matchless Jane Austen" (Art. I.-1 265). This writer bestowed this lofty

[11] Some of the pushback against women authors during this period may have been due to a fear of writing being a gateway for women taking authority (Gleadle and Richardson 13-14).

praise upon Austen a mere twenty-seven years following her death and, in doing so, implies that women could dominate the novel form.

Ann Radcliffe, the other author of note in this thesis, acquired similarly high regard during the period immediately after her death. *The Edinburgh Annual Register* in their article "Biographical Chronicle; or, Account of Eminent Persons Deceased During the Year" provides insight into the contemporary sentiments held toward the author, "Mrs Radcliffe was known and admired by the world, as the able and ingenious authoress of some of the best romances that ever appeared in the English language; and which, to the honour of the country, have been translated into every European tongue, and read everywhere with enthusiasm" ("Biographical Chronicle" 331). The Biographical Chronicle goes on to discuss the successes of *The Mysteries of Udolpho* and described it as "…one of the most extraordinary compositions in the circle of literature" ("Biographical Chronicle" 331). Based on this praise, women authors achieved success. Gender did not completely inhibit women from participating successfully in literary society, in fact, at times, it played to their advantage.

Society's influence on literary practices can be seen in the way some women found success by using womanly stereotypes to their advantage. Johnson in her description of the influence of Austen explains that "…such authors as Austen had helped to establish the woman's authority over a specific domain of knowledge— that of the emotions" (Armstrong 43). Emotions fit easily within the private, domestic sphere over which women were supposed to preside according to our understanding of gender in late-Georgian society. With this technique, presiding over emotions in literature, women authors used the attributes already associated with their gender in society to bolster their literary appeal. Armstrong recognizes that novels which featured women narrators in this period could contain political commentary as women were

considered separate from politics (Armstrong 29). But, just as women could take advantage of fitting within societal norms, they could be limited by these expectations.

The critiques and standards the ordinary woman faced impacted women authors. Even women who took the plunge and became authors continued to face challenges. It would seem their contemporaries felt that only certain women were worthy of being authors. Johnson mentions a contemporary example of this tendency: "[j]ust as Lord Merton had opined that women should not live after thirty, Croker implies that they should not write after thirty. Fiction by women must be fiction by young women—modest, delicate, wispy, delightful…" (Johnson xv). This expectation of the woman author continues to support the connection between the literary world and gender in the late Georgian period. Not only did the woman author face the confines of gender rules, but so did the heroine.

Social stereotypes about age provide the perfect example of the ways in which the ordinary woman, the novelist, and the fictional heroine all faced the same critiques. Eighteenth-century author, Elizabeth Montagu, described the ways in which being older changed her relationship to writing,

> '[w]hen I was young, I should not like to have been classed among authors, but at my age [nearly fifty], it is less unbecoming. If an old woman does not bewitch her neighbor's cows, nor make any girl in the parish spit crooked pins, the world has no reason to take offence at her amusing herself with reading books or even writing them' (Epstein 25).

While this may appear to contradict Croker's statement on the older woman author, I believe both depict the same tendency in society. Montagu indicates that society largely ignored the older woman and her writing habits. Croker endeavored to do exactly so by shaming older

women authors and praising only the young woman author. The older woman author occupied a liminal place in society; society neither shamed her nor revered her. Interestingly, heroines were held to this same standard, often appearing young and beautiful. In "Heroines in Flight: Narrating Invisibility and Maturity in Women's Gothic Writing of the Romantic Period," Angela Wright discusses the youth expected of heroines in relation to Eleanor Sleath's *The Orphan of the Rhine*. Wright accuses Sleath of bowing "…to the commercial pressures of heroine-centered narrative…" by transitioning from focusing on an older woman to a younger one (Wright 26). This is the first example, of many to come, of ways in which the societal pressures of the time appeared in fiction.

Clearly, literary culture and customs directly interacted with, were influenced by, and exerted pressure on gender practices during this era. This dynamic alone justifies the novels place within historical analysis of gender in the period. But, as touched on in the preceding two paragraphs, it was not just the reader or the author that bumped heads with the lived culture of the era, but the fictional heroines as well. This next part of the chapter will seek to justify why fictional characters, in particular leading heroines, can be used effectively in the study of history despite living in fictional worlds. The late-Georgian heroine is particularly effective for study, as strict standards were placed on the novel form in this period.

The successful late-Georgian novel met two criteria: it bore a resemblance to everyday life, and it focused on the individual. These traits resembled aspects of contemporary culture outside of the novel, meaning that the novel was interacting with society. Novels featuring heroines used these criteria to bolster their works. Though a form of fiction, novels had to resemble familiar or common life according to the era's readers. Critics of the time harangued books that featured an uncommon depiction of life and would periodically claim that these

novels "…insulted the intelligence of readers" (Armstrong 29). Armstrong explains that prominent women authors endeavored to separate their work from the masses with assertions of superior resemblance to everyday life (Armstrong 38). Events appearing in the novel did not themselves have to be real, but rather, as Watt explains, had to include that which would be considered familiar and recognizable (Watt 11).[12]

My own research into primary sources of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries reveals the pervasiveness of this craving for that which is familiar in the period. This phenomenon appeared most profoundly in an 1849 article of *The Athenaeum* entitled "Foreign Correspondence" in which the writer explains their experience of southern France after reading *the Mysteries of Udolpho*, which itself takes place partly in southern France.[13] The commentary of the writer, referred to only as T. A. T., is striking:

> Of all the mysteries of which have been written, whether of Paris, of London, of Brussels, or of elsewhere—all more than sufficiently fictitious,— I, writing now from Provence, pronounce the Mysteries of Udolpho to be the most mendacious. Oh, Mrs. Radcliffe! Mrs. Radcliffe! how could you with an audacious air of truthfulness to be paralleled only by Defoe's account of Mrs. Veale's Ghost,[14]— how could you write, sitting the while snugly by side an English sea-coal fire, all those too seducing descriptions of the vineyards, the olive-groves, the limpid streams, and the verdant valleys of sweet Provence? To all those who may be now

[12] The relevant quote by Watt on this matter is: "…the novel's realism does not reside in the kind of life it presents, but in the way it presents it" (Watt 11).
[13] While *The Mysteries of Udolpho* does take place in sixteenth century France and Italy, as is mentioned in the T.A.T quote, Radcliffe wrote all of the novel while residing in England. In fact, Radcliffe relied on other's portrayals in order to describe these foreign lands (Volz 95). As Radcliffe is herself English and wrote for an English late-Georgian audience who expected that which resembles everyday life in their novels, I believe this work may still be used to reflect contemporary English society, rather than the society of France or Italy.
[14] Here were see an interesting comparison between Radcliffe and the revered writer Daniel Defoe, a further example that men and women authors were compared freely in this period.

> devouring as eagerly and believing as fondly the Radcliffian version of the South of France as I did some quarter of a century ago, I conscientiously declare, that, as far as my rather extended knowledge of Europe goes, there does not exist within its limits so arid, so monotonous, so ugly, and so every way unattractive a region as Provence. (T. 488)

Clearly T. A. T., a figure of unknown gender, felt hoodwinked by the descriptions of Southern France laced within *The Mysteries of Udolpho.* The deception lasted upwards of twenty-five years, meaning T.A.T. first read the novel around thirty years after the original publication. T.A.T. demonstrates the trust readers had in novelists not to deceive. Despite T.A.T. knowing Radcliffe's location when she wrote *The Mysteries of Udolpho*, they still considered the fictional portrayal as representative of everyday life and assumed others might have felt similarly. This belief in the novel's resemblance to everyday life informs modern scholars that much of late-Georgian society may appear in the fictional work, making the period's novel a useful resource.

A successful novel highlighted the experience of the individual rather than a collective, which was a disruption of previous literary customs. A 2015 list created by the BBC called "The 25 Greatest British Novels" confirms this idea (Ciabattari). Of the ten books on this list that were first published between the years of 1700 and 1850, six of the titles include the name of a prominent character in the text. These texts are: *The History of Tom Jones, a Foundling*, *Emma*, *Clarissa*, *Frankenstein*, *David Copperfield*, and *Jane Eyre.* The novels not containing a name in the title are: *Persuasion*, *Pride and Prejudice*, *Vanity Fair*, and *Wuthering Heights*.[15] Watt regarded this emphasis of the individual in the eighteenth-century novel as a "…significant break with tradition…" and suggested that this choice implied that the characters "…were to be

[15] It is of note that of these ten works, six of them were written by women and six featured a woman, or multiple women, as their protagonist.

regarded as particular individuals in the contemporary social environment" (Watt 19). In my study of the heroine, the increased focus on the individual in this time span is essential. It is because society at the time was open to individualism that novels were able to feature an inner look at the young woman.

The reading public of the late Georgian period seemed to embrace the idea of entering the perspective of these prominent protagonists,[16] making the heroines all the more influential on the society reading them. This tendency aligns with the interest in perceiving the novel as an intrinsically familiar art form. This concept appears in an 1828 account within *The Newcastle Magazine* entitled "Wanderings of an Artist." The writer referred to only as C. states: "[t]he sun is now withdrawing in a misty set, and being on a point extremely high with prodigious slopes on either side, I sat down, and could not but most forcibly feel Mrs Ratcliffe's exalted descriptions of mountain scenery in the Mysteries of Udolpho…" (C. 299). In this account C. seems to elect to enter into the novel themself. Similarly, an example of note appears in the article "A Visit to the Castle of Luig" in an 1846 edition of the *Chambers's Edinburgh Journal*, in this account the writer relates their experience of a harrowing night in a castle directly to that of a Radcliffian heroine: "[n]ight closed in very shortly after our arrival, and we could not attempt to examine the interior of the cavern-castle till morning … we felt as though some of the old sleep-destroying romances of Ann Radcliffe had been realised for our special benefit ("A Visit to the Castle of Luig" 412). Once again, this account depicts the readers of Radcliffe's tendency to view their

[16] Armstrong claims that readers of the time embraced domestic novels as "…these stories of courtship and marriage offered their readers a way of indulging, with a kind of impunity, in fantasies of political power that were more acceptable because they were played out within a domestic framework..." (Armstrong 29). An indulgence of fantasies does appear to imply that readers placed themselves in the perspectives of the fictional characters.

own lives through the lens of a Radcliffe novel, bringing the everyday qualities of the novel into their own lives.[17]

With this evidence we can understand that readers would have associated themselves with the young women featured as heroines in the novels of the time. As will be discussed in the next chapters, heroines did not always fit within the expectations of society. If these novels were read widely, what must have been their influence on the reader? People who could directly relate to the heroines, like young marriage-eligible women, certainly read these novels. But the population of novel readers included those who were societally quite distant from the heroines, like men of all ages.[18] The elusive, hard-to-answer question becomes, could the reading of these novels have directly influenced the people who read them? In some ways we have historical evidence that novels held such possibility. According to Brownstein, in this period fears arose that novels could convince young women to seek heroes rather than reasonable husbands (Brownstein 26). While this in itself is interesting, Anna Laetitia Barbauld's response to this argument proves to be even more fascinating: "Barbauld identified the real evil novels encourage. It is, she argued perceptively, the expectation that the reader's actual life would have a pattern and a purpose and a meaning, as characters' lives do in fiction" (Brownstein 26). Barbauld's refutation does not attempt to counter the idea that novels have an influence over the reader, but rather the subject of this influence. While the extent of the direct influence of novels on readers is unsolvable, what can be studied are the exact qualities and experiences in which readers were welcomed into with these intensely familiar heroines. While we may only guess at

[17] It was not only Radcliffe's works with which readers stepped into the role of the protagonist. In *The Rise of the Novel* Watt features Aaron Hill's account of his relationship to literature: "Now and then, I am *Colbrand* the Swiss; but, as *broad* as *I stride*, in the Character, I can never escape *Mrs. Jewkes*: who often keeps me awake in the night" (Watt 201).

[18] Kelly notes that "…men were as active as women in writing and reading novels" (Kelly). Austen's *Northanger Abbey* features a man who has read *The Mysteries of Udolpho* in particular, Henry Tilney.

the reactions of readers, the literary analysis of *Pride and Prejudice* and *The Mysteries of Udolpho* in the next two chapters will isolate what exactly these readers were experiencing and how it related to the society around them.

In this chapter I addressed the ways in which British society appeared to associate gender with every facet of the literary process. The interactions between literature and society, it would appear, form a kind of metaphorical ouroboros, as one influences and bleeds into the other. Readership influenced publication, society reacted to this influence, the reaction influenced the status of the woman author, the woman author used her gender to market to readers, and so on and so forth. In this chapter, I addressed the heroine and the novel form. I concluded that while gender in fiction may not align directly with gender in everyday life, novels during this period could not veer too drastically from the what was considered common, thus making the heroine's relationship to gender a potentially interesting commentary on late-Georgian gender as a whole. This next chapter will put this theory into practice, as I explore the ways in which heroines represented both the conforming to and the breaking away from social norms.

2. Public Displays: Late-Georgian Heroines' and Social Convention

With the understanding that heroines were politically and socially charged figures in literature, as well as popular within late-Georgian novels, turning to the heroines in *The Mysteries of Udolpho* and *Pride and Prejudice* specifically becomes interesting. As mentioned in chapter one, the popularity of both of these works in the time in and around when they were written is striking. Their contemporary popularity makes them particularly helpful for modern scholarship. Due to a large readership pool, many late-Georgian individuals were exposed to the plights of Emily and Elizabeth. The two heroines were even potentially emulated by members of society. Women in particular were interacting with these characters as the novel was popular with this segment of the population. My interest naturally turns to the traits, ideas, and behaviors portrayed by these two heroines, both respectable young women. One would assume that these qualities must necessarily be at least palatable if not admired by late-Georgian society, as both books were widely consumed and were not, at least from my research, considered avant-garde in their portrayals of women.

The study of these novels together unlocks essential insight into the women of this era and the standards surrounding them. Unlike Elizabeth, Emily St Aubert likely would not spark the interest of an average, modern-day reader. At first glance she appears at best boring and at worst naïve, fragile, and overly idealized. In fact, her propensity to faint appears as a core quality, making Emily not the ideal fodder for the modern-day feminist imagination. But I believe this surface level interpretation of Emily is deceptive. My doubt does not lie in the veracity of her being these qualities, but rather in the belief that that is *all* that can be found in Emily. With some digging into the text, it becomes clear that Emily and Elizabeth hold many similar traits. I intend to spend the majority of this chapter exploring their commonalities.

The worthiness of this pursuit may be understood particularly as both these heroines experience happy endings. Emily and Elizabeth both win the societal lottery with their endings. Elizabeth marries the man with the most yearly income of all of her sisters, as Mr. Bennet states: "[Darcy] is rich, to be sure, and [Elizabeth] may have more fine clothes and fine carriages than Jane" (Austen 288). In turn, Emily not only marries the man she pines for throughout the majority of the 600-page novel, but she receives an added windfall from the blessing of her brother-in-law, "…that he immediately resigned to [Valancourt][19] a part of the rich domain, the whole of which, as he had no family, would of course descend to [Valancourt], on his decease" (Radcliffe 631). Emily and Elizabeth conclude with more than just monetary gains, they find emotional fulfilment. *The Mysteries of Udolpho* ends with Emily enacting and possessing everything she had expressly desired. In the chapters leading up to the conclusion, Emily states an interest in taking care of Annette and Ludovico, regaining "her father's paternal domain," and giving up the estates she possesses in Tholouse (Radcliffe 599). Upon the conclusion the novel, each of these desires has come to pass. A similar idea appears in *Pride and Prejudice*.

Elizabeth finds fulfilment, as well. She resigns herself to Pemberley, a place in which she happily finds herself "…removed from society so little pleasing to either, to all the comfort and elegance of their family party" (Austen 294). Elizabeth escapes all the vulgarity and impropriety that plagued her so distinctly earlier on in the novel. The happy endings of these two heroines are critical because it implies that both deserve to receive such rewards. The conclusions of the two novels indicate that Elizabeth and Emily are unique, as they each earn something that most young women fail to receive throughout the course of the novels. It would seem that these disparities make all the difference between a comfortable ending, like that of Jane or Lady

[19] Emily's love interest.

