

Translating Jane Austen's Style in *Pride and Prejudice*

Lisette Beun

0205400

30 June 2010

MA Thesis English Language and Culture

Dr. O.C.M. Fischer

Contents

Introduction	4
Chapter One. Beginnings.	7
1.1 <i>Titles</i>	7
1.2 <i>Opening Sentences</i>	8
Chapter Two. Translating Irony.	12
2.1 <i>The Ironic Narrator</i>	12
2.2 <i>Irony in Dialogue</i>	16
2.3 <i>Irony in Narrative Structure</i>	18
Chapter Three. Lost in Emotion.	20
3.1 <i>First Proposal</i>	20
3.2 <i>Second Proposal</i>	24
Chapter 4. Letters.	27
4.1 <i>Letter-Writing Manuals</i>	27
4.2 <i>Pride and Prejudice</i>	28
4.2.1 Function of Letters	28
4.2.2 Type of Letters	30
4.3 <i>Dutch Letter-Writing</i>	31
4.4 <i>Translations</i>	33
Chapter Five. Forms of Address.	38
5.1 <i>Titles Used</i>	38
5.2 <i>Personal Pronouns</i>	40

Conclusion	44
Work Cited	47
Appendices	49
Appendix A. Salutations and Closings of the letters in <i>Pride and Prejudice</i>	49
Appendix B. Mr. Collins' First Letter to Mr. Bennet.	52

Introduction

Jane Austen's *Pride and Prejudice* is one of the most famous English novels. Everyone knows the story of the witty but poor 19th-century Elizabeth Bennet, who catches the eye of a wealthy, and very proud, gentleman named Mr. Darcy. Before the couple can marry at the end of the novel, they have to overcome many difficulties. The plot lines are well-known, but almost as important as the content is the form used in *Pride and Prejudice*.

Austen is well-known for her formal style. Her language was slightly outdated at the time she wrote, which created distance between her characters and the readers. Present-day readers would feel even more alienated, since there is an even greater language gap. Another way in which Austen created distance between the characters and her readers is her use of irony. Characters are ridiculed, sometimes by other characters, other times by Austen's narrator. Letters are also an important part of Austen's novels. They are often used as an instrument to carry or alter plotlines. These elements: formality, irony and letters are present in all of Austen's novels. Therefore, they can be seen as trademarks of her style.

When translating famous novels translators are under much pressure. Especially, in novels where form plays as large a role as content, which is obviously the case in *Pride and Prejudice*. Therefore, it is interesting to look at the ways in which this style is conveyed in translations of this novel. I have chosen two Dutch translations for comparison and to determine how much of Austen's style is retained in these translations. The first translation I have chosen is by Annelies Roeleveld and Margret Stevens, *Trots en Vooroordeel* from 2009. The translators both teach English, the former at University level, the latter at HBO level, and have translated several other works of literature together. After reading it for the first time my, hesitant, conclusion was that they had attempted a more modern translation.

In order to achieve as large a contrast as possible, I started looking for a translation of *Pride and Prejudice*, which would contain as little modern language as possible. Since all

translations that can be found are from the second half of the 20th century, it is not possible to find a translation that uses actual 19th-century Dutch. However, since Austen uses an outdated language for her time, it is interesting to find a translation that uses outdated Dutch language. After comparing several versions that were all reasonably modern in their vocabulary, I encountered W.A. Dorsman-Vos' translation from 1980. I immediately noticed that she uses more old-fashioned vocabulary than the others, making it interesting for comparison. Interestingly enough, it has a different title: *Waan en Eigenwaan*.

In addition to the vocabulary difference between the two texts, which becomes evident at a first reading, it is interesting to look at how the other elements that characterise Austen's style are conveyed. When these elements are lost in translation, it can still be an interesting story, but Austen's intention of creating distance between the characters and the reader is lost. It simply would not be an Austen novel.

In determining whether Austen's style is conveyed in these two translations of her novel, the first chapter will discuss the titles and opening sentences of different translations. Translators are not only in dialogue with the original text and its author; they are also in dialogue with all other translations of the novel. It is important to determine how title and opening sentence are conveyed, since they are the "eye-catchers" of every novel.

The other chapters will focus on characteristic aspects of Austen's style. In creating distance between her characters and readers, her main tool is the use of irony. Therefore, chapter two will deal with different forms of irony present in the novel, namely verbal, dramatic and situational irony. These terms will be explained and I will look at how they have been translated.

Chapter three will deal with emotions. With all the emphasis on creating distance through form, it may easily be overlooked that *Pride and Prejudice* is a love story. It is interesting to look at the way emotions are portrayed and if the distance and formality

characteristic of her style is breached in emotional discourse. Chapter four and five will be dedicated to two main elements of formality of Austen's style. Chapter four will focus on the letters in the novel, while chapter five will concentrate on forms of address. I will then evaluate the comparisons made between the two translations and conclude whether they have conveyed Austen's form in addition to the content of the novel.

Chapter One. Beginnings.

There are two aspects with regard to the beginning of *Pride and Prejudice* that I would like to discuss in this chapter. These two aspects, title and opening sentence, are probably the first problems a translator encounters in translating a famous novel like *Pride and Prejudice*. The title of a novel is usually the first thing a reader notices about the book. Many readers will then either look at the description on the back cover or at the opening sentence. Since these two elements may catch a reader's eye, they are very important to translate. First, I will look at the titles of Dutch translations of *Pride and Prejudice*, and implications of the choices made. Then I examine the different variations of the opening sentence of the novel.

1.1 Titles

The first difficulty in translating *Pride and Prejudice* lies in its title. Its title is a reference to relevant themes in the novel and has been chosen with care. In translation therefore, it is important to convey these themes. Most translators of *Pride and Prejudice* have chosen a literal Dutch translation that indeed conveys the themes of pride and prejudice. The standard title is *Trots en Vooroordeel*. A problem with this literal translation, despite its references to key issues in the novel, is that it does not carry the alliteration of its English equivalent. This seems very difficult to achieve in Dutch.

While an attempt at assonance has been made with *Trots en Vooroordeel*, it does not have the same qualities as the original title. Apart from the alliteration, which is not conveyed in this translation, *Pride and Prejudice* contains multiple plosives in sequence. The second plosive in the middle of the word, give it extra strength and emphasis. *Trots en Vooroordeel* does not have the same emphasis; this could have been achieved by starting the second word with a plosive as well. A title like "Trots en Trouw", despite the fact that is not accurate at all,

since “trouw” refers to either “loyalty” or “marriage”, has much more emphasis than “vooroordeel”. “Vooroordeel” does have three syllables, like its original, which is a nice touch, but it could use more resonance.

Dorsman-Vos, in her 1980 translation, has chosen *Waan en Eigenwaan* instead, which has rhyming repetition as an alternative for alliteration. While this title has a similar literary form as the original title, it gives a different impression of the main themes of the novel. “Waan” and “eigenwaan” mean “delusion” and “arrogance”, which are different characteristics than “pride” and “prejudice”. Most literary critics would not agree with characterising Elizabeth and Darcy as delusional. However, prejudice is, in a broad sense, a form of delusion, just as pride is a form of arrogance. This title has the same number of syllables as the original and while this does not compensate for the absence of emphasising plosives, it does convey more than half of the title’s original meaning and has rhyming repetition. Therefore, *Waan en Eigenwaan* is perhaps the best translation to date.

1.2 Opening Sentences

The first sentence in a novel is of vital importance. Authors often spend a long time revising their opening sentence, because they only get one chance of a good first impression.

Obviously, the same applies to translators. When it comes to a famous novel, the pressure is even higher. *Pride and Prejudice* has one of the most famous opening lines in English literature: “It is a truth universally acknowledged, that a single man in possession of a good fortune, must be in want of a wife” (1). In translation there is another aspect that increases this pressure; the fact that a translator has responsibility over someone else’s work. The author may have done an excellent job on the opening sentence, if it cannot be conveyed into the other language, it may ruin the novel for its intended audience.

In the table below I have placed the different versions of the opening sentence that will be discussed in this chapter.

<i>Version</i>	<i>Translation</i>
Austen (1813)	“It is a truth universally acknowledged, that a single man in possession of a good fortune, must be in want of a wife” (1)
Roeleveld and Stevens (2009)	“Het is een waarheid die iedereen, waar ook ter wereld, zal onderschrijven: een ongehuwde man met een behoorlijk vermogen heeft behoefte aan een echtgenote” (5).
Dorsman-Vos (1980)	“Het is een waarheid die allerwegen ingang vindt, dat iedere vrijgezel die over een behoorlijk vermogen beschikt, verlegen zit om een vrouw” (7)
Meiborg (1996) ¹	“Het is een algemeen aanvaarde waarheid dat een alleenstaand man met een flink vermogen een vrouw nodig heeft”(5).
van Praag-van Praag (2005)	“Iedereen is het erover eens, dat een celibatair die een groot vermogen bezit, een vrouw moet hebben” (5)

Dorsman-Vos has chosen a style that is reminiscent of 19th century Dutch. Her translation is from 1980, but her choice of words seems archaic at times and the grammatical structure she uses was not in use in everyday Dutch language of the eighties. The use of a case-marked “allerwegen” makes this sentence feel outdated. The rest of the sentence, although quite formally expressed, could be used in the eighties, and today as well.

Dorsman-Vos’ translation uses alliteration that mirrors the original. Austen’s opening sentence contains an alliteration; “want of a wife” and an assonance; “truth universally”. “[T]ruth universally” creates extra emphasis because of the repetition of the “r” in addition to the assonance of the “u”. Dorsman-Vos’ translation cleverly incorporates two alliterations in her translation. She does not only connect, and emphasises, “want” and “wife”, which she does by using the alliteration of “verlegen” and “vrouw”, but also connects “wife” and

¹ For the first chapter I have chosen to compare four translations of *Pride and Prejudice*. This applies only to the first chapter, since I will compare only one sentence, therefore it is more interesting to have more examples. For the other chapter I will compare only the two translations mentioned in the introduction, Dorsman-Vos’ and Roeleveld and Stevens’.

“bachelor”, which also contains alliteration in Dutch (“vrouw” and “vrijgezel”). In this way she links multiple words starting with a “v” and thus links the most important words in the sentence to give them emphasis (“vrijgezel” (bachelor), “vermogen” (fortune), “verlegen” (want) and “vrouw” (wife)).

