

Contents

Series Editor's Preface <i>Elinor Shaffer</i>	vii
Acknowledgements	xiii
List of Contributors	xv
Abbreviations	xix
Timeline: European Reception of Jane Austen <i>Anthony Mandal and Paul Barnaby</i>	xxi
Introduction <i>Anthony Mandal</i>	1
1 The Reception of Jane Austen's Novels in France and Switzerland: The Early Years, 1813–1828 <i>Isabelle Bour</i>	12
2 The Reception of Jane Austen in France: The Later Nineteenth Century, 1830–1900 <i>Isabelle Bour</i>	34
3 The Reception of Jane Austen in France in the Modern Period, 1901–2004: Recognition at Last? <i>Isabelle Bour</i>	54
4 Going Dutch: The Reception of Jane Austen in the Low Countries <i>Maximiliaan van Woudenberg</i>	74
5 The Reception of Jane Austen in Germany <i>Annika Bautz</i>	93
6 'Unconditional Surrender'? Jane Austen's Reception in Denmark <i>Peter Mortensen</i>	117

vi *Contents*

7	Jane Austen and Norway: Sharing the Long Road to Recognition <i>Marie Nedregotten Sørbo</i>	132
8	Jane Austen's Reception in Sweden: Irony as Criticism and Literary Value <i>Git Claesson Pipping and Eleanor Wikborg</i>	152
9	The Reception of Jane Austen in Finland <i>Ellen Välle</i>	169
10	Still the Great Forgotten? The Reception of Jane Austen in Spain <i>Aída Díaz Bild</i>	188
11	The Reception of Jane Austen in Italy <i>Beatrice Battaglia</i>	205
12	The Reception of Jane Austen in Greece <i>Katerina Kitsi-Mitakou and Maria Vara</i>	224
13	Jane Austen in Hungary <i>Nóra Séllei</i>	239
14	A Hidden but Prestigious Voice: Jane Austen's Fiction in Slovenia <i>Vanesa Matajč</i>	257
15	Between Bath and Bosnia: Jane Austen and Croatian Culture <i>Tatjana Jukić</i>	274
16	Jane Austen in Serbia, 1929–2000 <i>Svetozar Koljević</i>	290
17	Jane Austen: Persuading Romanian Readerships and Audiences <i>Mihaela Mudure</i>	304
18	The Reception of Jane Austen in Poland <i>Grażyna Bystydzińska</i>	319
19	The Reception of Jane Austen in Russia <i>Catharine Nepomnyashchy</i>	334
	Bibliography	350
	Index	341

Series Editor's Preface

The reception of British authors in Britain has in good part been studied; indeed, it forms our literary history. By contrast, the reception of British authors in Europe has not been examined in any systematic, long-term or large-scale way. With our volume on Jonathan Swift (2005), we altered our Series title to 'The Reception of British and Irish Authors in Europe', as a reminder that many writers previously travelling under the British flag may now be considered or claimed as belonging to the Republic of Ireland (1948), or Eire.

Walter Scott has stood both as British and as Scottish, both in the British Isles and abroad. But the name of Jane Austen is everywhere associated with 'Englishness'. The movement of her reputation from Englishwoman to world classic is a startling journey.

It is the aim of this Series to initiate and forward the study of the reception of British authors in continental Europe, or, as we would now say, the other parts of the Europe to which we also belong, rather than as isolated national histories with a narrow national perspective. The perspectives of other nations greatly add to our understanding of individual contributors to that history. The history of the reception of authors of the British Isles extends our knowledge of their capacity to stimulate and to call forth new responses, not only in their own disciplines but in wider fields and to diverse publics in a variety of historical circumstances. Often these responses provide quite unexpected and enriching insights into our own history, politics and culture. Individual works and personalities take on new dimensions and facets. They may also be subject to enlightening critiques. Our knowledge of our own writers is simply incomplete and inadequate without these reception studies.

By 'authors' we intend writers in any field whose works have been recognized as making a contribution to the intellectual and cultural history of our society. Thus the Series includes literary figures such as Laurence Sterne, Virginia Woolf and James Joyce, philosophers such as Francis Bacon and David Hume, historians and political figures such as Edmund Burke, and scientists such as Charles Darwin and Isaac Newton, whose works have had a broad impact on thinking in every field. In some cases individual works of the same author have dealt with different subjects, each with virtually its own reception history; so Burke's *Reflections on the French Revolution* (1790) was instantaneously translated and moulded thinking on the power struggles in the Europe of his own day; his youthful 'Essay on the Feeling of the Beautiful and Sublime' exerted a powerful influence on aesthetic thought and the practice of writing and remains a seminal work for certain genres of fiction. Similarly, each of

Laurence Sterne's two major works of fiction, *Tristram Shandy* and *A Sentimental Journey*, has its own history of reception, giving rise to a whole line of literary movements, innovative progeny and concomitant critical theory in most European countries. In the case of Scott, individual works struck out a line in different directions, with *Ivanhoe* and its Romantic medievalism perhaps the most popular single volume, yet the *Waverley Novels* as a group modelling the ambitious historical and realist novel of the nineteenth century. His success was immediate. By contrast, Jane Austen, at first publishing anonymously, appeared to be one of a very considerable number of women novelists of the time, some of whom, whether Mrs Radcliffe, Maria Edgeworth, Frances Burney, or indeed Lady Morgan, appeared more dazzling. Translated by other novelists, first into French in Switzerland, the author of *Anna* (the Teutonic Anne Elliot of *Persuasion*) was praised for her quietness, a woman's quality, yet her intellect was perceived to cultivate a variegated garden.

The research project examines the ways in which selected authors have been translated, published, distributed, read, reviewed and discussed on the continent of Europe. In doing so, it throws light not only on specific strands of intellectual and cultural history but also on the processes involved in the dissemination of ideas and texts. The project brings to bear the theoretical and critical approaches that have characterized the growing fields of reader response theory and reception studies in the last quarter of the twentieth century and into the twenty-first century. These critical approaches have illuminated the activity of the reader in bringing the text to life and stressed the changing horizons of the reading public or community of which the reader is a part.

The Series as presented to the British Academy and published by Continuum International Books is open-ended and multivolumed, each volume based on a particular author. The authors may be regarded according to their discipline, or looked at across disciplines within their period. Thus the reception of philosophers Bacon and Hume may be compared; or Hume may be considered as belonging to an eighteenth-century group that includes writers like Swift and Sterne, historians and political figures such as Gibbon and Burke. As the volumes accumulate they enrich each other and our awareness of the full context in which an individual author is received. The Swift volume shows that in many places Swift and Sterne were received at the same time, and viewed sometimes as a pair of witty ironists, and sometimes as opposites representing traditional satire on the one hand (Swift) and modern sentimentalism on the other (Sterne), and equally or diversely valued as a result. The Romantic poets, Byron, Shelley and Coleridge, were carried forward into mid-century nationalist movements and late-nineteenth-century symbolist movements. The *fin-de-siècle* aspects of Pater, early Yeats, Woolf and Joyce are interwoven in a wider European experience. In the twentieth century, Sterne was paired with Joyce as subversive of the novel form; and Joyce and Woolf became Modernists. These chronological shifts, bringing different authors and different works into view together, are common to the reception process, so often displacing or delaying them into an entirely new historical scene or set of circumstances. The kaleidoscope of reception displays and discovers new pairings and couplings, new milieux, new matches and mismatches, and, of course, new valuations.

In period terms one may discern within the Series a Romantic group; a

Victorian group; a *fin-de-siècle* and an early Modernist group. Period designations differ from discipline to discipline, and are shifting even within a discipline: Blake, who was a 'pre-Romantic' poet a generation ago, is now considered a fully fledged Romantic, and Beckford is edging in that direction. Virginia Woolf may be regarded as a *fin-de-siècle* aesthete and stylist whose affinities are with Pater or as an epoch-making Modernist like Joyce. Terms referring to period and style often vary from country to country. What happens to a 'Victorian' author transplanted to 'Wilhelmine' Germany? Are the English Metaphysical poets to be regarded as 'baroque' in continental terms, or will that term continue to be borrowed in English only for music, art and to an extent architecture? Is the 'Augustan' Swift a classicist in Italian terms, or an Enlightenment thinker in French terms?

Is Scott a Romantic poet and regional singer, or is he an astute Realist, in art as in politics? Jane Austen is a period puzzle, for she is coeval with 'the Romantics', yet the description hardly fits; she came of the eighteenth century, still in fact the major moulding experience of the nation even while a few members of an avant-garde attracted attention to themselves who were only much later given the group label 'Romantic' that most of them in their lifetimes had rejected. Continental critics of the novel referred to it simply as 'The Age of Scott and Austen'. It is most straightforward to classify them simply according to century, for the calendar is for the most part shared. But the various possible groupings provide a context for reception and enrich our knowledge of each author.

Division of each volume by country or by linguistic region is dictated by the historical development of Europe; each volume necessarily adopts a different selection of countries and regions, depending on period and on the specific reception of any given author. Countries or regions are treated either substantially, in several chapters or sections where this is warranted, for example, the French reception of Austen, Yeats, Woolf or Joyce, or on a moderate scale, or simply as a brief section. In some cases, where a rich reception is located that has not been reported or of which the critical community is not aware, more detailed coverage may be justified. In general, comparative studies have neglected Spain in favour of France, Germany and Italy, and this imbalance needs to be righted. For example, we have shown the reception of Woolf in the different linguistic communities of the Iberian peninsula, and given a detailed treatment of a play of Yeats in Catalan, Galician and Basque. Scott's presence in Spain is remarkably extensive and enduring. A whole submerged continent of women writers and translators may need to be rediscovered in order to redraw the comparative atlas. But brevity does not indicate lack of interest. Where separate coverage of any particular country or region is not justified by the extent of the reception, relevant material is incorporated into the bibliography and the Timeline. Thus an early translation may be noted, although there was subsequently a minimal response to the author or work, or a very long gap in the reception in that region.

The project also takes cognizance of the studies of the material history of the book that have begun to explore the production, publication and distribution of manuscripts and books. Increasingly, other media too are playing a role in these processes, and to the history of book illustration and painting, must be added

lantern slides (as in the popular versions of both Scott's and Dickens's works), stage, opera, cinema (whose early impact forms an important part of our H. G. Wells volume) and, more recently, television. Jane Austen's phenomenally successful reclothing in film, and especially television film, testifies to her classic status as much as to her popular appeal. It may be that television's distant intimacy is entirely suited to one who wrote in her parents' sitting room.

The study of material history forms a curious annexe, that is of the objects that form durable traces of the vogue for a particular author, which may be parts of him- or herself (as with the macabre story told in our Shelley volume of the wish to possess the poet's heart), or souvenir objects associated with his or her characters, or the more elaborate memorial gardens and graveyards such as linked Rousseau and Sterne in France. The Czartorysky princes acquired a blade of dried grass said to be from Ossian's battlefield. Scott's spanking new Romantic 'castle' at Abbotsford (like those more ancient piles named in his novels) became a place of pilgrimage. Today Edward Austen's Chawton House, within the grounds of which Austen made her own home, is restored to literary activity. The author's own image may achieve iconic status, as with Byron 'in Albanian dress', yet tell us no more than Jane Austen's mob cap. The significance of such cults and cult objects requires further analysis as the examples multiply and diversify.

This kind of material will be fully described in the database (see below). It is, of course, always possible, and indeed to be hoped and expected that further aspects of reception will later be uncovered, and the long-term research project forwarded, through this initial information. Reception studies often display an author's intellectual and political impact and reveal effects abroad that are unfamiliar to the author's compatriots. Thus, Byron, for example, had the power of carrying and incarnating liberal political thought to regimes and institutions to whom it was anathema; it is less well known that Sterne had the same effect, and that both were charged with erotically tinged subversion; and that Pater suggested a style of aesthetic sensibility in which sensation took precedence over moral values. Woolf came to be an icon for women writers in countries where there was little tradition of women's writing. By the same token, the study of censorship, or more broadly impediments to dissemination, and of modes of circumventing control, becomes an important aspect of reception studies. In Bacon studies, the process of dissemination of his ideas through the private correspondence of organized circles was vital. Certain presses and publishers also play a role, and the study of modes of secret distribution under severe penalty is a particularly fascinating subject, whether in Catholic Europe or Soviet Russia. Much translation was carried out in prisons. Irony and aesopian devices, and audience alertness to them, are highly developed under controlling regimes. A surprising number of authors live more dangerously abroad than at home. Scott's central figures, like Waverley, who were able to see both sides, were attacked as gentry standing above conflict, but also embraced as vital 'focal consciences'. Austen was gradually understood to be an ironist, subtly decentring her astutely observed characters who required no world-historical events to show their true colours. Translators began to vary the tones accordingly. Yet it required the Marxist consciousness of György Lukács, the great twentieth-century Hungarian critic, to formulate the characteristics of the

classic critical realist novel of the nineteenth century, which whatever the political or social views of the writer set forth the *comédie humaine* for all to see. Into this great company, with Scott and Balzac and Tolstoy, Austen enters and takes her place.

Translation itself may provide a mode of evading censure. There is probably no more complex and elaborated example in the annals of Europe of the use of translation to invent new movements, styles and political departures than that of Ossian, which became itself a form of 'pseudo-translation', that is works by writers masquerading under pseudonyms suggestive of 'dangerous' foreigners but providing safety for mere 'translators'. 'Ossian' became the cover name for new initiatives, as 'Byron' flew the flag of liberation. If Henry James turned self-censorship into an art of civilization, Austen's civilized self-mastery assumes the form of nature.

New electronic technology makes it possible to undertake reception studies on this scale. An extensive database stores information about editions, translations, accompanying critical prefaces or afterwords, illustrations, biographies and correspondence, early reviews, important essays and book-length studies of the authors, and comments, citations and imitations or reworkings, including satire and pastiche by other writers. Some, as often Pater, live in the echoes of their style as understood in another language. Some authors achieve the status of fictional characters in other writers' works; in other cases, their characters do, like Sterne's uncle Toby, Trim and his own alter ego Yorick; or even their characters' family members, as in the memorable tale by a major Hungarian contemporary writer chronicling the early career and writings of the (Hungarian) father of Joyce's Leopold Bloom. No one was so often mistaken for a character in his own works than Byron.

The recording of full details of translations and translators is a particular concern, since often the names of translators are not supplied, or their identity is concealed behind pseudonyms or false attributions. The nature of the translation is often a determining factor in the reception of a work or an author; yet often the work was translated from a language other than English. The database also records the character and location of rare works. Selected texts and passages are included, together with English translations. The database can be searched for a variety of further purposes, potentially yielding a more complete picture of the interactions of writers, translators, critics, publishers and public across Europe in different periods from the Renaissance to the present.

Dr Elinor Shaffer, FBA
Director, Research Project
The Reception of British and Irish Authors in Europe



List of Contributors

Beatrice Battaglia is Associate Professor of English Literature at the University of Bologna. She is the author of *La zitella illetterata: parodia e ironia nei romanzi di Jane Austen* (1983), *La critica alla cultura occidentale nella letteratura distopica inglese* (2006); and editor of *Jane Austen: oggi e ieri* (2002) and *Re-Drawing Austen: Picturesque Travels in Austenland* (2004, with Diego Saglia). She recently completed a monograph on Ann Radcliffe and is currently working on eighteenth-century comedy.

Annika Bautz gained her doctorate in English Literature from the University of Newcastle, and is a Teaching Fellow in English at the University of Keele. She is currently completing a monograph, entitled *The Reception of Jane Austen and Walter Scott*, for Continuum, and is working on a study of the marketing and reception of Regency and Victorian novelists.

Aída Díaz Bild is Professor of English Literature at the University of La Laguna, Spain. Her scholarly interests focus on contemporary British fiction and eighteenth-century women's writing. She is the author of *Aspectos metonímicos en la obra de David Lodge* (1991), *Humor y literatura: entre la subversión y la liberación* (2000), *Charlotte Smith: la escritura como liberación* (2003), and co-author of *Ensayos sobre metaficción inglesa* (1994).

Isabelle Bour holds a PhD from the University of the Sorbonne nouvelle and is Professor of English at the University of Tours. Much of her recent work has been devoted to the epistemology of fiction between 1760 and 1830. She has edited *Maria, ou le malheur d'être femme*, the 1798 translation of Mary Wollstonecraft's *Maria, or the Wrongs of Woman* (2005), and her article 'Sensibility as Epistemology in *Caleb Williams*, *Waverley* and *Frankenstein*' was published in *Studies in English Literature 1500–1900* in 2005.

Grażyna Bystydzieńska is Head of the English Literature Department at the University of Warsaw. She has written monographs on the English mock-heroic poem of the eighteenth century, Edward Young and Laurence Sterne, and various articles on eighteenth-century and Romantic British literature. Her current research looks at the presentation of landscape by Milton and other eighteenth-century English writers.

Tatjana Jukić teaches in the English Department, University of Zagreb,

Croatia. She is the author of *Zazor, nadzor, svidjanje: dodiri književnog i vizualnog u britanskom 19. stoljeću* (2002). Her research interests include Victorian and twentieth-century art and literature, and critical theory.

Katerina Kitsi-Mitakou is Assistant Professor in the School of English, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki. Her research focuses on the English novel, as well as on feminist and body theory. Her book *Feminist Readings of the Body in Virginia Woolf's Novels* was published in 1997. She is currently working on Enlightenment sexualities and Defoe's novels, and co-editing a collection of essays entitled *The Flesh Made Text Made Flesh* (2006).

Svetozar Koljević has taught English and Comparative Literature at the Universities of Sarajevo and Novi Sad, and has been Visiting Professor at a number of universities. He is a member of the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts, and of the Academy of Sciences and Arts of the Republic of Srpska. His publications include *Yugoslav Short Stories* (1966), *Humor i mit* (1968), *The Epic in the Making* (1980), *Hirovi romana* (1988) and *Vječna zublja* (2006).

Anthony Mandal is Lecturer in English Literature at Cardiff University. His research focuses on the Romantic novel, book history and the Gothic. He is editor of the journal *Romantic Textualities: Literature and Print Culture, 1780–1840*, co-editor of *The English Novel, 1830–1836* (2003) and developer of *British Fiction, 1800–29: A Database of Production, Circulation & Reception* (2004). His monograph, *Jane Austen and the Popular Novel: The Determined Author*, is to be published by Palgrave in 2007.

Vanesa Matajč received her doctoral degree in 2003 at the Department of Comparative Literature at the University of Ljubljana, where she lectures on world literature, literary theory and the methodology of literary studies. Her publications include *Osvetljave*, a study of contemporary Slovene fiction, as well as discussions of existentialism, symbolism and the modern Slovene historical novel.

Peter Mortensen was educated in Denmark and the United States, and is currently Associate Professor of English at Aarhus University, where he teaches modern British and American literature and culture. He is the author of essays on Romantic, post-Romantic and Modernist literature and also of *British Romanticism and Continental Influences: Writing in an Age of Europhobia* (2004). His current research projects include an investigation of the complex interchanges between British and Nordic versions of Romanticism.

Mihaela Mudure is Reader at Babes-Bolyai University in Cluj-Napoca. She teaches courses in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century British literature, and has published extensively in Romania and abroad. She is the editor of *These Women Who Wanted to Be Authors* (2001) and *Ispitiri, trecute vremi* (2002), a selection of essays on seventeenth- and eighteenth-century British literature. She is currently preparing a translation into Romanian of Frances Brooke's *The History of Emily Montague*.

Catharine Nepomnyashchy is Professor and Chair of the Slavic Department at Barnard College and Director of the Harriman Institute at Columbia University. Her research interests include Aleksandr Pushkin, Andrei Sinyavsky, modern Russian literature and popular culture, and Russian women's studies. She is the author of *Abram Tertz and the Poetics of Crime* (1995) and co-editor of *Under the Sky of My Africa: Alexander Pushkin and Blackness* (2006).

Git Claesson Pipping is Lecturer in Gender Studies at Södertörn University College. Her published work includes *Könet som läsanvisning* (1993), a study of the Swedish reception of George Eliot between 1859 and 1895. Her second book (forthcoming) is on professional women's biographies. Her current research concentrates on identity formation within Finland's Swedish-speaking women's movement at the turn of the nineteenth century.

Nóra Séllei is Reader at the Department of British Studies of the Institute of English and American Studies, University of Debrecen. Her research focuses on gender studies and feminist literary theory. Her publications include *Katherine Mansfield and Virginia Woolf: A Personal and Professional Bond* (1996), *Lánnyá válik, s írni kezd* (1999) and *Tükröm, tükröm . . .* (2001). She is editor of the Hungarian feminist series *Artemisz Könyvek*, co-editor of *HJEAS*, and has translated works by Virginia Woolf and Jean Rhys.

Marie Nedregotten Sørbo is Assistant Professor of English Literature at Volda University College, Norway. She is currently completing her doctoral thesis on film adaptations of Jane Austen's novels, and has written a number of articles on the reception of Jane Austen in Norway and Scandinavia. Her recent publications include 'Can Narrative Irony Be Preserved on Film? A Comment on Four Adaptations' (2005) and *Adapting Austen: A Discussion of Some Problems of Adapting Ironic Novels for the Screen* (2006).

Brian Southam taught at the University of London before becoming an academic publisher. His principal contribution to Austen studies has been in pioneering the study of the literary manuscripts, beginning with *Jane Austen's Literary Manuscripts* (1964, 1966, 2001) and with editions of *Volume the Second*, *Sanditon* and *Sir Charles Grandison*. Forthcoming is a comprehensive edition of *Jane Austen's Later Literary Manuscripts*. He has also made a major contribution to reception studies in his two volumes of *Jane Austen: The Critical Heritage, 1811–1940* (1968, 1987).

Ellen Valle is currently Senior Lecturer in the Department of English at the University of Turku; her previous position, for almost twenty years, was in the Department of Translation Studies. Her primary field of research is the history of scientific writing, currently focusing on the epistolary genre in eighteenth-century natural history. She also researches and teaches eighteenth- and nineteenth-century fiction, in particular by women writers.

Maria Vara is currently a doctoral candidate in the School of English, Aristotle University, Thessaloniki, Greece, where she teaches courses in writing and

fiction. She has published articles on detective fiction, the Gothic and the fairy tale, most recently contributing to a collection of essays called *Metanarrative and Metahistory in Contemporary Women's Writing* to be published by Palgrave.

Eleanor Wikborg is Professor Emerita at Stockholm University. She has published articles on Jane Barker and Charlotte Smith in *Genre and English Studies*, as well as *The Lover as Father-Figure in Eighteenth-Century Women's Fiction* (2002). She has also published within the field of textual linguistics and composition in both Swedish and English, and has written a number of textbooks, including *Reading Texts: An Introduction to Strategies of Interpretation* (co-authored with Danuta Fjellestad, 1995).

Maximiliaan van Woudenberg is Professor of Communications at the Sheridan Institute of Technology in Oakville, Canada. His research situates the cross-cultural information interchange between British and continental Romantics, against the backdrop of early nineteenth-century media culture. He is the author of several articles on Coleridge's activities at the University of Göttingen and is currently completing a monograph on Coleridge and the German University.

Abbreviations

The following abbreviations of titles of works by and about Jane Austen are used throughout the book. The edition used for quotations of Austen's novels is R. W. Chapman's *The Novels of Jane Austen*, 3rd edn, 5 vols, London; New York; Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1965–69 [originally published 1932–34]. Citations from the minor works are taken from vol. 6 of *The Novels of Jane Austen*, ed. Chapman and revised by B. C. Southam, London; New York; Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1969 [originally published 1954].

References to Austen's works are to the original volume and chapter, followed by the relevant page numbers of Chapman's edition.

<i>BJA</i>	David Gilson, <i>A Bibliography of Jane Austen</i> [1982], Winchester: St Paul's Bibliographies; Newcastle, DE: Oak Knoll Press, 1997.
<i>CH</i>	Brian Southam (ed.), <i>Jane Austen: The Critical Heritage</i> , vol. 1, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1968.
<i>E</i>	Jane Austen, <i>Emma</i> (1816), <i>Novels of Jane Austen</i> , vol. 4.
<i>JAL</i>	Deirdre Le Faye, <i>Jane Austen's Letters</i> [1932], 3rd edn, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.
<i>LS</i>	Jane Austen, <i>Lady Susan</i> (c.1795), <i>MW</i> , pp. 243–313.
<i>MP</i>	Jane Austen, <i>Mansfield Park</i> (1814), <i>Novels of Jane Austen</i> , vol. 3.
<i>MW</i>	Jane Austen, <i>Minor Works</i> .
<i>NA</i>	Jane Austen, <i>Northanger Abbey</i> (1818), <i>Novels of Jane Austen</i> , vol. 5.
<i>P</i>	Jane Austen, <i>Persuasion</i> (1818), <i>Novels of Jane Austen</i> , vol. 5.
<i>PP</i>	Jane Austen, <i>Pride and Prejudice</i> (1813), <i>Novels of Jane Austen</i> , vol. 2.
<i>S</i>	Jane Austen, <i>Sanditon</i> , <i>MW</i> , pp. 363–427.
<i>SS</i>	Jane Austen, <i>Sense and Sensibility</i> (1811), <i>Novels of Jane Austen</i> , vol. 1.
<i>W</i>	Jane Austen, <i>The Watsons</i> , <i>MW</i> , pp. 314–63.



Timeline: European Reception of Jane Austen

Anthony Mandal and Paul Barnaby

In addition to the bibliographies provided by the contributors, this Timeline draws on UNESCO'S Index Translationum and the national libraries of the Czech Republic, Estonia, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Slovakia and Spain.

Year	Translations	Criticism	Other
1775			Austen is born on 16 December
1787–93			Austen writes juvenilia
1795			<i>LS</i> written
1804			<i>W</i> written
1811			<i>SS</i> published
1813	First translation into French (Switzerland): Extracts from <i>PP</i> in Genevan journal <i>La Bibliothèque britannique</i>		<i>PP</i> published
1814			<i>MP</i> published
1815	France: <i>SS</i> (Montolieu) Switzerland (French): Extracts from <i>MP</i> in <i>La Bibliothèque britannique</i>		
1816	France: <i>E</i> ; complete <i>MP</i> (both anon.)	Germany: English <i>E</i> reviewed in <i>Morgenblatt für gebildete Stände</i> and <i>Jenaische Allgemeine Literaturzeitung</i> Russia: English <i>E</i> reviewed in <i>Vestnik Evropy</i>	
1817			<i>S</i> written; Austen dies on 18 July
1818			<i>NA</i> , <i>P</i> (first signed work) published

Year	Translations	Criticism	Other
1821	France: <i>P</i> (Montolieu); complete <i>PP</i> (Perks)	France: Pigoreau's <i>Petite Bibliographie biographico-romancière</i> notes success in translation of <i>E</i> , <i>MP</i> , <i>SS</i> , and particularly <i>P</i>	
1822	First German translation: <i>P</i> (Lindau) Switzerland (French): <i>PP</i> (anon.)	France: Pigoreau, Second and third supplements to the <i>Petite Bibliographie</i> Germany: Lindau's <i>P</i> reviewed in <i>Morgenblatt für gebildete Stände, Wegweiser im Gebiete der Künste und Wissenschaften</i> and <i>Zeitung für die elegante Welt</i>	
1823–31			Russia: Pushkin, <i>Eugene Onegin</i>
1824	France: <i>NA</i> (Ferrières)		
1828		France: Marc, <i>Supplément au dictionnaire des romans</i>	
1830	Germany: First <i>PP</i> (Marezoll)		
1831		Germany: Marezoll's <i>PP</i> reviewed in <i>Jenaische Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung</i> and <i>Blätter für literarische Unterhaltung</i>	
1832		Germany: Anon., <i>Brockhaus der Zeit und Literatur</i>	
1833			Austen's novels published in Bentley's 'Standard Novels' series
1836	First Swedish translation: <i>P</i> (Westdahl)		
1839		France: Saint-Fargeau, <i>Revue des romans</i>	
1842		France: P. Chasles, 'Du roman en Angleterre depuis Walter Scott'	
1844		Germany: Ersch/Gruber (eds) <i>Allgemeine Encyclopädie der Wissenschaften und Künste</i>	
1849		France: Champion, <i>Etudes littéraires</i>	
1850		France: P. Chasles, <i>Etudes sur la littérature et les mœurs de l'Angleterre au XIXe siècle</i>	
1854		Russia: Druzhinin, 'Pis'ma inogorodnogo podpishchika ob angliiskoi literature i zhurnatlistike'	

1857	Sweden: First <i>E</i> (anon.; through 1858)	
1855	First Danish translation: SS (Karup; through 1856)	
1863		France: Taine, <i>Histoire de la littérature anglaise</i> (through 1864)
1864		Germany: Anon., <i>Brockhaus Conversations-Lexikon</i>
		Germany: Tauchnitz publishes edition of novels in English (through 1877)
1870		France: Guizot's praise of Austen reported in Austen-Leigh's <i>Memoir of Jane Austen</i>
1871		Russia: Tsebrikova, 'Anglichanki romanistki'
1876		France: Bougeault, <i>Histoire des littératures étrangères</i>
		Sweden: Austen praised in <i>Nordisk familjebok</i>
1877	France: Extract from <i>E</i> in E. Chasles's anthology <i>Extraits des classiques anglais</i>	
1878		France: Boucher, 'Le roman classique en Angleterre: Jane Austen'
1880		France: Demogeot, <i>Histoire des littératures étrangères</i>
1882	France: New <i>P</i> (Letorsay)	France: (1) Forgues, 'Femmes de lettres en Angleterre: Jane Austen' (2) Testard, <i>Histoire de la littérature anglaise depuis ses origines jusqu'à nos jours</i>
1883		France: Filon, <i>Histoire de la littérature anglaise depuis ses origines jusqu'à nos jours</i>
		Germany: Engel, <i>Geschichte der englischen Literatur</i>
1896		France: Jusserand, <i>Histoire abrégée de la littérature anglaise</i>
1897		Germany: Arnstein, 'Der Anteil der Frauen an der englischen Romanliteratur'
1898	France: New <i>NA</i> (Fénéon)	France: Duret, 'Miss Austen'
1899		Germany: Körting, <i>Grundriss der Geschichte der englischen Literatur</i>
1901		Denmark: Clausen (ed.), <i>Illustreret verdenslitteraturhistorie</i>
1902		Norway: Anderssen, <i>A Short History of English Literature</i>

Year	Translations	Criticism	Other
1910	France: New <i>E</i> (Puliga)	Germany: Frankenberger's thesis 'Jane Austen und die Entwicklung des englischen bürgerlichen Romans im 18. Jahrhundert' (Jena) Russia: Baring, <i>Landmarks in Russian Literature</i>	
1914		France: K. and P. Rague, <i>Jane Austen</i> Italy: Bassi, <i>Medaglioni letterari: la vita e le opere di Jane Austen e George Eliot</i> Sweden: Hallström, 'En klassisk fruntimmersroman'	
1915		France: Villard, <i>Jane Austen: sa vie et son œuvre 1775–1817</i> Italy: Cecchi, <i>Storia della letteratura inglese nel secolo XIX</i> Sweden: Malling, 'Jane Austen'	
1917		Norway: Undset, 'Hundrede aar: fra Jane Austen til Henrik Ibsen'	
1919	First translation into Spanish: <i>P</i> (Ortega y Gasset)	France: Larbaud praises <i>PP</i> in diary	
1920	Sweden: First <i>PP</i> (Ringenson)		
1921	Spain: First <i>NA</i> (Oyarzábal)		
1922	First translation into Dutch: <i>SS</i> (Uildriks) First Finnish translation: <i>PP</i> (Joutsen)		
1924	Spain: First <i>PP</i> (Urries y Azara)	France: Legouis and Cazamian, <i>Histoire de la littérature anglaise</i>	
1925		General: Rowland-Brown, 'Jane Austen Abroad'	
1928	Denmark: First <i>PP</i> (Brusendorff; through 1930)	Poland: Tretiak, <i>Literatura angielska w okresie romantyzmu</i>	
1929	First translation into Serbo-Croat (Serbia): <i>P</i> (Janković)	Denmark: Møller, <i>Verdenslitteraturen</i> Hungary: Szerb, <i>Az angol irodalom kis tükré</i> Norway: Bing, <i>Verdenslitteraturhistorie</i>	
1930	First Norwegian translation: <i>PP</i> (Harbitz)		
1932	First Czech translation: <i>SS</i> (Horská)		General: R. W. Chapman (ed.),

The Novels of Jane Austen (through 1933)

- First Italian translation:**
PP (Caprin)
France: New *PP* (Leconte and Pressoir)
- 1933 **France:** New *E* (P. and E. Saint-Segond)
- 1934 **First Hungarian translation:** *PP* (Hevesi through 1936)
First Polish translation: *SS* (Sujkowska)
Czechoslovakia (Czech): First *E* (Hrůša)
- 1935 **Poland:** Dyboski, 'Wielcy powieściopisarze angielscy XIX wieku z perspektywy dzisiejszej'
- 1936 **France:** Green praises *SS* in diary
- 1937 **Finland:** Railo, *Yleisen kirjallisuuden historia*
- 1939 **Germany:** New *PP* (Schab)
Greece: Delios, *Tō sinhrono mithistorima*
Netherlands: Kloos-Reyneke van Stuwe, 'Jane Austen: een der meest beroemde engelse schrijfsters uit den tijd van Walter Scott'
- 1940 **General:** Screen adaptation of *PP* (dir. Leonard)
- 1941 **First translation into Portuguese (Brazil):** *PP* (L. Cardoso; reprinted in Portugal, 1969)
Hungary: Szerb, *A világirodalom története*
- 1942 **Spain:** New *P* (anon.)
Spain: First *SS* (Moré)
Denmark: Mikkelsen, *Foregangskvinder i engelsk litteratur*
- 1943 **First European Portuguese translations:** *NA* (Donas-Boto), *PP* (E. Cardoso and Serpa), and *SS* (Mendes)
First Romanian translation: *PP* (Nenişor)
Spain: First *MP* (Villalonga); new *PP* (Berenguer)
- 1944 **Portugal:** First *E* (Parreira Alves) and *P* (Ferreira)
Spain: New *PP* (Molino)
- 1945 **Belgium (French):** *E*, *PP*, *SS* (all Rocart), *MP* (Bercy)
Sweden: Enehjelm, *Vandring med favoriter*

Year	Translations	Criticism	Other
	Denmark: First <i>LS</i> (Kruuse) France: New <i>P</i> (Belamich) Italy: First 2 <i>E</i> (Casalino, Tedeschi), first <i>P</i> (Casalino), first <i>SS</i> (Levi); new <i>PP</i> (Castellini and Rosi) Spain: First <i>E</i> (Bofill y Ferro); 3 new <i>NA</i> (Larios, Masoliver, 'S.L.C.'), 2 new <i>P</i> (Larios, Morales), and 3 new <i>PP</i> (anon., Larios, Lengotita)		
1946	Belgium (Dutch): First Dutch <i>PP</i> (Verachttert) Belgium (French): <i>E</i> (Dulac), new <i>PP</i> (Shops and Séverac) Czechoslovakia (Czech): First <i>PP</i> (Noska) France: New <i>PP</i> (Privat) Spain: New <i>NA</i> (anon.) and <i>SS</i> (Durán)		
1947	Sweden: New <i>PP</i> (Olzon) Finland: New <i>PP</i> (Norko-Turja) France: New <i>PP</i> (Castier) Norway: New <i>PP</i> (Knutsen) Spain: New <i>P</i> (Montenegro)	Hungary: Hatvany, 'Jane Austen'	
1948	France: New <i>PP</i> (Lalande) and <i>SS</i> (Privat) Germany: First <i>NA</i> ; new <i>P</i> and <i>PP</i> (all Rauchenberger) Spain: New <i>P</i> (anon.) Switzerland (French): <i>SS</i> (Castier) Switzerland (German): <i>PP</i> (Krämer)		
1949	Belgium/Netherlands: First Dutch <i>E</i> (Schröder) Czechoslovakia (Czech): New <i>PP</i> (Šimková) Portugal: New <i>PP</i> (Ferreira) Spain: New <i>PP</i> (anon.)		France: Danchin, <i>Jane Austen: Chapters from her Novels</i>
1950	First Greek translation: <i>PP</i> (Papayianni) Finland: First <i>E</i> (Brotherus) Italy: New <i>SS</i> (Minozzi)	Finland: Pennanen, 'Onko Jane Austen nero?' Germany: Franz, 'Jane Austen und George Eliot: Zwei Antipoden im englischen Frauenroman' (thesis, Kiel)	

- 1951 **First translation into Slovene:** Extracts from *SS* (Grahor-Škerlj)
Finland: First *P* (Kivivuori)
Germany (West): *PP* (Holscher)
Italy: New *E* (Praz) First
- 1952 **Denmark:** New *PP* (Plon)
Finland: First *SS* (Brotherus)
Italy: New *E* (Maurier), *P* (Agosti Castellani), and *PP* (Minozzi)
Spain: New *PP* (Nos Gray)
- 1953 **Finland:** First *NA* (Pennanen)
Italy: New *E* (Orso)
Netherlands: First Dutch *P* (Brunt)
Serbia: First *PP* (Janković)
Spain: New *NA* (anon.) First
France: King, 'Jane Austen in France' (through 1954)
Russia: Elistratova's entry on Austen in *Istoriya angliiskoi literatury*
- 1954 **Finland:** First *MP* (Koskimies)
France: New *PP* (Clarence)
Italy: New *E* (Maffi)
Serbia: First *E* (D. and J. Stojanović)
Spain: New *MP* (Balil Gíro)
Sweden: New *P* (Lundblad)
- 1955 **Portugal:** New *P* (Cidrais)
Serbia: First *MP* (Curčija-Prodanović)
Germany (East): Neubert, 'Die entwicklung der "Erlebten Rede" im bürgerlichen englischen Roman von Jane Austen bis Virginia Woolf' (thesis, Leipzig)
- 1956 **First Icelandic translation:** *PP* (anon.)
Belgium (Dutch): First Dutch *NA* (Jacobs)
Poland: First *PP* (Przedpeńska-Trzeciakowska)
Portugal: New *NA* (Fernanda) and *PP* (Natividade Gaspar)
Spain: 2 new *PP* (Durán, Santisteban)
Sweden: New *E* (Bergvall)
France: Green praises *E* in diary

Year	Translations	Criticism	Other
1957	Italy: 2 new <i>PP</i> (Migliarini, Silvestri) Spain: New <i>PP</i> (Lázaro Ros)	Hungary: Babits, <i>Az európai irodalom története</i>	
1958	Denmark: First <i>E</i> (Kastor Hansen) Hungary: New <i>PP</i> (Szenczi) Italy: New <i>PP</i> (Chini)		Slovenia: Šuklje, 'Ponos in predsodki Jane Austen' (radio broadcast)
1959	Italy: First <i>NA</i> (Pintacuda); new <i>PP</i> (Pino) Serbia: First <i>NA</i> (S. and N. Kršić), first <i>SS</i> (Simeonović) Sweden: First <i>SS</i> (Elliott)		
1960	Greece: First <i>P</i> (Alexiou-Proteou); 2 new <i>PP</i> (Alexiou-Proteou, 'P.V.') (all approx. date)	Italy: Praz, <i>Storia della letteratura inglese</i>	
1961	Germany (West): First German <i>E</i> (Henze) Italy: First <i>MP</i> (Bonacossa), new <i>NA</i> (Bianconcini), 2 new <i>P</i> (Cardone Cattaneo, Ceronne), new <i>SS</i> (Boffito Serra) Portugal: New <i>SS</i> (Costa Pires)	Italy: Izzo, <i>Storia della letteratura inglese</i>	Russia: <i>PP</i> published in English
1962	First Croat translation: <i>E</i> (D. and J. Stojanović) Italy: New <i>P</i> (Chini) Poland: First <i>P</i> (Przedpelska-Trzeciakowska)		
1963	Italy: New <i>E</i> (Brusasca) Poland: First <i>E</i> (Dmochowska) Portugal: New <i>E</i> (Costa Pires) and <i>NA</i> ('M.C.') Spain: New <i>PP</i> (Pinyana)		
1964	Netherlands: New <i>PP</i> (Praag-van Praag) Serbia: New <i>PP</i> (Simić)		
1965	Germany (East): <i>E</i> (Höckendorf), <i>PP</i> (Beyer) Italy: New <i>MP</i> (Chini and Bianconcini) Spain: New <i>SS</i> (anon.)	Belgium: Servotte, 'Emma and Middlemarch: twee auteurromans'	
1966	Italy: New <i>PP</i> (Iginia) Switzerland (German): <i>P</i> (Leisi)	Croatia: Beker, 'The Theme of Plain Honesty in English Literature: from the Renaissance to Jane Austen'	

- 1967 **First Russian translation:** **Russia:** Bel'skiĭ, 'Nravoopisatel'nyĭ roman PP (Marshak; introd. Demurova)
Czechoslovakia (Czech): New PP (Kondrysová)
Greece: First SS (Papanikolaou)
Italy: New E (Comucci)
- 1968 **First translation into Slovak:** PP (Košťál)
Czechoslovakia (Czech): First P (Ruxová)
Germany (East): P (Reichel)
Hungary: First MP (Réz)
Italy: New E (Virgili) and PP (Balboni)
Romania: New PP (Almăgeanu)
Slovenia: First PP (Stanovnik) and first E (Prajs; through 1969)
Switzerland (German): MP (Fein)
- 1969 **Belgium (Dutch):** New PP (Carette)
Hungary: First E (Csanak)
Italy: New PP (Corsini) and SS (Sorani)
- 1970 **Norway:** New PP (E. and E. Hauge)
Spain: 2 new PP (anon.; Misiego)
- 1971 **Belgium (Dutch):** New SS
Spain: New E (López Muñoz)
- 1972 **Czechoslovakia (Slovak):** First P (Vojtek)
Germany (East): First German SS (Gröger)
Romania: First SS (Mareş)
Spain: New E (Pitol)
- Russia:** Bel'skiĭ, 'Nravoopisatel'nyĭ roman Dzheĭn Ostin'
- Czechoslovakia (Czech):** Bryner, *Božena Němcová and Jane Austen*
Russia: Bel'skiĭ, *Angliiskiiĭ roman 1800–1810*
- General:** Robbins, 'Without the Gift of Tongues'
- Romania:** Matache, 'Metoda narativ oblică şi stilul indirect liber în romanul: *Emma* de Jane Austen' and 'Stilul indirect liber în romanul: *Emma* (1814) de Jane Austen'
- Germany (West):** Stegmaier, 'Die Auflösung der Szene im Übergang vom traditionellen zum modernen englischen Roman' (thesis, Tübingen)
- Italy:** Donini, 'Jane Austen in Italy'
- Poland:** Dobrzycka, 'Austen Jane'
- Russia:**
(1) Bayley, *Pushkin: A Comparative Commentary*
(2) Ivasheva, 'Dva romana Dzheĭn Ousten'
- Hungary:** Szobotka, 'Jane Austen'
- Norway:** Krabbe, 'Engelsk litteratur' Russia
- Russia/Latvia:** Amelina, 'Parodii Dzheĭn Ostin', and 'Rol' peisazha i bytovogo fona v romanakh Dzheĭn Osten'
- General:** Screen adaptation of *E* (dir. Glenister)

Year	Translations	Criticism	Other
1973	Spain: 3 new <i>PP</i> (anon., Costa Clavell, Villamuera de Castro)	Italy: (1) Battaglia, 'Ironia e "tecnica" narrativa nei romanzi di Jane Austen' (through 1974) (2) Nerozzi, <i>Jane Austen</i> Russia: Amelina, 'Problema realizma v tvorchestve Dzheĭn Osten (metod i stil')'	
1974	Denmark: First <i>MP</i> Kastor Hansen) and new <i>SS</i> (Hemmer Hansen)	France: Gilson, 'Serial Publication of Jane Austen in French' Italy: Sabbadini, 'L'avorio ideologico di Jane Austen' Russia: Ivasheva, 'Nesravnennaya Dzheĭn'	
1975	Denmark: First <i>NA</i> (Pihl) and <i>P</i> (Hemmer Hansen) Italy: New <i>PP</i> (Maranesi) Poland: First <i>NA</i> (Przedpelska-Trzeciakowska) Portugal: New <i>PP</i> (Ferreira de Lima)	General: Wright, 'Jane Austen Abroad' France: Goubert, <i>Jane Austen: étude psychologique de la romancière</i> Hungary: Szabó, 'A csípős nyelvű kisasszony: Jane Austen'	
1976	Hungary: First <i>SS</i> (Borbás) Romania: First <i>NA</i> (Popa) Serbia: Collected Novels (through 1977), incl. new <i>P</i> (Bauer-Protić)	Italy: Colaiacomo, 'Jane Austen: "nessuna speranza da Birmingham"' (through 1977)	
1977	Finland: First <i>S</i> (Helanen-Ahtola) Germany (West): New <i>PP</i> (C. and U. Grawe) Poland: New <i>SS</i> (Przedpelska-Trzeciakowska) Romania: First <i>E</i> (Roşu) Sweden: First <i>S</i> (Bergvall)	France: Teyssandier, <i>Les Formes de la création romanesque à l'époque de Walter Scott et de Jane Austen 1814-1820</i> Netherlands: Luijters, <i>Jane Austen</i> Poland: Spittal, 'The Use of Summary and Scene in Jane Austen's Novels' Romania: Constantinescu, 'The Living Pattern of Jane Austen's Novels'	
1978	Denmark: New <i>E</i> (Pihl) Finland: First <i>W</i> (Mäkelä) Italy: New <i>NA</i> (Banti) Spain: New <i>E</i> (Valverde)	France: Coustillas Petit and Raimond, <i>Le Roman anglais au XIXe siècle</i> Hungary: Gyergyai, 'Jane Austen nálunk' Italy: Bompiani, <i>Lo spazio narrante: Jane Austen, Emily Bronte, Sylvia Plath</i>	

- 1979 **Croatia:** First *SS* (Mihaljević and Grgić)
Germany (West): New *E* (Klinckowstroem)
Italy: First juvenilia (Ciotti Miller)
- 1980 **First Bulgarian translation:** *PP* (Božlova)
France: *LS, S, W*; new *NA* (all Salesse-Lavergne)
Germany (East): *NA* (Agricola)
Germany (West): New *E* (C. and U. Grawe)
Hungary: First *P* (Róna)
Netherlands: New *E* (Polderman-de Vries) and *PP* (Dorsman-Vos)
Romania: First *P* (Popa)
- 1981 **France:** New *PP* (Getzler)
Germany (West): New *NA* (C. and U. Grawe)
Portugal: New *SS* (Ferreira Costa)
Switzerland (German): *E* (Leisi)
- 1982 **Czechoslovakia (Czech):** New *E* (Kondrysová)
France: New *E* (Salesse-Lavergne)
Germany (West): New *SS* (C. and U. Grawe)
Italy: 2 new *NA* (Gaia, Zazo)
Netherlands: New *SS* (Dorsman-Vos)
Spain: New *E* (Pujol)
- 1983 **Czechoslovakia (Czech):** First *NA* (Kondrysová)
Germany (West): New *P* (C. and U. Grawe)
Hungary: First *NA* (Borbás)
Italy: New *MP* (Buffa di Castelferro)
Spain: New *NA* (Lorenzo)
- 1984 **France:** Juvenilia (Salesse-Lavergne)
Germany (West): First German *MP* (C. and U. Grawe)
Netherlands: First Dutch *MP* (Dorsman-Vos)
Romania: New *P* (Róna)
Spain: First *LS* (Cohen)
- Denmark:** Petersen (ed.), *On the First Sentence of 'Pride and Prejudice'*
Russia: Chechetko, 'Realisticheskii roman Dzhein Osten'
Russia: Nabokov, *Lectures on Literature*
- Hungary:** Borbás, 'Értelem és érzelem'
Spain: Crespo Allue, *La problemática de las versiones españolas de 'Persuasion' de Jane Austen*
Sweden: Lauritzen, *Jane Austen's 'Emma' on Television*
- Germany:** Fahnestock, 'The Reception of Jane Austen in Germany' (U. of Indiana diss.)
- General:** Gilson, *A Bibliography of Jane Austen*
- Italy:** Battaglia, *La zitella illetterata: parodia e ironia nei romanzi di Jane Austen* and "Female imagination" e romance nei romanzi di Jane Austen'
- General:** Screen adaptation of *PP* (dir. Coke)
Russia: *NA* publ. in English

Year	Translations	Criticism	Other
1985	First translation into Catalan: <i>PP</i> (Preses) First Estonian translation: <i>PP</i> (Rajandi) Spain: New <i>P</i> (anon.)	General: Burke, 'Seeking Jane in Foreign Tongues' Greece: Evangelides, <i>Jane Austen: Essays</i>	
1986	Spain: New <i>P</i> (anon.)	Germany (West): Schrick, <i>Jane Austen und die weibliche Modellbiographie des 18. Jahrhunderts</i> Romania: Popa, 'Jane Austen's Control of Dialogue' Russia: Genieva (ed.), <i>Dzheïn Osten: biobibliograficheskii ukazatel'</i>	
1987	Netherlands: New <i>P</i> (Dorsman-Vos) Spain: New <i>PP</i> (Ibañez)	Italy: Bertinetti <i>Ritratti di signore: saggio su Jane Austen</i> Poland: Tempska, 'The Spatial Aspects of Five Chosen Novels by Jane Austen and Charlotte and Emily Brontë' Slovenia: Žnidaršič, 'Jane Austen pri Slovencih'	
1988	Greece: First <i>E</i> (Kondilis); new <i>PP</i> (Zorbalas) Iceland: New <i>PP</i> (Aðalsteinsdóttir) Romania (Hungarian): <i>PP</i> (Zsenczi) Russia: Collected novels (through 1989), incl. first Russian <i>E</i> , <i>MP</i> , <i>NA</i> , <i>P</i> , and <i>SS</i> , and new <i>PP</i> (all Genieva) Spain (Catalan): First <i>P</i> (Arbonès)	Germany (West): C. Grawe, <i>Jane Austen</i>	
1989	Czechoslovakia (Czech): New <i>SS</i> (Kondrysová) Germany (East): <i>MP</i> (Meyer) Greece: New <i>PP</i> (Margarinos) Italy: New <i>P</i> (Pozzi) and <i>PP</i> (Moschitta)	Poland: Dobosiewicz, 'Jane Austen's Narrative Art in <i>Emma</i> '	
1990	Italy: First <i>LS</i> , <i>S</i> , and <i>W</i> (Gaia)	Portugal: Pina, 'No prólogo da inovação Austeniana'	
1991	Germany: New <i>SS</i> (Beck) Romania: First <i>LJA</i> and <i>LS</i> (both Lefter) Spain (Catalan): First <i>NA</i> (Arbonès)	Spain: Gómez Blanco, 'Marriage and Power Relations in Jane Austen's Novels'	

- 1992 **Bulgaria:** First *NA* (Nenkova) and *P* (Rankova)
Italy: First *LJA* (Gaia)
- Slovenia:** Kršić, 'Prevzetnost in pristranost ali znanost izkustva zavesti'
Spain:
(1) De la Concha, 'La sombra de la madre'
(2) Suárez Lafuente, 'The Jane Austen Tradition in Contemporary Women's Writing'
Norway: Aasen, *Driftige damer*
- 1993 **Germany:** New *MP* (Beck)
Greece: Selections (Papastavrou)
Romania: First *MP* (Radu); new *NA* (Sadoveanu)
Spain: New *SS* (Magrinyà)
Sweden: First *LS* (Liljegren) and *NA* (Nielsen)
- 1994 **Greece:** New *PP* (Andreou)
Italy: New *NA* (Grillo), new *PP* and juvenilia (both Censi)
Netherlands: New *SS* (Meiborg)
- Italy:** Marroni (ed.), *Dalla parte di Jane Austen*
Portugal: Pina, Furtado and Fernandes (eds), *Jane Austen*
- 1995 **Bulgaria:** First *E* (Rozova), *MP* (Milanova), and *SS* (Elcinova); new *NA* (Karadžova)
Greece: New *PP* (Yiannopoulou)
Italy: New *P* (Agosti Castellani) and *SS* (Meneghelli)
Poland: First *MP* (Przedpelska-Trzeciakowska)
Spain: 2 new *MP* (Martin, Torres Oliver)
- Germany:**
(1) Beck, *Jane Austen*
(2) Jehmlich, *Jane Austen*
(3) Martynkewicz, *Jane Austen*
- General:** Screen adaptations of *P* (dir. Michell), *PP* (dir. Langton), and *SS* (dir. Lee)
Romania: *PP* publ. in English
- 1996 **First translation into Basque:** *PP* (Morales)
Bulgaria: First *LS* and new *P* (both Elcinova)
Estonia: First *SS* (Suursalu)
Greece: New *E* (Sakellaropoulou), *PP* (Kikizas), and *SS* (Kalofolias)
Italy: 2 new *E* (Meneghelli, Petrignani) and new *SS* (Censi)
- Hungary:** Péter, 'Jane Austen: *Büszkeség és balítélet* (*Pride and Prejudice*, 1813)'
Italy: Kotnik, *Jane Austen, ovvero, Genio e semplicità*
- General:**
(1) Screen adaptations of *E* (dir. McGrath; Lawrence)
(2) Helen Fielding, *Bridget Jones's Diary*

Year	Translations	Criticism	Other
1997	<p>Netherlands: 2 new <i>E</i> (Jong, Roelvelde and Stevens) and new <i>P</i> (Meiborg)</p> <p>Norway: First <i>E</i> (Alfsen)</p> <p>Portugal: First <i>NA</i> 'Catharine' (Veríssimo); new <i>P</i> (Sequeira) and <i>SS</i> (Dias Correia)</p> <p>Slovenia: First full <i>SS</i> (Miklavc)</p> <p>Spain: First <i>S</i> (Torres Oliver); new <i>E</i> (A. M. Rodríguez), <i>P</i> (Torres Oliver), <i>PP</i> (López Muñoz), and 2 new <i>SS</i> (A. M. Rodríguez, anon.)</p> <p>First Lithuanian translations: <i>E</i> (Jomantienė and Keršienė) and <i>PP</i> (Juškienė)</p> <p>Croatia: New <i>E</i> (Balen-Heidl)</p> <p>Czech Republic: First Czech <i>MP</i> (Kondrysová)</p> <p>Estonia: First <i>P</i> (Villmann and Suursalu)</p> <p>France: 2 new <i>E</i> (Nordon, Seyrès)</p> <p>Germany: New <i>E</i> (Beck) and <i>PP</i> (Schulz);</p> <p>Netherlands: New <i>NA</i> (Brinkman and Spierdijk), <i>MP</i> (Zuidema) and <i>PP</i> (Meiborg)</p> <p>Norway: First <i>SS</i> (Alfsen)</p> <p>Poland: First <i>LS</i>, <i>S</i>, and <i>W</i> (Pietrzak-Merta)</p> <p>Portugal: New <i>P</i> (Pinto Rodrigues)</p> <p>Slovenia: New <i>E</i> (Skušek)</p> <p>Spain: Two new <i>E</i> (anon., Guerra) and <i>PP</i> (anon., A. M. Rodríguez)</p> <p>Spain (Catalan): First <i>E</i> (Ferrer i Costa)</p> <p>Sweden: First <i>MP</i> (Ekman)</p>	<p>Germany: Maletzke, <i>Jane Austen</i></p> <p>Poland: Dobosiewicz, <i>Female Relationships in Jane Austen's Novels</i></p>	
1998	<p>Germany: New <i>SS</i> (Bosshard)</p> <p>Greece: New <i>P</i> (Kikizas)</p> <p>Italy: New <i>MP</i> (Melchiorri)</p>	<p>Croatia: Jukić, 'Prevesti povijesni eho: Jane Austen' and 'Retorické strategije Jane Austen'</p>	

- 1998 **Norway:** First *P* (Alfsen)
Poland: First *LJA* (Kozak); selections (ed. Kerrigan)
Serbia: New *E* (Ančić, through 1999)
Slovakia: First *NA* (Krupa)
Spain: First *LF* (Gutiérrez); new *LS* (Casellas Guitart), *P*, and *PP* (both anon.)
- 1999 **Czech Republic:** First Czech *S*
Italy: New *MP* (Palma), juvenilia (Augustini)
Netherlands: Selections (Brinkman)
Slovakia: First *E* (Vilikovská), *MP* (Krejčíková), and *SS* (Vallová)
- 2000 **First Latvian translation:** *PP* (Melnbārde)
Estonia: First *E* (Rattus and Kangur); new *PP* (Linnart)
France: Complete novels, with new translations of *NA* (Arnaud), *PP* (Pichardie), *SS* (Goubert)
Germany: New *SS* (Schulz)
Norway: First *MP* (Alfsen)
Poland: New *SS* (Kolk-Wolańczuk)
Spain: First *W* (Salís); new *LS* (Salís) and *SS* (Matta)
- 2001 **Estonia:** First *LS* (Luts)
France: New *PP* (Vierne)
Greece: First *MP*, new *SS* (both Papathanasopoulou)
Latvia: First *E* (Blumberga) and *SS* (Dreika)
- 2002 **Estonia:** New *LS* (Drevs)
Germany: New *MP* (Schulz)
Italy: New *E*, *P* (both Zazo), and *PP* (Basso)
Latvia: First *NA* (Dreika)
Latvia: First *NA* (Dreika)
Spain: 3 new *PP* (Franco Lommers, Pareja Rodríguez, K. Rodríguez) and new *SS* (Herrero)
- Italy:** Zordo, 'Il "prezzo" della virtù: la storia di Fanny Price e della sua perfezione'
Spain:
 (1) Díaz Bild, 'Jane Austen: Artistic Mastery as a Means of Rebellion'
 (2) Hidalgo, 'Wollstonecraft and Austen'
Croatia: Jukić, 'A Lasting Performance' and 'Tijela i korpusi: vizualna Jane Austen'
Hungary: Séllei, 'Jane Austen and the Politics of the Novel' and 'Otthon a regényben. Jane Austen: a klastrom titka'
Germany: Chambers, 'Nineteenth-Century German Translations of Jane Austen'
Netherlands: Wassink, 'Jane Austen in Holland'
Russia: Masing-Delic, 'Peremena rolei: pigmalionovskie motivy v Emme Dzhein Osten i v Oblomove Ivana Goncharova'
- General:** Screen adaptation of *MP* (dir. Rozema) (US)
- Denmark:** Nielsen, *Jane Austen: hendes liv og forfatterskab*
France: Bernard, *Jane Austen, 'Pride and Prejudice', dans l'œil du paradoxe*
Netherlands: Wellens, 'Jane by Any Other Name: The Dutch Translations of Jane Austen'
France: Trunel, 'L'histoire éditoriale des traductions françaises de *Sense and Sensibility*'
Italy: Battaglia (ed.), *Jane Austen: oggi e ieri*
Poland: Bystydzińska, 'Houses and Landscapes in Jane Austen's Novels'
- General:** Helen Fielding, *Bridget Jones: The Edge of Reason*

Year	Translations	Criticism	Other
2003	Estonia: First 'Love and Freindship' and 'The Three Sisters' (both Luts) Greece: First <i>NA</i> (Papathanasopoulou); new <i>E</i> (Pappas) Norway: First <i>PP</i> (Alfsen) Poland: New <i>SS</i> (Filipczuk) Portugal: First <i>MP</i> (Pora) Romania: First <i>Juvenilia</i> (Constantin) Spain: New <i>P</i> (Zaro)	General: Gilson, 'Jane Austen in Europe' Spain: Caporale Bizzini, 'La otra cara del romanticismo'	
2004	Estonia: First <i>MP</i> (Jürisalu) Greece: New <i>PP</i> (Spiliopoulou) Italy: New <i>P</i> (Fantaccini) and <i>PP</i> (Placido) Portugal: New <i>NA</i> (Mascarenhas) Romania: New <i>MP</i> (Ihora), <i>NA</i> (Oanță), <i>P</i> (Constantin), <i>PP</i> (Florea), and <i>SS</i> (Grădinaru) Spain: New <i>P</i> (Fernández Z.) Spain (Catalan): First <i>SS</i> (Pàmies)	Italy: (1) Agorni and Giovanni, 'Pride and Prejudice in Italy' (2) Battaglia and Saglia (eds), <i>Re-Drawing Austen</i> Russia: Imposti, 'The Reasons for an "Absence": Jane Austen's Reception in Russia' Scandinavia: Sørbo, 'Portrett av ei dame: Jane Austen i skandinaviske litteraturhistorier'	General: Film musical of <i>PP</i> , <i>Bride and Prejudice</i> (dir. Gurinder Chadha)
2005	First translation into Galician: <i>PP</i> (Díaz Lage) Latvia: First <i>P</i> (Dreika) Netherlands: <i>W</i> , <i>S</i> (both Jong) Poland: New <i>E</i> (Teszna) and <i>PP</i> (Surówka)	General: Cossy and Saglia, 'Translations' Norway: Sørbo, 'The Latecomer: Jane Austen in Norwegian Schools' Romania: Constantinescu, <i>Jane Austen as a Woman Novelist</i>	General: Screen adaptation of <i>PP</i> (dir. Wright)
2005–			General: <i>The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Jane Austen</i>
2006	Estonia: First 'Lesley Castle' (Luts)	Switzerland: Cossy, <i>Jane Austen in Switzerland</i> Norway: Sørbo, <i>Adapting Austen</i>	

Introduction

Anthony Mandal

Jane Austen is undoubtedly one of the few anglophone writers whose quintessential 'Englishness' constitutes a vital element of her fiction and, consequently, her reader's experience. This Englishness has played a significant role in sustaining Austen's popularity for over two centuries, particularly in the 'heritage industry' that has bloomed around her in Britain and North America since the late twentieth century. The recent phenomenon of 'Austenmania' – manifesting itself in the wake of the various costume dramas of the mid-1990s and sustained through Anglo-American criticism – has been extensively addressed by various conferences and publications (see Troost and Greenfield 1998; Lynch 2000; MacDonald 2002; Parrill 2002). By contrast, despite the fact that anglomania/phobia has long been studied on the continent,¹ the issue of how Austen's Englishness has affected her reception on the European mainland remains an open one. In many respects, the essays in this volume seek to answer precisely this question, by analysing whether Austen's Englishness has abetted or hindered her transmission across national borders and cultural boundaries.

Discussions of Austen's European reception to date have been both fragmentary and uneven, appearing in the form of brief articles that provide a gloss on Austen's continental presence – albeit in a necessarily unsystematic manner. Offering analyses of translations and evaluations of criticism, most of these essays have focused on Austen's reception in France (Rowland-Brown 1925; King 1953–54; Robbins 1968; Gilson 1974), Italy (Donini 1971), Germany (Fahnestock 1982; Chambers 2000) and the Low Countries (Wellens [2001]). As part of the activity surrounding Austen's bicentennial, Andrew Wright and his colleagues each 'examine[d] a translation with the modern reader in mind, to canvass the difficulties that a young and literate but not necessarily learned and certainly not bilingual Chinese, German, Mexican, Romanian, Russian or Swede would encounter' (1975, 299). These assessments have been supplemented by bibliographic accounts of Austen translations, via listings provided in David Gilson's magisterial *Bibliography of Jane Austen* (1982, 1997) and

¹ Like other national manias and phobias, anglomania/phobia has been analysed through the discipline of 'imagology', a branch of comparative literature that deals with assumptions regarding 'national character' (see Barfoot 1997).

in the entry on 'Jane Austen' in the *The Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature* (Garside and Mandal 1999). A far more anecdotal account of Austen's global fortunes is supplied by Henry Burke's 'Seeking Jane in Foreign Tongues', which details his personal mission of 'accumulating whatever might be available in other languages' (1985, 17). A hiatus of nearly twenty years was broken by Gilson's more systematic evaluation of 'Jane Austen and Europe' (2003), which examines the dissemination of Austen's works across Europe during the nineteenth century, both in their original English editions and in translation. Most recently, Valérie Cossy and Diego Saglia (2005) have provided a brief but engaging account of nineteenth-century French and German translations, as part of the landmark *Cambridge Edition of the Works of Jane Austen* project (2005–).

The nineteen essays and supplementary bibliography in this volume build on these earlier commentaries by providing, for the first time, a comprehensive account of Austen's reception across seventeen nations. As will become evident in the following chapters, Austen was circulated and received in a variety of different ways, in a variety of different climates. Despite a period of relative neglect during the nineteenth century, her fortunes in Europe have steadily improved since the mid-twentieth, culminating with the pan-European (not to mention, transatlantic) 'Austenmania' of the mid-1990s. In their essays, the contributors provide clear and compelling explorations of each phase in Austen's continental adventures: her nineteenth-century obscurity, mid-twentieth-century appreciation and late-twentieth-century popularity.

Before moving on to a fuller historical account of Austen's European fortunes, it might be useful to offer some broad brushstrokes of our own, in order to contextualize the reception of this author's own 'little bit (two Inches wide) of Ivory' across the nations surveyed. Beginning most straightforwardly with quantifiable data, the popularity of each novel across Europe correlates with its respective status in Anglo-American circles. For the census period 1815–2005, *PP* is clearly the most translated text, comprising 28.9 per cent of 370 translations, followed by *E* (16.2 per cent), *SS* (14.1 per cent), *P* (13.8 per cent), *NA* (10 per cent) and *MP* (8.1 per cent).² The remaining 8.9 per cent constitute translations of Austen's minor works (the juvenilia, *LS*, *W*, *S*) and her letters.

Breaking these figures down chronologically reveals some notable shifts: while *P* seems to have been the novel-of-choice for nineteenth-century translators, between 1901 and 1945 *PP* was firmly established as the favourite (still followed by *P*). After World War II, the patterns that we recognize today across anglophone circles were established in Europe, during a period of almost exponential translation activity.³ *PP* was newly translated twice as many times (60) as its nearest neighbour, *E* (32), followed by *P* (24), *SS* (23), *NA* (22) and *MP* (12). It was during the 1990s, however, that the Austenmania sweeping

² Excerpted translations, reprints and reissues are excluded from the statistics detailed in the following commentary.

³ The output of new translations of the six novels for 1946–90 virtually quadrupled that of the preceding forty-five years (163 to 45).

across North America and Europe had a profound effect on Austen's presence in the mainland: the output of new translations of the novels during 1991–2005 (116) is comparable with that of the previous forty-five years (163). Once again, *PP* leads translation activities (26), but is now followed by *SS* (21) and *E* (20), with *P* (15), *MP* (15) and *NA* (8) occupying the lower half. A significant phenomenon of the last fifteen years is the heightened interest in Austen's minor works and correspondence, evidenced by the notable presence of translations (20). Such activity, which continues to produce new (and increasingly accurate) editions of established favourites, while simultaneously attending to the lesser-known works, anticipates a vibrant and long-lived future for Jane Austen in Europe as the twenty-first century unfolds.

Another way of considering matters is through the translation activity of individual nations: Table 1 summarizes the total number of fresh translations (including excerpts) of Austen's works, along with details of first publication.

Perhaps surprisingly, Austen – this most 'English' of authors – seems to have found fertile ground principally on the shores of the Mediterranean: Spain, Italy and France. Her works have been relatively well served in Germany, the Netherlands and Portugal, while Romania and Poland evidence a slightly diminished presence. By contrast, Scandinavia, the Balkans and Russia have experienced rather limited encounters with Austen (despite early translations in Sweden and Denmark). Overall, it would appear that translations have been most frequently printed and reprinted in Spain, Germany, Italy, Poland and the Netherlands.

Table 1 *Total number of new translations per nation, 1813–2005*

Country	Total	Total inc. reprints*	First title translated
Spain	73	162	<i>P</i> (1919)
Italy	60	82	<i>PP</i> (1932)
France	40	47	<i>PP</i> (1813: extracts), <i>SS</i> (1815)
Germany	32	156	<i>P</i> (1822)
Netherlands	22	49	<i>SS</i> (1922)
Greece	21	30	<i>PP</i> (1950)
Portugal	21	43	<i>SS</i> , <i>PP</i> , <i>NA</i> (1943)
Romania	19	34	<i>PP</i> (1943)
Poland	16	53	<i>SS</i> (1934)
Sweden	11	40	<i>P</i> (1836)
Denmark	10	21	<i>SS</i> (1855–56)
Finland	9	9	<i>PP</i> (1922)
Serbia	9	20	<i>P</i> (1929)
Norway	8	8	<i>PP</i> (1930)
Hungary	7	31	<i>PP</i> (1934–36)
Russia	7	7	<i>PP</i> (1967)
Slovenia	5	5	<i>SS</i> (1951: extracts), <i>PP</i> (1968)
Croatia	3	4	<i>E</i> (1962)

* Figures for reprints are incomplete, and should only be taken as indicative.

Statistics, however, can only tell us so much. Another important concern relates to the overall impression each nation has of Austen and her oeuvre, and whether they have been fixed over the last two centuries or have changed during the intervening years. In the remaining sections, this introduction will trace the development of Austen's presence in Europe at a more detailed level. Offering observations about common and divergent patterns of reception within and across national boundaries, the ensuing account will address three key periods: the nineteenth century, 1901–90 and 1991–2005.

The nineteenth century

Jane Austen's presence on the continent during the nineteenth century was relatively restricted, with translations of her works in only four languages (Danish, French, German, Swedish). That said, however, it should be noted that her works circulated around Europe in anglophone versions, both in editions with a British provenance and through such enterprises as Bentley's co-publication of Austen's novels with the Parisian firm Galignani in 1833, as well as Tauchnitz's German 'Collection of British Authors' (1864–77). Furthermore, the complex multilingualism of the mainland ensured that translations were not confined to national boundaries: as our contributors establish, French- and Swedish-language translations of Austen's works were circulating in the Netherlands and Finland respectively. Similarly, Hungarian repositories hold various nineteenth-century copies of *SS*, *MP* and *E* published in English and French, while the catalogues of Italian libraries list Tauchnitz's anglophone editions amongst their holdings.

Austen's presence in Europe began well within her own lifetime, beginning with the translation of *PP* in 1813, which was excerpted across four successive issues of the Swiss monthly *Bibliothèque britannique* (British library) – less than six months after its original British appearance that January. There are no comments by Austen regarding her circulation in Europe in her correspondence, so we cannot be certain that she was aware of this fact. Further translations into French followed speedily, so that by 1824 all six novels had been fully translated into at least one language. German translators followed suit fairly promptly (*P*, 1822; *PP*, 1830), while a Swedish *P* appeared in 1836. Following this initial burst of activity, however, nineteenth-century translations of Austen became more drawn out: a Danish *SS* and a Swedish *E* appeared at mid-century, to be followed in the last two decades by further francophone renditions (*E*, *P*). Overall, far more translations of Austen were prepared in those initial twenty-something years (twelve) than in the remaining sixty-five (four) of the nineteenth century.

Early translators of Austen enjoyed high literary reputations of their own: Isabelle de Montolieu (who prepared the French-language *SS*, 1815 and *P*, 1821) and Wilhelm Lindau (German translator of *P*, 1822) were novelists in their own right, whose works had themselves been translated into English. As Isabelle Bour makes clear in Chapter 1, however, the translators' understanding of their authorly craft sometimes adversely influenced their rendering of Austen's originals. Hence, Montolieu's credentials as a sentimental novelist

resulted in her diminishing the polyvalent richness of *SS*: not only are scenes cut from Austen's original, but episodes of a more 'pathetic' nature are inserted or existing scenes are 'heightened' emotionally, resulting in a text that more fully approximates the novel of sensibility – the very object of Austen's satire.

Other translators, such as Carl Karup (who rendered *SS* into Danish, 1855–56) and Félix Fénéon (translator of *NA* into French, 1898), were erudite belletrists, who approached Austen from eclectic perspectives. Karup was a Catholic propagandist and Fénéon an avant-garde anarchist: hardly the likeliest candidates for translators of Austen's domestic comedies! Yet, both translators prepared accurate renditions of Austen's originals, particularly so when compared to other nineteenth-century efforts.

There is also the provenance of these translations to consider. As our Swedish contributors point out, Emilia Westdahl's *Familjen Elliot* (*P*, 1836) was based on Montolieu's French translation of 1821, which itself contains a number of 'heightened' and interpolated scenes. Thus the question arises: to what extent can a translation-of-a-translation render accurately the author's work? In this specific case, the text is a watered-down version of *P*, which sits more comfortably with contemporary Swedish expectations of British fiction than with Austen's original itself.

Of course, Austen was not only received in Europe through translations, but in a variety of other forums: brief reviews, surveys of literature, encyclopaedia entries and textbook anthologies. As early as 1816, early comments from France, Germany and Russia singled out Austen's 'purity', 'morality' and domestic focus as the determining factors of her fiction. Less direct and more intriguing are the intertextual influences Austen's fiction might have had on European fiction: for instance, Catharine Nepomnyashchy (Chapter 19) draws attention to the remarkable resonances between *PP* and Aleksandr Pushkin's *Eugene Onegin* (1823–31). It was in France, however, that Austen received the most sustained critical attention, which nevertheless tended to fix her writing within clear parameters. While Austen was praised as 'a new kind' of novelist for her pictures of domestic manners, she was overshadowed by Scott and, to a lesser extent, Burney, Edgeworth and Radcliffe. Seen as a moralist, even a 'puritan', the overarching image of Austen that emerges is blandly didactic and humourless. Later in the century, attention was drawn to Austen's detailed psychological portraiture (Boucher 1878) and use of dialogue (Forgues 1882): nevertheless, critics continued to overlook her irony and humour. By the *fin de siècle*, however, Austen received more considered attention, with Théodore Duret (1898) acknowledging for the first time her use of language for the purposes of characterization, and significantly observing that Austen 'is now universally regarded as one of the great English writers'.

Despite these minor incursions into the European consciousness, however, Austen remained essentially unrecognized during the nineteenth century. As in Britain, a key element in this neglect was the overwhelming dominance of the historical novel as pioneered by Sir Walter Scott.⁴ Another major factor lay in

⁴ See Pittock (2007) for a full account of Scott's European reception.

the sociopolitical national contexts, which often led to the Scottish model being chosen in favour of other fictional forms. For instance, in Flanders, Greece, Finland and Slovenia, the desire to establish national and cultural sovereignty found its voice in more polemicized forms of fiction, rather than in *romans de mœurs*. As Peter Mortensen (Chapter 6) argues, it wasn't simply political convulsions *within* nations that occluded Austen's reception in nineteenth-century Europe: conflicts *between* nations (in this case Danish anglophobia) also pre-empted any positive interchange. In some cases, it was aesthetic rather than ideological factors that interposed. For example, Austen's ironic perspective did not accord with Swedish perceptions of novels by 'English lady novelists': this in a country that saw two of her novels translated by mid-century. Similarly, the partitioned Poland of the nineteenth century, which drew its aesthetic inspiration from France and held the novel in low esteem, would have hardly formed a conducive theatre for Austen's productions. Finally, Austen seems not to have reached some European shores during the nineteenth century (e.g. Croatia, Norway) simply because *she was unknown*.

1901–1990

The change in Austen's fortunes in French criticism at the turn of the nineteenth century was consolidated during the twentieth. Aside from a French *E* and Spanish *P* at either end of the 1910s, twentieth-century translations of Austen commenced in earnest from the 1920s onwards. As Table 1 (above) makes clear, Austen was translated for the first time into a large number of languages during the interwar period. This fairly moderate wave of activity culminated in a heightened period of production in the wake of World War II, which decisively established Austen's presence on the mainland. Forty-one new translations appeared during 1945–49 (twenty of these in 1945 alone), with the majority published in Spanish (fourteen) and French (twelve). This post-war period represents the second highest period of activity in Europe, exceeded only by the mid-1990s.

In the case of France, this revived interest in Austen seems part of a wider post-war phenomenon, in which the French sought a closer acquaintance with the literature of their allies. Finland similarly saw all six novels issued by the publisher WSOY in new translations between 1947 and 1954, three of them as part of 'The Great Novels of the World' series. In the partitioned Germany, it seems that Austen met East German ideological criteria regarding female emancipation and capitalist exploitation, which led to more systematic translation than in West Germany. The first introduction of Austen to Greece (*PP*, 1950) followed an initiative by the British Council introducing British culture. Transformations in cultural attitudes also heralded an increased interest in Austen, when Danish anglophobia was succeeded by post-war anglophilia, which arose from Denmark's desire to distance itself from German influences and a shared war against a common enemy. Hence, it becomes apparent that Austen's mid-century European appearance arose from a combination of cultural circumstances, ideological imperatives and straightforward promotion.

The first full translations of Austen arrived in a number of Eastern European

nations in the 1960s (Croatia 1962, Russia 1967, Slovenia 1968), with a second significant wave in the 1980s, although not as pronounced as the post-war period. Nevertheless, in the early 1980s there were French translations of the minor works, as well as Dutch activity. Many of these later translations arose from the concerted efforts of individual translators, who had either a personal or academic interest in Austen (Dorsman-Vos, Grawe, Przedpelska-Trzeciakowska, Salesse-Lavergne). In 1975, the bicentenary of Austen's death, Serbia issued a six-volume collected works, with a print run of 10,000 volumes, which, according to one review, had sold out by August 1977. Similarly, in Hungary, reprints of *PP* (1979) and *SS* (1980) had been published in even larger numbers (75,000 and 65,000 respectively). Russia had been a relative latecomer to Austen, but by the end of the 1980s this oversight had been rectified, with Ekaterina Genieva's complete novels in three volumes. Compared to the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the translations from this later period are more systematic, often resulting from the labours of the same, skilled figures, who were typically academics or professional translators.

Austen's status on the continent was confirmed by a number of studies written by European commentators. Early in the century, discussions of Austen were typically influenced by Anglo-American approaches, with articles often translating anglophone pieces verbatim (sometimes without acknowledgement). Nonetheless, as early as the 1910s, the mainland began generating its own assessments, for instance, in the works of Bassi (Italy 1914), Cecchi (Italy 1915), Rague and Rague (France 1914) and Villard (France 1915), which for the first time drew meaningful attention to Austen's sense of irony and depth of characterization. Danish commentators (Brusendorff 1928–30) emphasized Austen's incisive social commentary as the defining trait of her fiction. By contrast, other early studies, for instance in Italy (Cecchi 1915) and the Netherlands (Haan 1935), discussed Austen's literary style (rather than subject matter), while attempting to contextualize her against their own literary traditions.

Nevertheless, Austen's early twentieth-century critics tended to fix her oeuvre within very restricted parameters. The typical response is a paternalistic emphasis on her 'smallness', 'grotesque' narrowness and her 'innocent wit', as evidenced by responses in Norway (Bing 1929), Italy (Caprin 1932) and Hungary (Szerb 1941). Nearly twenty years later, Austen's supposedly limited scope was seen as grounds for depreciation, so that one Polish commentator describes *PP* as 'a stereotypical romance [. . .] sprinkled with a tender, sentimental sauce' (Michalski 1957). Even if Austen's ironic power had been acknowledged by early twentieth-century critics, they often found it difficult to move beyond an image of her benevolent humour, gentle comedy and her miniaturist approach, often compared to Flemish painting.

At mid-century, Austen's concern with propriety and her precise depictions of social hierarchies were sometimes perceived as antediluvian by egalitarian democracies such as 1950s Finland. By contrast, Apostolos Sahinis (1950) welcomed Austen's arrival, alongside the Brontës and Dickens, into Greek literary consciousness, albeit concluding his praise with a rather dismissive reference to women's writing. In Hungary (Szentkuthy 1958), Poland (Najder 1963), Slovenia (Šuklje 1968) and Romania (Teodorescu 1969), Austen was

contextualized within an Augustan tradition, in studies which underscored her stylistic innovation, ironic sense and social critique. Building on Carlo Izzo's 1961 interpretation of Austen's credentials in the humourist tradition, during the early 1970s Beatrice Battaglia analysed in detail Austen's stylistic methods and parodic approach. By contrast, other European critics found Austen's position in literary history difficult to fix: an inheritor of the Neoclassicists, a contemporary of the Romantics, a precursor of Victorian realism – and yet none of these. Often, the only response to such a paradox was to describe what Austen is *not*, a position argued for by the Croatian scholar, Breda Kogoj-Kapetanić (1962).

The later twentieth century witnessed a more considered evaluation of Austen, which mainly arose out of broader ideological and cultural imperatives. For instance, East German, Hungarian and Slovene commentators found Austen's realism and focus on issues of female marginalization useful in promoting socialist policies, while demonstrating the inadequacies of capitalist regimes. The pressures that critics understood that Austen was subject to resonated particularly with late-Soviet society, itself subject to political and literary scrutiny (Demurova 1967). The rise of the women's movement from the 1960s onwards appears to have galvanized further translations and critical attention. This culminated with a number of Danish and Norwegian considerations of her oeuvre (Petersen 1979), her significance in world literature (Ørum 1985; Østergaard 1987) and importance to feminist issues (Krag 1980; Larsen 1980). A vital turning point in Austen's Russian reception, coincidental with the height of *glasnost*, is signified by the publication of Genieva's bio-bibliographical index of Austen (1986), which anticipated her singlehanded translation of all six of the novels (1988–89). Such developments certainly represent an evolution in Austen's critical reception on the continent, and mark a transformation of pre-war responses into a recognition of her broader sociocultural significance.

1991–2005

From the 1990s onwards, there was a veritable explosion of 'Austenmania'. Without a doubt, the exponential growth in translation and criticism is largely due to the phenomenal success of the film and television adaptations of the mid-1990s. Nevertheless, other cultural stimuli can also be perceived as opening up previously restricted borders. The collapse of socialist ideology, which had dominated the Eastern bloc since the end of World War II, is a key factor in this. As Tatjana Jukić (Chapter 15) acutely observes, in the post-socialist era, Austen's *classedness* (always a problem for socialist criticism) was transformed into *classiness*, framed by the newly reintroduced discourse of capitalism. As a result, an era of responsiveness towards Western European culture coincided with the remarketing of Austen by film and television productions, which opened Austen up to new audiences, both in the Anglo-American world and elsewhere.

In the period 1995–99, no fewer than sixty-four new translations appeared across Europe, the increase in numbers matched by an increase in quality. For example, Austen's recognition as a literary 'classic' in France can be inferred from the inclusion of her collected works in Gallimard's prestigious Pléiade

series (2000–), edited by the leading Austen scholar in France, Pierre Goubert. The Greek publishers Smili released translations of the six novels between 1996 and 2003, in an annotated edition carrying extensive historical and contextual commentaries. Many recent versions have been prepared by the same translators, with either an academic or personal interest in Austen: Meiborg (Netherlands), Beck (Germany), Alfsen (Norway), Rodríguez (Spain) and Censi (Italy) have each made at least three translations of Austen from the 1990s onwards. In particular, Merete Alfsen received critical praise for her five translations (1996–2003) commissioned by Aschehoug, one of Norway's leading publishing houses.

In the reunified Germany, where Austen was once the province of specialists and devotees, she now seems to be drawing attention from a wider readership through the large quantities of reissues that have appeared since the 1990s. Similarly, the Danish mass-market publishers Lindhardt & Ringhof bought the copyrights to earlier translations of *PP*, *E* and *P*, repackaging them with covers carrying stills from the films. Austen's popularity is further evident in neighbouring Sweden, in the sales figures for paperback translations issued by Mån-pocket: *PP* (1996), 18,988; *E* (1997), 14,025; *NA* (2001), 10,115 – a normal print run for classics at Mån-pocket is 7,000 copies. Nevertheless, popularity does not always guarantee quality: according to Aída Díaz Bild (Chapter 10), apart from three fresh translations issued by the Madrid publishers Cátedra, the majority of Spanish translations are hastily prepared works aimed squarely at the mass market. Similarly, Goubert's Pléiade edition is balanced with a 1996 reprint of Montolieu's 'free' translation of 1815: as Bour (Chapter 3) points out, the result is that the film adheres more closely to Austen's original than the 1996 reprint! Battaglia (Chapter 11) comments that recent Italian translations are less precise and more rushed than earlier ones, the root cause being ignorance of the particular social contexts of the novels. This results in hybrid texts, which elide vital social distinctions, while utilizing archaic Italian grammar in order to supply a 'period' feel. Nonetheless, as Nóra Séllei (Chapter 13) observes, the commercial promise offered by Austen nowadays has at least guaranteed her sustained presence across the continent.

Commentary on Austen from the 1990s onwards has tended to emphasize her status as an author of world classics, whose canonical status is complemented by her popular appeal. In nations where she was relatively neglected until recently (e.g. Norway), she is now considered the most significant female novelist of the nineteenth century. Recent scholarship pays closer attention to the historical circumstances and literary context within which Austen wrote, as well as her use of language and, unsurprisingly, the issue of adaptation into film. In addition to translations of anglophone biographies of Austen into Finnish, Polish and Swedish, Europe has generated its own lives of Austen, with four biographies issued in Germany between 1988 and 1997. More recently, a transgressive, carnivalesque Austen has been excavated by Spanish scholarship, while Hungarian and Polish criticism similarly observe how the marginalization of women determines the Austenian obsession with marriage. More topically, an examination of Austen's world has enabled Romanian writers to question gender politics of the present, asking whether women 'have really evolved from being an object, a more or less dissimulated commodity'.

Despite the attempts of European scholars to interpret Austen in the wake of feminist criticism, a number of commentators perpetuate the associations of Austen with simple, escapist love stories, commonly linking her to today's Harlequin romances. Nevertheless, other writers point to the ironized separation between the Austenian author and narrator/protagonist, which opens up the novel to polemical readings. Two views of Austen emerge: she is either a conservative advocate of existing orthodoxies or a subversive critic of her world. Associated with the former perception is the recognizably wistful trend which receives Austen as arbiter of a bygone era, while the former emphasizes the restrictions placed upon women during Austen's lifetime, which are still perpetuated today. Janus-like, Austen looks back to a halcyon era of manners and morality, and forward to continued female emancipation. Particularly promising, however, is the sheer activity emanating from countries such as Italy, which has recently hosted a groundbreaking international conference and published notable pan-European collaborations on Austen (2002, 2004).

