

# Bibliotekarstudentens nettleksikon om litteratur og medier

Av Helge Ridderstrøm (førsteamanuensis ved OsloMet – storbyuniversitetet)

Sist oppdatert 09.12.20

## Sederoman

(\_sjanger) Engelsk: “novel of manners”. Det norske “sederoman” (som i “sed og skikk”) brukes som oversettelse. Kan også kalles “sedelighetsroman”.

Sederomanene dreier seg ofte om “morals and manners”, eller tre m-er: “manners, money, marriage”.

Sederomaner handler om personer, men gjennom dem også om normene, kodene, dannelsesidealene og etiketten i det samfunnet de tilhører. Handlingen er sentrert om menneskelige relasjoner og samfunnets konvensjoner. I det fiktive universet råder det en streng anstendighets- og dydighetskodeks, særlig for kvinner.

Romanene viser ikke bare hva konvensjonene består i, men også den sosiale prisen som må betales av dem som bryter med konvensjonene.

“A novel that describes in detail the customs, behaviors, habits, and expectations of a certain social group at a specific time and place. Usually these conventions shape the behavior of the main characters, and sometimes even stifle or repress them. Often the novel of manners is satiric, and it is always realistic in depiction.” ([http://web.cn.edu/kwheeler/lit\\_terms\\_N.html](http://web.cn.edu/kwheeler/lit_terms_N.html); lesedato 27.03.17) Romanen tematiserer “the importance of money, conduct, and social rank” (Sundell 1969 s. 3). Slike faktorer kaller Joseph Litvak for “social politics” i boka *Strange Gourmets: Sophistication, Theory, and the Novel* (1997) (<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/415158/summary>; lesedato 22.04.20).

“The novel of manners, which developed in the nineteenth century, portrays with detailed realism the social customs, conventions, traditions, mores, and shared habits of a given social group at a particular time and place and explores as well as demonstrates the powerful control that these social constructs exert over characters in the novel. Because it focused attention on the domestic arena and its emotional impact on the fictional characters, the novel of manners naturally attracted women writers. Many of these writers, however, did not succeed and wrote a type of fiction called the novel of sensibility or sentiment, which stressed the intensity of the characters’ emotional responses frequently beyond the limits of the rational. Some excellent women writers of novels of manners also wrote novels of sentiment or satires of such novels. It is important to note that the true novel of manners examines objectively the impact of social gestures and constructs on characters with attention to verisimilitude in an attempt to assist the intellect more than the

heart in grasping social and psychological profundities. One of the most successful writers of novels of manners was Jane Austen. Not only was Jane Austen (1775-1817) a novelist of manners, but her novels gave definition to the genre by bringing to culmination the artistic structure (including the perfection of an objective narrative technique infused with irony, wit, and perspicacity) and themes of the mainstream eighteenth-century novel. [...] Her determination to objectively and realistically depict these social constructs and their effects on character and situation gave the genre most of its themes and artistry.” (Gloria Stephenson i <http://gem.greenwood.com/wse/wsePrint.jsp?id=id413>; lesedato 26.05.16)

Romanenes “subject is the set of social conventions of a particular class in a particular time and place. The growth of the novel of manners appears to have been centered in the nineteenth century, although some critics place its emergence earlier, in the works of Henry Fielding (1707-1754) or Samuel Richardson (1689-1761); others insist it survives well into the twentieth century in the works of F. Scott Fitzgerald (1896-1940) and Sinclair Lewis (1885-1951). [...] And the class whose social relations are scrutinized in the novel of manners could be the aristocracy, but it is more likely the gentry, the emerging middle class, or even the lower class. Changes in English society in the nineteenth century that eroded the boundaries between these various groups provided the background for the emergence of the novel of manners. Industrialization, urbanization, and revolutions in transportation and communication were accompanied by profound changes in the social hierarchy. As the aristocracy lost power to industrial and business interests, the standard markers for determining an individual’s position in society were becoming increasingly unreliable. In some sense, the novel of manners emerged to clear up this uncertainty by offering detailed renderings of how the various groups behaved in everyday situations, and by both describing and prescribing codes of conduct. Many works contrasted the customs of the various groups, examining not only class and economic differences, but also the differences between city and countryside, between an earlier agrarian culture and a contemporary industrial order, and between England and America.” (<http://course.site.uhcl.edu/HSH/Whitec/terms/N/NovelOfManners.htm>; lesedato 27.03.17)

Begrepet “manners” omfatter i engelsk sammenheng både en persons “habitual behaviour or conduct” og dypere sett personens “moral character”. Sederomaner dreier seg både om personers ytre framreden eller oppførsel og om deres indre, moralske standarder. Standardene er alltid knyttet til en bestemt historisk situasjon og bestemte samfunnsklasser. Samfunnet vi opplever i tekstene, er gjennomsyret av konvensjoner når det gjelder “anstand”, sømmelighet, dekorum, etikette. Som en kodifisering av det sømmelige og passende fantes det gjennom århundrer såkalte “conduct books”, en slags moralske veiledningsbøker, som ikke minst formante kvinner til å oppføre seg på bestemte måter. Den moralske forankringen i sederomanene er ikke moralistisk på et universelt eller tidløst grunnlag, men knyttet til det verdihierarkiet og de sosiale normene som gjelder i et bestemt

samfunn. Mennesket møter det sosiale på et bestemt historisk tidspunkt, med moralske brytninger mellom menneskets offentlige og private liv.

“Manners” “doesn’t exactly mean the same thing as etiquette, but more like behavior and how it fits with others and what it means [...] Subject: courtship, social interaction of leisure class, [...] social codes [...] Characters test each other’s interest, honor, generosity, folly, irony [...] Misconceptions, false identities, blunders, connections” (<http://coursesite.uhcl.edu/HSH/Whitec/terms/N/NovelOfManners.htm>; lesedato 27.03.17). Manners inkluderer dannelse, å kunne oppføre seg dannet og snakke om dannete temaer.

“For critic Lionel Trilling, manners are “a culture’s hum and buzz of implication,” revealing what a society truly values. Manners, he continues, are “hinted at by small actions, sometimes by the arts of dress or decoration, sometimes by tone, gesture, emphasis, or rhythm, sometimes by the words that are used with special frequency or a special meaning.” James W. Tuttleton favors limiting the definition to novels “concerned about how manners reflect the moral condition of humanity” and concludes that in the novel of manners, “the manners, social customs, folkways, conventions, traditions, and mores of a given social group at a given time and place” are set out for preservation and analysis. [...] manners are more visible and accessible at a time when society is in transition, whether through war, economic upheaval, demographic shifts, or moral or cultural crisis.” (Cecilia Macheski i <http://ebooks.cambridge.org/chapter.jsf>; lesedato 02.06.16)

“Though Jane Austen may have disliked pictures of perfection in her heroes and heroines, Mr. Knightley [i *Emma*] came as near her ideal as possible, an ideal which she summed up in one of her letters as a person ‘where grace and spirit are united to worth, where the manners are equal to the heart and understanding’.” (Bradbrook 1961 s. 12) En mann skal verken være falsk eller overfladisk, for da har han “[n]one of that upright integrity, that strict adherence to truth and principle, that disdain of trick and littleness, which a man should display in every transaction of his life.” (fra kap. 46 i *Emma*) “[T]he ideal human activity is to introduce order, grace and harmony into the world, as the landscape-gardener does.” (Bradbrook 1961 s. 58) Hennes romancer driver indirekte “analysis of manners and morals within a limited social group”, analyse av “the changes and fluctuations of civilised life” (Bradbrook 1961 s. 58).

