PAMUKKALE ÜNİVERSİTESİ SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ DERGİSİ

PAMUKKALE UNIVERSITY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES INSTITUTE

ISSN 1308 - 2922 Sayı/*Number* 6 Nisan/April 2010

Hakemli bilimsel bir dergi olan PAUSBED yılda üç kez yayımlanmaktadır.
Dergide yayımlanan çalışmalardan, kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla alıntı yapılabilir.
Çalışmaların tüm sorumluluğu yazarına/yazarlarına aittir.

Grafik ve Dizgi
Gülderen ÇAVUŞ ALTINTAŞ

Baskı
Dijital Düşler
0212 279 64 44

Yazışma Adresi
Pamukkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Rektörlük Binası Kat: 2
Kınıklı Kampusu 20070 Kınıklı – DENİZLİ / TÜRKİYE
Tel. + 90 (258) 296 22 10 Fax. +90 (258) 296 23 47
e-posta: **pausbed@pau.edu.tr**

İÇİNDEKİLER/*CONTENTS*

Pamukkale Üniversitesi
Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi
Sayı 6, 2010, Sayfa 11-20

THE IDEOLOGY IN JANE AUSTEN'S *EMMA*

Cumhur Yılmaz MADRAN *

Abstract
This paper sheds light on the false consciousness which depends upon the hierarchical sense of class of the landed aristocracy in Jane Austen's Emma. In order to rationalise the ideas of class, hierarchy, rank and order as natural or given, upper class people employ ideology which depends upon the values of the polite society in order to hide their real intentions and to maintain the existing order. This paper's concern is to elucidate the fundamental and basic codes which shape both the characters's perception of social phenomena and their ideological plots to keep the current particular relations resting on money, status, rank in the light of Volosinov's discussion of ideology and language as one of the outstanding Marxist critics.

Key Words: *Ideology, Hierarchy, Landed Gentry, Polite Society, Status.*

JANE AUSTEN'IN *EMMA*'SINDA İDEOLOJI

Özet
Bu makale Jane Austen'ın Emma adlı eserinde arazi sahibi aristokrat sınıfın hiyerarşi düşüncesine dayalı ideolojisini incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Sınıf, hiyerarşi, statü ve düzen gibi kavramları doğal sosyolojik olgular olarak yansıtmak için yüksek sınıftan insanlar mevcut hiyerarşik düzeni korumak ve gerçek amaçlarını gizlemek amacıyla kibar sınıfın değerleri üzerine oturtulmuş ideoloji yürütmektedirler. Bu makalenin temel amacı önde gelen Marksist eleştirmenlerden biri olan Volosinov'un ideoloji ve dil tartışması ışığında, hem karakterlerin sosyal olguları kavrayışını, hem de para, statü ve hiyerarşiye dayalı mevcut sosyal ilişkileri sürdürmek için ideolojik komplolara şekil veren temel kodları tartışmaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *İdeoloji, Hiyerarşi, Arazi Sahibi Aristokrat Sınıf, Kibar Toplum, Statü.*

The present analysis is intended to shed some light on the class struggle and ideology in Jane Austen's *Emma*, which is one of the richest and most evocative texts. The novel provides a very satisfactory framework for the discussion of ideology which reflects the period, society and its relationships which depend upon false consciousness. *Emma* is a text which glosses over the traumatizing social problems when the reader focuses upon the psychological analysis of its protagonist, Emma Woodhouse. Her subjective psyche cannot be reduced to the introspective analysis of her mind. The reader faces a difficult problem of finding an approach through which she/he can criticise Emma's conscious, subjective psyche. Her conscious life is shaped by not the physiological or biological patterns, but by sociological environment. The boundary of the study is confined to the functions and the significance of the social factors such as class, hierarchy, rank and order as natural or given, and the fundamental and basic codes which represent the ideological tools. The introductory part revolves mainly around the general background discussion about the intrinsic relationship between ideology and language. This brief investigation is hoped to familiarise the reader with Jane Austen's perspective of ideology and social debates in the light of cultural and social ambiguities.

