University of Pardubice

Faculty of Arts and Philosophy

Masculinity in *Pride and Prejudice* by Jane Austen

Jindřich Vejvoda

Bachelor Thesis

2025

Univerzita Pardubice
Fakulta filozofická
Akademický rok: 2023/2024

ZADÁNÍ BAKALÁŘSKÉ PRÁCE

(projektu, uměleckého díla, uměleckého výkonu)

Jméno a příjmení:	**Jindřich Vejvoda**
Osobní číslo:	**H22092**
Studijní program:	**B0231A090018 Anglický jazyk**
Specializace:	**Anglický jazyk pro odbornou praxi**
Téma práce:	**Maskulinita v románu Pýcha a předsudek**
Téma práce anglicky:	**Masculinity in Pride and Prejudice**
Zadávající katedra:	**Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky**

Zásady pro vypracování

Závěrečná práce se bude zabývat zobrazením mužských postav v románu *Pýcha a předsudek* autorky Jane Austenové. V teoretické části student nastíní historicko-kulturní kontext relevantního období (tedy přelom 19. století ve Velké Británii) s důrazem na mužské genderové role. Součástí teoretické části bude také definice zásadních termínů a konceptů spojených s maskulinitou a (kritickými) mužskými studii (např. sex vs gender, mužské/ženské genderové role, mens studies, gentleman 19. století, maskulinita, genderové stereotypy 19. století apod.). Jádrem práce bude analýza zobrazení mužských postav v románu *Pýcha a předsudek* a jejich vztahy s dalšími muži, a také ženskými postavami. Student bude používat vhodné úryvky z primárních/sekundárních akademických zdrojů k ilustraci své argumentace. Závěr práce bude zhodnocení a shrnutí dílčích částí analytické části, ne sumarizace obsahu celé práce.

Rozsah pracovní zprávy:
Rozsah grafických prací:
Forma zpracování bakalářské práce: **tištěná/elektronická**
Jazyk zpracování: **Angličtina**

Seznam doporučené literatury:

Austen, Jane. *Pride and Prejudice*. Pasadena, Calif.: Salem Press, 1813.

Cohen, Michèle. "'Manners' Make the Man: Politeness, Chivalry, and the Construction of Masculinity, 1750–1830." *Journal of British Studies* 44, no. 2 (2005): 312–329. https://doi.org/10.1086/427127.

Connell, Raewyn. "Masculinities: The Field of Knowledge." In *Masculinities*, 39–51. Brill, 2020. https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9781003001201-23/social-organization--masculinity-raewyn-connell.

Gardiner, Judith Kegun . 2004. "Men, Masculinities, and Feminist Theory ." In *Handbook of Studies on Men and Masculinities*, edited by Michael Kimmel, Jeff Hearn, and R.W. Connell, 35–51. California: Sage Publications.

Griffin, Ben. "Hegemonic Masculinity as a Historical Problem." *Gender & History* 30, no. 2 (July 2018): 377–400. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0424.12363.

Malone, Meaghan. "'You Have Bewitched Me Body and Soul': Masculinity and the Female Gaze in Jane Austen's Pride and Prejudice." At the EDGE 1 (2010): 62–91. https://research.library.mun.ca/356/.

Reeser, Todd W. "Concepts of Masculinity and Masculinity Studies." In *Configuring Masculinity in Theory and Literary Practice*, edited by Stefan Horlacher, 11–38. Brill, 2015. http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1163/j.ctv2gjwt1m.5.

Robinson, Victoria. "Radical Revisionings?: The Theorizing of Masculinity and (Radical) Feminist Theory." *Women's Studies International Forum* 26, no. 2 (2003): 129–137. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277--5395(03)00016-5.

Wedgwood, Nikki. "Connell's Theory of Masculinity–Its Origins and Influences on the Study of Gender." *Journal of Gender Studies* 18, no. 4 (2009): 329–339. https://doi.org/10.1080/09589230903260001.

Vedoucí bakalářské práce: **Mgr. Petra Kohlová**
Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky

Datum zadání bakalářské práce: **1. června 2024**
Termín odevzdání bakalářské práce: **1. června 2025**

doc. Mgr. Jiří Kubeš, Ph.D. v.r.
děkan

Mgr. Olga Roebuck, Ph.D. v.r.
vedoucí katedry

V Pardubicích dne 1. června 2024

Prohlašuji:

Práci s názvem *Maskulinita v románu Pýcha a předsudek od Jane Austenové* jsem vypracoval samostatně. Veškeré literární prameny a informace, které jsem v práci využil, jsou uvedeny v seznamu použité literatury.

Byl jsem seznámen s tím, že se na moji práci vztahují práva a povinnosti vyplývající ze zákona č. 121/2000 Sb., o právu autorském, o právech souvisejících s právem autorským a o změně některých zákonů (autorský zákon), ve znění pozdějších předpisů, zejména se skutečností, že Univerzita Pardubice má právo na uzavření licenční smlouvy o užití této práce jako školního díla podle § 60 odst. 1 autorského zákona, a s tím, že pokud dojde k užití této práce mnou nebo bude poskytnuta licence o užití jinému subjektu, je Univerzita Pardubice oprávněna ode mne požadovat přiměřený příspěvek na úhradu nákladů, které na vytvoření díla vynaložila, a to podle okolností až do jejich skutečné výše.

Beru na vědomí, že v souladu s § 47b zákona č. 111/1998 Sb., o vysokých školách a o změně a doplnění dalších zákonů (zákon o vysokých školách), ve znění pozdějších předpisů, a směrnicí Univerzity Pardubice č. 7/2019 Pravidla pro odevzdávání, zveřejňování a formální úpravu závěrečných prací, ve znění pozdějších dodatků, bude práce zveřejněna prostřednictvím Digitální knihovny Univerzity Pardubice.

V Pardubicích dne 6. 3. 2025

Jindřich Vejvoda v. r.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to thank my supervisor, Mgr. Petra Kohlová, for her guidance and valuable feedback. Also, I am grateful to my brother and friends for supporting me while writing this thesis.

ANNOTATION

This thesis aims to explore the portrayal of gender roles and masculinity in Jane Austen's 1813 novel *Pride and Prejudice*. Defining terms such as gender, masculinity, and hegemonic masculinity theory creates the foundation for the practical part. The thesis focuses on 19th-century British gender roles, especially the role of Mr Bennet as a father. Also, this thesis explores two hegemonic masculinities of the period and their origins and compares how characters such as Charles Bingley, Fitzwilliam Darcy and George Wickham fit the historical notions of masculinities.

KEYWORDS

19th century, Britain, gender roles, gender, gentlemanly masculinity, hegemonic masculinity, Jane Austen, middle class, role of a father

NÁZEV

Maskulinita v románu *Pýcha a předsudek* od Jane Austenové

ANOTACE

Cílem této práce je prozkoumat zobrazení genderových rolí a maskulinity v románu Jane Austenové *Pýcha a předsudek* z roku 1813. Vymezením pojmů jako gender, maskulinita a vysvětlením teorie hegemonní maskulinity vytváří základ pro praktickou část. Práce se zaměřuje na britské genderové role 19. století, zejména na roli pana Benneta jako otce. Také tato práce zkoumá dvě britské hegemonní maskulinity začátku 19. století a jejich původ a porovnává, jak postavy jako Charles Bingley, Fitzwilliam Darcy a George Wickham odpovídají historickým představám o těchto maskulinitách.

KLÍČOVÁ SLOVA

19. století, Británie, genderové role, gender, gentlemanská maskulinita, hegemonní maskulinita, Jane Austenová, střední třída, role otce

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

This thesis deals with gender roles and masculinity in the 1813 classic *Pride and Prejudice* by Jane Austen. The novel follows Elizabeth Bennet and her life as a middle-class woman in the early 19th century. As the novel is focuses on marriage in this society, male characters have a significant role in the story. This thesis aims to explore how men are constructed in relation to the historical context of the period and how they fit into notions of masculinity.

The first chapter introduces *critical men and masculinity studies* and relevant terminology. It defines masculinity, explains how it is constructed and introduces a significant theoretical framework that is used to analyse masculinity in the third part of this paper.

The second chapter deals with gender roles in early 19th century Britain, explaining the strict divide between their role and briefly mentioning the differences in their status. The thesis mainly focuses on the different roles of men and women in the domestic environment and comments briefly on process of marriage. It also explores Mr Bennet as a father and his way of parenting in a historical context, as well as outlines Mr Bennet's relationships with his daughters.

The third chapter introduces two hegemonic masculinities of the period and the relevant historical influences that shaped them. Then, this chapter analyses how Charles Bingley, Fitzwilliam Darcy and George Wickham create their masculinity in a social environment and whether they fit into the ideals of the period.

1 Masculinity

This thesis explores masculinity in the novel *Pride and Prejudice*; therefore, it is essential to introduce related terminology to critical men and masculinity studies. As masculinity scholar Tim Edwards implies, critical men and masculinity studies is a multidisciplinary field that studies masculinity from perspectives of psychology, sociology and gender studies.[1] This thesis first introduces concepts of *sex, gender* and masculinity. Then, it explains hegemonic masculinity, a framework introduced by R. W. Connell (some texts attributed under the name Raewyn Connell), one of the most influential masculinities scholars.

Sex and gender are, according to humanist scholar Lauren Posey, commonly used as synonyms in colloquial speech, and the difference between them is dictated by context.[2] However, sex and gender are not the same. It is not an easy task to define them, as there are many possible perspectives. As masculinity studies are a multidisciplinary field, this thesis defines sex from a sociological, psychological, or feminist point of view to demonstrate multiple perspectives. However, since gender has a clear definition in masculinity studies, only the perspectives of sociology and masculinity studies are essential.

The perspective of sociology on sex can be explained by quoting Linda L. Lindsey, who claims that it "refers to the biological characteristics distinguishing male and female. This definition emphasises male and female biological differences in chromosomes, anatomy, hormones, reproductive systems, and physiology."[3] Another significant definition is the psychological one, which is in many ways similar to the sociological one. According to Janet Shibley Hyde et al., sex in psychology refers to physical aspects of sex invisible to the human eye as chromosomes and hormones, which influence resulting visible physiological differences significant for the differentiation of male and female. However, there are also people categorised as *intersex* who do not fit into terms male and female for their atypical physiology.[4] Feminist sociologist Christine Delphy defines sex differently. She sees it only as a label assigned to a person at birth based on their physiology. However, she adds that only several out of many variables are used to classify an infant as a male or female, and other variables are not

[1] Tim Edwards, "Introduction," in *Cultures of Masculinity* (Routledge, 2004), 2–4.
[2] Lauren Posey, "Gender," *Critical Quarterly* 58, no. 3 (October 1, 2016): 94, https://doi.org/10.1111/criq.12293.
[3] Linda L. Lindsey, "The Sociology of Gender," in *Gender Sociological Perspectives* (Routledge Books, 2020), 6, https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315102023.
[4] Janet Shibley Hyde et al., "The Future of Sex and Gender in Psychology: Five Challenges to the Gender Binary," *American Psychologist* 74, no. 2 (2019): 175, https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000307.

important in this process.[5] Generally, sex is a term that describes a distinction between people based on physiological differences. Sociologist Lindsey and psychologists Hyde et al. understand sex as categories which denote male and female, and there are also people who do not fit in such categories. On the other hand, Delphy considers the terms male and female as inaccurate labels imposed by other people rather than natural differentiation. Nonetheless, for this thesis, only male and female categories are to be used, as the novel only divides characters into these two categories.

Defining gender is more complicated as it can have more definitions based on context. One significant meaning of gender is in the sense of *gender identity*. Sociologist Deana F. Morrows suggests that gender identity "refers to an individual's personal sense of identity as masculine or feminine, or any combination thereof."[6] Moreover, Posey suggests that gender identity can be created intentionally to define personal identity that is not based on biology.[7]

The second meaning is associated with *social roles*. This term is used in sociology, and Lindsey claims it means: „the expected behaviour associated with a status. Roles are performed according to social norms and shared rules that guide people's behaviour in specific situations. Social norms determine the privileges and responsibilities a status possesses."[8] Lindsey characterises gender as „social, cultural, and psychological differences between males and females that are associated with masculinity and femininity." Lindsey moreover suggests that gender roles are acquired by interacting with society through *social learning*.[9] Social learning can be explained by feminist scholar Mari Mikkola, who claims that from birth, male and female infants are treated differently by parents. For example, parents use different adjectives associated with either gender, give infants clothes deemed appropriate for their gender and teach them different values and expected behaviours based on whether infants are male or female. children also learn their social roles by watching how men and women behave and interact with each other, learning the differences between masculine and feminine behaviour.[10]

---

[5] Christine Delphy, "Rethinking Sex and Gender," *Women's Studies International Forum* 16, no. 1 (1993): 3–6, https://doi.org/10.1016/0277-5395(93)90076-l.
[6] Deana F. Morrow, "Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity Expression," in *Sexual Orientation and Gender Expression in Social Work Practice: Working with Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender People*, by Deana F. Morrow and Lori Messinger (Columbia University Press, 2006), 8.
[7] Posey, "Gender," 95–96.
[8] Lindsey, "The Sociology of Gender," 5.
[9] Lindsey, 'The Sociology of Gender' 6.
[10] Mari Mikkola, "Feminist Perspectives on Sex and Gender," in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. Edward N. Zalta and Uri Nodelman, Summer 2024 (Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University, 2024), https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2024/entries/feminism-gender/.

