

Discussion

Scott Juengel: [to Jesse Molesworth] That's great. Super helpful. [to Adela Ramos] Should I go ahead?

Adela Maria Ramos: Yes, go ahead. I'm still writing down the question.

Juengel: Yeah; so a few threads there. I think the question about the particularity of the novel and, in particular, the particularity of the Austen novel... for me, I think it does work with how you are thinking about hospitality as a form (if we think about Austen as someone who is consolidating what we think of as the novel of manners and the domestic novel). Both manners and domesticity are something we've talked for two and half days about—how those are kind of complicit in questions of hospitality. And, I think if you think about the longer arc of the novel as a form, there is a sort of sense that so many early novels are about mobility: they're coming out of the picaresque, the romance. And, there is a sort of sense (I think maybe with *Belinda* as well as Austen) that we're seeing the construction of the novel as a certain kind of home for the modern, maybe, in one sense. And so, I think... and if you think about Lukács talking about the novel as a genre that captures the “transcendental homelessness of the modern condition”—that's a really evocative phrase for me, for thinking about novels and forms of mobility. So, I think there is, there are certainly ways in which, you know, the novel seems a particularly useful form for thinking about this.

There's also a great moment that I use as an epigraph in one of the chapters. It comes from Schlegel's lectures from the history of literature, and he talks about how, how—he's quoting someone, he can't remember who it is, and he says, “Someone once said that when society achieves the perfect police force, the perfect police state, brings an end to contraband, and can provide subjects with a passport that has a portrait and a biography of them, then the romance or the novel would be impossible.” And I love that because it suggests that somehow the novel is working in the gaps in a kind of administrative state. That idea that it is somehow speaking to that kind of tendency and those kind of questions. I'll come back to that later because I think it's useful and I've been trying to track instances of passports appearing in novels of the period because, you know, I think that's one of those kind of administrative protocols that nobody notices. It never really appears—with the exception of *Sentimental Journey*: He forgets his passport, and there's a whole thing about going to *Hamlet* to try to prove his own identity, which is again a kind of meta-literary way of thinking about passports. If anybody knows of any passport scenes in novels, let me know.

The question of irony I think is really pertinent for thinking about the fragment, the *Sanditon* fragment. Partly because, if anyone has ever read it, it has this kind of very weird energy. It feels like early Austen, it feels like it could be out of the juvenilia or *Lady Susan*. It doesn't cohere in any kind of interesting way, and I think people have really had a very hard time figuring out how to read it. What is the particular valence it's going for? It is in some ways highly ironic about the relationship to resort culture, economic modernization, and yet it has these moments that can be both quite poignant or quite chilling, and for me it's exactly it's unfinished-ness that makes it such an interesting place to think about genre. Because ... Well, I think at one point I *say*, what would it mean for it not to become a Jane Austen novel, in the way that we project a certain “Jane Austen” onto this form?

So, I think you're right. I think there is something about the kind of discerning knowledge that irony produces that is welcoming to an Austen reader. But I also think that's what makes that fragment also kind of difficult because it: you have to renegotiate that relationship because it doesn't, you know, we so like *Persuasion* because it feels like the perfect capstone to, you know, her trajectory. And then to know that she was working on this sixty-page, muddled, queer fragment, it feels like it does a disservice somehow to the symmetry of her career.

And, I'll come back later because I think it goes very nicely with *Northanger Abbey*, which you kept quoting from, because it's obsessed with fictionality. If David talked about yesterday the "as if." It's about the "what if," and that's a different proposition, but it shares something, I think, with that kind of Kantian "as if."

Ramos: Well, I really love your question. I don't think I'm going to answer it as much as like with a kind of single answer, but more think about more questions. I think it's important to articulate it as the bildungsroman that we're thinking about because I think one question that I had about animals in the eighteenth century and the novel is where are the animals in the novels of the eighteenth century? It's not necessarily something that quickly comes to mind; we don't necessarily come up with immediate examples. And so, I also think about in thinking about that question is where do we start thinking about the novel as "the novel"? So, because if you wanted to go back to Defoe and Swift where you have very interesting relations of novels there with Robinson's Crusoe's cannibals and potential animals, the parrot Poll, obviously, and his cats.

Molesworth: He's not very kind to those cats, is he? [laughter]

Ramos: He is, and then he then isn't—which is an important matter [laughter]. We have Swift: the Houyhnhnms and the Yahoos, right. But, when we come to the bildungsroman and this idea of sameness... I don't know, I think my immediate reaction is: Is *Belinda* about sameness, and is the novel about sameness? Does it become about sameness when it becomes, only when it becomes, a bildungsroman? Because the novel as a genre itself is constantly trying to differentiate itself from other genres, at least throughout more than the first half of the eighteenth century, right? And, Edgeworth is still playing with the moral tale, right, so she still doesn't know if she wants to write a novel.

And the question about *Belinda*'s plot is, I think, one that has bothered a lot of the critics of *Belinda* because, yes, you're right, *Belinda* doesn't really grow or transform. Well, she doesn't really transform she grows to a certain extent, but actually I feel like her growth ends quite quickly.

Molesworth: Well, Lady Delacour is the one who transforms.

Ramos: It's Lady Delacour, absolutely. And so it's kind of, that's where our eyes go to and why does it go to?... well, what would be a middle-aged woman in eighteenth-century or early nineteenth-century terms and not to *Belinda* herself is a question in and of itself. But, I don't know if it's the ideal genre to think about sameness between humans and animals because I feel like at least in *Belinda* we have an example of the need to domesticate. And in domesticating we come to the dilemma of, yes, we're creating relationships of sameness, we're saying, "You, well, I find things in you, animal, or emotions in you, animal, that speak about me." Right, that whole question of, we look at animals to learn about humans, which I'm always very suspicious of. We are

animals as humans, right? So the implication that we look to them to learn about ourselves, I think is something that we really have to question and be skeptical about.

One of the other things about *Belinda* that relates to the question of sameness is the role that Belinda plays. Where can we create more ethical, perhaps, or more respectful relationships with animals if we don't really see a lot of respect given to animals throughout the novel? Actually, even Mr. Vincent's relationship with his dog Juba could be considered (for some philosophers in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries) incredibly disrespectful because it's so anthropomorphic and so sentimentalized and, therefore, and of course, it's an extension of himself again. So, I think maybe the other question that comes up for me again is: Is sameness something that we want to create between us and other animals? Is that the most, I guess, hospitable way of treating them or the most respectful way of bringing them into our homes? Or should we really look to *difference* as a means of creating a hospitable relationships between us and other animals?

So, I can't think of any immediate work that comes to mind right now, but Lady Delacour herself is domesticated, right? And she talks about herself as a "beast" towards the end of—well, not the end, it's a long novel, so I guess more or less—the end of the novel saying, "I have been domesticated, but don't think I have been tamed." I can't think of the exact words right now, so she herself understands domestication as a kind of compromise between—and we're thinking about hospitality—the host and the guest, right? I will be domesticated, but there's always a question of: have I been tamed? And, do we want a guest who hasn't been tamed? And this novel suggests, "no, we don't." And, Lady Delacour can have that ambivalence between domestication and being tame because she is privileged, she is the ultimate social arbiter of the novel, but somebody like Mr. Vincent and certainly a dog like Juba has to be domesticated and tamed or they're out. So, I think sameness is just a degree of flattening, of disrespect ultimately—if we're thinking about, talking about respect between humans and animals. So, I think I would start with that, I guess.

Molesworth: Any smalls? Right now I have Sarah and Mary for big ones. Tracey, you jump the queue.

Tracey Hutchings-Goetz: Oh. Sure! OK, it's medium sized.