Her solution for Austen’s repetition of “u” and “r” in “truth universally” is the use of the case-marked “allerwegen”. Through this second alliteration in the opening sentence, she manages to emphasise “waarheid” through alliteration with “allerwegen”. This may explain why she has chosen to use an archaic grammatical construction. The only problematic element is the colloquial “zit” (sit) in the sentence. Due to this colloquial, and modern, use of the word “zit”, the connection to 19th-century Dutch is diminished. It would have been difficult to avoid, since the noun “verlegen” demands the verb “zitten”, but it shows that there is room for improvement.

Meiborg’s translation is more modern and colloquial. “A good fortune” and “een flink vermogen” are essentially the same, but the latter is more conversational, as is “nodig hebben”, which would translate as “need”. It loses much of Austen’s formal style and therefore fails to convey Austen’s style. It merely conveys the message, but in novels like *Pride and Prejudice* form is as important, if not more important, than content.

None of the versions discussed so far uses a Dutch equivalent of the modal “must”. Roeleveld and Stevens (2009) use the modal “zal”, but earlier in the sentence, creating a similar effect as the original opening sentence. However, their use of this modal conveys the same epistemic meaning as the original; its truth cannot possibly be denied. This epistemic element, the sense that such a man cannot possibly exist without wanting a wife, is important for the irony of the sentence, since in the course of narrative the reader discovers that while the narrator makes this statement, it is not the narrator’s opinion. It is the opinion of Mrs. Bennet. Rather than having Mrs. Bennet state this herself, the narrator indirectly transfers her

speech, or rather her thoughts, to the reader. This use of irony will be further explained in the next chapter. The absolute certainty with which Austen presents this “fact” is unfortunately lost in almost all other translations. Only van Praag-van Praag’s version (2005) uses the Dutch modal “moeten”; which would be the Dutch equivalent of “must.”

However, van Praag-van Praag’s version has another problem in conveying Austen’s irony. Where most translators copy the style and structure of the opening sentence by using an impersonal structure like Austen, she does not. Almost all translations begin with “it is”. The exception here is the van Praag-van Praag translation that starts with “iedereen”, which means “everyone”. “A truth universally acknowledged” obviously implies that everyone knows this and agrees. However, it is quite a deviation from the meaning conveyed by the original sentence. It may be that van Praag-van Praag has chosen this approach because it draws the reader in. An impersonal structure, just as the one Austen begins with, creates distance between the narrator and the reader. To use “everyone” instead may induce the reader to acknowledge this truth as well and immediately feel as if the reader is part of “everyone”. However, the formal, impersonal style of Austen’s opening sentence is characteristic of her style. It is an ironic sentence, since it contains both the element of truth and resistance against this truth (Prewitt Brown 145). Irony works by creating distance, in some case between the narrator, or author, and the characters, and sometimes between the narrator and the reader. In bridging the gap, including “everyone”, the sentence loses some of its sharp edges. Therefore, van Praag-van Praag’s translation appears least desirable in the attempt to convey Austen’s style.

Chapter Two. Translating Irony.

There are different kinds of irony² present in *Pride and Prejudice*. Verbal irony, which is present at sentence-level, is the most obvious form of irony. A speaker's ironic intention is shared by the speaker and the reader of the sentence. Through her use of the ironic narrator Austen also introduces dramatic irony in the novel. Dramatic irony takes part at plot-level. In this kind of irony the character is oblivious to the irony. It is shared by the author (and often the narrator) and the reader. The novel also contains situational irony, which is a form of irony where a character's intentions are not met: the contrary happens. This is also shared by the author (and narrator) and the reader, who often can see this happening.

While verbal irony is present in different forms, dramatic and situational irony leans heavily on Austen's ironic narrator. The ironic narrator allows Austen to be merciless to characters that are ridiculous, in the eyes of the narrator. In this chapter I will mainly focus on verbal irony, because this would seem like the most difficult form of irony to translate. Dramatic and situational irony are present in the narrative structure of a novel and are therefore easier to convey. They are difficult to not to convey. First I will examine the role of the narrator. This will entail some uses of dramatic irony, but mostly verbal irony. Then I will look at irony in dialogue, which is also often verbal irony and lastly I will briefly discuss situational irony.

2.1 *The Ironic Narrator*

The most interesting way of looking at how the ironic narrator is conveyed in translations of *Pride and Prejudice* is to focus on some examples of incidents that involve characters who the narrator believes to be ridiculous and are therefore likely to be subject to irony. Mr.

² The definitions of the different kinds of irony in this paragraph are paraphrased from M.H. Abrams' *a Glossary of Literary Terms*.

Collins is an excellent example. Austen’s narrator is merciless in describing the discrepancies between his formal, circumstantial and pompous manner and his actions.

One of these instances is when Mr. Collins is described as “not a sensible man, and the deficiency of nature had been but little assisted by education or society” (66). Austen’s use of verbal irony in this sentence is very subtle. The narrator plainly states that Mr. Collins is not a clever man. The rest of the sentence implies that she believes that this can be compensated through education and interaction in society. However, in the case of Mr. Collins this has helped “but little”. This use of understatement underlines that he is not clever, and it is enhanced by the contrast between Collins’ attempts to appear educated and his attempts to fit into society, as can be seen in his relationship with Lady Catherine de Bourgh.

<i>Version</i>	<i>Translation</i>
Austen (1813)	“not a sensible man, and the deficiency of nature had been but little assisted by education or society” (66)
Roeleveld and Stevens (2009)	“Mijnheer Collins was geen verstandig man en wat de natuur hem had onthouden, was maar in beperkte mate aangevuld door opleiding of menselijke omgang” (66)
Dorsman-Vos (1980)	“De Heer Collins was geen wijs man en de stiefmoederlijke manier waarop de natuur hem bedeed had, was maar in geringe mate goedge maakt door onderwijs of omgang met anderen” (58)

Both translations manage to capture the understatement and the verbal irony of the original sentence, although their translations deviate from the original meaning intended. While the original contains “assisted”, which translation in Dutch would come closest to “help”, both translations move in a different direction. Roeleveld and Stevens’ translation is a

more objective option than Dorsman-Vos'. The latter's translation "goedgemaakt", which means "make up for" is more explicit than "aangevuld" (complement); it seems to capture the irony in a better way. "[G]oedgemaakt" also means that something is well made, and that can be seen as a pun. Mr. Collins is not well-made, which is the essence of the sentence; nature has been deficient. This captures, and even enhances the ironic meaning of the sentence.

<i>Version</i>	<i>Translation</i>
Austen (1813)	"Mr. Collins, being in fact much better fitted for a walker than a reader, was extremely well pleased to close his large book, and go" (68).
Roeleveld and Stevens (2009)	"mijnheer Collins, die in feite veel beter geëquipeerd was als wandelaar dan als lezer, sloot met buitenveel genoeg zijn boek en vertrok" (68)
Dorsman-Vos (1980)	"neef Collins die eigenlijk veel beter was toegerust om te stappen dan om te lezen sloot met groot genoeg zijn dikke boek en vertrok" (60)

Furthermore, Mr. Collins is ridiculed for not being a reader. In itself there is nothing wrong with this fact. However, it is highly ironic that a person who is not a reader would like to be seen with a huge book. It illustrates that he wants to appear educated, which makes it extra ironic, because one might respect a person who does not prefer to read, but attempts it anyway. Mr. Collins is immediately ridiculed, because there could be no reason why someone who does not like to read would carry around a large book. The only reason is to impress people, which would be reason for ridicule rather than admiration.

In Roeleveld and Stevens' version part of the verbal irony is lost since they have not translated "large". It is still ironic that a character who is not well equipped for reading puts

away a book, but the fact that it was a large book adds to the irony. In van Praag-van Praag's translation she has translated "large book" with "groot boek", rather than 'dik boek' as Dorsman-Vos has. Both convey the irony quite well; they both convey that Collins just has a large book because it would make people notice that he is reading.

<i>Version</i>	<i>Translation</i>
Austen (1813)	"Happy for all her maternal feelings was the day on which Mrs. Bennet got rid of her two most deserving daughters" (373)
Roeleveld and Stevens (2009)	"Een zeer gelukkige dag voor al haar moederlijke gevoelens was de dag waarop mevrouw Bennet haar twee meest lofwaardige dochters van de hand deed" (353)
Dorsman-Vos (1980)	"Al haar moederlijke gevoelens ten spijt was de dag waarop ze het puikje van haar dochters prijs gaf een heerlijke dag voor mevrouw Bennet" (296)

The first sentence of the last chapter is highly sarcastic and also an excellent example of Austen's use of the ironic narrator. The narrator informs the reader: "Happy for all her maternal feelings was the day on which Mrs. Bennet got rid of her two most deserving daughters" (373). When looking up "to get rid of somebody" in the Oxford English Dictionary (OED) its definition is "to remove (an encumbrance) so as to leave a thing clear". Mrs. Bennet is glad to be rid of her daughters, since they would have become a burden had they not married, but it is an interesting paradox between "happy" and "deserving daughters" on the one hand, and "got rid of" on the other.

Roeleveld and Stevens use the Dutch expression "van de hand doen", which is similar in meaning, but has a more commercial connotation. It implies that they were sold, which is in accordance with the marriage conventions of the era. Unmarried daughters were seen as a financial burden. Dorsman-Vos has chosen the verb "prijsgeven", which comes closer to

“surrender” than “getting rid of”. Dorsman-Vos has managed to incorporate the alliteration of “deserving daughters” with her “puikje prijsgeven”. It may appear that Roeleveld and Stevens’ translation captured the paradoxical meaning of the sentence, in a better way, but there is another paradox in the sentence, which Dorsman-Vos captures.

Rather than stating that it was a happy day for Mrs. Bennet’s maternal feelings, her narrator states that it was a happy day for Mrs. Bennet *despite* her maternal feelings. Dorsman-Vos has caught the ambiguity of this sentence. “For” is ambiguous here, in the 19th century its use included “in spite of, notwithstanding” according to the OED. Roeleveld and Stevens have opted for one of the possible meanings; the most obvious one, since “for” is no longer used as “despite”, while Dorsman-Vos chose the other. Although both have conveyed the paradoxical meaning of the original sentence, its ambiguity is lost. This would have been very difficult, if not impossible, to achieve in Dutch.