However, what is considered masculine and feminine is *socially constructed*. The social construction of gender is acknowledged by many scholars who are interested in masculinity. For example, masculinity scholars Judith Kegun Gardiner and Tim Edwards claim that the concept of gender as a social construct means that men and women and their behaviour are not predetermined by nature but instead created by social, cultural and historical conceptions of how men and women should behave.[11] Therefore, gender identity refers to the personal perception of one's gender as opposed to gender as a social role, which is linked to the perception of a person by other members of society and a person's status within the society. Gender role is socially constructed through ideas of what is masculine and feminine and acquired through social learning.

Masculinity (and femininity) is closely related to gender in the sense of social role. Michael S. Kimmel and Amy Aronson claim, "[m]asculinities refers to the social roles, behaviours and meanings prescribed for men in any given society at any one time.[12] In other words, masculinity is a term for a gender role associated only with men. Kimmel and Aronson explain that there are many masculinities since every culture and historical period has their masculinities. They also suggest that even inhabitants of the same state or the same town might have different ideas about masculinity, especially if they belong to a different ethnical group. Moreover, they assert that masculinities not only evolve but are never the same even in the life of an individual, as each life stage requires different characteristics and behaviours.[13]

This thesis utilises the concept of hegemonic masculinity. There are two reasons for clearly defining this concept in this thesis. First, according to masculinity scholar Todd Reeser, hegemonic masculinity is the most impactful theoretical framework in men and masculinity studies.[14] Second, this thesis frequently refers to hegemonic masculinity theory in analysis. It was in the 1980s that Connell introduced the concept of hegemonic masculinity. According to Connell and her colleague sociologist James W. Messerschmidt, the concept was developed in several articles from the year 1982, but the most significant and cited academic source is a chapter in Connell's book *Gender and Power*, released in 1987.[15]

---

[11] Judith Kegun Gardiner, "Men, Masculinities, and Feminist Theory," in *Handbook of Studies on Men and Masculinities*, ed. Michael Kimmel, Jeff Hearn, and R.W. Connell (Sage Publications, 2004), 35–36; Edwards, "Introduction," 3.
[12] Michael S. Kimmel and Amy Aronson, *Men & Masculinities [2 Volumes]: A Social, Cultural, and Historical Encyclopedia* (Bloomsbury Academic, 2004), 503.
[13] Kimmel and Aronson, *Men & Masculinities*, 503–4.
[14] Todd Reeser, "Concepts of Masculinity and Masculinity Studies," *Configuring Masculinity in Theory and Literary Practice* 58 (2020): 20, https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004299009_003.
[15] R. W. Connell and James W. Messerschmidt, "Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept," *Gender and Society* 19, no. 6 (2005): 830–31.

Connell and Messerschmidt claim that hegemonic masculinity, in its original formulation, is a social theory whose goal is to explain a modern social order where men have a dominant position in society and women have a subordinate one. The theory introduces a concept of hegemonic masculinity as a socially dominant masculinity to which other masculinities are subordinated. They add that the goal and/or consequence of hegemonic masculinity is a subordination of all women, and other masculinities directly or indirectly help with this goal.[16] To distinguish between the subordination of women and men not belonging to hegemonic masculinity, it is possible to use the terminology of masculinity scholar Demetrakis Z. Demetriou. He uses *internal hegemony* to describe the subordination of other men and *external hegemony* as a term for dominance over women.[17] Other masculinities can belong to one of three possible relations to hegemonic masculinity: *complicity*, *subordination* and *marginalisation*. Sociologist Andrea Waling explains that in this theory, men's position in society is based on how close their identity is to hegemonic masculinity, which depends on their race, ethnicity, status and self-identification with hegemonic masculinity.[18] Connell asserts that men belonging to complicit masculinities want to keep the social order where women are subordinate. Even though they are not in the highest societal position, they still profit from male dominance. However, she further suggests that many men might have no benefits from a male-oriented society, and other groups can even be victims of attacks or mockery for not being able to fit into ideals of hegemonic masculinity.[19] Demetriou suggests that one modern example of marginalised masculinities is homosexual men, who tend to have lower social status than heterosexual men, and they also face discrimination in all its forms.[20]

However, hegemonic masculinity is not represented by the majority of men in society as historian specialising on gender Ben Griffin implies; only a small percentage of men act according to hegemonic masculinity standards.[21] Connell asserts that even though it is not the most common, hegemony masculinity is the most acceptable masculinity form in a society. It is even preferred by many people or organisations; for example, men belonging to hegemonic

---

[16] Connell and Messerschmidt, "Hegemonic Masculinity," 832–33.
[17] Demetrakis Z. Demetriou, "Connell's Concept of Hegemonic Masculinity: A Critique," *Theory and Society* 30, no. 3 (2001): 341–44, https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1017596718715.
[18] Andrea Waling, "Rethinking Masculinity Studies: Feminism, Masculinity, and Poststructural Accounts of Agency and Emotional Reflexivity," *The Journal of Men's Studies* 27, no. 1 (2018): 93, https://doi.org/10.1177/1060826518782980.
[19] Raewyn Connell, "The Field of Knowledge," in *Configuring Masculinity in Theory and Literary Practice*, ed. Stefan Horlacher (Brill, 2015), 49, http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1163/j.ctv2gjwt1m.6.
[20] Demetriou, "Connell's Concept of Hegemonic Masculinity," 341–44.
[21] Ben Griffin, "Hegemonic Masculinity as a Historical Problem," *Gender & History* 30, no. 2 (2018): 381, https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0424.12363.

masculinity are wanted in leadership positions.[22] Moreover, as Griffin explains, hegemonic masculinity also has the most significant impact on society, politics and culture in comparison to other masculinities.[23] Norwegian gender researcher Øystein Gullvåg Holter suggests that the dominant males serve as an influence for non-privileged men who try to repeat the seen behaviour to obtain the same position in society, and this is one of the reasons why the hegemonic masculinity is recreated in society.[24]

Even though hegemonic masculinity is commonly cited and used for analyses, its original formulation was criticised by many academics. The first critique is that the theory did not define characteristics associated with hegemonic masculinity. This was later reformulated by Connell and Messerschmidt in the article "Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept." They claim that hegemonic (and any other) masculinity depends on a specific region or organisation they belong to. Furthermore, as they explain, masculinity might not be based on the life of a real man; rather, it can be perceived as an idealised image of one.[25] They also claim that hegemonic masculinity and men's dominance is a process rather than a state that needs to be maintained by promoting hegemonic masculinity and undermining other masculinities and women's positions in society to continue.[26] A similar opinion is expressed by Demetriou, who sees hegemonic masculinity as a concept generated and supported by society and promoted by the media, which needs to be recreated in order to continue. He adds that hegemonic masculinity reacts to societal changes and transforms to stay relevant.[27]

The second critique of the original formulation is that the theory expects that hegemonic masculinity influences other masculinities. Reeser claims that the original theory does not consider how subordinate men can affect it or that men can incorporate some characteristics seen as feminine into their own identity.[28] Connell and Messerschmidt also reformulated this in the previously mentioned article. They claim that *protest masculinities* challenge hegemonic masculinity and thus initiate change, and women also have a crucial role in the construction of masculinities in relationships with males as their mothers, partners, schoolmates, etc.[29]

---

[22] Connell, "The Field of Knowledge," 43.
[23] Griffin, "Hegemonic Masculinity as a Historical Problem," 381.
[24] Øystein Gullvåg Holter, "Social Theories for Researching Men and Masculinities," in *Handbook of Studies on Men & Masculinities*, ed. Michael Kimmel, Jeff Hearn, and R. W. Connell (Sage Publications, 2005), 20.
[25] Connell and Messerschmidt, "Hegemonic Masculinity," 838–39.
[26] Connell and Messerschmidt, "Hegemonic Masculinity," 843–44.
[27] Connell and Messerschmidt, "Hegemonic Masculinity," 834–35.
[28] Reeser, "Concepts of Masculinity and Masculinity Studies," 23.
[29] Connell and Messerschmidt, "Hegemonic Masculinity," 847–48.

Therefore, the reformulated theory that hegemonic masculinity can be influenced by females and other masculinities.

Finally, Connell and Messerschmidt emphasise that hegemonic masculinity could be a pattern of behaviour that men adapt only in certain situations, especially when it is beneficial or they need to gain respect from others.[30] This also emphasises that it is the foremost social behaviour which makes society associate a man with hegemonic masculinity, even though he might not fulfil all expectations or requirements of what such a man should be.

In conclusion, hegemonic masculinity, while not being the most numerous in society, is the most privileged, desired and has the most significant political and cultural impact on society. A consequence of hegemonic masculinity is internal hegemony, in other words, domination over other masculinities and external hegemony, subordination of women. The actual characteristics of men that represent hegemonic masculinity are dependent on a specific society, ethnicity, and social class. Hegemonic masculinity is an ideal cocreated by upbringing, society, and media, evolving by reacting to societal changes. Behaviour corresponding to hegemonic masculinity might be only situational.

[30] Connell and Messerschmidt, "Hegemonic Masculinity," 841–42.

2 Gender roles

This part deals with gender roles in early 19th-century Britain, focusing on the domestic environment. Due to its limited scope, this thesis cannot explore all historical contexts that shaped gender roles and masculinity, as there are too many factors. Therefore, this thesis only explores the most relevant context. First, it defines *social spheres.* Then, it explains the different statuses of men and women and their responsibilities in the household. It also explores the importance of marriage for men and women and the reasons for the strict gender role divide. As the last point, it deals with the role of the father of Mr Bennet.

In order to analyse the different gender roles of middle-class men and women in early 19th century Britain, it is necessary to talk about the theory of social spheres. Historian John Tosh explains that there were two – *the public sphere* and *the domestic sphere* (also referred to as the private sphere). He suggests that men's and women's roles were connected to different social spheres. Men belonged to both social and domestic, but women only to the latter one.[31] However, this concept was not connected to the whole of British society. Historian Susie Steinbach asserts that this division is applicable only to middle-class families, as the working class in the early 19th century could not survive without the income of working women, and the nobility did not engage in work at all, so the differences between men and women were less profound.[32] Historian Jane Rendall also agrees that this public and domestic sphere is a concept only relevant to the middle class. She explains that the public sphere was connected to social life and interactions between men in the market, civil society, and other public spaces. Moreover, she adds that public life was connected to political discussion and interaction with other citizens.[33] Rendall further suggests that only a small percentage of women could participate in public life in the early 19th century.[34] Tosh asserts that men could freely decide how much time they would spend in the social and domestic spheres in contrast to women, who needed to listen to male authority and stay in the domestic sphere, where they had responsibilities connected to the management of the household.[35] Yet, not everyone agrees with the theory of the public and domestic spheres. For example, humanist scholar Michèle Cohen,

---

[31] John Tosh, "The Old Adam and the New Man: Emerging Themes in the History of English Masculinities, 1750-1850," in *Manliness and Masculinities in Nineteenth-Century Britain: Essays on Gender, Family and Empire* (London: Routledge, 2017), 69–70, https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315838533.
[32] Susie Steinbach, "'Can We Still Use "Separate Spheres"? British History 25 Years After Family Fortunes,'" *History Compass* 10, no. 11 (2012): 826–27, https://doi.org/10.1111/hic3.12010.
[33] Jane Rendall, "Women and the Public Sphere," *Gender & History* 11, no. 3 (November 1999): 478–82, https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0424.00157.
[34] Rendall, "Women and the Public Sphere," 480.
[35] Tosh, "The Old Adam," 71.

who has published many works about 18th and 19th-century British life, strongly critiques this explanation. She denies that the public or private sphere would accurately reflect history because she sees it as a simplification of gender roles. She claims there were *social spaces* that did not belong to either public or private categories. In these social spaces, middle-class women and men met and conversed with each other. Cohen adds that these social spaces could be assembly rooms, outside spaces for guests, coffee shops and many more.[36] In relation to *Pride and Prejudice,* this is the space where many parts of the novel take place. This thesis thus recognises that men participated in public and domestic spheres and social spaces, but most women participated only in the domestic sphere and social spaces.

