JANE AUSTEN'S PROPOSAL SCENES AND THE LIMITATIONS OF LANGUAGE

JANIS P. STOUT

"If I loved you less, I might be able to talk about it more."
Mr. Knightley, *Emma*

Jane Austen's proposal scenes, when her exemplary but chastened heroes and heroines finally arrive at a revelation of their love and a decision to marry, have long troubled readers and critics. One follows—with delight, of course, but with considerable perseverance—a series of lengthy "verbatim" conversations only to arrive at the culminating moment and find very nearly a blank. How did Darcy express himself when he learned to love Elizabeth Bennet properly and ask her, rather than summon her, to be his wife? What, exactly, did Emma Woodhouse say to Mr. Knightley when she discovered, to her joy, that he did not love Harriet Smith after all but always and only herself? One would like to know. But Austen is reluctant to tell.

It is *Pride and Prejudice* that affords the most familiar and most frequently noted example of Austen's reticence in presenting love scenes. Here, at the climax of the romantic plot, the second proposal, we are shut out. We hear Darcy ask permission to speak again, but we do not hear him speak. The narrator interposes, telling us that Darcy "expressed himself on the occasion as sensibly and as warmly as a man violently in love can be supposed to do."[1] Similarly, when the secondary love plot culminates in Bingley's proposal to Jane, we glimpse the lovers moments afterward, and we hear Jane's expression of happiness, but we are denied the actual proposal.

The omission or obscuring of such scenes, even though they are obviously crucial in novels patterned on the love and marriage plot, has caused readers to regard Austen as being unduly reserved, even cold, either ignorant or afraid of strong emotion. This view of her as being emotionally straitened has contributed to the traditional critical verdict that she is an exquisite but "limited"

novelist. Yet opinion on the subject is not unanimous; there is a minority report. Notably, Howard S. Babb develops a study of Austen's dialogue from the thesis that it "reveals a richer substance in the novels, and a far greater range of expressiveness on the part of the characters, than has generally been allowed."[2] More assertively, Alice Chandler, in an article on Austen's handling of sex, charges that she has "wrongly been seen as suspicious of all feeling" and goes on to argue the richness and subtlety of sexual emotion conveyed in the novels.[3] It is this minority view of Austen's work, the view that finds it not emotionally limited but emotionally subtle, that I want to support by examining the proposal scenes—or the absence of proposal scenes—in the six completed mature novels. Further, I will suggest that the reticence shown in Austen's proposal scenes manifests a larger set of views concerning the uses and the limitations of language itself.

Austen's characteristic practice, employed in all six novels, is to suspend the dramatized presentation of events leading up to the romantic climax, a presentation developed largely through close-grained dialogue, and to shift instead to indirect discourse or, more often, narrative summary.[4] At the same time, she renews her characteristic reliance on generalization, a practice which stresses the shared, common qualities of the characters' experience and which engages our participation or assent as readers while disengaging us from highly charged particulars.[5] The practice is thematically right, conveying as it does both Jane Austen's faith in the continuity between the individual's personal interests and those of society and her stress on the moral value of a widened perspective, even as it is dramatically disappointing to the emotionally involved reader.

In *Northanger Abbey*, for example, the culminating event is distanced both by being given in a narrator's account, rather than direct rendering, and by the narrator's gently amused tone ("explain himself," "so well," "could [n]ever be repeated too often"). Further, it is distanced and weighted by passive verbs, which put the emphasis on the action itself, as an idea, rather than the doing of it or the agents of the action as individuals. "Some explanation on his father's account he had to give; but his first purpose was to explain himself, and before they reached Mr. Allen's grounds he had done it so well, that Catherine did not think it could ever be repeated too often. She was assured of his affection; and that heart in return was solicited, which, perhaps, they pretty equally knew was already entirely his own . . ." (V, 243). That is all. Yet in *Northanger Abbey* the abbreviation of the proposal scene is not likely to be so bothersome to readers as it is in the other novels, since its tone throughout is parodic and its characters, as a result, generally distanced anyway. Further, the novel's theme—misinterpretation of appearances—is more directly insistent than is any abstract theme in any of the other works. Thus the mildly comic use of "explain" and "explanation" in the proposal scene—comic both because of its dry understatement and because of the disparity of meanings between

explaining his father's actions and explaining himself—continues that theme, even as it continues the amused, parodic treatment of the lovers themselves. For both effects, it is necessary that the proposal be presented in indirect statement. Thus the reticence of the proposal scene here can well be seen as not only appropriate but even essential to the design of the novel.