Dorsman-Vos’ translation with “ten spijt” shows another ironic element of the sentence. This is an example of dramatic irony. The character whose feelings are being described, Mrs. Bennet, is oblivious to the irony here, but the reader has found out during the course of the novel that Mrs. Bennet is not always influenced by her “maternal feelings”. This is clearest when Elizabeth states that she does not want to marry Mr. Collins; Mrs. Bennet does not care as much for her daughter’s future happiness, as she cares for having a daughter married. Another example is when she knowingly makes Jane walk through the rain so that she will catch a cold and will have to stay at Netherfield with Mr. Bingley. This illustrates that when the narrator refers to Mrs. Bennet’s maternal feelings, it is meant in an ironic way.

2.2 *Irony in Dialogue*

Irony is not only obvious in the descriptions of the ridiculous characters; it is also the words that are put in their mouths and their actions that illustrate Austen’s use of irony. When Mr.

Collins sees Mr. Darcy for the first time, he wants to introduce himself, even though he is of lower social status. Elizabeth tries to explain that he cannot do this; it is not proper. The way he pushes her objections aside is highly ironic. It is almost as if he thinks Elizabeth is embarrassing him by telling him what is proper, as if she is the ridiculous character in his eyes.

Mr. Collins tells Elizabeth: “I have no reason, I assure you to be dissatisfied with my reception” (95-96). The way this sentence is formulated is an illustration of Mr. Collins’ formal manner. Instead of merely stating that he has every reason to be satisfied with his reception, he denies the opposite instead. This shows that he needs to be circumstantial. It is highly ironic that a formal and circumstantial character like Mr. Collins would not know the rules of society. It illustrates that he makes his own rules and lives by them. Both translators have no trouble in capturing this kind of dramatic irony, which is again shared by the reader and the author, since only a literal translation is needed to convey it.

<i>Version</i>	<i>Translation</i>
Austen (1813)	“I admire all my three sons-in-law highly, [...] Wickham, perhaps, is my favourite; but I think I shall like <i>your</i> husband quite as well as Jane’s” (368)
Roeleveld and Stevens (2009)	“Ik heb veel bewondering voor alle drie mijn schoonzoons [...] Wickham is misschien mijn favoriet, maar ik denk dat ik jouw man net zo graag zal mogen als die van Jane” (348)
Dorsman-Vos (1980)	“Ik heb een diepe bewondering voor al mijn schoonzoons [...] misschien voor Wickham nog wel het meeste; maar ik geloof dat jouw man me evengoed zal gaan bevallen als die van Jane” (292)

Mr. Bennet and Elizabeth are the more sarcastic characters in the novel, so they are often used to express irony in dialogue. Wickham is often victim of sarcastic remarks by either of them. When Elizabeth tells her father she will marry Darcy he replies by saying: “I admire all my three sons-in-law highly, [...] Wickham, perhaps, is my favourite; but I think I shall like *your* husband quite as well as Jane’s” (368). Since Mr. Bennet has recently ventured far from his home to prevent Lydia of being compromised by her associations with Wickham, it is clear that Mr. Bennet actually means the opposite of what he is saying. The verbal irony here lies partly in the exaggeration “highly”, which shows a discrepancy between Wickham’s less than perfect moral behaviour and Mr. Bennet’s so-called opinion of him, and partly in the emphasis placed on “*your*” husband. While Darcy and Bingley would normally be seen as the better men, Mr. Bennet reverses the situation to make it seem like Wickham is indeed the best man. This irony, through emphasising “*your*” is lost in the two translations. Neither uses any emphasis, losing another important element of Austen’s style in translation.

2.3 *Irony in Narrative Structure*

Situational irony, which takes place in the narrative structure of a novel, is one of the easiest kinds of irony to translate. None of the translators had any trouble with it, because it merely requires adhering to Austen’s existing plot lines. In the course of the narrative of *Pride and Prejudice* Lady Catherine and Mr. Collins suffer most through situational irony. They direct Darcy’s and Elizabeth’s lives in ways they had not intended. For example, when Lady Catherine goes to Elizabeth to persuade her not to marry Darcy, she achieves the opposite.

It is Lady Catherine who brings Elizabeth’s declaration of love to Darcy, which leads him to propose to her again. Therefore, Lady Catherine is responsible for their happiness, which is completely the opposite of what she tried to achieve. Elizabeth’s marriage, as well as

Jane's, affects Mr. Collins too, although it is not in the way he had hoped, since she did not become his wife. These marriage will ultimately lead to Mr. Collins losing his inheritance, since it cannot be expected that he will remain the only male heir. The love story between Elizabeth and Darcy is ironic as well, since he is the only character in the novel that dislikes her at the start. It is ironic that he will be the one she will fall for. Their romance also takes place in reversed order. First, he loves her when she does not love him, then she loves him while she believes he loves her no more. Their trace each other's steps, from unrequited love to requited love, until they find each other.

Chapter Three. Lost in Emotion.

There are two passages in the novel that are very emotional and involve different kinds of emotions. Both times Darcy declares his love for Elizabeth and proposes to her, but her feelings are very different the second time. In the first passage love, pride and anger are present, while in the second love and shame play a large part. When Darcy first proposes to Elizabeth she is insulted, since he tells her he loves her despite her low station in life and her family. She is also angry because he confesses that he drove her sister and Bingley apart, and she believes he was unfair to Wickham. Therefore, she refuses him in a barely civilised manner. When Darcy later returns, he hopes that her feelings have changed, which is the case, and she feels mortified because she was wrong about many things. Austen seems to portray these strong emotions by using different kinds of emphasis. The most obvious way is her use of italics, but she also uses alliteration, modality and short, direct sentences.

3.1 *First Proposal*

Darcy is a stereotypical 19th-century English gentleman, which can be seen in his formal behaviour and speech in the novel. Therefore, it can come as no surprise that his proposal to the woman he loves is not flooded with emotions. The only difference with his usual way of expressing himself is that he is more adamant.

<i>Version</i>	<i>Translation</i>
Austen (1813)	“You must allow me to tell you how ardently I admire and love you” (183)
Roeleveld and Stevens (2009)	“Staat u mij toe u te vertellen hoe vurig ik u bewonder en bemin” (176)
Dorsman-Vos (1980)	“U moet me toestaan u te zeggen hoe vurig ik u bewonder en liefheb” (149)

Roeleveld and Stevens' translation lacks the modal "must". In Austen's sentence it is clear that Darcy is emotional here; he *must* express himself to Elizabeth. In both translations the emphasis that "must" indicates is lost. Dorsman-Vos does include the Dutch modal "moet", but ignores another emphasising element; the alliteration of "ardently" and "admire", which Roeleveld and Stevens have included with their "bewonder" and "bemin".

In Darcy's reply to Elizabeth's refusal Dorsman-Vos also chooses a different way of emphasis from the italics that Austen used.

<i>Version</i>	<i>Translation</i>
Austen (1813)	"why, with so little <i>endeavour</i> at civility I am thus rejected" (184).
Roeleveld and Stevens (2009)	"waarom ik, met nauwelijks een <i>poging</i> om hoffelijk te zijn , zo word afgewezen" (178).
Dorsman-Vos (1980)	"waarom u mij met zo weinig <i>plichtplegingen</i> afwijst" (150)

Roeleveld and Stevens merely copy the use of italics, which is the English way of emphasis, while in Dutch acute accents are used. The alliteration of "why" and "with" has been replaced by "waarom" and "afgewezen". Dorsman-Vos does not use acute accents for emphasis, which she does elsewhere in the translation; she adds another alliteration "weinig" in addition to "waarom" and "afwijst". Both versions lack the staccato-like rhythm of the original sentence, provided by the subsequent "w's". While the original sentence is a passive sentence, Dorsman-Vos has made it active, which is yet another way of adding emphasis; making it more direct. By making "u", which refers to Elizabeth, the subject of the sentence, it becomes more accusing, which seems to be what Darcy intends. However, in Roeleveld and Stevens' version, as in the original, the emphasis in the sentence is on Darcy; why am *I* rejected. This concurs with his pride, which is hurt at this moment. He can do nothing but undergo this passively.

Elizabeth's reply carries as much emotion and emphasis as Darcy's, but there are no italics in Austen's version.

<i>Version</i>	<i>Translation</i>
Austen (1813)	"I might as well enquire, replied she, why with so evident a design of offending and insulting me, you chose to tell me that you liked me against your will, against your reason, and even against your character" (184)
Roeleveld and Stevens (2009)	"Ik kan net zo goed informeren, antwoordde zij, waarom u zo duidelijk met de opzet mij te beledigen en te grieven verkozen heeft mij te vertellen dat u tegen uw wil, in strijd met uw verstand en zelfs in strijd met uw karakter van mij houdt" (178)
Dorsman-Vos (1980)	"Wellicht zou ik verlangen te horen antwoordde zij, waarom u me met de duidelijke opzet me te beledigen en te kleineren moest vertellen dat u genegenheid voor mij hebt opgevat in strijd met uw wil, uw verstand en zelfs uw natuur" (151)

Dorsman-Vos has chosen to add the acute accent here, where Austen did not put the italics, while in Darcy's reply the translator left them out. This can be explained by the fact that there are hardly any possibilities of adding emphasis in another way, such as through alliteration. However, her use of acute accents seems inconsistent, perhaps even reversed to Austen's, when she chooses not to include them in the next paragraph, where Austen did use italics.

<i>Version</i>	<i>Translation</i>
Austen (1813)	"Was it not some excuse for incivility, if I <i>was</i> uncivil?" (184)
Roeleveld and Stevens (2009)	"Was dat niet enige rechtvaardiging voor onhoffelijkheid, als ik al onhoffelijk was?" (178)
Dorsman-Vos (1980)	"Is dat niet alleen al een rechtvaardiging van mijn onwellevendheid, gesteld dat ik onwellevend was" (151)

While Dorsman-Vos has added "alleen", which means "merely" in this context, as a form of emphasis, it is remarkable that she deviates from what appears to be Austen's

standard way of portraying emotion: italics. Roeleveld and Stevens stay closer to the original when they use acute accents, but they are inconsistent as well.

Both translations seem to favour other ways of adding emphasis to emotional scenes. Both have a tendency of making Austen's sentences longer. This deviation from Austen's style is not logical in emotional situations. Especially, in emotional statements, it plausible that characters speak as fast as possible, sometimes barely containing their emotions. Therefore, it is more common to have shorter, or even fragmented, sentences in emotional dialogue. Both translators have not captured this aspect of Austen's style.