Blanche, and the outstanding endings of the heroines. Likely readers would have noticed and pinpointed the traits that made these heroines unique in their respective worlds. And, as their individuality earns rewards, the readers may have sought to emulate these exact traits.[20] I intend to examine these commonalities and to determine whether or not they aligned with societal expectations in order to provide further insight on these novels' role in their contemporary society.

To ensure that readers of this thesis have the basis of understanding necessary to comprehend the arguments I will make, I want to provide brief plots summaries of the two works. Neither plot summary is exhaustive, but hopefully they will prove useful. *Pride and Prejudice*'s heroine is Elizabeth Bennet, the second eldest of five daughters in the Bennet family. The Bennet family faces a dilemma as their father's estate is entailed to their distant cousin, Mr. Collins. This circumstance places added pressure on Jane and Elizabeth, the two eldest, to marry well. The book starts with the excitement in the Bennet household over a neighboring estate being rented by a young bachelor, Mr. Bingley, who brings his two sisters and his friend, Mr. Darcy, to the area. The exceedingly friendly Bingley and the beautiful, but timid Jane immediately fall for each other and seem on their way to an engagement. Darcy, in contrast, appears rude and almost immediately offends Elizabeth. Elizabeth then meets and becomes enthralled with a dashing militia man, Mr. Wickham, who tells her that Darcy wronged him in their youth. Elizabeth, who already lacked a fondness for Darcy, decides to hate him with this new information.

[20] As was mentioned earlier, some individuals of the time did see novels as potentially altering women's perspectives on their own lives, "Barbauld identified the real evil novels encourage. It is, she argued perceptively, the expectation that the reader's actual life would have a pattern and a purpose and a meaning, as characters' lives do in fiction" (Brownstein 26).

Mr. Collins arrives and proves to be incredibly pedantic and tiresome. He proceeds to horrify Elizabeth by proposing to her. She adamantly refuses and he in turn proposes to Elizabeth's best friend, Charlotte Lucas. Bingley and company leave to spend the winter in London which breaks Jane's heart. While visiting the newlywed Charlotte and Mr. Collins, Elizabeth meets Mr. Collins' patron, Lady Catherine de Bourgh, who happens to be Darcy's aunt. Unexpectedly Darcy pays a visit to his aunt and Elizabeth's anger at him rises as she learns that he played a part in separating Jane and Bingley. To Elizabeth's surprise and horror Darcy proposes to her, but at the same time insults her horribly. Offended, Elizabeth rejects his proposal outright and accuses him of mistreating Wickham. Darcy storms off, but later gives Elizabeth a long letter in which he explains the wickedness and deceitfulness of Wickham, effectively countering Wickham's claims. Elizabeth realizes she had grossly misjudged the situation, but Elizabeth and Darcy go their separate ways without further discussion.

Later Elizabeth, with her aunt and uncle, the Gardiners, finds herself at Darcy's estate. Darcy and Elizabeth run into each other. Rather than being disgusted with her, as Elizabeth expects, Darcy welcomes Elizabeth's party and introduces her to his sister, Georgiana. During this visit Elizabeth receives horrible news, by way of a letter from Jane, that her youngest sister, Lydia, has run off with the dishonorable Wickham and is missing. Elizabeth races home to console her family, but not before informing Darcy of the situation. Miraculously Wickham and Lydia turn up married. Later, readers learn it was Darcy who facilitated this arrangement between Wickham and Lydia in order to aid Elizabeth. Bingley returns to the neighborhood and proposes to Jane who gleefully accepts. Lady Catherine unexpectedly arrives and accuses Elizabeth of coercing Darcy into an engagement, a situation to which she disapproves of completely. While Elizabeth admits that no such engagement has occurred, she refuses to

promise not to accept such a proposal if it were to transpire. Lady Catherine then confronts Darcy who, upon hearing that Elizabeth may have changed her mind since his first proposal, arrives to ask Elizabeth once again. Darcy and Elizabeth are then married and go on to live happily together.

Radcliffe's gothic masterpiece, *The Mysteries of Udolpho,* includes an incredibly complex and convoluted plot. The work commences with the young and innocent Emily St Aubert living an idyllic French country lifestyle with her parents. After the unexpected death of her mother, Emily and her father, St Aubert, begin traveling around Southern France. While on this journey they meet a young man named Valancourt who accompanies them. Valancourt and Emily begin to fall in love under the careful, yet approving, eye of St Aubert. After parting ways with Valancourt, St Aubert falls ill and dies while in the care of a convent. Emily's guardian becomes her aunt, Madame Cheron, who quickly marries an Italian man named Montoni, becoming Madame Montoni.[21] While her aunt has humored Valancourt's courtship of Emily, Montoni does not. Montoni, with the blessing of her aunt, separates the young lovers by dragging an unwilling Emily to Italy.

Montoni, Madame Montoni, and Emily spend time in Venice where Montoni attempts to force Emily into marrying Count Morano, a man who has become besotted with her. Emily refuses adamantly, but Montoni insists until he falls out with Morano. Montoni brings their party to his castle, Udolpho, a crumbling and spooky fortress in the Italian countryside. There Emily and her faithful servant, Annette, deal with a number of terrors both real and imagined. These terrors include both imagined ghosts and dead bodies, as well as all too real carousing drunk men and physical fights. While at Udolpho, Montoni and Madame Montoni fight because Montoni

[21] Throughout this thesis this aunt will be referred to as either Madame Montoni or Emily's aunt (even at times prior to her marriage to Montoni) to prevent confusion.

wants to steal Emily's inheritance. Montoni locks Madame Montoni away where she becomes weak and dies. After further exploits, moments of terror, and the finding of new friends, Emily flees Udolpho with her companions. This party eventually makes their way back to France with the help of people met along the way, Count de Villeroi and his daughter Blanche. This duo takes the orphaned Emily under their wing. Once back in France, Emily learns that Valancourt has fallen from grace due to a number of sins. While heartbroken, she refuses to be attached to someone she sees as morally bad. During this time Emily unravels a complex mystery involving members of her family, Montoni, and a dying nun, Sister Agnes, otherwise known as Lady Laurentini. Valancourt eventually returns and explains that, contrary to previous accounts, he has behaved with nothing but gallantry. Emily and Valancourt are then happily married.

The other text requiring context and framing is the *Thraliana* written by Hester Thrale Piozzi.[22] Felicity A. Nussbaum's chapter, "Sociability and Life Writing: Hester Lynch Thrale Piozzi," informs readers that Piozzi was a prominent public writer (Nussbaum 55). The *Thraliana* was her personal diary written between the years of 1776 and 1809,[23] but which was never published in full until 1942. As the 1942 editor Katherine C. Balderston explains it, the *Thraliana* "is a pot-pourri of curious bits, strung together without plan…[anecdotes] sometimes culled from books, sometimes from life at second or third hand, and sometimes from her own experience, and are consequently of unequal interest and authenticity" (Balderston xi-xii). This text is particularly interesting because, in many ways it was original for the era, "Mrs. Thrale, therefore, under the triple incentive of Dr. Johnson's belief in the value of saving the fragments of life, Mr. Thrale's indulgent expectation, and her own delight in the French anas,[24] sat herself

[22] Née Hester Lynch in 1741 (Nussbaum 55).
[23] This paper primarily uses volume one of this two-part diary which spans the years of 1776 and 1784.
[24] The relevant definition of *anas* is: "[c]lever sayings or anecdotes of any one; notes and scraps of information relating to a person or place; literary gossip" ("ana, suffix and n.").

down to glean her wits, and to create what was almost, if not quite, the first English ana" (Balderston xi). Piozzi's perspective on daily life is absolutely a helpful resource for understanding the late Georgian period, but the *Thraliana* offers more than just that. Piozzi led a life that in many ways reflected that of a fictional heroine making this inside look into her life all the more intriguing to use in this research context. Piozzi married Henry Thrale a politician and businessman at the age of 22 (Balderston x). During her marriage to Thrale, Piozzi was in many ways the ideal late-Georgian woman, giving birth to twelve children,[25] socializing with many prominent figures of English society while hosting functions at her home, and caring for the many members of her close circle (Brownley 67). And yet, following the death of Thrale, Piozzi's life changed completely. In terms of finances Piozzi was well off despite her husband's death (Piozzi 531). It was Piozzi's heart that caused the drama in her life following Thrale's death. Piozzi fell in love with her child's Italian music master, Gabriel Piozzi, and married him in 1784 (Nussbaum 57). This event, and the following public scandal, occurred to the horror of Piozzi's family, friends, acquaintances, and society at large. As Balderston explains, Piozzi "…offended her world's code at its most vulnerable spot, by her second marriage…" (Balderston x).

This thesis seeks to explore the ways in which fictional heroines both represented the adherence to and the breakage from the social norm; therefore, Piozzi, a woman who walked that line, is the perfect historical figure to use to provide context for the episodes within the fictional narratives of *The Mysteries of Udolpho* and *Pride and Prejudice*. Piozzi's work supports this

[25] Piozzi had a number of miscarriages throughout her life and eight of these twelve children died before Piozzi, herself (Brownley 67).

thesis as it provides further perspective on the role of novels in late-Georgian society.[26] Insight from the *Thraliana* will appear extensively throughout the rest of this thesis.

This chapter, the first of two dedicated to this task, will center on the public and perceivable commonalties between the two heroines. Essentially, I am exploring the qualities that, if these two characters were relegated to side characters in their respective novels and if the narrators were third person limited, would still be perceivable by the reader. The third chapter will focus on the internal traits that are apparent only due to the inside look the novel provides. Both the late Georgian period's tendency to separate the private from the public and the novel form's ability to reveal the private inspired this chapter division.

The Public and the Polite

In many regards, Emily and Elizabeth possess the socially acceptable traits expected of refined ladies during the period in question. To begin, both Elizabeth and Emily appear well-liked and worthy of approval. Early on, Elizabeth's demeanor tempts Darcy, "…Darcy had never been so bewitched by any woman as he was by her" (Austen 38). Many others, besides Darcy, revere Elizabeth. Mrs. Bennet strongly implies that Mr. Bennet universally favors Elizabeth (Austen 2). And, interestingly, later in the novel Austen lists the people who desire to think fondly of Elizabeth, "…for those to whom she endeavoured to give pleasure were prepossessed in her favour. Bingley was ready, Georgiana was eager, and Darcy determined, to be pleased" (Austen 198). Elizabeth's likeability remains consistent throughout the novel. While some

[26] Piozzi was an avid reader of novels meaning that the *Thraliana* includes a number of references to works being published in her lifetime. Piozzi interacted with these books a good deal. At one point in the *Thraliana*, she ranks the authors of her time, "[w]as I to make a Scale of Novel Writers I should put Richardson first, then Rousseau; after them, but at an immeasurable Distance—Charlotte Lenox, Smollet & Fielding. The Female Quixote & Count Fathom I think far before Tom Jones of Joseph Andrews…" (Piozzi 328-9). Piozzi's inclusion of both men and women in this list confirms the previously claimed notion that men and women were frequently compared with each other in the literary world during this era. It is particularly interesting to note that Piozzi, herself, read *The Mysteries of Udolpho*, "[w]e have all been reading the Mysteries of Udolpho…" (Piozzi 886).

characters do express distaste in her, they are universally the characters in which the readers are themselves determined to dislike, the Bingley sisters and Lady Catherine. Elizabeth and Emily share this likeable personality.

Emily appears to be universally adored. A first description of Emily within the novel sets the tone in which she will be considered throughout,

> [i]n person, Emily resembled her mother; having the same elegant symmetry of form, the same delicacy of features, and the same blue eyes, full of tender sweetness. But, lovely as was her person, it was the varied expressions of her countenance, as conversation awakened the nicer emotions of her mind, that threw such a captivating grace around her… (Radcliffe 9).

One would find it difficult to write a more appealing description of a young woman than this one. Similarly to Elizabeth, many characters within the novel appear devoted to Emily. For instance, her father dotes on her until his untimely death (Radcliffe 26). Later, when she returns to the convent, the people she met there express joy at her arrival, "[i]n the parlour [of the convent], they found several of the boarders, who rejoiced to see Emily, and told her many little circumstances that had happened in the convent since her departure…" (Radcliffe 603). Emily's captivating qualities last throughout the work, just as Elizabeth's do, and she manages to amass quite a list of devotees by the end. The list of people who commit themselves to Emily's happiness over the course of the novel include: Valancourt, Mons. Bonnac, Lady Blanche, Lady Laurentini, Mons. Du Pont, Ludovico, Annette, the housekeeper Dorothée, and the brother of Valancourt, who gives "a part of the rich domain" in response to his pleasure at meeting Emily (Radcliffe 631). Radcliffe and Austen both create heroines who are universally adored.

The reverence that Elizabeth and Emily receive is not unexpected or unjustified. The qualities that make Emily likeable, are remembered in her late mother, "[her] smiles and fondness" (Radcliffe 27). The complete degradation of Elizabeth's sisters, except Jane, through the voice of the narrator seemingly justifies why society favors Elizabeth. A description of the middle child Mary appears to list all the ways a woman can go wrong:

> …Mary, who having, in consequence of being the only plain one in the family, worked hard for knowledge and accomplishments, was always impatient for display. Mary had neither genius nor taste; and though vanity had given her application, it had given her likewise a pedantic air and conceited manner, which would have injured a higher degree of excellence than she had reached. Elizabeth, easy and unaffected, had been listened to with much more pleasure, though not playing half so well; and Mary, at the end of a long concerto, was glad to purchase praise and gratitude by Scotch and Irish airs… (Austen 17-18).

In this tirade against Mary, Elizabeth's clear superiority shines through, even with her lack of musical talent. Catherine and Lydia face the same fate as poor Mary. The narrator ceaselessly criticizes the young women, "[t]he two youngest of the family, Catherine and Lydia, were particularly frequent in these attentions; their minds were more vacant than their sisters'…," as well as by their own father who says, "[f]rom all that I can collect by your manner of talking, you must be two of the silliest girls in the country. I have suspected it some time, but I am now convinced" (Austen 20, 21). Holding this superior position, as Elizabeth does, would have been considered an ideal situation in society. This being due to the competition to be the most desirable for marriage appearing at full force in daily life, as seen by Mrs. Bennet's many comments (Austen 108). Armstrong, in her account of *Pride and Prejudice*, explains this

phenomenon explicitly: "…traditional female attributes as chastity, wit, practicality, duty, manners, imagination, sympathy, generosity, beauty, and kindness are pitted against each other in the competition among the Bennet sisters and their friends" (Armstrong 50).

The two works do what Wright praises the hero of Radcliffe's *The Italian* of learning to avoid. The two novels manage to "…deify the young and beautiful heroine, and to dismiss all other female characters within the novel as mere adjuncts to the young heroine" (Wright 22). Overall, the ways in which Austen and Radcliffe portray their heroines, and then subsequently praise their heroines, is consistent with social norms of the time. The propriety of this praise is due to both characters possessing traits worthy of praise in the late Georgian period. These traits are often stressed repeatedly throughout both the texts.

The conscientiousness of both Elizabeth and Emily separate them from their companions. From the very start, Emily's commitment to others shines through. Early in the novel, following the death of her father, Emily questions whether or not to follow her father's wishes and burn the hidden documents or to satiate her curiosity. Emily ruminates on the choice before stating her decision, "I have given a solemn promise … Let me hasten to remove the temptation, that would destroy my innocence, and embitter my life with the consciousness or irremediable guilt, while I have strength to reject it" (Radcliffe 100). Emily's engrained sense of decorum allows for others, primarily her aunt and Montoni, to take advantage of her. When wronged, Emily's instinctual reaction appears to be to revert to silence. An example being when her aunt accuses her of being difficult to look after, "…grief and the pride of conscious innocence kept her silent…" (Radcliffe 106). Later, when accused by her aunt of indulgence, "…Emily's pale cheek became flushed with crimson, but it was the blush of pride, and she made no answer" (Radcliffe 155). This quality of Emily's continues even as she grows throughout the novel.

