Revista da Graduação

Vol. 4	No. 1	2011	26

Seção: FACULDADE DE LETRAS

Título: NO PLACE LIKE HOME: An analysis of the country houses in Pride and Prejudice

Autor: Elaine Aparecida Queiroz

Este trabalho está publicado na Revista da Graduação.
ISSN 1983-1374
http://revistaseletronicas.pucrs.br/ojs/index.php/graduacao/article/view/8818/6183

PONTIFÍCIA UNIVERSIDADE CATÓLICA DO RIO GRANDE DO SUL
FACULDADE DE LETRAS

ELAINE APARECIDA QUEIROZ

NO PLACE LIKE HOME:
An analysis of the country houses in Pride and Prejudice

Porto Alegre
2010

ELAINE APARECIDA QUEIROZ

NO PLACE LIKE HOME:
An analysis of the country houses in Pride and Prejudice

Trabalho de conclusão do curso de graduação apresentado à Faculdade de Letras da Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do Sul, como requisito parcial para a obtenção do grau de Licenciatura em Letras.

Advisor: Liane Mroginiski Zanesco

Porto Alegre
2010

I dedicate this paper to my mother, whose face I am proud to find in my own. To my fair Leide.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to say thanks to my family in first place. To my father, for teaching me the value of persistence and dedication. To my mother, for her infinite and affectionate care, and for teaching me hope and compassion. To Fernanda, “for you my dear sister, holding onto me forever”, I say thanks for your guidance, advices, and intimate support. To Du, the owner of the best heart I will ever meet, thanks immensely. And, finally, Cláudio, thank you for showing me that I can always improve.

To my dear Valter, my love, thanks for the support and for the patience in the many moments of anxiety, and for helping me to be a better person. Thanks to my in laws, for their support and for considering me family.

Thanks to my friends, Gisele, Natália, and Carla. You are responsible for making Porto Alegre a much happier place for me. Thanks for worrying about me finishing the semester without my old classmates.

I would also like to thank my teachers, especially those who are a source of admiration and inspiration: Vera Müller, Erica Schultz, Pedro Theobald, Liane Zanesco, Jocelyne Bocchese, and Marisa Smith. I want to thank Liane once more for taking the trouble of accepting an extra advisee, for her patience, assistance, words of incentive, and dedication on a Saturday morning.

O rio

Ser como o rio que deflui
Silencioso dentro da noite.
Não temer as trevas da noite.
Se há estrelas no céu, refleti-las
E se os céus se pejam de nuvens,
Como o rio as nuvens são água,
Refleti-las também sem mágoa
Nas profundidades tranquilas.

Manuel Bandeira

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to analyze how the country houses in Jane Austen's *Pride and Prejudice* stand as representations of the characters. This analysis is conducted in two parts: the first, based mainly on Osman Lins's studies of the narrative space, seeks to determine the emblematic correspondence between houses and families through the perspective of society; the second part aims at analyzing the relations between home and self according to Gaston Bachelard's phenomenology of the house. This study tries to clarify some issues concerning the heroine's relationship to the two houses she inhabits: the significance of the insubstantiality of Longbourn, and her reasons to desire being the mistress of Pemberley. This analysis concludes that the architectural elements of the country houses reveal the families' social rank and tradition as well as the characters' sense of identity and of belonging to their homes. The lack of concreteness of Longbourn reflects the heroine's difficulty in identifying herself with her family and with its entailed house. At Pemberley, she finds love, protection, and her place in the world.

Keywords: Pride and Prejudice. Space. House. Architecture.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION

On a lazy afternoon at home a couple of years ago, I almost accidentally came to watch a film adaptation of *Pride and Prejudice* that was being displayed on television. I confess that by that time I did not even know who the author was and the literary importance of this novel, but, as it often happens to Jane Austen's fans, I instantly got obsessed with it and lost count of how many times I watched the film. The husband-hunting schemes, comic scenes, clever dialogues, fancy balls and beautiful manors, and, above all, the tension in Elizabeth and Darcy's meetings thrilled me. After that, I spent my summer vacation reading a long annotated version of the novel, full of illustrations of carriages and clothes, information on sermons and women's proper behavior books, etc.

Although the annotations were very enlightening and interesting, one scene remained unexplained to me. It was Elizabeth's thought at seeing Pemberley that being the mistress of that place "might be something". I could not clearly identify her motives for wishing that — materialistic interest seemed out of place with the romantic circumstances of that passage. That was the initial inspiration of this paper. After studying more about the relation between space and characters in *Pride and Prejudice,* I could see that it was more complex and intriguing than I had imagined, and thus it became the theme of my analysis.

The aim of this paper is to analyze how the country houses stand as representations of the characters in Jane Austen's *Pride and Prejudice*. The main focus of this study lies in the examination of the heroine's relationship to the two houses she inhabits and in clarifying some specific issues related to it: the significance of the lack of concreteness of Longbourn, and Elizabeth's reasons to desire being the mistress of Pemberley.

This analysis is conducted in two parts, organized in the following two chapters. *House and Family*, our next chapter, seeks to determine the emblematic correspondence between houses and families through the perspective of society. This analysis is based mainly on Osman Lins's studies of the narrative space. Four country houses and their respective families are analyzed in this perspective: Pemberley, Netherfield, Rosings, and Longbourn. After that, in *House and Self,* the

relations between home and self are analyzed according to Gaston Bachelard's phenomenology of the house. In this chapter, the main characters, Elizabeth and Darcy, and their houses are the object of the analysis.

2 HOUSE AND FAMILY

In *Pride and Prejudice*, the relation between characters and property is very intricate and assumes a primary importance in the plot. Such relation figures in the opening lines of the novel:

> It is a truth universally acknowledged, that a single man in possession of a good fortune, must be in want of a wife.
> However little known the feelings or views of such a man may be on his first entering a neighborhood, this truth is so well fixed in the minds of the surrounding families, that *he is considered the rightful property* of some one or other of their daughters. (AUSTEN, 1962, p.13, emphasis added)

Dorothy Van Ghent (2001) calls our attention to the sentence highlighted above, noting that property was so highly valued that here the word becomes a metaphor for the young man himself. Property included all kind of possessions that one could hold, being the estate the principal element.

This chapter proposes an analysis of the interaction between space and characters that takes place in the novel. Being the setting composed basically of country houses, we aim to analyze how these spaces can represent the characters socially. By social representation we understand the social position of the characters in relation to each other, their influence, relations and roles in society. The analysis will comprehend the four main houses — Pemberley, Netherfield, Rosings, and Longbourn — and their owners (except for Longbourn, which will be associated with Elizabeth, the novel's heroine), who will be considered the representatives of the families that inhabit these places.

In the first section, *The House as a Social Representation of the Family*, we are going to provide a theoretical background as to the studies of the space in the novel, the relationship between space and character, the house as a setting and the social value that space may assume in narratives. In the following section, *Houses and families in Pride and Prejudice*, we will proceed to the analysis of each house and the families' representatives.

2.1 THE HOUSE AS A SOCIAL REPRESENTATION OF THE FAMILY

One of the basic assertions of narratology is that a character performs his/her actions in a given space and in a given time. Osman Lins (1976) affirms that space and time cannot be dissociated; he also observes that space is intimately connected to character. In regard to the narrative form, the author affirms that all of its elements are interconnected and reflect each other, composing a unit; it is only for the sake of analysis that these ingredients are arbitrarily taken in isolation in theoretical studies. Thus, character and time, as well as plot, structure, themes, and other aspects of the narrative have received the attentions of many theorists of literature. However, Osman Lins (1976), Marie-Laure Ryan (2009), and Antonio Dimas (1994) all agree that the study of space does not figure in this list for it has been, undeservedly, quite neglected in studies of the narrative.

Dimas (1994) believes that the reason for such indifference may be that, in some narratives, space may seem to have little relevance in contrast to the other elements. Although it may not always be apparent, "all narratives imply a world with spatial extension, even when spatial information is withheld (as in Forster's: 'The king died, and then the queen died of grief')" (RYAN, 2009). That does not mean that space is a minor constituent of the fictional work; it may even be the case that the attenuation of space bears a significance to the characters:

> Observa-se que em algumas narrativas o espaço é rarefeito e impreciso. Mesmo então — excetuada, evidentemente, a eventualidade de inépcia —, há desígnios precisos ligados ao problema espacial: intenta-se, por um lado, concentrar o interesse nas personagens ou nas motivações psicológicas que as enredam; pode ser também que se procure insinuar — mediante a rarefação e a imprecisão do espaço — que essas mesmas personagens e as relações entre elas são mais ou menos gerais, eternas por assim dizer, carentes, portanto, de significado histórico ou sociológico: de significado circunstancial. (LINS, 1976, p.65)

Space thus may assume different levels of importance. Dimas (1994) offers three possibilities of degree: in some narratives, space may be extremely diluted so that its importance becomes secondary; in others, it may be primary and fundamental, if not determinant, to the development of the plot, as in Aluísio Azevedo's *O Cortiço*; as the third possibility, space is given no priority and

harmonizes so easily with the other elements of the narrative that its functionality and interdependence must be gradually unveiled by the reader.

Osman Lins (1976) believes that space and character are so deeply connected in the novel that it is hard to determine where one begins and the other ends. He even comes to declare that “a personagem *é espaço*” (p.69). His views on the relation between space and character include that such as the character assimilates space, space assimilates the character as well, refuting thus the idea of space as something detached from character, a mere place for the action:

> Podemos […] dizer que o espaço, no romance, tem sido — ou assim pode entender-se — tudo que, intencionalmente disposto, enquadra a personagem e que, inventariado, tanto pode ser absorvido como acrescentado pela personagem, sucedendo, inclusive, ser constituído por figuras humanas, então coisificadas ou com a sua individualidade tendendo para zero. Difere, portanto, nossa compreensão do espaço da de Massaud Moisés, para quem no “romance linear (o romântico, o realista ou o moderno), o cenário tende a funcionar como pano de fundo, ou seja, *estático*, *fora das personagens*, descrito como um *universo de seres inanimados* e opacos.” (p.72)

David Lodge (1992, p.57) seems to agree to Lins when he says that the description of space represents an important aspect of the novel and is thus associated with its quality, as he affirms that “description in a good novel is never *just* description”.