It would be impossible to discuss Austen's European fortunes over the last decade without considering the impact of the recent screen adaptations. The abundance of films and television serials has undoubtedly accelerated Austen's status across the mainland, as well as generating a large number of new and reprinted translations. For instance, in the Netherlands, following the theatrical release of Douglas McGrath's *E* (1996), four translations were published in the same year, only two of which were fresh. In Germany, following the screening of Ang Lee's *SS* in 1996, ten editions appeared in that year, with only two offering new translations. A number of editions employed stills from the films on their covers, in order to market the books. While the adaptations seem to have generated dramatically increased interest in Austen's novels, in some countries (such as Norway), this phenomenon seems to have been short-lived, while in others (Hungary) Austen has been included in the top hundred 'best reads'. In the wake of McGrath's *E*, such was Austen's popularity that Croatian and Slovene readers were advised 'If you've never read Austen's *E*, don't say it in public', with Austen clearly functioning as a legitimizing trope for cultural consumption.

The popularity of the screen adaptations is corroborated by the repeated prime-time scheduling of the films on television channels over the past decade. Aside from the increased circulation of Austen in print, the main response to the films has appeared in newspaper reviews. Commentators are generally happy with the adaptations, although some refer to the 'blandness', 'vapidity' and lack of depth, admonishing readers to return to the original texts. A number of reviews praise the accuracy and attractiveness of the sets, while others judge that the psychological nuances of Austen's originals are lost in adaptation. In Sweden, the success of the films led to a televised interview in 1998, which asked: 'Why is Jane Austen so popular?' But a more salient question is, granted that the films have led to an increase in translations, have they led to Austen being *read* more, as opposed to being *watched* more? In many cases, the answer is *no*: as Mihaela Mudure (Chapter 17) notes, since the screen adaptations are readily available, many young viewers are of the opinion that there is no need to read the novels themselves. Despite the popularity of the films and serials (or perhaps because of them), Austen's typical readership in Europe remains

restricted to a determined few, while the films distil a less polyvalent version of the stories for a mass audience, a version which is absorbed by the category of 'costume drama'.

Conclusion

What the nineteen essays in this volume demonstrate is the range of responses and variety of ways in which Austen has been received on the continent. At times, her reception has been a convoluted process, especially when her ironic perspective and subtle characterization have been ignored or misinterpreted. Nevertheless, as the years have progressed, European responses have become increasingly nuanced and attuned to the polyvalency of her writing. Despite a meagre presence during the nineteenth century, the attention given to Austen (at times, the Austenmania) on the continent establishes that her 'Englishness' – the issue with which this introduction began – has functioned less as a barrier than a point of interest for European readers and scholars. The phenomenal success of the screen adaptations has played a considerable part in establishing Austen as a leading writer in the canon of world literature by the start of the twenty-first century. This study presents a point of departure for future and more extended evaluations of the reception of Jane Austen in Europe.

1 The Reception of Jane Austen's Novels in France and Switzerland: The Early Years, 1813–1828

Isabelle Bour¹

The most striking facts about the reception of Jane Austen's novels in France and Switzerland are that within ten years – between 1815 and 1824 – all six major novels had been fully translated, and that there was not a single review of any of the translations. This chapter will attempt to explain both these facts. This will involve first looking at the French literary scene during the late eighteenth and the early nineteenth centuries: what did the French read at the time, what was the status of the novel in general, and of British fiction in particular? What were the expectations of French novel readers? In the absence of any reviews, knowledge of both literary output and readers' expectations will provide some idea of *how* Austen's fiction was read.

To begin this sketch of the French literary scene in the Revolutionary, Napoleonic and Restoration eras, it is worth pointing out that there was an overall time lag between Britain and France in terms of readers' expectations, owing to the very different ways in which the novel developed in the two countries. Notwithstanding the fiction of such writers as Abbé Prévost and Restif de la Bretonne, France had no native equivalent to the impetus provided by the fictional rogue autobiography initiated by Defoe and to the third-person narration and social realism perfected by Fielding; hence, the epistolary form popularized by Richardson endured in French fiction into the early nineteenth century. It may also be said that France resisted the 'novel' and remained faithful to the 'romance'; or at least, what novels France had were often satirical, in imitation of Lesage's *Gil Blas* (1715–35), and the romance focused on the passion of love, with powerfully drawn female characters: Rousseau's *Julie, ou la nouvelle Héloïse* (1760) provides the archetypal example of this kind of romance,

¹ I would like to thank Mireille Chauveinc and Florence Lignac, senior librarians at the Bibliothèque nationale de France; I also owe a debt of gratitude to Michel Crouzet, Jean Goulemot and Didier Masseau.

and its influence on French fiction, into the early nineteenth century, cannot be overstated. This may explain why the novel of sensibility was not as worn-out a genre in France as it was in Britain in the 1800s, by which time it was largely discredited and abundantly parodied, after being transformed, and undermined, by Gothic fiction. This state of affairs helps us to understand Mme de Montolieu's translation (1815) of *SS*, as well as why Austen's generic ironies sometimes went unnoticed or at least untranslated. Alternatively, this shortsightedness might be construed as resistance to Austen's subversive originality.

During the late eighteenth century, the French novel was undergoing a period of relative fallowness, and the leading genre was drama, which partly explains why the literary market was heavily reliant on translations, especially of British fiction. Of course, anglophone fiction had been very popular in France since the 1740s, when Samuel Richardson's *Pamela* (1740–41) and *Clarissa* (1747–48) enjoyed a huge vogue throughout Europe, but the dearth of significant French authors created a void that was filled by English sentimental, political and Gothic novels. Marie-Joseph Chénier, in his *Tableau historique de l'état et des progrès de la littérature française, depuis 1789* (*Historical Survey of the State and Progress of French Literature, since 1789*, first published in book form in 1816, but written in the very early 1800s) devotes several pages to 'outstanding' literature in translation, adverting to the large number of translations from the English, noticing Elizabeth Inchbald's *Simple Story* (1791), devoting a paragraph to William Godwin's *Caleb Williams* (1794), and discussing Ann Radcliffe's novels at some length, which reflects their great popularity in France. A propos of Frances Burney, he remarks that 'in England, as in France, the most distinguished modern novelists are women' (Chénier 1816, 268). At the end of his survey, he does not consider authors such as Anna Maria Porter, Regina Maria Roche, and M. G. Lewis beneath his notice.²

Chénier points out that the production of novels has reached industrial proportions in Europe: he speaks of the 'manufactures' of the Palais-Royal in Paris, the Strand in London, and the Leipzig fair, and of the plethora of poor novels available (1816, 275). The growth of a mass market for books is indeed another factor accounting for the high rate of translation of fiction. Yet another is the

² Elizabeth Inchbald's *Simple Histoire* was published in 1791, Godwin's *Les Aventures [sic] de Caleb Williams, ou les choses comme elles sont* in 1795. Ann Radcliffe's *La Forêt ou l'abbaye de Saint-Clair* (a translation of *The Romance of the Forest*, 1791) appeared in 1794, *Les Mystères d'Udolphé* (*The Mysteries of Udolpho*, 1794) in 1797, *Les Châteaux d'Athlin et de Dunbayne, histoire arrivée dans les montagnes d'Ecosse* in 1797 (*The Castles of Athlin and Dunbayne*, 1789) and there were two translations of *The Italian* within two years, first *Eléonore de Rosalba ou le confessional des pénitents [sic] noirs*, published in Geneva, and then a French translation, *L'Italien, ou le confessional des pénitents noirs*. Still within the period considered by Chénier, Anna Maria Porter's *Octavia* came out in 1801 (the English version having been published in 1798), Regina Maria Roche's *Les Enfants [sic] de l'abbaye* (*The Children of the Abbey*, 1796) in 1797, and *La Fille du hameau* (*The Maid of the Hamlet*, 1793) in 1801; finally Matthew Lewis's *Le Moine* (*The Monk*, 1796) was first published in 1797.

fact that during the French Revolution there was little demand for genres other than fiction and political literature of a more or less ephemeral and topical nature, the two genres off-setting each other. This lopsidedness of the book market in the 1790s becomes evident upon examination of the lists of some of the leading publisher-booksellers of the 1790s; besides, there were frequent complaints about how difficult it was to publish books of learning.

Later, during the Consulate (1799–1804) and the Empire (1804–15) periods, official censorship did not make for formal inventiveness: rather, it led publishers to favour translations of works which were by definition available for pre-publication examination, and authors who wrote within well-established, or indeed, worn-out, genres. In other words, political instability, political supervision of the print market and the resulting aesthetic unoriginality favoured translation. The leading genres during the Empire were sentimental and Gothic fiction (*roman noir*), and the leading authors of sentimental fiction were women. Among those well-regarded women novelists were Cottin, Flahaut (later Souza), Charrière, Genlis and, most notably, Krüdener, whose *Valérie* (1803) shows the influence of Rousseau and German Romanticism. The leading female novelist, however, was Mme de Staël, who took the sentimental novel to its limits in *Delphine* (1802), and went beyond it in *Corinne* (1807), a travel narrative-cum-feminist romance. All these works, with the subtle, and extensive, convolutions of their analyses of romantic passion, were not really compatible with the study of manners that Maria Edgeworth and Jane Austen were developing in the British Isles. During this period a few important novels by male authors came out, such as *Obermann* (1804) by Senancour (which only became influential about a decade later), *Atala* (1801) and *René* (1802) by Chateaubriand, as well as *Adolphe* (1816) by Constant. Such works pointed to a new trend in the French novel, which, while still frequently employing first-person narration, turned away from the epistolary mode to adopt a more autobiographical, more confessional form.

During the French Restoration (1814–30), Paris was the European capital of literary cosmopolitanism. There was a widespread desire, after years of censorship and blockade, to become better acquainted with foreign literatures and cultures, a desire illustrated by the publication of Staël's essay *De l'Allemagne* (On Germany, 1814). There were few new French authors, and few good novels, the most notable female ones being by Mme de Duras: her novel *Ourika*, the bestselling book of 1824, has a black heroine, whose torments (induced by her irremediably ambiguous status in French society) unfold during the French Revolution when the massacres in Santo Domingo exacerbate the debate over human rights. Thus the sentimental novel (which is our focus here) acquired a sharper edge in France from the sufferings of the Revolution and the ensuing, protracted wars. What was to take the French novel out of its generic repetitiveness was the discovery of Walter Scott. As in Britain, he brought about a literary revolution. The first novels to be translated were *The Antiquary* and *Guy Mannering*, both in 1816, but Scott's fiction only became truly influential in France in the 1820s; Scott made the novel respectable, and freed French fiction from past patterns and themes.

To form a more accurate idea of the standing of the novel in France in the early nineteenth century, three kinds of contemporary literary material have

been examined: literary textbooks then known as ‘rhetorics’, histories of literature, and literary periodicals. In all these, the novel is regarded as a minor genre, as was generally the case at the time in France and Britain, and indeed across Europe. Rhetorics or anthologies of literature (in the broad sense of the term) are very conservative; whether they are focused on French or English literature, they devote very little space to fiction. François-Joseph-Michel Noël (1817–19), only anthologizes Sterne, Goldsmith, Radcliffe, Barbault and Edgeworth. By contrast, Jean-François la Harpe’s extremely influential 23-volume *Lycée, ou Cours de littérature ancienne et moderne* (*Lyceum, or Course in Ancient and Modern Literature*, 1798–1804) devotes ample space to fiction, the English authors he selects being Defoe, Richardson and Fielding, whose *Tom Jones* he styles ‘the foremost novel in the world’ (1843, 23: 28). Even more broad-minded is Quentin Craufurd (1803), who discusses a good deal of fiction, including such recent authors as Mme Riccoboni and Gabriel Sénac de Meilhan.

As for early nineteenth-century French literary periodicals, it is quite striking that they reviewed less fiction than their British counterparts, and their choice seems to have been dictated by fashion. The *Mercure étranger* (1813–15), which excerpted and reviewed foreign literature, had no time at all for fiction, the only British novel it mentions appearing in a short bibliographical notice in its ‘Gazette littéraire’ (1814, 70) – Isabella Kelly’s *Jane de Dunstanville* (1813). *La Quinzaine littéraire* (1817–18) carries three reviews of British fiction: of Lady Morgan’s *Novice of Saint Dominick* (1806), Jane Porter’s *Pastor’s Fireside* (1817) and Maria Edgeworth *Ormond* (1817), all of which were translated in 1817. The *Magasin encyclopédique* (1804–16) reviewed only a handful of novels over twelve years, and the selection did not evince great acumen. (In this perspective, the anthologizing of Austen novels by the Swiss *Bibliothèque britannique*, which will be discussed later, was particularly enlightened.) The *Magasin encyclopédique* changed its title to *Annales encyclopédiques*, published during 1817–18, and carried a section entitled ‘Literary News’, in which it gave short notices of Scott’s *Black Dwarf* and *Old Mortality* (both 1816; translations of these two novels, *Le Nain mystérieux* and *Les Puritains d’Ecosse* had appeared together in 1817). This kind of editorial policy in itself is enough to explain why there are no reviews of a little-known novelist such as Jane Austen.³ Before Walter Scott, the novelist most often reviewed or noticed was Lady Morgan, partly because she published so many novels in the 1800s and 1810s. (The success of Walter Scott, and his impact on the status of prose fiction may explain why, during the Restoration, the interest in fiction grew, notably in such periodicals as *Minerve*, *Mercure de France* and *Journal des débats*.)

³ In Britain, there were fewer than twenty contemporary reviews and notices of Austen’s fiction. Furthermore, prior to Montolieu’s translation of *P* (1821), none of the translations of Austen’s novels identified her as its author, which could hardly have assisted her reception in early nineteenth-century France.

Early comments

Against this background, the success of Jane Austen's novels in France is all the more remarkable. Of course they did not take France by storm as Scott's did, but they enjoyed real success, as is attested by Alexandre-Nicolas Pigoreau, a publisher–bookseller, who notes that translations of *E*, *MP*, *SS* and in particular *P* 'have been extremely successful' (1821b, 8). In a letter to her Parisian publisher regarding the success of her translation of *SS* in Switzerland, Isabelle de Montolieu noted in December 1815: 'Reason and Sensibility is quite successful – it is thought to be agreeable – in spite of what may be said in Paris.'⁴ (The latter part of the sentence may reflect some initial reservations about the novel; Pigoreau's assessment, which came several years later, is a better reflection of the novel's standing over time.) Eloïse Perks, a translator of *PP*, mentions in her very short preface that the translation of *SS* was 'extremely successful in France'.

The standing of Austen's fiction in France can be estimated more precisely thanks to lists of recommended reading in contemporary guidebooks. Pigoreau provides a list of authors 'who may safely be turned to' (1821a, 347); there are many English authors on this list, the leading contemporary novelists being named as August Lafontaine, Walter Scott and Lord Byron [*sic*]. The ensuing list of British authors comprises Radcliffe, Roche, Bennett, Burney, Edgeworth, Helme and the Porter sisters, among others, but does not include Jane Austen (Pigoreau 1821a, 347). One year later, however, Pigoreau does include Austen on a list of 'estimable novelists' ('romanières estimables'; 1822b, iv). Similarly, Antoine Marc (1828) provides a list of sixteen 'famous English, American, and German authors', among whom are eight women: Morgan, Riccoboni, Burney, Inchbald, Edgeworth, Radcliffe, Roche and Jane Porter. Marc also supplies a selection of the best novels, which includes *Orgueil et prévention* (*PP*) and *Raison et sensibilité* (*SS*).

Although there were no contemporary reviews of any of the early Austen translations, there are some extant critical statements. Those available are of two kinds: short notices in Pigoreau's *Petit Bibliographie bibliographico-romancière* (Small biographical bibliography of novelists, 1821) and translators' prefaces at the beginning of the novels. Pigoreau (1821b) supplies ten lines on *Orgueil et prévention* (*PP*) and twelve on *La Famille Elliot, ou l'ancienne inclination* (The Elliot family, or the old inclination; *P*). Montolieu's 1815 translation of *SS* carries a 'Preface', the anonymous 1816 translation of *E* has an 'Advertisement' and Montolieu's 1821 translation of *P* carries a 'Translator's Note'; all three are about a page long. In addition, the 1822 translation of *PP* has a very short 'Translator's Preface'.

Isabelle de Montolieu (1751–18), a French-speaking Swiss sentimental novelist made famous by *Caroline de Lichtfield* (1786), and translator of German and English fiction (though her command of both languages was imperfect),

⁴ 'Raison et sensibilité réussit assez bien – on le trouve agréable – quoi qu'on en dit [*sic*] à Paris' (in Cossy 1996, 162).

certainly contributed to making Austen's fiction better known.⁵ In 1815, as her preface makes clear, she was not aware of the identity of the author of *SS*. But, by 1821, her advocacy of Austen in her Translator's Note must have carried some prestige, both in France and Switzerland. (There are not enough data to distinguish the French from the Swiss reception of her translations.)

Montolieu's preface to her 1815 translation of *SS* differs in emphasis from the two contemporary British reviews of this novel (see *CH*, 35–40). She says that it is of a new kind ('d'un genre nouveau'): though it has come out of Britain, it is not a novel of 'terror' – which is to her a relief; indeed, she feels, it is of a kind which may have gone to the other extreme, by depicting events that might happen to any of its readers, by focusing on trivial concerns and rivalries. This slight reservation is offset by her praise of the plausibility of events, the consistency in the behaviour of characters, the simplicity of the style. She also singles out Austen's truthfulness in depicting manners.⁶ Unlike the anonymous British reviewers, she does not stress the opposition between Elinor and Marianne, nor Austen's attack on excessive sensibility. Indeed, she says that Marianne's sensibility is endearing.

This might seem to be a deliberate distortion of Austen's intentions, but the fact is that Montolieu is so steeped in sensibility, the mode in which she herself writes – she had met Jean-Jacques Rousseau as a child, and was deeply influenced by *La Nouvelle Héloïse*, which she had read in 1768 – that she fails to perceive the depth of Austen's satire and critique. This is amply confirmed by Montolieu's translation and the liberties she takes with the plot (as will be seen). So, while she underestimates the satire, she is more aware than British reviewers are of the carefulness and minuteness of Austen's social realism. She has no doubt that the author of the novel is a woman.⁷ Montolieu also contextualizes what she sees as a novel of everyday life by saying that, after the events provided by recent history, an 'eventful novel' would have been unbearable. Is this not a way of saying that, by 1815, Gothic fiction had been made redundant by recent European history?

The idea that Austen is more concerned with social description than action reappears in the 'Advertisement' to *La Nouvelle Emma* (1816), presumably by the anonymous translator. *E* offers 'a picture of contemporary manners' ('un tableau des mœurs du temps'), and like Montolieu, the writer sees the novel of manners as a specifically English genre. He or she perceptively senses that Austen has direct knowledge of the world she depicts, and suggests that readers like to see themselves in a novel more than they do the exotic. In *E*, the defining

⁵ Montolieu's *Caroline de Lichtfield* (1786), a bestselling novel well into the nineteenth century (translated into English by Thomas Holcroft in the same year, as *Lindorf and Caroline*) may well have been a model for *SS*. Furthermore, a copy of Montolieu's novel was given by Austen to her niece Fanny. See Moody (2003) for further details.

⁶ Walter Scott makes very similar points to these in his unsigned review of *E* for the *Quarterly Review* (1816; in *CH*, 61).

⁷ Of course the title page of the first edition of *SS* announced that it was 'by a Lady', but this was occasionally said of anonymous novels written by men.

criterion of good and bad characters is mainly social, morality being informed by a true sense of social standing and responsibilities: this interest leads the translator to discuss the meaning in English of the word ‘gentleman’.

The penultimate early assessments of Austen’s fiction are provided, again, by Montolieu, whose translation of *P* came out in 1821, and by Pigoreau’s short notice for this translation. Montolieu begins by explaining why she chose to translate Henry Austen’s ‘Biographical Notice’. Although she initially considered it too laudatory to be true, an Englishman of distinction told her that the notice did not exaggerate Austen’s merits and reputation: these were gained because she was the creator of a new genre, characterized by the simplicity of the means used, the masterly development of character and the truthfulness of the feelings described. By the time she comes to translate *P*, Montolieu’s aesthetics have not drastically changed, as she can still understand why some of Austen’s readers might find the naturalness of her family scenes uninteresting; however, she identifies this naturalness as delineating Austen’s specificity. Finally, Montolieu argues that Austen’s domestic novels offer the best critique of Gothic fiction. In his entry for Montolieu’s translation of *P*, Pigoreau characterizes ‘this pretty novel’ by its ‘delicate sentiments, effusions of gentle friendship, and family pictures’.⁸

The last critical statements on Austen’s fiction concern Eloïse Perks’s translation of *PP* (‘1822’, actually 1821). Pigoreau (1821b) emphasizes the novel’s function as a picture of English manners, its attention to detail and handling of character. A perceptive parallel is drawn between Richardson and Austen: a single house enabling the former to depict all possible types of character, a small community being enough for the latter to give a just representation of English manners. In the final early French comment, Perks’s prefatory note to her translation stresses that *PP* owes its merit to Austen’s detailed picture of manners rather than to romantic happenings.

There is a further, apocryphal assessment of *PP*, by Madame de Staël, who is known to have borrowed a copy of the book from her publisher in Britain, Henry Colburn, while in London during 1813. In his *Memoirs*, James Mackintosh mentions that he recommended a novel by Austen to Staël; it is likely that this was *PP*, which she declared to be ‘vulgar’ (*vulgaire*; see Gilson 1974, 547). Why vulgar? It may be surmised that this was mainly because of the role money plays in the romance between Elizabeth and Darcy: Staël’s own female protagonists were aristocrats, whose romantic attachments and dilemmas never bear any financial dimension. She might also have objected to the pertness of Elizabeth, to the depiction of the trivialities of provincial life and to the dour pragmatism of Charlotte Lucas.

Overall, what most commentators highlight in Austen’s novels is the prevalence of the description of manners over the dynamics of plotting. They respond to one aspect of Austen’s originality: a new kind of psychological analysis focusing on minute mental and emotional phenomena. Nonetheless,

⁸ ‘ce joli roman’; ‘sentimens [*sic*] délicats, doux épanchemens [*sic*] de l’amitié, tableaux de famille’ (Pigoreau 1821b, 19–20).

no critic mentions irony, none even comes close to some kind of dim awareness of Austen's subtle use of shifts in focalization (Richard Whately, in his important 1821 review of *NA* and *P* hovered around this question, when he contrasted at length the benefits of first-person and third-person narration; see *CH*, 96–98).

Translations

The first novel by Jane Austen to appear in French was *PP*, as *Orgueil et préjugé*, excerpted during 1813 in four successive issues of the Swiss monthly journal, *Bibliothèque britannique; ou recueil extrait des ouvrages anglais périodiques et autres* (British library; or a collection of extracts from English periodical works and other items; hereafter *BB*). This was a remarkable publication, edited by two brothers, Marc-Auguste and Charles Pictet, who both knew Britain very well. *BB* (1796–1815), ensured that, despite the lengthy wars between Britain and France, francophone Europeans could keep up with developments in science and literature in Britain (see Bickerton 1986). Initially, the editors did not wish to excerpt new fiction, preferring to concentrate on such classic authors as Shakespeare, Milton, Pope and Thomson, but very soon they had to bow to readers' pressure. During the 1790s, *BB* spurned Gothic fiction (except for Radcliffe's), preferring to publish excerpts from Inchbald, Burney, Roche, as well as political fiction by Holcroft, Bage and Godwin. Later on, they published excerpts of fiction by Edgeworth, with whom they were acquainted. It is worth adding that they did not move in the same circles as Isabelle de Montolieu.

David Gilson hypothesizes that the translator of Austen may have been Charles Pictet (1974, 138). Edmond Pictet, in his 1892 biography of his grandfather, explains that Charles frequently enlisted the help of his wife and his two daughters for 'quick translation of novels' (in Cossy 1996, 43). As for *MP*, the translator is likely to have been Pierre Prévost, Charles Pictet's collaborator in editing the literary section of *BB*. For one thing, in 1814–15, Charles was involved in the negotiations at the Congress of Vienna; besides, Prévost, who had travelled around Britain in 1774, had several close relatives domiciled there. In 1814, Prévost is known to have quarrelled with Marc-Auguste Pictet and Frédéric-Guillaume Maurice (the third member of the editorial team), and seemingly abandoned his contribution to the 'Littérature' volumes by 1815. This might explain why there was no more excerpting from novels by Austen after 1815, when selected passages from *MP* were published: the *BB* continued publication under a different title, *Bibliothèque universelle* (Universal library), and with different emphases.

The four excerpts from *PP* appeared promptly after the publication of the British edition late in January 1813, between July and October 1813. This promptness was part of the editorial policy of the Pictet brothers, as was the fact that they published only material as yet unavailable in French. In 1798, Charles Pictet described standard English style in a way that illuminates the translation choices of *BB*, and indeed of nearly all translators of Jane Austen over the next two decades:

English composition has certain features which are striking to the French reader; such are the length of phrases, frequent suspension of the flow of the meaning by subsidiary ideas, striving for vivid expressions, overuse of adjectives, laborious turns of phrases, in a word, something which to us appears limp, stilted or obscure.⁹

What is implied here is that English writing calls for pruning, which would have come even more naturally to editors and their collaborators, as they seem to have sometimes dictated their translations to amanuenses. The translations of Walter Scott enjoyed a higher standard of accuracy possibly because Scott, though prolix, was much more concerned with narration and description. The translator of *PP* chose scenes of daily life, in which the reader witnesses Darcy's ambivalent interest in Elizabeth and sees them interacting, and scenes of social comedy. *PP*, which might summarily be described as a novel of sentiment and psychological analysis, is turned by the selection of excerpts into more of a novel of manners than it really is, becoming to some extent more like a novel by Maria Edgeworth.

The translation is also a systematic abridgement: the translator clearly thought that Austen's detail was redundant, not intrinsically important. Shades of meaning and feeling are eliminated: Austen appears as a much less subtle and intelligent writer than she was; even more importantly, she seems less analytical. The systematic pruning concerns mainly narrative and descriptive passages: thus, for instance, the first two paragraphs of *PP*, 1.15 are translated into a shorter one (*BB* 1813, 53.3: 399). Slight inaccuracy is quite common, which sometimes affects the focalization, and thus the attendant narratorial irony may be lost. This is how the Swiss translator renders Austen's original sentence, 'Elizabeth admired the command of countenance with which Charlotte talked of the healthfulness of the exercise [gardening], and owned she encouraged it as much as possible' (*PP*, 2.5: 156): 'Charlotte put on a brave face, praised the advantages of outdoor exercise, adding that she encouraged it as much as possible.'¹⁰ In the translation, Charlotte's behaviour is not filtered through Elizabeth's amused perception, but presented in a declarative statement by the omniscient narrator.

Another striking characteristic of the *BB* translation is that it often does away with free indirect discourse, which it clearly finds alien to the French language. Very occasionally, there is some explication. For instance, when Elizabeth looks at Darcy's portrait at Pemberley, her feelings are made explicit, or speculated upon, and an unfortunate parallel is drawn by the narrator with the first proposal, when Darcy was not at his friendliest, nor particularly benevolent; the parallel between the man in the picture and the aggressive lover is unconvincing (*BB* 1813, 54.1: 105–06).

⁹ 'La composition Anglaise a de certains caractères qui frappent le lecteur Français; tels sont la longueur des périodes, la suspension fréquente du sens par des idées accessoires, la recherche des expressions qui font image, l'abus des épithètes, les tournures qui sentent l'effort, quelque chose enfin qui nous paroît lâche, guindé, ou obscur' (in Bickerton 1986, 490).

¹⁰ 'Charlotte fit bonne contenance, loua les avantages de l'exercice de plein air, ajoutant qu'elle l'encourageoit de son mieux' (*BB* 1813, 53.4: 524).

PP was not fully translated until 1822, but in that year *two* translations appeared: one in Switzerland called *Orgueil et préjugé*, one in France entitled *Orgueil et prévention*. Overall, the French of the Swiss translation seems more archaic, partly because of the use of the *-oit* form for verb endings: until the late eighteenth and the early nineteenth centuries, French verbs conjugated in the imperfect, conditional and future tenses had an *-oi* rather than an *-ai* ending: *je chanterois* rather than *je chanterais*, for instance. The Swiss translator also has fairly conventional views about love and marriage, which results in significant, though limited, censoring: for instance, the narrator's comments about Charlotte Lucas's reasons for accepting Collins are omitted, as they must have appeared crude, pragmatic and totally unromantic. The translation is more long-winded, but often more accurate than that of Perks, who indulges in some very light pruning. The translator sometimes misconstrues the English, which never happens with Perks. By the third and fourth volumes, the Swiss translator had become perceptibly weary of Austen's analytical style, cutting out whole paragraphs, sometimes essential ones with regard to Elizabeth's psychological evolution.

According to Pigoreau (1821b, 8), the Paris translation was by Eloïse Perks, a young Englishwoman. In her short preface, Perks self-deprecatingly refers to Montolieu's *élégante plume* (elegant quill). Perks provides some notes covering British manners, places and foods. The two titles are slightly different, but the meanings of *prévention* and *préjugé* are very close. Though the Swiss translation and the excerpts published by the BB bear the same title, they are otherwise unrelated.

The variety among the three translations can be illustrated by quotation of the famous opening of the novel. The BB offers a pared-down version, where the supposed universality of the initial statement goes unmentioned:

It is an acknowledged truth that a young man in possession of a fortune must seek to marry. This is so well known in all families that, without information being sought on his plans and manner of thinking, any gentleman, on his arrival in a neighbourhood, is already regarded as belonging to one of the local families.¹¹

Perks is much more accurate, though the translation of the first sentence does away with the inconsistency between a 'truth universally acknowledged', which calls for a declarative statement, and the use of the modal verb 'must'; thus much of the irony is erased:

It is an almost irrefutable truth that a young man in possession of a large fortune must be in want of a wife. Though the sentiments and tastes of such a man are not known, as soon as he establishes himself in a county, the local families

¹¹ 'C'est une vérité reconnue, qu'un jeune homme qui a de la fortune doit chercher à se marier. On sait si bien cela dans toutes les familles, que sans s'informer des projets et de la façon de penser d'un gentilhomme qui arrive dans un canton, il est déjà regardé comme acquis à une des familles du voisinage' (BB 1813, 53.3: 373).

regard him as a possession which must shortly belong to one or another of their daughters.¹²

The Swiss translation is signally precise, but ponderous and insensitive to the rhythm of Austen's opening sentences; the last sentence in the second paragraph is an addition; the slightly archaic flavour of this translation can be felt here:

If there is a widely acknowledged idea, it is that a very rich man must be thinking of marriage.

However little known his habits and intentions may be, this idea is so strongly implanted in the minds of all the families of the neighbourhood in which he settles, that he is immediately considered as the *legitimate property* of the young persons who live there. It is only a matter of knowing which one will engage his attention.¹³

The first full French translation of Austen was of *SS*, entitled *Raison et sensibilité, ou les deux manières d'aimer* (Reason and sensibility, or the two ways of loving), published in Paris by Arthus Bertrand in 1815; the title page announced that this was 'a free translation from the English, by Mme Isabelle de Montolieu'. Unlike Noel King (1953–54, 6), I do not think that the fact that Montolieu may have resorted to amanuenses to polish her translations is the reason why they were loose renderings of the originals (see Cossy 1996, 150–51). It is much more likely that, as a practitioner of the novel of sensibility, she must have felt, at least in 1815, that Austen was too unromantic. She perceived that the framework of *SS* was still basically that of the novel of sensibility, and chose to enhance that aspect; this meant undercutting Austen's critique of sensibility, which was mostly left standing, but weakened by the very addition of pathetic scenes. It is precisely because hers is a loose translation that it is particularly interesting, as it illustrates the aesthetic gap between such an innovator as Austen and a routine sentimental novelist. Again, I do not agree with King that Montolieu was 'a total stranger to Jane Austen's art' (1953–54, 5): her distortions imply some more or less conscious perception of Austen's originality; besides, her later translation of *P* is much more faithful to the original and, as has been seen, her preface to *La Famille Elliot* shows some understanding of Austen's uniqueness. Further, while it is true that Montolieu's 'text has no unity of style or point of view' (King 1953–54, 7), that can also be said of Austen's text, as the satire of high-blown sentiment is not consistent.

¹² 'C'est une vérité presque'incontestable qu'un jeune homme possesseur d'une grande fortune, doit avoir besoin d'une épouse. Bien que les sentimens et les goûts d'un tel homme ne soient pas connus; aussitôt qu'il vient se fixer dans une province, les familles du voisinage le regardent comme un bien qui doit dans peu appartenir à l'une ou l'autre de leurs filles' (Perks 1822, 1: 1–2).

¹³ 'S'il est une idée généralement reçue, c'est qu'un homme fort riche doit penser à se marier. / Quelque peu connues que soient ses habitudes et ses intentions, cette idée est si fortement gravée dans l'esprit de toutes les familles du pays dans lequel il se fixe, qu'il est à l'instant considéré comme la *propriété légitime* des jeunes personnes qui l'habite [*sic*]. Il ne s'agit plus que de savoir laquelle fixera son attention' (Perks 1822, 1: 1–3).

Montolieu's changes to *SS* highlight Austen's originality and exemplify the resistance to it. First, there are changes to the plot: a significant deviation occurs when Montolieu makes Maria's illness (Marianne becomes 'Maria') largely consequent upon her seeing Willoughby and his wife go by in his curricule. There is a pathetic scene in which Brandon, closely followed by Elinor, finds Maria apparently lifeless on the steps of a Greek temple. (This scene is illustrated in the frontispiece to vol. 3 of the 1828 edition of *Raison et sensibilité*.) The biggest alteration to the plot, however, is the introduction of a Madame Smith, a Methodist, who has taken under her protection a remote relative, Madame Summers, and her young son. Madame Summers turns out to be Brandon's ward, Caroline Williams (the younger Eliza in the original), whom Willoughby had seduced; the identity of the child is unmistakable, as he is 'a Willoughby in miniature' (Montolieu 1815, 4: 248). Under the same impetus, Montolieu further alters the end of the novel, making it more sensational and more reliant upon hackneyed sentimental patterns: she has Willoughby's unloved wife die after being thrown from her phaeton, which she insisted on driving herself. In the letter which conveys this news to Maria, Willoughby hints that he hopes that one day she will agree to marry him, but Maria tells her sister that her heart now belongs to the best of men, Colonel Brandon. It is Elinor who answers Willoughby's letter; Willoughby then does the right thing: a year after his wife's death he marries Caroline Williams who, fortunately, has become 'much prettier and lovable than she used to be' (Montolieu 1815, 4: 266).

It is quite clear from all this that Montolieu resorts to situations and peripetia that are the stock-in-trade of the novel of sensibility. The tampering with the ending of the novel is worst, as conventional morality is made to triumph, with Maria explicitly renouncing her love for Willoughby and the dishonoured Caroline Williams being restored by marriage to her seducer. Montolieu wants vice to be squarely renounced, whereas Austen makes it clear that Willoughby was not unhappy all of the time with his wife, and could get engrossed in sport.

Apart from straightforward departures from the plot, there is much resorting to what could be called 'heightening' of scenes: Montolieu rarely misses an opportunity to have characters cry and fall into each other's arms. Thus, in the very first chapter of the novel, she adds a little pathetic vignette about the death of Mr Dashwood:

The last moments of the dying man were lightened by this assurance; he expired calmly in the arms of his wife and daughter despairing at his loss; his son, seated a little distance away, was reflecting on his promise and on what he might and should do to fulfil it.¹⁴

Some passages are also expanded: after the scene of the large party where the

¹⁴ 'Les derniers instans du mourant furent adoucis par cette assurance; il expira doucement dans les bras de sa femme et de sa fille, au désespoir de sa perte, et son fils, assis à quelques pas plus loin, réfléchissait à sa promesse, et à ce qu'il pouvait et devait faire pour la remplir' (Montolieu 1815, 1: 6–7).

Miss Dashwoods see Willoughby again, Montolieu swells the last two paragraphs of the chapter into four pages, in which Elinor tries to find excuses for Willoughby's behaviour (SS, 2.6: 178–79; Montolieu 1815, 2: 28).

Linked to this is her trivializing of complex emotion, by the introduction of romantic clichés. Austen's Marianne may be very romantic, whereas Montolieu's Maria often falls into hyperbole. Montolieu slides into bathos with Willoughby's reflections when he tells Elinor of his feelings after receiving Maria's first note in London:

'But Maria deserved something better than a prodigal or a libertine. She would have corrected all my faults, I would have become worthy of her. But now, what encouragement, what example shall I find to become virtuous? I rage, I despair! He rose, and strode about agitatedly, his fist clasped to his brow.'¹⁵

Montolieu also tends towards amplification and explication, where Austen chooses understatement, or leaves it to the reader to deduce certain conclusions. This is how Austen introduces the character of Marianne: 'Marianne's abilities were, in many respects, quite equal to Elinor's. She was sensible and clever; but eager in every thing; her sorrows, her joys, could have no moderation' (SS, 1.1: 6). Montolieu spells out the excesses in Marianne's nature:

In intelligence, sense and talents, Maria was in no way inferior to Elinor; but her restless sensibility was never reined in by reason. Without measure or restraint she yielded to her every impression; her sorrows, her joys were always extreme [. . .].¹⁶

Montolieu also significantly inflects what is perhaps most innovative about Austen's writing: her use of narration, focalization and free indirect discourse – in other words, her handling of voices and perspective in the narrative. These are Edward's feelings after Elinor has told him that Colonel Brandon wants to give him the living of Delaford:

What Edward felt, as he could not say it himself, it cannot be expected that any one else should say for him. He *looked* all the astonishment which such unexpected, such unthought-of information could not fail of exciting. (SS, 3.4: 289)

This becomes:

What Edward felt at this moment cannot be described; but it certainly was not joy.

¹⁵ 'Mais Maria méritait mieux qu'un dissipateur, qu'un libertin. Elle m'aurait corrigé de tout; je serais devenu digne d'elle. A présent, quel encouragement, quel exemple ai-je pour devenir vertueux? O rage! ô désespoir! Il se leva et se promena violemment le poing serré sur son front' (Montolieu 1815, 4: 90).

¹⁶ 'Pour l'intelligence, l'esprit et les talents, Maria ne le cédait en rien à Elinor; mais sa sensibilité toujours en mouvement, n'était jamais réprimée par la raison. Elle s'abandonnait sans mesure et sans retenue à toutes ses impressions; ses chagrins, ses joies étaient toujours extrêmes [. . .]' (Montolieu 1815, 1: 12–13).

What was expressed in his face was extreme surprise, blended with a very painful feeling. The die was cast; he had no further pretext to delay his marriage.¹⁷

Montolieu does away with the omniscient narrator's playfulness, and spells out Edward's likely thoughts. In SS, 1.5: 27, the polyphony between free indirect speech and narratorial discourse is erased by Montolieu's introduction of direct speech (1815, 1: 74). Free indirect speech is also mostly turned into direct speech in Miss Steele's voluble account of the interview between Edward Ferrars and Lucy Steele (SS, 3.2; Montolieu 1815, 3: 39); as it allows for a blending of the narrator's and the character's voices, this means that the implicit narratorial irony is done away with.

Noel King quotes the following passage for the amusing addition of a comparison, which marks out the translator as Swiss, but it is also remarkable for its focalization. Maria and Emma (Margaret) have been overtaken by the rain, and run down the hill to go home; the perspective seems to be that of a hypothetical remote observer, perhaps Willoughby: 'Maria took off also and, running down the hill so quickly in their white dresses, they must from a distance have looked like those balls of snow which start off avalanches.'¹⁸ As for the modal 'must' (*devaient*), it seems that the translator is not sure of the comparison she has introduced.

Finally, Montolieu makes some significant lexical choices: she uses the words *sensibilité* and *sympathie* much more often than Austen does 'sensibility' and 'sympathy'. When she employs the word *sympathie*, it is usually to spell out the nature of love: for Montolieu, sympathy is principally an irresistible and reciprocal predisposition. As for her frequent use of the word *sensibilité* (where Austen might use 'feeling' or 'tenderness'), it is a tangible sign that to Montolieu sensibility remains the defining characteristic of a truly noble human being, rather than a dangerous faculty that must be kept in check by reason. This reading of Montolieu's attitude to sensibility is confirmed by her hesitation in the translation of 'sense' and 'sensible'. Thus, in the portrait of Lady Middleton (SS, 1.11: 54–55), 'sense' is translated as 'un manque total d'idées et de sentiments', which seriously erodes the difference between 'sense' and 'sensibility'. 'Sense' is often translated by *esprit* (this applies to other early translations): *esprit*, as the principle of intellectual life, tends to lack the meaning of common sense, or what the OED terms 'practical soundness of judgement'.

The BB published excerpts from *MP* (retaining its original title) over four successive months, between April and July 1815. The short summary of the beginning of the novel is preceded by a note explaining that the success of '*Pride and Prejudice*, *Orgueil et préjugé*' has led the editors to publish extracts from a

¹⁷ 'Ce qu'Edward éprouvait dans ce moment ne peut être rendu; mais ce n'était pas de la joie. Une surprise extrême, mêlée d'un sentiment très-douloureux, voilà ce que sa physionomie exprimait. Le sort en était jeté; il n'avait plus / de prétexte pour retarder son mariage' (Montolieu 1815, 3: 228–29).

¹⁸ 'Maria s'élance aussi, et avec leur robe blanche, descendant aussi rapidement, elles devaient ressembler, à quelque distance, aux boules de neige qui commencent les avalanches' (Montolieu 1815, 1: 118).

second novel by the same author (58.4: 490). There is considerably more linking summary in this selection than in the 1813 passages from *PP*; this is partly because *MP* is a longer work, but mostly because it is a conversational novel, in which lengthy passages of dialogue slowly propel the plot forward, and partly because *BB* would not give very long sections from any work. Thus, the selection from *MP* is much less satisfactory than that from *PP*, which has a neater, more linear plot. Another problem is *MP* has a larger cast of main characters, and more subplots, the main romantic interest (if it may be so called) being enmeshed with those subplots, and being less flamboyant than Darcy's pursuit of Elizabeth. The excerpted *MP* is also unsatisfactory because the translator did not attempt to convey the psychological and moral complexity of the passages translated, but opted for compression, with no attempt at stylistic exactitude. Sometimes, one feels that what is being offered is more an explanatory paraphrase than a true translation: there is much pruning, within and between sentences. As with *PP*, there is a marked tendency to turn free indirect speech into dialogue.

In 1816, there appeared in Paris a full translation of *MP*, under the title of *Le Parc de Mansfield, ou les trois cousines* (Mansfield Park, or the three cousins). The title page indirectly refers to Montolieu's translation of *SS*, as it announces: 'par l'auteur de Raison et sensibilité ou les deux manières d'aimer'. The translator, who appears on the front page as Henri V*****n, can be identified as Henri Vilmain or Villemain, who, like Montolieu, translated from the German of August Lafontaine and was an author of fiction in his own right. The French title, *Le Parc de Mansfield, ou les trois cousines*, changes the focus of the original title: firstly, because *parc* does not denote a mansion which is part of an estate, as 'park' does in English; secondly, because it introduces a bias towards characters, rather than foregrounding the life of a small community. Again, the translation is characterized by considerable pruning, within and between sentences: Vilmain clearly found Austen too long-winded, precise and analytical. No character or episode is omitted, but Austen's narrative style is considerably altered. The most striking linguistic feature of the translation is the way it turns free indirect speech into dialogue: this may be partly ascribed to the tendency to summarize and abridge rather than translate, but it also has to do with a widespread tendency in early translations to make Austen's texts less dialogic.

The only translation to retain Austen's multivocal narrative style is that of *E*, which appeared in Paris in 1816, a partial reprint of the first half (with a hasty conclusion tacked on) appearing in Vienna the following year. Of all the early translations, this is the only fairly accurate one: it is usually precise, rendering subtle changes in the handling of narration and focalization. Long, complex sentences tend to be broken down into shorter ones, but this is something that translators from English into French still do nowadays. Nevertheless, there is little evidence that accuracy in translation in general was undergoing radical improvement (see Lambert 1975).

The French title of *E* deserves consideration: *La Nouvelle Emma, ou les caractères anglais du siècle* (The new Emma, or the English characters of the age) Why *La Nouvelle Emma*? In 1776, a novel entitled *Emma; or, the Child of Sorrow* had been published anonymously in London. The novel was not translated immediately after publication, but in 1788 it was translated twice into French:

once by Mademoiselle Haudry with some success, and once less successfully by an anonymous translator (although it was reprinted under a new title in 1792). This novel thus enjoyed more success in France than in Britain, for reasons which remain obscure, as it is a run-of-the-mill novel of sensibility; however, the fact that the translator of Austen's novel felt it necessary to entitle it *La Nouvelle Emma* is a sure sign of the other *Emma*'s continuing popularity. The appended subtitle, *Les Caractères anglais du siècle* (the English characters of the age), results from the translator's belief, expressed in his 'Advertisement', that *E* is not a novel but a picture of modern manners. This subtitle is evocative of a gallery of pictures, a series of individual portraits which have a characteristic value, revealing national traits: the narrative dimension of the work is thus glossed over.

This translator's accuracy did not completely rule out redaction, and Miss Bates's two outpourings are severely reduced, which must have tried the translator's patience – and sense of humour. Also, by the third volume, the translator seems to have wearied of Austen's precision, indulging in some light pruning. There is also the occasional compression, as well as a few inaccuracies and mistakes, but this no more marked than in the other early translations.

While *NA* and *P* originally appeared together in 1818, *P* alone was translated in 1821, while *NA* did not appear until 1824: no doubt because a parody of Gothic fiction was regarded as somewhat outdated. Isabelle de Montolieu, translator of *P*, decided to include Henry Austen's 'Biographical Note of the Author', which opened the original posthumous edition; however, she omitted the 'Postscript' altogether, and did not translate the last three paragraphs of the 'Biographical Note', substituting her own concluding paragraph.

Apart from *L'Abbaye de Northanger*, only Montolieu's translations carry illustrations: *La Famille Elliot* (*P*) and the second edition of *Raison et sensibilité* (which, along with *P*, appeared as part of Montolieu's collected works in 1828). In these two novels, the illustrator and engraver are the same, and there is some stiffness in the design of the pictures. Predictably, in *Raison et sensibilité*, the illustrations are of romantic or pathetic scenes: Willoughby rescuing Maria (Marianne in the original) (vol. 1); Maria at the large party in London hoping that Willoughby will see her (vol. 2); Brandon finding Maria senseless on the steps of the little Greek temple (vol. 3; this scene is an invention of Montolieu's). The first illustration of *La Famille Elliot* reflects the domesticity of the book: though it is not keyed to a specific page, it shows Captain Wentworth relieving Anne Elliot (called 'Alice' in the translation) of the burden of the young Charles Musgrove clinging to her back; the illustration to vol. 2 portrays a moment when Wentworth points out his letter to Alice. This is a very delicate etching, with a sense of something momentous happening and intense looks on both their faces.

Montolieu's translation of *P* is presented as 'freely translated from the English of a posthumous novel by Miss Jane Austen', and is the only time before the publication of *L'Abbaye de Northanger* (1824) that Austen's name appears in a translation. This is a free translation, which involves a good deal of heightening, explicating and trivializing. Once again, Montolieu lengthens rather than shortens the novel, unlike other translators. There are a few added scenes. At the beginning of *La Famille Elliot* (2: 6), Montolieu inserts a conversation at the Elliots', which is ambiguous enough for Alice to be led to think that Wentworth is to marry Louisa Musgrove; Alice then goes to her room and ponders the

situation, regretting that she does not have Louisa's firmness of character, which attracted Wentworth. Her despair is expressed in cliché-ridden language:

All is now over; o memories, love, hope, I must erase you from my heart! This cruel moment destroys the illusion which sustained it still! She confessed to herself that as long as Wentworth had been free, she had made no attempt at banishing him from her heart; now she must, and no doubt she will succeed [. . .]¹⁹

Montolieu's invented peripeteia implies the end of all Alice's romantic hopes, and makes stoical reasonableness necessary. Only after this added episode does Alice receive Mary's letter. Another significant change occurs in *La Famille Elliot*, (2: 7), when Lady Russell does not see Wentworth in the street, whereas in Austen's original she sees him but pretends not to; it may be that Montolieu did not want to assign petty feelings to the mentor-figure of Lady Russell.

There is also repeated expansion and explication, and Montolieu turns Alice/Anne into a Cinderella-like figure (1: 7), who 'counted for nothing in the house, though she took upon herself everything that was demanding and tedious'.²⁰ There is considerable expansion of the passage in which Sir Walter Elliot assesses his daughters and the likelihood of one of them making a 'suitable' marriage:

Some years earlier, Alice had been very pretty, less in the regularity of her features, which did not equal those of her elder sister, than by much freshness of complexion and an agreeable expression; but she had become much thinner and paler, and even in her bloom, her father would never agree that she might be handsome: fine, delicate features, velvety black eyes, and the fair skin of a dark-haired girl – all this bore no resemblance to him and the fair Elizabeth, and could in no way please him: he recognised beauty only in blond hair, large blue eyes, an aquiline nose, fine, vermilion lips, and a slender, upright figure, of an above-average height; Alice was of medium height, and she had lost none of her charms. Alice, who was so different from his ideal of beauty, and who was not in the first flush of youth, seemed to him not worthy of notice; he no longer had any hope of writing beside her name that of a spouse worthy to appear in his favourite book; but Elizabeth, who was so beautiful and always beautiful, would surely gain for him this indescribable pleasure, and would no doubt make a very brilliant marriage.²¹

¹⁹ 'A présent tout est fini; souvenir, amour, espoir, vous devez vous effacer de mon cœur! Ce cruel moment détruit la chimère qui le flattait encore! Elle s'avoua à elle-même que, tant que Wentworth avait été libre, elle n'avait fait aucun effort pour le bannir de son cœur; maintenant elle le doit, et sans doute elle y parviendra' (Montolieu 1821, 2: 89).

²⁰ 'comptait pour rien dans la maison, quoiqu'elle se chargeât de tout ce qu'il y avait de pénible et d'ennuyeux' (Montolieu 1821, 1: 7).

²¹ 'Quelques années auparavant, Alice avait été très-jolie, moins par la régularité de ses traits, qui n'égalait pas ceux de sa sœur aînée, que par beaucoup de fraîcheur et une aimable physionomie; mais elle avait beaucoup maigri et pâli, et même lorsqu'elle était dans tout son éclat, son père n'avait jamais voulu convenir qu'elle fût bien: des traits fins et délicats, des yeux d'un noir velouté, un teint clair de brune, tout cela n'avait aucun rapport avec lui et avec la belle Elisabeth, et ne pouvait lui plaire: il n'accordait la beauté qu'à des cheveux blonds, des grands yeux bleus, un

Montolieu feels that she has to provide a physical description of Sir Walter's ideal woman (Elizabeth), probably because Austen's descriptions are very brief, or non-existent, and because womanhood for Montolieu is much more a matter of physical appearance than it is for Austen. Further, it is noticeable that Sir Walter's ideal beauty is also a continental person's stereotypical view of an English beauty, complete with Anglo-Saxon blondness and northern stature.

Often, Montolieu makes situations more dramatic and extreme than in the original: thus, in *La Famille Elliot* (1: 4), the narrator has Wentworth go without taking leave of Alice after they bring their engagement to an end. When Alice and Wentworth meet again after eight years, Montolieu gives the protagonist additional impressions and feelings, and adds a short conversation between Alice and her sister Mary, the latter asking her why she has sighed (which Anne does not do in the original). Montolieu repeatedly makes explicit the characters' supposed feelings: thus, when Anne is seen manoeuvring to have a new opportunity to speak to Captain Wentworth at the rooms in Bath (*P*, 2.8), Montolieu makes the underlying psychological explanation explicit:

She is no longer the girl of nineteen, timorous and submissive, who would not challenge the unfair prejudices of her friend, sacrificing her happiness to them. Too long has Alice suffered the consequences of her weakness and docility not now to display courage and firmness, if this happiness she rejected is once more within her reach.²²

Montolieu even lapses into bathos and the most hackneyed sentimental language. Here are Alice's thoughts after Wentworth has secured a place for her in the carriage after the walk to Winthrop:

Yes, it was he, Frederich [*sic*], her Frederich of old! She could still feel the pressure of that still-dear hand; yes, it is that hand, and it is his wish which has placed her there: he has noticed that she was tired, so he has paid some attention to her, while she thought him solely occupied with Louisa, and he wanted her to rest calmly next to her sister.²³

nez aquilin, des lèvres fines et vermeilles, et une taille bien prise et bien roide, au-dessus de la grandeur ordinaire; celle d'Alice était moyenne et pleine de grâces qu'elle n'avait pas perdues. Alice, si différente de ce beau modèle, et qui n'avait plus même la fraîcheur de la jeunesse, ne lui paraissait pas digne d'être regardée; il n'avait plus aucun espoir d'inscrire à côté de son nom celui d'un époux digne de figurer dans son livre favori; mais Elisabeth, toute belle et toujours belle, lui procurerait sûrement ce plaisir indicible, et ferait sans doute un très-brillant mariage' (Montolieu 1821, 1: 8–9).

²² 'Ce n'est plus la jeune fille de dix-neuf ans, craintive et soumise, n'osant braver les injustes préventions de son amie, et leur sacrifiant son bonheur. Alice avait souffert trop long temps de sa faiblesse et de sa docilité pour ne pas avoir maintenant du courage et de la fermeté, si ce bonheur qu'elle a rejeté vient s'offrir encore' (Montolieu 1821, 2: 153).

²³ 'Oui, c'était lui, c'était Frederich, et presque son Frederich d'autrefois! Elle sentait encore la pression de cette main toujours chérie; oui, c'est cette main, c'est sa volonté qui l'a placée là: il a remarqué qu'elle était fatiguée, il a donc fait quelque attention à elle, lorsqu'elle le croyait uniquement occupé de Louisa, et il a voulu qu'elle se reposât doucement à côté de sa sœur' (Montolieu 1821, 1: 185–86).

Montolieu does not shrink from altering characters' feelings to make Austen's text fit standard novel-of-sensibility schemas. While Montolieu makes Alice's behaviour and emotions evince run-of-the-mill sensibility, she is also constrained by her conception of men as creatures of reason who cannot descend to a certain level of silliness: this explains why she cuts much of Sir Walter Elliot's tirade about counting ugly women in Bath (*P*, 2.3: 141–42). Here, she erases a streak of subversiveness in Austen, as Sir Walter exemplifies the intellectual and moral decline of a self-regarding gentry obsessed with the past.

Montolieu's fondness for sentiment and her persistent tendency to use it as a benchmark of individual worth may explain why she repeatedly translates 'sensible' as *sensible*, a modern equivalent of which would be 'sensitive'. On the other hand, her awareness of Austen's originality may account for her retaining much of the free indirect discourse used in the original, although some is still turned into direct discourse.

The last novel by Jane Austen to be translated into French was *NA* (*L'Abbaye de Northanger*, 1824), published by Pigoreau who, with his special interest in fiction, may have thought that the novel was worth translating, though its concerns had become unfashionable. Most copies (though not the one in the Bibliothèque nationale de France) have a fairly unsophisticated unsigned engraved frontispiece, illustrating the beginning of *NA* 1.6, conflating the moments when Catherine first sees the large chest in her room and tries to open it (*BJA*, 175).²⁴ The translator, Hyacinthe de Ferrières, was a novelist in her own right, who had an interest in making the French more familiar with British manners, as evinced by her novel *Le Jeune William, ou l'observateur anglais* (*Young William, or the English observer*, 1808). She provides a fairly accurate translation of Henry Austen's 'Biographical Notice of the Author', again omitting the 'Post-script'. Overall, her translation, while relatively accurate, is uninspired. There is some pruning, which becomes systematic only towards the end, suggesting that the curtailment may have been dictated by the need to keep the novel within a certain length. Ferrières has a good command of English, with some mistakes, which, as in the other translations examined so far, arise with idiomatic phrases, rarer vocabulary and the handling of negatives.

Ferrières's translation of the long opening paragraph of the novel is quite representative of her work: the opening sentence is clumsy; she makes minor changes, minor errors (she thinks that 'character' means 'disposition' when it is an equivalent of 'reputation'); she leaves out some of the ironies (what is said of the Christian name of Catherine Morland's father or of large families); she makes the physical portrait of Catherine less damning; she does away with a synthesizing sentence that gives the portrait of Catherine its structure: 'Such were her propensities – her abilities were quite as extraordinary' (*NA*, 1.1: 14).

The main characteristic of this translation is that it quietly adapts the text – it takes liberties with vocabulary and syntax. A good example is provided by the portrait of Eleanor Tilney (*NA*, 1.8: 55–56):

²⁴ This illustration is reproduced in Robbins (1977, 72).

Miss Tilney was young and quite pretty; she had agreeable features, and a distinguished bearing; her manners, which were neither so affected nor so brilliant as Isabelle's, were more genuinely elegant. They were the manners of a sensible, well-bred person; while not being distant or officious, she had an amiable disposition, which however did not attempt to attract the attention of all men; she was not constantly seen, at the slightest provocation, affecting extremes of joy or sorrow.²⁵

Ferrières does not keep the ternary rhythm in the initial half of the first sentence in the English, she does not distinguish between 'manners' and 'air'; the second sentence is not very accurately translated. Here and elsewhere, Ferrières is insensitive to, or unconcerned with, the carefully crafted rhythm of Austen's sentences or lexical choices.

Ferrières occasionally spells out what Austen leaves implicit. Regarding Catherine's gradual realization that John Thorpe is a fairly dimwitted young man, Ferrières adds: 'she started using her own [judgement], and began to think that having Mr Thorpe as a partner, either in a carriage or at a ball, was perhaps not the greatest of life's pleasures'.²⁶ Conversely, she tends to erode Austen's parodic intentions. In Catherine's assessment of Captain Tilney, Ferrières removes the sentence that is in open parody of the romantic excesses typical of the worst kind of sentimental fiction: 'He cannot be the instigator of the three villains in horsemen's greatcoats, by whom she will hereafter be forced into a travelling-chaise and four, which will drive off with incredible speed' (NA, 2.1: 131). She replaces a parodic remark with narrative commentary about the protagonist, which in a way spells out the fact that Catherine's story is separate from the meta-narrative parodic discourse – that in the Bath section of the novel, the parody is of the discourse, rather than the plotting, of sentimental and Gothic fiction.

Conclusion

I would like to close this analysis of the early French reception of Jane Austen's novels with brief consideration of Alexandre-Nicolas Pigoreau's discussion of two translations of Walter Scott's *The Pirate*. Most of this unusually long entry (over an octavo page in small print) is given over to the question of

²⁵ 'Miss Tilney était jeune, et assez jolie; elle avait une physionomie agréable, un maintien distingué; ses manières, qui n'étaient ni si affectées ni si brillantes que celles d'Isabelle, étaient plus véritablement élégantes. Elles étaient celle [sic] d'une personne raisonnable et bien élevée; sans être ni froide, ni trop prévenante, elle avait une amabilité par laquelle toutefois elle ne cherchait pas à fixer l'attention de tous les hommes; on ne la voyait pas à tout instant, à la plus légère circonstance, affecter l'exaltation dans la joie ou le chagrin' (Ferrières 1824, 1: 55–56).

²⁶ 'elle commença à faire usage du sien [de son jugement] et à s'arrêter à la pensée que le plus grand des plaisirs n'était pas celui d'avoir M. Thorpe pour partener [sic], soit en voiture, soit au bal' (Ferrières 1824, 1: 151–52).

translation. Pigoreau begins by quoting the famous adage by Horace: 'Nec verbum verbo curabis reddere fidus / Interpretes' ('As a true translator you will take care not to translate word for word'), and by remarking that this maxim was successfully put into practice by Abbé Prévost, whose 'translations of *Clarissa* and *Pamela* can still be read with pleasure'.²⁷ He makes his point clear: 'French vivacity is unsympathetic to British phlegm, which dwells on any idea and presents it under a thousand different aspects.'²⁸ But Pigoreau goes on to make a point that, while not new in the early nineteenth century, was increasingly voiced from the end of the eighteenth: 'However, everybody must keep his national manner; an Englishman in French costume is graceless.'²⁹

I would suggest that the need to respect the national identity of a text was more keenly felt with Walter Scott, whose novels had a very specific geo-historical anchoring. It was more difficult for what Pigoreau calls *littérateurs* (men of letters) to identify the Englishness of Austen's novels, save for their pictures of manners. The dialogue that Austen maintained with earlier kinds of fiction, and earlier types of narration – especially Richardson's – was difficult for French translators to identify. So was the specificity of her narrative voice, which is reliant on English language and syntax: on the flexibility with which it can use free indirect discourse and thus convey irony.

Consequently, Austen's early translators distorted her narrative voice and frequently suppressed the multivocality of her texts, but (excepting Montolieu's SS) they did not reshape her novels to such an extent that she appeared as just another sentimental novelist. While her rhetorical subtlety was partially lost, her social satire was perceived as innovative, and would have appeared and appealed to French readers as being particularly English. In the absence of any reader responses, it can only be speculated that Jane Austen was perceived in France as an author for whom the depiction of manners was essential.

Nevertheless, the limits of Austen's success are partly evident in the very small number of copies of the translations extant: three or four of each novel, dotted about Western Europe. The print runs of *Raison et sensibilité* (SS), *Le Parc de Mansfield* (MP), *La Nouvelle Emma* (E) and *La Famille Elliot* (P) amounted to 1,000 copies each. Such relatively low figures can partly be explained by the fact that publishers issued novels mostly for the circulating-library market; that Austen's novels were geared towards circulating libraries is confirmed by the duodecimo format, which was typical for library books. It allowed for large print and wide margins, which were comfortable on the eye; more importantly, multivolume editions increased publishers' profits. Prices for early

²⁷ 'On lit encore avec plaisir les traductions qu'il nous a données de *Clarisse*, de *Paméla*' (Pigoreau 1822a, 12).

²⁸ 'La vivacité française ne sympathise pas avec le flegme britannique qui s'appesantit sur son idée et nous la présente sous mille formes différentes' (Pigoreau 1822a, 12).

²⁹ 'Il faut néanmoins conserver à chacun sa tournure nationale; l'Anglais n'a pas de grâces sous le costume français' (Pigoreau 1822a, 12).

editions of Austen's novels (when they are known) vary from six to ten francs, and few people indeed could have afforded to buy such expensive items on a regular basis.³⁰

³⁰ This is equivalent to approximately £18 to £30 in present-day currency. I owe these figures about individual sales and prices to Jean-Yves Mollier, whose knowledge of publishing in nineteenth-century France is matchless.

2 The Reception of Jane Austen in France: The Later Nineteenth Century, 1830–1900

Isabelle Bour

As we have seen in the previous chapter, Madame de Montolieu's two translations from Jane Austen (*SS*, *P*) were reissued in 1828, as part of the translator's complete works. Nevertheless, there were to be neither reissues of the early translations nor any new ones until 1882. This does not mean that Austen was forgotten in France, however, which would have been all the easier, as her first four novels had been published anonymously, and it is unlikely that élites in France would have known before Austen's death the identity of 'the author of *Sense and Sensibility*' as they did in Britain.

In order to contextualize the pioneering importance of the nineteenth-century French discussions of Austen, it is worth considering the Franco-British literary scene in France, from the July Monarchy (1830–48) to the end of the century. Through what channels were the French informed about new British fiction? What did they read and where? The ensuing study will identify a shift in emphasis in critical discussions about Austen: from her treatment as a novelist of manners and an analyst of the human mind towards being perceived as a humourist and a stylist.

I have just mentioned French readers of British literature in France; there was also a large British audience in France from the beginning of the Restoration (1814–15) onwards, whether travellers or more long-term expatriates.¹ There were fluctuations in political relations between the two nations, but relations were much better after the Restoration than they had been during the Revolutionary and Napoleonic wars: the French monarch, Louis-Philippe (who replaced a Bourbon king, Charles X, thanks to an uprising in 1830, and was to be brought down by the 1848 Revolution), was an anglophile; besides, the parliamentary monarchy he introduced was inspired by Britain's own

¹ Expatriates numbered about 20,000 at mid-century, while there were 82,000 British travellers to France in 1855.

regime. The anglophilia of the French, or at least of the cultural elites, which had never died, was revived. This anglophilia, as well as the large number of expatriates, explains the presence of anglophone periodicals, reading rooms (*salons littéraires*) and bookshops.

Indeed, there were no fewer than six publishers supplying literature in English in France: Baudry, Galignani (the leaders in the field), Dautherau, Lequien, Truchy and Cormon & Blanc. The first four published entire series of works, among them: Baudry's ambitious 'Standard Ancient and Modern British Novels and Romances', Galignani's *Meilleurs auteurs contemporains d'Angleterre* (Best modern English writers) and Dautherau's *Collection des meilleurs romans français et étrangers* (Series of the best French and foreign novels). In the absence of international copyright (at least until 1852), it was easy for continental publishers to produce pirated editions of British books, which were sold much more cheaply.

These bookseller–publishers employed *cabinets de lecture* (circulating libraries), where people could read, as well as borrow, books. Some, like Galignani, whose library boasted about 30,000 volumes, provided a *salon littéraire* overlooking a garden, where people could linger and socialize among themselves. Apart from books, visitors to foreign bookshops could also read periodicals published by some of these firms: Galignani had its *Messenger*, a daily, and Baudry its weekly, the *Athenæum* (with 22,000 subscribers in 1830).² Francophone journals also reviewed English fiction, sometimes in the original language, which may have prompted translations of favourably assessed works. The leading journals were *La Revue des deux mondes* (The review of the two worlds), which started in 1829 and is still published today; *Le Journal des débats* (Journal of debates), an influential daily; *L'Artiste* (The artist); *Le Journal des savants* (Scholarly journal); *La Revue encyclopédique* (The encyclopaedic review); *La France littéraire* (Literary France); and, most importantly, *La Revue britannique* (The British review, 1825–1901). Initially, *Revue britannique* only published articles taken from various British journals (and occasionally adapted for French readers), but gradually began to offer original material. Like the Swiss *Bibliothèque britannique* (British library) and the *Edinburgh Review*, it shaped the literary opinions and tastes of franco-phone culture.

Some of these journals carried only brief notices, amounting to little more than advertisements; others supplied lengthy articles about new literature. Thus, while none of the articles in the *Revue britannique* mentions Jane Austen between 1825 and 1880, its wide-ranging articles on British fiction kept French anglophiles abreast of literary criticism in Britain. In 1827, there was a piece from the *New Monthly Magazine*, entitled 'Whence the insipidity of romance heroes?' ('D'où vient l'insipidité des héros de romans?'): the answer, provided in the first sentence, was that they were perfect human beings. In 1833, an article from the *Monthly Review* on 'Commercial literature in England' ('De la littérature marchande en Angleterre') was published in extracts. In 1834, a piece from the *New Monthly Magazine* on 'The intellectual powers of our age'

² Another anglophone periodical published in France was the *Parisian Bell, or the Paris and London Advertiser*.

(‘Puissances intellectuelles de notre âge’) appeared. Finally, in 1836, there was an article from the *British and Foreign Review* on ‘Women writers in England’ (Les Femmes auteurs en Angleterre).³

It is most interesting that articles on British fiction disappear from the *Revue britannique* after 1836. Following a slight delay, this coincides with the completion of Walter Scott’s Waverley Novels, and the period when both British and continental critics were searching for novelists of Scott’s calibre and failing to find any. After Scott, the most famous British novelist in France was Charles Dickens. Dickens was never to achieve the status of Scott in France, as he was seen as a popular novelist rather than a creative genius, but he was welcomed, partly because, like most French novelists, he wrote about the modern world. This is what the newspaper *Le Constitutionnel* (The constitution) wrote on 14 April 1839:

Currently, English literature is turning away from the genre of Walter Scott and towards the French school. Among the authors who have given up Walter Scott and Byron to imitate Molière and Le Sage, who have given up the past for the present, poetry for common sense, drama for comedy, we have mentioned the author of *Pickwick*.⁴

For all the sense of a decline in British literature, its fiction was still very popular in France. Until 1842, Scott’s works continued to sell very well and, for every two French novels published, one British novel was translated; after that date, the ratio dropped to about one in seven. French critics felt that British literature had become a little lacklustre when compared to such authors as Stendhal, Balzac and Hugo. The growth of nationalism may have exacerbated this perception. It remains that, during the 1840s and 1850s, French novelists had a greater impact on the British cultural scene than British fiction had in France: the direction of the literary exchange had definitely been reversed.

Before dealing with general criticism of British fiction, some mention must be made of François Guizot’s opinion of Jane Austen, which is quoted in James Edward Austen-Leigh’s *Memoir of Jane Austen* (1870):

Mons. Guizot writes thus: ‘I am a great reader, but I seldom read German or French novels. The characters are too artificial. My delight is to read English novels, particularly those written by women. “C’est toute une école de morale.” Miss Austen, Miss Ferrier, &c., form a school which in the excellence and profusion of its productions resembles the cloud of dramatic poets of the great Athenian age.’ (Austen-Leigh 2002, 111)

³ Respectively, these appeared in *Revue britannique* 1st series, 15 (1827): 26–39; 3rd series, 2 (1833): 227–44; 3rd series, 7 (1834): 275–87; 4th series, 6 (1836): 89–107.

⁴ ‘Il s’opère en ce moment dans la littérature anglaise une réaction contre le genre de Walter Scott en faveur de l’école française. Parmi les écrivains qui ont renoncé à Walter Scott et à Byron pour imiter Molière et Le Sage, qui ont abandonné le passé pour le présent, la poésie pour le bon sens, le drame pour la comédie, nous avons cité l’auteur de *Pickwick*’ (in Devonshire 1929, 289).

François Guizot (1787–1874) was not just any ‘foreigner’ able to ‘appreciate’ the works of Jane Austen (to use Austen-Leigh’s words). Brought up in Geneva, he had very good German and English. He read law at university and was Professor of Modern History at the Sorbonne (1812–49); he also enjoyed a long and distinguished career in the civil service and in politics. Guizot had a special interest in British culture, translating Gibbon, preparing encyclopaedic studies of the English Revolution, briefly serving as Ambassador to the court of St James’s, and spending an extended period again in Britain during 1848–49, when exiled after the fall of the July Monarchy. Guizot was not just a cultivated member of the French Establishment with an interest in British fiction, possessing many friends in the British Establishment itself, who might have influenced his reading. Guizot bestows extraordinary praise on women novelists of the late-Hanoverian period; he only mentions Jane Austen and Susan Ferrier, but no doubt also has Maria Edgeworth in mind – most commentators up to the late nineteenth century regarded Burney and Edgeworth as the main novelists of manners during the earlier part of the century. The sources of his enthusiasm seem to be the ‘typicality’ of characters in the didactic novel, as well as its strong moral bent, which must have been congenial to him, a devout Protestant. Like others after him, Guizot perceives Austen as one of a ‘school’, rather than as a radically original writer.

I now wish to examine French criticism of the novel and assessments of Austen’s works: both kinds of criticism will be studied concurrently, as Austen was often discussed within broader topics. Austen is not mentioned in Charles Coquerel’s *Histoire abrégée de la littérature anglaise, depuis son origine jusqu’à nos jours* (Short history of English literature, from the earliest times to the present, 1828): despite the title, Coquerel stops at the end of the eighteenth century with Thomas Chatterton, Allan Ramsay and Robert Burns. Equally, Austen is absent from an anthology edited by D. O’Sullivan (1830): the only female novelists of the period to be included are Radcliffe, Edgeworth and Morgan. Victor Rendu’s *Nouvelles leçons anglaises de littérature et de morale* (New English lessons in literature and morals, 1828) is even more conservative, including only two nineteenth-century authors in his ‘Prose’ section: John Keats and Walter Scott.

The only mention of Austen during the 1830s is in Eusèbe de Saint-Fargeau’s *Revue des romans* (Review of novels, 1839), a quasi-dictionary of novels, providing ‘1,100 systematic analyses’. Saint-Fargeau was a hack writer of reference works, particularly geographical ones. In his preface, he notes that the novel has become family reading, but that readers in search of ‘emotion, an imaginary world, escape from the self’ need guidance (1839, vii): this is what he provides. Saint-Fargeau has entries for the French translations of *SS*, *P* and *PP*: what he writes about the first two novels is substantially taken from Montolieu’s prefaces, while he provides only one sentence about the third novel. Saint-Fargeau’s view is similar to that expressed in the prefaces of the early translations, which position Austen as a novelist of manners and a master of psychological analysis. Like Montolieu, he focuses his account of *SS* on the two sisters. His comparison of Elinor Dashwood to Mademoiselle de la Vallière, a mistress of Louis XIV’s who repented and became a Carmelite, is interesting. When asked if she was happy in her convent, she answered: ‘No, but I am contented.’ Saint-Fargeau argues that Elinor’s stoicism echoes that of tragic

heroines, or at least of women governed by a pre-sentimental code of ethics in which duty overrides feelings, no matter how strong these might be. Nevertheless, Saint-Fargeau overlooks Austen's satirical streak, and *SS* is implicitly categorized as a didactic sentimental tale. Most of the entry on *P* paraphrases Montolieu's prefatory comments; however, Saint-Fargeau does highlight the importance of the letter scene, which replaced Austen's earlier and different revelation of Wentworth's love. The short biographical notice which he provides is important, insofar as it puts Austen on a par with Burney and Edgeworth. Despite this, Saint-Fargeau does very little to promote any better understanding or appreciation of Austen's work, merely selecting her as offering interesting and suitably moral reading.

Only in the 1840s did real critical appraisal of Austen begin, manifesting assessments that were more than accompaniments to translations. During this decade, the French continued to read the eighteenth-century classics, as well as Scott, and more recent anglophone bestsellers: Fenimore Cooper, Bulwer-Lytton, Marryat and Dickens (Lafforgue 1840). One critic who undeniably shaped the way the French thought about British literature was Philarète Chasles (1798–1873). Chasles became Professor of Northern Literature at the Collège de France, after being Curator of the Bibliothèque mazarine in Paris. As a teenager (1817–18), he spent some time in Britain, working for the London printer and publisher A. J. Valpy. It was at that time that he became familiar with English literature. Despite many inconsistencies in his autobiographical accounts, he nevertheless 'contributed signally to popularizing English literature among us', as Baudelaire put it.⁵

In 1842, Chasles published a thirty-page essay in the *Revue des deux mondes*, entitled 'Du Roman en Angleterre depuis Walter Scott' (Of the novel in England since Walter Scott). Despite the title, lengthy consideration is given to the novel *before* Scott, beginning with John Bunyan. Chasles's main thesis is that, since Scott (who created a new kind of epic fiction), the novel has declined and split into countless variants: among them, the maritime novel, the rogue novel, the Irish novel. Chasles sees Austen as belonging to the school of Samuel Richardson, whom he associates with moral dogmatism, speaking of a 'puritan and didactic school' ('école puritaine et pédagogique'; 1842, 193). He stresses that this school dwells on the minute, and highlights 'its tenuous, imperceptible analyses, and its high seriousness about small things'.⁶

Chasles offers brief characterizations of Burney, Ferrier and Austen. What he sees as specific to Austen is 'a blend of sweet sensibility' ('un mélange de sensibilité douce'; 1842, 194), an attribution which seems bland and inappropriate. Indeed, when set against his slightly longer assessments of Edgeworth, Burney and Ferrier, that of Austen appears as the blandest and least interesting. Chasles is clearly impervious to her irony and the subtlety of her satire. In the

⁵ 'Philarète Chasles, qui a tant contribué à populariser chez nous la littérature anglaise' (in Pichois 1965, 1: 41).

⁶ 'sa ténuité d'imperceptible analyse et son sérieux appliqué aux petites choses' (Chasles 1842, 193).

end, however, he does not think that there is much difference between these female writers of a new kind of domestic fiction:

Only nuances and slight shadings differentiate these lady novelists. Imagination is not their *forte*. What prevails in these delicate and graceful works are female mischievousness, puritan prudishness and the resulting *étiquette*, the morality preached by Richardson which is their heirloom, and a somewhat sickly study of characters and the human heart.⁷

In other words, such fiction upholds strait-laced morality and constrained social behaviour, while demonstrating a somewhat pathological interest in the complexities of the human mind. After all this, it seems somewhat paradoxical to call these psychological novels of courtship ‘delicate’ and ‘graceful’. After his fairly damning assessment, Chasles singles out Ferrier as a better novelist, because of the quality of her satire, although he does not mention satire in connection with Austen.

To Chasles, Elizabeth Inchbald is totally unlike these puritan novelists; her *Simple Story* he calls ‘a miniature masterpiece’. She clearly has some of the male qualities Chasles admires in Byron and Scott: she is ‘passionate and naturally heroic’ (1843, 195).⁸ By the conclusion of his essay, Chasles synthesizes his ideas: the gist of his conception of the novel is that ‘[a]s soon as it desists from [Scott’s] universal sympathy, and shrinks to the size of a Flemish painting, nothing great can be expected from it’.⁹

Eight years later, and with a little more distance from his topic, Chasles identifies Carlyle, Macaulay and Bulwer-Lytton as the new luminaries of literature, in a period when literature is ‘waning and getting tarnished’ following the deaths of Scott and Byron (1850, 395). Chasles provides a section on women’s fiction, which focuses on ‘Miss Burney’, merely mentioning Austen and Edgeworth (but not Ferrier). Despite such oversights, Chasles’s inclusion of Austen in his influential studies prevented the French public from forgetting an author whose identity probably became known only in the 1820s.

Jane Austen is also noticed in Georges Hardinge Champion’s well-informed

⁷ ‘Entre ces romancières, il n’y a guère que des nuances et des demi-teintes. L’imagination n’est pas leur fort. La malice féminine, la prudence puritaine, l’étiquette sociale née de cette prudence, la tradition de la moralité prêchée par Richardson, et l’étude un peu malade du cœur humain et des caractères, règnent dans ces œuvres délicates et gracieuses’ (Chasles 1843, 194).

⁸ When he introduces Walter Scott, Chasles continues his literary typology. He sees Scott as quite apart from the ‘puritan school’, combining as he does ‘the Shakespearean or observational school’ and the ‘archaeological novel’ brought into fashion by Horace Walpole. Chasles states that the characteristic quality of Scott’s fiction lies in its impartiality, and waxes lyrical about the power and the acuteness of Scott’s assessment of the way the world goes. He does, however, concede that there is a certain laboriousness and fastidiousness about Scott’s novels.

⁹ ‘Dès qu’il a délaissé son caractère d’universalité sympathique, pour se renfermer dans les bornes d’un tableau flamand, rien de grand n’est à attendre de lui’ (Chasles 1842, 212).

Etudes littéraires, ou cours complet de littérature anglaise à l'usage des maisons d'éducation (Literary studies, or complete course in English literature for the use of educational establishments, 1849). Champion was a teacher at the Ecole nationale des Mines and the Collège Stanislas in Paris. He gives much attention to fiction of the Romantic period, devoting a paragraph to Austen (only slightly shorter than that allotted to Edgeworth):

Miss Jane Austin [*sic*] is a very praiseworthy novelist of the early nineteenth century; her works combine a felicitous design with a very natural depiction of characters, as well as a moral purpose which may not be as lofty as Miss Edgeworth's, but is more effective, and great delicacy of feeling, a feature which seems to be the usual prerogative of women writing with honourable intentions. Specially deserving of praise are the accuracy and the simplicity of Miss Austen's works.¹⁰

Of course, this assessment is vague, but its very existence is remarkable and seems to confirm that those authors who discussed Austen had some kind of English connection.

Thus, Austen's reputation was established slowly and quietly, and she escaped recognition as a major writer. Of course, one might hypothesize that people continued to read Austen in France during the 1820s and 1830s, but this is not likely to have been widespread, hardly accounting for her posthumous reputation in France. A more convincing explanation for Chasles's interest in Austen is that he was in London when she died and her authorship became widely known. He would have derived his assessment of Austen from what was being said in Britain, rather than from her continental reputation.

Aside from Chasles's book, the only other notice of Austen during the 1850s is to be found in the *Nouvelle biographie universelle* (New universal biography, 1853). Austen's entry occupies a mere twenty lines in a single column, including a list of her novels. After a few biographical facts, the assessment consists of quotations from Scott about Austen, given in the original English, in which her name appears alongside those of Edgeworth and Ferrier, and where Austen's 'talent for describing the involvements and feelings of ordinary life' is stressed.

The next belletrist to discuss Austen at length after Chasles was Hippolyte Taine (1828–93), who was even more influential as a popularizer of English literature, being one of the leading intellectuals of the late nineteenth century. An accomplished analyst of philosophy, literature and the history of art, Taine, like Chasles, wrote for major periodicals such as the *Journal des débats* and *Revue des deux mondes*. A stay in Britain in 1858 led him to focus his next works on British culture, among them studies of Carlyle and Mill in 1864, while his four-volume *Histoire de la littérature anglaise* (History of English literature, 1863–64) was the most comprehensive such work to date, in any language, with

¹⁰ 'Miss Jane Austin est un romancier plein de mérite qui ouvre le XIX^e siècle; elle unit à une grande habileté de plan, à une peinture naturelle des caractères, une intention morale moins élevée peut-être, mais plus efficace que miss Edgeworth, et une profonde délicatesse de sentiments qui semble être l'apanage ordinaire des femmes qui écrivent dans des vues honorables. Le grand mérite des ouvrages de miss Austin consiste dans leur fidélité et leur simplicité' (Champion 1849, 197).

a fifth volume (1869) covering contemporary writers. In the *Histoire*, Taine expounded his famous theory about the factors underlying the production of an author (climate, ethnicity and the historical moment), and was more concerned with marshalling British authors to illustrate his theory than with a dispassionate assessment of their achievements. However, Taine's impressive account exerted influence in Britain as well as in France, where Emile Zola, for instance, was a proselytizer.

In a chapter entitled 'The modern age', at the end of a long section devoted to Walter Scott, Taine has a couple of pages on authors who, in Scott's day or later, wrote novels of manners (*romans de mœurs*). Significantly, the only contemporary of Scott to be examined is Jane Austen: Taine does not mention Maria Edgeworth, who was well known in France during her lifetime and after. Remarkably, Austen is bracketed with Victorian writers (Charlotte Brontë, Gaskell, George Eliot, Bulwer-Lytton, Thackeray, Dickens), whom Taine sees as having created a new genre, the novel of manners of contemporary society, which he considers specifically British. The new genre Taine defines as realistic and moral; however, while he praises the realism of these novelists, he sees them as building on the failure of some imitators of Scott, who were 'incapable of the broad divination and generous sympathy which open up history'.¹¹ He can be quite harsh about the supposed limitations of these new realists: 'they are bourgeois writers addressing bourgeois readers, that is, sedate people blinkered by their occupations, whose very imagination is matter-of-fact and microscopic'.¹² Taine's assessment echoes Chasles's, though Chasles was more concerned with the constricting effects of puritanism than of middle-class professionalism. Taine sees the moral bent of contemporary fiction as congruent with the fiction of the previous century. However, he stresses that the new didacticism adds a sociological dimension, aimed at relieving poverty and preventing injustice. His conclusive assessment, given in a fine oratorical sentence, is laudatory:

These are singular works, unmatched in any period, for no period had a similar society – works which, though mediocre in the eyes of lovers of beauty, are praiseworthy in those of lovers of utility, offering, in their countless variegated pictures and the invariable firmness of their spirit, a depiction of the only democracy capable of containing, governing and reforming itself.¹³

While the consideration of Austen alongside Victorian novelists is an acknowledgement of her historical importance, Taine's picture of her achievements is a

¹¹ 'incapables des grandes divinations et des larges sympathies qui ouvrent l'histoire' (Taine 1863–64, 4: 494).

¹² 'ils écrivent en bourgeois et pour des bourgeois, c'est-à-dire pour des gens rangés, enfermés dans une profession, dont l'imagination vit à terre et regarde les choses à la loupe' (Taine 1863–64, 4: 495).

¹³ 'Singulière œuvre, qui dans toute l'histoire n'a point sa pareille, parce que dans toute l'histoire in n'y a pas eu de société pareille, et qui, médiocre pour les amateurs du beau, admirable pour les amateurs de l'utile, offre dans l'innombrable variété de ses peintures et dans la fixité invariable de son esprit le tableau de la seule démocratie qui sache se contenir, se gouverner et se réformer' (Taine 1863–64, 4: 496).

distorted one. Nevertheless, the mere fact that he discusses Austen, albeit as part of a 'school', would have signalled her significance in the eyes of his wide readership.

Possibly as a result of Taine's success, two histories of English literature were published late in the century, in addition to surveys of foreign literature. Alfred Bougeault's three-volume *Histoire des littératures étrangères* (History of foreign literatures, 1876) is the earliest and encompasses all European literature. The only early nineteenth-century female novelist to be discussed at length (twenty lines) is Maria Edgeworth, while Elizabeth Inchbald and Lady Morgan are merely mentioned. Similarly, Jacques Demogeot's *Histoire des littératures étrangères* (History of foreign literatures, 1880) concludes its survey of English literature with Byron and Shelley, and considers only one nineteenth-century novelist, Scott. (Austen appears in the index, but in a quotation from Taine's *Histoire*.) By contrast, Emile Chasles's anthology, *Extraits des classiques anglais* (Extracts of English classics, 1877), contains one piece from Austen, as well as one each from Maria Edgeworth and Ann Radcliffe. The text by Austen is from *E* (which is not identified), and is entitled 'A woman who speaks': this is Miss Bates's logorrhoea – a passage which was severely curtailed in the first translation of *E* in 1816 is now thought worth anthologizing. Such boldness can probably be explained by the fact that Emile Chasles (1827–1908) was Philarète Chasles's son, and a former Sorbonne professor who, by the 1870s, had become Inspector-General of Public Instruction for Modern Languages.