Even when Emily overcomes silence, she functions within the realm of the socially acceptable. She attempts to convince her aunt not to drag her forcibly to Italy with "gentleness" and her rebuff of Count Morano's attentions "was too gentle to repress his assiduities…" (Radcliffe 138, 179). Even in her endeavor to avoid being kidnapped by the count Emily utilizes shame rather than brute force or rudeness, saying: "Count Morano! I am now in your power; but you will observe, that this is not the conduct which can win the esteem you appear so solicitous to obtain, and that you are preparing for yourself a load of remorse, in the miseries of a friendless orphan, which can never leave you" (Radcliffe 251). Other characters do not share Emily's unwavering propriety, the biggest gulf appearing between the actions of Emily and those of her aunt. Emily must bear witness to her aunt unwittingly committing numerous social faux pas, "Madame [Montoni] did not perceive the meaning of this too satirical sentence, and she, therefore, escaped the pain, which Emily felt on her account" (Radcliffe 127). Emily maintains her commitment to decorum throughout the novel, indicating that it is a quality engrained into her being, much like it seems to be an essential part of Elizabeth.[27]

Well-mannered describes Elizabeth, particularly in comparison to those around her. Social blunders appear repeatedly throughout the text and often Elizabeth must bear witness to them. Mr. Collins's lack of propriety helps highlight Elizabeth's propensity for proper behavior as she appears the exact opposite of the man who impolitely asked who cooked the meal while at Longbourn and told Elizabeth that her clothes were distinctly inferior to those of Lady Catherine (Austen 49, 123-4). Similarly, the frivolity of Mrs. Bennet, "…she still was occasionally nervous and invariably silly," counters the more socially acceptable modesty of Elizabeth (Austen 295).

[27] Volz interestingly argues that Radcliffe's usage of St Aubert's perspective at the beginning of *The Mysteries of Udolpho* indicates "that women's views of decorum had to comply with male-perceptions" (Volz 131). This perspective does give further support to the idea that a need to maintain decorum was a social expectation placed on Emily.

The extent of her family's misbehavior even jeopardizes Jane's happiness, "…Jane had been deprived, by the folly and indecorum of her own family" (Austen 163). With the definition of decorum being: "[t]hat which is proper, suitable, seemly, befitting, becoming; fitness, propriety, congruity," it is easy to understand how being followers of decorum meant that Elizabeth and Emily met societal standards of the late Georgian period ("decorum, n."). Having both heroines possess these ideal qualities is no accident.

On the surface, Emily and Elizabeth appear to be the perfect women of their time. It is easy to understand why an author would want to have protagonists with this quality. As discussed in chapter one, women were held to strict standards of conduct and society had many opinions on a woman's place in the social hierarchy. Novels were expected to reflect everyday life and focus on a single individual. If only one individual could maintain the bulk of a reader's attention, it seems strategically wise for a woman author to create a heroine who embodies the very idea of propriety. Critics appeared to praise depictions featuring "…the triumphant beauty of the heroine's character…" ("Advertisement").[28] In fact, idealized heroines were so popular in 1790s gothic fiction that parodies were made of them (Wright 16).[29] These portrayals alone either confirm the expectations of this era or discount the novel as a reputable source due to the overly faultless quality of the heroines. But as will next be discussed, neither Austen nor Radcliffe took the easy route in terms of their heroines; therefore, the portrayals remain historically stimulating.

Public Impropriety

This next section addresses the qualities of Elizabeth and Emily which were perceptible by those around them and yet which break away from the social norms of the era in which they

[28] This specific praise was bestowed on Charlotte Brontë's eponymous heroine in *Shirley*.
[29] Austen herself poked fun at this trope of the gothic with the heroine of *Northanger Abbey* (Wright 16).

were written. According to late-Georgian society, women were supposed to be private figures. Interestingly, neither Emily nor Elizabeth are completely private, which raises the question of whether the ideal heroine necessarily reflected the ideal late-Georgian woman.

In Emily's case, her private emotions appear publicly throughout the novel. As St Aubert dies, he warns Emily of the risks of entertaining excess, including excess emotions, "[a]ll excess is vicious; even that sorrow, which is amiable in its origin, becomes a selfish and unjust passion, if indulged at the expence of our duties—by our duties I mean what we owe to ourselves, as well as to others" (Radcliffe 23). Radcliffe sets the standard with this line and repeats it later when St Aubert warns of "becom[ing] the victims of our feelings" (Radcliffe 78). Yet, despite Emily assuring her father that "his advice was most precious to her, and that she would never forget it, or cease from endeavouring to profit by it," Emily fails to live by this statement (Radcliffe 78). In fact, Emily consistently breaks this convention.

As is apparent to both the reader and Emily's companions, Emily repeatedly does externalize, and thusly succumb, to her emotions. Just moments after St Aubert gives the advice, "Emily felt tears swell into her eyes…" and while sitting at her father's death bed Emily finds that "…the more she endeavoured to restrain her emotion, [the more she] found it the less possible to do so" (Radcliffe 25, 76). The extent of the display of these excess emotions, both positive and negative sentiments, appears as characters surrounding Emily react to her exposed feelings. Valancourt absolutely picks up on Emily's sentiments as Radcliffe describes how he "…frequently fixed his eyes pensively on her countenance, which expressed with so much animation the taste and energy of her mind" (Radcliffe 43). Radcliffe provides further example of this externalization of inner emotions when Montoni forces Emily to attend dinner with him, her aunt, and two chevaliers, "…the emotion of her mind threw a faint blush over her

countenance…" (Radcliffe 294). This language, "the emotion of her mind," perfectly describes this phenomenon of making the private public (Radcliffe 294). But blushes and facial expressions are not the only ways in which Radcliffe has Emily display her emotions.

Fainting appears as the most prominent way in which Emily conveys, albeit inadvertently, her emotions to those around her. Emily faints for the first time upon the injury of the newly met Valancourt. In the moment, her distress levels reach such a point that Valancourt ends up having to comfort her despite being the one injured (Radcliffe 40). She faints upon realizing the imminency of her father's death, when saying goodbye to her father's corpse, when she finds the wax sculpture of a rotting corpse, and many more times throughout the story (Radcliffe 74, 85, 236). Emily does minorly improve her ability to contain her emotions during the novel. She mostly avoids fainting by the end of the book, save for the moment when she almost faints upon seeing Valancourt unexpectedly,

> [a]t the sound of [Valancourt's voice], never heard by Emily, without emotion, she started, in terror, astonishment and doubtful pleasure, and had scarcely beheld him at her feet, when she sunk into a seat, overcome by the various emotions, that contended at her heart, and almost insensible to that voice, whose earnest and trembling calls seemed as if endeavouring to save her (Radcliffe 627).

And she even successfully convinces Valancourt of her lack of interest in him, a claim that does not resemble the truth or her inner sentiments at all. For the sake of decorum, Emily agrees that Valancourt has lost her esteem and love and says, "…if you had valued my esteem, you would not have given me this new occasion for uneasiness" (Radcliffe 627). However, these final chapters of slightly modified internal regulation do not outweigh the six-hundred previous pages of emotional expulsion that readers experience when reading *The Mysteries of Udolpho*. Emily

consistently breaks the expectation placed upon her by her father with her outbursts of emotion. While Elizabeth does not faint like Emily, she has her own way of challenging the privacy standard.

Elizabeth exposes the private publicly, breaking the well-mannered veneer expected of late-Georgian women of society. One example of this phenomenon appears while Elizabeth attends the dance in which Darcy makes his first appearance. While attending the dance, Darcy famously refers to Elizabeth as "tolerable; but not handsome enough to tempt *me*…" (Austen 7). Elizabeth's reaction to this slight is telling. She does not indecorously spout off in anger, nor does she sulk in a corner licking her wounds at the insult. Instead, Elizabeth immediately recounts the event "with great spirit among her friends; for she had a lively, playful disposition, which delighted in any thing ridiculous" (Austen 8). Elizbeth has no qualms about exposing what some might consider an embarrassing tale.

While Emily externalizes her intense emotions, Elizabeth openly displays her inner thoughts and reactions. Contrasting the overly reserved Jane who hides her interest in Bingley so well that she almost loses her chance with him, Elizabeth externalizes her interest in Wickham. When getting ready for the Netherfield ball where she intends to see Wickham, Elizabeth "dressed with more than usual care, and prepared in the highest spirits for the conquest of all that remained unsubdued of his heart…" (Austen 67). In fact, Elizabeth fails to disguise her interest in Wickham, as her aunt, "…rendered suspicious by Elizabeth's warm commendation of him, narrowly observed them both…their preference of each other was plain enough to make her a little uneasy…" (Austen 110). Earlier, when faced with the disappointment over the absence of Wickham, Elizabeth immediately confides her distress in Charlotte (Austen 68). The Mr. Collins proposal scene provides an even more telling example of this behavior. Austen describes how

Mrs. Bennet perceives Elizabeth's "vexed and embarrassed looks," meaning Elizabeth's thoughts on this event appear through her expressions (Austen 80). And, upon finding herself alone with Mr. Collins, Elizabeth endeavors "to conceal by incessant employment the feelings which were divided between distress and diversion," meaning that Elizabeth does not naturally hide her feelings despite being inclined to express them (Austen 80). Austen indicates that an excessive display of emotions or thoughts is generally frowned upon within the society of the novel, as Darcy's response to Bingley's commendation of Jane shames her tendency to smile, "Miss Bennet he acknowledged to be pretty, but she smiled too much" (Austen 11). Neither of these heroines are particularly private people, which is certainly interesting for the time.

The *Thraliana*, the personal diary written by Piozzi, provides relevant insight into the experience of living in a society torn between an obsession with the private matters of women and a conviction that women must remain proper and private at all costs. In an entry made on October 30th, 1781 Piozzi explains why she feels women are perceived as more emotional, "…I think the Reason of that Furor being more violent among the Female Sex is chiefly because being less tolerated to *declare* their Passion, it preys upon the Mind till it bursts all Reserve, & makes itself amends for the long Concealment" (Piozzi 517).[30] Emily's emotional displays align with this belief, that emotions are a woman's domain. However, as Piozzi alludes to, women were not supposed to expose their emotional sides, rather suppress them. This belief provides an interesting perspective on Emily and Elizabeth. Emily appears to be a classic example of exactly what Piozzi describes, a woman trying to keep composure yet who eventually succumbs to the heightened feelings due to the pressure building inside of her. Elizabeth, in turn, shirks convention. She does not disguise completely these inner thoughts, rather displays them freely

[30] Punctuation and capitalizations reflect those found within the 1942 published version of the *Thraliana*. This applies to all quotes from the *Thraliana* featured in this thesis.

and willingly on occasion.[31] As pointed out by William McCarthy in "The Repression of Hester Lynch Piozzi; or, How We Forgot a Revolution in Authorship," Piozzi's own life indicates that society did obsess over the private lives of interesting young women, as between 1833 and 1861 at least three different collections of the personal letters or writings of Piozzi were published (McCarthy 99). While it is clear that women were expected to be private, *Pride and Prejudice*, *The Mysteries of Udolpho*, and the *Thraliana* all appear to imply that while this was the expectation, society actually praised disobeying this spoken rule for the sake of entertainment.

As previously established in this chapter, Emily and Elizabeth both possess some qualities that would have been considered ideal in women in the late Georgian period. And yet, clearly these two women break convention with their openness. To provide more historical context, it is known that Piozzi excelled at covering up her emotions, unlike Elizabeth and Emily. Brownley provides an example: "[i]n 1777 in the midst of coping with serious difficulties with Thrale and the brewery,[32] she presided at a particularly successful dinner party" (Brownley 67). Yet Piozzi was more complicated than this narrow idea, indicating that this supposed hard and fast line of what may be shared and what must be hidden was more complex than society may have wished. Honesty was considered Piozzi's specialty. Brownley explains that Piozzi "insisted that an artist depict her facial scar and heavy rouge in his painting…" and that she was "often equally frank in her verbal self-portraits" (Brownley 65). An entry in the *Thraliana* from the fall of 1776 stresses the inconsistency of expectations placed on women. The account discusses the advice given to Piozzi by a Doctor Collier: "Doctor Collier used to caution me always against any Tendency towards secrecy or Clandestine Conduct; never said he be

[31] As stated previously women authors were supposed to be experts over emotions in literary works. What is interesting is not that Austen and Radcliffe include these moments of strong feeling, but rather that both works particularly feature their heroines publicly displaying these inner feelings.
[32] Thrale ran a brewery.

mysterious about Trifles; it is the first advance towards Evil, particularly in the Female Sex…" (Piozzi 12). This advice appears the exact opposite of what has previously been discussed, that women must be private on all matters. It would seem that women could not win on this account, shamed for being too private as much for being too public. If this was the case, and women were expected to walk an impossible line between oversharing and undersharing, then either way Elizabeth and Emily can be interpreted as outside the bounds of societal standards with their openness.

A more definitively socially unacceptable trait within the eyes of the late Georgian period that both heroines possess is stubbornness. To many modern readers of *Pride and Prejudice* Elizabeth's steadfast conviction brings them great joy and helps give the book a sense of timelessness. What did contemporary readers of the novel think upon reading that Elizabeth rejects two worthy proposals merely because they were unappealing to her? Elizabeth maintains her conviction throughout the entire novel, meaning that readers were forced to address this trait of hers. When Mr. Collins presents Lady Catherine and her estate as awestriking, Elizabeth remains unphased and unintimidated, "…Elizabeth's courage did not fail her. She had heard nothing of Lady Catherine that spoke her awful from any extraordinary talents or miraculous virtue, and the mere stateliness of money and rank, she thought she could witness without trepidation" (Austen 124). Later, when Lady Catherine arrives at Elizabeth's doorstep to try to prevent a marriage between Elizabeth and Darcy, Lady Catherine accuses Elizabeth of being an "[o]bstinate, headstrong girl!" (Austen 272). Of course, Lady Catherine is right. Elizabeth refuses to back down or be backed into a corner, again traits that endear her to many modern readers. In response to Lady Catherine's rudeness, Elizabeth states confidently, "I have said no such thing. I am only resolved to act in that manner, which will, in my own opinion, constitute

my happiness, without reference to *you*, or to any person so wholly unconnected with me" (Austen 273). After hearing Darcy's account of the slimy Wickham's past actions, Elizabeth refuses to humor Wickham in conversation, "[s]he saw that he wanted to engage her on the old subject of his grievances, and she was in no humour to indulge him" (Austen 179-180). This interaction indicates that Elizabeth's stubbornness does not apply only to Lady Catherine.

Elizabeth's steadfastness differentiates her from her companions. Jane serves as the greatest contrast. Elizabeth comments on Jane's behavior, "you are a great deal too apt you know, to like people in general. You never see a fault in any body. All the world are good and agreeable in your eyes. I never heard you speak ill of a human being in my life" (Austen 10). The implication of Elizabeth's statement is that that Elizabeth, herself, does not share this proclivity. Austen confirms for readers that this trait of Elizabeth's was considered unideal in polite society when Mr. Collins explicitly states that "if [Elizabeth] is really headstrong and foolish, I know not whether she would altogether be a very desirable wife…" (Austen 84). Elizabeth continues to feel separate from the ideal late-Georgian woman.

Emily's determination appears more subtly, but is present, nonetheless. While Emily often remains silent when people question her honor, she immediately rises in defense of others. When her aunt attacks the memory of her recently deceased father she does not hesitate to respond, "[m]y father's pride, Madam, had a noble object — the happiness which he knew could be derived only from goodness, knowledge, and charity" (Radcliffe 195). Later in the novel she stands up for this same aunt against the attacks of Montoni (Radcliffe 296). Emily's determination appears once again in the form of her resolve to reunite with Valancourt. She places this goal above all else. Emily almost succumbs to the idea of hiding from the world and becoming a nun, but "[i]t was the remembrance of Valancourt, of his taste, his genius, and of the

countenance which glowed with both, that, perhaps, alone determined her to return to the world" (Radcliffe 87). One could even say that Emily's determination grows within the work as by the end she begins to stand up for herself, as well. For instance, when she thinks Valancourt immoral she successfully "…repulse[s] his attentions, with an air of reserve…" (Radcliffe 627). Emily, like Elizabeth, does not follow social expectations and universally back down. Furthermore, as discussed at the beginning of this chapter, both heroines are rewarded for their defiance despite it breaking convention.