“As the aristocracy lost power to industrial and business interests, the standard markers for determining an individual’s position in society were becoming increasingly unreliable. In some sense, the novel of manners emerged to clear up this uncertainty by offering detailed renderings of how the various groups behaved in everyday situations, and by both describing and prescribing codes of conduct. Many works contrasted the customs of the various groups, examining not only class and economic differences, but also the differences between city and countryside, between an earlier agrarian culture and a contemporary industrial order, and

between England and America. [...] although the focus of the novel of manners – domestic life, matrimony, and social behavior – tends to be narrow, the “manners” being studied very often have far wider implications beyond the pouring of tea and the search for the proper mate. Adherence to good manners in these texts is not only a reliable indicator of one’s social standing, but is intended to serve as an indicator of good morals as well. The novel of manners often deals with gender issues as well, as the accepted standards for both manners and morals differ markedly between men and women. Regardless of the social class under study, there are frequently two distinct sets of codes in operation, and as many feminist critics point out, the ideals prescribed for women were often a source of anxiety for nineteenth-century women writers – an anxiety that plays itself out in the novels. In many woman-authored texts, the interaction of individual characters with the social conventions of their cultures is not a happy one, and the conventions themselves are as likely to be satirized as celebrated.” (Denise Evans m.fl. i <https://www.enotes.com/topics/novel-manners>; lesedato 24.11.16)

Madame de La Fayette’s roman *Prinsesse de Clèves* (1678) har blitt oppfattet som en av de første sederromanene fordi den på en realistisk måte handler om menneskelig oppførsel, innplassert både historisk og sosialt (Demougin 1985 s. 1399). En mer entydig pionér innen sederromansjangeren er den engelske forfatteren Fanny Burney, særlig med romanen *Evelina: Or The History of A Young Lady’s Entrance into the World* (1778). Hennes roman *Camilla* (1796) “gives a wonderful depiction of public entertainment and pleasure in late eighteenth-century England as well as the manners and fashions that made up the social theater – in particular the social restrictions and even dangers that confronted young women.” (Boxall 2006 s. 77) Det kreves “moral discipline” (R. Christiansen 1988 s. 189). “The eighteenth century is typically seen as a period in which British society was radically transformed so as to witness a ‘birth of polite society’ ” (Goring 2005 s. 6).

Mot slutten av Fanny Burneys *Cecilia* (1782) oppsummeres en lærdom eller moral med de to stikkordene som Jane Austen brukte i sin mest kjente boktittel: “ “The whole of this unfortunate business”, said Dr. Lyster, “has been the result of PRIDE and PREJUDICE. Your uncle, the Dean, began it, by his arbitrary will, as if an ordinance of his own could arrest the course of nature! And as if *he* had power to keep alive, by the loan of a name, a family in the male branch already extinct. Your father, Mr Mortimer, continued it with the same self-partiality, preferring the wretched gratification of tickling his ear with a favourite sound, to the solid happiness of his son with a rich and deserving wife. Yet this, however, remember, if to PRIDE and PREJUDICE you owe your miseries, so wonderfully is good and evil balanced, that to PRIDE and PREJUDICE you will also owe their termination.” ” (Burney sitert fra Hudelet 2006 s. 9)

Engelske Jane Austen skrev sederromaner på begynnelsen av 1800-tallet, blant andre *Sense and Sensibility* (1811), *Pride and Prejudice* (1813), *Mansfield Park*

(1814) og *Emma* (1816). Austens romaner foregår hovedsakelig blant den sosiale klassen som blir kalt “the gentry”, med sine landeiendommer og sitt tjenerskap, men ikke alltid med store formuer. Mennesker som tilhørte “the gentry” var forventet å te seg på helt bestemt måter. “The gentry” var vanligvis ikke adel (men Charlotte Lucas’ far i *Pride and Prejudice* har blitt adlet; jf. begynnelsen av kap. 5). Det er klassen under adelen, men som i livsstil likevel har et aristokratisk preg og ikke spesifikke yrker. Austen tilhørte “the lower gentry and clergy” (Tauchert 2005 s. x). Hennes romaner foregår i den såkalte regency-perioden, oppkalt etter den britiske prins George. I årene 1811-20 var kong George 3. blitt både blind og sinnssyk, og kunne ikke lenger i praksis fungere som monark, men hans sønn George (senere George 4.) var ennå ikke konge. George 3. døde i 1820.

Austen skrev om det som i dag av mange oppfattes som “the fabric of an imaginary lost Englishness, now associated with the Regency period; [...] her writing establishes the immediate conditions for the empirical realism that comes to dominate nineteenth-century narrative.” (Tauchert 2005 s. 4)

“Austen is always acerbic and penetrating in her representation of the foibles of her own class, but as Raymond Williams has argued, ‘All her discrimination is understandable, internal and exclusive. She is concerned with the conduct of people who, in the complications of improvement, are repeatedly trying to make themselves into a class. But where only one class is seen, no classes are seen’ (117).” (Nelson 2013)

“Austen’s novels are often criticized for what is seen as a too narrow range of interests. She concentrates on the country life among the upper middle class in southern England near the end of the eighteenth century to the exclusion of interest in even major national and international events. On the other hand, Austen is the subject of almost unbroken praise for the complex portrayal of what she called “the delicacy of mind,” captured only by a supreme concentration on looking and listening. Many critics and readers go further to praise Austen’s moral concerns, which they feel give her themes the highest significance. She is further praised by feminists for what Ellen Moers calls Austen’s “deep concern with the quality of a woman’s life in marriage” (107); other critics note her depiction of society’s lack of concern for unmarried women. All of these concerns informed the development of the novel of manners. Among Austen’s precursors were Fanny Burney (1732-1840) and Maria Edgeworth (1768-1849). Three of Burney’s novels were novels of manners: *Evelina* (1778), *Cecilia* (1796), and *Camilla* (1796). Although all three have many of the characteristics of Austen’s major novels, *Cecilia* is least susceptible to being classified as a novel of sentiment. At the same time, Wilbur L. Cross describes *Evelina* as “the novel in which we move from the old to the new manners” (94). Cross also remarks, “Before Fanny Burney, the novel of manners had been cultivated exclusively by men” (95). Austen paid Burney homage by taking from her works the title and theme of *Pride and Prejudice*. Maria Edgeworth wrote novels of manners that exposed false sentiment and frivolous nonsense in

fashionable London society (e.g., *Belinda* [1801]). Edgeworth spent her childhood in England but moved to Ireland, a set of circumstances that allowed her to write fiction contrasting the manners of two societies (*Ennui* [1809]; *The Absentee* [1812]) and thus create the international novel.” (Gloria Stephenson i <http://gem.greenwood.com/wse/wsePrint.jsp?id=id413>; lesedato 26.05.16)

William Forsyth i boka *The Novel and Novelists of the Eighteenth Century* (1871) “tempers his praise of Jane Austen’s novels by criticizing the constant “husband-hunting” by Austen’s female characters. But although the focus of the novel of manners – domestic life, matrimony, and social behavior – tends to be narrow, the “manners” being studied very often have far wider implications beyond the pouring of tea and the search for the proper mate. Adherence to good manners in these texts is not only a reliable indicator of one’s social standing, but is intended to serve as an indicator of good morals as well. The novel of manners often deals with gender issues as well, as the accepted standards for both manners and morals differ markedly between men and women. Regardless of the social class under study, there are frequently two distinct sets of codes in operation, and as many feminist critics point out, the ideals prescribed for women were often a source of anxiety for nineteenth-century women writers – an anxiety that plays itself out in the novels. In many woman-authored texts, the interaction of individual characters with the social conventions of their cultures is not a happy one, and the conventions themselves are as likely to be satirized as celebrated.” (<http://coursesite.uhcl.edu/HSH/Whitec/terms/N/NovelOfManners.htm>; lesedato 27.03.17)

“Austen’s novels famously prefer to turn their gaze from a potentially vivid window onto the violent social upheavals which marked the culmination of a century or so of ‘European Enlightenment’, towards the microcosmic intensities of the drawing room at its domestic heart. Austen’s signature is visible in the work’s uninterrupted focus on the minutiae of a dozen or so mostly rural English families drawn from the clergy and the gentry, documenting their courtships, foibles, dramas, domestic habits, and manners. This interior turn is a characteristically feminine move; to draw the curtains, light the fire, and keep loved ones close to home in times of trouble. These famous and much-loved novels are unavoidably femino-centric, attending quietly to the detail of spoilt dresses, pretty bonnets, secret love notes, long walks reading letters, sisterly love, and the private dramas of uncertain courtship.” (Tauchert 2005 s. 2)

Austens forfatterskap “is still received as moral realism at the same time that it functions as ‘stealth’ radical feminism. Austen has effectively undermined the very social categories she has also been understood rather problematically to champion: marriage, feminine virtue, constancy, propriety, humility, domesticity, modesty, gentility, proper hierarchy.” (Tauchert 2005 s. 21) De kvinnelige hovedpersonene hos Austen har noe relativt fritt og uhemmet ved seg, samtidig som de har gode manners. De er både relativt ærlige og relativt selvstendige. De har en høy moralsk

standard (delvis med unntak av Emma i *Emma*). “Jane Austen connects social and moral flaws.” (Bradbrook 1961 s. 47)