Austen is discussed in two books both entitled *Histoire de la littérature anglaise depuis ses origines jusqu'à nos jours* (History of English literature from its origins to the modern age), which came out within a year of each other. Henri Testard, who published his study in 1882, taught French in London and at Queen Elizabeth's Grammar School, Cranbrook. Testard's examination of Romantic-era literature is unusually detailed, and can perhaps be put down to his having access to British works of literary history (all the books in his bibliography are British; he does not mention Taine's *Histoire*). He devotes eight pages to the novel of manners, seeing Austen exclusively in this light, perceiving neither humour nor comedy in her novels. His assessment is brief enough to be quoted in full:

As a rule, her novels are distinguished neither by variety nor picturesqueness, but the dialogue is fluent and natural. To achieve her ends, she never has recourse to emotion or laughter, let alone to humour, but she is well endowed with sagacity and common sense. Never has the English middle-class been better, and more faithfully, depicted than by her.¹⁴

To say the least, Testard is ambivalent and undiscerning about Austen.

¹⁴ 'En général, ses romans ne brillent ni par la variété, ni par le pittoresque, mais le dialogue en est aisé et naturel. Elle ne fait jamais appel à l'émotion ni au rire, encore moins à l'humour, pour produire l'effet voulu, mais elle a beaucoup de jugement et de bon sens. La bourgeoisie anglaise n'a jamais été mieux peinte, ni plus fidèlement, que par elle' (Testard 1882, 429–30).

Augustin Filon's experience was not unlike Testard's: first tutor to Napoleon III's son, Filon (1841–1916) became a man of letters, writing fiction and non-fiction, publishing essays in both French and British journals. He lived in Croydon near London from 1879. In his *Histoire de la littérature anglaise* (1883), Filon has a chapter on the modern novel. After adverting to the large number of women writers in Britain, he points out that, unlike their French counterparts, 'they keep their sex in literature': what they feel, observe and say, men could not have said.¹⁵ His first mention of Austen is to stress how different she is from Frances Trollope. Austen's genius he characterizes, oxymoronically, as both 'attractive and austere', adding that, had she lived longer, she might have eclipsed Burney and Edgeworth. Filon says that in her novels she focuses on the gentry, bringing out both its sterling qualities and its prejudices. Very little happens in these narratives where young women enter into life and overcome their minor faults: 'all the emotions that a young woman's heart holds and keeps, Miss Austen first dared, and knew how, to disclose'.¹⁶ The attention Filon pays to Austen's psychological insights is notable, demonstrating greater acumen than Testard.

The 1870s, the decade when the British re-evaluation of Jane Austen commenced, witnessed only one piece of French criticism proper: Léon Boucher's twenty-page essay in the *Revue des deux mondes*, the first French periodical essay devoted entirely to this author. It is entitled 'Le Roman classique en Angleterre: Jane Austen' (The classical novel in England: Jane Austen, 1878), and was prompted by the publication of 'The Works of Jane Austen, with a memoir by her nephew, J.-E. Austen Leigh' (1872–77). The adjective 'classical' in his title is to be understood as being in paradigmatic opposition to 'Romantic': the controversy between the Classicists and the Romanticists raged in France throughout the nineteenth century. That Boucher was aware of the impact of Austen-Leigh's *Memoir* is made clear by his mentioning, about the middle of the essay, that this biography, 'however imperfect', was well received (1878, 450).

Writing late in the century, Boucher feels able to consider Austen's characters as of historical interest, though he adds that their emotions and passions are not dated. Austen's novels reflect the lack of polish of life in the country during the early nineteenth century: this is a little surprising, as rusticity is not a salient feature of Austen's characters, whose lives, besides, are not described in graphic material detail. Like all francophone commentators on Austen since the 1810s, he notes that there are no extraordinary happenings in Austen's fiction. The world explored by the novelist is limited, and only her detailed psychological portraiture brings it to life. Boucher's favourite novel is *MP* and the most successful character in this work he judges to be Mrs Norris. Passages he singles out for praise are the argument Fanny Dashwood puts to her husband to deter him from providing for his mother and sisters in *SS*, the beginning of *PP*, the

¹⁵ 'elles ont conservé leur sexe en littérature' (Filon 1883, 606).

¹⁶ 'tout ce qu'un cœur de jeune fille garde et contient d'émotions, miss Austen osa, et sut, la première, le dévoiler' (Filon 1883, 606).

portrait of Mr Collins and his proposal to Elizabeth, and the description of the noisy Price household in *MP*.

Like his antecedents, Boucher is impervious to Austen's narratorial irony and to the polyphony of her narratives. Indeed, to him, Austen's novels seem to exist simply as portraits of people in action:

She [Austen] is never to be spied behind them [her characters]; she allows them to act and speak without intervening in their actions or conversations, leaving to the perspicuous reader the pleasure of knowing and the care of judging them.¹⁷

He has nothing to say about style and rhetoric.

Boucher locates Austen as a moralist, for whom psychological analysis is a means to an end: hence her appeal for 'so many earnest readers who expect something more from the novel than accurate depictions of manners'.¹⁸ He identifies Austen as a social satirist, though the word 'satire' is never used. On more than one occasion, he seems to be responding to Philarète Chasles's assessment and rejecting it. Thus, when Boucher says, '[w]hen she takes pleasure in dissecting her characters, it is not only to gratify some learned curiosity, but also for them to provide a lesson to her readers',¹⁹ he denies that Austen had a sickly interest in the workings of the human heart, as Chasles had suggested. Again, unlike Chasles, he compares Austen with Fielding, not with Richardson. Further, whereas Chasles called the works of Austen and her female contemporaries 'delicate and graceful', Boucher thinks that her works lack grace and femininity. The phrase 'superior woman' that he uses about her suggests that he sees her as endowed with male strength and vigour, and in his concluding words he compares her with Balzac. Boucher's assessment thus appears as less constrained by a desire to locate an author within a literary movement than either Chasles's or Taine's. While the former saw her as a lady novelist of the school of Burney and the latter as a Victorian realist, Boucher, though saying that 'she belongs in the great school of moralist novelists' (1878, 467) and neglecting her style, is more aware of her individuality.

The next two decades were to confirm the growing – though hardly popular – interest in her work; in each decade there was to be one important essay published in a leading journal, and each decade saw a new translation, first of *P*, in 1882, then of *NA*, in 1898.

The first such essay was by Eugène Forgues, entitled 'Femmes de lettres en Angleterre: Jane Austen' (Women of letters in England: Jane Austen), which appeared in the *Revue britannique* in 1882, on the publication by Bentley

¹⁷ 'Jamais elle ne se trahit derrière eux; elle les laisse agir et parler sans se mêler à leurs actes ou à leur conversation, abandonnant au lecteur intelligent le plaisir de les comprendre et le soin de les juger' (Boucher 1878, 465).

¹⁸ 'tant d'esprits sérieux qui demandent au roman quelque chose de plus que des tableaux fidèles de mœurs' (Boucher 1878, 467).

¹⁹ 'Si elle se donne le plaisir de disséquer ses personnages, ce n'est pas seulement pour satisfaire à une curiosité savante, mais encore pour qu'ils servent d'enseignement aux autres' (Boucher 1878, 467).

of a new edition of Austen's novels. The author, unlike earlier writers on Austen, can be called a gentleman amateur: Forgues (also Daurand-Forgues, 1857–1932) read Law and had a career as a magistrate; when he retired in 1912 he was Procureur général de la Guadeloupe (Attorney-General of Guadeloupe). Forgues's article is very interesting, especially in its comparison between Austen's fiction and the literature fashionable in France during the second half of the nineteenth century.

Forgues has strong views which he expresses forcefully, occasionally self-contradictorily. His critical approach borrows from Taine, focusing on the influence on Austen of her times, her milieu and, to a lesser extent, her 'race', which here is not very different from her nationality. The structure of Forgues's article is similar to Boucher's: both begin with biographical information, then provide a general assessment of Austen's oeuvre. In both cases, the second section of each article begins with a general characterization of Austen's manner: Boucher sees it as unpretentious, Forgues as simple. Indeed, this notion of simplicity forms the underlying thread of his article. Later, he argues that further salient characteristics of Austen's art are honesty and her anchoring in bourgeois provincial life.

Forgues's opening lines are portentous: he states that any age, any historical period, will ultimately be judged by its literature: the late nineteenth century, which enjoys Zola, may well lose much of the respect it thinks it deserves. Forgues adds that he disapproves of 'systems in *ism*' ('un système en *isme*'; 1882, 430), of schools of literature with rigid programmes (such as Zola's): he views them as a form of moral deviation. He says he wants to give an example of what he means in a study of 'one of the last writers of the old style', a 'simplist', as opposed to the 'complicated' writers of modern times, characterized by their 'over-refined analyses, their relentless descriptions, their constant striving for the true, the *lifelike* detail'.²⁰

Forgues provides a biographical sketch of Austen, mentioning that 'this serene old maid' never experienced passion, stressing how limited her acquaintance was. He underlines that Austen wrote in the family sitting room, in constant noise and with people going in and out: his information clearly comes from Austen-Leigh's *Memoir*. He mentions that Austen did not like pedants and bluestockings, and quotes from the two letters to James Stanier Clarke, the Prince Regent's librarian. Forgues then looks at three kinds of external circumstance, which may have influenced Austen's talent: the era in which she lived, her social milieu and objective factors which inflected the events in her life. Forgues describes Austen's age as a transitional period, with Richardson's literature being in decline, and Scott and Byron's not yet born. He wonders what the role of 'pure literature' (*la littérature pure*) may be during a politically and economically troubled period,²¹ answering his own question by saying that 'amidst

²⁰ 'leur analyse raffinée, leur acharnement descriptif, leur recherche perpétuelle du vrai, du *vécu*' (Forgues 1882, 430).

²¹ The phrase 'pure literature' is very interesting: it had not been used before by a French critic with regard to Austen, and the most obvious implication is that in Austen's work the aesthetic purpose prevailed over any documentary or didactic one.

daily public emotions, artistic emotion is out of place and worthless'.²² He considers that the political turmoil explains the poverty of literature in France and Britain at the turn of the nineteenth century. 'The age is benighted' ('C'est le règne des ténèbres'), he concludes grimly.

Forgues tampers somewhat with chronology and plausibility to explain Austen's success from 1813 onwards, putting this down to the end of the war. This caused people to long for fiction again: though fiction was actually as popular during the Revolutionary and Napoleonic wars as before. He parallels Austen's success with that of George Sand's 'pastorals' after 1848: 'After a war and its grandiose concerns, the public seeks repose and calls for a literature that is soothing or induces gentle emotion'.²³ His somewhat convoluted theory allows him to account for the 'thinness' of Austen's novels and for their post-war success:

Two factors complete and justify each other; on the one hand, a work of art born in an age when art is minimal will unavoidably be puny and anaemic; on the other, public favour will be granted it spontaneously, often undiscerningly and for no reason.²⁴

Though Forgues has said that he does not like 'isms', he himself generates his own rather rigid and unconvincing theory of literary production.

After discussing the historical moment, Forgues moves to the milieu, in a sense writing the detailed study of Austen that Taine did not. His main argument is that Austen wrote about the class she knew: that of the genteel, provincial middle class and that the events in her novels are very similar to the uneventful happenings of her own life. Because Austen was honest and simple, her fiction is honest and simple. As was the case with Boucher, Austen's irony and narrative subtlety completely elude Forgues. He believes that her simplicity shows in the fact that all her novels follow the same pattern: they aim at highlighting one moral truth thanks to events taken from everyday life; he takes Austen as primarily a didactic novelist. Like his predecessors, Forgues summons the great rival novelists of the eighteenth century: Austen has adopted Richardson's sentimental morality, lacking Fielding's fancifulness and his robust vitality; nonetheless, her succinct style is as good, possibly better, than Fielding's.

That Forgues totally missed Austen's irony is confirmed when he says that 'in her work impersonality, which is a major dogma of our modern school,

²² 'Au milieu des émotions journalières de la place publique, l'émotion artistique n'a pas de place ni de prix' (Forgues 1882, 436–37).

²³ 'Après la guerre et ses préoccupations grandioses, l'esprit public cherche le repos et veut une littérature qui l'apaise ou l'émue doucement' (Forgues 1882, 437).

²⁴ 'Il y a donc là deux courants d'influences qui se complètent et se justifient l'une par l'autre; d'une part, l'œuvre d'art, née dans une époque où l'art est réduit à un minimum, sera forcément malingre et anémique; et, d'autre part, la faveur publique lui sera accordée sans calcul, et souvent sans discernement ni raison d'être' (Forgues 1882, 437).

prevails'.²⁵ He reads Austen through the French 'naturalist' novel and simply does not *hear* her narrative voice. His familiarity with French realism sometimes serves him better; for instance, when he accounts for there being no descriptions in Austen: 'description would have the drawback of taking our attention, away from mankind, to objects'.²⁶ Forgues's exposure to realist fiction has made him alive to the fact that Austen's world is not highly visual. He quotes the first appearance of Henry Tilney in *NA*, and says that this is like being at the back of a box in a theatre: one hears the play, one cannot see it (1882, 441). Forgues then notes that Austen uses dialogue and narration in equal proportion, arguing that her dialogue is extremely good and provides the only justification for the host of minor characters to be found in her fiction.

That Austen depicted only the world she lived in makes her work realistic, 'in the good sense of the word': Forgues's reader would by this time have been made very much aware that he had a low opinion of the realist novel. Forgues likens Austen to a miniaturist and compares her art to that of Flemish painters. The problem with this kind of minuteness is that it makes for pedestrian writing, something which characterizes the *roman bourgeois* (middle-class novel). At this point, Forgues mentions Flaubert: 'The talent shown by Flaubert in *Madame Bovary* cannot conceal how repellent his subject is' (1882, 443). He particularly deplores the intellectual poverty and the absence of lofty ideals in Austen's characters, quoting the depiction of Elizabeth Elliot in *P* to explain his meaning. The implicit parallel with Flaubert is most interesting: it is not at all developed, but Forgues seems dimly aware that both novelists crafted their novels with the greatest care. More obviously, he comments on the gap between the mediocre world they explore and the consummate art of fiction.

Forgues then moves to Austen's characters, finding her heroines unappealing: they are too adept at capturing rich men. Austen seems to be advising her female readers to be like her heroines if they wish to find a husband. Besides, there is no affection in the hearts of Austen's protagonists, both female and male. Apart from its psychological realism, Austen's fiction is characterized by its humour. She brings out the silliness of some of her characters, without underlining it with any narratorial interventions. Despite her experience of the struggle for life (the Darwinian English phrase is used), Austen retained her capacity for harmless pleasantries. The reference to Darwin is significant: it confirms that Forgues assesses Austen very much within a developmental (not to say evolutionary) psychological and literary–historical framework.

Having stated a few pages earlier that Austen's work was the apex of impersonality, Forgues now contradicts himself by stating that in the background of her masquerades there is a bantering satirist who ridicules absurd characters. His example is taken from *SS* (this he calls *Bon Sens et sensibilité*, which suggests that he may not have been aware of Montolieu's 1815 translation): it is the scene

²⁵ 'Son œuvre est le triomphe de l'impersonnalité, ce grand dogme de notre école contemporaine' (Forgues 1882, 440).

²⁶ 'la description aurait l'inconvénient de nous détourner de l'humanité pour nous attacher aux choses' (Forgues 1882, 440).

where Mrs Jennings tries to convince Marianne that Colonel Brandon is in love with her (SS, 1.8). He concludes that Austen does not describe her characters but shows them in action, taking another example from *NA* (1.6): namely, the scene in which Isabella Thorpe inveighs against men while displaying a keen interest in them.

In his concluding paragraph, Forgues says that he wants to highlight the most salient characteristic of Austen's work: its simplicity. He contrasts this simplicity with 'the refinement, the artificiality, the rankness' ('le raffiné, l'artificiel, le faisané') of modern writers, singling out Baudelaire as an instance. He reverts to the point from the start of his article: such taste cannot last; the public will tire of complicated literature; it will request gay, naïve and brisk stories such as did credit to the eighteenth century: 'When that happens, *Gil Blas* will prevail over *Pot-Bouille* [by Emile Zola], and in the libraries of *cognoscenti* Jane Austen will have pride of place, well above Fielding, Smollett and Richardson.'²⁷ After this, the last few sentences are anticlimactic: in the meantime, young girls of all countries should read Austen, whose novels provide 'a complete course in practical education' ('un cours complet d'éducation pratique'), teaching them how to find a husband.

This analysis will have shown that there are strange shifts in tone and perspective in Forgues's essay: he passes from insightful, sometimes very original, comments to a much more trivial level of assessment. Though he does not discuss Austen's writing, he has moved on from the mid-century critics in that he does not just consider Austen as a novelist of manners but characterizes her brand of realism very precisely in relation to Flaubert and Zola.

It might be because Forgues had claimed *P* as Austen's best novel that, in the same year, 1882, Madame Letorsay offered the public a new translation of this novel, sixty years after Isabelle de Montolieu's. Nothing is known about Letorsay, who only has one entry (for this translation) in the Bibliothèque nationale de France catalogue. Her performance as a translator makes it clear that her command of English was limited. Problems start with the first sentence of the novel, when she translates 'the Baronetage' as 'the heraldic book' ('le livre héraldique'). Quite often the English is misunderstood, sometimes seriously: 'For one daughter, his eldest, he would really have given up any thing, which he had not been very much tempted to do' (*P*, 1.1: 5), becomes 'In truth, for the eldest only was he prepared to make a gesture, provided it did not cause any financial difficulties.'²⁸ There are countless inaccuracies (Mrs Clay's freckles become pockmarks, for instance), as well as systematic pruning and some serious compression, which often detract from the social satire and comedy. Where Montolieu expanded, Letorsay contracts, proving that Letorsay was insensitive to the minuteness of perceptions in *P*, which themselves reflect Anne

²⁷ 'Ce jour-là, *Gil Blas* prendra le pas sur *Pot-bouille*, et Jane Austen viendra, dans la bibliothèque des amateurs, occuper la place qu'elle mérite, au-dessous et pas bien loin de Fielding, de Smollett et de Richardson' (Forgues 1882, 456).

²⁸ 'En réalité, pour l'aînée seule, il était disposé à faire quelque chose, mais à condition de ne pas se gêner' (Letorsay 1882, 5).

Elliot's extreme sensitivity to any change in Wentworth's behaviour. In a word, this translation cannot have provided the best representation of the subtlety and originality with which late-nineteenth-century French critics credited Jane Austen.

A work of literary history published in the 1890s strongly suggests that these are the very years when Austen came to be seen as a great writer, greater than other women novelists of the late-Hanoverian period. Like Forgues, Jean-Jules Jusserand (1855–1932) was an educated man writing on literature rather than a professional critic or an academic. He was distinguished enough, however, to be appointed Professor at the Collège de France. In 1896, Jusserand published his *Histoire abrégée de la littérature anglaise* (Short history of English literature). First, it is notable that he discusses Austen in a chapter entitled 'Johnson and his day', not in the next (and last) chapter entitled 'The modern period', where he deals with Scott, Thackeray, Dickens, George Eliot and 'various novelists'. This means that he sees Austen basically as an eighteenth-century novelist, even though she was a contemporary of Scott.

Jusserand identifies two different novelistic schools operating during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries: the 'familiar' school (*l'école familière*) and the 'romantic' school (*l'école romantique*). The familiar school comprises Burney, Inchbald, Edgeworth, Ferrier, More and, above all, the 'very charming' Jane Austen. He singles Austen out as the best, explaining that she produced 'familiar' novels unalloyed with traits from any other genre, being content with 'observing people around her, describing what she knows, laying bare the motives behind ordinary actions'.²⁹ He is quite clear about her importance: 'she is the one who had the greatest influence, who opened up the widest perspectives, and who retains the largest number of admirers'.³⁰ Jusserand takes an exclusively thematic interest in Austen, and is a little patronizing about the achievements of the 'familiar' school. However, what he implies when he says that Austen wrote unalloyed familiar novels is that she was an innovator, and used mimesis for its own sake: thanks to Austen, the novel became essentially representational. In his earlier inaugural lecture at the Collège de France (1886), he had used the same typology of fiction, there describing the works of the 'familiar school' as 'tea-party novels' (*romans à la tasse de thé*), already singling out Austen's novels as the best.

Two years later, Théodore Duret published a short but important piece on Jane Austen (1898) in *La Revue blanche* (The white review). Issued from 1889 to 1903, the *Revue blanche* was an avant-garde journal, the herald of French symbolism and champion of Dreyfus in the eponymous Affair. Around it gathered such writers and intellectuals as Stéphane Mallarmé, André Gide, Léon Blum and Charles Péguy, and painters such as Edouard Vuillard and Henri de Toulouse-Lautrec. Like Forgues, Duret was an enlightened amateur: he had a

²⁹ 'Jane Austen de contente d'observer les gens autour d'elle, de décrire ce qu'elle connaît, de découvrir les mobiles des actions communes' (Jusserand 1896, 208).

³⁰ 'C'est elle qui eut le plus d'influence, ouvrit la voie la plus large, et qui garde aujourd'hui encore le plus d'admirateurs' (Jusserand 1896, 208).

career as a politician and journalist, in 1868 founding an opposition paper, *La Tribune*. He was one of the first supporters of Impressionist painting in France, and wrote on such diverse subjects as Japanese art, Cézanne, Whistler and military history. Below the title of his article, soberly entitled 'Jane Austen', is a line-drawing version of the portrait by Ozias Humphrey claimed to be of Jane Austen. This article was probably intended as an introduction to the serialization of *NA*, which began in the next volume (no. 17) of the journal.

Duret's four-page essay opens with a brief biographical outline, referring to Henry Austen's 'Biographical Notice' of 1818 and commenting that '[s]ince then her [Austen's] reputation has grown steadily and she is now universally regarded as one of the great English writers'.³¹ He praises Austen at length for writing for her own satisfaction, rather than with an eye to popular success. Much of his critical assessment rehearses what had been said by many before him. There is nothing 'romantic' about Austen's fiction, her characters are taken from the ordinary world she knew and the manners she observes are so common that she might fall into triviality. But she never does: Duret praises Austen's gift for subtle observation and the masterly depiction of minute occurrences. Some of his ideas echo Boucher's: thus, he says that Austen, though she focuses on the middle class, provides a picture of the whole of society. Like Forgues, he agrees that she observes, rather than philosophizing or judging. He thinks (disagreeing with Boucher) that the felicitousness of Austen's writing is specifically feminine, and that her humour is specifically English, endowing her books with a national identity. With Austen, humour never tilts into satire, sarcasm or caricature. Similarly, her didacticism is not heavy-handed. Duret aligns her with Fielding, another exponent of the great tradition of omniscient narration and social realism, which flourished in the nineteenth century – rather than with Richardson, who is not even mentioned. He considers Britain as well ahead of France in the development of the novel:

At a time when, in France, classical tragedy was still cultivated, being regarded as a higher form of literature, and when the renewal of imagination had only produced the romantic works of Rousseau and Chateaubriand, England had already yielded, in the field of the exact observation of life, the novels of Fielding and Miss Austen.³²

The truly original part of Duret's assessment of Austen is the attention he pays to her writing: when a novelist focuses on the minutiae of life, 'the level of the topic is raised by the rhetorical and stylistic qualities of the writing; now Miss Austen indeed possesses such rhetorical and stylistic qualities as belong

³¹ 'Sa renommée a depuis toujours grandi et elle occupe maintenant, du consentement de tous, une des premières places dans la littérature anglaise' (Duret 1898, 278).

³² 'A l'époque où, en France, on cultivait encore la tragédie classique, comme forme littéraire supérieure, et où l'imagination se renouvelant n'avait produit que les œuvres romantiques de Rousseau et de Chateaubriand, l'Angleterre avait déjà donné, dans le domaine de l'observation exacte de la vie, les romans de Fielding et de Miss Austen' (Duret 1898, 282).

only to writers of the first rank'.³³ He is particularly sensitive to stylistic nuances, observing that each character has his idiolect, the use of which is akin to what happens in Shakespeare's plays. Duret is the first French critic to have considered Austen's use of language for the purposes of characterization. In this, he shows great perspicuity, remarking that the narrator in Austen's fiction has a specific voice, becoming a kind of actor in the text: 'She tells a story, and then *she* is on stage, with her own way of telling this story.'³⁴ He insightfully notes that the speech of some characters is idiosyncratically faulty, using 'incomplete sentences, repeated words, hesitant syllables'.³⁵ One feels that a French critic had at last done justice to Jane Austen.

The high standards of the *Revue blanche* may explain the quality of the translation of *NA* published there in instalments in 1898, and in 1899 in book form, under the title of *Catherine Morland*. The translator, Félix Fénéon (1861–1944), was an art critic, journalist, editor and art dealer. His interest in primitive art made him an avant-gardist, as did his interest in Post-Impressionism (indeed he was the critic who coined the term 'Post-Impressionist'). His anarchist sympathies caused him to lose his job in the civil service, and from the early 1890s to 1903 he was editorial secretary to the *Revue blanche*, so it would have been easy for him to have his translation accepted. His choice of *NA* seems to chime with his rejection of conventionality in all things, and the fact that the only other novelist he translated was Dostoevsky indicates the high esteem in which he held Austen. Indeed, his reading of English and Russian literature is part of a wider phenomenon: the rediscovery by French intellectuals of what could be called the 'psychological novel', of a kind of fiction which, unlike the French *naturaliste* novel, was not characterized by painstaking description of the physical world nor by aesthetic or political militancy.

In 1909, a few years after the demise of the *Revue blanche*, the *Nouvelle Revue française* (New French review) was launched, which often discussed the writings of Dostoevsky. One of the founding members of the journal, André Gide, wrote several essays and lectures on the Russian novelist from 1908 (collected in book form in 1923). During its early years, the *Nouvelle Revue française* also translated such authors as George Meredith, Coventry Patmore and Arnold Bennett, later developing links with the Bloomsbury Group. A new cosmopolitanism developed, in some way reminiscent of the literary cross-fertilization between English and French literature during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Consequently, this growing interest in the works of Jane Austen may be seen as an aspect of the rise of Modernism.

The serial publication of *Catherine Morland* was not preceded by any

³³ 'Ce sont alors surtout les qualités de forme et de style qui relèvent le sujet, et Miss Austen possède en effet de ces qualités de forme et de style, qui n'appartiennent qu'aux écrivains de premier rang' (Duret 1898, 281).

³⁴ 'Elle narre, et alors c'est elle qui se tient en scène, avec sa façon propre de raconter' (Duret 1898, 281).

³⁵ 'de phrases tranchées, des répétitions de mots, des heurts de syllabes' (Duret 1898, 281).

introduction, and the book edition carried the following lapidary statement, presumably by Fénéon: 'Since [Austen's] death, the English novel of manners has been more intricate with regard to landscape, farce and pathos. Jane Austen will have been its most flawless exponent.'³⁶ This is the first French translation of a novel by Austen which really is a translation, in spite of some very light pruning and some inaccuracies; on the whole, it is quite felicitous and very idiomatic, notably capturing the narrator's flippant tone. The translation of the opening paragraph is vastly better than that of Madame de Ferrières (1824): the translator's sense of rhythm is particularly good. Unlike Ferrières, Fénéon translates the sentence in this first chapter about Mrs Morland's lying-in: 'her time was so much occupied in lying-in and teaching the little ones, that her elder daughters were inevitably left to shift for themselves' (*NA*, 1.1: 15). In *NA*, 1.3, unlike Ferrières again, he does not 'improve' the portrait of Henry Tilney, whom Austen hardly depicts as the typical romantic hero. Equally, Fénéon does not evade difficulties. Ferrières had not translated the following sentence about Catherine: 'and believing so far [that Henry loved her], her doubts and anxieties were merely sportive irritations' (*NA*, 2.13: 221). Fénéon chooses to explicate the meaning of 'sportive', perhaps because the hypallage (the transferred epithet) would make a one-word translation difficult, and writes: 'her doubts and fears she indulged in rather than suffered from: they did not affect her innermost self'.³⁷ There is only one note to the translation, about the author of *Camilla*: 'the authoress referred to here is Fanny Burney, who married M. d'Arblay'.³⁸ Even here Fénéon's unconventional views surface, as he uses the very unusual feminine form of *auteur*, *autrice*.

In 1899, the writer 'Rachilde' [Marguerite Vallette-Eymery] wrote a short notice about this translation in the well-known *Mercure de France* (French Mercury). It is not insightful, playing on the cliché of the charming English spinster (still resorted to in the literature pages of some present-day French dailies), the adjective 'charming' also epitomizing *NA* for Rachilde:

One can picture to oneself the woman who must have written it, with her hands wearing delicate black mittens made of yarn lace or silk net which set off the white skin and the small blue veins of the wrist; the earnest fingers of Félix Fénéon, the translator – who is also a good writer – of this work nearly dedicated to *French* misses, have not lessened its gracefulness, which has long been acknowledged in England, where Jane Austen is held to be a classic novelist of manners.³⁹

³⁶ 'Depuis elle, le roman de mœurs anglais a pu se compliquer de paysage, de farce et de pathétique. Jane Austen l'aura formulé en son type le plus pur' (Fénéon 1899, unpaginated).

³⁷ 'Ses doutes et ses craintes, elle s'y complaisait plutôt qu'elle n'en souffrait: ils ne touchaient plus au profond d'elle-même' (Fénéon 1899, 315).

³⁸ 'L'autrice dont on parle ici est Fanny Burney, qui épousa M. d'Arblay' (Fénéon 1899, 56).

³⁹ 'On voit la femme, qui le dut écrire, les mains ornées de délicates mitaines noires, dentelles de fil ou réseau de soie, faisant transparaître davantage la peau blanche, les petites veines bleues du poignet, et les doigts sérieux du bon écrivain qu'est Félix

This prose is too self-indulgent and anecdotal to convey any real judgement of the work and of the translation.

Nevertheless, as a whole, the 1890s may be considered an auspicious decade for the criticism and translation of Jane Austen in France, as Théodore Duret and Félix Fénéon signally contributed to a better understanding of Austen's modernity. I believe it is significant that both men were avant-garde appreciators of the most adventurous art of their day. They came to Austen's work unprejudiced, and were unburdened by too great a belief in compartmentalizing authors into literary schools. Thus, they were alive to her individuality, both as a prose writer and novelist.

Fénéon, le traducteur de cette œuvre presque dédiée aux jeunes misses [...] françaises, n'ont point atténué sa grâce déjà bien connue en Angleterre où l'on place Jane Austen parmi les classiques du roman de mœurs' (Rachilde 1899, 182).

3 The Reception of Jane Austen in France in the Modern Period, 1901–2004: Recognition at Last?

Isabelle Bour

The most striking features of the twentieth-century reception of Jane Austen in France are the consolidation of her importance in the landscape of English literature and the explosion of new translations immediately following World War II. As there is no direct correlation between the place of Austen in French criticism and the proliferation of translations, the two will be considered separately. The word ‘criticism’ will be construed broadly to include comments in diaries, anthologies, textbooks and academic monographs. A glimpse will also be provided of the teaching of Austen in modern French universities. Finally, I will assess the extent to which Austen has become better known, if not popular, thanks to the films shown in France; à propos of this, I will also consider newspaper articles dealing with Austen in recent years.

Translations

There are three ‘peaks’ in the publication of translations: the 1940s, by far the most active period, the 1980s and the 1990s onwards. The proliferation of translations after World War II is truly striking. It is part of a wider phenomenon: journalists of the post-war period spoke of a veritable flurry of translations of foreign literature (Blanzat 1946). Raymond las Vergnas’s introductory piece on Austen in the journal *Hommes et mondes* (Men and worlds, 1949) was prompted by seeing two of her novels in a bookshop window. How can this interest in Austen be accounted for? The French and the Belgians may well have wanted to acquire a better knowledge of the culture of one of their main allies, by getting to the truly idiosyncratic heart of it: the Englishness of Austen had been stressed in French criticism from the 1810s. Further, a number of educated French people had fled to Britain to escape from danger or to join the Free French Forces of General de Gaulle. Several years spent in Britain afforded time to read the literature, and to take back to France a more specific knowledge of it.

This multiplication of translations, however, did not make Austen popular. So, in the 1980s, the publisher Christian Bourgois, who wished to promote Austen's works personally, commissioned new translations of some of the novels and reissued good versions of the others. These inexpensive, easily available paperback books *did* enable some educated and avid readers to discover Austen. Nonetheless, they failed to make her fashionable. By contrast, the wave of translations of the 1990s was clearly related to the release of the film and television adaptations, which publishers hoped to capitalize on. This can be the only explanation for the reprinting of Montolieu's highly eccentric 1815 translation (in the slightly revised 1828 version) of *SS!* Gallimard's *Pléiade* edition of the novels cannot be lumped with such opportunistic publications: the *Pléiade* series is the most prestigious literary series in France, releasing only past and modern classics (or indeed authors who acquire classic status from being available in handsome leather-bound volumes).

During the twentieth century, *SS* was 'done into French' four times: by Eugène Rocart (1945), Jean Privat (1948), Jules Castier (1948) and Pierre Goubert (2000). Rocart's translation was published in Brussels and Castier's in Lausanne. Privat's version was the principal one for decades, being reissued many times, and has not been superseded in terms of availability, as Goubert's translation is still only to be had in the expensive *Pléiade* edition. To these must be added the reprint of Montolieu's translation in 1996, which can be dealt with first.

Montolieu's title, *Raison et sensibilité* (Reason and sensibility), was replaced with Privat's, *Raison et sentiments* (Reason and feelings). This translation was published following the release of Ang Lee's 1995 film, and was undoubtedly chosen because it was out of copyright, consequently avoiding the demands of commissioning a new translation. The front cover shows a still from the film, while the book provides full details of the cast. The front page states that Montolieu's translation has been revised, but there are no discernible corrections or changes, except for a reversion to Austen's original forenames. There is a fifteen-page 'Foreword' by the 'reviser' of the translation; this relates the shooting of the film, stressing that the director was 'attentive to the opposition between the yin and the yang which he perceived in *Sense and Sensibility*' (Montolieu 1996, 11) and was therefore anxious, like Austen herself, to avoid the pitfalls of sentimentalism. The 'Foreword' also mentions that Montolieu sometimes turned free indirect speech into dialogue, 'to keep up the reader's interest' (22), and that she made a few changes – not a word is breathed about her adding scenes and characters. Readers must have been rather baffled by differences between this putative translation and the film's scenes, which are, in fact, closer to the original text.

The change in the title raises the question of the best way of translating Austen's chosen title: a delicate matter. Rocart retained Montolieu's *Raison et sensibilité* (Reason and sensibility), Privat preferred *Marianne et Elinor* (but in the 1979 reissue Bourgois favoured *Raison et sentiments*: Reason and feelings), while Castier opted for *Le Cœur et la raison* (The heart and reason), which Goubert acknowledged having borrowed from him. By reverting to Austen's original title of *Elinor and Marianne*, Privat perhaps wanted to avoid having to deal with

the polysemous 'sense', which really cannot be translated into French as one word – with the consequence that some academic studies refer to the novel as *Bon Sens et sensibilité* (Good sense and sensibility), although this title was never used in a published translation. *Le Cœur et la raison* puts Austen's didactic intentions out of focus, and seems to distort Austen's purpose altogether: she was interrogating the dominant eighteenth-century paradigm of sensibility, rather than setting up an opposition between reason and passion. The title *Raison et sentiments* is open to the same kind of stricture. Montolieu's approach to translation may have been cavalier in many ways, but she understood precisely what was meant by 'sensibility', which she herself upheld as an aesthetic standard.

Turning to the two main translations of *SS*, Privat's version was not preceded by an introduction when it first appeared in 1948. By contrast, as is usual in Gallimard's *Pléiade* series, the general editor provides an introduction to volume 1, and there are further short introductions to the individual novels. Goubert's general essay examines the political and literary context, and discusses the complexities of Austen's moral and social views, while his introduction to *Le Cœur et la raison* focuses on the vogue for sensibility and the satire thereof in the novel, stressing that the title does not set up an irrefragable antinomy. Goubert's introduction makes up for the misleading French title.

Jean Privat's translation, while satisfactory, is not particularly accurate: some of his changes cannot be explained by a desire to evade difficulties and the register is often slightly too colloquial. As for Pierre Goubert's version, it is the best translation of Austen which I have studied. Austen crafted every sentence carefully; very few translators have had the desire, or the opportunity, to pore over each one: Goubert has. He makes careful lexical choices, judges the registers sensitively and has a fine sense of the syntactical rhythm of Austen's writing. He also has a very good command of eighteenth-century French, which enables him to give his style a period flavour, without approaching pastiche. Here are the two translations of part of the episode where Elinor Dashwood, Lucy Steele and Edward Ferrars find themselves awkwardly brought together, which is originally rendered as:

Lucy, with a demure and settled air, seemed determined to make no contribution to the comfort of the others, and would not say a word; and almost every thing that *was* said, proceeded from Elinor, who was obliged to volunteer all the information about her mother's health, their coming to town, &c. which Edward ought to have inquired about, but never did.

Her exertions did not stop here; for she soon afterwards felt herself so heroically disposed as to determine, under pretence of fetching Marianne, to leave the others by themselves: and she really did it, and *that* in the handsomest manner, for she loitered away several minutes on the landing-place, with the most high-minded fortitude, before she went to her sister. When that was once done, however, it was time for the raptures of Edward to cease; for Marianne's joy hurried her into the drawing-room immediately. Her pleasure in seeing him was like every other of her feelings, strong in itself, and strongly spoken. She met him with a hand that would be taken, and a voice that expressed the affection of a sister. (*SS*, 2.13: 241–42)

This is Privat's rendering:

Lucy, with a resolutely unobtrusive air, seemed determined to do nothing to ease the situation, and took no part in the conversation; nearly everything that was said came from Elinor, who was obliged to volunteer all sorts of particulars about her mother's health, their arrival in town, etc., which Edward should have enquired about, but did not think of doing.

Her exertions did not stop here; for she soon decided, under pretence of fetching Marianne, to leave them together; which she actually did, in the most obliging manner, for she lingered on purpose in the vestibule before fetching her sister. Once the latter had been informed, for Edward the pleasure of the tête-à-tête was over. For Marianne immediately rushed into the drawing-room. Her pleasure in seeing him was, like all her feelings, strong in itself and in her way of displaying it. She went up to him, her hand extended, her voice expressing sisterly affection.¹

'Demure' is not properly translated by *effacé* (unobtrusive); 'felt herself so heroically disposed' is not translated at all; 'handsomest' is not quite the same as *obligeante* (obliging); *s'attarda exprès* (lingered on purpose) is not accurate; 'the most high-minded fortitude' goes untranslated, as does 'joy'. The play on the cognates 'strong' and 'strongly' is not rendered; 'would be taken' is not translated. Here is Goubert's translation:

Lucy, who had assumed a demure and quiet air, seemed determined to do nothing that might contribute to putting the others at ease, and remained resolutely silent. Almost everything that was said came from Elinor, obliged to volunteer information about her mother's health, their arrival in London, etc., all things which Edward ought to have enquired about, though he did not.

Her exertions did not stop here. Soon afterwards, she felt heroic enough to determine, under pretence of fetching Marianne, to leave the others by themselves. And she did so, in the most generous way possible: she lingered for several minutes on the landing, supported by the most magnanimous fortitude, before she went to look for her sister. Once her mission had been accomplished, however, Edward's raptures could last no longer. Marianne's joy caused her to run to the drawing room at once. Her pleasure on seeing the young man was like all her other feelings, naturally keen, and strongly expressed. She went up to him

¹ 'Lucy, avec un air résolument effacé, semblait déterminée à ne rien faire pour faciliter les choses et ne prenait pas part à la conversation; et presque tout ce qui fut dit venait d'Elinor, qui fut obligée de donner spontanément toutes sortes de détails sur la santé de sa mère, leur arrivée en ville, etc., dont Edward aurait dû d'enquérir, ce qu'il ne songeait pas à faire. / Ses efforts ne s'arrêtèrent pas là; car, bientôt, elle décida, sous prétexte d'aller chercher Marianne, de les laisser ensemble; ce qu'elle fit réellement, et de la façon la plus obligeante, car elle s'attarda exprès plusieurs minutes dans le vestibule avant d'aller trouver sa sœur. Quand celle-ci fut prévenue, la joie du tête-à-tête cessa pour Edward. Car Marianne fit immédiatement irruption dans le salon. Son plaisir de le voir fut comme tous ses sentiments, vif en lui-même et dans sa façon de se manifester. Elle l'aborda la main tendue et sa voix exprimait une affection fraternelle' (Privat 1948, 208).

reaching out a hand which would be taken, and speaking in a tone of sisterly affection.²

PP is Austen's most frequently translated novel, with nine versions between 1932 and 2000, five of which appeared between 1945 and 1948 (three in France and two in Belgium). There seems to have been an unquenchable desire to appropriate British culture, not balking at its subtleties and the historical remoteness of Austen's world. There is again some variety in the choice of a French title, though there is less difficulty than with *SS*. Most eccentric is *Les Cinq Filles de Mrs Bennet* (Mrs Bennet's five daughters), which tips the book towards the social comedy of match-making, and echoes the French title of Louisa May Alcott's *Little Women* (1868), *Les Quatre Filles du docteur Marsch* (Dr Marsch's four daughters, 1881), thus creating a misleading analogy. Other variations include *Orgueil et préjugé* (Pride and prejudice), *Orgueil et préjugés* (Pride and prejudices), *Orgueil et préventions* (with a synonym of *préjugés*), *L'Orgueil et le préjugé* (with articles, which cannot be rendered in English).

That reviewers expected higher standards of accuracy in translation during the early twentieth century, and that they did not get them, is made clear by F. Delatte's short discussion of Leconte and Pressoir's 1932 translation. Delatte lists seven types of failings he encountered: entire paragraphs are untranslated; whole sentences are omitted; some phrases are left out; the translation is vague or inaccurate; text is merely paraphrased; the specific valencies of some words are weakened; there is use of over-emphasis (1934, 213). He concludes that the vaunted translation is actually no more than an adaptation. Though this is certainly a very poor translation, it was reissued as late as 1996 by Omnibus: again, no doubt, to exploit the vogue resulting from the televised adaptation.

Eugène Rocart's 1945 translation, which was reissued twice, cannot be recommended either: it is much too colloquial, employing anachronistic vocabulary and making occasional mistakes. This is how he translates the opening of the novel: 'A bachelor in possession of a certain fortune must

² 'Lucy, qui avait pris un air modeste et tranquille, paraissait déterminée à ne rien faire qui pût contribuer à mettre les autres à l'aise et se taisait résolument. Presque tout ce qui fut dit le fut par Elinor, contrainte de fournir de son propre chef des renseignements sur la santé de sa mère, leur arrivée à Londres, etc., toutes choses dont Edward aurait dû s'enquérir, alors qu'il n'en faisait rien. / Ses efforts ne s'arrêtèrent pas là. Peu après, elle se sentit assez d'héroïsme pour prendre la décision, sous prétexte d'aller chercher Marianne, de laisser les autres en tête à tête. Et c'est ce qu'elle fit, de la manière la plus généreuse qui soit: elle s'attarda plusieurs minutes sur le palier, soutenue par la résolution la plus magnanime, avant d'aller trouver Marianne. Mission accomplie, toutefois, les transports d'Edward ne purent durer davantage. La joie qu'éprouva Marianne la fit courir au salon tout aussitôt. Son plaisir à la vue du jeune homme fut semblable à tous ses autres sentiments, naturellement vif et vigoureusement exprimé. Elle alla à sa rencontre en lui tendant une main qui n'admettait pas d'être refusée et en lui parlant sur un ton qui était celui de l'affection fraternelle' (Goubert 2000, 431–32).

absolutely marry. This is a universally accepted axiom.³ This completely misses the ambiguity of Austen's 'must'. Next came Shops and Séverac's translation (1946), commended as 'aiming at faithfulness to the character and the spirit of the original, under the supervision of a devoted English Austenian who has perfect mastery of the language of Colette'.⁴ In spite of this, there is a good deal of pruning, many inaccuracies and some mistakes. Jean Privat's translation (1946) is not very accurate, but it is distinguished by its fluency: his French is more idiomatic, his syntax more flexible than that of earlier translators. Yet it was never reissued, unlike his translation of *SS*. His opening is somewhat casual, however: 'Who could doubt it? A bachelor of substance must necessarily be in search of a wife.'⁵ Jules Castier's *PP* (1947) was enhanced by a preface by the distinguished scholar Louis Cazamian; it was only reissued once, in 1961: regrettably, as it is both accurate and idiomatic. Germaine Lalande's translation (1948), published in a series of books for children, is the first illustrated edition of the novel, with forty line drawings. Though this is nowhere mentioned, it is an abridgement: there are only forty-nine chapters to Austen's sixty-one. Very similar is Luce Clarence's 1954 translation, which indulges in the systematic pruning that characterizes the nineteenth-century translations, with occasionally drastic condensation. Nonetheless, it was reissued as late as 1977. Its opening sentence is ambiguous, implying a moral broadmindedness that Austen certainly did not intend: 'It is a truth universally acknowledged that a single man in a possession of a great fortune cannot do without a woman.'⁶ This suggests rather hasty work. After a gap of nearly fifty years, Jean-Paul Pichardie's *Orgueil et préjugé* (2000) appeared in the Pléiade series, followed by Béatrice's Vienne translation (2001), which bears the same title and is of a high standard.

MP has been much less well served, with only two translations appearing in the twentieth century, and a third forthcoming in Gallimard's Pléiade series. The 1945 Belgian translation I have been unable to consult; Denise Getzler's 1981 version, which has been reissued several times (being part of Bourgois's proselytizing effort), is workmanlike, but neither idiomatic nor free of errors.

E is nearly as popular with publishers as *PP*, with seven twentieth-century translations. The first two are silent abridgements: in 1910, the *Journal des débats* (Journal of debates) serialized *E* over nearly three months, in a translation by Pierre de Puliga. P. and E. de Saint-Segond's 1933 translation is closely based on Puliga, being indistinguishable from it for paragraphs on end, although there is

³ 'Un célibataire qui possède une certaine fortune doit absolument se marier. Voilà un axiome universellement admis' (Rocart 1945, 5).

⁴ 'avec le souci d'une grande fidélité au caractère et à l'esprit de l'œuvre originale, sous le contrôle d'un fervent austenien anglais, pratiquant à la perfection la langue de Colette' (Shops and Séverac 1946).

⁵ 'Qui songe à en douter? Un célibataire nanti d'une belle fortune doit être nécessairement à la recherche d'une femme' (Privat 1946, 5).

⁶ 'C'est une vérité universellement reconnue qu'un célibataire en possession d'une importante fortune ne peut se passer de femme' (Clarence 1954, 7). In French, *femme* translates both 'woman' and 'wife'.

no acknowledgement of this. Though an abridgement in the style of the nineteenth century, this translation was reissued as late as 1981. I was unable to consult Eugène Rocart's 1945 translation. Sébastien Dulac's 1946 version is workmanlike. Among more recent translations, the one which stands out is Josette Salesse-Lavergne's (1982), being quite idiomatic, with some omissions of adverbs and adjectives (probably because a precise translation would have required careful rephrasing of syntagms). In the 1980s, Salesse-Lavergne was the main translator of Jane Austen: she was the only one to have translated the juvenilia and Austen's unfinished works before the first *Pléiade* volume appeared. Her translation of *E* seems to have been used by Pierre Nordon (1997), whose own rendering was prompted by Douglas McGrath's film (a still from which is shown on the cover). Like its predecessors, Hélène Seyrès's translation, also published in 1997, is uneven. Overall, modern translations (from the 1980s onwards) are reasonably idiomatic, with few serious mistakes, the evasion of some difficulties and a number of inaccuracies. The main difference from earlier translations is that there is less quiet pruning. Ignorance about the manners and practices of Austen's times can be a problem, however; thus, in *E* (1.16) we are told that Emma's hair was curled, which several translators think means that it was braided.

The same strictures apply to *NA*, which was translated twice in the twentieth century, first in 1980, then in 2000 (in the *Pléiade* series). *P* was only translated once (1945), although a new translation is forthcoming in Gallimard's *Pléiade* series. André Belamich's 1945 rendering of *P* is a good one, which is probably why Christian Bourgois chose to reissue it in 1980, rather than to commission a new translation. The 1980 edition carries an 'Afterword' by Henri Plard, whose most interesting point is that filmed versions of Austen's novels are dull comedies, because what matters in her fiction is her narrative technique, not the story.

Overall, the number of translations of each novel is linked to its literary standing, Austen's most accomplished pieces being widely thought to be *PP* and *E*. Furthermore, with the signal exception of Goubert's *SS*, francophone readers do not have access to translations of Austen which do justice to the meticulousness, the alertness to irony and the multivocality with which she wrote.

Personal assessments

The first notable commentary on Austen during the early twentieth century appears in a short tribute published in 1917 on the centenary of her death in a leading literary periodical, *Le Mercure de France* (The French Mercury). The piece emphasizes Austen as a satirist and critic of sentimentalism. The author is clearly enthusiastic, thinking her genius equal to that of Walter Scott, of Wordsworth 'and even of Coleridge' (Anon. 1917, 767). The actual assessment matters less than the fact that such a 'trendsetter' as the *Mercure de France* judged it worth noticing Austen's centenary.

Whereas there are no accounts of nineteenth-century readers' impressions of Austen's works (excepting Staël's monosyllabic assessment), during the

following century three major writers recorded theirs, sometimes across several decades. Two were keen anglophiles, one (Julien Green) was an American, but is regarded as a French author. Valéry Larbaud (1881–1957) was only twenty when he translated Coleridge's *Rime of the Ancient Mariner*; a little later, he was involved in the translation of James Joyce's *Ulysses*, and translated several novels by Samuel Butler single-handedly. Fluent in both English and Spanish, he wrote articles in both languages for newspapers. This explains why he used English for his diary entry where, in the summer of 1919, he jotted down his thoughts about *PP*:

I have just finished reading Jane Austen's book. Clearly the story is told from Lizzy's point of view. The other people, – except Mr and Mrs Bennet – are nowhere (Collins too grotesque to be convincing). No landscape, no mystery; but there is an element of dramatic truth: the question Parents versus Children is touched upon. 'Mr Bringley [*sic*] and Jane remained at Netherfield only a twelvemonth. So near a vicinity to her mother and Meryton relations was not desirable even to his easy temper or *her affectionate heart* (!!!)' It would be difficult to give a sadder, and a truer, picture. Still one wonders: will many readers see *that*? J.A. puts too much conventionality (or, as Samuel Butler would say: *suet*) about these bitter truths. Some may even prefer the Bringley–Jane group to the Darcy–Lizzy couple [. . .] And J. Austen could have spared us at least 100 pages. (Larbaud 1971, 50–52).

Larbaud has no difficulty in detecting Austen's irony, which had eluded nearly all nineteenth-century critics, and he is the first to comment explicitly on the use of internal focalization in *PP*. As for his criticisms, like those translators who pruned Austen's text rather vigorously, he may find Austen's prose too circumstantial or may object to the peripetia that delay the happy ending.

André Gide (1869–1951) read several of Austen's novels over a period of twenty-five years. In a diary entry for 13 November 1919, he merely mentions that he read *E* aloud, suggesting his admiration for Austen's style (Gide 1996, 1106). In the entry for the same day, he mentions reading Balzac's *La Rabouilleuse* and Conrad's *Arrow of Gold* – doubtless in silence. Ten years later, Gide read *PP*: on 24 January 1929, he declares that Austen 'reaches perfection' in this novel, though 'one very soon senses (as with Marivaux) that she will not venture on summits exposed to high winds'.⁷ About his reading of *MP* in April 1940, he merely records, in a lapidary but enthusiastic way: '*Mansfield Park*, in a nearly uninterrupted rapture'.⁸ Finally, on 12 June 1944, he mentions reading *SS*, which he compares to the early nineteenth-century portraits of Ingres and Chassériau; he likes Austen's depiction of feelings, her psychological acumen, her satire, her dialogue (Gide 1997, 992).

The most extensive comments by a French writer on Austen are those by Julien Green (1900–98). On 26 December 1936, he read *SS*, which filled him with '[a] sense of deep security, akin to this peace beyond understanding

⁷ '[L]'on sent assez vite (comme chez Marivaux) qu'elle ne se risquera pas sur des sommets exposés à des vents trop forts' (Gide 1997, 115).

⁸ '*Mansfield Park* avec un ravissement presque constant' (Gide 1997, 687).

mentioned in the Bible'.⁹ Less favourably, he thinks Austen creates oppositions between moral qualities, which she attempts to personify in a somewhat mechanical fashion. Twenty years later, Green read *E*, which is mentioned in seven diary entries, spanning 6 July to 6 August 1956. He praises her gifts of (ruthless) observation and dialogue, while finding the plot a little thin. Coming from a bilingual writer, the following remark on translating Austen is particularly significant: 'It may be said that she is virtually unknown in France, for translations can only render thicker and heavier such light, crisp prose.'¹⁰

It is notable, and perhaps significant, that all three writers had a highly religious upbringing, and were, at least as far as Gide and Green were concerned, tormented by the tension between their faith, their moral rigour and their hedonism. It may be that the secret, often repressed, emotions in Austen, somehow found an echo in their own mental lives, though, of course, it hardly accounts for their admiration. Rather, this must be related to the fact that all three writers read Austen in English, and could take the full measure of her complexities and subtleties.

Pedagogic and academic material: anthologies and textbooks

Until World War II, the English language in French secondary education was taught mainly through literature: hence, the steady demand for anthologies. Early twentieth-century anthologies would have been aimed at secondary-school pupils between the ages of fifteen and eighteen; after World War II, the principal audience became students in the first two years of higher education. This may account for the slightly greater sophistication of the critical presentations in the later anthologies, though it may also be explained by the greater concern with matters of narrative voice, style and rhetoric in modern literary criticism. The use of anthologies in French secondary and higher education must also be related to the emphasis on the close study of texts (*explication de textes*) in the teaching of literature.

It will be remembered that Austen was quite often missing from nineteenth-century anthologies and histories of literature: this omission is infrequent in the twentieth century. Nevertheless, Austen is excluded from a number of significant anthologies (Koszul 1921; Rérat 1929; Rancès 1948). Georges Guibillon (1925) contains one passage by Austen (Scott is also given one, longer excerpt), from *SS* entitled 'A dinner at Barton Park', on Sir John and Lady Middleton's differing reasons for giving parties. Guibillon wants to single out the social satirist in Austen. His assessment is made up of the well-known quotations from Charlotte Brontë and Walter Scott, whom he pitches against each other. The focus on Austen and Scott as the leading novelists of the

⁹ 'Impression de sécurité profonde, voisine de cette paix qui passe l'entendement et dont il est question dans la Bible' (Green 1961, 1: 103–04).

¹⁰ 'On peut dire qu'elle est presque inconnue en France, parce que les traductions ne peuvent qu'épaissir et alourdir cette prose si légère et si fine' (Green 1961, 2: 1222).

Romantic period slowly established itself during the interwar period. Georges Roger (1941) stresses that Austen makes up for the narrowness of her range by the unerringness of her touch. Roger offers a long excerpt from *E*, which foregrounds the social comedy in the novel and the importance of dialogue.

The first, and only, anthology to be devoted exclusively to Jane Austen was Fernand Danchin's *Jane Austen: Chapters from Her Novels* (1949). As a consequence of his singular focus, Danchin's is a substantial introduction, which eschews the received wisdom about Austen. For instance, while he acknowledges that historical events only impinge on her world as refracted by officers of the Royal Navy, he points out that Austen's silence about the Napoleonic Wars may be explained by the fact that the British felt protected by the Channel, which was not the case during the two recent World Wars. Similarly, Danchin suggests, if Austen does not seem to have been interested in social problems, that is because the Industrial Revolution had impacted minimally on the home counties of England during the early nineteenth century. Again, Danchin challenges the oft-repeated idea that many pages in Austen's books are like scenes in comedies, by pointing out that Austen achieves something that drama cannot, because a theatrical performance is too short, therefore rendering psychological development in a rudimentary manner. Finally, Danchin points out that Austen's language, except for an occasional dated word, is very modern and that, while her style may seem simple and natural, it is actually the result of consummate art. Danchin selected seven excerpts from *PP*, five from *P*, and only one each from *SS*, *NA* and *E*. *MP* is not featured, an absence which characterizes most anthologies, but is particularly significant in this single-author collection.

Laffay and Kerst's 1960 anthology saw a small but significant change: Austen is included not just alongside Scott, but Ann Radcliffe; there is also no introduction to the texts. Ginestier and Hoyles (1965) are similarly cursory, offering a short introduction and short extracts. They make two interesting points, however: that Austen wrote fiction with the care usually devoted to poetry and that her last three novels evince a subtler irony, and more sympathy, on the narrator's part towards her characters. Appearing nearly twenty years later, Métral (1982) contains four excerpts from the novels, preceded by a one-page introduction, which paradoxically combines the nineteenth-century emphasis on the neutrality of Austen's narrator and the belated critical recognition of her irony. The prominent fact about Grellet and Valentin's 1984 anthology is the way in which it juxtaposes excerpts from *PP* and George Eliot's *Middlemarch*, strikingly highlighting the rhetorical and psychological resemblances between the Austen's Mr Collins and Eliot's Mr Casaubon. The last anthology to be published in the twentieth century (Castex and Jumeau 1992) extracts British and American texts, evidencing the increasing importance of American literature in English degrees in France. Austen is given one excerpt, from *P* (1.17); after a well-handled biographical sketch, the presentation stresses that Austen's heroines do not experience love as a passion, but as an emotion leading to improved self-knowledge, which comes after a series of illusions or errors.

Fourteen textbooks devoted to English literature appeared during the twentieth century; as with anthologies, they were aimed initially at secondary education and later at higher education. Walter Thomas (1909) devotes six lines

to Austen, one more than to Edgeworth, whose didacticism is said to be reminiscent of 'the old school' (what is meant by this remains unclear). Austen is judged to be more talented than Edgeworth and her irony is noted.

In 1924, a landmark textbook appeared: Legouis and Cazamian's *Histoire de la littérature anglaise* (History of English literature), which has been frequently reprinted, both in French and English. It was the most significant work devoted to English literature since Hippolyte Taine's multivolume history (1863–64). The careful balance between analysis and synthesis has made this a classic work, as recognizably French as the compendia of learning that were the old-style doctoral theses, the famous (and notorious) *thèses d'Etat*. Two pages are given to Austen, who is first favourably contrasted with Burney and Richardson: there is more inwardness in Austen's fiction than in Burney's and more psychological realism than in Richardson's. Legouis and Cazamian characterize Austen's gift for psychological explication by contrasting it with the bitterness of the seventeenth-century French moralist La Rochefoucauld and with the lavish means deployed by the 'pessimistic novel' (by which they probably mean the 'naturalist' fiction of Flaubert or Hardy):

There is nothing more objective than these stories with their spirit of gentle tolerance, one might even say their *naïveté*, if a subtle suggestion of irony did not hover over every page, revealing a sharpness of vision that could be unmercifully severe.

The sentimentality of Miss Burney is entirely absent. Everything shows a delicacy of touch, a sense of balance, a serene reasonableness. All Jane Austen's work is transfused with the spirit of classicism in its highest form, in its most essential quality – a safe, orderly harmony among the powers of the mind, a harmony where of necessity the intellect is paramount.¹¹

The classicism of Austen's works is irresistibly reminiscent of the art of 'the great French analysts' (La Bruyère, La Rochefoucauld and Pascal, who belong to France's 'Classical Age', the seventeenth century). Correlatively, Austen is impervious to Romanticism, which she treats with irony, though in *MP* and *P* there is more tenderness and a greater warmth of sentiment, which attune her to her times.

Paul Dottin's *Littérature anglaise* (English literature, 1931) devotes one page to Austen, discussing her life in a patronizing manner and defining her themes as 'matrimonial bargains and rivalries between people of the world'.¹² Dottin sees her irony and the pleasure with which she exposes small failings as those of an old maid. *SS* is translated as *Sentiment et sensibilité* (Feeling and sensibility), which

¹¹ 'Il n'y a rien de plus objectif que ces récits indulgents, on dirait même candides, si une malice partout diffuse ne révélait une clairvoyance qui pourrait être impitoyable. / La sentimentalité de Miss Burney a disparu. Tout est finesse, équilibre, raison sereine; et le classicisme sous sa forme la plus haute, en sa réalité la plus essentielle – l'harmonie sûre et réglée des puissances morales, une harmonie où par nécessité l'intelligence domine – émane subtilement de toute cette œuvre' (Legouis and Cazamian 1924, 927).

¹² 'de bonnes affaires matrimoniales et de rivalités mondaines' (Dottin 1931, 33).

strongly suggests that the meaning of *sense* is misunderstood, and, indeed, that the novel may have been no more than a title for the author. Finally, Dottin firmly states that Austen is no longer much read, because the society she describes is gone, and that her novels are mainly of historical interest!

Two short histories of literature appeared in the twentieth century in the famous 'Que Sais-Je?' series (published by Presses universitaires de France), which offers brief studies of subjects in all fields of knowledge. René Lalou (1944) states that *SS* and *PP* are Austen's two masterpieces: not a common view among French critics. He praises self-possession, clear-sightedness and perspicuity as notable features of Austen's fiction, and as reminiscent of 'our classical analysts'; the parallel, clearly echoing Legouis and Cazamian, highlights the stylistic and intellectual limpidity of Austen's prose. More recently, Jean Raimond (1986) deals briefly with Austen in his section on Romanticism, making points which resurface in later criticism. After emphasizing that Austen and Edgeworth both wrote domestic fiction marked by the cult of reason, Raimond identifies the root of Austen's comedy as the confusion between life and literature in the minds of immature people, and the thematic focus of her novels as the nature of an ideal marriage. He stresses that Austen's irony is neither cynicism nor satire, and that her heroines see love as indissoluble from husband-hunting. Raimond's characterization of Austen is analytical, while Lalou's was pithy and 'essentialist'.

Three textbooks published after World War II dutifully discussed Austen; after that, there was to be no new textbook for twenty-five years, until the publication of Coustillas, Petit and Raimond's *Le Roman anglais au XIXe siècle* (The English novel of the nineteenth century, 1978). (Michel Mercier's *Le Roman féminin* (The female novel, 1976) is more an idiosyncratic essay than a work of literary history; he gives five pages to Austen, seeing her as a 'joyful and unflappable' blend of Stendhal and La Rochefoucauld.) Raimond's view of Austen is that mentioned in the previous paragraph, but he characterizes her works in a more detailed way, both generically and historically. In Austen's novels, 'the depiction of life, so dear to Fielding, instead of encompassing all of reality, has a restricted scope, and comprises, as in Richardson, the careful observation of emotions and of the movements of the heart'.¹³ Raimond concludes his assessment by saying that if there are such things as 'pure novels', just as there is 'pure poetry', Austen may be said to have written some. A century after Eugène Forgues, Raimond makes the same point: in Austen's fiction, the mimetic function prevails, which is the quintessential characteristic of the genre of the novel. The 1990s saw the publication of two textbooks (Angel-Perez 1994; Laroque, Morvan and Regard 1997), which both endorse much of the French critical consensus on Austen, although Laroque *et al.* were the first to state the importance of ideology in Austen (her implicit politics, her latent feminism and her Christian faith).

¹³ 'La peinture de la vie, qui est chère à Fielding, au lieu d'embrasser la totalité du réel, s'applique à un domaine beaucoup plus restreint, et inclut, comme chez Richardson, l'observation scrupuleuse des émotions et des mouvements du cœur' (Raimond 1978, 80).

Monographs

There are few monographs devoted to Austen or containing substantial studies of her works. The first two came out within a year of each other. Kate and Paul Rague's *Jane Austen* (1914) explicitly sets out to make the novelist better known in France. The foreword mentions that a recent translation of *NA* enjoyed limited success, but could not make Austen's name familiar to the French; it is also stated, inaccurately, that only one study has been devoted so far to Austen, Léon Boucher's in *La Revue des deux mondes* (1878). The book follows the 'life-and-works' formula, and is an uninspired study. The literary analysis consists mainly of psychological portraits of the characters, with very little attempt at a sociological and thematic analysis, which one would have expected in post-Tainean days. The book has one rewarding feature, however: the chapter on 'Style and humour' is a genuine attempt to capture the specificity of Austen's rhetoric, and the terseness and precision of her language are noted. Very perceptively, Austen is said to provide detailed physical description only when it is psychologically significant; the example quoted is the passage in *MP* (3.7) where Fanny is back in Portsmouth after several years at her aunt's, and is repelled by the pokiness and untidiness of her parents' house. The authors remark:

This was, at the time, a new way of conveying to us the feelings of a character; the author no longer explains what his hero feels, he does not have him express his sensations, but meticulously describes the glaring sun which hurts his eyes, the oppressive atmosphere, the nauseating filth, the tedious chattering. There is no need for comments, and despite Fanny's silence, her depression sinks into us. ■

Further, the Ragues compare Austen's technique with that of Impressionist and Pointillist painters, selecting the staccato account of Mrs Elton's gushing enthusiasm during the strawberry-picking scene in *E* (3.6). On the next page they go into more detail: 'Her comparisons are rare, but exact. She does not shower adjectives on us: those she selects perfectly particularize their object; they are there because they are needed to specify a quality, and not in order to round off a period.'¹⁴ They also make a worthy attempt at defining what they think indefinable: Austen's irony. Despite the general limitations of the Ragues' book, in this chapter they make points which had not been made before by any

¹⁴ 'Il y a là une manière neuve pour l'époque de nous communiquer les sentiments d'un personnage; l'auteur ne nous explique plus ce que son héros éprouve, il ne lui fait plus exprimer ses sensations, mais il nous décrit minutieusement l'éclat du soleil qui blesse ses yeux, l'atmosphère qui l'opprime, la saleté qui lui soulève le cœur, les radotages qui fatiguent ses oreilles. Il n'y a pas besoin de commentaires, et malgré le silence de Fanny, sa dépression pénètre en nous' (Rague and Rague 1914, 147).

¹⁵ 'Ses comparaisons sont rares, mais exactes. Elle ne nous accable pas sous un flot d'adjectifs, mais ceux qu'elle choisit caractérisent parfaitement leur objet; ils sont là parce qu'ils sont nécessaires pour préciser une qualité, et non pas pour arrondir une période' (Rague and Rague 1914, 148).

French critic, complementing the insights of Théodore Duret at the end of the previous century.

Léonie Villard's doctoral thesis (1915) gives much less attention to Austen's style, though hers is a bigger book. Two-fifths of *Jane Austen: sa vie et son œuvre 1775–1817* (Jane Austen: her life and her works 1775–1817) are devoted to Austen's life. Part II, given over to the works, examines women in eighteenth-century women's fiction and the depiction of the gentry: men and their duties, women and love and marriage; further chapters deal with 'psychology', Jane Austen's art, humour and satire, these being concluded by an overall assessment. Villard's critical approach is still in the socio-thematic Tainean style which prevailed in the late nineteenth century. Like earlier critics, she links the novels of Austen, Burney and Edgeworth, and judges that Austen is at her greatest when she is at her most impersonal, and not at her best when directly intervening in the narrative (as in *MP* and *NA*). Again, like her predecessors, Villard thinks that, beyond its spontaneity, Austen's style is simple, unsophisticated and unoriginal. A few ideas stand out: unlike earlier novelists, Austen sees love from the perspective of women, rather than men; before Austen, only Shakespeare had intuited that in women the most noble love can coexist with practical considerations; the older women in the novels are mostly unpleasant, if not downright obnoxious. Later on, Villard characterizes Austen's humour as 'the attitude adopted spontaneously and unfailingly before the real world', not as an occasional feature of her writing.¹⁶ When Austen's irony takes the form of satire and parody, as in *NA*, it is not uniformly well judged. Villard, having written the only doctoral thesis on Austen to be published for decades, was to stand as the leading Austenian scholar in France, usually being called upon to review books and essays in the field. Part of her thesis was translated into English.

In 1968, Victor Dupont, Professor of English Literature at the University of Toulouse, published *Cinq Leçons de littérature anglaise* (Five lessons in English literature), which a preliminary notice indicates were based on courses given between 1960 and 1962. Chapter 4 is entitled 'Caractères du roman féminin d'hier: l'exemple anglais' (Characteristics of the women's novel of yesterday: the example of England). It is an astonishing performance, and it is difficult to believe that it could have appeared as a welcome publication in the 1960s! The chapter begins:

We, men, have always known that women do not see the broader picture. They care more about the concrete details of life than about wide-ranging matters; when they meddle with abstract questions (some have tried to do so lately – they meant well, poor things!), they cannot but remain subjective, with sentimental reactions, prompted by exclusively personal factors. Their world is that of small material concerns, their prerogative the handling of small daily problems which bear no relation to the high intellectual calibre of their lords and masters; indeed

¹⁶ 'l'attitude adoptée spontanément et toujours en face du réel' (Villard 1915, 354). This statement is not fully compatible with the assertion that Austen is at her best when she is at her most impersonal: can humour be impersonal?

great philosophers, for lack of hot meals, should not be allowed to suffer from dyspepsia.¹⁷

The rest of the chapter is less chauvinistic, though Dupont sees Austen's humour as specifically feminine, as akin to the cattiness of one woman to another. He stresses that the inner life of characters matters more than any external occurrences, and that often these are filtered through the consciousness of the protagonist. Such pointillism would make Austen's characters somewhat hazy figures, were it not for a recurrent ruling feature in their personalities. Dupont's ideological conservatism goes hand-in-hand with that of his critical approach, focused exclusively on plotting and the depiction of women. He is deeply convinced of the femaleness of Austen's novels, and subsequently of their inescapable limitations.

After Léonie Villard retired from academic life, France's leading 'Austenian' was Pierre Goubert, whose *thèse d'Etat* was published as *Jane Austen: étude psychologique de la romancière* (Jane Austen: a psychological study of the novelist, 1975). Most of his publications, spanning several decades, are devoted to Austen. In his preface, Goubert explains that he is concerned with the novelist, not the woman, though when her personality can be discerned in the novels, that will be discussed. He offers a thorough thematic study: it begins with considerations on Austen's aesthetics, then explores at length her conception of the heroine (and, thus, of women) in psychological and social terms, and more briefly her conception of the mind, specifically of mental faculties, as well as her ethics. This study is bolstered by reference to, and comparison with, many works of theory and imagination from the Georgian and Regency periods.

Two years later, Hubert Teyssandier brought out his *Les Formes de la création romanesque à l'époque de Walter Scott et de Jane Austen 1814–1820* (Variations of fictional form in the age of Walter Scott and Jane Austen 1814–1820, 1977). Chapter 3, which spans over seventy pages, deals with Austen. Teyssandier's overall stance positions Austen's novels as moral tales, showing to what extent they diverge from the standard pattern (from the fiction of Ferrier and Edgeworth, for instance). This generic approach may be contrasted with Goubert's thematic approach: it is broadly structural without becoming technical. Teyssandier is less involved in psychological analysis than Austen's critics generally are, or rather he closely relates the psychological to the formal or diagrammatic. Indeed, he employs diagrams, which are both useful and

¹⁷ 'Nous autres hommes, nous savons depuis toujours, [*sic*] que les femmes ne voient pas grand. Elles sont sensibles aux détails concrets de la vie plus qu'aux vastes problèmes et si elles se mêlent de parler de choses abstraites (il y en a quelques-unes qui s'en mêlent depuis quelques temps, croyant bien faire, les pauvres) elles demeurent là encore subjectives et leurs réactions sont sentimentales, déterminées par des facteurs entièrement personnels. Ce qui leur convient c'est le monde des petites préoccupations matérielles, ce qui leur revient c'est le soin de résoudre les petits problèmes quotidiens peu en rapport avec la vigoureuse stature intellectuelle de leurs seigneurs et maîtres; car il n'est pas bon que les grands philosophes, faute de repas chauds, souffrent de dyspepsie' (Dupont 1968, 125).

convincing, to schematize the changing relationships between characters and places. His approach definitely bears the mark of French structuralism.

The next academic study had to wait for nearly twenty-five years, until Catherine Bernard's *Jane Austen, 'Pride and Prejudice', dans l'œil du paradoxe* (Jane Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, in the eye of paradox, 2001). The only monograph in French on a novel by Austen (apart from two handbooks by Nathalie Roulon and Catherine Letellier aimed at sixth-form pupils), it came out in a series intended for students of English, but makes a significant contribution to the field of Austen studies. Combining as it does a structural and narratological study with an ideological, not to say neo-Marxist, one, it bears the hallmark of much French criticism in the last few decades.

It will be clear from this discussion of only three major studies in France (Goubert, Teyssandier, Bernard) that Austen has generated nowhere near the same proportion of publications as in Britain and America. Over the last forty years in France, there have been more students of the great novelists of the eighteenth century than of Austen and her contemporaries. One reason might be that women's and gender studies, though at first heavily influenced by French feminists such as Hélène Cixous and Luce Irigaray, have never assumed the same importance as in the anglophone world. This has combined with the appeal of twentieth-century literature and culture. However, in the last few years, there have been several doctoral theses on aspects of Austen's works or on film adaptations of them.

Though few francophone academics write about Austen, her novels are often found in the syllabi of English degrees. An internet survey of members of the Société des anglicistes de l'enseignement supérieur (Association of teachers of English in higher education) received twenty answers, which revealed that Austen's novels are taught at all undergraduate levels, and that many Master's theses have been written on them. The study of a novel usually takes six weeks, sometimes with formal lectures and seminars, sometimes only with seminars, usually lasting two hours each. As might be expected, *PP* is most frequently found in syllabi or reading lists (followed by *NA*, then *SS*, *E* and *MP*); *P* was only mentioned once as having been read in full; in another instance, excerpts were studied. While some students appreciate Austen's humour, they often find it difficult to detect and discuss her irony, and the subtleties of free indirect discourse. More generally, they are intrigued by a society governed by so many explicit and implicit rules and codes. No teacher mentioned studying Austen as part of a course on women. The slant seems broadly to be historical and sociological, combined with a focus on narrative technique, which is always given prominence in French literary studies.

Screen adaptations

Five film adaptations of, or relating to, Austen have appeared in France: Amy Heckerling's *Clueless* (1995, released in France in 1996), Ang Lee's *Sense and Sensibility* (1996), Douglas McGrath's *Emma* (1997), *Bridget Jones's Diary* (2001) and *Bride and Prejudice* (2004, as *Coup de foudre à Bollywood*: Love-struck in Bollywood). The BBC's 1995 dramatization of *PP* has been shown several

times on cable television. All of them except for *Bride and Prejudice* were shown in both dubbed and subtitled versions; Gurinder Chadha's film was only shown in a subtitled version. A detailed study of the reception of the adaptations is warranted in its own right, because it provides a snapshot of Austen's standing in modern France and demonstrates that there is a very limited familiarity with her novels, even in supposedly cultivated circles. This very superficial acquaintance may be related to the fact that reviewers tend to be professional journalists (who often do not have a degree in the arts), rather than academics reviewing for periodicals.

Clueless was not widely reviewed: *La Croix* (The Cross), a Catholic daily, referred to it in passing as 'this week's American piece of junk'.¹⁸ The only two (short) reviews appeared in the daily newspaper *Le Monde* (The world) and in the weekly news magazine *Le Point* (Focus). Both introduce the protagonist as an archetypal spoilt Californian teenager, and characterize the film as little more than a situation comedy: neither Austen nor *E* are mentioned.

The film that introduced Austen's name widely was Lee's *Raison et sentiments* (SS). Annie Copperman (1996a) somewhat trivialized the plot by subtitled her article 'Les Peines de cœur de deux demoiselles anglaises' (The crossed love of two English misses). Michel Pascal, who liked the film very much, nonetheless entitled his review 'Les Demoiselles d'Angleterre' (English misses). Generally speaking, it is very striking, and disheartening, that in reviews of film adaptations of the novels, as well as in reviews of the translations, critics frequently resort to a clichéd view of England as the land of mists, Georgian houses and green hills, and to English fiction by female authors as being by, and about, 'English old ladies' or 'English misses'. Austen is often associated with such writers as Ivy Compton-Burnett, Barbara Pym and Anita Brookner. It is also notable that most reviewers of the film adaptations have no acquaintance with Austen's fiction, or only a very cursory knowledge, which necessarily restricts the scope of their review.

Most reviewers of Lee's *Raison et sentiments* admired the script (by Emma Thompson) and the two female leads (Emma Thompson and Kate Winslett). Many thought that the direction was conventional and unadventurous, with only Coppermann (1996a) thoroughly enjoying this 'most suavely British film' ('le plus suavement britannique des films'). Owing to the regrettable, and long-standing, slip in the translation of the title, where 'feelings' (*sentiments*) replace 'sensibility', critics tend to think that Marianne Dashwood stands for 'the heart', while Elinor embodies 'reason'. Sophie Grassin (1996) calls Marianne a 'Brontë-like' character, which completely misses the pastiche and satire of the fashionable sentimental fiction of Austen's day. She praises Thompson's Elinor, as does Pascal Mérigeau (1996), but he regrets that the representation of the characters' pains and passions will be smothered by the lushness of the sets and costumes or the virtuoso handling of light. Michel Pascal approvingly comments: 'Nothing is trivial in those bitter stories, which are no mere

¹⁸ 'le nanar américain de la semaine' (Royer 1996, 11).

entertainment for Victorian young ladies.’¹⁹ Only Didier Peron, from the traditionally whimsical and provocative daily, *Libération*, did not like the film at all, which he saw as blandly nostalgic, preferring the satire of the original novel instead (1996, 33). When *Raison et sentiments* was shown on television, the weekly magazine *Le Point* praised it again, summarizing the plot by saying that it was a ‘story of amours crossed by a disappearing inheritance, in a society which is strait-laced to choking-point’.²⁰

Just as the ‘entry point’ in reviews of *Raison et sentiments* was frequently Emma Thompson, who is quite well known in France, or Ang Lee, when *Emma l’entremetteuse* (Emma the matchmaker) came out a little over a year later, reviewers focused on the American star Gwyneth Paltrow. This film clearly benefited, in terms of media coverage, from the success of *Raison et sentiments*. Several newspapers carried interviews with, or profiles of, Paltrow, as well as reviews of the film. These reviews tended to be shorter than those of the earlier adaptation. The two longest reviews (about two hundred words each) were provided by the dailies, *Le Figaro* and *Les Echos* (The Echoes). In the latter, Annie Coppermann complimented the scenery, the costumes and the acting, but was unable to enjoy a film in which nothing happens ‘apart from the false plots and the true blunders of the pretty Emma’.²¹ Claude Baignères’s review in *Le Figaro* offers an instance of the cultural and rhetorical stereotypes often employed in French reviews of Austen, as well as evincing unusual familiarity with Austen’s fiction:

Jane Austen knew how to spice up her tales with some ferociousness. She did not indulge in romantic sentimentality. She satirized, with affection but also with perceptiveness, a life ruled by rigid decorum, and hearts which had frozen in colleges but were always willing to melt, because such was their purpose, to their great surprise or panic. Austen painted elegant, vigorous and colourful pictures of modern manners. Douglas McGrath’s screen adaptation is but an exceedingly pale watercolour.

This flaw cannot be brushed aside, and we are inclined to deprecate a story which stages puppets rather than human beings, confines itself to appearances, never trying to reach under them. What remains is the small-talk of society parties. The whole thing constantly threatens to tilt into boredom. [. . .]

One needs to have read the book to understand all that is going on under the smooth surface of that kind of life. By choosing smooth realism, McGrath seems to suggest that there is nothing under the surface. As a result, his whole venture, which is visually successful, is of little interest.²²

¹⁹ ‘Rien nest anodin dans ces histoires amères qui ne sont pas de simples distractions pour les demoiselles de l’Angleterre victorienne’ (Pascal 1996, 88).

²⁰ ‘cette histoire d’amours contrariées par un héritage manqué, dans une société britannique corsetée jusqu’à l’étouffement’ (Anon. 1997b).

²¹ ‘les faux complots ou vraies bêtises de la ravissante Emma’ (Coppermann 1996b).

²² ‘Seulement, Jane Austen s’entendait à pimenter ses récité par une certaine dose de férocité. Elle ne dérivait pas seulement dans l’eau de rose. Elle satirisait, avec affection certes mais perspicacité, cette vie réglée par une rigide étiquette, ces cœurs surgelés dans les collèges mais toujours prêts à fondre parce qu’ils sont faits pour ca,

The BBC serialization of *PP* must certainly have been popular, as it was shown several times on cable television. On the occasion of the second screening, in February 2003, Francis Cornu thought that Simon Langton's production was good enough to warrant a 300-word article in the television supplement of *Le Monde*.

In 2001, *Le Journal de Bridget Jones* (*Bridget Jones's Diary*) was not widely reviewed. All reviewers refer to the worldwide success of Helen Fielding's novel, some thinking that the film is as good as the novel, a few that it is better. Only two articles, in *Le Monde* and *Le Point*, refer to Austen. Consequently, the film could not possibly have encouraged familiarity with Austen's fiction in France, and the undeniable popularity of the film bore no relation to the critical appraisal of it.

When *Coup de foudre à Bollywood* (*Bride and Prejudice*) came out in France in late 2004, Austen was mentioned, if only because critics were aware of the pun on the title of *PP*. Geneviève Welcomme (2004) commented on the remoteness of the film from Austen's novel, but enjoyed the colourfulness of the Indian weddings in the film. Florence Colombani (2004) thought the film was 'kitsch and voluptuous' and lacked pace, as the two main protagonists were too placid to create a sense of drama. Finally, Ange-Dominique Bouzet (2004) was rather benevolently inclined toward this film, which nevertheless met with little success.

If one tries to assess the 'visibility' of Jane Austen in the French print media, taking into consideration both book and film reviews, of all newspapers, it is not *Le Monde*, the finest quality daily, which offers the largest number of commentaries on Austen, but *Libération*. Though unconventional and iconoclastic in its tastes, in 1996 it ran a short piece on Austenmania in Britain and in 1998 a snippet on the Rice portrait – a rarefied subject in France if ever there was one! Meanwhile, *Le Monde* published a brief article in October 2004, which discussed a website offering an English-language annotated edition of *PP*. This cannot but suggest that some educated French readers might have enough interest in Austen lore for such information to be publicized.

Overall, have film adaptations of Austen's novels made her more popular in France? The success of *Raison et sentiments* and *Le Journal de Bridget Jones* might suggest that they have, as does the efflorescence of editions of the novels during the 1990s. Perhaps surprisingly, however, French spectators do not necessarily

à leur grande surprise ou panique. Austen a peint d'élégants mais vigoureux et colorés tableaux de mœurs. En portant Emma à l'écran, Douglas MacGrath nous en propose une aquarelle exagérément délavée. / C'est un reproche fondamental. Nous voilà porté à dénoncer la superficialité d'une anecdote qui met en scène des mannequins plus que des êtres humains, qui se limite aux apparences et n'en sonde pas les profondeurs. Reste seulement le 'short talk' [*sic*] qui meuble les conversations mondaines. Le résultat frise constamment l'ennui. [...] Il faut avoir lu le livre pour mesurer ce qui se joue sous la surface lisse des choses. En choisissant de rester benoîtement réaliste, MacGrath semble préciser que sous cette surface il n'y a rien. Si bien qu'on ne voit pas l'intérêt de son entreprise au-delà de la réussite décorative' (Baignères 1997, 30).

make a close connection between these films and Austen. This is principally because Austen is not a household name in France: teenagers do not read her at school, nor do they see adaptations of the novels on screen at regular intervals. Further, the films are identified by the specific aesthetics and plot dynamics of costume drama, rather than as being based on the works of a particular author. So, while it is impossible to quantify the extent to which Austen is now better known in France thanks to those films, it may be safely stated that she remains an author for the *cognoscenti*. The films are more dramatic, and considerably less ambiguous, than Austen's prose, which requires fairly sophisticated readers, or a captive audience that has grown up in the conviction that, like Shakespeare, she is a major writer. She has no such audience in France.

Conclusion

What overall conclusion can be drawn about the reception of Jane Austen over nearly two centuries? What are its specificities, and what is specifically French about it? Firstly, no other country showed such interest in her fiction so early on – though, in truth, it was interest in British fiction in general rather than in *Austen's* fiction in particular. In the early twenty-first century, discounting the impact of the films, this perhaps remains the case. Now, as in the early nineteenth century, this thirst for literature-in-translation has to be considered an effect of the relative paucity and unadventurousness of French fiction. Ultimately, as even film, that most popular of media, has failed to make Austen popular, non-academic appreciation of Austen is now entwined with anglo-philia and functions as a sign of aesthetic sophistication. Secondly, discussion of Austen, which was non-existent in the 1810s and 1820s, and developed only in the 1840s, remains scarce. Austen is well entrenched only in academic circles, though scholarly criticism is not abundant, and was not significantly inflected during the post-war period by influential British assessments such as those of Mary Lascelles, Lionel Trilling and F. R. Leavis. Twentieth-century French criticism of Austen bears the mark of French critical trends: Taineian socio-historical approaches, thematic criticism and structuralism. It remains the case, however, that recognition of Austen as a major writer came from Britain and gained from the sharp decline in Walter Scott's popularity. Most to be valued as a specifically French reception is perhaps the focus within higher education on Austen's writing, on her handling of voice and voices, and on the workings of her irony. This is little to be found, for instance, in American universities, and gets to the heart of Austen's greatness.

