



UNIVERSITY OF MURCIA

International Journal
of
English Studies

IJES

<http://revistas.um.es/ijes>

The ethics of neoaustenism: from Jane Austen to Taylor Swift in the age of metamodernism

ALEJANDRO SÁNCHEZ CABRERA*

University of Salamanca (Spain)

Received: 29/06/2025. Accepted: 15/10/2025.

ABSTRACT

This article introduces *neoaustenism* as a metamodern-feminist sensibility rooted in Jane Austen's fiction and paradigmatically articulated today through Taylor Swift's songwriting. While other metamodern-rooted discourses such as neoromanticism revive a largely male genealogy of longing and melancholy, neoaustenism retrieves a specifically feminine grammar of irony, self-reflexivity, and relational ethics. Grounded in affect theory and the ethics of care, the concept reframes vulnerability as a shared resource that turns personal wounds into collective agency. The article first situates neoaustenism within metamodern oscillation and the affective turn. It then traces a gendered genealogy of sentiment from Austen's heroines to Swift's layered lyrical voices, showing through close reading how Swift's songwriting translates Austenian irony and care into pop rituals that foster horizontal communities through reflective nostalgia, audience co-authorship, and embodied practices. Finally, this article argues that neoaustenism holds potential beyond Swift and offers a critical horizon for (re)imagining feminine identity and resilience in neoliberal culture, thus inviting further interdisciplinary inquiry.

KEYWORDS: Neoaustenism, metamodernism, affect, irony, ethics of care, Taylor Swift, Jane Austen

1. INTRODUCING THE CONCEPT OF NEOAUSTENISM IN CONTEXT

In the fragmented cultural landscape of the twenty-first century, exacerbated by the hegemonic dominance of neoliberal and capitalist ideologies (Berlant, 2011; Illouz, 2007) and a growing shift towards conservative and far-right politics (Fraser, 2013), the seemingly distant voices of Jane Austen and Taylor Swift resonate with clarity. Both writers have emerged as essential narrators of the feminine experience, as they engage with what it means to live, feel, and survive as women within systems of constraint (Johnson, 1988; Li, 2024; Poovey, 1984; Tong, 2024). Though separated by over two centuries and bound to different cultural panoramas, their

***Address for correspondence:** Calle Placentinos, 18, Departamento de Filología Inglesa, Universidad de Salamanca, 37008, Salamanca; e-mail: alejandros28@usal.es

work shares a narrative and praxis marked by irony, affective negotiation, and self-reflexivity, and it offers a site for rethinking feminine identity, resilience, and care in a world marked by emotional precarity and fragmentation. Swift, in particular, brings these concerns into the present day through a metamodern mode of storytelling, one that oscillates between vulnerability and performance, creating emotionally charged spaces of feminine subjectivity and relationality.

This article proposes that these parallels between Austen and Swift reflect a mode we may call *neoaustenism*: a metamodern sensibility and ethics grounded in Austenian imagination that enables a renewed understanding of affective subjectivity, ironic oscillation, and relational ethics as feminist responses to the emotional and relational failures of postmodern irony and the atomizing effects of neoliberal individualism, which, as Fraile-Marcos suggests, are often “collateral”, yet deeply disruptive (2020, p. 1). These elements operate within a metamodern cultural field, a term which I adopt here over competing labels such as digimodernism or transmodernism. Whereas transmodernism emphasizes intercultural hybridity and digimodernism foregrounds the cultural transformations of digital participation, metamodernism proves particularly productive for theorizing the oscillatory dynamics of irony and sincerity and performance and authenticity (Gibbons, 2015, Vermeulen and van den Akker, 2010)ⁱ. This logic provides a more precise framework for reading Austen’s legacy and Swift’s narrative together, allowing neoaustenism to be situated within a broader cultural paradigm that explicitly theorizes affect and relationality.

Emerging in response to the affective turn and the wider cultural need to restore meaning and emotional intelligibility in the wake of postmodern disaffection, neoaustenism operates in parallel to neoromanticism but introduces a crucial gendered perspective, often dismissed in other metamodern discourses like the latter. Drawing from Austenian tropes such as irony, self-awareness, and female agency, this sensibility articulates a metamodern mode of feminine resilience that reconfigures the relationship between irony and care, subjectivity and relationality, and aesthetics and ethics, through cultural expressions that recast feminine agency by transforming vulnerability and individual experience into a shared narrative and ethical force. In the particular case of this study, Taylor Swift’s storytelling, which navigates between the intimate and the performative, will be considered a paradigmatic manifestation of the neoaustenian sensibility in the metamodern era.

The sensibility that binds Austen and Swift is defined not only by what their thematic choices are but by how they are felt and performed: both authors craft narrative forms where emotional depth coexists with stylistic distance. And subjectivity takes form relationally rather than individually. Their protagonists, Austen’s heroines and Swift’s lyrical voices, are dialogic agents shaped through encounters and affective negotiations with an “other”. Like Austen’s heroines, Swift’s lyrical I’s enact an affective narration that turns vulnerability into resonance, and individual wounds into collective spaces of healing and thriving, thus articulating fragility, learning, and mutual care as central to contemporary feminine agency.

By proposing the concept of neoaustenism, which is supported by feminist theory, affect studies, and studies on resilience, the present study seeks to contribute to ongoing scholarly efforts to rethink narrative, affect, and care today. It suggests that the affective turn we are experiencing is not a mere retreat into sentimentality, but a strategic re-engagement with feeling as a mode of knowing, surviving, resisting, and imagining otherwise. This article is thus structured around three aims: first, to contextualize neoaustenism within the metamodern landscape and its theoretical implications; second, to draw a continuous line from Austen’s heroines to Taylor Swift’s metamodern storytelling; and third, to show how both authors’ shared grammar of irony, self-reflexivity, and relational resilience articulates a feminist-metamodern sensibility introduced here as neoaustenian. Through this approach, this concept is presented not only as a mode of textual analysis, but also as a broader cultural framework

capable of illustrating metamodern reconfigurations of feminine identity and care in the contemporary world. In doing so, this study seeks to extend the term beyond its scattered critical appearances, reframing neoaustenism as a productive category for theorizing the affective, ethical, and narrative textures of contemporary femininity; the label neoaustenian (orthographic variants include neo-austenism, neo-Austenian) has so far appeared only in ad-hoc ways, rather than as the marker of an established field. For instance, Gündüz argues Austen screen adaptations “evolve into neo-Austenian phase evoking a sense of postmodern nostalgia” (2024, p. 40), while Waterman suggests Sally Rooney’s fictional couples “might be understood in one sense as a very old form of romantic sentimentality, of virtue beyond market rationality, of neo-Austenian romance” (2022, p. 243).

