A 21st Century Gala

Saturday, May 3, 2008   9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.

Allerton Hotel, 701 N. Michigan, Chicago, IL (valet parking)
Enjoy a Brunch Buffet and an Ice Cream Buffet

Among the Heirs of Austen: A Celebration of Four Centuries
Celebrating the 18th Century—Joseph Wiesenfarth presents
The Rebirth of the Juvenile Jane Austen

Celebrating the 19th Century—
Kathleen (Mrs. Robert Newberry) McCready presents
Julia Newberry at Home and Abroad:
The Diary of a Young Chicagoan on the Grand Tour

Celebrating the 20th and 21st Centuries—
Victoria Hinshaw presents
Georgette Heyer and the Regency Romance:
Eight Decades of Popularity and Influence

Plus a Book Exchange: bring your books——buy books someone else brought

GALA REGISTRATION FORM

Members: $65; Guests: $70
Registration deadline: April 28

Member Name__________________________________________________________

Guest(s) Name(s)________________________________________________________

Address________________________________________ City________________ State __________ ZIP__________

E-mail________________________________________ Phone_____________ Amount enclosed __________

You can register by
1. Going online to www.jasnachicago.org and pay using your Visa or MasterCard.
   or 2. Mailing your check—payable to JASNA-GCR—and this form to Elsie Holzwarth, 1410 East 55th Street, Chicago, IL 60615-5409.
By far the most successful adaptation in the Masterpiece series: The Complete Jane Austen, the 1995 film of Pride and Prejudice is lively, modern and visually stunning.

Producer Sue Birtwistle and writer Andrew Davies had six hours to develop the characters and capture the humor. They had the budget for beautiful costumes and multiple locations; they filmed at four National Trust properties and Luckington Court, the perfect house for Longbourne. I admit I am a fan of this film. I bought The Making of Pride and Prejudice (Penguin Books 1995), have poured over maps, and plan someday to visit Lackock village, Wiltshire, the film’s Meryton. I enjoy the dancing and gave the piano score to my daughter. I have long admired the actors. The three lead roles among the Bennet sisters—Elizabeth (Jennifer Ehle), Jane (Susannah Harker) and Lydia (Julia Sawalha)—are well balanced in demeanor from Elizabeth’s teasing tone and love of walking, to Jane’s serene smile and sedate ways, to Lydia’s shouts and boisterous behavior. The eligible bachelors are cast to highlight their differences, especially between the tall, dark, handsome and reserved Fitzwilliam Darcy (Colin Firth), and his cute, cheerful, outgoing friend, Charles Bingley (Crispin Bonham-Carter).

PBS has been conducting an online poll of Austen’s most popular hero. No surprises here. Fitzwilliam Darcy places first with Colin Firth inhabiting the much expanded role. His Darcy is athletic—riding, fencing, swimming. At the assembly ball where his rude comments inspire ridicule, Darcy seems haughty but vulnerable and shy. Darcy’s glances are important, especially the looks exchanged with Elizabeth at Pemberly. Romance that is subtle in the novel is visible in the film.

But my pleasure in returning to this adaptation is to see the wonderful comic characters and hear so much of Austen’s text. Perhaps my favorite among the fools is Mr. Collins (David Bamber). Every gesture, posture, and sniveling word demonstrates the character Austen describes as “a mixture of pride and obsequiousness.” Small gestures work well in the ensemble; Mary Bennet (Lucy Briers) steps forward when Collins says he will invite one of his cousins for the first two dances, but steps back when Elizabeth is asked instead. Darcy almost laughs aloud when Collins goes the wrong way in the dance, but Elizabeth’s angry glance stops the mocking. When Mr. Bennet (Benjamin Whitrow) stops Mary from performing a second song at the ball, he speaks Austen’s lines with emphasis on the consonants that highlights the irony. Even when Austen’s lines are used in new situations, the words fit the scene. Elizabeth’s recital of the narrator’s opening line echoes Mr. Bennet’s ironic response to the arrival of strangers into the neighborhood. Austen’s words are used to dramatic effect. Darcy’s letter is incorporated into the action in part because we watch Darcy writing and Elizabeth reading, but also because we both hear their voices and glimpse scenes to which the letter refers. Overall, the film is satisfying to watch and true to the spirit of Jane Austen.
Austen’s Legacy
Did you know that James Fenimore Cooper, author of the legendary *Leatherstocking Tales*, admired Jane Austen so deeply that he named his first novel *Precaution* (1820) in her honor? Or that J.K. Rowling has been quoted assaying “My favorite writer is Jane Austen”? And are you aware that young Japanese women are likely to become acquainted with Austen through comic books?

