

## Austen's Inharmonious Numbers

Bharat Tandon teaches at the University of East Anglia, Norwich, UK. He is the author of *Jane Austen and the Morality of Conversation* (2003), and the editor of *Emma: An Annotated Edition* (2012). He gave the Carol Medine Moss Lecture at the JASNA AGM in Washington, DC in 2016.

Square pianos, grand pianos, harps: as customary parts of the furniture of social performance in Austen's milieu, it is hardly surprising that an author so attuned to the expressive freights and charges of everyday surroundings should have gained so much comic and serious mileage out of instruments. However, the most radical innovations and experiments of her fictional style may pertain to a rather different form of "music": the music of English sentences themselves. And if the juvenilia may have perplexed their first public readers on account of their perceived "impropriety", that very complex of qualities has contributed signally in recent years to the reappraisal, not only of the three manuscript volumes themselves, but also of the artistic and ethical temper of their creator. As Jill Heydt-Stevenson has argued, in one of the most important of such studies, "Austen's conjunctions allow for the simultaneous apprehension of paradoxical responses when she presents courtship as comic and moving, as erotic and ridiculous, as satisfying and disturbing. An elastic structure, the unbecoming conjunction shakes up conventions and emphasizes point of view and the process of judging over judgment itself" (Heydt-Stevenson, 25-26).

In what follows, I shall be investigating the variety of ways in which the juvenilia's rhetorical improprieties "shake up" readerly expectations regarding sound and sense in late eighteenth-century prose. More particularly, I shall focus on the

connections between the larger idea of the harmony of “numbers” in composition, and what Austen does in the juvenilia through the precise (and imprecise) deployment of actual arithmetical numbers, in what is not only an astonishing satirical achievement, but a precocious creative-critical examination of the fundamental techniques of realist fiction itself.

Perhaps the most famous reference to late eighteenth-century theories of rhetoric and composition in Austen’s fiction is that moment in *Northanger Abbey*, where Eleanor Tilney jokes about her brother’s punctiliousness in matters of usage, after he has upbraided Catherine Morland’s careless employment of “nice” to describe *The Mysteries of Udolpho*:

“The word ‘nicest,’ as you used it, did not suit him; and you had better change it as soon as you can, or we shall be overpowered by Johnson and Blair all the rest of the way.” (107-8)

Like so many of Austen’s literary jokes, this one works on two distinct but complementary levels at the same time: within the frame of the novel’s plot, Eleanor’s affectionate retort wryly sends up a prevalent mode of what might nowadays be called intellectual “mansplaining”; over and above this, Austen’s own style nods and winks pointedly over her character’s shoulder, reminding a reader by its very existence and manner that this is not the work of someone who has been “overpowered” by Samuel Johnson or Hugh Blair. Far from being “overpowered”, in fact, Austen’s teenage productions are positively *empowered* by their instinct for the expected arrangements of a “decent” sentence, and the contagious delight they take in skewing those

arrangements so as to question the ability of language and narrative to contain and order the matter of lived experience.

In this regard, one thing that unites Johnson and Blair, as both antecedents of and comic foils for Austen's own nascent fictional voice, is the attention they afford to the now archaic idea of metrical "numbers" in writing. It is an idea which, not coincidentally, emerged into prominence from the late sixteenth century, at a time when poets were experimenting (with varying degrees of success) with neo-classical verse-forms which often borrowed strict and arithmetical prosodic forms from Latin and Greek verse. Johnson's *Dictionary*, for example, offers two successive definitions of "numbers" that sit textually and etymologically next to each other: "Harmony; proportions calculated by *numbers*", and "Verses; poetry" (n.p.). Likewise, the term crops up frequently in his critical discussions of poetic form: writing of Milton's versification in *Rambler* 94, for example, he notes that "[t]he resemblance of poetick numbers to the subject which they mention or describe, may be considered as general or particular" (Johnson 4: 135), and in the *Lives of the English Poets*, he remarks that "[a]s much of Waller's reputation was owed to the softness and smoothness of his Numbers; it is proper to consider those minute particulars to which a versifyer must attend" (Johnson 21:316). In both of these examples, Johnson suggests that a reader might perceive some meaningful relationship between the prosodic form of a poem and the subjects with which it deals; that the 'music' of poetry might be intimately bound up with its metrical pulses and pauses; and that a good poet might hope to energise all these relationships in the performative being of a poem on the page.