The previous examples show that when the characters themselves vent their emotions these are greatly emphasised. However, when the emotions of the characters are described by the narrator, they are hardly less emphasised. The way in which the narrator emphasises their emotions is different. While Austen seems to favour italics by adding emphasis in dialogue, she seems to prefer alliteration in the description of emotions by the narrator. The sentences that are used are also longer, because the narrator is not overcome by emotions.

<i>Version</i>	<i>Translation</i>
Austen (1813)	"she was at first sorry for the pain he was to receive; till, roused to resentment by his subsequent language, she lost all compassion in anger" (183)
Roeleveld and Stevens (2009)	"Was ze aanvankelijk met hem begaan om de pijn die ze hem zou gaan doen, tot hij haar verontwaardiging wekte met zijn verdere betogen en al haar medelijden oploste in woede (177)
Dorsman-Vos (1980)	"Speet het haar eerst hem verdriet te moeten doen; tot haar wrok, ontketend door de woorden die hij eraan toevoegde al haar deernis smoorde in boosheid" (150)

Roeleveld and Stevens present a much more prosaic version of the sentence. Both translations lack the alliteration of “roused to resentment”. The sentence loses some of its emphasis in this way. Both translations have made the original passive sentence active, which is interesting. In Austen’s case there is a paradox between the passive nature of the sentence and being “roused”. One might even go so far as to state that although Elizabeth is roused she is held back, by social constraints, which is represented by the passive sentence. This may be a case of reading too much into a sentence, but the paradox remains. By turning this into an active sentence, it corresponds to the meaning of the sentence, but the interesting paradox is lost.

3.2 *Second Proposal*

Darcy’s second proposal is introduced by Lady Catherine who has heard rumours of a marriage between Elizabeth and Darcy. While this is not true at that time, it indirectly leads to their marriage, since it convinces Darcy that Elizabeth loves him. When Lady Catherine asks Elizabeth about these rumours Elizabeth is overcome by anger.

<i>Version</i>	<i>Translation</i>
Austen (1813)	“I do not pretend to possess equal frankness with your ladyship. <i>You</i> may ask questions, which <i>I</i> shall not choose to answer” (342)
Roeleveld and Stevens (2009)	“Ik pretendeer niet even openhartig te zijn als uzelf, mevrouw. Ú kunt vragen stellen, die ík niet zal verkiesen te beantwoorden” (324)
Dorsman-Vos (1980)	“Ik beroem me niet op een even grote openhartigheid als u. Misschien dat ú vragen stelt die ík niet wil beantwoorden” (272)

In this case both translators have chosen to use the acute accents for emphasis. None of the translations has managed to convey the emphasis through alliteration in the first sentence, although Roeleveld and Stevens have tried with “pretendeer” and “openhartig”, but this does not work since the “p’s” are not both at the beginning of the word or syllable. Both

versions deviate from the original in their translation of the modals “may” and “shall” in this sentence. Dorsman-Vos has translated “I shall not choose to answer” with “ik niet wil beantwoorden”. This translation is less formal than the original sentence. In the original sentence Elizabeth tries to vehemently decline Lady Catherine’s request as politely as possible. Dorsman-Vos’ translation makes the refusal more direct, which is unlikely to be Austen’s intention, since she often uses formality as an instrument for creating distance.

When Elizabeth sees Mr. Darcy again after she practically told his aunt that she loves him, her language is less controlled and more open towards Darcy than in the dialogue surrounding the first proposal. She is more direct and willing to talk about her feelings, which she tried to avoid at all costs in the previous situation.

<i>Version</i>	<i>Translation</i>
Austen (1813)	“Mr. Darcy, I am a very selfish creature; and, for the sake of giving relief to my own feelings, care not how much I may be wounding yours” (353)
Roeleveld and Stevens (2009)	“Mijnheer Darcy, ik ben een heel zelfzuchtig persoon en omwille van het feit dat ik mijn hart wil luchten, kan het mij niet schelen hoeveel pijn ik u misschien doe” (335)
Dorsman-Vos (1980)	Meneer Darcy, ik ben een zelfzuchtig schepsel en ongevoelig voor de mate waarin ik u misschien het gemoed pijnig als ik het mijne maar kan luchten” (281)

Roeleveld and Stevens make the connection between “selfish creature” and wounding Mr.

Darcy’s feelings more explicit than Austen does. Austen merely implies that Elizabeth considers herself to be selfish because she will speak her mind. Roeleveld and Stevens change Austen’s “and” into “omwille van” (“because”) making it a direct consequence.

When Darcy declares his love once more, it is obvious he is very emotional, but his language has not changed since his last proposal. He is not overcome by joy and retains his formal way of expressing himself. This can be explained because he tries to contain his hopes.

<i>Version</i>	<i>Translation</i>
Austen (1813)	“You are too generous to trifle with me. If your feelings are still what they were last April, tell me so at once. <i>My</i> affections and wishes are unchanged, but one word from you will silence me on this subject for ever” (354)
Roeleveld and Stevens (2009)	“U bent te grootmoedig om achteloos met mij om te springen. Als uw gevoelens nog dezelfde zijn als afgelopen april, zeg het me dan meteen. Mijn gevoelens en wensen zijn onveranderd, maar één woord van u zal mij over dit onderwerp voorgoed tot zwijgen brengen” (335)
Dorsman-Vos (1980)	“U bent te edelmoedig om met mij te spelen. Als uw gevoelens nog dezelfde zijn als toen in april, zeg mij dat dan nu. Mijn liefde, mijn verlangens zijn bij het oude gebleven, maar één woord van u en ik zal dit onderwerp nooit meer aanroeren” (282)

He is more direct, though, when he asks her to “tell me so at once”. Dorsman-Vos’ translation has the same number of syllables, making it slightly faster than Roeleveld and Stevens’ version. It has more authenticity this way, as if Darcy needs to say this as soon as possible, as if he may be overcome by emotions. The change in Darcy’s language is in the way he focuses on Elizabeth. His first proposal was dominated by the word “I”. Here he is more concerned with *her* feelings. Both translations have captured this. In all versions “you” (“u”) is the subject of most sentences.

Chapter 4. Letters.

Letters play an important role in *Pride and Prejudice*. They are one of the main tools at Austen's command to convey formality. In Austen's time letters were bound to strict rules. I will elaborate on these rules, both in English and Dutch letters, and determine whether the translators have chosen to adhere to the same strict rules.

4.1 *Letter-Writing Manuals*

The first letter-writing manuals that, as their name suggests, provide instruction on how to write different kinds of letters, date from the Renaissance. This period was also the start of colonial expansion, which made it more essential to communicate over long distances. In many countries language was not standardised yet and communication between different regions could pose problems. By introducing letter-writing manuals it was ensured that all English speaking persons could communicate through the medium of the letter. In the late 18th century letter-writing became an obligatory course on all British and American schools, effectively ensuring that all English speakers, despite their social status, level of education or their dialect (Tavor Bannet xiii). In Jane Austen's time letter-writing has become such a fixed part of education that it often appeared in novels.

The letter-writing manuals consisted of lists of forms of address, which will be further discussed in the next chapter, followed by samples. In the sample section of the book, emphasis was placed on the beginning of sentences, forms of address and opening sentences, and the ending. This section of the book also contains samples of different kinds of letters, both formal and informal. They provide the reader with standard sentences for different situations.

4.2 *Letters in Pride and Prejudice*

4.2.1 Function of Letters

Form of letters was essential, which can be seen in many novels of the 18th and 19th century. Epistolary novels were very popular during the 18th century and Jane Austen also experimented with this style in *Lady Susan*. In her more famous novels she often used letters to carry the plotline and plot twists. This is also the case in *Pride and Prejudice*, where Elizabeth often receives letters that alter the plot significantly. An example of such a letter is the one Jane sends her to inform her that Lydia has run away with Mr. Wickham. The letter that she receives from Mr. Darcy, where he tries to acquit himself of Elizabeth's charges against his character, alters her image of Darcy and Wickham and thus carries another important plotline. In *Emma* Jane Austen used letters as an illustration of a character's prestige in society. Well-written letters were proudly shown to the entire Highbury society, which was most often the case in letters of Jane Fairfax and Frank Churchill (Favret 136).

In *Pride and Prejudice* letters are more private. They are not shown to all neighbours and friends, only, at times to other family members. However, prestige of people who can produce well-written letters is present in the novel, when Caroline Bingley complements Mr. Darcy on his writing skills. The narrator comments on “[t]he perpetual commendations of the lady, either on his handwriting, or on the evenness of his lines, or on the length of his letter” (44). Caroline Bingley comments on the standard 19th-century virtues of fast and even writing, which Darcy both possesses. She clearly lets her audience know that she favours a man who can write well. This can be seen when she compares Darcy's elegant script with her brother's: “Charles writes in the most careless way imaginable. He leaves out half his words, and blots the rest” (44). Mary, after reading Mr. Collins' letter, makes a similar comment: ‘In point of composition,’ said Mary, ‘the letter does not seem defective. The idea of the olive-

branch perhaps is not wholly new, yet I think it is well expressed.’ (60) These examples show that a person’s social status was partly determined by their writing-skills, since that is what others judge them on.

Austen also uses reactions to letters as a tool to illustrate a person’s character in *Pride and Prejudice* (Tavor Bannet xxi). When Mr. Bennet receives a letter from his brother-in-law, Mr. Gardiner, stating that Lydia and Mr. Wickham will marry, all Bennets react in different ways to this news. Whereas Jane and Elizabeth are immediately overjoyed, not only for the fact that Lydia’s honour has been saved: their own honour, in association with such as sister, has been saved as well. Mr. Bennet is glum when he receives the news: he is immediately concerned of the debt he now owns to his brother-in-law. Elizabeth is also concerned with this debt after her initial joy. Mrs. Bennet on the other hand, does not concern herself with such trivial matters. The only thing she has heard in the letter is the fact that her daughter is married, which is the most important goal in her life. This letter illustrates their characters perfectly since Mr. Bennet and Elizabeth are the most sensible ones and Mrs. Bennet the silliest in the eyes of the narrator.

The length of letters also played an important part in the 19th century. Most 19th-century letters were concise and neatly written. This was due to the costs of letter-writing. These costs were dependent on the number of pages and had risen drastically during the late 18th and early 19th century (Favret 135). It was a sign of luxury, or great need, when one could afford to write a long letter. Most letters in the novel do not contain more than one page. The exceptions are the ones written by Mr. Darcy, who is indeed wealthy enough to be able to afford this luxury, and the letter where Jane explains Lydia’s predicaments, which falls under the category of great need.