Juengel: It *is* like a game show! [laughter]

Hutchings-Goetz: Yeah. So, my comment/question for Scott really brings together two of your suggestions, Jesse, and this concerns the possibility that Austen's irony might, itself, be a tenancy in different genres, right? And so, the idea that she is basically *renting* a form: whether it's the novel or the bildungsroman or whatever, and that her irony emphasizes this process. And, like the Harvilles, you know, she's making it better, right? She's sprucing up the form as she's living in it.

Juengel: Yeah, that's great, and I have a great analogy for that. There's a... so there's a moment in Kant's *Metaphysics of Morals* that I find kind of weird... [group chuckles]. My weird Kant [group laughter], which just means you don't read Kant well [group laughter]. But, there's a moment in the discourse on right, right after, interestingly right after he's laying out the rights of, domestic rights and he has kind of a taxonomy of contractual forms and then he says he wants to talk about instruments of transfer and then there are two sections: "What is Money?" followed by

“What is a Book?” And he says, money is an instrument for the transfer of things, and a book is an instrument for the transfer of ideas, of thought. And then when he talks about money it is very much an Adam Smith, *Wealth of Nations*, it’s a kind of indirect form of value. But when he gets to what is a book he gets side-tracked on the question of unauthorized publishing, OK? Which is something he is obsessed with throughout his career, he had written an essay about it right after “What is Enlightenment?” and he’s worried that the phenomenon of reprinting—and this gets back to tenancy, don’t worry—the phenomenon of reprinting is... It confuses two different rights: the right to a thing versus the right of a person. So, what he basically says is: if you have a book and you think you have a right to the thing, you think you can reprint it without worrying about copyright, intellectual property, anything like that, and those who think of reprinting like Adrian Johns talks about (“no piracy, no Enlightenment”), they would subscribe to that. But, if you think of a book as the voice of the author, then to reprint is to violate the right of this person.

So, he lays that out quite nicely, and then he turns to an analogy. And the analogy he comes up with is a landlord-tenant relationship. He has this whole thing about if a landlord sells his property that has someone else leasing it, does the lease break with the sale? And it’s sometimes kind of hard to figure out how this fits with his writing about books, but what’s interesting to me is that it suggests that for Kant the book is something that we kind of rent, that the fictional world is a kind of rental world. And, I find that utterly fascinating, and it’s something I’m still trying to think through, both in relation to *Persuasion* and also Edgeworth’s Irish tales which are so much about, you know, absentee landlords, the hospitality of tenants. And so, I think you’re absolutely right. There’s something going on there that is... that the novel might be able to speak to. I find that whenever Kant turns to an analogy, I feel like it opens up something, you know, that we hadn’t quite seen before. And to me like ... how you get from, you know, landlord and tenant to author and book suggests already a kind of associative logic that, you know, is conceptually, at least, capacious. So, I don’t know if that answers your question.

Hutchings-Goetz: Yeah, I mean, that helps. I think it also kind of leads to a really interesting way to continue thinking about that totally bizarre Sir Edward passage that you end on, right?¹

Juengel: Right.

Hutchings-Goetz: And then, you know, the fact that he goes: “oh, but I couldn’t afford to rent this.” [laughter]

Juengel: Right.

Hutchings-Goetz: I mean, it’s such a strange and such an upsetting moment.

Juengel: Yeah, it is, it is. And, again, I’m still trying to figure out exactly what to do with it. I mean and, of course, going to back to Jesse’s point about *Northanger Abbey*, *Northanger Abbey*, too, is a hostage novel in many ways. I mean, that’s what I think... the very fact that she was ed-

¹ “If she could not be won by affection, he must carry her off. He knew his business... If he *were* so constrained to act, he must naturally wish to strike out something new, to exceed those who came before him—and he felt a strong curiosity to ascertain whether the neighborhood of Timbuctoo might not afford some solitary house adapted for Clara’s reception—but the expense, alas! of measures in that masterly style was ill-suited to his purse.” Jane Austen, *Lady Susan, The Watsons, and Sanditon*, ed. Margaret Drabble (New York: Penguin, 2003), 192.

iting *Northanger Abbey* while she was writing *Persuasion* and beginning to work on *Sanditon* is, you know... To me you can read these together in a way through the kind of historical accident that might allow us to think about them together.

Molesworth: Sarah?

Sarah Knott: Oh, OK. So, I think these are two really broad questions for all of us to the ends of multidisciplinary more than to you two specifically, but I'm just going to throw them out there because they're really questions about the relationship between text and context or archives and actualities. So: I really welcomed Jesse's invitation to think about the novel per se, right, and certainly when we sent out our call for papers, we imagined a lot of proposals that were about the novel, right. The novel seemed like the place to think about hospitality, but as I was reading your paper and even more now as you speak, I'm also struck by oeuvre. You refer to her oeuvre, you think of her career, you think of her trajectory. And so, I'm wondering if you might want to speculate about a relationship between oeuvre, career trajectory, and history? In part because there's an implicit shift in Austen's interest from this country-house hospitality to this tenancy hospitality, right. So, I'm wondering if you can sort of open that out: is there a historical argument there or is it very much a literary argument? That's one kind of question or one way of asking the question.

And the other question, which again I think is for all of us, is to do with what we think is or is not shown imaginatively in the texts of the eighteenth century, in relation to hospitality? Because it seems to me that most of our conversations have had to do with failed hospitalities or extreme hospitalities, right? The hospitality of a very poor family to an aristocrat, the hospitality of Tahitians to French travelers—and what we have seen incredibly little of is what I suspect were cases of what hospitality looked like on the ground, it's that huge missing middle, right. So, I'm wondering what we might make of that and how we might pair with... I mean I love Lara [Kriegel]'s question that she put in, yesterday, “What's the archive of hospitality?” and I'd add to that, “What's the history of hospitality?” right. That seems a reasonable question to ask of an eighteenth-century workshop [group laughter], and a good moment to ask it, right, as we think about the novel as an exemplary place to think with and as we work towards our final session as well.

Juengel: Yeah, that's great.

Knott: So, that's more of a comment in some ways, than a set of questions. But if you have something to say about the, you know, the issue of text and context, especially because you're talking about a biography, right, you're talking about an author who is grappling with change over time. We had a Kant so incredibly located in his moment yesterday [during David Clark's presentation about Kant and the French Revolutionary wars].

Juengel: Right, right, right. Yeah, and I mean the title of my book is *Hospitality in the Age of Austen*, and I chose that sort of wooly *Age of Austen* (which sounds very, you know, 1955) because I think that there's something about the period that she lives in 1775-1817 that really prescribes to what James Chandler calls, “a hot chronology.” Like *so much* happens in that time. And against it is this instinct to read Austen as a kind of heritage industry: this is how we preserve in amber, you know. And, you know, people make this argument, you know, she had two brothers in the British navy, she had a cousin who married a royalist (a French royalist officer)

who was guillotined, you know... I mean, like clearly even her family life is surrounded by the stuff of historical eventfulness.

But, I think for me, like the question of tenancy is... You know, the landlord-tenant relationship might be the most common legal relationship in England in the eighteenth and nineteenth century, and if you think about the history of the novel so much of it is about inheritance. And, Austen is kind of working through, it seems with entailments and encumbrances, I mean clearly she's very well versed in the kind of vocabulary of this. But, I almost feel like there is something that happens (particularly with *Persuasion* it seems to me) where I feel like we have so many instances of, you know, the kind of floating domestic life that Mrs. Croft talks about. You know, "how do you live on a man of war"? And, I don't know... there's a kind of larger, necessarily a larger history that she's somehow intuiting, but it seems to me that there is something about the country-house ethos that she feels is eroding in ways, you can't quite have the kinds of, you know, dishevelment of *Mansfield Park* any longer. I mean what's interesting there is, of course, Said's reading is that *Mansfield Park* is all about slavery and how slavery is the infrastructure of this estate...but, you know, there's no Miss Lambe who arrives to really force you to confront that and when Fanny asks about slave trade she's met with "dead silence." But, it's so interesting to me that by the time we get to something like, you know, these last couple novels, there is a sense in which the ocean currents are bringing history, you know, to those shores. So...but I want to keep thinking about that because that's an interesting question.