The same cannot well be argued of *Sense and Sensibility*, yet the proposal scene here is very similar. What might be expected to be the romantic climax of the book, Edward's proposal to Elinor, is not a "scene," properly speaking, at all. It is merely acknowledged to have occurred.

> How soon he had walked himself into the proper resolution, however, how soon an opportunity of exercising it occurred, in what manner he expressed himself, and how he was received, need not be particularly told. This only need be said;—that when they all sat down to table at four o'clock, about three hours after his arrival, he had secured his lady, engaged her mother's consent, and was not only in the rapturous profession of the lover, but in the reality of reason and truth, one of the happiest of men. (I, 361)

Not only the tone of disavowal and the absence of direct depiction, but the formally balanced syntax and the play of light mockery ("the rapturous profession of the lover," "the happiest of men") distance the reader, as well as the author, from the experience of a proposal of marriage.

Similarly, Edmund's proposal to Fanny in *Mansfield Park* is shunted aside in favor of commentary on the naturalness of his coming to want her for his wife. "Edmund did cease to care about Miss Crawford, and became as anxious to marry Fanny, as Fanny herself could desire" (III, 470). Recalling the brother-sister quality of their relationship, it would be tempting to read this as meaning, in other words, that he did not want it very much, or at least very passionately. Such a meaning, however, is certainly foreign to Jane Austen's intentions. Her irony is not so surreptitious as that, and Fanny remains, after all, the moral center of the novel. Nevertheless, the report of their feelings is so subdued that the actual proposal, as an occurrence, gets lost. Two paragraphs after the assurance that Edmund's feeling came to equal Fanny's, the reader discovers that the engagement is an accomplished fact: "Their own inclinations ascertained, there were no difficulties" (III, 471). The nearest thing we have to the proposal is thrown into a participial phrase!

The proposal motif in *Mansfield Park* is actually considerably more complex, and bears considerably wider implications, than this summary of Edmund and Fanny's engagement indicates. We will return to a consideration of those complexities and their similarity to the structures of *Pride and Prejudice* later.

A very different situation is presented in *Emma* in that the proposal scene is extended for some pages with close attention to the fluctuating emotions of

both Emma and Mr. Knightley. However, the words of the actual proposal are again omitted. Solicited to give her assurance that she will at least hear him, Emma says "just what she ought" as a "lady always does" (IV, 431). Beyond this the reader is given no indication of the words or actions in which they pledge themselves. For this reason, *Emma* is generally included in the prevailing critical indictment of Austen's proposal scenes as being "frigid exercise[s]."[6] To be sure, Austen retains in great measure the decorum we expect of her. Much of the proposal sequence is given in something between indirect discourse and narrative account, summarizing a retrospective view of Emma's and Mr. Knightley's emotional development toward the sharing of love. Even in the indirect discourse, however, the pressure of emotion is conveyed in the brokenness of the phrasing, sharply interrupted by dashes and exclamation points.

Emma does offer considerably more of the direct discourse of the love scene than do the other novels. Mr. Knightley's apology for his verbal inadequacies—"If I loved you less, I might be able to talk about it more" (IV, 430)—is quoted. We are given a more minute account than in other novels of the surging of emotions as the scene progresses. Even so, even in the passages of direct quotation, much of the deepest feeling is conveyed, not so much by what is said and done, as by what is omitted. When Mr. Knightley speaks of how fortunate Frank Churchill is in finding and engaging his love so early in life, what he does not say is what he most feels, how he wishes that he were so fortunate with Emma. Once again, as she had most successfully in *Pride and Prejudice*, Austen uses, in Chandler's phrase, "the language of speechlessness" to convey her characters' deepest feelings. Naturally, the "reading" of such a language requires the greatest care and sensitivity to nuance. To some degree, in fact, Austen's reticence in delineating highly emotional scenes can be seen as an expression of her demand for an intelligent, participating audience. Moreover, the demands made on the reader for perceiving the unstated are another form of decorum or distancing. It is possible to conclude, as Lloyd W. Brown does, that Mr. Knightley and Emma talk "at cross purposes" in an "irony of errors."[7] These very errors, however, are the means by which Austen lets the reader see her hero and heroine's hopes and fears, and are the means by which they arrive at an understanding. Howard S. Babb is much more correct and helpful here, I think, in his tracing of the ways in which indirection in the dialogue conveys the "intense private emotions" of both.[8]

In *Emma*, then, Austen offers a fuller rendering of the emotional evolution of her characters toward a commitment to marry. But it is still a subdued revelation of that commitment, and one which avoids a direct rendering of the pledges of love.