The theory and the critique of ideology in the nineteenth century which totally depends upon Cartesianism and the rationalism of the 17th and 18th centuries defined itself as a way of thinking which is systematically mistaken, as a form of false consciousness or as a distorted representation of reality. Ideological phenomena are reduced to the phenomena of individual consciousness which strip it of its sociality and materiality. Ide-

* Yrd. Doç. Dr. Pamukkale Üniversitesi Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi Batı Dilleri ve Edebiyatları Bölümü İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Anabilim Dalı Kınıklı/Denizli cymadran@pau.edu.tr

ology is accepted as a fact of consciousness. The reduction of ideology to individual consciousness stems from Saussure's giving priority to the abstract system of langue and ignoring actual speech, unique utterances of individuals as he called parole. Langue is a definite, fixed and determined system, and it is independent of the human subject. The system has its autonomous existence. Saussure alienates the individual from society. Saussurean sense of language has phobia of history and society, denigrating the role of diachrony and sublimating and exalting the role of synchrony. Saussure strips the language of its historical development. If the arbitrary relationship between signifier and signified is considered as completely random and accidental as Saussure did, it will mean "signifying processes are totally removed from the exigencies of history and class struggle" (Williams, 1977: 37). Semiotics and deconstruction challenge Saussure's one dimensional and monologic sense of language. Volosinov's Marxism and the Philosophy of Language (1973) "shifts the conceptual terrain away from an epistemological preoccupation with cognitive distortion and vague notions like 'world-view' or 'belief system' towards a concern with semiotic and linguistic processes." (Gardiner, 1992: 9) Opposed to Saussure, Volosinov was interested in unique utterances of particular individuals in particular social contexts. Rather than seeing language as static, determined and fixed structure, he saw it as a dynamic medium which is in continual changing process. The social role of parole and the social, historical context in which parole is produced are his major concerns. Particular individual utterances cannot be evaluated regardless of social factors in time and space. As Terry Eagleton explains, "language was not to be seen either as 'expression', 'reflection' or abstract system, but rather as a material means of production, whereby the material body of the sign was transformed through a process of social conflict and dialogue into meaning." (1983: 102)

Language is inherently dialogic, that is, each utterance is directed towards another utterance. As pointed out by Michail Bakhtin;

> *The living utterance, having taken meaning and shape at a particular historical moment in a socially specific environment, cannot fail to brush up against thousands of living dialogue threads, woven by socio-ideological consciousness around the given object of an utterance; it cannot fail to become an active participant in social dialogue. After all, the utterance arises out of this dialogue as a continuation of it and as a rejoinder to it… (1981: 276)*

Both addresser and addressee occupy different social contexts. The social role of verbal utterances as social interaction is the core of Volosinov's philosophy of sign. As he explained:

> *Any ideological product is not only itself a part of a reality (natural and social), just as is any physical body, any instrument of production, or any product for consumption, it also, in contradistinction to these other phenomena, reflects and refracts another reality outside itself. Everything ideological possesses meaning: it represents, depicts, or stands for something lying outside itself. In other words, it is a sign. Without signs there is no ideology. A physical body equals itself, so to speak; it does not signify anything but wholly coincides with its particular, given nature. In this case there is question of ideology. (1996: 9)*

The verbal sign which is implemented in parole is the most fundamental and the most revealing characteristic of social intercourse. The analysis of utterances sheds light on social psychology. Ideological phenomena cannot be accepted as phenomena of consciousness and analysed psychologistically. It cannot be reduced to the assessment of the subjective consciousness and psyche as the idealistic philosophy of culture and psychologistic studies do. "Its real place in existence" as Volosinov put it "is in the special, social material of signs created by man. Its specificity consists precisely in its being located between organised individuals, in its being the medium of their communication." (1996: 12) If we deprive consciousness of its socio-ideological content, it means to deprive it of the most fundamental and the most characteristic of that which is the main value about man. The sociological dimension of consciousness cannot be disregarded;

> *The study of ideologies does not depend upon psychology to any extent and need not be grounded in it. …objective psychology must be grounded in the study of ideologies. The reality of ideological phenomena is the objective reality of social signs. The laws of this reality are the laws of semiotic communication and*

> *are directly determined by the total aggregate of social and economic laws. Ideological reality is the immediate superstructure over the economic basis. Individual consciousness is not the architect of the ideological superstructure, but only a tenant lodging in the social edifice of ideological signs. (1996: 13)*

As seen, Volosinov emphasized the role of parole in particular social contexts by focusing on the material and social character of the sign which is the production of dialogical communication. In this sense, each sign is in the sphere of ideology in that they complement each other. It is inevitable to come across ideology where the sign exists. Parole, individual utterance or actual speech, is a social ideological fact. Thus, parole is the ideological phenomenon. Language is not a system of signs which can be analysed synchronically. It cannot be handled as an abstract grammatical category. It is a concrete dialogic medium in which there is a continual struggle over the sign between different forces. It stands for the co-existence of different perspectives and socio-ideological contradictions.