Nonetheless, the different spheres they usually attended were not the only difference between men and women in early 19th-century Britain. Both were perceived differently by the public. One such difference can be illustrated by the article "Gentlemanly Masculinities as Represented by the Late Georgian *Gentleman's Magazine*" by historian William Stafford, in which he analyses articles from *Gentleman's Magazine* between 1785 and 1815, representing various opinions of middle-class men. William Stafford explains that in obituaries of *Gentleman's Magazine*, men were praised for their public achievements and care for the community or family. He continues that an obituary often links a man to his relatives and ancestors, sometimes not even including the man's deeds, only a genealogy of his family.[37] On the other hand, Stafford asserts that the name of a woman was usually complemented by the name of her male relatives; sometimes, the obituaries did not even mention a woman's name but only her relationship to a man, who is named in the magazine. He continues that an obituary could then list the achievements of her male relatives without any additional information about her.[38] This suggests that while men were praised for their achievements in public life or at least for their family relations, women were not viewed the same. It also indicates women were not treated as individuals, rather than as only members of a man's family. Lack of attention to women in this way can be a consequence of public and private sphere division where middle-class women could not generally engage in public life, resulting in dependency on their husbands or other heads of the family. The different perceptions of women and men in the early 19th century originated from the previous one. Historians Hannah Barker and Elaine Chalus

[36] Michèle Cohen, "Manliness, Effeminacy and the French: Gender and the Construction of National Character in Eighteenth-Century England," in *English Masculinities, 1660-1800*, ed. Tim Hitchcock and Michèle Cohen (Routledge, 2014), https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315840314 (This e-book does not carry stable page numbers.).
[37] William Stafford, "Gentlemanly Masculinities as Represented by the Late Georgian Gentleman's Magazine," *History* 93, no. 309 (2008): 53–55, https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-229X.2008.00413.x.
[38] Stafford, "Gentlemanly Masculinity," 52–53.

suggest that in the 18th century, male writers often viewed women as different and unequal to men. They emphasise that women were viewed as incompetent in taking care of themselves and required leadership from men.[39]

In order to better explore gender roles, it is crucial to illustrate what was considered a middle-class family. Cultural historian Naomi Tadmor explains the basic arrangement of the 19th-century family: there was a male breadwinner who had authority over his dependents. Tadmor adds that they could be wife and children, but middle-class men could also include servants in their families.[40] Historians Leonore Davidoff and Catherine Hall explain that a head of the family was "the eldest male: the husband and father or, in his absence, brother, brother-in-law, or eldest son."[41] Davidoff and Hall, as well as historian Joanne Bailey, suggest that the head of the family held a legal responsibility to provide for his wife, children, or other dependents. They add that if he was unable or unwilling to do so, he was seen as an inadequate member of society.[42] Therefore, the crucial responsibility of the head of the family was to serve as the breadwinner of the family. Women's responsibilities were in a household where the roles of men and women met. Before exploring gender roles in a British household, it is necessary to explain the importance of the house for the middle-class. Gender studies scholar Chris Roulston explains that the role of the house was to become a separate space from the public sphere, offering the whole family a sense of "privacy, intimacy and protection from the outside world."[43] This is connected to the general role of a woman in the household. According to historian Karen Harvey, the role of a wife was to create a perfect environment for her husband and other family members. She continues that unmarried or widowed men could not experience domestic space as they had different responsibilities.[44] Harvey suggests that a wife, with the help of daughters, managed the household and servants and conducted housework, and a leading man supervised the management of the house and servants. He was also responsible for educating wives and servants about the proper management.[45]

---

[39] Hannah Barker and Elaine Chalus, "Introduction," in *Gender in Eighteenth-Century England*, ed. Hannah Barker and Elaine Chalus (Routledge, 1997), 1–2, https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315842523.
[40] Naomi Tadmor, "The Concept of the Household Family in Eighteenth Century England," *Past & Present*, no. 151 (1996): 119–21.
[41] Leonore Davidoff and Catherine Hall, *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class, 1780-1850* (University of Chicago Press, 1987), 329.
[42] Davidoff and Hall, *Family Fortunes*, 334–35; Joanne Bailey, "'A Very Sensible Man': Imagining Fatherhood in England c.1750–1830," *History* 95, no. 3 (319) (2010): 279–81.
[43] Chris Roulston, "Space and the Representation of Marriage in Eighteenth-Century Advice Literature," *The Eighteenth Century* 49, no. 1 (2008): 26–28.
[44] Karen Harvey, *The Little Republic: Masculinity and Domestic Authority in Eighteenth Century Britain* (Oxford University Press, 2012), 9, https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199533848.001.0001.
[45] Harvey, *The Little Republic*, 40–51.

A strict divide between the roles of a husband and wife in the family resulted in different power dynamics in the household. Tosh asserts that Britain in the 18th and 19th centuries was a *patriarchal society*, of which household dominance was an essential part.[46] Before continuing, it is vital to define patriarchy. For example, feminist anthropologist Sherry B. Ortner sees patriarchy as a society where men have power over women. However, men belong to a hierarchy, on whose top are leading men. She explains that in a purely patriarchal society, women stay outside of the hierarchy and usually face oppression, even more significantly when they try to gain power.[47] However, a man's power and authority were not unlimited; according to Harvey, British domestic patriarchy was not:

> a rigid system of male governance but a flexible "grid of power" in which several different groups attained status and authority. [...] it should not be understood to mean that only a male household head possessed authority and at the expense of others in the household. If patriarchy in general was a grid of relations, then domestic patriarchy was a system of order in the household in which different individuals may each have access to different kinds and levels of power.[48]

This suggests that domestic patriarchy in the early 19th century was not about the absolute rule of the head of the family. Even though a wife was always subordinated to her husband, who had authority over her, she had authority over other people. Harvey then continues that a woman, thanks to the maintenance of the house, obtained limited power over the household, family, servants, and also her husband. She asserts that this position in a household was unique to women as men generally could not or did not engage in domestic activities and management of a household.[49]

Davidoff and Hall suggest that daughters helped their mothers with their duties.[50] Harvey explains that middle-class women were involved in the management of the house, cooking, and servitude to their husbands, other family members and guests.[51] Harvey further suggests that women were expected to be skilful, knowledgeable about the house, capable of running the household on their own, and at the same time, submissive and compliant to their husbands.[52] Nonetheless, what domestic duties women in the middle-class household needed to attend was determined by their economic status. For example, Mrs Bennet or her daughters do not prepare

---

[46] Tosh, "The Old Adam," 67–68.
[47] Sherry B. Ortner, "Patriarchy," *Feminist Anthropology* 3, no. 2 (2022): 308–9, https://doi.org/10.1002/fea2.12081.
[48] Harvey, *The Little Republic*, 4.
[49] Harvey, *The Little Republic*, 9.
[50] Davidoff and Hall, *Family Fortunes*, 334–35.
[51] Harvey, *The Little Republic*, 33.
[52] Harvey, *The Little Republic*, 34–35.

meals for the family; as Mrs Bennet implies, they are rich enough to be able to afford a cook.[53] Other responsibilities can be explained by Davidoff and Hall, who claim that among the responsibilities of a woman were cooking and cleaning (if these activities were not conducted by servants). According to them, it is linked to a woman's responsibility for the servants of the household; it was her duty to give them assignments and check their completion. Davidoff and Hall continue that a wife was overseeing the finances of the family. Her task was to ensure that money was spent on necessary commodities and wages of servants in order to prevent financial problems caused by too expensive a lifestyle.[54] In the novel, this is reflected by Mrs Bennet; it is mentioned that she "had no turn for the economy,"[55] in other words, not being able to manage finances effectively and worsening their financial situation.

The ability to manage a household well was the most significant skill for a woman in the early 19th century. It played an essential role when a man was selecting his future wife. This is represented by William Collins, who praised her "modesty" and "economy",[56] while proposing to her, implying that he believed Elizabeth would be a perfect wife for him. This can be explained by Davidoff and Hall, who suggest that the ability to manage a house and provide a comfortable domestic environment was considered innate for women and closely connected with ideal femininity.[57] Therefore, Mr Collins especially praised the abilities connected with the management of the household, not only to persuade Elizabeth that he has no doubt about her abilities as his future wife but also as the highest compliment. Mr Collins decided to marry on the advice of his patroness, Lady Catherine. She described an ideal wife for Mr Collins as follows: "[c]hoose a gentlewoman for my sake; and for your own, let her be an active, useful sort of person, not brought up high, but able to make a small income go a good way."[58] Her requirements for Mr Collins' future wife highlight one significant role of a wife in this historical period. A well-governed household was not only important for a comfortable domestic life but also benefited men in other ways. Harvey suggests that in the early 19th century, the house was evidence of economic success and thus a mark of social status in the society.[59] She further explains that a well-managed household for significant for a man as he was then viewed as an adequate master of the house, which positively influenced his public perception. She continues

[53] Jane Austen, *Pride and Prejudice* (1813; repr., Surrey, England: Alma Classics, 2016), 48.
[54] Davidoff and Hall, *Family Fortunes*, 360–61.
[55] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 216.
[56] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 79.
[57] Davidoff and Hall, *Family Fortunes*, 362.
[58] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 77.
[59] Harvey, *The Little Republic*, 170–71.

that the household could raise the social standing of the family, which could lead to more connection with people of wealth and power.[60] In other words, the adequately governed household was a mark of the social position of a middle-class family, and the better the status, the better the possibilities to connect with wealthy families. Nonetheless, there was a second reason why the selection of an adequate wife for a man was of foremost importance. For example, Harvey suggests that the marriage also opened new financial possibilities for a middle-class man. For example, a man could receive money or a loan from his father-in-law to furnish the house for the future family. Furthermore, a man could also gain new social connections with his wife's family and acquaintances and open new business opportunities.[61] Which leads to the point that often, a man's choice of a wife was limited by her status, as Colonel Fitzwilliam comments on his lack of freedom in this aspect of his life: "I may suffer from want of money. Younger sons cannot marry where they like. […] Our habits of expense make us too dependent, and there are not many in my rank of life who can afford to marry without some attention to money."[62] Therefore, a choice of a wife could strongly benefit a man financially and socially and therefore, this choice needed to be made very carefully as a man could lose the opportunity to improve or preserve his status and gain new connections.

However, it was not only a man's decision what woman to marry. Davidoff and Hall explain that it was the head of a family who had the last say in the selection of a bride.[63] This can be seen as a reminder of the 18th century's traditions. Lawrence Stone claims that marriage was usually similar to a business transaction between the bride's and groom's parents, kin and family friends. He adds that often, children had no right to engage in the selection of a future wife; sometimes, they might have a right to veto the choice of their relatives.[64] Such involvement of other people is demonstrated in the novel. Darcy reveals in a letter that he and Bingley's sisters Caroline Bingley and Mrs Hurst persuaded Charles Bingley of the disadvantages of marrying Jane.[65] Caroline Bingley does this as she would be glad if her brother married Georgina Darcy, Mr Darcy's sister because it would greatly increase her chance of marrying Mr Darcy himself.[66] This represents how impactful marriage was for all relatives. That this was not an exception can be supported by Davidoff and Hall, who suggest that a future

[60] Harvey, *The Little Republic*, 134.
[61] Harvey, *The Little Republic*, 102–4.
[62] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 131.
[63] Davidoff and Hall, *Family Fortunes*, 331–32.
[64] Lawrence Stone, "Mating Arrangements," in *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England, 1500-1800* (New York: Harper & Row, 1979), 181–82.
[65] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 141.
[66] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 86–87.

husband's brothers, sisters and friends had a significant role in courtship. They would convince a man not to marry his chosen one if they considered her financial status or social connection inadequate or if there were problems with her character or the character of her family.[67] Therefore, it can be said his sisters were mainly interested in marriage that would personally benefit them, rather than one, in which their brother would be content. In contrast, Mr Darcy persuaded Bingley not to marry Jane mainly because he believed Jane to be indifferent towards Bingley rather than not having high social and financial status.[68]

Nonetheless, a woman in the early 19th century was often forced to marry even when she did not want to. According to Davidoff and Hall, many women in this period were pressured to marry in order to secure home and money, so they would no longer trouble their family financially.[69] This is connected to Charlotte Lucas, who married Mr Collins even though, as explained in the novel, his company annoys her.[70] After Charlotte agrees to marry Mr Collins, she explained her reasons to Elizabeth:

> "I am not romantic, you know; I never was. I ask only a comfortable home– and considering Mr Collins's character, connection, and situation in life, I am convinced that my chance of happiness with him is as fair as most people can boast on entering the marriage state."[71]

In other words, even though Charlotte did not want to marry Mr Collins, she saw it as the last and very beneficial possibility to marry. She most likely felt pressure as she did not want to put financial strain on her family any further. Her family is satisfied with her choice as it would benefit them financially, which could improve chances of more beneficial marriage of Chalotte's younger sisters.[72] In brief, the selection of the marriage partner was significant for a future husband and wife, as it greatly influenced their future life. While men mainly obtained property and connections, for middle-class women, it was often the only way to access financial security.

As illustrated by many points, gender roles in the early 19th century were strictly defined. It is vital to explain why there was such a divide and how it was justified. Tosh believes that strict role division in the early 19th century was caused by Christian beliefs impacted by the

[67] Davidoff and Hall, *Family Fortunes*, 323–29, 332.
[68] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 141.
[69] Davidoff and Hall, *Family Fortunes*, 325.
[70] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 81.
[71] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 91.
[72] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 89.