4 Going Dutch: The Reception of Jane Austen in the Low Countries

Maximiliaan van Woudenberg

Readers of this volume have no doubt become aware of, indeed enjoyed, some of the transliterate liberties taken by translators with the titles of Jane Austen's novels. Henry Burke comments on the 'struggle over [identifying] the titles [of Austen translations] because frequently original efforts were made by the translators instead of merely accepting the English version' (1985, 18). The efforts taken with the transliterations of the titles of Austen's novels into the Dutch language are certainly no exception. While the titles of *MP* and *E* remained the same in Dutch, *SS*, *PP*, *NA* and *P* underwent interesting transformations.

In Dutch, *SS* was typically translated as *Gevoel en verstand* (Feeling and understanding, 1922), or variations thereof: *Rede en gevoel* (Reason and feeling, 1971); *Verstand en onverstand* (Understanding and foolishness, 1982); *Verstand en gevoel* (Understanding and feeling, 1996); but also quite differently as *Meisjeshoofd en meisjeshart* (Girl's mind and girl's heart, 1954). Initially, *PP* was translated literally as *Trots en vooroordeel* (1946), but was later thematically as *De gezusters Bennet* (The Bennet sisters, 1964). In 1980, the significance of 'pride' and 'prejudice' was restored, but less literally, in *Waan en eigenwaan: waan* (delusion, misapprehension) and *eigenwaan* (self-satisfaction, conceit) connote a more singular focus on the complexities of characterization. The title of *NA* underwent possibly the most humorous transliteration, as *Heldin op hol* (Heroine out of control, 1956): a title which certainly captures the characterization of Catherine Morland. By contrast, *Catherine* (1997) is the title of the only other Dutch translation of *NA*. The title of *P* was translated both literally and figuratively. The 1953 translation emphasized the realization of Anne Elliot's feelings for Wentworth in the title *Het late inzicht* (The late insight). In 1987, *P* was translated as *Overreding en overtuiging* (Persuasion and conviction) and in 1996 simply as *Overtuiging* (Conviction).

These transliterations offer some interesting insights into the reception of Austen's works in the Low Countries. The variations in titles indicate that these novels continue to be translated anew, despite the existence of older interpretations. Moreover, this implies a continued interest in, as well as a growing demand for, Austen by the Dutch reading public. In fact, she has never

been as popular in Belgium and the Netherlands as during the last twenty-five years. The total of pre-1980 Dutch translations of Austen amounts to fourteen: after 1980, there was a dramatic increase, with the publication of twelve new translations and twenty-one reprints in just twenty years!

What is all the more intriguing about this current activity in the Low Countries is precisely its contrast to the indifference towards, at times neglect of, Austen that preceded the 1980s. Austen's contemporary popularity can be explained through the success of the screen adaptations (see Wellens [2001]). Undoubtedly, the stimuli of television and cinema fostered an interest in the printed editions of Austen's works amongst the reading public and publishing houses alike. During the 1980s and 1990s, the Austen market grew exponentially, with the production of hardcover and paperback editions at varying prices, collected sets, large-type editions, an English-language *PP* and even an illustrated collection of translated extracts from her novels. Clearly, Austen is both popular fare and big business in the Low Countries.

Yet, what does this recent popularity tell us about the reception history of Austen by the Dutch reading public? In Belgium and the Netherlands, foreign-language programmes on television are usually subtitled rather than dubbed. It is impossible to determine how many readers purchased a Dutch translation simply out of awakened interest in Austen or in response to the linguistic limitations of subtitles. Beyond the printing of translations, details about the reception of Austen by the Dutch reading public remain elusive, while most Dutch scholarship on Austen is either published in English or remains conspicuously absent. This division between literary critic and reading public manifests itself specifically in the cultural and linguistic reception surrounding the translated Austen. Before 1980, her works were read in English and represented in Dutch commentary by a handful of enthusiasts and literary scholars. After 1980, Austen became widely available in Dutch to the reading public, while scholarship in Dutch seems largely to have disappeared. Without representative commentaries in Dutch, our greatest challenge lies in tracing the dialogue between Austen and the Dutch majority who read her in translation.

Austen's recent popularity is especially remarkable considering the previously widespread neglect, indeed ignorance, of her work in the Low Countries. Why did it take until the late twentieth century for Austen to be widely translated into Dutch and embraced by a Dutch reading public? Why were there no translations of Austen during the nineteenth century? When considering the number of publications of her work during the nineteenth century in neighbouring countries (Germany, France and Britain), it seems odd that the first publication of Austen in Dutch appeared as late as 1922.

In response to these questions, I wish to contextualize the relationship between the initial period of neglect and ignorance of Austen during the nineteenth century, and the slowly emerging appreciation of her work during the twentieth century. To this end, we can categorize the reception history of Austen in the Low Countries into three distinct periods: neglect (1815–1922), appreciation (1922–80) and popularity (1980 onwards). An analysis of the first two periods aims to foster a point of departure for future scholarship on the third phase of Austen's reception in the Low Countries.

Neglect of Austen, 1815–1922: a literary history of the Low Countries

The seeds of the Low Countries' initial neglect of Austen were sown in the post-Waterloo treaties of 1815, which established the Kingdom of the Netherlands. Created as a buffer against future French expansion, the Netherlands was comprised of the geo-political regions known today as Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg. This kingdom was short-lived: Belgium declared independence in 1830, and following a nine-year struggle the Kingdom of Belgium was recognized by the Netherlands in a treaty that established today's boundaries.

The official language of the Kingdom of the Netherlands had always been Dutch, and remained so after the secession of Belgium, whereas French replaced Dutch in the newly created Kingdom of Belgium, resulting in the 'political, cultural, and also social subjection of the Flemish majority to the French-speaking minority' (Kossman 1988, 170). Therefore, it is not surprising that the literary traditions of the two countries developed differently during the nineteenth century.

First, let us clarify the use of the terms 'Dutch' and 'Flemish' as linguistic, national and cultural signifiers. 'Dutch' geographically signifies the Netherlands, and culturally the people who live in the Netherlands, while 'Flemish' refers geographically to the Belgian province of Vlaanderen (Flanders), and culturally to the people of Flanders. Linguistically, however, 'Dutch' is the language spoken in both Flanders and the Netherlands, crossing national boundaries between the Netherlands and Belgium. David Gilson notes that it 'has not been found possible, in listing or in indexing, to distinguish between Flemish and Dutch' (*BJA*, 136). Indeed, there would be little, if any, noticeable linguistic differences between Dutch translations published in either Belgium or the Netherlands.

Despite sharing a common language, however, there are major distinctions between Dutch and Flemish literary traditions, most obviously in the cultural and political attitudes towards the Dutch language. The people of Flanders struggled to preserve the Dutch language in the new Belgium, with Flemish writers cultivating Dutch as an integral expression of their political identity and cultural heritage. By contrast, Dutch writers tended to draw on Dutch, as well as English and French, literature to foster aesthetic, rather than political, modes of expression.

The dominance of French as the official language of nineteenth-century Belgium permeated all levels of civic life. In response to this 'Frenchification', the Vlaamse Beweging (Flemish movement) attempted to keep Flemish culture alive, by writing specifically in Dutch about Flemish history and culture in order to awaken, and later preserve, Flemish nationalism. From the 1860s onwards, this literary and artistic movement (consisting of philosophers, historians and writers) also became a political one, with aspirations towards Flemish independence. One of the first and most influential novels arising out of Flemish nationalism was Hendrik Conscience's *De leeuw van Vlaanderen* (The lion of Flanders, 1838). This historical romance celebrates the Flemish victory over the French army at the Gulden Sporen Slag (Battle of the Golden Spurs) in 1302, when the outnumbered and inferior Flemish forces defeated the French

army, the military superpower of the time. Positioning a half-millennium of Flemish history within the framework of the political tensions of contemporary 'Frenchification', Conscience (and his followers) fostered a nationalism that made the historical romance a popular and widespread mode.

It becomes obvious that within such a context there would be little demand for Dutch translations of Jane Austen. The subject matter of her novels would not have resonated with nineteenth-century Flemish culture, its literary traditions and emerging nationalism. Furthermore, Austen would have been an imported writer, and the emphasis on Flemish culture would have prioritized a native literature. Finally, the domestic detail underlying Austen's psychological characterization and social observation differed significantly from the sentimental style of the historical romances penned by Conscience and his successors. Consequently, there would not have been a large audience for Austen in Flanders during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

The literary traditions in the Netherlands during the nineteenth century were rather different from those in Flanders. Unlike in Belgium, Dutch had always been the only official language of the Netherlands. There are signs of a French influence on literature, as well as the social usage of French among the upper classes. Nevertheless, the political urgency of the Dutch language never materialized in the Netherlands, and its literary movements therefore felt little need to preserve and protect linguistic and cultural identity. While Flemish literature drew on linguistic and cultural inspirations, Dutch belles-lettres privileged aesthetic models, embracing foreign literatures and movements. In fact, Dutch writers tended to be critical of their native literature: for example, members of *De Beweging van Tachtig* (The movement of the eighties) critiqued perceived deficiencies within Dutch writing, especially that of the popular *domineedichters* (preacher-poets) who versified about 'home and hearth'. The movement founded its own literary magazine, *De nieuwe gids* (The new guide), in order to voice its criticism and publish literary works. The manifesto for the movement, written by one of its most influential members, Willem Kloos, drew heavily on the British Romantics.

The literary movements in the Netherlands during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were more receptive to foreign literature than Flanders. Given the geo-political location of the Netherlands – its ports and trading routes interacted directly with France, Germany and Britain – it is often perceived as a 'transition culture' that engages with, and at times adapts, elements from other cultures for its own purposes. Indeed, evidence suggests that a limited readership for Austen in French did exist in the Netherlands. Gilson describes the 'title-page of vol. I [of *Raison et sensibilité*] dated 1816, in a possibly slightly later half binding which may be Dutch, since the endpapers have Dutch watermarks', while '[t]he British Library's copy [of *L'abbay de Northanger*], acquired in 1876, was previously in a reading room or lending library in Holland, bearing the labels of a "Cabinet de Lecture" of "G. Dufour et Co., Libraries, Amsterdam"' (2003, 38, 41). Clearly, it would appear that French editions of *SS* and *NA* were indeed available in the Netherlands during the nineteenth century, albeit among a limited, francophone readership.

By the turn of the century, it was more common for Dutch bibliophiles to read Austen in the original English: for example, the collections of Willem

Kloos and his wife Jeanne Kloos-Reyneke van Stuwe contained a good selection of her novels. Nevertheless, the reception of Austen occurred on a very restricted scale, because these privileged readers enjoyed an education, linguistic ability and leisure which allowed them to read Austen in French or English. By contrast, given the economic recession in the Netherlands during the nineteenth century, poverty during the twentieth century and the low level of literacy among the working classes, there would have been little demand for mass translations of foreign authors. Consequently, what we can ascertain is that, prior to 1922, Austen was known in the Netherlands only to a handful of individual readers.

Appreciation of Austen, 1922–80

The reception of Austen remained a trickle into the consciousness of individual Dutch anglophiles until 1922, which marked the appearance of Hillegonda van Uildriks's translation of *SS* as *Gevoel en verstand* (Feeling and understanding). Targeting a domestic readership in the Netherlands, the edition was published as part of the 'Wereldbibliotheek' (World library) series, which had been established in 1905 with the aim of making significant works of world literature available in cheap editions (Wellens [2001]). *Gevoel en verstand* was available in various formats at different prices, clearly signalling a sustained introduction of Austen to the Dutch reading public.

The volume includes a brief introduction by the editors of the Wereldbibliotheek, which draws a comparison between Austen and two well-known Dutch authors, 'our Betje Wolff and Aagje Deken' (Uildriks 1922, v):

There is little English work that affects us in its relationship with the spirit of our own Dutch literary art as [Austen's]. The wittiness of Betje Wolff is more cordial and compelling, but Jane Austen's work is purer in its absence of all sentimentality.¹

By making the comparison between Austen and Wolff, the introduction addresses a Dutch, rather than Flemish, readership through the presumed familiarity with Dutch literary history, further suggested by an assumed knowledge of English literature. In fact, the Wereldbibliotheek published translations of numerous British authors, among them Charlotte Brontë, Dickens, Galsworthy, Meredith, Stevenson and Wilde. Although this does not mean that the translations did not circulate in Flanders, we can infer that, despite a shared language, early Dutch translations followed defined literary traditions, themselves circumscribed by national boundaries: the edition was only priced in Dutch florins, and fits clearly within the context of Dutch interest in foreign, especially English, literatures.

¹ 'Er is weinig Engelsch werk, dat ons zoo aandoet om zijn verwantschap met den geest van onze eigen Nederlandsche letterkundige kunst als het hare. De geestigheid van Betje Wolff is guller en meesleepender, maar Jane Austens werk staat zuiverder in zijn afwezigheid van alle sentimentaliteit' (Uildriks 1922, vi).

The Wereldbibliotheek introduction praises Austen's 'zuiver talent' ('pure talent'), which has withstood the test of time:

Her people and her settings are alive for us in an absolute purity, and in her time, in which one romanticized everything, this came as such a big surprise that even the romantic master, Walter Scott, praised her with zeal for this.²

Considering the relatively late introduction of Austen to the Dutch reading public in the Wereldbibliotheek catalogue, there is a certain irony in these declarations of her literary genius and her affinities with Dutch literature: *Gevoel en verstand* was number 433 in the series, having been preceded by translations of other English authors for seventeen years!

The 1922 edition was reprinted several times, albeit in 'revised and abbreviated' editions throughout the 1950s (*BJA*, 189), but it did not foster an active interest in Austen. It was not until 1946 that the next Dutch translation appeared: *Trots en vooroordeel* (*PP*) by Frans Verachttert, published in Diest, Belgium. Dutch translations of Austen were published either in Belgium or the Netherlands, and occasionally jointly, as is the case with L. J. Veen's Amsterdam/Antwerp release of Johan Antoon Schröder's translation of *E* (1949). In stark contrast to the slow appreciation of Austen in Dutch, francophone interest was booming in Belgium: in 1945, French-language editions of all of her novels except *P* had been published either in Brussels or jointly in Paris and Brussels.

In the preface to his translation, Schröder comments on the 133-year gap between the English publication and Dutch translation of *E*, adding:

Curiously, this authoress of large significance was never estimated in our country at her real worth until a few decades ago. In 1922 her *Sense and Sensibility* [was] published in Dutch, and in 1946 *Pride and Prejudice*; nothing more. But in the end her significance is also recognized in this country, albeit late.³

Schröder does not suggest any reasons for this oversight; however, what is perhaps more significant is that such statements about Austen's literary genius by her translators did not encourage her popular reception among Dutch readers.

Schröder expands on the praise of the Wereldbibliotheek editors regarding Austen's timelessness and genius. His brief introduction comprises three

² 'Haar mensen en haar omgeving leven voor ons in een volkomen zuiverheid, en in haar tijd, waarin men alles romantiseerde, kwam dit als een zoo groote verassing, dat zelfs de romantische grootmeester Walter Scott er haar met ijver om prees' (Uildriks 1922, v–vi).

³ 'Merkwaardigerwijze is deze schrijfster van grote betekenis ten onzent tot enige tientallen jaren geleden nooit op haar werkelijke waarde geschat. In 1922 is haar *Sense and Sensibility*, "Gevoel en Verstand", in het Nederlands uitgekomen, en in 1946 *Pride and Prejudice*, "Trots en Vooroordeel"; meer niet. Maar ten slotte is haar betekenis dan toch ook ten onzent erkend, zij het laat' (Schröder 1949, 5).

sections: the first introduces the critical significance of her technique and style; the second supplies a literary biography of Austen; the last provides a commentary about the protagonist, contextualized within the episode of the Prince Regent's request to Austen to dedicate her next novel to him. Schröder concludes his introduction by stating: 'And we have also to thank this personality [Austen] for a book like *Emma*, which can be termed a monument in literature.'⁴

Schröder's introduction is significant to the Dutch reception of Austen, particularly because his 1949 *E* is arguably the most popular Dutch-language translation of Austen, reaching its eighth edition in 2005. Undoubtedly, its enduring strength lies in Schröder's insight into Austen's literary significance and her techniques of characterization:

A novel, which bears the stamp of its time and place, of the peaceful, and of little disturbed passions England circa 1800; but the *other* impression which it gives us is stronger, that of the difference in human figures. Difference and intellect, in character, in sincerity, in intentions and in attitudes to life; these things, which are not bound to time, more the emotions afresh in all eras, when they are pure and truly described. So the apparently insignificant becomes *fascinating*.⁵

Schröder's passionate commentary is an engaging introduction for those unfamiliar with Austen, English literature and English society, who may otherwise perceive her world as simple and quotidian.

Schröder's introduction is not only significant for its content, but also because it is one of only a few prefatory comments found in translations of Austen at this time. The book-jacket blurb for Maria Paulina Brunt's 1953 translation of *P, Het late inzicht* (*The late insight*) comments on the emerging interest in Austen over the past twenty years, arising from her realistic characterizations and sense of irony. Similarly, Jean Jacob's 1956 translation of *NA, Heldin op hol* (*Heroine out of control*) includes a blurb that again focuses on Austen's characterization and humour. Interestingly, the blurb classifies the book as a 'geniaal-eenvoudige familieroman' ('brilliantly simple family saga') which will fascinate every reader ('zal elke lezer boeien').

In stark contrast to Austen's growing popularity among the Dutch reading public, especially since the 1980s, scholarly commentaries are rather sparse. Only four full-length critical discussions in Dutch have been located: two published in literary journals during the 1930s, and a further pair in 1965

⁴ 'En aan deze persoonlijkheid hebben wij ook een boek als "Emma" te danken, dat een monument in de letterkunde mag worden genoemd' (Schröder 1949, 7).

⁵ 'Een roman, die den stempel van zijn tijd en zijn omgeving draagt, dien van het rusige, door weinig hartstochten bewogen Engeland van omstreeks 1800; maar een *andere* indruk dien hij ons geeft is sterker, die van het verschil in de menselijk figuren. Verschil en intellect, in karakter, in oprechtheid, in bedoelingen en in levenshouding; deze dingen, die aan geen tijd zijn gebonden, treffen in elken tijd opnieuw, wanneer zij zuiver en waar zijn beschreven. Zo wordt het schijnbaar onbelangrijke [*sic*] *boeiend*' (Schröder 1949, 5).

and 1977. The nature of Austen's reception in the Low Countries becomes consequently difficult to determine beyond these responses. In the Low Countries, Austen scholarship appears to be a separate enterprise from the translations produced in Dutch. Literary critics of the 1930s read Austen's works in English, while commenting on her in Dutch, but most criticism on Austen emanating from the Low Countries (especially after 1980) appears to be written for an international, anglophone audience, rather than a native Dutch readership. Ironically, then, while Austen is currently more popular in the Dutch language than ever before, publications about her *in* Dutch are diminishing. Reception of Austen, therefore, operates on the following levels:

1. A Dutch reading majority receiving Austen in translation (primarily after 1945 and especially after 1980);
2. Enthusiasts and scholars reading Austen in English and writing in Dutch (particularly during the 1930s);
3. Dutch scholars reading and writing in English for an international audience (during the late twentieth century).

These elements make the few Dutch-language articles on Austen all the more intriguing because they target a specific audience, about which we may draw some conclusions.

During the early twentieth century, scholarly interest in Austen was confined primarily to the Netherlands, apparently the result of her growing popularity in Britain. Reflecting the influence of English literature on Dutch literary circles, Britain functioned as the main conduit for the discovery of Austen. Interestingly, both authors of the 1930s' articles were accomplished literary critics, who aimed to introduce Austen to a Dutch audience ignorant of her merits. M. H. de Haan had already written about Richardson's influence on the Dutch author, Adriaan Loosjes; Kloos-Reyneke van Stuwe was a novelist herself and had written many articles for the *De nieuwe gids*, edited by her husband Willem Kloos. Despite De Haan's and Kloos-Reyneke van Stuwe's familiarity with British literary history, both scholars appear to have discovered Austen serendipitously, rather than by design.

In his 1935 article, De Haan confesses his ignorance of Austen in what appears to be the first scholarly discussion of her work in Dutch. He recounts how he discovers Austen quite by accident, when, during a holiday in England, he borrowed a copy of *P* from the hotel library in order to satisfy his curiosity about Louisa Musgrove after she falls down the Cobb: 'Before I started to read the book I knew nothing about Jane Austen, not even the period in which she had lived, but since *Persuasion*, my literary conscience has given me no rest.'⁶ This confession is all the more surprising considering that, a year earlier, De Haan had completed his doctoral dissertation on Richardson and Loosjes.

⁶ 'Voordat ik het boek begon te lezen wist ik niets van Jane Austen, zelfs de tijd niet waarin ze had geleefd, maar sinds "Persuasion", heeft mijn litterair geweten me geen rust gelaten' (Haan 1935, 274).

Judging by this accidental discovery by a scholar versed in the literary traditions of the eighteenth-century novel, it is clear that Austen was ignored in the curricula of Dutch universities. De Haan's discovery, then, offers an insight into the general lack of awareness of Austen's work, despite Uildriks's translation more than a decade earlier.

De Haan immediately acknowledges the genius of Austen, framing his discovery of her work comparatively through the prism of his scholarship on Richardson and Dutch literature. Although the article numbers only six pages, and was written within a year of his discovery of Austen, De Haan's criticism is astute. For instance, he recognizes in her style and characterization a psychological depth comparable to Richardson, although her novels are not as dramatically and fiercely rendered as her antecedent's (Haan 1935, 275). Austen's genius is evaluated not directly on its own terms, then, but through the stylistic influences of, and similarities with, Richardson.

Initially, De Haan foregrounds Austen's indebtedness to Richardson who was well known by Dutch scholars of English literature; however, his admiration and appreciation of Austen in her own right quickly emerges:

Besides Jane Austen's ability, equal to that of Richardson, to portray dramatically the consciousness of her characters, she also had, in stronger degree than her instructor, the talent to illustrate the lives of her figures from the outside. She knew how to penetrate [her characters] internally, but also understood the art of having her creatures perform through dialogue as if on the stage and acting freely. She, above all, controlled the technique of external drama. [. . .] But although she had independently developed her talent, I still believe that this development would not have been possible without the schooling of Richardson.⁷

This passage makes some significant observations. While the Dutch prefaces and blurbs often praise Austen's characterization in passing, De Haan is the first Dutch critic to single out her style and technique. Having studied Austen's major novels, he argues that the surface link between Richardson and Austen is unobservable to those who do not consider stylistic techniques. De Haan argues for Austen's significance within the tradition of the novel, primarily in her abandonment of the epistolary form, which enabled her to dramatize inner psychological consciousness through outer behaviour.

In analysing Austen's style (rather than subject matter), De Haan compares Richardson's influence on Dutch authors with that on Austen. Firstly,

⁷ 'Jane Austen had echter behalve het vermogen om, gelijk Richardson, het bewustzijn harer personages dramatisch uit te beelden ook en in veel sterker mate dan haar leermeester het talent om het leven van haar figuren van de buitenkant te laten zien. Zij wist in hun binneste door te dringen, maar verstond ook de kunst om haar creaturen sprekend in te voeren als op een toneel vrij handelend te laten optreden. Zij beheerste daarenboven de techniek van het uiterlijke drama. [. . .] Maar al heeft zich haar eigen talent ook geheel zelfstandig ontplooid, ik geloof toch dat die ontwikkeling zonder de scholing van Richardson niet mogelijk geweest was' (Haan 1935, 276–77).

differences arise simply because Richardson and his Dutch successors did not share a common national and linguistic culture, so that elements of the form and structure would undoubtedly have been lost in translation by Dutch writers. Secondly, authors such as Loosjes, Wolff and Deken were inspired by the content of Richardson's novels, rather than by their form and style. Thirdly, Wolff and Deken read Richardson at a much older age than Austen, which meant that Richardson's influence, had less impact on their craft than on that of the developing novelist.

What De Haan argues is not only that Austen's talents and style were unique, but that their uniqueness arose from the inspiration and influence of Richardson. Indeed, De Haan concludes by lamenting that it is a shame Austen had not been known to Wolff and Deken:

Because if this had been the case, then maybe they [Wolff and Deken] would have understood that there were other possibilities for the novel, and that through the abandonment of the epistolary form, and through the treatment of alternating picturesque and dramatic scenes, developed her [Austen's] talent in a completely different manner.⁸

This observation is one of the few pieces of Dutch criticism that frames Austen's strengths within Dutch literary traditions, and De Haan's article remains one of the best critical discussions of Austen in Dutch. For De Haan, however, she is not a popular novelist to be translated for the general reader: the audience for the *De nieuwe taalgids* was a specialized one. Even by today's standards, the article is squarely aimed at an audience comprising scholars of English and Dutch literary history. As such, De Haan assumes an audience which had the liberty to travel and the leisure to read Austen in English. Clearly, the appreciation of Austen was to remain a specialized literary discovery.

This is also the case with Jeanne Kloos-Reyneke van Stuwe's overview (1939a, 1939b) of Austen's life and works in *De nieuwe gids*, which targeted a wide range of scholarly readers and enjoyed an impressive editorial board of professors and academics. What is interesting about Kloos-Reyneke van Stuwe's response to Austen is that she was herself a female novelist who wrote on similar themes of courtship and marriage. Representative works include: *Een verloving* (An engagement, 1903), *De comédie der liefde: roman* (The comedy of love: a novel, 1922) and *Emma, de bruid* (Emma, the bride, 1932). *Emma, de bruid* – perhaps an unlikely nod to Austen's own work? – focuses on a protagonist who must choose between two lovers: the man she marries and her first love. While elements in the novel are very different from Austen's moral tone and style, Kloos-Reyneke van Stuwe was clearly knowledgeable about anglophone female novelists.

⁸ 'Want wanneer dat het geval geweest was, dan hadden zij misschien begrepen dat er voor de roman nog andere mogelijkheden zijn, en dan hadden zij door het opgeven van de briefvorm, door een behandeling van afwisselend picturale en dramatische scènes, haar talent nog op heel andere wijze tot ontplooiing kunnen brengen' (Haan 1935, 280).

This is what makes it so surprising that she had not written on Austen earlier. Previously, she had written on George Eliot, George Sand, Harriet Beecher Stowe, Colette, Bettina von Arnim, Karoline von Günderode, the Brontës, Frances Burney, the comtesse de Noailles – but not on Austen. On the eve of World War II, Kloos-Reyneke van Stuwe comments about her late discovery of Austen: ‘at present I hope to discuss one of the most famous female authors during the time of Walter Scott, who has gained the reputation of a classic, which appears to be still increasing’.⁹ One wonders about the reasons for her late discovery, given her husband’s excellent library collection, which boasted an extensive collection of English-language authors. Presumably, it was the growing popularity of Austen in Britain that influenced Dutch interest – especially considering that Kloos-Reyneke van Stuwe translates directly from English sources such as James Edward Austen-Leigh’s *Memoir of Jane Austen* (1870).

Kloos-Reyneke van Stuwe’s article appeared as part of the series ‘Feiten and fantasieën’ (Facts and fantasies), and was published over several issues of *De nieuwe gids*. The piece aims to inform the reader about the merits of Austen, lauding her work as a ‘classic’ and Austen as a ‘most famous’ author. Yet, there is a tone of justification accompanying this praise. In her introduction Kloos-Reyneke van Stuwe states that the pieces of juvenilia ‘Frederic and Elfrida’ and ‘Love and Freindship’ are currently being published, proving that ‘Jane Austin [*sic*] is still to the taste of the cultured lovers of literature, because it appears one cannot get enough of even, until recently, the best-known novels.’¹⁰ This of course is not entirely correct, as Austen’s early works had been published in Britain ever since the inclusion of *LS* and other excerpts in Austen-Leigh’s *Memoir*. Clearly, Kloos-Reyneke van Stuwe invokes the British reception of Austen as a strategy to engage a Dutch reading audience ignorant about her work. Presumably, Dutch readers of *De nieuwe gids* looked towards Britain in order to cultivate their reading tastes.

The article provides little literary criticism (unlike De Haan’s piece), instead presenting a biographical account of Austen’s life, interspersed with historical details about the major novels and ‘Love and Freindship’. To convince her readers of the enduring popularity of Austen, Kloos-Reyneke van Stuwe cites the praise of Walter Scott, Richard Whately, Coventry Patmore and Margaret Oliphant (1939a, 270–71, 405). Her prose is repetitive in its praise, accentuating Austen’s literary value, reputation and popularity. For instance, she observes that in *PP* ‘children and old people [. . .] but also persons of middle age, young girls and youths will find something to their liking’, or ‘when we reach the end of *Emma*, then we really have the impression, which the

⁹ ‘thans hoop ik een der meest beroemde vrouwelijke auteurs uit den tijd van Walter Scott, die een klassieken naam heeft gekregen, welke nog steeds vergroot schijnt te worden’ (Kloos-Reyneke van Stuwe 1939a, 268).

¹⁰ ‘Dat Jane Austin nog altijd in den smaak valt van de beschaafde letter-lievenden, omdat men niet meer genoeg blijkt te hebben aan de tot voor kort slechts van haar bekende romans’ (Kloos-Reyneke van Stuwe 1939a, 268).

literary historians have given us, that here we have a real masterpiece of English literature'.¹¹

Like De Haan, Kloos-Reyneke van Stuwe draws on anglophone sources, but whereas De Haan's criticism contextualizes Dutch approaches to English literature, Kloos-Reyneke van Stuwe acts not as a critic, but more as a translator of English scholarship for her reader. Although there is no evidence that she had read De Haan's article, she similarly agrees that *MP* and *E* are the best works and accentuates the appreciation for Austen's characterization:

From the characters, which she ridicules, we perceive her sharpness of observation, her inclination to satire and her fine humour; not many authors combine so much witticism with such a strict avoidance of cynicism and vulgarity. [. . .] It is in the course of daily life, the conversations, actions and people's thoughts, that her characters are sculpted for us. And one esteems this art – because it is an art! – in no small degree.¹²

If one juxtaposes this passage with Schröder's introduction to *E* (discussed above), it becomes clear that a pattern of Dutch appreciation of Austen centres on the subtle portrayal of character:

She knew the subtleness of the human psyche; and even if the representation of a specific character is sometimes a bit one-sided, often she knows how to blend the light and darkness within one person in a miraculous manner.¹³

Apart from some interesting asides, Kloos-Reyneke van Stuwe's article provides little analysis of Austen in terms of literary history. One of these asides, however, is intriguing, as it contextualizes Austen's reception within a Dutch perspective of literary Modernism. Kloos-Reyneke van Stuwe finds it a wonderful, yet odd, feeling to read a book written over 150 years ago that does not give the impression of being outdated to the 'modern person'. Austen is contrasted with Modernist writers such as James Joyce, Lawrence Durrell and

¹¹ 'kinderen en oude mensen [. . .] maar ook personen van middelbaren leeftijd, jonge meisjes en jongelui zullen hier iets van hun gading vinden'; 'Wanneer wij aan het einde van Emma zijn, hebben wij werkelijk den indruk, dien de literatuur-historici ons hebben gegeven, namelijk, dat wij te doen hebben gehad met een meesterwerk der Engelsche letterkunde' (Kloos-Reyneke van Stuwe 1939b, 148, 808).

¹² 'Uit de karakters, die zij ridiculiseert, worden wij haar scherpe opmerkingsgave, haar neiging tot satire en haar fijne humor gewaar; weinig schrijvers combineeren zooveel geestigheid met een zoo strenge vermindering van cynisme en vulgariteit. [. . .] Het is in den loop van het dagelijksch leven, in de gesprekken, de handelingen, de gedachten der personen, dat haar menschen ten voeten uit voor ons worden gebeeld. En men achte deze kunst, – want het is een kunst! – niet gering!' (Kloos-Reyneke van Stuwe 1939b, 272)

¹³ 'Zij kende de subtiliteit van de menselijke psyche; en al is de voorstelling die zij van een bepaald karakter geeft soms ook wat eenzijdig, vaak weet zij licht en duister in één mens op bewonderenswaardige wijze te mengen' (Schröder 1949, 6).

Henry Miller, with the result that her 'books are refreshing, a pleasant surprise, – yes, a mental relaxation, as through a trusted calmative'.¹⁴ Austen is prescribed as the tonic for the stress of modern life, and such comments evidence an appreciation for Austen's style by those disoriented and alienated by the experimental techniques of Modernist literature. Given the scholarly and professional readership targeted by the article, it would seem that certain contemporary responses tended to construct Austen through a conservative literary lens. The irony here is that it was only the leisurely and educated readers who could read, and get their hands on, Austen in the original English editions. Kloos-Reyneke van Stuwe's article should have sparked a more wide-ranging appreciation of Austen amongst this Dutch-reading audience which might have resulted in more translations, but any momentum of appreciation was disrupted by the events of World War II. By contrast, the post-war period saw Austen's novels translated at the expense of scholarly discussion in Dutch.

As noted above, the short introductions to the translations offer the post-war Dutch reader only passing critical insights into Austen. This changed with the appearance of Herman Servotte's *De verteller in de engelse roman: een studie over romantiek* (The narrator in the English novel: a study of novel techniques, 1965). Published in Hasselt, Belgium, Servotte's study includes an interesting chapter, entitled 'Emma en Middlemarch: twee auteursromans' (Emma and Middlemarch: two authors' novels), which compares the narrative styles of Austen and George Eliot. The chapter addresses an academic audience, and although insightful for the Dutch scholar, it provides little commentary on Austen's reception in the Low Countries.

The last consideration of Austen in Dutch is the interesting *Jane Austen* (1977) by Guus Luijters, published as part of 'Het Jane Austen Gezelschap' (The Jane Austen society) – surely the first such society in the Low Countries. Responding to the lack of appreciation of Austen, Luijters founded a society:

On Sunday 18 July 1976, I lifted myself at a good moment out of my easy-chair, and I cast a vague glance through the bay window in my living room, and then said aloud: 'The Jane Austen Society is hereby established.' [. . .] There should be more attention paid to the work and the person of Jane Austen, and honestly, that has already been achieved pretty well; everyone who has visited a bookstore will concur with this: there should be new translations of Jane Austen's work, and indeed Uitgeverij Het Spectrum is preparing a translation of *Emma* [the 1980 translation by Polderman-de Vries] [. . .] There should be contact between the members of the Jane Austen Society, and that will happen even if it is via the telephone, and every year there should appear a booklet dedicated to Jane Austen. This booklet is proof that the Jane Austen Society is not a paper-club, but a fast-growing organization.¹⁵

¹⁴ 'zijn Jane Austen's boeken een verkwikking, een zoele verrassing, – ja, een geestelijk uitrusten, als door een betrouwbaar kalmeerginsmiddel' (Kloos-Reyneke van Stuwe 1939b, 149).

¹⁵ 'Op zondag 18 juli 1976 heb ik mij op een goed moment uit mijn luie stoel gehesen; ik heb een vage blik door het venster van de erker in mijn huiskamer geworpen en toen hardop gezegd: "Het Jane Austen Gezelschap is bij deze

More specifically, the aim of the society is to function as a Dutch branch of The Jane Austen Society in England, and Luijters states that the first aim of the branch will be to pressurize Dutch publishers to issue the entirety of Austen's oeuvre (Luijters 1977, 15).

Sharing the enthusiasm and passion expressed by previous scholars and translators, Luijters's aim during the late 1970s was to expedite the availability of Dutch translations and the appreciation of Jane Austen in the Low Countries. (Luijters's own discovery of Austen was precipitated by his reading of *PP* in English.) By 1977, all of the aforementioned Dutch translations were out of print, the last new translation being published in 1971. Judging by the post-1980 popularity of Dutch translations, it would appear that Luijters's quest was not fruitless, although most likely other forces were at work beyond his own direct influence. In fact, the publication of Luijters's volume in 1977 appears to be the only publication of the Dutch Jane Austen Society, whose activities beyond this publication remain tantalizingly unknown.

Nevertheless, Luijters's booklet marks an interesting attempt by the grass roots to popularize Austen in the Low Countries. Only 300 copies were printed for subscribers to the journal *HORUS* and for members of the Dutch Jane Austen Society. A handful of illustrations are included: of Chawton Cottage, its interior and Austen's gravestone in Winchester Cathedral. In addition, the volume contains a supplement by Kwis Kraus-van Essen, while Luijters also includes a bibliography of Dutch translations, as well as an abridged bibliography of selected anglophone criticism. Interestingly, the penultimate page contains a membership form to join the society at a cost of fl.12,50: all the information needed to launch a Dutch Austen society!

The text itself is a first-person discussion by Luijters about his admiration for Austen and his search for her in England, in which he refers to her novels, letters and other biographical details throughout. In this little volume, Luijters recounts his own Austenmania: having read everything about her available in the Netherlands, Luijters could 'no longer stand it. I had to and I would go to England: to Steventon, Chawton, Winchester, to the place where she was born, the house in which she worked, the city in which she died and is buried.'¹⁶ He recounts his pilgrimage through entertaining anecdotes interspersed with

opgericht." [. . .] Er moest meeraandacht komen voor het werken en de persoon van Jane Austen, en echt eerlijk waar, dat is al heel aardig gelukt, iedereen die wel eens een boekhandel bezoekt zal dit kunnen beamen, er moesten nieuwe vertalingen van het werk van Jane Austen komen, en zowaar Uitgeverij Het Spectrum bereid een Emma-vertaling voor. [. . .] er moesten contacten komen tussen de leden van het Jane Austen Gezelschap onderling, en dat zal gaan gebeuren al is het maar via de telefoon, en ieder jaar moest er een aan Jane Austen gewijd boekje gaan verschijnen. Dit boekje is het bewijs dat het Jane Austen Gezelschap geen papieren club is, maar een snel groeiende organisatie' (Luijters 1977, 9).

¹⁶ 'ik hield het niet meer. Ik moest en ik zou naar England: naar Steventon, Chawton, Winchester, naar de plek waar ze geboren werd, het huis waar ze werkte, de stad waar ze stierf en begraven ligt' (Luijters 1977, 15–16).

critical and biographical commentary, and, like other Dutch admirers of Austen before him, praises her technique and style. Luijters's enthusiasm makes interesting reading, because it presents an interpretation of Austen through the prism of his own readings and opinions, reading like a dialogue between commentator and texts.

While Dutch appreciation of Austen was slowly emerging during the period 1922–80, it was at best a diverging appreciation. The scholarly commentaries on Austen are clearly specialist discussions, which focus on English editions and anglophone sources: little, if any, discussion of the Dutch translations of Austen's works exists. It becomes clear that, at the start of the twentieth century, Dutch scholarly reception positioned Austen as a highbrow interest for those who studied and read English literature, an act distanced from the reading pleasures of the masses. Even the call for further Dutch translations by Luijters, an enthusiastic Austenite, was sparked by his initial reading of her novels in English.

Despite the number of publications during this period (totalling fourteen translations and reprints), not much can be deduced about Austen's wider readership in the Low Countries beyond the selected prefatory comments and blurbs of Dutch translations. Undoubtedly, future research will uncover commentaries about post-war reading and reception of Austen in Dutch among magazines and weeklies, diaries and journals. Interestingly, however, scholars, translators and Dutch Austenites during this period all appear to agree that *E* is Austen's masterpiece and that the simplicity of her work is tendered timeless through her innovative techniques of characterization.

Austen's growing popularity, 1980 to the present

Since the 1980s Austen has enjoyed unprecedented popularity in the Low Countries. Specifically, the editions published between 1980 and 2000 include twelve translations and twenty-one reprints of Austen's six novels. Not only is Austen growing in popularity among the Dutch reading public, but also becoming big business in the Low Countries. Consultation of publication records reveals a wide array of activity in hardcover, paperback and collected editions. At the time of writing, the complete data on Dutch Austen publications for the period 2000–05 were not yet fully available. A casual search of the catalogue of the National Library of the Netherlands, however, lists several entries, including the seventh and eighth printings of Schröder's *E* (1949) in 2001 and 2005 respectively; the sixth printing of Van Praag-van Praag's *PP* (1964) in 2005, and the first Dutch translations of *W* and *S* by Akkie de Jong (2005).

The post-1980 translations of Austen were primarily the domain of two publishing houses. Het Spectrum (The spectrum) issued translations during the 1980s: by Carolien Polderman-de Vries (*E* 1980) and W. A. Dorsman-Vos (*PP* 1980, *SS* 1982, *MP* 1984, *P* 1987). The other main publisher of Austen in the Low Countries, BoekWerk (Book-work), issued translations a decade later: by Elke Meiborg (*SS* 1994, *P* 1996, *PP* 1997), Akkie de Jong (*E* 1996), Ben Zuidema (*MP* 1997), and Sophie Brinkman and Maarten Spierdijk (*NA* 1997). Spectrum and BoekWerk's translations were reprinted throughout the 1990s. In

addition, reprinted editions of earlier translations – such as L. J. Veen's republications of Schröeder (*E* 1949) and Van Praag-van Praag (*PP* 1964) and new translations published by Athenaeum-Polak & van Genneep (*E* 1996, translated by Annelies Roeleveld and Margret Stevens) – testify to an active market.

The popular introduction of Austen to a Dutch reading public started with Spectrum's translations of *PP* and *E* in 1980. Published in both hardcover and paperback editions, Carolien Polderman-de Vries's new translation of *E* followed the 1816 edition published by John Murray. Including notes, an afterword and a short 'Life and Work' of Austen, the Spectrum editions aimed to foster appreciation of Austen within the context of literary history. The notes, for example, inform the Dutch reader about English literary references in *E*, as well as explaining puns, customs and traditions in order to guide the reader through Austen's world.

The afterword by Jenny Leach-Reitsma contextualizes Austen against the backdrop of economic and literary developments in eighteenth-century England. Briefly tracing the emergence of a reading public, and the rise of the sentimental novel and Gothic romance, Leach-Reitsma frames Austen's craft:

Jane Austen can be compared with [Frances Burney and Maria Edgeworth]: they all had Richardson's interest in the inner nature of humanity and morality in common, and they wrote about the same subjects: women of the well-to-do middle class in their daily surroundings. But Jane Austen surpassed them by far through the genius with which she, in a marvellous manner, transformed the very modest literary traditions (described above) by the writing of her masterworks. Their exciting construction, insight into human nature and brilliant style are qualities which do not become old-fashioned like changes in rules of conduct, and Jane Austen's works remain current and much read. ■

This celebrated timelessness of Austen's genius echoes the prefatory commentaries of previous translations: what is essentially new in these editions of *E* is that the scholarly discussion in Dutch about Austen is no longer separated from the Dutch translation, as was common during the pre-1980s period. Here, the readership of Austen in Dutch is addressed in Dutch! Leach-Reitsma's analysis of *Emma*'s characterization not only provides literary criticism of the novel, but also invites the reader to engage in, discuss and think about the issues of translation and interpretation symbiotically, rather than discretely. Other translations by Spectrum, such as Dorsman-Vos's *SS* (1982), also included an

¹⁷ 'Jane Austen met [Frances Burney en Maria Edgeworth] te vergelijken: zij hadden allen Richardsons belangstelling voor de innerlijke mens en moraliteit gemeen, en zij schreven over dezelfde onderwerpen: vrouwen van de gegoede middenstand, in hun dagelijkse omgeving. Maar Jane Austen overtrof hen verre door de genialiteit waarmee ze de (hierboven beschreven) zeer bescheiden literaire tradities op wonderbaarlijke wijze herschiep bij het schrijven van haar meesterwerken. Hun spannende opbouw, inzicht in de menselijke natuur en briljante stijl zijn eigenschappen die niet ouderwets worden zoals veranderende gedragsregels, en Jane Austens werken blijven actueel en veel gelezen' (Leach-Reitsma 1980, 412).

afterword. This combined approach was certainly new in the Low Countries' reception of Austen, making Dutch commentary more accessible to the general reader, and increased knowledge about the writer resulted in a growing appreciation of her work.

This practice does not appear to have become the standard for Dutch editions, however: for example, BoekWerk's translations of *SS* (1994) and *P* (1996) by Elke Meiborg limit commentary to a short (one-page) prefatory statement. The back-cover blurbs consist of two brief paragraphs: one an account of the novel itself, the other a standardized paragraph about Austen – both of which are used almost verbatim with slight variations for other translations. BoekWerk's 1994 *SS*, for example, reads:

The novels of Jane Austen (1775–1817) have captivated generations of readers and brought them into rapture with their unique, funny and smart depictions of the perpetual patterns and problems of love and marriage. Jane Austen is recognized as a brilliant and provocative critic of society, with a deep and sometimes shocking understanding of the bright and gloomy sides of human nature.¹⁸

In contrast to the detail of Leach-Reitsma's afterword, the adaptability of this blurb for other editions suggests that BoekWerk targeted a popular readership, rather than fostering a serious appreciation of Austen within literary history. It is clear that by the 1990s, Austen had become a marketable commodity in the Low Countries. That Austen market grew exponentially, with the production of hardcover and paperback editions at varying prices; collected editions of Austen, Gaskell and the Brontës; large-type editions; an English edition of *PP*; and even an illustrated collection of translated extracts from Austen's novels.

Undoubtedly, the stimuli of television and cinema fostered an interest in the printed editions of Austen's work amongst the reading public and publishing houses alike. For example, in 1996 four editions of *E* were published: presumably to coincide with either Douglas McGrath's cinema version or Diarmuid Lawrence's television adaptation. (It is worth noting that each edition was translated by a separate translator.)

Two editions were reprintings: Spectrum reissued the 1980 Polderman-de Vries translation complete with Leach-Reitsma's afterword. This edition continued to target a readership wishing to broaden their understanding of Austen's craft and her era. The Pandora Klassiek (Pandora classic) edition by L. J. Veen was the fifth printing of Schröder's 1949 translation and was marketed for a post-adaptation readership, although his insightful prefatory comments are omitted from this edition. The front cover duplicates the movie poster of Gwyneth Paltrow in her role as Emma and the back cover lists the film's credits.

¹⁸ 'De romans van Jane Austen (1775–1817) hebben generaties lezers gecharmeerd en in vervoering gebracht met hun unieke, grappige en slimme schilderingen van de eeuwigdurende patronen en problemen van liefde en huwelijk. Jane Austen wordt erkend als een geniaal en gedurfd criticus van de maatschappij, met een diep en soms shockerend begrip van de lichte en donkere kanten van de menselijke natuur' (Meiborg 1994).

Clearly, this edition targeted a popular audience, both through its association with the film version and being the cheapest edition available (fl.15). The two new translations were Akkie de Jong's translation of *E* for BoekWerk and Athenaeum-Polak & van Genneep's edition translated by Annelies Roeleveld and Margret Stevens. The fact that four individual translations were circulating in competition suggests that Austen was in high demand.

The degree of appreciation of Austen's writing, however, is more difficult to determine. Despite her popularity, surprisingly little is known about the post-1980 reception of Austen in the Low Countries, arising from the difficulty in tracing responses that document the dialogue between the author and her Dutch readership. Firstly, the more Dutch translations of Austen there are circulating, the less, it seems, her work is being critically discussed in Dutch print. Hence, while it is clear that the Dutch readership of Austen is expanding, the specific details of her popular reception are obscured at present, owing to a lack of commentary. Secondly, in contrast to this popular audience for Austen in Dutch, a smaller and more select one for her works in the original English remains. The reception of Austen in the Low Countries, then, seems to have several distinct readerships: readers of Dutch translations, readers of the original English editions, and a putative cross-readership of both translations and originals.

Such activities by a divergent Dutch audience raise some complex issues for reception history. Are commentaries in English by readers in the Low Countries who have read Austen's novels in English representative of an international or a national (Dutch/Flemish) reception? After all, the cultural dynamic of reading, response and interpretation need not be tied solely to language. Moreover, is reception history to trace multilingual dialogues about Austen by a cross-readership: in other words, those who read Austen in one language (for example, English), but write about her in their native language (for example, Dutch), or vice versa? In addition, we need to examine the relationships between the different readerships: is the reading of Austen in English a reaction against her current popularity in translation, aiming for an authentic experience, or is it simply intellectual snobbery?

Finally, an account of the reception of Austen in Dutch, especially since the 1980s, also needs to consider more fully the role of screen adaptations of Austen's works, which during the 1990s stimulated a whole new audience. The influence of the media in forging a new Dutch readership and the ways in which screen adaptations create a new market for print editions are emerging fields of study, which reception history must consider as fundamental. While there is no immediate answer to these nascent issues, the popular reception of Austen that started in the 1980s currently shows no signs of diminishing.

Conclusion

The reception of Austen in the Low Countries is a complex phenomenon, owing partly to the discrete practices of Dutch reception. Flemish and Dutch literary traditions, for different reasons, neglected Austen until the early twentieth century. Since 1922, Austen's works have been translated gradually

into Dutch, crossing the national and cultural boundaries of Flanders and the Netherlands. However, the readership was divided again, between critical appreciation of Austen in the original English and a Dutch–Flemish response to Austen in translation. The post-1980s period signalled further transformations in the reception field, with the general popularity of Austen’s work, evidenced by the numerous translations and subsequent reissues as well as the influence of visual media. Nevertheless, surprisingly little is known about the reception of Austen by the Dutch reading public since the 1980s because her current popularity continues to develop and expand.

While this chapter has provided a general overview of the different readerships for, and responses to, Austen in the Low Countries, many issues and questions remain unanswered. In the light of this, it is hoped that this study will provide a useful point of departure for future scholars of a hitherto-understudied topic. Considering the continuing and increasing popularity of Austen in Dutch, the reception history of her work in the Low Countries is only just beginning in earnest.

5 The Reception of Jane Austen in Germany

Annika Bautz

The reception of Jane Austen in Germany can be split into three main periods: 1811–1948, 1949–90 and 1991 onwards. During the long first period, there was a somewhat limited awareness among German readers of Austen; consequently, recognition of her oeuvre was relatively restricted in Germany until after World War II, when the second phase of her reception began. From 1949 to 1990, Germany was divided into two independent states with separate ideologies, which resulted in each country receiving Austen very differently. The final phase occurred after the German reunification in 1990, witnessing Austen's status rise to a level approaching that which she has enjoyed in Britain to this day.

Jane Austen in Germany, 1811–1948

For the entirety of the nineteenth and the first half of the twentieth centuries, Austen's novels had a somewhat limited impact in Germany. Only three translations appeared during this period: *P* (1822), *PP* (1830) and then, after more than a century, another translation of *PP* (1939). Consequently, the majority of German readers were unfamiliar with Austen's works: hence, this chapter will briefly sketch her reception during this first, fallow period, before moving to focus on the post-war response. The account given here draws on two independent studies that examine Austen's early fortunes in Germany (Fahnestock 1982; Chambers 2000), limiting itself to German translations and their reception.

The earliest German reference to Austen's works can be found in two short notices on the publication of *E* in Britain (Anon. 1816a, 1816b), appearing alongside surveys of contemporary English literature in two German periodicals, *Morgenblatt für gebildete Stände* (Morning paper for the educated ranks) and the other in *Jenaische allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung* (Jena general literary newspaper). Both mention the success of Austen's earlier works, *SS* and *PP* (but omit *MP*), while praising the domestic world sketched in *E*. Nevertheless, as Mary Lane Fahnestock notes, although these two periodicals were among the leading literary journals of their time, 'their mentioning Jane Austen seems to have been a matter more of coincidence than of conscious and significant interest' (1982, 11).

Anna: Ein Familiengemählde (Anna: a family picture; *P*) was published in 1822 by Christian Ernst Kollmann of Leipzig and translated by Wilhelm Adolf Lindau, who had established his reputation as a translator of Walter Scott's immensely popular works. A one-time police inspector in Dresden, but educated among the intellectual elites in Jena and Göttingen (Fahnestock 1982, 13), Lindau was also an author himself, having written a number of essays and historical novels, as well as *romans de mœurs*, typically set in foreign locales (Portugal, Batavia, America). Fahnestock notes that alongside its more exotic neighbours, *P* seems oddly out of place, and Lindau's incitement to publish Austen's novel possibly arose from Richard Whately's unsigned 1821 review of *NA* and *P*, which appeared in the *Quarterly Review*, which Lindau faithfully read. A second impetus might have arisen from Isabelle de Montolieu's French translation of *P*, as *La Famille Elliot, ou l'ancienne inclination*, which appeared in 1821. Fahnestock notes that the presence of 'family' in both the French and German translations may indicate Lindau's awareness of Montolieu's version, although Lindau's own status as an established and rigorous translator would probably have led him to pay little attention to the work of a renowned sentimentalist like Montolieu.

Anna was prefaced by a condensed translation of Henry Austen's 'Biographical Notice of the Author', which had appeared with the posthumous four-volume *NA* and *P* in 1818. While providing a chronological account of Austen's life and publishing history, as well as a sketch of her family, and account of her illness and death, Lindau's translation omits the personal resonances of Henry's account. Fahnestock notes that Lindau's *Anna* 'is not only complete, it is about as word-for-word, or at least as sentence-for-sentence and paragraph-for-paragraph a translation as possible' (1982, 15). Nevertheless, Helen Chambers identifies a number of deviations from Austen's text: for example, Lindau

minimise[s] the number of foreign proper names [...] to render the surface appearance of the text as German as possible. This assumes a target readership which is looking for a good read about recognisable family relationships, not one seeking enlightenment about the habits of an exotic species located offshore. (2002, 233)

Anne becomes 'Anna', Frederick 'Friedrich', Charles 'Karl' and even Jane Austen becomes 'Johanna Austen'; English distances are given in a German equivalent; street names are substituted by towns.¹ Despite Lindau's various inaccuracies, Chambers judges his translation 'a sound and intelligent [one] by the standards of the period' (2002, 237). There was a minimal amount of annotation supplied by Lindau, with four footnotes providing factual information about aspects of English life that may have been unfamiliar to the German reader.

¹ The French translations of Austen's novels also make comparable changes, although neither *P* nor *PP* appear to have come from the French: in fact, the title page of *Stoltz und Vorurtheil* states that it is 'from the English' ('aus dem Englischen').

The second translation to appear was Louise Marezoll's *Stolz und Vorurtheil* (PP, 1830), published by C. H. F. Hartmann of Leipzig. The edition states that the translation is 'frei nach dem Englischen' (freely after the English), and, accordingly, Marezoll takes more liberties with the original than Lindau had. *Stolz und Vorurtheil* was Marezoll's first translation, but many were to follow. Little information is available on Marezoll, but her father Johann Gottlieb Marezoll was a professor of theological studies at the University of Göttingen before becoming a pastor in 1794. In 1803, he moved to Jena, where he gained a reputation as 'one of Germany's most significant rationalist preachers' (Fahnestock 1982, 30). Marezoll herself not only continued translating works of fiction during the 1830s, but also published a cookery book and edited a newspaper for women for a short period. Her publishing career concluded in 1865, with translations into German of two novels by Charlotte Yonge. Fahnestock (1982, 31) suggests that Marezoll's motivation in translating *PP*, with very little immediate impetus (the last anglophone translation appeared in 1817, while two French editions appeared in 1822), probably lies in a chance encounter with Austen's original, which she enjoyed.

Chambers notes that Marezoll repeatedly 'rewrite[s] substantial blocks of dialogue as summarised reports' (2002, 240), shifting the focus towards the plot and losing much of Austen's subtle characterization through speech. Moreover, Marezoll 'heighten[s] expressions of emotion [. . .] and finishe[s] with a lively and entertaining but sentimental and trivialized love story' (Fahnestock 1982, 31). The various excisions and extended use of summary and paraphrase detrimentally affects Austen's carefully delineated characterizations and use of wit. The heightening of sentiment by Marezoll similarly diminishes the subtlety of Austen's study of manners, often losing the narrator's ironic distancing from the limited perspectives of Elizabeth and Darcy. Unlike Lindau's nearly faithful translation, Marezoll's acknowledged 'free rendering' results in a novel that lacks the painstaking structuring of Austen's original and nuanced tones.

Neither the publishers nor the translators of these two novels embarked upon further translations of Austen, suggesting that they cannot have been very successful (particularly at a time when the novels of Walter Scott were enjoying immense popularity with German readers). As Chambers notes, the 'subject matter and style [of Austen's] family portraits were not to the taste of a public accustomed to more exciting and eventful plotting in their English imports' (2002, 245). The reviews that appear allow for similar conclusions about how German readers received Austen's works. As noted earlier, two short notices on the British edition of *E* had already appeared in 1816 (in *Morgenblatt für gebildete Stände* and *Jenaische allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung*). As far as the two German translations were concerned, relatively few reviews appeared: three on *Anna* (in *Zeitung für die elegant Welt*, Anon. 1822c; *Dresdener Abend-Zeitung*, Anon. 1822a; and *Morgenblatt für gebildete Stände*, Anon. 1822b) and two on *Stolz und Vorurtheil* (in *Blätter für literarische Unterhaltung*, Anon. 1831; and *Jenaische Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung*, Voigt 1831). Fahnestock notes that Lindau was 'contributor to all three of the journals which published notices of *Anna*' (1982, 27): a fact that may well have ensured their noticing his translation. Of the reviews of *Anna*, only one (Anon. 1822a) mentions Austen at all, although all three echoed the same comments on Austen's qualities as a domestic author

given in Lindau's redacted preface. All three reviews also emphasize the unexceptionable morality of the novel and the ways in which it engages the reader's emotions.

In the reviews, both translators' efforts are mentioned and praised, with one notice of 1831 going as far as stating that the translation is 'probably improving the original through its more concise nature' – a statement the reviewer (Amalie von Voigt) makes without having seen the original (see Fahnestock 1982, 40). In fact, Voigt calls for 'more translations by this hand',² not for more novels by this author. If criticism of the translations is voiced, it is that the text still sounds too English: 'The translation is quite readable, on the whole, though terms and expressions frequently occur that remind the reader of the text's foreign origin.'³ It is the novels' morality and purity that the reviewers single out for praise, but these works are not for those who 'look for adventurous and wonderful events, or the fortunes of famous and infamous persons', since 'the mind is not vivaciously moved but softly affected'.⁴ Despite the reviewers' positive judgements, Austen nevertheless does not appear to have fulfilled early nineteenth-century German expectations of British fiction.

No further translation of an Austen novel appeared for more than one hundred years, and neither of the two early nineteenth-century translations was reissued during this interval. Austen was occasionally mentioned in encyclopaedias or general magazines of foreign literature, but these notices are few, and never of any meaningful length.⁵ Nevertheless, Austen was available to those Germans who could read English: Bernhard Tauchnitz of Leipzig included her in his 'Collection of British Authors' series, selecting anglophone works that met both critical and popular acclaim. Tauchnitz commenced publication of Austen's works in the 1860s, when sales of her novels increased in Britain: *SS* (1864), *MP* (1867), *PP* (1870), *NA* and *P* (1871), *E* (1877). That he brought out all six of Austen's novels indicates that their publication must have been judged successful; however, the fact that no other publishers showed any interest in issuing her works, either in English or in translation, illustrates the limited impact these editions must have had.

The early twentieth century saw no further translations into German of Austen's works, and only one English edition appeared in Germany: *SS*, in the

² '[wir wünschen] von dieser Hand mehrere Uebersetzungen zu erhalten' (Voigt 1831).

³ 'Die Uebersetzung läßt sich im Ganzen recht gut lesen, allein man wird doch oft durch Ausdrücke und Wendungen an den ausländischen Ursprung erinnert' (Anon. 1822b, 408).

⁴ 'abenteuerliche unerhörte Begebenheiten, die Schicksale berühmter und berühmter Personen' (Voigt 1831); 'Wird das Gemüth darin auch nicht lebhaft ergriffen, so wird es doch sanft erregt' (Anon. 1822a).

⁵ Chambers lists four entries in *Magazin für die Literatur des Auslandes* (Magazine of foreign literature) that mention Austen (in 1844, 1848, 1875 and 1879); Fahnestock notes several nineteenth-century works that refer to Austen: Anon. (1832), Ersch and Gruber (1844), Anon. (1864), Engel (1883), Arnstein (1897) and Körting (1899).

'English Library Series' (1922). By this period, however, Austen began to feature as the subject of academic analysis (including the first German doctoral thesis on her: Frankenberger 1910), as well as appearing more frequently in literary histories and periodicals (see Fahnestock 1982, 146–52). The next translation of Austen's fiction appears to have been one such token of individual interest: Karin von Schab's translation of *PP* as *Elisabeth und Darcy* (1939). Fahnestock argues that the translation attempts to update the novel, and is characterized by 'a greater informality in general tone and a more impulsive, less circumspect Elizabeth Bennet [. . .] [as well as] by the prevalence of colloquial expressions in the language of both narrator and characters' (1982, 116–17). No responses to the translation are recorded, nor are reissues: neither of which is surprising given the impending outbreak of war.

By contrast, no fewer than three Austen translations appeared in 1948: *Anne Elliot* (*P*), *Stolz und Vorurteil* (*PP*) and *Die Abtei von Northanger* (*NA*). All three were translated by Margarete Rauchenberger and published by Schaffrath of Cologne. Cologne was then a British-occupied zone, which may have catalysed the publication of Austen's novels, since they were considered by the occupying forces as highly appropriate reading for the German public. Post-war demand for foreign literature in Germany was high anyway, and it was promoted as part of the rebuilding of German civil society with allied help through institutions such as the British Council and the Amerika Houses. The paper of these editions is of poor quality and the translations are rushed, with many mistakes and omissions. Nevertheless, *Die Abtei von Northanger* carried a preface by Daphne du Maurier and *Anne Elliot* an introduction by Angela Thirkell, which testifies to some care being taken. None of these translations was reissued for several decades, however.

Jane Austen in East and West Germany, 1949–90

Between 1949 and 1990, Germany was split into two separate states with very discrete ideologies. Nevertheless, although divided across two countries, German readers shared a language and cultural history, which was not that of the author. Differences in reading between the two nations indicate the immediate impact of culture, while similarities point to a specifically 'German' reading.

The number of editions published in the two German states serves as a measure of public popularity and the extent to which Austen was read. Contrastingly, the prefaces to the translations indicate the ways in which she was received, as well as giving indications of her cultural status, in the different German states. While the West German market operated under free-market capitalism influenced largely by reader selection, East Germany was subject to censorship and material restrictions. The West German market functioned much like the British one, but East German publishing conditions may require some explanation. To analyse East German conditions, I have supplemented published accounts (Emmerich 1989; Barck, Langemann and Lokatis 1997) with letters received from former publishers and questionnaires distributed to people who used to live in the former German Democratic Republic (GDR).

Education was held in high esteem in GDR ideology, as 'the universal and harmonious socialist personality needed to be created and educated' (Maes 2003; see also Barck, Langermann and Lokatis 1997, 12). Education should therefore be understood to contain the shaping of political ideas (*Bewusstseinsbildung*). According to Friedemann Berger (2003), former director of the Gustav Kiepenheuer publishing house, the state 'imputed the central role in the intellectual and emotional education of the human being to literature before all other arts'. Some classic European novels were seen not only as harmless, but also as promoting these educational aims. The influence of Georg Lukács's concept of 'critical realism' on socialist criticism meant that nineteenth-century realism came to be seen as the highpoint of pre-socialist prose literature (see Lukács 1920, 1955a, 1955b). This meant, as Berger points out, that in addition to contemporary Russian literature, numerous nineteenth-century British authors were at the centre of East German translation activities. Furthermore, the GDR's aim of furthering women's emancipation meant 'a partiality towards female authors of the 19th century developed' (Berger 2003). Consequently, these four factors were favourable to the publication of Austen: an emphasis on education, the role of literature in this education, classic realist novels as part of this process and a stress on emancipation.

There were two main obstacles to overcome when publishing in the GDR: censorship and shortage of paper. Censorship arose out of the paradoxical aim to 'promote and at the same time control [literature]' (Barck, Langermann and Lokatis 1997, 12). A publishing house needed a licence from the Ministry of Culture to issue a book; few books were rejected each year, not owing to literary liberalism, but because censorship began prior to submission of manuscripts. Authors knew the conditions and subjected themselves to self-censorship, while publishers' readers would usually supervise a work-in-progress, so that authors generally did not present a finished work to a publisher. Furthermore, the director of the publishing house decided whether or not to submit the work to the Ministry of Culture, thus functioning as another filter. The same was true for translations: every publishing house had its authorized translators, whose work was supervised, and their translations required permission to be printed. Friedrich Baadke (2004b), reader for the East German publishing houses Aufbau Verlag and Rütten & Loening, states that even where a finished manuscript was deemed unsuitable, it would not be rejected; instead, the publishing house would be asked to withdraw its application, 'so that censorship did not become obvious as such'.⁶

Books were cheap, but because of censorship the choice was limited mainly to Russian and GDR literature as well as European classics. Owing to paper shortages, there were never enough even of those books that were thought to be harmless (though there was of course always enough paper for Marx and Lenin). Paper shortages thus facilitated censorship, as the size of editions could be controlled through paper supplies. Consequently, borrowing and lending were

⁶ 'so dass die Zensur nicht als solche in Erscheinung trat' (Baadke 2004b). On the process of publication in the GDR, see Wicht (2002).

important features of reception in the GDR, which makes the reputation of an author harder to assess. Readers tended to purchase a book simply because it was uncertain how long it would be possible to do so. Paradoxically, readers seem to buy fewer books in the over-supplied market of today than they did when books were more difficult to obtain. Baadke substantiates this fact from a publisher's point of view, especially where English authors were concerned. Before the reunification, the question had been

'Will we get it through [censorship]?' [. . .] The question after the reunification was 'will it sell?' As regards the last question, we had no experience because we did not have to worry about sales of our limited print runs where authors with an English name were concerned.⁷

Quite apart from the state promoting classic writers, this hints at a special taste for British or Western authors' works among general readers. The state promotion of literature, as well as its limited availability, resulted in a nation of readers who were eager to get hold of books. In fact, '[t]he GDR, together with Japan and the Soviet Union, publish[ed] more books per head of population than any other nation. About a third of this [was fiction]'.⁸

Editions, reissues and translations

The East and West German literary markets were independent of one another and therefore received Austen in different ways and at different times. With three exceptions, each country published and distributed Austen's works separately within their borders. Consequently, the reception of authors in one German state would have had little or no impact on their reception in the other. Overall, Austen's novels were available earlier to East German readers than to those in the West.⁹ In fact, it was not until the late 1970s and 1980s that there was a dramatic increase in translations of Austen in West Germany, with nine new translations during this period (seven of which appeared from 1977 onwards).

Circulation of Austen's works was limited in West Germany between the 1950s and early 1970s, with only two translations of Austen's novels appearing: *PP* (1951) and *E* (1961), neither of which was reissued. The year 1977

⁷ '“Kriegen wir es durch [die Zensur]?” [. . .] Nach der Wende lautete die Frage: läßt es sich verkaufen? Hinsichtlich der letzten Frage hatten wir keine Erfahrungen, denn um den Absatz unserer begrenzten Auflagen brauchten wir uns bei Autoren mit englischen Namen keine Sorgen zu machen' (Baadke 2004a).

⁸ 'die DDR, was die Pro-Kopf-Produktion von Büchern angeht, [steht damit] neben der Sowjetunion und Japan an der Spitze in der ganzen Welt [. . .] etwa ein Drittel davon [ist Belletristik]' (Emmerich 1989, 24)

⁹ In the East, translations of Austen appeared in 1965, 1965, 1968, 1972, 1980, 1989, while in the West, they were more scattered, appearing in 1951, 1961, 1977, 1979, 1980, 1981, 1982, 1983, 1984.

represents a turning point, however, marked by the publication of Ursula and Christian Grawe's translation of *PP*. The publisher, Reclam, provides editions that are both cheap and scholarly (comparable to Penguin Classics in Britain), therefore reaching a wide audience. Not only was the Grawes' translation reissued several times, but it was also followed by a flood of translations and editions of Austen, so that it can be seen as the inauguration point of Austen's West German popularity. Between 1977 and 1990, there were twenty-three new editions; if we include reissues, sixty-one editions were published during these thirteen years.

It is in this context that the three exceptions to the generally complete division between the East and West German markets occurred, when West German publishers issued translations prepared in the East. Fischer Verlag published Werner Beyer's *PP* (1965) in 1980 and Erika Gröger's *SS* (1982) in 1984, while VMA-Verlag published Christiane Agricola's *NA* in 1980. While Fischer is one of Germany's leading publishing houses, VMA-Verlag is a small, relatively unknown firm. Both Fischer editions were published after Reclam had issued the Grawes' translations. Publishing the East German translations in the West can be interpreted as an effect of Austen's popularity among West Germans, rather than a testament to the influence of East German publishing practices on the West: crudely put, Fischer wanted a share of the expanding market.

Six of the West German translations were by Ursula and Christian Grawe, a professional translator and professor of German respectively. All of their translations were published by Reclam, Christian Grawe providing detailed notes and an epilogue to each. He recalls that he and his wife approached Reclam, who agreed to a trial publication with *PP*: as this elicited a positive reader response, the Grawes were commissioned to translate the remaining five novels. Grawe (2003a) explains that he was impelled to translate Austen having read her 'with great enthusiasm' while living in the USA for three years and finding her 'underrepresented' in West Germany on his return. Although there were Swiss and East German editions, they were not sufficient: the Swiss translations were not ideal owing to lexical differences, while the GDR translations were difficult to access. Both Dietrich Klose (2003) and Ursula Krause (2003) from Reclam state that the Grawes' translations were 'the first ever into German' ('die ersten überhaupt ins Deutsche'). As well as emphasizing the lack of impact of the earlier West German translations of 1951 and 1961, such comments also underscore the strict division between the East and West German markets: a reviewer of the Grawes' *SS* states that the novel has now been translated into German 'for the first time' (Winter 1983), although Erika Gröger's translation of *SS* had appeared in East Germany in 1972. The same applies in the opposite direction, since Horst Höckendorf, who translated *E* for Aufbau-Verlag in 1965, regards his as the first translation though there had been Helene Henze's West German version in 1961.

While the Grawes' translations were, according to Krause (2003), 'essential for the Jane Austen boom in Germany', they did not dominate the market as absolutely as one might think. Other publishers followed suit, usually by reissuing older translations, so that before the reunification all of Austen novels were available in at least two (*SS*, *MP*, *P*), sometimes three (*PP*, *E*, *NA*) different translations. Nonetheless, the Grawes dominated the Austen market through

having translated all six of her novels, each in the same scholarly format. Reviewers describe the translations as 'exceedingly reliable and stylistically adequate',¹⁰ so that Grawe's claim of having 'adequately introduced Jane Austen into Germany' (2003a) seems well founded.

In East Germany, Austen was translated and published from the 1960s onwards. Three novels appeared during the same decade: *PP* and *E* in 1965, and *P* in 1968, followed by *SS* (1972), *NA* (1980) and *MP* (1989). As noted, more versions of Austen's novels were available earlier in East than in West Germany, although numbers of editions cannot necessarily be seen as indicators of an author's popularity, as readers' demands were not the deciding factor in East Germany. Instead, publication might indicate the promotion of an author by the state as useful for their aims. Baadke (2003) explains publication practices: in order to make the best use of the limited paper allocations, publishing houses cooperated, so that at least one work by core authors would appear no more than once each year. Berger adds: 'Part of this well-balanced basic supply was that at least one work of one of the mentioned English authoresses of the 19th century [Austen, the Brontës, Eliot] would be either newly published or reissued each year.'¹¹ Austen was thus part of the 'basic supply' provided by publishers in accordance with Ministry of Culture rubrics; nonetheless, editions and reissues still provide an indication of what was available to readers.

The restricted literary market in the East meant that the approved translation was adhered to, so that even in the case of different editions of a novel, the same translation would be used. All translations apart from *NA* were reissued or newly edited before 1990, which shows that, while it was the state's decision to publish Austen, East German readers must have bought her novels in sufficient quantities to create demand. For classic novels, translations tended to be newly commissioned, with East German translators unanimously stating that the Austen translations had not been their choice or initiative. Margit Meyer (2003) relates how the publishers Aufbau-Verlag had approached her, referring to *MP* as her 'unloved child': this contrasts with West Germany, where – at least in the cases of the Grawes and Charlotte Gräfin von Klinckowstroem – the translation had been on the translator's initiative (Fahnestock 1982, 172). Meyer's translation was revised by an editor, Klaus Udo Szudra, which seems to support her judgement of her relationship with Austen's text.

In the West, publication depended on the marketability of Austen, whereas in the East it depended on how she related to state-approved cultural projects. However, as an East German translator of *NA* points out, 'books were mainly translated that showed a deficient state of social affairs, preferably with a bad ending'.¹² By these criteria, however, Austen does not match the required East

¹⁰ 'Überaus zuverlässig und stilistisch adäquat' (Winter 1983).

¹¹ 'Zu dieser ausgewogenen Basisversorgung gehörte auch, dass wenigstens ein Werk der oben genannten englischen Autorinnen des 19. Jahrhunderts in jedem Jahresangebot entweder mit einer Neuausgabe oder wenigstens Nachauflage vertreten war' (Berger 2003).

¹² 'Übersetzt wurden vornehmlich solche Bücher, die gesellschaftliche Missstände zeigten, möglichst mit schlechtem Ausgang' (Agricola 2003).

German template, as she is not critical of society in their sense. The decision to publish Austen is made more surprising by the fact that two of her novels appeared in East Germany (*PP*, Beyer 1965; *E*, Höckendorf 1965) before the first Russian translation (*PP*, 1967). In the light of this, the ensuing discussion will explore East and West German readings of Austen, as well as reasons for Austen's having been published earlier in the East, and why she was thought – and proved to be – marketable in the West in the late twentieth century, and not before.

Prefaces and epilogues

In East Germany, only one monograph appeared on Austen between 1949 and 1990, while in West Germany over twenty were published: this discrepancy makes a comparison of critical trends in the academic reception of Austen across the two states impossible. One study cannot be seen as representative of academic responses to Austen in the GDR, nor does the lack of academic texts on Austen reflect public opinion, since the number of editions show that she was read in East Germany. Although the greater number of academic studies in West Germany would allow for some conclusions about general critical trends,¹³ the discussion of prefaces reveals more about critics' general attitudes and the relationship between critics and the public. Of all scholarly essays on a novel, introductions are most likely to reach general readers: their implied audience discloses critical perceptions of the relationship between general and specialist readers, as well as to what extent scholars construct, rather than simply reflect, their readership and whether they see themselves as cultural mediators. Since prefaces exist in both countries, they can be compared to one another and thereby reveal some of the differences in the reception of Austen in the two German states.¹⁴

The inclusion of a preface in an edition already gives some indication as to the literary status of an author. In both East and West Germany, the majority of Austen translations include prefaces of between ten and twenty pages long. That the majority of translations carried a preface can be seen as indicating that publishers in both countries accorded Austen a high literary status. In the East, it points to publishers caring how she is read, while in the West, to publishers believing readers to be interested more generally in the author and her works. Both East and West German prefaces are scholarly, well-researched essays, and four main issues determine East and West German readings of Jane Austen: her realism, her gender, her attitude to society and her response to contemporary events.

Austen's realism is stressed in the majority of East and West German prefaces.

¹³ For an account of academic theses on Virginia Woolf, see Nünning and Nünning (2002).

¹⁴ For an analysis of German academic studies of Austen, see Fahnstock (1982) and Jehmlich (1995).

Differences become apparent in the way this is explored, however: in the East, she is seen in relation to other nineteenth-century British realists, such as Thackeray and Dickens, while in the West, it is the content rather than the context of the novels that is stressed.

Austen's reception in both states focuses significantly on her gender. East German prefaces see her in the context of the male realist tradition, although she is not discussed for her aesthetic achievement, but in connection with her writing at all in a heavily patriarchal society. As in late-twentieth-century British responses, writing is perceived as a liberating act. Elfi Schneidenbach sees *E* as promoting emancipation mainly because of 'the time of its creation, at the beginning of the struggle for the social acknowledgement of women'.¹⁵ While Schneidenbach contextualizes Austen using citations from Mary Wollstonecraft and a pamphlet from the French Revolution, she tends towards generalizations, which results in Austen appearing to share these opinions. Austen's presentation as a woman in favour of emancipation would have recommended her to both publishers and censors. Agricola states that 'essential GDR policy was to show that bourgeois ways of life in comparison to one's own brought bad living conditions'.¹⁶ Schneidenbach argues that this derives partly from the subjugation of women: Britain and other capitalist countries have not taken the emancipation promoted by Austen far enough (1980, 472). Such comments render Austen topical, while also serving the ideological function of demonstrating how far forward the GDR has moved from Austen's times (in contrast to capitalist countries). Whereas the West German prefaces were written entirely by men, half the prefaces to the East German editions were penned by women, indicative of a clear emphasis on Austen's gender and a female target audience.

By contrast, the West German prefaces focus less on emancipation and more on Austen's gender, her consideration of everyday life and her female perspective. In the West, what was published was not determined by what the state thought useful but by market forces. Dietrich Klose from Reclam states that what persuaded him to attempt the Austen trial suggested by Grawe were 'the quality of the originals [as well as the timing of Grawe's suggestion] coinciding with the rapid increase in interest in women's literature'.¹⁷ Especially given the suddenness of Austen's success, the growth of feminism appears to have provided a positive context for her reception in West Germany. The timing of the publication of her novels in East and West Germany can thus be seen in both states as being connected with an increasing cultural emphasis on female emancipation. This focus is further highlighted by the

¹⁵ 'in der Zeit seiner Entstehung, am Anfang des Ringens um die gesellschaftliche Anerkennung der Frau' (Schneidenbach 1980, 464)

¹⁶ 'Wesentliches Prinzip der DDR war zu zeigen, dass bürgerliche Lebensformen im Vergleich zur eigenen schlechte Lebensbedingungen brachten' (Agricola 2003).

¹⁷ 'Die unbezweifelbare Qualität der Originale [sowie der Zeitpunkt von Grawes Vorschlag]. Koinzidenz mit dem sprunghaft steigenden Interesse an Frauenliteratur' (Klose 2003).

publishers' choice of title, with both states favouring *E* and *PP*, despite the national division and separate literary markets. The different readings of Austen's gender show how much she has been appropriated to fit in within dominant cultural trends: East Germans were required to see her as feminist from the start because she was used to promote emancipation, whereas in West Germany her readership developed only once cultural shifts created an interest in female issues.¹⁸

East and West German preface writers agree in seeing Austen as writing within an established order which she does not question, except in relation to issues of female emancipation. Nevertheless, they differ in what they regard as her attitude to society, mainly because their definitions of 'social criticism' diverge: because Austen does not question fundamentals, East Germans see her criticism as limited to human weaknesses, whereas West Germans see her as critical of both individual and social faults. Contrary to what one might expect, it is the West Germans that regard her novels as containing 'consistent social commentary' ('konsistenten sozialen Kommentar'; Grawe 1984, 571). However, they also see Austen's ideal as a person whose exterior and interior correspond, such as Mr Knightley. Grawe states that 'two types of social education and social values oppose each other in Mr Knightley and Mr Churchill':¹⁹ the true and truthful English gentleman and the dazzling French deceiver. While this means that one should look for interior qualities rather than be blinded by a splendid exterior, it also means that only those who are 'internally noble' ('innerlich vornehm'; Grawe 1980, 437) deserve to ascend the social scale: a Jane Fairfax, but not a Harriet Smith. West German commentators perceive Austen as differentiating socially between the characters, so that her criticism is not limited to the characters as individuals of the same social class, but also as characters representing a section of society.

None of these gradations feature in the East, and Austen is not situated as a social critic herself, but as realistically depicting a society that the authors of the prefaces can then criticize. This limits her as an author, and the commentators criticize Austen's class as a whole: her contemporaries and her characters live 'parasitically – off wealth that they have not themselves worked for'.²⁰ For East Germans, reading Austen is justified because of her irony and her personal distance from events; although she can never be called a true social critic, because she does not question the fundamental structures of her class, but 'judges from the point of view of her class'.²¹ They can therefore only go so far as to see her as having 'together with Walter Scott made the way for the glorious literary age of Victorian realism, so that she became an immediate

¹⁸ By comparison, in the case of Virginia Woolf's reception in the GDR, the 'emancipationist' and socialist works came first: notably, *A Room of One's Own* and *Three Guineas* (see Wicht 2002).

¹⁹ 'In Mr. Knightley und Mr. Churchill stehen sich also zwei Typen gesellschaftlicher Schulung und gesellschaftlicher Werte gegenüber' (Grawe 1980, 429).

²⁰ 'parasitär – von einem Vermögen, das sie nicht selbst erarbeitet haben' (Szudra 1965, 530).

²¹ 'urteilt sie vom Standpunkt ihrer Klasse' (Szudra 1965, 526).

predecessor of Charles Dickens, William Makepeace Thackeray and George Eliot',²² whose works *would* connote social criticism in the GDR.

East and West also interpret Austen's treatment of marriage differently. East Germans again see Austen as criticizing individuals and they then generalize from this in order to critique society's attitude towards it. Austen promotes a choice of partner 'for love', rather than money. Commentators use marriage as an illustration of what they perceive to be Austen's general criticism of material considerations, her depiction of the 'pitifulness of vain hankering after money' ('Erbärmlichkeit eitlen Gewinnstrebens'; Szudra 1984, 534). East Germans place Austen definitively on the side of love against money, thereby positioning her as critical at least of social attitudes, if not class structures. By contrast, West German prefaces locate Austen's discussion of marriage within the eighteenth-century philosophical debate between heart and head. Norbert Kohl (1985) sees the different marriages of *PP* as promoting a choice based on feeling combined with prudence. Love is the deciding factor that defeats material and social considerations in both Jane and Elizabeth's relationships. Nevertheless, money remains a component, as in Austen's fiction 'personal deservedness correlates with the wealth of the "breadwinner"'.²³

The differences between East and West German readings testify to different ideological values, especially regarding attitudes towards money and the impact of cultural traditions on literary interpretation. East German writers see Austen as neither including, nor having been influenced by, the events of her time. However, to exclude major political events and social changes makes the absolute realism they claim for her virtually impossible: political commentary is expected from a realistic writer, therefore commentators have to create reasons for her 'immunity' from contemporary events (Agricola 1980, 305). There are two justifications given by East German critics. One explanation argues for Austen's unawareness, owing to ignorance (Szudra 1965, 523), and her eighteenth-century insulation in the pre-industrial south of England from the transformations of the nineteenth century (Findeisen 1965, 504). The other explains this omission through Austen's compositional principle, according to which she included 'nothing, absolutely nothing, that she did not immediately know, feel, see'.²⁴ East Germans depict Austen as focusing on characters and their 'psychology and vitality unaffected by time' ('überzeitliche Lebenskraft'; Agricola 1980, 321) and point out her timeless message of humanism and tolerance. This enduring quality renders Austen's novels still relevant and appealing, making it all the easier to critique those aspects of her society which East German commentators regard as continuing in capitalist societies during

²² 'gemeinsam mit Walter Scott dem glanzvollen Literaturzeitalter des viktorianischen Realismus den Weg bereitete und so zur unmittelbaren Vorläuferin von Charles Dickens, William Makepeace Thackeray und George Eliot wurde' (Szudra 1965, 513).

²³ 'persönliche Verdienste korrelieren mit dem Wohlstand des "Ernährers"' (Kohl 1985, 415).

²⁴ 'nichts, aber auch gar nichts zu behandeln, was sie nicht aus eigener Anschauung durch und durch kennt, spürt, sieht' (Agricola 1980, 303).

the twentieth century. At the same time, the historical and literary contexts within which Austen writes are equally stressed, but are generalized into symbols of capitalist oppression as a global and enduring phenomenon. So, while Austen may depict the English gentry, her criticisms are levelled at universal (capitalist) evils.

In contrast to other nineteenth-century British writers, Austen's significance to East German commentators is not articulated in terms of any political or class commentary she might have to offer. Instead, it is focalized through her realism and influence on later realist authors, her tendencies towards emancipation, her depiction of characters, and their timeless psychology and morality. Austen's significance is defined by gender and literary history, and her social situation suitably fits the template of literature that appealed to those who oversaw publishing policy in the GDR: a female author writing realistically at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Elucidating this approach, Friedemann Berger explains his 'consciousness that women represented a higher proportion of novel readers than men, and that they would find their questions and problems more addressed by female authors than in novels written by men, such as Thackeray and Dickens'.²⁵

This awareness of a female audience emphasizes the importance of Austen's gender and the historical context, establishing that Austen was used to promote women's emancipation. Regarding the content of her novels, however, preface writers felt acutely the need to justify reading them, because, while realistic in her depictions, she was clearly not a social critic. Approval of Austen's texts was further problematized not only by her being limited in her social scope, but also by her belonging to a class that socialists felt compelled to criticize. The result of the conflicting issues in East Germany is predictably contradictory: preface writers emphasize her humanity, love and tolerance, see her as amiable and unaware of major contemporary events, rather than critical of society in terms of class, and yet as an authoress who leads the way into emancipation.

Despite this paradoxical situation, the fact that Austen continued to be printed in the GDR suggests that the Ministry of Culture regarded her literary status and social usefulness as high enough to justify such attention. It also indicates that readers were buying her. Critical status and public popularity therefore appear to coincide, given the limited influence that public demand had on publication in East Germany.

While West German preface authors also emphasize Austen's realism and gender, pointing to her social criticism and satire, they do not position her as an emancipating writer. Instead, they stress the fact that she is a woman, writing from a female perspective about women. The schism between East and West is striking: West Germans see her as socially critical but not as emancipated, whereas East Germans see her as not socially critical but as a pioneer of emancipation.

²⁵ 'dass man sich durchaus bewußt war, dass Frauen den weitaus größten Teil der Roman-Leser ausmachten und dass sie ihre Fragen und Probleme bei Autorinnen besser als bei Mannsbildern wie Thackeray und Dickens wiederfinden würden, konnte nicht ausbleiben' (Berger 2003).