Emma is a text in which the subjective psyche of its character is not an object for natural-scientific analysis, as would be any item or process in the natural world; the subjective psyche is an object for ideological understanding and socio-ideological interpretation via understanding. As a fictional character, Emma is the production of the social context. The processes that create Emma are not inside, but outside her. The fundamental task of the reader is to unearth the covered social realities Emma's characteristics which strike the reader at the beginning of the novel such as "handsome, clever" (1994: 1) are extraordinarily shaky in order to winnow a meaning. These characteristics of Emma gloss over the following words of the narrator which will provide the reader with clues as to the existence of some type of social stratum: "and rich, with a comfortable home and happy disposition, seemed to unite some of the best blessings of existence; and had lived nearly twenty-one years in the world with very little to distress or vex her." (1) Emma as a member of an upper class family is totally devoid of any restraint and is free to do as she wishes as a pampered child of wealthy class after her mother's death: "Emma doing just what she liked; highly esteeming Miss Taylor's judgement, but directed chiefly by her own. The real evils, indeed, of Emma's situation were the power of having rather too much her own way, and a disposition to think a little too well of herself." (1) Her social status and her hierarchical power lead her to change the familial roles by diminishing her father's role. To quote Joel Weinsheimer's words, "in the relation of "Emma" and "Mr. Woodhouse" the genealogical line stands on its head, and the child is father of the man." (1979: 198) Both Mr. Woodhouse and Emma have similar characteristics. Their gentle selfishness coincides with the class, the gentle and polite society they belong in Highbury. The sense of class that is observed in Highbury is strikingly apparent not only in the physical description of the society, but also in the descriptions of the father and daughter by the narrator:

> *The Woodhouses were first in consequence there. All looked up to them. She had many acquaintances in the place, for her father was universally civil, but not one among them who could be accepted in lieu of Miss Taylor for even half a day. …He was a nervous man, easily depressed; fond of everybody that he was used to, and hating to part with them; hating change of every kind. …From his habits of gentle selfishness, and of being never able to suppose that other people could feel differently from himself. (1994: 3)*

Like a child who is fond of her dolls and never bears the idea of parting with them, Mr. Woodhouse cannot put up with Miss Taylor's, Emma's governess, marriage, thinking that she has done as sad a thing for herself as for them. The idea of possession is so strong that he does not refrain from saying that had she spent the rest of her life with the Woodhouses in Hartfield, she would have been a great deal happier. His peevish snobbishness is in line with Highbury's sense of class. Mr. Woodhouse's class consciousness is utterly absorbed by Emma, whose idea of class is sharper than her father. Emma, like her father, as she herself expresses, is "sometimes very fanciful and troublesome." (5) Depending upon her highest position in the society, she develops a distorted vision of life, people and reality, and an exalted conception of herself due to her vanity. She is somewhat narcistic, and because of her idealised role she has embraced, she is ignorant and immature. Emma fails to realise her own problem in order to change her course of life, so she turns her attention upon the other people to find solace since she is unable to find

herself in real life. Her leisured class pushes her into her imaginative world in which she has overdeveloped superiority complex and organised marriage plots in order to hide the vain pride of her class. Emma who always acts snobbishly is accustomed to being pampered by the people around her except Mr. Knightley:

Mr. Knightley, in fact, was one of the few people who could see faults in Emma Woodhouse, and the only one who ever told her of them; and though this was not particularly agreeable to Emma herself, she knew it would be so much less to her father, that she would not have him really suspect such a circumstance as her not being thought perfect by everybody. (5)

She wishes to be approved by everybody. Neither her father nor her governess finds any fault in Emma who stands for the symbol of perfectness. Emma's sense of hierarchy shapes her character, her relationships with the other characters in the novel and contaminates her vain imagination. As being the one of the highest members of the landed aristocracy, she also needs a doll to play with in order forget about the grim dullness of her life to assert herself as a person who has the power to demonstrate her superiority. As Richard Handler and Daniel A. Segal have pointed out:

> *Those who are independent have dependents – and depend on them to be able to express their own high status. Austen's novels exploit the irony of a hierarchy grounded in a concept (independence) that contains its own negation- since completely independent persons could have no connections to others. Moreover, the native understanding of rank as based on the unchanging, natural facts of birth and blood is belied by Austen's depiction of the performance of rank. Austen shows that relative status is not natural but is continually recreated through symbolic interactions. (1985: 691)*

Emma's social relations contribute to the fortification of her class consciousness regarding social hierarchy. Thus, her desire to keep some relationship with Harriet Smith whose genealogy is not known and her appreciation of her reflect her point of view of social status and her pragmatic attempts to establish particular hierarchical social relations.