Proceeding to the analysis of the house as a space that bears such a strong relation to the characters that inhabit it, that is, the family, we now come to examine how such choice of setting is associated with the novel. In a broader level, the relation between house and novel can be extended to that between architecture and literature. As Mezei and Briganti (2002, p.838) point in their article *Reading the House: a literary perspective*,

> The house — and architecture — have served as foundational, powerful, and recurring analogues throughout the history of literary interpretation: thus, Walter Pater proposes the term *literary architecture;* Henry James, his *house of fiction;* Gaston Bachelard, the *poetics of space;* and Edith Wharton, her *House of Mirth*. (p.838)

The authors strengthen their argument by citing Philippa Tristram (1989 apud MEZEI and BRIGANTI, 2002), who indicates that the reflexes of such relation can even be seen in the terms used in critical discourse: the words *structure*, *aspect*,

outlook, and *character*[1] are originally related to architecture. Mezei and Briganti (2002, p.838) would add some more words to this list such as "*content* (contents of the house, content of the novel), *liminal, threshold, entry point, style, perspective, kitchen sink drama, aga sagas, country house mysteries,* and *the domestic novel*."

The interconnection between novel and house is a special one as the authors explain. Mezei and Briganti (2002) mention that the novel reached its climax as a genre during the eighteenth century, a period that also saw what was considered to be the best form of the English country house. Since novels are associated with domestic life, the house emerged as a frequent option for setting. Consequently, designs for houses and their furnishings became another aspect of the writer's art. Antonio Candido and others (1968, p.79) talk about the significance that details may assume in the novel:

> Os romancistas do século XVIII aprenderam que a noção de realidade se reforça pela descrição de pormenores, e nós sabemos que, de fato, o detalhe sensível é um elemento poderoso de convicção. A evocação de uma mancha no paletó, ou de uma verruga no queixo, é tão importante, neste sentido, quanto a discriminação dos móveis num aposento, uma vassoura esquecida ou o ranger de um degrau. Os realistas do século XIX (tanto românticos quanto naturalistas) levaram ao máximo esse povoamento do espaço literário pelo pormenor, — isto é, uma técnica de convencer pelo exterior, pela aproximação com o aspecto da realidade observada.

David Lodge (1992, p.57) illustrates the comment of Candido and others in his comparison of the scarce description of places in Henry Fielding's *Tom Jones* (1749) to the "vivid visual detail" employed by Dickens in his descriptions of London in *Oliver Twist* (1838). Lodge explains that the responsible for such development in the art of description was the Romantic movement, "which pondered the effect of *milieu* on man, opened people's eye to the sublime beauty of landscape and, in due course, to the grim of symbolism of cityscape in the Industrial Age." (p.58)

Both the comments of Lodge and of Antonio Candido and others reinforce the idea defended by Lins, previously presented here, that the details of the house may

[1] According to *The New Webster Encyclopedic Dictionary of English* (THATCHER, 1970, p.138), the word "character" was introduced into English in its Latin form, equally spelled, meaning "an engraved mark". Its origin, however, is Greek, "from *charattō*, *charaxō*, to cut, engrave". Its first meaning is described as "a distinctive mark made by cutting, stamping, or engraving, as on stone, metal, or other hard material".

become details of the character and vice versa. Osman Lins (1976, p.97) shows us, through many other authors, that such configuration of space is markedly present in the novel:

> Tem-se acentuado, no espaço romanesco, como das mais importantes, sua função caracterizadora. O cenário, escreve Philippe Hamon, no estudo sobre Émile Zola, "confirma, precisa ou revela o personagem". Mais ou menos o mesmo, lemos num estudo de Jean-Pierre Richard sobre os objetos em Balzac: "É verdade que o objeto, mais frequentemente, tem aqui valor de índice psicológico ou social." Michel Butor, por sua vez, ocupando-se especificamente dos móveis, sublinha que estes, no romance, não desempenham apenas um papel "poético" de proposição, mas de reveladores, "pois tais objetos são bem mais ligados à nossa existência do que comumente o admitimos." Continua: "descrever móveis, objetos, é um modo de descrever os personagens, indispensável". Apenas repetimos, portanto, esses estudiosos da arte romanesca, quando indicamos, no espaço — notadamente no espaço doméstico —, a função de, situando a personagem, informar-nos, mesmo antes que a vejamos em ação, sobre o seu modo de ser.

Lins concludes this comment by demonstrating that the description of a house may even anticipate and reveal the description of a character. He gives the example of Maria Rita, a character of *Triste fim de Policarpo Quaresma*, whose house description predicts the reader's perception of the character who has not been presented yet.

Along with the rise of the novel and of the English country house, the eighteenth century was a time that also saw the emergence of an aspiring bourgeoisie. Deirdre Le Faye (2003) explains that in the middle of the seventeenth century, as the absolute power of the English sovereign was gradually taken over by the Parliamentary government, the great medieval manor houses, that once had the obligation of hosting and entertaining the king and attendant courtiers for long periods, could now be substituted by country houses built in a smaller scale, for practicality and economy sake. This produced "an extraordinary advance in wealth, luxury and refinement of taste" (p.126). According to Mezei and Briganti (2002), an urge for privacy, isolation, domesticity, and comfort arose. Stone (1991) explains that the house became a place of intimacy and the family members were given their private spaces, separated from the intromission of servants and visitors:

> This search for privacy and domestic intimacy, this desire to create the emotional atmosphere of a home, took a variety of forms,

> depending upon who was excluding whom in order to achieve it. First and most serious was the struggle by the family to obtain some measure of privacy from the always intrusive domestic servants; second was the segregation, especially in the nineteenth century, of males and females, each with their own separate zones of occupation within the house; third was the segregation of adults from children, who had to be both easily accessible, and yet prevented from disturbing the grown-ups; fourth was a demand for personal privacy, for reading, writing, or contemplation; and fifth and last, the most intractable struggle of all was to achieve privacy for all members of the household, male or female, masters or servants, adults or children, from the outside world of uninvited visitors. (p.233-234)

The bourgeois age was responsible for the creation of the concepts of home and family as we see them today. (MEZEI and BRIGANTI, 2002)

Thus, all these aspects mentioned about the eighteenth century — the emergence of the bourgeoisie, the rise of the novel and of the country house — provided an abundant supply for the exploration of the relation between space and character, or rather, between house and family. The author in question in this paper, Jane Austen, experienced all of these circumstances and — we defend — made an intelligent use of the space, the country houses, in the representation of her characters, for whom the family's social rank and property played an important role.

Based mainly on Osman Lin's (1976) ideas about the interaction between space and character, we believe, therefore, that the domestic space may convey many aspects of the character, and our interest lies in their social representation. Lins talks of a *social space*, that is, "certo conjunto de fatores sociais, econômicos e até mesmo históricos que em muitas narrativas assumem extrema importância e que cercam as personagens, as quais, por vezes, só em face desses mesmos fatores adquirem plena significação." (1976, p.74) In the next section, we are going to analyze how important the family houses are in the characterization of their owner's social stand in *Pride and Prejudice*.

2.2 HOUSES AND FAMILIES IN PRIDE AND PREJUDICE

According to Charles J. McCann (1964), the country house is certainly the most prominent element of Jane Austen's setting. Its presence in her novels may differ in complexity; however, in all of them, and especially in *Pride and Prejudice,* the

country house's function goes beyond that of location or decoration — it works as an emblem or symbol of the economic, social, or intellectual condition of the characters. Thus Netherfield, Pemberley, Rosings, and Longbourn are not merely spaces where the action takes place, but they stand as representations of their owners.

However, space in Jane Austen's novels is described with economy of details. As W. A. Craik (1969 apud HART, 1975, p.305) says, "Jane Austen is always clear in her own mind as to the size and shape of the various houses she invents," and "when it is to Jane Austen's purpose to give full details of an establishment, she can be explicit." Austen's regard of economy of details is clear in her novels and supported by her writing advices to her niece Anna: "You describe a sweet place, but your descriptions are often more minute than will be liked. You give too many particulars of right hand and left." (AUSTEN, 1814, apud LE FAYE, 2003, p.152) Nevertheless, Austen's sparing use of description did not prevent her from providing details of distance, geographic and social, as well as of chronology, with such an accuracy that has rendered her fame (LITZ, 1952 apud HART, 1975).

The role of space in *Pride and Prejudice* seems to be of that third kind described by Antonio Dimas, as explained in the previous section. It cannot be considered secondary for, although description is economical, its function goes beyond that of merely serving as a scenery for the action. It is not primary either because the characters enjoy a relative freedom of action amidst their social environment, such as Elizabeth's refusals to two advantageous marriage proposals, which distinguishes her in a society where marriage was the uppermost concern of women. This paper defends that space in *Pride and Prejudice* has the power of enriching the novel with new meanings that are associated with the characters in a subtle manner. Therefore, space is neither decorative nor determinant in *Pride and Prejudice*. Its symbology is hidden in the descriptions of houses, their furnishings and surroundings, demanding from the reader a careful reading and some knowledge about the customs and social aspects of Jane Austen's time.

In the following subsections, the four main houses of *Pride and Prejudice* will be analyzed as to their relation with the families, represented by the owner of each house — except Longbourn, of which Elizabeth is not the owner, but is the most representative inhabitant of the house and the main character of the novel. Each

analysis will begin with a review of the family story and its social position, passing to the explanation of the situation of the family and its house, and the meanings of some details that are mentioned in the narrative.