In *Persuasion*, too, Austen manages to give a sense of the emotional pitch of Wentworth's and Anne's declaration of continuing love, yet to retain, finally, the overall decorum and concealment that have so often been pointed to

as evidence of her supposed incapacity for or fear of strong emotion. She does this, of course, by means of Wentworth's impulsive, urgent letter, which conveys the intensity of his feelings in such language as, "You pierce my soul. I am half agony, half hope" (V, 237). At the same time, it *is* a letter. Recourse to presenting a declaration of love in writing is a way of avoiding the confrontation, interaction, and sharing of a face-to-face love scene. Later, when Anne and Captain Wentworth do meet and talk, their arrival at an understanding is not only offered through the convention of indirect discourse (a perfectly legitimate device for maintaining pace and for avoiding effects of bathos) but is marked by brevity, passive verbs, generalization, and formal syntax, all of which are means of dissipating the immediacy and the emotional impact of the proposal scene itself. In spite of the greater openness to intuitive or emotional values which many readers have noticed in *Persuasion*, Austen maintains her practice of subduing the most intensely emotional moment of the novel.

* * *

In all of the proposal scenes of her heroes and heroines, then, Jane Austen avoids fullness or directness. In part, this restraint in presenting what is, in terms of plot at least, the climactic point of her novels, is a function of her concept of novelistic tact. She meant to avoid the bathetic and trivial effects of a preoccupation with private details. In *Persuasion*, she censures such a preoccupation, in connection with everyday gossip about an upcoming wedding, as "minutiae which, even with every advantage of taste and delicacy which good Mrs. Musgrove could not give, could be properly interesting only to the principals" (V, 230). We may disagree; we may protest that we would be very interested indeed in such minutiae. But we do not live in an age committed to decorum. Austen did. At any rate, her tastes and convictions were formed in such an age. Further, it is clear that Austen's reluctance to give her characters' emotional lives—and for the modern reader this means to a great degree the physical aspects of their emotional lives—a fully rendered immediacy is partly determined by her purpose of keeping the thematic dimension central to her fiction. She appears to see a full depiction of powerful private emotions as a detraction from that emphasis.[9] The bareness of her proposal scenes, then, is a result of a deliberate aesthetic choice, not simply the manifestation of Austen's own anxieties or emotional limitations.

But beyond these factors, what I want to suggest is that the quietness, the virtual negativeness, of Jane Austen's proposal scenes arises not only from a theory of the novel but from a theory of language. Even an eagerness to avoid the breaking of decorum does not explain the verbal absence of her proposals. The language of love is not only moderated, it is for the most part passed over. Her reason for doing this, finally, is a belief that language is in itself inadequate to the expression of strong emotion. Austen's problem as a novelist, then, was how to render in a verbal medium a quality of experience beyond words.[10]

In life, the inadequate words themselves might be supplemented by gesture, intonation, eye contact, and, most emphatically, body contact. But these forms of expression are, for the most part, unavailable to Austen, for the reasons (decorum, emphasis on general themes rather than individual events) that we have already seen. Only the smallest gestures—gestures, though, which are very highly charged with emotional significance—might be delineated. We have, for instance, Elizabeth's and Darcy's walking together in the scene of his second proposal, an almost balletic movement conveying their joy in being together and their success in accommodating their previous excesses of personality to the corrective of each other and of their love: "They walked on, without knowing in what direction" (II,366). Elizabeth's excited anticipation and her awareness of the overwhelming emotional import of the moment are conveyed in the mere phrase, "had Elizabeth been able to encounter his eye" (II, 366). Similarly freighted physical details are, from *Emma*, her turning away from the door in order to walk further with Mr. Knightley and, from *Persuasion*, the view of Anne and Captain Wentworth as they "slowly paced the gradual ascent, heedless of every group around them" as he now walks "by her side" (V, 240-41).