4.2.2 Type of Letters

The following table illustrates the type of the letters in *Pride and Prejudice*. I have included only the full letters in the novel. At times passages from letters are introduced, but since they cannot illustrate the complete structure of letters these are excluded.

<i>Relationship</i>	<i>Number of letters in novel</i>
Family and friends	9
Relative strangers ³	5

One of the most important elements in the form of letters, which could be seen in the letter-writing manuals, is the salutation and the closing of letters (*The Ladies Complete Letter-Writer* 14). Therefore, I have listed all first and last sentences, divided into formal and informal letters. These tables are listed under appendix A. The most obvious difference between informal and formal letters in *Pride and Prejudice*, when comparing them, is that the informal nature of the former cannot only be seen in the language used, but also in the (lack of) salutations used. In informal letters it is more common to move the salutation into the first sentence of the letter, as can be seen in the informal examples six and nine. It is logical that informal letters would deviate more often from the strict rules, since these letters do not depend on the impression that is made on the reader. There is less pressure in writing an informal letter.

In the first example of the formal letters, Darcy also shifts the position of the salutation. When looking at standard examples of “letters to clear our selves of a false report” (Tavor Bennet 116) it becomes clear that the standard salutation is “Sir,” or “Madam”, followed by the first sentence. Austen’s deviation from the standard style must be an indication of something. It may be Darcy’s way to ensure Elizabeth’s attention, to affirm that he will not repeat what she does not want to read, in order for her to continue reading. It may

³ This category includes family members and friends who are not as close as to use informal forms of address in letters.

also be that this is a display of his feeling of superiority towards her. She is inferior in social rank, which is something he has clearly shown the previous day, when he proposed to her.

This possibility of deviation from the rules of letter-writing related to the recipient's social inferiority can be supported by another letter in *Pride and Prejudice*. When Caroline Bingley wrote to Jane Bennet to invite her to dinner, she did not adhere to the letter-writing rules. She did use a proper salutation in her letter, but her letter contains an imperative "Come as soon as you can on receipt of this", while the letter conventions demand something more polite. This imperative shows a hierarchy: Caroline Bingley expects 'inferior' Jane to be there.

In informal letters "my dear" followed by a first name or family connection such as "aunt", are most common, which is in accordance with the conventions of letter-writing. These kinds of terms of endearment are common when writing informal letters. The tendency of deviating from conventions can also be seen in the closing of informal letters. At times no closing is used, and there are hardly any formal last sentences. This is in contrast to the ending of formal letters, where such formalities obviously are honoured. In translation, therefore it is more interesting to look at formal letters, since they carry the formal element that is so typical of Austen's style.

4.3 *Dutch Letter-Writing*

The abovementioned examples of the different functions of letters that Jane Austen used in *Pride and Prejudice* demonstrate that they play a significant part in the novel and thus it is important for translators to convey them properly. Therefore, it is vital to look at Dutch letter-writing in the 19th century. Unfortunately, Dutch letter-writing manuals are either not in existence, or very hard to locate. Another solution is to look at some samples of 19th-century

Dutch letters and see how much they differ from their English counterparts as presented in the letter-writing manuals.

When comparing Dutch 18th and 19th-century letters to the English letter-writing manuals, many similarities can be found. In *Sara Burgerhart*, a late 18th-century epistolary novel containing Dutch informal letters, it can be seen that salutations between friends were similar to the English ones. Sara often uses "dierbare vriendin" (dear friend), which is the same salutation that Caroline Bingley uses to address Jane. "Mijn waarde" (my dear) in combination with a first name or term of endearment is also often used. In *Majoor Frans*, a novel from 1875, friends are often addressed with "beste vriend" (dear friend) or "lieve" (dear/sweet). The latter seems to be restricted to addressing females. With regard to 19th-century informal letter salutations, it may be expected that "beste", "waarde" and "lieve" will be used most often, in addition to the omission of salutations and closings, which can also be found in *Sara Burgerhart*. Subsequently, the closing of informal letters "uw vriendin" (your friend) and "uw (toegenegen) dienaars" (your (dedicated) servant) are most often used in *Sara Burgerhart* and *Majoor Frans*. Therefore, these forms may be expected in the translations of the closings of the informal letters.

Formal Dutch letters can be found in Multatuli's *Minnebrieven*. He uses "Weledele Heer" (honourable sir) to address strangers. The formal element in *Sara Burgerhart* can be found when she writes to her guardian. She addresses him as "geëerde heer" (honourable sir). The closings most used are "UEd (toegenegene) dienaarsse en nicht" (your (dedicated) servant and niece) "UEd dienaar" (your servant). The term "UEd" will be further explained in the next chapter on forms of address.

4.4 *Translations*

Informal letters would seem to pose a lesser problem for translators, since informal letters are not as strictly bound to rules as formal letters. An example of an informal letter, where this can be seen is the letter Jane Bennet writes to her sister Elizabeth when she is sick at Netherfield.

<i>Version</i>	<i>Translation</i>
Austen (1813)	My dearest Lizzy, I find myself very unwell this morning, which, I suppose, is to be imputed to my getting wet through yesterday. My kind friends will not hear of my returning till I am better. They insist also on my seeing Mr. Jones— therefore do not be alarmed if you should hear of his having been to me— and excepting a sore-throat and head-ache, there is not much the matter with me. Yours, &c. (28)
Roeleveld and Stevens (2009)	Mijn liefste Lizzy, Ik voel me helemaal niet lekker vanmorgen, wat waarschijnlijk te wijten is aan het feit dat ik gisteren doornat ben geregend. Mijn lieve vriendinnen willen er niet van horen dat ik naar huis ga voordat ik me beter voel. Ze staan er ook op dat mijnheer Jones langskomt – dus schrik niet als jullie horen dat hij hier voor mij geweest is – en behalve een zere keel en hoofdpijn mankeert me eigenlijk niets. Hartelijk etc, (31)
Dorsman-Vos (1980)	Lieve Lizzy, Ik voel me helemaal niet goed vanochtend en dat zal wel toe te schrijven zijn aan het natte pak, dat ik gisteren opgelopen heb. Mijn hartelijke gastvrouwen willen er niet van horen dat ik naar huis ga voordat ik beter ben. Bovendien staan ze erop dat meneer Jones naar me komt kijken – dus schrik niet als je mocht horen dat hij bij mij is geweest. Behalve een schorre keel en hoofdpijn mankeert me eigenlijk niet veel. Je Jane. (29)

When looking at the salutation and closing translated in Jane's letter it becomes clear that Dorsman-Vos has chosen to stay close to the 19th-century Dutch letters. She has chosen "Lieve" (dear/sweet) and "je" (your), which is consistent with both Austen's original and authentic Dutch letters of the same period. She has chosen to use "je" rather than the polite form "uw", which was used in 19th-century Dutch letter-writing, but this is consistent since the sisters never use the polite form in addressing each other in her translation.

Roeleveld and Stevens have chosen "mijn liefste", which is a literal translation of "my dearest". It creates more intimacy, but it is not a common way of addressing family member in Dutch. *Sara Burgerhart* offers the alternative of "Zusje-lief" (27) (sister-dear), which also creates more intimacy. "mijn liefste" and "hartelijk" (kind), their closing of the letter, are more modern than Dorsman-Vos' version.

Mr. Collins' letters are an excellent example of the conventions of letter-writing, since he tries to adhere strictly to these rules. His first letter to Mr. Bennet contains some text-book examples of letter-writing. At the same time it also contains some text-book examples of what-not-to-write in formal letters. This paradox in Mr. Collins, the need to be accepted by society by adhering to its conventions versus large errors against the same conventions, is also demonstrated by his letter. This is an example of how Austen employs letters as an illustration of a person's character. I have chosen three significant passages of this letter to discuss. The full letter, and its translations can be found in Appendix B.

Mr. Collins uses the formal salutation in his letter and his tone in the first part of the first sentence is reconciliatory, which is advised in letter-writing manuals of the 18th and 19th century. It was advised to always beg for forgiveness, even if the writer did not feel that any wrong-doing had occurred (Tavor Bannet 174).

<i>Version</i>	<i>Translation</i>
Austen (1813)	Dear Sir, The disagreement subsisting between yourself and my late honoured father, always gave me much uneasiness, and since I have had the misfortune to lose him, I have frequently wished to heal the breach; but for some time I was kept back by my own doubts, fearing lest it might seem disrespectful to his memory for me to be on good terms with any one with whom it had always pleased him to be at variance.
Roeleveld and Stevens (2009)	<i>Geachte heer,</i> <i>De verwijdering die bestond tussen u en wijlen mijn geachte vader heeft mij altijd erg dwarsgezeten en sedert hij mij tot mijn verdriet ontvallen is, heb ik deze breuk dikwijls willen helen; maar een tijdlang werd ik weerhouden door mijn eigen twijfels, door de vrees dat ik zijn nagedachtenis niet zou eerbiedigen door op vriendelijke voet te verkeren met iemand met wie hij altijd had verkozen gebrouilleerd te zijn.</i>
Dorsman-Vos (1980)	<i>Zeer geachte heer,</i> <i>De onenigheid die bestaan heeft tussen u en wijlen mijn geëerbiedigde vader heeft mij altijd vervuld met onbehagen en sedert ik het ongeluk heb gehad hem te verliezen, heb ik dikwijls verlangd de breuk te helen; ik werd daarvan een wijle weerhouden evenwel door mijn eigen weifeling, vrezend dat ik de schijn op mij zou laden zijn nagedachtenis te ontluisteren door op goede voet te verkeren met lieden met wie hij meende van inzichten te moeten verschillen.</i>

The translations both capture Mr. Collins' formal manner. Austen uses two outdated words in this sentence. "Lest" had very few instances left in the 19th century according to the OED. This use, in combination with "fearing" is the only one left. "Subsisting" is the other outdated word Austen uses. Roeleveld and Stevens and Dorsman-Vos have both translated it with a verb. In present day English, this verbal meaning is the only meaning of "subsisting" that is left. However, in the 18th century, according to the OED, it could also be an adjective

meaning "abiding/lasting". This fits with the meaning of the sentence, but both translators have ignored this potentially outdated use of the word.