“Utgangspunktet for dramaet i Jane Austens roman er god, gammeldags kvinnediskriminering: Mr. Bennets eiendom følger en mannlig arverekkefølge, og ved hans død vil den gå over til den selvgode og latterlige slektningen Mr. Collins. Det er derfor Mrs. Bennet er så hysterisk etter å få de fem døtrene godt gift, så deres økonomiske og sosiale posisjon er sikret etter ektemannens død. Den urettferdige arveregelen til tross: Jane Austens forfatterskap kan i høyden beskrives som feminisme på halvveien. Hun er god på problembeskrivelsen, men skuffer når det gjelder løsninger. Overklassepikene hennes er utsatt for til dels grundig kjønnsdiskriminering. De stiller sist i arverekkefølgen og har ikke andre muligheter til å skaffe seg egne inntekter enn ved å bli gift. Den manglende økonomiske selvstendigheten blandes med sosiale regler: Menn kan komme og gå, mens kvinnene må vente. Vente på å bli fridd til, vente på å bli invitert med på reise med onkels tospann, vente på å bli bydd opp til dans. [...] Hennes heltinner finner løsningen innenfor systemet, de står opp for seg selv, selv om det sosiale regelverket ikke inviterer til det, og blir til sist gift med et praktkeksemplar av en mann som vil gi dem respekten og handlefriheten som samfunnet ikke unner dem. [...] Austens romaner handler ikke om annet enn klasseførmelser.” (Marit K. Slotnæs og Maria B. Reinertsen i *Morgenbladet* 8.–14. mars 2013 s. 4 og 6)

Austen spiller i *Pride and Prejudice* og andre romaner på kjente romantyper når hun skriver, f.eks. den romantiske heltinne (Lizzy i *Pride and Prejudice*), narren (Mr Collins), kjeltringen (Wickham), den falne kvinne (Lydia) osv. Den styrtrike Lady Catherine i *Pride and Prejudice* er ufølsom og har mange klassefordommer. Hos Austen kan de samme karaktersvakhetene og personlige feilene forekomme i alle sosiale lag og klasser, altså uavhengig av rang og formue. Sentralt i bøkene er konflikten mellom fornuftsekteskap og følelsesekteskap, samtidig som romantisk føleri ikke vises som noe positivt. Austens romaner har ofte blitt sammenlignet med romantiske komedier – “Some critics do also use the drama genre to characterized the novel: ‘the genre to which this novel [*Pride and Prejudice*] belongs, that of easy romantic comedy’ (Jenkyns 2004, 12)” (Sørbo 2008 s. 97). Noen innslag i handlingen kan i dag oppleves som komiske “storm i vannglass”, f.eks. mye av det som hovedpersonen i *Emma* er sysselsatt med.

*Pride and Prejudice* “handler om noe så tilsynelatende kjedelig som avmålte menn i stive skjortebryst og ekteskapslengtende unge kvinner i enda stivere korsetter. De er presset inn i strengt høviske omgangsformer, trange konvensjoner og et evig sus av landsbysladder fullt av fornuft og følelser, av fordommer og noe så gammeldags som stolthet. [...] “Stolthet og fordom” skildrer britisk småmiljø på 1790-tallet, med fokus på familien Bennet, der en pinlig ufølsom og skravlete mor gjør altfor iherdige forsøk på å gifte bort sine fem ugifte og uformuende døtre. Den begynner som en satirisk landsby- og familieskildring, men utvikler seg til drama og dypfølt fortelling om kjærlighetsforviklingene og – til slutt – forlovelsen mellom den stolte

og fritalende Elizabeth fra en relativt lurvere lavadel, og Darcy, en av Englands rikeste og mest rakryggede høyadelsmenn. [...] Austen holder opp ironien og ler av overfølsomhetens narraktighet. Samtidig insisterer hun på at de store livsdramaene og de skjellsettende følelsene finnes, og viser oss menneskeliv der store sinnsendringer skjer og får følger. [...] Nysgjerrighet og tørst etter dette alvoret er den viktigste grunnen til at hun fremdeles fenger oss.” (Arnhild Skre i *Aftenposten* 7. januar 2006 s. 9)

Et eksempel på en diskusjon om “manners” mellom romanpersonene finnes i kapittel 18 i *Emma*. Emma og Mr. Knightley diskuterer her hvorfor ikke Frank Churchill har besøkt sin far, og har ulike meninger om det de tror er grunnen. Knightly mistenker Churchill for å ha “no English delicacy towards the feelings of other people”.

“Kritikeren Lionel Trilling bemerket en gang om Austen at en leser alltid vil merke hennes “omtanke for *hans* moralske velbefinnende, hennes bekymring for den rette vei hans utvikling bør ta”.” (*Morgenbladet* 18.–24. oktober 2013 s. 51)

Det er uenighet blant litteraturforskere og lesere om handlingen i *Pride and Prejudice* foregår på 1790-tallet, da Austen skrev utkastet til romanen, eller på 1810-tallet, da hun redigerte romanen for publisering (Hudelet 2006 s. 45).

For Jane Austen er selvbeherskelse et ideal: kontroll over hva en sier og gjør også når lidenskapene syder inne i en. De kvinnelige hovedpersonene i Austens romaner har dannelse og god smak, men er vanligvis uten penger (dvs. medgift, deres usynlige “prislapp”). Fortelleren viser stor innlevelse i hovedpersonene, samtidig som fortelleren ironiserer over eller latterliggjør de kvinnene og mennene som ikke vil velge etter hjertet. Handlingen i Austens bøker består i en serie av fortelser, fornærmelser, følelsesutbrudd, avvisninger, tilnærmelser, misforståelser – med påfølgende forsoning og ekteskap. “[I]n Jane Austen’s work, irony is more than a trope; [...] It approximates an attitude, an outlook; [...] The effect of this ironic omniscience is to create distance from the world described, and to question its basic values.” (Sørbø 2008 s. 37)

“Manners and good breeding do require some codes and decorum, and conventions are not [i Austens romaner] presented as so constraining when they allow the preservation of politeness, civility, and even dignity, in moments for crisis.” (Hudelet 2006 s. 65) Om Austens romaner, og *Pride and Prejudice* spesielt, skriver Geoffrey Nash: “[T]he moral outlook of her novels can be summoned up like this:

(1) Feelings are meant to be governed by reason and by following the moral laws accepted by society and taught by religion. Those characters who follow their passions, or have no powers of reason, are criticised (for example, Wickham and Lydia).



2) The standards of society are not to be broken, but while some characters (such as Collins, Lady Catherine, and Miss Bingley) follow them blindly to flatter their own social standing and show how good they are, the intelligent ones (such as Elizabeth and the Gardiners) use them as the measure of good sense and propriety.” (Nash 1980 s. 64)

Austens personer avslører seg i små detaljer, og den som er upålitelig i smått, er det også i stort. Små tegn viser for den oppmerksomme leser hvem som er svikefulle.

Det hender at personer i Austens romaner snakker direkte om “manners”. I kapittel 31 i *Pride and Prejudice* samtaler Elizabeth, Darcy og Fitzwilliam: “Elizabeth laughed heartily [...] and said to Colonel Fitzwilliam, “Your cousin [dvs. Darcy] will give you a very pretty notion of me, and teach you not to believe a word I say. I am particularly unlucky in meeting with a person so able to expose my real character, in a part of the world where I had hoped to pass myself off with some degree of credit. Indeed, Mr. Darcy, it is very ungenerous in you to mention all that you knew to my disadvantage in Hertfordshire – and, give me leave to say, very impolitic too – for it is provoking me to retaliate, and such things may come out as will shock your relations to hear.” “I am not afraid of you,” said he [Darcy], smilingly. “Pray let me hear what you have to accuse him of,” cried Colonel Fitzwilliam. “I should like to know how he behaves among strangers.” “You shall hear then [sier Elizabeth] – but prepare yourself for something very dreadful. The first time of my ever seeing him in Hertfordshire, you must know, was at a ball – and at this ball, what do you think he did? He danced only four dances, though gentlemen were scarce; and, to my certain knowledge, more than one young lady was sitting down in want of a partner. Mr. Darcy, you cannot deny the fact.” “I had not at that time the honour of knowing any lady in the assembly beyond my own party.” “True; and nobody can ever be introduced in a ball-room. Well, Colonel Fitzwilliam, what do I play next? My fingers wait your orders.” “Perhaps,” said Darcy, “I should have judged better, had I sought an introduction; but I am ill-qualified to recommend myself to strangers.” “Shall we ask your cousin the reason of this?” said Elizabeth, still addressing Colonel Fitzwilliam. “Shall we ask him why a man of sense and education, and who has lived in the world, is ill qualified to recommend himself to strangers?” “I can answer your question,” said Fitzwilliam, “without applying to him. It is because he will not give himself the trouble.” “I certainly have not the talent which some people possess,” said Darcy, “of conversing easily with those I have never seen before. I cannot catch their tone of conversation, or appear interested in their concerns, as I often see done.”