These are very significant patterns of motion. Yet they are undeniable, on the surface at least, subdued, even minimal. With no further notation of the various lovers' physical responses and gestures, and with only a minimal indication of what they said to each other, we are left to "supply from our own imaginations," as Chandler summarizes it, "the potency and force" of the characters' emotions. Austen presents the reader with a nearly empty space and invites the reader to fill it in out of the reader's own wishes, memories, and shared feelings.

That this can work, can make even a few of Austen's readers (those who are willing to allow her her own methods and standards) feel that the culminating scenes of the love plots are satisfying, is largely a matter of her understanding how to use the techniques of large contrasts. It is a matter of her allegiance to a theory of language and her alertness to the possibilities of making that theory work positively in the dramatic structures of the novels.

First, and more generally, the proposal scenes do stand in strong contrast to the earlier scenes in all the novels, which are typically developed in reliance on elaborated discourse. That is, Austen gains the impact of strong difference by poising her nearly speechless love and proposal scenes against the sheer spokenness of sequences involving all other matters. In *Pride and Prejudice*, she takes us through those wonderful, witty dialogues of Elizabeth and Darcy and the vapid or deadly prolixity of Collins and the Lady Catherine de Bourgh, building our expectation that all of the important relationships between characters will be dealt with in speech, only to have the lovers fall speechless at the time of their revelation. This scene, Austen's practice tells us, is different and special. Words, she implies, cannot possibly fill the need—either the charac-

ters' words or her own. This time, we must consider "the implications of silence" and conceive of a state of anticipation, as well as "confusion and intensity of feelings," which are "beyond mere statement."[11] Much the same thing happens in *Emma*. After experiencing in chapter after chapter an Emma who brightly and confidently pronounces her playful caveats and a Mr. Knightley who does not hesitate to enunciate his settled judgments to Emma and to his acquaintances in general in weighty, well-rounded cadences, we find a Mr. Knightley who must rely on "looking the question" and whose speech rhythms are nervous and broken: " 'As a friend! . . . Emma, that I fear is a word—No, I have no wish—Stay, yes, why should I hesitate?—I have gone too far already for concealment.—Emma, I accept your offer—Extraordinary as it may seem, I accept it' " (IV, 429-30). The difference in his speech patterns and his loss of confidence in his own saying—" 'I cannot make speeches, Emma' "—make us realize the greatness of his emotional stress. A somewhat different contrast between speech and tacitness occurs to great effect in *Persuasion*. After the lengthy and often empty speech of the populous social situations with which she surrounds her lovers, Austen poises them in their crucial hour walking quietly and without reported dialogue among the "sauntering politicians, bustling house-keepers, flirting girls, . . . nursery-maids and children" (V, 241) of busy ordinary life.[12]

It is largely because of this contrast between the relative speechlessness of her lovers at the moment of their revelations and their talkativeness on other occasions that we believe the scenes involved are very special and worth our imaginative filling in. They *must* be presented indirectly and filled in by the imagination, not provided in the characters' own speech, precisely because they are so important. Conversation, Austen believes, always to some degree falsifies. People exaggerate, or they fall into embarrassment, or they misremember the actual truth they are reporting and resort to imaginative embellishment, but at any rate they are never able to communicate to others the precise state of their views and feelings. Even when they believe that they are being most candid, they are likely to misunderstand what it is that they are conveying to others. Thus Elizabeth, in *Pride and Prejudice*, means to be honest when she is, in fact, needlessly bold and pridefully opinionated. She means to be a thorn in Darcy's side, but so intrigues him that he falls in love.

Conversation, then, is necessarily imprecise. From the vagaries of the speaker's intentions and abilities and the predilections of the listener, as well as from the nature of language itself, it inevitably misses the mark. As Emma herself remarks, expressing her concern that Mr. Knightley might not have caught Robert Martin's meaning regarding his engagement to Harriet Smith, " 'Did you not misunderstand him?—You were both talking of other things; of business, shows of cattle, or new drills—and might not you, in the confusion of so many subjects, mistake him?' " (IV, 473). If conversation is so inadequate on ordinary occasions, how much more so when the emotions are strained! It is

on these occasions that people most need to express themselves, yet such occasions are too important, to the principals involved, to be entrusted to discourse. Through a very delicate irony, then, when Austen's characters most need to communicate with one another, they dare not place their confidence in the primary medium of communication, conversation. After the scene of Mr. Knightley's proposal to Emma, Austen as narrator steps in to observe, "Seldom, very seldom, does complete truth belong to any human disclosure; seldom can it happen that something is not a little disguised, or a little mistaken; but where, as in this case, though the conduct is mistaken, the feelings are not, it may not be very material" (IV, 431). Her heroes and heroines must hope to convey their meaning despite the inadequacies of language. Accordingly, Austen hopes to convey the sense of their avowal scenes in other ways than by reporting their speech.