Likewise, the fact that Austen could joke so easily about Blair's *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres* (1783) is some indication of the hold that the work was

already taking by the end of the century as a pre-eminent, prescriptive guide to correct usage and rhetorical poise. Moreover, one of Blair's more influential arguments is his suggestion that the idea of poetic "numbers" might also be extended to cover the structure of prose sentences. Devoting three whole lectures to aspects of sentences, Blair looks back to Cicero and other classical rhetoricians:

They hold, that to prose as well as to verse, there belong certain numbers, less strict, indeed, yet such as can be ascertained by rule. (1: 298)

And while Blair recognises that the less "quantitative" nature of English prose means that the rules can't be so precise as in Latin ("The quantities of their syllables were more fixed and determined" (1: 300)), he maintains that the 'prosodic' elements of prose are not irrelevant ("although I apprehend, that this musical arrangement cannot be reduced into a system, I am far from thinking, that it is a quality to be neglected" (1:305)).

Johnson and Blair, then, contribute signally to the complex of attitudes towards the "music" of late eighteenth-century prose into which Austen was born, and amid which she had to find her voice. However, underpinning both Johnson and Blair is a conviction not unlike that of "natural theology" – in other words, that there exists some analogical relationship between the harmonious "numbers" of prose and verse, and a larger order in creation itself. On the other hand, one only has to read a few lines of Austen's teenage fiction to see and hear the ordered cadences of late-Augustan prose being turned to altogether more anarchic purposes.

Of course, it is unlikely that Austen would have encountered Blair's complete lecture in her early teens, although they were excerpted and 'sampled' in Vicesimus

Knox's *Elegant Extracts*, a work which lurks in the background of her novels, most particularly in *Emma*. Over and above that, though, she would have been surrounded by the belletristic, masculine intellectual culture which Blair's lectures distilled, not only via her father's schooling activities at Steventon Rectory, but also through her elder brothers and their periodical *The Loiterer* (indeed, Eleanor's retort to Henry may not have been wholly fictional in inspiration). Conversely, the long shadow of Johnson's direct and indirect influence is easier to trace; while James Edward Austen-Leigh's highly selective account of his aunt's favourite reading in the *Memoir* has rightly been questioned for the rectitude it projects onto her, it may still tell some truths about her stylistic lineage:

Amongst her favourite writers, Johnson in prose, Crabbe in verse, and Cowper in both, stood high. It is well that the native good sense of herself and of those with whom she lived, saved her from the snare into which a sister novelist had fallen, of imitating the grandiloquent style of Johnson.

(71)

Austen is at once one of the greatest inheritors of Johnson's style, and the most savage parodist of those who sought to co-opt it; and that "sister novelist" mentioned by Austen-Leigh, Fanny Burney, fell somewhere in between those two conditions.

Burney – at once a cherished influence for Austen, and a model for where Austen might not have wanted her own style to end up – was personally acquainted with Johnson via Hester Thrale, and her own stylistic relationship with what Macaulay famously termed "Johnsonese" is a less complicated one, as Austen-Leigh's offhand

dismissal suggests. Take a typical passage from *Cecilia* (1782), in which the narrator introduces the heroine (and the novel's central plot-complication) to a reader:

They had bequeathed to her 10,000 *l.*, and consigned her to the care of the Dean of ——, her uncle. With this gentleman, in whom, by various contingencies, the accumulated possessions of a rising and prosperous family were centred, she had passed the last four years of her life; and a few weeks only had yet elapsed since his death, which, by depriving her of her last relation, made her heiress to an estate of 3000 *l.* per annum; with no other restriction than that of annexing her name, if she married, to the disposal of her hand and riches.