If you answered “No”, then register for the AGM, October 2-5, 2008, and let our fabulous breakout speakers enlighten you on our theme: the inspiration Jane Austen has continued to exert over so many talented people throughout history and across the globe. Even if you answered “Yes”, we venture that you will still be amazed by the insights you will gain into the most impressive body of works created in the wake of Austen’s debut in the world of letters in 1811. Rest assured that the breakout speakers will educate and entertain you with their wonderfully stimulating ideas about the many writers and artists (including themselves), oeuvres and genres, which Jane Austen has influenced since her emergence into the literary and cultural scene.

Our speakers will trace the entire breadth and depth of the heritage of Jane Austen to be discovered (1) in museums and collections (both private and public); (2) in literature, book publishing, film and other media; and (3) in landscaping, gardening, and the preservation of historic houses in Great Britain.

We are proud to welcome representatives from the Jane Austen House Museum, Chawton House Library, The University of Southampton, and the Henry and Alberta Hirshheimer Burke Collection at Goucher College. A private collector will reveal the secret of her passion for amassing objects associated with Austen. Two JASNA members promise to give a stimulating slide lecture comparing Austen’s landscapes to ours. Finally, we look forward to a fascinating presentation on the book covers that have graced Austen’s novels through the ages.

We will pay tribute to the great authors who acknowledged Austen as their muse: Elizabeth Gaskell, L.M. Montgomery, Virginia Woolf, Oscar Wilde, Carol Shields, and more. Less well known, but as interesting, are the literary connections that other speakers will discuss between Austen and others: her connections with Wordsworth, the Duchess of Devonshire, the Victorian novelist Margaret Oliphant, and Ian McEwan. For Austen’s legacy in film speakers will be tracing the wonderful heritage of cinematic adaptations, reflecting upon the process itself as book is translated into film; or upon the specific traditions in which Austen’s clergymen, Austen’s mothers, and Austen’s women are depicted.

Many excellent teachers will speak about their profession and their contribution to the survival of Austen’s great name and work. We are excited about the creative writers and young, new authors who have offered their own stories as evidence of the ways in which Austen’s bequest is honored and handed down through generations. Presentations about the completion of Austen’s fragmentary novels will complete an already rich offering, with a talk about “Why Austen still makes us laugh” and a contemplation of “Jane Austen: End or Beginning?”

All attendees must be members of JASNA, national. See their website.

Chicagoland AGM Attendees are requested to commute from home to the AGM, if you can; the hotel will booked to capacity. Volunteers, contact Marianne Newman at newmariann@aol.com
Among the Heirs of Austen: 
A Legacy in Four Centuries

For our final Legacy theme Gala May 3, prior to our AGM this October, we have a trio of speakers who address topics directly or indirectly related to Austen in the 18th, 19th, 20th and 21st Centuries.

9:30 a.m. Registration

10:00 a.m. 18th Century
Perhaps the first legacy Austen created was the one to herself as well as to us. Professor Joseph Wiesenfarth of Madison, Wisconsin examines that legacy in The Rebirth of the Juvenile Jane Austen.

Austen was a dedicated and rather prolific writer from an early age. Recent years have seen a growing interest in the juvenile works of Jane Austen. Professor Wiesenfarth brings his love of Austen and his scholarly expertise together to share his own recent fascination with the writing produced by the younger Austen.

11:00 a.m. Brunch Buffet and Toast to Jane Austen

Noon 19th Century
Austen’s work directly and indirectly touched numerous other female writers and in turn their readers and devotees.

Chicagoan Kathleen McCreary presents a portrait of one such heir of Austen in Julia Newberry at Home and Abroad: The Diary of a Young Chicagoan on the Grand Tour.