Both translations have used other outdated Dutch words in the sentence, which conveys some of its formal manner. Especially, Dorsman-Vos' version contains many outdated words, making it very formal and creating distance between the character and the reader. While Roeleveld and Stevens have used "sedert" (since) and "gebrouileerd" (displeased), which are both outdated, Dorsman-Vos also uses "geëerbiedigde" (honoured), "wijle" (some time) and "weifeling" (doubt). This creates the same kind of distance between the character and the reader that Austen's contemporaries must have experienced, since it presents the reader with a similar feeling of alienation through outdated language. In contrast to the use of outdated words, both translators have chosen to use the modern form of salutation. The 19th-century equivalent could have been "wel-edele heer" (honourable sir).

Mr. Collins' closing of the letter is also according to the conventions.

<i>Version</i>	<i>Translation</i>
Austen (1813)	If you should have no objection to receive me into your house, I propose myself the satisfaction of waiting on you and your family, Monday, November 18th, by four o'clock, and shall probably trespass on your hospitality till the Saturday se'night following, which I can do without any inconvenience, as Lady Catherine is far from objecting to my occasional absence on a Sunday, provided that some other clergyman is engaged to do the duty of the day. I remain, dear sir, with respectful compliments to your lady and daughters, your well-wisher and friend, WILLIAM COLLINS. (60)
Roeleveld and Stevens (2009)	<i>Indien u er geen bedenken heeft tegen mij in uw huis te ontvangen, zal ik u en uw gezin volgaarne een bezoek brengen op maandag 18 november, tegen vier uur, en ik zal waarschijnlijk een beroep op uw gastvrijheid</i>

	<p><i>doen tot de zaterdag van de week daaropvolgende, hetgeen zonder beletselen mogelijk is, aangezien lady Catherine in het geheel geen bezwaar heeft tegen mijn incidentele afwezigheid op een zondag, zolang er een andere predikant is geëngageerd om de diensten van die dag waar te nemen. Ik verblijf, geachte heer, met eerbiedige complimenten aan uw echtgenote en dochters, uw vriend die u het beste toewenst,</i> <i>William Collins (60)</i></p>
Dorsman-Vos (1980)	<p><i>Mocht u er geen bezwaar tegen hebben mij in uw huis te ontvangen, dan stel ik me voor het genoeg te hebben op maandag 18 november om vier uur ten uwent mijn opwachting te maken, en zal waarschijnlijk van uw gastvrijheid gebruik maken tot de zaterdag van de daarop volgende week. Ik kan dat zonder enig ongerief doen aangezien lady Catherine het tegendeel van bezwaar ziet in mijn afwezigheid op zondag bij tijd en wijle, mits een andere predikant gevonden wordt om de dienst waar te nemen. Intussen verblijf ik, hooggeachte heer, met eerbiedige complimenten aan mevrouw uw gade en uw dochters Uw welwillende vriend <i>William Collins (53)</i></i></p>

Especially, the last sentence adheres closely to the conventions of letter-writing. Roeleveld and Stevens and Dorsman-Vos have chosen to adhere to these rules as well. Both translations are a prototype of how a Dutch 19th-century letter should be concluded. Both translators have obviously differentiated between informal and formal letters. Where they follow Austen's example and deviate from the rules in the former case, they appear to adhere to the rules in formal letters. Therefore, both translations convey Austen's formal style in letters.

Chapter Five. Forms of Address.

In the 19th century, forms of address played a central role in both English and Dutch society. Therefore, it can be no surprise that it also plays a large part in *Pride and Prejudice*. It is another aspect of Jane Austen's formal style to create distance between certain characters and her readers. It is interesting to look at the Dutch translations, to find out how much of the original formality, which is another of Austen's ways of creating distance, they have managed to convey.

5.1 Titles used

In the late 18th-century manual for letter-writing, an important subsection is dedicated to “rules for addressing Persons of Distinction either in Writing or Discourse” (6). In this subsection all different address forms to higher ranked persons are extensively discussed. It addresses royalty, nobility, parliament, clergy, military and judges, who all require to be respectfully addressed. In the 19th century these rules were still strictly adhered to. This can also be seen in *Pride and Prejudice*, where all higher ranked people are respectfully addressed.

Austen adheres to these rules in her novel, which can be seen in the way she distinguishes between Sir William and Lady Lucas on the one hand and Lady Catherine on the other. The difference between Lady Lucas and Lady Catherine probably lies in the fact that Sir William is a baronet. In such cases, when their husbands have a title in their own right, or are the eldest son of higher nobility, such as a Duke or Marquess, their wives use “Lady” in combination with their husband's surname. Since Lady Catherine uses her first name in combination with “Lady”, it can be deduced that she married a younger son of higher nobility. Although they are of different social status, and have different titles, this should not

change the way they are addressed, both Lady's should be addressed, according to the rules, as "Madam" and "my lady".

However, while Sir and Lady Lucas are always addressed and described with their title, they are not addressed with "my lady" or "my lord" in regular conversation. When they are referred to, Austen uses "he" and "she". In contrast, Lady Catherine is always referred to as "her ladyship". This could be explained because the Lucases have close ties to the Bennets, while Lady Catherine is a stranger. It is also an example of Austen's use of formal style to create distance between the reader and certain characters. It enhances the reader's dislike for Lady Catherine.

Both translations have captured this difference in address between the Lucases and Lady Catherine. Both use "ze" (she) and "hij" (he) when the Lucases are referred to, while Lady Catherine is referred to as "lady Catherine". Dorsman-Vos switches between "lady Catherine" and "de douanière" (271), which comes closer to the original, but both translations capture the distance that is created between Lady Catherine and the reader in this way.

Austen also adheres to the other 19th-century rules with regard to forms of address. The use of merely first names is only used between family members and close friends, such as Charlotte and Elizabeth. The use of merely surnames, such as between Darcy and Bingley, was a common way for men who knew each other well to refer to one another; it was used at English schools (Görlach 41). This was also the common way for Dutch men with close relationships to address each other (Vermaas 77). Since both translators have translated literally in these cases no mistakes can be made.

One difference in address forms between English and Dutch, which both translators have captured, is the way in which young ladies, such as the Bennets were addressed. In 19th century England, the eldest daughter was referred to as "Miss" followed by her surname; in

the case of Jane, Miss Bennet. Her sisters were all referred to as “Miss” followed by their last name. In 19th-century Dutch there was no such difference. However, a class difference was made. Upper class females, both married and unmarried, were addressed as “mevrouw” (“Ma’am”), middle class females as “mejuffrouw” (“Miss”) and lower class females as “vrouw”; (“woman”) (de Vooy 77). Roeleveld and Stevens and Dorsman-Vos refer to all single middle class females as “mejuffrouw”.

5.2 *Personal Pronouns*

Jane Austen had only one form of address at her command. In the 19th century the difference between formal and informal address forms was only present in English dialects. Since the 18th century, “thou” was no longer used in Standard English (Görlach 40), and Austen did not use dialects, so it is logical that she would use “you”. In Dutch, this difference between formal and informal forms of address is still present. Therefore, it may pose problems in translation. The translators have different options. In the 19th century, “gij” and “u” were the standard forms of address in Dutch. Modern colloquial forms “je” and “jij” were also in use at the time, but only in speech, not yet in writing (Vermaas 51). Neither Roeleveld and Stevens, nor Dorsman-Vos have chosen to use these forms, probably because they are too archaic. They have chosen the contemporary colloquial pronouns “je” and “jij” and the polite form: “u”.

However, the translators’ problems do not end with choosing the present-day pronouns. Their use has changed since the end of the nineteenth century. Therefore, they still have to choose between an older and a more modern use of these pronouns. Formally, the difference in address forms was based on social status and familiarity. Until the 1960’s everyone older, and strangers, were addressed with the polite form “u”, while only people of

one's own age and who one was familiar with were addressed with the colloquial form "je" or "jij". This approach includes using the polite form in addressing parents and grandparents. Since the 1960's it has become more common to address one's parents, and sometimes even grandparents, with the colloquial "je" or "jij", in addition to one's peers (Vermaas 78).

In Roeleveld and Stevens' translation only characters that share a level of familiarity address each other with the colloquial form, such as married couples, like Mr. and Mrs. Bennet, sisters among themselves, and dialogue between Darcy and Bingley. For females, the rules are different. Miss Bingley, addresses Mr. Darcy, who is her superior, with the polite form: "U hebt het wel gezien, mijnheer Darcy, dat weet ik zeker" (35). She addresses him with "mijnheer" ("mister"), while her brother simply addresses him as Darcy and uses the colloquial form: "Kom, Darcy [...] jij moet ook dansen" (12).

When addressing persons below her own social status, Caroline Bingley uses the colloquial address form. When she writes to Jane Bennet whom she has met only once, to invite her for dinner, she addresses her with the colloquial form in her letter, in Roeleveld and Stevens' translation. Caroline Bingley clearly feels superior to Jane, which also becomes clear later in novel, when she tries to separate her brother and Jane because she believes Jane is not good enough for her brother. She is only friendly to Jane in order to obtain information to keep them apart, which she can gain by pretending to be her friend. Throughout the narrative she is nice to Jane on the surface, while in fact she loathes her. This can also be seen in the imperative used in her letter to Jane, which is, as discussed in the previous chapter, also a form of exercising superiority. This general attitude of Caroline Bingley is in accordance with Roeleveld and Stevens' use of the colloquial form in that letter.

Dorsman-Vos on the other hand, has chosen to use the polite form in her translation of this letter. "Als u niet genoeg met ons lot begaan bent om vandaag met Louise en mij te

komen eten” (28). This can be explained because Caroline Bingley is often described as very formal and proper. For example, when all the Bennet ladies visit her at Netherfield, ostensibly to ensure that Jane is properly taken care of, Caroline, in response to the informal, and in her eyes, ridiculous way the Bennets act, is described as answering “with cold civility” (38). Caroline is thus portrayed as civility personified. Roeleveld and Stevens have translated this with “beleefd maar koel” (41), which conveys the same meaning. It is possible that a character that embodies cold civility would use the polite form to address someone she has just met.

Dorsman-Vos has chosen the same general approach as Roeleveld and Stevens, with regard to the use of the polite and colloquial form of the pronouns, although her execution is slightly different. She also chooses the polite form in most cases, and only characters that have close relationships use the colloquial form. Similar to Roeleveld and Stevens’ approach, she does not use the colloquial form when children address their parents. She also uses the polite form in interaction between family members that have never met. Mr. Collins addresses all the Bennets, not merely Mr. and Mrs. Bennet, with the polite form. Roeleveld and Stevens use this form as well.