Stubbornness in Britain at the time was certainly looked down upon in women. The very fact that Lady Catherine went to Elizabeth before Darcy to try to prevent the engagement begins to indicate that women were expected to be more pliable. Johnson's commentary on Austen's protagonists begins to give an idea of this phenomenon, "[i]n endowing attractive female characters like Emma Woodhouse and Elizabeth Bennet with rich and unapologetic senses of self-consequence, Austen defies every dictum about female propriety and deference propounded in the sermons and conduct books…" (Johnson xxiii). Clearly, society would not have looked favorably on young women who did not defer to those around them. This concept appears to be supported historically with the systematic shaming Piozzi faced for publicly not fitting within societal expectations when she married Gabriel Piozzi. Montagu wrote to a friend during the scandal following Piozzi's second marriage, that Piozzi had fallen from being a woman who should be revered to "a disgrace on her sex" (Brownley 73). Even Piozzi's close friends, Samuel Johnson and Frances Burney, criticized her decision (Nussbaum 57). As Brownley discusses, Piozzi had to balance "duty and self-fulfillment," but did eventually transition from basing herself "on others and on the roles tailored for her by others to a self-image grounded in an acceptance of her own individuality and priorities" (Brownley 68, 65). This transformation

reflects that of Emily and Elizabeth. While Piozzi did go on to live a satisfying life, she was certainly not rewarded in the same fashion as these two fictional heroines, further confirming that society did not necessarily appreciate the traits that these two characters possessed.

A penchant for reason and rational thinking is yet another prominently featured trait that both Elizabeth and Emily possess and which counters ideals of the time. Elizabeth's usage of this skill appears, for instance, during the visit of Lydia and Wickham after their hasty marriage. Mrs. Bennet fully embraces the situation, but Elizabeth remains wary and cautious of the uncouth situation. Elizabeth definitively does not allow Lydia to gloss over the uncivilized way in which she found herself married. In response to Lydia's offer to find her sisters husbands Elizabeth states point blank, "I thank you for my share of the favour… but I do not particularly like your way of getting husbands" (Austen 241). Though Lydia seems unlikely to learn her lesson, this rebuke reminds the reader that Elizabeth and her standards remain steady and unwavering despite Lydia's supposed happy ending. An even more telling example of the rational nature of Elizabeth appears during the aforementioned argument with Lady Catherine over a potential marriage with Darcy. Elizabeth uses reason in her retort to Lady Catherine,

> And I certainly *never* shall give it. I am not to be intimidated into anything so wholly unreasonable. Your ladyship wants Mr. Darcy to marry your daughter; but would my giving you the wished-for promise, make *their* marriage at all more probable? Supposing him to be attached to me, would *my* refusing to accept his hand, make him wish to bestow it on his cousin? Allow me to say, Lady Catherine, that the arguments with which you have supported this extraordinary application, have been as frivolous as the application ill-judged (Austen 273).

While this is a moment of high emotions and intensity for Elizabeth, the accusations and tone of Lady Catherine being incredibly rude, Elizabeth outlines her argument clearly and succinctly. She states her stance, "I certainly *never* shall give it," she outlines the situation, "I am not to be intimidated into anything so wholly unreasonable," and then in the rest of the quotation she demonstrates the fallacy in Lady Catherine's argument. (Austen 273). This is not an overly emotional response, but rather a cool and collected reply to an irrational situation.

Emily appears as a rational figure while facing her own improbable and unreasonable situations. When Emily finds herself at the precipice of being dragged against her will to Italy by her aunt and Montoni, she forgoes the drama that Valancourt encourages,

> Emily only sighed, while Valancourt proceeded to remonstrate and to entreat with all the energy that love and apprehension could inspire. But, as his imagination magnified to her the possible evils she was going to meet, the mists of her own fancy began to dissipate, and allowed her to distinguish the exaggerated images, which imposed on his reason (Radcliffe 150).

In this moment Emily's ability to think rationally, even in the face of a dire and emotionally burdensome situation, rises above that of her love interest. Annette, in turn, exposes Emily's sensible nature by providing a contrast. While at Udolpho, Annette lets her fears run wild meaning that Emily often must remind the servant of the more probable and reasonable explanations, "…was only the wind…" (Radcliffe 225). Emily recognizes that she remains more collected than Annette in high stress situations, as her reaction to hearing Annette's wails over fear of imminent demise, "O holy Mary!...am I to stay here by myself all night! I shall be frightened out of my senses, and I shall die of hunger; I have had nothing to eat since dinner," is to tamp down a smile (Radcliffe 303).

Emily does have her moments of irrational behavior, but they are always checked by a return to reason soon after. If anything, these moments of illogical thought serve as proof of her tendency towards rational thinking. Emily descends into a state of delirium upon believing that Montoni has murdered her aunt, "[Emily] often fixed a wild and vacant look on Annette, and, when she spoke, either did not hear her, or answered from the purpose" (Radcliffe 331). In this moment the roles of Annette and Emily reverse, "… [Annette] lost in these moments all her former fears of remaining in the chamber, and watched alone by Emily, during the whole night" (Radcliffe 332). And yet the following day Emily returns to her calculating self (Radcliffe 333). The reaction to the wax sculpture of the rotting corpse initially seems illogical on Emily's part; however, the narrator explicitly gives Emily the benefit of the doubt on the matter, explaining "…that it is not surprising Emily should have mistaken it for the object it resembled, nor since she had heard such an extraordinary account … that she should have believed this to be the murdered body of the lady Laurentini…" (Radcliffe 622). Overall, Emily's rational moments do not erase her many moments of calm, reasonable thought.

Based on the world created by Radcliffe, it would seem that the role of the voice of reason was more often filled by men, rather than women, making Emily unique. The perfect example of this being the marked difference between St Aubert and his sister Madame Montoni. Jessica A. Volz, in her article "Ann Radcliffe's Gothic Reconstructions of Female Identity and Experience," explains that "[w]hereas St Aubert warns against sensibility on his deathbed, Madame Montoni threatens the heroine on the eve of her metaphorical death. The woman's call for Emily to 'be something like a reasonable creature' is juxtaposed with its antithesis…" (Volz 133).[33] Outside of literature there appears confirmation that Emily and Elizabeth, might have

[33] This association of the masculine with rationality is interesting when compared to the previously mentioned quote (p. 12) that describes the perceived difference in the minds of men and women: "[t]hough both sexes possess in

been interpreted as taking up masculine tendencies with their rational thinking. It appears that men were considered to be rational in their natural state. A book called *A Tale of the Times. By the Author of A Gossip's Story*. *Dedicated by Permission to Mrs. Carter* from 1799 written by Jane West uses the phrase "…[it] contained a sufficient number of wonders to entertain any rational man…" seeming to imply that an odd and uncommon man would be the one without rational thought (West 297).

In contrast, it appears that young women did not naturally possess rational thought according to society. A book published in 1800 called *The School for Fashion, in Two Volumes* by Ann Thicknesse describes the danger of leaving a young woman to her own amusements, "[a] very celebrated French writer has given it as her opinion, that nothing can be more dangerous for a young woman than solitude : it certainly is so; unless she has free access to a well chosen library, and some other rational amusements, to employ her thoughts and time … (Thicknesse 121-122). According to this quotation, the library and related amusements are the only hope in ensuring that the young woman in question stays rational. It would seem, that Emily and Elizabeth's innate propensities for rational thinking separate them from the average woman. This perspective further indicates that Emily and Elizabeth would have been perceived as different from the common woman by contemporary readers; therefore, making it interesting that their novels were wildly successful in the late Georgian period.

This chapter began the exploration of the ways in which these two heroines, Emily and Elizabeth, both conformed to and broke away from the era's standards for young women. Many similarities between these protagonists emerge, despite them appearing in drastically different

---

common the faculties of mind which are enumerated by philosophers, these faculties are doubtless modified by various courses, so that there often spread a marked difference in their mental organization ("Character and Condition of Woman" 87).

works. This chapter particularly focused on the external and public qualities that both the heroines share. Emily and Elizabeth follow social norms by being adored and proper and, yet, they are overly open, determined, and reasonable, in comparison to the expectations of young women at the time.[34] The two authors praise the traits held by the heroines, both the unconventional and the conventional, as the two heroines both receive happy endings. In the next chapter I will explore how the novel form reveals further information on the ways Emily and Elizabeth balance being ideal women and improper women.

[34] I am not the first to point out many of these qualities in Elizabeth. While I paint these traits as those which pull Elizabeth out of the perceived social norm, Armstrong argues that these qualities demonstrate a masculine side of Elizabeth, "[w]hile excelling in none of the traditionally feminine qualities represented by her competitors … [Elizabeth's] particular assets are the traditionally masculine qualities of rational intelligence, honestly, self-possession, and especially a command of the language, all of which at first seem to impede a good marriage" (Armstrong 50). Either way, these qualities make Elizabeth unique in comparison to her companions. The fact that Armstrong and I identified so many of the same qualities in Elizabeth supports the notion that these traits would not have gone unnoticed by contemporary readers.

3. The Inside Look: Late-Georgian Novels and the Heroine's Inner Life

While the perceptible traits of Emily and Elizabeth begin to challenge the idea of what gender in the late Georgian period actually looked like, the traits hidden below the surface of these characters, both socially appropriate and not, display the importance of the novel form and the prominence of the heroine in the early years of this genre of literature. This chapter will discuss the traits held by Emily and Elizabeth that are perceptible to readers because they appear in novels with third-person omniscient narrators. As explained by Watt, novels leave room for a discussion of the unseemly or private (Watt 199). The power of these particular novels comes, in part, from their look into the minds of young women, a previously off-limits space in society. Gary Kelly in his chapter "Religion and Politics" within *The Cambridge Companion to Jane Austen* describes this phenomenon in Austen's work:

> …Austen's use of third-person narration with free indirect discourse makes it possible for the reader to ignore the narrator's ironic distance from the protagonist and identify with the protagonist and her 'readings,' or rather misreadings, thereby experiencing with the protagonist her romance journey … (Kelly).

Similarly, Volz in their article describes how Radcliffe shifts "responsibility for interpreting sights onto the reader" to ensure that readers are immersed within the confusion of the mystery in *The Mysteries of Udolpho* (Volz 88). With the understanding that readers of the time would have been identifying with these two heroines, interest turns to what exactly this inside look would have told readers about the lives and experiences of women.

A good portion of thesis is dedicated to discussing how these two novels bring the reader and the heroine together. However, it must be recognized that both novels use third-person narration, which naturally creates a distance between these two entities. Both authors were themselves avid readers, which means that both Radcliffe and Austen were aware of the different

narration styles at their disposal. Therefore, the choice to use third-person narration was not accidental for either woman. While third-person narration does create distance, this narration style allows for Radcliffe and Austen to have control over their respective depictions of womanhood. Neither author allows readers to glean the information on what being a woman means themselves, rather readers are directed in their understanding by the usage of free indirect discourse. This narration style allows for both authors to mold the interpretations of the reader.

While Radcliffe's and Austen's works cannot be understood as exact representations of daily life in late-Georgian Britain, they do not represent complete fiction either. As discussed in chapter one, readers expected a degree of that which could be considered familiar or common in their fiction. Even more convincingly, contemporary critics credited Austen for her ability to portray everyday life. As seen in Jennie Batchelor's chapter "Jane Austen and Charlotte Smith: Biography, Autobiography, and the Writing of Women's Literary History," an 1862 work written by Julia Kavanagh called *English Women of Letters* describes Austen as someone who "painted life so well" and successfully portrayed the commonplace (Batchelor 189,190). Kavanaugh does not give Radcliffe the same praise but rather mentions her "picturesque faculty" (Batchelor 190). It would seem that to praise women authors for their inclusion of that which was considered familiar and quotidian was common during the time as Piozzi describes Burney's *Cecilia* as being "the Picture of Life such as the Author sees it" (Piozzi 536). Piozzi goes on to explain that due to this resemblance to everyday life, "…while therefore this Mode of Life lasts, [Burney's] Book will be of value, as the Representation is astonishingly perfect…" (Piozzi 536). In this quotation Piozzi indicates that she perceived novels as having the potential to portray life authentically. This statement certainly encourages the use of the novel as a method to provide historical insight.

Perhaps Piozzi is implying with this citation that current members of society can take advice from *Cecilia* due to its resemblance of everyday life. If this is true, then it makes the heroines in *Pride and Prejudice* and *The Mysteries of Udolpho* all the more interesting, as they may have been seen as role models. According to Jane Rendall in "Women and the Enlightenment in Britain, c. 1690-1800," after 1789 "[w]omen readers not only identified with the representation of emotion, but found in such novels the empowering of emotional expression" (Rendall 16). This understanding of the late-Georgian reader blends with the argument that readers associated themselves with the heroines depicted. Helen Berry in her article "Women, Consumption and Taste" in *Women's History: Britain, 1700-1850* provides further proof of this tendency to search for true representations of self in fiction, as she highlights an anecdote made by a servant in 1842 which complained of the lack of ordinary women in novels (Berry 209-210). It would seem that fictional works attempted to depict women who resembled those found in everyday life. Therefore, the inside looks into young women may likely have resembled, or at least were assumed by the readers to resemble, the familiar, everyday woman.

Internal Perfection

In terms of their interior selves, Emily and Elizabeth do appear to fit some of the expectations of a classic late-Georgian woman. One interesting commonality is less of a trait and more of an experience. Emily and Elizabeth share a lack of agency, but to varying degrees. Radcliffe routinely stresses Emily's lack of agency over her own life. After the death of her father, her aunt, "…had ordered, that all letters, addressed to her niece, should be delivered to herself, and who, after having perused [Valancourt's letter] and indulged the expressions of resentment… had consigned it to the flames" (Radcliffe 142). Prior to this occurrence Madame

Montoni had already separated Emily and Valancourt. With Madame Montoni throwing the letters into the flames, Radcliffe confirms for readers the occurrence of a systematic removal of Emily from society. At this moment Emily's plight is just beginning. Emily proves to be keenly aware of her powerlessness, "[s]he had no wish to reside with her uncle, M. Quesnel, since his behaviour to her late father and to herself, had been uniformly such as to convince her, that in flying to him she could only obtain an exchange of oppressors…" (Radcliffe 194). Volz in her work explains how Radcliffe's gothic form allows for Radcliffe to depict common social dynamics, "…the Gothic novel's preoccupation with terror and the undefined allows her to dramatize real power structures in ways that torment the eyes and minds of her heroines." (Volz 87). Volz later goes on to say that "[Radcliffe's] novels owe much of their psychological depth to her method of making the boundlessness of male power and female oppression visible" (Volz 135). Emily certainly lacks control and based on Volz's argument this depiction resembles the lived experiences of women at the time. Emily is certainly not the only heroine to struggle with such an issue as losing control.

Elizabeth does not face the same physical isolation or terror as Emily, but she does have moments in which she appears alone or out of control. An example of such a moment is the period directly after when she reads Darcy's letter, a time in which she faces a number of realizations about herself and those around her. Elizabeth later expresses to Jane what she felt at this time, "I was very uncomfortable, I may say unhappy. And with no one to speak to, of what I felt, no Jane to comfort me and say that I had not been so very weak and vain and nonsensical as I knew I had! Oh! how I wanted you!" (Austen 172). At this instance Elizabeth lacks a companion with whom she feels comfortable conveying her distress. This secret that Elizabeth has to keep continues to weigh on her and isolate her even when first reunited with Jane and it is

a “state of indecision in which she remained, as to the extent of what she should communicate; and her fear, if she once entered on the subject, of being hurried into repeating something of Bingley, which might only grieve her sister farther” (Austen 166). A slightly comical moment in which Elizabeth appears out of control emerges when Mr. Collins plagues her at a ball (Austen 78). Because she must avoid dancing with him again, she lacks the agency to dance with anyone else. In *Pride and Prejudice* readers are given insight into the ways in which Elizabeth does not completely control her life. This shared lack of agency between these two separate heroines is far from a coincidence, in fact these two books alone provide a host of other examples of women facing this same experience.