But though thus largely indebted to fortune, to nature she had yet greater obligations: her form was elegant, her heart was liberal; her countenance announced the intelligence of her mind, her complexion varied with every emotion of her soul, and her eyes, the heralds of her speech, now beamed with understanding and now glistened with sensibility. (Burney, I, 4-5)

As befits a late-eighteenth-century social romance, it's worth noting how *Cecilia's* exposition embeds and frames emotional and psychological qualities, right from the start, within precise economic measurements (of which more later). Even more worthy of note, though, is the way in which Burney's Johnsonian cadences play off an idea of harmonious 'numbers' and balances. "[I]ndebted"/"obligations", "fortune"/"nature", "form"/"heart", "countenance"/"complexion", "intelligence of her mind"/"emotion of her soul", "beamed with understanding"/"glistened with sensibility": in order to suggest

that her heroine unites the best of both head and heart, Burney's prose not only sets Cecilia's complementary qualities in parallel, but, through the prosodic symmetry of the clauses and phrases, implies an equivalence or relatedness of value that is *heard* as well as grammatically articulated. Here in Burney, as in Johnson and Blair, the harmonious numbers of prose are assumed to carry, and point a reader toward, intrinsic and stable values.

Now, there are many lines in Austen's teenage skits that bear striking formal similarities to the kind of late-Augustan sentences of which Burney is so fond; but it does not take much acclimatisation for a reader to realise that something altogether different, and more comically dangerous, is going on here. Compare Burney's introduction of Cecilia Beverley with the narrator's superficially similar manoeuvre at the beginning of "Jack and Alice":

Miss Simpson was pleasing in her person, in her Manners & in her Disposition; an unbounded ambition was her only fault. Her second sister Sukey was Envious, Spitefull & Malicious. Her person was short, fat & disagreeable. Cecilia (the youngest) was perfectly handsome but too affected to be pleasing.

In Lady Williams every virtue met. She was a widow with a handsome jointure & the remains of a very handsome face. Tho' Benevolent & Candid, she was Generous & sincere; Tho' Pious and Good, she was Religious & amiable, & Tho, Elegant & Agreeable, she was Polished & Entertaining. (13)

It is extraordinary to witness here the varieties of comic damage which Austen inflicts, in such a short textual space, on the assumptions underlying polite eighteenth-century sentences: far from having a natural “fit” with their subjects, the “numbers” of these sentences tell a reader too much, too little, or take them somewhere else altogether, all while staying within the earshot of their original models. First off, the neatly tricolon description of Miss Simpson’s “pleasing” qualities seems innocuous enough, only for the sentence to spill across the semi-colon into a qualification in which “unbounded” undoes all the restraint and measure that have preceded it, putting a further comic pressure on the phrase ‘her only fault’: limitation and the “unbounded” come to play off each other like a pair of comedians . Then, the account of Sukey, rather than offering mind and body as harmonious analogues to each other after the manner of Burney, implies a blunt rhythmic equivalence between them (“Envious, Spitefull & Malicious”/“short, fat & disagreeable”). Lady Williams’ moral qualities are set out in a series of what should be symmetrical antitheses, but turn out to be appositions (“Tho’ Pious & Good, she was Religious and amiable”). From Johnson, Blair and Burney, Austen drags a reader away into a world in which there no longer appears to be a natural correspondence between rhetorical periods and their referents, and where experience itself always, one way or another, thwarts fictional language’s capacity to marshal it, as witnessed by the endless canine profusion in “The Generous Curate” (“Newfoundland...from whence he regularly sent home a large Newfoundland Dog every Month to his family” (78)).

Time and again in these writings, the often anarchic and violent state of nature which they depict is shown bursting at the syntactic seams of decorous prose and formal conventions, even when those formal features are so highlighted by comic compression as to be almost the only things there on the page. Take “The Beautifull



Cassandra”, whose chapters are deliberately so short as to be barely longer than their own chapter-headings; yet even here, chaotic life finds a way:

---

Chapter the 4<sup>th</sup>

---

She then proceeded to a Pastry-cooks where she devoured six ices,  
refused to pay for them, knocked down the Pastry Cook & walked away.