In order to elucidate the underlying implications concerning Emma's establishing a proper relationship with Harriet, it will be much better to have a look at her perspective of Harriet Smith:

> *She was not struck by anything remarkably clever in Miss Smiths's conversation, but she found her altogether very engaging – not inconveniently shy, not unwilling to talk –and yet so far from pushing, showing so proper and becoming her deference, seeming so pleasantly grateful for being admitted to Hartfield, and so artlessly impressed by the appearance of everything in so superior a style to what she had been used to. (1994: 14)*

Being admitted by Emma who is at the top of the social ladder seems to Harriet as something extraordinary, unusual, and she is very happy since she is far away from capturing the underlying false consciousness:

> *The happiness of Miss Smith was quite equal to her intentions. Miss Woodhouse was so great a personage in Highbury, that the prospect of the introduction had given as much panic as pleasure; but the humble, grateful little girl went off with highly gratified feelings, delighted with the affability with which Miss Woodhouse had treated her all the evening, and actually shaken hands with her at last! (16)*

Shaking hands with Emma is something which cannot be imagined by Harriet, which indicates her mood constructed by the landed gentry. She is presented as if she were some type of grace or blessing, who belittles the lower class values. Emma, who is 'clever and rich' in an ironical way cannot find something 'clever' in Harriet. On the other hand, Harriet is shy and is devoid of the self confidence of the landed gentry like Emma's, which could be accepted as the character traits of the lower class girls who are modest, introvert and who have hidden aspirations of climbing the social ladder through a social marriage. Harriet Smith's true nature is identified not by Emma, but by Mr. Knightley:

> *I think her the very worst sort of companion that Emma could possibly have. She knows nothing herself, and looks upon Emma as knowing everything. She is a flatterer in all her ways; and so much the worse, because undersigned. Her ignorance is hourly flattery. …I will venture to say that she cannot gain by the acquaintance. Hartfield will only put her out of conceit with all other places she belongs to. She will grow just*

refined enough to be uncomfortable with those among whom birth and circumstances have placed her home. (25)

In order to satisfy her selfish egoism as to her class and her superiority complex, Emma needs someone who will feel the feelings of gratefulness towards herself and who will satisfy her hunger for being pampered by someone who has been suffering from the inferiority complex of the class in which she is. It is quintessentially Harriet Smith who does not have a history. Having lost Miss Taylor, it is a good opportunity for Emma to come across with someone in order to enjoy her leisure time:

Those soft blue eyes, and all those natural graces, should not be wasted on the inferior society of Highbury and its connections. The acquaintances she had already formed were unworthy of her. The friends from whom she had just parted, though very good sort of people, must be doing her harm. They were a family of the name of Martin, whom Emma well knew by character, as renting a large farm of Mr. Knightley, and residing in the parish of Donwell – very creditably, she believed; she knew Mr. Knightley thought highly of them; but they must be coarse and unpolished, and very unfit to be the intimates of a girl who wanted only a little more knowledge and elegance to be quite perfect. She would notice her; she would improve her; she would detach her from her bad acquaintance, and introduce her into good society; she would form her opinions and her manners. It would be an interesting, and certainly a very kind undertaking; highly becoming her own situation in life, her leisure, and powers. (14-15)

Emma's ideological class consciousness is so strong that she divides Highbury society into some categories in her mind. One of them is the inferior society from which Harriet should be kept away. She has already had some relationships which are not worthy of her such as her relationship with Mr. Martin. Since he belongs to the agrarian class, he is accepted as a 'coarse' and 'unpolished' one. Emma, who stands for the landed aristocracy, looks down upon Mr. Martin who deals with agriculture, but who does not have the lands. Highbury's polite society which values civility, some codes of behaviour, manners, and politeness excludes Mr. Martin who is thought not to deserve the friendship of Harriet Smith. The landed gentry naturally divide the society into two groups as good and bad societies. In order to skip her class, Harriet needs Emma who will provide her with the necessary elegance and a little knowledge to be a perfect member of the aristocracy. As elucidated by Richard Handler and Daniel A. Segal:

The representation of land as a familial attribute that is given rather than constructed illustrates a more general point: hierarchy in Austen's social world is rationalized as natural or given. That children are inferior to parents, younger to older, women to men, and landless to landed is thought to follow inevitably from the respective abilities and 'natures' of each type of person. Many of the characters in Austen's novels routinely assume that talent and conduct depend upon 'birth', that is, upon inherited, natural qualities." (1985: 695-696)

The ideology of the landed gentry forms a stable and simple background through which the enlarging and often intensified consciousness of the characters charts its course. Harriet Smith responds to the basic ideology of Emma's class and its expectations while remaining quite unconscious of her own class and its realities.