2. THEORIZING THE NEOAUSTENIAN: TURNING TO A GENDERED GENEALOGY OF AFFECT AND CARE

Positioned within the broader metamodern discourse, one that “oscillates between a modern enthusiasm and a postmodern irony, between hope and melancholy, between naïveté and knowingness, empathy and apathy, unity and plurality, totality and fragmentation, purity and ambiguity” (Vermeulen & van den Akker, 2010, p. 6), neoaustenism functions as a resonant counterpart to the already established category of neoromanticism, identified by Vermeulen and van den Akker as the most salient expression of metamodern aesthetics. In their groundbreaking 2010 article, “Notes on metamodernism”, the authors outline a series of tendencies in contemporary narratives that articulate the oscillatory logic of the metamodern condition. Among these, they suggest the paradigm “appears to find its clearest expression in an emergent neoromantic sensibility” (2010, p. 8), as today’s cultural context, they claim, demands an affective turn that recenters modes of feeling reminiscent of Romanticism at the core of our experiences. In the same line, as a metamodern sensibility, the emergence of neoaustenism coincides with what has been identified as the “affective turn”: a shift in critical theory that foregrounds affect as a central piece for understanding the functioning of the social and “ongoing political, economic, and cultural transformations” we face as a global society (Clough & Halley, 2007, p. 1).

This epistemological reorientation is rooted in a philosophical genealogy associated with Spinoza, Bergson, and, later, Deleuze and Guattari, whose work anticipates body, sensation, and temporality as key elements of thought and experience. For Spinoza (1959), affects are not just emotions but dynamic forces that emerge from our embodied encounters with the world, “confused ideas” –as he describes them– shaped by interactions and relations (as cited in Lord, 2010, p. 84). Bergson, similarly, offers a processual understanding of affect. His emphasis on intuition over abstraction supports a view of affect that is pre-personal, embodied, and resistant to linguistic capture (1950). Building on both, Deleuze (1992) interprets affect as intensity and becoming, nonlinear and always in motion. His work with Guattari (1987) further develops this framework by proposing affect as a distributed, vibratory force, embedded in the nervous and social strata of experience, which sheds light on how capacities, in the words of Sara Ahmed, “do not belong to individuals, but are about how bodies are affected by others” (2014, p. 183).

This turn to affect marks a decisive movement away from a disembodied discourse towards more relational forms of thought and experience. In the words of Massumi, affect becomes a “state of suspense, potentially of disruption. It’s like a temporal sink, a hole in time . . . not exactly passivity, [but] filled with motion, vibratory motion, resonation” (1995, p. 86). This conceptualization displaces traditional structuralist approaches and foregrounds affect as a nonlinear force, one that “enables a different connectivity, a different difference” (Massumi,

1995, p. 85). In other words: affect operates beyond meaning, turning towards embodied and dynamic dimensions of experience. In fact, as Margaret Wetherell puts forward in the introduction to her *Affect and emotion: A new social science understanding* (2012), “to turn to affect becomes a decisive shift away from the current conventions of critical theory, away from research based on discourse and disembodied talk and texts, towards more vitalist, ‘post human’ and process-based perspectives” (p. 3).

Yet, while metamodern-rooted discourses such as neoromanticism have emerged over the last two decades to account for the return of sentiment, they often privilege male-authored traditions, such as Wordsworthian sincerity or Nietzschean intensity, paying little to no attention to other historical genealogies of sentiment, particularly those grounded in feminine and/or feminist traditions of emotional self-reflexivity, ironic oscillation, and relational ethics. Authors such as the Brontës, Louisa May Alcott, or Jane Austen, just to mention a few of the best-known examples, have articulated a way of feeling that is simultaneously critical, ironic, and affectively rich. Revisiting these authors and traditions can enable a broader, more inclusive understanding of how affect operates through gendered narratives.

In the case of neoromanticism, as its focus is the reactivation of Romantic tropes through canonical (male) poets, it reveals a gendered aesthetic imagination largely centered on male figures, experiences, and, of course, affects. According to Vermeulen and van den Akker (2010), the paradigmatic examples of neoromantic sensibility are overwhelmingly male artists and creators: Bas Jan Ader, Peter Doig, Gregory Crewdson, David Lynch, Michel Gondry, Wes Anderson, David Thorpe, among (many) others (pp. 7–8). These figures embody a neoromantic vision, characterized by solitary quests, mystical longing, tragic irony, and affective intensity. Even when the aesthetic is one of vulnerability, or even failure, we can extrapolate that it is part of a broader tradition that frames such tropes as the melancholic burden of the white, male, Western, artist. While a few women artists are briefly mentioned (Catherine Opie, Justine Kurland, and Kaye Donachie), their inclusion in this context is quite desultory, not as central to the conceptual development of neoromanticism as a metamodern aesthetic. This asymmetry in representation reinforces the notion that the neoromantic revival, at least as it is articulated here, is not only sustained by masculine traditions (the male-centered German Romanticism), but also replicates their affective hierarchies: longing, the existential struggle, the solitary genius, the quest for the sublimeⁱⁱ. That said, in my other publication, “An approach to metamodern intertextuality and the neoromantic discourse in Taylor Swift’s *Folklore* (2020)” (drafted prior to this article), I develop a gender-aware neoromantic reading of Swift’s *Folklore*, which serves as the seed for the perspective I elaborate in this article.

Considering a female-centered genealogy, as discussed, permits a form of feminine resilience that reclaims affect not as a grandiloquent expression, but as a situated and relational ethics for narrating and surviving. Neoaustenism offers precisely such a female-conscious critical lens within the metamodern paradigm, recovering a lineage of sentimentality rooted in the Austenian tradition, where affective practices function as strategies of endurance and recognition within systems of restraint, or what Sara Ahmed describes as “affective economies” (2014, p. 8). These affective economies describe how “feelings do not reside in subjects or objects, but are produced as effects of circulation” (2014, p. 8). They offer a lived mode of affective subjectivity. As Ahmed explains, “emotions create the very effect of surfaces and boundaries that allow us to distinguish an inside and an outside in the first place. So emotions are not simply something ‘I’ or ‘we’ have. Rather, it is through emotions, or how we respond to objects and others, that surfaces or boundaries are made: the ‘I’ and the ‘we’ are shaped by, and even take the shape of, contact with others” (2014, p. 10)ⁱⁱⁱ.