Evangelism revival, an event that occurred in the 1730s and 1740s.[73] As Rendall explains, there were many arguments why women should not participate in public life. She suggests that middle-class women were seen as unfitting to public life because they were perceived as loving, trusting, and innocent, and the public sphere was perceived as a hostile environment in which women would not be able to orient.[74] Tosh, in addition, Davidoff and Hall suggest that in early 19th century Britain, it was believed that a middle-class woman was generally a highly moral person. They add that a wife's role was, therefore, to create a domestic environment to balance the influence of the public world, which was seen as detrimental to a man's morality.[75] Harvey agrees that the patriarchal structure of the family was supported by the interpretation of the Christian faith. She claims that it was a husband who was supposed to lead the moral and religious education of his wife, children and other members of the family, so it became a well-functioning unit from the perspective of morality.[76] This can be supported by quoting Davidoff and Hall:

> Within the household it was natural that the husband should command and the wife, children and servants should obey. These were the laws of God and of man. Such a view was built on the assumption that the household was the basic unit of society and that within most households there was a family, including servants. [...] [For society] to be lasting, religious knowledge needed to be based within that household.[77]

This quote suggests that a dominant man leading the household was considered the only correct option, as he was the only one who could ensure the transmission of religious practices to the next generation. This was significant, as it was believed that society could be maintained only if Christianity was strongly rooted in families. One other possible reason why a head of the family was trusted to lead a family religious life was that they had a public duty to attend church, representing family, as explained by Davidoff and Hall.[78] Bailey connects religious responsibilities to a role of a father, as the most crucial. She claims that a moral head of the family and his attentive education of children in Christianity was considered necessary for children's moral and intellectual development.[79] Davidoff and Hall suggest that a mother had a

[73] John Tosh, "Home and Away: The Flight from Domesticity in Late-Nineteenth-Century England Re-Visited," *Gender & History* 27, no. 3 (2015): 562–64, https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0424.12150.
[74] Rendall, "Women and the Public Sphere," 475–83.
[75] Tosh, "Home and Away," 561–62; Davidoff and Hall, *Family Fortunes*, 74.
[76] Harvey, *The Little Republic*, 47.
[77] Davidoff and Hall, *Family Fortunes*, 108.
[78] Davidoff and Hall, *Family Fortunes*, 107.
[79] Bailey, "'A Very Sensible Man,'" 286–88.

different role from a father as she stayed at home. Mothers were supposed to take care of their children, spend time with them and teach them basic skills such as reading and writing.[80]

Bailey and likewise Davidoff and Hall agree that being regarded as a competent father was significant for to be considered a competent man.[81] Furthermore, Bailey explains a father was believed to be responsible for his children's future, if he was unable to provide for his family, he was blamed for his family's unfortunate life. Bailey explains that there was public opinion that a man's effort to ensure a better material life for his family was the most worthwhile activity he could do.[82] This is contrasted by the approach of Mr Bennet, who did not try to improve his family income because of "his love of independence," as described in the novel.[83] Mr Bennet thus does not perceive his family's well-being as worthy of his time. This is also connected to Mr Bennet's reluctant approach to matters concerning his family. When Elizabeth refuses to marry Mr Collins in the novel, Mrs Bennet comes to Mr Bennet's room to make him persuade Elizabeth to accept Mr Collins' proposal. However, Mr Bennet quickly resolved the situation by allowing his daughter not to marry Mr Collins and then he said, "I shall be glad to have the library to myself as soon as may be."[84] From the quote, it can be interpreted that Mr Bennet treats family matters as unimportant or unworthy of his time, and he would rather spend his time reading. This is supported by Elizabeth's comment later in the novel. When Lydia was allegedly kidnapped by Wickham, her father was supposed to persuade Wickham to marry Lydia. However, Elizabeth does not believe that her father would resolve the situation as she comments: "from my father's behaviour, from his indolence and the little attention he has ever seemed to give to what was going forward in his family, that he would do as little, and think as little about it, as any father could do, in such a matter."[85] The lack of trust in her father can be traced to how little attention he paid to his daughters. Earlier in the novel, Elizabeth explained that Mr Bennet was unwilling to pay attention to his three youngest daughters: Mary, Catherine and Lydia.[86] Elizabeth expresses this apprehension because she believes he would be able to change their behaviour in society, which she sees as unfitting. She believed their behaviour makes the public image of the family worse and consequently lowers their chances for a beneficial marriage.[87] With this, Elizabeth implies that Mr Bennet could change the nature of

[80] Davidoff and Hall, *Family Fortunes*, 340–41.
[81] Bailey, "'A Very Sensible Man,'" 279–81; Davidoff and Hall, *Family Fortunes*, 334–35.
[82] Bailey, "'A Very Sensible Man,'" 279–81.
[83] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 216.
[84] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 82.
[85] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 198.
[86] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 167.
[87] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 167.

his youngest daughters, which would increase the financial security of the family, yet it seems he was not interested in it. That the three youngest of the Bennet family are acting unacceptably in society can be supported by Mr Darcy's letter, in which he wrote that they show "total want of propriety." Behaviour of them and also of Mrs Bennet and Mr Bennet, was the main reason why Darcy persuaded Mr Bingley not to marry Jane.[88] This illustrates that the inappropriate behaviour of Mary, Catherine and Lydia did have a negative result. Mr Bennet's relationship to his younger daughters can explained by the way he talks about his daughters. In front of his wife, he calls all his daughters "silly and ignorant" except for Elizabeth.[89] And later, he directly told Catherine and Lydia: "[f]rom all that I can collect by your manner of talking, you must be two of the silliest girls in the country. I have suspected it some time, but I am now convinced."[90] These examples imply that he might resent, with the exception of Elizabeth, his daughters, especially Catherine and Lydia, which might be the reason he acts indifferent towards them. Elizabeth believes that her father's indifference to her upbringing had one other negative consequence. Elizabeth believed that Lydia allowed Wickham to kidnap her, and she was willing to live with him without marrying because of her low moral standards.[91] She explains why her sister had such ideas as follows:

> [s]he has never been taught to think on serious subjects; and for the last half-year, nay, for a twelvemonth—she has been given up to nothing but amusement and vanity. She has been allowed to dispose of her time in the most idle and frivolous manner, and to adopt any opinions that came in her way.[92]

Elizabeth thinks that her father neglected Lydia's moral education and paid her no attention, and what happened to her was his fault. All these examples illustrate that Mr Bennet is rather indifferent to his responsibilities as a father. The way how he is blamed for his daughter's behaviour can be explained by the beliefs of the period. For example, Bailey claims it was believed that parents, especially fathers, were the ones who shaped their children's character and behaviour by their parenting. She suggests that parents were largely blamed for the unfitting behaviour of their children.[93] Bailey moreover suggests that in this historical period, a father's affection toward his children was seen by many as crucial; the father should participate in the

---

[88] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 141.
[89] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 4.
[90] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 21.
[91] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 198.
[92] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 198.
[93] Joanne Bailey, "The Disciplining and Instructive Parent," in *Parenting in England, 1760-1830: Emotion, Identity, and Generation* (Oxford University Press, 2012), 74–78, https://ualresearchonline.arts.ac.uk/id/eprint/22519/.

upbringing of the children, and his absence from the child's life, especially in the early stages, was believed to have a detrimental effect on his children minds and behaviour.[94] Even though a father was blamed for his children's character, it was typical that a middle-class father did not accompany his daughters much. Davidoff and Hall assert that a father often did not spend much time with his children because of trade or public duties. They moreover suggest a father spent only limited time with his children, more time with his sons than daughters, as he was supposed to prepare his sons for their adult life.[95] The idea of parental responsibility for the behaviour of his children is reflected in the novel. At one time, while Lydia was still missing, Mr Bennet accepted his responsibility for Lydia's conduct in front of Elizabeth, and when she tried to comfort him, he replied: "Who should suffer but myself? It has been my own doing, and I ought to feel it. […] No, Lizzy, let me for once feel how much I have been to blame."[96] This suggests that Mr Bennet accepted his responsibility for Lydia's future as a direct consequence of his lack of attention as a father. It also implies that he, at this moment, realised that he could have had a positive impact on his children, but he rather spent time reading in the library.

Nonetheless, there is another example to support the idea of a father's responsibility for the behaviour of his children. At the end of the novel, Mr Darcy explains the reason for his negative behaviour in the novel's first part:

> I have been a selfish being all my life, in practice, though not in principle. As a child I was taught what was right, but I was not taught to correct my temper. […] Unfortunately as an only son (for many years an only child), I was spoilt by my parents, who, though good themselves (my father, particularly, all that was benevolent and amiable), allowed, encouraged, almost taught me to be selfish and overbearing; to care for none beyond my own family circle; to think meanly of all the rest of the world.[97]

In this example, Mr Darcy blamed his parents, especially his father, for the negative behaviour he was conducting in the first part of the novel. He considers his parents fully responsible for such character, not mentioning any other influence. Darcy thus believes that upbringing is the most significant factor shaping the child's behaviour.

Returning to Mr Bennet. There are moments where Mr Bennet behaves differently as a father. In the case of Jane and especially, his favourite daughter, Elizabeth, whom he likes because he considers her the most intelligent of her sisters.[98] For example, after Jane and

---

[94] Bailey, "'A Very Sensible Man,'" 278–79.
[95] Davidoff and Hall, *Family Fortunes*, 330–34.
[96] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 210.
[97] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 260.
[98] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 4, 167.

Elizabeth return from Bingley's estate, Mr Bennet's interaction with them is described as follows: "their father, though very laconic in his expressions of pleasure, was really glad to see them; he had felt their importance in the family circle."[99] His attention to Elizabeth is also demonstrated when he supports Elizabeth's decision not to marry Mr Collins, even though it is highly economically beneficial for the family.[100] Later, when Mr Darcy asks for Elizabeth's hand, Mr Bennet shares his concern, whether Elizabeth is not willing to marry him only for his status.[101] This implies that Mr Bennet does care, at least for Elizabeth, that he would rather lose the possibility of the utmost beneficial marriage that would raise his social and financial status than to see his second daughter unhappy. This demonstrates that Mr Bennet showcases interest in family matters concerning Elizabeth. That Mr Bennet has a stronger bond with Elizabeth in indicated by the fact she is "grateful for [Mr Bennet's] affectionate treatment of herself."[102]

Therefore, Mr Bennet's lack of attention to his daughters is according to views of the period responsible for them. He does not try to improve his family's financial status, which would result in more beneficial possible marriages for his daughter. Moreover, as a father was considered more important than a mother in the context of the moral education and behaviour of his children, Mr Bennet underestimated his role as a father, and he is not adequately interested in his three youngest daughters. His parental responsibility is confirmed by him when he accepts Lydia's kidnapping as his fault. However, Mr Bennet shows interest if it is connected to his favourite daughter, Elizabeth, and he has a more affectionate relationship with her.

[99] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 44.
[100] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 81–82.
[101] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 265.
[102] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 167.

3 Masculinity in early 19th century Britain

The following part of the thesis explores masculinity in *Pride and Prejudice,* which is set in approximately the early 19th century Britain. It focuses on middle-class British masculinities. First, it briefly introduces two significant British masculinities in the period between the end of the 18th century and the start of the 19th century – *gentlemanly masculinity* and *masculinity of honour* (term borrowed from Stafford's article). Then, the thesis focuses on gentlemanly masculinity and its origins. Second, it uses understanding to analyse whether Mr Bingley and Mr Darcy fit into the notions of masculinity in approximately early 19th century Britain and how other characters perceive them. Then, it deals with George Wickham's masculinity of honour and emphasises how he performs it. The analysis of male characters in the novel is specific for two reasons. First, the perception of characters is often impacted by the protagonist, Elizabeth Bennet. Second, male characters in every scene interact with female characters; in other words, there are no moments in the novel (apart from the ones that are reported by the characters involved) where male characters interact with each other without the company of female characters. This limits the analysis, and thus, it mainly explores how male characters interact in social spaces in front of women.

According to William Stafford, there was not only one hegemonic masculinity around the end of the 18th century. He identified two such masculinity archetypes: gentlemanly masculinity, which Stafford sometimes refers to as "Christian masculinity" or "polite masculinity," and the other one he calls masculinity of honour.[103] A similar opinion is expressed by humanist scholar Michèle Cohen, who agrees there were these two widespread elite masculinities around the end of the 18th century. However, she sees these masculinities as variations of gentlemanly masculinity and considers a polite gentleman as hegemonic in contrast to Stafford.[104] Nonetheless, this thesis takes both masculinities for hegemonic, as in the context of the novel, both masculinities seem to be equally accepted in society, as demonstrated later in this thesis. The main difference between these two masculinities is emphasised by Cohen, who claims that each established their identity and authority in different ways. She refers to two academic publications, *Men and the Emergence of Polite Society, Britain 1660-1800*, by historian Philip Carter and *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class, 1780-1850*, by Leonore Davidoff and Catherine Hall.[105] Historian Philip

[103] Stafford, "Gentlemanly Masculinity," 47, 65–66.
[104] Michèle Cohen, "'Manners' Make the Man: Politeness, Chivalry, and the Construction of Masculinity, 1750–1830," *Journal of British Studies* 44, no. 2 (2005): 312–13, https://doi.org/10.1086/427127.
[105] Cohen, "'Manners' Make the Man," 312–13.