Molesworth: This is a small one, Oz?

Oscar Kenshur: Yeah, this is actually a question that came to mind when you read those passages from *Northanger Abbey* regarding, you know, the rehabilitation of the status—or not the rehabilitation, the *elevation* of the status of the novel—and I'm just curious whether those were in the original manuscript or ... Because it sounds like something... you talk about the trajectory of her career, I could imagine those being inserted later; you know, once she had written her other novels.

Juengel: I don't know that.

Mary Favret: Well, she couldn't have written it in the 90s because *Belinda* hadn't been published yet.

Juengel: Oh, of course, of course, yes.

Molesworth: Well, I think she added it later, *Camilla* was already there.

Juengel: Yeah, yeah, that's interesting.

Molesworth: A small one? Go ahead.

Johannes Türk: A small one concerning the animals. Maybe you know Hoffmann's *Lebens-Ansichten des Katers Murr*, which is a romantic novel, an autobiography of a cat. [group laughter].

Ramos: Of course I know that.

Türk: Now, the funny thing is there are actually two parts, it was supposed to have three. What happened is that an editor mixes up his autobiography with that of a weird, misanthrope musician. And so, what you get in a way is this mixed-up by the editor, parts separated into fragments, chaotically jumping between the cat and the musician, it's very weird, but basically placing the musical genius, you know, in proximity to the cat, it's kind of biographic, and it constantly asks the question because it's so external and an editorial error: how does he relate?

Ramos: If I remember, the cat is also some kind of prodigy.

Türk: Yeah, he's a self-taught—

Ramos: Self-taught.

Türk: A self-taught cat. [group laughter].

Richard Nash: As so often... they all are.

Molesworth: Mary's next.

Favret: Yeah, I have some big questions. And I think part of this comes from the fact that I've been thinking about Jimmy's paper yesterday and the question of sexuality lurking in hospitality. But, also because I saw *Grand Budapest Hotel* last week, and I was struck by Michel Serres' appearance in the hotel in that [film], Scott. So, two questions for you and one question for Adela.

So, if we're all in universal dispossession, we're all tenants on or in this grand hotel, who's cleaning up? I mean, who's making it run, because I mean—

Nash: I thought you meant who was making the money off of it? [group laughter]

Favret: I mean who's responsible for the people who, you know, trash the rooms? In that model, it seems to me the serving class, the stewards... I want to know who's taking care of things, right, because if we're all checking into a hotel, you know [Favret chuckles], and maybe Michel Serres has a very different understanding of what, of how to behave in a hotel, but it seems to me precisely that a hotel is not governed by rules of hospitality.

Juengel: Right.

Favret: So, that's one question. But, also thinking about the *Grand Budapest Hotel*, I want to think about sex and marriage, and it seems to me that in the way you're reading Austen there's a shift from, let's say, the domestic novel (which ends in marriage) to a novel that is more interested in tenancy. And then, so what happens to marriage which is supposed to be long-lasting? What happens to the understanding of sexual relationships? Are they queered in a way in this model, in basically a *Sanditon* world? And, does that, do we have to rethink the orientation of the domestic novel if we start thinking about it through the lens of hospitality and tenancy, rather than as a conduit for marriage?

So, that's my questions for you, and then my question for Adela actually has to come... it's actually Richard's question, so ... sorry [group laughter]. If you watch the Jane Austen movies, the remakes, they're *full* of animals. I mean animals are everywhere in a way that they aren't in the novels. And, what's interesting is in *Belinda* you get *one* macaw, you get *one* dog. You know, they are these sort of individuals with no sense of the larger species, right? And yet, in the Austen movies, you've got herds of sheep and you've got, you know, all kinds of horses running around, dogs—they do amazing work in these movies, they're well worth thinking about. But, I mean... Richard would say this is about breeding. It's about understanding animals as a sign of, not just of domesticity, but of breeding and English breeding in particular. So, I invite you to think (again) about reproduction and about the question of breeding and when breeding... When animals evoke breeding and when they don't? You know, when they're not, sort of, when they're isolated from reproduction. So, there's my question.

Nash: I like that question. [group laughter].

Favret: Yeah, I took it from you.

Juengel: So, the Serres *Malfesance*, it's a slim little book, I think it's kind of a sequel to the stuff on the *Natural Contract*, and it's interesting you would put it in terms of who's cleaning up because the... what he lays out is the problem of kind of hyper-private property is that we mark our territory. This is a kind of trope that he keeps coming back to: this is what, this is how we create an environment of spoliation that we... You know, because we own it we actually treat it with a kind of, you know, disrespect. You know, we piss on our border lines. This is his trope he's working through. So, I think when he turns to the notion of the grand hotel, I think what he just wants to do is try to find some kind of, you know, vocabulary that will allow him to think about this question of dispossession, and I tried to talk a little bit about how he's using it to think through a kind of metaphysics of "passing through." That our relationship to things, you know, there may still be pollution—obviously, that's just a fact of living in earth on a certain level—but in a weird way he says that because we own things we are actually less, you know, obligated to take care of them. You know, whether you buy all of that, I think the fact that he's turning to something that we would read normally—if you read like Judith Butler on dispossession, it's a bad, bad thing—but at the same time there's this other sense of how do we escape a certain kind of history of our own, you know, soiling our soil, in some sense?

The question about marriage and tenancy is a really interesting one, and one answer I would offer is I think Admiral and Mrs. Croft are one of the most companionate marriages in all of Austen. They seem to get along so well, and they do not seem to have a home—with the exception of like, being on a ship and, like, making do with tiny spaces and, you know, those sorts of things. So, I feel like she's intuiting something about...you know, maybe, and I don't know if that's a shift historically in how she's thinking about marriage in some way.

Favret: Well, when she says, when Mrs. Croft says, "there's nothing so accommodating as a man of war."

Juengel: Mmhmm. [smattering of group laughter]

Favret: That's a—

Juengel: Yep. [group laughter]. Just let that hang there for a second.

Favret: That's just so loaded [group laughter], but in *so* many ways. You know, Austen loves that kind of stuff. But that, that's a model for their marriage, you know, so, you know, that's accommodation of a sort.

Juengel: But here's the piece I would add to that... But of course when they go to Kellynch Hall and rent it out they are some of the most hospitable people, you know, they have to remove all of the mirrors that, you know, the previous owner had left behind to reflect himself.

Favret: In the bedroom.

Juengel: Right, but what's interesting is... If you know *Persuasion*, Austen wrote an original ending and then revised it. One of the big changes is that she resets the climactic scenes in a hotel, so how the marriage plot comes together is actually restaged in an inn, the White Hart Inn, I believe it's called. And, I think, again, I can't help but feel like either she's already starting to think about this project about resorts, or she's interested in that fact ... because I think originally it's like an accidental meeting at somebody's home, and then she restages it in a literally commodified scene of hospitality. And there it seems that she really wants to pull the marriage plot and the engineering of the marriage plot together in a space that kind of conspires with the Dutch innkeeper and the Serres and, you know, and then, obviously, *Sanditon*. So, I feel like there's something going on there. Then again, I'm still trying to kind of tease out, but every time I find out, realize one of those things I think, "oh, this kind of fits."