(45)

The indecorous pile-up of clauses and actions might just have passed without notice in a full-length narrative; but since they take up almost all of a chapter, they are all oddly thrust to the foreground by the absence of any context or explanation, emphasising both the perfect internal and causal logic they seem to have, and the absurdity of a world in which rhetorical tropes correspond directly and uncomplicatedly to the things they describe.

But perhaps the most creative form of rhetorical indecency featured in the opening of “Jack and Alice” – certainly, one which has a profound influence on Austen’s later fictions – is the wicked juxtaposition of Lady Williams’ “handsome jointure & the remains of a very handsome face”. Freya Johnston and Kathryn Sutherland have rightly drawn attention to the prevalence in these early skits of the figure of “syllepsis, or zeugma, whereby one verb governs two different, incongruous objects....a technique she probably learned from Pope’s *Rape of the Lock*, in which Queen Anne’s dignity is vaguely compromised when she is said to ‘take’ both ‘Counsel’ and ‘Tea’” (*Teenage Writings*, xxxi); and it is easy to see what this particular form of bathetic earthing-device might offer to a writer of Austen’s temperament. On the one hand, zeugma can yoke the

ethereal to the embarrassingly material, a potent technique for an artist whose humour, in Heydt-Stevenson's felicitous phrase, "places the physical world's viscera at the center of her fictional universe" (19); and it cannot be a coincidence that so many of the most-quoted lines from the juvenilia are jokes of this form, whether in "Jack and Alice" ("Oh! cruel Charles to wound the hearts & legs of all the fair" (22)) or 'Love and Freindship' ("Beware of the insipid Vanities and idle Dissipations of the Metropolis of England; Beware of the unmeaning Luxuries of Bath & of the Stinking fish of Southampton' (78-9)). But it can also dramatize a different kind of bathos, one that mires pure thoughts and motives in much less pure ones; and in this strategy, Austen doesn't just look back to writers such as Pope, but also anticipates later, nineteenth-century social satirists like Thackeray. The narrator of "Jack and Alice", for example, tells us that "Alice had too sincere a respect for Lady Williams & too great a relish for her Claret, not to make every concession in her power" (18), which looks forward to novels such as *Vanity Fair*, where zeugma repeatedly reminds a reader that ideals have to make their way through the refracting medium of economic reality and necessity ("But he was unluckily endowed with a good name and a large though encumbered estate, both of which went rather to injure than to advance him" (Thackeray, 101)).

As I have written elsewhere, part of Austen's comic and ethical achievement revolves around the relationships her writing sets up between the acts of judgement dramatized within her plots and the (complementary but not identical) judgements which the ambiguities, obliquities, and silences invite her readers to make<sup>1</sup>. Looking again at these earliest, creative-critical fictions, those relationships are already alive and well; and as I shall now go on to investigate, readers' active engagement with questions of evaluation and judgement are so often articulated through both rhetorical "numbers" and the strategic deployment of numbers themselves. Underpinning both senses of the

word is a large range of overlapping but not identical concerns: with rank, with economic property, as well as more metaphysical concerns with 'placement' and aesthetic proportion; and it is precisely this overlap which means that a satirist such as the young Austen can play a reader's understanding of quantity off the more specialised aesthetic understandings of numerical proportion (and vice-versa), in order to wreak havoc with the order, and orderings, of the world, and of fiction's attempts to represent it.

On the surface, it might seem as if the historical associations of arithmetical numbers with realist fiction were so well established as to need no further comment. Since the novel as an artform is a child of Enlightenment empiricism, runs the story, it is only natural that an artform which makes a virtue of mimicking the real, verifiable world should have recourse to arithmetic, the Adamic language of verification, as one of its core techniques. Defoe is traditionally the great test-case for this thesis, not least that moment from *Robinson Crusoe* which has not only passed into literary-critical folklore, but also, via J. M. Coetzee's novel *Elizabeth Costello*, into metafictional posterity:

....reflecting upon all my Comerades that were drown'd, and that there should not be one Soul sav'd but my self; for, as for them, I never saw them afterwards, or any Sign of them, except three of their hats, one Cap, and two Shoes that were not Fellows. (Defoe, 41)

Numbers connote presence and quantity simply by being mentioned, but Defoe compounds this effect by choosing to make each quantity an odd number, since

asymmetry will look even less deliberately contrived, less like an invention. Three hats, one cap, two shoes that could have been a pair, but are carefully described as not being so, because (of course) this isn't some neatly "made-up" story; surely numbers here are doing the core work of classic realism, acting as the most solid representatives of what Roland Barthes called the "reality effect", telegraphing to a reader that they are "the real"?

Well, yes; but that's not quite what numbers do in Austen's fiction, even in the earliest surviving examples of it. Indeed, it is often when they appear to be doing their most conventional work that the writing itself seems least "real". Take the shrubbery in "Evelyn" ("the surface of it perfectly even & smooth, and grazed by four white cows which were disposed at equal distances from each other...These four Rose trees served also to mark the quarters of the Shrubbery" (181, 184). Realist fiction has long drawn on traditions of visual details in painting; but Austen here teases out the counterintuitive logic of that influence to its absurd conclusion, with the neatly numerical correspondence of "four white cows" and "four Rose trees" (not unlike a mathematical cousin of zeugma) combining with the tell-tale connotations of "disposed" to make the scene look less like three-dimensional reality than like a two-dimensional painting of it – anticipating the Highbury street-scene in Vol. II, Ch. 9 of *Emma*, which, as I noted in my 2016 JASNA lecture, comes to feel oddly like a flat stage-set.<sup>2</sup>

Over and above this quality, though, is the fact that, right from the beginning, Austen has her own, rather different investment in numerical details. To be blunt, she isn't particularly interested in numbers, or physical objects, as realist lumber, unlike Defoe before her and mid-nineteenth-century social-realist novelists after her. Rather,

numbers and objects are primarily of interest to her insofar as they participate in networks of psychological investment, as tokens of value to characters, and as signifiers of those characters' values to a reader; in other words, they are important not so much for any intrinsic value they might have, but for the values that are *attached* to them by people, although the relations that numbers have to each other can produce superlative comic effects.

One of the finest insights in Johnston and Sutherland's introduction to the Oxford edition of the *Teenage Writings* is their analysis of the language of excess and insufficiency: "One of the keywords in the teenage writings is the busy, unobtrusive 'too'—as in 'too high', 'too much', 'too small', 'too great'". Their analysis gets to the heart of what Austen does with number and quantity, since phrases such as "too much" and "too little" are completely meaningless without reference to a presumed norm: to translate this into the logic of Goldilocks and the three bears, porridge can, logically speaking, only be either too hot or too cold once people have agreed on what counts as "just right". The twentieth-century philosopher of language Paul Grice famously formulated a set of maxims underlying conversational conduct, first among them being the Maxim of Quantity. "If you are assisting me to mend a car," he suggests, "I expect your contribution to be neither more nor less than is required; if, for example, at a particular stage I need four screws, I expect you to hand me four, rather than two or six" (Grice, 28). But he also recognises that such rules of conduct are often more honoured in the breach than in the observance, leading to his influential formulation of the term "implicature" to cover all those instances in which people say more, less, or other than the maxims of conversation might dictate, in order to suggest something that isn't being stated directly; this is an expressive resource which Austen understood instinctively

even in her teens, and which she employs with particular creativity in the comic mileage that the juvenilia get out of numbers.