Reviews in both countries raise points similar to those in the prefaces. In East German papers, Austen is seen as 'emancipating herself out of the narrowness of her time and the country in that she took up her pen and wrote' (Anon. 1973).²⁶ In their keenness to show Austen as challenging the society in which she lived, reviews tend towards exaggeration more than the prefaces. Austen's emancipation is partly constructed through the negative reaction of her contemporaries towards her novels, so that 'conservative English society turns upside down'.²⁷ Austen realistically depicts a society that values only wealth, rank and reputation, one in which loving relationships are destroyed. ('D.B.' 1973; Kreß 1983). Despite these obstacles, she nevertheless emphasizes humanity and celebrates those general human character traits, so that her works continue to remain topical (Kreß 1983). Although West German reviews range more widely, the main points raised in the prefaces also tend to recur in reviews: Austen's presentation of characters following realistic patterns of behaviour and probability (Mander 1981), her criticism of society ('W.R.' 1982), her subtle irony and the marriageability of her heroines (Winter 1982). Overall, West German reviews praise Austen's achievement warmly, arguing that her novels deserve a 'high rank [. . .] in European literature'.²⁸

The Graves' scholarly editions of the six novels catalyzed the rise in Austen's West German popularity: they appeared at the right time and in the right format, as a set of scholarly yet affordable editions offering readers accuracy and apposite commentary. Nevertheless, that other publishers subsequently issued or reprinted competing (if inferior) translations points to a more varied readership for Austen. The rise of Austen's critical status (as testified to in introductions) and the increase of public popularity (as indicated by demand for new editions) are thus symbiotic: the Graves decided to translate Austen's novels on finding her unknown and the public purchased their translations once they were available. Austen's novels achieved popularity in late-twentieth-century West Germany owing mainly to two circumstances: the kind of editions meeting the needs of readers and the time of publication coinciding with the cultural emphasis on women and their lives.

It becomes clear, then, that Austen's fortunes in the two halves of the divided Germany arose out of divergent circumstances. West German prefaces focused on the content of Austen's novels rather than on their context, so that Austen's literary reputation was based on the texts; contrastingly, in the East, it was largely the author's literary and historical context that appealed. In the West, Austen was published independently from other nineteenth-century British realists, and it was the quality and subject matter of her novels that determined publication rather than contextual elements. West German preface writers did not encounter Austen with the ideological expectations of the East, but

²⁶ 'Jane Austen selbst emanzipierte sich aus dieser Enge von Zeit und Provinz, indem sie zur Feder griff und schrieb' (Anon. 1973).

²⁷ 'die konservative englische Gesellschaft Kopf steht' (Anon. 1965).

²⁸ 'der hohe Rang, der diesem Roman in der europäischen Literatur zukommt' (Winter 1983).

accepted her limited social scope, perceiving Austen as aware of her times and contemporary events as featuring in her novels, either directly or indirectly. Commentators do not see any overt political commentary, but unlike their East German counterparts they do not have to justify this, instead positioning Austen's novels as cultural products of her times (Sühnel 1961, 348).

West German prefaces differentiate more keenly than those in the East: the society Austen depicts is seen as consisting of various components. Societies at different points in history are not seen as equivalent to one another, nor are societies in different nations. Instead, what Austen shows is the early nineteenth-century English gentry. As a consequence of West German prefaces differentiating between Austen's and twentieth-century society, she is not seen as particularly relevant for a specific society but as generally significant. In spite of emphasizing national differences, the West German approach is much like that of Anglo-American commentary from the 1960s and 1970s: the focus is on the text and Austen's timeless relevance is stressed. West German commentators emphasize the fact that she is a woman dealing with women's issues, however, so that they do not appear to copy specifically Anglo-American trends, being instead influenced by general cultural movements.

Mary Lane Fahnstock supplies reasons for what she perceives as Austen's intrinsic lack of appeal for German readers. She is mainly concerned with the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, but also considers Austen's reception since 1949. Her study appeared in 1982, so that her judgements are made without knowledge of the immense growth of Austen's popularity during the 1980s, particularly in West Germany. Her basic argument is that Austen cannot be of interest to the German national character: 'Germany has, indeed, produced a great many poets and philosophers, but Germans also have a reputation for exaggerated intellectuality', an 'insistent and earnest search for depth, for substance, for ideals' (Fahnstock 1982, 257–68). In contrast, the present analysis has already established not only that both East and West Germans read Austen, but that they read her in different ways, independent of their shared national identity. Also, lack of depth is not discussed in West German prefaces, and although the East German complaint about Austen's lack of scope comes closest to Fahnstock's allegation, they nonetheless identify attributes that compensate for this perceived fault.

Fahnstock further argues that the public German reception has throughout the centuries followed the English (1982, 249–50). This appears not to be the case for the decades considered in my study, however: in East Germany, editions of her novels come out before there is an increase in her British popularity and East German prefaces discuss issues that do not feature in British criticism. West German popularity and critical readings do not copy British trends either: they show trends that develop simultaneously with Austen's British reception, so that no time lag that would indicate imitation is involved.²⁹

Neither the public nor critical receptions of Austen were determined by

²⁹ For Austen's reception in Britain during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, see Bautz (2007).

nationality. West German readings of her are different from East German and similar to Anglo-American interpretations, without any signs of West German critics deliberately adopting anglophone approaches. East German commentators read Austen according to the dominant trends of their culture, appropriating her in order to fit their ideology. The reading of an author is necessarily influenced by dominant cultural trends, so that the German reception of Austen during the twentieth century can be seen as determined by transnational ideologies (capitalism, socialism), rather than by a common language or a shared history.

Germany after reunification, 1991–2005

The two German states were reunited on 3 October 1990: the West German literary market was relatively unaffected by this, whereas East German market structures changed fundamentally. Literature had been controlled, but it had also been promoted, and had been regarded as fulfilling a central role in the education of citizens of the GDR. With the dissolution of the state system and the privatization of publishing houses, the latter had to refocus. As Baadke (2004a) recalls, prior to reunification he did not have to worry about selling his limited print runs of British authors, whereas post-1990, his publishing house had to learn how to market the printed books to potential readers. This proved especially difficult with literature, since reading tastes and habits changed immediately. As part of the dismantling of communist structures, public provisions of social services were reduced. More than half the public libraries disappeared within the first two years of reunification, while those that remained discarded about 40 per cent of their stock (Emmerich 1997, 437). The popularity of Jane Austen in a reunified Germany is thus to be seen in the context of a literary market determined by capitalist market forces.

In the reunified Germany, whose literary market operated under previously West German conditions, Austen's increasing popularity continues. Between 1990 and 2002, there have been eighty-four editions of Austen novels (averaging seven per year), a number which includes reissues of West and East German editions as well as nineteen fresh translations. The number of publishing houses publishing Austen has also risen: both high- and low-brow firms are involved, from across the reunified nation, while the format of editions varies from expensive, illustrated hardbacks to cheap mass-market paperbacks.

Without a doubt the single most influential factor in Austen's increasing prominence in reunified Germany is the recent spate of film adaptations of her novels. The exponential increase in editions of Austen's novels following the broadcast of the film adaptations during the mid-1990s indicates the huge impact of films. The most striking example is *SS*, which overtakes the hitherto most popular novels, *E* and *PP*.³⁰ Ang Lee's 1995 adaptation of *SS* was screened

³⁰ The following numbers of new editions obtain for the years 1990–2003: *SS* (twenty-three), *PP* (twenty), *E* (eighteen), *MP* (twelve), *P* (six), *NA* (five).

in German cinemas in 1996, and in that year ten editions of *SS* appeared, with only two offering new translations. In 1997, three editions of *SS* were published, all of them new, and since then there has been an average of two editions of *SS* per year. The 1996 and 1997 editions in particular reference the film: the front cover showing actors from the film, the film is referred to in the blurb and the books bear stickers on the front stating *Jetzt im Kino* (Now in the cinema). The continued popularity of the film is testified to by television broadcasts: there has been one each year since 1996.³¹ A similar pattern emerges for the connection between film and print versions of Austen's other novels that have been adapted for the cinema, although these are nowhere on the same scale as that of *SS*. The influence of the *SS* film becomes obvious in the distribution of Austen titles after the reunification: *SS* is now sold in equal proportion to *E* and *PP*; before 1990, in both East and West Germany, *PP* and *E* were the most frequently published titles.

A greater proportion of editions were published without a preface between 1991 and 2002 than before the reunification (half as opposed to one-third pre-1990). Only three new prefaces have accompanied translations of Austen's novels published from 1991 onwards: two by Angelika Beck for fresh translations of *SS* (2001) and *PP* (2002) by Helga Schulz, and one by Fabian Bergmann (1999) for the 1965 GDR translation of *E* by Horst Höckendorf. All three prefaces focus on Austen's biographical circumstances. Bergmann emphasizes Austen's life and attitudes much more than the novel itself, which testifies to his belief that it is the author's life, rather than the novel's themes, that readers wish to be informed about in a preface. His Austen is emancipated, critical of social norms and unwilling to marry for any reason other than love. His tone is entertaining rather than academic and he provides neither footnotes, references nor a bibliography, although there are few inaccuracies. Beck's essays are similar in the overall image they supply, although she comments more on the individual novels than Bergmann does; however, her analyses are not interpretations of the novels' thematics but histories of their composition, and therefore also concerned with Austen's biographical circumstances. This emphasis is made more explicit by the fact that Beck identifies strong autobiographical elements in both novels, so that Elizabeth becomes an 'idealized self-portrait'. Beck perceives Austen's social criticism as limited, owing to the author's insistence on anonymity at a time when writing was deemed unseemly for women: 'Jane Austen appears to have internalized the role-specific expectations that society had of women at least in this point'.³²

It is not just that post-1990s German editions omit prefatory comments, the great majority of those works that do include a preface recycle older ones: including reissues, only five out of the eighty-four editions of Austen's novels

³¹ Interest in the film, rather than primarily in the novel, is also testified to by a German translation of a report on the making of *SS* by Emma Thompson (1996).

³² 'Jane Austen [scheint] die an ihre Geschlechtsgenossinnen herangetragene Rollenerwartung zumindest in diesem Punkt verinnerlicht zu haben' (Beck 2001, 424).

published between 1991 and 2002 carried a fresh preface. With two exceptions (Agricola 1980; Schneidenbach 1980), all of the older prefaces, written between 1949 and 1990 in both East and West Germany, were reprinted in the reunified state. Although most of these prefaces are fairly scholarly, the time-span between their composition and their reprinting rendered them increasingly less apposite. Most were not revised at all, and the few that were updated still retain even the most obsolete passages that seem irrelevant to a modern-day reading of Austen. (A representative example is Szudra's epilogue, which refers to Austen's 'parasitical', capitalist heroes, and was included in two post-reunification editions of *E* in 1996 and 2001.) In addition to this decline in editions that carry new prefaces, it seems that publishers no longer regard scholarly editions as necessary in order to make Austen's novels appealing. The data therefore testify to a change in Austen's German reading public: from a principally academic towards a more general audience. While academic editions, with high-quality translations and scholarly prefaces, were important for the inauguration of Austen's reception, especially in West Germany, since the 1990s, she has been published and read in any format that is handy.

Translations in East, West and reunified Germany

As already noted, there were only two nineteenth-century translations of an Austen novel into German: *P* (1822) and *PP* (1830) (see Chambers 2000). Then, a gap occurred of over one hundred years, until the appearance of a new translation of *PP* (1939). This was followed in 1948 by three translations of *PP*, *P*, and *NA*, before Germany was divided into two independent states with their own literary markets and translations. East Germany developed an interest in Austen earlier than West Germany, but both countries translated all her novels at least once before the reunification in 1990.

The quality of the translations varies significantly: from careful and exact to hasty and careless; from an attempt to imitate Austen's style and syntax to a focus on plot; from nineteenth-century idiolect to twentieth-century colloquialisms. The most rushed translations were those by Margarete Rauchenberger, who translated three Austen novels in the same year. The editions are all printed on cheap paper, so that the publisher's concern generally appears to have been speed rather than quality. Although East German prefaces were influenced by Communist ideology, the translations typically bear little evidence of any systematic tampering: on the contrary, as Baadke claims, East Germans applied 'strict standards of truthfulness to the text. [. . .] The translations were checked by the responsible Reader in a sentence-by-sentence comparison [with the original].'³³

The samples of translations presented below demonstrate the difficulties involved and indicate that every translation is necessarily an interpretation.

³³ 'strenge Maßstäbe der Texttreue. [. . .] Die Übersetzungen wurden vom zuständigen Lektor im Satz-für-Satz-Vergleich redigiert' (Baadke 2004b).

The selected passage is from *PP*, the novel that has been translated most in Germany: in 1939, 1948, 1951, 1965, 1977 and 1997, with a Swiss edition of 1948 appearing in Germany in 1993.

English: 'He spoke well, but there were feelings besides those of the heart to be detailed, and he was not more eloquent on the subject of tenderness than of pride. His sense of her inferiority – of its being a degradation – of the family obstacles which judgment had always opposed to inclination, were dwelt on with a warmth which seemed due to the consequence he was wounding, but was very unlikely to recommend his suit' (*PP*, 2.12: 189).

Schab (1939), Rauchenberger (1948): omit the passage 'which seemed due to the consequence he was wounding'.

Krämer (1948): 'redete er mit einer Glut, die sich, ihrer Folgen bewusst, zu verletzen, durchaus nicht geeignet war, für seinen Antrag zu werben': 'conscious of its result being to hurt' (252).

Holscher (1951): 'Das alles sollte wohl erklären, wieso er aus den gesellschaftlichen Schranken ausbreche': 'All this was probably meant to explain why he was breaking out of social barriers' (158).

Beyer (1965): 'über den Widerstand der Familie, in der die Vernunft stets über die Liebe gestellt worden war – über all dies sprach er mit großer Wärme und sehr ausführlich, was wohl auf die Empfindungen zurückzuführen war, daß er *Standesvorurteile* verletzte': 'Regarding the resistance of the family, in which reason had always been put above love – about all this he spoke very warmly and elaborately, which probably stemmed from the sense of violating prejudices of rank' (246).

Graue (1977): 'Das Bewußtsein ihrer sozialen Unterlegenheit, sein gesellschaftlicher Abstieg, die Überzeugung, daß familiäre Hindernisse seiner Neigung im Weg standen, wurden mit einer Leidenschaft vorgetragen, aus der seine ganze *Selbsterniedrigung* sprach': 'The consciousness of her social inferiority, his social decline [. . .] with a passion that testified to all his self-degradation' (206).

Schulz (1997): 'bei all dem verweilte er mit einem Eifer, der eher auf eine Kränkung hinauslief und seinen Heiratsantrag nicht unbedingt annehmbarer machte': 'that was more likely to amount to an insult' (224).

In the majority of these translations, Darcy emerges in a more negative light than in Austen's original and the passage loses its subtlety and suggestiveness. His later transformation becomes more difficult to understand, given that his previous feelings have been depicted as more unilaterally negative. The quality of the translations of this passage is representative of the whole. Austen's phrase 'seemed due to the consequence he was wounding' illustrates especially how much the *act of translation* signifies a specific *act of reading*, thereby limiting readers' options. None of the translators employ the same term when translating 'consequence', and all the translations miss the nuances of Austen's original, which results in a more monological image of Darcy.

Hence, there are major qualitative differences between the translations, yet all of the above, apart from Holscher's translation, were reprinted in West Germany during the 1980s and in the reunified Germany of the 1990s. East Germany reissued only its own translations, so that no Austen novel was available in the GDR in more than one translation. While the quality of the

Grawes' translation affected Austen's popularity in West Germany, quality does not seem to be the deciding criterion for either publishers or general readers once Austen had become more broadly popular. The sheer variety of translations indicates that many publishers want a share of the Austen market, that they cater for various groups of readers with different requirements, but most importantly that readers rarely base their choice of edition on the quality of the translation.

Biographies

In the space of just under ten years, four German biographies of Jane Austen were published in Germany: one in the West (Grawe 1988) and three in the reunified nation (Beck 1995; Martynkewicz 1995; Maletzke 1997). The appearance of biographies indicates that by the late 1980s, a broader German readership had become interested in Austen and her works, that this readership wanted to know about Austen the person and that they required more than the prefaces as sources about her.

All four biographers address a readership with a German cultural–historical background, and their descriptions of Austen's time and society differ significantly from those of their British counterparts. Austen's historical context is narrated in relation to German history, so that Christian Grawe describes her as a contemporary of Ludwig van Beethoven, Heinrich von Kleist, Madame de Staël, Napoleon and Queen Louise of Prussia (1988, 18). In order to enable German readers to understand Austen's education, Wolfgang Martynkewicz explains that Britain had no 'state-run educational system, such as the one that developed in Prussia at the end of the seventeenth and during the eighteenth century'.³⁴ Biographers explain the sociological conditions of Austen's time, including the term 'gentry': Martynkewicz notes that, because the Austens belonged to the gentry, their income still sufficed for a considerable number of servants (1995, 16), while Grawe states that the Austens belonged to 'the gentry, the upper-middle class, which, after the higher aristocracy, was comprised of the lower aristocracy and the landowning bourgeoisie'.³⁵

While the four German biographies address a readership unfamiliar with conditions in early nineteenth-century Britain, they vary in tone and level of pitch. The most academic biography is the first to appear, that by Grawe (1988), in which he supplies sources for his statements, remains objective rather than emotional and translates a selection of letters at the end of his monograph. The three later studies speculate more and make more factual errors: Elsemarie

³⁴ 'Ein staatliches Schulsystem, wie es sich Endes des 17. und im Laufe des 18. Jahrhunderts in Preußen herausbildete, gab es in England nicht' (Martynkewicz 1995, 37).

³⁵ 'Die Austens gehörten der "Gentry" an, dem oberen Mittelstand, der nach der höheren Aristokratie den niederen Adel und das landbesitzende Bürgertum umfasste' (Grawe 1988, 66).

Maletzke mentions Austen's 'seven completed novels' (1997, 15). Maletzke writes subjectively and emotionally, accusing Austen's family of not appreciating her artistic talent, even after her death: 'But it is typical of the family that they unaffectedly dozed through Austen's existence as an artist. To give away the table at which she had written! To misplace her manuscripts!'³⁶ Nevertheless, although there are many inaccuracies and mistakes in her account, Maletzke's tone is entertaining and her work is easily readable. Maletzke (1997), Martynkewicz (1995) and Beck (1995) are similar in their emphasis on Austen's gender and her concern with women's lives, representing Austen as transgressing prescribed sociological norms. Maletzke is the most extreme in this approach and maintains that Austen deliberately did not marry because she wanted 'time to write' (1997, 20): as a result, she depicts Austen as having consciously chosen between her professional career and a life as wife and mother.

Beck's account is rather more factual, although she also attempts to offer reasons for Austen's not marrying. For instance, she finds Austen's accepting and then rejecting Harris Bigg-Wither an 'incomprehensible step' and attempts to render it as a moral, rather than ideological or practical, decision (Beck 1995, 105). Martynkewicz similarly fills gaps in Austen's life that existing sources leave out, interjecting qualifying modifiers such as 'one feels' or 'surely Jane Austen must have'. In three of the four biographies, the emphasis is therefore less on the accuracy of the facts than on readability and entertainment value.

The pattern of Austen's increasing popularity during the 1980s and 1990s, that editions, translations and prefaces illustrate, is confirmed by these biographies. The first appeared in 1988, when her works were already widely read in Germany and when Grawe could expect readers to take an interest in Austen's life. The other three were published between 1995 and 1997, when the novels had gained even more popularity, and when the film adaptations (particularly *SS*) had led to an abundance of new editions. It therefore appears no coincidence that the first German biography is more academic than its three successors, while a higher percentage of editions published during the 1980s carry more scholarly prefaces than those issued during the 1990s. Both factors – the differing slant of the mid-1990s biographies and the less academic trappings of post-reunification editions – hint at a more general readership increasingly taking an interest in Austen.

In the course of their analyses, the biographers address the reception of Austen's works in Germany, and their respective opinions again testify to the growth in her popularity. Grawe writes that in spite of her novels 'finally obtaining more attention in Germany, her reputation is still so little established that information about her and her life is not available in German'.³⁷ By contrast, seven years later, Beck states that

³⁶ 'Aber es sieht der Familie ähnlich, daß sie ihre Existenz als Künstlerin so ungerührt verschlief. Den Tisch wegzugeben an dem sie schrieb! Die Manuskripte zu verkramen!' (Maletzke 1997, 301–08).

³⁷ 'Obwohl ihre Romane endlich auch in Deutschland mehr Aufmerksamkeit finden ist der Ruhm der Schriftstellerin hier noch so wenig etabliert, dass Informationen über sie und ihr Leben auf deutsch nicht verfügbar sind' (Grawe 1988, 7).

Since the 1970s at the latest, [Austen's] works have been increasingly popular with German readers, and exist in several translations. It therefore seems strange that this author's life, which has by now been as exhaustively studied as her work, remained well-nigh unnoted here.³⁸

Again, this recognition of the transformation of Austen's popularity in Germany confirms the development that the frequency and positioning of the editions hint at.

Conclusion

In the reunified Germany, the trend initially evidenced in West Germany continued: Austen's popularity grew and her primary audience was increasingly the general reader rather than the academic specialist. The film adaptations of the mid-1990s influenced this transformation to no small degree. Whereas in the 1980s, commentators lamented that Austen's name was only known in Germany to the literati (Steuhl 1988), by the late 1990s critics could state that Austen's works are 'world classics, and some of the films that have been based on them have become blockbusters [...] and are watched both on TV and in the cinema by an audience of millions'.³⁹ Austen's mass-market appeal is reflected in the sheer numbers and varieties of editions now available. Her novels are exceptions to what Emmerich calls the 'retrogression of the reading culture to an expert culture',⁴⁰ instead embodying the very opposite paradigm: they have become popular with a wide and multifarious cohort of different readers. While interest in scholarly editions seems to have played a large part in her initial reception during the twentieth century, she now appeals to a broader market, whose interest in an Austen novel does not depend on the quality of the edition.

The 1980s saw the highest quality of Austen translations, through scholarly editions, although this does not coincide with her highest overall popularity, which testifies to her public and critical reputations existing independently of one another. Her popularity since 1990 was conditioned by different factors from before 1990: it was not the state that promoted her, as the GDR did, nor is there a complete focus on the content of the novels, which was the initial way in which Austen was presented in West Germany. Instead, her reception has been to a large extent determined by the film adaptations that have been broadcast in

³⁸ 'Spätestens seit den 70er Jahren erfreuen sich ihre in mehreren Übersetzungen vorliegenden Romane wachsender Beliebtheit beim deutschen Lesepublikum. Da mutet es seltsam an, dass das Leben dieser Schriftstellerin, das mittlerweile ebenso eingehend erforscht wurde wie ihr Werk, bei uns nahezu unbeachtet blieb' (Beck 1995, 10).

³⁹ 'Weltliteratur, einige der nach ihnen gedrehten Filme sind zu Kassenschlagern geworden [...] und finden immer noch im Fernsehen und Kino ein Millionenpublikum' (Anon. 1998, 228).

⁴⁰ 'Rückentwicklung der Lesekultur zu einer Expertenkultur' (Emmerich 1997, 448).

Germany. Films have made her novels accessible to a broader audience, especially a non-anglophone culture unfamiliar with the world that Austen depicts.

Female qualities are still major aspects in the reception and representation of Austen. Two readings exist, one similar to that in the GDR (Austen as a leading figure of women's emancipation) and one following the West German trend (emphasizing Austen's gender and female perspective without seeing her as a pioneer of emancipation). The films feed into the former, portraying Austen's heroines as spirited and emancipated, so that some reviewers describe them as having to choose between 'adapting and resisting [. . .] whether to fulfil other people's wishes or follow their heart'.⁴¹ Both Austen and her heroines are seen as 'refusing to compromise in matters of the heart' ('In Herzensfragen kompromißlos'; Anon. 1998, 231). The three most popular novels are the ones whose heroines are arguably the most independently minded: *PP*, *E*, *SS*. It seems no coincidence that *MP* gained popularity after the appearance of Patricia Rozema's film, which exhibits a much more spirited Fanny than the novel. A more conservative reading, similar to the former West German one, continues alongside this: some reviewers describe Austen as depicting 'womanly matters as the quintessence of diplomacy – not aggressively creative, but subversive, while maintaining the status quo'.⁴² Austen's being a woman writing about women thus remains a major factor in her popularity.

The study of Austen's reputation in Germany over two hundred years has shown that the reception of an author depends fundamentally on readers' immediate cultural contexts. Similar readings in West German and British interpretations indicate shared cultural values. East Germans received Austen differently, however: according to the dominant ideology of their society, which shows the dependence of reading on the immediate culture, rather than on a shared, antecedent cultural history. Differences between East and West Germany also point to the varying nature of any text. Once the two German states were reunited, the dominant model was that of the West German market, resulting in a pattern of reception which followed West German trends, which, as a result, moved closer to Austen's Anglo-American reception. It becomes evident, then, that during the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, it is no longer inherited national values that determine readings but transnational, sociocultural developments.

⁴¹ 'Anpassung und Widerstand [. . .] ob sie die Wünsche anderer Leute erfüllen oder lieber ihrem Herzen folgen sollen' (Anon. 1998, 230).

⁴² 'Weiblichkeit als die Quintessenz von Diplomatie – nicht aggressiv kreativ, sondern subversive; unter Wahrung des Status quo' (Leupold 2000).

6 ‘Unconditional Surrender’? Jane Austen’s Reception in Denmark

Peter Mortensen

When Mary Wollstonecraft published her travelogue *A Short Residence in Sweden, Norway and Denmark* (1795), she used a mixture of aesthetic and political terminology to record her impressions of late-eighteenth-century Scandinavia, which she had visited as a travelling sales agent for her mercurial American lover Gilbert Imlay. Of the northern countries, Wollstonecraft by far favours Norway, which appears to her a picturesque Arcadia of primitive republican virtues. By contrast, the more prosperous and powerful nation of Denmark seems dominated by a spirit of commercial pettiness, producing an oppressive Gothic atmosphere in which ‘every house made me think of a tomb’ (Wollstonecraft 1987, 185).

Unlike her near-contemporary, Jane Austen never set foot in Denmark, and apart from a casual reference to Queen Anne of Denmark in the juvenile *jeu d’esprit*, ‘The History of England’ (1791), Austen’s novels make no mention whatsoever of Danish affairs (*MW*, 144). In her correspondence, however, one does come across an intriguing letter, written in July 1813, to her brother Francis (Frank), who was a naval officer patrolling the Baltic:

It must be a real enjoyment to you, since you are obliged to leave England, to be where you are, seeing something of a new Country, & one that has been so distinguished as Sweden. – You must have great pleasure in it. – I hope you may have gone to Carlsroon. – Your Profession has its’ douceurs to recompense for some of its’ Privations; – to an enquiring & observing Mind like yours, such douceurs must be considerable. – Gustavus-Vasa, & Charles 12th, and Christiana, & Linnaeus – do their Ghosts rise up before you? I have a great respect for former Sweden. So zealous as it was for Protestan[t]ism! – And I have always fancied it more like England than many Countries; – & according to the Map, many of the names have a strong resemblance to the English. (*JAL*, 214–15)

Here as elsewhere, Austen’s oblique references require some contextual clarification. Austen’s ‘Carlsroon’ is Karlskrona, the southern Swedish naval base where Frank was stationed. ‘Christiana’ must refer to the Swedish Queen Kristina Wasa (1626–89), who abdicated the throne in 1655 and converted to

Catholicism. By 1813, Sweden had recently joined Britain in the struggle against Napoleonic France, which no doubt explains Austen's admiration for this 'distinguished' nation. Austen chooses to define Sweden in terms of its national heroes, but Swedish heroism also presupposes a corresponding villain, whose name remains unspoken. In this case, the major enemy necessitating the Royal Navy's massive presence in the Baltic was Denmark–Norway, a Napoleonic ally officially at war with Britain since 1807.

But if Jane Austen thought and wrote little of Denmark, nineteenth-century Danes evidently cared even less for Jane Austen. The first recorded reference to Austen in Danish appears in a short anonymous article in the journal *Det nyeste skilderie* (The recent review) for 30 September 1826, where Austen is briefly mentioned along with Radcliffe, Maturin, the Porter sisters, Edgeworth, Inchbald and Scott (Nielsen 1977, 2: 57). The first translation is Carl Karup's version of *SS, Forstand og hjerte* (1855–56), and this remained the only extant translation for seventy-five years. Thus, in accounting for Austen's Danish reception, one must first unravel the answers to several puzzling questions: Why did only one Danish translation appear prior to 1930? And why did this text only appear well after the publication of comparable French, Swiss, German and Swedish versions?

I

To understand the relative belatedness of the Danish appreciation of Austen, one must return to the political situation hinted at in the letter quoted above. The Anglo–Danish hostilities of the Napoleonic period significantly complicate the nineteenth-century reception not only of Austen but of most other English writers. The Battle of Copenhagen (2 April 1801) and the bombardment of Copenhagen (2–5 September 1807), when British troops killed some 1,600 townspeople and destroyed more than 300 buildings, including the medieval Church of Our Lady, considerably strained Danish attitudes towards Britain and British culture. In one fell stroke, the assault on Copenhagen robbed Denmark of its status as a major naval power, reducing it to an impoverished, second-rate nation. The consequent alliance with Napoleonic France proved an unmitigated disaster, as the victorious powers at the English-dominated Vienna Congress (1814–15) further punished Denmark by transferring Norway to Sweden. Not surprisingly, many Danes chose to hold the British responsible for the nation's misfortunes, rather than their own incompetent politicians.

For centuries, the main cultural reference point for educated Danes had been Germany, and this remained the case throughout the nineteenth century. Many post-Waterloo cultural documents are marked by anti-British attitudes. In his youthful works, N. F. S. Grundtvig, the father of Danish cultural nationalism, bitterly complained about the arrogance of England, vowing to avenge the humiliation of 1807 (Grell 1992, 14). The stereotype of the deceitful, power-hungry Englishman also appears in Carl Bagger's popular poem 'Den engelske kaptajn: et billede fra 1807' (The English captain: an image of 1807, 1834). Here, Bagger cleverly ventriloquizes his own anglophobia through the objections of a noble-hearted young English sea-captain, who chooses to commit suicide

rather than participate in the dishonourable attack on Copenhagen. By contrast, Austen never made a secret of her support for the British cause in the war, nor did she conceal her insular suspicion of the European 'other'. Austen's values are quintessentially English, typically charting 'a movement from immaturity to maturity, from imagination to reason, from folly to wisdom, from vice to virtue, and ultimately from things French to things English' (Hellstrom 1965, 617). In the immediate aftermath of 1815, it seems likely that putative Danish publishers would have been put off both by Austen's outspoken (if also sometimes ambivalent) support for the Royal Navy, and by specific passages like Emma Woodhouse's apostrophe to 'English verdure, English culture, English comfort' (*E*, 3.6: 360).

If nineteenth-century Danish readers would have been disinclined to enjoy Austen's patriotic effusions, they would also have had more fundamental difficulties in recognizing her novels *as* novels. Reflecting the recent rise of the middle-class reading public, early and mid-nineteenth-century translators of foreign novels generally favoured sentimental tales, Gothic thrillers, historical romances and silver-fork fiction. Even if Danish readers' awareness of English texts lagged somewhat behind their interest in French and German literatures, it would be misleading to imply that there was no direct cultural traffic whatsoever linking Britain and Denmark (Nielsen 1977). Patrons of Danish circulating libraries were far from unwilling to suspend their animosity towards England, if only English novelists could provide them with what they most desired in novels: exotic descriptions, highly coloured dialogue, sentimental intrigues, extravagant turns of event. These aesthetic priorities gave Danish readers a strong liking for the novels of Fenimore Cooper, Bulwer Lytton, Marryat and especially Scott, whose works began to appear, often in several rival versions in the early 1820s. Yet the same preference for romantic incident – the very taste burlesqued in *NA* – would also have worked against Austen's successful introduction in Denmark.

These factors help to explain not only the puzzling absence of rival translations during the nineteenth century, but also the strange presence of the one translation that did appear: Karup's *Forstand og hjerte*. Carl Friedrich Wilhelm Ignatius Karup (1829–70) was an eccentric, literary jack-of-all-trades. After a foreign journey in 1852, he converted to Catholicism, and for the remainder of his career he vacillated among heterogeneous projects that were all 'literary' in the widest sense of the word: original poetic compositions, commercial novel translations, virulent anti-Protestant propaganda and various ill-fated periodical publications. *Forstand og hjerte* was Karup's fourth English translation within a few years, the previous being works by fellow Catholic Julia Kavanagh, humourist Douglas Jerrold and historical novelist G. P. R. James. The publisher of *Forstand og hjerte*, Ludvig Jordan (1813–89), was an adept Copenhagen businessman specializing in translation, whose literary staff included many local hack writers. Besides running a successful bookstore and circulating library, Jordan published many novels by English authors; he also pirated and popularized French-language authors, such as Paul de Kock, Eugène Sue, Paul Ferval and Alexandre Dumas.

Whether Jordan or Karup knew other novels by Austen than the one that they chose to translate must remain a matter of conjecture, but even if they did it

is easy to see why they may still have preferred *SS* to its rival candidates. More explicitly than any other novel except *NA*, *SS* assumes its readers' familiarity with the popular literature of the day. Originally conceived as a novel-in-letters during the 1790s, *SS* makes detailed references to popular writers like Byron, Scott and Cowper. The narrative premise of two sisters with contradictory notions of right and wrong was a familiar motif in the politicized fiction of the post-revolutionary era, and Marianne Dashwood is easily recognizable as a variation on the hackneyed character-type of the 'female Quixote'. In addition, Austen could hardly have conceived more striking melodramatic incidents, such as Marianne's first encounter with Willoughby or Willoughby's nocturnal pleading with Elinor at Marianne's sickbed, without a solid grounding in various kinds of literary sentimentalism and sensationalism. Of course, it must be added that Austen borrows such incidents self-consciously, intending to criticize the underlying ideology of 'sensibility', but even so the satire seems less clear-cut in *SS* than in *NA* or *MP*. Austen's relationship to popular literary conventions was never based on mimesis, but neither was it one of pure antagonism.

Given the rather dismal quality of much mid-nineteenth-century Danish translation, and especially considering Jordan's posthumous reputation as a cynical provider of sub-literary trash to an incipient mass culture, *Forstand og hjerte* must be described as a surprisingly punctilious performance. Apart from a few factual blunders – confusing 'red-gum' (teething pains) with heat rash (*hedepletter*), for example – Karup generally avoids the confusions and misunderstandings otherwise endemic to the period's translations, by carefully following the twists and turns of the action. He finds it difficult to translate the non-standard speech of lower-class characters, and particularly that of Nancy Steele, whose many malapropisms leave him somewhat at a loss. Most other characters, however, successfully retain their characteristic voices in Danish. For example, it is entirely in character when the plainspoken Sir John Middleton introduces Marianne as 'en Satans smuk Pige' ('a monstrous pretty girl'; Karup 1855–56, 1: 185). Karup is also fully attuned to the subtler ironies of Austen's psychological portraiture, as is borne out by his delicate treatment of John and Fanny Dashwood's insidious sophistries. What is most remarkable for an era when few Danish writers had detailed awareness of English affairs, however, is the extensive cultural background knowledge that the translator reveals. Thus, Karup is unfazed even by relatively obscure proverbial sayings, such as Mrs Jennings's 'Den enes Død er den andens Brød' ('"One shoulder of mutton [...] drives the other one down"') and 'Det er aldrig saa ondt, der ikke er godt for noget' ('"tis a true saying about an ill wind"'); 1855–56, 1: 115 [*SS*, 2.8: 197], 2: 114 [*SS*, 2.8: 196]). In addition, Karup successfully negotiates the problems posed by the many culturally specific discourses which Austen alludes to, from inheritance legislation to horticulture and the recent vogue for the picturesque. Hence, one is inclined to forgive Karup for his slightly misleading rendering of the controversy over the proposed 'improvement' of Barton Cottage. Here, Karup's Danish term for 'improvement' – *udvidelse* – denotes a mere expansion in size, which implies that the translator was probably unfamiliar with Humphrey Repton's controversial programme of total aesthetic redesign.

II

Forstand og hjerte was probably never intended and certainly failed to convert Danish readers into Austen aficionados. Drowning in the multitude of more or less indistinguishable novels from the English, *Forstand og hjerte* was never reprinted, and therefore Austen's Danish discovery largely remains a twentieth-century phenomenon. For reasons too complex to be explored here, Germany's traditional influence on Danish culture began to wane during the first decades of the twentieth century, while interest in Britain and America began to wax (Hertel 2003, 431–35). The pioneer in this turn to the West was the influential journalist and critic Georg Brandes (1842–1927), who combined high-cultural tastes with an intense admiration for Britain's democratic legacy and industrial achievement. Brandes not only travelled widely in Britain, where he made the acquaintance of several eminent English intellectuals, he also lectured and wrote prolifically (and in several different languages) on many aspects of British culture, including classic and modern literature. Another eminent intellectual who laboured to bridge the gap and overcome former hostility was the Nobel Prize-winning author Johannes V. Jensen (1873–1950), who celebrated the 'Gothic Renaissance' and compiled an elaborate racial mythology asserting a deep spiritual kinship between ancient Nordic civilization and machine-driven Anglo-American imperialism (1901, 135–51).

During the twentieth century, a newly respectful attitude towards England, Englishness and classic English literature comes to the fore. To simplify matters somewhat, it might be said that where nineteenth-century publishers, critics and readers had viewed English literature as a potential source of interesting narrative material, their successors began to consider the Englishness of English fiction a desideratum in itself. Such readers were more likely to value writers whose texts conveyed a distinct impression of English manners and the English national character. Among these, Shakespeare, Fielding and Dickens loomed large, but Austen also began to receive her share of interest.

Greater appreciation of English high culture triggered a greater appreciation of Austen, whose critical canonization in Britain and America was just then underway. Jensen admired Kipling (whose works he also translated) more than any other British writer, but the Nietzschean disciple Brandes does not mention Austen, not even in the volume of *Hovedstrømninger i europæisk litteratur* (Main currents in nineteenth-century literature, 1875) explicitly devoted to nineteenth-century English literature (Brandes 1966). One of Brandes's heirs, however, was the prominent academic C. A. Bodelsen (1894–1974), who wrote about Dickens, Kipling and T. S. Eliot, besides preparing general introductions: *Engelske essays* (English essays, 1929a) and *Moderne engelsk skønlitteratur* (Modern English fiction, 1929b). Bodelsen was aware of the Austen revival gathering momentum in the English-speaking world; so was Aage Brusendorff (1887–1932), another early Danish advocate of English belles-lettres, who preceded Bodelsen as Chair of English at Copenhagen University.

Brusendorff's second wife Ebba (1901–35) prepared the first twentieth-century Danish translation of *PP*, *Stolthed og fordom* (1928–30). In her preface, she notes that so far Austen has been known to Danish readers only through SS,

‘which was translated into Danish sometime in the last century’.¹ Brusendorff deplores this, for not only is Karup’s translation poor, but *SS* is

probably the weakest of Jane Austen’s works. She still has not found herself and seems rather pedantic and stiff in her portrayal of the two sisters, whose characters contrast each other (as sense and sensibility). Furthermore this is the novel that lies closest to the contemporary taste for extravagant incidents. Thus, one of the book’s heroines lies sick, and her former lover, now a married man, comes to her at night to beg for forgiveness.²

Perhaps following Walter Scott’s review of *E* in the *Quarterly Review* (1816), Brusendorff goes on to relocate Austen’s genius not in the low-cultural appetite for ‘incidents’, but in her sense of detail and her talent for painstaking social observation. With the exception of Darcy, the characters of *PP* are all ‘humans of flesh and blood’ (‘Mennesker af Kød og Blod’; Brusendorff 1928–30, 14). Austen’s ‘attitude towards life is the observer’s, and she finds everyone and everything worth noticing’.³ The milieu represented, moreover, is particularly English, for Brusendorff points out that ‘Jane Austen never left England, and none of her books contains a single account of foreign countries.’⁴

Defining Austen’s works in terms of a pervasive though rather ill-defined Englishness, Brusendorff’s translation perfectly illustrates the aesthetic and ideological shifts that enabled twentieth-century Danish readers to appreciate both the style (domestic realism) and content (English provincial life) of Austen’s major novels. Yet, while Brusendorff assigns *PP* a ‘very high place in the English novel’,⁵ attempting a faithful rendering of Austen’s original, she also introduces certain changes. Most seriously, Brusendorff censures Austen’s ‘inability to sustain action’, and her penchant for wasting energy on ‘things which must necessarily be told, but which are not in themselves very interesting’.⁶ Brusendorff corrects this flaw and actively enforces a stricter narrative economy, by condensing the narrative at key points. Some characters’ speeches (for example Lady Catherine de Bourgh’s) are considerably shortened, the

¹ ‘som blev oversat paa Dansk engang i forrige Aarhundrede’ (Brusendorff 1928–30, 12).

² ‘sikkert det svageste af Jane Austens Værker. Hun har endnu ikke helt fundet sig selv og synes ikke saa lidt pedantisk og stiv i sin Fremstilling af to Søstre, hvis Karakter kontrasterer mod hinanden (som Forstand og Hjerte). Det er tillige den af hendes Bøger, der kommer nærmest til Tidens Smag angaaende oprivende Optrin. En af Heltinderne i Bogen ligger saaledes syg til Døden, og hendes tidligere Elsker, nu en gift Mand, kommer til hende ved Nattetide for at trygle om hendes Tilgivelse’ (Brusendorff 1928–30, 12).

³ ‘Hendes Holdning overfor Tilværelsen er Jagttagerens, og hun finder alt og alle værd at lægge Mærke til’ (Brusendorff 1928–30, 8).

⁴ ‘Jane Austen kom aldrig udenfor England, og der findes i alle hendes Bøger ikke én Beskrivelse af Udlandet’ (Brusendorff 1928–30, 10).

⁵ ‘En meget vigtig Plads i den engelske Roman’ (Brusendorff 1928–30, 15).

⁶ ‘vanskeligt ved at holde Handlingen i Gang’; ‘hvad der nødvendigvis maa fortælles, men som i sig selv ikke er saa interessant’ (Brusendorff 1928–30, 15).

Lydia–Wickham intrigue is somewhat curtailed, and Brusendorff lets the narrative voice summarize the contents of certain letters that Austen gives at length (like Mr Gardiner's letter to the Bennets in *PP*, 3.8), thereby concealing Austen's debt to the not entirely respectable tradition of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century epistolary fiction. Most materially, Brusendorff entirely excises the short episode of *PP*, 1.12, which concludes Elizabeth and Jane's stay at Netherfield, and relates the surly greeting they receive from Mrs Bennet. Here, Brusendorff apparently feels that Austen belabours the obvious: the intelligent reader will already have grasped the developments – Bingley's headlong infatuation with Jane, Darcy's reluctant attraction to Elizabeth, Miss Bingley's jealousy of both Bennet sisters – necessary to understand the further unfolding of the plot.

III

Stolthed og fjordom deserves notice because it is the first Danish text that defines and defends Austen as a novelist of domestic English manners and character. Still, although Brusendorff's pro-English views are evident, her admiration for Austen is not limitless. With Denmark's English-led liberation from Nazi occupation in 1945, however, the highbrow trend of cultural anglophilia became a mass-cultural fashion. According to Hans Hertel, the war brought an 'unconditional surrender and admiration [. . .] for the British, their institutions and values' (2003, 461). Denmark was viewed as lacking substantial values – courage, industry, liberality, self-confidence – that could only be supplied by a withdrawal from Germany's sphere of influence, and by a closer alignment to the English-speaking world. Seizing this opportunity, a number of Danish journalists, politicians and academics attempted to capitalize on the vogue for all things English by fashioning themselves as mediators between Denmark and England. These writers produced a virtual outpouring of texts designed to introduce the glories of England to Denmark and establish Englishness as the authoritative model for cultural imitation: Mogens Knudsen's *Dr Johnson og hans muntre England* (Dr Johnson and his merry England, 1945), Uffe Grosen's *Danmark og England: mod vinduet i vest* (Denmark and England: looking westward, 1945), Henrik Ringsted's *En have i London* (A garden in London, 1949), Flemming Bergsøe's *John Bull og hans nabo* (John Bull and his neighbour, 1950), Helge Knudsen's *Det nye England* (The new England, 1950) and Steen Eiler Rasmussen's *Rejse i England* (Travelling in England, 1952), to mention but a few.

As a result of the dominant anglocentric trend, the number of Danish translations of English novels skyrocketed within a few years (Hertel 2003, 448–51). These post-war translations, moreover, are often characterized by a new deference, at times even a new obsequiousness, towards canonical writers like Austen. A case in point is the critic Jens Kruuse's translation of *LS* (1945), published by Carit Andersen as part of a series entitled 'Store Mestres Smaa Værker' (Minor works by major writers) and illustrated by Des Asmussen. In his preface, Kruuse downplays *LS*'s satirical import, stressing instead its fundamental truthfulness to life. The attempt to deal with 'disagreeable people' ('usympatiske Mennesker'), he believes, is *LS*'s weakest point, and he criticizes Lady Susan's character as

‘obtrusive’ (‘paatrængende’; Kruuse 1945, 9). By contrast, Austen’s writing succeeds when it is ‘descriptive of manners’ (‘sædeskildrende’; p. 8), with the narrator acting as a careful observer of the peculiar – and peculiarly English – life of the gentry and clerical class: ‘The setting is her own: the homes of the gentry and country parsons. The protagonists are such unmarried girls as Jane Austen was.’⁷ Like Brusendorff, Kruuse constructs Austen as an informed and largely loyal guide to an ostensibly timeless English world of manor houses, cottages and rectories.

More interestingly, Kruuse also postulates a special sympathetic rapport between Austen and her readers:

Her books have a unique, mysterious ability to put the reader in intimate connection with the author. There is a concealed sympathy between Jane Austen and those of us who read her books. [. . .] The truth is that every real admirer of the novels cherishes the happy thought that he alone – reading between the lines – has become the secret friend of their author.⁸

The last sentence is a direct and unacknowledged translation of a statement made by Katherine Mansfield (1930, 304), whose judgement Kruuse appropriates and expands upon. Avoiding all vulgar display, Austen’s novels use standards of taste to separate the true from the false elite: ‘Jane Austen’s novels are suitable for people who take their time in life. [. . .] They must be read as one would drink a truly excellent cognac, with quiet caution and careful savouring of all the effects of taste and smell.’⁹ Of course, there is nothing strikingly original about this rather snobbish conceit, which Kruuse could have derived from a number of sources, and which is most likely inspired Kipling’s well-known short story, ‘The Janeites’ (1924). In Kipling, the mystique enveloping the ‘Janeite’ brotherhood presupposes a certain national exclusiveness, whereas Kruuse opens Kipling’s select fraternity of English gentlemanliness to a wider, international membership. If only they could possess the aesthetic sensibility enabling them to ‘read between the lines’, Danes too might be initiated into Austen’s world of cultured and graceful ease, and may in effect become (almost) as English as the English themselves.

Later in his career, Kruuse continued his advocacy of Austen, when he devoted a chapter to *PP* in the popular survey of literary classics that he simply entitled *Mesterværker* (Masterpieces; Kruuse 1955, 238–47). A more extreme

⁷ ‘Milieuet er hendes eget: Lanadelen og Præsternes Hjem. Personerne er saadanne Frøkener, som Jane Austen var’ (Kruuse 1945, 6).

⁸ ‘Hendes Bøger har den sære, hemmelighedsfulde Egenskab at sætte Læseren i intim Forbindelse med Forfatteren. Der er en dulgt Sympati mellem Jane Austen og os, der læser hendes Bøger. [. . .] Sandheden er, at enhver rigtig Beundrer af disse Romaner kæler for den lykkelige Tanke, at han alene – der kan læse mellem Linjerne – er blevet Forfatterens hemmelige Ven’ (Kruuse 1945, 8).

⁹ ‘Jane Austens Romaner egner sig for Mennesker, der giver sig god Tid overfor Tilværelsen. [. . .] De skal læses som en virkelig god cognac drikkes, med stille Dvælen og forsigtig Efterprøven af alle Smagens og Duftens Virkninger’ (Kruuse 1945, 6).

case of post-war anglophile mimicry is the first Danish version of *E* (1958), whose translator, Johanne Kastor Hansen, sets out to define and defend Austen as a major English writer. In her short preface, Kastor Hansen explicitly alludes to Kipling when she labels Austen 'England's Jane', maintaining that 'Jane Austen's way of writing is particularly English.'¹⁰ This is clearly meant as a compliment, but unfortunately the precise manifestation of this unique national genius in Austen's novels is never explained. Instead, the translator simply quotes the author's reference to her 'bits of ivory', fawns over Austen's tomb 'in Winchester's wonderful, bright cathedral' ('Winchesters skønne, lyse katedral'), and once again briefly invokes the nineteenth-century tradition of establishment 'Janeites' running from Scott and George IV to Macaulay and Kipling.

Often regarded as Jane Austen's most determinedly English novel, *E* defends a 'specifically English ideal of life' at a historical moment when this ideal was threatened by events both abroad and at home (Trilling 1966, 40). The appearance of *E* (December 1815) almost coincided with the culmination of Britain's protracted anti-Revolutionary and anti-Napoleonic campaign, and the hero George Knightley's name clearly aligns him with values of chivalric Englishness (Hellstrom 1965, 614–15). By contrast, the inveterate game-player Frank Churchill betrays unsound continental influences, when he baldly declares '“I am sick of England – and would leave it to-morrow, if I could”' (*E*, 3.6: 365). Austen's acute awareness of linguistic difference – George Knightley, we are told, speaks 'in plain, unaffected gentleman-like English' (*E*, 3.15: 448), and the two brothers are said to converse in 'the true English style' (*E*, 1.12: 99) – certainly makes *E* an interesting if also problematic text for translation into a foreign language.

Kastor Hansen wholeheartedly endorses the national mythology of 'engelsk grønsvær, engelsk landbrug, engelsk velbefindende' propounded by *E*, and this submissive stance also causes her to choose a translation strategy that is extremely faithful, at times even slavish, in relation to the original (Kastor Hansen 1958, 377). Kastor Hansen consistently paraphrases English locutions with word-by-word directness, and this obedience occasionally leads her to ride roughshod over good taste and proper linguistic usage. To pick an example almost at random, a few pages from the conversation in *E*, 1.8 between Emma and Knightley supplies numerous telling illustrations of Kastor Hansen's extreme literal-mindedness, as sentences, phrases and word are simply copied from the English. Thus, 'You have cured her of her school-girl's giggle' is rendered awkwardly as 'Du har kureret hende for hendes skolepigeftnis'; 'Harriet Smith will soon have an offer of marriage' as 'Harriet Smith vil snart faa et frieri'; 'Nonsense' as 'Det rene nonsens!'; 'a girl of such obscurity' as 'en pige af saa obskur ekstraktion'; 'Elton may talk sentimentally, but he will act rationally' as 'Elton taler maaske nok følelsesfuldt, en han handler fornuftigt'; 'It would be a degradation' as 'Det ville være en slags degradation' (Kastor Hansen 1958, 64–72). The last example is probably the most revealing blunder, since the Danish term 'degradation' is a loanword only used in a military context. Kastor

¹⁰ 'Jane Austens skrivemaade er speciel engelsk' (Kastor Hansen 1958, 6).

Hansen's subservience to the English text seems particularly counterproductive, because it not only disrupts the reading experience but also causes nuances of meaning to be lost or changed. In Kastor Hansen's version, for example, Knightley's correct assessment of Martin's character – 'he has too much sense of reality to haphazardly propose to a woman' – considerably skews the sense of the original ('"He has too much real feeling to address any woman on the hap-hazard of selfish passion"'; *E*, 1.8: 63).¹¹

Kastor Hansen's *E* provides the best illustration that intense admiration for an original and the cultural values that it embodies is not necessarily conducive to accurate translation. An altogether more felicitous performance from the post-war period is Lilian Plon's retranslation of *PP* which appeared as *Stolthed og fordom* (1952), under the same title as Brusendorff's 22-year-old volume. Unlike Brusendorff, Plon was an experienced translator, who adapted a number of texts – novels, crime stories, children's tales – from English, Swedish and German, although *Stolthed og fordom* remained her greatest success. This professionalism is borne out by the result, for Plon consciously improves upon her predecessor's sometimes cumbersome style, aiming for a lively and natural Danish. Making no attempt to approximate her characters' speech to nineteenth-century Danish usage, Plon generally chooses idiomatic expressions instead. Mrs Bennet's fondness for 'visting and news', for example, is rendered colloquially as 'venindebesøg og sladder' ('visits to her girlfriends and gossip'; Plon 1952, 7). During their final *éclaircissement*, Plon also allows Darcy and Elizabeth to exchange the formal 'De' form of address for the informal 'du', which seems natural since they have admitted their mutual love. Similarly, estimates of characters' financial standing – for example Bingley's 'large fortune; four or five thousand a year' – are consistently translated into Danish currency: 'En ugift mand med en stor formue: 80.000 eller 100.000 kroner om året' (1952, 6). A particularly challenging problem concerns the entail on the Bennet estate, which will seem incomprehensible to most Danes, since there is no equivalent concept in Danish. Plon intelligently handles this dilemma by supplying a brief paraphrase: 'Mr Bennet's property consisted almost entirely in an estate of 40,000 a year, which unfortunately was to be inherited by a distant relative, since the family had no sons.'¹² These may seem like relatively minor alterations, but they contribute to making Plon's *Stolthed og fordom* a remarkably readable translation, even after more than fifty years. Where Kastor Hansen's *E* seems a remarkably passive transcription of the original, Plon successfully captures the enduring modernity of Austen's English. Deservedly, Plon's translation of *PP* entirely displaced Brusendorff's volume, and since then it has remained the standard Danish version of Jane Austen's most beloved novel, reprinted in 1962, 1970, 1976, 1988, 1996 and 2000.

¹¹ ' "Han har altfor megen sans for virkeligheden til at fri til en kvinde paa lykke og fromme" '; Kastor Hansen 1958, 71).

¹² 'Mr. Bennets formue bestod næsten udelukkedne af en ejendom, der gav 40.000 om året, og som uheldigvis skulle arves af en fjern slægtning, da der ikke var sønner i familien' (Plon 1952, 26).

IV

During the first half of the twentieth century, Danish translations of Austen were invariably prefaced by biographical accounts situating the author within her historical context. Since the 1970s, this practice has been discontinued, undoubtedly because publishers can now assume their readers to have more knowledge about Austen specifically and English affairs more generally. Although the tradition of Danish-language literature is well established and remains vibrant, English-language translations now occur in virtually every aspect of Danish cultural life, and their influence transcends the otherwise stark discrepancy between intellectual high culture and commercialized mass culture. Meanwhile, organizations like the Society of Danish Language and Literature (Danske Sprog- og Litteraturselskab) are fighting an uphill battle to (re)acquaint Danish readers with native classic writers like Hans Christian Andersen, whose bicentennial was celebrated in 2005. In general terms, this state of affairs can surely be attributed not just to the prestige of English, the undisputed *lingua franca* of globalization, but also to Danish literature's relative marginality within the 'polysystem' of Western European literary culture (Even-Zohar 2001). But Austen's high degree of visibility in Danish culture, even compared to other English writers of similar status (Dickens, for example), has also been determined by some more specific developments.

The most recent wave of new Danish Austen translations all appeared within a few years in the mid-1970s, which saw new versions of *SS* (Hemmer Hansen 1974), *MP* (Kastor Hansen 1974), *NA* (Pihl 1975), *P* (Hemmer Hansen 1975) and *E* (Pihl 1978). It can hardly escape notice that all the new translators of Austen were women, and indeed there is a suggestive historical coincidence between the dates of the new Austen revival (1974–78) and the emergence of the women's movement in Denmark. The feminist reinterpretation of Austen had been anticipated by Aslaug Mikkelsen's informed discussion in *Foregangskvinder i engelsk litteratur* (Female pioneers in English literature, 1942). Several of the new translators, not coincidentally, were active in the women's movement, and one, Eva Hemmer Hansen, chaired the Danish Women's Society (Dansk Kvindeselskab) from 1968 to 1970.

Around the same time, Danish academics also began to take Austen more seriously. Danish university studies in English were traditionally weighted towards Old and Middle English, but during the 1970s the traditional philological curriculum began to unravel, and since approximately 1980 all English departments in Denmark have typically assigned an Austen novel as part of their first-year survey courses in English literary history. The professionalization of Danish Austen criticism probably began with the inaugural volume of Aarhus University's publication series 'The Dolphin', entitled *On the First Sentence of 'Pride and Prejudice': A Critical Discussion of the Theory and Practice of Literary Interpretation* (Petersen 1979). Staging an intertextual dialogue, the contributors to this volume adopt a range of the newer analytical methods imported from America and the continent, including psychoanalysis, feminism, structuralism and cultural materialism, to explain the power of Austen's most famous sentence. Danish university students of English will read and discuss Austen's novels in English, but the academic study of Austen is not restricted to English

departments. In fact the two most sophisticated discussions of Austen's place in modern fiction by Danish academics to date (ørum 1985; østergaard 1987) were published by comparativist scholars writing in Danish during the 'High Theory' era of the mid-1980s.

Last but not least, all the most recent Austen translations were republished, most of them repeatedly, during the short-lived but intense Austenmania following the release of film versions of *SS* (1995), *P* (1995), *E* (1996) and *MP* (1999), all of which played with original English soundtracks at major Danish cinemas. The major paperback publisher Lindhardt & Ringhof purchased the rights to the translated versions of *SS*, *E* and *P*, which were now refurbished as cheap mass-market editions. Targeting an audience that was youthful, middle-class and primarily female (but not feminist), Lindhardt & Ringhof cunningly capitalized on the film industry's romantic repackaging of Austen, by providing its new paperbacks with enticing cover photos of Emma Thompson and Kate Winslett, Gwynneth Paltrow and Jeremy Northam, and Amanda Root and Ciaran Hinds. In another telling move, the publisher also changed the title of *P* from *Kærlighed og svaghed* (Love and weakness) to *Lydighed og længsel* (Obedience and longing), thus replicating the Danish title of Nick Dear's recently released film. Recent discussions have treated 'Jane Austen in Hollywood' as though it were a purely Anglo-American trend, involving only English-speaking moviegoers, but this complex phenomenon needs to be studied in greater detail, especially as the vogue manifested itself outside the anglophone world (Troost and Greenfield 1998). It remains unclear, for example, what non-English viewers derive from watching costume dramas that seem drenched in culturally specific forms of nostalgia. In Denmark, the Austenmania of the 1990s also spawned the first book-length introduction to Austen, when the retired librarian Jonna Wennerstrøm Nielsen published her broadly conceived and somewhat superficial biography *Jane Austen: hendes liv og forfatterskab* (Jane Austen: her life and writings, 2001).

V

During the 1790s, when Jane Austen was embarking on her first literary experiments, anti-Jacobin writers and critics routinely warned that Britain was being 'flooded', 'inundated', 'deluged' (all these metaphors were frequently used in contemporary accounts) by popular European literature, which one writer referred to as 'those swarms of Publications now daily issuing from the banks of the Danube, which, like their ravaging predecessors of the darker ages, though with far other and more fatal arms, are overrunning civilised society' (More 1799, 41; see also Mortensen 2004). Since the 1950s, the tide has changed: now it is Denmark which, like other countries on the European continent, is being overwhelmed by anglophone cultural products. With the eager embrace of the Austen-on-film phenomenon, the last traces of Danish ambivalence towards Austen appear to have vanished, as audiences finally capitulated to the compelling power of Englishness. With the convergence of Austen and Hollywood, English high culture and American mass culture, anglophone culture could finally assert its now almost complete sway over the Danish mentality.

Speaking of Danes' 'unconditional surrender' may still be premature, however, for residues of the old ambivalence still persist. While Danes have increasingly oriented themselves towards the Anglo-Saxon world, Denmark's changing relationship with Anglo-American culture has also become fraught with political controversy. There is a lingering suspicion, particularly in intellectual circles, that Danes may have been too hasty in accepting the superiority of anglophone culture, and that continuing anglicization may in time produce dire consequences for the nation's democratic culture. Evoking alarming concepts such as 'linguistic imperialism', some commentators have suggested that Danish language and culture are slowly but surely being consumed by a mighty hostile 'other' (Haberland and others 1991). Yet, it is hoped that it is not too late to devise strategies that will curtail the power of Anglo-American media and protect the status of Danish as a culture-bearing language (Davidsen-Nielsen, Hansen and Jarvad 1999).

Do contemporary translations of Jane Austen's 'quintessentially English' novels facilitate or resist this gradual erosion of cultural identity? In this context, it may be instructive to consider the linguistic strategies chosen by the most sophisticated and successful modern Danish translator of Austen, Eva Hemmer Hansen, who reacts against the submissive attitude of her predecessors. Hemmer Hansen (1913–83) held a university degree in English and Danish and was best known as a novelist, journalist and women's activist, but she also had a distinguished career in translation, which earned her the prestigious Danish Translators' Organization's Honorary Prize in 1983. Her most ambitious project was a retranslation of Dickens's complete works, which she did not live to finish. Both her Austen translations, *Fornuft og følelse* (SS) and *Kærlighed og svaghed* (P), are fluent renderings that capture the novels' wit with considerable success. But what has made Hemmer Hansen's versions controversial, and, in the eyes of some critics, notorious, is their extremely free-spirited approach to translation, and especially their pronounced taste for colloquial Danish expressions with a distinctly modern ring.

According to the translation scholar Itamar Even-Zohar, one must expect a national literature occupying a marginal position in the larger hierarchy of the literary 'polysystem' to favour translations that are relatively close to the original in terms of syntax, vocabulary, narrative technique and so on: 'Under such conditions the chances that the translation will be close to the original in terms of adequacy (in other words, a reproduction of the dominant textual relations of the original) are greater than otherwise' (2001, 196). Hemmer Hansen, however, is willing to stray far, occasionally very far, from the original text. For one thing, she extrapolates the principle of PP and SS by changing the title of P to *Kærlighed og svaghed* (Love and weakness), although Anne Elliot lacks an obvious dialectical counterpart in the novel. The contents of both translations reveal even more sweeping changes, in syntax and especially in vocabulary. In terms of sentence structure, Hemmer Hansen consistently simplifies Austen's long paratactic sentences, which seem even heavier in Danish than in English, by substituting main and subordinate clauses. More problematically still, in recreating Austen's novels Hemmer Hansen draws on modern Danish language of a highly colloquial nature.

To illustrate this practice, a number of everyday locutions could be cited from

either novel. In *Fornuft og følelse*, some of the striking informal formulations include the following: 'et flot stykke mandfolk' ('a fine figure of a man') for 'extremely handsome'; 'en kedelig dødbider' ('a deadly bore') for 'so grave and so dull'; 'meget langt ude økonomisk' ('in a deep financial mess') for 'all to pieces'; 'nu sætter jeg fut i obersten' ('I'll get the Colonel to perk up') for 'I shall spirit up the Colonel'; 'Hvorfor kommer hun dog rendende her hele tiden?' ('Why does she keep pestering us?') for 'What can bring her so often?'; 'nu da han ikke ejede en pind' ('now that he was flat broke') for 'now he had no fortune'; 'hvor mit hjerte flæbede' ('how my heart whined') for 'all the murmurings of my heart'; and 'den bøvede made, jeg takkede ham på' ('my oafish way of thanking him') for 'thanks so ungraciously delivered as mine' (Hemmer Hansen 1974, 94, 96, 154, 156, 193, 214, 273, 292). Reflecting the sombre mood characteristic of Austen's last completed novel, Hemmer Hansen's version of *P* appears more subdued than *Fornuft og følelse*, but the translator nevertheless continues the strategy adopted in the earlier text. Consequently, *Kærlighed og svaghed* is punctuated by modern expressions such as 'have knubser i hovedet' ('suffer boo-boos to the head') for 'be knocked on the head'; 'havde ikke opfundet krudtet' ('was not quite the full pound note') for 'was not very wise'; 'sidde her og kukkelure' ('twiddle one's thumbs') for 'be pretty well off'; 'Ellers dryssede han tiden hen' ('otherwise he frittered away the time') for 'his time was otherwise trifled away'; 'ikke et hår bedre' ('not a bit better') for 'as bad as any of them'; 'himlede mere op' ('made a bigger fuss') for 'said more than'; and 'hun har mas med sit ben' ('her leg is bothering her') for 'she [. . .] is tied by the leg' (Hemmer Hansen 1975, 19, 23, 36, 37, 46, 94, 138).

Hemmer Hansen's method admittedly produces occasional contradictions, as when she uses an unwarranted anglicism ('dandy') to render Nancy Steele's Frenchified references to 'beau' and 'beaux': 'Deres bror, var han ikke en rigtig dandy, før han blev gift, han flyder jo i penge' ('I suppose your brother was quite a beau, Miss Dashwood, before he married, as he was so rich?'; Hemmer Hansen 1974, 99). Nonetheless, Hemmer Hansen's most controversial colloquialisms generally fit the carefully drawn psychology of Austen's characters. In modern Denmark, Nancy Steele would be precisely the sort of girl who would seek to spice up her conversation with uncalled-for English expressions. Similarly, Hemmer Hansen lets Sir John Middleton use a somewhat off-colour phrase to tease Marianne for her infatuation with Willoughby: 'Jeg forudser, hvad der nu vil ske. Nu lægger De an på ham og dropper stakkels Brandon' ('"I see how it will be. You will be setting your cap at him now, and never think of poor Brandon"'; SS, 1.9: 45). The jargon verbs 'lægge an på' (make a move on) and 'droppe' (dump) may seem to strike a falsely risqué note in a nineteenth-century context, but again this tastelessness seems entirely in keeping with Sir John's characteristic overfamiliarity. After all, the 'gross' and 'illiberal' connotations of such language are precisely what incites Marianne's incensed rejoinder:

'Der brugte De et udtryk, Sir John,' sagde Marianne heftigt, 'som jeg ikke kan fordrage! Jeg kan ikke døje disse vulgære talemåder, der skal være morsomme – "lægge an på" og "gøre en erobring", det er noget af det mest afskyelige. Det røber en grov og materialistisk tankegang, og hvis de nogensinde har lydt som kvikheder, er de blevet aldeles forslidte for længe siden.' (Hemmer Hansen 1974, 38)

'That is an expression, Sir John,' said Marianne, warmly, 'which I particularly dislike. I abhor every common-place phrase by which wit is intended; and "setting one's cap at a man", or "making a conquest", are the most odious of all. Their tendency is gross and illiberal; and if their construction could ever be deemed clever, time has long ago destroyed all its ingenuity.' (SS, 1.9: 45)

As one might expect, Hemmer Hansen's fondness for modern colloquial language has exposed her to the criticism of several translation scholars, one of whom arraigns her for her 'nonchalant' and 'undisciplined' treatment of Dickens's *Bleak House* (Sørensen 2000, 12, 18). Even so, it must be conceded that her embellishments to *Fornuft og følelse* and *Kærlighed og svaghed* hardly stem from simple carelessness on the translator's part. Given what we know of Hemmer Hansen's competence and experience as a translator, there is no doubt that her decisions result from a deliberately chosen strategy. Her main priority clearly is not faithful reproduction; rather, she believes that to bring Austen's novels to life for a contemporary Danish audience one must above all create an easygoing, natural and spirited style. Modernizing Austen's prose is a step she consciously takes to avoid the greater faults of introducing archaic or English-sounding formulations, which she fears are more likely to alienate her contemporary reading public.

Considering the complex dynamics of English–Danish cultural exchange, one might also regard Hemmer Hansen's refreshingly disrespectful interspersion of modern Danish colloquialisms as a cogent response to the prevalent fear of domination by the English-speaking 'other'. Hardened cultural nationalists urge that Danish culture must purge itself of alien elements, while Hertel speaks of the Danish cultural establishment's 'unconditional surrender' to English values after World War II. Whereas it would seem obviously futile to try to stem the tide of Anglo–American cultural influence entirely, it is equally clear that passive adoption of English or American values is unlikely to serve Danish culture's best interests in the long run. What seems remarkable about Hemmer Hansen's delicately balanced translations, however, is precisely that they render Austen's Englishness with considerable exactitude, while also retaining an intransigent loyalty to modern Danish language, culture and experience. She consciously repudiates the self-effacing role chosen by most twentieth-century translators of Austen. Although Hemmer Hansen excels at translating English classics, she remains first and foremost a writer of modern Danish prose, with an aesthetic vision of her own. Thus, she shows that it is possible to appreciate the qualities of Austen's English novels to the full, while also remaining faithful to one's own, non-English cultural tradition.

7 Jane Austen and Norway: Sharing the Long Road to Recognition

Marie Nedregotten Sørbo

It is a curious fact that the modern Norwegian state dates back to the same period as Jane Austen's authorship. The year she published her first novel, 1811, also marks the founding of the first Norwegian university, while the most important year in recent Norwegian history, celebrated annually on 17 May, is 1814: the year of the Constitution. Only days before, Austen had seen her third novel, *MP*, in print. But like Austen's reputation, the establishment of a modern Norwegian state was a long and slow process, and its creation registers the reawakening of a nation that had not been independent of its neighbours since the Middle Ages. When full independence was at last achieved in 1905, Norway had been in union with Denmark for more than four hundred years, and then with Sweden, following the watershed year of 1814.

There is an informative discussion of the rise of a Norwegian culture in Julius Clausen's *Illustreret verdens-litteraturhistorie: under medvirkning af en kres af fag- og videnskabsmænd* (Illustrated world literary history: with the co-operation of a circle of professional and scholarly men, 1898–1901). In the third volume, J. B. Halvorsen argues that Norway had for a long time experienced a separate cultural development from the movements and fashions prevalent in Denmark. Where Denmark looked to Germany, Norway was, owing to its merchant navy, more influenced by Britain and France.

Our contacts with Britain, however, did not bring much of Austen's work, judging from the small number of nineteenth-century editions in libraries. The University of Oslo Library possesses copies of five of her novels in editions published between 1886 and 1892. The oldest copies in Norwegian libraries, a few mid-nineteenth-century editions, are found at the University of Bergen (established 1946), and stem from the collection of the university library's fore-runner: Bergen Museum Library. Apart from these, there is a copy of Goldwin Smith's *Life of Jane Austen* (1890) in Oslo, and of George Pellew's *Jane Austen's Novels* (1883) and Lord Brabourne's *Letters of Jane Austen* (1884) at the public lending library in Bergen. The scarcity of copies certainly indicates a very limited interest in Jane Austen in nineteenth-century Norway.

‘Little was known by the world in general’

Though two hundred years have passed since Austen lived, it is only in the last hundred that she has left any traces in Norway. This is hardly unexpected, since she seems to have been almost entirely forgotten even in her own home country for at least half a century. As her grand-niece, Mary Augusta Austen-Leigh, comments later: ‘Little was known by the world in general [. . .] for many years’ after her death (1920, 1). An intriguing example of an early Norwegian textbook aimed at young, but advanced, students of English, *Sketches of Eminent English Authors* (Barnard 1862), reveals just how little. There are at least two reasons why one would look for a mention of Austen in this overview of English literature. Firstly, the English author, Revd M. R. Barnard, BA, seemed devoted to his task of making Norwegian pupils better acquainted ‘with the Lives and Writings of the great master-spirits of English literature’. Secondly, the book is based on a series of lectures he gave to ‘young ladies at Mr Nissen’s Academy’ in Oslo (then Christiania). In addition, it is also a fairly comprehensive volume: he discusses almost 230 writers over five hundred pages. Also, Barnard does not seem to omit women because they are women: he presents Ann Radcliffe, Frances Burney, Maria Edgeworth and Charlotte Brontë, and gives Felicia Hemans slightly more room than William Wordsworth. Not only does he include women writers, he also praises them; but he does not mention Jane Austen at all. Exactly the same pattern is seen in other similar anthologies and historical overviews, both before (Autenrieth 1844) and after Barnard (Løkke 1875; Bendeke 1879; Ross 1880). All of them, except Løkke, include a selection of women, but Austen is conspicuously absent.

So why was Austen omitted from these later nineteenth-century surveys? It is unlikely that it was a matter of taste, as they have such a varied collection otherwise. It is more probable that they did not mention her because they did not know her, which confirms the impression that she was little read and talked of. Only around the turn of the century do things seem to improve: not only do the first copies of her novels appear on library shelves, but she is also sometimes mentioned (often only *en passant*) by literary historians. Nevertheless, it took another three decades before she received anything resembling serious treatment in such works and before the first translation made her novels more accessible to Norwegian readers.

Translations

Norway was late in getting translations: both Sweden and Denmark had enjoyed mid-nineteenth-century editions. When the literary historian Just Bing lists translations of authors into the Scandinavian languages in 1929, he only mentions one for Jane Austen, a Swedish *Stolthet och fördom* (PP) from 1920 (1929, 2: 432). It is unlikely that the Danish and Swedish translations had many Norwegian readers, and there are no copies of the nineteenth-century translations in Norwegian libraries now, and only a few copies of the 1920s ones.

Only a year later, however, Norwegian readers could for the first time read an Austen novel in their own language: Alf Harbitz’s translation of PP, *Elizabeth og*

hennes søstre (Elizabeth and her sisters, 1930). It is a beautifully produced book, incorporating Charles E. Brock's illustrations from Macmillan's 1895 edition, in addition to vivid endpapers. The translator's preface presents Jane Austen as a master of ladies' novels: 'A better book for young girls has never been written'; 'of all amusing ladies' novels' it is 'the most amusing'; 'it is a literary masterpiece'.¹ The target group is also clear in the lists of additional reading at the back, where we find recommended books for young girls. According to Harbitz, *PP* is worth more than a whole cupboard-full of the ordinary kind, and as if to convince his young readers further, he mentions that Austen wrote it when she was twenty-two. However, he does not say anything about the revisions she made much later, as it probably would not have suited his purpose to present *PP* as written by a mature woman in her late thirties. This image of Austen as a young girl writing masterpieces was one that would remain prevalent in Norwegian literary histories and criticism.

At the end his preface, Harbitz discusses his chosen method of translation. He wants to be 'free in letter, but faithful to the spirit' of Austen's book, evidently feeling that this freedom gave him a better chance to render Austen in a modern Norwegian context. And the liberty he takes with the novel is clear from the start. Harbitz is caught up with the idea that simplification means improvement, and therefore he generally abbreviates. His version is eminently readable and even enjoyable, but compared to the original the losses are striking. He cuts long passages (such as the episode of Mr Collins introducing himself to Darcy at the Netherfield ball in *PP*, 1.18) and in one case even an entire chapter (*PP*, 2.16). Sometimes he loses only a few (nonetheless significant) words, as in Elizabeth's first reaction to Darcy's proposal: 'Elizabeth's astonishment was beyond expression. She stared, coloured, doubted, and was silent' (*PP*, 2.11: 189), which is reduced to 'Elizabeth stared at him, turned red, but did not answer'.² At other times he omits key concepts or ideas of the novel, for example discarding all of Elizabeth's contribution to the argument about 'the accomplished woman' (*PP*, 1.8). It is no longer an argument, since her objections are gone, but only a statement of what young ladies should learn to do: thus, the point made is in fact the opposite of Austen's.

Among the most striking of these losses are the reductions of Elizabeth's (but also Darcy's) emotions. It is at first reading almost unbelievable that Harbitz chooses to cut the last half-page of the proposal scene in *PP*, 2.11. He thereby loses the whole account of Elizabeth's tumultuous emotions after Darcy has left, which of course has direct bearing on the further development of their relationship. But the cut proves to be one of several similar ones. In the Pemberley meeting (*PP*, 3.1), he cuts a long paragraph about Elizabeth's emotional reactions before Darcy's portrait, her confusion, her questions and her fascination with his eyes and his smile. This is nothing less than the turning point of the novel, when Elizabeth's dawning attraction to Darcy is made clear. To cut this

¹ 'En bedre ungpiksbok er aldri skrevet'; 'Av alle de morsomme dameromaner [. . .] den morsomste'; 'den er et litterært mesterverk' (Harbitz 1930).

² 'Elizabeth stirret på ham, blev rød, men svarte ikke' (Harbitz 1930, 137).

pivotal paragraph can only be motivated by a wish to soften the focus on female emotions. Harbitz may aim his edition at young women, but it is the traditional young woman of male making: the one who is an *object* of love, not a *subject*.

There are also other expressions of censorship in Harbitz's abbreviations. In cutting the first half of *PP*, 2.19 he discards the description of the Bennets' unhappy marriage: Mr Bennet's frustrations and his 'breach of conjugal obligation' in ridiculing his wife. Is the cut motivated by the thought that young girls should not read of such disillusioning examples of marriage? The suspicion is reinforced when he also cuts the words where Mr Bennet clearly alludes to his own marriage, and begs Elizabeth not to make the same mistake: "My child, let me not have the grief of seeing *you* unable to respect your partner in life" (*PP*, 3.17: 376). In Harbitz's translation, he only says, "Dear child, let me not have this grief." ³

Seventeen years later, *PP* was translated a second time, by Lalli Knutsen (1947). This time, the novel was given a Norwegian title equivalent to that of the English original (*Stolthet og fiendom*). Presumably, the Harbitz translation had by this time been out of print for some years, and Knutsen reveals no signs of being familiar with it. The two versions are very different, both in their treatment of the text, and in appearance. Where Harbitz's translation was quite lavishly illustrated, Knutsen's is printed on cheap, thick paper, bound in cardboard and carrying no illustrations or decorations at all; there is no preface or appendix, just the bare text of the novel.

Compared to Harbitz, Knutsen gives a much fuller, although far from complete, but also a much more uneven version of *PP*. Some chapters are quite well translated, others full of the crudest mistakes. Like Harbitz, she omits almost an entire chapter (*PP*, 1.12), and she feels free to cut words, lines and passages whenever it suits her. Knutsen also makes numerous mistakes in her readings of Austen, some of them banal, like words and actions being ascribed to the wrong character or evening being changed to morning. But it is more serious when an insufficient mastery of English vocabulary leads to loss of meaning; as when Darcy writes of 'the utmost force of passion' 'required' 'to put aside' his objections to Elizabeth's family (*PP*, 2.12: 198), which is translated not in the meaning of love, but of suffering. ⁴ The notion is meaningless – even ridiculous – in this context.

One of Knutsen's weaknesses is a tendency to use stronger words than Austen, and as a result there are numerous examples where she exaggerates the feelings and expressions of the characters. Mr Bennet speaks 'coldly' to his daughters where Austen has him speak 'coolly'. He proclaims their youngest daughters to be 'uncommonly idiotic' where Austen has 'uncommonly foolish'. The most extreme examples of these modifications are the expletives that have been introduced into Bingley and Darcy's dialogue in the Meryton Assembly scene (*PP*, 1.3). In Knutsen's version, Bingley describes Elizabeth as 'damned nice!!' ('forbannet hyggelig!!'; 1947, 13). (She must have found Austen's 'very

³ "Kjære barn, la mig ikke ha den sorg" (Harbitz 1930, 245).

⁴ 'som måtte vike for min uendelige lidelse' (Knutsen 1947, 173).

agreeable' too watery.) And Darcy's annoyance throws him out of character as he exclaims that 'she is damned well not pretty enough to tempt me'.⁵ Stylistically speaking, this is an appalling choice: the swear words sound completely inappropriate, belonging to men of a different century and social environment.

It is interesting to note that Knutsen was also an author of light entertainment fiction, releasing two works the year before and one the year after; so, the translation was undertaken during a productive period of crime stories and fiction for young girls, alongside her other translations which draw upon these genres. To some extent, this would explain her style of translation, also possibly indicating Austen's own status in Norway as a rather 'lightweight' author.

There is no record of any later editions of any of these first two translations, and we must conclude that they must have had a limited readership. Nevertheless, both turned up decades later: Harbitz in an article (see Krag 1980) and Knutsen in a schoolbook anthology.

By the 1970s, *PP* had been translated into Norwegian for the third time, in an undated edition *c.* 1970. Unlike the two previous translations, this one was reissued a number of times in succeeding years, and remains in print. It was made by Eivind and Elisabeth Hauge, both of whom seem to have been fairly active as translators between the 1940s and 1960s. In a sense, the Hagues' translation belongs to two periods: its translators and their linguistic style are at home in the 1950s, while the translation has only been available to its readers since the 1970s, with most reprints appearing during the 1990s.

The Hagues' translation is a very uneven one. The first half of the novel is poorly translated, although there are snatches of good dialogue. Then follow some chapters of a much higher standard, although again with some lapses, and for the rest of the novel we alternate between decent and weak chapters. It is natural to conclude that the two translators divided the novel between them, and that one had better mastery of English than the other. Unfortunately, the weaker translator dominates and is probably behind three-quarters of the translation. In one respect (but in one only), the Hagues' translation is better than those of Harbitz and Knutsen: it retains more of Austen's novel. Each successive Norwegian version of *PP* keeps more than the previous one, culminating with Alfsen's complete translation of 2003. However, Hauge and Hauge also make substantial cuts (for instance one-third of *PP*, 1.14). As with the previous translations, sentences and paragraphs are often simplified, shortened and rewritten, with the result that, although the main information about people's doings and sayings is retained, much of Austen's style, humour and irony is lost. For all three translations, there must have been an underlying idea that Austen was too verbose and long-winded, and that some pruning would polish up her writing for new readers. There seems a tendency to underestimate Austen's mastery of style, her careful selection of every word and phrase.

The extent of rewriting in the Hagues' translation makes it their chosen method. In places, they simplify so much that the narration sounds more like a

⁵ 'hun er pokker ikke pen nok til å friste meg' (Knutsen 1947, 14).

summary. It is difficult to see the point of these reductions. They retain the fact that Mr Bennet had missed his eldest daughters in the evenings, but not the point that the conversation 'had lost much of its animation, and almost all its sense' without them (*PP*, 1.7: 60). And they have kept Darcy's resolution not to pay Elizabeth any attention, but lost the account of him sitting with his nose in a book for half an hour without looking at her. These are what lend colour to the story: the small details, the striking phrases. The Hauges cut the fun and just keep the facts.

But there is a third main weakness in the Hauges' translation, beside deletions and rewritings: like Knutsen, they sometimes have significant problems coping with the English language. A list of their mistakes would fill pages, and at worst they turn Austen's meaning upside down, or give entirely new versions that have little in common with her sentences. When Elizabeth jokingly asks Colonel Fitzwilliam: ' "And pray, what is the usual price of an Earl's younger son?" ' (*PP*, 2.10: 184–85), the Hauges change it to ' "And what does a younger son need, then?" ' ⁶ Quite typically, they not only misunderstand her meaning, but lose her joke as a consequence. They have problems with relatively simple words: 'profuse' and 'diffuseness' are both translated as if they meant 'confused', while 'nonsensical' is translated as if it meant 'insensitive'. Sometimes they seem to be guessing where they do not know. Her complicated syntactical structures seem to cause particular problems, and their tactic appears to be to pick out a significant word and invent a new sentence on the basis of this – for instance, the word 'pardon' in Elizabeth's thoughts of Darcy after he has just proposed to her: 'his unpardonable assurance in acknowledging, though he could not justify it [his part in Jane's story]' (*PP*, 2.11: 193); this is rendered: 'and that he did not even want to apologize!' ⁷

A striking stylistic peculiarity is the exaggerated use of exclamation marks. In one conversation between Elizabeth (playing the piano), Darcy and Colonel Fitzwilliam (*PP*, 2.8), no less than fourteen new exclamation marks have been introduced, instead of Austen's full stops, over little more than a page of text. This certainly changes Austen's calm and deliberate prose into something more youthful, breathless (at best) or naïve, especially since it goes hand-in-hand with syntactical changes from long, intricate constructions to short, simple statements.

The many serious weaknesses will colour the reading of the Hauges' translation, even if they have excellent renderings of some dialogues, where they resist the temptation to rewrite more than they do with direct narrative.

With its many mistakes and rewritings, the Hauges' translation is the one people purchase if they pick up the edition with a photograph from the BBC's 1995 adaptation on the cover. This edition from 2000 is the fifth. Compared to the two others, the Hauges' translation has dominated the book market and library collections, so that most Norwegians, if they have read *PP* at all, will have read it in their translation. This situation may be changing, though, since a

⁶ ' "Og hva trenger så en yngre sønn?" ' (Hauge and Hauge 1970, 148).

⁷ 'og at han ikke en gang hadde lyst til å be om unnskyldning!' (Hauge and Hauge 1970, 157).

fourth translation appeared on the market in 2003, which will almost certainly challenge the dominance of the Hauges' translation in a few years' time.

A new era of Norwegian reception of Jane Austen dawned in 1994, when one of Norway's leading publishing houses, Aschehoug, commissioned translations of five of Austen's novels: *Emma* (1996), *Fornuft og følelse* (*SS*, 1997), *Overtalelse* (*P*, 1998), *Mansfield Park* (2000) and *Stolthet og fordom* (*PP*, 2003). All these have been prepared by the same translator, Merete Alfsen, and to great critical acclaim. According to the publisher, *NA* will *not* be included in the series, and is thus the only one of Austen's major novels that has not received a Norwegian translation.

If we compare Alfsen's translation of *PP* with its three predecessors, she must be said to be in a class of her own. She gives us the only translation that conscientiously tries to include every detail of Austen's text. This does not mean that she does not occasionally slip up, but there seem to be few, if any, deliberate cuts. Alfsen is the only translator to keep Austen's original sentence structure and paragraph divisions, or sometimes lack of divisions as in Darcy's long letter. The others divide up her long sentences and introduce new paragraphs, in this particular case completely disregarding the fact that Austen's page echoes Darcy's letter: 'written quite through, in a very close hand' (*PP*, 2.12: 196).