Carter explains that gentlemanly masculinity is centred around politeness and refinement, in other words, how men act in society.[106] On the other, as Historian Donna T. Andrew implies, the masculinity of honour was centred around following rules called the *honour code* (or the code of honour).[107] Nonetheless, the masculinity of honour could refer to two distinct groups of men: Noblemen and officers of the British army. Andrew explains that the honour code for nobility included rules on how noblemen should interact with themselves and noble women. She continues that this code of honour for nobility was based on a desire for recognition from other people belonging to the same class, and thus, noblemen only competed for honour with other aristocrats.[108] Davidoff and Hall suggest that nobility gained their honour based on their "achievement in hunting, riding and military prowess."[109] Nonetheless, the second group, military officers, had a different code of honour. Historian Arthur N. Gilbert suggests the code of honour was a value system of members of officers of the British army in the 18th and early 19th centuries.[110] This masculinity of honour, as Gilbert implies, was more connected to gentlemanly masculinity because soldiers were instructed to act like gentlemen.[111] Masculinity of honour connected to the British military is more significant for this thesis, as one of the most noteworthy characters, George Wickham, is connected to it. As masculinity of honour for military officers was connected to gentlemanly masculinity, it is necessary to explore first what it meant to be considered a gentleman.

First, it is crucial to understand the meaning of gentleman. According to the Cambridge Dictionary, the modern use of the word means: "a man who is polite and behaves well towards other people, especially women."[112] The emphasis on good treatment of women is strongly connected to gentlemanly masculinity, as explained later in this paper. However, the original meaning was different; historian Duncan Stone explains that gentleman was a title associated only with aristocratic and upper-class men since the Middle Ages. He adds that the title gentleman became used for middle-class men in the first half of the 18th century, and then it

[106] Philip Carter, "Introduction: Gentleman, Manliness and Polite Society," in *Men and the Emergence of Polite Society, Britain 1660-1800* (London: Routledge, 2014), 1–3, https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315840239.
[107] Donna T. Andrew, "The Code of Honour and Its Critics: The Opposition to Duelling in England, 1700-1850," *Social History* 5, no. 3 (1980): 411–14.
[108] Andrew, "The Code of Honour," 413–14.
[109] Davidoff and Hall, *Family Fortunes*, 110.
[110] Arthur N. Gilbert, "Law and Honour among Eighteenth-Century British Army Officers," *The Historical Journal* 19, no. 1 (1976): 75–76.
[111] Gilbert, "Law and Honour," 75–77.
[112] Cambridge Dictionary, "Gentleman | Meaning in the Cambridge English Dictionary," Cambridge.org, 2020, https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/gentleman.

rapidly expanded to the middle class in the period of the first Industrial Revolution.[113] Tosh also comments on historical changes and how they influenced masculinity:

> "[t]he transition from a genteel masculinity grounded in land ownership to a bourgeois masculinity attuned to the market. The new commercial society was made possible by, and in turn reinforced, a new manhood. The man of substance and repute came to be someone who had a steady occupation in business or the professions."[114]

This example emphasises that hegemonic British masculinity changed from gentry to middle-class man. Also, the source of hegemonic masculinity became achievements in one's occupation rather than title and property associated with a man. This can be supported by quoting Davidoff and Hall, "[h]onour and competence in business and professional dealings became more closely associated with both manhood and respectability."[115] Therefore, the title gentleman at the start of the 19th century was associated with both upper-class and middle-class men.

Returning to attributes of gentlemanly masculinity, politeness was seen as the essential part of gentlemanly masculinity, as Cohen, Stafford, and Carter confirm.[116] In order to understand why politeness was crucial for the construction of gentlemanly masculinity, it is necessary to trace its origins. The two most significant influences that created British masculinity of the early 19th century can be found in the previous century. They were French politeness and chivalric values.

Before French influence on English masculinity, which took place in the 18th century, the ideal man was connected to "physical strength, hardiness, courage and martial values", as historian Jeremy Gregory claims.[117] Tosh agrees that before the 18th century, militant education and skills and the desire to protect the home through violent conflict were key parts of masculinity in these historical periods. However, since the second half of the 18th century, this slowly changed. Military education stopped being a significant attribute of masculinity, even though it could still improve a man's social picture before the 1820s when military masculinity ceased to be greatly beneficial.[118]

---

[113] Duncan Stone, "Deconstructing the Gentleman Amateur," *Cultural and Social History* 18, no. 3 (2019): 2, 5–6, https://doi.org/10.1080/14780038.2019.1614284.
[114] Tosh, "The Old Adam," 63.
[115] Davidoff and Hall, *Family Fortunes*, 111.
[116] Cohen, "Manliness, Effeminacy and the French"; Stafford, "Gentlemanly Masculinity," 62–66; Carter, "Introduction," 1–5.
[117] Jeremy Gregory, "Homo Religiosus: Masculinity and Religion in the Long Eighteenth Century," in *English Masculinities, 1660-1800*, ed. Tim Hitchcock and Michèle Cohen (Routledge, 2014), https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315840314 (This e-book does not carry stable page numbers.).
[118] Tosh, "The Old Adam," 65.

The transformation from a soldier to a polite gentleman began, according to Cohen, in the first half of the 18th century, when the English highly regarded the French for their politeness and speaking skills. Cohen adds that there have been efforts to implement politeness in English social behaviour since the start of the 18th century.[119] Yet, as Cohen explains, even though the British were inspired by French politeness, they did not want to accept it completely. According to her, English saw it necessary to create a distinct "English" politeness that would be different from "French" politeness.[120] Cohen argues that the British considered stereotypical French men to be excessively speaking, passionate, and lacking self-control. On the other hand, she adds that English saw themselves as "plain, sincere and rational."[121] Moreover, Stafford emphasises French politeness, ornament language and excessive speaking were connected to French stereotypical masculinity, who were thought to use flattery for personal gain.[122] This leads to the most significant difference the British men thought they had and the French did not – sincerity. Cohen suggests that there was a conflict between politeness and sincerity, as being sincere could result in breaking the rules of politeness. She adds that from the second half of the 18th century, there was a substantial shift towards sincerity over politeness.[123] She moreover asserts that this resulted in a change in British masculine characteristics around the end of the 18th century. She explains that politeness alone stopped being considered the key part of a British gentleman as it became connected with "hypocrisy" and "insincerity."[124] This is related to Tosh's claim that in the 18th century, English masculinity was not assessed based on "appearance" and "behaviour" but also through "moral qualities" necessary for manliness, which he claims are "courage, resolution and tenacity." He adds that accomplishments and honour were not as important without such qualities.[125] Therefore, it can be said that politeness in the early 19th century was not enough to establish a man as masculine, as it needed to be complemented with moral values. Even though politeness was still essential. Cohen and Stafford explain that at the start of the 19th century, there was tension about the ideal level of politeness; if a man was not polite enough, he would not be considered "manly," but in other cases, he could be seen as effeminate.[126]

---

[119] Cohen, "Manliness, Effeminacy and the French."
[120] Cohen, "Manliness, Effeminacy and the French."
[121] Cohen, "Manliness, Effeminacy and the French."
[122] Stafford, "Gentlemanly Masculinity," 62.
[123] Cohen, "Manliness, Effeminacy and the French."
[124] Cohen, "'Manners' Make the Man," 314–15.
[125] Tosh, "The Old Adam," 73.
[126] Cohen, "'Manners' Make the Man," 313; Stafford, "Gentlemanly Masculinity," 62.

The reason why excessive politeness was considered a female characteristic dates to the 18th-century assumption. Cohen claims that women were essential for politeness, as many essayists, clergymen, and philosophers in the 18th century believed when a man interacted and discoursed with women, he could learn politeness from them. She elaborates that these authors shared the belief that women were naturally polite.[127] Cohen also suggests that it was believed that men needed to talk with women in order to transform from what was believed to be "natural" manliness, "roughness, brutality, ungraciousness", to politeness and refinement. Cohen claims that this was linked to another assumption that a man would become effeminate after too much interaction with women because he would lose characteristics of his "natural manliness" and become too similar to a woman.[128] This would happen, as Joanne Begiato implies when a man's expressions, gestures or voice resembled those perceived by society as female.[129] Nonetheless, the other reason why men in the 19th century did not want to appear overtly polite (and, in consequence, effeminate) was that they would resemble how the British saw a stereotypical French man, who, as Stafford argues, was seen as effeminate.[130] In this period, it was seen as highly negative. This was caused by a strong anti-French sentiment as part of nationalism since the 1790s. Historian Gerald Newman explains that in the 1790s, after the French Revolution, Britain saw a strong wave of anti-French propaganda that was driven by ideological differences. Newman continues that this anti-French discourse influenced literature, political discourse and subsequently nationalism and masculinity.[131] In other words, British nationalism in the 1790s was heavily connected to anti-French propaganda, which influenced British men to avoid stereotypical behaviour associated with the French.

This is closely connected with the second influence, which had a significant impact on British masculinity – Chivalry. Cohen suggests that the British wanted to find their own identity in this period. She claims that the concept of chivalry helped to support the confidence of the nation because it celebrated the past Britain and its values, which connected British people with their ancestors, allowing them reinforce their national identity and independence from other influences.[132] Cohen argues that in the second half of the 18th century, the "revival of chivalry

---

[127] Cohen, "Manliness, Effeminacy and the French."
[128] Cohen, "Manliness, Effeminacy and the French."
[129] Joanne Begiato, "Between Poise and Power: Embodied Manliness in Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Century British Culture," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 26 (September 29, 2016): 132, https://doi.org/10.1017/S0080440116000086.
[130] Stafford, "Gentlemanly Masculinity," 67–68.
[131] Gerald Newman, "Anti-French Propaganda and British Liberal Nationalism in the Early Nineteenth Century: Suggestions toward a General Interpretation," *Victorian Studies* 18, no. 4 (1975): 388–92.
[132] Cohen, "'Manners' Make the Man," 318.

began," which reintroduced this concept in Britain.[133] Historians Derek Brewer and Barry Windeatt claim that core chivalric values were "bravery, loyalty, truth, fair play, disinterestedness."[134] In chivalric values, an explanation of why a man should treat a woman in an especially polite manner can be found. Cohen claims that chivalric masculinity was centred around the relationship with women. She adds that chivalric men viewed women as physically weaker and submissive, therefore requiring protection from them.[135] The view of women as weak might be the motivation why men should treat women in a more polite manner than men.

Focusing now on gentlemanly masculinity and the characters of *Pride and Prejudice,* characters Mr Bingley and his friend Mr Darcy are to be discussed. As mentioned, social performance was the most significant mark of masculinity of the period, which can be illustrated by Mr Bingley. He is a middle-class man who comes to Meryton to rent Netherfield. He is invited by Mrs Phillips to a ball, where he meets important citizens of Meryton for the first time, and thus he needs to establish his social image. This can be seen in the following example: "Mr Bingley had soon made himself acquainted with all the principal people in the room; he was lively and unreserved, danced every dance, was angry that the ball closed so early, and talked of giving one himself at Netherfield."[136] This part shows how Mr Bingley treats other people when he meets them for the first time: he openly talks with everyone in the room in order to initiate social connections with important people. Furthermore, he also dances with women, which female characters appreciate.[137] The significance of dancing can be explained by Cohen's comment that it was essential for a gentleman to please women in social interactions to be seen as polite.[138]

Bingley's positive first impression ensures he is universally liked whenever he appears.[139] Moreover, when Jane described him after meeting him for the first time, she said, "[Bingley] is just what a young man ought to be, [..] sensible, good humoured [sic], lively; and I never saw such happy manners! —so much ease, with such perfect good breeding!"[140] Elizabeth described him later in the novel as a "sweet-tempered, amiable, charming man."[141] Jane and Elizabeth put emphasis on his exemplary behaviour, which seems the most significant mark of a gentleman

[133] Cohen, "'Manners' Make the Man," 315–19.
[134] Derek Brewer and Barry Windeatt, "Chivalry," June 4, 2019, 88, https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118902226.ch6.
[135] Cohen, "'Manners' Make the Man," 328–29.
[136] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 8.
[137] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 8–9.
[138] Cohen, "'Manners' Make the Man," 313, 320.
[139] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 12.
[140] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 11.
[141] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 60.

for them, at least in Mr Bingley's case. They both appreciated the open friendliness that he displayed towards them, as well as his manners, which Jane perceived as sincere. This is connected to another example from the novel. After Elizabeth arrives to visit her ill sister Jane at Bingley's residence, this example shows how Bingley acted toward Elizabeth:

> [Mr Bingley] was the only one of the party whom [Elizabeth] could regard with any complacency. His anxiety for Jane was evident, and his attentions to herself most pleasing, and they prevented her feeling herself so much an intruder as she believed she was considered by the others.[142]

This illustrates that Mr Bingley is thoughtful towards Elizabeth, and even though his sisters display passive animosity towards Elizabeth, as implied in the excerpt, he tries to make her feel wanted in his residence. He even forced his sister Caroline to act politely towards Elizabeth, as he disliked his sister's impolite behaviour towards Elizabeth.[143] Mr Bingley also gave orders to his housekeeper to pay the fullest attention to Jane and Elizabeth, ensuring that they have everything that they need.[144] In other words, for Bingley, it was important that his behaviour was not only polite and thoughtful but also that of his family and his servants. This suggests that a gentleman such as Bingley wants every social interaction to be conducted in a civilised manner.