Darcy skjuler sin usikkerhet overfor Elizabeth bak stive manerer og en arrogant fasade. Men han er fascinert av Elizabeth og stirrer ofte på henne, så tydelig at hun legger merke til det. “Gazes are an important index for this powerful narrative.” (Tauchert 2005 s. 163)

Elizabeth “analyserer” manners i etterkant av noen begivenheter, f.eks. Wickhams oppførsel: “She perfectly remembered everything that had passed in conversation between Wickham and herself, in their first evening at Mr. Phillips’s. Many of his expressions were still fresh in her memory. She was *now* struck with the impropriety of such communications to a stranger, and wondered it had escaped her before. She saw the indelicacy of putting himself forward as he had done, and the inconsistency of his professions with his conduct. She remembered that he had boasted of having no fear of seeing Mr. Darcy – that Mr. Darcy might leave the country, but that *he* should stand his ground; yet he had avoided the Netherfield ball the very next week. She remembered also that, till the Netherfield family had quitted the country, he had told his story to no one but herself; but that after their removal it had been everywhere discussed; that he had then no reserves, no scruples in sinking Mr. Darcy’s character, though he had assured her that respect for the father would always prevent his exposing the son.” (fra kap. 36) Wickham har brutt med reglene for sømmelighet og gentlemanlike oppførsel.

Det var en slags nedverdiggelse for en frier i å bli avvist, og tilnærmet utenkelig å fri igjen til samme kvinne. I *Pride and Prejudice* står det at “Darcy had walked away to another part of the room. She followed him with her eyes, envied every one to whom he spoke, had scarcely patience enough to help anybody to coffee; and then was enraged against herself for being so silly! “A man who has once been refused! How could I ever be foolish enough to expect a renewal of his love? Is there one among the sex, who would not protest against such a weakness as a second proposal to the same woman? There is no indignity so abhorrent to their feelings!” She was a little revived, however, by his bringing back his coffee cup himself; and she seized the opportunity of saying, “Is your sister at Pemberley still?” “Yes, she will remain there till Christmas.” ”

“It is typical of Austen’s tone that her narrator pretends to associate with the perspective of ‘the room’, reporting the views of ‘the gentlemen’ and ‘the ladies’ respectively as if they were perfectly valid, while leading us towards the conclusion that they are inconsistent and ridiculous.” (Sørbo 2008 s. 70) “Instead of an attempt at objectivity, there is here a constant evaluation, a judging eye that sees the people and their behaviour in terms of their own values, and reveals their shortcomings and indeed the shortcomings of the value-system itself.” (Sørbo 2008 s. 67)

*Pride and Prejudice* “is not an attack upon the ridiculous sentimentality and false romance of other novelists, “... nobody strays from Longbourn into the world of illusion;” it is rather an application of her satirical spirit to the manners of contemporary society. Thus it constitutes the first complete positive contribution toward her development of the critical novel of manners and represents her idea of what the novel *should* be.” (Anthony J. Peterman i [http://ecommons.luc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1316&context=luc\\_theses](http://ecommons.luc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1316&context=luc_theses); lesedato 08.03.17)

Austens romaner rommer svært mange sosiale situasjoner: korte visitter, besøk som kan vare i ukevis, familiesammenkomster, ball ... I disse situasjonene er det alltid mange samtaler og vanligvis lite dramatik. Konversasjonen har stor sosial betydning. "This question of speech is not so simple as might appear. It is partly used as a means of estimating degrees of intelligence, but it does not provide an absolute standard of either intelligence or integrity. The subject of conversational powers is itself touched with irony. It is connected with the habits of gossip and small-talk, and an over-indulgence in it leads to inaccuracy and slackness of language. On the other hand, to introduce intelligent conversation is a sign of good-breeding. The ideal seems to consist in striking a proper balance between talking too much, and being too silent. Glibness and facility are distrusted, particularly in men. [...] Great conversationalists are usually insincere as well as incorrect in their use of language, and reading a novel of Jane Austen is largely a matter of distinguishing between the nuances and gradations of insincerity in 'the usual rate of conversation'." (Bradbrook 1961 s. 41)

Austen romaner har ofte blitt filmatisert (adaptert til spillefilmer og TV-serier). "Here we will see *how* the country gentry lived – in an ambience of cultivated politeness. ... We will also see *where* they lived, the aesthetic perfection of the English country house crowning an almost equally perfect landscape" (Susan Watkins i <http://assets.press.princeton.edu/chapters/i6989.pdf>; lesedato 29.03.19).

I Austen-filmatiseringene får vi ofte se at familiene danner "tablåer" der kvinnene sitter og venter på den som har meldt sin ankomst eller har blitt observert fra vinduet. Kvinnene setter seg til rette og gjør det som passer/sømmer seg: leser, broderer og lignende. De gjør seg presentable, og det innebærer å gjøre små sysler (resten skulle i prinsippet tjenerne ta seg av). Typiske kjennetegn er at kvinnene oftest går i "empire-waist dresses" med puffermer (empire-stilen).

Kvinner i Austens England fikk ikke en systematisk utdanning slik som menn. De burde derimot drive med såkalte "female accomplishments" som å spille klaver, syng, brodere, male og lignende sysler. De burde også være gode til å danse og konversere, og gjerne være beleste innen skjønnlitteratur. Slik viste de seg verdig sin sosiale klasses tilhørighet og markerte seg som respektable og dannede.

"For women of the "genteel" classes the goal of non-domestic education was thus often the acquisition of "accomplishments" such as the ability to draw, sing, play music, or speak modern (i.e. non-Classical) languages (generally French and Italian). Though it was not usually stated with such open cynicism, the purpose of such accomplishments was often only to attract a husband; these skills tended to be neglected after marriage. All this is not to say, by any means, that all women were ignorant; only that, since there was no requirement for academic education for women, and very little opportunity for women to use such knowledge (so that for women learning is only for "the improvement of her mind"). Therefore it depended very strongly on what kind of instruction each woman's parents offered her in

childhood and on the individual inclinations of the woman herself. Intelligent girls could even have an advantage over boys in being able to more or less choose their own studies, and in not being subject to the rather mixed blessings of a more uniform Classical curriculum. [...] Most important was it to have a great many accomplishments, like playing the piano, dancing and drawing. The most women had no other choice than to marry. If they remained unmarried, they became an “old maid” and were dependant of the charity and good-will of the rest of their family. A woman could never live on her own, she always needed companionship of another woman (in most cases they hired a ‘Lady’s companion). There were almost no professions for women, except for becoming a governess, or a ‘Lady’s companion, and these were not very much respected jobs.” (Manon Schuurkes i <http://www.scholieren.com/profielwerkstuk/14773>; lesedato 28.08.14)

Den amerikanske forfatteren James Collins skrev 14. november 2009 en kronikk i *Wall Street Journal* med tittelen “What would Jane do? How a 19th-century spinster serves as a moral compass in today’s world” der han tematiserer det moralske i Austens bøker og deres aktualitet i dag. I kronikken skriver han: “In their essence, Austen’s books are moral works. “Northanger Abbey” is really about Catherine Morland’s moral education: She learns that the world does not operate on the principles of a gothic novel. As the title indicates, “Sense and Sensibility” is a moral tale: It is the story of Elinor’s self-command and Marianne’s self-indulgence. The central event of both “Pride and Prejudice” and “Emma” is each heroine’s discovery of her own moral weakness. “Manfield Park” treats any number of moral issues, from the propriety of engaging in amateur theatricals to the consequences of leaving one’s husband for another man. The premise of “Persuasion” is that Anne Elliot once sacrificed her happiness by doing her duty and obeying the admonishment of her moral guide, Lady Russell. Moral concerns are not only reflected in the large themes of the books, however: They are pervasive. Even the smallest act or the briefest dialogue or the mere description of a character’s manner of dress is freighted with moral content. Today’s readers tend to appreciate Austen despite her didacticism rather than because of it. She can be positively priggish, and that is an embarrassment. The contemporary reader who loves Jane Austen sort of blips over the moralizing sections and tells himself that they don’t really count. It is possible to ignore this aspect of her work, just as it is possible to discuss a religious painting with hardly any reference to the artist’s religious intent. But this seems absurd: Ignoring a writer’s central concern is a strange way to attempt to appreciate and understand her.” (<http://online.wsj.com/article/>; lesedato 24.01.13)

“I find that reading Jane Austen helps me clarify ethical choices, helps me figure out a way to live with integrity in the corrupt world, even helps me adopt the proper tone and manner in dealing with others. Her moralism and the modern mind are not, in fact, in direct opposition, as is so often assumed. [...] What, then, are the values that Austen would teach us? Value-laden words and phrases appear again and again in her work, often in clusters: self-knowledge, generosity, humility; elegance, propriety, cheerful orderliness; good understanding, correct opinion,

knowledge of the world, a warm heart, steady, observant, moderate, candid, sensibility to what is amiable and lovely. Austen's moral instruction points one toward a more moral life – where “moral” refers not only to right principles but to conduct in general. Austen's value system can be thought of as a sphere with layers. The innermost core might be called “morals,” the next layer we could call “sentiments,” and finally the surface “manners.” Morals are the fundamental principles: self-knowledge, generosity, humility, tenderest compassion, upright integrity. [...] Austen's regard for self-control, especially as expressed in “Sense and Sensibility,” can seem hard, but it must be remembered how the author clearly regards Marianne's emotionalism with the greatest compassion. Austen is not advocating a suppression of the feelings themselves – despite her faultlessly correct behavior, Elinor undergoes great suffering and feels every bit of it. What Austen is saying, as a modern psychologist might urge, is that one should try to prevent the disintegration of one's personality. Sentiments are built on the foundation of our morals: an amiable heart, sensibility to all that is lovely. Manners, in turn, have to do with behavior, with the way we work in the world: perfect good breeding, gentle address. Surely it is still necessary to have models of good sense and gentle manners held up for us.” (James Collins i <http://online.wsj.com/article/>; lesedato 24.01.13) Noen menn har “been bred gentlemen” (Goring 2005 s. 80), og det skulle helst avspeile seg i alt de gjør.