The worlds of the two novels indicate that many women in this historical period lacked agency. *Pride and Prejudice* provides many examples of women being at the whim of society. The Bingley sisters’s snarky comments about the Bennet’s extended family, which includes an attorney residing in Cheapside, demonstrates the idea that a woman’s status and place in society was linked with her family (Austen 26). While men faced a similar expectation, a man likely had more options for ways in which to appropriately make a name for himself where a woman could not. Women lacked physical control of themselves within good society. Lady Catherine’s remark on the impropriety of a woman traveling alone indicates that women could not be independent without being considered improper (Austen 162). Finally, Mary’s ill-timed comment on the virtue of women in response to Lydia’s social fall accurately depicts the plight of women at the time:

> [u]nhappy as the event must be for Lydia, we may draw from it this useful lesson; that loss of virtue in a female is irretrievable– that one false step involves her in endless ruin– that her reputation is no less brittle that it is beautiful, – and that she

> cannot be too much guarded in her behaviour towards the undeserving of the other sex (Austen 219)

Emily's woes, though perhaps slightly different in nature from those within *Pride and Prejudice*, are similarly shared with the other women around her. Madame Montoni faces the same seclusion as Emily by the end of her life as she exclaims: "… [Montoni] has taken me from my country and friends, to shut me up in this old castle; and, here he thinks he can compel me to do whatever he designs!" (Radcliffe 265). Both Emily and Elizabeth appear to lack control over their own lives, and yet this quality does not discount them from being idealized as heroines. While Emily's physical isolation may not have been relatable to the average late-Georgian woman, the concept that women lacked the ability to control their own destiny was present outside of fiction.

Unsurprisingly, historical evidence emerges supporting the belief that women lacked agency in this period. Piozzi serves as a helpful example once again. In her early life Piozzi aimed to please everyone but herself, "[a]fter her mother and her uncle chose her husband, her mother and her husband between them amiably scheduled her life for their convenience. Together they evolved for her the narrowest imaginable interpretation of the traditional feminine role" (Brownley 66). In fact, Piozzi admits to herself that she married Thrale to please her mother, "…I married the first Time to please my Mother, I must marry the second Time to please my Daughter…" (Piozzi 544). Later in the same entry, Piozzi writes on the burden of trying to not damage the status of her daughters with her actions:

> but I am the Guardian of five Daughters by M^{r} Thrale, and must not disgrace *their* Name & Family… I have always sacrificed my own Choice to that of others, so I must sacrifice it again: — but why? Oh because I am a Woman of superior

> Understanding, & must not for the World degrade my self from my Situation in Life. but if I *have* superior Understanding, let me at least make use of it for once; & rise to the Rank of a human Being conscious of its own power to discern Good from Ill—the person who has uniformly acted by the Will of others, has hardly that Dignity to boast. but once again I am Guardian to five Girls; agreed—will this Connection prejudice their Bodies, Souls, or Purse? my Marriage may assist *my* Health, but I suppose it will not injure *theirs*: — will his Company or Companions corrupt their Morals; God forbid, if I did not believe him one of the best of our Fellow Beings I would reject him instantly. Can it injure their Fortunes? and could he impoverish (if he would) five Women to whom their Father left 20,000£ each—independent almost of Possibilities? To what then am I Guardian? to their Pride and Prejudice? & is anything else affected by the Alliance? (Piozzi 544-545).

Not only does Piozzi evoke the name of an 1813 book in 1782, but she highlights many of the subjects that appear in both *Pride and Prejudice* and *The Mysteries of Udolpho*, questions of familial status, duty, logistics surrounding money, and more. Piozzi's mentioning of the financial burden of being a woman certainly relates her to the two heroines.

Elizabeth and Emily both lack financial agency. Early in the novel, St Aubert expresses concern over his ability to provide for Emily, "[m]y income, you know, was never large, and now it will be reduced to little indeed! It is for you, Emily, for you, my child, that I am most afflicted" (Radcliffe 59). The parallels between this circumstance and that faced by Mr. Bennet and his daughters is clear. As Austen helpfully explains to readers, "Mr. Bennet's property consisted almost entirely in an estate of two thousand a year, which, unfortunately for his

daughters, was entailed … and their mother's fortune, though ample for her situation in life, could ill supply the deficiency of his" (Austen 20). Clearly, both Elizabeth and Emily lack any form of financial freedom, Emily due to a lack of available funds and Elizabeth due to the entailing system and her lack of brothers. This burden that Elizabeth and Emily bear appeared outside of fiction and even in the sensational life of Piozzi.

Actual women of the time faced their own financial burdens. Epstein, in her book on Burney, describes how "…women remained the property of their fathers and husbands and without useful legal status, and continued to serve as pawns in an increasingly competitive marriage market with complex rules of property settlement and entail still supporting the powers of the patriarchal family" (Epstein 7). She goes on to stress that financial means for women of this social class were particularly limited in this period due to "…the shift away from cottage industry in the home and toward domestic specialization and enforced idleness…" (Epstein 7). With this historical perspective, readers can understand that Emily's and Elizabeth's lack of financial means did not prevent them from representing the common late-Georgian women. Not only do both heroines' lack financial agency, as well as personal agency, but both fictional and historical women of the time faced the burden of the marriage customs.

Emily faces more oppression than just forced isolation and migration. Terrifyingly, according to Emily, Montoni appears ready to force her into a marriage with Count Morano. Emily holds no faith in her ability to prevent such an event, despite her deep aversion to the concept, "[s]he was not even perfectly certain of the consequence of her steady refusal at the altar, and she trembled, more than ever, at the power of Montoni…" (Radcliffe 208). This experience, once again, directly relates the two novels to each other. While Emily uniquely faces isolation, potential loss of physical agency with an attempted kidnapping, and fear of invasion of

her personal space, a fear of a forced marriage to an undesirable partner haunts both Emily and Elizabeth (Radcliffe 213, 249, 364).

Elizabeth fears being forced into marriage for a brief moment in *Pride and Prejudice*. After Elizabeth turns down Mr. Collins, the desperate Mrs. Bennet runs to Mr. Bennet and tells him "[y]ou must come and make Lizzy marry Mr. Collins, for she vows she will not have him, and if you do not make haste he will change his mind and not have *her*" (Austen 85). Very quickly this fear is laid to rest as Mr. Bennet jokes, "[f]rom this day you must be a stranger to one of your parents.—Your mother will never see you again if you do *not* marry Mr. Collins, and I will never see you again if you *do*" (Austen 85). While Elizabeth never appears in any real danger of being forced into an unwanted marriage, Austen does stress that most proposals are not turned down. Both Mr. Collins and Darcy fully expect their proposals to be accepted by Elizabeth. The certainty of Mr. Collins appears to know no bounds as when Elizabeth declines, his first assumption is that she is feigning disinterest to make the marriage process a game (Austen 82). Later, Elizabeth claims to "…see that [Darcy] had no doubt of a favourable answer. He *spoke* of apprehension and anxiety, but his countenance expressed real security" (Austen 145). While Elizabeth does not experience a forced marriage, her rejection of such suitable marriages is certainly seen as out of the ordinary. Elizabeth simultaneously fits expectations by fearing a forced marriage and breaks them by rejecting what could be considered ideal marriage matches. As is well known, marriage figured prominently in late-Georgian society; therefore, it is unsurprising that all of these comments on marriage applied to the heroines appeared in other characters within the two novels, as well.

Both novels provide other examples to demonstrate that this experience, or fear of such an experience, was not unique to these particular heroines. Readers hear of an example of an

actual forced marriage with the history of the Marchioness and former-Marquis de Villeroi, the unhappy conclusion of this event being murder (Radcliffe 618-9). Overall, the lack of agency that Emily experiences did not distinguish her from other the women; therefore, it is not the circumstances of Emily's life that made her break convention. This experience is confirmed both by historical evidence and by looking at other women in *Pride and Prejudice*.

In *Pride and Prejudice* marriage plays a similarly crucial role for both Elizabeth and the other young women featured. With the voice of Mrs. Bennet at the very beginning of the novel readers hear of the competition that develops between families to get young women married, "I do not believe Mrs. Long will [provide an introduction to Mr. Bingley]… She has two nieces of her own. She is a selfish, hypocritical woman, and I have no opinion of her" (Austen 3). Marriage carries an immense social weight. *Pride and Prejudice* features characters who particularly expound on this circumstance. Charlotte, in the moments after accepting Mr. Collins's proposal, thinks that marriage "…was the only honourable provision for well-educated young women of small fortune, and however uncertain of giving happiness, must be their pleasantest preservative from want" (Austen 94). Jane's fateful journey to Netherfield by horseback in the pouring rain, a set of circumstances carefully orchestrated by her mother in order that she "…must stay all night," demonstrates a tendency to use women as pawns in the game of marriage (Austen 22). Jane continues to fulfil the role of the pawn, according to Elizabeth, as the Bingley sisters and Darcy attempt to maneuver Jane and Bingley apart (Austen 99). The routine nature of these marriage games means that readers of the time would not have found any of these sentiments or concerns about marriage in any of the women characters to be unusual or disconcerting.

It is important to note that Austen did not present women as possessing absolutely no say in marriage. Mr. Bennet does allow Elizabeth to reject Mr. Collins and feels the need to confirm with Elizabeth numerous times that she genuinely wishes to marry Darcy before he agrees to the match. Even earlier, Elizabeth indicates that Jane has a decision to make on the marriage front, "[y]ou must decide for yourself…and if upon mature deliberation, you find that the misery of disobliging his two sisters is more than equivalent to the happiness of being his wife, I advise you by all means to refuse him," implying that Jane does hold the power to make such decisions (Austen 92). While this does complicate the idea of marriage at the time, the presence of a forced marriage plot at all, in a book praised by contemporaries for its resemblance to everyday life, implies that forced marriages or distinctly unhappy matches did occur in society. Primary sources of the era verify that this circumstance was, in fact, common.

Piozzi's *Thraliana* once again provides examples of this social expectation. As mentioned earlier, Piozzi's first marriage to Thrale was decided upon by her mother. She references the ceaseless pressure placed on women to marry in her diary. Piozzi in November of 1782 complains that "[t]here is no Mercy for me in this Island—I am more and more disposed to try the Continent. one Day the paper rings wth my Marriage to Johnson, one Day to Crutchley; one Day to Seward. I give no Reason for such Impertinence, but cannot deliver myself from it" (Piozzi 547). This portrayal of marriage fits with that depicted in the two novels. Interestingly, Piozzi shirks the idea that she must marry:

> … a Woman of passable Person, ancient Family, respectable Character, uncommon Talents, and three Thousand a Year: has a Right to think herself any Man's *equal*; & has nothing to seek but return of Affection from whatever Partner She pitches on. to marry for *Love* would therefore be rational in me, who want no

> Advancement of Birth or Fortune, and till I am in Love, I will not marry—*nor perhaps then* (Piozzi 531).

This position does not appear directly in *The Mysteries of Udolpho* or *Pride and Prejudice*; however, Charlotte does not seem enamored by the concept of marriage, which perhaps invokes the mentality of Piozzi. The commitment to love in marriage included by Piozzi resembles that of Elizabeth and Emily, as well as Jane and Lady Blanche. While in both works women appear to generally lack agency, readers are particularly privy to the heroine's experiences with this social circumstance. The internal look provided by the novel form effectively presented the lack of agency of these two heroines,[35] but this perspective provided more than just insight on the circumstance in which the heroines navigated. These two novels successfully conveyed the morals of the heroines to readers, as well.

The compassion which both Elizabeth and Emily possess was certainly a socially acceptable trait in women, according to the late Georgian period. The end of *The Mysteries of Udolpho* provides the best example of Emily's compassionate soul. The conclusion of work sees Emily fully coming into her role as the loving provider. During the final pages she finances the marriage of Annette and Ludovico before providing them positions in her household and she resigns her inheritance from Lady Laurentini to Monsieur Bonnac (Radcliffe 631). The narrator describes this ending as the restoration "…to the exercise of the benevolence, which had always animated their hearts…" (Radcliffe 632). This moment is Emily's culminating point, her happy ending, and it distinctly features her care of others. This is a quality that appears throughout the work.

[35] These portrayals of heroines lacking agency had a political undertone. Johnson explains this notion in her discussion of Austen: "the device of centering her novels in the consciousness of unempowered characters—that is, women … enables Austen to expose and explore those aspects of traditional institutions—marriage, primogeniture, patriarchy—which patently do not serve her heroines well" (Johnson xxiv).

Emily routinely puts the needs of others before her own. When her father first falls ill and Emily finds herself alone in the woods searching for help, "[h]er mind was for some time so entirely occupied by anxiety and terror for her father, that she felt none for herself…" (Radcliffe 64). In this moment the inclination to put others before herself shines through. Emily tolerates the faults of those around her, which becomes a fault of her own. Until her aunt's dying breath Emily remains tolerant, despite the many wrongs of her aunt. An example of this tolerance appears when Emily first faces her aunt's accusation of impropriety, "… pride and anxiety struggled in her breast; and, till she recollected, that appearances did, in some degree, justify her aunt's suspicions, she could not resolve to humble herself so far as to enter into the defence of a conduct, which had been so innocent and undesigning on her part" (Radcliffe 107). Emily gives her aunt the benefit of the doubt. Later when Montoni discovers Morano attempting to kidnap an unwilling Emily, Emily steps up as the voice of empathetic reason in order to try and prevent the men from killing each other. She "…pleaded a cause of common humanity, with the feelings of the warmest benevolence, when she entreated Montoni to allow Morano the assistance in the castle, which his situation required" (Radcliffe 253). She goes through the pains of beseeching these two men despite distinctly not liking either of them. Annette even accuses Emily of being too compassionate, "[a]h dear, ma'amselle!—to see now how considerate you can be about some folks, who care so little about you! I cannot bear to see you so deceived…" (Radcliffe 270). Towards the end, when Emily's fate still seems unclear, she tries to be positive so that others may enjoy her company, "[i]n the gaiety, which surrounded her, Emily vainly tried to participate, her spirits being depressed by the late discoveries, and by the anxiety concerning the fate of Valancourt…" (Radcliffe 624). She remains kind until the end and because of the inner look of

the novel readers are privy to this compassion. This integral part of Emily appears in Elizabeth, as well.

Elizabeth possesses a similar degree of kindness. In fact, Elizabeth closes her own story as a provider, much in the way of Emily. Austen reveals that Elizabeth uses her personal funds to support the still hopelessly silly Lydia and devilish Wickham, as well as takes part in the upbringing of both Darcy's young sister Georgiana and Kitty (Austen 295-7). Elizabeth routinely shows compassion to her sisters even before the end of the novel. When Lady Catherine criticizes all of the Bennet daughters being out in society at once, Elizabeth defends the decision for the sake of her youngest sisters, "[b]ut really ma'am, I think it would be very hard upon younger sisters, that they should not have their share of society and amusement because the elder may not have the means or inclination to marry early" (Austen 128). With both heroines serving as emblems of compassion it is easy to once again see them as idealized women.

Late-Georgian society praised compassion in women. Piozzi references her desire to serve others in a 1782 entry, "may my Fortune & Talents be ever devoted to Charity & Friendship! & may I have Strength & Courage to despise them who would hinder its Current…" (Piozzi 531). Further evidence of the expectation placed on women to do good and help others appears in Hannah More's 1796 work called *The way to plenty; or the second part of Tom White*, which sought to be a moral guide for the period. The wife of the eponymous character, referred to as only Mrs. White, appears in direct acts of service to others. More describes how "…Mrs. White dressed a very plentiful supper of meat and pudding; and spread out two tables… At these sat all the old and infirm poor… in the little court, sat the children of his labourers, and of the other poor … he gave them plenty of pudding…" (More 14-15). While More's description of this generosity includes both Tom and Mrs. White, Mrs. White predominantly appears in the story at

these particular moments of generous hospitality, which attaches her womanhood to these acts. Overall, it is clear that society positively associated women with charity work and kindness.