The following day, when Mrs Bennet visits Jane, she apologised that Jane is too ill to return home and she would need to stay as a guest in Bingley's residence. Bingley replied, "Removed! […] It must not be thought of. My sister, I am sure, will not hear of her removal."[145] Bingley reacts this way to ensure that both Jane and Elizabeth would not feel ashamed that they abuse his hospitality. Even later in the novel, Bingley demonstrates similar behaviour towards Elizabeth. When he met her again after several months, he greeted her with "unaffected cordiality," and then he "inquired in a friendly, though general way, after her family, and looked and spoke with the same good humoured ease [sic] that he had ever done."[146] This is another example of Bingley's politeness. By asking about Elizabeth's family, he expresses interest in her relatives, and he clearly states that he thinks of her family in a friendly manner.

Whenever Mr Bingley comes into contact with society, he speaks with people, prevents others from feeling unwelcomed and interacts with women to please them. Moreover, his manners seem sincere by Elizabeth. He also dislikes impolite behaviour and urges other

---

[142] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 25.
[143] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 33.
[144] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 29.
[145] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 30.
[146] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 182.

characters to act civilised. As Mr Bingley is universally liked, it can be said that he represents an archetypal gentleman of the early 19th-century Britain.

Mr Darcy provides a stark contrast to his friend Mr Bingley. Even though he is at first admired for his "tall person, handsome features and noble mien,"[147] after a while, public opinion changed, as shown in this excerpt:

> 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; […] Mr. Darcy danced only once with Mrs. Hurst and once with Miss Bingley, declined being introduced to any other lady, and spent the rest of the evening in walking about the room, speaking occasionally to one of his own party. His character was decided. He was the proudest, most disagreeable man in the world, and everybody hoped that he would never come there again.[148]

There are two main differences in Darcy's behaviours, which resulted in a negative perception of his masculinity. As opposed to Bingley, Darcy did not meet other people or established conversations with people in the ballroom; instead, he only conversed with people he knows, not showing any interest in others. He also refused to dance with other women than Miss Caroline Bingley and Mrs Hurst, who are his acquaintances.[149] Another passage from the text points out his unwillingness to talk. Mrs Bennet shared with the family the experience of Mrs Long with Darcy. According to Mrs Bennet, Mr Darcy "sat close to [Mrs Long] for half of an hour without once opening his lips," and when Mrs Long addressed Mr Darcy, he "seemed very angry at being spoken to."[150] From the examples, it can be said that he failed to engage in conversations with women; in other words, he failed to please them, which was important to be recognised as polite, as already mentioned. The society attending the social gathering interpreted Darcy's behaviour as him thinking they are not worthy of his attention since he considers himself to be of higher social standing. This suggests that the party at the ball thought of him as lacking modesty. There are two claims to support the significance of humility: Stafford explains that men were praised by other men for "modesty, humility, and meekness,"[151] and Gregory, in a similar way, concludes that Christian virtues such as humility and modesty were essential for a gentleman.[152] There is also another significant example of a lack of

[147] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 8.
[148] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 8.
[149] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 9.
[150] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 14.
[151] Stafford, "Gentlemanly Masculinity," 57.
[152] Gregory, "Homo Religiosus."

humility. The way Mr Darcy proposed to Elizabeth in the later part of the novel is detailed in this excerpt:

> He spoke well, […] and he was not more eloquent on the subject of tenderness than of pride. His sense of her inferiority—of its being a degradation—of the family obstacles which had always opposed to inclination, were dwelt on with a warmth which seemed due to the consequence he was wounding, but was very unlikely to recommend his suit.[153]

The example suggests that Darcy was expressing his superior status over Elizabeth and emphasised her lowly connection, which can be interpreted as unhumbled behaviour. Elizabeth herself commented later that Mr Darcy should have behaved "in a more gentlemanlike manner" when proposing to her.[154] The statement implies that Elizabeth considers a lack of humility when interacting with her as ungentlemanlike.

Although Darcy's behaviour in social spaces in the first half of the novel is not in accordance with gentlemanly masculinity, there are other aspects of masculinity in which he fits into the hegemonic masculinity of the period. According to D. Stone, other characteristics of the ideal gentleman were bravery, loyalty and chivalry. He further explains that the gentlemen participated in events they were personally interested in rather than for profit, they also prioritised public good over their individual gain.[155] Care about public good aligns with Darcy's action accurately, as presented by many actions reported in the novel. When George Wickham left debts behind him in Derbyshire, Mr Darcy paid them to alleviate his debtors.[156] Darcy's charitable behaviour is mentioned by Wickham himself, who explained to Elizabeth that Darcy tends to be "liberal and generous, to give his money freely, to display hospitality, to assist his tenants, and relieve the poor."[157] His behaviour to the public is later in the novel confirmed by his housekeeper, Mrs Reynolds. She suggested that "[h]e is the best landlord, and the best master that ever lived. There is not one of his tenants or servants but will give him a good name."[158] These examples clearly illustrate that Mr Darcy does care about his servants and other people surrounding him. Therefore, even though Mr Darcy, at least in the first half of the novel, fails to display behaviour associated with gentlemanliness in public, his actions that escaped public scrutiny, such as care for the public good, align well with gentlemanly masculinity.

---

[153] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 135.
[154] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 137.
[155] Stone, "Deconstructing the Gentleman Amateur," 2.
[156] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 185.
[157] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 59.
[158] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 174.

Another important aspect of gentlemanly masculinity was self-control, and it can be illustrated in Darcy's reaction to seeing Elizabeth unwell after she receives news about Wickham's kidnapping of her sister Lydia:

> "Good God! what is the matter?" cried he, with more feeling than politeness; then recollecting himself. "I will not detain you a minute; but let me, or let the servant go after Mr and Mrs Gardiner. You are not well enough; you cannot go yourself."[159]

When Darcy expresses his surprise for Elizabeth with emotion, the novel directly claims that this behaviour is impolite. In other words, at least for a man, politeness is strongly connected to self-control. Genuine emotions, even those that can be interpreted as real interest in a person or their health, can be seen as impolite. This is supported by Stafford, who explains that men saw self-control as the most significant because they considered passionate behaviour as unfitted of a man and also uncivilised.[160] Tosh adds that it was expected for a man to repress their feelings and impulses, as he further elaborates in a sense to repress their authenticity and act according to social expectations of the time period. If a gentleman could not control his impulses, he could be considered effeminate.[161] Darcy thus hides his authentic emotion of surprise and care for Elizabeth in order not to feel ashamed of his behaviour. After he restored control over his emotions, he expressed his concern for Elizabeth in a way that was appropriate for a gentleman. This is not the only example where Darcy acted emotionally rather than with detached rationality. Earlier in the novel, Mr Darcy proposed to Elizabeth but was bluntly rejected by her. His reaction to this is as follows:

> Mr Darcy, who was leaning against the mantelpiece with his eyes fixed on her face, seemed to catch her words with no less resentment than surprise. His complexion became pale with anger, and the disturbance of his mind was visible in every feature. He was struggling for the appearance of composure, and would not open his lips till he believed himself to have attained it.[162]

From this example, it is clear that Darcy was in a state of high emotional distress after being rejected by Elizabeth, as can be interpreted from the text. Even though this was a highly emotional moment for Darcy, and he was alone with Elizabeth, he did not respond with sincere emotions. Instead, he waited before he was able to appear calm. The reason can be that after being rejected, Mr Darcy did not want to worsen Elizabeth's perception of him and be

[159] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 193.
[160] Stafford, "Gentlemanly Masculinity," 67.
[161] Tosh, "The Old Adam," 73.
[162] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 135.

considered uncivilised and effeminate. The second possibility is that he feared that Elizabeth could share what happened with someone else, which could hurt his social image. This example illustrates that a gentleman needed to hide his emotions that were not considered appropriate if he did not want to commit what was seen as shameful behaviour. In other words, social expectations of the period limited a man's ability to express emotions in public.

Even though behaviour in society was crucial, gentlemanliness was also connected to education. This is represented in the novel by Mr Darcy, who has a big library in his mansion, Pemberley. At one point in the novel, he commented that his library "has been the work of many generations" and that he "cannot comprehend the neglect of a family library."[163] Caroline Bingley, in the same conversation, told Mr Darcy: "You have added so much to it yourself; you are always buying books."[164] Moreover, when Darcy is asked about who he thinks is an "accomplished woman", he mentioned that she should "improve her mind by extensive reading."[165] These examples illustrate that reading and education had an importance for Mr Darcy, and he thinks highly of people who spend time reading. His care for the family library also indicates that he is willing to spend money on gaining knowledge, and he aims to provide his future children with the means to an excellent education. This positive attitude to reading is a typical habit for gentlemanly masculinity, as Stafford suggests, gentlemen saw self-education via reading and appreciation for literature as a very positive habit, for which many men were highly regarded.[166]

The main differences that distinguish Mr Bingley and Mr Darcy is their public behaviour. Mr Bingley expresses interest in people, is always polite, especially to women and ensures that the behaviour of others is also polite. What makes Darcy distinct in the first part of the novel is that he does engage in communication with people, and the way he sometimes speaks gives an idea he is not humble. Furthermore, Darcy demonstrated that he sometimes has problems controlling his emotions, even though self-control was crucial for gentlemanly masculinity, as the opposite was considered impolite. Another important factor was also care for the well-being of a community and a love of education and literature.

The following part of the thesis is about George Wickham and the masculinity of honour connected to British military officers. As previously mentioned in this part, soldiers should act like gentlemen, which means that many attributes connected to the ideal gentleman are also

---

[163] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 27.
[164] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 27.
[165] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 29.
[166] Stafford, "Gentlemanly Masculinity," 61.

valid for Wickam. Nonetheless, a soldier needed to follow the code of honour in order to fit into the ideal of an officer. Gilbert argues that the significant values were bravery and loyalty to other soldiers. Gilbert continues that when a soldier committed an act that goes against the principles of the honour code, he would be excluded from the community by other soldiers.[167] According to Andrew, the military code of honour was a very rigid system of values, which was believed to be a tool how to motivate soldiers to fight and act according to the code, as cowardice or violating the code would result in strong feelings of shame in the individual soldiers.[168] Even though the code of honour governed relationships within groups of soldiers (and nobility), it was, as Andrew suggests, recognised and respected by all social layers.[169] Therefore, masculinity of honour connected to military had similar attributes as gentlemanly masculinity with the addition of a rules represented by the honour code.

Before commenting further on the code of honour, it is crucial to explore Wickham's other attributes, first his physical description. From the first moment he is introduced in the novel, he draws the attention of people, especially women, and becomes popular among the people of Meryton for being perceived as an ideal soldier with gentlemanlike behaviour.[170] The first aspect of Wickham's masculinity explored in this thesis is his physical appearance, as Connell and Messerschmidt claim that physical appearance is significant in the construction of masculinities, especially in the case of hegemonic masculinity.[171] The first description that is given of Mr Wickam is when he first arrives in Meryton: "[h]is appearance was greatly in his favour; he had all the best part of beauty, a fine countenance, a good figure, and very pleasing address."[172] Among other things, this description highlights Wickham's figure, which was a very significant mark, especially for soldiers. According to Begiato, members of the military and navy were presented as men with tall and robust bodies, and the upright posture was especially highlighted because it was a posture that was connected to both the ideal body and high moral standards.[173] The connection between body and morality is represented in the novel when Elizabeth almost said to Wickham, "A young man, too, like you, whose very countenance may vouch for your being amiable."[174] Elizabeth is not the only character who considers physical appearance a sign of high moral standards. After Elizabeth shares with Jane

[167] Gilbert, "Law and Honour," 75.
[168] Andrew, "The Code of Honour," 414.
[169] Andrew, "The Code of Honour," 415.
[170] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 52–62.
[171] Connell and Messerschmidt, "Hegemonic Masculinity," 851.
[172] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 52.
[173] Begiato, "Between Poise and Power," 133–34.
[174] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 59.

Wickham's true nature, Jane commented, "Poor Wickham! there is such an expression of goodness in his countenance!"[175] This illustrates that Jane, before learning the truth, also held the opinion that Wickham was a moral person, and this opinion was partially influenced by his physical appearance and manners.