“Perhaps Austen's strictness is very old-fashioned, but anyone can find merit in the concepts of honor, duty, and obedience. Those strings have gone so slack that there's nothing wrong in their being tightened by a sympathetic reading of this aspect of Austen; they will loosen again soon enough. [...] The lesson is that it is sometimes right to sacrifice something we want for the sake of our conscience. With Fanny Price it almost seems as if Austen set out to create a character that has no manners and no personality, but is simply raw morality. She is famously disliked by readers, but her actions and attitudes can be defended. For all her timidity, she has real courage. She stands up to all the others when they want her to participate in the play, and she even withstands the terrible onslaught of Sir Thomas's disapproval when she refuses to marry Crawford. It is too rarely acknowledged that Fanny is right. The danger of the theatricals is that they bring young men and women together in a sexually charged setting, and, indeed, they do lead to the very outcome Fanny dreads: Henry Crawford and Maria Rushworth run off together. So Fanny is not simply adhering to an arbitrary and silly rule about whether amateur theatricals are proper, she is trying to forestall a circumstance that does end up causing real pain. Jane Austen's principles are of transcendent value, they are not “priggish,” and her novels illustrate and advocate a way of being in the world that is ethical, sensitive and practical.” (James Collins i <http://online.wsj.com/article/>; lesedato 24.01.13)

Austens “Neoclassical outlook was based upon accepted rules – there must be order, proportion, and, above all, reason must control the passions.” (Nash 1980 s. 8). De aksepterte reglene kunne gjøre det vanskelig å bli kjent med og vurdere

andre: “Knowing others was also difficult because of the limitations imposed on social intercourse, and the rigid codes that regulated conversation and behaviour among the British gentry and aristocracy at the turn of the nineteenth century. The acute presence of constraints and necessary secrecy or modesty are seen as an important dimension of the novels, praised by some, detested by others [...]. Women, especially, were not supposed to show their feelings in public, and certainly not demonstrate their attention to a man. What women could or could not discuss with strangers was extremely codified [...]. The recognition, in Austen’s texts, of the limitations and strictures that regulated the privileged classes, does not necessarily mean that all are considered necessary and desirable. The concealment of ideas and feelings generally brings unfortunate consequences in the novel, whereas openness and outspokenness end up having, however indirectly, a positive effect for the main characters.” (Hudelet 2006 s. 64) “Elizabeth [i *Pride and Prejudice*] very often refrains from speaking her reactions and emotions aloud. When Charlotte comes to tell her about her engagement to Mr Collins, the character in the novel makes tremendous efforts to conceal her disgust and disbelief.” (Hudelet 2006 s. 65)

“Jane Austen’s narrative technique, notably its reliance on contrast and counterpoint, invites a very dynamic reading, a constant reevaluation of the plot and characters all along the text. The refusal to give certainties from the beginning corresponds to the moral and spiritual evolution of the heroine: *PP* is mainly about the difficult access to knowledge, of others, and of oneself, about the right balance to be found between intuition, perception, and reason. The narrative displays and examines errors of judgement, mistaken perceptions, and the overall difficulty of deciphering appearances. [...] Thanks to the focalization on Elizabeth, the reader witnesses her errors, and goes through the same problematic interpretations, of language, of appearances, of others.” (Hudelet 2006 s. 51) “We are similarly deceived by the very partial information about Wickham. The text gives the impression of a narrative presentation of the character, but actually all the elements mentioned about the character reflect the way he is perceived by Elizabeth or by the Meryton community. Public opinion and rumor are often used by the narrative to lead the reader into errors of judgement, in spite of the warning given by the two opening paragraphs of the novel, in which we could see how “truths universally acknowledged” were to be doubted. [...] Free indirect discourse manages to conceal the partiality of these comments under the appearance of narratorial authority.” (Hudelet 2006 s. 55)

Ikke bare manners, men også penger spiller en stor rolle i Austens romaner når det gjelder hvem som kan få hverandre. “Colonel Fitzwilliam, who, although the son of an Earl is only a younger son and needs a rich wife to make him economically independent. He gives Elizabeth a hint that however much he admires her, he cannot marry her. Elizabeth takes the hint, but covers up her embarrassment with one of her ironic jokes: ‘And pray, what is the price of an Earl’s younger son? Unless the elder brother is very sickly, I suppose you would not ask above fifty

thousand pounds' [...]. As is often the case, jokes and exaggerations express a truth that could not have been plainly stated. These young marriage candidates are wares on a market. If Elizabeth had possessed a fortune, she could have purchased Colonel Fitzwilliam, had she so wanted. Also, we notice that the joke presents the matter in an unusual gender perspective. The woman buys the man, either with her beauty alone (if he is a rich man, and can afford it, like Mr Bingley and Mr Darcy) or with her money alone (the freckled Miss King, the sickly Miss de Bourgh, if they ever find husbands) or if the man is lucky, with her beauty *and* money (which is probably what Colonel Fitzwilliam is looking for, but which there is no example of in *PP*).” (Sørbø 2008 s. 89)

“Mr Bingley has five thousand a year, Mr Darcy ten (in comparison Mr Bennet has two, and his wife’s total inheritance from her father was four). Elizabeth will on her parents’ death have ‘one thousand pounds in the 4 per cents.’ [...], which means a yearly income of forty pounds, of which Mr Collins has counted every penny, as he reveals in his proposal to her. Mr Wickham is bribed with a small nominal sum of one hundred per year (Mr Bennet suspects that the bribe in reality amounts to ten thousand) to marry Lydia, after having lost his gilded bird, Miss King, with an inheritance of ten thousand, or before that, Miss Darcy’s fortune of thirtry thousand pound. An explanation of what these sums signify in the contemporary context is found in Edward Copeland’s article on ‘Money’ in *The Cambridge Companion to Jane Austen* (Copeland 1997, 131-48). Clearly, these people come with price tags.” (Sørbø 2008 s. 89) Likevel er kjærligheten viktigst for Austens heltinner. De hungrer etter romantisk kjærlighet og er klare til å slippe den første “verdige” mann inn i sitt hjerte. Verdighet innebærer for dem mer standsmessighet og dannelse enn rede penger – jamfør Elinor Dashwood og Edward Ferrars i *Sense and Sensibility*.

“The fact is that whether cynically scheming (Charlotte) or romantic (Jane) or idealistic (Elizabeth), all three girls in the end satisfy their mothers’ ambitions and more than that, by marrying men with estates, or at least future estates. The one daughter who does not, and who is definitely not mercenary, is Lydia, who chooses from physical attraction only, and her marriage turns out to be a disastrous one. Readers who want a confirmation of romantic notions must overlook this pattern.” (Sørbø 2008 s. 110) Elizabeth i *Pride and Prejudice* finner til slutt den mannen som passer for henne både emosjonelt og økonomisk. Hun finner gullet som glimter i mørket av Darcys sjel og hun får gjennom ekteskapet innpass i hans sosiale sirkler i overklassen. Hvis Elizabeth hadde akseptert Darcys første frieri, ville Darcy neppe gjennomgått noen transformasjon. Når han frir for andre gang, har både han og hun klart å forandre seg på grunn av sin kjærlighet til hverandre. Og Elizabeth har vist styrke: Hun vil heller forbli ugift enn å gifte seg inn i et kjærlighetsløst ekteskap.