Through her husband, Robert Newberry McCreary, Kathleen is a family connection of Julia Rosa Newberry whom McCreary has called a “veritable Jane Austen”. Newberry (d. Rome, 1876. age 22), was an extensive traveler. She left a diary, which reveals a keen observer, a witty writer and a sophisticated reader. The diary includes the period of the great Chicago fire and gives a distinctly Mid-Western view of a dazzling era of European society. Her father’s bequest founded one of Chicago’s most important cultural institutions—the Newberry Library.

1:00 p.m. 20th & 21st Centuries
JASNA favorite and great friend to us in GCR, Victoria Hinshaw of Milwaukee will speak on Georgette Heyer and the Regency Romance: Eight Decades of Popularity and Influence.

Writing just over a century after the life and work of Austen, Georgette Heyer (1902-1974) created a carefully drawn picture of the world that Austen wrote about as a contemporary. The popularity and influence of her 54 novels have followed us into the 21st century. Victoria Hinshaw brings her abilities, as a thorough researcher, engaging presenter and accomplished writer of Regency Romances herself, to bear on her examination of Heyer as an heir of Austen. She also touches briefly on Heyer’s own considerable influence.

2:00 p.m. Ice Cream Buffet

3:00 p.m. Closing Remarks

Bring a Book/Buy a Book
Donate one or two books for our book exchange table at the Gala. Browse the book table at registration and during breaks for our two sumptuous buffets.

All donated books will be for sale to support our High School Outreach programs. You may buy books for 50 cents a paperback and $1.00 a hardcover.
February Lunch

Three biographies of Austen, by Carol Shields, Claire Tomalin and Jon Spence, and a film, Becoming Jane, were the focus of the discussion at The Parthenon, moderated by Jane Davis.

Carol Shields, Natalie Goldberg reported, wrote from the point of view of a “novelist interested in what makes a novelist. How does one become an artist?” “Austen was a girl with a limited education who nearly died of ‘putrid fever.’ But she had an encouraging father who gave her a notebook with a lovely note, a writing desk with precious paper, and wrote to a publisher on her behalf. Her juvenilia filled 3 notebooks.” Austen wrote novels “that champion the underprivileged child.” Novelist don’t write in a void. In the midst of company “Austen would laugh and write something down. But there are things not in her novels: Aunt Philadelphia’s journey to India to marry; cousin Eliza’s marriage to a French count who was guillotined; Aunt Leigh-Perrot’s arrest for shoplifting; sister Cassandra’s regret over the death of the fiancé.” Did Austen avoid marrying to avoid bearing children because women in her family died in childbirth, or did no one suitable want to marry her? What of her years of silence between the 2 sets of 3 novels? “Austen could thrive in a small community; although in exile in Bath, she gathered her strength at Chawton.”

Claire Tomalin, according to Elisabeth Lenckos, “wanted to celebrate Austen as a writer.” Austen was “in exile in school, in exile in her 20’s when forced to leave Steventon for Bath, in exile because she was too smart and not pretty enough for marriage, in an exile of illness after her move to Chawton where she had a regulated life and could write.” After Austen fell in love and was spurned by a young man (Tom Lefroy) she wrote a beautiful novel. After she was asked to marry (by Harris Bigg-Bother) and first said yes and then said no, she returned home and wrote again. Austen “translated the tragic stuff of everyday life into beautiful and romantic fiction... the most beautiful love stories in the English language.”

Jon Spence, William Phillips noted, says “Austen is a liver of life.” To Spence it is “important that Austen was in love with Tom Lefroy. That relationship fueled her imagination for the rest of her life.” Austen “did not make characters out of people she knew. But real situations were her starting point which she developed into something quite separate from real life, in the crude sense.” In Pride and Prejudice “Darcy and Elizabeth are Austen and Lefroy, with a gender reversal.” There were 5 daughters in the Lefroy family before Tom was born. That Austen was “working out an ambivalent relationship with Eliza” is shown by the “bits” of Eliza that “appear in female and male characters.” John Austen’s peculiar will for the benefit of Jack Austen is a bit of family history used to begin Sense and Sensibility.