Austen creates stunning complex connections in the world of Highbury delineating the social realities surrounding Emma and Harriet. Emma's ideological perspective is predominantly hierarchical which depends upon moving up and down the social scale, which constructs sharp distinctions among different segments of the society. As observed by Maaja A. Steward:

Emma at the beginning of her story tries to establish structures of hierarchy. Not only does she insist on dividing the Highbury world into first, second, and third sets, but she also possesses all the conventional drives of the comic protagonist toward secular power and success that are traditionally rendered by images of dominance: the penetration of the secrets of others and the simultaneous preoccupation with legacies or with heiresses. (1986: 74)

Emma tries to impose the values of her own class upon Harriet and seeks domination over her through her sense of upper class ideology, which tries to cover its vanity through its false values. Her ideology is commensurate with the perspective of her own society. She believes in

the existence of so called 'Great Chain of Being' in which everybody knows his or her place, which is the main source of order in the society. Implied here are the ideas of class, order, rank, gradation, hierarchy and lastly ideology of the aristocracy. In order not to disrupt this order, it is essential for Harriet who, Emma believes, has a noble lineage that she should contribute to this ideologically well-ordered society by marrying someone from the same noble lineage in order to maintain the existent social pattern as it is, which is commensurate with the ideology of the landed gentry. Harriet's friendship to Mr. Martin, who belongs to lower steps of the social ladder and who is one of the lower rings of the so-called 'Great Chain of Being', is seen as something which is against to the 'natural order', which is the main source of peace, comfort and happiness of the upper classes as long as they keep it going as usual. Such a relationship is something to be avoided since it may distort the balance in the existing ordered society. As James Gregory Murray explains, "[it] may be said to produce the imbalance in the sense that to an orderly ordered society she brings management. It isn't that she sees disorder and would correct it, but that she wants a more perfect order. The proper marriage for Harriet is for Emma a type of measure and balance essential to the more perfect order." (1954: 162)

Emma constructs her hegemony upon Harriet through her sense of propriety, civility, politeness, good manners, which are the ideological apparatuses through which she imposes her supremacy upon her. It is one of the sinister ways of assimilating and controlling the other classes. As the narrator makes it clear, "Harriet certainly was not clever, but she had a sweet, docile, grateful disposition, was totally free from conceit, and only desiring to be guided by any one she looked up to." (1994: 16) According to Emma, Harriet needs refining, polishing and civilising. She needs Harriet in order to assert herself and justify the values of her own class. This is the struggle of her own class for power. It is an internalised form of social control. Emma's exploitation of Harriet as one social class is related to the ideology. Harriet is insidiously forced to submit without being aware of her situation. Jonathan H. Grossman quotes Pierre Bourdieu's reflections on the political, socializing force of politeness:

> *If all societies…set such store on the seemingly most insignificant details of dress, bearing, physical and verbal manners, the reason is that, treating the body as a memory, they entrust to it in abbreviated and practical, i.e. mnemonic, form the fundamental principles of the arbitrary content of the culture. The principles em-bodied in this way are placed beyond the grasp of consciousness, and hence cannot be touched by voluntary, deliberate transformation…;nothing seems more ineffable…than the values given body, made body by the transubstantiation, achieved by the hidden persuasion of an implicit pedagogy, capable of instilling a whole cosmology…The whole trick of pedagogic reason lies precisely in the way it extorts the essential while seeming to demand the insignificant: …obtaining the respect for form and forms of respect which constitute the most visible and at the same time the best-hidden… manifestation of submission to the established order…The concessions of politeness always contain political concessions. (1999: 149-150)*

Emma's ultimate goal is to shape Harriet as she wishes alienating her from her surrounding and from her own nature. Harriet, who is governed by the will-power of Emma, undergoes a process of change. She is a dependent one, an incomplete one who suffers from lack of her own individuality through which she will be able stand firmly upon her own feet. She is bound to live in the shadow of Emma's social identity. She can never develop her social identity. In such a repressive society, the characters do not have two options. As Mr. Knightley expounds at the beginning of the novel, "when it comes to the question of dependence or independence!—At any rate, it must be better to have only one to please than two." (1994: 5) They will either be independent characters like Emma who is governed only by her own will, or will give up their independence depending upon superiors as in the example of Harriet. She is said to look up to Emma and to owe her gratitude and obedience. She cannot even choose her own husband. According to Emma, Harriet has no other means than an acceptable and appropriate marriage to establish herself. She constructs a logical justification for hierarchical ideology as natural through her match-making plot. Her cognizance of ideology is promulgated by Harriet.