As such, the neoaustenian sensibility does not simply revise aesthetic paradigms: it foregrounds affect as a site of ethical and political negotiation; it privileges relationality over individualism, and perspective over absolutism; it distances itself from the tragic toward the

resistant. This alternative genealogy challenges the neoliberal cultural project precisely by proposing a form of resilience grounded in emotional consciousness, relational care, and narrative complexity, rather than self-sufficiency, radical individualism or stoic detachment. As Susie O'Brien propounds, “resilience—which suggests that we thrive not in spite of upheaval but because of it—appears to provide an effective conceptual apparatus” for confronting the “site of acute concern” that the future might be (2017, p. 45). Leaning on this, Fraile-Marcos argues that, in fact, the discourse of resilience has recently emerged across a wide range of spheres, noting that the concept is linked to “the capacity of beings—human or nonhuman, individual or collective—to withstand adversity, to endure by being flexible, to adapt to conditions of crisis[, involving] not only mere survival, but also flourishing in the midst of difficulties” (2020, p. 1). In this light, neoaustenism becomes a mode of reimagining the future not as a site of fear, dearth, or competition, but as a space for affective engagement, mutual recognition, and care, in the contemporary cultural imagination. Simultaneously, it provides the space for imaginatively recovering alternative present(s) and past(s), thus aligning closely with a metamodern sensibility that embraces the self-conscious pursuit of possibility, however unattainable it may be (Turner, 2015; van den Akker and Vermeulen, 2017).

Leading scholars in this field, such as Sara Ahmed, Lauren Berlant, and Ann Cvetkovich, have reoriented affect studies toward conversations that entail gendered survival and relational structures of care, thus challenging the abstract, dis-embodied, universalism of earlier affect philosophies. Ahmed links affect to relational ethics, insisting that emotions are not private states but products of “circulation” that materialize the very boundaries between bodies. She traces this insight back to feminist work that “*challenged from the outset* mind-body dualisms, as well as the distinction between reason and passion” (2014, p. 206). Building on that premise, Berlant proposes affect as strategy: in late-capitalist precarity, attachments, however compromised they may be, “promise to guarantee the endurance of something, the survival of something”, and thereby sustain everyday life through a “compromised endurance” (2011, p. 48). Cvetkovich further articulates a queer-feminist infrastructure of care, arguing that public feelings turn private pain into collective resources and that “affective investment can be a starting point for theoretical insight” within the very “institutions where we live” (2012, pp. 9–10). Their work reclaims emotion as a space of public, political, and epistemological negotiation, shedding light on how “attending to emotions might show us how all actions are reactions, in the sense that what we do is shaped by the contact we have with others” (Ahmed, 2014, p. 4).

Building on these insights, neoaustenism marks a decisive departure from both the ironic and parodic detachment of postmodernism and the uncritical idealism of other metamodern currents like neoromanticism, which, as seen, rarely interrogates the gendered and ideological structures underpinning the different Romantic tropes it reactivates. Unlike postmodern irony, which Linda Hutcheon describes as “a discursive practice or strategy” with “a critical edge”, “semantic complexity”, and a strong reliance on contextual framing and discursive communities (1994, pp. 13–15), neoaustenism seeks not to dismantle feeling or meaning but to reframe these notions through critical emotional engagement, offering a situated, gender-aware lens, thereby articulating a distinctly feminine resilience.

Such a vision of feminine resilience resonates closely with the foundations of the ethics of care forged by feminist theorists. Carol Gilligan notes in *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development* (1982) that “[t]his ethic, which reflects a cumulative knowledge of human relationships, evolves around a central insight, that self and other are interdependent” (p. 74), foregrounding relationality rather than autonomy as central to human life. Joan C. Tronto extends that insight in *Moral boundaries: A political argument for an ethic of care* (1993), and claims that “[t]he moral question an ethic of care takes as central is not—What, if anything, do I (we) owe to others? But rather—How can I (we) best meet my (our)

caring responsibilities? (p. 137). Tronto further radicalizes the point and calls for political action in terms of care: “[t]o recognize the value of care calls into question the structure of values in our society [c]are is a central concern of human life. It is time that we began to change our political and social institutions to reflect this truth” (Tronto, 1993, p.179). On her part, in *The ethics of care: Personal, political, and global* (2006), Virginia Held globalizes the argument, contending that a world organized around interdependence offers a more resilient horizon than one built on autonomous rational agents: “[t]he ethics of care . . . sees persons as relational and interdependent, morally and epistemologically” (p. 13), and that “in the ethics of care, the values of trust, solidarity, mutual concern, and empathetic responsiveness have priority; in practices of care, relationships are cultivated, needs are responded to, and sensitivity is demonstrated” (p. 16). Collectively, these theorists provide the ethical architecture for understanding neoaustenism’s commitment to resilience through care, locating ethical agency within the embodied networks of dependence and responsiveness that Austen narrates and Swift reactivates.

3. THE AUSTEN-SWIFT DIALOGUE AND THE NEOAUSTENIAN SENSIBILITY IN SWIFT’S NARRATIVE

Having established in the preceding sections the theoretical architecture of neoaustenism as a feminist-metamodern sensibility, the present section shifts from the conceptual cartography to a textual terrain. The introduction of this article presented neoaustenism as an ethics of irony, self-reflexivity, and relational resilience capable of recentering feminine agency within conditions of emotional precarity, while the previous section located such ethics in a gendered genealogy of affect and care within the often-male-centered metamodern paradigm. The present section demonstrates how the neoaustenian sensibility becomes operative in narrative practice, tracing the dialogic arc that links Austen’s narratives to Swift’s songwriting strategies.

In both authors, irony functions not as cynical negation but as a strategic distancing device, that is, a “biting irony without cynicism” that critically observes and denounces both absurd and restrictive social norms (particularly those related to gender) while still emotionally engaging with them (Booth, 1983, p. 34). In a similar way, self-reflexivity emerges in Austen and Swift as an acute narrative consciousness: both frame emotional experiences through heroines/lyrical voices who observe, doubt, learn, and change, thereby interrogating their own position in society as both subjects and critics of the emotional discourses of their respective contexts. Complementary to this, the ethics of care articulated by Austen and Swift emphasizes relational resilience, highlighting feminine interdependence as key to thriving within systems of oppression.

Thus, the following section excavates Austen’s grammar of care: the strategic irony and self-reflexivity that enable moral navigation without lapsing into detachment, and the relational ethics through which situated dependency is transformed into negotiated agency, as seen in her heroines. Close readings of Austen’s novels illustrate how vulnerability is transformed into relational strength, thus supporting Gilligan’s insight that the self and other are interdependent (1982, p. 74) and Tronto’s claim that ethical life turns on “caring responsibilities” extending beyond solitary autonomy (1993, p. 137). The subsequent section relocates these logics within Swift’s neoaustenian storytelling. Through layered lyrical voices, oscillations between confession and performance, and the emotional contracts the artist establishes with the listeners, Swift reactivates Austen’s ironic self-reflexivity for a metamodern audience, while her songs forge emotional bonds that function as a connective tissue, demonstrating how relational resilience flourishes within pop’s architectures of vulnerability.