2.2.1 Pemberley

The Pemberley estate, in Derbyshire, belongs to the Darcys, a wealthy, traditional family. The only male child, Mr. Darcy inherited the property after his father's death. Although his social origins are not explicitly put in the text, there are some indicators that the reader of the nineteenth century would perceive, such as peerage titles. Mr. Darcy's mother was Lady Anne Darcy; as David Shapard (2004, p.155) explains, a title such as *lady* followed specifically by a first name indicates that she was the daughter of an earl or higher — the same applies to her sister, Lady Catherine. Therefore, Darcy is the grandson of an earl. His cousin, Colonel Fitzwilliam, admits being the son of an earl but not the eldest son and, therefore, not the heir to the title. Shapard (2004) assumes that Darcy's father had no title, otherwise, Mr. Darcy would have a "handle to his name", as the Victorians used to say. Darcy did not inherit his grandfather title probably because it went to Colonel Fitzwilliam's eldest brother, through Darcy's uncle. For that reason, Shapard (2004, p.xxiiii) places Darcy as "almost part of the aristocracy": although he possesses a wealth comparable to that of many titled lords, he lacks a title of nobility. However, "being a long-establish family, as the Darcys apparently are, would be a distinction even if the family had no title". (p.647)

McCann (1964) calls the attention for the simultaneity of Darcy's and Pemberley's first appearances in the novel. The owner and his house are introduced together at the Netherfield assembly to the society of Hertfordshire. His relationship to the house, however, is unclear:

> […] Mr. Darcy soon drew the attention of the room by his fine, tall person, handsome features, noble mien; and the report which was in general circulation within five minutes after his entrance, of his having ten thousand a year. The gentlemen pronounced him to be a fine figure of a man, the ladies declared he was much handsomer than Mr. Bingley, and he was looked at with great admiration for about half the evening, till his manners gave a disgust which turned the tide of his popularity; for he was discovered to be proud, to be above his

> company, and above being pleased; and not all his large estate in Derbyshire could then save him from having a most forbidding, disagreeable countenance. (AUSTEN, 1962, p.19)

The general good opinion of Darcy changes as his proud attitude comes into view. Thus the image of Pemberley gets associated with pride as well, be it Darcy's pride or other characters' own kinds of pride towards the estate (McCANN, 1964). Elizabeth responds to his pride with her own self-defensive pride while Miss Lucas considers Darcy's right to be proud of his condition:

> "His pride," said Miss Lucas, "does not offend *me* as much as pride often does, because there is an excuse for it. One cannot wonder that so very fine a young man, with family, fortune, everything in his favour, should think highly of himself. If I may so express it, he has a *right* to be proud."
>
> "That is very true," replied Elizabeth, "and I could easily forgive *his* pride, if he had not mortified *mine*." (AUSTEN, 1962, p.26)

Miss Bingley's pride of Pemberley becomes apparent in her mockery of the absurdity of having Mrs. Bennet's in the property, should she become Darcy's mother-in-law. Her attitude shows her feelings of identification with Darcy's social rank, or rather, her wish of belonging to the same environment. Her praise for Pemberley, as well as her desire of being its mistress, provides the reader with an account of the condition of the house as an object worth of pride (McCANN, 1964). Another display of this behavior is Miss Bingley's resentful attempt to embarrass Darcy with the possibility of placing the portrait of Elizabeth's uncle Phillips, who was an attorney in Meryton — that is, who worked in trade and, therefore, was bellow the gentry —, in his family art gallery: "Oh! yes. Do let the portraits of your uncle and aunt Phillips be placed in the gallery at Pemberley. Put them next to your great-uncle the judge. They are in the same profession, you know, only in different lines." (AUSTEN, 1962, p.53)

Shapard (2004) remarks on the location of Pemberley as an important element in the constitution of the general opinion on Darcy. Pemberley is located outside Hertfordshire — more precisely, in Derbyshire — and visiting it would demand traveling a considerable distance. For this reason, it is probable that nobody in Hertfordshire was familiar with his character or shared important acquaintances or relations with him. Also his condition as a guest in the rented house of Netherfield makes him a momentary acquaintance of whom people are not interested in knowing

better. Thus the local community is left to precipitately rely on first impressions of him.

Furthermore, we believe that Pemberley distance from Hertfordshire may have a symbolic meaning. The geographic distance between the two counties could be related to Darcy's natural reserve and the social distance between him and Hertfordshire families. After Elizabeth goes through that geographic distance, she also transcends the gulf between Darcy and herself as she overcomes her prejudiced opinion against his social position and character.

The library of the Darcys works as another emblem of the family's tradition and refinement. It is the first concrete element of Pemberley to be mentioned in the novel as it becomes the subject of a conversation that Elizabeth testifies during her stay at Netherfield. In this scene, the Bingleys wish their small library were as great as Darcy's and could offer more books for Elizabeth to read. As Darcy proudly puts, his library "ought to be good" for "it has been the work of many generations" (AUSTEN, 1962, p.41). According to Shapard (2004, p.69), this comment indicates that Darcy "comes from a family that has long been wealthy and prominent". Darcy's statement reveals the pride he takes in his ancestral prestige but, more importantly, it reveals the value he gives to reading as a means of cultivating the mind. After Miss Bingley recites a list of various superficial and display qualities that an accomplished woman must have, Darcy adds to it the benefits of reading: "to all this she must yet add something more substantial, in the improvement of her mind by extensive reading." (AUSTEN, 1962, p.42)

As McCann (1964) observes, Pemberley is talked about in several circumstances but its true correspondence to Darcy remains unknown for most of the plot, more specifically, up to the third and last volume. Early in the novel, most of the information about the estate comes from Miss Bingley and, since she is determined in winning Darcy's attentions by flattering him, her opinions and descriptions are not reliable. The postponing of this revelation creates a mystery as to Darcy's character, which the reader can only solve when Elizabeth finally steps on Pemberley grounds and sees the house and its surroundings for herself.

Pemberley is the only house to be described in details. The Darcys's wealth becomes evident in the enumeration and description of the elements of the house and its surroundings. From the lodge-gate to the top of a hill, there is a half-mile drive through woodland. A lodge-gate, or gatehouse, would demand the hiring of a porter to control the access of carriages into the park and thus provided an impressive welcome to visitors that only grand houses — especially those open to the public — could offer (SHAPARD, 2004). The park, "the ground that had been landscaped" (p.447), is ten miles in circumference. Along the park drive, the Pemberley house can be spotted from the top of a hill standing on the opposite side of a valley:

> It was a large, handsome, stone building, standing well on rising ground, and backed by a ridge of high woody hills; — and in front, a stream of some natural importance was swelled into greater, but without any artificial appearance. Its banks were neither formal, nor falsely adorned. (AUSTEN, 1962, p.202)

Stone houses were associated with wealth and high status, for this material had long been the preferred one for grand houses. The lake in front of the house demanded some alteration of the natural environment as Shapard (2004) explains:

> […] a stream that was naturally of good size was made grander by being dammed or redirected in some manner. Landscape designers of the period often altered streams, for a beautiful body of water within a park was considered essential. In many cases streams were dammed to create a lake, though the lake was make to look as natural as possible. (p. 447)

However, such changes did not look artificial and did harmonize with the natural landscape. This reflected the landscaping ideal of that time, which assumed that even though whole hillsides could either be built or destroyed, architects should be concerned with creating a naturalistic sense that allowed the alterations to mingle with the original environment (HUNT, 1997; SHAPARD, 2004; STONE, 1990).

The house, although some parts of it have been remodeled, is not modern, confirming the long established status of the Darcys family. As Le Faye (2003, p.1998) affirms, the house is

> […] certainly not modern, and the existence of a great staircase and long picture gallery suggests that this part of the building at least is Elizabethan or Jacobean; no doubt like many other English country mansions Pemberley has been added to and remodeled over the centuries.

The main rooms shown during Elizabeth's visit include: a dining parlor, a large library, a saloon suitable for summer use, the late Mr. Darcy's study room, Georgiana's music room, a spacious lobby at the top of the staircase, a sitting-room, two or three of the principal bedrooms, and a long gallery. Both the gallery and the former study room of Darcy's father are filled with pictures of family members of different generations — the gallery holds family portraits and other paintings, and the study room holds Mr. Darcy senior's favorite family miniatures on the wall. The existence of these two spaces reveals the Darcys's pride in their family history. It is important to notice, however, the presence of Wickham's portrait among the family miniatures. Wickham was neither part of the family nor was in the same social position as the Darcys. His portrait in Mr. Darcy's study room indicates that the family may not be so rigid as to keep from associating with people of lower social level. This endorses the possibility of his accepting Elizabeth as part of the family as well.

2.2.2 Netherfield

Netherfield Park is an estate in the Hertfordshire county, three miles away from Longbourn and to the north of Meryton. The house is rented by Mr. Bingley, a young man arrived from London, who brings with him his two elder sisters and his brother-in-law, Mr. Hurst.

The Bingleys's fortune is very recent: Mr. Bingley's father made fortune in the north of England through trade, possibly of wool (LE FAYE, 2003, p.186). Mr. Bingley senior left his son nearly one hundred thousand pounds, a large amount that he had intended to use to purchase an estate for the family but did not live to do it. Therefore, the task is passed on to Bingley, who rents Netherfield in response to his sisters' urge to acquire an estate. However, Bingley's undecided and relaxed temper makes the purchase very unlikely to happen:

> Mr. Bingley intended it likewise, and sometimes made choice of his county; but as he was now provided with a good house and the liberty of a manor, it was doubtful to many of those who best knew the easiness of his temper, whether he might not spend the remainder of his days at Netherfield, and leave the next generation to purchase. (AUSTEN, 1962, p. 23)

The urge of Bingley's sisters is comprehensible. The Bingleys have a large amount of money and are educated enough to be part of the gentry; however, the lack of a family estate would not allow the family to rise socially and become part of this class. As Shapard (2004, p.27) explains:

> This [owing an estate] is the critical requirement for attaining true gentility. The Bingley family presents a standard example of social climbing. Earlier generations have attained wealth through trade; this generation uses it to gain acceptance among the elite. The expensive schooling of Bingley's sisters, which Bingley probably had also, was a principal means for this, for it enabled its recipients to learn the habits of genteel people and to form friendships with them. (SHAPARD, 2004, p.27)

Thus, McCann (1964) defends that Bingley's relation to Netherfield is emblematic because his impermanence at the house reflects his unstable personality. His situation as a tenant, rather than a house owner, not only indicates his irresolute and careless nature, but also reveals his being a nouveau riche.