But Austen goes further, even, than this. She not only doubts the adequacy of language to strong emotion, she doubts as well the integrity of language when used in situations where there ought to be strong emotion. More accurately, she doubts the integrity of those who are able to remain fluent, flowery, or verbose in such situations.

The readiest examples, of course, are the contrasting proposals in *Pride and Prejudice*—Mr. Collins's proposal first to Elizabeth, then (reported indirectly) to Charlotte, and Darcy's first proposal, against which his second is poised. Mr. Collins's proposal to Elizabeth is one of the great bits of satiric comedy in all of literature. He convicts himself out of his own mouth of being a great fool. Most obviously, his proposal speech is very long, some three pages (II, 105-7) as compared to the brief two paragraphs of narration given to Darcy's second proposal and Elizabeth's acceptance. Beyond his mere verbosity, however, Collins's speech is repulsive and ridiculous for its smug self-assurance, indeed its utter self-preoccupation, its inflated formality ("you can hardly doubt the purport of my discourse"), its false claims to emotion ("before I am run away with by my feelings on this subject," he says, while Elizabeth stifles a laugh at the improbability of Collins's ever being run away with by his feelings), and its tactlessness ("your wit and vivacity, I think, must be acceptable to her, especially when tempered with . . . silence and respect"). Collins, in short, is not honest; one guesses that he does not know how to be. So it is certainly not surprising that he complacently assumes Elizabeth is not honest either when she rejects him. His insincerity is demonstrated, of course, when he applies to Charlotte Lucas only two days later, again in "long speeches" that only delay the answer Charlotte, in the "pure and disinterested desire of an establishment" (II, 122) has already determined to give him.

In the case of Collins's proposals, Austen has no need to maintain decorum. No strong emotion is present which might violate it, and she has no wish to spare Collins but to hold him up to laughter. Her brevity in the matter of Collins's proposal to Charlotte derives simply from her wish not to repeat what

he had already said so ludicrously to Elizabeth. His prolixity to her, of course, indicates only his lack of emotional substance. He likes the sound of his own voice more than he wants to gain Elizabeth. The matter of Darcy's first proposal is very similar in that he, too, conveys primarily his own egotism. His opening statement may at first seem like a direct outburst of strong emotion: " 'In vain have I struggled. It will not do. My feelings will not be repressed. You must allow me to tell you how ardently I admire and love you' " (II, 189). With a little care, however, we can see in it an egotism only a little less extreme than Collins's, though not so ridiculous. His emphasis is not only on himself but on his wish that he did not care for her. And he is scarcely less assured than Collins: " 'You must allow me to tell you. . . . ' " As Chandler observes, the proposal is something like a "verbal rape."[13] Darcy goes on, as tactlessly as Collins though with more reason, to dwell on "his sense of her inferiority—of its being a degradation—of the family obstacles" (II, 189). His lengthy letter of explanation does not have to bear the same censures of pretense or insincerity that Austen attaches to long speeches because, first, it is a convincing explanation (particularly of his dealings with Wickham) and, second, when writing a letter one is relieved of the emotional pressure of a personal presence, and therefore free to be fully detailed, rational without heartlessness, and frank without breach of decorum. The letter begins to change Elizabeth's mind. A long speech, which could be heard only once and would surely have aroused her spirited rejoinder, could not have done that.