Emma's negative ideological questions which try to undermine Harriet's sense of Mr. Martin such as Mr. Martin is not a man of information?, he does not read? or what sort of looking man is Mr. Martin? are implicit questions which are suffused with her own values and assumptions which emanate from her own class. She intends to undercut simplistic notions of communication between Harriet and Mr. Martin. She tries to bring Harriet into alignment with her social perspective when she has seen Mr. Martin utterly worthless or despicable:

> *I may have seen him fifty times, but without having any idea of his name. A young farmer, whether on horseback or on foot, is the very last sort of person to raise my curiosity. The yeomanry are precisely the order of people with whom I feel I can have nothing to do. A degree or two lower, and a creditable appearance might interest me; I might hope to be useful to their families in some way or other. But a farmer can need none of my help, and is therefore, in one sense, as much above my notice, as in every other he is below it. (18-19)*

Emma's ideological condemnation of Mr. Martin and her rejection of him as an appropriate match for Harriet stem from the social norms which shape the characters' relations. Her polished society gives much importance to the manners, through which the characters are evaluated. Mr. Martin's status as a farmer in the society does not provide him with the right type of manners and the expected codes of behaviour. Mr. Martin, who stands for 'the labour' or 'the hands', is not interested in the representations at the heart of this polite society. The system of representations in which vanity, hypocrisy and affectation are the only values contributes to the preservation of the status quo in the society. Class differences coming from high or low birth have great importance in the social life. Mr. Martin is shown and reflected with a light touch of tone. He is seen as a character of inferior rank and consequently inferior manners:

> *Mr. Martin looked as if he did not know what manner was…He is very plain, undoubtedly; remarkably plain; but that is nothing compared with his entire want of gentility. I had no right to expect much, and I did not expect much; but I had no idea that he could be so very clownish, so totally without air. I had imagined him, I confess, a degree or two nearer gentility. …he is not so genteel as real gentleman. …He has not such a fine air and way of walking…What say you to Mr. Weston and Mr. Elton? Compare Mr. Martin with either of them. Compare their manner of carrying themselves, of walking, of speaking, of being silent. You must see the difference. (20-21)*

Emma is so meshed with and so inextricably tied to socially accepted codes of manners and behaviours in Highbury that her judgements of Mr. Martin are in alignment with the values of the landed gentry. In an ironical way, while she accuses Mr. Martin of the intrigues of the artificial behaviour, she herself is utterly immersed in such artificial conducts, which are the main sources of her affectation and the false consciousness of her own class. Emma asks for an utter obedience to the strictures of her class.

Ideological power is much more effective upon the lower class people than material power since it works implicitly through some social apparatuses such as social conventions and norms which are exploited for the status quo. Mr. Elton, whose manners are superior, who has more gentleness than Mr. Martin is the one chosen by Emma for driving Mr. Martin out of Harriet's mind. Mr. Elton who "is good-humoured, cheerful, obliging and gentle" (22) is Emma's candidate who will be an excellent match and who is desirable, and natural one. Emma's "vanity" (26) as expressed by Mr. Knightley himself prevents her from capturing the reality about Mr. Elton. Once more she is warned by Mr. Knightley about Mr. Elton:

> *Elton will not do. Elton is a very good sort of man, a very respectable vicar of Highbury, but not at all likely to make an imprudent match. He knows the value of a good income as well as anybody. Elton may talk sentimentally, but he will act rationally. He is as well acquainted with his own claims as you can be with Harriet's. He knows that he is a very handsome young man, a great favourite wherever he goes; and from his general way of talking in unreserved moments, when there are only men present, I am convinced that he does not mean to throw himself away. (46)*

Despite Emma's tacit plans for Mr. Elton, he turns out to have his own plot about Emma. She is deluded by the false values of her own class combined with her vanity. S he is terribly disappointed about Mr. Elton, who has very

polished manners. However, she learns that social appearance does not always mean goodness in nature. As an ideological tool, social appearance is a type of mask which is persona, namely a social face. This way takes man to self-deception as in the example of Emma. She has to learn that only by most careful scrutiny that we can see beneath the appearance and find the true causes of human action. It is her ignorance of the way of this world which causes her troubles and struggle. She becomes the victim of her self deceit, vanity and ignorance which are the common characteristics of landed gentry.