3.1 Austen's grammar of care: Irony and self-reflexivity

Central to the neoaustenian sensibility explored in this study are the twin rhetorical pillars of irony and self-reflexivity, both of which Austen masterfully deploys. Austen's irony, as foundationally defined in critical traditions, serves not merely as a stylistic device, but as an incisive instrument for moral and social critique, while also acting as a strategy of ethical navigation within harsh social environments. D. W. Harding introduces the pivotal notion of Austen's irony as a form of "regulated hatred", arguing against sentimental or purely satirical readings of her work^{iv}. He writes:

To speak of this aspect of her work as 'satire' is perhaps misleading. She has none of the underlying didactic intention ordinarily attributed to the satirist. Her object is not missionary; it is a more desperate one of merely finding some mode of existence for her critical attitudes. To her the first necessity was to keep on reasonably good terms with the associates of her everyday life; she had a deep need for their affection and a genuine respect for the ordered, decent civilization that they upheld. And yet she was sensitive to their crudenesses and complacencies and knew that her real existence depended on resisting many of the values they implied. The novels gave her a way out of this dilemma. This, rather than the ambition of entertaining a posterity of urbane gentlemen, was her force in writing (1998, pp. 11–12)

Marvin Mudrick extends this perspective in *Jane Austen: Irony as defense and discovery* (1952), asserting that Austen's ironic stance serves as both defense and discovery, effectively protecting the heroine's interiority while simultaneously uncovering social hypocrisies. According to Mudrick, irony was Austen's "artistic impulse", the instrument "of her temperament" by which to "sharpen and expose all the incongruities between form and fact, all the delusions intrinsic to conventional art and conventional society", thus becoming "the only possible interpreter of life" (1952, pp. 1–3). As he further observes, Austen consistently highlights "incongruities between overt and hidden, between professed and acted upon, failures of wholeness which in life have consequences and must be judged but in comedy—and for Jane Austen—are relieved of guilt and responsibility at the moment of perception, to be explored and progressively illuminated by irony" (Mudrick, 1952, p. 3). This view positions irony not as a retreat from meaning, but as a mode of ethical and emotional inquiry.

The gendered dimension of Austen's narrative consciousness is particularly emphasized by Mary Poovey, who argues in *The proper lady and the woman writer* that Austen negotiates the constraints of gendered decorum not through overt defiance, as figures like Wollstonecraft or Mary Shelley might do, but through subtle and self-conscious formal strategies. Rather than assuming a position of explicit narrative authority, Austen crafts a style that, according to Poovey, reveals "what the challenge to traditional values looked like from the inside and how an artistic style could constitute part of a defense against this challenge" (1984, p. 172). Through narrative indirection, tonal ambiguity, and carefully staged gaps between what is said and what is implied, Austen invites the reader to detect the dissonance between correctness and desire without simply condemning either (Poovey, 1984, pp. 172–73). In fact, as Poovey further notes, "Austen does not establish a genuinely critical position within the fiction but depends instead on an implicit contrast between the values presented and those the satire presumes but does not formulate" (1984, p. 178). In this sense, Austen's narrative form enacts a kind of self-reflexive restraint, for it transforms the pleasures of imaginative engagement into a mode of ethical inquiry, or, as Poovey writes, she "attempts to convert the pleasure generated by imaginative engagement into a didactic tool" (1984, p. 183). What emerges here is a distinctively feminine act of critique, one that works within the boundaries of propriety to subtly expose their contradictions. Claudia Johnson expands on this idea in *Jane Austen: women, politics, and the novel*, and asserts that Austen's irony operates as a politically self-

reflexive tool that enables critique from within normative landscapes. Rather than renouncing politics, Austen “developed stylistic techniques which enabled [her] to use politically charged material in an exploratory and interrogative . . . manner” (Johnson, 1988, p. xxi). Such irony is not merely aesthetic but also profoundly inflected by gender, what allows Austen “to defy every dictum about female propriety and deference” while appearing to comply with these (Johnson, 1988, p. xxiii).

Yet, Austen’s irony, and so the neoaustenian sensibility, is also affective and even somatic. As John Wiltshire argues in his groundbreaking study *Jane Austen and the body*, Austen’s narratives must be understood, as the author herself notes in her writings, as “pictures of health”, where bodily states mediate both ethical awareness and emotional complexity (1992, p. 23). Far from merely staging polite decorum or rhetorical play, her free, indirect style brings into play “the educational and courtship narratives” through the embodied experience of her heroines, thus making the body itself a site of interpretive tension (1992, p. 9), and consequently reframing Austen’s irony as grounded in bodily perception.

This embodied and affective dimension of irony resonates closely with recently published cognitive-narratological perspectives. Charlton argues in her 2022 *Jane Austen and reflective selfhood: Rereading the self*, that Austen’s narratives engage both the characters and the readers in a shared process of critical self-assessment and reflective selfhood. Charlton states: “[b]y using narrative techniques which complicate our interpretation of her characters, Austen provokes in the reader the same critical analysis that is required of her heroines. As a result, we ourselves participate in the process of reflection which causes us to reread and reinterpret both the text itself and our responses to it” (2022, p. 5). She further notes that “[i]n our own interactions with Austen’s texts, we experience for ourselves the complex relationship between sympathy and judgement, and are encouraged to find the right balance between individual experience and general principle within our own moral framework. As Austen’s heroines reflect on their reading of other characters, so are we invited to reflect on our reading of them, on the complexity of our sympathetic responses and moral judgements, and on our own interaction with the text” (2022, p. 169). Complementing this reading, Müller (2017) further highlights the participatory nature of Austen’s irony. Müller emphasizes the cognitive dimension, noting Austen’s encouragement of readers to actively (co)produce ironic meanings, thus creating a reflective ethical space shared by author, character, and audience. For Müller, “such an irony-saturated narrative requires a perceptive reader. Engaging the reader strongly and stimulating his or her mental activity, Austen’s novels produce intellectual and aesthetic delight” (2017, pp. 48–49).

What emerges from this critical genealogy is a clearer view of irony’s ethical function in Austen: far from being neutral or decorative, it forms the groundwork of a relational narrative ethics, one that privileges attention, emotion, and critical self-awareness. From our feminist-metamodern reading, irony shifts from a posture of postmodern detachment to an affective way of knowing: a strategy for inhabiting ambivalence without renouncing to emotional engagement.