Jeff Nigro cautioned that one keep in mind Becoming Jane is a movie, “a collaboration with lots of cooks in the kitchen: 2 writers, a director, many actors.” Austen is shown as a “flesh and blood human being with real emotions and as a writer in the act of writing.” The film’s Tom Lefroy is a combination of Darcy, to whom everything in the country is so provincial, and Wickham, a bad boy in town. The film implies, “when her one great love in life fails, Austen becomes a spinster writing in the country.” There must have been something more. “Many of us have a sad love story at age 20, but we don’t all become Jane Austen.”
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Northanger Abbey

Luanne Redmond

During our family screening of the new Masterpiece version of Northanger Abbey, my 10-year-old snuggled up next to me, shivering, as my astonished spouse stared at me in consternation and exclaimed, “Turn it off!” He was referring to the cuts from the story to the lurid gothic fantasies, filmed in a blue-gray palette and with a florid musical background, that lead the viewers through the mind of Catherine Morland. People who have never read Northanger Abbey are always surprised that it is, in part, a sly commentary on contemporary fiction, its readers and detractors.

The new production gave the heroine’s dramatic adolescent fantasies full rein. The fantasy sequences are not Jane Austen, of course, but they were fun and very well done. The film pleased all of us, bringing to life the ordinary Catherine, whose life became less commonplace upon her visit to Bath and introduction into a wider society. Felicity Jones’ Catherine was believably pretty but not glamorous; JJ Feild’s Henry Tilney was witty and good-looking without being a heartthrob; and Carey Mulligan is delicious as Isabella Thorpe, the pretty gold-digger who becomes Catherine’s best friend only because she thinks Catherine’s brother James has money.

Jane Austen fans cannot resist comparing any production of an Austen novel with the book, and as always, we found that some differences between the production and the book are appropriate, while some are not. I can understand why Eleanor Tilney’s suitor is brought into the story earlier—for a TV audience, having him appear at the very end, as he does in the book, would be almost incomprehensible. I do not, however, understand why the conversation between Henry and Catherine regarding the possibility of his marrying someone who had little fortune, was added—it adds a shade to his character that I believe was unintended by Jane Austen. The scene in which it is clear that Isabella has been duped into an affair by Captain Tilney was also not entirely accurate, though from a contemporary point of view it did add to the story on screen.

But the chief difference between this production and the book was in the character of John Thorpe. In the book he is described by James Morland as a “rattle,” and by the narrator as being stout and plain. Though William Beck’s Thorpe is certainly profane and boisterous, deceitful and a braggart, his personality appears more sneaky and dangerous than in the book. He has the face for it, too—sort of a cross between Puck and a leprechaun, but older, more predatory and worldly-wise. I thought he was very handsome, but my daughters found him “creepy.”

Still, the Austen story rings true—Thorpe’s rough courtship of Catherine, based primarily on his misperception of her wealth; her dislike of him and discovery of his lies; Henry’s witty courtship and simultaneous education of Catherine. I have always wondered what Henry Tilney sees in Catherine—he is so well-read and well-informed, while she is simple and ignorant. That is not a fault of the production, therefore, but a point on which the production follows the book. Likewise the ending, which is abrupt in the film as it was in the book. It came too soon, not just because Jane Austen wrote it that way, but because the production was so enjoyable.

Mansfield Park

Shirley Holbrook

To begin with an obvious question: How could the same 90-minute span allotted to Northanger Abbey accommodate Mansfield Park?
Park, a book twice as long and considerably more complex? A partial answer is: By omitting the Grants and Mr. Yates, as well as Sotherton and Portsmouth and everything associated with them. Instead of dwelling on the evils of these omissions let us judge the new film within its chosen boundaries.

First, pretend there is no Jane Austen book, only this film. How well does it work? On the whole, the production is lively, pretty, and well-acted. But the radical compression of plot required even after major omissions leaves its characters’ motivations confused. Is Lady Bertram somnolent or perceptive? How does Sir Thomas skip from disdain toward Fanny to respect? Henry Crawford, the catalyst for so much of the action, is particularly puzzling. His first scene has him speaking of the Bertrams with mischievous glee: “They are doomed . . . Are we not more likely to deceive than to be disappointed?” Yet in what seems like no time he goes from mistaking Fanny for a servant, to deciding “to make a small hole in Fanny Price’s heart”, to making an apparently sincere proposal of marriage.