McCann (1964) observes that while Darcy's ownership of Pemberley is subject matter of some conversations, when it comes to Netherfield, Mrs. Bennet is the only person to praise it even though the house stands out in the neighborhood. Her doing so may be based on her interest in pleasing Mr. Bingley by flattering him. Despite the house being prominent in the Hertfordshire community, it is never in the neighbors' conversations — differently from Pemberley, which is referred to as soon as Darcy is introduced.

This may be due to the fact that the Hertfordshire neighborhood is already acquainted with Netherfield for its proximity and sees no novelty in it; Pemberley, alternatively, is located in Derbyshire, conserving thus some excitement for the unknown. Also neighbors may not feel attached to Netherfield for it is a rented house, a place of transitory residents, while Pemberley is a traditional house belonging to the Darcys for generations. (McCANN, 1964)

Another emblematic aspect of Netherfield Park is its scarce description in details. Its "pointed nondescriptness has an analogy in Bingley's character, and a blandness already suggested in him as here intensified." (MCCANN, 1969, p. 69). Furthermore, his relation to Netherfield expresses the mildness of his character: he shows no attachment of any kind to this house or to any other place and has no

preferment for the town or the country. Bingley admits his impulsive nature in the following passages:

> 'Whatever I do is done in a hurry,' replied he; 'and therefore if I should resolve to quit Netherfield, I should probably be off in five minutes. At present, however, I consider myself as quite fixed here.'
>
> [..]
>
> 'When I am in the country,' he replied, 'I never wish to leave it; and when I am in town it is pretty much the same. They have each their advantages, and I can be equally happy in either.' (AUSTEN, 1962, p.45)

The temporary aspect of Bingley's renting of Netherfield reflects his inconstant disposition and his difficulty in making decisions. Such restrictions of his personality are the object of Darcy's preoccupation. Accordingly, he criticizes Bingley's readiness to yield to the suggestions of others without reasoning:

> '[…] Your conduct would be quite as dependent on chance as that of any man I know; and if, as you were mounting your horse, a friend were to say, 'Bingley, you had better stay till next week,' you would probably do it, you would probably not go — and at another word, might stay a month.'
>
> […]
>
> '[…] you must remember, Miss Bennet, that the friend who is supposed to desire his return to the house, and the delay of his plan, has merely desired it, asked it without offering one argument in favour of its propriety.'
> 'To yield readily — easily — to the *persuasion* of a friend is no merit with you.'
> 'To yield without conviction is no compliment to the understanding of either.' (AUSTEN, 1962, p.50-51)

Darcy's censure of Bingley converts in care and assistance for his friend. Bingley, alternatively, has enough confidence in Darcy's judgment as to accept his advice to leave Netherfield and forget his loved Jane. Their friendship is based on the reciprocal completing of their each other's faults:

> Between him and Darcy there was a very steady friendship, in spite of great opposition of character. Bingley was endeared to Darcy by the easiness, openness, and ductility of his temper, though no disposition could offer a greater contrast to his own, and though with his own he never appeared dissatisfied. On the strength of Darcy's regard, Bingley had the firmest reliance, and of his judgment the highest opinion. In understanding, Darcy was the superior. Bingley was by no means deficient, but Darcy was clever. (AUSTEN, 1962, p. 23)

The contrast between the Netherfield library with the one at Pemberley is also suggestive of Bingley's social position and indolence. McCann (1964) shares the same opinion of Shapard (2004) when the latter affirms:

> In this comment [about the ancestry of his family library] Darcy indicates that he comes from a family that has long been wealthy and prominent. In contrast, Bingley's small library reflects not only his own idleness, but also his family's recent arrival into a higher social rank, which means his ancestors would have lacked the resources or the educated taste to accumulate a fine collection. (p.69)

Bingley's library is very limited and cannot bear comparison with Darcy's vast and old library. Differently from the Darcys, the Bingleys family did not collect their books over generations. The few books the family now possesses were bought by Mr. Bingley senior, and we learn that even though he worried about his children's instruction — possibly motivated by the requirements for social ascension —, his son's indulgence towards his own education becomes apparent in his comment on the family's small collection of books: "And I wish my collection were larger for your benefit and my own credit; but I am an idle fellow, and though I have not many, I have more than I ever look into." (AUSTEN, 1962, p.41)

It is important to allude to Darcy's reproach to Bingley's attitude: "I cannot comprehend the neglect of a family library in *such days as these*" (AUSTEN, 1962, p.41, emphasis added). As Shapard (2004) points out, the previous century had witnessed an abundance in publishing, and books became much more accessible, in terms of both value and availability, so that "those of Jane Austen's time could justly regard themselves as living at a time of unprecedented opportunity for reading and book collecting". (p.69)

2.2.3 Rosings

Rosings Park is the house of Darcy's aunt, Lady Catherine de Bourgh, and her daughter Miss de Bourgh. Lady Catherine is the widow of Sir Louis de Bourgh. Due to "his handle", Shapard (2004) explains, her husband could either be a knight or a baronet. As Lady Catherine eventually reveals when she visits Elizabeth to command her not to marry Darcy, her nephew and daughter "are descended on the maternal side, from the same noble line; and, on the father's, from respectable, honourable,

and ancient, though untitled families". (AUSTEN, 1962, p.288) Her comment shows that his title was not hereditary and could not be passed on; for this reason, he could only have been a knight, such as Sir William Lucas, rather than a baronet. Lady Catherine's title did not derive from him, otherwise, she would be Lady de Bourgh and her daughter would have the title "lady" with her first name. Including a first name in the title indicated that the woman was "the daughter of a duke, marquess, or earl, the three highest ranks of the Peerage or nobility". (SHAPARD, 2004, p.115) As formerly explained about Lady Anne Darcy, Lady Catherine's father was an earl. According to Shapard (2004, p.115), "since the number of such nobles was small, with only around 125 at this rank in England at the time, Lady Catherine has a very high pedigree".

Lady Catherine's house, the second in rank in the novel, is first presented by the flattery compliments of Mr. Collins. As McCann (1694) points, this anticipated introduction creates some suspense such as happens with Pemberley; however, very soon it ends to give place to Elizabeth's own view of the house and its owner, preventing the reader from associating the two houses.

In his adulation of "the Right Honourable", Mr. Collins boasts about the glazing of Rosings:

> […] Elizabeth saw much to be pleased with, though she could not be in such raptures as Mr. Collins expected the scene to inspire, and was but slightly affected by his enumeration of the windows in front of the house, and his relation of what the glazing altogether had originally cost Sir Lewis de Bourgh. (AUSTEN, 1962, p.139)

As Shapard (2004), McCann (1694), and Ray (2008) note, a large number of windows was a clear sign of wealth and ostentation. One of the taxes at the time was the window tax imposed between 1696 and 1851 that was charged according to the quantity of windows of the house.

Furthermore, Mr. Collins's rapture reveals that Sir Lewis de Bourgh was the responsible for building Rosings, which indicates that the house is not an ancient one, as Pemberley. Ray (2008) presents some calculations of Miss de Bourgh's age and concludes that Sir Lewis should had been born between 1743 and 1753, "putting him in the right age bracket to build a Georgian house and pay for its original glazing" (p.69). Seen from Hunsford, Mr. Collins's rectory, the house is described very

similarly to Pemberley: “It was a handsome modern building, well situated on rising ground.” (AUSTEN, 1962, p.135) The adjective “modern”, however, could never be applied to Pemberley; it refers to the Georgian period, which was current at the time. In terms of architecture, Deirdre Le Faye (2003) believes it to be an Adam-style house and explains that “by the end of the eighteenth century, however, Adam’s work was considered fussy and frivolous” (p.128). All these elements help to construct the idea of a new, flashy, and gaudy house, which matches the image of the snobbish and shallow Lady Catherine. They also create an opposition between Pemberley and Rosings that symbolizes the differences in character between Darcy and Lady Catherine. This is clear in Elizabeth’s perception of the difference between Pemberley decorations to those of Rosings:

> The rooms were lofty and handsome, and their furniture suitable to the fortune of its proprietor; but Elizabeth saw, with admiration of his taste, that it was neither gaudy nor uselessly fine; with less of splendour, and more real elegance, than the furniture of Rosings. (AUSTEN, 1962, p.203)

The opposition is also social. Rosings house being modern, its furnishings — that reflect “nouveau riche taste” (RAY, 2008, p.68) —, and Sir Lewis’s knighthood all suggest that the de Bourghs are nouveau riche. It was not uncommon for the daughters of nobility, like Lady Catherine and Lady Anne Darcy, to marry men of lower social rank but of higher economic standing. (RAY, 2008; COPELAND and McMASTER, 1997). Ray (2008) defends that, although Lady Catherine refers to her family and Darcy’s as ancient families[2], her veracity is not to be trusted. Lady Catherine made such statement in a moment of hysteria, in which she was concerned with emphasizing the social inferiority of Elizabeth in relation to Miss de Bourgh and Mr. Darcy. The author also believes that her allegation of the cousins being destined to each other is another lie, for neither Darcy nor the gossipy Colonel Fitzwilliam ever speak of it.