For Austen’s heroines, irony thus becomes a method of care. Elinor Dashwood’s careful moderation of her sister Marianne’s emotional anguish in *Sense and sensibility* exemplifies how irony in Austen sustains relational resilience, embodying Tronto’s values of caring: attentiveness, responsibility, nurturance and compassion (1993, p. 3). In a similar way, Elizabeth Bennet’s ironic wit in *Pride and prejudice* allows her to expose social disparities while remaining emotionally engaged, especially in her growing bond with Mr. Darcy. And the same dynamic recurs across Austen’s other novels. In *Mansfield park* and *Emma*, bodily vulnerability is the proving ground of ethical perception: Fanny Price’s physical fragility and social marginality grant her a subtly ironic perspective, turning her bodily unease (something particularly evident during the *Lovers’ vows* rehearsals) into a moral barometer for the entire

household, while Emma's repentant self-reproach after Mr. Elton's proposal –“If I had not persuaded Harriet into liking the man, I could have borne anything” (Austen, 1815/2018, p. 96)– shatters her self-deception and initiates the ethical turn that will lead, over the course of the novel, to a genuine empathy and attentive listening. Emma's initial inability to sympathize sincerely, something highlighted by her misunderstanding of Jane Fairfax's true circumstances, does transform into genuine empathy as she learns to appreciate Jane's difficult position: “If a woman can ever be excused for thinking only of herself, it is in a situation like Jane Fairfax's. —Of such, one may almost say, that ‘the world is not their's, nor the world's law’” (Austen, 1815/2018, p. 285). Emma's reflections on “the difference of woman's destiny” signal her deepening capacity for sympathy and ethical insight (Austen, 1815/2018, p. 272). Here irony thus converts bodily and social constraint into expanded care. *Persuasion* shows on its part a similar transformation of remembered pain: Anne Elliot, who was “forced into prudence in her youth” and “learned romance as she grew older” (Austen, 1818/2009, p. 49), turns regret into a relational self-compassion that extends not only to Captain Wentworth but also to Mrs. Smith. *Northanger abbey*, in turn, illustrates how imagination itself can be guided into responsible feeling: Catherine's passage from her gothic daydreaming to what Charlton calls “clear-sighted” discernment demonstrates that she “repeatedly refuses to reject fact in favour of fantasy in her daily life” (Charlton, 2022, p. 74).

Austen's narrative demands that readers reread, revisit, and reinterpret, thus assuming an active role in ethical meaning-making. As Charlton further observes, “[i]n asking us to consider the potential for other outcomes and other readings, Austen's challenge to us in these texts is to engage not just with her expositions of reflective selfhood, but also with her narrative presentation of them in the act of writing: for if we are to fulfil our own potential as readers, we must bring our own ingenuity to her texts and demonstrate that we understand the value of both reading intelligently and reading again” (2022, p. 252). Such a challenge anticipates what I term neoaustenian sensibility: a narrative disposition shaped by feminine experience, which recasts vulnerability into reflective resilience and susceptibility into agency. Such sensibility not only defines Austen's fiction, but also resonates deeply in contemporary narrative forms, most notably in the layered, self-aware lyrical voices of Taylor Swift. Just as Austen's “irony-saturated narrative requires a perceptive reader” (Müller, 2017, p. 49), Swift's songs invite listeners to peel back autobiographical fragments, recalibrate sympathy and judgement, and engage in a comparable practice of reflective (self-)exploration. Irony, then, is not the opposite of care, but its medium: a transtemporal bridge connecting women's vulnerabilities and agency.

3.2 Swift's neoaustenian grammar of care^v

Taylor Swift's narrative architecture and storytelling rely on a clearly layered set of voices reminiscent of Austen's focalization and free indirect discourse. At the surface is her media persona, consciously crafted (and even exaggerated) to preempt and ironize public narratives and tabloid mythologies of femininity that particularly portray Swift as a doomed lover or calculating businesswoman, allowing the singer to reclaim control over her own publicly altered image (Fogarty & Arnold, 2021, p. 4). This same self-authoring impulse surfaces when Swift steps outside her lyrics and, echoing Shakespeare's notion that all the world's a stage, claims the spotlight beyond her music and speaks directly to her audience. One salient example of this occurred during her 2016 Grammy acceptance speech for Album of the Year, when she declared: “[t]here are going to be people along the way who will try to undercut your success or take credit for your accomplishments . . . but if you just focus on the work and you don't let those people sidetrack you, someday when you get where you're going, you'll look around and you will know that it was you . . . who put you there. And that will be the greatest feeling in the world” (as cited in Sloan, 2021, p. 1). Beneath this constructed image lies the confessional

voice of a lyrical “I” that offers calculated disclosures of private feelings and experiences, sharing selected moments of vulnerability while carefully maintaining distance and control. A third layer is the intradiegetic narrator, who recounts stories about others: (un)known figures, lovers, (un)named protagonists, experiencing heroines. This intradiegetic voice allows Swift to explore perspectives beyond her own. Finally, the metatextual voice behind the Taylor’s Versions^{vi} revisits her earlier material, rewriting musical and narrative elements in acts of, as Svetlana Boym would put it, reflective nostalgia (2001), while reclaiming legal control of the masters of songs already sedimented in pop culture memory.

These layers are not isolated but fluid: they interpenetrate through deliberate ruptures of the fourth wall, that is, moments when a lyric directly addresses the listener or highlights its own crafted nature within the song, resembling Austen’s narrative winks. Swift’s metaleptic intrusions turn listeners into co-authors and meaning-makers. In the renowned “Blank Space”, she caricatures her tabloid persona with a deliberately absurd self-portrait, as she sings in the camp couplet: “Got a long list of ex-lovers / They’ll tell you I’m insane / But I’ve got a blank space, baby / And I’ll write your name” (Swift, 2014, 1:15–1:25), transforming criticism into shared amusement (Sloan, 2021, p. 6). The same strategy resurfaces in her 2017 comeback single, “Look What You Made Me Do” where a simulated phone call announces “[t]he old Taylor can’t come to the phone right now / Why? Oh! / ‘Cause she’s dead!” (Swift, 2017, 2:53–3:00), staging the burial of her public persona, at the time misunderstood. “Mastermind” (2022) confesses the singer’s calculated compositional trick: “What if I told you none of it was accidental? . . . I laid the groundwork and then just like clockwork / The dominoes cascaded in a line / What if I told you I’m a mastermind?” (Swift, 2022, 0:38–0:55), making the listener complicit in the career-long plot the singer has just revealed^{vii}. Finally, in the 2024 song “But Daddy I Love Him”, Swift goes further and breaks the narrative illusion: “Now I’m running with my dress unbuttoned / Screaming “But Daddy, I love him! / I’m having his baby” / No, I’m not, but you should see your faces”, a meta-aside that disrupts the boundary between narrator and audience and exposes the listeners’ expectations, namely, the melodramatic script in which she is expected to enact romantic excess, and even pregnancy, and public confession, only to mock and refuse to play the expected game (Swift, 2024a, 0:54–1:05). As Sloan observes, a “dark playfulness” runs through such tracks, where an unreliable narrator dissolves and reassembles the singer’s identity through “the maximum of compositional logic” (2021, p. 16): Swift crafts an illusion of chaos by carefully controlling her songwriting decisions. These decisions foreground the songs’ artifice while securing the listener’s complicity, much like Austen’s ironic nods to readers.