Unfortunately, Dorsman-Vos appears to be slightly inconsistent in her use of the address forms. She seems to apply the rule that family members of the same age and know each other well use the colloquial form among themselves. This can be seen in interaction between Elizabeth and Wickham, when he has married her sister Lydia; making them family as well. Both use the colloquial form in addressing each other. However, when Wickham asks Elizabeth a question, the polite form is suddenly used: “En vond u haar aardig?” (252). This is in contrast to another question he asks her, several sentences before that: “Heb je de oude huishoudster nog gesproken?” (252).

Since both of these sentences are questions, it seems unlikely that they would require a different form. However, a possible explanation can be found when considering the context of the remark. Wickham is trying to find out if Elizabeth knows that he has lied to her, and he is in fact the bad guy in the story they are discussing. She has just remarked that Darcy's housekeeper feared he "had not turned out well". When considering this, and the fact that Austen's style is characteristic of formality when trying to create distance, this is a moment where Wickham would want to create distance, and one option to portray this is to use the polite form, which is an interesting translation. The rest of the conversation, when Wickham tries to reconcile Elizabeth with his side of the story is in the colloquial form again.

Conclusion

Based on the opening sentences and titles, Roeleveld and Stevens' and Dorsman-Vos' translations are the most interesting for comparison. This is obviously due to the difference in titles, but also their choices of the opening sentences. In both cases Dorsman-Vos' version is more creative. She shows that, without moving too far from the original, it is possible to incorporate alliteration and repetition, which is an important characteristic of Austen's style.

This can also be seen in the way the translators convey irony. Both translations had no problem in conveying Austen's dramatic and situational irony. This was to be expected since it merely requires a literal translation of the plot of the novel. However, in the translation of verbal irony differences between the translations are more evident. Dorsman-Vos' translation is, again, more creative. She incorporates more alliteration than Roeleveld and Stevens and alliteration occurs often in *Pride and Prejudice*.

Roeleveld and Stevens also have a tendency to leave small, but essential, elements out of their translations, which removes the sharp edges from some of the narrator's ironic remarks. This shows that Dorsman-Vos seems to have a better indication of Austen's use of irony. This can be illustrated in the sentence "[h]appy for all her maternal feelings was the day on which Mrs. Bennet got rid of her two most deserving daughters". In addition to the use of alliteration that Dorsman-Vos incorporated in her translation, while Roeleveld and Stevens missed this opportunity, the former recognised an older meaning of "happy for". This shows that Dorsman-Vos has done more research into 19th-century expressions and thus, at times, provides a more accurate translation.

In conveying the emotions of the main characters of the novel, both Roeleveld and Stevens and Dorsman-Vos deviate from Austen's method. Austen favours the use of italics when these feelings are conveyed by the characters themselves. When the narrator describes

these, they are often emphasised through alliteration. Although Dorsman-Vos has shown more use of alliteration in translations of other parts of the novel, the alliterations lack when she attempts to convey emotion. However, she does use acute accents, which is the standard way of conveying emphasis in Dutch, while Roeleveld and Stevens merely copy Austen's use of italics. This again indicates that Dorsman-Vos has done more research.

The main problem in conveying emotion in both translations is the fact that their sentences are too long. Emotional sentences, especially in dialogue, when characters speak their emotions, are likely to be shorter than other sentences. In most cases all translators have chosen sentences that are almost twice as long as the original, thus losing a part of Austen's style in translation.

In conveying Austen's formal style in letters, both translations have succeeded. Both Roeleveld and Stevens and Dorsman-Vos have differentiated, like Austen, between formal and informal letters. In the former case they have adhered closely to the rules. The only aspect that could be improved with regard to letters in the novel, is that they could have adhered to the 19th-century Dutch rules for letter-writing. While Dorsman-Vos clearly has done some research in other fields, she has ignored the possibility of looking at 19th-century Dutch letters. Had the translators adhered to these rules, their translations would have had a more authentic feel to them. It seems inconsistent on Dorsman-Vos' part that she attempts to invoke a 19th-century Dutch feeling to her translation, through her use of outdated language, but she does use modern salutations and closings of letters. It would have been more consistent, and more in accordance with Austen's outdated style (for her time), to use as much 19th-century Dutch elements as possible.

Austen's use of formality in the novel seems the easiest aspect of her style to translate. The translators have succeeded with the letters in the novel and the forms of address also

posed no problems. Since Dutch makes a difference between formal and informal forms of address, Austen's formal way of writing is conveyed into Dutch without major problems.

While Dorsman-Vos is not consistent in her use of archaic forms, she does manage to create a more authentic 19th-century atmosphere in her translation, which is something Roeleveld and Stevens' translation lacks. It may appeal to modern readers to read a more modern version, but many of the elements characteristics of Austen's style are lost in this way. In addition, when a reader chooses to read a 19th-century novel, or a translation thereof, it seems obvious that they expect the novel to have a 19th-century feeling to it, which is more the case in Dorsman-Vos' translation than in Roeleveld and Stevens'.

Dorsman-Vos has succeeded in conveying important elements that are characteristic of Austen's style. She has done more research into 19th-century use of language, incorporated more alliteration and thus has produced a creative translation. Therefore, Dorsman-Vos seems to have produced the best translation to date.

Works Cited

- Abrams, M.H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. Boston: Michael Rosenberg, 2004.
- Austen, Jane. *Pride and Prejudice*. Ware: Wordsworth Classics, 1992.
- Austen, Jane. *Trots en Vooroordeel*. Trans. H.E. van Praag-van Praag. Amsterdam: Uitgeverij L.J. Veen, 2005.
- Austen, Jane. *Trots en Vooroordeel*. Trans. Elke Meiborg. Groningen: BoekWerk, 1996.
- Austen, Jane. *Trots en Vooroordeel*. Trans. Annelies Roeleveld and Margret Stevens. Amsterdam: Athenaeum – Polak & Van Genneep, 2009.
- Austen, Jane. *Trots en Vooroordeel*. Trans. W.A. Dorsman-Vos. Utrecht: Het Spectrum, 1980.
- Bosboom-Toussaint, A.L.G. *Majoer Frans*. Utrecht: L.J. Veen, 1980.
- Favret, Mary. *Romantic Correspondence: Women, Politics and the Fiction of Letters*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Görlach, Manfred. *English in Nineteenth-century England: an Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- The Ladies Complete Letter-Writer: Teaching the Art of Inditing Letters On Every Subject that Can Call for their Attention, as Daughters, Wives, Mothers, Relations, Friends, or Acquaintance. Being a Collection of Letters, Written by Ladies, Not Only on the More Important Religious, Moral, and Social Duties, but on Subjects of Every Other Kind that Usually Interest the Fair Sex: the whole Forming a Polite and Improving Manual, For their Use, Instruction, and Rational Entertainment. With Many Other Important Articles*. Eighteenth Century Collections Online.
- <http://galenet.galegroup.com/servlet/ECCO?vrsn=1.0&dd=0&h2=1&af=BN&locID=amst&srchtp=a&d1=0789700900&c=1&ste=11&d4=0.33&stp=Author&dc=etoc&docNum=CW415502907&ae=T175334&tiPG=1>

Multatuli, *Minnebrieven*. Amsterdam: G.L. Funke, 1875.

Oxford English Dictionary. Oxford University Press, 2010. Online Edition.

<http://www.oed.com/>

Tavor Bannet, Eve. *Empire of Letters: Letter Manuals and Transatlantic Correspondence*.

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Vermaas, J.A.M. *Veranderingen in de Nederlandse Aanspreekvormen van de Dertiende t/m de Twintigste Eeuw*. Utrecht: LOT, 2005.

Vooy, de, C.G.N., *Nederlandse Spraakkunst*. Groningen: J.B. Wolters, 1967.

Wolff, Betje, and Aagje Deken. *De Historie van Mejuffrouw Sara Burgerhart*. Amsterdam:

Uitgeversmaatschappij The Reader's Digest N.V., 1998.

Appendices

Appendix A. Salutations and Closings of the letters in *Pride and Prejudice*

1. Salutation of Informal Letters

<i>Letter</i>	<i>Direction</i>	<i>Salutation (and first sentence)</i>
1	Lydia to Elizabeth	“MY DEAR LIZZY, I wish you joy” (374)
2	Elizabeth to her aunt; Mrs Gardiner	“I would have thanked you before, my dear aunt, as I ought to have done, for your long, kind, satisfactory, detail of particulars” (370)
3	Mrs Gardiner to Elizabeth	“MY DEAR NIECE, I have just received your letter, and shall devote this whole morning to answering it, as I foresee that a LITTLE writing will not comprise what I have to tell you” (309)
4	Mr. Gardiner to his brother-in-law Mr. Bennet	“MY DEAR BROTHER, At last I am able to you some tidings of my niece, and such as, upon the whole, I hope it will give you satisfaction” (290)
5	Lydia to Harriet, her close friend	“MY DEAR HARRIET, ‘You will laugh when you know where I am gone, and I cannot help laughing myself at your surprise to-morrow morning, as soon as I am missed’” (279)
6	Jane to Elizabeth	“By this time, my dearest sister, you have received my hurried letter; I wish this may be more intelligible, but though not confined for time, my head is so bewildered that I cannot answer for being coherent. Dearest Lizzy, I hardly know what I would write, but I have bad news for you, and it cannot be delayed” (262)
7	Jane to Elizabeth	“MY DEAREST LIZZY,— ‘I find myself very unwell this morning, which, I suppose, is to be imputed to my getting wet through yesterday’” (28)
8	Jane to Elizabeth	“My dearest Lizzy will, I am sure, be incapable of triumphing in her better judgement, at my expense, when I confess myself to have been entirely deceived in Miss Bingley’s regard for me.” (143)
9	Jane to Elizabeth	“Since writing the above, dearest Lizzy, something has occurred of a most unexpected and serious nature; but I am afraid of alarming you—be assured that we are all well” (261)