“Lydia exposes herself in her eagerness to dance with *all* the officers. Mary is never asked, and takes her consolation in rational philosophy. Mr Elton won’t dance with Harriet, while Mr Knightley and Mr Darcy turn out to be fine dancers

after all. For the dance to be successful each must know their part, subordinate their movements to the whole, without being able to appreciate that whole in its entirety. Partnership between a masculine and feminine couple centres the dance, and its formal movements emphasise this elemental pair. [...] Dance and narrative are both metaphors for the rhythm of the natural cycle of life.” (Tauchert 2005 s. 161)

Robert Z. Leonards filadaptasjon *Pride and Prejudice* (1940) lar Lizzy framstår mindre kritisk til seg selv enn i romanen. “[I]n the 1940 film, the line ‘I never knew myself’ seems to refer to her awakening romantic interest in Darcy, rather than to her discovery of her own prejudice” (Sørbø 2008 s. 155). Elizabeths selvbebreidelser er generelt gjort mye mildere i alle filmadaptasjonene enn de er i roman (Sørbø 2008 s. 155-156).

Dobbeltbryllupet på slutten av *Pride and Prejudice* blir ikke beskrevet i det hele tatt i romanen: “There is a mention of ‘the day’ [...], but it turns out to be only an ironic comment on Mrs Bennet’s immense pride in the social advancement of her daughters. There is no description of the ceremony or the party, no interest in dresses and veils and flowers, nothing at all about all the usual trimmings of weddings. Nor is there anything about genuine joy of their hearts, the fulfilment of love, or anything about the feelings of the couples on the day. The focus of the chapter is entirely on the behaviour and attitudes of the people around them, and how this must affect their happiness. It is as if Austen has written an ironic twist on the ‘forever afterwards’ cliché. This is a description of happiness modified by trivial problems; the happy couple in their paradise being continuously bothered by little snakes. Instead of simply living happily ever afterwards, they will be struggling with the same problems for ever afterwards.” (Sørbø 2008 s. 106)

“Readers [av Jane Austens romaner] are in effect limited to the women’s world, and hence the frustration of male readers over the years who have complained about her small world. They are simply not used to these strict boundaries, and perhaps it is one of the triumphs of Austen’s irony that she forces them to endure it. When they complain about being hemmed in, we can imagine her smiling sardonically and responding: ‘now do you see what it feels like?’ – silently reminding them that this is the world they have given women.” (Sørbø 2008 s. 55)

I filmer av Jane Austens romaner følges ofte mest mulig kodene fra romanenes tid (“heritage films” skal være mest mulig historisk korrekte): i selskapslivet sitter kvinnene, mens mennene står, tjenerne har parykker osv.

Den engelske forfatteren Jo Bakers roman *Huset Longbourn – Stolthet og fordom: Tjenestefolkets historie* (2013; på norsk 2014) dikter opp historiene til tjenerne i familien Bennets hjem. Tjenestejenta Sarah vasker familien tøy, blant annet søstrene Bennets skitne undertøy. Husholdersken Mrs. Hill har oversikt slik at alle hjulene holdes i gang. “Hoveddelen av handlingen foregår parallelt med intrigene i “Stolthet og fordom”, men her er Mr. Darcy en svært ubetydelig bifigur.



Hovedpersonene er de unge tjenerne Sarah og James. Avstanden mellom dem og paret fra originalen er særlig tydelig i en scene der Sarah spør Elizabeth om hun har hørt noe nytt om “Mr Smith” (James), som forlot Longbourn noen måneder tidligere. Elizabeth forstår ikke hvem hun snakker om, før Sarah forklarer nærmere. [...] En kan fort bli litt indignert på Elizabeths vegne av å lese Bakers roman. Hun, som er blant de høyest elskede heltinnene i litteraturhistorien, kjent for sitt klare hode og skarpe tunge, framstår i “Huset Longbourn” som både selvopptatt og nokså jålete. Men det er påfallende, når vi tenker på det, hvor sjelden tjenerne blir nevnt i “Stolthet og fordom”. De er forutsetningen for at Elizabeth kan bruke dagene på teselskaper, lesing og brevskrivning, og behagelige månedslange ferieturer. Likevel bryr verken Jane Austen eller hennes heltinne seg særlig mye om hvem de er og hva de driver med.” (Marie L. Kleve i <https://www.dagbladet.no/kultur/skjorta-som-skapte-en-industri/60212511>; lesedato 25.04.18)

Austen tilbrakte perioder av sitt liv i Bath vest i England, og Bath nevnes i flere av hennes romaner. Romanen *Persuasion* foregår hovedsakelig i Bath. I Bath hadde dandyen Beau Nash på 1700-tallet vært ledende i å skape moter for påkledning og oppførsel. Nashs liv er beskrevet i Oliver Goldsmiths bok *The Life of Richard Nash, of Bath, Esq.: Extracted principally from his original Papers* (1762).

Den amerikanske forfatteren James Fenimore Cooper var kritisk til engelske sederomaner, og prøvde selv å skrive en bedre bok med *Precaution* (1820) (Fields 1979 s. 58). “The entire focus of this novel rests on the determined though sometimes woefully mistaken efforts of three British families – the Moseleys, the Jarvises, and the Chattertons – to arrange suitable marriages for their respective sons and daughters. The bulk of the early-nineteenth-century action is therefore played out through dinners, social calls, visits to summer resorts, and development of various designs employed toward the end of matrimony. The “precaution” displayed by Mrs. Wilson in guiding her niece Emily Moseley through the treacherous shoals toward a sound Christian marriage furnishes the novel’s title and indicates the author’s moral and ethical position.” (<http://external.oneonta.edu/cooper/writings/plots/walker-precaution.html>; lesedato 13.06.17)

“Among novelists following Jane Austen was Elizabeth Gaskell (1810-1865), who wrote various kinds of novels, but her subject was always women. Several of her novels, including *Cranford* (1853), *North and South* (1855), and *Silvia’s Lovers* (1857), are aptly called novels of manners. In all her novels, characters struggle to understand their social circumstances and moral obligations. Charlotte Smith (1749-1806), Elizabeth Inchbald (1753-1821), Frances Trollope (1780-1863), Susan Ferrier (1782-1854), Catherine Gore (1799-1861), and Harriet Martineau (1802-1876) are other women novelists of the period who worked in the genre. Later in the nineteenth century, certain works by the realist George Eliot (1819-1880), such as *Middlemarch* (1872), *Daniel Deronda* (1876), and *Mill on the Floss* (1860), mark her as an important recorder and analyst of social manners. Harriet Beecher Stowe (1811-1896) wrote short novels about New England that are

explorations of the society of the region. Sarah Orne Jewett (1849-1909) wrote almost all short fiction, but it concentrates on the intense and subtle ways society's manners and conventions dominate people. Kate Chopin's *The Awakening* explores the manners of Creole society in the South and its various methods of controlling characters' intentions and actions. Later yet is the novelist of manners Edith Wharton (1863-1937). Wharton's province was upper-class New York society, and her fiction depicts and contrasts the manners of both the old and new moneyed families, and American and European manners. Wharton's novels share with other novels of manners a moral concern for the characters as well as for the effects of moral and immoral behavior of the societies involved." (Gloria Stephenson i <http://gem.greenwood.com/wse/wsePrint.jsp?id=id413>; lesedato 26.05.16)

Den britiske forfatteren William Makepeace Thackerays *Vanity Fair: A Novel without a Hero* (1848) regnes som en sederoman. Austen er den mest kjente sederoman-forfatteren, men det er ikke riktig å begrense sederomanen til engelsk middelklasse, slik Lewis Turco gjør. Sederomanen viser ifølge Turco "the sensibilities and actions of the genteel middle class in England" (1999 s. 64). Den amerikanske forfatteren Edith Wharton og andre har skrevet sederomaner som foregår andre steder og i andre historiske perioder enn Austens. "Following the example of her friend and mentor, Henry James, Wharton took up the novel of manners, chronicling the customs and beliefs of her social class. Over the next forty years, she published eleven collections of stories and sixteen novels, including *The House of Mirth* (1905), *Ethan Frome* (1911), and *The Age of Innocence* (1920), the last of which won the Pulitzer Prize in Fiction." ([http://us.penguin.com/static/rguides/us/age\\_of\\_innocence.html](http://us.penguin.com/static/rguides/us/age_of_innocence.html); lesedato 22.03.12) Wharton har også skrevet en bok som heter *Other Times, Other Manners*, 1911. Den franske naturalisten Guy de Maupassants *Bel-Ami* (1885) og noen av hans andre bøker regnes som sederomaner. I Frankrike brukes "roman de mœurs" om alle romaner som skildrer folkelivet og fokuserer på sosiale og moralske spørsmål – jf. Philippe Hamon og Alexandrine Vibouds *Tematisk ordbok for roman de mœurs 1850-1914* (2003). De store realistiske romanene på 1800-tallet var sederomaner hevdes det i et fransk litteraturreksikon (Demougin 1985 s. 1400). Dette gjelder f.eks. noen av Balzacs romaner. Andre forfattere som har skrevet sederomaner er den nevnte Henry James, Evelyn Waugh og John Phillips Marquand.