Within Swift’s layered storytelling, irony functions not as a distancing mechanism to keep listeners at arm’s length; on the contrary, it serves as a backstage pass that brings the audience into the intimate workings of her songs. And nowhere is Swift’s invitational irony more vivid than in *THE TORTURED POETS DEPARTMENT: THE ANTHOLOGY* (2024), whose hyperbolic confessions blend layered humor with confessions of raw ache. At the extradiegetic level, through the booklet poem, which acts as a prologue to the album, Swift steps outside the songs’ diegesis and addresses “my fellow members of the Tortured Poets Department”, pleads “temporary insanity” for her “restricted humanity”, and admits that the account that follows in the album “was a mutual manic phase / it was self harm / it was house and then cardiac arrest” before concluding “it’s the worst men that I write best” (Swift, 2024b). The album’s coda, “The Manuscript”, further steps outside the autofiction: “Now and then I reread the manuscript / But the story isn’t mine anymore” (Swift, 2024c, 3:22–3:32). Together, these two extradiegetic commentaries rupture the musical illusion, one at the very beginning of the album, and the other, at the close. Yet, this act of naming the “manic phase” turns self-exposure into agency by framing vulnerability as her own mechanism to narrate. As Harrison and Ringrow note of Swift’s seemingly disnarrative turns since the albums *folklore* (2020) and

evermore (2020), “[t]hese strategies work to position audiences in complex ways: listeners overhear the conversations presented . . . but simultaneously are invited to enact specific roles in the discourse” (2022, p. 3). What initially looks like chaos is meticulously staged, converting fracture into a shared ethical and emotional asset.

Building on that architecture, Swift shifts from playful fourth wall breaks and extra/intra-diegetic commentaries to a second strategy: self-aware nostalgia that binds artist and audience and creates a shared narrative space where resistance takes shape of relationality. In the fan-favorite “All Too Well (10 Minute Version) [Taylor’s Version] [From The Vault]”, the repeated cry “I was there, I was there” all throughout the outro works not only to prove autobiographical testimony but also to invite shared remembrance; each repetition intensifies the communal memory rather than just addressing a lyrical you: “It was rare, you remember it / All too well” (Swift, 2021, p. 8:43–10:04). Much like Austen lets Elizabeth reread Darcy’s letter and allows her to reinterpret his previous actions with new insight, Swift’s outro does precisely recast earlier imagery through a mature and distanced lens. And these temporal loops are epistemological: emotion does not passively follow knowledge but actively rewrites it, turning memory into a collaborative act. This invitation to co-remember resonates with Svetlana Boym’s notion of reflective nostalgia, a stance “enamored of distance, . . . aware of the gap between identity and resemblance” that values the past as a resource of possibility rather than just as a plan to reconstruct (2001, p. 50). Reflective nostalgia is, as Boym writes, “a form of deep mourning that performs a labor of grief both through pondering pain and through play that points to the future” (2001, p. 55). Such reflective engagement does not remain theoretical, as it materializes in the practices of Swift’s fandom, where remembering becomes a collaborative craft. By evoking childhood bedroom, adolescent dreams (*folklore*’s love triangle, for instance), and early-career imagery, Swift draws attention to the fact that these memories are being consciously re-enacted and not merely recalled. Recent fandom studies confirm the effect: Galloway (2023) and Burns (2025) show how listeners adapt the singer’s past to articulate their own present identities. In fact, as Lauren Alex Hooper observes, Swift explicitly encourages this act of co-remembering, noting that “[d]espite the often clear and stated inspiration and intention behind Swift’s lyrics, so much of engaging with music is about interpretation . . . she also encourages people to find their own stories. When she released *1989* (2014), she specified this in the prologue of the album: ‘These songs were once about my life. They are now about yours’” (2025, p. 196).

The clearest demonstration of this is the Taylor’s Version project. By revisiting her early albums, Swift layers a matured voice and subtle lyric revisions onto tracks that were initially released in her teens and early twenties^{viii}. Swift does not, in fact, try to pass the updates off as time travel; instead, she foregrounds the new seams, letting fans hear the mature register, the new production details, and the legal backstory. The recent purchase of her original work closes this loop: Swift now owns not only the stories told but the recordings themselves. That achievement, coming after five years of fans streaming and buying the Taylor’s Versions, literalizes how resistance does indeed take the shape of relationality. Listeners now hold both versions in productive tension, negotiating questions of ownership, ageing, and memory alongside the artist herself. What started in 2021 as a battle for the masters has transformed into yet another shared narrative, a space where relationality flourishes as fans go deeper into the renewed projects by annotating differences, commenting on the stories (something enhanced by the “From the Vault” tracks added to the Taylor’s Versions) and moving from a monologic storytelling to a dialogic archive co-authored by the fandom. In short, reflective nostalgia here converts inner turmoil (in and out of the lyric) into collective ethical vehicle.

Memory becomes for Swift and fans alike material to build with, not a memento to worship; and the community that forms around these songs learns to inhabit that tension together. The outcome recalls Austen’s late novels, where past pain evolves into a resource for

relational renewal. For listeners, holding past and present versions simultaneously becomes an ethical exercise as they learn to value both change and continuity. This collective practice exemplifies what Sara Ahmed calls “affective economies”, in which “emotions *do things*, and they align individual with communities—or bodily space with social space—through the very intensity of their attachments” (2004, p. 19). These textual reorientations underscore an ethos of care and interdependence, mirroring Butler’s idea that acknowledging our “inevitable interdependency” and shared vulnerability fosters an ethical and political space of resistance (2004, p. xii). Swift’s performances enact this very choreography of interdependence, affirming the political force inherent in recognizing our collective sensitivity and interconnectedness.

4. NEOAUSTENISM: A FEMINIST AESTHETIC AND ETHICAL HORIZON

Throughout this study, I have traced how neoaustenism crystallizes as a distinctly metamodern paradigm; one that runs alongside neoromanticism yet re-centers the gendered imagination grounded in Jane Austen’s grammar of relational care. Anchored in Austen yet open to a multitude of contemporary cultural expressions, the concept foregrounds affective complexity and ethical interdependence as feminist resources for rethinking subjectivity today. Within this framework, Taylor Swift’s multilayered songwriting offers a paradigmatic present-day expression of a neoaustenian sensibility: her oscillation between irony and sincerity and her practices of reflective nostalgia transform emotion into a mode of knowing while turning vulnerability into collective resilience.