2. *Closing of Informal Letters*

	<i>Direction</i>	<i>Closing (and prior sentence)</i>
1	Lydia to Elizabeth	“Any place would do, of about three or four hundred a year; but however, do not speak to Mr. Darcy about it, if you had rather not. Yours, etc.” (374)
2	Elizabeth to her aunt; Mrs Gardiner	“You are all to come to Pemberley at Christmas. Yours, etc.” (371)
3	Mrs Gardiner to Elizabeth	“But I must write no more. The children have been wanting me this half hour. Yours, very sincerely, M. GARDINER.” (314)
4	Mr. Gardiner to his brother-in-law Mr. Bennet	“I shall write again as soon as anything more is determined on. Yours, etc., EDW. GARDINER.” (291)
5	Lydia to Harriet, her close friend	“Good-bye. Give my love to Colonel Forster. I hope you will drink to our good journey. Your affectionate friend, LYDIA BENNET.” (280)
6	Jane to Elizabeth	“In such and exigence, my uncle’s advice and assistance would be everything in the world; he will immediately comprehend what I must feel, and I rely upon his goodness.” (264)
7	Jane to Elizabeth	“excepting a sore throat and headache, there is not much the matter with me.—Yours, etc.” (28)
8	Jane to Elizabeth	“Pray go to see them, with Sir William and Maria. I am sure you will be very comfortable there.—Yours, etc.” (145)
9	Jane to Elizabeth	“I am afraid you will not be able to make it out, but I hardly know what I have written.” (262)

3. *Salutation of Formal Letters*

	<i>Direction</i>	<i>Salutation (and first sentence)</i>
1	Mr. Darcy to Elizabeth	“Be not alarmed, Madam, on receiving this letter, by the apprehension of its containing any repetition of those sentiments, or renewal of those offers, which were last night so disgusting to you” (189)
2	Mr. Bennet to Mr. Collins	“DEAR SIR, I must trouble you once more for congratulations” (371)
3	Mr. Collins to Mr. Bennet	“MY DEAR SIR, I feel myself called upon, by our relationship, and my situation in life, to condole with you on the grievous affliction you are now suffering under, of which

		we were yesterday informed by a letter from Hertfordshire” (284)
4	Mr. Collins to Mr. Bennet	“Dear Sir,— The disagreement subsisting between yourself and my late honoured father always gave me much uneasiness, and since I have had the misfortune to lose him, I have frequently wished to heal the breach; but for some time I was kept back by my own doubts, fearing lest it might seem disrespectful to his memory for me to be on good terms with anyone with whom it had always pleased him to be at variance” (59)
5	Miss Bingley to Jane	“MY DEAR FRIEND,— If you are not so compassionate as to dine to-day with Louisa and me, we shall be in danger of hating each other for the rest of our lives, for a whole day’s tete-a-tete between two women can never end without a quarrel” (27)

4. Closing of Formal Letters

	<i>Direction</i>	<i>Closing (and prior sentence)</i>
1	Mr. Darcy to Elizabeth	“I will only add, God bless you. ‘FITZWILLIAM DARCY.’” (197)
2	Mr. Bennet to Mr. Collins	“He has more to give. Yours sincerely, etc.” (371)
3	Mr. Collins to Mr. Bennet	“Let me then advise you, dear sir, to console yourself as much as possible, to throw off your unworthy child from your affection for ever, and leave her to reap the fruits of her own heinous offence. I am, dear sir, etc., etc.” (285)
4	Mr. Collins to Mr. Bennet	“I remain, dear sir, with respectful compliments to your lady and daughters, your well-wisher and friend, WILLIAM COLLINS.” (60)
5	Miss Bingley to Jane	“My brother and the gentlemen are to dine with the officers. Yours ever, CAROLINE BINGLEY.” (27)

Appendix B. Mr. Collins' first letter to Mr. Bennet.

1. Austen

Dear Sir,

The disagreement subsisting between yourself and my late honoured father, always gave me much uneasiness, and since I have had the misfortune to lose him, I have frequently wished to heal the breach; but for some time I was kept back by my own doubts, fearing lest it might seem disrespectful to his memory for me to be on good terms with any one with whom it had always pleased him to be at variance.—'There, Mrs. Bennet.'—My mind, however, is now made up on the subject, for having received ordination at Easter, I have been so fortunate as to be distinguished by the patronage of the Right Honourable Lady Catherine de Bourgh, widow of Sir Lewis de Bourgh, whose bounty and beneficence has preferred me to the valuable rectory of this parish, where it shall be my earnest endeavour to demean myself with grateful respect towards her Ladyship, and be ever ready to perform those rites and ceremonies which are instituted by the Church of England. As a clergyman, moreover, I feel it my duty to promote and establish the blessing of peace in all families within in the reach of my influence; and on these grounds I flatter myself that my present overtures of good-will are highly commendable, and that the circumstance of my being next in the entail of Longbourn estate will be kindly overlooked on your side, and not lead you to reject the offered olive-branch. I cannot be otherwise than concerned at being the means of injuring your amiable daughters, and beg leave to apologise for it, as well as to assure you of my readiness to make them every possible amends—but of this hereafter. If you should have no objection to receive me into your house, I propose myself the satisfaction of waiting on you and your family, Monday, November 18th, by four o'clock, and shall probably trespass on your hospitality till the Saturday se'night following, which I can do without any inconvenience, as Lady Catherine is far from objecting to my occasional absence on a Sunday, provided that some other clergyman is engaged to do the duty of the day.

I remain, dear sir, with respectful compliments to your lady and daughters, your well-wisher and friend,

WILLIAM COLLINS. (59-60)

2. Roeleveld and Stevens

Geachte heer,

De verwijdering die bestond tussen u en wijlen mijn geachte vader heeft mij altijd erg dwarsgezet en sedert hij mij tot mijn verdriet ontvallen is, heb ik deze breuk dikwijls willen helen; maar een tijdlang werd ik weerhouden door mijn eigen twijfels, door de vrees dat ik zijn nagedachtenis niet zou eerbiedigen door op vriendelijke voet te verkeren met iemand met wie hij altijd had verkozen gebrouilleerd te zijn. – Ziedaar, mevrouw Bennet.- Mijn besluit staat nu echter vast, want met Pasen is de voltooiing van mijn predikantsopleiding kerkelijk gevierd en ik heb nu de eer gehad de eminente begunstiging deelachtig te worden van de hooggeboren lady Catherine de Bourgh, weduwe van sir Lewis de Bourgh, die mij in haar grootheid en vrijgevigheid heeft begiftigd met de aanzienlijke post van predikant in deze

parochie, waar het mijn welgemeend streven zal zijn mij met dankbaarheid en ontzag jegens mevrouw de douanière te gedragen en immer gereed te staan om de rituelen en ceremonieën te volvoeren die door de anglicaanse kerk zijn ingesteld. Als predikant acht ik het bovendien mijn plicht de godsgave der eendracht in alle families binnen het bereik van mijn invloed te verspreiden en bevorderen en op deze gronden vlei ik mij dat deze mijn goedwillende toenaderingen zeer lofwaardig zijn en dat de omstandigheid dat ik de directe erfgenaam ben van Longbourn, uwerzijds uw welwillend door de vingers gezien zal worden en u er niet toe zal brengen de u toegereikte olijftak te weigeren. Het spreekt vanzelf dat het mij zeer bekommert dat ik het instrument ben waardoor uw liefallige dochters schade wordt berokkend en ik vraag u verlot mij daarvoor te verontschuldigen en tevens mijn verzekeringen te aanvaarden dat ik bereid ben hun iedere mogelijke genoegdoening te verschaffen; maar daarover zal ik later spreken. Indien u er geen bedenken heeft tegen mij in uw huis te ontvangen, zal ik u en uw gezin volgaarne een bezoek brengen op maandag 18 november, tegen vier uur, en ik zal waarschijnlijk een beroep op uw gastvrijheid doen tot de zaterdag van de week daaropvolgende, hetgeen zonder beletselen mogelijk is, aangezien lady Catherine in het geheel geen bezwaar heeft tegen mijn incidentele afwezigheid op een zondag, zolang er een andere predikant is geëngageerd om de diensten van die dag waar te nemen.

Ik verblijf, geachte heer, met eerbiedige complimenten aan uw echtgenote en dochters, uw vriend die u het beste toewenst,

William Collins (60-61)

3. Dorsman-Vos

Zeer geachte heer,

De onenigheid die bestaan heeft tussen u en wijlen mijn geëerbiedigde vader heeft mij altijd vervuld met onbehagen en sedert ik het ongeluk heb gehad hem te verliezen, heb ik dikwijls verlangd de breuk te helen; ik werd daarvan een wijle weerhouden evenwel door mijn eigen weifeling, vrezend dat ik de schijn op mij zou laden zijn nagedachtenis te ontluisteren door op goede voet te verkeren met lieden met wie hij meende van inzichten te moeten verschillen. – ‘luister je wel, mevrouwtje Bennet’ – Desniettemin staat nu mijn besluit vast, aangezien ik laatstleden Pasen tot geestelijke ben gewijd in de Anglicaanse Kerk en mij het grote geluk en de grote onderscheiding te beurt zijn gevallen me onder de bescherming te mogen stellen van Catherine, douanière de Bourgh, weduwe van sir Lewis de Bourgh, die me uit hoofde van haar beschermvrouwschap beroepen heeft bij deze winstgevende gemeente, waar ik met grote ernst zal streven die hooggeboren vrouwe met dankbare eerbied tegemoet te treden, en altoos klaar zal staan mij te kwijten van de riten en ceremoniën die de Anglicaanse Kerk heeft ingesteld. Buitendien gevoel ik het als predikant als mijn plicht de zegen van de vrede te bevorderen of te brengen in alle huizen binnen het bereik van mijn invloed. In dier voege vlei ik mij met de hoop dat mijn toenaderingspogingen mij tot aanbeveling strekken, en dat het toeval dat mij aanwijst als de rechtmatige erfgenaam van Longbourn mij door u niet aangerekend wordt en u niet zal bewegen de aangereikte olijftak te verguizen. Ik kan niet anders dan met kommer bedenken dat uw liefallige dochters door mijn toedoen schade wordt berokkend; vergun mij u mijn leedwezen hierover te betuigen en buitendien u te verzekeren van mijn bereidheid om hen schadeloos te stellen voor zover dat in mijn vermogen ligt – maar hierover later. Mocht u er geen bezwaar tegen hebben mij in uw huis te ontvangen, dan stel ik me voor het genoeg te hebben op maandag 18 november om vier uur ten uwent mijn opwachting te maken, en zal waarschijnlijk van uw gastvrijheid

gebruik maken tot de zaterdag van de daarop volgende week. Ik kan dat zonder enig ongerief doen aangezien lady Catherine het tegendeel van bezwaar ziet in mijn afwezigheid op zondag bij tijd en wijle, mits een andere predikant gevonden wordt om de dienst waar te nemen.

Intussen verblijf ik, hooggeachte heer, met eerbiedige complimenten aan mevrouw uw gade en uw dochters

Uw welwillende vriend

William Collins