More troubling problems arise for people who know Austen’s book and hope to see it reflected on film. This version makes a hash of the character development central to the book. Readers who have relished the biting portrait of the terrible Mrs. Norris will find nothing like it in the film. Worse, because it underplays her pernicious role in raising Maria and Fanny, the film cannot draw a contrast between her values and Sir Thomas’. There can be little understanding of his shifting point of view and the “anguish arising from the conviction of his own errors in the education of his daughters.”

Tom, too, seems to grow very little, ending up engrossed in the racing papers, unlike Austen’s Tom, who “became what he ought to be. . .steady and quiet, and not living merely for himself.”

Worst of all is the depiction of Fanny. Jane Austen describes Fanny as growing up timid and diffident, kept back by everyone at Mansfield except Edmund. But contrary to series host Gillian Anderson’s introduction, Edmund (and thus the reader) “knew her to be clever, to have a quick apprehension as well as good sense, and a fondness for reading . . . he recommended the books. . . encouraged her taste, and corrected her judgment.” Compare the two versions of the response to Sir Thomas’s departure for Antigua: In the book, “Fanny’s relief, and her consciousness of it, were quite equal to her cousins’, but a more tender nature suggested that her feelings were ungrateful, and she really grieved because she could not grieve,” wrote Austen. But in the film, Fanny’s voiceover exults, “I was 18, it was summer, and I had never been happier,” as she races across the park.

This ever romping, tousled Fanny is hard to reconcile with Austen’s girl, who “enjoyed being avowedly useful as her aunt’s companion . . . talked to her, listened to her, read to her; and the tranquility of such evenings . . . was unspeakably welcome.” Even less does the film’s portrayal hint at Fanny as the unwavering moral center of the book.

Finally, in the book Mansfield Park itself is a sort of character, a locus of values. The film fails to contrast its way of life with Sotherton or Portsmouth and depicts it simply as a beautiful estate, suitable for frolic, merely a setting for romantic encounters. The film’s hectic pace, melodramatic music, and lack of concern with motives keep it from evoking a sense of the deliberate procession of seasons and orderliness of living arrangements that characterize Austen’s Mansfield.
While the new film dramatizes incidents of the book, it violates its tone and values. For a more faithful, if still not satisfying, adaptation, readers will have to turn back to the 1986 BBC version. But if the cool, ironic voice of the narrator is indispensable, only the book itself will serve.

**Persuasion**

Elsie Holzwarth

Fanny Price may be a tousled romper (see *Mansfield Park* review). Anne Elliot is a spit-curled sprinter who’d win a foot race against any Austen character. Why she positively flies up and down the sidewalk in Bath when she gets the famous Wentworth “You pierce my soul” letter, handed to her by what seems to be a servant. No scene in the film at the White Hart where Austen gives us a hint of Wentworth’s emotion when he drops his pen “striving to catch sounds” of conversation between Anne and Captain Harville, and Anne claims for her “own sex” the “privilege. . . of loving longest, when existence or when hope is gone!” Instead, in the film Anne makes her remarks to Captain Benwick seemingly as a condolence on the loss of his intended, Harville’s sister Fanny.

Anne may conquer the 100 yard dash, but she’s a flop at long distance. Fatigued by the walk to Winthrop, Austen’s Anne is “assisted” by Wentworth into the Crofts carriage; “his will and his hands had done it. . . She was very much affected by the view of his disposition towards her.” The film’s Wentworth merely picks her up and plunks her onto the back of the gig, much as one puts a cookie jar on a kitchen shelf. Here was a cinematic opportunity to exchange a glance, show some, if suppressed, emotion. But no, the gig merely rolls on down the lane.

Indeed, there is little chemistry between the film’s Anne and Wentworth. And surely, gentle Reader, such attraction is a major element of a true attachment. When Anne isn’t dashing, she’s twitching, no more so than when her tremulous self expectantly awaits Wentworth’s kiss on the Bath sidewalk. When surrounded by her self-centered family and acquaintances Sally Hawkins’ Anne so broadly broadcasts her feelings with facial contortions one wonders why they simply don’t ask, What’s the matter now, Anne? Obtuse they are, but not totally blind. In contrast, being “composed” was important to Austen’s Anne. Rupert Penry-Jones’ Wentworth is a pretty face, but a rather vacuous man who stares a lot. It’s hard to imagine him commanding a crew of hundreds in a sailing ship, capturing other ships to earn his prize money.