To mark the end of Aschehoug's Austen series, Alfsen (2003) has prepared an appendix describing her aims and methods. Here, she declares her intention to mirror Austen's intricate syntax, using only a moderately old-fashioned vocabulary and modern orthography to avoid presenting Austen as a museum piece. She also raises the question of whether Austen's novels have been seen as literary masterpieces or as entertaining ladies' novels, and blames earlier translators for presenting them as the latter. Alfsen is, however, more ensnared by the old vocabulary than she thinks: her first reaction when asked to translate Austen was 'I had never translated anything this *old* before.'⁸ She describes the joy of taking out half-forgotten words, like antique, cherished objects from bottom drawers: her fascination comes across clearly in her translation, which abounds in archaisms and words that have not surfaced for half or even a whole century. The paradoxical consequence is that this latest translation is also in places the most old-fashioned, since the previous ones tried to write in contemporary Norwegian idiom, which only later became dated. Apart from spelling, Alfsen makes no attempt at modernity.

The two most competent translators, Harbitz and Alfsen, are both overwhelmed by what they see as Austen's 'oldness', but have chosen opposite solutions in dealing with it: Harbitz modernizes and Alfsen archaicizes. When Alfsen writes *aften* instead of *kveld* (evening), she chooses the option with a poetic or archaic ring to it (more or less like 'eve' in English), rather than the one in common usage (like Austen's 'evening'). The fact is that Austen's language sounds more modern, or timeless, than any of the Norwegian translations: her sentences may be more elaborate, her vocabulary more varied than our own, but apart from the occasional 'freindship' or 'chuse', Austen's spelling looks

⁸ 'Jeg hadde aldri oversatt noe så *gammelt* før' (Alfsen 2003, 359).

modern, and the forms of verbs, nouns and pronouns are the same. Part of the problem is that the Norwegian language has changed much more in two centuries than English, in orthography and syntax as well as vocabulary. After all, in Austen's day, the official language of Norway was Danish. The stability of English compared to the near revolution of Norwegian for the last century and a half makes it very difficult for any translator to attempt to mirror the Norwegian of Austen's period, or even to convey a vague idea of the Norwegian of 'olden days'. Austen's timelessness consequently is lost, and she becomes more dated than she is in English.

It is a pleasure reading Alfsen's thorough translations, but it is a nostalgic pleasure, like looking through old photo albums. The Aschehoug editions are in this sense related to the cloud of nostalgia that envelopes Austen. Much of her recent popularity is an escapist longing for a world that is long gone, clearly manifested in the fanclubs, film addicts and paraphernalia of souvenirs – the whole 'heritage industry'. Alfsen's choice of a linguistic style that is in several respects more old-fashioned than Austen's own is a testimony of the strength of such nostalgia. Austen's peculiar value does not lie in her relevance to contemporary issues (for instance feminist ones), but in her ability to carry us back two hundred years.

All of Alfsen's five new translations were first published in Aschehoug's series 'De store romaner' (The great novels), then reissued in cheaper editions. *E* was a bestseller in the book club Dagens Bok (Today's book). *PP* was also, within the year of its first publication, reissued by one of Norway's biggest book clubs, Den Norske Bokklubben (The Norwegian book club), in the series 'Verdensbiblioteket' (World library), where Austen is among the one hundred 'best and most important' authors of all times. This edition includes an introductory essay by Doris Lessing, and Austen has been included in a brochure to tempt new members, along with Dostoevsky, Cervantes, Dickens and Euripides. At the turn of the millennium, the Norwegian reception of Austen clearly places her in the first rank of world writers.

Literary histories

Jane Austen made her first appearance in Scandinavian literary histories at the turn of the twentieth century. She is briefly mentioned in Clausen (1901) and in a Norwegian literary history for schools (Anderssen 1902). The Swede Henrik Schück (1925), however, does not acknowledge her existence at all in his hefty volumes on world literature. This neglect is only partly remedied in the seven-volume Swedish *Bonniers illustrerade litteraturhistoria* (Bonnier's illustrated literary history, 1929), edited by Fredrik Böök, which does not treat Austen individually, although she is mentioned twice as a source of inspiration for Walter Scott. Only when we turn to the Norwegian literary historian Just Bing (or, in the same year, the Dane Niels Möller) do we receive a proper representation of Austen's career.

Bing's 1929 literary history of the world remains the most comprehensive study written in Norway. He gives one and a half pages to Austen in a chapter on British Romanticism, squeezed in between Wordsworth and Coleridge

(six pages) and Scott (eight pages). Bing does not, however, mention Austen in his chapter on the English novel in the third volume. He employs a very personal and readable approach to literary history, presenting some selected works in detail, and for Austen, discusses *MP* as an example both of her world and of her characters. Quite surprisingly, he demonstrates a fondness for the character of Mary Crawford – ‘the masterpiece among her portraits of ladies’ – and expresses a clear irritation that she loses her game ‘merely because she does not show the proper moral indignation when her brother runs away with the young Mrs Rushworth’.⁹ This leads him to a quite harsh observation about Austen’s social circle, ‘where trousers are called “the unmentionables”, and where it is a sacred commandment not to eat fish with your knife’.¹⁰

Regarding Austen herself, however, Bing makes only positive comments: her novels are full of life; her characters vividly portrayed; she is, no less, a master of the English novel. Bing’s characterizations are accurate: although he places her under Romanticism, he begins by saying that ‘she is everything but romantic’, and then states that ‘her mastery lies in the artistically perfect depiction of the small topics’.¹¹ But here we come upon a keyword in Bing’s discussion: he uses the word ‘small’ seven times about her novels, characters and themes, but never intentionally in a derogatory way, it seems. It is more an expression of the male view of the achievements of women: women can be ardently admired, but their accomplishments are always seen to be on a smaller scale than those of men. Bing’s descriptions sound like the loving observations we make of children and their activities: ‘Her small heroine [. . .] is quite overcome’; ‘many small intrigues, silk-thread knots tied with cunning and loosened with tact and deftness by small, white fingers’; some of the young girls are ‘small powder kegs’.¹²

Bing locates Austen in a light genre for young women, a world apart from men. Paradoxically, he begins and ends his essay by stating that Jane Austen is a master of the novel, but still concludes that this, in effect, does not matter much in the world of literature: ‘The modern novel had got its small masterpieces in the ladies’ style, but a different kind of novel would conquer the world. A new type of novel arose, the historical novel, the creator of it, WALTER SCOTT [. . .] was a man through and through.’¹³ The historical irony is, of course, that masculinity is no longer (we hope) such an obvious qualification in itself.

⁹ ‘mesterstykket av dameportrettene’; ‘bare fordi hun ikke viser den tilbørlige moralske indignasjon, når hennes bror bortfører den unge fru Rushworth’ (Bing 1929, 247).

¹⁰ ‘hvor bukser kalles “de unevnelige” og hvor det er et hellig bud at man ikke skal spise fisk med kniven’ (Bing 1929, 248).

¹¹ ‘Hun er alt annet enn romantisk’; ‘hennes mesterskap ligger i den kunstnerisk fullkomne skildring av de små emner’ (Bing 1929, 246).

¹² ‘Hennes lille heltinne [. . .] er rent overgitt’; ‘mange små intriger, silkegarnsfloker som knyttes med lumskehet og løses med takt og hendighet av hvite små fingre’; ‘små krutt’ (Bing 1929, 247).

¹³ ‘Den moderne roman fikk sine små mesterverker i damestil, men en annen slags roman skulde erobre verden. En ny art roman oppstod, den historiske roman, skaperen av den WALTER SCOTT [. . .] var helt igjennom mann’ (Bing 1929, 248).

Moreover, while Bing and the other early historians of literature were right to record Scott's enormous contemporary popularity, it is striking to note how Bing states that Scott's female characters are mere stereotypes, and that if we want nuance, we must turn to Austen (1929, 253).

The mid-twentieth century saw another Norwegian world literary history that again included and praised Austen, but on a decidedly smaller scale and with much less personal involvement than Just Bing twelve years earlier. Francis Bull was one of the most prominent Norwegian scholars of his time, primarily known for his work on Norwegian literary history. In his *Verdenslitteraturens historie* (History of world literature, 1941), Bull devotes a few appreciative lines to Austen, whom he presents as a renovator of the novel. He sees her as 'unsentimental', and writes that she 'described scenes and characters from middle-class English family life with downright ingenious powers of observation, and with irony as well as humour'.¹⁴ Her portrait (Lizars's steel engraving) is given more space than the text about her. His generally respectful presentation is somewhat marred by his chosen focus on Austen's 'extraordinary gift for sewing and embroidery' rather than her literary skills. Bull's work was translated into the other Scandinavian languages and remained in circulation until the 1970s.

A work still to be found in many Norwegian homes is Beyer and others' *Verdens litteraturhistorie* (World literary history) published in seven volumes during the early 1970s. Although a Norwegian publication, it was a pan-Scandinavian project, and the chapter on English Romanticism was written by the Dane Henning Krabbe and translated into Norwegian. Here, Austen receives one of the fullest accounts in Scandinavian reception (ten pages). Although this cannot compare to Byron's or Shelley's twenty-three pages apiece, it places her clearly above the minor figures. The headline for her section is 'Jane Austen: empires tidens romanforfatter' (Jane Austen: the novelist of the Regency period). For the first time, she is singled out as the principal novelist of her time: Walter Scott, although given more space, no longer occupies this role, something which Krabbe deplors. Krabbe writes with great enthusiasm, always emphasizing Austen's mastery of her genre, and how much she has been loved since her own times. Although he starts out with some reservations about the snobbery of the Austen cult, which he thinks Austen herself would have laughed at, he ends his article with an extravagant simile, stating that reading her novels is pure happiness:

Her novels are like the Regency drawing-rooms, where nothing can be changed without disturbing the classical peace and harmony. To live in these drawing-rooms is happiness, for even if they are small, their perfect proportions ensure that they never feel cramped.¹⁵

¹⁴ 'skildret scener og karakterer fra borgerlig engelsk familieliv ut fra en likefrem genial iakttagelsesevne og med både ironi og humor' (Bull 1947, 402).

¹⁵ 'Hennes romaner er som empires tidens stuer, hvor intet kan endres utan at den klassiske ro og harmoni forstyrres. Det er en lykke å leve i disse stuene, for selv om de er små, gjør de fullkomne proporsjonene at de aldri kjennes trange' (Krabbe 1972, 212).

Krabbe is the only literary historian (published in Norway) to discuss all of her major works, even including a paragraph on her juvenilia.

The most recent world literary history used in Norway was published between 1985 and 1994. It was a joint Scandinavian project, and the main editor (Hans Hertel) as well as the author of the relevant chapter (Per Øhrgaard) are Danes. Judging from the large number of Norwegian libraries that own copies of it, this work has been in widespread use for the last ten years and more. Two of Øhrgaard's observations about Austen are worthy of note: the claim that she was more limited than her male contemporaries and the need to provide a Marxist-feminist apology for her. Øhrgaard analyses Austen's themes from a sociopolitical point of view, claiming that 'feminists have hailed her consciousness of gender roles and women's conditions under the pressure of family life – and Marxists her economic precision'.¹⁶ And there is, as so often elsewhere, a striking contrast between the description of Austen as a supremely gifted and significant novelist and the conclusion that she is limited, making her a subordinate figure to the Romantic poets. There seems to be an underlying assumption that there is such a thing as a 'limitless' author.

Unlike the other literary histories, Svend Einar Hansen's *Verdens største forfattere* (The world's greatest authors, 2002) is not a scholarly work, but a coffee-table book written by a journalist, which is also evident in its lack of logical structure or academic apparatus. Nonetheless, it is included here since it offers the latest Norwegian evaluation of Jane Austen's position in world literature, and the only one of the post-adaptation period. The world's greatest authors are declared to be ninety-seven in number, and Austen is one of them. As is the case in most of the articles, half of the allotted space is taken up by exaggeratedly blown-up pictures: of the Bennet family from the BBC's *PP* (1995), from an unidentified 'dramatization' of *MP* and of Chawton Cottage; plus smaller versions of one of the much-used steel engravings of Austen and of an unidentified edition of *E*.

Already, the impression of a certain levity is strong, further confirmed when we read Hansen's presentation of Austen, which positions her as a prudish moralist – even more Victorian than the Victorian novelists themselves: 'One has to look far to find anything more decent, moral and virtuous than Jane Austen's books.'¹⁷ Hansen seems to be drawn in two directions: on the one hand, the whole presentation is clearly meant to be positive (how else would she deserve her place among the greatest?); on the other, he feels that, '[s]een with the eyes of today, [Austen's work] all seems like hopeless clichés in the same class as the most banal of entertainment literature'.¹⁸ But then he immediately assures us that her characters and dialogues set her far above such clichés. His

¹⁶ 'Feminister har hyllet hennes sans for kjønnsroller og kvinnevilkår under familjelivets trykk – og marxister hennes økonomiske presisjon' (Øhrgaard 1987, 279).

¹⁷ 'For noe mer anstendig, moralsk og dydig enn Jane Austens bøker skal en lete lenge etter' (Hansen 2002, 175).

¹⁸ 'Sett med dagens øyne, virker det hele nærmest som håpløse klisjeer i klasse med den mest banale kiosklitteraturen' (Hansen 2002, 174).

repeated emphasis on her prudishness does, however, reveal a certain misunderstanding of her writing, as does his somewhat surprised observation that ‘even professors of literature at the most well-known universities of the Isles’ have succumbed to the ‘Jane Austen cult’.¹⁹ On the whole, Hansen’s book establishes Austen’s hard-earned and indisputable place among the greatest authors of all time, while inadvertently demonstrating that she remains the victim of familiar stereotypes.

Early critical reception: Emma Woodhouse and Hedda Gabler

Although Austen’s name was still obscure in Norway a hundred years ago, she was at least recognized by our most famous female novelist of the early twentieth century and winner of the 1928 Nobel Prize, Sigrid Undset. Undset wrote a provoking and entertaining article comparing Austen’s Emma Woodhouse with Ibsen’s Hedda Gabler, which was published in the Oslo (then Christiania) newspaper *Tidens tegn* (Sign of the times) in 1917. She must have read *E* in English, unless she had come across the anonymous Swedish translation of 1857–58. Undset argues that Emma is the same type of woman as Hedda: they are ordinary, shallow, unerotic and lacking in personal resources. Hence, they both suffer from an unhappy tendency to meddle in the affairs of others. Their very different fates she puts down to the different attitudes of the two authors:

When Jane Austen treated the type of woman that both Emma and Hedda belong to, she had the advantage over Ibsen that she was not old and she was not a man. That Miss Austen was wise is perhaps to say too much, but she was very clever and young and pretty. The last thing is a tremendous advantage for an authoress – a pretty lady can speak far more honestly about her own sex than an ugly one, who will always risk being accused of being slanderous out of envy. [. . .] she is very honest without being unbecomingly loose-tongued; in her books she says nothing that is not true and never once [gives] her opinion.²⁰

Undset claims that, because Ibsen takes Hedda seriously, she becomes a tragic figure, whose mistakes kill her; by contrast, Austen’s Emma becomes comical, and the author exposes her to readers’ laughter. But Undset also sees this difference as a consequence of changing times: one hundred years earlier, times were

¹⁹ ‘selv litteraturprofessorer ved øyrikets mest kjente universiteter’; ‘en Jane Austen-kultus’ (Hansen 2002, 175).

²⁰ ‘Da Jane Austen tok under behandling den kvindetype, hvortil baade Emma og Hedda horer, hadde hun fremfor Ibsen de fordele, hun var ikke gammel og hun var ikke mand. At miss Austen var vis er vel formeget sagt, men hun var saare klok og ung og smuk. Det siste er en umaadelig fordel for en forfatterinde – en smuk dame kan tale ganske anderledes ærlig om sit eget kjøen end en styg, som alltid risikerer at bli beskyldt for at baktale af misundelse. [. . .] hun er meget ærlig uten uklædelig aapenmundethet; i sine bøker sier hun intet som ikke er sandt og aldrig en eneste gang sin mening’ (Undset 1917).

better for 'such a small, dull nature as Emma's or Hedda's': society knew how to protect them, encourage their small gifts and see to it that they met the right kind of men.²¹

Provocatively, Undset even claims that the new freedom for women is not a good thing for 'the many women whose only distinctive gift is the gift to do mischief'.²² Earlier, Mr Knightley could come and correct them:

give pussy a few smacks and then carry it away on his arm as his own pussycat. Then came the days when any little house-cat learnt that her attraction was [. . .] that she was distantly related to lions and tigers.²³

And when the kitten cannot cope as a lion, it all ends badly. Undset was a severe polemicist and an excellent pamphleteer: she had a sharp pen, in some ways like Austen; but where Austen laughs, Undset scolds, and in the present example sounds almost misogynistic. Perhaps more important than her analysis of Emma is her strikingly accurate observation that Austen 'says nothing that is not true and never once gives her opinion'. It points to Austen's realism as well as her lack of bitterness (which Virginia Woolf would draw attention to ten years later).

Sigrid Undset was obviously familiar with Austen's novels in 1917, since she could describe her 'books' (in the plural) and her style so accurately. But as a professional author who had also lived abroad for years, she was hardly representative of the general reading public in Norway. It took a long time before Austen became a familiar name to the average reader, and before she found a (still uncertain) place in the academic world.

Academic syllabi

There are two indications that Austen, although probably recognized, was very lightly treated in Norwegian academia in the early and mid-century: her rare appearances on reading lists and the few Master's theses (and absence of doctoral dissertations) about her. Although the syllabi of the English courses at the University of Oslo did include Jane Austen as an optional alternative from 1951, she was neither a mandatory part nor an obvious choice for English students, and is still not on the first-year syllabus in most institutions. Only one institution (beside Oslo) reported having Austen in their set syllabus before the 1970s.

But by the late 1970s, there was a marked change, evidently connected to the new wave of feminism in those years. The women's movement was a considerable influence in Norwegian society at the time. The connection to Austen is

²¹ 'saan en liten stump natur som Emmas og Heddass' (Undset 1917).

²² 'for alle de mange kvinder, hvis eneste utprægede evne er evnen til at gjøre ugagn' (Undset 1917).

²³ 'gi pus nogen smaa smæk og saa bære den bort paa armen som sin egen kjælepus. Siden kom de dage, da enhver liten huskat fik høre, hendes fornemste tiltrækning var [. . .] at hun var fjernt ute i slegt med løver og tigre' (Undset 1917).

perhaps primarily an indirect one: the new focus on female authors led to Austen being recognized along with other neglected women. It is also quite possible that the (modest) new age for Austen was inspired by the reading of Virginia Woolf's *A Room of One's Own* (1929), which was very popular in women's literature seminars in Norway from the late 1970s onwards. Woolf, as we know, praises Austen as a pure artist, unhampered by bitterness and frustrations.

What seems to have been the first seminar on women's literature was held at the University of Bergen in 1976, initiated by female graduate students. Austen's *PP* was one of the set texts; after this, she was included in reading lists for the basic and intermediate courses in 1981, remaining there throughout the 1980s, after which she was dropped. Other institutions followed suit: at the University of Trondheim, for instance, the 'basic course' English students read *PP* throughout the 1970s. But of the numerous regional university colleges offering BA courses in English, only Volda and Buskerud seem to have introduced Austen into their reading lists.

The most recent development, however, does not go in Austen's favour. Of the few institutions reading Austen, some of them now see a two- or three-decade-long tradition coming to an end, since the latest reform in higher education has resulted in fewer works on reading lists. We notice that when cuts are necessary, Austen seems to go before the Brontës or Dickens, and she usually comes third or fourth, alongside Hardy, on the priority list of nineteenth-century British novelists. But if Austen has been removed from the elementary courses, she may still be found in some intermediate- and advanced-level courses. Oslo has offered two different types of graduate seminars including Austen in recent years: one devoted to 'Austen and her times', the other including *SS* in a course on film adaptations of novels. Trondheim has regularly included Austen in their advanced-level courses on the nineteenth-century novel, on women's literature and on Romanticism. Academics from Trondheim have also produced two textbooks for university courses on English literature that refer extensively to Austen's novels (Sherry 1988; Hawthorn 2001).

The infrequent appearances of Austen on reading lists are also reflected in the small number of early Master's theses: before 1960 only four Austen theses are registered (1920, 1934, 1940, 1948). Then there are two in 1965, and then suddenly nine in the 1970s. There is a lull during the 1980s (only two) before we register a new, small wave from the late 1990s (twelve). Almost half of the Austen theses in the 1970s adopted a feminist approach, but since then there has been only the occasional example, and some of the most recent topics seem to be inspired by the historical focus of Oslo's 'Austen and her times' seminar.

Since the scope of this chapter does not allow for a discussion of Austen's reception in the lower levels of Norwegian education (in practice, upper-secondary schools), it must be mentioned here that the pattern is roughly the same as in higher education. Austen is only rarely and briefly mentioned in twentieth-century literary histories for schools, and extracts from her novels (*PP*, *SS* or *E*) are only found in a handful of post-1988 anthologies. In the same way as in academic syllabi, we can distinguish two waves of influence: those from the late 1980s and early 1990s take a clearly feminist angle in their presentation of Austen, while the most recent books seem inspired by the screen adaptations.

Scholarly criticism

Few Norwegian scholars have written about Austen. In addition to four essays included in the newest translations (Langholm 1996; Ullmann 1997; Tysdahl 1998; Hareide 2000), there were twelve articles published in journals, books and reports between 1975 and 2005, four of them internationally. Sixteen articles spanning thirty years seem at first to indicate limited academic interest, and there is in fact no Austen milieu in Norway – neither among scholars nor among the general reading public. In only about three of the twenty-two university college English departments are there academics who have written on Jane Austen – in addition to a few contributions from other departments, notably comparative literature.

The research interests of these rare Austen scholars cover different fields: thematics (Ek 1975; Olsen 1977, 1986; Eliassen 2004), historical context (Nessheim 2003), adaptations (Sørbø 2005a, 2006), reception (Sørbø 2004, 2005b) and linguistics (Schmidt 1980). They also propound different views of Austen: as an advocate of moral values on the one hand and as a subversive critic of her society on the other. The former position (and more common one) is most thoroughly endorsed by Haugom Olsen (1977, 1986), the latter by Fehr (1983) and Johannessen (2001). Neither interpretation is specifically Norwegian, reflecting instead the international debate surrounding Austen. The Norwegian perspective is perhaps best seen in Hareide (2000) who compares Austen to a novelist of a generation later, Camilla Collett.

We have already stated above that there were few early theses and relatively few scholarly articles; however, the fact is that little is written about nineteenth-century British authors at all. We are a small country, and although we now have six universities and numerous regional university colleges comprising twenty-two English departments, we only had one university until the 1940s. There were therefore relatively few Masters of English Literature in Norway during the first half of the century. Nevertheless, they had clear preferences, as will be seen.

The catalogues of Master's theses provide the following data regarding nineteenth-century British authors studied between 1906 and 2004: Charlotte Brontë (sixteen), Emily Brontë (eleven), Dickens (twenty-four); Austen (thirty); George Eliot (thirty-one); Hardy (forty-five). Further examination makes it clear that Hardy and particularly Eliot were popular during the first part of the century, and academic interest has since declined. While interest in Eliot had waned by 1975, consideration of Austen increased remarkably after this date. All in all, Austen compares favourably with other nineteenth-century British authors among Masters theses.

Austen's lowly position during the first half of the century, as well as George Eliot's position as the leading British female novelist, are both confirmed in Reidar øksnevad's bibliography *Det britiske samvelde og Eire i norsk litteratur: en bibliografi* (The British Commonwealth of Nations and Eire in Norwegian literature: a bibliography, 1949), which lists translations, textbook editions and criticism to 1946. It contains only one reference to Austen, namely the first translation. At the other end of the scale, Shakespeare occupies eight pages of references, and, not unexpectedly, is the most influential British author in

Norway. Of the nineteenth-century novelists, Dickens seems to have been the most popular, with almost three pages, but is (perhaps surprisingly) followed closely by Marryat, Conan Doyle and Kipling. The Brontës share Austen's position at the bottom of the list, while George Eliot's half-page is comparable to Haggard or Hardy, and less than Scott or Stevenson. As for Austen, it seems, the general public and the academic world agree: she is little read and written of during the first three-quarters of the century.

Later critical reception

If scholarly articles on Austen have demonstrated diverse fields of study, the general criticism published in cultural journals tends to reflect the feminist interest in her, while the articles published in women's magazines seem to balance feminism and escapism, often favouring the latter.

There is an illustrative example of an early, overtly feminist response to Austen in 1980, when the feminist magazine *Sirene* (Siren) published an article on her accompanied by a full-page portrait, a four-page illustrated extract from *PP* (in Harbitz's translation) and a note about the difficulties Austen encountered in publishing her novels. This last piece was written by a key feminist thinker of the period, Ida Lou Larsen, while the main article was by Helena Krag. Political feminists meet Austen: it is conceivable that the outcome might have been condemnation of her maintenance of the traditional values of her society, or at least annoyance that her heroines only seek marriage. Instead, what we get is a clear endorsement, echoing Virginia Woolf's analysis: 'One of the great [authors] of world literature was a woman who never acquired as much as a room of her own.'²⁴ Throughout the piece, Krag praises Austen's amazing literary achievement despite unfavourable circumstances. *Sirene*'s extracts from *PP* are headed 'To frierier' (Two proposals), and suggest a feminist interpretation by showing an independent woman's rejection of two haughty and overbearing men (Collins and Darcy). These conclusions are left to the reader, however, as the extracts stand on their own, without any attempts at interpretation.

Owing to the new perspectives of the women's movement, Austen also found a place in general cultural histories. In *Driftige damer* (Enterprising ladies) for example, she is proclaimed to be the most prominent female novelist of the nineteenth century, and is said to mirror the limitations of women's lives (Aasen 1993). The neutral tone of the presentation demonstrates that it is no longer only the enthusiasts who know Austen: she is now one of those authors who must be discussed in order for the picture to be complete. Moreover, there are instances where Austen, as a famous author, functions as an enticement for Norwegian readers to try lesser-known authors (Schüssler 2002, 2003). Nevertheless, there are still the enthusiasts: writers who claim that she is not

²⁴ 'En av verdenslitteraturens store var en kvinne som aldri oppnådde så mye som å få sitt eget værelse' (Krag 1980, 10).

properly understood, and that 'readers of Austen today often do not see past the outer shell of dresses and conversation and sentimental novel'.²⁵ There are those who see an expression of women's need for personal freedom in Austen's books, and her heroines as 'passionate women of independent minds, who never let themselves be subdued'.²⁶

A brief look at the world of women's magazines provides a different picture. Some of them may echo feminist issues, as when novelist Line Baugstø (1996), writing for *KK* (an abbreviation for 'women and clothes'), observes the extreme restrictions on a woman's life depicted in Austen's books and describes her stylistic mastery. Still, the article does not maintain this focus, mainly considering the romantic enjoyment of the screen adaptations, which draw us in through women 'sighing from pent-up love and men sending their chosen one burning glances'.²⁷ Even Austen's own life is presented romantically, and the title of the article is 'Top entertainment'. Other magazine articles are even more blatantly escapist, sometimes expressing more admiration for Colin Firth than for Jane Austen. One preview of the Miramax *E* significantly sees it as 'a typical Jane Austen film', by which is obviously meant 'more romantic intrigues' and, paradoxically, 'silliness in quality wrapping'.²⁸ The last phrase reveals these writers' fundamental doubt about Austen: the fear that they have been taken in, that it is all really nonsense. But the conclusion is, bravely: 'We let ourselves be carried away!'.²⁹ Typically, the attitude is one of illicit enjoyment: we should not, it is too silly, but we do enjoy it. The prejudice that Austen is simple, escapist entertainment is hard to overcome.

Influence of the screen adaptations

As is already apparent, a study of the academic and critical reception of Austen in Norway reveals the substantial influence of the different screen adaptations of her novels which appeared during the latter half of the 1990s. Many of them were immensely successful in Norway, and newspaper critics often write of an Austen 'wave' or 'renaissance'. Norwegian moviegoers experienced directly what the films retain of Austen's dialogue in the original language, as only young children's films are dubbed in Norway. The films happened to coincide (by a 'lucky chance', according to the publisher) with the launch of the new series of Norwegian translations (1996–2003). Also in 1996, Norwegian viewers could see Simon Langton's television adaptation of *PP*, and Ang Lee's *SS*, Roger Michell's *P*, Douglas McGrath's *E* and Amy Heckerling's *Clueless* in

²⁵ 'Slik mange av Austens lesere i dag ikke ser forbi det ytre lag av kjoler og konversasjon og *sentimental novel*' (Kvanvig 1999, 44).

²⁶ 'Austens heltinner er alle lidenskapelige og frittenkende kvinner som ikke lar seg kue' (Kvanvig 1999, 44).

²⁷ 'kvinner som sukker av innestengt kjærlighet og menn som sender sine utkårede brennende blikk' (Baugstø 1996, 44).

²⁸ 'nye romantiske intriger', 'tåpeligheter i kvalitetsinnpakning' (Lid 1996, 8).

²⁹ 'Vi lar oss rive med!' (Lid 1996, 8).

the cinema, to be followed by Diarmuid Lawrence's *E*. Nothing in the Norwegian reception of Austen beats the enormous popularity of the BBC's mini-series of *PP*, although *SS* came close. The least popular films seem to have been *P* and Patricia Rozema's *MP* (screened in Norway in 2000), both of which went rather unnoticed. Of the two versions of *E*, Miramax's Hollywood adaptation (featuring Gwyneth Paltrow) seems to have won people's attention, over Meridian's (starring Kate Beckinsale). Norwegian teenage girls also received the *Clueless* film and follow-up television series eagerly, but it is rather doubtful whether many of the youthful viewers discovered Austen as a result. Generally speaking, however, Austen does seem to have gained new readers in Norway because of the adaptations, although, according to the publisher's sales, the effect was rather short-lived.³⁰

If we compare brief encyclopaedic entries for Jane Austen in works from the same publisher before and after the screen adaptations, the difference is revealing. While she is treated as a minor author before and dismissed with the line 'described the life of the English gentry and the middle classes' (Steigan 1995), two pieces of information are added later: that a number of films and television series have been made, and that she is today regarded as one of England's greatest authors.³¹ One cannot help but notice the connection between these two facts: there is wider recognition of her greatness after the adaptations.

The impact of the BBC series of *PP* (1995) is also seen in a Norwegian textual adaptation from 1996. The women's magazine *Familien* (The family) printed a sixteen-page extra containing a paraphrased version of *PP*, amply illustrated with photos from the series. The text, although presented as a 'novel by Jane Austen', is mostly a summary of her novel, but with some pieces of dialogue and letters kept in part (Arpas 1996). There is also an introduction about the author (plus full-page portrait), which gives a much more sensible presentation than is usually seen in the weekly magazines, but basically repeats the universally acknowledged truths about her: that she had an uneventful life, and yet wrote masterpieces about her small world (Vislie 1996).

The recent interest in Austen caused by the screen adaptations and new translations also found its expression in a number of newspaper articles of differing length and focus. In general, commentators are of two kinds: the ones who do not like romantic stories, or think they should not, but who have understood that Austen is important, and therefore try to present her as such; and the enthusiasts, who have read all her books and who enjoy her humour enormously, and try to convince their readers that she is different from the common stereotype ('there is nothing less romantic than this razor-sharp miss's

³⁰ Of the Norwegian translations appearing between 1996 and 2003, the first (*E*), which appeared on the market at the same time as most of the films, was the one that sold best (the original hardback edition sold around 6,000 copies, compared to approximately 1,200 for the later titles). A second, bookclub edition of *E* was a huge success the year after. Subsequent editions of all translations have enjoyed only moderate sales.

³¹ 'I de senere år er det laget en rekke kjente filmer og TV-serier basert på hennes romaner, og hun regnes i dag som en av Englands største forfattere' (*Caplex* 2006).

unsentimental character studies').³² What we notice about recent Norwegian Austen criticism is its positive note, in the sense that nobody argues against her reputation as an important novelist.

Conclusion

Norway is a relatively young state, though an old nation, and this is part of the reason why it took over a hundred years for Jane Austen to find a place in Norwegian letters. After all, Norwegian cultural and educational institutions were only gradually established over these two centuries, and even our own nineteenth-century authors, for instance Ibsen, wrote in a language that is more Danish than modern Norwegian, and often published their books in Copenhagen rather than Oslo.

But this one century of Austen reception, exactly coinciding with the period of Norway's independence, is characterized by certain tendencies. First of all, although five of her novels are now translated, Austen is primarily known as the author of *PP*: the novel has had four different Norwegian translations, it was the only one translated before the 1990s and the television series had such a great impact. She is also to a great extent, particularly by the general public, perceived as a romance writer, the source of the nostalgic costume dramas of the late 1990s. Furthermore, she is a women's author: we notice that of the thirty registered Master's theses about her in Norway, only two are written by men. Austen's reputation in Norway undoubtedly suffers from her works' frequent classification as 'ladies' novels', which some publishers have supported or created with editions clearly aimed at young girls (Harbitz) or the female readers of popular romances (notably a 1991 paperback edition featuring a dreaming girl surrounded by hearts and flowers). Paradoxically, the fact that she came into academic reading lists as part of the wave of women's literature has the drawback that she is thought of as relevant to women only. This tendency is further reinforced by the escapist nostalgia of some of the screen adaptations.

But Norwegian commentary on Austen presents a different picture. She is generally classified among the greatest novelists and highly admired for her irony, comic characters and language. Similarly, in most editions, her novels are presented as timeless classics. There are, however, also common misconceptions, or at least cherished stereotypes among Norwegian writers. It is striking how many commentators still choose to present her as a young girl, although she was at the height of her powers when she died at the age of forty-one (Undset 1917; Bing 1929; Harbitz 1930). More curiously, she is sometimes also associated with Victorian times (Bing 1929; Bull 1941; Hansen 2002).

The longest-surviving image of her is inherited from her British reception: it is that of the spinster with limited life experience, echoed by most Norwegian writers, from the simplest schoolbooks to the weightiest literary histories. It is

³² 'finnes det ikke noe mindre romantisk enn denne sylskarpe frøkenens usentimentale karakterstudier' (Lodén 2003).

assumed that she knew little of the world beyond the village, and was only familiar with the life of the gentry. Mary Augusta Austen-Leigh's frustration at such misapprehensions among critics in 1920 would have been even greater had she known that they would still be perpetuated today.

And at the centre of Norwegian Austen reception there is a paradox. In the academic world particularly, she is a recognized, but neglected, classic. She has become a familiar name; everybody respects her, but few select her for their courses. When the different university college English departments were asked whether they studied Austen, the commonest answer was, significantly: 'We do not read her, but perhaps we should.'

8 Jane Austen's Reception in Sweden: Irony as Criticism and Literary Value

Git Claesson Pipping and
Eleanor Wikborg

Prologue

One important truth about Jane Austen's reception in Sweden dawned on me in the early 1990s when teaching literature to a class of eighteen-year-olds.¹ While discussing *PP*, I discovered that half the class had read the famous opening statement as non-ironic, as a straightforward truth from Austen's lips. Those who had read the statement as ironic greatly enjoyed the book, but those who had not considered the novel a romance of a kind not worthy of serious study.

The realization that it may be an ironic versus a literal reading that determines one's evaluation of her work helped me understand the violent dislike of some of my own male fellow students almost fifteen years earlier. At the time, I put their reaction down to the fact that the protagonist of *PP* is female and – as they saw it – upper class. But if they too had missed the irony and considered the novel a cheap romance, their response was more understandable.

Interestingly, when going through the Swedish reception for this chapter, I have found that, on the whole, the more a present-day review discusses Austen's use of irony, the more positive the review is likely to be – while those who do not discuss the irony are much more likely to be defensive in their praise of her work.

¹ The first-person pronoun in this sentence refers to Claesson Pipping. Although the text as a whole is the result of close cooperation between Wikborg and Claesson Pipping, the latter is responsible for all of the research except for Wikborg's investigation of the novels' translations into Swedish in the second and third sections and of the prefaces to the twentieth-century editions.

Swedish reception of 'English lady novelists' in the nineteenth century

There are no records of Jane Austen's nineteenth-century reception in Sweden in the form of review articles of her novels or essays on her work; nor are any sales figures available. There are two reasons for this: first of all, only two translations of Austen's novels were published during the century (Emilia Westdahl's of *P* in 1836 and *E* by an unknown translator in 1857–58); secondly, Sweden did not develop a media landscape that included many reviews until the last decades of the nineteenth century. According to Rydén (1987), reviews of all kinds during the first half of the century were scarce, and when a culture of reviewing was finally established, novels by 'English lady novelists' (*engelsk författarinneroman*) were firmly categorized within a genre which was seldom considered worthy of the attention of male reviewers (Claesson Pipping 1993).²

When Jane Austen was first published in Sweden, Swedish readers had already formed a set opinion of what a novel by an English lady novelist should be like. The genre *engelsk författarinneroman* was defined in Sweden as early as 1772, when a Swedish article in the journal *Fruentimmers-tidningar* (Ladies' magazine) on whether novels were suitable reading for young women contended that English novels are better than the French since they contained characters who, by not encouraging escapism and immorality, could 'improve the young mind' ('förbättra det unga sinnet'; Anon. 1772, 96). The most popular were Eliza Haywood's *Miss Betsy Thoughtless* (1751) and Frances Sheridan's *The History of Nourjahad* (1767), both published in Swedish for the first time in 1772 (Böök 1907, Björkman 1992; Östman 1983). As Böök pointed out in 1907, English novels were thought to be more moral in spite of the fact that the interaction between the sexes which they depicted was informal and, according to him, 'the threat of rape is as common to the English novel as gallantry is to the French'.³ His explanation of the Swedish predilection for English novels of the eighteenth century is that, in their plots, morality 'always triumphs in a palpable and emphatic way'.⁴ Thus, we see that the concept of a moral content in novels by English lady novelists is not only an eighteenth-century opinion, but that it is continued by Böök in 1907.

For modern Swedish readers, that English novels were preferred reading for young women on account of their morality might seem surprising, since French eighteenth-century novels also seem to concern themselves with

² We use the term 'lady novelist' to give the translation the correct connotations. During the nineteenth century, Swedish term *författarinna* referred to an educated middle- or upper-class woman. The term *kvinna*, the proper translation of 'woman', was only used to refer to women of the lower classes. Middle- and upper-class women were referred to as *damer* (ladies) or *fruentimmer*, a term which is now used jokingly and often deprecatingly, but which in the nineteenth century referred exclusively to middle- or upper-class women, especially educated ones (see Hallström 1914).

³ '[v]åldtäktsförsök äro lika typiska för den engelska romanen som galanteriet är för den franska' (Böök 1907, 280).

⁴ 'segrar på ett handgripligt och eftertryckligt sätt' (Böök 1907, 280).

morality. This means that the concept of what moral literature is must depend on something other than whether a novel itself deals with moral questions. Though it is difficult – indeed impossible – to prove it statistically, a large number of the novels by English lady novelists sold in Sweden in the eighteenth century feature a plot that revolves round the development of a self-assertive, independent girl into a submissive, sensible woman ready to take a husband (Östman 1983). This might mean that the higher morality claimed for English novels specifically refers to the fact that they gave woman readers a sensible ‘moral’ view of marriage (Claesson Pipping 1993, 151 n.7).

During the nineteenth century, the two Swedish editions of Austen’s novels are exceeded numerically only by eleven (full or partial) French translations, while matching the number of German translations. However, there is no evidence that Austen was at all well known in Sweden: indeed, she seems far less so than, for example, Maria Edgeworth, who is mentioned in several nineteenth-century articles on the English novel. The explanation for this might well lie in the Swedish conception of the English lady novelist genre, whose characteristics fit Edgeworth but not Austen. The popularity of the genre made publishing Austen seem worthwhile, but her irony may have left readers less satisfied, despite the translators’ attempts to make her novels fit better into their conceptions of the genre (see the next section).

One reason for the popularity of the English novel lies in Sweden’s development during the first half of the nineteenth century, when the Swedish industrial revolution was under way. The middle classes were growing, and between 1830 and 1850 they were strongly influenced by British liberal ideas both politically and aesthetically. Middle-class aesthetics were partly a reaction against the early nineteenth-century fascination with German poetry, which was associated with the aristocracy. In spite of the fact that such French novels as *Les Mystères de Paris* (1842–43) by Eugène Sue (an urban ‘Gothic’ novel, rather than a novel of manners and morals) dominated the publishing lists, discussion of the aesthetics of the novel in 1830–70 concentrated on the English novel. Thus, relatively unromantic novels set in British middle-class homes by authors such as Dickens and Thackeray were valued more highly than the French mystery and sensation novels. But their reign was short. In the early 1850s, a member of the Swedish Academy was willing to lend his name to an advertisement for English novels translated into Swedish, among them such well-known works as *Jane Eyre* (1855), *Shirley* (1855) and *Dombey and Son* (1855). But in the latter half of that decade there was a reaction against what was perceived as a growth of sentimentalism and religious dogmatism in English novels by women writers. ‘Tea-water novels’ (*thévatensromaner*) was the term used by some reviewers.⁵

⁵ The term was probably coined by Herman Bjursten in a newspaper column of 1856, which declared that all English women writers except Charlotte Brontë dwelled too long on descriptions of tea-making and stables. Bjursten thus held the view that novels by English lady novelists lacked dramatic concentration and contained overly detailed depictions of everyday country life. The term ‘tea-water novels’ is used occasionally during the next two or three decades to refer to novels by English lady novelists (Claesson Pipping 1993, 26).

During the first half of the nineteenth century, then, two parallel processes can be identified in the Swedish reception of the novel as a genre: the growing popularity of the novel genre by 'English lady novelists' and a greater acceptance of the novel itself as an aesthetic genre. By the middle of the century, however, the 'English lady novelist' genre is aesthetically dismissed simply because it is women's writing and thus judged less worthy of attention. For Swedes, novels by 'English lady novelists' were characterized by the same features that were ascribed to the British upper-middle classes by their liberal Swedish admirers: industry, good sense and moderation. Irony was not a concept that figured in the Swedish discussion on aesthetics, and hence it was not considered a virtue. Thus, it is likely that Austen's irony went undetected, either because it was unexpected in the genre or because it caused Swedish readers to wonder whether they were at the receiving end of the joke. Neither reaction would have brought them pleasure in Austen's novels.

The nineteenth-century translations

The two translations into Swedish published during the nineteenth century were of *P*, as *Familjen Elliot: skildringar af engelska karakterer* (The Elliot family: descriptions of English characters, 1836) by Emilia Westdahl, and of *E*, as *Emma, eller talangen att uppgöra partier för sina vänner* (Emma, or the talent to arrange marriages for one's friends, 1857–58) by an unknown translator. *Familjen Elliot*, as Gilson surmises (*BJA*, 183), is a translation from the French of Isabelle de Montolieu's reworking of *P* as *La Famille Elliot* (1821, revised 1828). Compared to *Familjen Elliot*, which, like its French original, adds metaphors and essayistic passages of its own to Austen's original (e.g. passages which criticize the discrimination against women), the Swedish *E* is a fairly close translation of Austen's text. It does, however, omit a substantial number of sentences and phrases from the original.

For example, in *E* (1.1: 5), the sentence which reads, 'The real evils indeed of Emma's situation were the power of having rather too much her own way, and a disposition to think a little too well of herself', in the Swedish is stripped of 'the power of having rather too much her own way' (Westdahl 1857–58, 4). This reduction of Emma's power is accompanied by the toning down of her vivaciousness, and indeed of her self-absorption. In the scene where she reflects upon the debacle of Mr Elton's proposal, the translator has opted to cut all but one of the exclamations which characterize Emma's internal review of the situation: 'It was a wretched business, indeed! – Such an overthrow of every thing she had been wishing for! – Such a development of every thing most unwelcome! – Such a blow for Harriet!' (*E*, 1.16: 134) The Swedish omits the first three of these four exclamations, so that Emma emerges as not thinking at all of the repercussions of Mr Elton's proposal on herself, but only on Harriet – as befits a more conventionally virtuous young woman (Westdahl 1857–58, 114).

Some of the translations of particular sentences and words reinforce the stylistic effects of such omissions. The 'clever' of the novel's opening ('Emma Woodhouse, handsome, clever, and rich') is changed into 'sensible' (*förståndig*)

– again subtly reducing Emma’s force, and making of her a more conventional heroine. The characterization of Mr Knightley also changes him into a more familiar mentor figure: his ‘cheerful manner’ becomes a ‘kindly patience’ (‘en vänlig tålmodighet’). When he and Emma argue over the suitability of Robert Martin as Harriet’s suitor, the energetic ‘“Nonsense!”’ with which he responds to Emma’s claim that ‘“A man always imagines a woman to be ready for anybody who asks her”’ (E, 1.8: 60) is toned down in the Swedish to the more sedate ‘Now you are unreasonable’ (‘Nu är Ni orimlig’; Westdahl 1857–58, 54).

One can only speculate on the reasons for such stylistic alterations, as one might speculate upon the reasons why Westdahl, who four decades later translated three other works directly from English into Swedish, would choose Madame de Montolieu’s version of *P* over Austen’s original. The explanation may be owing to chance factors, but it is significant that both Swedish translations water down the spirit and individuality of Austen’s protagonists. The result is that the Swedish translations of these two novels fit better into what the reader expected of novels by ‘English lady novelists’.

Twentieth- and twenty-first-century translations

The first twentieth-century translation of an Austen novel was of *PP* in 1920 by C. A. Ringenson. It was published by Bonniers, a major publisher, which has continued printing Austen translations to this day. Starting with Ringenson’s translation then, the earlier scarcity of Austen translations has been remedied in full measure. Ringenson’s translation of *PP* was revised in 1946 by Gösta Olzon, who made a number of stylistic changes designed to modernize the text. These involved changes in punctuation conventions, simplifying the sentence structure and opting for a more colloquial vocabulary. There is no record of the reception of either volume.

Olzon’s translation was subsequently reprinted in nine editions between 1953 and 1998. The same pattern of an early translation followed by reprints is to be found in the publishing history, in chronological order, of *P* (1954), *E* (1956) and *SS* (1959). *NA*, *LS* and *MP*, however, were not translated until the 1990s (*NA* and *LS*, 1993; *MP*, 1997). These translations, as well as the many reprints of Austen novels during the 1990s, were clearly riding the wave of Austen popularity occasioned by the spate of adaptations shown on Swedish television and at the movies during the same decade. All the films were subtitled and appeared on Swedish television as follows: *PP* (1995), *E* (1997), *SS* (1997), *P* (2000) and *MP* (2001). The films had the same effect on borrowings of Austen’s works from public libraries, with figures from 1997 being almost three times those from 2004.⁶ The films also resulted in an interview on TV4 in 1998 with Eleanor Wikborg (and a style consultant) on the topic ‘Why is Jane Austen so

⁶ According to Sveriges författarfond, the borrowing figures for Austen’s novels for 1997 were 117,925, as compared to 46,932 in 2004 (e-mail correspondence with librarian Maria Hermanson on behalf of the authors, 19 September 2006).

popular?' All these films (except for *NA*) are freely available for sale or hire from the large chainstores which sell videos and DVDs – a clear sign of the popularity of Austen's stories in Sweden today.

The twentieth- and twenty-first-century translations, unlike their nineteenth-century counterparts, neither add passages of their own nor omit portions of Austen's text. On the contrary, all clearly aim at following their originals closely and at devising stylistic equivalents of her ironies. In the first sentence of *PP*, for example, '[i]t is a truth universally acknowledged, that a single man in possession of a good fortune, must be in want of a wife', it is impossible to translate 'universally' with anything but the Swedish word for 'generally' (*allmänt*), because 'en allmänt erkänd sanning' ('a generally acknowledged truth') is a set phrase in Swedish. However, Ringenson has compensated for the loss of the greater mockery of Austen's 'universally' by using a strongly ironic Swedish word to translate the adjective 'good' in 'a single man in possession of a good fortune'. Instead of opting for the more common adjective *stor* (large) to characterize Bingley's fortune, Ringenson selects *vacker* (beautiful), a word which in combination with *förmögenhet* (fortune) evokes the style of early twentieth-century Swedish satirical literature as it poked fun at the materialism of the upper-middle classes. The same type of solution is found in the scene of Mr Collins's proposal, where his use of the word 'amiable' in his flattery of Elizabeth – "You would have been less amiable in my eyes had there *not* been this little unwillingness" (*PP*, 1.19: 105) – is translated by the exaggerated *dyrkansvärd* ('worthy of worship'; Ringenson 1920, 124). The translator has rendered the irony of Collins's performance of the role of submissive lover by opting for a Swedish term which by the early twentieth century had become ridiculously romantic. Such allusions to the satirical idiom of such Swedish authors as Hjalmar Bergman (1883–1931) and Birger Sjöberg (1885–1929) make clear the degree to which the translators of *PP* drew upon the stylistic resources of the most ironic period in twentieth-century Swedish literature.

It has been difficult to assess Austen's popularity in Sweden in the last decades by means of sales figures because only one publisher was able to provide any. Månpocket, Sweden's best-known publisher of budget paperbacks, has published three Austen novels: *Stolthet och fördom* (*PP*, 1996) sold 18,988 copies; *E* (1997) sold 14,025; *NA* (2001) sold 10,115. A normal print run of classics at Månpocket is 7,000 copies: according to Månpocket's Anders Sjöqvist, Austen has sold 'OK but not exceptionally well'.⁷

There is no doubt then that Jane Austen is well known to Swedes today. By no means, however, does she outrank all other women novelists of the nineteenth century. Novels by Charlotte and Emily Brontë, for example, boast a larger number of Swedish editions. All Charlotte Brontë's novels were translated in the 1850s, and *Jane Eyre* and Emily Brontë's *Wuthering Heights* have both appeared in twenty editions as compared with the eleven editions of *PP* (not to

⁷ 'OK men inte exceptionellt' (e-mail correspondence with the authors, 13 February 2004).

mention the fifty-nine editions of a comparable Swedish classic: *Gösta Berling's Saga* [1891] by the Nobel Laureate Selma Lagerlöf).

Encyclopaedias

As no reviews or articles on Jane Austen are to be found in nineteenth- or early twentieth-century Sweden, we must rely on encyclopaedia entries to find out what Swedish readers might know about Austen. Interestingly, the information in the entries is to the point and concentrates on her work, whereas the entries on better-known novelists in Sweden (which focus on their lives and works) are not as valuable as Austen's.

From as early as the first edition of *Nordisk familjebok* (The Nordic family's book; hereafter *NF*), Sweden's first general encyclopaedia in 1876, until *Nationalencyclopedia* (The national encyclopaedia) in 1990, Austen is considered to be one of the finest writers of her period. The brief entry in *NF* (1876, 1: 1351) is an example:

Austen [å'sten], Jane, English lady novelist, b. 1775, d. 1817. Her depiction of everyday life of the English upper-middle classes is excellent. E.g. she wrote *Sense and Sensibility*, *Emma* (trans. into Swedish in 1857) and *Persuasion* (published posthumously).⁸

The amount of information given on Austen is slight. Frances Burney's entry in the same edition is 50 per cent longer, but focuses on her life and does not mention the titles of her novels (1878, 2: 1357). However, even the entry devoted to Burney is short compared to Maria Edgeworth's, which is three times as long (1881, 4: 153). Although Austen's entry is the shortest, it is the most positive: what little is said of her work is unqualified praise – 'excellent' – while Edgeworth is criticized for being overly didactic and Burney's unnamed novels are dismissed with the comment that they 'still have value'. We would suggest that the amount of text devoted to the authors was determined by how well known they were in Sweden. At least five of Edgeworth's novels were translated, and for reasons suggested above she was considered a very good writer during the early nineteenth century, while, as we have seen, Austen's were not mentioned in the earlier period (see Claesson Pipping 1993, 25).

The same pattern is to be perceived some decades later. In the next edition of *NF* (1899) the entries on Burney and Edgeworth were edited only marginally, in Burney's case by the insertion of a few titles and the editions of her published diaries (*NF* 1905, 4: 653), in Edgeworth's case by the insertion of information on Edgeworth criticism (*NF* 1907, 6: 1348). The Austen entry, on the other

⁸ 'Austen [å'sten], Jane, engelsk romanförfattarinna, f. 1775, d. 1817. Hon skildrade på ett utmärkt sätt den högre engelska medelklassens hvardagslif. Bl.a. skrev hon *Sense and Sensibility*, *Emma* (öfvers. på svenska 1857) och *Persuasion* (utgifven efter hennes död)' (*NF* 1876, 1: 1351).

hand, has been edited extensively, even to the point of changing the instructions for how to pronounce her name:

Austen [ä'stin], Jane, English lady novelist, b. 1775, d. 1817, who depicted, in an admirably unaffected and finely nuanced style, often tinged by innocuous satire, the everyday life of the English rural upper-middle classes, e.g. in *Sense and Sensibility* (1811) and *Emma* (1816; trans. 1857). All her work was published in 6 vols in 1882, her letters in 2 vols in 1884. Biogr. by Austen-Leigh (2nd edn 1871), Tytler (1880), Malden (1889), Smith (1890) and Pollock (1899). E.F—t.⁹

The author of the entry, Eugen Fahlstedt (1851–1935), was one of the editors of this edition of *NF*, and is known only for translating some of Strindberg's French texts into Swedish. As we see, the evaluation is even more positive, and Fahlstedt gives room for as much information as possible. Nevertheless, no Swedish edition of Austen's work was in print when this was written.

The fact that no works on Austen were currently available at the time she was being described as a writer of great value in the Swedish encyclopaedias of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries reveals a discrepancy between the judgements made by the authors of the encyclopaedias and their publishers. One can only speculate on the reason. Perhaps the information on Austen in the encyclopaedias is grounded on British material, rather than on information available to the writers of the entries through their own reading? And if they judged Burney and Edgeworth on the basis of their own reading but described Austen by way of second-hand knowledge, this could explain their more critical comments on the other two authors.

Twentieth-century criticism, 1914–45

Two essays on Jane Austen were published in the early twentieth century, and both serve to indicate how little known she was. Indeed, the literary essay in Sweden tends to introduce less well-known writers.

The earliest, Per Hallström's essay 'En klassisk fruntimmersroman' (A classic ladies' novel) in *Levande dikt* (Living poetry, 1914), is a typical example of the genre. Hallström's aim is to compare *PP* with *Much Ado about Nothing*. He finds not only that Austen's novel is less true art than Shakespeare's comedy, but that although it cannot reach the greatest heights, it is still a work of real art because of its truthfulness to human nature: 'Thus, a durable piece of art has risen out of something that seems as flighty as a ladies' novel.'¹⁰

⁹ 'Austen [ä'stin], Jane, engelsk romanförfattarinna, f. 1775, d. 1817, skildrade, i en mönstergillt ökonstlad och fint nyanserad stil, som ofta färgas af harmlös satir, den högre engelska medelklassens på landet hvardagslif, bl.a. i *Sense and sensibility* (1811) and *Emma* (1816; trans. 1857). Hennes samlade skrifter utgavos i 6 bd 1882, hennes bref i 2 bd 1884. Biogr. av Austen-Leigh (2nd edn 1871), Tytler (1880), Malden (1889), Smith (1890) och Pollock (1899). E.F—t.' (*NF* 1904, 2: 443).

¹⁰ 'Så har det blivit ett varaktigt mästerverk av något, som kan tyckas så flyktigt som en fruntimmersroman' (Hallström 1914: 170).

The second essay was written in 1915 by the novelist Mathilda Malling, in the prestigious journal on art and literature *Ord och bild* (Word and picture). Malling's essay is valuable because it shows how little Swedish readers knew Austen at this time, as well as indicating those writers whom Malling expected to be familiar to the Swedish reader. After an introduction aimed at establishing how well known Austen is in Britain, and pointing out that she herself would easily take a place in the British intellectual classes when it comes to knowledge of Austen's works, she evaluates Austen for the Swedish reader:

There is no gainsaying that Austen is England's finest lady prose writer. She is not as strong as the two [*sic*] Brontë sisters, not as fresh as Fanny Burney in her first novel, not in any way as purposeful as Miss Edgeworth and later Mary [*sic*] Gaskell (whose classic *Cranford* was undoubtedly partly inspired by Miss Austen) – but fine – quite fine.¹¹

Clearly, Malling expects the reader to be at least familiar with the other writers she names. Also, she goes on to compare Austen to Elizabeth Barrett Browning, who, she claims, has 'the entire literary world at her feet'.¹² Malling fears that the same is not the case for Austen, though she deserves the same status. The rest of the essay tells us about Austen's life and her novels. Malling clearly failed to interest the Swedish audience in Austen: an edition of *PP* was published in 1920, but that is the only sign of interest in Austen until 1946 when Olzon's revised translation of *PP* was published.

The only lengthy biographical piece on Austen to appear in Sweden was published in 1945 by Helen af Enehjelm, a novelist and journalist of American origin belonging to the Swedish-speaking minority in Finland. The 38-page essay, 'Jane Austen and her sister Cassandra', is included in a volume *Vandring med favoriter* (Rambles with favourites) and includes similar accounts of Katherine Mansfield, Emily Brontë, Emily Dickinson and Edgar Allan Poe. The volume was also published in Finland in the same year under the title *Promenad med favoriter*. Claiming to be writing not as a critic but as a book-lover, Af Enehjelm bases her account of Austen's life on contemporary biographers such as Elizabeth Jenkins and Léonie Villard, as well as on Chapman's edition of the letters. Gossipy and speculative, her piece develops the thesis that Cassandra played a role similar to that of Balzac's Cousine Bette in relation to her sculptor protégé – that of guardian of her sister's peace. She claims that Cassandra was more beautiful, more practical and of a milder disposition than her sister, and in the spirit of D. W. Harding's 'Regulated Hatred' (1939–40) she stresses what she sees as Austen's malicious streak.

¹¹ 'Jane Austen [är] utan gensaga Englands finaste prosaberätterska. Inte så stark som de två systrarna Brontë, inte så frisk som Fanny Burney i sin första bok, inte på något sätt så målmedveten som Miss Edgeworth och senare Mary Gaskell (vars klassiska *Cranford* säkert delvis inspirerats av Miss Austen) – men fin – just *fin*' (Malling 1915, 274).

¹² 'hela den bildade världen för sina fötter' (Malling 1915, 274).

Prefaces/epilogues to the twentieth-century translations

The translations of four of Austen's novels include a total of seven commentaries in the form of prefaces or epilogues. In chronological order, these are: two separate anonymous prefaces to *PP* (1920, 1946), two separate prefaces to *P* by the translator, Jane Lundblad (1954, 1981), an epilogue to *SS* also by Jane Lundblad (1959, reprinted 1996) and two separate prefaces to *NA*, one by Staffan Bergsten (1993) and one by Lisbeth Larsson (2002). All of these essays provide the reader with the publication dates of Austen's six best-known novels, as well as with brief biographies which stress her uneventful life and the anonymity of her authorship during her lifetime. All of them praise Austen's work, with the three earliest referring to her novels as classics. All mention her wit, with five of them dwelling on the effectiveness of her irony as a means of characterization, and three of them praising the clarity and power of her style.

Both prefaces to *PP* refer to views of the novel in the 1920s and 1940s which rate it below Austen's other works. The 1920 essay maintains that *PP* may be Austen's most popular, but it is not her best, novel. The 1946 piece reports that many readers consider the novel to be her masterpiece, while others find it to be the least original of her works. Both commentaries are brief – the first one and a half and the second two pages long – and they do not elaborate on the reasons for these views.

Jane Lundblad's two prefaces to *P* are separated by a period of twenty-seven years. Lundblad (1905–86), was a translator and journalist with a doctorate in literature. In addition to *P*, she translated works by Mary Wollstonecraft, Henry James, Virginia Woolf and Angus Wilson. The 1954 piece links the experience of the French Revolution and Napoleonic Wars during the 1790–1810 period to the British experience of World War II, arguing that wartime readers found strength in Austen's quiet clarity of vision, the gaiety of her wit and her contempt for false values. Lundblad maintains that both her life and works resemble miniature paintings, and that part of her strength as a writer was her exclusive focus on what she knew (for example, she did not attempt to render the conversation of men when no women were present). Lundblad notes the opposition between the landed gentry and the rising middle classes in the novel as a new feature in Austen's social satire, and contrasts *P* with Austen's earlier works also in terms of the handling of point of view: the narrator's voice is muted in favour of Anne Elliot's perspective, she writes. This makes for more 'warm feeling' (*varm känsla*) than the 'harsh irony' (*hård ironi*) of the earlier novels. She sees some flaws in tone: for example, she finds the handling of the Musgroves' dead son offensive.

Lundblad wrote a new preface for the 1981 reprint of her translation. In place of the reference to World War II, we find in this essay a close reading of the opening of the novel as an illustration of the effects of Austen's style, and comments on the importance of her contribution not only to the history of the European novel, but also to the history of the women's movement. She notes that the Crofts' marriage and the promise of the Wentworths' future life together are a central affirmation of the companionate marriage, which, she claims, is also an important ideal in our own times. Other ideals, however, have changed since Austen's day: we no longer admire the means of Captain

Wentworth's rise in the world, nor do we share Anne's conviction that she did right to yield to Lady Russell's earlier prejudice against Wentworth's social position.

Lundblad's epilogue to the translation of *SS* argues that the novel lacks the deeper insight into human nature of the later works and points out that it is not as popular as Austen's other works. She argues that *SS* is a young person's novel about the high expectations of youth, its generosity and hunger for life. She sees Marianne Dashwood as the protagonist of the story with Elinor representing the importance of rationality as an antidote to the vanity, materialism and envy of the world ranged against the youthful ideals.

NA was not translated until 1993, by which time the screen adaptations of Austen's novels had introduced her works to the general Swedish public. In keeping with this situation, the first preface by Staffan Bergsten (1993) and the second by Lisbeth Larsson (2002) are longer and more ambitious than the essays accompanying the earlier translations. Bergsten (b. 1932), critic and lecturer at Lund University, has published extensively on Swedish literature, including two textbooks; while Larsson (b. 1949) is the first Swedish professor of Gender Studies in Literature at Gothenburg University, and literature and drama critic for the daily, *Expressen*. Bergsten's ten pages give a literary–historical background to the novel: his essay compares Austen's comments on novel-reading to similar ones by a Swedish contemporary, Anna Maria Lenngren (1754–1817); it outlines the history of the Gothic novel in England; it compares Catherine Morland to Richardson's Pamela; and it hypothesizes that the novel's comedy would probably have resulted in the form of a play had it been written by a man, since (he claims) writing for the theatre was a male genre. Bergsten notes that General Tilney represents the political history of male violence and that in this novel Austen emphasizes the irony of a young woman's exchange of her father for a husband, both of whom are entitled to oppress her. Finally, Bergsten comments on Austen's lack of erotic experience and the limitations this imposes on her psychological insight, whilst at the same time claiming that because of this limitation she was freed from household cares and thus became the mother of the English woman's novel – a point which aroused the mockery of Ulf Olsson a year later (see below).

Nine years later, Lisbeth Larsson sets out in the space of thirteen pages to place *NA* in a tradition of women's writing. She starts with Virginia Woolf's appreciation of Austen, and emphasizes the degree to which the novel is written in dialogue with her sister authors. She goes on to consider whether it is really the case that the novel is a satire of novel-reading and of Ann Radcliffe's *The Mysteries of Udolpho* (1794), as has so often been claimed. In Larsson's view, *NA* is far more complicated: she argues that it is the most anti-patriarchal of all Austen's novels in the way it points out that it is men rather than women who create problems in the interaction between the sexes. Larsson notes the way the text highlights a woman's right to say 'no' to a man, but she claims that it also illuminates the degree to which women are pressured into saying 'yes' – not least in the distancing irony of its proposal scene. She concludes that Catherine Morland's insights into the male violence and female vulnerability of the society in which she lived represent the core of the novel's Gothic elements.

These seven pieces may to some extent be said to represent the literary values of the times in which they were written. The two earliest commentaries are concerned above all with the status of Austen's works: to establish them as classics and to rank *PP* in relation to her other novels. Lundblad's introductions to *P* and *SS* share this approach but, with a clearer address to the book market, all three commentators focus on a comparison of the novels' values with those of contemporary readers. As for Bergsten's and Larsson's recent essays on *NA*, they are partly written with students in mind: students of a novel that by now is an established classic in Sweden. For this reason they regard a historical background and – in Larsson's case also a feminist one – as one of the main purposes of their respective texts, although they also offer closer readings of the novel.

University study

The study of literature at Swedish universities is divided into departments of literature (*litteraturvetenskap*: 'the science of literature') and departments of foreign languages. In all English departments, Austen is on the syllabus, and the textbooks used are often British or American. In the departments of literature, however, the object of study has historically been the Swedish and Western canons. In the last few decades, literature from other parts of the world has been added, but the Western (and Swedish) canon still forms the backbone of the syllabus. Interestingly, however, not all university textbooks and reference books for students include Austen as a canonical author.

Six main textbooks and reference books have been used during the last four decades: *Bonniers allmänna litteraturhistoria* (Bonnier's general history of literature, 1961), *Litteraturens världshistoria* (World literary history [revision of a Danish original], 1973), *Epoker och diktare: allmän och svensk litteraturhistoria* (Epochs and poets: general and Swedish literary history, 1977), *Allmän litteraturhistoria* (General history of literature, 1982), *Litteraturens historia* (History of literature [translated from Danish], 1987), *Litteraturens historia i världen* (The world history of literature, 1990). Two of the six, *Epoker och diktare* and *Allmän litteraturhistoria*, do not mention Austen at all, while the others include Austen in their definition of the Western canon. Significantly, they all take her gender into account to a greater extent than the nineteenth-century encyclopaedia entries, and it is quite possible to use their discussions of Austen as samples of the classic strategies of how to diminish and dismiss the value of women's writing.

Indeed, we even find blatant sexism in *Litteraturens världshistoria*, where the work becomes inseparable from the author and is stereotypically described in terms of feminine beauty. *PP* retains 'the girlish charm' ('flickaktiga charm') of youth (Krabbe 1973, 198). Anne Elliot is like 'the ripe and delicious fruit of late summer' ('en mogen och läcker sensommarfrukt'; 205). Elizabeth Bennet owes her allure to the fact that Jane Austen was chic and fond of dressing up for balls at the time she conceived the novel (202). Interestingly, this instance of sexism is found in the work that presents the most extensive and circumspect discussion of her writing. Henning Krabbe, the Danish author of the chapter, carefully discusses the merits of Austen's work from several angles: her meticulous composition (*PP* is discussed in detail), her juvenilia (to draw attention to her sense

of humour), the way dialogue establishes character, the careful depiction of human development (where Fanny Price is seen as one of Austen's triumphs). Thus, judicious criticism is coupled with sexism.

In recent years, the advent of both international and Swedish feminist criticism has prevented some open sexism, but as we shall see, it is possible to use feminist readings to belittle women writers. The latest of the textbooks, *Litteraturens historia i världen* (Algulin 1990, 332) tries to mainstream feminist theory in a context still suspicious of it and places Austen with other women writers, namely, the Brontës, Elizabeth Gaskell and George Eliot under the heading 'Female novelists depicting society' ('Kvinnliga samhällskildrare'). Thus, three different generations of writers are grouped together on grounds of their gender, and the discussion focuses on this, instead of – as is the case with male writers – their originality within the framework of their period. As in most of the other textbooks, Austen is characterized as a realist rather than as a romantic, although several deal with her works under the heading 'The Romantic Era'. However, it is not the character of her work that links her to the Brontës, but rather the fact that both were clergymen's daughters with limited experience of urban life. Thus, their own lives are used to explain why all their works deal with is the 'woman's psychological attempts to break out of the Victorian [*sic*] era's enclosed milieu'.¹³ Undoubtedly, this conclusion rests on feminist readings of these authors, but it is used to make their significance rather less than had they stated – as *Bonniers allmänna litteraturhistoria* does – that Austen depicts human folly in a way that makes her characters and her work timeless (Tigerstedt 1961, 58). But even this statement, aimed at establishing her as a classic, is the product of a description that focuses on her limitations: according to this account, no wars or political changes intrude into her world, and she chooses her subjects from the small circle of everyday family life: 'in this world Jane Austen moves freely and securely'.¹⁴ The treatment of Austen and the other women writers thus confirms the findings of Anna Williams in her work on how textbooks treat Swedish women writers: they categorize women as 'deviating' from the male norm and writing within a low-status genre, 'women's literature'. A woman's perspective is seen as 'limiting, and thus less interesting from a perspective that stresses quality'.¹⁵

All textbooks agree that Austen is atypical of her age, as she is a realist rather than a Romantic, and this too can be used as an excuse to devalue her work. *Litteraturens historia* (1987) claims that:

Novels such as Jane Austen's link eighteenth-century bourgeois emancipation to the Victorian bourgeois establishment, across and throughout the Romantic period. [...] Jane Austen represents one important movement in the art of writing in combination with its limitations, which means that it is not so much she as the more

¹³ 'kvinnans psykologiska utbrytningsförsök ur den viktorianskt inhägnade miljön' (Algulin 1990, 334).

¹⁴ 'inom denna värld rör sig Jane Austen fritt och säkert' (Tigerstedt 1961, 58).

¹⁵ 'begränsat och därmed kvalitetsmässigt mindre intressant' (Williams 1997, 185).

daring and problematic writers who have created the period's English literature of world class.¹⁶

To sum up, in textbooks Austen is presented as an atypical Romantic writer and is often diminished in classic chauvinist fashion. The only non-diminishing text by Henning Krabbe is blatantly sexist in its discussion of her work as the product of an alluring lady.

Press commentary, 1990–2003

The bulk of Swedish commentary on Jane Austen is from the last two decades, but it is not to be found in scholarly articles. Swedish researchers on English literature have traditionally published their work in English in international publications. The one exception, an English scholarly text on Austen published in Sweden, is Monica Lauritzen's *Jane Austen's 'Emma' on Television: A Study of a BBC Classic Serial* (1981). In the newspapers, however, more than one hundred reviews and articles were printed in this period. This is hardly surprising: with the exception of *NA*, all the films have been shown in Sweden, and all her novels published in Swedish during this period, including Anne Telscombe's version of *S*. Furthermore, a number of biographies of Jane Austen have been translated: Hughes-Hallett (1994), Myer (1997) and Shields (2002).

The main characteristics of the newspaper material are the ways the reviewers either embrace Austen fully (in which case they extol her use of irony as a critic of mores and values) or defend themselves against the possible accusation of liking romances, and – what's more – conservative ones. To demonstrate these two approaches we have chosen to discuss three typical articles. One of them was published in *Dagens nyheter* (The daily news), the leading Swedish daily, and one in the runner-up for this title, *Svenska dagbladet* (Swedish daily newspaper). Both newspapers are published in Stockholm but have a nationwide readership. The third was published in *Expressen* (The express), one of the leading tabloids. Two of the reviewers, Christine Sarrimo and Ulf Olsson, have doctorates in literature, while the third, Åsa Beckman, is one of the nation's leading critics of contemporary poetry. Thus, these reviews are not only representative of modern views on Austen, but they are also among those likely to have been most widely read.

Christine Sarrimo's account of Austen's works in her review of *S* in *Svenska dagbladet* (1997) is an example of the position that Austen's novels are conservative romances. Indeed, her opening sentence reads: 'Jane Austen is a

¹⁶ 'Romaner som Jane Austens knyter samman 1700-talets borgerliga emancipation med vitorianismens borgerliga etablering, tvärs över eller under romantiken [. . .] Jane Austen [representerar] i England ett slags huvudlinje i skrivandets konst och samtidigt den begränsning som gör att det inte är hon utan de mer vittsvävande och problematiska figurerna som skapar periodens engelska världslitteratur' (Heggelund and Öhrgaard 1987, 278–79).

high-culture writer of Harlequin romances.¹⁷ The article's main argument is that Austen never challenges gender structures in her works: this is indicated in the headline, 'Strict gender relations in Jane Austen's works'.¹⁸ Sarrimo praises Austen for the economy with which she tells her stories, but speculates that her recent popularity is due to the familiar plot of her stories and their happy, conservative endings.

Indeed, the Harlequin and romance associations of Austen's novels are so strong that even those who see Austen as a critic of society sometimes find it necessary to take their cue from this position. Thus, Ulf Olsson in the tabloid *Expressen* (1994) opens his discussion of *NA* by asking: 'Is it possible to gain anything from reading a novel where the heroine's greatest concern is what dress to wear?'¹⁹ Olsson does not make this question a cause for concern, however, as the headline announces that this is an article on the subversive features of Austen's novels: 'Concealed from the father's eyes: Ulf Olsson sees Jane Austen choose the path of disobedience.'²⁰ He goes on to argue that Austen's world, that of the English gentry, is the perfect setting for a novel on women and their society, in which patriarchal structures can be challenged:

In Austen's world the father [. . .], remarkably often portrayed as extraordinarily stupid and blinded by social prejudice, is deprived of his empty and pompous power. At the same time Austen recognizes how patriarchy is developed in a fine web of social and familial structures that cannot be reduced to the simple exercise of male power.²¹

Olsson's argument not only focuses on *NA*, but also takes on modern-day pomposity. Thus, he attacks the editor of the series in which the novel is published, Staffan Bergsten, who appoints Austen the mother of the English women's novel, a position Bergsten claims she can only hold because she did not achieve 'full erotic love'. Olsson does not agree: 'If that is the case, the conclusion must be that her novels are the result of virgin birth. That, among other things, is the kind of patriarchal arrogance that Austen effectively punctures in her novels.'²²

¹⁷ 'Jane Austen är en finlitterär Harlekinförfattare' (Sarrimo 1997).

¹⁸ 'Ordning och reda mellan könen hos Jane Austen' (Sarrimo 1997).

¹⁹ 'Kan man med någon behållning läsa en roman där hjältinnans huvudsakliga bekymmer är vilken klänning hon skall bära?' (Olsson 1994).

²⁰ 'Dolt för faderns blick: Ulf Olsson ser Jane Austen välja olydnadens väg' (Olsson 1994).

²¹ 'I Austens värld berövas [. . .] fadern, påfallande ofta framställd som utomordentligt korkad och förblindad av bördsfördomar – sin tomt pompösa auktoritet. Samtidigt ser Austen hur patriarkatet utvecklas i en finförgrenad familje – och samhällsstruktur som inte låter sig reduceras till enbart enkel manlig maktutövning' (Olsson 1994).

²² 'Alltså får man förstå hennes romaner som resultatet av en jungfrufödsel. Det är bland annat den typen av faderlig uppblåsthet som Austen så effektivt punkterar i sina romaner' (Olsson 1994).

Åsa Beckman is a reviewer in the leading Swedish daily, *Dagens nyheter*, and takes on Edward Said in her discussion (1997) of the role of irony in *MP*. Beckman agrees with Said that the novel makes the West Indian colony a nameless place beyond the workings of orderly society. But that is as it should be: *MP* is 'a novel on how a culture is created and maintained and how it protects people inside the culture. This function includes uneasiness about what is outside.'²³ Beckman contends that through her irony Austen positions herself outside the structures she depicts, thus undermining them. Hence, she finds Austen ambivalent, but her heroine steadfast:

So Jane Austen the writer is ambivalent. But Fanny Price, on the other hand, remains loyal. When the family's continued existence is threatened by lovesick daughters on the run she resolutely marries Edmund and re-establishes order at Mansfield Park. Under her protection England to this day would not have let even the tiniest colony go.²⁴

Beckman thus uses Austen's irony to interpret her seemingly apolitical novel as an illustration of Britain's relation to its colonies.

To conclude, twentieth-century Swedish reviewers all consider Austen a classic; however, there is a difference between two main approaches: the first finds her conservative and never discusses her irony, while the second reads her as ironic, as constructing stories where the discrepancies lead to radical interpretations.

Epilogue

In my work on the Swedish reception of George Eliot (Claesson Pipping 1993), one of my most significant findings was that Swedish readers interpreted Eliot differently, depending on their conception of what an English lady novelist normally was. Those who expected God-fearing religion found it, while those who expected radical philosophy found that as well.

Interestingly, the same structures seem to permeate present-day Swedish readings of Austen: those who think radical social criticism can be formulated even in novels which on one level conform to conservative values will find criticism in Austen's work, but those who think plots like hers are innately conservative will find them to be so. Amusingly, there is one review in my material that illustrates this latter point. In the Nonconformist conservative daily, *Nya dagen*, Gudrun Brunegård (1996) argues that today's interest in

²³ 'en bok om hur kultur skapas, upprätthålls och skyddas den som befinner sig i den. I det ingår obehag för det som väntar utanför' (Beckman 1997).

²⁴ 'Så författaren Jane Austen är ambivalent. Fanny Price däremot förblir lojal. När familjens fortbestånd hotas av kärlekskranka döttrar på rymmen gifter hon sig rådigt med Edmund och återställer ordningen på Mansfield Park. Under hennes beskydd skulle England än i dag inte ha släppt ifrån sig en endaste liten koloni' (Beckman 1997).

Austen is occasioned by the fact that young people today long for the structure of true values, values that the Nonconformist church upholds. Hence, Brunegård claims that the interest in Austen shows how the Nonconformist churches are the bearers of worthy traditional values – the same values which, according to Brunegård's reading, Austen promotes.

9 The Reception of Jane Austen in Finland

Ellen Valle¹

While all of Austen's novels have been published in Finland, her work is not widely familiar to Finnish readers, nor, generally speaking, has it been viewed as of particular literary interest. Three of the works (*PP*, *SS* and *E*) are known from recent television and film adaptations, but the novels themselves are not necessarily read and tend to be seen as romantic love stories. As of summer 2003, none of Austen's novels is in print or available in bookshops. In this chapter, I wish to examine the reception of Austen's work in the context of Finnish literature and culture, in order to account for this relatively 'cool' response. There seem to be two main reasons: the general Finnish cultural context and the translations of Austen's novels into Finnish.

Finland is a bilingual country, with Finnish and Swedish as official languages; Swedish is currently spoken by approximately 5 per cent of the population, but has historically been culturally dominant. Swedish-language literature in Finland has enjoyed a controversial status, at times excluded from the body of 'Finnish' literature, at other times seen as an integral element. It is therefore important to note that I shall be dealing in this chapter with the reception of Austen in *Finnish* alone. In a historical context, however, some aspects of Swedish literature in Finland need to be accounted for. For instance, the interest in the novel, and in reading for pleasure and entertainment rather than for edification or religious purposes, which arose in Finland at the turn of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (Varpio 2002, 391–92), meant

¹ I wish to thank the many people who have helped me in writing this essay, in particular Professor Päivi Lappalainen of the University of Turku and Professor Hannu K. Riikonen of the University of Helsinki. I am also grateful to Dr Richard Goymer of the University of Oulu, for his insightful comments on Finnish readings of Austen and to Professor Tuomas Huomo of the University of Turku for information on linguistic questions. I am grateful to the Cultural Section at *Helsingin sanomat*, who were kind enough to send me photocopies of all the material they had on Austen dating back to 1950. My students helped me by answering my questions on their reading of Austen. Finally, Mrs Marja-Liisa Potinkara served as a Finnish 'common reader' of Austen.

reading in Swedish, not Finnish: this influenced subsequent developments in Finnish-language writing and translation, if only indirectly.

It should also be noted that, until the 1950s, the English language and anglo-phone culture were less familiar to Finns than other European languages. Finland has historically had closer cultural ties to Sweden and to German-speaking Central Europe. Finnish artists and writers close to the Modernist movement in the first half of the twentieth century, on the other hand, tended to look chiefly to France.

The historical context

The context in which Austen has (or has not) been read in Finland can be divided into three periods. The first, during which a mature Finnish literature in the vernacular began to take shape, lasted approximately from the mid nineteenth century to World War I; the second took place during the interwar years; and the third from 1945 to the present. Each of these periods is characterized by specific cultural features, but none of them has been particularly receptive to a writer like Austen.

The emergence of Finnish literature during the nineteenth century was strongly linked with the creation of a national identity which would be uniquely 'Finnish'. At first, this literature was primarily in Swedish rather than Finnish. It was only in the 1860s and early 1870s that Aleksis Kivi (1834–72) – above all, in his novel *Seitsemän veljestä* (Seven brothers, 1870) – created the first 'mature' literature in Finnish. Kivi's work, however, is in many ways more closely linked with literature of the Renaissance than with contemporary European literature (Lyytikäinen 2003, 295).

What, then, was the specifically Finnish national character described by these writers? For some, it was the Finnish-speaking independent peasant: hardy, hard-working, pious, honest, and above all patriotic and loyal – a concept which has no exact equivalent in English (the other estates were the aristocracy, the bourgeoisie and the clergy, which were almost entirely Swedish-speaking). In Kivi, we find a very different national character, rejected at the time by the literary establishment as insufficiently 'noble'. In *Seitsemän veljestä*, the brothers are physically strong, pugnacious and headstrong, but are unwilling to accept the constraints of village life. They exile themselves to the wilderness for many years, surviving at first on their skills as hunters, gradually learning to cultivate the land. Ultimately, they return to the village and accept its norms (including that of literacy), some of them even prospering and becoming important local figures.

The female characters in these works are far fewer and less carefully developed, but share many of the same characteristics. What is important for understanding the Finnish reception of Austen is that in none of these canonical works is romantic love a significant theme. A peasant woman needs to be strong and hardworking, a good child-bearer, usually pious as well. The intricacies and difficulties of romantic courtship among the leisured classes are irrelevant to the lives of Kivi's protagonists. There was also a strong feminine voice in fiction, above all in the work of Minna Canth (1844–97), who was influenced by

Ibsen: women are seen as strong, but as victims of their circumstances and of the constraints imposed by a male-dominated society. After World War I, Modernism began to gain ground, but did not become a dominant voice. The literary trend of the period favoured the strong woman, the hardworking maternal figure, who ensured the safety and security of the fallible male: 'Such a woman is the object of his longing and the goal of his journey.'²

Following World War II, the dominant cultural ethos has favoured egalitarian social democracy and the avoidance of 'elitism'. The most influential literary works of the post-war period have been the novels by Väinö Linna: *Tuntematon sotilas* (The unknown soldier) and the trilogy *Täällä Pohjantähden alla* (Here under the Northern Star). These works are considered to offer an accurate and realistic picture of the Finnish character: yet again, the stubborn, determined, hardworking 'man of the people' and his equally strong, hardworking and loyal wife. While some of the characters use irony as a skilful tool, intellectual values, cleverness and wit are nevertheless secondary. Upper-class characters are automatically suspect. Once again, the values implicit and explicit in Austen's work do not find fertile ground.

This brief historical survey helps to contextualize the generally unenthusiastic reception of Austen in Finland. Another perspective is suggested by Richard Goymer, who also sees historical factors underlying Austen's lack of resonance among Finnish readers: an original strong sense of Protestant pietism, focused on sin and redemption, which in a modern context has been replaced by a secular code of national egalitarianism. 'The Finnish doctrine of egalitarianism entails a principle of social meliorism, in which everyone is potentially educable, all can achieve the same level; Jane Austen says no' (Goymer, personal communication).

Finnish literary translation practices

Until the first decades of the nineteenth century, translations into Finnish consisted almost entirely of religious and didactic texts, and legal and official documents: the chief function of publications in the vernacular was one of instruction and edification for the common people. A similar function was served by the earliest literary translations. In 1834, the Society for Finnish Literature (founded in 1831) initiated a programme of translation, aimed at arousing an interest in reading among the common people and 'preventing idleness and drunkenness' (Hellemann 1970, 418). Another motive for literary translation was to assist the development of a 'native' literature and literary language. The development of a standard literary language, however, took place relatively slowly. At mid-century, attempts were made to increase literary translation, but for various reasons these came to nothing. Another attempt to introduce world literature to Finnish readers took place in 1871: the list of

² 'tällainen nainen on miehen kaipuun kohde ja miehen tien päämaali' (Lyytikäinen 2003, 301–02).

works included Homer, Shakespeare, Dickens, Tolstoy and Dostoevsky. None of these proposals include Austen. In any case, few of these translations were actually undertaken.

Toward the end of the century, the publication of Finnish translations of foreign novels became more widespread; one purpose was to attract upper-class Finnish women to read literature in Finnish (Mäkinen 2003, 310). Finnish nationalists continued to see one of their chief goals as the creation of an original national literature; as one means towards this end, it was important to make the best works of world literature available in Finnish. At the same time, they were concerned that Finnish readers were being exposed to literary 'trash', in particular escapist romantic fiction. What was translated and published, and how it was presented to Finnish readers, was to a considerable extent influenced by this national project.

At the turn of the century, translation into Finnish expanded greatly. Nevertheless, important works were often not translated because the market was simply too small to make such publications profitable. For this reason, a fund was established to support literary translations seen as culturally important. Around this time, three leading Finnish publishers (Werner Söderström, Otava and Karisto) established series that disseminated 'great novels' in translation: all the Finnish translations of Austen have been published in these series, by WSOY and Karisto.

Finnish translations of Austen

During the first century after her death, Austen's works were more or less unknown to ordinary Finnish-speaking readers in Finland. There were two nineteenth-century translations of Austen into Swedish published in Sweden: *P*, as *Familjen Elliot: skildringar af engelska karakterer* (The Elliot family: descriptions of English characters, 1836) and *E* as *Emma, eller talangen att uppgöra partier för sina vänner* (Emma, or the talent to arrange marriages for one's friends, 1857). Thus, there may have been some Finnish readers familiar with Austen in another language, but they do not fall within the purview of this chapter.

The first Finnish translation, *Ylpeys ja ennakkoluulo* (*PP*), was published in 1922. Another edition of the same novel was published in 1947, followed in fairly rapid succession by the other works: *E* (1950), *P* (1951), *SS* (1952), *NA* (1953) and *MP* (1954), translated respectively as *Emma*, *Viisasteleva sydän* (The capricious heart), *Järki ja tunteet* (Sense and sensibility), *Neito vanhassa linnassa* (The maiden in the old castle) and *Kasvattitytön tarina* (The fostergirl's story). Other than *MP*, all the novels were published by WSOY, one of the two major Finnish publishers and the chief publisher of translated fiction: *MP* was published by Karisto, a smaller and more 'provincial' publisher, specializing at that time in translations of lesser-known European fiction. Karisto also published translations of the unfinished works, *S* (Helanen-Ahtola 1977) and *W* (Mäkelä 1978), but to my knowledge, the juvenilia, *LS* and the letters remain unpublished.