McCann’s (1964, p.65) affirmation that “the pretentiousness of Rosings reveals Lady Catherine” serves as a conclusion for the emblematic relation between the house and its owner. Also, the contrast between Pemberley and Rosings demonstrates that Darcy and Lady Catherine, although close in wealth and kin, project different images of the upper class: the first is virtuous, the other is frivolous.

[2] See quotation in the first paragraph of this subsection.

2.2.4 Longbourn

The last house of our analysis is the heroine's residence. The house is given no special name as the others presented here; it is called Longbourn, the same name of the village where it is located in the county of Hertfordshire. Elizabeth's father, Mr. Bennet, is the owner of the estate and is a gentleman — that is, he is part of the gentry. Her mother is the daughter of an attorney, which places her side of the family among the members of the middle class: "merchants and manufacturers as well as the members of most professions" (SHAPARD, 2004, p.xxiii). The couple has no male children and Mrs. Bennet has passed the menopause, which places a crucial problem for the five Bennet girls: the entailment of the property. As Copeland and McMaster (1997, p.119) explain,

> The entail, so prominent in *Pride and Prejudice*, legally formalizes this customary practice of inheritance. If an estate were divided equally between all siblings, as our understanding of equitable practice would suggest today, the estate would be dispersed, and would ultimately cease to exist. The system of primogeniture, which unfairly privileges one family member by accumulating all property in his hands, was developed as an arrangement for the preservation of the family name and the family estate through the generations.

This means that the Bennet girls are to be turned out of the house, together with their mother, after their father dies. The estate will pass on to the next nearest male relative, their distant cousin, Mr. Collins. To make the women's situation even worse, Mr. Bennet has never cared to increase his income and make savings, leaving his daughters very small dowries.

The Bennets are the family of highest position in their village. Shapard (2004, p.21) explains that "a village is defined by the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* of the time as 'an assemblage of houses inhabited chiefly by peasants and farmers, and having no market, whereby it is distinguished from a town." According to Le Faye (2003), the property is an agricultural estate that must employ the laborers of the village of Longbourn.

Although it is the house of Elizabeth, the protagonist of the plot and the one whose point of view conducts the novel, Longbourn is barely described. All the information we can grasp about it is the existence of some rooms, like the dining

room and the library, that hold no special connotation for they are expected to figure in properties such as the Bennets's house. Le Faye (2003) argues that this is due to the fact that Elizabeth has no need of telling herself what her own house is like. Although this explanation can be considered fair enough, it is not sufficient to clarify why Elizabeth shows no sign of attachment to her family house, no childhood memories, no resentment as to the possibility of losing it for the entail. Nina Auerbach (2001) refers to the lack of physicality of Longbourn, a house where the scenes are hardly ever located, where even food seems to be "invisible". She affirms that "the vaporousness of Longbourn, as a narrative center and as an empty reflection in memory, is surprising in view of the primacy of the family in Austen's other novels" (p.333). The contrast between the "vacuum" of Elizabeth's house and her amusement and detailed descriptions of Pemberley poses a question as to the importance of inhabiting an entailed house and as to her sense of being at home.

Elizabeth's reaction to the visit to Pemberley and the subsequent transformation of her opinion of Darcy have raised an argument as to her being materialistic or opportunistic. The admittance that "she felt that to be the mistress of Pemberley might be something!" (AUSTEN, 1962, p.202) and her answer to Jane's question about the moment she begun to love Darcy — "It has been coming so gradually, that I hardly know when it began. But I believe I must date it from my first seeing his beautiful grounds at Pemberley." (AUSTEN, 1962, p.302) — led Sir Walter Scott and other commentators to defend that Elizabeth had mercenary motives in accepting Darcy's proposal (DUCKWORTH, 2001; McCANN, 1964; SHAPARD, 2004). This assumption, however, has been widely refuted.

Shapard (2004, p.681) defends that Elizabeth's answer to her sister's question "is meant primarily as joke […] indicated by Jane's subsequent entreaty to be serious", and adds that throughout this entire dialogue "Elizabeth is resorting to humor to lighten what is obviously a difficult ordeal". The author says that, although she recognizes the advantages of becoming the mistress of Pemberley, it is less due to Darcy's wealth than "to her perception of how much good someone in charge of it could do, and of what the beauties of Pemberley revealed about the taste and judgment of its proprietor" (Ibid., p.681). Alistair Duckworth (2001) seems to agree to Shapard's comment regarding Elizabeth's reasons:

> Thus, when Elizabeth comes to exclaim to herself that “to be the mistress of Pemberley might be something”, she has, we might conjecture, come to recognize not merely the money and the status of Pemberley, but its value as the setting of a traditional social and ethical orientation, its possibilities — seemingly now only hypothetical — as a context for her responsible social activity. (DUCKWORTH, 2001, p.311)

McCann (1964, p.74) calls attention to the fact that “Elizabeth has been presented as the sort of girl who would not return love unless her suitor possessed those traits which Pemberley happens to reflect and foster”; Drew (1959) recalls two other important factors that add to the heroine’s defense: Elizabeth refuses Darcy’s first marriage proposal even though she was aware of his fortune, and the effects that Darcy’s letter produces are crucial in Elizabeth’s change of opinion on him and on her own judgment skills.

In conclusion, Elizabeth’s reasons for her preferment of Pemberley over her own house cannot be explained in terms of social representation, for aspiration for wealth and elevated social status may be considered to be a minor wish of hers, otherwise she would have accepted Darcy’s first proposal. Therefore, we believe that Elizabeth’s attachment to Pemberley deserves a deeper reflection and analysis. The next part of this paper will be occupied in clarifying this problem.

3 HOUSE AND SELF

In the previous chapter, we sought to demonstrate how space and characters are deeply connected in *Pride and Prejudice* by analyzing how the houses represent the families socially. That analysis, however, could not explain two important issues that we now would like to examine in a different light: the significance of Elizabeth's desire to live at Pemberley, and the lack of solidity of her family's house. Such questions seem to go beyond the matter of social representation; it seems to us that these issues are related to the character's individuality and their relation to their homes. Therefore, we propose here an analysis of the relationship between Darcy and Elizabeth to their homes focusing in these questions.

In order to clarify these issues, we are going to base our analysis mainly in the ideas proposed by Gaston Bachelard (1969) in his book *The Poetics of Space*. The main aspects of his phenomenological interpretation of the relation between house and the self are going to be presented in the first section of this chapter. After that, we are going to analyze how Pemberley and Longbourn are related to Elizabeth and Darcy, and the significance of this relation to the plot.

3.1 THE HOUSE AS A REPRESENTATION OF THE SELF

In order to study the house as a representation of the self, it is necessary to understand the significance of home to the individual. That significance goes beyond the function of the house as a shelter. It is deeply connected to one's soul and is part of one's subjectivity, identity, and sense of existence. The fundamental ideas expressed in this chapter are based on the reflections of Gaston Bachelard about the image of the house as it is represented in literature. In his book *The Poetics of Space*, Bachelard (1969) proposes a phenomenological determination of the significance of the house for the individual as it is represented in poetry.

Bachelard affirms that one should abandon rationalism if it is one's interest to study the problems presented by the poetic imagination. He proposes a philosophy of poetry in which the poetic image must be apprehended at the moment it figures in the individual consciousness, "in the very ecstasy of the newness of the image" (p.xi). He

seeks to determine the novelty of an image in the individual mind, where its onset has no past or causality.

Therefore, he argues that even though psychology or psychoanalysis seek to explain the poetic act as it is conceived by the poet, "the poet does not confer the past of his image upon me, and yet his image immediately takes root on me" (p.xiii). Bachelard recognizes that using such methods for analyzing the psyche of the poet can be helpful as to provide the extent of the pressures and oppressions he/she suffered in life; he defends, however, that the relation between the poetic image and the unconscious is not causal, since "the poetic image has an entity and a dynamism of its own" (p.xii) as an ontological entity.[3] As such, the significance of an image can only be accessible by a phenomenology[4] of the imagination:

> In order to clarify the problem of the poetic image philosophically, we shall have to have recourse to a phenomenology of the imagination. By this should be understood a study of the phenomenon of the poetic image when it emerges into the consciousness as a direct product of the heart, soul and being of man, apprehended in his actuality. (p.xiv)

Given that images are variational, Bachelard delimits the scope of this work to "the quite simple images of *felicitous space*" (p.xxxi) in an investigation that he calls *topophilia*. The hostile space is left aside to make room for the study of images that attract.[5] However he states that attraction and repulse do not give contrary experiences and that images are not definitive ideas. In his analysis of the happy space, Bachelard chooses the spaces of intimacy, starting his exploration with the poetics of the house and the hut, then turning his attention to the poetics of drawers, chests and wardrobes, nests, shells, corners, and miniature, to finally end with the examination of the intimate immensity, the dialectics of outside and inside, and the phenomenology of roundness. His topo-analysis includes elements of descriptive psychology, depth psychology, psychoanalysis and phenomenology.

Bachelard defends that the house can be taken as a means for the analysis of the human soul, for it is related to our memories and identity (p.xxxiii):

---

[3] This is not to say that Bachelard rejects the contributions of psychology and psychoanalysis; indeed he makes use of those in relation to the phenomenological perspective.

[4] Bachelard defines phenomenology as the "consideration of the *onset of the image* in an individual consciousness". (1969, p.xv)

[5] Bachelard justifies this limitation of scope by explaining that "the space of hatred and combat can only be studied in the context of impassioned subject matter and apocalyptic images." (p.xxxii)

> Not only our memories, but the things we have forgotten are "housed". Our soul is an abode. And by remembering "houses" and "rooms", we learn to "abide" within ourselves. Now everything becomes clear, the house image moves in both directions: they are in us as we are in them […]

Its chief benefit is to protect, to shelter. When we are brought into the world, we are taken to the safe environment of the house, enclosed and warm. The house has "maternal features". As we become more attached to it, the childhood house becomes our "shell", our space of private intimacy, our personal universe: "For our house is our corner of the world. As has often been said, it is our first universe, a real cosmos in every sense of the word." (p.4)

Mallett (2004) examines the relation between home and identity. She cites Clare Cooper (1976 apud MALLETT, 2004), whose studies rely on the Jungian concept of the collective unconscious to affirm that the house can be considered a symbol of the self. Jung's theory conceives the collective unconscious as a repository of archetypes, which are universal, pre-existent forms present in the psyche. According to Cooper (1976 apud MALLETT, 2004), the interior design of the house, the decorations and the use of space are representations of the inhabitant's self.