In Emma, the striking aspects of hypocrisy and vanity are shown through Mr. Eliot and Frank Churchill who pretend to have more modesty, more learning and more gentility than they actually posses. Mr. Knightley and Emma cannot agree upon the social faces of the people within the social hierarchy. Mr. Knightley makes his warnings of these two men, which is of no importance for Emma who is stuck to her own blind perspective of Highbury. The striking irony of the novel is that while she tries to manoeuvre Harriet in the way as she thinks best, her father, Mr. Woodhouse, who is fastidious about social appearance, in the same way, manipulates her ideas about Frank Churchill whom she has been thinking to have some type of relationship although she repeatedly expresses that she will never marry. "In spite of Emma's resolution of never marrying, there was something in the name, in the ideas, of Mr. Frank Churchill, which always interested her. She had frequently thought – especially since his father's marriage with Miss Taylor – that if she were to marry, he was the very person to suit her in age, character and condition." (85) There are some strong resemblances between Emma's and Mr. Woodhouse's criticism of Mr. Martin and Frank Churchill as being daughter and father. Their spring point is based upon the expected codes of behaviour although Mr. Martin belongs to lower class, and Frank Churchill belongs to upper class. Their ideology which is commensurate with the period and their class consciousness depends upon politeness, polished manners, status, and the values of the landed gentry. Emma's opinion of Frank Churchill is shaken, for the first time, when she has heard that Frank Churchill has gone off to London for such an unimportant reason as having his hair cut:

> *There was certainly no harm in his travelling sixteen miles twice over on such an errand; but there was an air of foppery and nonsense in it which the rationality of plan, the moderation in expense, or even the unselfish warmth of heart, which she had believed herself to discern in him yesterday. Vanity, extravagance, love of change, restlessness of temper, which must be doing something, good or bad; heedlessness as to the pleasure of his father's and Mrs. Weston, indifference as to how his conduct might appear in general; he became liable to all these charges. His father only called him a coxcomb, and thought it a very good story. (146)*

Frank's immodest behaviour shocks and embarrasses not only Emma, but also her father because they think that it is rude. Emma searches for propriety, fitness and delicacy. Her father's judgement about Frank as coxcomb is enough to create some gap between Emma and Frank Churchill. Emma herself becomes the victim of her own ideology like Harriet. The ideology which derives from surface social persona shakes Emma and stops her to go a step further as a controlling buffer:

> *"Oh! no," said he; "it would be the extreme of imprudence. I could not bear it for Emma!— Emma is not strong. She would catch a dreadful cold. So would poor little Harriet. So you would all. Mrs. Weston, you would be quite laid up; do not let them talk of such a wild thing. Pray do not let them talk of it. That young man (speaking lower) is very thoughtless. Do not tell his father, but that young man is not quite the thing. He has been opening the doors very often this evening, and keeping them open very inconsiderately. He does not think of the draught. I do not mean to set you against him, but indeed he is not quite the thing!" (177)*

Mr. Woodhouse's ideas about Frank Churchill which mostly stem from social imperatives are so effective upon Emma's mind that like Harriet, she cannot resist such harsh criticism about Frank's politeness. Frank Churchill does not act in the same line with Hartfield's polite society. The idea of class is the guiding factor in Emma and in Mr. Woodhouse in their rejection of Frank Churchill since Frank, who is fond of dancing, would like to bring all the classes together as opposed to Emma and Mr. Woodhouse who try to separate the classes from each other in an ideological

sense by employing social imperatives:

> *He saw no fault in the room, he would acknowledge none which they suggested. No, it was long enough, broad enough, handsome enough. It would hold the very number for comfort. They ought to have balls there at least every fortnight through the winter. Why had not Miss Woodhouse revived the former good old days of the room?—She who could do any thing in Highbury! (140-141)*

Money, status and class are controlling elements and ideological apparatuses of the landed gentry which shape the relationships of the characters. Frank Churchill does not show an utter obedience to the bourgeois ideology. Hence, he is excluded from the Woodhouse's environment. The aforementioned apparatuses are effective upon every sphere of life from hospitality, friendship, visits to invitations. Each type of social contacts is strictly observed whether they are appropriate to the social conventions and ideology of that class. Emma commands his father's visitors as the "first set" and as the "second set" depending upon her ideological separation according to their money, status and classes.

> *Real, long-standing regard brought the Westons and Mr. Knightley; and by Mr. Elton, a young man living alone without liking it, the privilege of exchanging any vacant evening of his own blank solitude for the elegancies and society of Mr. Woodhouse's drawing-room, and the smiles of his lovely daughter, was in no danger of being thrown away. After these came a second set; among the most come-at-able of whom were Mrs. and Miss Bates, and Mrs. Goddard, three ladies almost always at the service of an invitation from Hartfield, and who were fetched and carried home so often, that Mr. Woodhouse thought it no hardship for either James or the horses. Had it taken place only once a year, it would have been a grievance. (12)*