This section's focus on the interior, socially acceptable qualities of the two heroines confirms that many of the topics and sentiments of contemporary society did appear in fiction. These inclusions confirm the presence and prevalence in the late Georgian period of social expectations placed on women. As discussed, the heroines seemed to conform not only to the standards set in the fictional worlds, but those of late-Georgian society too. Austen and Radcliffe both indicated that the innerworkings of women can fit with societal norms. As the inner minds of young women were, in some ways, considered off limits in realms outside of fiction, it feels crucial that Radcliffe and Austen did not completely shirk expectations with the interiority of their heroines particularly as both heroines are granted happy endings. That being said, the interior qualities of both heroines certainly include those which broke convention.

Private Rebellions

Perhaps the traits with the most potential for further study are those shared between the two heroines which are looked down upon by society and yet are revealed due to the intimacy of these novels. These are the qualities that bring up the question of how the average late-Georgian reader would have reacted to the heroines in the two novels. While we may never know the individual reactions of readers, this section will endeavor to explore how these depictions of young women varied from the social norm in order to allow for an understanding of the power of the novel form in its ability to present inside knowledge to readers.

A powerful example of just such an unconventional trait can be seen with the intellectual nature of the two young heroines. One of the very first descriptions of Emily describes her intellectual pursuits, "[h]ere she usually exercised herself in elegant arts, cultivated only because they were congenial to her taste, and in which native genius, assisted by the instructions of

Monsieur and Madame St Aubert, made her an early proficient" (Radcliffe 7). These elegant arts include reading, drawing, playing instruments, and studying birds and plants (Radcliffe 7). The word accomplished accurately describes Emily. Later Radcliffe informs readers of Emily's educational background, in particular, "[St Aubert] gave her a general view of the sciences, and an exact acquaintance with every part of elegant literature. He taught her Latin and English, chiefly that she might understand the sublimity of their best poets. She discovered in her early years a taste for works of genius…" (Radcliffe 9). The extent of Emily's education appears truly vast. Emily treasures her intelligence just as St Aubert hoped, "…poverty cannot deprive us of intellectual delights…" (Radcliffe 59). Notably, the bonds between Emily and Valancourt include an intellectual one, "[Emily] would work, while Valancourt read aloud works of genius and taste, listened to her enthusiasm, expressed his own, and caught new opportunities of observing, that their minds were formed to constitute the happiness of each other… (Radcliffe 133). Emily's intellectual nature shines through in these three examples. Emily's devotion to cerebral thought further contributes to the list of similarities held by the two heroines.

Elizabeth's intellectualism materializes first in her slight preference for books while staying at Netherfield**,** "[o]n entering the drawing-room [Elizabeth]… found the whole party at loo, and was immediately invited to join them; but suspecting them to be playing high she declined it, and making her sister the excuse, said she would amuse herself for the short time she could stay below with a book" (Austen 27). Later, during her conversation with Lady Catherine on education, Elizabeth's intellectual tendencies once again emerge. Elizabeth describes her upbringing explicitly, "…such of us as wished to learn, never wanted the means. We were always encouraged to read, and had all the masters that were necessary. Those who chose to be idle, certainly might" (Austen 127). As Elizabeth rarely appears idle within the book, this

statement implies that Elizabeth did not choose idleness, which means she took initiative in learning as much as she wished. While she did not have a personal instructor like Emily did with St Aubert, it still stands to reason that she had an interest in the intellectual side of life. While both heroines possess this trait of intellectualism, society during this period was unsure about the intellectual woman.

Society's relationship to a scholarly woman was tenuous during the late Georgian period. Traditionally these portrayals of intellectual women may have seemed completely out of line; however, this period did see a growing trend of the cultivation of the woman intellectual (Brownley 66). With this understanding the two heroines appear to be in keeping with the time. Rendell even goes as far as to claim that

> [s]eventeenth-century rationalism, which emphasized the separation of mind and body, seemed to make the physical differences between the sexes less significant and provide new ground for the assertion of intellectual equality…Women writers restated the case for intellectual equality in these terms from the beginning of the eighteenth century onwards (Rendall 18).

Society even celebrated certain intellectual women who were considered part of the "polite and conversational culture" (Rendall 19). Piozzi can certainly be understood to be an intellectual woman of this period. In the *Thraliana* she makes countless intellectual references, she seemingly seamlessly translates between multiple languages, and she comments on the political with regularity. Interestingly, Piozzi had people around her who encouraged her intellectual pursuits. As Brownley notes, "[Samuel] Johnson's insistence on her mental development is a small reflection of the tentative changes beginning to be made in women's images by eighteenth-century advances towards feminine intellectual liberation" (Brownley 66). With these

perspectives alone, one might think that Austen's and Radcliffe's portrayals of intellectual women should be in the socially conventional section of the chapter; however, the place of highly educated women in society was not fully stable.

Women's intellectualism did not find complete acceptance and stability in this era. This uncertainty surrounding the woman intellectual makes a case for the uniqueness or at least the unconventionality of Austen and Radcliffe's inclusion of intelligent women. Deborah Simonton, in her chapter "Women and Education" within *Women's History: Britain, 1700-1850*, explains how the increased emphasis put on the education of women focused less on the benefit for the young girls' minds and more on the crafting of young girls to be the future ideal partners for men (Simonton 52). While Emily does bond with her lover over intellectual ideas, neither Elizabeth nor Emily seem to pursue higher thought solely for the sake of pleasing the men around them. Radcliffe even mentions specifically that Emily finds a distinct joy in these pursuits. While at Udolpho, to make herself feel better, she "unpacked her books, her sweet delight in happier days, and her soothing resource in the hours of moderate sorrow…" (Radcliffe 235). If this second understanding of education at the time is to be believed, then both women subverted the expectation that the education of women was for a man's benefit. Hannah More, a previously mentioned contemporary writer, vocally criticized education's tendency to stress the public side of women's lives. As Simonton observes, "More also criticized female education because it was geared exclusively for the transient period of youth and beauty: 'We educated them for a crowd, forgetting they live at home, for the world and not for themselves, for show and not for use, for time and not eternity'" (Simonton 45). Interestingly, this implies that education was understood as a tool for public use rather than private. Elizabeth and Emily's propensity for academics thus interacts well with their disinterest in keeping to the private sphere. These historical additions

indicate that Elizabeth and Emily break the norm with their intellectualism. Being intellectuals is not the only inner quality of the two heroine's that snubs the era's social norms.

The observational skills of Emily and Elizabeth appear at the center of their respective novels. Austen makes Elizabeth's tendency towards this trait readily apparent as Elizabeth constantly watches and judges the world around her. In an awkward conversation between Mrs. Bennet, Bingley, Darcy, and Elizabeth, Bingley comments on how Elizabeth studies the character of those around her (Austen 31). Elizabeth replies that "intricate characters are the *most* amusing. They have at least that advantage… people themselves alter so much, that there is something new to be observed in them for ever" (Austen 31). Austen explicitly informs readers of Elizabeth's observational tendencies with this interaction.

Even a not particularly astute reader would likely have already picked up on this propensity due to the third-person omniscient narrator. Elizabeth's power of scrutiny and deduction appears just pages later when she finds herself in the company of Bingley, his sisters, and Darcy. In observing Darcy, she deduces that his smile actually covers the offence he has taken at Miss Bingley's comment and in response to this understanding "checked her laugh" (Austen 37). Here Elizabeth's ability to maintain decorum, as discussed earlier, is aided by her ability to calculate astutely Darcy's inner thoughts. Readers would never know this fine balance that Elizabeth strikes if the narrator were not so forthcoming with the inner monologue of Elizabeth. In the same scene the relationship between gender and observation emerges. The comical moment in which Miss Bingley desperately attempts to gain Darcy's attention by asking Elizabeth to walk around the room with her provides the reveal. Miss Bingley asks Darcy to join and his quip in response is:

> You either chuse this method of passing the evening because you are in each other's confidence and have secret affairs to discuss, or because you are conscious that your figures appear to the greatest advantage in walking;– if the first, I should be completely in your way;– and if the second, I can admire you much better as I sit by the fire (Austen 42).

Everyone in the room is well aware that Miss Bingley's motivation has nothing to do with the first option. With this somewhat snarky remark on Darcy's part, Austen provides readers insight into the idea that men were supposed to be the observers of women, not the other way around. The intriguing nature of this idea grows when combined with Elizabeth's other exploits as an astute observer. Elizabeth's tendency appears as she makes quick judgments on Mr. Collins based on his letter and as she later watches the first interaction between Darcy and Wickham with intrigue (Austen 48, 55). Elizabeth does not function as the only woman who takes on the role of observer within *Pride and Prejudice*, Charlotte tells Elizabeth: "I see what you are feeling" and later observes and correctly guesses the dynamic between Elizabeth and Darcy (Austen 96, 139). However, being an observer seems to be a fundamental aspect of Elizabeth.

Emily proves to be quite observant of the world around her, as well. In a comment on the intelligence of Emily, the narrator mentions that "[t]he intelligent eyes of Emily seemed to read what passed in the mind of her father…" (Radcliffe 61). This phrase could easily be used to describe Elizabeth. Later, Emily sees through Valancourt's veneer, according to the narrator, "[b]ut she saw the veil he had spread over his resentment, and, his assumed tranquillity only alarm[ing] her more…" (Radcliffe 139). Emily maintains this ability throughout the book, in the latter half she observes that Monsieur Bonnac "did not appear so much affected now, as on the preceding evening" (Radcliffe 611). Emily earlier in the work stands in as the witness of her

aunt's death (Radcliffe 354). This perspective of Emily is only available to the readers due to the narrator explicitly informing the reader of these perceptions. Often Emily does not clearly react to any of her observations; therefore, without the narrator, readers would lose this observant side of her. While observation in itself could be considered in itself harmless, Emily and Elizabeth do not only observe in their respective books.

Emily and Elizabeth judge those around them. Upon seeing the countenance of her guide, Barnardine, when Montoni sends Emily away from Udolpho, Emily deduces that his visage indicates "that there was no deed, however black, which he might not be prevailed upon to execute" (Radcliffe 319). Emily sees and she judges. Later as Emily finds herself at the bedside of the raving Agnes, Emily decides that "more than madness" plagues the poor woman (Radcliffe 606). And Emily, despite her best efforts, does judge her aunt for placing herself in such a horrible situation, "…she could not avoid musing upon the strange infatuation that had proved so fatal to her aunt, and had involved herself in a labyrinth of misfortune, from which she saw no means of escaping,–the marriage with Montoni" (Radcliffe 355). Once again, it is because of Emily's relationship with the narrator that readers know the extent of Emily's judgments. This dynamic appears in *Pride and Prejudice*, as well.

Examples of Elizabeth's capacity to judge powerfully materialize throughout *Pride and Prejudice*. Without pause she tells Darcy that his defect is "… to hate every body" (Austen 43). Later, upon first seeing Lady Catherine's daughter, Elizabeth makes the snarky remark, "[s]he looks sickly and cross" (Austen 122). Not only does this example indicate Elizabeth's tendency to make a snap judgment on someone based on appearances alone, but the rudeness of the remark further separates her from the ideal kind-hearted late-Georgian woman. This judgmental side appears periodically to be a fault of Elizabeth's as she can possess fully unsubstantiated

confidence in her assumptions that she freely shares with those around her. Events such as these reveal that while her observational skills are astute, her judgment is not faultless. With confidence she states: "I can much more easily believe Mr. Bingley's being imposed on, than that Mr. Wickham should invent such a history of himself as he gave me last night; names, facts, every thing mentioned without ceremony" (Austen 65). Readers eventually learn of the falsity of this claim. However, Elizabeth often does assess correctly. Jane, in a letter, writes that Elizabeth has judged the Bingley sisters entirely correctly (Austen 114). A clear difference between Emily and Elizabeth is that Elizabeth's judgments are not necessarily always private. Even without the narrator readers would know of her habit because she explicitly states her judgments with regularity. Nonetheless, Elizabeth's judgments do not conform to the societal standards around her.

While many revere Elizabeth in *Pride and Prejudice*, Elizabeth's judgment is not universally praised even within the text. Darcy's response to one of Elizabeth's accusations informs readers that he does not appreciate this tendency, "…I could wish, Miss Bennet, that you were not to sketch my character at the present moment, as there is reason to fear that the performance would reflect no credit on either" (Austen 71). But Elizabeth does not cease to continue her habit, despite Darcy's reprimand. She turns her judgmental gaze frequently on her own family, "[t]o Elizabeth it appeared, that had her family made an agreement to expose themselves as much as they could during the evening, it would have been impossible for them to play their parts with more spirit, or finer success…" (Austen 78). Elizabeth's longtime friend Charlotte does not find herself exempt from the scrutiny either. After Charlotte agrees to marry Mr. Collins, Elizabeth feels "that no real confidence could ever subsist between them again. Her disappointment in Charlotte made her turn with fonder regard to her sister…" (Austen 98).

Elizabeth makes a judgment on her friend and from then on an irreparable mark on their relationship appears. Elizabeth ceases to confide in Charlotte and yet continues to judge her. When visiting Charlotte and Mr. Collins, Elizabeth immediately makes judgments on the state of her friend's marriage, "…Elizabeth in the solitude of her chamber had to meditate upon Charlotte's degree of contentment, to understand her address in guiding, and composure in bearing with her husband, and to acknowledge that it was all done very well" (Austen 122). Elizabeth's judgments are not harmless nor simple curiosity, she examines morals and makes critiques of those around her.

It could be argued that Elizabeth learns her lesson in *Pride and Prejudice* not to judge, a potentially unladylike activity. After learning of Darcy's true nature, Elizabeth expresses horror at her previous thoughts and opinions,

> [h]ow despicably have I acted…I, who have prided myself on my discernment!– I, who have valued myself on my abilities! who have often disdained the generous candour of my sister, and gratified my vanity, in useless or blameable distrust.– How humiliating is this discovery!– Yet, how just a humiliation!– Had I been in love, I could not have been more wretchedly blind! (Austen 159).

Yet, Elizabeth's judgment of other people, excluding Darcy, does not waver. Upon returning home Elizabeth does not hesitate to judge Lydia's and Kitty's behavior, "[v]ain, ignorant, idle, and absolutely uncontrouled!" (Austen 177). In fact, Elizabeth remains the judgmental person she was at the beginning of the novel. She goes on to pass rightful judgment on her beloved father, "Elizabeth, however, had never been blind to the impropriety of her father's behaviour as a husband… [she had never] been so fully aware of the evils arising from so ill-judged a direction of talents…" (Austen 181). While Elizabeth's discernment may not always be right, her

desire to understand and categorize the people in her life remains consistent throughout the novel. Unlike the previous examples of her judgment, these final ones did rely on the narrator to convey them, further proof that, in fact, the novel form does allow for readers to get a clearer view of Elizabeth and her judgments.

Taking on the role of judge or critic did not align with traditional standards of womanly behavior. An earlier quote from Epstein on the expected behaviors of women proves to be insightful, "…modesty, artlessness, submissiveness, passivity, and silence [were] on the list of feminine virtues…" (Epstein 24). Elizabeth's openness with her judgments clearly breaks this social norm as it is a far cry from being submissive, passive, or silent. However, even Emily's silent judgments of those around them prove to be controversial in a young woman as it implies a lack of adherence to the expectation of artlessness. With their observational and judgmental tendencies Emily and Elizabeth continue to veer further away from the idealized woman.

This thesis has examined the possibility that Elizabeth and Emily simultaneously represented both the ideal and the imperfect woman of the period. A helpful addition to this argument is the understanding that both heroines, within their respective stories, appear unique. Within the first few pages, Austen differentiates Elizabeth from the masses of young women in a conversation between Mrs. and Mr. Bennet. Mr. Bennet explicitly states that "…Lizzy has something more of quickness than her sisters" (Austen 2). The Bingley sisters' reaction to Elizabeth's hike to Netherfield confirms that Elizabeth differs from the standard woman, "[t]o walk three miles, or four miles, or five miles, or whatever it is, above her ancles in dirt, and alone, quite alone! what could she mean by it? It seems to me to shew an abominable sort of conceited independence, a most country town indifference to decorum" (Austen 26). Interestingly, Bingley rises to her defense and accurately assesses her true motive, "[i]t shews an

affection for her sister that is very pleasing" (Austen 26). This response from Bingley, stating that the act impresses him, itself indicates the out of the norm quality of this behavior. This positive spin on Elizabeth's uniqueness is an essential part of Austen's portrayal.