Cooper employs the Jungian archetype of the house standing on the ground as a symbol of the self. Bachelard also incorporates the psychoanalytical symbology of the free-standing house and affirms that such archetype must be taken into consideration in order to understand the phenomenology of the self:

> If we follow the inspiration of Jung's *explanatory* example to a complete grasp of psychological reality, we encounter a co-operation between psychoanalysis and phenomenology which must be stressed if we are to dominate the human phenomenon. (1969, p.19)

Bachelard states that "a house is imagined as a vertical being. It rises upward. It differentiates itself in terms of its verticality. It is one of the appeals to our consciousness of verticality." (1969, p.17) The author explains that Jung's archetype of the house presents a vertical polarity of the attic and the cellar. The attic, or roof, is the place of rationality, its purpose being to provide shelter from the threats of the rain and the sun. The cellar, the place of irrationality, is the "dark entity" of the house, connected with subterranean forces. Thus, the attic would be the consciousness, while the cellar represents the unconscious.

Mallett (2004) presents different aspects of the relation between home and the self. One is the assumption that home “may be an expression of a person’s subjectivity in the world” (p.82). It is a space where people feel comfortable enough to express and fulfill their identities. As a consequence, home does not have to be necessarily a house: “It may be an emotional environment, a culture, a geographical location, a political system, a historical time and place, a house etc., and a combination of all of the above.” (p.83)

Another interpretation of this relation is that of home as a source of identity. As such, it involves every aspect of our location in the world and of our existential experience. All of these aspects — house, village or town, family, social environment, professional environment, the nation, civic society, the civilization and the world — are equally important in people’s lives but may have different priorities at different times of life; they constitute an inalienable and inseparable part of human identity.

Mallett (2004) also talks about the importance of building a home in relation to our existence. Whether it be material or imaginary, our building of a home derives from “our immersion in the world — the very homeland of our thoughts” (p.83). Quoting Ingold, he talks of the nature of human beings as homemakers:

> We make our homes. Not necessarily by constructing them, although some people do that. We build the intimate shell of our lives by the organization and furnishing of the space in which we live. How we function as persons is linked to how we make ourselves at home. We need time to make our dwelling into a home. . . . Our residence is where we live, but our home is how we live. (INGOLD, 1995 apud MALLETT, 2004, p.83)

We have already explained in the previous chapter that the eighteenth century has brought some important changes that are concerned with the elements of our analysis: the rise of the novel and of the English country house, and the ascension of an aspiring bourgeoisie that was responsible for an urge for privacy and comfort. Hart (1975, p.307) relates the appearance of the need for privacy with the emergence of individualism. Accordingly, Mezei and Briganti (2002) affirm that all these changes in society reflected a development in the human consciousness: the internal world of the individual, the self, and the house as the space for an emerging interior life. These authors agree to the phenomenological views of Bachelard (1969, p.xxxii)

when he says that “the house image would appear to have become the topography of our intimate being.”

Lawrence Stone (1991) believes that “this search for privacy and domestic intimacy, this desire to create the emotional atmosphere of a home” (p.233), was produced by three fundamental forces: the rise of individualism, the rise of Romanticism after 1760, and the Enlightenment. The rise of individualism was responsible for a shift in the concept of the self, now seen as unique and free to pursue his/her own goals instead of being obliged to the kin, the society, or the state. Romanticism reinforced “the importance of individual freedom by combining it with the concept of romantic love and domestic affection as an ideal” (p.233). And last, the Enlightenment, “with its rationalist and secular ideas about aspirations for human happiness and a belief in the perfectibility of the man” (p.234).

Mezei and Briganti (2002) defend that these new perspectives of domestic privacy and intimacy added much significance to the literary imagination, reinforcing the relationship between the self and the house as setting. They affirm that

> Our imagination, our consciousness, needs to locate itself in a particular space, to find a home, to articulate its homelessness, its longing for home, its sickness for home (nostalgia). Thus, novels and houses furnish a dwelling place — a spatial construct — that invites the exploration and expression of private and intimate relations and thoughts. (p.839)

They illustrate such observation by alluding to two writers, Virginia Woolf and Katherine Mansfield, whose works present a private, domestic space that functions as a “frame and metonym of inner, psychological space” that “reflects this recent validation of privacy and intimacy” (p.839). As to Virginia Woolf, the authors comment that her contrasting her father’s house with her new home reflects the “exhilaration she felt at the ‘transition from tyranny to freedom’ that followed the death of her father” (p.839).

Such transition is one of the themes studied by Mary Douglas (1991). While Bachelard (1969) limits his reflection to the images of the felicitous space, Douglas talks of the “tyrannies of the home” that make the young wish to move out of it. According to her, the family house is a place of subversion because it nullifies the individual’s private self-interest for the sake of collective good. She offers a series of

examples that compose this image of home as an authoritative and rigid place like: the difficulty in changing mealtimes to accommodate an unexpected visitor; the arrangement of the whole family's regular menu to avoid foods that are deeply disliked by or prohibited for health issues to one of the family members; the censorship of speech through the disallowance of certain tones of voice, conversational topics and types of language; etc. Douglas says it is not hard to understand children's urge to leave their parents' house and set up a new house that is differently organized.

3.2 HOUSES AND INDIVIDUALS IN PRIDE AND PREJUDICE

We have seen this far that the house may tell a lot about the individual who dwells in it. It may offer information about one's position in society, as we sought to explain in the analysis presented in the first part of this paper. As Bachelard and the other authors mentioned in this chapter demonstrate, the house may also represent the self, as one's sense of being at home is deeply connected to one's identity and subjectivity.

In this section, we are going to analyze how the main characters of *Pride and Prejudice*, Darcy and Elizabeth, relate to their own houses. Pemberley is going to be analyzed through the point of view of Elizabeth as she proceeds in her exploratory visit to the estate. In our analysis of Longbourn, its lack of description is going to be the focus of our study.

The intention of this analysis is to explain how Elizabeth's visit to Pemberley helped to change her opinion on Darcy and led her to accept his second marriage proposal. It also aims at clarifying the insubstantiality of the heroine's house and its significance to the plot.

3.2.1 Pemberley

Pemberley is described through Elizabeth's impressed and delighted eyes. The route she takes in her tour seems to retake the up and downs of her relationship with Darcy and the transformation of her image of him. When she enters the

property, she is in the lowest grounds of the park, surrounded by trees. Her vision of the landscape, thus, is limited by the surroundings. This scene may evoke the circumstances in which she first met Darcy at the Meryton ball: Elizabeth is in a lower position there too, be it of social order or in Darcy's regard, and her ignorance of his character, that is, her limited vision of the bigger picture, makes her determined to loathe the one who hurt her pride. As she ascends to the top of a hill, where the wood ceases, she can see Darcy's house in the distance.

Her description of this first glimpse of the house shows her admiration of the architectural setting. Darcy's house is made of stone. Stone evokes ideas like concreteness, permanence, stability, and protection. These qualities seem to be part of Darcy as well, and also of his long-established family. In front of the house, there is

> a stream of some natural importance [that] was swelled into greater, but without any artificial appearance. Its banks were neither formal nor falsely adorned. Elizabeth was delighted. She had never seen a place where natural beauty had been so little counteracted by an awkward taste. (AUSTEN, 1962, p.202)

That means that a stream that was already of good size was altered and made greater, forming a lake in front of the house (SHAPARD, 2004, p.447). Elizabeth's perception reveals that Darcy has a refined taste for architecture. The harmony with which man-made alterations merge with natural features was not only an aesthetic ideal of the architecture of time; design principles were also connected to social morality:

> In Pride and Prejudice Elizabeth Bennett's exclamation —"What are men to rocks and mountains?" — might recall Knight or Price; a large part of her education in matters of human importance is conducted at the very Reptonian landscape of Pemberley Woods, the seat of Mr. Darcy. […] Jane Austen shares Repton's confidence, as he wrote in his *Fragments*, that "the same principles that direct taste in the polite arts, direct the judgment in morality". What one of her heroines learns from a landscaped estate is that "*true* taste in *landscape gardening*…is not an accidental effect, operating on the outward senses, but an appeal to the understanding". (HUNT and WILLIS, 1993, p.372)

As Duckworth (2001, p.311) remarks, "there is perhaps something here, too, of a Shaftesburian recognition that excellent aesthetic taste denotes an excellence of moral character." Thus, Elizabeth is led to see in Darcy's architectural choices a

moral value that is an important part of his character: his despise for deceit and artificiality of character.