Emma's condemnation of Miss Bates as poor and stupid should be handled in the same way. While she is 'handsome, clever, and rich', Miss Bates "enjoyed a most uncommon degree of popularity for a woman neither young, handsome, rich, nor married. Miss Bates stood in the very worst predicament in the world for having much of the public favour; and she had no intellectual superiority to make atonement to herself, or frighten those who might hate her into outward respect. She had never boasted either beauty or cleverness." (12-13) Emma does not refrain from insulting Miss. Bates while talking to Harriet: "That is as formidable an image as you could present, Harriet; and if I thought I should ever be like Miss Bates! so silly—so satisfied—so smiling—so prosing—so undistinguishing and unfastidious—and so apt to tell every thing relative to every body about me, I would marry to-morrow. But between us, I am convinced there never can be any likeness, except in being unmarried." (60) She openly looks down upon Miss Bates as if she were her superior. Her vain pride concerning her physical and social characteristics leads her snobbishly to humiliate Miss Bates at Box Hill, which is the climactic point of the novel, where Emma reminds Miss Bates of her personal deficiencies, defects, weaknesses and her lowly status in the society. There is no reasonable explanation of Emma's insulting Miss Bates except her vain upper class ideology which shapes and constitutes her character.

Ideological social machinery is in operation. This ideological consciousness makes itself felt throughout the novel. The marriage plots at the end of the novel are ideological means which aim at uniting the members of the same class. Marriages are broken because of the social differences, and in the same way marriages are constructed because of social similarities. Emma and Mr. Knightley who belong to the landed aristocracy are brought together through marriage, which stands for the merging of the two materialist and capitalist companies as a part of the business in order to enlarge the scope. Although the ideological status of the upper class people is a fallacy, it is continually reshaped and maintained through such symbolic marriages which have nothing to do with love, but with money, status and class. To borrow Jonathan H. Grossman's words, "the marriage plots, which so sensitively register gradations of wealth and rank (as does the rather snobby Emma herself), also robustly represent the activity of a leisure class engaged in reproducing itself through proper conduct." (1999: 157)

Certain references in Jane Austen's Emma gain a new meaning when the false consciousness which is glossed over by the aristocracy is perceived. According to this ideology, the well-being of the upper classes depends upon the maintenance of this hierarchical order in the society. This order

results from obedience of all classes to ideological laws which govern not only the social and political institutions but also man the individual. In the period in which Austen lived, this ideological order could be seen in many things, such as a rigid class struggle in which everyone and each class has his or its fixed place. Order is seen as the frame upon which the ideological apparatuses of the landed aristocracy are placed. In this sense the 18th century was governed by those ideological laws which the upper classes just wanted to exist in order to keep their status. Austen's cognizance and portrayal of classes in terms of history and politics through fictional narrative which has the notoriety of domestic life is highly elucidating in that it uncovers the hidden signs regarding the existence of false consciousness. As explained by Richard Handler and Daniel A. Segal, "Austen's novels suggest the ability of fictional narratives to illuminate political and social debates by exploring rather than ignoring cultural ambiguity and diversity." (1985: 691) Jane Austen's study of classes, rank, hierarchy and ideology in Emma is due to her deep interest in historical, cultural, social and political factors which create them. Austen's novel helps us to apprehend and unravel the period in which it was written.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Austen, J. E. K. (2000). **Wordsworth Editions Limited**.

Bakhtin, M. (1981). **The Dialogic Imagination**. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Eagleton, T. (1996). **Literary Theory: An Introduction**. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Gardiner, M. (1992) **The Dialogics of Critique: M.M. Bakhtin and the theory of ideology**. Kent:Routledge.

Grossman, J. H. (Sep., 1999) "The Labor of the Leisured in Emma: Class, Manners, and Austen". Nineteenth-Century Literature, Vol. 54, No. 2, 143-164.

Handler, R. and S., (Nov., 1985). Daniel A. "Hierarchies of Choice: The Social Construction of Rank **in Jane Austen".** American Ethnologist, Vol. 12, No. 4, 691-706.

Murray, J. G. (Dec., 1954). "Measure and Balance in Jane Austen's Emma". College English, Vol. 16, No. 3, 160-166.

Steward, M. A. (Jun.,1986). "The Fools in Jane Austen's Emma". Nineteenth-Century Literature, Vol. 41, No. 1, 72-86.

Volosinov, V. N. (1996). **Marxism and the Philosophy of Language.** Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Weinsheimer, J. (autumn., 1979). "Theory of Character: Emma". Poetics Today, Vol. 1, No. 1 / 2, Special Issue: Literature, Interpretation, Communication 185-211.

Williams, R. (1977). **Marxism and Literature.** Oxford: Oxford University Press.