Other cast members are disappointing due to miscasting. Alice Krige (Mrs. Russell) is better suited to be Wentworth’s sister, Mrs. Croft. Instead, the Crofts are a much too old couple. Marion Bailey (Mrs. Croft) would have been a perfect Mrs. Russell. But then, Mrs. Russell and the Crofts are given short shrift in the film. And so is Austen’s housebound Mrs. Smith. Her film role is to be so robust as to hurry out to meet Anne and tell her of William Elliot’s plan to marry Anne while, at the same time, keeping Mrs. Clay as a mistress. Austen may hint at a connection between them, but it is only in the original two last chapters (discarded by Austen) that Mrs. Clay is “established under his Protection in London.” Only in those unused chapters do the Crofts volunteer to cancel their lease at Kellynch, making possible the film’s preposterous ending: Wentworth surprising Anne, and us, with Kellynch Hall.
Miss Austen Regrets

Lori Davis

Woe to anyone whose recorder missed the first minutes of the film; that person has paid dearly for choosing to watch the Super Bowl instead. In those first minutes we see Jane’s giddy acceptance of Harris Bigg’s hand in marriage and then Jane and Cassandra’s hasty retreat the next morning. In the carriage Jane silently prays, “Tell me I have done the right thing. Tell me I was right to change my mind. Dear God, let me never regret this day.” What follows is a skillful depiction of the answer to this prayer.

Regret, by nature, is a messy, uncertain, confusing mixture of self-justification and self-recrimination that passes judgment on past faults, acts, losses, and decisions made under pressure and without the knowledge of future consequences. As Jane says, “If we could only see into the future and know in advance if our choices will turn out to be wise.” Jane’s feelings toward her own choices resurface as her niece Fanny seeks her marriage advice. Her feelings are compounded when she again sees the Rev. “Brook” Bridges, Fanny’s uncle and an old friend and suitor, who, though long married, has never forgotten Jane. He assures her he would have supported her writing. She assures him the demands of a family would have made that impossible. She sees the possibility of love come and go when her new friend, her brother Henry’s doctor, pays attention to her, and then to Fanny (from an age standpoint, a more prudent choice). Jane’s past choices slap her in the face as her mother castigates her for choosing “principle,” marrying for love, over the means of assuring the security of her sister and mother.

In the end, when Jane is losing ground to terminal illness, Jane reassures Cassandra, “All any one of these men might have done is make me ‘quite happy.’

‘Quite happy’ is not enough. ‘Quite happy’ is not the ending I want to write for my story. And quite poor is the absolute limit! The only regret I have about not marrying Harris Bigg is that I’m going to die, and I’m going to leave you and mother with nothing.” . . . “I made you refuse him.” . . . “You made me see the choice for what it was.” . . . “Because of me you chose loneliness and poverty.” . . . “Because of you I chose freedom.” . . . “I didn’t do it for you, Jane.” . . . “I know.” . . . “I’m so ashamed!” . . . “Cassie, everything I am, and everything I have achieved, I owe to you. To the life we have made here, to the love that we have together. And the life I have is what I needed. It’s what God intended for me. I’m so much happier than I thought to be. So much happier than I deserve to be.” . . . This fierce bond between Jane and Cassandra convinces us her words are true.

I found the casting dead on (including a family likeness between Olivia Williams’ Jane and Greta Scacchi’s Cassandra), the acting first rate, the dialog excellent (with direct Austen quotes integrated seamlessly), the plot intriguing, and the conclusion satisfying.

Were I to pick one highlight of the piece, Olivia Williams is it! She carries off Jane’s contradictions with compelling grace—from the arch and witty indefatigable dancer who would do anything to escape afternoon calls, to the romantic pragmatist who would rather name a dozen characters than even one baby. In fact, I would love to see Olivia Williams bring her energy, intelligence, and sense of fun to the role of Jane in films of Stephanie Barron’s Jane Austen mysteries.

My only regret is that blighting previews might have kept away viewers prone to enjoy the film as much as I did.
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