Whartons *The Age of Innocence* "is a title both ironic and poignant: ironic because the "age" or period of the novel, the late nineteenth century, teems with intolerance, collusion, and cynicism; poignant because the only innocence lost is that of Newland Archer, the resolute gentleman whose insight into the machinations of aristocratic life comes late. The novel proceeds from a working assumption that is best summed up by Ralph Waldo Emerson in his essay "Self-Reliance": "Society everywhere is in conspiracy against the manhood of every one of its members." Edith Wharton advances this belief with a vengeance, and it gives tragic depth to the life of Newland Archer, a life that might otherwise seem pedestrian and unworthy of close examination. Wharton presents Archer as a man of refined

sensibilities, well educated, responsible, alert to expectations. He works in an old law firm just enough to achieve an air of respectability and importance. He attends opera, keeps up with the galleries in Europe, and thinks “few things seemed...more awful than an offence against ‘Taste’ ” (p. 12). At the same time, Archer is a harsh judge of his fellow man.” ([http://us.penguin.com/static/rguides/us/age\\_of\\_innocence.html](http://us.penguin.com/static/rguides/us/age_of_innocence.html); lesedato 22.03.12)

“The overall style of Wharton’s novel [*The Age of Innocence*] can be described as ‘society realism’ and the novel is often referred to as a novel of manners. [...] Throughout the story Wharton describes the norm and value system of a limited social group in New York society of the 1870s. The behavioral patterns of the members of this group were heavily prescribed by a set of rules and regulations, hence the terms ‘society realism’ and ‘novel of manners.’ Gary H. Lindberg, *Edith Wharton and the Novel of Manners* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1975). [...] the other major strength of Old New York’s manners: they sustain personal dignity while providing a delicate measure of one’s feelings and sacrifices” (Lindberg, 107). [...] Wharton knew very well how to assess her readers and she seemed to realize that contemporary readers would still also look at the moral aspects of the story. Her depiction of social manners and roles allows a questioning of the correct types of behavior which is quite modern for the time, but not too extreme.” ([http://www.rug.nl/research/portal/files/14565352/05\\_c5.pdf](http://www.rug.nl/research/portal/files/14565352/05_c5.pdf); lesedato 19.05.16)

“[W]hen Wharton received the Pulitzer Prize in 1921 the judges motivated their selection by stating that the book: “best present[s] the wholesome atmosphere of American life and the highest standard of American manners and manhood” [...]. The Pulitzer Prize publicized that their jury found the book to be in line with their beliefs and “morally uplifting” (Lewis 433) [...] As an author, she focuses not only on the social status but also on the constraints put on women.” (Riëtte Wolting i <http://arts.studenttheses.ub.rug.nl/14471/1/Ma-1887610-R.Wolting.pdf>; lesedato 31.01.17)

Den engelske forfatteren E. M. (Edward Morgan) Forsters litterære verk, “conservative in form, is in the English tradition of the novel of manners. He explores the emotional and sensual deficiencies of the English middle class, and examines its relationship to other social classes, developing his themes by means of irony, wit, and symbolism. He also often treats the contrasts between human freedom and repression. His first novel, *Where Angels Fear to Tread*, appeared in 1905 and was followed in quick succession by *The Longest Journey* (1907), *A Room with a View* (1908), and *Howard’s End* (1910). His last and most widely acclaimed novel, *A Passage to India* (1924), treats the relations between a group of British colonials and native Indians and considers the difficulty of forming human relationships, of “connecting”; the novel also explores the nature of external and internal reality.” ([http://encyclopedia2.thefreedictionary.com/Forster%2c+E.+M.](http://encyclopedia2.thefreedictionary.com/Forster%2c+E.+M.;); lesedato 28.03.17)

John Phillips Marquand “was an American novelist of manners whose works enjoyed enormous popular success. The best of his novels, such as *The Late George Apley*, *Wickford Point*, *H. M. Pulham, Esquire*, and *Point of No Return* give firm, skilled, accurate, but deeply ironic representations of the upper class and the upper-middle class.” (<http://www.bookrags.com/biography/john-phillips-marquand-dlb/>; lesedato 22.03.12) “Marquand novels exploring New England and class themes include *Wickford Point* (1939), *H.M. Pulham, Esquire* (1941), and *Point of No Return* (1949). The last is especially notable for its satirical portrayal of Harvard anthropologist W. Lloyd Warner, whose Yankee City study attempted (and in Marquand’s view, dismally failed) to describe and analyze the manners and mores of Marquand’s Newburyport.” ([http://www.enotes.com/topic/John\\_P.\\_Marquand](http://www.enotes.com/topic/John_P._Marquand); lesedato 22.03.12) Robert Owen Johnson har skrevet avhandlingen *John P. Marquand and the novel of manners* (1964).

Gordon Milnes bok *The Sense of Society: A History of the American Novel of Manners* (1977) kombinerer “a historical survey of the American novel of manners with concentrated attention on the major practitioners of the genre”, som ifølge Milne er Henry James, William Dean Howells, Edith Wharton, Ellen Glasgow, John P. Marquand og Louis Auchincloss ([http://www.goodreads.com/book/show/2293318.The\\_Sense\\_of\\_Society](http://www.goodreads.com/book/show/2293318.The_Sense_of_Society); lesedato 20.09.16).

“Henry James observed in 1888, “We know a man imperfectly until we know his society, and we but half know a society until we know its manners.” [...] James’ comment positions the writer as a sensitive investigator, a historian who documents the environment out of which character is construed. Wharton suggests that events can shatter assumptions, tossing the writer into the role of voyeur and journalist, but at the same time open new possibilities for understanding the society racing past. To understand manners, the writer positions himself or herself as an outsider, an observer, an anthropologist taking notes on a culture, even as that culture is undergoing change. Understanding what is meant by “manners” as novelists approach the term prevents readers from expecting merely rules on table settings or wedding etiquette. [...] As Wharton suggests with her image of the house on fire, such manners are more visible and accessible at a time when society is in transition, whether through war, economic upheaval, demographic shifts, or moral or cultural crisis.” (Cecilia Macheski i <http://ebooks.cambridge.org/chapter.jsf>; lesedato 02.06.16)

Amerikanske Ellen Glasgow ble “a best-selling author of 20 novels, the last of which (*In This Our Life*) won a Pulitzer Prize in 1942. The majority of her novels have Southern settings, reflecting her awareness of the enormous social and economic changes occurring in the South both in the decades before her birth and throughout her own life. [...] Long before Deborah Tannen began exploring linguistic differences between male and female communication styles, Ellen Glasgow depicted the problem in *The Romantic Comedians* [roman utgitt i 1926].

Playing on ideas about gender and power through sexual alignments, the novel offers rare feminist insight into relations between the sexes in southern society during the twenties. It is one of the few American comedies of manners written by a woman. In *The Romantic Comedians* Glasgow takes the familiar story of the cuckold and raises it to a new level. Her sixty-five-year-old male protagonist, the recently widowed Judge Gamaliel Honeywell, falls in love with and marries an impulsive twenty-three-year-old woman, emblem of the 1920s. As the symbol of patriarchy, the Judge espouses all of the chivalrous myths about women, insisting that older women are not interested in love, that a man is only as old as his instincts, and that some young women prefer old lovers to young ones. His sheltered mind allows these delusions about women as it allows him to delude himself.” ([http://www.goodreads.com/book/show/1733836.The\\_Romantic\\_Comedians](http://www.goodreads.com/book/show/1733836.The_Romantic_Comedians); lesedato 08.11.16)

Noen litteraturforskere hevder at sederomanen “survives well into the twentieth century in the works of F. Scott Fitzgerald (1896-1940) and Sinclair Lewis (1885-1951). If critics agree on England as the country of origin, there is considerable disagreement on whether the form exists at all in America. And the class whose social relations are scrutinized in the novel of manners could be the aristocracy, but it is more likely the gentry, the emerging middle class, or even the lower class.” (<http://www.enotes.com/topics/novel-manners>; lesedato 31.03.16)

Amerikaneren James Gould Cozzens’ bøker har blitt oppfattet som sederomaner, bl.a. *By Love Possessed* (1957) der hovedpersonen er Arthur Winner, “a reputable, middleaged lawyer and family man who is exposed, during the two days and nights covered by the action, to a variety of unsettling experiences [...] Although Winner behaves like a prig, he is not meant to be one, if only because the main theme of the novel, the moral testing and education of a good man, would then collapse” (<http://www.johnderbyshire.com/Books/Doomed/Blog/cozzens1.pdf>; lesedato 08.11.16).