Molesworth: Adela? Or Rebecca, did you want to get in now or shall we have Adela reply?

Rebecca Spang: It is a perfect bridge.

Molesworth: OK.

Spang: Because the passage that Scott just cited from Michel Serres about we piss on things because we own them, seems to me to have the most bizarre sort of anthropomorphic, caninamorphism at work there. Because of course, we as people, don't actually tend to piss on things that we own. At least, I don't [group laughter].

Juengel: Wait, no one else does?! [group laughter]

Spang: But we *predicate* of dogs that they are claiming possession when they pee, whereas most often... I would say that what dogs are doing is saying, "hmm, I was here." But it is, it's a passing state, it's tenancy. They're not saying, you know, "my bush, keep off," it's just, you know... and they're sniffing around to see who else was at that bush.

Juengel: Yeah.

Spang: So, it's not a possessive claim. But because we imagine dogs to be ... sort of post-Lockean [group laughter]...

Nash: Potentially a canine pissed office [group laughter]

Spang: So, to just gloss how Serres has misunderstood animals [group laughter]. Which I think ought to get us—

Juengel: It's not the first time, actually.

Molesworth: Lauren, you want to go now?

Lauren Miller: Just a very quick little thing just building off this, something I was just curious about: to what extent in Austen's novels does anyone own anything?

Juengel: Yeah.

Miller: And, thinking about the... particularly maybe this brings in the question of women and inheritance and what... Thinking about *Sense and Sensibility* and regardless of, say, the challenge of socio-economics, it doesn't matter, right, it's a gender thing: to say that if it's a boy he can lay claim to your home, your library, your possessions, anything, it can be disrupted. And, so that notion of permanent tenancy is something that... yeah, gender . . .

Juengel: Yeah, did you want to?

Erin Myers: Yeah, I wanted to jump in there because I had a note when you started speaking about "the right to resort" on the bottom of your page two, I was wondering if this was a plug for radical, feminine freedom? What woman has ever known the right to resort?

Juengel: Mmhmm. Just quickly: I think I am interested in that, and I don't think it's inconsequential that most of the writers I'm looking at are women. And, like one of the key figures for me is Charlotte Smith, who took in refugees, who writes these refugee novels: *The Banished Man*, *The Wanderings of Warwick*, even *Old Manor House* has scenes. Frances Burney writes a tract about being hospitable to the clergy who are fleeing from the French Revolution and how English women in particular have to be—have to sort of step up and open their homes and think about a larger geo-political world. And, again I don't know if that's just the consequence of the sort of consolidation of a certain kind of novel form, but I think there is this sense that—you know, in at least the works that I'm looking at—so many female writers seem to have a kind of political sensitivity to these issues that is really acute. Ann Radcliffe is another figure I look at, and I could say more about her later if we go in that direction.

Ramos: I think ...I lost the link I was going to make. Anyway, in answer to Mary's question: it immediately made me think of Juba the dog and how he does not have, he doesn't belong to, any recognizable breed. We don't actually even know where he comes from. We can assume he's been brought from Jamaica, but it's never clear if that's true or if this is a dog that Mr. Vincent took in once he was in England. So... and you're making me think about how it might be linked

to questions of reproduction. Because ultimately the kind of unspoken fear behind Lady Delacour's, I guess, nightmarish fantasy of "What if Belinda marries Mr. Vincent?" is that they would reproduce. That there would be a marriage between England and the West Indies, and, therefore, there would be children. And so...that Mr. Vincent's dog is the one that doesn't have the breed is very important.

He's also one of the only animals that is named, whereas, as you say, the other animals are single, but they are identifiable by species only: the macaw, the goldfish. So, I guess that's also leading me to think a little bit about—

Favret: He's named after Juba—

Ramos: the slave.

Favret: In *Cato*.²

Ramos: Yeah, which then leads to—

Favret: In the play *Cato* ... So, then there's all kinds of stuff.

Ramos: Which is... Yes, absolutely. So, yeah, I don't have an immediate answer for that, but I think it does have... it is linked to this idea of who can reproduce. But it also makes me think a little bit about individuality and you did use the term "individual." Because the names of... well the fact that the macaw and the goldfish don't have a name makes them seem that they're... well the goldfish we assume are in a bowl together. There might be more than one, maybe more.

Favret: Everybody knows goldfish in a bowl die. Everybody knows that [group laughter].

Ramos: But, it makes me think about Noah's ark, for some reason. And how we really don't have *pairs* in the novel and, therefore, these animals that have been brought from abroad... Is there a way for them to reproduce at home? Or do they have to reproduce abroad and then be brought home? So, there's a lot of really great questions you've made me think about.

Molesworth: Lara, you have a big one.

Lara Kriegel: OK. In some ways this follows in the spirit of some things Sarah was asking about, and I guess I'll start with Scott and move to Adela's paper as well. And, in some ways this may be actually sort of an editorial question, because it seems that you suggest a lot of these things that I'm wanting to see drawn out more, you know, through the category of tenancy (which I found really fruitful and interesting). And, one has to do with your... the matter of your kind of "hot chronology" and the things that happen in this period. I mean, things like the ending of the slave trade looking forward to the end of slavery and, you know, the questions [we just had] made me think about slavery and holding persons as perhaps a form of tenancy. Then there's also questions about independence in Haiti and things like that, so there's the geopolitical which you kind of gesture to with the empire stuff.

² Joseph Addison, *Cato, A Tragedy* (first performed, 1713).

But, what I think might be really interesting to think about is tenancy and temporality—and I'm not thinking necessarily about context; I'm thinking about the way in which we are tenants of different historical moments and the referent that we use. And, the thing that I love so much was your—I get that it is it from *Sanditon*—your excerpting the phrase, “for Waterloo’s more the thing now.” That was so great, occupying those moments where we have particular referents and thinking about, you know, lateness and tenancy in that way. So, I’d really be more interested to hear a little more about that.

And then for Adela, I wanted ... I was just hoping we could talk more about your master analytic of reciprocity, which I also found interesting, and I was just wondering whether... I mean at first I was thinking, “Well, is reciprocity a form of tenancy?” and I’m like, “Well, I don’t really think so, necessarily,” but maybe one way to think about reciprocity is to think about temporality, too, and the temporalities of these sort of reciprocal engagements. So, I thought I might throw that in as a way to kind of put reciprocity on the table as well.

Juengel: All right. So, yes, the slave trade and empire. One of the interesting things that doesn’t get obviously worked out in the *Sanditon* fragment is there’s a moment when Edward Denham (the Lovelace-in-Africa guy) he misquotes James Montgomery’s *The West Indies*, this long four-part poem that’s about the abolition of the slave trade. This is before Miss Lambe arrives, and one wonders, like first of all, what does it mean that—I mean, and he misquotes everything Burns, Scott, you know, but he wants to really sort of come off as a man of feeling and somebody who’s well read, but he just constantly makes an ass of himself—but I find it really interesting that that poem is in amongst his sort of personal archive. We don’t know what Austen planned for that, but we also have that sort of suggestion at the very end of the novel that Lady Denham is planning to maybe marry her nephew, Edward, to Miss Lambe and the novel sort of states this without a shudder. Drabble [the editor of this edition], on the other hand, finds this all very disquieting.