Austen appears to stress the superiority of Elizabeth over other women. Mrs. Bennet believes that Elizabeth possesses a stronger mental fortitude than Jane, "[p]oor Jane! I am sorry for her, because, with her disposition, she may not get over it immediately. It had better have happened to *you*, Lizzy; you would have laughed yourself out of it sooner." (Austen 109). A slightly less obvious difference between Elizabeth and the women around her becomes apparent at the conclusion of her story. Early on, Charlotte warns Elizabeth of the importance of securing a husband by being clear and explicit in one's interest in the man and worrying about compatibility and happiness later (Austen 15). While this tactic could be considered mercenary, in many ways Charlotte is right. Jane almost loses Bingley due to her lack of explicit interest in him. Charlotte, herself, must marry the first man to express interest as her chances of marriage otherwise appear to be dwindling. However, this truth does not seem to apply to Elizabeth. As mentioned earlier, Elizabeth 'wins' in the marriage race, as she marries the richest bachelor in the book. Elizabeth does the furthest thing from Charlotte's advice; she insults Darcy and rejects his initial proposal. Yet, Elizabeth still catches the man. Even as the book nears its conclusion Elizabeth does not pursue Darcy. In fact, Darcy remains unaware of her interest until Lady Catherine recounts what she considers to be Elizabeth's impropriety. This perception of Elizabeth is confirmed by Elizabeth's remark to Darcy after his proposal, "[y]ou were disgusted with the women who were always speaking and looking, and thinking for *your* approbation alone. I roused, and interested you, because I was so unlike *them*" (Austen 291). Elizabeth earns the winning prize match by balking all convention.

It is precisely with her unconventional qualities that Elizabeth wins Darcy, as she does not claim superiority in all the traditional womanly talents. For instance, she has sisters who are said to have greater prowess over the traditional feminine arts. Mrs. Bennet outlines this exactly, when informing Mr. Bennet that "Lizzy is not a bit better than the others; and I am sure she is not half so handsome as Jane, nor half so good humoured as Lydia" (Austen 2). In a society that prized beauty and personality in women, Elizabeth does not seem to be the most proficient, yet Darcy chooses her. Later Miss Bingley lists the skills that make a woman "accomplished": "…knowledge of music, singing, drawing, dancing, and the modern languages… she must possess a certain something in her air and manner of walking, the tone of her voice, her address and expressions, or the word will be but half deserved" (Austen 29). Throughout the text Elizabeth repeatedly stresses her lack of proficiency in both music and art. Darcy chimes in during this conversation adding that to him an accomplished woman "…must yet add something more substantial, in the improvement of her mind by extensive reading" (Austen 29). While this trait notably does not make either Miss Bingley or Mrs. Bennet's list of ideal qualities in young women, it is a trait that readers are well aware Elizabeth possesses. Therefore, Darcy does not desire the ideal woman, but rather a unique woman. If Austen alone had included this praise of the unique one might be able to write it off as a coincidence; however, Radcliffe uses a similar tactic.

Emily proves to be one of a kind in her novel, as well. When at a social gathering a man tries to win her attention, he lacks success due to Emily being uninterested in the classic womanly topics of conversation, "…he sometimes addressed Emily: but she knew nothing of Parisian fashions, or Parisian operas; and her modesty, simplicity, and correct manners formed a decided contrast to those of her female companions" (Radcliffe 26). Here Radcliffe particularly

specifies that Emily did not resemble those around her in polite society. At yet a different party the narrator praises Emily by outlining the qualities in a different woman which bear no resemblance to Emily,

> [t]his lady, who possessed all the sprightliness of a Frenchwoman, with all her coquetry, affected to understand every subject, or rather there was no affectation in the case; for, never looking beyond the limits of her own ignorance, she believed she had nothing to learn. She attracted notice from all; amused some, disgusted others for a moment, and was then forgotten (Radcliffe 117).

In this instance, according to the narrator, the qualities of Emily are clearly considered to be superior. Emily may be an incredibly idealized character, but she does not fit the contemporary ideal to a tee. Much like Elizabeth, Emily is rewarded despite breaking the conventions expected of young women in the era in which this book was written. These differentiations are exposed by the narrator and the novel form's inside look into the inner workings of young women.

The beginning of the chapter explained that both women are rewarded for their personalities as they marry well and happily. To further support this idea, it is interesting to note that both resemble their male love interests. Elizabeth's frankness is mirrored in Darcy, as can clearly be seen in his first proposal, "[t]he situation of your mother's family, though objectionable, was nothing in comparison of that total want of propriety so frequently, so almost uniformly betrayed by herself, by your three younger sisters, and occasionally even by your father" (Austen 152). By the end of the novel irony emerges in Darcy's rebuke of the Bennet family's impropriety as his family proves to be just as shamefully improper. Lady Catherine's rude arrival factors in as the most telling example of such a similarity between the two lovers. Both Darcy and Elizabeth appear as socially superior to their family members, as well as more

conscientious. The pair share an awkwardness in love that they bond over, "'[b]ut I was embarrassed.' 'And so was I,'" which confirms the similarity between the two (Austen 292). Readers are given information and details that specifically indicate the similarities between the set of love interests, this same ideal can be seen in Radcliffe's work, as well.

The descriptions of Valancourt and Emily found within *The Mysteries of Udolpho* link the two lovers. Early in their acquaintance, when the pair part after their first meeting, the narrator compares his "earnest and pensive eye" with her "countenance full or timid sweetness" (Radcliffe 38). Later Radcliffe describes that Valancourt "…looked timidly at Emily…" (Radcliffe 57). Clearly, the two share a timidity. Emily and Valancourt both frequently find themselves spilling over with emotions. While Emily frequently faints, Valancourt physicalizes his intense emotions, as well: "Valancourt understood her feelings, and was silent; had she raised her eyes from the ground she would have seen tears in his. He rose, and leaned on the wall of the terrace, from which, in a few moments, he returned to his seat, then rose again, and appeared to be greatly agitated…" (Radcliffe 102). This tendency repeats later when "…Valancourt could for some time only utter incoherent expressions of his emotions…" (Radcliffe 145). So, while Darcy and Elizabeth share a frankness and an inclination to be embarrassed in love, Emily and Valancourt both have timid and emotional sides. As with other shared commonalities, this similarity between the two novels should not be written off as a coincidence, particularly as this portrayal of the sets of lovers is telling.

The similarities between significant others matter, in part, as *Pride and Prejudice* clearly states that the ideal marriage involves partners who respect and understand each other. Austen explains this notion, through the voice of Mr. Bennet as he tells Elizabeth:

> … [you] could be neither happy nor respectable, unless you truly esteemed your husband; unless you looked up to him as a superior. Your lively talents would place you in the greatest danger in an unequal marriage. You could scarcely escape discredit and misery. My child, let me not have the grief of seeing *you* unable to respect your partner in life. You know not what you are about (Austen 288-9).

Mr. Bennet's mention of the goal of equality in marriage is striking. A pair of lovers with distinct similarities appears to fit this mold fairly well. This goal in marriage materializes outside of fiction, as well. Brownley argues that one aspect of Gabriel Piozzi that attracted Hester Piozzi was that he "offered the emotional reciprocity for which she had sought vainly in her marriage [to Thrale] and her family" (Brownley 69). The implication of mutual benefit and equality in the term 'reciprocity' harkens to Mr. Bennet's quote within *Pride and Prejudice*. Therefore, the similarities between lovers depicted in both *Pride and Prejudice* and *The Mysteries of Udolpho* further indicate that Emily and Elizabeth are rewarded immensely for their uniqueness.

Emily and Elizabeth were not ideal late-Georgian women, and yet they were well liked on the pages of novels. This perspective opens up a number of possibilities in the realm of historical study. The inclusion of these unideal heroines in popular fiction may imply that society tolerated these qualities in women more than vocal purveyors of propriety claimed. Or, perhaps this dynamic actually reveals that society held fictional women to a distinctly different standard than women outside of fiction. Yet if novels were expected to resemble everyday life, this completely different set of expectations appears odd. A more radical conjecture on this pattern is that society happily accepted notions of women's independence through these heroines due in

part to a changing social current surrounding gender at the time.[36] Many questions remain unanswered.

With an understanding that these two heroines were distinct from the average woman even in their fictional worlds, this thesis will turn its focus further to why it was significant that these heroines were depicted in the novel form. Because novels provided an inner look into the minds of the heroines, due to the third-person omniscient narrators, readers were able to understand the motives and thought processes of these young women. This ability proves to be critical particularly in moments when the heroines are misunderstood or misrepresented. Austen and Radcliffe with their novels let readers see that assumptions made about young women are not always correct, as readers know what the heroines' true motivations are.

Throughout *The Mysteries of Udolpho* people misconstrue Emily's motives. When her aunt first accuses Emily of being improper for entertaining Valancourt, whom she perceives as an "idle admirer," readers are aware that this is an unfair judgment of the situation (Radcliffe 105). Pages later, her aunt accuses Emily of prejudice based on physiognomy, "…you have a great many of your father's prejudices, and among them are those sudden predilections for people from their looks. I can perceive, that you imagine yourself to be violently in love with this young adventurer, after an acquaintance of only a few days" (Radcliffe 108). Once again, readers are aware that this is a misinterpretation particularly as readers witness earlier in the book Valancourt's treatment of Emily. Perhaps more concerningly, Montoni frequently accuses Emily of malice or of housing ulterior motives. When Emily does not immediately embrace being wooed by Morano, Montoni accuses her of being "capricious" despite readers knowing the innocence of Emily's motives as she had been astonished moments earlier by the mere thought

[36] It is notable that many consider the birth of the women's movement to be 1850 (Barker and Chalus 2).

of any connection between Morano and herself (Radcliffe 189). Later, Morano accuses Emily himself, "[b]ut you trifle with my patience and my distress" (Radcliffe 250). Yet again, from the reader's perspective, Emily has exclusively been polite and clear about her lack of interest in such a match. Finally, while the narrator has been clearly describing Emily's compassion and empathy throughout, her aunt calls Emily an "[u]nfeeling, cruel girl!" (Radcliffe 267**)**. Because Radcliffe presents readers with the story through the experiences of Emily, readers have the ability to accurately understand Emily's true motives despite the slander uttered against her. Similar scenarios emerge in *Pride and Prejudice*.

Elizabeth faces misunderstandings and misinterpretations throughout the novel. Elizabeth's own father severely misjudges her inner thoughts when he tries to joke about the letter from Mr. Collins which discusses Lady Catherine's distress at the idea of a marriage between Darcy and Elizabeth. Mr. Bennet coarsely states,

> [c]ould he, or the Lucases, have pitched on any man, within the circle of our acquaintance, whose name would have given the lie more effectually to what they related? Mr. Darcy, who never looks at any woman but to see a blemish, and who probably never looked at *you* in his life! It is admirable! (Austen 277).

As Austen eloquently puts it, "[n]ever had his wit been directed in a manner so little agreeable to [Elizabeth]" (Austen 277). Mr. Bennet completely miscalculates the situation, and the margin of this miscalculation is absolutely apparent to readers who already know of the reverence Elizabeth fosters for Darcy. This situation directly connects Elizabeth and Emily, whose desires are similarly misunderstood. Yet, a second example demonstrates a way in which these heroines diverge. While spending her days at Netherfield tending to Jane, Elizabeth faces the accusations of Miss Bingley. Miss Bingley attempts to speak for Elizabeth, "Miss Eliza Bennet … despises

cards. She is a great reader and has no pleasure in anything else" (Austen 27). While readers likely automatically pick up on the falsity of this statement, Austen makes it explicitly clear when Elizabeth retorts, "I deserve neither such praise nor such censure…I am *not* a great reader, and I have pleasure in many things" (Austen 27). In this instance, the inner look inside the mind of Elizabeth is not necessary to understand the misinterpretation. Overall, the examples from both books reveal the ways in which women are falsely judged by the people around them.

Both Radcliffe and Austen make it clear that being misunderstood is not an inconsequential event for young women; it could have intense ramifications. When Elizabeth mentions knowing of Georgiana to Georgiana's cousin, she is sure to clarify that Georgiana's reputation is still intact, "[y]ou need not be frightened. I never heard any harm of her; and I dare say she is one of the most tractable creatures in the world. She is a very great favourite with some ladies of my acquaintance, Mrs. Hurst and Miss Bingley" (Austen 142). The earnest forthcomingness of Elizabeth demonstrates an understanding that any reputation a young woman may possess out in society could be dangerous. Within *The Mysteries of Udolpho* the delicacy of a woman's reputation is revealed by Emily's reaction to Madame Montoni's improper questioning of Valancourt, "'Good God!' exclaimed Emily, 'what an opinion must he form of me, since you, Madam, could express a suspicion of such ill conduct'" (Radcliffe 123). By this point in the novel Valancourt and Emily have interacted quite a bit, and yet she is sure that a single conversation with her aunt could change his opinion of her forever. A woman's place in society, at the time, certainly seems delicate.

Members of late-Georgian society would have known of this fragility, but, if they were not young women themselves, may not have ever experienced the fear one feels when placed in such a precarious position. With the novel's ability to bring the reader into the position of the

heroine, Austen and Radcliffe allowed readers to experience what it was like to navigate society as a young woman who consistently must deal with people misconstruing her actions and speech. Thus, one of the most powerful effects of the novel form is that, regardless of gender, a reader is confronted with the burden of being a young woman during this time. The power of the novel's inside look is confirmed as interiority in books increased marketability.

As a reminder, an interest in the inner workings of women serves as a hallmark of the late Georgian period. Piozzi's life and work once again serves as an interesting historical example. An intense interest into women's inner thoughts appeared during this period with the "…growth in the market for memoirs or dictionaries of illustrious and learned women…" (Batchelor 181). Fascinatingly, some women capitalized on this interest in the private. Piozzi's biography of Samuel Johnson featured personal letters and anecdotes that enticed readers (Nussbaum 62). Yet, even with increased interest in the private, women were meant to disguise their inner feelings and concerns. Nussbaum's description of Piozzi reflects this experience,

> As the hostess of Streatham society during the 1770s, Thrale cultivated a private-in-the-public sociability, but after her first husband's death she fell out of favour with the more restrained Bluestockings who feared that her linkage of unorthodox behaviour with intellectual pursuits would tarnish their reputations into a corrupted version of fame (Nussbaum 57).

This description of a "private-in-the-public sociability" indicates that this balance of public and private did impact women in the period and reveals that society wanted stylized inside looks into the lives of young women.

This chapter discussed the unique perspective afforded by the novel form and its relationship with the late-Georgian heroine in comparison to historical understanding of gender

in the period. From the inner perspective of the heroines, readers witness the young women's propensity for possessing a lack of agency and feeling genuine care for others. However, this perspective shows the ways in which these two authors depicted heroines who challenged social norms as they are both intellectual at heart, keen observers, and generally different from the standard woman. This realization spurred contemplation of the novel's ability to portray the undercurrents of society's relationship to gender. Finally, a discussion was begun on the ways in which the novel form proved particularly critical in its ability to justify a young woman's actions even when those around the woman undermine her, a notable dynamic for the period.