While these dynamics –transforming vulnerability into shared agency, converting memory into collaborative practice, and cultivating relational care within a commodified pop marketplace– unfold inside an industry shaped by aspirational consumerism and genre conventions, Swift’s strategic engagements, even if they do not neutralize capitalist logics, convert them into opportunities for feminist resistance and relational ethics. Ultimately, despite Swift’s exemplary status here, neoaustenism holds broader potential. Future work might extend this framework to other contemporary artists and formations, for instance, to singer-songwriters such as Phoebe Bridgers, Florence Welch, and Mitski, or collaborative constellations like boygenius and HAIM; to literary voices, including Sally Rooney and Dolly Alderton; and to fandom-based communities that enact care through participatory remembrance and co-authorship. In doing so, neoaustenism not only reconfigures feminine selfhood in Swift’s oeuvre, but claims critical ground for cultural criticism rooted in care, resilience, and interdependence, which can be extended to other artists and productions.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This publication has been supported by funding from the University of Salamanca and Banco Santander. It is carried out within the research lines of Intersecciones: Literatura, Arte y Cultura en el Limen (iLAC) and the research project M+PoeMAS, “Mucho más que poemas. Poesía para más gente y poética de la canción” (PID2024-158927NB-100).

NOTES

¹ Artistic representations that lack any of these dimensions fall outside the category, and those cultural products that display them without drawing on Austen’s grammar are discussed as adjacent currents such as post-postfeminist pop –see Rosalind Gill’s “Post-postfeminism?: new feminist visibilities in postfeminist times” (2016)– rather than as purely neoaustenian.

ⁱⁱ For a contrasting example of a female-authored reimagining of longing, space, and vulnerability, see Justine Kurland’s *Girl pictures* (2020), a photographic series that portrays groups of teenage girls in

wild, remote environments, articulating a shared feminine journey of exploration. While not thoroughly examined by Vermeulen and van den Akker, Kurland's work does resonate with metamodern aesthetics and suggests how alternative affective genealogies can be activated from a female-centered perspective.

ⁱⁱⁱ For a complementary view that nuances Ahmed's affective economies, see Margalida Pons's discussion on emotion and affect in her article "Poetes emprenyats: possibilitats i reptes del gir afectiu en la interpretació de textos literaris" (2016), where she proposes "a continuum in which *emotion* is an immediate sensation and *affect* a feeling elaborated from emotion", adding that "[i]f emotion puts the body in the foreground, the experience of affect already involves reflective thought" (p. 17, my own translation). Pons's emphasis on the passage from pre-reflexive bodily intensity to semantically charged feeling usefully underscores Ahmed's point that emotions materialize the very surfaces of bodies through which they later circulate.

^{iv} Harding introduces the concept in his essay "Regulated hatred: An aspect of the work of Jane Austen", first published in 1940 and later reprinted in *Regulated hatred and other essays on Jane Austen* (1998), from which the quotations in this article are taken.

^v This analysis does not attempt an exhaustive survey of Taylor Swift's catalogue; such a task falls outside the scope of this article and will instead be reserved for a more extensive future project. Rather, the focus here will be on specific songs that stand out due to critical acclaim, thematic richness, and significant cultural impact. These songs help show how Swift re-works the discussed practices already traced in Austen: irony as care, relationality as resistance, and emotion as knowledge; all of which collectively articulate a distinctly feminine resilience. The present analysis demonstrates how Swift employs these intertwined elements to recast feminine agency through vulnerability, self-awareness, and affective engagement, thus creating narratives that transform personal storytelling into shared ethical and emotional asset.

^{vi} "Taylor's Version" is the tag Swift has applied to the re-recordings of her first six studio albums, a project the singer launched in 2021 after the masters of her music were sold without her consent. Four albums have been re-recorded and re-released at the time of writing: *Fearless (Taylor's version)* (2021), *Red (Taylor's version)* (2021), *Speak now (Taylor's version)* (2023), and *1989 (Taylor's version)* (2024). The remaining albums, *Taylor Swift* (2006) and *reputation* (2017), were reportedly in progress; however, on 30 May 2025 Swift announced on social media that she had repurchased the masters of her entire early catalogue, leaving the release of any further Taylor's Versions uncertain.

^{vii} Swift winks at a playful feminist genealogy when she confesses in the same song, "you see all the wisest women had to do it this way" (Swift, 2022, 1:10–1:16). This line traces a transtemporal bridge implying that a seeming narrative ingenuity has long served as a mode of feminine self-preservation and survival.

^{viii} The most widely discussed change, one that highlights a feminist course-correction, appears in "Better than revenge", originally released on *Speak Now* (2010) and re-recorded on *Speak Now (Taylor's Version)* (2023). The 2010 lyric "But she's better known / For the things that she does / On the mattress, whoa" (Swift, 2010, 0:51–0:58) is replaced in the 2023 version by "He was a moth to the flame, she was holding the matches, whoa" (Swift, 2023, 0:51–0:58).

REFERENCES

Ahmed, S. (2004). Affective economies. *Social Text*, 22(2), 117–139. <https://muse.jhu.edu/article/55780>

Ahmed, S. (2014). *The cultural politics of emotion* (2nd ed.). Edinburgh University Press.

Austen, J. (2009). *Persuasion*. Barnes & Noble Classics. (Original work published 1818)

Austen, J. (2018). *Emma*. Standard Ebooks. (Original work published 1815)

Bergson, H. (1950). *Time and free will: An essay on the immediate data of consciousness* (F.L. Pogson, Trans.). George Allen & Unwin. (Original work published 1889)

Berlant, L. (2011). *Cruel optimism*. Duke University Press.

Booth, W. C. (1983). *The rhetoric of fiction* (2nd ed.). University of Chicago Press.

Boym, S. (2001). *The future of nostalgia*. Basic Books.

Burns, C. (2025). Make it old: (Taylor's version) and the art and experience of re-creation. In C. A. Bentley, K. Galloway & P.C. Harper (Eds.), *Taylor Swift: The star, the songs, the fans* (pp. 161–176). Routledge.

Butler, J. (2004). *Precarious life: The powers of mourning and violence*. Verso.

Charlton, L. (2022). *Jane Austen and reflective selfhood: Rereading the self*. Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-12160-9>

Clough, P. T., & Halley, J. O. (Eds.). (2007). *The affective turn: Theorizing the social*. Duke University Press.