So I feel like the novel seems like it’s already kind of playing with some of the specter of maybe even the end of the slave trade. The sense of like, you know, there might be—and, you know, again this is just me freestyling—but, you know, the sort of sense that a new kind of demographic is going to come with the likes of a Miss Lambe coming from the West Indies. There’s a moment in *Persuasion* where Mrs. Croft is talking about their naval adventures and she says, “We haven’t been to the West Indies. I want to be clear, Barbados and the Bahamas are not in the West Indies.” So there, Austen is clearly making very fine-grained geographical distinctions. If you go back to her juvenilia, there’s a great moment in *Catharine, or the Bower* where we’re told a woman is sent to Bengal or Bermuda...no, “Bengal or Barbados or whatever” for a husband [group laughter]. So, I think it’s really interesting that like early on... if you read the juvenilia, they’re filled with geographical allusions to Lake Ontario, to Niagara Falls... but as we get further into her career, if there is going to be some sort of geographic allusion, she’s going to be very careful about it.... And that epigraph I begin with, “never leave England” or “better not to leave England”—it’s because she’s warning her niece that if you’re going to have your characters going to Ireland, you better know something about Ireland. So, clearly she has this kind of sensitivity to that, that I think is really, really interesting.

The Waterloo: to me that’s a really telling passage, because it suggests first of all that the novel recognizes the difference between 1805 and 1815. And *that* is inseparable in some ways from a commercialization of history, or a commodification of history, perhaps. And so, to me, that helps me make the case that this is a novel that is attuned to the tempos not just of war, but

of abolition, to world history in certain ways...and I can't shake that sense from that great moment.

Molesworth: About hot time?

Robert Schneider: Well, if we're talking about hot time and events...I mean, it just so happens that around—in 1814, I think—it was when the Treaty of Ghent (which ended the War of 1812)... The British and the Americans were in very intense negotiations about slaves that had either been captured or freed or otherwise ended up in the hands of the British. And the British had to indemnify the Americans; and there was this whole prolonged... they both had to sort of have, present documentation about the worth of slaves broken down by category.

Juengel: Oh, wow.

Schneider: And then they were arbitrated, and that was happening exactly in 1814.

Juengel: All right, we're going to talk after this session. I want a bibliography. [group laughter].

Ramos: I really like your question, Lara, because I think I've been thinking mostly about reciprocity in spatial terms—the movement, right—but, the first thing that came to mind is the ending of *Belinda*, which is incredibly, if we're thinking of temporality, definite. I don't address it at all in the paper, but ...the narrative turns to a moment of basic theatricality, right, and Delacour announces that this is the end of the novel and she asks everybody to perform a tableau vivant and, and, and really makes present the fact that it's a fiction and it ends, right. So, there's a very definite ending to the novel itself and to the time of the novel, and so that leads me to think about Mr. Vincent, about the reciprocity between his hosts and Mr. Vincent... and also quite definitely when he's basically exiled or he leaves. And, it suggests... I guess one of the things that comes to mind is that there has to be a link there between the spatial and the temporal in relationships of reciprocity. If, in order for the novel to make clear that there is no more to reciprocate between the guest and the host, the guest has to leave, right? And, that is the ultimate kind of... this is where a relationship between guest and host ends: you leave. So, there is an inherent temporality in the facts of reciprocity if it ends, well, or it's in how does one know that our time together has ended? Well, you leave or the sense of exit. So, yeah, I think I'd really like to explore the relationship between the ending of the novel and the ending of his ...or his departure ultimately and reciprocity. So, thanks.

Molesworth: I've got Jimmy, then David, then Fritz.

Jimmy Casas Klausen: I've got a question for Adela about... I think this is in relation to... I can't remember which paper it was, but someone yesterday, it was probably during Heather's paper, someone asked what would be an inhospitable landscape? And so that made me think of wildness. I think yesterday I brought up the wild boys, you know, the feral children of Lithuania and Hestia, so that made me think of the category of the "wild" versus the "exotic" and the relationship between them. You said in the novel there's a distinction between "domesticating" and "taming," right? So, I'm wondering if the category of the wild is coded at certain times as wildness within Europe, say, so the wild boys from the forests of, you know, wherever... and that the

exotic is somehow, I mean, is clearly trying to code wildness in a different way, but it's interesting that there's a relationship between an exotic wildness that is then tamed and brought into the home, right? So, I'm thinking, I guess, whether the sameness and the difference are actually sort of following from the, whichever comes first: so, if domesticating and taming are two different moments, then is an exotic pet versus a domestic pet, one that has been tamed first and then domesticated later or domesticated first and then tamed later? I don't... there's just a bunch of different terms that I guess I'm trying to get you to think about, and "wildness" is interesting for me because French philosophers in the eighteenth century are constantly talking about it: Condillac, Rousseau. So, I don't know to what extent that's showing up in British literature, but it strikes me that perhaps wildness is not as important in Britain at that period as it is, you know, in philosophers who are thinking about the remaining forests of Eastern Europe.

Ramos: I think it is very much present in the British imaginary because of Rousseau and, you know, all the theories of wild boys and wild children and what happens.. I think that they're definitely part of... but I guess I would go to *Robinson Crusoe* to think about wilderness, wildness, and the exotic.

Molesworth: Richard? Richard, you're the authority...

Nash: I've written a wonderful book you should read on this. [group laughter]

Ramos: And all the answers will be in there. But, I think in relation to *Belinda* what I would say is that wildness and... Well, wildness is something that I think ultimately, especially after Romanticism, is going to become somewhat desirable, right? Exoticism needs... I think wildness is something we can have and cultivate, whereas the exotic always is going to be outside or outside of us (if we are speaking from the Eurocentrist, obviously, ethnocentrist kind of perspective). And... I think your question really makes me think about how, what, yeah: how domesticating is a process of rendering similar, whereas taming ultimately suggests that there's always the difference, the difference remains, and so I guess that's why it's necessary to tame the exotic pet before you bring it home, but it's also very dangerous because it's always going to remain different. But that then leads me to think about how we do ultimately adopt exotic pets and integrate them into our hierarchies and our social fabric.

Klausen: Yeah.

Ramos: So, there might be a sense of a domestication, or at least an illusion of domestication that we agree upon in order to accept them and make them our guests and ultimately our... You know, depending on what kind of relationship we're talking about, our relatives or love them... I guess, develop these more elaborate emotions towards them. And then, you also made me think about the goldfish which are exotic, but don't need to be tamed. Because they're a very different, they have very different natures. So, thank you.

Klausen: Can I just say one more thing? Are Juba's fleas ever talked about? Because host/parasite is another relationship.

Ramos: Yeah, you we're telling me about this last night. No.

Klausen: And that's one of the ways a landscape can be forbidding: if there are too many mosquitos, right; if we're constantly getting sick from the water, right. So, I sort of wonder if part of the domestication contract with pets is that we have to keep the parasites at bay.

Ramos: Yes, and then you did make me think a little bit about the landscape that's not, that's never described or... but is always present through Mr. Vincent, which is the landscape of Jamaica, where we would have potential parasites—or he himself could be this kind of traveling parasite. But, the fact that he is a landowner complicates the idea of him being a parasite, because in fact he lends money to one of the characters of the novel. So, I don't know.

Juengel: Michel Serres has written a book called *Parasite*.

Klausen: Yeah, yeah; it came up because of your paper.

Juengel: It's all fitting together, hopefully. [group laughter].

Molesworth: We have small ones from Lauren and then Rebecca.

Miller: Just real quick on eighteenth-century exoticism: something very helpful I've found recently thinking through this question of wilderness and domestication is the epic of *Gilgamesh*. The figure of Enkidu [a wild man, formed by the goddess of creation from clay and raised by wolves; after a wrestling match with Gilgamesh, he becomes the hero's closest companion]—it really complicates exotic-wilderness for me.

Ramos: Thank you, yeah.