Annette Welds bok *Barbara Pym and the Novel of Manners* (1991) er en studie av en engelsk romanforfatter som skrev bl.a. romanene *Some Tame Gazelle* (1950), *Excellent Women* (1952) og *Quartet in Autumn* (1977). “Weld’s is the first detailed analysis of the entire canon, both published and unpublished, within the conventions of the novel of manners. By looking discerningly at so much of Pym’s work from this critical perspective, Weld produces compelling new insights into this significant British writer and adds appreciably to our understanding of an “unarticulated feminism, an ironic wit, and a firmly detailed documentation of the world as she saw it.” Specifically, Weld’s stated purpose is [...] to define the novel of manners and Pym’s place within the genre; [...] to consider the reasons for Pym’s rejection, resurrection, and valediction; [...] Henry James’ argument that the writer of fiction should be “one upon whom nothing is lost” received an emphatic embodiment in the life of Pym, whose life and observations are woven inextricably into the fabric of her fiction.” (<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/244874>; lesedato 10.05.16)

Bege K. Bowers og Barbara Brothers redigerte i 2010 boka *Reading and Writing Women's Lives: A Study of the Novel of Manners*. Boka “focus on how men and (particularly) women respond to the ideological pressure of manners for their gender and class as they attempt to define themselves in the novel of manners. Focusing on literary, feminist, and general political concerns, the essays explore the relationships between society's and literature's conventions in works by Jane Austen, Anthony Trollope, George Eliot, Henry James, Virginia Woolf and Barbara Pym, among others.” (<https://boydellandbrewer.com/reading-and-writing-women-s-lives-pb.html>; lesedato 17.06.16)

Den britiske, adelige forfatteren Julian Fellowes har blant annet publisert romanen *Snobs* (2004). Fellowes er “concerned with the British upper crust, particularly in their relationship to and transgressions against the class system. His debut novel, *Snobs*, takes up the theme yet again, but it serves as something like a keystone to his previous work: It's not just an observation of modern-day British class mores, it's a pithy, detailed guidebook, built around a central example. *Snobs* is mostly written from the first-person point of view of a nameless narrator, a highborn actor with a detached, critical perspective on the social conventions of his separate worlds. Having one foot in high society and the other in film and television gives him a uniquely close perspective on Edith Lavery, the charismatic, ambitious daughter of a successful-but-average accountant. She initially enters his circle through a pair of desperate social climbers, but she surpasses them when she happens to meet, charm, and marry a local aristocrat. Suddenly, she shoots into a rarified world of wealthy, titled people who've known each other from birth, and who regard her as something between an amusing diversion and a mercenary interloper. Nonetheless, Edith considers herself well deserving of power and glory, and she adapts skillfully to her new setting, until it begins to bore her and she leaves her husband for a handsome TV star. [...] Fellowes frequently pauses the action for wry explanations of his characters and country: “The English have a deep, subconscious need to read their difference in the artefacts around them. Nothing is more depressing (or less convincing) to them than the attempt to claim some rank or position, some family background, some genealogical distinction, without the requisite acquaintance and props.” Or, “In England one of the saddest mistakes a social climber can make is excessive generosity... these courteous acts are as clear a signal to the Insiders that the would-be benefactor is a newcomer to their world as if they had worn a sign on their hat.” ” (<http://www.avclub.com/review/julian-fellowes-isnobsi-4670>; lesedato 03.05.16)

Fellowes' *Past Imperfect* (2008) handler om Damian Baxter, som “is hugely wealthy and dying. He lives alone in a big house in Surrey, England, looked after by a chauffeur, butler, cook and housemaid. He has but one concern – his fortune in excess of 500 million pounds, and who should inherit it on his death. *Past Imperfect* is the story of a quest. Damian Baxter wishes to know if he has a living heir. By the time he married in his late thirties he was sterile (the result of adult

mumps), but what about before that unfortunate illness? Had he sired a child? He sets himself (and others) to the task of finding his heir. [...] [Fellowes is] working in P.G. Wodehouse/Evelyn Waugh territory – an English novel of manners – a mix of novel and ethnography of the upper crust with plenty of humor thrown in.” ([http://www.goodreads.com/book/show/2392839.Past\\_Perfect](http://www.goodreads.com/book/show/2392839.Past_Perfect); lesedato 06.05.16)

Elsie B. Michie's *The Vulgar Question of Money: Heiresses, Materialism, and the Novel of Manners from Jane Austen to Henry James* (2011) forklarer hvordan det var “in the novel that writers found space to articulate the anxieties surrounding money that developed along with the rise of capitalism in nineteenth-century England. Michie focuses in particular on the character of the wealthy heiress and how she, unlike her male counterpart, represents the tensions in British society between the desire for wealth and advancement and the fear that economic development would blur the traditional boundaries of social classes. Michie explores how novelists of the period captured with particular vividness England’s ambivalent emotional responses to its own financial successes and engaged questions identical to those raised by political economists and moral philosophers. Each chapter reads a novelist alongside a contemporary thinker, tracing the development of capitalism in Britain: Jane Austen and Adam Smith and the rise of commercial society, Frances Trollope and Thomas Robert Malthus and industrialism, Anthony Trollope and Walter Bagehot and the political influence of money, Margaret Oliphant and John Stuart Mill and professionalism and managerial capitalism, and Henry James and Georg Simmel and the shift of economic dominance from England to America.” (<http://www.goodreads.com/book/show/12304430-the-vulgar-question-of-money>; lesedato 25.05.16)

Hanna Kurz Charney ga i 1981 ut boka *The Detective Novel of Manners: Hedonism, Morality, and the Life of Reason*. “The detective novel, a genre long associated with reading for escape, is here found to be the literary successor to the nineteenth-century English “novel of manners.” The author examines the works of Agatha Christie, Dorothy Sayers, and Rex Stout, among others.” (<https://www.buffalolib.org/vufind/Record/92398/Reviews>; lesedato 14.02.17)

Den franske økonomen Thomas Pikettys bok *Capital in the Twenty-First Century* (2014, oversatt til norsk i 2014) bruker noen skjønnlitterære eksempler. Austens romaner brukes fordi “they dramatize the immobility of a 19th-century world where inequality guaranteed more inequality – a world our own century is beginning to resemble once again. Since returns on capital were reliable, especially for large fortunes, the best way to get ahead was to start out ahead; income from labor could never catch up. The stability of 19th-century wealth is felt not only in plots that center on inheritance, but also, Piketty adds, in the references that flesh out a fictional world. “Specific references to wealth and income were omnipresent in the literature of all countries before 1914,” he writes, because money was a stable social reference point.” (<http://www.slate.com/articles/business/moneybox/>

2014/12/thomas\_piketty\_on\_literature\_balzac\_austen\_fitzgerald\_show\_arc\_of\_money.html; lesedato 04.06.15)

“Den alternative høyresiden i USA (“alt right”) liker å smykke seg med Jane Austen, påpeker Nicole M. Wright i en artikkel i *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Den britiske forfatteren tjener som godt eksempel på jomfruelighet, tradisjonell hvit kultur og er unntaket som bekrefter regelen om kvinners underlegenhet (!). Slik ufarliggjør alternativhøyre tankene om den hvite rasens overlegenhet, mener Wright “(v)ed å sammenligne bevegelsen sin ikke med Hitlers og Goebbels tyske mareritt, men i stedet Austens koselige England.” ” (*Morgenbladet* 31. mars–6. april 2017 s. 54)

Kent Pucketts bok *Bad Form: Social Mistakes and the Nineteenth-Century Novel* (2009) berører sederomaner. “While everyone knows that the nineteenth-century novel is obsessed with gaffes, lapses, and blunders, who could have predicted that these would have so important a structural role to play in the novel and its rise? Who knew that the novel in fact relies on its characters’ mistakes for its structural coherence, for its authority, for its form? Drawing simultaneously on the terms of narrative theory, sociology, and psychoanalysis, this book examines the necessary relation between social and literary form in the nineteenth-century novel as it is expressed at the site of the represented social mistake (eating peas with your knife, wearing the wrong thing, talking out of turn, etc.). Through close and careful readings of novels by Flaubert, Eliot, James, and others, this book shows that the novel achieves its coherence at the level of character, plot, and narration not in spite but because of the social mistake.” (<http://www.universitypressscholarship.com/>; lesedato 14.06.16)

Alle artiklene og litteraturlista til hele leksikonet er tilgjengelig på <https://www.litteraturogmedieleksikon.no>