All of the translations are the work of professional translators, some of them with a professional background as publisher's editors or English teachers.

Special mention should be made of the translator of *NA*, Eila Pennanen (1916–94), who was also the author of a number of novels in the realist mode, which were relatively successful with both the critics and the public. Pennanen was also one of the most active Finnish ‘defenders’ of Austen.

The translations of Austen’s novels follow the translating norms for ‘serious’ fiction prevailing in Finland at the time. None of the translations practise the extreme domesticating strategies characteristic of the nineteenth century, where ‘translation’ frequently meant ‘adaptation’ to a varying degree (Paloposki 1999). A ‘domesticating’ or ‘familiarizing’ strategy in translation involves the assimilation of the text to the target language and culture, removing traces of foreignness or strangeness. At its most extreme, this would involve for instance inventing Finnish names for the characters, changing English place names to Finnish ones, etc. (see Bassnett 1991; Hermans 1985). The Austen translations do, however, domesticate the text, in that many central terms are translated by their nearest Finnish equivalent: the result is to shift the social setting of the narrative from the landed gentry, however impoverished or displaced, to the lower rural ranks or to the middle classes. In *SS*, for instance, ‘estate’ is translated as ‘farm’ (*maatila*); in *E*, ‘farmer’ becomes ‘peasant’ (*talonpoika*). This may explain why, as we shall see, so many critics (as well as publishers) have situated the novels among the (petty) bourgeoisie.

The language of the translations is the relatively formal style typical of contemporary mainstream Finnish fiction. The translations adhere fairly closely to the original text; little if anything is added or omitted, for instance on ideological grounds or for reasons of unacceptability in the target culture. Thus, they are relatively accurate as far as content is concerned (apart from the 1922 *PP*, which contains numerous mistranslations owing to a misunderstanding of the source text). Nonetheless, they often fail to convey the precise shade of authorial stance, in particular irony. This may be one reason why Finnish readers tend to read the novels primarily as romantic courtship narratives. An example is the translation of John Dashwood’s famous interior monologue at the beginning of *SS*:

‘Yes, he would give them three thousand pounds: it would be liberal and handsome! It would be enough to make them completely easy. Three thousand pounds! he could spare so considerable a sum with little inconvenience.’ (*SS*, 1.1: 5)

The narratorial irony of this is lost by the mistranslation of ‘spare’ as ‘save’ (*säästää*), probably under the influence of Swedish *spara*, ‘to save’. The suggestion that John Dashwood will have to save the money in order to give it to his sisters makes his offer seem more generous than in fact it is.

Key Austenian concepts: semiotic transfer in translation

One way of evaluating the ‘equivalence’ of a literary translation is in terms of the key concepts of the work: those which contribute to and construct its semiotic structure. In Austen’s fiction, there are several such load-bearing semiotic pillars, the translation of which is particularly important: if, for

instance, one such word or phrase is translated by a variety of target-language expressions, governed by context, the structure of the novel may be obscured to the reader.

The most frequently occurring words in Austen's novels, in decreasing order, are *happy* and its derivatives, *proper/propriety*, *handsome*, *character*, *pleasant*, *fortune* and *amiable*: the words 'un/happy', 'un/happiness' and 'felicity' occur a total of 1,038 times, compared to 388 instances of the next term, 'im/proper' or 'im/propriety'. The appropriate achievement of happiness is of course the objective of the narrative. Otherwise, most of the highest-ranking items have to do with personal characteristics: moral competence (*character*) and the propriety or otherwise of one's behaviour. Words referring to social position and money, often regarded as central to Austen (*fortune*, *gentleman/like*, *respectable*) actually occur far less often. Of the seven terms, ones which suffer particularly in Finnish translation are *amiable* and *proper*: each may be translated by any one of a dozen equivalents, thus losing their thematic power. (Of course, these words, like many others in Austen, no longer carry their original force for many present-day anglophone readers as well.)

In the following analysis, I wish to show some of the translations of *proper* and *propriety* in *E*. The actual force of the word in the original context, of course, depends on the speaking voice: for instance, Mr Knightley uses it in a very different sense from Mrs Elton. For the reliable speakers (mainly Mr Knightley, Mrs Weston and, towards the end of the novel, Emma), the word is linked with character; for the unreliable ones (above all Mrs Elton), it is linked with situation. It might almost be claimed that the changing use of the word by Emma herself helps the reader to recognize her moral growth as a character. The Finnish translations tend to be more often situation-bound, thus losing a great deal of the original force. The most common translation is *sopiva* ('suitable', 'appropriate': chiefly situational); others are *sovelias* ('appropriate'), *luonnollinen* ('natural'), *asiaankuuluva* ('appropriate' chiefly situational), *asian vaatima* ('demanded by the situation'), *hyvä* ('good'), *oikea* ('correct', 'right'), *haluttu* ('desired'), *aito* ('genuine'), *vilpitön* ('sincere') and *paikallaan* ('appropriate for the situation'). Sometimes the word is not translated at all. A few examples:

English: "“Oh, no, no! the letter had much better be all your own. You will express yourself very *properly*, I am sure. [. . .] such expressions of gratitude and concern for the pain you are inflicting as propriety requires, will present themselves unbidden to your mind, I am persuaded.”" (*E*, 1.7: 51–52; my emphasis)

Finnish: "“Olen varma siitä, että tulette sanomaan sanottavanne aivan *oikein*. [. . .] Olen vakuuttunut siitä, että *asian vaatimat* kiitollisuuden ilmaukset ja valittelut tuskan johdosta, jonka tuotate, itsestään tulevat mieleenne.”" [correct, appropriate; demanded by the situation] (Brotherus 1950, 50–51)

English: 'Emma could not forgive her; – but as neither provocation nor resentment were discerned by Mr Knightley, who had been of the party, and had seen only *proper* attention and pleasing behaviour on each side, he was expressing the next morning [. . .] his approbation of the whole.' (*E*, 2.3: 170)

Finnish: 'Oli havainnut vain *asiaankuuluvaa* huomaavaisuutta.' [appropriate to the situation] (Brotherus 1950, 161)

English: 'Her heart was grieved for a state which seemed but the more pitiable from

this sort of irritation of spirits [. . .] and it mortified her that she was given so little credit for *proper* feeling, or esteemed so little worthy as a friend [. . .]' (E, 3.9: 391)

Finnish: 'Häntä loukkasi niin ikään se, ettei hänen *vilpittömille* tunteilleen annettu sen suurempaa arvoa [. . .]' [innocent, sincere] (Brotherus 1950, 373)

English: 'Her own conduct, as well as her own heart, was before her in the same few minutes. [. . .] How *improperly* had she been acting by Harriet! How inconsiderate, how indelicate, how irrational, how unfeeling had been her conduct!' (E, 3.11: 408)

Finnish: 'Miten *väärin* hän oli käyttäytynyt Harrietia kohtaan!' [wrongly] (Brotherus 1950, 388)

As a result of such misapplications, many distinctions in narratorial attitude and distance from the characters are consequently lost. This translational loss probably contributes to the relatively cool Finnish reception of the novels primarily as love stories.

Explanatory paratexts: footnotes and introductions

Explanatory and background information is offered to the reader in the form of footnotes and introductions in both translations of *PP* (1922, 1947) and in the revised edition of *MP* (1977). Other translations do not contain any such explanatory material. Both translations of *PP* contain footnotes by the translator, explaining cultural concepts which are assumed to be unfamiliar to the reader. The first translation contains numerous footnotes, most of which explain points relating to English culture. The second translation has fewer footnotes on similar points, which are generally more concise. The explanations draw on associations with other classic English writers, such as Scott and Dickens; this is perhaps a way of making Austen more 'important' as a writer.

Both translations of *PP* also include an introduction by the translator. O. A. Joutsen, the first translator of Austen into Finnish, introduces her as an entirely new and unfamiliar 'authoress' for Finns. In his brief account of a 'simple and uneventful life', Joutsen foregrounds Austen's respectably gender-appropriate behaviour, including some surprising claims: 'she by no means neglected her feminine domestic tasks', managing the household, taking care of her mother and sisters in their frequent illnesses, knitting and weaving – 'the cloth woven by her was greatly admired'.³ At this time, the weaving of cloth was a skill commonly practised by Finnish women in the home and good weavers were admired; weaving was also perhaps perceived as a specifically Finnish cultural practice, and therefore relevant to the national identity. The 'authoress' is being domesticated, in every sense of the word, and presented as a suitably feminine writer for Finnish readers.

The actual discussion of the novel as such is shorter. There is a brief comment on Elizabeth's 'girlish charm' combined with the appeal of intelligence, good humour, wit and her admirable self-restraint. Joutsen concludes: 'We hope that Finnish readers will take pleasure from an acquaintance with this wise, modest

³ 'Hänen kutomiaan kankaita suuresti ihailtiin' (Joutsen 1922, 6).

and amiable authoress, who in her life was no coldly rational “bluestocking”, but a true woman to her ladylike fingertips.’⁴

The revised edition of *MP* (1977) contains an introduction by Kari Jalonen, including a brief account of Austen’s life and works. Jalonen’s biographical account predictably emphasizes the uneventfulness and placidity of Austen’s life. At the same time, he comments on her physical weakness and ‘neurotic’ nature: she was sensitive and cautious, but at the same time irritable and impulsive. She did not need to take part in taking care of the household, since her sister Cassandra did the necessary work: a picture more or less the opposite of Joutsen’s account in the 1922 translation of *PP*.

According to Jalonen, Austen’s works ignore contemporary political and social developments. In their themes, the novels resemble the mechanical products of the modern entertainment industry. What, then, makes Austen so popular even today, particularly in anglophone countries? Jalonen points to Austen’s exceptional ability to enhance the narrative with well-considered details and to her skill at dialogue. Her plots appeal to the reader’s sense of security and satisfy the requirements of a ‘good read’. Generally speaking, this assessment seems to prevail in the Finnish reception of Austen as a writer who provides entertainment and escape but not necessarily intellectual stimulation, and whose triviality of plot is only partly redeemed by her skilful handling of the narrative.

Framing Austen’s work: publishers’ covers and book jackets

When a translation is published of a work by a foreign writer who is relatively unknown in the target culture, how the work will be perceived by readers is often affected to a considerable extent by the information provided by book covers and/or dustjackets. The covers of early Finnish editions of Austen’s novels carry a great deal of information. The novels were mostly published in two forms: an expensive hardcover with a dustjacket and a cheaper soft-cover (cartonnage) edition of the same size, with front and back flaps. Both editions were published simultaneously and contain the same information, the only difference being one of price. The information offered, along with the cover illustrations, presents the author as a charming, feminine, modest and domestic young woman, and her novels as romantic love stories.

The cover of the 1922 translation of *PP*, for instance, is dominated by a generic romantic illustration, evidently depicting Darcy proposing to Elizabeth. The young woman is wearing a vaguely Empire-style dress, but sleeveless and with a deep décolleté: closer to the 1920s style of feminine evening dress than to Austen’s own time. Elizabeth is standing with her back to the gentleman, who is kneeling in a generalized formal dress not belonging to any particular period.

⁴ ‘Toivomme, että meikäläinenkin yleisö mielellään tutustuu tähän viisaaseen, vaatimattomaan ja herttaiseen kirjailijattareen, joka eläessään ei ollut mikään kylmästi järkeilevä “sinisukka”, vaan todellinen nainen hienoja sormenpäitä myöten’ (Joutsen 1922, 8).

The author's name is printed in small type near the upper edge of the cover, and is in fact relatively unnoticeable. We can infer that in the publisher's opinion Austen's name carried no recognition-value for Finnish readers at this time. The title is somewhat more prominent, placed below the centre of the cover. The text beneath the title begins by describing the work as a love story; it goes on to call it 'one of the great recent discoveries in older English literature – at one time so admired that for instance the great statesman Disraeli read it seventeen times'.⁵ The comment about Disraeli's admiration for Austen is repeated in almost every Finnish advertisement for her novels, as well as on the covers of most of the novels. The publishers evidently assumed that Disraeli would be more familiar to Finnish readers, or carry greater weight, than Austen herself.

The novels published by WSOY after World War II include *PP* (1947), *E* (1950), *P* (1951), *SS* (1952), *NA* (1953) and *MP* (1954). Of these, *E*, *SS* and *NA* were included in the 'Maaailman suurromaaneja' (Great novels of the world) series. Again, all of them carry a cover illustration identifying the work as a romantic love story: a depiction of a man and a woman in vaguely historical attire, often indicating conflict and misunderstanding. The front flap offers biographical information, once again emphasizing Austen's charm, femininity and domesticity, along with her intelligence and wit. The picture is that of a modest young woman who did not seek artistic fame – in other words, an appropriately feminine one. At the same time, we are presented with the romantic stereotype of the artist who dies young and unrecognized, but achieves posthumous fame.

The back flap presents information about other novels in the series. Two particularly interesting aspects of these texts are the frequent repetition of the middle-class, even petty-bourgeois, setting of Austen's work and the emphasis on her femininity and delicacy, along with her playfulness and cheerful spirit. Typical in both respects is the back cover of *SS*:

Sense and Sensibility describes the intertwined love story of two sisters, the sensible Ellinor [*sic*] and the sentimental Marianne, against a background of the self-important petty-bourgeois social circle of the good old days. The novel is full of colourful events [. . .] like a cunningly knotted silken web, which in the authoress's little white hands are gently and tactfully disentangled. This novel [. . .] has charmed generations of readers into smiling with pleasure.⁶

The petty-bourgeois milieu within which the novels are thus situated may come as a surprise to anglophone readers of Austen: it is as though Austen's protagonist families were not the Bennets or the Woodhouses, but the Gardiners or the

⁵ 'Tämä rakkausromaani on viime aikojen suuria löytöjä Englannin vanhemmasta kirjallisuudesta, – aikanaan niin ihailtu, että esim. suuri valtiomies Disraeli luki sen seitsemäntoista kertaa' (Joutsen 1922).

⁶ "‘Järki ja tunteet’ on kahden sisaruksen, järkevän Ellinorin ja tunteellisen Marianen toisiinsa kietoutuvien rakkaustarinoiden kuvaus – taustana vanhan hyvän ajan tärkeilevä pikkuporvarisseurapiiri. Romaani on täynnä värikkäitä tapahtumia ja ristiriitoja, “kuin viekkasti punottuja silkkisolmuja, jota kirjallijattaren pienissä, valkoisissa käsissä avautuvat vaivattomasti ja tahdikkaasti”. Tämä romaani [. . .] on saanut lukijapolven toisensa jälkeen hymyilemään mielihyvystä' (Brotherus 1952).

Coles. The concept of the gentry, or of the social, cultural and economic tension between the gentry and the urban middle classes, is omitted. This should probably be seen as part of the attempt to familiarize and domesticate Austen for Finnish readers, in terms of both the socioeconomic and the national contexts: the 'gentry' – and in general the upper classes – in Finland were Swedish-speaking, and in the creation of a national identity these groups were to some extent the enemy, the 'Other'.

Austen in Finnish periodicals

Attention to Austen in the periodical press has consisted chiefly of reviews of new translations in the literature columns of the daily papers and of articles in more specialized literary journals (in particular *Parnasso*). There have also been some articles on Austen in women's magazines. Until the 1990s, interest in Austen was relatively slight; during the mid 1990s, there was an upsurge of media attention with the film and television adaptations of the novels, all of which have been released or shown in Finland, but since then interest has again faded. In general, it can be said that during the 1950s, when most of the translations were published, views of Austen were fairly conventional, emphasizing on the one hand her skill at constructing a plot (her novels offer an old-fashioned 'good read'), on the other her lightness of touch: there was little suggestion that Austen is an 'important' novelist. Her 'snobbish' attitudes toward social class are also sometimes referred to, either to disqualify her from serious consideration or to be dismissed by those who admire her. In general, what went counter to the prevailing Finnish culture during this time was probably Austen's attention to distinctions of quality, in every sense: the idea that some are foolish and some dull, and that not everyone is capable of improvement. In addition, the concerns of the leading characters and their way of life are seen as trivial and irrelevant. (Quite recently there have been signs of a shift in this social and cultural climate, and it is possible that attitudes towards Austen will change accordingly.) Writers who do take pleasure in her novels tend to see them as representing a nostalgically recollected past, now irretrievably lost under the pressures of modern life.

The leading Finnish dailies during the period when the translations were being published were *Uusi suomi* (New Finland) and *Helsingin sanomat* (Helsinki news/messages). Finland had gained independence in 1917, and the national project of the interwar years mandated a focus on Finnish writers and artists. There was relatively little reference to foreign literature, except for a few writers and works considered important classics, none of which included Austen. This situation changed only gradually during the post-war period, and from the 1950s onward all the translations of Austen's novels were reviewed at least in *Helsingin sanomat*. Two critics in particular wrote extensively on Austen: Toini Havu, a cultural journalist, and Eila Pennanen, herself a novelist and literary translator, who published several articles on Austen.

Havu reviewed all five of the translations from the early 1950s (i.e. all of the novels apart from *PP*) in *Helsingin sanomat*. Havu was active and influential as a literary critic, and her reviews of the Austen translations would certainly have

influenced the Finnish reception and understanding of Austen. Havu presents a fairly conventional picture of Austen's novels as lively, satirical depictions of the manners and customs of her time: the novelist shows 'intelligent and cheerful common sense' and has a sharp sense of humour. Havu also refers several times (especially in connection with *P* and *MP*) to the novelist's attention to propriety (*säädyllisyys*). This term is quite important for understanding the Finnish reception of Austen. Its transparent etymology links it with *sääty*, '(social) estate' – rank or status, in particular a higher rank; thus the form *säätyläis-* denotes the respectable middle and upper classes. Consequently, Austen's 'propriety' becomes overtly linked with behaviour specifically appropriate to a higher social position, making Austen's works seem irrelevant to Finnish culture at a time when the dominant ideology was one of egalitarian democracy.

In her reviews, Havu tends to adopt *PP* as the touchstone against which the other novels are to be compared. This may be because *PP* was the first of the novels to be translated, and was thus likely to be familiar to Finnish readers, but it is probably also the work most popular among readers generally. Havu, like many other Finnish writers, locates Austen socially within petty-bourgeois circles. *P*, according to Havu (1952a), is more 'fresh' (*raikas*) than *E*, but like *E* it is somewhat dimmed by an over-acquiescence to social conventions. Later that same year, Havu (1952b) described *SS* as the most mature and artistically controlled of Austen's works translated so far.

Finally, Havu reviewed the translation of *MP*, under the title 'The respectable/proper Jane Austen' (1954b). The heading and the entire article again play on the multiple meanings of the term *säädyllinen*, referring simultaneously to the attributes of propriety and respectability and to the social system of *säädtyt* (estates), in terms of rank. Havu stresses Austen's total adherence to the social and moral values of her time: social rank and appropriate conduct are sacred in Austen's eyes, although she distinguishes carefully between foolish pride of rank and an almost democratically open-minded laxity. Under careful authorial guidance, the reader is almost as touched and grateful as its object in each of the novels.

In 1966, an essay by Kersti Bergroth appeared in *Helsingin sanomat*, in a column entitled 'Old books'. The article describes the writer's personal pleasure in reading Austen, specifically *PP*. Like Havu, Bergroth, reads Austen against the grain of modern culture: Elizabeth is without the morbid vagaries and inhibitions that make the characters of much modern fiction so boring and irritating. She may be a bit superficial, but at least she is not in the throes of some Faustian struggle. Hers is a time and society in which inherited morality still keeps human hideousness under control; the idyll is flawed by only a few indications of weakness and falsehood. Austen's charm is irresistible.

In 1978, Paavo Lehtonen reviewed the completion of *S* by 'Another Lady' (Anne Telscombe). In addition to his comments on the work, he discusses more general aspects of Austen as a writer. What, asks Lehtonen, makes Austen a good writer? Our attention is first drawn to the freshness, crispness and clarity of her language. Her characterization is economical and restrained, and her portrayal of complex relationships is acute. While *S* can be read as a novel of manners depicting the early nineteenth century, it has a psychological timelessness. Austen was an anachronism – to her credit. Living at a time of supreme

Romanticism, sensibility and even sentimentality, she stubbornly continued to write in the spirit of the Enlightenment: rationally, analytically, sometimes with a rococo lightness. Compared to Austen, many of her contemporaries (and successors) today seem airless and covered in dust.

Another site of media discussion is the literary journal *Parnasso*. In 1953, Eila Pennanen (herself the translator of *NA*) reviewed the translation of *SS*, which, she says, is evidently the earliest work exemplifying Austen's full maturity as an artist. The harshest satire is directed at John Dashwood, his callous and greedy wife, and their unpleasant relatives. They are condemned by their own words and the narrator's ironic comments give the final blow. The rift between reason and feeling seems great in Austen, but is nevertheless less crucial than that between selflessness and selfishness.

Pennanen returned to Austen over a decade later, in an article on *MP* (1964), focusing on parental and family relationships in the novel. Fanny hates her 'mothers': her real mother, who doesn't care about her; her neurotically passive foster-mother; and her selfish and unpleasant aunt. She loves her 'father' Edmund and succeeds in marrying him, after killing off all the mothers: she mentally renounces her real mother, makes her foster-mother dependent on her and gets her aunt expelled from the family circle. This reduplication of characters, according to Pennanen, enriches the novel greatly, while also pointing to an implicit authorial irony.

An interesting discussion of Austen (Toivanen 1987) was published in a conservative women's magazine, *Kotiliesi* (Home hearth). Its editorial quality is high and it has a wide circulation: hence, Toivanen's article would have reached a large audience of potential or actual readers of Austen. While there is nothing surprising in Toivanen's views for the anglophone reader, some of his comments were unusual in Finland at the time, certainly in a women's magazine. He begins with the conventional picture of the pretty and vivacious rector's daughter, who spent a placid and uneventful life in the idyllic surroundings of southern England. Austen, Toivanen says, continues to occupy literary scholars, who have created an entire industry to analyse and explain her work. Austen differs from other important women writers in that she did not rebel, accepting the world and the society she was born into. And there was certainly nothing to complain about: the gently rolling landscape, with fields, orchards, picturesque villages, grey stone churches and modest but comfortable vicarages lent force to the sense of community of the people living here and the continuity of this society. Such conservative values would have been particularly appropriate to *Kotiliesi's* editorial policy. Austen was related by birth to the minor gentry, the educated classes, which also provided officers for the British army and navy. (Toivanen recognizes this class, rather than the bourgeoisie, as central to Austen's life and work.)

In spirit, Austen belonged to the eighteenth-century Enlightenment, a spirit which (according to Toivanen) survived untouched in English rural villages well into the nineteenth century. The ideals of the time included rationalism and a faith in common sense, moderation, a restrained taste and quiet good manners. Out of solid English self-confidence grew a sense of humour: pomposity and fanaticism were seen as amusing weaknesses, deserving of benevolent laughter. Religion too was both practical and moral, as far from the self-centred

evangelicalism of the nineteenth century as from the destructive fanaticism of the seventeenth. These were the values adopted by Austen as self-evident. Her works reflect this, in their refreshing common sense, their pleasant manners, their enlightened intelligence, their restrained sense of religion and their sparkling good humour. It is thus not surprising that they appeal to readers of our own time. Austen dissects her characters' inner life strand by strand, making them visible to the reader: for this reason, she is justifiably considered a masterful pioneer of the psychological novel.

Academic discussion of Austen

There has been relatively little academic discussion of Austen in Finland. There are two potential venues for such discussion: departments of English and of comparative literature. Scholars belonging to English departments publish in English, and primarily in journals published in anglophone countries; hence, they are outside the scope of this chapter. There have been some articles on Austen, focusing on either literary or linguistic aspects of the texts (Curry 1992; Skinner 2001). The Finnish Literary Research Society publishes an intermittent index to research (Haltsonen 1954, 1959, 1963; Korhonen 1971; Tiitinen 1975; Karttunen and Koskela 1984, 1986; Koskela 1997). This index records no entries for Austen except for 1987 (Toivanen's article, discussed above) and 1992 (Ovaska on *NA*, discussed below).

In 1950, Eila Pennanen published an article in *Näköala* (the predecessor of *Parnasso*), asking 'was Jane Austen a genius?' The discussion is based on German psychological theories of genius; the evidence is taken from the novels and in particular the letters. Pennanen does not offer a definitive answer, concluding that a) Austen herself would not have cared, b) the question is in any case irrelevant: 'We do not answer such awkward and dreary questions, when what is involved is world's most light-handed and most amusing writer.'⁷

A more recent article dealing in part with Austen is Ovaska (1992), which draws on contemporary feminist literary criticism. Her topic is women's Gothic writing in general; she briefly discusses *NA* as a parody of Gothic conventions. According to Ovaska, *NA* belongs to a literary subgenre going back to Lennox's *The Female Quixote* (1752), in which the heroine entertains amusingly misleading notions arising out of her predilection for romantic fiction. Austen, however, modifies this model in many ways, as her heroines cannot return home again, at least permanently, as the knowledge they have acquired from the world cannot be undone. Catherine's family perceives life as simpler and purer than she has learnt to: she now knows that evil does exist, having more experience and perhaps less good will than her parents. Austen takes two steps towards something that can be called a modern feminist view of marriage: she questions the notion of 'romance' and she shows repeatedly that marriage is a social and

⁷ 'Niin kömpelöihin ja ikäviin kysymyksiin ei vastata, kun on kysymys maailman kepeimmästä ja hausimmasta kirjailijasta' (Pennanen 1950, 356).

material contract. *NA*, Ovaska concludes, is Austen's most powerful critique of the society in which she herself lived.

The other recent article on Austen (Niemelä 2003) can be classified as academic, although it was published in a non-academic literary journal. It is basically a survey of some recent approaches to Austen and to *NA*. Niemelä starts with the famous lines from the last chapter of *NA*, on 'the tell-tale compression of the pages before them'. He sees these lines as signalling many of the issues which have occupied literary scholars in recent years. *NA* has not yet been canonized as a pre-postmodern work, of the likes of *Tristram Shandy* or *Don Quixote*; perhaps because Austen's best-known novels today seem tame and safe – a mixture of *Bildungsroman*, romantic intrigue, comedy of manners and realistic narrative. Our picture of Austen does not sit comfortably with postmodern literary theory.

Niemelä next deals with the concept of the *Bildungsroman* in European literature, a genre that typically ends with a harmonious, economically and socially appropriate marriage. Austen's novels are all of this type; it is only later, with Eliot, Flaubert and Tolstoy, that the novel enters into the problems of the marriage itself. Niemelä then examines Gothic itself: *NA* is often referred to as a parody of the Gothic novel, although the parody takes up less than a third of the book. More importantly, the novel deals with questions of reading – and misreading. It is Catherine's misreading of the Gothic romance, and of fiction in general, that leads her astray: like Marianne in *SS*, like Lennox's heroine and of course like many other young women in European fiction. Niemelä cites Terry Castle, arguing that *NA* constitutes a historical moment in European feminism: the 'birth of the thinking woman's heroine'. Austen's revolutionary contribution to modern life was the idea that women are capable of rational thought. Austen is thus the first and greatest of women critics.

Austen in general surveys of literature

Finnish surveys of European or world literature are intended primarily for the general reader, but are also used in university departments of comparative literature. Most of these pay little or no attention to Austen, and where they do they tend to express fairly conventional views.

The earliest such work is *Yleinen kirjallisuuden historia* (General history of literature), published in 1900 as a translation from the Danish. Volume 3 deals with the literature of England [*sic*], the Netherlands and Germany. The 240-page chapter on literature in English, by Adolf Hansen, covers everything from Beowulf to the Victorians, including North America. Austen is not mentioned. Of other women novelists, Charlotte and Emily Brontë are mentioned in a subordinate clause, while George Eliot receives two paragraphs.

The next writer (and the first Finnish one), Eino Railo (1937) devotes some lines to Austen in his multivolume history of literature, covering the nineteenth century and the years preceding World War I. Railo was at the time Docent of the History of Literature at the University of Helsinki, and the work seems more academically oriented than most of the others. Austen is presented as a representative of realism, in the same context as Fielding and Mitford; later, he

compares her satire to that of Ben Jonson (Railo 1937, 80–81, 85). He returns briefly to Austen's wholesomely realistic vision of life in the context of the Victorian women writers, above all the Brontës (98).

Railo was followed after World War II by Vappu Roos's *Suuri maailmankirjallisuus: länsimaisen kirjallisuuden vaiheet Homeroksesta Seferisiin* (Great literature of the world: history of western literature from Homer to Seferis, 1949, revised 1956 and 1965). This single-volume work is aimed at students, adult education classes and the general public. The main focus is on 'great writers' and their major works. Austen is dealt with briefly in the chapter on the English Romantics. Of the chapter's eleven pages, the Romantic poets occupy eight; Austen is given four paragraphs. She is described as the first important, classic female writer; a wise and sharp-eyed observer of reality, realist and novelist of manners. The usual cliché is mentioned of her 'retiring and unassuming' life. Austen was not a Romantic writer, except in sharing with Wordsworth a focus on home life and on trivial, modest themes. She despised the fashionable Gothic genre and created her own quiet, charming domestic milieu, full of understanding, empathetic wisdom and delicate irony. Her great strength is in her characterization and in her ability to bring to life a vivid picture of a certain, if restricted, social setting. As a realistic novelist she anticipates the powerful novels of the Victorian era. Roos mentions the recent Finnish translations of all of Austen's novels.

Henrik Schück's *Yleinen kirjallisuuden historia* (General history of literature, 1961) is again a translated work, written originally for Swedish readers in 1951. Volume 9 covers the first phase of Romanticism. Scott receives over forty pages, including biography, plot summaries, predecessors, influences and followers, while Austen is not mentioned at all.

Almost contemporary with Schück is Rafael Koskimies's *Maailman kirjallisuus* (World literature, 1964). Volume 3 covers the eighteenth century and Romanticism. The chapter on English literature during the Romantic era includes an unusually detailed account of Austen. The writer comments on her use of the novel genre for comedies of manners, and her skill as an accurate and intelligent observer of her surroundings. In Austen's case, we can speak of *realism* in the most natural and characteristic sense of the word. The outer world is depicted in its essential outline, while the focus is always on the inner development of the characters. In particular, the portrait emerges of an intelligent young woman. Sentimentality and the grand gesture are absent, and her best-known work, *PP*, is nearest to true comedy.

The multivolume survey *Kansojen kirjallisuus* (Literature of the nations) was published in 1976. Volume 7, covering the Romantic era, supplies the longest account of Austen of any of the surveys. The author places Austen in the context of the eighteenth-century novel and of 'modern' writers such as Scott and Byron. After a brief biographical background, the author discusses the writing and publication history of the novels. Austen is able to create exciting novels out of seemingly unpromising materials: a young woman needs to get married, specifically to the man she loves; he has to love her; and between them they have to have a fortune. The writer gives brief accounts of each of the novels. He draws attention to Austen's skill at presenting unpleasant or unsympathetic characters, such as Mrs Bennet, Lady Catherine de Bourgh and

Mr Collins. Whereas in the later books they would be treated with cold contempt, in *PP*, they are depicted with sparkling humour, lending the novel an almost Dickensian exuberance.

Austen in Finnish universities

Austen is taught in Finnish universities in departments of English and of comparative literature. English departments in Finland, as in most non-anglophone countries, combine the teaching of language and literature (to some extent also cultural studies) of the English-speaking world. One of their important functions is to train teachers of English for primary and secondary schools. All English departments include one novel by Austen, almost always *PP*, in a survey of English literature or of the novel. Many departments of comparative literature also include Austen in their survey courses or in courses on the Romantic period, sometimes also in courses in women's writing; again, it is almost always *PP*. The novel may be optional or obligatory. There seems to be little other reading of Austen. All the departments report little or no scholarly research on Austen; in some cases, there may be an MA thesis on her every now and then, usually depending on the individual interests of the teachers in the department.

Austen on film and television

Many of the adaptations of Austen's novels for film and television have been seen in Finland. Finnish television (excluding cable, satellite and digital channels) has two public and two commercial channels. All the Austen dramatizations have been shown on Channel 1, the more 'serious' and 'cultural' of the two public channels. This has stimulated discussion of the writer and her works, and made them more familiar. As one of my students put it: 'Now even my mother knows about Austen, after seeing *Pride and Prejudice* on television.'

In 1969, Jukka Kajava (1969) reviewed the earliest BBC serialization of *PP* (1967), directed by Joan Craft.⁸ The reviews are very negative, although primarily with respect to the television version rather than Austen herself. The scriptwriter and director have eliminated anything to do with social reality, and present Austen as a sort of upper-class procuress. Jane Austen, the radical of her time, is today a innocuous elderly lady. The final ignominy is a comparison to *Peyton Place*, running concurrently on Finnish television. In 1981, Kajava reviewed the BBC *PP*, dramatized by Fay Weldon. He describes it as very well produced, enjoyable and acutely observed. Weldon's adaptation of Austen's country-house novel retains precisely what has made it a classic: a young woman striving to become a human being, against a background of Victorian

⁸ Kajava (1943–2005) was perhaps the best-known (and, by some, most feared) commentator on Finnish television and theatre for forty years; beginning as an 'angry young man' (as reflected in this review of *PP*), he became one of the most highly regarded critics and commentators.

[sic] manners. As a television series, *PP* is in the category of the good old adult fairy tale. It is somewhat redeemed by its painstaking realization and momentary sharp bite.

It was in 1996 that Finnish interest in Austen suddenly exploded.⁹ The single most extensive feature on Austen and her work (eleven pages long, with illustrations) was published in *Helsingin sanomat*'s monthly magazine supplement for March 1996, at the peak of the boom, with the concurrent release of the BBC *PP*, Ang Lee's *SS*, the films based on *E* (including *Clueless*) and *P*. The feature begins with a background article by Tuija Verkkola on Austen's life, her works and her literary importance; this is followed by an extended discussion of Lee's film, also by Verkkola, a separate article on the director by the *Helsingin sanomat* film critic Helena Ylänen and a feature on the BBC's *PP* by Eeva-Liisa Pere.

In her introductory article, Verkkola, discusses the Austen 'industry', analysing some of the reasons for Austen's popularity in Britain. She also refers to Austen's importance in the history of fiction, emphasizing her creation of the 'well-made novel'. Verkkola sees one reason for the appeal of Austen's world to modern readers in the slow pace of life. Another reason, in an age of explicit sex, violence and corruption, is the 'innocence' of the novels. Nevertheless, Austen's world is far from idyllic: greed and malice often prevail, stupidity, self-importance and vanity blossom, and there is no lack of small-mindedness. Money determines who can marry whom; a poor man cannot marry for love, and a poor woman has no choice at all. Austen is irritated by ignorance and poor breeding; equally, she judges those who lack innate propriety and integrity. Above all, she condemns the lack of principle in matters of money and love. Her virtues are considerateness towards the feelings of others, along with 'friendliness' (presumably the modern Finnish equivalent of Austen's *amiability*); even good-hearted foolishness is acceptable. Her favourites, male or female, have insight, understanding and a sense of humour.

In March 1996, Ylänen reviewed Ang Lee's *SS* in the regular *Helsingin sanomat* film column (1996b). She notes that this film differs from the usual English costume-drama Austen: sedate British correctness has been injected with a dose of American energy and Lee's tranquil wisdom. The film is romantic without being fulsome, funny without being malicious, elegant without being superficial and historically accurate without being pedantic. Importantly, Ylänen corrects the idea of many other Finnish writers: the novelist views the world from the perspective not of the petty bourgeoisie but of the impoverished gentry, who are unable to do anything very much to improve their lives. The family can move into a smaller house, they can keep fewer servants or light fires in fewer rooms; but there is no employment open to them except for a few positions in the Church. And for women there is no way at all to earn any money. It is life in a kind of cushioned prison cell. A more general point of view is thereby introduced into a very private story.

In May of the same year, Ylänen reviewed Roger Michell's film adaptation of

⁹ In May 1996, *PP* was ranked second in the list of bestselling translated fiction in Finland (*Helsingin sanomat*, 11 June 2006, C2).

P (1996c): she compares it to Lee's film and to the BBC's *PP*, which had been seen in Finland earlier the same year. The novels on which the films were based are very similar, although in terms of Austen's minimalism there are also significant differences: in her last novel, the author's voice has become gentler, and there is a barely perceptible sense of renunciation and loss. Michell's Austen is less delicate and fragile than usual, and the actors are more natural and ordinary: their faces are shiny, their hair untidy and their teeth bad. *But*: the seriousness and relative coarseness of Michell's *P* stand out only in relation to other versions of Austen. Austen's fans should enjoy it greatly; for others it will be more of the same insubstantial and unrealistic inanity as all the rest.

Finally, in November 1996, Ylänen reviewed the Miramax adaptation of *E*, directed by Douglas McGrath. Enough Austen! *PP* was not bad, *SS* and *P* were amusing movies, each good in their own way. There was also the light-as-air *Clueless*, an innocuous, frothy version of *E*. Now, we have the culturally correct *E*: the ladies wear high-waisted Empire dresses and talk a lot; gentlemen's minds also revolve around matchmaking. The plot is the basic Austen story: at the end, the heroine gets the most interesting man in the book. This is an elegant but lifeless movie, in which the main character remains two-dimensional, while the others are more or less non-existent.

The last item from 1996 is Marjatta Möttölä's feature on *PP*, based on an interview with Diana Webster. Webster was a long-time lecturer in the English Department at the University of Helsinki, introducing generations of Finnish students to the pleasures of English literature, including Austen. The question is, how can a writer whose works are placed on library shelves between *Angelica* and Barbara Cartland be a literary classic? While in Britain Austen's status is unquestioned, in Finland it becomes necessary to explain: the Finnish translations do not do her justice, and the film and television versions are a feast for the eye rather than the mind. Webster emphasizes Austen's irony, which is not always easy for Finnish readers to recognize or understand. She makes the point that irony, which is so central to English culture, is a mode relatively unfamiliar in Finnish literature and culture more generally: Finns tend to say what they mean, fairly directly.

Conclusion

As we have seen, the image of Austen in Finland has been somewhat ambiguous. The reviews of the novels during the 1950s, although conventional, were relatively positive, and the translations were reprinted several times. Why does Austen continue to be relatively unknown among the general public, except through film and television versions? I have discussed what I consider to be some reasons for this in connection with the Finnish historical background. The novels have not been particularly well served by their translators or by the publishers, who have presented them as light feminine stories of romantic love. It may also be relevant that Finnish students in secondary school do not usually read much fiction other than Finnish. Basically, it seems that, at least until recently, Austen's particular brand of social comedy and her ironic treatment of human relationships is not what Finnish culture has looked for. For various

reasons, Austen has been perceived as a writer of romantic fiction about – and for – aristocratic and idle young women, irrelevant to the modern reader. Today, however, the situation is changing, due not only to the popularity of screen adaptations, but also because of more fundamental changes in Finnish culture.¹⁰

I want to give the final word to a ‘common reader’ of Austen. Marja-Liisa Potinkara is a Finnish woman in her early sixties; as a young girl living in a small town, she was – in her own words – both gluttonous and omnivorous with regard to fiction. Marja-Liisa first read all of Austen’s novels in her early teens during the 1950s. Since then she has reread them many times, in young adulthood and middle age. She has always loved Austen’s works, although they have of course meant different things to her at different times in her life. What she has always liked is Austen’s acuteness of observation, her precision of expression and her humour. Marja-Liisa admires Austen’s insight into the problems faced by young women, both from their families and from peers: this is something that has not fundamentally changed over the last two centuries. Her favourite has always been *PP*, her least favourite *NA*. It is likely that to such a reader, the element of literary satire will not be apparent – the more so in translation into a culture which has never possessed a Gothic tradition. Marja-Liisa may have missed some of the subtle details of Austen’s irony; but she is, I think, the kind of reader that Austen may have had in mind. May there always be such readers for Jane Austen: it is through them that a writer truly lives.

¹⁰ Since this chapter was written, a Finnish translation of Carol Shields’s biography of Austen has been published; this is the first publication on Austen aimed at a general audience. Interestingly, it was published by a small, independent firm, Ajatus Kirjat.

10 Still the Great Forgotten? The Reception of Jane Austen in Spain

Aída Díaz Bild

Nowadays, nobody would deny that Jane Austen is one the greatest British writers and occupies a privileged position in the literary canon. But to what extent is this fact reflected in the reception of her work in Spain? The main aim of this chapter is to answer precisely this question by focusing on three aspects of Austen's presence in Spain. The first is the study of the Spanish translations of her work, particularly those most significant from a critical perspective. The second is the analysis of the different ways in which Austen has been read and understood in university circles since the 1950s, when English became an academic discipline in Spain. Lastly, this chapter will survey the presence of Austen in academic syllabi in order to determine where academics tend to 'place' her in the tradition of the English novel and in the context of her age.

Translations

There are no translations of Jane Austen's work from the nineteenth century; however, the large number of twentieth-century translations have established her popularity amongst Spanish readers – or at least amongst publishers. There is a significant degree of variation in both the number of translations and the dates of publication from one novel to another, so it is more convenient to analyse the reception of each novel separately. In most cases there is a long period between the 1940s and the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s during which no translation was printed. This may be owing to the political, economic and social situation in Spain during General Franco's regime. As Monterrey (2000, 2003a, 2003b) has explained, during the period of dictatorship there was a certain hostility towards non-Hispanic cultures and a desire to improve the study of the Spanish language and culture. Moreover, Franco's attitude to Mexico, which received Spanish Republican exiles, and Peron's Argentina was certainly not the same. It is also revealing that most of the translations belong to the 1980s and 1990s: the period in which, as we shall see in the second section, research in English language and literature developed more fully.

There are at least fifteen editions of *NA*, with the first dating from 1921 (Oyarzábal) and the latest 2004 (a reprint of Lorenzo 1983).¹ There was a lengthy interval between 1953 and 1983 when translations of the text commenced publication again, although there have been no new translations to date since Lorenzo's version. The original title has been respected, being translated into Spanish as *La abadía de Northanger*.

Publishers issued around twenty-two editions of *SS*: the first translation appeared in 1942 (Moré) and the last in 2005 (a reprint of Herrero 2002). As in the case of *NA*, there was a long period, between 1965 (a redacted version of the novel) and 1993 (Magrinyà), during which no translation of *SS* was printed. One of the most interesting aspects of the Spanish translations of *SS* is the variety of titles given to it: three editions (1942, 1993, 1996) were titled *Juicio y sentimiento* (Judgement and sentiment) and there is also a translation of 2000 that has changed the original title to *Sensatez y sentimientos* (Good sense and sentiments). The Spanish versions issued after 1996 respect Austen's published title, however, translating it as *Sentido y sensibilidad*. It is also interesting to note that most of the editions came out after the release of Ang Lee's cinematic adaptation of *SS* (1995), which was a great success in Spain, partly owing to the popularity of its main actors.

There are at least twenty-one editions of *E*, the first appearing in 1945 (Bofill y Ferro) and the last in 2004 (a reprint of Rodríguez 1996). Again, there was a hiatus between 1945, when the first translation was published, and 1971 (López Muñoz), when the next Spanish version appeared.

In the case of *MP*, nine editions appeared between 1943 (Villalonga) and 2004 (a reprint of Martín 1995). All but two leave the title untranslated: Villalonga (1943) translates it as *El parque Mansfield* and Balil Giró (1954) as *En el pargne Mansfield*. Although 'park' in Spanish has the two meanings of an area of land in town with grass and trees where people go to enjoy themselves and a piece of land surrounding a country house, the latter is seldom used in Spanish and, therefore, the title *El parque Mansfield* sounds awkward.

P went into at least nineteen editions, the first of which appeared in 1919 (Ortega y Gasset) and the last in 2004 (Fernández Z.). As in other cases, there is a gap between the 1919 edition and the six published during the 1940s, and those that came out in the 1980s. Since the title causes no problem in translation, it has been rendered literally, as *Persuasión*.

PP seems to be the favourite amongst Spanish readers: there are at least seventy editions, the first dating from 1924 (Urries y Azara) and the last from 2006 (a reissue of Franco Lommers 2002). In this case, there is a smaller hiatus between the earliest and latest editions, since one translation was published in the 1920s, eight in the 1940s, twenty-three during the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s, eight in the 1980s and the remainder over the last two decades. The original title has not been altered, being rendered literally as *Orgullo y prejuicio*, apart from

¹ The term 'edition' here refers not only to different translations of the same text, but also to different editions of the same translation or the publication of the same translation by different publishers.

two exceptions (1945 and the 1952 reprint of Berenguer 1943) which are very curious, since they transform *PP* into *Más fuerte que el orgullo* (Stronger than pride).

Lastly, there is one edition of 'Love and Freindship', which has been translated literally (except for Austen's all-important misspelling of 'friendship') (*Amor y amistad*, 1998) and five editions of *LS*, the first dating from 1984 (Cohen) and the last from 2000 (Salís). In this latter case, the original title has not been translated but reproduced exactly.

Prologues and introductions

As far as prologues and introductions are concerned, only a few of the translations contain them. Most of them are elegantly written, attempting to convey a sense of Austen's mastery as a writer. The introductions deal with the main aspects of the author's work: her attack on the romantic and sentimental novel, her use of a technique similar to that of a miniaturist, her brilliant handling of dialogue, the subversive role of irony and humour in her novels, her wonderful creation of characters who reveal themselves through their speech, the perfect structure of her texts, her indirect criticism of society, her range of heroines, her approach to marriage and other social questions. The following extract, taken from Carlos Pujol's introduction to *E*, exemplifies the delicacy and subtlety with which some of the critics describe Austen's literary merits:

Going a bit deeper, knowing how to read between the lines, it is not difficult to perceive a strange emotional shiver which is repressed at all costs, a painful vibration which rejects any kind of exhibitionism; and without any doubt a certain acidity that a *comme il faut* young lady from the provinces had to conceal or soften, dilute as far as possible in the water of roses of a story in which, apart from the fact that nothing really happens, everything must end well.²

Interestingly enough, only one of the prologues (by José Maria Valverde, 1986) takes into consideration the difficulties a twentieth-century reader may have in understanding the structure of Austen's fiction:

The contemporary reader must apply his sense of historical hermeneutics to overlook the deliberate and heavy slowness of *Emma* – a novel belonging to a time when reading need not be hurried and detail could be leisurely highlighted. What is probably most surprising for us is that, after the denouement, there is still a good fifth of the book left in which loose ends will be tied and final touches made with regard

² 'Profundizando un poco, sabiendo leer entre líneas, no es difícil captar un extraño temblor emocional que se reprime a toda costa, una dolorosa vibración que rehuye cualquier exhibicionismo; y sin duda un punto de acidez que una señorita *comme il faut* de provincias debía disimular y amortiguar, diluir todo lo posible en el agua de rosas de una narración en la que, además no pasar nada, todo tiene que acabar bien' (Pujol 1997, xii).

to characters; here, it becomes clear that the relationship of the readers with the novels was one of habit and devotion, without being in any hurry to move on to another novel.³

Valverde's view of Austen's verboseness seems an extraordinary one, given the economy of writing for which she has typically been praised.

Only a few editions add bibliographical information that may be of interest to the reader. Thus, Pujol (1997) includes a chronology of Austen's life and work as well as a short bibliography on her life and novels, while Marta Pessarrodona (in Cohen 1984), apart from providing the reader with a chronological table, lists some anglophone editions of Austen's texts, as well as the main Spanish translations. However, more interesting in this sense are the translations of *PP* (1993), *E* (1997) and *P* (2003) published by the Madrid-based academic publishers Cátedra, in their 'Letras universales' (Universal letters) series. The three books include extensive introductions by scholars from Spanish universities and explore the main aspects of Austen's novels more fully than the other prologues. Whereas the other introductions are written for the general reader, these target a more specialist audience, requiring fuller knowledge of Austen's art. Not only do the introductions contain numerous references to the main critical studies on the author, they also supply a wide-ranging and scholarly bibliography on Austen's life and works, and the main English editions of her texts. Hidalgo's analysis of Austen's works in Zaro's translation of *P* (2003) is particularly interesting because she dedicates a whole section to 'Austenmania' in the 1990s. Hidalgo focuses on television and film adaptations of Austen's fiction, as well as on the presence of elements of intertextuality in novels by Helen Fielding and Emma Tennant. Hidalgo is less interested in exploring the reponse of the Spanish audience to the film adaptations of *PP*, *P*, *SS*, *E* and *MP* than in highlighting the key thematic aspects of these films.

Quality of translations

If, in general terms, the introductions to Jane Austen's novels are fairly satisfactory, as far as the translations themselves are concerned, there are fewer opportunities for enthusiasm, as they tend not only to distort the original, but also to impoverish it. The reasons for this 'depreciation' of Austen's texts are outlined in the following paragraphs.

(1) *Use of archaisms.* Valverde translates 'suspense' (*E*, 3.19: 483) as 'suspension'

³ 'El lector actual tiene que aplicar su sentido de la hermenéutica histórica para descontar la deliberada y lastrada lentitud de *Emma* – novela de un tiempo sin prisa para la lectura y con regodeo en los detalles. Lo más sorprendente para nosotros es, probablemente, que, después de la gran resolución de la novela, todavía quede una buena quinta parte del libro para atar los cabos y dejar resueltos a todos los personajes; ahí se hace más visible que la relación de los lectores con las novelas llegaba entonces a ser de costumbre y cariño, sin prisa por pasar a otra novela' (Valverde 1986, 15).

(1968, 537); Rodríguez 'fonder' (*PP*, 3.19: 387) as 'afecta' (1996, 278); Lázaro Ros 'said his lady to him one day' (*PP*, 1.1: 3) as 'díjole cierto día al aludido su propia esposa' (1957, 19) and 'Mr Bennet replied that he had not' (*PP*, 1.1: 3) as 'El señor Bennet contestó que nada sabía' (1957, 19);⁴ Cohen 'stay' (*LS*, 243) as 'estadia' (1984, 21). All of these are terms rarely used by contemporary Spanish speakers.

(2) *Incorrect use of Spanish expressions.* In *E*, Valverde translates 'housebreaking' (3.19: 483) as 'allanamiento de domicilio' (1978, 537) when it should be 'allanamiento de morada'. A similar instance is that of Pujol's *E*, in which the Spanish version of 'Selina would stare when she heard of it' (*E*, 3.19: 484) is 'Selina abrirá unos ojos como platos' (1982, 398), when it would be more correct to say 'Selina abrirá los ojos como platos'. Cohen translates 'in general' (*LS*, 313) as 'por lo corriente' (1984, 110), an expression that does not exist in Spanish.

(3) *Awkward syntax in the Spanish translation makes it difficult for the reader to follow the meaning of the sentence.* This happens, for instance, with Lázaro Ros's translation of the second paragraph of *PP*, 1.1, or with Cohen's version of the first sentence of *LS*.

(4) *The translator omits words that are in the original.* In his version of *E*, Valverde omits the word 'confidence' from the sentence: 'But, in spite of these deficiencies, the wishes, the hopes, the confidence, the predictions of the small band of true friends who witnessed the ceremony, were fully answered in the perfect happiness of the union' (*E*, 3.19: 484). Likewise, in the first page of *LS*, Cohen decides to translate 'dear Father' (244) as 'Father' (1984, 21) for no obvious reason. Zaro (2003) goes even further when he 'forgets' to translate in the last pages of *P* 'it did not give her a moment's regret' and 'Lady Russell, in spite of all her former transgressions, he could now value from his heart' (*P*, 2.12: 251).

(5) *Translated terms distort the meaning of the original text.* In *E* (3.19: 484), Austen uses the word 'distress', in the sense of 'anxiety' or 'suffering', but Valverde changes the writer's intention by translating it as 'apuro' (1978, 537), the meaning of which is closer to 'emergency' or 'hardship'. At the beginning of *LS*, Susan Vernon writes that 'I long to be made known to your dear little Children' (243), a sentence which Cohen translates as 'I long to familiarize myself with your dear little Children.'⁵ Luis Magrinyà translates 'constitutional' in 'the constitutional safe-guard of a flannel waistcoat' (*SS*, 3.14: 378) as 'sanitary' ('sanitario'; 1996, 366). But it is Rodríguez who provides us with some of the strangest translations. When, at the beginning of *PP*, Mrs Bennet gives her husband all the details regarding Mr Bingley, especially those concerned with his large fortune, she exclaims '“What a fine thing for our girls!”' (1.1: 4),

⁴ Lázaro Ros has revised his translation of *PP* in the edition published by Suma de Letras in 2001. Thus, he translates 'Mr Bennet replied that he had not' as 'Mr Bennet contestó que no sabía nada' ('Mr Bennet replied that he knew nothing'; Lázaro Ros 2001, 15), which obviously sounds much better to the ears of the contemporary Spanish reader, but still uses the old-fashioned term *díjole* in 'said his lady to him one day'.

⁵ 'Anhelo familiarizarme con vuestros queridos niños' (Cohen 1984, 21).

which Rodríguez translates as ‘“What a wonderful match for our girls!”’,⁶ thus transforming the word ‘thing’ into ‘match’. Obviously, this translation makes it difficult for the reader to understand the remaining conversation in which Mrs Bennet explains to her husband that by saying that it is ‘a fine thing’ for the girls that Mr Bingley is a rich man, she means that she hopes he will marry one of them. The most perplexing translation occurs when we are told that Lydia’s husband, instead of enjoying himself in London or Bath, ‘enjoyed himself in London or the baths!’⁷

(6) *The original is altered without any apparent need.* At the end of *E*, Austen writes: ‘The strength, resolution, and presence of mind of the Mr Knightleys, commanded his fullest dependence’ (3.19: 484). Valverde not only translates the word ‘dependence’ as ‘confidence’ (1978, 537), but utilizes a poorly structured sentence in Spanish. At other times, translators decide to transform a short and concise sentence into an unnecessarily long one. Thus, Pujol’s version of ‘Pilfering was *housebreaking* to Mr Woodhouse’s fears’ (*E*, 3.19: 483) as ‘In Mr Woodhouse’s fears pilfering was transformed into theft on a large scale with housebreaking.’⁸ Similarly, Cohen translates ‘She had nothing against her, but her Husband, & her Conscience’ (*LS*, 313) as ‘At least nothing but her husband and her own conscience separated her from happiness.’⁹ This tendency to add words in translation not in the original is a recurrent feature: for instance, Rodríguez, translates the last part of the famous opening of *PP*: ‘It is a truth universally acknowledged, that a single man in possession of a good fortune, must be in want of a wife’ (1.1: 3) as ‘feels one day or another the need of a wife’.¹⁰ A last example of the way in which Austen’s texts are distorted in their Spanish versions is provided by Ibáñez’s translation of *PP* (1987). We include the English original and a translation of the Spanish text in order to better appreciate the differences between them:

However little known the feelings or views of such a man may be on his first entering a neighbourhood, this truth is so well fixed in the minds of the surrounding families, that he is considered as the rightful property of some one or other of their daughters. (*PP*, 1.1: 3)

However, little do we know about the feelings or views of a man in such conditions on his coming into the neighbourhood. This truth is so well fixed in the minds of some of the surrounding families that some consider him their rightful property and others that of their daughters.¹¹

⁶ ‘¡Qué partido tan estupendo para nuestras hijas!’ (Rodríguez 1999, 11).

⁷ ‘iba a divertirse a Londres o a los baños’ (Rodríguez 1999, 278).

⁸ ‘En los temores del señor Woodhouse un pequeño hurto se convertía en un robo en gran escala con allanamiento de morada’ (Pujol 1997, 398).

⁹ ‘Por lo pronto, nada que no fuera su marido y su propia conciencia la separaban de su dicha’ (Cohen 1984, 110).

¹⁰ ‘siente un día u otro la necesidad de una mujer’ (Rodríguez 1999, 11).

¹¹ ‘Sin embargo, poco se sabe de los sentimientos u opiniones de un hombre de tales condiciones cuando entra a formar parte de un vecindario. Esta verdad está tan arraigada en las mentes de algunas de las familias que lo rodean, que algunas le consideran de su legítima propiedad y otras la de sus hijas’ (Ibáñez 1993, 73).

The source for the translations is not always specified, but when it is, the original English text forms the basis for the Spanish version. At the same time, few of the translators cited already explain the criteria they have followed in undertaking their work. Zaro's note is particularly revealing, however, not only because he describes his approach to the text in great detail, but because he acknowledges the never-ending problems a translator has to confront. Thus when referring to the difficulties of translating terms such as 'sense', 'sensible', 'character', 'mind' and so on, the meaning of which has changed with the passing of time, he affirms:

Nevertheless, I want to make clear (and as translation theory has so often pointed out) it is impossible to establish single, unchanging equivalents for each of them and that the specific context in which a term is placed is essential when making a given decision. Although I have tried to be systematic, I should point out that, as a translator, I have let my instinct as a reader and user of the Spanish language guide me. I am aware of the fact that in many instances my choices will therefore be difficult to justify through other arguments.¹²

It must be added that, unlike other translators of Austen's novels, who have had to find their own way, Zaro has found a useful starting point for his translation in Maria José Crespo Allue's *La problemática de la versiones españolas de Persuasion de Jane Austen: crítica de su traducción* (The problems with the Spanish versions of *Persuasion*, by Jane Austen: a critique of the translation, 1981). Indeed, in his preliminary note Zaro acknowledges his indebtedness to Crespo's study.

As the preceding pages have made clear, both in general terms and with the sole exception of the Cátedra series, most of the Spanish publishers who have been interested in issuing Austen's works tend to be popularizers, whose main target is the general reader, rather than the academic specialist. Although we have drawn attention to the deficiencies in the translations of Austen's works, it is not our intention to undervalue the task undertaken by Spanish translators, since many of them were working against the grain, and the difficulty of their task went for a long time unrecognized by most publishers and readers. Fortunately, things have changed in the last few years as the improvement in the translation of foreign texts illustrates.

Criticism

Any analysis of the critical reception of Jane Austen's work in Spain must start with the recognition that, unfortunately, not much has been published on this

¹² 'No obstante, quisiera precisar, como ha señalado tantas veces la teoría de la traducción, que resulta imposible establecer equivalencias únicas e invariables para cada uno de ellos y que el contexto específico en el que se sitúa el término es imprescindible a la hora de tomar una decisión concreta. Aunque he procurado ser sistemático, debo señalar que, como traductor, me he dejado guiar ante todo por mi instinto de lector y usuario de la lengua española. Soy consciente de que, en muchos casos, mis opiniones de traducción serán, por tanto, difíciles de justificar mediante otros argumentos' (Zaro 2003, 69).

outstanding novelist. It must also be admitted that, in general terms, academics have been content to follow the lead of Anglo-American criticism, absorbing and developing its main tenets and ideas. Nevertheless, the different articles and essays to which we have had access provides a clear idea of those elements of Austen's work with which Spanish scholars have been most concerned. All the essays analysed in this section belong to the last two decades of the twentieth century and the beginning of the twenty-first. The reason for that is that although English became an academic discipline in the 1950s, it was really during the 1980s that research started bearing its worthiest fruits. This does not mean that before this time nothing worth reading was published, but it is undeniable that it was not until after the 1970s that the critical work of Spanish scholars became more productive and substantial.

As a matter of fact, AEDEAN, Asociación Española de Estudios Anglo-Norteamericanos (Spanish Association of Anglo-American Studies) – which has contributed so much to the development of English studies in Spain, not only through its annual conference but also through its journal *Atlantis* – was founded in 1976. This was followed by the emergence in the 1980s and 1990s of small, independent societies that focused on different aspects of English language and literature. We also have to take into consideration that, as Monterrey has explained, although Modern Philology was created to promote the systematic study of foreign languages and literature, one of its initial aims was 'to improve the linguistic skills of the language teachers in secondary education, who, until that time, had not been qualified for that aim' (2000, 39).

Undoubtedly, one of the defining characteristics of Jane Austen as a novelist is her constant use of humour and irony, and this aspect of her work has clearly attracted the attention of Spanish critics, who have underlined the subversive role that laughter plays in her novels. An interesting article on the subject is 'The Pursuit of Love: A Motive for Literary Humour' (1984) by Patricia Shaw, former Professor of English at the University of Oviedo, which analyses the different ways in which several British writers – including, of course, Austen – have exploited the theme of love for humorous ends. According to Shaw, we must differentiate between her full novels and her early parodies. Whereas in the latter the pursuit of love is just one more incident among many and the humour derives from the dialogue rather than from a specific comic episode, in the former love represents the main theme, while the humour is diffuse and all-pervading, resulting from situation rather than from verbal expression. Shaw illustrates her argument with wonderfully comic examples from two of Austen's early pieces from the juvenilia, 'The Three Sisters. A Novel' and 'Love and Freindship', in which the element of burlesque prevails. She also explores the way in which Austen, like many other writers, satirizes egocentric suitors in *PP*:

The epitome of such proposals must, surely, be that of the ineffable Mr. Collins to Elizabeth Bennet, in which he tells off on his fingers, as it were, the reasons which have moved him to take such a step: to set a good example to his parish, to add to his own happiness, and to comply with the wishes of his patroness, Lady Catherine de Bourgh, whose visits will be not 'the least of the advantages' he is offering, his speech being rounded off by references both snobbish and vulgar to the financial situation of the Bennet family. (Shaw 1984, 94)

Shaw emphasizes that authors who approach love from a comic perspective do not look on it as something trivial. On the contrary, it is precisely because they respect true passion that they can mock those manifestations which are but a caricature of the real thing: 'Humour generally implies a fair dose of irreverence, but without something to revere, there is no irreverence possible' (Shaw 1984, 87).

Aída Díaz Bild (1998) has also analysed the presence of humour in Austen's novels, but from a different perspective: her starting point is Mikhail Bakhtin's liberating concept of 'laughter'. Bakhtin celebrates the revolutionary and anti-authoritarian character of laughter, and how we find in it the victory of the new over the old. For the comic feature, nothing is eternal or stable and absolute, and indisputable truths are rejected. In fact, laughter purifies dogmatism, fanaticism, fear and sentimentality. Whereas seriousness leads the human being to desperation, humour gives hope and allows us to face and transcend any situation. Comedy in Austen's novels clearly fulfils the 'carnavalesque' function that Bakhtin attributes to it by undermining 'truths universally acknowledged' – that is to say, social follies and hypocrisies – and by resisting any unilateral interpretation. But more revealing is the way in which Austen blends the comic and the serious to avoid falling into false sentimentalism and to allow the reader, the narrator and the heroine to face up to painful circumstances and transcend them. In this sense, Austen seems to have anticipated what psychologists nowadays identify as the therapeutic function of humour. It is also worth noting that, as Austen felt freer to express what she really thought and felt, the element of laughter became much more subdued, as can be appreciated in *P.*

As Díaz Bild further explains, Bakhtin's theory enables us to understand not only the role that humour plays in Austen's novels, but also the extent to which she was subversive in her use of literary conventions – an aspect of her work that, as we will see, has also attracted the attention of Spanish critics. According to Bakhtin, the novel is always criticizing itself, examining itself and subjecting its established forms to review, and this is precisely the task that Austen's novels fulfil. Díaz Bild discusses the way in which Austen interrogates antecedent literary traditions, by subverting the established roles of hero and heroine, providing a new concept of female heroism based on self-control and the grasp of social virtues, as well as undermining the intellectual and moral superiority of men over women. Austen was not only satisfied with parodying other genres, however, and was always 'looking for new ways of exploiting her material and experimenting within the limits of her creative scene' herself (Díaz Bild 1998, 81). Also, in her use of free indirect speech or the way in which she improved and refined the realistic tradition, she proved to a pioneer of literary innovation.

This subversive aspect of Austen's novels has also been explored by other Spanish scholars. A clear example is Carlos J. Gómez Blanco's 'Marriage and Power Relations in Jane Austen's novels' (1991), which follows a familiar trend in Anglo-American criticism, arguing that the marriages which conclude Austen's novels are not conventional at all, but disrupt the dominant ideology of the perfect, submissive wife by proposing marital arrangements based on equality and mutual respect: 'Jane Austen's heroes and heroines are asked to renounce sexual and social relationships defined in terms of dominance or submission, aggression or powerlessness' (242). Austen seems to suggest that this is the only

way to achieve domestic and social harmony inside marriage. As a matter of fact, her heroes only become acceptable suitors when they are capable of relinquishing their attitude of superiority and their pretensions to absolute power. In contrast to heroines such as Emma Courtney, who is willing to dedicate her whole life to Augustus Harley, in Mary Hays's *Memoirs of Emma Courtney* (1796), or Lady Matilda in Elizabeth Inchbald's *A Simple Story* (1791), who worships her tyrannical father, Austen's heroines never demonstrate excessive admiration for the patriarch. Gómez Blanco emphasizes that Austen is aware of the fact that the private behaviour of her protagonists cannot alter the course of history, but hopes that at least her readers will follow their example and therefore approve of more equal marital arrangements. Interestingly enough, neither Gómez Blanco nor any of the commentators mentioned in the present assessment attempt to compare Austen's works with those of her Spanish contemporaries, or to establish a connection between the Spanish and the English cultural, economic and social contexts at the turn of the eighteenth century. They are not concerned with the way in which contemporary Spanish readers of Austen read and understood her novels, but with the way in which they were perceived by English readers.

In 'La otra cara del romanticismo: trabajo, educación y escritura' (The other face of Romanticism: work, education and writing, 2003), included in *Historia crítica de la novela inglesa escrita por mujeres* (A critical history of the English novel written by women), Silvia Caporale Bizzini also highlights the subversive aspects of Austen's novels, making special reference (as Gómez Blanco does) to the writer's defence of more balanced relationships between men and women. Jane Austen, who is greatly ironic about the marriage market, creates heroines who learn to act in the light of reason and who know how important it is for their future happiness to choose a partner who prefers to treat his wife as an equal. This leads to a rejection of the authoritarian model of marriage, in which power resides in the husband, while submissiveness and obedience are expected of the wife. Closely related to Austen's critical approach to the traditional notion of marriage is her rejection of inheritance law and, more precisely, the practice of entailment, which prevented women from inheriting the property of their fathers or husbands (as enacted in the plots of *SS* and *PP*). Austen also undermines the double standard of the age, which demanded that women be above reproach, while tolerating a more permissive order of conduct in men. Like Díaz Bild, Caporale Bizzini emphasizes how Austen creates a new type of heroine. Referring to Elizabeth Bennet, Caporale Bizzini notes:

the character of Elizabeth Bennet can be read as the representation of a social subject who is not and does not feel inferior to any man, however rich or noble he may be. Elizabeth Bennet is the representation of an ideal(ized) woman who, although knowing her difficult situation, is not willing to give up her pride and dignity in order to solve the financial problems that an unfair and arbitrary law may generate (unlike Charlotte Lucas).¹³

¹³ 'De ahí que el personaje de Elizabeth Bennet se pueda leer como la representación de un sujeto social que no es, ni se siente, inferior a ningún hombre, por muy rico o

Caporale Bizzini deals with other well-known features of Austen's novels, such as the way in which the speech of each character reveals their true personality, the writer's portrayal of the decay of an old social order and the rise of a new one in her later novels, and the process of emotional growth and social status that the heroines undergo.

Ángeles de la Concha (1992), Professor of English at the UNED (Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia: the Distance-Learning University) also contributes to uncovering the radical elements hidden within Austen's works and, although she mainly focuses on three contemporary novels, she also includes Austen in her analysis of the way in which women have undermined myth, literature and narrative structures that reinforce the patriarchal construction of femininity. De la Concha focuses on the most 'fruitful' myth of our culture: the Oedipus complex, and Sigmund Freud's exploration of it, in order to show how women writers since the eighteenth century have deconstructed it:

Already from its very origins, in the eighteenth century, we perceive a recurrent pattern. Practically every independent and active heroine is motherless. Whether she makes mistakes, whether she triumphs or fails, whether she achieves her aims or they become frustrated, that is another question, but it is clear that simply to embark on her venture she needs to break in a socially acceptable way, that is to say, not in a transgressive way, with what seems to be the first obstacle in the heroine's process of personal maturity. Arabella in *The Female Quixote*, by Charlotte Lennox, Emma and Jane Eyre in the novels of the same name by Jane Austen and Charlotte Brontë respectively, Dorothea Brooke in *Middlemarch*, by George Eliot, and many others, are all motherless. ■

Very often the mother is replaced by another female figure, such as a step-mother or an aunt, which allows Austen to vent sublimated aggression, without disturbing readerly expectations and values. This is what happens, for example, in *MP* with Mrs Bertram and Mrs Norris, the aunts that care for Fanny Price. What is particularly revealing about this novel, as De la Concha emphasizes, is

noble que sea. Elizabeth Bennet es la representación de una mujer ideal(izada) que, aún conociendo su difícil situación, no está dispuesta a perder su orgullo y dignidad con tal de resolver los problemas de carácter económico a los que la puede condenar una ley injusta y arbitraria (al contrario que Charlotte Lucas)' (Caporale Bizzini 2003, 109).

¹⁴ 'Ya desde sus orígenes, en el siglo XVIII, percibimos un dato que será recurrente. Y es que prácticamente toda heroína independiente y activa es huérfana de madre. Que se equivoque, que triunfe o fracase, que vea colmadas o frustradas sus aspiraciones, es otra cuestión, pero simplemente para iniciar la empresa, está claro que se necesita romper de una forma socialmente aceptable, esto es no transgresora, con lo que aparece como el primer obstáculo en la maduración personal de la protagonista. Arabella, en *The Female Quixote* de Charlotte Lennox, Emma y Jane Eyre en las novelas del mismo nombre de Jane Austen y Charlotte Brontë respectivamente, Dorothea Brooke en *Middlemarch* de George Eliot, y otras muchas, son todas huérfanas de madre' (De la Concha 1992, 37–38).

that Austen does not even idealize the absent mother. Although in the case of Fanny's mother her attitude and personality derive from an oppressive economic situation, the fact remains that the whole situation is the result of

an 'imprudent' marriage [which] only reinforces the Freudian paradigm of the need to break with the mother in order to reinforce the patriarchal model – which is its cause – when the novel offers us as the only possible ending for the story the 'prudent' marriage of the daughter as a kind of reward.¹⁵

Finally, De la Concha argues that in Austen's novels and under the mask of caricature we find the most dangerous maternal characters, such as Mrs Bennet in *PP*, who represents the main obstacle Jane and Elizabeth have to overcome in order to achieve their aspirations.

De la Concha's essay is another obvious illustration of the way in which Spanish scholars have been influenced by Anglo-American criticism, since the role of the different types of mothers created by Austen – dead, absent or flawed – has been given special attention in anglophone circles. Another representative instance is 'Jane Austen and the Tradition of the Absent Mother' (1980) by Susan Peck MacDonald, who examines some of the issues present in De la Concha's article, although from a different perspective. MacDonald holds a less bleak view of the mother in Austen's novels: 'I think we would be mistaken in assuming either that these writers were neurotic or that mothers themselves are in general negative influences. The negativity seems to have its psychological source, instead, in the demands of adolescence' (1980, 68). According to MacDonald, the girl must be separated from her mother in order to learn to see and act for herself, thus achieving maturity. This process will allow the heroine to recreate her mother's life without simply copying it: she will avoid its failures but preserve its virtues.

If some Spanish critics have focused on the subversive aspects of Austen's work, others have tried to link the novelist to other women writers of the age. This again connects with more general attempts in Anglo-American criticism to contextualize Austen's work within the writing of her contemporaries and to show how they, and their predecessors, paved the way for Austen (see e.g. Showalter 1977). This increasing interest in the female writers of the eighteenth century – not only the most famous ones (Burney, Edgeworth, Radcliffe, Wollstonecraft), but also the lesser-known ones (such as Hamilton, Opie, Smith) – stems from the desire to counter the view that woman's literary history begins somewhere about 1830 and to establish links between eighteenth- and nineteenth-century women authors. One writer who seems to have awakened the interest of scholars is Mary Wollstonecraft: thus, Maria José Chivite suggests that Mrs Mason in *Original Stories* not only represents Wollstonecraft's ideal woman – virtuous, rational, cultivated, strong, autonomous – but becomes the

¹⁵ 'un matrimonio "imprudente" no hará sino reforzar el paradigma freudiano de la necesidad de ruptura con la madre, para reforzar el modelo patriarcal – que es su causa – al presentar como único final feliz posible el matrimonio "prudente" de la hija como recompensa' (De la Concha 1992, 38).

model for Austen's heroines (2003, 52). Professor of English at the University of Málaga, Pilar Hidalgo, offers a deeper and fuller analysis of the main similarities and differences between the two writers, drawing parallels between some of Wollstonecraft's ideas in *Thoughts on the Education of Daughters* (1786) and those articulated in Austen's novels (1998). The two writers share the view that marriage is very often a site of discord; that whereas men have access to education and are occupied with their professions, pursuits, business and duties, married women are confined at home; and that it is a mistake to celebrate first attachments, since people are prone to change their feelings when they discover that the object of their love is not worthy.

Hidalgo's analysis of Wollstonecraft and Austen asserts that both writers share the same ideas on female education: women should not only learn something of drawing, dancing and so on, but should also cultivate their minds. Austen and Wollstonecraft emphasize the contribution of reading to the development of women's understanding and, as a matter of fact, all of Austen's heroines are great readers. At the same time, both writers were very much aware of how painful and difficult it was for women to earn a living. They did not have many alternatives and those they had – becoming a governess or a companion – were generally humiliating, which explains why in *E* Austen saves Jane Fairfax from the fate of work, by marrying her into genteel money.

Hidalgo also explores a theme that can be found in much recent Anglo-American criticism: the relevance of the discourse of sensibility. On the one hand, Wollstonecraft in *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman* criticizes excessive emotionalism and women's recourse to cunning as a means to seduce and conquer men, therefore anticipating some of Austen's main concerns. On the other, in her fiction she indulges in the excess of sensibility and thus departs not only from her own ideas but also from Austen's. Hidalgo agrees with Janet Todd (1986) that the element of self-pity so evident in Wollstonecraft's writing is absent in Austen's. The latter is perceived as repeatedly revealing a certain disenchantment politically speaking. But one of the obvious differences between Wollstonecraft and Austen lies in the artistic mastery of the novelist, which the radical polemicist never achieved, an aspect that Hidalgo does not fail to stress:

The opening paragraph of *Mary, a Fiction* (1788) contains what would later be key Austenian words and concepts: *expectation of a large fortune, consequence, accomplishments, rank*; what is missing is the irony implicit in Austen's beginnings and, as the novel progresses, the novelist's ability to embody themes in characters and dialogue. If we take up for a moment an old-fashioned critical distinction, Wollstonecraft tells, while Austen shows (and sometimes famously tells). (1998, 6–7)

Hidalgo also compares *SS* with another text, Maria Edgeworth's *Belinda* (1801), which also exposes the dangers of sensibility. She illustrates similarities of plot between the two books and the ways in which the novelists create the same kind of heroine. At the same time, Hidalgo also shows that whereas in *Belinda* marital harmony is a reality, in Austen's novels, with some minor exceptions, it is simply something we must deduce from the happy ending of the novel.

Another writer whose work has been analysed in detail in order to establish links between her work and Austen's is Charlotte Smith. Díaz Bild (2001, 2003)

attempts to contribute to the debate on whether Jane Austen simply ridiculed and parodied the sentimental and romantic conventions of Charlotte Smith or was greatly and profoundly influenced by her. After closely examining what different critics have written about possible influences, Díaz Bild focuses on one aspect of Smith's work that has only been superficially touched on by other scholars and which, nevertheless, plays a vital role in her work: the use of irony as a means to ridicule and satirize/subvert those characters who are defined by hypocrisy, social prejudices and lack of moral values. Díaz Bild demonstrates how Smith uses the same devices and techniques as Austen to introduce irony into her novels, so well described by Andrew Wright (1953): the contrast between an elevated style and a trivial or insincere content, antiphrasis, understatement, anticlimax and the use of metaphorical or figurative language by those characters we are meant to dislike. The argument is illustrated with some examples taken from the novels of both authors.¹⁶

So far, we have mentioned how Spanish scholars have analysed Austen's work in reference to other women writers of her age, but María del Rocío Ramos Ramos (2002) also draws attention to some similarities between Austen and a male novelist: Thomas Love Peacock. Both were particularly fond of satire, as becomes clear in the titles of their novels *Nightmare Abbey* and *NA*, both published in 1818 and both denouncing society's transformation of marriage into a closed system of economic interests. This attack on the institution of marriage is clearly seen in *Crotchet Castle* (1831) and *PP*, in which Peacock and Austen use the fates of Lady Clarinda and Charlotte Lucas respectively to denounce the abuses of married life.

Other scholars have focused not so much on the differences or parallels between Austen and other contemporary writers, but on the way in which she might have been a source of influence for those who came after her, thus establishing links not only between the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, but also between the age of Enlightenment and the twentieth century. Beatriz Villacañas Palomo (1993, 1994) briefly comments on the way in which both Anne Brontë and Jane Austen reject the prototype of the aggressive dominant male and deal with individuals who interact in a very specific society. Sara Martín Alegre (2003) makes a passing reference to Austen functioning as a model for most nineteenth-century women writers and discovers echoes of *SS* in Harriet Martineau's *Deerbrook* (1839). Miguel Ángel Pérez Pérez (1999) identifies the influence of Austen not on another woman writer, but on a male author, explaining that Anthony Trollope learned from Austen how to create characters such as Mrs Proudie, who in spite of being a 'bore' is not 'flat'. However, he adds that Trollope lacked Austen's subtlety when delineating such fictional beings.

In contrast, María Socorro Suárez Lafuente, Professor of English at the University of Oviedo, argues that, although Austen's work had an effect on the narratives written after her, she did not have much influence in the nineteenth

¹⁶ Ballesteros González (2003) and Caporale Bizzini (2003) have also referred to passing to Charlotte Smith's influence on Austen's development as a writer.

century (1992). Nevertheless, Socorro Suárez mentions two Victorian writers who greatly admired their predecessor: Catherine Gore, who, like Austen, was concerned with women's economic dependence, but lacked her artistic mastery; and Catherine-Anne Austen (later Hubback), who in 1850 completed *W*, the novel her aunt had left unfinished (retitled *The Younger Sister*). Socorro Suárez then turns to the twentieth century, which has been more receptive to Austen's literary work. The starting point is, obviously, Virginia Woolf, who always acknowledged women writers' debt to Austen. This is followed by a brief analysis of those authors whose work bears the 'Austenian' imprint: Ivy Compton-Burnett, Elizabeth Bowen, Elizabeth Taylor, Barbara Pym, Anita Brookner, Fay Weldon and Barbara Kerr Wilson. Most of them prove to be as ironic as Jane Austen and concerned with the same themes that she exemplified in her work. In the case of Fay Weldon and her novel *Letters to Alice on First Reading Jane Austen* (1984), the element of intertextuality, which, as Socorro Suárez claims, has defined English literature over the later decades of the century, must be added. Special reference is made to the way in which feminist criticism has contributed to a better understanding of Austen's literary genius and the discovery of the ideas hidden beneath the surface irony.

Socorro Suárez mentions Barbara Pym as one of the female writers who has followed the Austenian line and Patricia Shaw (1988) explores in depth the main points of similarity between Pym and Austen. Thus, it turns out that both writers conceive their novels as vehicles for humour, irony and satire; that they deliberately restrict their choice of character, environment and subject matter; that they create heroines endowed with similar virtues, who provide the novel's perspective; that, although in different ways, they offer the reader optimistic endings. Shaw also points out some differences between Pym and Austen, the most obvious being that:

Jane Austen, as tradition then demanded, generally presents relationships tending to courtship and marriage between young people, whereas Barbara Pym tends to favour, on the face of it, the affairs of the heart of more unlikely heroines – spinsters in their thirties who, in their self-disparaging way, no longer have many hopes in that direction, middle-aged or even elderly women. (1988, 72)

Lastly, Shaw comments on how Pym paid tribute to Austen, by introducing in her novels specific references to the work of her predecessor.

What becomes obvious after this survey of the translation and critical reception of Jane Austen's work in Spain is that although she is considered to be a most important and interesting writer, as can be deduced from her presence in key histories of English literature published in Spain,¹⁷ scholars do not seem to have devoted much energy to her work. There is no monograph study on her work or life, and the few articles and essays published have simply followed the main trends in Anglo-American criticism. Similarly, there has been no attempt

¹⁷ See Hidalgo and Alcaraz (1981); Pérez Gállego (1988); Portillo, Carnero and Prieto (1981); Pujals (1984); Álvarez Amorós (1988); Monnickendam and others (1999).

to make a comparative analysis between Austen's work and that of her Spanish contemporaries. This remains to date an open and inviting field of enquiry.

Austen in the university

Fortunately, the English departments in the different Spanish universities also seem to accept the 'truth universally acknowledged' that Jane Austen is one of the most important British novelists.¹⁸ She is present in the undergraduate programmes of all Spanish universities bar one and the general tendency is to place her in the nineteenth century and, within it, in the Romantic period. In some cases, Jane Austen is studied in survey courses the aim of which is to introduce students to the history of English literature from the medieval period to the twentieth century, or from the Restoration or the eighteenth century to the present. At other times, the British novelist is included in courses that try to provide a more detailed analysis of the main movements, authors and genres of either the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries or just the nineteenth century. The works of Austen are also studied in courses which do not function as a broad overview of a period, but focus on more specific issues. Thus, Austen may be part of a course that deals with British women writers exploring, for example, the subversive aspect of their work; or her texts may be analysed along with those by other writers in order to illustrate different trends in contemporary literary theory and criticism, such as postcolonialism, semiotics, narratology, ecocriticism, feminism, and so on. The novel most often chosen to be read by students is *PP*, followed by *E* and *SS*. It is also interesting to note that Austen's main 'rival' for the Romantic period is Mary Shelley and her novel *Frankenstein*. Very often both a novel by Austen and *Frankenstein* are included among the compulsory readings, but in a few instances *Frankenstein* is preferred, and no text by Austen is read. The reason for that may be not only that the story of the monster can be more attractive or exciting for young undergraduate students, but that feminist criticism has greatly contributed in the last years to a richer, deeper and more rewarding reading of Shelley's text.

We have also found a course that concentrates only on Jane Austen's life, her narrative technique, and her relation to Romanticism and to other authors who wrote in the Romantic period. We want to reproduce here the lecturer's description of her main aims, since it reveals the passion with which those scholars interested in Austen's work approach their subject:

If you hate Jane Austen and think she only wrote sickly sweet novels about young women in search of a husband, this course is for you. It will give you a chance to see Austen as an imaginative, almost radical writer whose biography is a site of contest and whose oeuvre is being reappraised nowadays. Jane Austen lived at a time when

¹⁸ Austen is not read at schools where pupils study only English language and not English literature.

women were struggling to be independent and earn a living with their pens. She also lived at a time when novel-readers, both male and female, were fighting to change the status of novels and make people take the novel seriously as a valuable literary genre. Her significant contribution to both is beyond dispute.

If you belong to that large group of human beings who have already succumbed to the allure of Austen's style, this course is also for you. It will help you to cope with your addiction and will take you into new paths and avenues, enhancing your understanding and enjoyment of her six major novels, her juvenilia, and her letters.¹⁹

Jane Austen is, thus, a must in Spanish universities. Most lecturers agree that it is impossible to understand the development of English literature over the last two centuries and into the twenty-first without making reference to the work of this brilliant author.

Conclusion

Without a doubt, Jane Austen understood the complexity and contradictions of human nature and therefore would have merely smiled at the reception of her work in Spain, which is to certain extent paradoxical. She seems to be a favourite amongst Spanish publishers and readers and she is given a distinguished place in the literary canon in university syllabi. However, these very scholars who believe Jane Austen to be a must for undergraduate students do not show that same enthusiasm for her work as far as research is concerned. Maybe the tendency in feminist criticism over the last quarter of the twentieth century to recover lost authors and works and thus extend the canon has contributed to this relative marginalization of her work in Spain. With her ironic detachment and a sense of her own literary value, however, Jane Austen would have perhaps been happy to wait for better times.

¹⁹ Cited from the catalogue entry for a course entitled 'Jane Austen and Her Fictional World', lead by Professor Clara Calvo, at the University of Murcia, 1999–2000 (personal communication).

11 The Reception of Jane Austen in Italy

Beatrice Battaglia

The works of Jane Austen, for all their popularity, cannot be considered to be among the most admired foreign classics in Italy. This limited interest is due to numerous reasons, and the overall effect is the persistence of an image of the author as, to use Claudia Johnson's expression, 'a great anomaly of literature' (1989, xiv). The gulf is indeed great between her high place in the literary Olympus on one hand, and the modest biographical and intellectual experience attributed to her on the other. In fact, in the majority of introductions to current editions of the novels this discrepancy (unfailing underlined) is not explained in a convincing manner. The reader cannot but be perplexed at the unexplained affirmation of a greatness which seems as mysterious and indecipherable as a classic episode of English nonsense.

The anomaly of this 'little middle-class provincial spinster' – who, despite 'living the most ordinary of existences without rebellion',¹ has been described as 'the greatest artist that has ever written' (G. H. Lewes, in *CH*, 140) – appears even greater to the Italian reader. The latter, not engaged with the Englishness of the novels and consequently not fully able to appreciate the sophisticated and subtle social comedy, sees in the content only the description of the banal and the commonplace. This response is underwritten by the attitude of indulgent superiority with which commentators on Austen's novels assert that there is little to say and that this can be understood by the reader without assistance. This in turn explains why Italian publishers have rarely given serious attention to the choice of writers of prefaces and introductions for their editions. When they have, the only criterion seems to have been the need to compensate for the slight appeal of the author with the choice of a name well known to the general reading public, such as the novelist Dacia Maraini for example.