Miller: So, yeah.

Spang: I was just thinking that the goldfish don't have to be tamed because they can be so easily confined, and in that way they are like the turtledove in the Rousseau text, you know. There's no question of trying to tame or domesticate the turtledove, because you just grab her and wrap her up in your fabric and hold on to her. So, confinement as another very inhospitable way of locating something in your own domestic sphere without paying any attention to its wants, needs, or desires at all.

Molesworth: I have big questions from David, Fritz, and hopefully Richard, so . . .

David Clark: Thank you; big question, but in little bits and pieces, I'm afraid. I just think: "Better not leave England"... I suddenly recognize that this is the precursor to that cat on the boat in *Apocalypse Now*. He says, "Don't, don't ever get off the boat"; he says to him, "whatever you do, don't get off the boat." [group laughter]. I was just thinking about this question of the wild child and the wild animal that's sort of brought into the human space... and my understanding is that, you know, one of the reasons for the eighteenth-century fascination with this question is that it marks a kind of anxious place about the impossibility of thinking the transition from nature to culture. That it sort of covers over that black box, that sort of is infinitely attractive and

yet completely unexplainable. No matter how far back you go it's still...you know, it's like turtles all the way down, it's culture all the way down, no matter how... You can't sort of get "behind" it and that you, instead of trying to solve that you just plunk in there what I think what Žižek calls "the vanishing mediator," in the form of the wild child or the... Possibly, I'm just waging, the animal that is wild and somehow tamed at the same time, like a cat. It's supposed to be, you know, have those two qualities.

I was thinking, Adela, too, about the name of the dog. I mean I just happen to be writing at this very moment about a little essay by Levinas called "The Name of a Dog." It is the only case in his entire oeuvre in which he speaks autobiographically about his wartime experience in a slave labor camp in which a dog figures, and he gives the dog two names: "Bobby" and "the last Kantian in Nazi Germany." [group laughter]. So, you can see why I'm attracted to that story. By the way, you know, Eichmann in Jerusalem characterized himself as the last Kantian in Nazi Germany, too...so there's a whole lot of stuff going on there. But I was thinking about namelessness and Arendt says (I just can't remember where) that unnamed animals are a figure for the rightlessness of dispossessed peoples. And, that if you're an animal with a name, you're more likely to have rights given to you and protections afforded to you. It's the unnamed that for her is kind of this metaphor for, the unnamed animal is for her a metaphor for the rightlessness of the dispossessed. So, I just thought that might be useful here, given both papers.

Scott, I was thinking about calmness. And I would love to hear more about what calm, much less what utmost calm is... Isn't it Coleridge in "Frost at Midnight," doesn't he in manuscript correct "dead calm" to "deep calm"?

Juengel: "Deep calm," yeah.

Clark: Or maybe it's the other way around?

Juengel: Jacques' written about this.

Clark: "Dead calm" to "deep calm," and I think that's a very interesting revision that says something: in calmness, there's a deathliness and immobility of it, about it. And then something else, that it also appeals to profundity.

Juengel: Right.

Ramos: I'm thinking just about the "as quiet as a blah, blah, blah upon a painted ocean," so it does have this... and this is in Coleridge's "Rime of the Ancient Mariner" when he does have—³

David Simpson: "Shape upon a . . ."

Juengel: Right, right. Yeah.

Ramos: Thank you.

³ "As idle as a painted ship/Upon a painted ocean. . . . At first it seemed a little speck/And then it seemed a mist;/It moved and moved, and took at last/A certain shape, I wist." Coleridge, *Rime of the Ancient Mariner* (Sections II-III).

Favret: I think that's "a stillness..."

Ramos: Oh, stillness.

Juengel: Stillness.

Clark: I just wanted to return to Sarah... and I mean Scott your paper invites me, encourages me, to go back because... I'll be honest with you: I put this thing down because I just felt like it's ... the argument that was being made there sounded like Heidegger on homelessness, and Heidegger talking about homelessness amid the ruins of Europe and giving it, trying to get us to think about homelessness otherwise than as privation. And I guess I find it very hard to go there.

Juengel: Yeah.

Clark: And so, with Sarah I feel like, you know, do we go there given what dispossession, you know, means today? That being said, Kant does say in an essay from the late 1780s, he says that the idea that human beings are creatures that are passing through is, he says—I can't remember the German—but it's something like "it's a monstrous notion." He's really, really definitive about that, like it's repulsive to him, the idea that we're moving through. And, I think it's important—

Juengel: This is the guy who never left Königsberg, ever. [group laughter]

Clark: Never left Königsberg. Ever. Ever. And, I think it's in part... it's because for him the idea of being somewhere else was a figure for being, being someone else.

Juengel: Right.

Clark: And he was repulsed by that notion that somehow we... As you said, we have no reason to envy the angels... We should, you know, hang on to what we have and we have more than we think, and that's something to cherish and affirm and shelter in the classroom and outside of the classroom. And, so in a way the hotel with which *Perpetual Peace* begins is a little bit at odds with that remark (only from five or six years earlier) in which the idea of tenancy is for him a dangerous sort of figure with which to identify the humanness of human beings.

Juengel: Right.

Clark: But what this made me wonder about was: so we have "tenancy" here, I wonder if there are other sorts of figures that are useful, for thinking about trying to connect the eighteenth century to our own time? What about "occupation"? There's a word with all sorts of valences. So, we have a certain kind of occupation that we know is absolutely horrific, but there is another occupy that isn't quite tenancy, and not, not homelessness either...not dispossession. I'm just thinking about throwing up languages that are on the periphery of tenancy, but don't quite go down the path that I'm reluctant to go down with Serres.

Juengel: Right, right.

Knott: There's "habitation"—

Clark: Habitation.

Knott: Right. I mean, thinking about that line between inhabitants and citizens, right, that's produced by the census-taking of exactly this historical moment.

Clark: Yeah.

Juengel: Habitation.

Knott: Habitation, yeah; and "inhabitant."

Clark: Is it in Shakespeare, "habitation and a name"?⁴

Favret: It's Wordsworth, is it Wordsworth?

Clark: "Habitation and a name," yeah.

Molesworth: Rob, a tiny one?

Schneider: Well, I mean, there's also... To get back to the eighteenth century and before: there's also the very vexed issue of the commons and property rights and I think this is, of course, more present in England than it is on the continent, because you have very lively manorial rights regimes still persisting and the question of tenancy and how long tenants can hold their land in parliamentary enclosures. And then the long tradition, which is not so robust in the eighteenth century, of occupying the commons or breaking down the hedges and the like. So, these issues, I think, are really part of eighteenth-century economic and rural life, parliamentary life, legal life. I guess in conjunction with that it would be—I don't know, I can't make a comparative statement about eighteenth-century British novels and continental ones—but, I mean, it seems to me, one of the things that distinguishes the British novel, at least with Austen, is this preoccupation with [tenancy] precisely because it is part of the larger historical context.

Juengel: Right.

Schneider: And while tenancy seems to, persists across time...the question of time and tenancy in an inflationary era was much more urgent.

Juengel: Yeah, there's a lot going on [in the discussion] right now. The matter of vocabulary: I think for me, partly because Austen is so at the center of how I'm thinking about this, I want to retain the kind of legal valence of tenancy, where habitation doesn't feel like it has quite the same, you know.... Edgeworth being another figure I'm looking at. I mean, I think occupation is

⁴ [Editor's Note]. "And as imagination bodies forth/The forms of things unknown, the poet's pen/Turns them to shapes and gives to airy nothing/A local habitation and a name." Shakespeare, *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (Act V, scene i).

interesting; I know Jacques Khalip has already written some work on occupation and Romanticism⁵ ... I don't know, it would be interesting to find out when the particular kind of governmentality of how we think about occupation, when that begins. When do we, when does that, in the vocabulary of political theory, when do we start talking about occupations in the way that we do? You know, in occupying Haiti or occupying Berlin or Japan after the war? My partner works on theories of occupation, so maybe I strayed away from it there, too, because it just seems like we're sharing too much in the household. [group laughter].