Cvetkovich, A. (2012). *Depression: A public feeling*. Duke University Press.

Deleuze, G. (1992). Ethology: Spinoza and us. In J. Crary & S. Kwinter (Eds.), *Incorporations* (pp. 625–633). Zone Books.

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1987). *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia* (B. Massumi, Trans.). University of Minnesota Press. (Original work published 1980).

Fogarty, M., & Arnold, G. (2021). Are you ready for it? Re-evaluating Taylor Swift. *Contemporary Music Review*, 40(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07494467.2021.1976586>

Fraile-Marcos, A. M. (Ed.). (2020). *Glocal narratives of resilience*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429291647>

Fraser, N. (2013). *Fortunes of feminism: From state-managed capitalism to neoliberal crisis*. Verso.

Galloway, K. (2023). Podcasting Taylor: Listening strategies, fandom, and the sonic environments of Taylor Swift podcasting. *Journal of Popular Music Studies*, 35(4), 91–110. <https://doi.org/10.1525/jpms.2023.35.4.91>

Gibbons, A. (2015). “Take that you intellectuals!” and “kaPOW!”: Adam Thirlwell and the metamodernist future of style. *Study Neophilologica*, 87(1), 29–43. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00393274.2014.981959>

Gill, R. (2016). Post-postfeminism? New feminist visibilities in postfeminist times. *Feminist Media Studies*, 16(4), 610–630. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14680777.2016.1193293>

Gilligan, C. (1993). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Harvard University Press. (Original work published 1982)

Gündüz, E. İ. (2024). “Lost in Austen,” found in Regency. *Cankaya University Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 18(1), 39–55. <https://doi.org/10.47777/cankujhss.1429495>

Harding, D. W. (1998). *Regulated hatred and other essays on Jane Austen* (M. Lawlor, Ed.). Athlone Press.

Harrison, C., & Ringrow, H. (2022). Disnarration and the performance of storytelling in Taylor Swift's *folklore* and *evermore*. *International Journal of Literary Linguistics*, 11(1), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.15462/ijll.v11i1.140>

Held, V. (2006). *The ethics of care: Personal, political, and global*. Oxford University Press.

Hooper, L. A. (2025). Lyrical world building: An exploration of Taylor Swift's use of intratextuality and intertextuality. In C. A. Bentley, K. Galloway & C. Harper (Eds.), *Taylor Swift: The star, the songs, the fans*. Routledge.

Hutcheon, L. (1994). *Irony's edge: The theory and politics of irony*. Routledge.

Illouz, E. (2007). *Cold intimacies: The making of emotional capitalism*. Polity Press.

Johnson, C. L. (1988). *Jane Austen: Women, politics, and the novel*. University of Chicago Press.

Li, J. (2024). Feminist expression in American country music: A case study of Taylor Swift. *Interdisciplinary Humanities and Communication Studies*, 2(9). <https://doi.org/10.61173/0gege84>

Lord, B. (2010). *Spinoza's ethics*. Edinburgh University Press.

Massumi, B. (1995). The autonomy of affect. *Cultural Critique*, 31, 83–109.

Mudrick, M. (1952). *Jane Austen: Irony as defense and discovery*. Princeton University Press.

Müller, W. G. (2018). Irony in Jane Austen: A cognitive-narratological approach. In J. Alber & G. Olson (Eds.), *How to do things with narrative: Cognitive and diachronic perspectives* (pp. 43–62). De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110569957-004>

O'Brien, S. (2017). Resilience stories: Narratives of adaptation, refusal, and compromise. *Resilience: A Journal of the Environmental Humanities*, 4(2-3), 43–65.

Pons, M. (2016). Poetes emprenyats: Possibilitats i reptes del gir afectiu en la interpretació de textos literaris. *Els Marges*, 110, 10–33.

Poovey, M. (1984). *The proper lady and the woman writer: Ideology as style in the works of Mary Wollstonecraft, Mary Shelley, and Jane Austen*. University of Chicago Press.

Sloan, N. (2021). Taylor Swift and the work of songwriting. *Contemporary Music Review*, 40(1), 11–26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07494467.2021.1945226>

Spinoza, B. (1959). Spinoza's ethics: And on the correction of understanding (A. Boyle, Trans.). Everyman's Library. (Original work published 1677).

Swift, T. (2010). Better than revenge [Song]. *Speak Now*. Big Machine Records.

Swift, T. (2014). Blank space [Song]. *1989*. Big Machine Records.

Swift, T. (2017). Look what you made me do [Song]. *reputation*. Big Machine Records.

Swift, T. (2021). All too well (10-minute version) [Taylor's Version] [From The Vault] [Song]. *Red* (Taylor's Version). Republic Records.

Swift, T. (2022). Mastermind [Song]. *Midnights*. Republic Records.

Swift, T. (2023). Better than revenge (Taylor's Version) [Song]. *Speak Now (Taylor's Version)*. Republic Records.

Swift, T. (2024a). But daddy I love him [Song]. *THE TORTURED POETS DEPARTMENT: THE ANTHOLOGY*. Republic Records.

Swift, T. (2024b). *THE TORTURED POETS DEPARTMENT: THE ANTHOLOGY* [Album]. Republic Records.

Swift, T. (2024c). The manuscript [Song]. *THE TORTURED POETS DEPARTMENT: THE ANTHOLOGY*. Republic Records.

Tong, O. X. (2024). Unpacking affect in Taylor Swift's feminism. *Journal of International Women's Studies*, 26(7), 1–17. Retrieved March 18, 2025, from <https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/unpacking-affect-taylor-swifts-feminism/docview/3161975903/se-2>

Tronto, J. C. (1993). *Moral boundaries: A political argument for an ethic of care*. Routledge.

Turner, L. (2015, January 12). Metamodernism: A brief introduction. *Notes on Metamodernism*. Retrieved January 26, 2025, from <https://bit.ly/41qczJH>

van den Akker, R., & Vermeulen, T. (2017). Periodising the 2000s, or, the emergence of metamodernism. In R. van den Akker, A. Gibbons & T. Vermeulen (Eds.), *Metamodernism: Historicity, affect, and depth after postmodernism* (pp. 1–20). Rowman & Littlefield International.

Vermeulen, T., & van den Akker, R. (2010). Notes on metamodernism. *Journal of Aesthetics and Culture*, 2, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.3402/jac.v2i0.5677>

Waterman, S. (2022). Sally Rooney's sapiosexuals. *Contemporary Literature*, 63(2), 230–268. <https://doi.org/10.3368/cl.63.2.230>

Wetherell, M. (2012). *Affect and emotion: A new social science understanding*. SAGE.

Wiltshire, J. (1992). *Jane Austen and the body: "The picture of health"*. Cambridge University Press.