Another essential aspect of Wickham's masculinity is his social behaviour. Wickam is contrasted to the other soldiers attending Mrs Phillips' ball, "The officers of the ***shire were in general a very creditable, gentlemanlike set, [...]but Mr Wickham was as far beyond them all in person, countenance, air, and walk."[176] From this quote, it is clear that Wickham is superior to other soldiers in terms of social performance. In other words, he represents the ideal of hegemonic masculinity better than any of the other soldiers present. This is the reason why he draws the attention of people, especially women, as illustrated in the following example:

> Mr. Wickham was the happy man towards whom almost every female eye was turned, and Elizabeth was the happy woman by whom he finally seated himself; and the agreeable manner in which he immediately fell into conversation, though it was only on its being a wet night, made her feel that the commonest, dullest, most threadbare topic might be rendered interesting by the skill of the speaker.[177]

This example demonstrates Wickham's communicative skills and ability to lead an amusing conversation. Stafford points out that conversational skills played an essential role in a gentleman's life; a man with eloquent speech was highly regarded.[178] From the excerpt, it can be said he can fulfil societal expectations concerning speaking skills. Nonetheless, Wickham also seems skilful in creating his public image through lies and manipulation. When Wickham is invited to Mrs Phillip's social gathering, he sits down with Elizabeth and her sister Lydia. After Lydia leaves, he begins to talk about his childhood that he spent with Mr Darcy and explains that he was favoured by Darcy's father, who expressed a wish for him to inherit the parsonage. Wickham explained (while omitting important details) that after Mr Darcy's father's death, Mr Darcy had rejected his wish and gave the position in the church to another man.[179] When Elizabeth asked why he had not exposed him, Wickham replied: "[s]ome time or other he will be—but it shall not be by me. Till I can forget his father, I can never defy or expose him."[180] Elizabeth's reaction to this claim was as follows: "Elizabeth honoured him for such

[175] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 159.
[176] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 55.
[177] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 55.
[178] Stafford, "Gentlemanly Masculinity," 62–63.
[179] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 57–58.
[180] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 58.

feelings and thought him handsomer [sic] than ever as he expressed them."[181] This example is significant as it shows how Wickham successfully manipulated Elizabeth into thinking he is kind and forgiving and foremost loyal to Mr Darcy's father, his patron. It was loyalty that was one of the crucial aspects of gentlemanly masculinity, as D. Stone claims.[182] It can be said that Mr Wickham uses this opportunity to improve his public image and persuades Elizabeth to think he possesses attributes that are in accordance with the hegemonic masculinity of the period. Wickham does this to look as close to hegemonic masculinity and gentlemanly masculinity in this period as possible because it is beneficial for him. Consequently, Wickham is commonly invited to public events. For example, he is invited to a social gathering organised by Mrs Phillips.[183] Later, he is also frequently visits the Bennet family.[184] Nonetheless, Mr Wickham is not only liked by inhabitants of Meryton. He is also universally liked by other officers, as noted by the one who danced with Elizabeth at Mrs Philip's Ball.[185] This illustrates how men who can fit into hegemonic masculinity tend to be appreciated by other men from the same group.

Nonetheless, Wickham only appears in coherence with hegemonic masculinity, as implied by using lies and deception to gain a more favourable social image. Even though he is a soldier who should follow a code of honour, it seems in several places in the novel that he is indifferent to any moral values. Wickham made debts in Derbyshire (although he was not an officer at that time) and afterwards in Meryton before leaving the places without paying them.[186] Also, Jane shares with Elizabeth that Colonel Foster changed his formerly good opinion of Wickham and called him "imprudent" and "extravagant", which implies that Colonel Foster thinks that Wickham's behaviour in Meryton is unfitting of a soldier.[187] Colonel Foster's opinion of him might be related to the fact that Wickham is accused of many acts of seduction by inhabitants of Meryton.[188] Furthermore, Colonel Foster afterwards revealed that in Brighton, he also left debts for his expenses and debts of honour (debts he made while gambling).[189] These acts can be interpreted as violations of the code of honour. Gilbert suggests that there were many transgressions against the code of honour, and discrediting the regiment was one of them.

---

[181] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 58.
[182] Stone, "Deconstructing the Gentleman Amateur," 2.
[183] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 55.
[184] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 99.
[185] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 66.
[186] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 185, 203.
[187] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 203.
[188] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 206.
[189] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 209.

Gilbert continues that when a soldier violated the code of honour, he would face reclusion from other soldiers and he might be discharged from the army.[190] Instead of dealing with the problems and accusations, he runs away, which can be interpreted as cowardice. It was cowardice, which Gilbert suggests was the most contradictory to the code of honour.[191]

From these excerpts, it can be said that Wickham violated the code of honour. Even though Wickham belongs to the officers, he does not feel ashamed of his behaviour, as can be seen when he returns to Bennet's family after he marries Lydia. His behaviour is cheerful, and he even "inquired about his acquaintances with a good humoured ease [sic]."[192] There are no examples that would suggest that Wickham regrets or feels ashamed of his transgressions against the honour code, which suggests he did not adopt the values of the honour code. Furthermore, it can be interpreted that he is not interested in the opinions of other soldiers and does not fear their ostracization.

To sum it up, the masculinity of honour required behaviour that was akin to gentlemanly masculinity, but it also connected with an ideal body image. An officer also needed to follow a code of honour with values such as bravery and loyalty to other officers. If an officer violated the code of honour he would face condemnation by other soldiers. It can be said that Wickham successfully replicates the behaviour of an ideal officer, and with the help of lies and manipulation, he creates a favourable public image and the illusion of high moral standards. His behaviour is successful as he was seen in Meryton, according to Elizabeth, as "almost an angel of light."[193] This illustrates that a man can imitate behaviour associated with hegemonic masculinity without accepting its ideals and values and use behaviour situationally to gain the trust of others to benefit himself.

[190] Gilbert, "Law and Honour," 75–77.
[191] Gilbert, "Law and Honour," 75.
[192] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 221–22.
[193] Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 206.

Conclusion

Regarding gender roles in early 19th century Britain, middle-class women and men belonged to different social spheres. Social sphere theory talks about the public sphere and the domestic/private sphere. Men were active in the public sphere connected to market and public life, where they could earn a living. Women generally could not attend the public sphere and stayed in the private sphere. There were also social spaces, such as assembly rooms, where middle-class men and women met. In the early 19th century, a middle-class man's choice of wife was crucial if he wanted to conserve or increase his status, as marriage could bring a man finances and new connections. Also, a wife was necessary for a well-managed house, which raised the social status of a family. This thesis also highlighted that the choice of wife was dependent on the decision of the head of the family, and other relatives and family friends had an influence on this matter, as their future was also affected. In the novel, this is illustrated by Mr Bingley's sisters and his friend Darcy persuading him not to marry Jane on the basis it was not an adequately beneficial marriage. In many cases, women needed to marry only because they did not want to put a strain on family finances, as in the case of Charlotte Lucas marrying William Collins, even though she disliked him as a person. It also dealt with Mr Bennet's role as a father. It demonstrated that Mr Bennet conducted his role poorly by not trying to increase his family's wealth and rather spending time alone, even though it was believed that improving the status of a family was a worthwhile activity. He also paid very little attention to family matters, treating them as unimportant. This thesis also suggested that Mr Bennet was, according to notions of the period, responsible for the unacceptable behaviour of his three youngest daughters because he did not seriously engage in their upbringing, as it was his responsibility to teach them moral values. Mr Bennet himself accepted his responsibility for fate of his younger daughter Lydia.

Moreover, this thesis also explored masculinity early 19th century. It defined two hegemonic masculinities of the period: gentlemanly masculinity connected with Charles Bingley and Fitzwilliam Darcy and the masculinity honour with George Wickham related to British officers. It suggested that a gentleman was a man who was polite, especially to women. In order to be recognised as a gentleman, a man needed to socialise in society and be polite when interacting with women, as demonstrated by Mr Bingley. A gentleman also wanted social interaction among others to be conducted in a civilised manner. Nonetheless, a gentleman was not only recognisable through his politeness but also his modesty, love of education and actions benefiting the public. A man belonging to gentlemanly masculinity needed to exercise a high

degree of self-control as emotions in public were not considered polite, and therefore, a gentleman's emotional expression was limited. This thesis also explored masculinity of honour connected to officers of British army, which incorporated gentlemanly behaviour, but its members also needed to follow an honour code consisting of rules such as loyalty to the group, and if a man violated it, he would be condemned by his community. For masculinity of honour, physical appearance and manners were significant because they were thought to signify high moral standards. This part also emphasised that a man can adopt only the behaviour of masculinity without accepting its values, as in the case of George Wickham, because being aligned with the hegemonic masculinity of the period is highly beneficial. This is the reason why Wickham also uses manipulation and lies to seem closer to hegemonic masculinity.

Resumé

Tato práce se věnuje zobrazení genderových rolí a maskulinity v románu Jane Austenové *Pýcha a předsudek z* roku 1813. Definováním pojmů jako gender, maskulinita a teorie hegemonní maskulinity vytváří teoretický rámec pro praktickou část. Nejprve se tato práce zaměřuje na britské genderové role 19. století, zejména roli otce pana Benneta a nastiňuje také jeho vztah s dcerami. Dále tato práce zkoumá dvě dobové hegemonní maskulinity a jejich původ a porovnává, jak Charles Bingley, Fitzwilliam Darcy a George Wickham odpovídají historickým představám o maskulinitě.

Tato práce představuje kritická maskulinní studia jako multidisciplinární obor, který zkoumá maskulinitu z perspektivy např. psychologie, sociologie a genderových studií. Dále definuje termín pohlaví z několika perspektiv. Sociologická a psychologická definuje pohlaví jako termín označující muže a ženu na základě fyzických odlišností, ale existují i lidé označováni jako intersex, kteří nezapadají do těchto kategorií na základě jejich atypické fyziologie. Pohled na pohlaví u feministické socioložky Christine Delphy je však odlišný. Delphy považuje termíny muž a žena za nepřesné kategorie, které rozlišuje lidi na základě pouze několika proměnných, přičemž ostatní pro tuto klasifikaci nejsou důležité. Tato práce však pracuje pouze s kategoriemi muž a žena, neboť román rozděluje postavy do těchto kategorií. Tato práce také přestavuje výraz gender, který může mít dva významy. Zaprvé ve smyslu genderová identita, jinými slovy vnímání vlastního genderu, jež může být odlišné od vnímání společnosti. Zadruhé ve významu genderové role jako docíleného statusu, se kterým se pojí očekávané a společností přijímané chování pro jedince. Genderové role jsou tvořeny sociálními, kulturními a historickými představami o správném chování pro muže a ženy, jinými slovy sociálně konstruované a toto chování je pak předáváno jedinci pomocí sociálního učení. Maskulinita označuje genderovou roli pro muže. Neexistuje však jedna maskulinita a její vnímání se liší v závislosti na regionu a historickém období, ale i každý jedinec může mít své vlastní pojetí maskulinity. Dále představuje teorii hegemonní maskulinity, kterou zavedla R. W. Connellová v 80. letech 20. století. Cílem této teorie je vysvětlil moderní společenský řád, kde mají muži vyšší postavení než ženy. Teorie pracuje s konceptem hegemonní maskulinity, která je nadřazená nad ostatními maskulinitami. Jednou z nich je komplicitní maskulinita, jejíchž členové pomáhají udržovat tento společenský řád, protože je to pro ně výhodné. Existují však také podřízené a marginalizované maskulinity, které z nadřazenosti mužů ve společnosti neprofitují. Hegemonní maskulinita je společností nejvíce přijímána a také má největší vliv na politiku a společnost. Hegemonní maskulinita navíc nemusí vycházet z chování skutečného

muže, je to spíše ideál vytvořený výchovou a médii, který díky tomu přežívá ve společnosti. Avšak stejně jako u všech maskulinit jsou její charakteristiky závislé na regionu a sociálním postavení mužů. Navíc chování hegemonní maskulinity může být pouze situační za účelem získání lepšího postavení.

Druhá kapitola se zabývá genderovými rolemi členů střední třídy v Británii na počátku 19. století. Vzhledem k omezenému rozsahu této práce není možné prozkoumat historický kontext do hloubky, neboť počet vlivů, které formovali genderové role a maskulinitu je příliš rozsáhlý, a proto se tato práce zabývá jen nejvíce relevantním kontextem. Práce pracuje s teorií sociálních sfér a hovoří o veřejné a domácí/soukromé sféře. Muži ze střední třídy působili ve veřejné sféře spojené s trhem a veřejným životem, kde si vydělávat na živobytí. Ženy se života ve veřejné sféry zpravidla nemohly účastnit a zůstávaly v soukromé sféře. Tato teorie však byla kritizována za zjednodušení reality, protože existovaly společenské prostory, kde se setkávali muži a ženy z této sociální vrstvy. Tato práce tak pracuje jak s konceptem společenských prostorů, tak sociálních sfér. Pohled na muže a ženu byl v této době odlišný. Žena byla často vnímána pouze jako součást rodiny svého manžela nebo jiné hlavy rodiny a je mu podřízená. Muži však byli oslavováni za činy prospěšné společnosti nebo původ. Muži a ženy měli v soukromé sféře odlišné role. Hlava rodiny dohlížela na vedení domácnosti a využíval její prostředí k odpočinku od veřejné sféry, jeho manželka řídila domácnost, což zahrnovalo vaření, finanční hospodaření a vedení služebnictva. Přestože Británie byla patriarchální společností, britští muži ze střední třídy neměli v domácí sféře absolutní moc. Manželky prostřednictvím řízení domácnosti a služebnictva získávaly v domácnosti moc například nad služebnictvem. Na počátku 19. století byl výběr manželky pro muže rozhodující, pokud si chtěl zachovat nebo zvýšit své postavení, protože sňatek mohl muži přinést finance a nové konexe. Manželka byla důležitá správu domu, neboť dobře spravovaná domácnost zvyšovala společenské postavení rodiny. Tato práce také zdůrazňuje, že volba manželky závisela na rozhodnutí hlavy rodiny a vliv na tuto záležitost měli i ostatní příbuzní a přátelé rodiny, protože mohla silně ovlivnit jejich budoucnosti. V mnoha případech se ženy musely vdát jen proto, že nechtěly zatížit rodinné finance. Toto je v románu reprezentováno na případu Charlotty Lucasové, která si vzala Williama Collinse, i když jí jeho přítomnost obtěžuje. Tato práce též vysvětluje, že striktní rozdělení genderových rolí byl důsledek křesťanských názorů ovlivněné obnovou evangelismu. Místo žen ze střední třídy v domácnosti a jejich podřízené postavení bylo zdůvodňováno neschopností žen orientovat se ve veřejné sféře a jejich nevinností, která by byla pošpiněna v nemorálním tržním prostředí. Dále tyto názory předpokládali, že hlava rodiny/otec je zodpovědný za mravní výchovu svých dětí a předávání křesťanské víry dětem, což bylo

považováno za nezbytné pro mravní vývoj dětí a zachování společnosti. Tato práce se také zabývala, jak pan Bennet plní svou roli otce. Pan Bennet svojí roli zanedbával, protože se nesnažil zvýšit jmění rodiny a rodinným záležitostem věnoval málo pozornosti. Tato práce tvrdí že pan Bennet byl podle dobových představ zodpovědný za nepřijatelné chování a nízkou morální úroveň svých tří nejmladších dcer, protože se vážně nezaobíral jejich výchovou. Nepřijatelné společenské chování mělo za důsledek zhoršení veřejného postavení rodinu a možností sňatku jeho dcer. V románu byl reflektován koncept rodičovské zodpovědnosti za chování dětí, kdy pan Bennet přijme vinu za osud své nejmladší dcery Lydie, která se z jeho pohledu nechala unést Georgem Wickamem, protože z důvodu svého špatného vychování nevěděla, co je společensky nepřijatelné.