But, yeah, it is an interesting question. I think with the Serres... and I agree, it's a provocative, polemical text, as you said, a kind of Heidegger warmed over. But I think one of the things that was interesting to me, and I actually think it plays into the return to the question of the commons that we see now. I mean, Fred Moten writing about the "undercommons" in relation to the university and academic labor.⁶ I think that is, you know, it's of a piece with a certain trying to think outside the strictures of private property relations. And so, and for me it was just, you know... trying to get this in on time, it worked in terms of finding someone who wanted to rethink the ways in which we think about possession in certain ways, and who was, just happened to be using this hotel trope, who calls it a "peace treaty" ... I mean, it just felt like it was conspiring so much with what I'm trying to do. I really want to read that Kant essay because that will help me think through an eighteenth-century philosophical tradition for thinking about that, and that's just a place where I haven't read enough at this point to know for sure.

Clark: There is a little book called *Hotel Theory*.

Juengel: Yeah, and I've read that, Wayne Koestenbaum.

Clark: Koestenbaum, yeah, yeah.

Juengel: Right.

Clark: And, it's not that good. [group laughter]. It's just the idea that's good.

Juengel: Good; *you* said it. I know, it's not that good. I bought it thinking it would be great, and it's really fascinating, but it's not doing what I want it to do.

Molesworth: A small one or a big one, Ana?

Ana Rueda: In between. [group laughter].

Molesworth: OK, I'll have Ana and then Mary for a small one.

Rueda: I'm not sure how to articulate this yet, but I've been thinking about the containment of animals and the containment of humans and the containment of the exotic pet, monstrosity subdued—that's in *Beauty and the Beast*—and so on. And, I was interested in the reprehensible pet practices that you describe in your paper and, you know, that excessive love for animals. I don't

⁵ Jacques Khalip, "The Ruin of Things" in *Romantic Frictions* (Romantic Circles Praxis Series, 2011), [on-line](#).

⁶ Fred Moten and Stefano Harney, "The University and the Undercommons," *Social Text* 79 (summer 2004), 101-115.

know much about when animal societies or when societies for the protection for animals began in England, I don't know, but maybe that's an important piece. And, I was wondering if there is here some kind of critique of social customs, in England specifically?

As far as the containment of people... We have people who don't leave England, right, as your epigram illustrates. So we end up with hospitality as a form of travel without leaving the home, which I find interesting. So, you never leave the *oikos*, the home, and that's tied with economy because *oikos* and economy are related etymologically, so that calls for adapting to the foreigner or to the stranger, making all kinds of accommodations, not only to the other, but to the self. So, I was wondering if this is something that each of you would like to address in different ways?

Ramos: Two things come to mind, one would be containment. I think the most obviously contained entity in the novel is the goldfish, but the macaw would have its wings probably clipped, so that it wouldn't fly away. And then you also have the image of the bird fancier where you may have some birds probably out of cages, but they would live in a cage... so you have these cages kind of traveling around. And, I think it is definitely linked to a critique of, in, at least in, one of the things that I think is being critiqued is the containment of emotion when we're talking about reprehensible love for animals. How do you express your love? And, that's also a fear that Mr. Vincent's figure brings up, which is that he is too passionate, right? His passion overflows, and so you have, I think, an underlying critique of behavior: how are you supposed to behave and what are you, how are you supposed to conduct yourself in society? And so, being a good pet owner means knowing how to keep certain emotions at bay, and also kind of, maybe even a practice of public and private affection, that might be interesting there. And it just, I don't know, for some, like, free-association reason, it made me think about the daughters that are being contained, as well, throughout eighteenth-century novels, and traveling at home being a very feminine practice as these women in these novels are ultimately, usually moving from wherever they come from—like *Belinda*, obviously, also *Evelina*—to where they will ultimately become mistresses, but are guests for a long time as you, you point out in your, so kind of, yeah . . .

Molesworth: Mary, did you want to, or has the thread been lost?

Favret: No, I... well I wanted to go back to the thought of... and one of the reasons why I don't like the hotel as an image, unless we want to think of ourselves as the staff. I mean, so, again, you know, it's an old biblical model of the steward, you know, that assumes that nobody's the landlord, you know, that our job is to take good care, but there's no ownership involved. Now, of course that's... I'm going to say that's a biblical notion, assuming a certain theology, but it seems to me that the hotel model and the passing through model (and maybe this is what drives Kant crazy) there's no sense of responsibility. I mean, absolutely none, and so—

Juengel: I'm not entirely sure—

Favret: It seems to me... I, too, am trying to find some model between, you know, just kind of individual, you can come into my house, and some kind of state policy, and—

Juengel: And this is why "resort" is interesting to me.

Favret: Yeah, resort's interesting.

Juengel: As a term that in English at least toggles between the logic of recreation and the logic of asylum to a certain extent and it's... I want to keep thinking about it because I think there is...I mean just the way in which Sanditon is sort of described, whatever, I mean, obviously it's going to be a kind of medicinal spa, but it's... It's so thought through the question of the wounded, the melancholic, the, you know, the people who need support in some way, and I can't help but feel that is, of course, part of resort culture.

But, and I'm not entirely sure that I...You know, it's hard to know what Austen's commitments are, and I'm not really (despite maybe everything in the paper, you know), I want to be careful about thinking of this as simply, well, what does Austen intend in this? As much as I'm interested in the kind of "bleeding" between what Austen is writing and then what we've imposed on her symptomatically: that's why the Drabble is so interesting to me because it speaks to a certain kind of, you know, fear and affective quandary, that some of this is getting threatened as the currents as history and the currents of oceans are bringing, and, of course, the shores she's writing about are where there was a sense of alarm for years about Napoleon invading there. So, I think there's, there's, but I think your caution is a really good one and I want to kind of take it up, so . . .

Molesworth: David, a small one?

Clark: Yeah, just two little tiny things. One: Ana, your question, I should know more about this, but I do know from the work of David Perkins and others on romantic animals that the societies for the prevention of cruelty to animals and the abolitionist societies track simultaneously—

Ramos: Yeah.

Juengel: Yeah.

Clark: —and, in fact, they share members. And, I was also thinking that Thomas Taylor publishes the *Vindication of the Rights of Brutes* in a satirical response to and an attack on Wollstonecraft.

Favret: Wollstonecraft, yeah.

Clark: And, just a quick point about Austen and dispossession... maybe you do actually allude to this in passing, Scott, in your paper? It's the loss of the mother and loss of the child that sets, as it were, the novel's events in motion, isn't it? So there's a way in which the novel happens, as it were, in the wake of two dispossessions.

Juengel: Wait, this is...?

Clark: *Persuasion*. Sorry, I'm talking about *Persuasion*.

Juengel: Oh, yeah, yeah, right.

Clark: So, there's these two losses that precede the thing that—

Juengel: And I feel like that's all... I mean that's... you know, *Sense and Sensibility*, there's, there's that sense in which there's that affective dispossession that, yeah, I need to think through that a little bit more because—

Clark: Sorry, not property dispossession—

Juengel: Right.

Clark: —but other kinds of dispossession.

Juengel: Right, emotional dispossession. Yeah, I will think through that further.

Molesworth: OK, so I have... a tiny one?