Conclusion

Each chapter of this honors thesis focused on a different aspect of the overall argument that novels can provide helpful insight into the complexity of the late Georgian period's relationship with women. The introduction presented my personal attachment to this subject of research, began to breakdown what makes this type of literary-historical study worthwhile, as well as outlined the argument and provided context. With a study of primary and secondary sources in chapter one, I linked literary society and society at large by demonstrating the ways these two branches were constantly interacting with and influencing the other in this era. I concluded that due to period's novels resembling everyday life and centering on the individual, the portrayals of the heroines likely reflected at least some of the ideals placed on actual young women of the era. In chapter two I studied certain features in the heroines in comparison to primary sources in order to confirm that Emily and Elizabeth neither perfectly fit nor completely break away from social standards of the time. Particular attention was placed on the fact that both heroines remain well-regarded despite them not meeting all the expectations. Chapter three continued to complicate the understanding of gender at the time by highlighting the inner qualities of the two heroines. This analysis further demonstrated the way in which the era's novel immerses the reader in an individual's specific perspective. As both of these heroines are young women, these deep looks into the innerworkings of a single character means that readers, past and present, experience being a woman in this period. This perspective, that of a young woman is often neglected in men-focused, traditional historical sources which makes this perspective potentially refreshing for modern day scholars

With each of these explorations the complexity of womanhood in the late Georgian period emerges. Critically, this complicated vision of gender that the novel displays aligns with the actual state of gender at the time. Of course, as with any era, there was likely never any true

consensus on matters of gender. The period was rife with political disagreements and dramatic disparities between conservative and more liberal ideologies. It stands to reason that the arguments on gender would have been just as muddled. Johnson describes the late eighteenth century as being filled with paradoxes as society both dictated that women must remain in a position of inferiority in comparison to men, as well as encouraged women's involvement with political commentary (Johnson 2). The two novels discussed today display a multifaceted image of womanhood that fits alongside this perspective that gender was a complex topic in society. This convergence of literary analysis and historical perspectives further confirms the usefulness of studying the novels of a period in order to better understand society, as society and literary culture clearly interact with each other.

As this thesis endeavored to blend the two sides of my major, English and History, primary sources from the period in question played a major role in my explorations. Advertisements and reviews presented the public reaction to novels, while works published in this time span, such as periodicals or books, offered insight into social expectations. The most notable historical source featured in this thesis is, of course, the *Thraliana*. This text offered firsthand, nonfictional accounts of both daily life as a woman, as well as commentary on the familiar nature of novels. By using this text in such a way, I differentiated myself from scholars of the past. Many scholarly explorations of gender and literature during this period have been published in the past few decades. There have even been many instances in which scholars have used literary analysis to bolster thoughts on the history of gender. I feel my thesis finds its niche, in part, due to my usage of a primary source which can comment directly on both the status of gender and the status of literature in late-Georgian society. I feel that Piozzi's work, alongside

the other primary sources used in my thesis, justifies my blending of literary and historical studies well.

While the *Thraliana* proved to be an important source for my research on a number of levels, the *Thraliana*'s inclusion in this thesis has a larger meaning for me. Hester Thrale Piozzi is most often remembered as being a companion and biographer of the revered Samuel Johnson. I find that she is very infrequently remembered for her own merit. Using her as a source to deliver insight on her own life, as well as the lives of fictional women, has felt to me to be in keeping with the overarching goal of my paper.

Of course, as with any historical research, there are many questions left unanswered. Some of them will unlikely ever be answered. For instance, how did reading novels like *Pride and Prejudice* and *The Mysteries of Udolpho* change how readers viewed women as both novels challenged the idea of traditional femininity? Or, how close to everyday life did Austen and Radcliffe feel their own depictions of womanhood were? Or even, are Piozzi's inner thoughts as seen in the *Thraliana* at all representative of those undocumented inner thoughts of the standard woman? These questions are hard to answer for a number of reasons. One reason for this difficulty is that readers may not have noticed themselves how books impacted them, much less have written it down. Many people did not write down their thoughts and considerations nor even share them publicly meaning much of the evidence required to make such claims never existed. Without these sources, the inner thoughts of the general population can never truly be known. In terms of the authors, Austen and Radcliffe were both private people, which means limited sources remain which could give insight into their intentions. While I wish I could have answers to queries like these, unless some very specific primary source materials are discovered, likely we will have to be satisfied with conjecture. Even if a source appeared confirming some or

many of these ideas, one source would bring us only minutely closer to comprehending the general consensus of the period.

There are many possibilities for further research in and surrounding this topic. It would be interesting to apply this same strategy to both novels featuring heroes, rather than heroines, and books written by men, but featuring heroines. I would be interested to see how the depictions of gender in these novels reflected that of the historical understanding of gender at the time. Would the depiction of women written by men bear more of a resemblance to the true ideal placed on women by society? Or would the woman character appear to resemble the everyday woman less with literary and historical analysis? Would these heroines bear the same qualities as those found in both Emily and Elizabeth?

Throughout this thesis I identified specific traits that the two heroines have in common. Emily and Elizabeth are ideal, proper, open, stubborn, rational, unempowered, kind, intellectual, perceptive, judgmental, and unique. As these qualities have been found in two fictional heroines, they could potentially be used as a measuring device with which to compare heroines in works beyond the two featured in this thesis. If applied to a number of other books, it is possible that one may be able to see how common it was for such virtues to appear in fiction of the time. As I have identified which of these traits follow social convention and which do not, one could then identify the frequency at which novels completely adhere, completely ignore, or carefully balance the era's gender expectations with their fictional heroines. This perspective could help with research on some of the questions posed above. For instance, it would help identify the difference between a heroine written by a man and a heroine written by a woman in terms of faithfulness to propriety.

Further studies could include an application of this general technique, blending the literary and historical, to the histories of other groups in society. I feel that this technique is particularly helpful to get further information on marginalized groups who were not accurately represented by the documentation of their own era. Finally, it would be interesting to apply this technique to countries outside of Britain who have their own literary traditions and their own relationship to depicting the common and familiar in fiction.

Personally, I have gained a lot from this project. This thesis has allowed me to prove to myself that I can successfully blend the two sides of my major. The biggest surprise of this experience has not actually been finding evidence that women were pushing the boundaries of social convention in the worlds of novels, but that I could research, consider, and write on a single topic for such a long period of time and still have more to say. While I previously had been incredulous at how Radcliffe wrote a six-hundred-page novel, looking at this over one-hundred-page document I feel put in my place. My only justification for this long a thesis is that I feel that the women included deserve these words. As the epigraph at the beginning of this paper by Lucrezia Marinella touches on, for much of recorded history women have been either overlooked or misrepresented. While happily women today are more well-represented in popular media, that does not make up for the centuries of neglect women's stories have faced. It has been a joy to devote myself to women's voices this year.

Works Cited

"A Visit to The Castle of Luig." *Chambers's Edinburgh Journal*, Feb.1832- Dec.1853, no. 156, 1846, pp. 411-413. *ProQuest*, https://login.proxy.library.emory.edu/login?url=https://www-proquest-com.proxy.library.emory.edu/docview/2561484?accountid=10747.

"Advertisement." *The Athenaeum*, no. 1155, 1849, pp. 1260. *ProQuest*, https://login.proxy.library.emory.edu/login?url=https://www-proquest-com.proxy.library.emory.edu/docview/9274558?accountid=10747.

"ana, suffix and n." *OED Online*, Oxford University Press, March 2021, www.oed.com/view/Entry/6862. Accessed 9 Mar. 2021.

Armstong, Nancy. *Desire and Domestic Fiction*. Oxford University Press, 1990.

"Art. I.-1. Œuvres Complètes de M. De Balzac." *The Foreign Quarterly Review*, July 1827-July 1846, vol. 33, no. 66, 1844, pp. 265-298. *ProQuest*, https://login.proxy.library.emory.edu/login?url=https://www-proquest-com.proxy.library.emory.edu/docview/2638581?accountid=10747.

Austen, Jane. *Pride and Prejudice*. Edited by James Kinsley, Reissued, Oxford Univ. Press, 2008.

Balderston, Katharine C., editor. "Introduction." *Thraliana: The Diary of Mrs. Hester Lynch Thrale (Later Mrs. Piozzi) 1776-1809*, vol. 1, Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1942, pp. ix–xxxii.

Barker, Hannah, and Elaine Chalus, editors. "Introduction." *Women's History: Britain, 1700-1850: An Introduction*, Routledge, 2005, pp. 1–8.

Batchelor, Jennie. "Jane Austen and Charlotte Smith: Biography, Autobiography and the Writing of Women's Literary History." *Women's life writing, 1700-1850: gender, genre and*

authorship, edited by Daniel Cook and Amy Culley, Palgrave Macmillan, 2012, pp. 181–96.

Berry, Helen. “Women, Consumption and Taste.” *Women’s History: Britain, 1700-1850: An Introduction*, edited by Hannah Barker and Elaine Chalus, Routledge, 2005, pp. 194–216.

“Biographical Chronicle; or Account of Eminent Persons Deceased During the Year.” *The Edinburgh Annual Register*, vol. 16, 1823, pp. 320-379. *ProQuest*, https://login.proxy.library.emory.edu/login?url=https://www-proquest-com.proxy.library.emory.edu/docview/2722119?accountid=10747.

Brownley, Martine Watson. “Eighteenth-Century Women's Images and Roles: The Case of Hester Thrale Piozzi.” *Biography*, vol. 3, no. 1, 1980, pp. 65–76. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/23539198.

Brownstein, Rachel M. “Why We Read Jane Austen.” *Why Jane Austen?* Columbia University Press, 2011, 17-69. *JSTOR*, https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7312/brow15390.6.

C. "Wanderings of an Artist." *The Newcastle Magazine*, vol. 7, no. 7, 1828, pp. 299-302. *ProQuest*, https://login.proxy.library.emory.edu/login?url=https://www-proquest-com.proxy.library.emory.edu/docview/2844720?accountid=10747.

"Character and Condition of Woman.” *The Mirror of Literature, Amusement, and Instruction*, Nov.1822-June 1847, vol. 38, no. 1071, 1841, pp. 87-88. *ProQuest*, https://login.proxy.library.emory.edu/login?url=https://www-proquest-com.proxy.library.emory.edu/docview/2822504?accountid=10747.

Ciabattari, Jane. *BBC*, 2015, “The 25 Greatest British Novels.” https://www.bbc.com/culture/article/20151204-the-25-greatest-british-novels. Accessed 22 Nov. 2020.

"decorum, n." *OED Online*, Oxford University Press, February 2021, www.oed.com/view/Entry/48410. Accessed 11 Feb. 2021.

Epstein, Julia. *The Iron Pen: Frances Burney and the Politics of Women's Writing*. University of Wisconsin Press, 1989.

Gleadle, Kathryn, and Sarah Richardson, editors. "Introduction: The Petticoat in Politics: Women and Authority." *Women in British Politics, 1760-1860: The Power of the Petticoat*, St. Martin's Press, 2000, pp. 1–18.

Gonzales, Erica. "82 Million of Us Burn for 'Bridgerton.'" *Harper's BAZAAR*, 28 Jan. 2021, https://www.harpersbazaar.com/culture/film-tv/a35122184/bridgerton-viewers-netflix/.

Johnson, Claudia L.. *Jane Austen: Women Politics and the Novel*. University of Chicago Press, 1990.

Kelly, Gary. "Religion and Politics." *The Cambridge Companion to Jane Austen*. Edited by Edward Copeland and Juliet McMaster. Cambridge University Press, 1997, pp.131-148. *ProQuest*, https://login.proxy.library.emory.edu/login?url=https://www-proquest-com.proxy.library.emory.edu/books/religion-politics/docview/2137993217/se-2?accountid=10747.

Marinella, Lucrezia. *The Nobility and Excellence of Women and the Defects and Vices of Men*, University of Chicago Press, 2000. *ProQuest Ebook Central*, https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/emory/detail.action?docID=408564.

McCarthy, William. "The Repression of Hester Lynch Piozzi; or, How We Forgot a Revolution in Authorship." *Modern Language Studies*, vol. 18, no. 1, 1988, pp. 99–111. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/3194704. Accessed 11 Sept. 2020.

More, Hannah. *The way to plenty; or, the second part of Tom White*. Sold by J. Marshall, (printer to the Cheap Repository for Moral and Religious Tracts) No. 17, Queen Street Cheapside, and No. 4, Aldermary Church-Yard and R. White, Piccadilly, London. By S. Hazard, at Bath: and by all booksellers, newsmen, and Hawkers, in town and country. - Great Allowance will be made to Shopkeepers and Hawkers, [1796]. *Eighteenth Century Collections Online*, link.gale.com/apps/doc/CW0117057895/ECCO?u=emory&sid=ECCO&xid=d2a87134&pg=14. Accessed 4 Mar. 2021.

"novel, n." *OED Online*, Oxford University Press, September 2020, www.oed.com/view/Entry/128757. Accessed 22 Nov. 2020.

Nussbaum, Felicity A. "Sociability and Life Writing: Hester Lynch Thrale Piozzi." *Women's Life Writing, 1700-1850: Gender, Genre and Authorship*, edited by Daniel Cook and Amy Culley, Palgrave Macmillan, 2012, pp. 55–70.

Paulson, Ronald. "Gothic Fiction and the French Revolution." *ELH*, vol. 48, no. 3, 1981, pp. 532–554. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/2872912. Accessed 13 Mar. 2021.

Piozzi, Hester Lynch Thrale. *Thraliana: The Diary of Mrs. Hester Lynch Thrale (Later Mrs. Piozzi) 1776-1809*. Edited by Katharine C. Balderston, vol. 1, Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1942, pp.1–610.

Piozzi, Hester Lynch Thrale. *Thraliana: The Diary of Mrs. Hester Lynch Thrale (Later Mrs. Piozzi) 1776-1809*. Edited by Katharine C. Balderston, vol. 2, Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1942, pp. 611–1191.

Radcliffe, Ann. *The Mysteries of Udolpho*. 1794. Edited by Jacqueline Howard, Penguin Classics, Penguin Books, 2001.

Rendall, Jane. “Women and the Enlightenment in Britain, c. 1690-1800.” *Women’s History: Britain, 1700-1850: An Introduction*, edited by Hannah Barker and Elaine Chalus, Routledge, 2005, pp. 9–32.

Shakespeare, William. *As You Like It*. Edited by Juliet Dusinberre, Arden Shakespeare, 2006, pp. 145–348. *Drama Online*, <http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781408160497.00000005>. Accessed 25 Feb. 2021.

Simonton, Deborah. “Women and Education.” *Women’s History: Britain, 1700-1850: An Introduction*, edited by Hannah Barker and Elaine Chalus, Routledge, 2005, pp. 33–56.

Sims Bishop, Rudine. “Windows and Mirrors: Children’s Books and Parallel Cultures.” *14th Annual Conference*, CSUSB Reading Conference, 1990, pp. 3–15, https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED337744.pdf#page=11.

T., T. A.. “Foreign Correspondence.” *The Athenaeum*, no. 1124, 1849, pp. 488-489. *ProQuest*, https://login.proxy.library.emory.edu/login?url=https://www-proquest-com.proxy.library.emory.edu/docview/9253486?accountid=10747.

Thicknesse, Ann. *The school for fashion, in two volumes. By Mrs. Thicknesse. ...* Vol. 1, printed by H. Reynell, No. 21, Piccadilly, for Debrett and Fores, Piccadilly; Hookham, Old Bond Street; and Robinsons, Pater-Noster-Row, MDCCC. [1800]. *Eighteenth Century Collections Online*, link.gale.com/apps/doc/CW0125914942/ECCO?u=emory&sid=ECCO&xid=fbbf816d&pg=1. Accessed 5 Mar. 2021.

Volz, Jessica A. “Ann Radcliffe’s Gothic Reconstructions of Female Identity and Experience.” *Visuality in the Novels of Austen, Radcliffe, Edgeworth and Burney*, Anthem Press, 2017, pp. 87–136. *JSTOR*, http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1m321ff.7.

Watt, Ian. *The Rise of the Novel: Studies in Defoe, Richardson and Fielding*. University of California Press, 1967.

West, Jane. *A tale of the times. By the author of A gossip's story. Dedicated by permission to Mrs. Carter. In three volumes.* ... Vol. 1, printed for T. N. Longman and O. Rees, Paternoster-Row, 1799. *Eighteenth Century Collections Online*, link.gale.com/apps/doc/CW0110057320/ECCO?u=emory&sid=ECCO&xid=5435a54a&pg=310. Accessed 5 Mar. 2021.

Wright, Angela. "Heroines in Flight: Narrating Invisibility and Maturity in Women's Gothic Writing of the Romantic Period." *Women and the Gothic: An Edinburgh Companion*, edited by Avril Horner and Sue Zlosnik, Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh, 2016, pp. 15–30. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/10.3366/j.ctt1bgzdfx.5. Accessed 11 Sept. 2020.