A recurring numerical joke in the juvenilia involves details which are precise enough to feel important, but are not given enough contextual space for that importance to be fully explained, with the result that the narrative can often feel simultaneously too precise and too vague. In “Jack and Alice”, the (in)decencies of mourning are lampooned through the precise rendition of durations, as the funeral baked meats coldly furnish forth the marriage tables:

Among the most afflicted of her friends were Lady Williams, Miss Johnson & the Duke; the 2 first of whom had a most sincere regard for her, more particularly Alice, who had spent a whole evening in her company & had never thought of her since. His Grace’s affliction may likewise be easily accounted for, since he had lost one for whom he had experienced during the last ten days, a tender affection & sincere regard. He mourned her loss with unshaken constancy for the next fortnight at the end of which time, he gratified the ambition of Caroline Simpson by raising her to the rank of a Dutchess. (28-9)

Likewise, in “Love and Freindship”, Isabel’s famous remarks about “unmeaning Luxuries” and “Stinking fish” are framed by Laura’s snarky account of her inferior accomplishments: “Isabel had seen the World. She had passed 2 years at one of the finest Boarding-schools in London; had spent a fortnight in Bath & had supped one night in Southampton” (78). Both of these passages take it as read that certain kinds of

feeling or knowledge have their natural periods and durations, hence the increasing quantities in 'Jack and Alice' and the decreasing ones in 'Love and Freindship'. And at the level of syntax and grammar, as I have been arguing, these jokes play off larger received expectations that harmonious rhetorical "numbers" have some intrinsic relationship to the objects they emphasise and compare; when the truth is that there's no necessary connection between style and subject at all. But Austen's jokes in the juvenilia also exploit the internal, arithmetical relations between numbers themselves. "[A] whole evening", "ten days", "the next fortnight": part of the gag is not just that the quantities are out of true with the decorous expectations set up by the balanced prose-rhythm, but that they also have some meaningful mathematical connection to each other. This is a technique which is frequently brought to a pitch of brilliantly suggestive precision in the teenage skits:

Mrs Fitzroy did not approve of the match on account of the tender years of the young couple, Rebecca being but 36 & Captain Roger little more than 63. ("Frederic & Elfrida" (7))

The dear Creature is just turned of two years old; as handsome as tho' 2 & 20, as sensible as tho' 2 & 30, and as prudent as tho' 2 & 40. ("Lesley Castle" (111))

Numbers are here held to account, with grimly comic determination, for the roles that they play in the 'novel slang' that Austen lampoons throughout her teenage writings: the cliché of 'tender years' is presented as if it might stop a reader noticing the arbitrary reversal of '36' into '63', much as the toddler's virtues ("handsome...sensible...prudent") are listed as if they underwrite the otherwise inexplicable crescendo of "20...30...40".

Austen often flirts with the ghostly possibilities of arithmetical patterns or proportions between the numbers she mentions, another trick she may have picked up from the intellectual atmosphere, and the reading matter, of Steventon Rectory in its role as a boy's school. Many young women would barely have touched formal mathematics in their early years (although older female readers would have had access to the influential mathematical puzzles published in *The Ladies' Diary*). Boys' education, on the other hand, customarily included arithmetic as part of the curriculum, and numerical proportion featured significantly in entry-level textbooks. For example, Thomas Keith's *The Complete Practical Arithmetician* (1788) demonstrates mathematical proportion in a way that might feel surprisingly familiar to a modern reader:

Ex. If 2 yards of cloth cost four shillings, what will 8 yards cost at the same rate.

State it thus:

1<sup>st</sup> term.    2<sup>d</sup> term.    3<sup>d</sup> term.    4<sup>th</sup> term.

If 2 yards    :    4 shillings    ::    8 yards    :    16 shillings, Answer

(Keith, 23).

And it is this particular form of proportion problem which lurks around so many of the jokes in the juvenilia, and is in turn writ large in one of the most outrageous comic moments in *Pride and Prejudice*, when Darcy makes his first appearance at Netherfield:

His brother-in-law, Mr. Hurst, merely looked the gentleman; but his friend Mr. Darcy soon drew the room by his fine, tall person,



handsome features, noble mien; and the report which was in general circulation within five minutes of his entrance, of his having ten thousand a year. (10)

As with comparable moments in “Henry and Eliza” and “Jack and Alice”, the outrageous unspoken possibility that Austen dangles before us through the proportional relationship between “five” and “ten” is that, as in one of Thomas Keith’s math problems, the report might only have taken two and a half minutes had Darcy’s income been twenty thousand a year.