Türk: Tiny.

Molesworth: I will hold you to that. [group laughter].

Türk: So, I wonder, you know, with the spa, the medical idea, if there's not more there than appears to the eye. Simply because in a certain way spas are, on the one hand, invented as hospitable, in hospitable climates that are conducive to health. So, there's a certain geographic, medical idea there that places heal: just as there is a soil for a specific plant, there's also a territory for a disease, or also against a disease. At the same time though, it's a place for the anti-social, because many of the diseases are actually thought of as being dangerous to the social. So, in a certain way the resort is a hospitable place, and you mentioned this, you know, so it's a hospitable place for the antisocial, for the pathological, for the abnorm. So, it's a hospitality to something outside of the social, in an interesting way. And I was wondering then if there's a link on a wider scale, you know, between what you call the imaginative and the...you know, you make a link between the imaginary or imaginative and the . . . and some other forms of abnormality. And, I think there the novel is actually hospitable to the socially, the imaginatively, and the pathologically abnorm in an interesting way.

Juengel: Yeah, and, yeah, *Sanditon*, it's obsessed with different forms of fictionality from hypochondria, quixotism, to fictionality itself—

Favret: Speculation.

Juengel: What's that? Speculation, land speculation, I mean, and it's like *Northanger Abbey*—it seems to be this kind of return to an almost, and this is kind of the larger project is about the relationship between hospitality, philosophical hospitality, and novel worlds. Sort of taking Kant as a place to start to think about and what is involved in, you know, what I call, you know, I'm trying to think about as a world effect. How do novels suggest that they are a part of a larger world? Whether it's just an illusive, you know, version of that or something else? An awareness that there are people dispossessed who are moving about the earth. And so, like, Frances Burney's

The Wanderer is a really important text for me; it's a thousand-page novel about a woman who flees the French Revolution, but she won't reveal her name, her history, anything. And people keep taking her into their homes because she's, you know, helpless, and then they have to kick her out because they don't know anything about her. You know, you can't get, be a guest if you are absolutely unknown in this culture, but then they feel bad about kicking her out because that makes them look bad as hosts. And at the end we find out—and this goes back to something Jimmy talked about—we find out that the reason she's disguising her identity is because her father figure is being held hostage: which, of course, is the guest who can't leave. And so, I mean, ... a lot of these are hostage narratives in one form or another. So I feel like there's, there's definitely a way in which that, that question about fictionality, novel worlds, and hospitality are some way woven together here that I'm working out.

Molesworth: I still have Fritz and Richard, so I'm wondering if you could *both* speak, and then if there's—

Kenshur: Simultaneously. [group laughter].

Molesworth: And then we'll have, hopefully, replies.

Fritz Breithaupt: Thank you. I'm actually following the discussion here about tenants, but I want to tie to the question of individuality, and then bring it back to Jesse's opening question about the novel here... and let me tie in an animal just for the sake of, by means of analogy. [group laughter]. In this week's *New York Times* science section there was a beautiful article about social spiders. (Spiders are wonderful when talking of hospitality). In the article, they discussed how these social spiders, who live in groups, how they become, gain personalities and it said if they are in the same group they all radicalize their individuality: I mean some become very timid, some very courageous. However, if you mix them up in some way, they don't develop individualities, they all remain in the average kind of sphere. And that's basically what I kind of want to... Now I'm using this merely... you don't have to discuss spiders [group laughter]—

Nash: So diversity promotes mediocrity? [group laughter].

Breithaupt: So, if it is as it proves, this would be suggesting—and I will cite some other evidence here in a second—that in this new culture of tenants and hotels we constantly mix, which means that there's a question of individuality. Does individuality... is it the same thing as if you had the old Austen novels of people with possession and full estate around them, what happens there? And, indeed, two scholars around 1900 who look back at the novels of the nineteenth century made exactly this claim (this is Georg Simmel, father of cultural studies, and [Siegfried] Kracauer). They both looked at the novels and what happened in the nineteenth century and said: it's a loss of individuality, people are just tenants, they are nomads, they lose distinctiveness, they lose character and independence, and so on and so on. Even in this new culture of the hotel and tenants, even if someone new arrives, it's only a short-lived mystery. So, this is my question. First of all, is that something that you would confirm, within Austen, does it seem to be that way?

And now the second question. This is the question then that brings us back to Jesse's question of the novel: if this is so, then the novel gains a completely new function, one it probably did not

have in the eighteenth century, which is to serve as the place and the site where this lost individuality can maybe be re-found. So, the first time the novel would actually be a host, that was exactly Jesse's suggestion here—or it was one of the possibilities that was suggested—but then the novel's new function would be to kind of, to recapture something that gets lost along the way. Is that a new way of reclaiming things? But here I stop.

Molesworth: Can we have Richard?

Nash: I now have so many questions, so many comments for so many people that I cannot possibly [group laughter] get to any of them, but I'm going to... I want to invoke Evan's nieces at the beginning, and try to direct this as a suggestion to Adela (picking up on a side comment that you made); while, at the same time, juggling Jesse's topic given to Scott about irony. And, when you [Ramos] were responding to Mary's question, which was my question that she was channeling—

Ramos: Yeah.

Nash: You were noting that the animals in *Belinda* are individuated animals, for the most part, rather than breeding stock, and it does seem to me certainly in your paper that the logic here is the logic of the pet, in particular; and, there is a history where that term originally migrates from livestock, where the pet lamb or the pet foal was the animal that was orphaned at birth, and because orphaned at birth was then raised by hand, in the household, so you get the "Mary had a little lamb" imprinting technology. So, the notion of the pet that emerges over the course of the eighteenth century is this specifically sentimentalized version of bringing into the household as a form of domestication a particular individuated animal from what was originally a breeding stock and a breeding species. And, in some ways that logic of the pet is... As I've been thinking about this, it echoes for me all the way back over the course of this workshop to the category of the "niece" in Evan's paper. And, your side comment about where, about wondering about finding animals in the eighteenth century got me to thinking (as I've been listening to this conversation) about the degree to which, the way in which, we're thinking about animals in the context of this conversation has to do with what we can associate with the novel and with sentiment about affective socialability and social relations and how animals function as understandable in that context. Whereas, there's an earlier trajectory—if you're willing to go back to Lovelace's precursor of Rochester in something like "A Satyr Against Reason and Mankind"—where the human/animal relation is much more about ironic self-knowledge, right? So it is the ironist's capacity to know one's self ironically as animal, which then gets, in some ways, subjugated to a more social understanding of human/animal relations through a kind of sociability that emerges by the end of the eighteenth century. So, if you take that long view, there's a kind of transition there that... that was going to be a question originally, but... to hell with it. [group laughter].

Molesworth: Just a tiny one; but we are out of time.

Heather Morrison: Oh, OK, well, your reference to Keith Thomas, I believe, saying that pets are not eaten reminded me of this very brief story of when my brother was in Bolivia in the Peace Corps he was hosted by a family that were guinea pig farmers. And he told them that, "In America, guinea pigs are pets," and they said, "Yes, yes, pets. Until we eat them." [group laughter]. And that's why, you know, in this paper I particularly appreciated the reference to animals

really being guests, because all of the sentimentalizing of them can be withdrawn really rapidly and radically. And yeah, so that was my brief . . .

Ramos: So, just quickly this idea of orphans and dispossession is ultimately really important as well there. We give them, they become our possessions and we give them possessions or rights, but then we withdraw them and eat them or objectify them.

Nash: Which strikes me as not unlike what you're suggesting happens with Mr. Vincent, as well.

Ramos: No, exactly... They take away, yeah.

Molesworth: Let's thank both speakers. [applause].