Next, Elizabeth crosses a bridge to get to the house. This act seems to have a symbolical meaning that marks a transition from the exterior to the interior of the house, a transition from quick impressions of appearance, represented by the distant view of the house, to a more detailed and studied perception of the inside that provides a deeper knowledge of Darcy's interior. The bridge works as a threshold or a door. Bachelard (1969) says that crossing a door is like entering the dimension of intimacy in which the self abides:

> For the door is an entire cosmos of the Half-open. In fact, it is one of its primal images, the very origin of a daydream that accumulates desires and temptations: the temptation to open up the ultimate depths of being, and the desire to conquer all reticent beings. The door schematizes two strong possibilities, which sharply classify two types of daydream. At times, it is closed, bolted, padlocked. At others, it is open, that is to say, wide open. (p.222)

The doors of Pemberley are opened to strangers. Darcy, a reserved and rather unsociable man, seems to have no problems with the intrusion of curious strangers in his house. This apparent contradiction seems to be related to another one: Darcy's behavior at home is much pleasanter and friendlier than Elizabeth has ever seen. His attitude towards Elizabeth's uncle and aunt, and herself as well, is thus described:

> When she saw him thus seeking the acquaintance and courting the good opinion of people with whom any intercourse a few months ago would have been a disgrace; when she saw him thus civil, not only to herself, but to the very relations whom he had openly disdained, and recollected their last lively scene in Hunsford Parsonage, the difference, the change was so great, and struck so forcibly on her mind, that she could hardly restrain her astonishment from being visible. Never, even in the company of his dear friends at Netherfield, or his dignified relations at Rosings, had she seen him so desirous to please, so free from self-consequence or unbending reserve, as now, when no importance could result from the success of his endeavours, and when even the acquaintance of those to whom his attentions were addressed would draw down the ridicule and censure of the ladies both of Netherfield as Rosings. (AUSTEN, 1962, p.215)

As McCann explains, Darcy's love for Elizabeth certainly worked to soften his proud character; however, the transformation of his attitude at Pemberley seems to be rather sudden if we consider that he had been in love with her for some time then.

The author alludes to Bingley's comment on his friend: "I declare I do not know a more awful object than Darcy, on particular occasions, and in particular places; at his own house especially" (AUSTEN, 1962, p.52). McCann's position on this subject agrees to Bachelard's idea that the house is the place where we can be ourselves:

> His setting seems to be a condition of Darcy's being. […] But there is no real contradiction — this merely reveals how sensitive Darcy is to both setting and character, and when either, as at Longbourn, is distasteful to him, he assumes a forbidding manner. But at Pemberley, where setting and Elizabeth's company are congenial to him, the forbidding manner falls away, thereby revealing it to be a polite form of indignation. At Pemberley, with those he cares for, he can be his true self. (McCANN, 1964, p. 72)

Inside Darcy's house, Elizabeth is taken to the dining-parlor. After "slightly surveying it", she goes to a window and looks out:

> The hill, crowned with wood, which they had descended, receiving increased abruptness from the distance, was a beautiful object. Every disposition of the ground was good; and she looked on the whole scene, the river, the trees scattered on its banks and the winding of the valley, as far as she could trace it, with delight. (AUSTEN, 1962, p.202-203)

From the interior of Darcy's house, she is able to see the whole of the places she had got across to get to the building. Elizabeth's thoughts here seem to expose the process she must go through in order to make a better understanding of Darcy. She must look at him from a distance as well in order to get a whole picture of his personality (DUCKWORTH, 2001). The abruptness of the hill she sees translates in the landscape the forbidding side of Darcy: "an abrupt hill may have its steepness emphasized, just as Darcy's personal abruptness may be exaggerated, by the distance from which it is viewed." (Ibid., p.312)

As the group of visitors proceeding to other rooms, Elizabeth resumes her activity of admiring the external picture through the windows: "as they passed into other rooms these objects were taking different positions; but from every window there were beauties to be seen." (AUSTEN, 1962, p.203) Elizabeth's interest reflects the lesson she takes in such exercise: the different windows all provided images of the same objects, what changed was the perspective of the observer. Thus,

> Her position, not the disposition of the ground, is what has altered. By traveling first through the park, then by looking back over it, Elizabeth

> is made aware of the permanence of the estate and yet of the necessarily partial and angled view of the individual. She sees that no overall view is possible to the single vision, but that an approximation to such view is possible provided the individual is both retrospective and circumspect. (DUCKWORTH, 2001, p.312)

Elizabeth learns that her judgment of Darcy was hasty and partial. She had readily believed in Wickham's account, a false perspective on Darcy, and shut her eyes to Bingley's and Colonel Fitzwilliam's good opinions of him, for instance.

The visitors see the portraits of Wickham and of Darcy in the office of late Mr. Darcy. The portraits were commissioned by the same time, which reinforces the affection of Darcy's father for both the boys. Darcy's preserving of Wickham's picture shows Elizabeth that he is not that implacably resentful as to losing someone's high regard as she accused him earlier (SHAPARD, 2004).

The housekeeper advises the group that a "finer, larger picture" of Darcy can be found in the gallery upstairs. The picture displays a smile on his face that Elizabeth "remembered to have sometimes seen, when he looked at her" (AUSTEN, 1962, p.206). The servant informs that it had been taken during his father's lifetime. For that, we can assume that Darcy's infrequent smiles are a sign of affection and of a wish for intimacy. Elizabeth finds the portrait the "striking resemblance" of Darcy and stands several minutes staring at it. After learning from the housekeeper about Darcy's virtues as a good landlord, master, and brother, Elizabeth's contemplation of his portrait now appeals to the attractiveness of his physical attributes. All the women present in the scene agree that he is a very handsome man. Until now, Elizabeth had never shown any sign of physical attraction to him. While Wickham, and even Colonel Fitzwilliam, exercised some attraction to her, Elizabeth can only admire Darcy's handsomeness now that she admires his character.

When the visitors leave the house, Elizabeth spots Darcy arriving at the stable. Shapard (2004, p.457) comments that "the casual nature of Darcy's entrance, one of the most important events in the novel, is remarkable. It occurs with so little fuss or fanfare that it is almost possible for the reader to miss it." His entrance is natural because Darcy is at home; this reinforces the idea that home is a place where one feels truly at ease, where the limits between space and person become unclear.

After such an unexpected meeting, Darcy heads to his house and Elizabeth proceeds in her tour through the park with the others. Elizabeth cannot help but wondering about Darcy's image of her: "Her thoughts were all fixed on that one spot of Pemberley House, whichever it might be, where Mr. Darcy then was. She longed to know what at the moment was passing in his mind" (AUSTEN, 1962, p.208). Here, Pemberley representation of Darcy is iconic; Elizabeth looks at the house as if it could offer her some hint of Darcy's mind.

Her anxiety for the situation does not allow her to see that the party "had now entered a beautiful walk by the side of the water, and every step was bringing forward a nobler fall of ground, or a finer reach of the woods to which they were approaching." (Ibid., p.208) The scenery anticipates a joyful event that is about to take place; however, Elizabeth is too absorbed in her thoughts to notice it, which causes her to fail once again in her assessment of Darcy: they meet again, and she is certain that his pride and social position will make him ignore her uncle and aunt. For her surprise, he treats them with much civility and interest. This humbler version of Darcy takes place in an appropriate environment. Elizabeth has just crossed another bridge, now a

> simple bridge, in character with the general air of the scene; it was a spot less adorned than any they had yet visited; and the valley, here contracted into a glen, allowed room only for the stream, and a narrow walk amidst the rough coppice-wood which bordered it. (AUSTEN, 1962, p.208)

This "less adorned" place suits Darcy less adorned attitude, that is, he strips off his pride and any feeling of arrogance that society allowed him to socially inferior ones.

It seems reasonable to affirm that the descriptions of Pemberley and the landscape surrounding it provide us more knowledge about Darcy's personality and feelings. As Elizabeth explores Pemberley grounds, she also explores Darcy's soul. This is certainly one of the most important events of the plot for it concludes the transformation of Elizabeth's feelings for Darcy. Such transformation was started by Darcy's letter, however, at that point, Elizabeth had no expectations of ever seeing him again. After her visit to the estate, she regrets having refused Darcy and wishes to be the mistress of Pemberley.

3.2.2 Longbourn

In the previous chapter, we pointed out that the Longbourn house, even though it is the heroine's home, lacks details and physicality. In our analysis of the relation between home and the self, we shall explore this issue more deeply.

The "invisibility" of Elizabeth's house seems to be a more complex issue than Le Faye (2003) proposes by explaining that such economy of description is due to the heroine's familiarity with the space. It appears to us that it is not a matter of economy of description, which Jane Austen employs so well, but indeed a lack of attachment. If one's house is deeply connected with one's sense of subjectivity, identity and of existence, then Elizabeth seems to be deprived of her place in the world.

Starting with her family, Elizabeth seems to be misplaced. She is the daughter of an irresponsible father and a foolish mother, and the sister of silly girls to whom she speaks little — except for Jane, whose self-consciousness and judgment is more like hers. Still there is some limitation of intimacy among the two sisters: Elizabeth hides important secrets from Jane that she later regrets, such as the true story about Wickham and her change of feelings for Darcy. As Nina Auerbach (2001) points, there is no unity among the Bennets. The author finds only one instance of the sisters gathering together and acting in unity:

> It is true that in the second chapter, "the girls" all flock around Mr. Bennet in rapture at his having paid a call on Bingley, but this is the last time they act in concert. After their first shared joy at *this possible escape from home* […] the unity between the sisters fractures, the two younger raucously pursuing officers in Meryton and the two elder more decorously pursuing gentility at Netherfield, while plain Mary disappears at home into being a mouthpiece of platitudes. (p.329, emphasis added)

The author indicates, however, that the sisters' shared interest in Bingley actually reflects a possibility of leaving home. The entail of their house is an important factor to be considered. The Bennets's house is a lost house: it does not belong to any of the girls; the entail "denies a family of women's legal existence" (Ibid., p.330). Thus, Longbourn is not a place for setting roots; it is a place to abandon. Indeed the girls seem to enjoy the possibility of leaving it. There seems to be no joy in being at home;

leaving it, however, does not give Lydia or Elizabeth any pain. When Elizabeth visits Charlotte, she thinks: “There was novelty in the scheme, and as, with such a mother and such uncompanionable sisters, home could not be faultless, a little change was not unwelcome for its own sake.” (AUSTEN, 1962, p. 131)

Another important aspect of Longbourn’s insubstantiality is its lack of a past (AUERBACH, 2001). Elizabeth seems to have no memories of her childhood or a family past. Darcy remarks that when he tells her: “*You* cannot have a right to such very strong local attachment. *You* cannot have always been at Longbourn.” (AUSTEN, 1962, p.152). Auerbach (2001) concludes:

> Elizabeth Bennet is the only one of Austen’s heroines who is deprived of a childhood and a setting for her childhood. Marianne Dashwood’s rhapsody [in *Sense and Sensibility*] to the “dear, dear Norland” she is forced out of would have some resonance for all the rest. Only Elizabeth shares none of Maggie Tulliver’s later panic at childhood dislodged [in George Eliot’s *The Mill on the Floss*]: “The end of our life will have nothing in it like the beginning.” With her home a vacuum and her memory a blank, such an end can only be Elizabeth’s dearest wish. (p.330-331)

If Longbourn is a place deprived of solidity, family bonds and a past, Pemberley is not. As to its physicality, Auerbach (2001) affirms that it has “architectural solidity and domestic substance”: “It has real grounds, woods, paths, streams, rooms, furniture; real food is eaten there” (p.332). While Elizabeth has no attachment to Longbourn, Darcy’s subjectivity and identity is reflected in the architecture of his estate. His family history and tradition is an important part of his being and is displayed all over Pemberley: the age of the building, the gallery full of pictures of his ancestors, the family library, etc.