Třetí kapitola se zabývá maskulinitou v Británii přibližně v na počátku 19. století. Tato práce definuje dvě hegemonní maskulinity v tomto období: gentlemanskou maskulinitu spojenou s Charlesem Bingleym a Fitzwilliamem Darcym a maskulinitu cti George Wickhama. Avšak maskulinita cti byla spojena s dvěma skupinami, šlechtou a Britskou armádou, jelikož pro obě byla čest důležitá. Kodex cti pro šlechtice upravoval vztah mezi nimi a ženami stejného původu. Tato práce se však hlavně zabývá maskulinitou cti spojenou s důstojníky Britské armády jako je George Wickham. Ideální chování gentlemanů a ideálních důstojníků však bylo podobné, a proto očekáváné chování platí pro obě skupiny. Avšak členové Britské armády měli povinnost ctít kodex cti, systém pravidel pro důstojníky britské armády. Tato práce naznačuje, že titul gentleman byl původně používán pro muže ze šlechtického rodu, ale v 18. století se tento titul začal používat i pro muže ze střední třídy. Tato práce se také zabývá vlivy na Britskou maskulinitu a tvrdí, že ten nejdůležitější aspekt gentlemana: zdvořilost, lze přičíst dvěma vlivům. Prvním vlivem byla inspirace francouzskou zdvořilostí, ale namísto plného přijmutí francouzského modelu kladli Britové větší důraz na upřímnost. Britský gentleman na přelomu století čelil úzkosti o správnou úroveň zdvořilosti, pokud byl příliš zdvořilí mohl být považován za zženštilého. Být považován za zženštilého bylo pro Britského muže nepříjemné, protože pak se podobal britskému stereotypu francouzského muže, což bylo považováno za vysoce negativní z důvodu anti-francouzské propagandy v devadesátých letech 18. století. Druhým vlivem na britskou maskulinitu byly rytířské ideály jako je odvaha, férovost a loajalita. Aby byl muž ve společnosti uznáván jako gentleman, musel se chovat společensky a zdvořile, a v sociálních interakcích být schopen potěšit ženy. Gentleman také chtěl, aby společenský styk mezi ostatními probíhal civilizovaným způsobem. Nicméně gentlemanská maskulinita se nepojila jen podle zdvořilosti, ale také se skromností, láskou ke vzdělání a péče o dobro společnosti. Navíc muž, který patřil ke gentlemanské maskulinitě, musel projevovat vysokou

míru sebeovládání, protože když gentleman projevil emoce na veřejnosti bylo to považováno za nezdvořilé, a proto byl citový projev mužů silně omezen. Tato práce se také zabývala maskulinitou cti spojenou s důstojníky britské armády, která zahrnovala gentlemanské chování, ale její členové museli také dodržovat kodex cti sestávající z pravidel, jako je loajalita ke skupině. Pokud jej voják porušil, byl zavržen svou komunitou a mohl být propuštěn z armády. Pro maskulinitu cti byl důležitý fyzický vzhled a způsoby chování, protože byly spojeny s vysokou morální úrovní. Tato část pojednává o tom, že muž nemusí přijmout hodnoty, které se pojí k jeho maskulinitě a jen situačně používat takové chování. George Wickham také používá lži a manipulace, aby přesvědčil ostatní, že patří do maskulinity cti, protože je pro něj výhodné být spojen s hegemonní maskulinitou svého času a přineslo mu to popularitu a mnoho výhod.

Bibliography

Andrew, Donna T. “The Code of Honour and Its Critics: The Opposition to Duelling in England, 1700-1850.” *Social History* 5, no. 3 (1980): 409–34.

Austen, Jane. *Pride and Prejudice*. 1813. Reprint, Surrey, England: Alma Classics, 2016.

Bailey, Joanne. “‘A Very Sensible Man’: Imagining Fatherhood in England c.1750–1830.” *History* 95, no. 3 (319) (2010): 267–92.

Bailey, Joanne. “The Disciplining and Instructive Parent.” In *Parenting in England, 1760-1830: Emotion, Identity, and Generation*, 71–100. Oxford University Press, 2012. https://ualresearchonline.arts.ac.uk/id/eprint/22519/.

Barker, Hannah, and Elaine Chalus. “Introduction.” In *Gender in Eighteenth-Century England*, edited by Hannah Barker and Elaine Chalus. Routledge, 1997. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315842523.

Begiato, Joanne. “Between Poise and Power: Embodied Manliness in Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Century British Culture.” *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 26 (September 29, 2016): 125–47. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0080440116000086.

Brewer, Derek, and Barry Windeatt. “Chivalry,” June 4, 2019, 87–103. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118902226.ch6.

Cambridge Dictionary. “Gentleman | Meaning in the Cambridge English Dictionary.” Cambridge.org, 2020. https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/gentleman.

Carter, Philip. “Introduction: Gentleman, Manliness and Polite Society.” In *Men and the Emergence of Polite Society, Britain 1660-1800*, 1–14. London: Routledge, 2014. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315840239.

Cohen, Michèle. “Manliness, Effeminacy and the French: Gender and the Construction of National Character in Eighteenth-Century England.” In *English Masculinities, 1660-1800*, edited by Tim Hitchcock and Michèle Cohen. Routledge, 2014. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315840314.

Cohen, Michèle. “‘Manners’ Make the Man: Politeness, Chivalry, and the Construction of Masculinity, 1750–1830.” *Journal of British Studies* 44, no. 2 (2005): 312–29. https://doi.org/10.1086/427127.

Connell, R. W., and James W. Messerschmidt. “Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept.” *Gender and Society* 19, no. 6 (2005): 829–59.

Connell, Raewyn. “The Field of Knowledge.” In *Configuring Masculinity in Theory and Literary Practice*, edited by Stefan Horlacher, 39–52. Brill, 2015. http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1163/j.ctv2gjwt1m.6.

Davidoff, Leonore, and Catherine Hall. *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class, 1780-1850*. University of Chicago Press, 1987.

Delphy, Christine. “Rethinking Sex and Gender.” *Women’s Studies International Forum* 16, no. 1 (1993): 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/0277-5395(93)90076-l.

Demetriou, Demetrakis Z. “Connell’s Concept of Hegemonic Masculinity: A Critique.” *Theory and Society* 30, no. 3 (2001): 337–61. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1017596718715.

Edwards, Tim. “Introduction.” In *Cultures of Masculinity*, 1–5. Routledge, 2004.

Gardiner, Judith Kegun. “Men, Masculinities, and Feminist Theory.” In *Handbook of Studies on Men and Masculinities*, edited by Michael Kimmel, Jeff Hearn, and R.W. Connell, 35–51. Sage Publications, 2004.

Gilbert, Arthur N. “Law and Honour among Eighteenth-Century British Army Officers.” *The Historical Journal* 19, no. 1 (1976): 75–87.

Gregory, Jeremy. “Homo Religiosus: Masculinity and Religion in the Long Eighteenth Century.” In *English Masculinities, 1660-1800*, edited by Tim Hitchcock and Michèle Cohen. Routledge, 2014. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315840314.

Griffin, Ben. “Hegemonic Masculinity as a Historical Problem.” *Gender & History* 30, no. 2 (2018): 377–400. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0424.12363.

Harvey, Karen. *The Little Republic: Masculinity and Domestic Authority in Eighteenth Century Britain*. Oxford University Press, 2012. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199533848.001.0001.

Holter, Øystein Gullvåg. “Social Theories for Researching Men and Masculinities.” In *Handbook of Studies on Men & Masculinities*, edited by Michael Kimmel, Jeff Hearn, and R. W. Connell, 15–34. Sage Publications, 2005.

Hyde, Janet Shibley, Rebecca S. Bigler, Daphna Joel, Charlotte Chucky Tate, and Sari M. van Anders. “The Future of Sex and Gender in Psychology: Five Challenges to the Gender Binary.” *American Psychologist* 74, no. 2 (2019): 171–93. https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000307.

Kimmel, Michael S., and Amy Aronson. *Men & Masculinities [2 Volumes]: A Social, Cultural, and Historical Encyclopedia*. Bloomsbury Academic, 2004.

Lindsey, Linda L. “The Sociology of Gender.” In *Gender Sociological Perspectives*, 3–37. Routledge Books, 2020. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315102023.

Mikkola, Mari. “Feminist Perspectives on Sex and Gender.” In *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, edited by Edward N. Zalta and Uri Nodelman, Summer 2024. Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University, 2024. https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2024/entries/feminism-gender/.

Morrow, Deana F. “Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity Expression.” In *Sexual Orientation and Gender Expression in Social Work Practice: Working with Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender People*, by Deana F. Morrow and Lori Messinger, 3–17. Columbia University Press, 2006.

Newman, Gerald. “Anti-French Propaganda and British Liberal Nationalism in the Early Nineteenth Century: Suggestions toward a General Interpretation.” *Victorian Studies* 18, no. 4 (1975): 385–418.

Ortner, Sherry B. “Patriarchy.” *Feminist Anthropology* 3, no. 2 (2022): 307–14. https://doi.org/10.1002/fea2.12081.

Posey, Lauren. “Gender.” *Critical Quarterly* 58, no. 3 (October 1, 2016): 94–96. https://doi.org/10.1111/criq.12293.

Reeser, Todd. “Concepts of Masculinity and Masculinity Studies.” *Configuring Masculinity in Theory and Literary Practice* 58 (2020): 11–38. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004299009_003.

Rendall, Jane. “Women and the Public Sphere.” *Gender & History* 11, no. 3 (November 1999): 475–88. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0424.00157.

Roulston, Chris. “Space and the Representation of Marriage in Eighteenth-Century Advice Literature.” *The Eighteenth Century* 49, no. 1 (2008): 25–41.

Stafford, William. “Gentlemanly Masculinities as Represented by the Late Georgian Gentleman’s Magazine.” *History* 93, no. 309 (2008): 47–68. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-229X.2008.00413.x.

Steinbach, Susie. “‘Can We Still Use “Separate Spheres”? British History 25 Years After Family Fortunes.’” *History Compass* 10, no. 11 (2012): 826–37. https://doi.org/10.1111/hic3.12010.

Stone, Duncan. “Deconstructing the Gentleman Amateur.” *Cultural and Social History* 18, no. 3 (2019): 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/14780038.2019.1614284.

Stone, Lawrence. “Mating Arrangements.” In *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England, 1500-1800*, 181–216. New York: Harper & Row, 1979.

Tadmor, Naomi. “The Concept of the Household Family in Eighteenth Century England.” *Past & Present*, no. 151 (1996): 111–40.

Tosh, John. “Home and Away: The Flight from Domesticity in Late-Nineteenth-Century England Re-Visited.” *Gender & History* 27, no. 3 (2015): 561–75. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0424.12150.

Tosh, John. “The Old Adam and the New Man: Emerging Themes in the History of English Masculinities, 1750-1850.” In *Manliness and Masculinities in Nineteenth-Century Britain: Essays on Gender, Family and Empire*, 61–82. London: Routledge, 2017. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315838533.

Waling, Andrea. “Rethinking Masculinity Studies: Feminism, Masculinity, and Poststructural Accounts of Agency and Emotional Reflexivity.” *The Journal of Men’s Studies* 27, no. 1 (2018): 89–107. https://doi.org/10.1177/1060826518782980.