And yet, where do these jokes come from? Not from numbers themselves: they remain neutral and inscrutable, they do their own thing, they have their own internal correspondences and consistencies; and, most importantly, *they don’t know that they’re funny*. It takes people to do that; which is why they offer such fertile comic and creative resources to a writer of Austen’s temperament, a temperament which is already working wonders in these earliest surviving fictions. Whether in the mismatch between form and content in the rhythmic “numbers” of sentence structure, or in the suggestive numerical innuendos that the teenage writings set up, these effects are only funny – indeed, they only mean anything at all – once we introduce human beings, with their interpretations and valuations, to the scene. For this reason, Virginia Woolf’s classic account, in *A Room of One’s Own*, of female responses to the Augustan sentence may need some qualification: “That is a man’s sentence,” she argues, “and behind it one can see Johnson, Gibbon, and the rest. It was a sentence that was unsuited for a woman’s use....Jane Austen looked at it and laughed at it and devised a perfectly natural, shapely sentence proper for her own use and never departed from it” (Woolf, 58). Woolf’s

description, for all its perceptions, remains beholden to a binary that may not need to exist. For sure, Austen saw that sentence and laughed at it, as the three volumes of the juvenilia attest; but the cast of Woolf's language underplays the extent to which Austen's creative birth springs from a brilliant mode of stylistic "entryism". She saw that sentence, but she also *heard* its "numbers", its prosodic music, inhabited it, tried it on for size, and blew it up from the inside; therefore, to get one of the juvenilia's jokes about numerical value is already so much more than that: it is to have begun to engage with the huge reciprocal complex of valuations – from characters, from narrators, from implied readers – that is the great comic and ethical quarry of her published novels.

#### **Works Cited:**

Austen, J., -----, *The Works of Jane Austen*, ed. R. W. Chapman. 3<sup>rd</sup> edn. Oxford: OUP, 1933-69.

-----, *Teenage Writings*. Ed. Kathryn Sutherland and Freya Johnston. Oxford: OUP, 2017.

Austen-Leigh, J. E., *A Memoir of Jane Austen*. 1871. *A Memoir of Jane Austen and Other Family Recollections*. Ed. Kathryn Sutherland. Oxford: OUP, 2008.

Blair, H., *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres*, 3 vols. Dublin: Whitestone, Collet,

Burnet, et al., 1783.

Burney, F., *Cecilia, or Memoirs of an Heiress*, 5 vols. London: T. Payne & T. Cadell, 1782.

Defoe, D., *The Life and Strange Surprizing Adventures of Robinson Crusoe of York, Mariner*. 1719. Ed. Thomas Keymer. Oxford: OUP, 2007.

Grice, P., 'Logic and Conversation'. 1967. *Studies in the Way of Words*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1989.

Heydt-Stevenson, J., *Austen's Unbecoming Conjunctions: Subversive Laughter, Embodied History*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.

Johnson, S., *A Dictionary of the English Language*, 6<sup>th</sup> edn, 2 vols. London: J. F. C.

Rivington, et al., 1785.

-----, *The Yale Edition of the Works of Samuel Johnson*, 23 vols. Ed. E. L. McAdam, et al. New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1958-2010.

Keith, Thomas, *The Complete Practical Arithmetician*. London: B. Law, 1788.

Tandon, Bharat, *Jane Austen and the Morality of Conversation*. London: Anthem Press, 2003.

-----, 'Labours Not Her Own: *Emma* and the Invisible World'. *Persuasions* 38, 2016, 116-130.

Thackeray, William Makepeace, *Vanity Fair: a Novel Without a Hero*. 1847. Ed. Helen Small. Oxford: OUP, 2015.

Woolf, V., *A Room of One's Own*. 1929. *A Room of One's Own and Three Guineas*. Ed. Anna Snaith. Oxford: OUP, 1992.

---

<sup>1</sup> See my *Jane Austen and the Morality of Conversation* (London: Anthem Press, 2003).

<sup>2</sup> 'Labours Not Her Own: *Emma* and the Invisible World'. *Persuasions* 38 (2016), 125-6.