Thus, it is not hard to understand Elizabeth’s wish to live at Pemberley. Pemberley, and therefore Darcy, is a promise of fulfillment of Elizabeth’s empty gaps. It may provide her an identity, it enables her to partake Darcy’s past and tradition, and it may supply her with a family feeling. The account of Darcy’s housekeeper about his being an excellent landlord, master, and brother seems to make a deep impression in Elizabeth: “As a brother, a landlord, a master, she considered how many people’s happiness were in his guardianship! How much of pleasure or pain was it in his power to bestow! How much of good or evil must be done by him!” (AUSTEN, 1962, p. 206). It seems that Darcy’s responsibility and control over

people's destines are what Elizabeth craves for herself. As a child of an absent father and an imprudent mother, she looks for Darcy's care and protection. And that seems to be a function that Darcy takes as his: he interferes with Bingley's affair when he judges it to be the best for his friend, he assumes the role of a parent by saving Lydia from social disgrace, and he even decorates a room for his sister at Pemberley as a surprise for her, instead of letting Georgiana herself be in charge of it.

As Mary Douglas (1991) talks of the "tyrannies of home", the tyranny of Longbourn is not that of a subversive authority and control, but of the total lack of it. The negligence of Elizabeth's parents with their children's education, manners, and financial situation is one of the most important elements of her desire of leaving home.

Therefore, Elizabeth's desire for Pemberley cannot be seen only in terms of financial prospects and stability. Pemberley is the image of Darcy, the man she loves, and a promise of happiness and development of a sense of existence and identity. It is also the image of social responsibility, for its importance in Derbyshire's economy, of which Elizabeth possibly wants to take part. As Auerback (2001, p.332) puts: "Surely, to be the mistress of Pemberley is 'something', in view of the imprisoning nothing of being mistress at Longbourn."

4 CONCLUSION

Appropriating ourselves of the image Bachelard creates when he speaks of "writing a house" (1969, p.14), we have tried in this paper to read the stories written on the walls of the houses in *Pride and Prejudice.* We perceived, in the two faces of those walls, different projections of complementing images of the residents: while the façade exposes the family to the outer world, we find, engraved in the inner walls of our rooms, the hidden, protected and intimate corners of the soul.

As to the projections to the outer world, that is, to society, we tried to demonstrate that the country houses have an emblematic correspondence to the families' social rank and to their past. The ancient house of Pemberley tells us of the tradition, the noble descent and the moral orientation of the Darcys. Netherfield, a rented house, shares the transitional aspect of its inhabitants' social position. Lady Catherine's modern house displays characteristics of its owner: it is pretentious, gaudy, and frivolous, and does not possess that aged structure that reflects the Darcys's cultivated values.

The house of our heroine, however, is a "house of air". Different from the others, it bears no name of its own, no past to remember. We cannot read its story for it seems to have none to tell. Its inhabitants, however, are not invisible; rather, they make too much noise to be ignored. But they form no unit, no family structure. Longbourn is a house that gives more satisfaction by leaving it than by living in it. The entail deprives its inhabitants of a home and a place in the world. It seems to us that this is what Elizabeth understands when she thinks that being the mistress of Pemberley might be something.

When she enters Pemberley, she sees through Darcy. After having learned of the wrongs in her judgment of his character, she is given the opportunity of knowing him more deeply. She sees a man she loves in the old stone walls of the house, in the harmony of the symmetric rooms, in the natural looks of the landscape designs. Darcy is the family and the home she lacks. By marrying him and moving to his house, Elizabeth is given a chance of setting the roots of her soul and defining her identity.

As readers of the twenty-first century, the role of Darcy in providing organization, protection, and identity to Elizabeth may fail our feministic expectations of an ideal heroine. However, we believe that the message of *Pride and Prejudice* is that love is a place for mutual growth and devotion. Both characters have much to learn and to benefit from each other. While Elizabeth must learn to be more serious and prudent as Darcy, he can benefit from her playfulness and liveliness. The lovers complement each other, which does not mean Elizabeth's obliteration. Rather, it makes her stronger as a part of a solid unit, as she finds in Darcy her partner of a happy alliance of mutual care, protection and development of the soul.

REFERENCES

AUERBACH, Nina. Waiting together: Pride and Prejudice. In: GRAY, Donald (Ed.). **Pride and Prejudice**: an authoritative text backgrounds and sources, criticism. 3.ed. New York : Norton, 2001. p. 326-338.

AUSTEN, Jane. **Pride and Prejudice**. New York: Collier Books, 1962.

BACHELARD, Gaston. **The poetics of space**. Boston: Beacon Press, 1969.

BODENHEIMER, Rosemarie. Looking at the Landscape in Jane Austen. **Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900**. Houston, v. 21, n. 4, p. 605-623, autumn 1981. The Nineteenth Century.

CANDIDO, Antonio et al. **A personagem de ficção**. São Paulo : Perspectiva, 1968.

COPELAND, Edward; McMASTER, Juliet (Eds.). **The Cambridge companion to Jane Austen**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

DIMAS, Antonio. **Espaço e romance**. 3rd.ed. São Paulo : Ática, 1994.

DOUGLAS, Mary. The idea of home: a kind of space. **Social Research**. New York, v. 58, n.1, p. 287-307. spring 1991.

DUCKWORTH, Alistair. Pride and Prejudice: the reconstitution of society. In: GRAY, Donald (Ed.). **Pride and Prejudice**: an authoritative text backgrounds and sources, criticism. 3.ed. New York : Norton, 2001. p. 306-315.

DREW, Philip. A significant incident in "Pride and Prejudice". **Nineteenth-Century Fiction**. Berkeley, v. 13, n. 4, p. 356-358. mar., 1959.

GRAY, Donald (Ed.). **Pride and Prejudice**: an authoritative text backgrounds and sources, criticism. 3.ed. New York : Norton, 2001.

HART, Francis R. The spaces of privacy: Jane Austen. **Nineteenth-Century Fiction.** Berkeley, v.30, n.3, p. 305-333, dec., 1975.

HUNT, John Dixon; WILLIS, Peter (Eds.). **The genius of the place**: the English landscape garden 1620-1820. Cambridge : The MIT Press, 1993. p.372-375.

HUNT, John Dixon. Sense and Sensibility in the landscape designs of Humphry Repton. In: **Gardens and the picturesque**. 2nd. ed. Massachusetts : MIT Press, 1997. p.139-168.

LE FAYE, Deirdre. **Jane Austen**: the world of her novels. London: Frances Lincoln, 2003.

LINS, Osman. **Lima Barreto e o espaço romanesco**. São Paulo : Ática, 1976.

LODGE, David. The sense of place. In: _____. **The art of fiction**. London : Penguin Books, 1992.

MALLETT, Shelley. Understanding home: a critical review of the literature. **The Sociological Review**. Oxford, v. 52, n. 1, p. 62-89, feb., 2004.

McCANN, Charles J. Setting and character in Pride and Prejudice. **Nineteenth-Century Fiction**. Berkeley, v. 19, n. 1, p. 65-75, jun., 1964.

MEZEI, Kathy; BRIGANTI, Chiara. Reading the house: a literary perspective. **Signs**, Chicago, v. 27, n. 3, p. 837-846, spring 2002.

PEVSNER, Nikolaus. The architectural setting of Jane Austen's novels. **Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes**, London, v. 31, p. 404-422, 1968.

RAY, Joan Klingel. Pride and Prejudice: the tale told by Lady Catherine's house. **The Explicator**, Abindon, v. 67, n. 1, p. 66-70, fall 2008.

RYAN, Marie-Laure. Space. In: HÜHN, Peter et al. (eds.). **The living handbook of narratology**. Hamburg: Hamburg University Press, 2009. Available at: <http:// http://hup.sub.uni-hamburg.de/lhn/index.php/Space>. Accessed on 08 nov. 2010.

RYKWERT, Joseph. House and home. **Social Research**. New York, v. 58, n.1, p. 51-62. spring 1991.

SHAPARD, David M. (Ed.). **The annotated Pride and Prejudice**. New York : Anchor, 2004.

STONE, Lawrence. The public and the private in the stately homes of England, 1500-1990. **Social Research**. New York, v. 58, n. 1, p. 227-251, spring 1991.

THATCHER, Virginia (Ed.). **The New Webster Encyclopedic Dictionary of the English Language**. New York : Grolier, 1970.

VAN GHENT, Dorothy. On Pride and Prejudice. In: GRAY, Donald (Ed.). **Pride and Prejudice**: an authoritative text backgrounds and sources, criticism. 3.ed. New York : Norton, 2001. p. 299-306.