This pattern of contrasts, best known and most acutely developed in *Pride and Prejudice*, appears in other novels as well. In *Mansfield Park*, Henry Crawford is "quite determined to marry Fanny Price" (III, 291) and approaches her with a "sanguine and pre-assured mind" (III, 302). Like Collins, though without Collins's ridiculousness, he speaks at length, not once, but twice. Crawford is, of course, one of Austen's stock characters, the insincere young man. At an early stage of his courtship he admits to his sister that he likes to win the hearts of girls simply for gratification. In *Emma*, the foolish Mr. Elton, a figure not quite so obtuse or so vicious as Mr. Collins, presses on Emma an elaborate proposal so "violent" that she can only suppose he is drunk. The proposal is not given directly, so we do not have the verbal fun of Collins's proposal, but the reporting of a speech containing such cant language of wooing as "hoping—fearing—adoring—ready to die if she refused him" (IV, 129) certainly conveys the impression of pretentiousness and length. We are not given any hint of Frank Churchill's proposal, since he never misrepresents himself so far as to propose to Emma and his secret engagement to Jane Fairfax is established before the opening of the novel, but a part of the reader's impression of his unreliability derives from his idle talkativeness, very similar to Willoughby's in *Sense and Sensibility*. In each case, as Norman Page observes in *The Language of Jane Austen*, "readiness of speech is associated

with the vicious, and taciturnity with the virtuous" and "any fluency becomes suspect."[14]

Plainly, working with such a set of associations, Austen could not give verbally rich proposal scenes to her authentic heroes and heroines, particularly since they number among their virtues a becoming diffidence naturally at war with glib speechifying. We believe them and esteem them all the more for this trace of reticence, with its hint of their being slightly overwhelmed by the experience of loving and hoping to be loved in return. Denying herself the recording of their direct expressions, then, Austen also denies herself the author's prerogative of speaking for them, very fully at any rate, through narration. Here her commitment to decorum and to an emphasis on general truth, rather than details of private experience, precludes any very detailed account of her characters' approaches to each other. The result, in her proposal scenes, is the bareness that so many readers, especially in the "open" twentieth century, have seen as being so insipid, timid, or priggish. Perhaps those elements were present in her personality, though the letters do not seem to indicate that they were, and they may have become embodied to an extent in her fiction. But it is clear that a biographical explanation of the point is by itself insufficient. Austen was working out of a conscious theory of her medium and her form. There is considerable irony in the fact that a novelist who worked so much in dialogue and who believed so firmly in conversation as a social bond, should also demonstrate a belief in the failure, the ultimate inadequacy, of language for the expression of strong feeling. There is also considerable intellectual honesty in her willingness to admit this inconsistency into the structure of her fiction.

RICE UNIVERSITY

NOTES

1 *The Novels of Jane Austen*, R. W. Chapman text, 2nd ed. (Oxford Univ. Press, 1926), II, 366. All citations are to this edition.

2 Howard S. Babb, *Jane Austen's Novels: The Fabric of Dialogue* (Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, 1967), p. 4.

3 Alice Chandler, " 'A Pair of Fine Eyes': Jane Austen's Treatment of Sex," *Studies in the Novel*, 7 (1975), 88.

4 Cf. Norman Page, in *The Language of Jane Austen* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1972), p. 137: Austen "tends to renounce dialogue when events seem about to precipitate a scene with considerable emotional potential."

5 See Babb, pp. 9-15.

6 Chandler, p. 100.

7 Lloyd W. Brown, *Bits of Ivory: Narrative Techniques in Jane Austen's Fiction* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State Univ. Press, 1973), p. 197.

8 Babb, p. 198.

9 Ibid., pp. 8-15.

10 Bernard Paris is working with the same general idea of Austen's technical problems in her love scenes, but approaching it from a psychological or sociological rather than a semantic angle, in discussing the "recurring problem" she encountered in writing the proposals. Paris states the problem by asking, "given the restrictive patterns of courtship and the modest behavior prescribed for women, how are young people to come to an understanding?" (Bernard J. Paris, *Character and Conflict in Jane Austen's Novels: A Psychological Approach* [Detroit: Wayne State Univ. Press, 1978], p. 109). I believe the problem arose at least as much from Austen's own beliefs about language and about the novel as a form as from social norms.

11 Chandler, p. 100.

12 A very similar moment occurs at the end of Dickens's *Little Dorrit* as the newly married couple "went quietly down into the roaring streets, inseparable and blessed; and as they passed along in sunshine and in shade, the noisy and the eager, and the arrogant and the froward and the vain, fretted, and chafed, and made their usual uproar."

13 Chandler, p. 98.

14 Page, p. 38.