It is also true that, virtually throughout the twentieth century, there were no lively studies of Austen in Italy that interacted with international ones. This closed attitude towards new developments in the field of Austen studies, evident

¹ 'zitellina medioborghese di provincia'; 'avendo vissuto senza ribellarsi la più comune delle esistenze' (Bertolucci 1975, viii).

from the 1960s onwards, has caused the approaches of subversive criticism, close textual reading and historical criticism to be considered little more than fashions that could not significantly change the dominant view of the importance of Austen's narrative art.

This attitude of deep and stubborn resistance is only now beginning to be redressed by a growing awareness that so-called 'Austenmania' is much more than a mere commercial phenomenon. In 2002, the first international conference 'Jane Austen: oggi e ieri' (Jane Austen: now and then) was held at the University of Bologna, accompanied by various publishing ventures, annual teaching courses and degree theses. It is clear that the revaluation of Austen in Italy can only be effected through the assured and convincing explanation of her narrative art. In turn, such a reinscription can only begin from those same centres of academic study where that initial image of the author took shape, which itself has until recently caused her to be held in such low critical esteem in Italy.

This chapter will consider how such a conventional image was formed and consolidated, and how the recent revaluation of Jane Austen can be attributed substantially to the development of one critical approach in particular. This approach was present in Italy at the beginning of the twentieth century, but remained long in the shadows before revealing itself as the most suitable means available of convincingly explaining Austen's significance. The first section of this chapter will be devoted to what could be defined as the 'romance of the reception' of Jane Austen between two conflicting interpretations, associated with the names of two key critics: Mario Praz and Emilio Cecchi. The second section will discuss more recent Italian commentary on Austen. Finally, this chapter will consider the problems connected with the translation of Austen's text, including a survey of the main and most widely circulating translations.

The romance of the reception: Praz and Cecchi

Jane Austen did not make her entrance into Italy and become visible to the Italian reading public until 1932, with a translation of *PP*, *Orgoglio e prevenzione* by Giulio Caprin. Caprin was the author of the first portrait of Austen presented to the general reading public in Italy. In his introductory essay, both the biographical image and the critical evaluation seem powerfully conditioned by the emotional pulse of the 1930s, which was not particularly sensitive to comic art in general and not very willing to give importance to the dramatic quality pervading the writing of this modest daughter of 'perfida Albione' (perfidious Albion).² Nevertheless, Caprin cannot but reveal and reflect Austen's dramatic qualities in his translation, which for this reason remains unsurpassed today. The favourable portrait by this contemporary and admirer of Gabriele d'Annunzio is, however, rather paternalistic and patronizing: '[this] young lady without horizons, without passions [. . .] had two eyes that saw well and precisely and

² This term, coined at the time of the French Revolution, was widely used in Fascist propaganda.

also, despite the strict adherence of her feelings to her own mediocre world, a natural sense of humour'.³ Caprin is attracted by the dramatic qualities of Austen, but in comparing her with Goldoni he highlights the inferior quality and triviality of her themes:

This unlearned girl had an instinct for shrewd construction. Naturally a naïve little Goldoni: serious parts alongside comic ones, all mainly concerning girls who confide their little secrets and, when they sigh with love, they lower their eyes as little girls from good families about to enter the nineteenth century should: each with her little character as well as her whims.⁴

Faithfully following James Edward Austen-Leigh's *Memoir of Jane Austen* (1870), Caprin reports and confirms the myth of her 'innocent wit' and 'most uneventful life imaginable',⁵ happily unaware of the Napoleonic wars, going on to add a final deadly touch, perhaps drawn from Henry James: 'the English girl [wrote] without the aspirations of a writer, as a pastime and to read what she wrote within the family, as she would have embroidered a bag or painted a screen'.⁶ All the Victorian commonplaces are collected and assembled here to underline the sense of narrowness, banality and lack of interest in Austen's fiction.

It is not so much the portrait itself which amazes us as the fact that it should be proposed again and again almost unchanged for virtually the whole century. Just a few years later in fact, in 1937, the Jane Austen of Caprin received academic authority in *Storia della letteratura inglese* (History of English literature), by Mario Praz, which with more than forty reprintings was to fix this view definitively as an unquestionable truth. First of all, Austen is placed in the chapter 'Pre-Romanticism, 1770–1798', even before Crabbe and is therefore associated with the previous generation. What follows are the distinguishing features and keywords of the dominant image of Austen's reception in Italy that has survived for almost seventy years, and indeed still appears in contemporary introductions:

anti-romantic mentality [. . .] small provincial world [. . .] short and monotonous life (she died of consumption) [. . .] The affairs of the heart of young girls are the

³ 'signorina senza orizzonti, senza passioni [. . .] aveva due occhi che vedevano bene e preciso e, non ostante la piena aderenza dei suoi sentimenti a quelli del suo mondo mediocre, anche un nativo senso del comico' (Caprin 1932, 8).

⁴ 'Aveva l'istinto della accorta costruzione questa ragazza non letterata. Naturalmente una goldonetta ingenua: le sue parti serie accanto a quelle comiche, spesso sono parti di ragazze che si confidano i loro segretucci e, quando sospirano d'amore, abbassano gli occhi come si conviene a ragazze di buona famiglia che stanno per entrare nell'Ottocento: ciascuna con il suo caratterino, oltre che con i suoi capricci' (Caprin 1932, 8).

⁵ 'candida arguzia'; 'vita che più povera di casi non si può immaginare' (Caprin 1932, 11, 9).

⁶ 'giovannetta inglese [scriveva] senza pretese di scrittrice, per passatempo suo e per leggerlo in famiglia, come avrebbe ricamato una borsetta o dipinto un paravento' (Caprin 1932, 7).

principal subject of these novels: but even the love scenes are described with chaste and restrained language that would have suited Manzoni perfectly [...] of the kisses of love not even one [...] not because of puritanism but because she will describe nothing that she has not known; [...] the neat, notarial writing, the exactness of actions and reactions as the extreme limit of the anti-romantic [...]

It would seem that Praz allows one passion alone to this 'positive and enigmatic young lady' by labelling her, with a paternalistic tone that borders on the burlesque, 'an enthusiastic dancer' – the dance, an abstract symbol of amorous commerce, being the 'supreme experience of Jane Austen in the sensual field'.⁸ While dance is presented as the inspiring principle of her novels, in place of the comic spirit (as Caprin saw it), the portrait of the writer becomes even more stiff and cold, more abstract and predictable, where 'three or four families go about their business',⁹ indifferent to the fact that Europe has been turned upside down by the Napoleonic saga. Her world, Praz pronounces, is that of Vermeer, Addison and Dr Johnson: 'Austen is, with Richardson, the most typical novelist of the English eighteenth century.'¹⁰

If we remember that, up to the year 2000, the *Storia della letteratura inglese* was issued forty-seven times, we can well understand why Praz's Jane Austen is still to be found not only in introductions to the translations of her novels, but also in most recent literary histories. While both Mirella Billi (2000) and Silvia Albertazzi (2002) cast aside with feminine sensitivity the paternalistic tones of Praz, they still allow a fundamental prejudice to survive: that Jane Austen, being easily decipherable as a writer, does not require a deep critical context.

Billi presents Austen as a writer who recapitulates the lessons of the eighteenth-century novel. On the one hand, it is acknowledged that Austen performs 'a meta-narrative operation' by means of a 'dual parodying of the sentimental and Gothic novel', and 'has really foreshadowed the interior monologue of the modern novel' in the form of her *Bildungsroman*.¹¹ On the other, Billi's three short pages provide neither explanation nor evidence of how this pupil of Dr Johnson employs interior monologue or how she can reconcile the *Bildungsroman* form with that of ironic parody. The image consequently remains

⁷ 'mentalità antiromantica [...] piccolo mondo provinciale [...] vita monotona e breve (mori di consunzione) [...] Gli affari di cuore delle ragazze sono il soggetto principale di questi romanzi: ma anche le scene d'amore son descritte con casto e contenuto linguaggio che sarebbe andato a genio al Manzoni [...] ma di baci d'amore neanche uno [...] non per puritanesimo, ma perché nulla essa descrive che non abbia conosciuto; [...] la linda stesura notarile, la puntualità delle azioni e reazioni come l'estremo limite dell'antiromantico' (Praz 1960, 404).

⁸ 'signorina positiva e [...] indecifrabile'; 'entusiastica danzatrice'; 'suprema esperienza di Jane Austen nel campo voluttuario' (Praz 1960, 404–05).

⁹ 'tre o quattro famiglie si fanno gli affari loro' (Praz 1960, 406).

¹⁰ 'la Austen è, con Richardson, la romanziera più tipica del Settecento inglese' (Praz 1960, 406).

¹¹ 'un'operazione metanarrativa'; 'duplice parodizzazione del romanzo sentimentale e gotico'; 'anticipato il monologo interiore proprio del romanzo moderno' (Billi 2000, 380–82).

confused and blurred, remote and devoid of memorable justifications or illustrations.

Albertazzi, while perpetuating the traditional commonplaces – Austen’s Augustan anti-Romanticism, her narrow horizon and provincialism – nonetheless comes nearer to the writer by opening a perspective on the ‘problems connected with the pursuit of capitalism [. . .] and female education’, as demonstrated by ‘the obsession of her characters with economic problems’ and with ‘matrimonial politics’.¹² The very sensitivity that allows Albertazzi to overlook, if not ignore, Prazian teaching, however, causes her to fall under the influence of another famous critic, Edward Said. In fact Albertazzi writes, ‘*Mansfield Park* [. . .] appears to be the first nineteenth-century novel whose author openly supports the British colonial enterprise.’¹³ Albertazzi appears to accept Fanny as the spokeswoman for the values and innate conservatism of Austen’s class, while simultaneously acknowledging the ambiguity of Austen’s language and her use of double-talk: ‘first stating the obvious and then, using the same words, suggesting the narrowness of the society that accepts it’.¹⁴ Albertazzi’s hesitation between labelling Austen’s writing as both Augustan and distinctly nineteenth-century, as well as her identification of Austen’s open support for and ambiguous critique of imperialism, exemplifies once more the lack of a critical focus sensitive to the complexities of Austen’s fiction. What emerges is the limitation of both Praz’s and Said’s approaches, which privilege content over style and the analysis of themes over language.

The real problem, and the origin of the uncertainty, confusion and contradictory presentations of Austen, lies in the undervaluing of her parodic and ironic style. The dominant prejudice concerning her ‘neat, notarial writing’ makes it impossible to move beyond the innocuous wit, gentle humour and benevolent irony. The irony underlying the whole structure of the novels – in fact, a general or romantic irony – is consequently never taken into proper consideration.

The introductions to the recent editions of *Ragione e sentimento* (SS) and *Orgoglio e pregiudizio* (PP) in the series ‘I grandi dell’Ottocento’ (The great writers of the nineteenth century, 2004), by Pietro Meneghelli and Riccardo Reim respectively, reflect what I have been suggesting. The authors of these prefatory notes appear to have absolute faith that what needs to be said about Austen has already been said in Praz or in Bertolucci’s introductions, which are repeatedly and extensively quoted. This renders any reference to the existence of Anglo-American, or even other Italian, criticism of Austen superfluous. Consequently, readers are not disturbed by even the echo of the *controversiality* and

¹² ‘problematiche legate all’incalzare del capitalismo [. . .] e relative all’educazione femminile’; ‘l’ossessione dei suoi personaggi per i problemi economici’; ‘politica matrimoniale’ (Albertazzi 2002, 186–87).

¹³ ‘*Mansfield Park* appare come il primo romanzo ottocentesco il cui autore sostenga apertamente l’impresa coloniale britannica’ (Albertazzi 2002, 188).

¹⁴ ‘prima affermare l’ovvio, poi, usando le stesse parole, suggerire la pochezza della società che lo accetta’ (Albertazzi 2002, 188).

dialectic characteristic of Austen studies abroad. Nor are readers made aware that as many as eight biographies have been written since 1997 (Battaglia 2006) or that new readings have been identified by Italian scholars over the last three decades (Sabbadini 1974; Colaiacomo 1976–77; Bompiani 1978; Battaglia 1983a, 1983b, 2002b; Zordo 1998). These studies, resulting from a close dialogue with Anglo-American criticism, agree on the need to ‘historicize’ Austen in several contexts – social and economic, as well as aesthetic and literary – and to give precedence to formal language over thematic content in her writing.

It was only because of another fertile critical approach that the stylistic and historical approaches in vogue within Austen studies during the 1960s had any influence or were even able to take root at all in an uncongenial Italian terrain still soaked in Crocean idealism. This approach antedates that of Praz and had remained in the shadows during the Fascist period. During the 1960s, it was developing into a ‘school’, with the appearance of Carlo Izzo’s *Storia della letteratura inglese* (The history of English literature, 1961–63). Presenting Jane Austen as ‘she who carries the domestic novel to such *structural and formal perfection* that after her nothing else was possible except for the Victorian novel’,¹⁵ and comparing her style to Ariosto’s (and not, like Praz, her themes to Manzoni’s), Izzo returns directly to the first important essay on Austen in Italy in Emilio Cecchi’s *Storia della letteratura inglese nel secolo XIX* (The history of English literature in the nineteenth century, 1915).

Cecchi (1884–1966), a man of letters and an art critic always in contact with international culture, was not an academic; however, his polymathic background enabled him to appreciate the complexity of Austen’s art and to adumbrate modern critical approaches. His view of Austen remains valid and up-to-date, and could very happily replace certain contemporary introductions. He knew all the six novels (none of which had yet been translated into Italian), the letters and the juvenilia (then unpublished). Contrary to conventional criticism, he locates Austen neither beside Addison nor the beloved Dr Johnson, but correctly between the first and second Romantic generations, and beside Scott. It is clear, therefore, that he prefers the ‘poor little housewife with her little bundle of novels [to] the filibusterer [. . .] with all his plumes and shiny medals in Dutch metal’.¹⁶ It is very significant that Cecchi begins his chapter with an observation completely opposed to that with which the present essay had to commence, in ‘considering [. . .] the disparity between the humble literary fate and the great merits of the writer’ – merits that he finds in her style.¹⁷

As an expert in Impressionist painting, Cecchi is sensitive to the narrative technique that Austen draws on, using the rules of composition of the

¹⁵ ‘colei che porta il romanzo domestico a un livello di tale *perfezione strutturale e formale* che dopo di lei non altro fu possibile se non il romanzo vittoriano’ (Izzo 1961, 280; emphases mine).

¹⁶ ‘poverella massaja con il fagottello dei suoi sei romanzi [al] filibustiere [. . .] con tutti i suoi pennacchi e luccicanti medaglie di similoro’ (Cecchi 1915, 229–30).

¹⁷ ‘considerando [. . .] la disparità fra la sua umile sorte letteraria e i grandi meriti della scrittrice’ (Cecchi 1915, 228).

picturesque of William Gilpin. He consequently rejects 'the common comparison of Austen's art to Flemish painting', defining this as 'nothing more than a coarse, external parallel'.¹⁸

Miss Austen has nothing sensual and mystical. She does not have a visual imagination, a plastic sensitivity in which her carnality might commit a sin, in order that her innerness might concentrate more on itself and exalt itself. Crabbe looks at the rural scenes like a grammarian analysing the layout of a sentence with a magnifying glass. Miss Austen behaves in the same way concerning petty-bourgeois life, and to do this with greater ease and lucidity, before doing anything else she clears sentiment out of the way. [...] here everything pulses with a clean dynamism that redeems minuteness [...] and a curious stylistic joy is never absent.¹⁹

According to Cecchi, it is the 'stylistic thrust' ('mordente stilistico'; 1915, 239) of her writing that explains why Austen is admired more by writers than by ordinary readers. This focus on style enables Cecchi to anticipate two fundamental strands in subsequent Austen criticism: the interpretation of her irony and, as a consequence, the characteristics of her moral vision.

Her art constitutes a silent underground link between the eighteenth-century novel and the Victorian novel, I would say the critical and ironic novel of Thackeray, [...] and yet one is initially inclined to believe that Miss Austen's speciousness is only a tidied-up ancientness, a residue of the inspiration of the Richardsons, Fieldings and Sternes, appropriate for a womanly organism [...]. Now this is not the case with Miss Austen [...] there is in fact nothing of the sermonizing in her intuitions about life. If her characters are often instructive, this does not concern the writer. If anything, the gaunt, slightly demented sadness at the heart of the laughter in Sterne in her has become logical.²⁰

¹⁸ 'il paragone comune fra l'arte della Austen e la pittura di genere dei fiamminghi'; 'nulla più di un raffronto esterno e grossolano' (Cecchi 1915, 232).

¹⁹ 'Miss Austen non ha nulla di sensuale e di mistico. Non ha un'immaginazione visiva, una sensibilità plastica nella quale, a così dire, la sua carnalità pecchi, perché la sua interiorità più si concentri in sé e si esalti. Crabbe guarda gli scenari agresti come un grammatico che analizza la testura d'un periodo con la lente d'ingrandimento. Miss Austen si comporta nello stesso modo, rispetto al meccanismo della piccola vita borghese. E per far con maggior agio e lucidità la sua analisi, toglie di mezzo prima di tutto il sentimento. [...] qui tutto vibra di un lindo dinamismo che riscatta la minuziosità [...] e non mai viene a mancare una curiosa letizia stilistica' (Cecchi 1915, 233–34).

²⁰ 'La sua arte costituisce un silenzioso tramite sotterraneo fra il romanzo settecentesco e il romanzo vittoriano, dico quello critico e ironico di Thackeray, [...]. E, a tutta prima, uno è inclinato a credere che la speciosità di Miss Austen sia soltanto un'arcaicità ravviata, un residuo dell'ispirazione dei Richardson, dei Fielding e degli Sterne, adattato a un organismo muliebre [...]. Ora ciò non si adatta a Miss Austen [...] nella sua intuizione della vita è invece poco o nulla di predicatorio. Se i suoi personaggi sono spesso istruttivi, questo non concerne la scrittrice. Se mai la scarsa tristezza un po' demente ch'è in fondo al ridere dello Sterne s'è andata in lei logicizzando' (Cecchi 1915, 228, 231–32).

Cecchi does not let himself be influenced by the Victorian portrait of the proper lady endowed with innocuous and candid wit. Terms repeatedly used like 'affectionate cruelty', 'cynical and crude', 'unarmed wickedness', 'mockery', 'derisory', 'grotesque', 'buffoonish', 'irony', 'ambiguity', 'caricature', 'bizarre [. . .] precise Hogarthian anger',²¹ demonstrate a perception of Austen similar to that of David Nokes, which recently provoked much discomfort in Austen criticism, but which seems the only approach capable of convincingly resolving the anomaly that Claudia Johnson speaks of. The following observations below, if applied to *MP*, reveal the ambiguity of the relationship between author and narrator, striking a note with Reginald Farrer's observations of 1917:

[Austen] was able to let a small humanity live, in which the appearance of the notion and aspiration of good was in fact economic need, social advantage and the desire not to commit social mistakes. When she has to be constructive, highlight something, lay down some rigid lines or emphasize some important words, she goes out in falsetto atrociously. With moral sense, she obviously lacks compassion and indignation.²²

Cecchi's unequivocal emphasis on Austen's anti-dogmatic approach and subtle subversiveness becomes an invitation to penetrate Austen's ironic and indirect language, almost a challenge to comprehend her style and thus to analyse the narrative technique and form of the novels.

This challenge is even more clearly articulated by Carlo Izzo, who, as a Dickens scholar and translator of Defoe and Edward Lear, is struck above all by the stylistic 'weighted perfection' ('soppesata perfezione'), which is typical of 'great comedy' ('grande commedia'; 1961, 281). Far from considering Austen's fiction on the basis of its content, as 'decorous novels for young ladies', Izzo underlines that 'Austen's brilliant ability to set up in such a limited context the most subtle and surprising arabesques, has assured them a much higher place in the hierarchy of literary values.'²³ Her ease, like that of Ariosto, is the fruit of much effort. Her so-called anti-Romanticism is not backwardness or provincialism, but rather 'absolute originality' ('assoluta originalità'; Izzo 1961, 284). There is no space here for the paternalism of Praz: behind a mask of innocence

²¹ 'affettuosa crudeltà', 'perfidia disarmata', 'beffa', 'beffardo', 'grottesco', 'buffonesco', 'ironia', 'ambiguità', 'caricatura', 'bizzarro [. . .] minuta rabbia hogarthiana' (Cecchi 1915, 235–42).

²² 'questa scrittrice poteva far vivere una piccola umanità nella quale l'apparenza della nozione e dell'aspirazione di bene era in realtà bisogno economico, tornaconto sociale, desiderio di non commettere civili sgrammaticature. Quando per necessità costruttiva, per bisogno di risalti, ella deve stabilire qualche linea forte, appoggiar qualche grossa parola, esce atrocemente in falsetto. Con il senso morale le manca naturalmente la facoltà della commozione, dell'indignazione' (Cecchi 1915, 238).

²³ 'garbati romanzi per signorime'; 'la magistrale abilità della Austen nell'intessere su così limitata scacchiera arabeschi tra i più sottili e sorprendenti, ha assicurato loro un posto ben più alto nella gerarchia dei valori letterari' (Izzo 1961, 282).

and ironic detachment of the 'incomparable Jane' ('impareggiabile Jane'), Izzo perceives the complexity of a great artist of the novel which is still to be completely deciphered (see Battaglia 2002a, 11).

Nevertheless, during the 1970s, it was a thankless task to follow the path of Cecchi and Izzo, both in subject matter and methodology. Austen's language and style, authoritatively and definitively labelled as 'neat, notarial writing', needed no analysis, especially if it were inappropriately applied to the narrative 'technique' – such an extra-literary word that it had to be used within inverted commas! Furthermore, 1973 saw the publication of Patricia Nerozzi's *Jane Austen*, as part of 'Biblioteca di studi inglesi', under the direction of Agostino Lombardo, Praz's successor at the helm of English studies in Italy. Nerozzi's study, the first monograph really worthy of the name, ran to 334 pages, but did no more than give extensive sanction to the orthodox Jane Austen, whose mediocre life, arising from a limited and secluded world, distanced her from the great issues of her day.

Recent Italian criticism

Around the same time, at the Accademia delle Scienze dell'Istituto di Bologna, Izzo was presenting an essay by Beatrice Battaglia, entitled 'Ironia e "tecnica narrativa" nei romanzi di Jane Austen' (Irony and 'narrative technique' in the novels of Jane Austen, 1973–74), which presented a challenge to conventional criticism. In the essay the intuitions of subversive criticism (by D. W. Harding, Marvin Mudrick and Andrew Wright) are passed through the sieve of a rigorous textual analysis that, following Norman Page (1969, 1972), reconstructs the narrative point of view in the novels. What emerges is the role of the author as director, or rather as one who directs the movements of the narrative 'camera'. The analysis (from narrative to indirect and direct speech, etc.) establishes that the director is not worried about being in harmony with the narrating voice and the apparently exemplary characters, rather tending to free herself, if imperceptibly: Austen's irony is deemed to have its origin in the interaction and subtle dissociation between author and narrator. In those years, *MP* was read as the great involution or apostasy from irony, as the evidence of Austen's didacticism and anti-theatricality. Battaglia, deeming it the most complex of Austen's works, suggests reasons for this controversial issue:

The interpretation of *Mansfield Park* as a serious-minded and didactic novel is justified by the existence of a moralistic narrator who, from beginning to end, judges and comments with severity and seriousness according to the moral standards of the time. She can be traced, following her Johnsonian style, sitting in the shadow in the drawing-room at Mansfield, or at Portsmouth, or on the stage in the final chapter, set on condemning vice and praising virtue with such rigour as to make anyone familiar with the *juvenilia* and the letters feel somewhat uneasy and unconvinced, and consequently more alert and attentive. [...] it becomes evident that a split between the Narrator and the Author has taken place in the course of the novel. The former can be traced by following her language, the latter through her technique. The technical strategy devised by the Author of *Mansfield Park*

gives expression to the moralist in the role of the Narrator and to the ironist as Stage-Director.²⁴

This analysis, continued and extended through the criticism of Litz (1965) and Moler (1968), led to Battaglia's essay *La zitella illetterata: parodia e ironia nei romanzi di Jane Austen* (The unlearned spinster: parody and irony in Jane Austen's novels, 1983b). Battaglia starts from the premise that Austen is 'the most ambiguous and controversial writer in English literature'.²⁵ This is due to a

strategy of parody [which] reveals itself as the dominant characteristic of her narrative language, of her 'feminine writing', since it allows her to keep her distance from, while declaring her own awareness of, contemporary narrative conventions precisely at the moment when she seems to follow them.²⁶

This evaluation of Austen's narrative strategy, which evolved from the overt burlesque of her early writings to the ironic parody of the Chawton novels, is an indispensable premise to the interpretation, both of the content of her novels and her attitude towards contemporary society. The study of the sociocultural and political background (Colaiacono 1976–77; Bompiani 1978) is also invaluable, but not sufficient (as asserted by Battaglia 2002a, 11–13), and must be confronted with the double-faced, chameleon-like writing through which Austen expresses her attitude towards her own society (Lascelles 1968, 103).

Italian criticism from the 1980s, however, evidences a reluctance to deal with these two aspects (stylistic analysis and historical-cultural contextualization), considered necessary by Battaglia. Some commentators prefer a discursive mode, avoiding notes (Bertinetti 1987), or even a fictionalized one (Livi 1984; Kotnik 1996). Others seemingly wish to address the growing importance of

²⁴ 'L'interpretazione che vede in *Mansfield Park* un romanzo serio e morale, è giustificata dal fatto che esiste una narratrice moralista, che commenta e giudica con serietà e severità, secondo gli standards del tempo, dal principio alla fine del romanzo. La si può rintracciare, seguendo il suo accento johnsoniano, seduta nella penombra della *drawing-room* a Mansfield o nel salotto di Portsmouth oppure sulla scena, nell'ultimo capitolo, intenta a condannare il vizio e lodare la virtù con un rigore che non può non suscitare, in chi abbia dimestichezza con la Jane Austen dei juvenilia e delle lettere, quel vago senso di disagio che si accompagna alla mancanza di convinzione e che risveglia perciò una più vigile attenzione [. . .] Alla successiva, indispensabile rilettura, appare evidente che, nel corso del romanzarsi è realizzato uno sdoppiamento tra la narratrice e l'autrice: la prima è rintracciabile attraverso il suo linguaggio, la seconda sulla base della "tecnica". La struttura tecnica sviluppata dall'autrice di *Mansfield Park* appare articolata in modo da dare espressione alla moralista nel ruolo di narratrice, e all'ironista nei panni di "regista" (Battaglia 1973–74, 149–50).

²⁵ 'la scrittrice più ambigua e controversa della letteratura inglese' (Battaglia 1983b, 7).

²⁶ 'strategia parodica [che] si rivela la caratteristica dominante del suo linguaggio narrativo, della sua "scrittura femminile", poiché le consente di prendere le distanze, dichiarando la propria consapevolezza dalle convenzioni narrative contemporanee proprio nel momento in cui pare aderirvi' (Battaglia 1983b, 7).

Austen since the bicentenary, by making use of complex and frankly abstruse language, as in the case of Enrico Groppali's introduction of 1983 (reprinted 2003), which describes *PP* thus:

The plot is nothing else than the meandering of binary relationships, the final conjunction is brought about carefully and stealthily, the overcoming of the solipsistic individual ego is reached in the cathartic unity of the *ab aeterno* undivided monad.²⁷

Even the valuable *Dalle parte di Jane Austen* (On the side of Jane Austen, 1994), edited by Francesco Marroni, is not exempt from an excess of specialist jargon. The volume is a doctoral collection and therefore consists of studies by younger scholars, conscientiously informed but not very open to conflict and debate. With Austen, humility is required: the exact opposite of the attitude long dominant in Italian criticism. There are notable exceptions to this, marked by their intuitive sensitivity (Zazo 1982, 2002a, 2002b; Zordo 1998; Citati 1999b). It is in this way that Ornella de Zordo dares to introduce *MP*:

One of the textual strategies through which Jane Austen carries out her attack on the educational stereotypes of her time is the distinction, or better, the split between an external and omniscient narrative voice, which we will call the narrator of the novel [. . .] and an ironic author, who in a subterranean and indirect way consistently undermines and delegitimizes the narrative voice.²⁸

This is the first instance of a truly critical dialogue about Austen in Italy, the first to take up the thesis of Austen's strategy and the natural role of the artist as director or dramatist, which is re-examined by Battaglia in several subsequent studies (2002b, 2003, 2004).

Battaglia has recently argued that the numerous recent biographies of Austen (above all, Nokes 1997), in opening new perspectives on the life of the author, justify and confirm the modernity of her writing, which has been so strongly contested until now. The chameleon-like writing of Austen's 'dramatic' novels is, in fact, the natural product of Gilpin's 'rules of composition' (Battaglia 2004, 20–23) and the heritage of eighteenth-century female comedy (from Centlivre to Cowley to Inchbald). So, the Jane Austen that Battaglia presents to Italian readers in the last popular edition of her masterpieces (*Romanzi: Mansfield Park, Orgoglio e pregiudizio, Emma*), published by Garzanti in 2005, is a very different character from the traditionally received one, but without doubt more credible as the *inventor* (to use Claudia Johnson's term) of the modern novel:

²⁷ 'L'intreccio non è che uno snodarsi di rapporti binari, la copula finale è tenuta accuratamente in sordina, il superamento dell'ego solipsistico individuale viene raggiunto nell'unità catartica della monade *ab aeterno* indivisa' (Groppali 2003, xiii).

²⁸ 'Una delle strategie testuali attraverso cui Jane Austen muove il suo attacco agli stereotipi educativi del suo tempo è la distinzione, o per meglio dire, lo sdoppiamento tra una voce narrativa esterna e onnisciente, che chiameremo la narratrice del romanzo [. . .] e una autrice ironica che in modo sotterraneo e indiretto ne delegittima costantemente l'autorità' (Zordo 1998, 7–8).

The historical, cultural and literary studies of the last decades allow us [. . .] to free her image from the Victorian ‘iron mask’ which, flattening the novelist into a serious and didactic writer, has transformed her into an icon of *Englishness*, guilty of having promoted the ideology of British imperialism in the world. Identifying, as Edward Said does, the author of *Mansfield Park* with her Victorian mask while completely ignoring her formal language, prevents us from reaching that critical and metanarrative dimension in which the writer’s relevance as a novelist and ‘our contemporary’ lies. [. . .] Her novels take up political positions concerning the economic and social condition of women, diplomatically expressed, as in eighteenth-century female comedies, with playfulness, wit and *humour*, which, while never openly criticizing patriarchal laws, stimulate criticism in the reader.²⁹

As further evidenced by the publication of the essay collection, *Re-Drawing Austen: Picturesque Travels in Austenland* (Battaglia and Saglia 2004), with its wide-ranging cohort of Austen scholars drawn from the anglophone world, the University of Bologna is at present the focal point in Italy both of Austen studies and of the revaluation of this great novelist.

The translations

The earliest edition of Jane Austen’s novels listed in the *Catalogo unico delle biblioteche italiane* (Integrated catalogue of Italian libraries) is an anglophone *SS*, in the ‘Collection of British Authors’ series published in 1864 by Bernhard Tauchnitz of Leipzig (four copies). This is followed by the remaining novels issued by Tauchnitz: *MP*, 1867 (two), *PP*, 1870 (seven), *NA and P*, 1871 (two) and *E*, 1877 (two). These few copies are found in libraries in northern Italy, and even if some copies of the Dent’s 1906 edition were added, Austen was practically unknown in Italy before the first translation of *PP* in 1932. This first translation by Giulio Caprin, which continued to be published under the title *Orgoglio e prevenzione* until as late as 1970, was followed by another sixteen translations entitled *Orgoglio e pregiudizio*, the last in 2004. The other novels were translated for the first time between 1943 and 1961, and they have been translated a considerable number of times, though not as often as *PP*.

In general it can be said that, even more than the critical introductions, it is

²⁹ ‘Gli studi storici, culturali e letterari degli ultimi decenni consentono [. . .] di liberare la sua immagine dalla “maschera di ferro” vittoriana che, appiattendola in una scrittrice seria e didattica, l’ha trasformata in icona della *Englishness*, responsabile di aver divulgato l’ideologia dell’imperialismo britannico nel mondo. Ma, identificare, come fa Edward Said, l’autrice di *Mansfield Park* con la sua maschera vittoriana, ignorando del tutto il suo linguaggio formale, impedisce di accedere a quella dimensione critica e metanarrativa su cui poggia la rilevanza della scrittrice come romanziera e “nostra contemporanea” [. . .] I suoi romanzi sono delle prese di posizione politiche sulla situazione economica e civile della donna, diplomaticamente espresse, come nelle commedie femminili settecentesche, con garbo, spirito, *humour*, che pur senza mai contestare apertamente le leggi patriarcali, stimolano la critica nel lettore’ (Battaglia 2005, x–xiii).

the translations themselves which are responsible for the limited interest of Italian readers in Austen. The evaluation cannot be positive for a variety of reasons, and not merely owing to the interpretation and untranslatable ambiguity of great art (elements never taken into consideration by the Italian translator of Austen, who has always considered the text transparent and 'notarial'). Even if we set aside the fundamental contentious argument concerning the parodic and ironic nature of Austen's writing, and we consider the six works merely as novels of manners or pleasing tales of virtue rewarded, their translation poses problems which have been completely ignored.

The only criterion of evaluation in the various translations seems to be that of an external adaptation of the *style* in response to changes in taste and fashion. Examining the different translations of *PP*, Mirella Agorni and Elena di Giovanni (2004) limit themselves to identifying the main choice between translating or not translating names and titles, without questioning the validity of such a criterion. This choice in fact does not apply, because no Italian equivalent of the novels' social setting exists. There are no Italian equivalents of Mr and Mrs Bennet: no Italian wife would address her husband in private as '*Signor Bennet*', except in jocular or playfully mocking terms. Mrs Bennet, however, is perfectly serious: she is not simply a rather silly woman tormenting her husband, but also a mother worried about the survival of her daughters in a world where profit is the secretly omnipotent force which, abetted by the law, generates the subtlest social and moral nuances, conventions and manners. In such a world as this, form becomes an important and vital substance.

We cannot therefore ignore the difference between the 'Mr Knightley' of Emma and the 'Knightley' of Mrs Elton. In the last translation of *E* (Petrignani 1996), the titles have sometimes been translated, but for the most part eliminated, and first names have been added: poor 'Mr Woodhouse' has become 'Henry Woodhouse', when not the simpler 'il vecchio Woodhouse' (old Woodhouse) or even merely 'Woodhouse'; while 'Mr Knightley' becomes (in the narrator's mouth exactly as in that of the vulgar Mrs Elton!) simply 'Knightley' or 'George Knightley'. At the same time, 'to respect the formal veneer of relationships between characters that are still profoundly eighteenth-century', Petrignani feels obliged to preserve the *voi* pronoun, in order to 'remain faithful to the original', in which she sees only 'the colourful and buzzing beehive' of Piero Citati or the 'cheerful concert [of the different characters] all involved in the dance' of Praz!

Clearly, a deeper awareness of the full meaning of manners and their roots, especially in the case of the upper-middle classes or gentry in Regency England, would produce more caution when confronting complex characters such as Sir Thomas or Edmund Bertram. It is futile and misleading to search for their Italian equivalents, whereas it would be sufficient to translate these characters in their diversity, which is itself rooted in the originality and uniqueness of their social setting. By ignoring or confusing the original historical setting, the translations of the novels thus become re-makings, which, depending on the sensitivity of the translator, tend towards the romantic fiction of Georgette Heyer or Barbara Cartland, or else towards a fantastic sentimental comedy, which could be set anywhere.

Even as romantic comedies, however, the Italian translations are unsatisfactory in terms of style and language. If we share Cecchi's opinion that Austen's 'natural voice' ('natural posizione di canto'; 1915, 235) is dialogic, then translation from a dramatic language like English into Italian – a language that is by nature literary and less suggestive of gesture and intonation – is anything but an easy task. The translator needs a dramatic ear and instinct, a good knowledge of Italian registers, as well as a sophisticated command of syntax and lexicon. It is not by chance that the best of the seventeen translations of *PP* is the work of Giulio Caprin, a lover of Goldoni's drama, and himself a writer and literary critic. Austen's witty comedy requires a precise language indeed, clear but at the same time natural enough to run unnoticed without obstructing the appreciation of wit and irony.

However, with the exception of *Orgoglio e pregiudizio*, where the romantic plot attracts all the attention, thus attenuating the defects, the language of the translations generally conveys hurry and imprecision, and presents an irregular modulation that, consequently, makes it unrealistic and difficult to read. For example, in the latest translation of *PP* (Placido 2004), we find English expressions like 'young man' incorrectly translated as 'giovane uomo' (5; italics mine), or arbitrarily added explicitions ('at loo' translated with '*intenti a giocare*' (45), where the added *intenti*, meaning 'intent', contrasts with the atmosphere of the Netherfield party) or literary and obsolete words ('trovo *diletto* in molte altre cose' (45) for '“I have pleasure in many things”' (*PP*, 1.8: 37)). These obsolete words are inserted, it is explained (xxvii–xxx), to fix the novel in its eighteenth-century frame. To the same end, the *voi* pronoun is preserved but the translation of the characters' titles such as *Signor*, *Signora* and *Signorina* have the effect of rendering everything as unreal as in the eighteenth-century world of operetta.

An obsolete and uneven language, full of anglicisms (especially syntactic) is also typical of what is considered the best among the Italian translations, that of *E* by Praz (1951). Praz's translation is undoubtedly more convincing than the first (Casalino 1945), which was fairly free and which made some amusing 'additions' to the original, for example giving a pair of spectacles to Emma.³⁰ Praz was right to retain the characters' English names and titles, while a place like Donwell Abbey, translated as 'l'Abbazia di Donwell', acquires an irrelevant and unhistorical ecclesiastical echo. Nevertheless, Praz's view of Austen's narrative world as an eighteenth-century dance is reflected in a formal and, at times, awkward language, far from everyday use: 'handsome' becomes *avvenente* (comely) and 'evening parties' becomes *brigata serali* (companies of the evening). The past tense is translated into the Italian *imperfetto* (imperfect), a tense that instead of highlighting the comic action by fixing its uniqueness of action, waters it down into repetitiveness: 'Non c'era [instead of *fu*] a questo proposito nessuna voce discordante, sia quando Mrs Perry *prendeva* [instead of *prese*] il tè da Mrs e Miss Bates, sia quando Mrs and Miss Bates *restituivano* [instead of *restituirono*] la visita'; 'Correva [instead of *Corse*] una strana voce per Highbury che tutti i piccoli

³⁰ 'She [. . .] arranged the glasses [of the carriage window]' (*E*, 1.13: 114) is translated as 'si aggiustò gli occhiali' ('She set her spectacles right'; Casalino 1945, 114).

Perry' (Praz 1951, 10, 12).³¹ Personal subject pronouns and possessive adjectives are retained in the translation even when they are redundant in Italian. The same applies to the English passive forms that are not at all common in Italian: 'Ora in occasione del matrimonio del padre, *era stato suggerito da parte di moltissimi che quella visita dovesse avere luogo*'; 'Sapeva che talvolta la sua mancanza *doveva essere sentita* [instead of *si sarebbe sentita la sua mancanza*]' (Praz 1951, 10, 11).³²

The same excessive adherence to English syntax is found in the latest translation of *E* (Zazo 2002a), which gives the style a stiffness that is perhaps the combined result of the translator having been domiciled in England for many years and the Prazian influence she admits in her introduction (xvi). It is difficult to say how far economic considerations have contributed to the production of such a large number of translations of the six novels: *PP* (seventeen), *E* (twelve), *SS* (six), *MP* (five), *P* (five), *NA* (three). Merely revised translations are not infrequent, as in the case of Meneghelli's *SS* (1995), which is similar to Boffito Serra (1961). There seems to be no apparent dialogue or development between translations, as far as either the problems posed by Austen's text or the results are concerned. The celebrated opening of *PP* has never been adequately translated to reflect either the analogical and metaphorical matrix of the economically laden bourgeois language, the doubleness of the writing ('universally'/'neighbourhood'; 'good fortune'/'want') or the ironic overstatement ('truth universally acknowledged'/'must be'). Among the translations that are still widely available, the most successful remains the earliest, even if it sounds a little longwinded for Austen's sobriety of style:

Caprin 1932: 'E' verità universalmente riconosciuta che uno scapolo largamente provvisto di beni di fortuna debba sentire il bisogno di ammogliarsi': 'It is a truth universally acknowledged that a single man largely provided with property must feel the need to marry' (1957, 13).

Castellini and Rosi 1945: 'E' cosa ormai risaputa che a uno scapolo in possesso di un vistoso patrimonio manchi soltanto una moglie': 'It is by now a well-known thing that a single man in possession of an outstanding fortune is lacking nothing but a wife' (2006, 15).

Agosti Castellani 1952: 'E' una verità universalmente ammessa che uno scapolo fornito di un buon patrimonio debba sentir bisogno di ammogliarsi': 'It is a truth universally admitted that a single man provided with a good fortune must feel the need to get married' (11).

Maranesi 1975: 'E' cosa nota e universalmente riconosciuta che uno scapolo in possesso di un solido patrimonio debba essere in cerca di moglie': 'It is already a well-known and universally admitted thing that a single man in possession of a substantial fortune must be in search of a wife' (1).

³¹ 'There *was* not a dissentient voice on the subject, either when Mrs Perry *drank* tea with Mrs and Miss Bates, or when Mrs and Miss Bates *returned* the visit'; 'There was a strange rumour in Highbury of all the little Perrys' (italics mine)

³² 'Now, upon his father's marriage, *it was very generally proposed*, as a most proper attention, that the visit should take place'; 'She knew that at times *she must be missed*' (italics mine).

Placido 2004: 'E' una verità universalmente riconosciuta che uno scapolo in possesso di una buona fortuna sia in cerca di moglie': 'It is a truth universally acknowledged that a single man in possession of a good fortune is in search of a wife' (5).

In fact, Placido (2004, xxix–xxx) poses the problem of the translation of 'in want of a wife' and then translates it as 'in cerca di moglie' (as if the text were 'in search of a wife'), ignoring the more accurate translations by Caprin and Agosti Castellani, who choose the word *bisogno* (lack, need). Placido's note is significant, however, because it is the first acknowledgement that Austen's writing is difficult to translate, being 'so intricate, so rich and so varied' ('intricato e complicato'; xxix), and that most difficulties stem from the great importance Austen ascribes to language: 'The text has within it a range of voices (those of the various characters) and modes (from dialogues to indirect speech to letters).'³³ This is an important starting point for future translations, especially for those of the novels in which narrative is given more space (*SS*, *MP* and *P*).

The clumsy and unfocused effect produced by the Italian translations of *MP* is linked to the fact that the original *direction* (in the cinematic sense) of the novel is not always respected. There is no close adherence to the skilful movement of the narrative camera, which establishes the exact position and distance of the character on stage and focuses, even with a single adjective, on certain details rather than others, thus evoking a subtly ironic dimension and a potential ambiguity of interpretation. For example, Mrs Norris's covert and subtle manoeuvring to make her rich brother-in-law support their poor niece loses its original emphasis if the translation transforms the calculated repetition of the action ('Mrs Norris *was often observing*') into habit (as if the original were 'Mrs Norris *was used often to observe*'): 'Mrs Norris *soleva spesso* far osservare agli altri' (Bonacossa della Valle di Casanova 1961, 23). Moreover, by replacing the free indirect speech of the source ('"What if they were among them to undertake the care of her eldest daughter"' ; *MP*, 1.1: 5) with direct speech – 'Potremmo prenderci a carico la figlia maggiore' ('"We might take care of the eldest daughter"') – Mrs Norris is foregrounded, in contrast with her patient and cautious proceeding in the original.

In the four translations of *MP*, the recurrent flaw is the lack of precision in those lexical terms that should respect the analogical matrix of Austen's 'economic' language: 'The letter was not *unproductive*' ('la lettera non fu infruttuosa'; *MP*, 1.1: 5) is translated as 'La lettera non fu *inutile* [*useless*]' (Bonacossa della Valle di Casanova 1961, 25); 'La lettera non fu *spedita invano* [*was not sent in vain*]' (Buffa di Castelferro 1983, 5); 'La lettera *recò buoni frutti* [*bore good fruit*]' (Palma 1999, 65). Furthermore, in the case of *MP*, the best translation in terms of the correct use of Italian remains the first, Bonacossa della Valle di Casanova's (1961), while Palma's (1999) is the hardest to read because it is full of improprieties and genuine errors: 'Sir Thomas sent friendly advice *and*

³³ 'Il testo ha al suo interno una varietà di voci (quelle dei vari personaggi) e di modi (dai dialoghi al discorso indiretto, alle lettere)' (Placido 2004, xxx).

professions' (MP, 1.1: 5) becomes 'Sir Thomas inviò amichevoli consigli riguardo varie professioni [concerning various professions (i.e. employment)]' (p. 65). Even the translation by Melchiorri (1998) falls below the level of its introduction by Zordo.

Following *PP* and *E*, it is *SS* which has received most translations and different titles. The first translation was by Evelina Levi in 1945, whose inversion of the original title, *Sensibilità e buonsenso* (Sensibility and sense), possibly reflects the translator's attempt to mediate between the two contrasting views of Cecchi and Praz (7–8). Today, the translation has a powerful sentimental veneer characteristic of the 1940s. *Senno e sensibilità* by Beatrice Boffito Serra is more faithful to the original, beginning with the title itself. It appeared in 1961 and has been subsequently republished (from 1996 onwards), with a title that has become generally accepted in Italy, though less appropriate than its predecessor, *Ragione e sentimento* (Reason and sentiment). Finally, it is also worth mentioning *L'eterno contrasto* (The eternal contrast), a translation and abridgement by Rosanna Sorani (1969) for the 'Collana per signorinette' (Collection for young ladies) series.

The year 1945 saw the first translation of *P* by Mario Casalino (the first translator of *E*), a fluent but not excessively rigorous practitioner. Six full-length translations have appeared since 1961, and of the four most readily (because cheaply) available (Cardone Cattaneo 1961; Pozzi 1989; Zazo 2002b; Fantaccini 2004) it can be said that there are no great differences, except perhaps for the Italian, which is more precise and accurate in the earlier translations than the later ones. The various imperfections and inaccuracies of these translations highlight just how much attention is required in order to reproduce the refined precision of Austen's dramatic narrative art.

I wish to give an example of how the imprecise translation of a single adjective can modify the characterization of the heroine. In *P* (1.3: 25), Anne, finishing a conversation in which she has participated only to suggest the name of Wentworth, 'left the room, to seek the comfort of cool air for her flushed cheeks; and as she walked along a favourite grove, said, with a gentle sigh, "a few months more, and he, perhaps, may be walking here."' The reader does not yet know the character of the young woman whose internal agitation is evident from her inflamed cheeks – badly translated as *accaldate* (hot), instead of *arrossate* (red). The word 'gentle' should not, therefore, be translated as 'tenero sospiro' ('tender sigh'; Pozzi 1989, 25), nor as 'dolce sospiro' ('sweet sigh'; Cardone Cattaneo 1961, 30), nor even as 'delicato sospiro' ('delicate sigh'; Fantaccini 2004, 39). Here, 'gentle' simply means 'light', 'small' or 'short': it is rather a neutral term, however, with no aim to anticipate or condition the interpretation that readers will have to form by themselves.

As Norman Page (1969) has already shown, of the six novels *P* is the one which, because of its sophisticated narrative technique, most needs to be translated according to the rules that Anna Luisa Zazo gave herself for the translation of *NA*:

Two elements have always been respected: the individual use of indirect speech treated as direct speech [free indirect speech] and the particular punctuation (with an excess of hyphens), not only for obvious reasons of faithfulness to the text, but

because both characteristics are typical of the stylistic immediacy of Austen and the theatrical quality of her novels.³⁴

Of the four unabridged translations of *NA* that have so far appeared – from the first (Pintacuda 1959) to the most recent (Grillo 1994) – the one by Zazo (1982) is (despite the usual anglicisms in the translation of passives and superfluous possessives) undoubtedly the best. As we can understand from her astute introductory essay, Zazo seems to be the only one to approach the translation with the awareness that *NA* is not a simple and immature burlesque of the Gothic novel: '*Northanger Abbey* is thus the parody of a Gothic novel that is at the same time a Gothic novel stripped of the improbable elements [. . .] The monsters are among us, the monsters are ourselves.'³⁵ With these preliminary assumptions, Zazo is able to reflect the ambiguous complexity of the great chapters of the novel (*NA*, 1.14 and 2.9). *NA* has also had two adaptations in translation: *Caterina* (1978), prepared by Anna Banti for schoolchildren, and published by Marzocco; and *Katherine Morland* (1961), part of a children's series published by the Bolognese firm Capitol, which has produced the other novels as part of the same series.

We cannot conclude this rapid survey of Italian translations without mentioning the important work by Malcolm Skey, who edited for Theoria, in addition to *L'abbazia di Northanger* (*NA*; Gaia 1982) and *Ragione e sentimento* (SS; Censi 1996), two volumes of translations of the unfinished novels and minor works: *Sanditon*; *Lady Susan*; *I Watson* (Gaia 1990) and *Amore e amicizia*; *Catherine, ovvero la pergola e altri scritti giovanili* (Love and freindship; Catherine, or the Bower and other juvenilia, Censi 1994a). Skey also edited a volume of about a third of the *Lettere* (Gaia 1992), drawn from correspondence during 1811–17. Skey's introduction is extremely useful to the Italian reader, since it provides both a precise and indispensable picture of the social position of the Austen family, and, in terms of psychological analysis, valuable suggestions to help track down a Jane Austen who is 'subversive and with a mastery of a double-edged language that undermines those very social values that she herself apparently defends and promotes'.³⁶

³⁴ 'Si sono sempre rispettati il singolare uso del discorso indiretto trattato come discorso diretto [free indirect speech] e la particolare punteggiatura (con la sovrabbondanza di trattini) non soltanto per ovvie ragioni di fedeltà al testo, ma perché entrambe le caratteristiche sono tipiche dell'immediatezza stilistica della Austen e della qualità teatrale dei suoi romanzi' (Zazo 1982, xvi).

³⁵ '*Northanger Abbey* è dunque la parodia di un romanzo gotico che insieme è un romanzo gotico, spogliato degli elementi di improbabilità [. . .] I mostri dunque sono tra noi, i mostri siamo noi' (Zazo 1982, xiv–xv).

³⁶ '*subversive* e padrona di un linguaggio a doppio taglio che mina quegli stessi valori sociali da lei apparentemente difesi e promossi' (Skey 1992, 10).

Conclusion

It is significant that, in order to underline Austen's importance in the history of the novel, Skey concludes his introductory essay by returning to the words of Emilo Cecchi and places him alongside the most important modern Austen scholars such as David Gilson and Deirdre Le Faye. This seems to suggest that deeper knowledge is still needed in order to understand the simultaneously simple and complex style of this great novelist. Here, in fact, lies the task to be performed in Italy, if we really desire to liberate Austen from her tough and resistant Victorian mask, and then show, especially to a younger audience, that to read Jane Austen is to study not a 'small ancient world',³⁷ lost forever, but rather to study the very history and culture, which are themselves the origin of *our own* bourgeois society.

³⁷ From the title of Antonio Fogazzaro's novel, *Piccolo mondo antico* (1895).

12 The Reception of Jane Austen in Greece

Katerina Kitsi-Mitakou and Maria Vara¹

The nineteenth century

In order to interpret the complete absence of Jane Austen's name from the body of novels translated into Greek during the nineteenth century, it is essential to review in brief the most important historical facts concerning Greece at that period. The decade that followed the publication of Austen's novels in England was for Greece a decade of political agitation and turbulent revolts. After almost four centuries of Turkish rule, the nationalist Greek movement began to take shape by the end of the eighteenth century, and in 1821 the Greeks proclaimed their independence. The most dramatic and crucial battles by land and sea were fought within the next ten years, until in the Convention of London in 1830 the Great Powers officially recognized Greece as a sovereign and independent kingdom.

Taking into consideration the centuries of political subjugation and economic chaos that preceded the founding of the new Greek state, it is easy to understand that during the 1830s, and for almost a century after this date, the formation of a Greek national identity was for the Greeks an issue of vital importance. According to scholars and writers of the time, this new identity had to be shaped on the basis of the old models they had inherited, and as a consequence they aimed at establishing links between the present and the Classical and Byzantine past, and at developing the concept of a continuous, uninterrupted national chronology (Chryssanthopoulos 1997, 66). This explains why the literary production of Greece for the years to follow focused on history, and also accounts for the general distrust towards any kind of writing that did not aim at highlighting historical facts or deploying Greek morals and customs.

¹ We would like to thank Michalis Chryssanthopoulos, our colleague from the Department of Medieval and Modern Greek Studies, for his insightful overview of nineteenth- and twentieth-century Greek letters and criticism, and Fotini Stavrou, our librarian, for her valuable help in our effort to locate past editions and electronic sources.

Moreover, the novel as a genre was strongly criticized, a trend clearly shown in an 1856 article published in the newspaper *Athina*, which launched an attack against *Pandora*, the most important literary periodical of the time (1850–72), for publishing samples of this ‘immoral’ literary genre, which threatened to defile the existing ‘pure’ social values and ethical codes (Sahinis 1964). In their effort to defend the novel, a number of critics draw the distinction between ‘bad’ or harmful novels that corrupt their reading public and ‘good’, useful novels that promote loyalty towards one’s country, love for education and learning, for knowledge that is lasting, not superficial and transient (Dragoumis 1856–57). ‘Good’ novels are thereby called to fulfil the beneficial function of bringing the people closer to the history of the Greek nation.

The first period of the modern Greek novel (1830–80) is defined by the literary critic Apostolos Sahinis as the period of the historical novel (a view with which most modern critics, such as Vitti, Politis, Moullas and Mitsakis, tend to agree). Rather than referring to themes taken from contemporary life and modelling their characters on everyday people, most writers of the period set their stories in a historical time and place and employed historical figures as their protagonists. Nevertheless, Denisi argues that the majority of the Greek novels written during the years 1830–80 are *not* historical, instead emphasizing the fact that the most remarkable novels of this period *are* historical: for example, Alexandros Rangavis’s *O afthentis tou Moreos* (The ruler of Moreas, 1850–51), Stephanos Xenos’s *I irois tis Ellinikis Epanastaseos: iti skine en Ellathi apo tou etous 1821–1828* (The heroine of the Greek Revolution: scenes from life in Greece during the years 1821–1828, 1861), Emmanuel Roidis’s *I Papissa Ioanna* (Pope Joan, 1866) and Demetrios Vikelas’s *Loukis Laras* (1879).

In their effort to create stories that were both pleasant and useful, nineteenth-century Greek writers soon realized the need to follow the models set by the West. Walter Scott’s Waverley Novels, for instance, seemed to offer the perfect example for them, as they manage to combine historical truth with myth. The literary critic Al. Vyzantios believed that through historical fiction people would learn about history, and aspired to defend the novel in 1863, by declaring that Macaulay’s historical masterpieces were all in vain: the English people would never have known the Stuart history had it not been for Scott’s magic pen.

In a time that favoured history, it is not difficult to understand why Jane Austen’s domestic novels were overlooked. The reason for this neglect lay not only in her witty language, her subtle use of irony, her complex narrative voices, her idiosyncratic form of realism, which demanded readers that would be skilful and sensitive enough to explore the polyphony and multidimensionality of her marriage plots. The absence of historical facts from Austen’s fiction was also a major factor that discouraged the Greek translator and reader from approaching her. The highly stratified society about which Austen wrote, the delicate balances and the mobility between classes on which she often focused were far too remote for the Greek nation at its infant stage, when no analogous class system existed.

During the years 1830–80, the number of translations published in Greece was about seven times higher than native literary production, as Sofia Denisi has shown in her exhaustive study of prose translated into Greek during the

nineteenth century (she has estimated that during this period about 750 translations appeared, compared with only 135 original works; 1995, 15). It is interesting to note, however, that 90 per cent of these translations were translations of French novels, while the remaining 10 per cent mainly reflects translations of English novels and a few German, Italian and Spanish ones (Denisi 1995, 21). This partiality for French novels can be justified to a large extent by the fact that since the end of the eighteenth century the bonds between the Greek and the French had become particularly strong. The community of the Greek diaspora in France, constituted by an important number of Greek intellectuals and merchants, became at that time a substantial nucleus through which progressive ideas were filtered and promoted to the homeland. Scholars and fighters who ignited and supported the Greek national movement, like Adamantios Korais or Rigas Ferreos, had been inspired by the French Revolution. Since then, Greeks had felt more affiliated to the French culture and language: a tendency clearly reflected in the policy of establishing French as a second language in all Greek schools – not only in regions of the country that had gained their independence, but also in those that still belonged to the Ottoman Empire. (The study of English as a second language was introduced in Greek secondary schools as late as the 1960s.)

Yet this preference for French novels is attributed by Denisi – and we share her view – mainly to the fact that the nineteenth-century reading public had not matured enough in order to appreciate writers that dealt with serious social issues. The secular, scandalous, titillating novels of Dumas *père* and *fils* or Eugène Sue, which offer a small dose of inaccurate historical facts, were more appealing than Scott, who, although a favourite of Greek scholars, was translated to a much smaller extent than the French, or Dickens, who was translated into Greek after 1880, despite the numerous references made to him by critics who favoured the novel (Denisi 1995, 24). If we consider the fact that the English novels that dominated nineteenth-century Greece are Swift's *Gulliver's Travels* and Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* (Denisi 1995, 31), it is easy to comprehend why Jane Austen stood no chance of being translated, let alone arousing the interest of the critics. In fact, there is no traceable evidence of Austen scholarship in Greece during the nineteenth century. Lacking both the background information needed to appreciate her stories and the perceptiveness to detect Austen's humour and wit, the readers and critics of the time could find neither pleasure nor profit in her novels, and as a result disregarded her. When in the 1880s Greek prose writers abandoned the historical novel of the old school of Athens, and turned towards the *roman de mœurs* that depicts the Greek countryside and the simple life of the Greek villages, and even during the first two decades of the twentieth century, when serious attempts at realist writing were made, the small middle-class society and the country gentry, which preoccupies Austen, were far too alien to attract their attention. Although the National Library in Athens holds two nineteenth-century editions of Austen's novels (Tauchnitz editions of *PP*, 1870 and *NA*, 1871), we have been unable to trace when exactly these books were purchased, as no records from that time exist. Nevertheless, this is in any case a meagre sample of Austen, compared to the eleven copies of Scott's *Complete Works* that the National Library owned by 1865 (Roidis 1978, 37).

The twentieth century: 1900–90

Austen's novels received hardly any acclaim until the dawn of the twentieth century in Greece. During the 1920s and the 1930s, when a wide range of Russian, Scandinavian and European writers were translated into Greek, the focus was on Modernism and the orientation chiefly towards France again, and only secondarily towards England (Mackridge 1985, 1). Virginia Woolf and Katherine Mansfield were the only women novelists in English to attract the attention of Greek scholars. In his study, *To sinhrono mithistorima* (The modern novel, 1939), the writer and critic Yiorgos Delios, before focusing on Woolf, makes passing references to Jane Austen, Charlotte Brontë and Katherine Mansfield, in order to point out that the creative abilities of modern women writers have caused a 'peaceful' (*iriniki*) revolution in English literature (1939, 9). Delios's comments on Austen are to a large extent misleading: he commits a common fallacy of Greek critics of the period, who tended to identify the personality and thoughts of the leading characters in a novel with those of their author. As a result, he declares with certainty that Austen is the first woman novelist in the history of English literature to enliven the 'genre of autobiography' ('to idos tis aftoviografias'; Delios 1939, 5). Such observations transmit a false and dangerous impression, which most probably stems from a misreading of her ambiguous domestic plots and from the need to extract arbitrarily from Austen's unsettling female characters a kind of didactic message for the Greek female reading public. In a manner representative of early twentieth-century Greek attitudes towards gender roles, Delios concludes that Austen is suspicious of women's free will and values 'submission' (*ipotagi*) as the only obligation of women towards their husbands (1939, 5). (The same comments on Austen are cited verbatim in Delios [1963], which is largely a rewrite of *To sinhrono mithistorima*.)

The next attempt to introduce Austen to the Greek readership was made a year before the first translation of *PP*, in what seems to be a translation of an essay by Augustus Muir in the mainstream periodical *Angloelliniki epitheorisi* (Anglo-Greek review), published in 1949. The essay is entitled 'Diasimes Anglides Mithistoriografi' (Eminent English novelists) and refers to Jane Austen, George Eliot and the Brontë sisters. Judging by the author's name (apparently, an English writer of crime and horror fiction) and also by the fact that it was common practice for this particular periodical to publish articles translated from English without acknowledging them as translations, we assume that this article is a translation. Muir presents us first with some biographical information about Austen, and continues by attempting an overview of her oeuvre. His conclusions – quite reflective of the critical context of the 1950s in Greece – are somewhat naïve and revolve around the satisfaction one experiences through reading her novels. Moreover, Muir characterizes Austen's novels as chronicles of the life of the south of England, which depict what he mistakes to be 'lower-class' characters: an inconsistency which is either Muir's own or simply a bad translation. The straightforward but lively narrative technique of Austen's novels which verges on satire, Muir contends, grants the reader a sense of pleasure when entering the 'small world' (*mikro kosmo*) she has created. Having expressed his conviction that Austen is by no means a reformist, as she holds the

institutions of marriage and family in high esteem, Muir concludes by praising Austen's novels for having succeeded in illustrating the spirit and the atmosphere of nineteenth-century England.

The first translated novel by Austen in Greek was *PP* (*Perifania kai prokatal-ipsi*), published by Ikaros, and translated by Ninila Papayianni in 1950. It was sponsored by the British Council in its effort to promote British literature and culture in Greece, and to bridge the existing gap. There is no introduction or biographical information about Austen in this edition, and the translation is on the whole an accurate attempt to convey the original, but the subtle use of language and the sharp wit underlying most of the novel's dialogue – this process of layering of joke upon joke – is missing. The title phrase, which is a faithful interpretation of the original, alliterates in Greek too; unlike the English one, however, it has no lively history, and it would be almost impossible for the Greek reader to grasp the allusions to Jeremy Taylor, Samuel Richardson or Frances Burney.

It is also interesting to notice that the Greek translation of the famous opening assertion, 'It is a truth universally acknowledged, that a single man in possession of a good fortune, must be in want of a wife' (*PP*, 1.1: 3), does not convey to the reader the complexity and sharp irony of this passage.² The ambiguity of the words 'single', 'possession', 'fortune' and 'want' is lost in the translation, and the reader can hardly suspect that the narrator sets up a 'universal truth' only to undercut it, to prove how limited this perspective of truth is or even to question the very notion of 'truth' itself. The insinuations and sly comments of the narrative voice that dominate in the English text are not evident in the translation and the italics of the original – given by the author for the sake of emphasis – are not retained. As a result, the reader completely misunderstands the tone of the narration from the very first page. For example, Mr Bennet's wry observation in the acerbic phrase, '“You want to tell me and I have no objection to hearing it”' (*PP*, 1.1: 3), is turned into a mere encouragement towards his wife to start narrating her story when the emphasis is omitted in the translation. There is also inconsistent use of quotation marks, so the reader is not sure exactly when a character is directly quoted. Furthermore, the translator repeatedly takes the liberty of using exclamation marks in place of full stops, a device which adds a silly tone and a sense of superciliousness to the narration. When Mrs Bennet addresses her husband commenting on Darcy: '“I wish you had been there, my dear, to have given him one of your set downs. I quite detest the man”' (*PP*, 1.3: 13), her affirmative tone becomes rather pompous.³ Finally, there are instances in which the narrator's neutral comments are given negative connotations in the Greek version. For example, in the phrase, 'The business of her life was to get her daughters married; its

² 'Ine pangkosmia anagnorismeni alithia pos enas anipandros kai plusios andras tha echi vevea anangi apo mia sizigo': 'It is a universally acknowledged truth that an unmarried and rich man would surely need a wife' (Papayianni 1950, 7).

³ 'Thathela poli na isoun eki gia na tou ethines ena kalo mathima apo ekina pou kseris na thinis! Then kseris poso ton sihenome!' (Papayianni 1950, 17).

solace was visiting and news' (*PP*, 1.1: 5), the word 'news' is interpreted as *kouskousouria* (Papayianni 1950, 9) which is a slang word for 'gossiping'. Obviously, the translator here guides her readers towards her own conclusions, rather than granting them the freedom to interpret the text.

This first translation was followed by an article in *Angloelliniki epitheorisi* written by the University of Thessaloniki professor, eminent critic and fervent supporter of realism Apostolos Sahinis, entitled 'To angliko mithistorima' (The English novel, 1950–52). It warmly welcomes the first translations of Austen's *PP*, Charlotte Brontë's *Jane Eyre* and Dickens's *Great Expectations*, all eminent examples of 'classical English literature' that, as the critic postulates, reflect the spirit and atmosphere of nineteenth-century England. Sahinis criticizes the Russian and French translations that dominated Greece during the 1920s and 1930s, and laments the post-war influence of translations of Scandinavian novels – mainly Norwegian ones (such as those of Knut Hamsen) – on Greek novelists of the time. The example these novels set, he continues, guide Greek novelists towards heretical narrative strategies, lyricism and subjective representations of reality, and hopes that the positive influence from the orthodox, objective and solid, classical English novel, represented by these three translations by Ikaros, will work as a remedy (Sahinis 1950–52, 157). Sahinis's passionate adherence to the narrative techniques of the classical English novel vividly reflects one of the dominant post-war literary trends in Greece: that affiliated with realism/naturalism and traditional values. This trend was opposed to the current represented by 'progressive' or 'cosmopolitan' novelists and critics who were keen to praise the narrative methods of the Norwegian novelist Knut Hamsun and applaud the influence of the early translation of his novel *Hunger* on Greek letters (see Moullas 1993, 73).

Despite the undeniably positive qualities of these new translations, however, Sahinis believes that the newly translated English novels are by no means flawless. The descriptive style in *Great Expectations* is characterized as 'tiring', whereas Austen's and Brontë's tendency to repeat statements already mentioned is attributed to women's desire for 'prattle' (*fliaia*), a quality which he believes characterizes all women's writing. This last statement is in sharp contrast with his earlier positive appraisal of Austen, as a narrative that 'chit-chats' can hardly obey the basic principles of prose writing, for example objectivity, solidity and focus on narration, as defined by Sahinis (1950–52, 157). The superficiality of such commentary is indicative of most Greek critical approaches coming from the mid twentieth century, and also anticipates a number of misinterpretations of Austen's novels incorporated in the introductions of the translations that followed Ikaros's *PP*.

Since Greek publishing houses have only recently started keeping records of their publications, it has been impossible to identify the publication dates or the names of translators for a number of translations that most probably appeared in the 1960s. The translation of *PP* (*Perifania kai prokatalipsi*) published by Daremas for example, carries neither date of publication nor full translator's name (simply given as 'P.V.') – a common policy for editions of the time, as copyright law did not come into being until the mid 1970s. Based on the memory of a number of booksellers and librarians and judging from the appearance of the book, we estimate that it was published in the 1960s. There is a short

biographical note on Austen and an introduction, which is by no means a serious attempt to read her critically, as it merely consists of a series of simplistic comments on plot and character formation. The importance of this introduction, however, lies in its assertive tone, typical for the 1950s, more than in its content. 'There is no way that the rational reader would ever resist the radiance of *Pride and Prejudice*',⁴ the anonymous author firmly concludes, echoing similar cliché remarks of the time in introductions of translated novels of the classic Russian literature that attempt to predispose the reader positively towards the text that follows. As regards the translation itself, it does not reflect the witty, precise and slyly ironic manner of Austen's writing; moreover, it begins as a more simplified version of the previous one by Ikaros, but ends up copying verbatim Papagianni's earlier translation. We assume, therefore, that this must have been a pirate edition.

Georgia Alexiou-Proteou's *Perifania kai prokatalipsi* (*PP*), published by Damianos (1960?) is a translation that flows more smoothly (although the italics of the original are again omitted in the translation), with a better sense of Mr Bennet's jokes but with some colloquial use of language that disturbs the attempt to create a nineteenth-century atmosphere. Unlike the earlier version by Ikaros, here Mrs Bennet addresses her husband using his title (*Mr Bennet*), a fact which correctly transmits Austen's emphasis on the social aspect of marriage. Without an explanatory footnote, however, the text sounds unfamiliar and bizarre to the Greek reader, who would have little knowledge of the stratification of the English society or the institution of marriage during Austen's time. Furthermore, the French word 'mama' with which the daughters address Mrs Bennet is misinterpreted in Greek as *mana*, a term which bears associations with a working-class woman, laden with burdens – quite the opposite of Mrs Bennet.

Alexiou-Proteou's translation contains a short biographical note, followed by an introduction by Stathis Proteos, who rather pompously and over-rhetorically begins by characterizing the nineteenth century as the century of women in English literature, owing to a number of distinguished women authors, such as Austen, the Brontës and George Eliot. The only significant comment Proteos makes is to ascribe the 'harmonious' structure of *PP* to the fact that events unfold in a manner similar to *ikos* (probability) and *anangeo* (necessity). These terms, from Aristotle's *Poetics*, underline the importance of causality and cohesion of plot in tragedy, grounded in a teleological movement from a well-delineated beginning, through a solid middle part, towards a sound conclusion that entails *disclosure*, a change from ignorance to knowledge. *Anangeo* is the actual, the necessary event, which is to dominate the plot among the *ikota*, the whole range of events that could potentially happen.

The reader of this introduction, however, runs the risk of not recognizing it as an allusion to the ancient Greek tragedy and to Aristotle, since no explanatory comments are provided. Furthermore, his observation is not representative of

⁴ 'I aftovevei lampsi tou *Perifania kai Prokatalipsi* then bori na apokrousi ton sofrona anagnosti' ('P.V.' [1960–69]).

Greek critical approaches to literature during the 1960s, as Aristotle's writing did not attract serious critical attention in Greece until the 1980s. This allusion to Aristotle is an echo of older commentary on Austen, which established a link between her narrative technique and Aristotle's theory: for instance, an early reviewer of Jane Austen, Richard Whately (1821), observes, '[w]e know not whether Miss Austen ever had access to the precepts of Aristotle, but there are few, if any, writers of fiction who have illustrated them more successfully' (*CH*, 117). Interestingly, Proteos anticipates Tony Tanner's observation that Austen's universal themes resemble the format of the ancient Greek tragedy in the sense that they revolve around recognition, 'that act by which the mind can look again at a thing and if necessary make revisions and amendments until it sees the thing as it really is' (1972, 8). More recently, Ruderman (1995) has discussed the connection between Austen's novels and Aristotle.

The final publication which apparently emanates from the 1960s is *Anna Elliot (P)*, with the original thematic title being replaced by the novel's heroine. The text is preceded by an introduction by the translator, Yeorgia Alexiou-Proteou, who, in a flamboyant style, provides some biographical details regarding Austen, along with simplistic information concerning the plot and characters of the novel. As for the translation itself, the attempt to be accurate is marred by a colloquial use of language, and, most importantly, by the liberty the translator takes to split each paragraph of the original into many. As a result, the flow of the narration is undercut and readers are directed towards multiple misunderstandings as regards whose point of view they follow. Furthermore, no explanatory footnotes accompany the text, even in cases where they are indispensable for the comprehension of the story.

No new translations appeared during the 1970s – most probably owing to the fact that Greece was undergoing a difficult period of military dictatorship (1967–74) – and only two were published during the 1980s, a new translation of *PP* and the first translation of *E*, both in 1988. The most important publication in the 1980s, however, is a 78-page monograph entitled *Jane Austen: Essays*, by Costas E. Evangelides (1985). This has so far been the only original book-length critical study on Austen published in Greece; it is, however, written in English, therefore addressing a more limited reading public. This monograph is an exhaustive account of all the military officers and clergymen that appear in Austen's six major novels, and provides brief characterizations of each one of them. The point Evangelides wishes to make is that Austen does not disregard history, but consciously chooses to limit herself to a small cross-section of society she is familiar with, and which she can very faithfully and successfully depict (1985, 40).

The 1990s to the present

The numerous new editions of Austen's novels in the 1990s clearly indicate a rise in the interest of the Greek readership, a rise which coincided with the broadcast of the 1995 BBC television production of *PP* by the Greek State Television. This series, as well as Ang Lee's *SS* (1995) and Douglas McGrath's *E* (1996), are repeatedly broadcasted by Greek television, and have become very

popular among viewers. The fact that both the subtitled series and the films to a large extent do justice to Austen's humour and wit, and very successfully transmit the spirit and the atmosphere of Austen's time and society, has made her more accessible to the Greek audience and ignited their interest in her novels. This increasing interest in Austen and her times was reflected in the publication of *Jane Austen, ikononografimeni anthologia* (Jane Austen, illustrated anthology), edited and translated by Anna Papastravou, in 1993, a short collection of excerpts from Austen's novels and letters, accompanied by a few comments about her by critics and writers (such as Scott, Lewes, Trollope, Forster), as well as a large number of illustrations. Responding to this same call, Smili editions undertook the task of translating all of Austen's novels, providing at the same time their readers with rich visual, historical and critical information that would help them appreciate and enjoy Austen's texts, by placing them within their historical and social contexts. The sales records for these books prove that despite the fact that Austen's translations have never soared to the heights, there has nevertheless been a stable interest in her novels since the mid 1990s.

The first translation that Smili attempted was *PP* (the most favoured novel in Greece, owing most probably to the success of the BBC series) by Dimitris Kikizas in 1996, carrying explanatory notes and a translator's commentary. The sixty-six notes, which refer to historical events, places or customs of the time, or present the English original text in cases where a phrase is ambiguous or hard to translate, are very enlightening for the reader. In his commentary, Kikizas provides a brief and accurate sketch of Austen's life, and speaks of her as a female writer whose perspective was limited and who therefore restricted herself to a small portion of society she knew well. The characters of this microcosm are, however, Kikizas contends, depicted with precision and faithfulness to reality, her tone is subtly ironic and she makes extensive use of free indirect speech. As his sources, he acknowledges R. W. Chapman, Isobel Armstrong, W. A. Craik, Christopher Gillie, J. D. Grey and Tony Tanner.

In 1998, Smili published *Pitho (P)* translated again by Kikizas, containing sixty-five explanatory notes, twenty-four plates (portraits of the Austen family, pictures of Bath, Lyme, the Chawton house, sketches of a barouche and a chariot, etc.), a list of the characters of the novel, a chronology of Jane Austen and the most important historical events of her time, a translator's commentary and a collection of critical comments/essays on Austen. The short excerpts by quite a number of nineteenth-century writers, such as Scott, Charlotte Brontë, Macaulay, Twain, Emerson, as well as those of Forster and Virginia Woolf early in the twentieth century, depict clearly the division of authors and critics into 'Janeites' and 'anti-Janeites' – a schism that lasted until the end of the 1930s. This edition contains also a short excerpt by Dimitrios Kapetanakis (1912–44), a Greek writer and critic who moved to London in 1939, and ardent admirer of Austen, as his short reference to her in his essay on Dostoevsky testifies. Austen's novels, Kapetanakis remarks, offer a protective shield to their readers, the shield of reason and moral values, that guarantee a life without hazard (in Kikizas 1998, 430–32). The translation of *P* concludes with the full text of a 1975 article by A. Walton Litz, which offers some very important observations about the double structure of the novel (the poetic use of nature in the first part as opposed to the dullness of Bath and the loneliness Anne experiences there), and argues that this

last novel of Austen's deals with very modern themes, such as isolation, imprisonment and mobility, allowing few hopes for a harmonious union between stasis and change in contrast to her earlier novels.

Logiki kai evesthisia (SS) was published by Smili in 2001, translated by A. Papathanasopoulou. It accommodates eleven plates (a map of Steventon, a picture of the Chawton living room, sketches of Godmersham Park, Hurstbourne Park, shops of the time, a barouche and a chariot), a very short biographical note on Austen and a collection of five critical essays on Austen. These short essays help the reader understand that the cult of sensibility, and the reaction against it, was a significant issue at the time Austen was writing. In particular, Claire Tomalin's statement concerning the oscillation of Austen between sense and sensibility and the ambiguity of Austen's perspective in this novel urges the reader towards a more careful reading of the book.

In the same year, Papathanasopoulou also translated *MP*: this has so far been the only Greek translation of the novel and was nominated in 2003 as one of the six best translations published in Greece, an award given every year by the Ministry of Culture. The book includes twenty-two plates (portraits of Austen and her brother Charles, pictures of David House at Winchester, Chawton House, sketches of Godmersham Park, Manydown Park, Northampton, Twickenham, Portsmouth, ships of the Royal Navy, etc.), the two scenes from Kotzebue's *Lover's Vows* rehearsed by the characters of the novel, a short biographical note on Austen, and a collection of six critical essays on *MP*. Brian Southam's essay, 'The Silence of the Bertrams', on Sir Thomas's colonial role and his imperialist attitude, as well as his discussion of the allusions to the slave trade in the novel highlight an important aspect of *MP*. Some of the essays that are translated, however, are very short, and the selected excerpts do not allow the reader to gain a clear view of the critic's argument. The extract from Isobel Armstrong, for example, stops at a crucial point where the critic disagrees with Trilling's and Farrer's monolithic approaches and is about to suggest her own deconstructionist reading. Likewise, Joseph Litvak's important statement that Austen's work both promotes and undermines conservative tendencies, or Jan Fergus's conclusion that Fanny Price and Emma are women who influence and recreate the society they belong to are presented in a very short paragraph, and the reader is not allowed to follow the argument of the critic.

In the summer of 2003, Smili completed the translations of Austen's novels with editions of *E*, translated by A. Pappas, and *NA*, translated by A. Papathanasopoulou. Smili's *NA*, the only Greek translation of this novel, contains fifteen plates (mainly sketches of Bath, also Reading Abbey, Horace Walpole's Gothic folly, Strawberry Hill, and a picture that illustrated *The Mysteries of Udolpho*), a translation of Henry Austen's biography of his sister, and a collection of thirteen critical essays, also in translation. To a great extent, these are comments made by nineteenth- or early twentieth-century critics, which offer no fresh insight into Austen's writing. Marvin Mudrick's conclusions, however, that Austen's aim is to defend the genre of the realist novel and ridicule the Gothic by creating a narrative that oscillates between the real and the Gothic, or Brian Southam's argument that *NA* alludes through its satire to the real terror, violence and chaos that prevailed in England during the rule of George III, steer towards more acute and receptive interpretations of the text.

The translation of *E* includes a short biographical note on Austen, as well as the landmark review of the novel by Walter Scott, which discusses the plot and characters of the novel and concludes that Austen's writing is so close to reality, that it reminds us of Flemish painting. The footnotes that accompany the main text are generally illuminating, as they supply historical, cultural, literary and geographical details, depicting with precision the atmosphere of early nineteenth-century England. There are a number of footnotes, however, that provide biographical details about Austen which might mislead readers into blending fact with fiction. For example, in the translation, we are told that Mrs Goddard's boarding school is thought to reflect Austen's own memories as a student, or that Austen herself particularly liked charades and swimming – details that add nothing to our understanding of the text and that further undercut the narrator's attempt to submerge readers in the novel's hermetic microcosm.

The translation itself reflects and accounts for a great change in the standards of Greek translations of Austen's texts, but is still not fully able to transmit the allusiveness of her characters, the sharpness of her dialogue or the sophistication of the narrative voice, which itself manipulates the reader into numerous misconceptions. For instance, in the original text, we are told that 'Miss Hawkins was the youngest of the two daughters of a Bristol – merchant, of course, he must be called' (*E*, 2.4: 183), becomes in translation, 'She was the youngest of the two daughters of a Bristol merchant – yes, Bristol.'⁵ A footnote underlying Austen's supposedly evident contempt for Bristol accompanies the excerpt, and the reason given is that Bristol used to be the major English port that was involved in slave trade until 1808. Apart from the evidently unsuccessful translation, it is apparent here that the reader becomes implicated in numerous layers of misconceptions regarding the narrative point of view. Although this phrase is filtered through Emma's perspective, the reader is misled into mistaking it for that of Austen, who in the original seems to be implicitly criticizing Emma's contempt for merchants through the voice of the narrator. Moreover, it is the profession of *trade* that Emma scorns, not the city of *Bristol*, as implied in the translation. Further ahead, the remark that 'Mr Knightley, in fact, was one of the few people who could see faults in Emma Woodhouse' (*E*, 1.1: 11), becomes 'Mr Knightley, in fact, was one of the few people who could see Emma Woodhouse's faults.'⁶ While the English version does not determine whether these faults that *Mr Knightley* sees in Emma really exist or not, the Greek translation has decided for the reader that Emma *does* have faults. In addition, in a number of cases the reader is guided by the translator to interpret a word or phrase in a certain way. For instance, in the extract, 'There was no recovering Miss Taylor – nor much likelihood of ceasing to pity her: but a few weeks brought some alleviation to Mr Woodhouse' (*E*, 1.2: 19) the word 'pity' is

⁵ 'Itan I mikroteri kori enos emborou tou Bristol – nai tou Bristol' (Pappas 2003, 237).

⁶ 'O kirios Knightley itan pragmati enas apo tous elahistou anthropous pou borousan na diakrinoun ta elatomata tis Emma Woodhouse' (Pappas 2003, 16).

placed in quotation marks in the Greek text, and so the tone of the narration changes dramatically, as the use of quotation marks imply that the word is ironic.

The plain language the narrator uses in the original text is turned into bookish Greek in several occasions, but the major weakness of this translation lies in its inability to reconstruct successfully the epigrammatic power of the text's most renowned phrases: 'It darted through her, with a speed of an arrow, that Mr Knightley must marry no one but herself!' (E, 3.11: 408), Emma contemplates; but the assertive tone of the original acquires in the translation a touch of silliness: 'At that particular moment a thought crossed her mind like an arrow: Mr Knightley must marry no one else apart from [. . .] herself!'⁷ Later on, when Knightley confesses his affection to Emma with legendary economy, '“If I loved you less, I might be able to talk about it more. But you know what I am”' (E, 3.13: 430), his understatement obtains in the Greek version a feel of overconfidence, as his utterance now sounds like a handy shorthand phrase for such occasions. Moreover, Knightley's affirmative declaration of his omission, which incorporates a sense of regret, '“God knows, I have been a very indifferent lover”', is completely misunderstood by the translator: 'The way that I express myself is not perhaps the best.'⁸

The translation in a variety of cases works as a barrier and obscures the capacity of the text to urge us to oscillate between multiple viewpoints and an array of red herrings while searching for clues, together with Emma, towards final recognition. There are points, however, where the Greek text performs a converse act: that of over-interpretation, by imposing false layers of meaning upon the English text. When, for instance, Emma sees Frank Churchill for the first time, the English text states:

She felt immediately that she *should* like him; and there was a well-bred ease of manner, and a readiness to talk, which convinced her that he came intending to be acquainted with her, and that acquainted they soon *must* be. (E, 2.5: 190; our emphasis)

This becomes:

Emma felt immediately that she *would* like him; anyway, his well-bred ease of manner, and his willingness to address her, convinced her that he had definitely come with the intention to be acquainted with her – *something that was about to happen soon*.⁹ (our emphasis)

It is clear here that the Greek version turns Emma's conviction of the 'marital predestination', as Ronald Blythe puts it (1972, 22), between herself and Frank

⁷ 'Tote akrivos mia skepsi diaperase san velos to mialo tis: o kirios Knightley den eprepe na pandrefi kamia alli ektos [. . .] ap'tin idial' (Pappas 2003, 529).

⁸ 'O tropos pou ekfrazome isos then ine kai o kaliteros' (Pappas 2003, 557).

⁹ 'I Emma eniose amesos oti tha ton simpathouse idietera. Alloste, I anesi pou edihne stous tropous tou, hari stin kali tou anatofi, kai I prothimia me tin opia tis apifthine to logo, tin episan oti eihe erthi me safi prothesi na ti gnorisi, – kati pou, vevea, den th'argouse na gini' (Pappas 2003, 246–47).

Churchill into a mere instinctive liking of hers for Frank. This is a serious shortcoming in the translation, in the sense that the Greek text does not allow the reader to follow the gradual development of Emma's character through a series of disillusionments concerning the nature of her relationship to Frank. In addition, while in the original, Emma is actively involved in the writing of her own story, in the Greek version she is a character simply entangled in a plot which is beyond her understanding.

The translation of the above extract inspires and illustrates the core argument of one of the three articles on Austen in a recent issue of the magazine *Vivliothiki* (Library),¹⁰ which appears every Friday along with *Eleftherotypia* (Liberty of the press), a newspaper widely circulated in Greece. This was, in fact, the first issue of a periodical dedicated to Austen in Greece, appearing on 31 October 2003. The article by Tassos Goudelis, 'Ena nouar horis fono' (A thriller without a murder), opens with the aforementioned extract and argues that the text raises readers' expectations for a plot that unfolds in a manner similar to that of mystery stories, disregarding completely the comic vein of *E*. According to Goudelis, this happens because the reader knows and sees more than Emma – a statement applicable to many other points in the text, but definitely not here – and constantly feels the urgent need to make her cautious of the forthcoming dangers. The fact that the author of this article structures his argument on a part of the novel which is mistranslated illustrates the perils that an unsound translation entails.

The other two articles in the same issue of *Vivliothiki* aim at providing a broader perspective on Austen. Elena Houzouri's piece, 'I anatomos tis kathimerinis zois' (The anatomist of everyday life), is an overview of Austen's life, given through the prism of the social and literary background of her time. It concludes with an emphasis on Austen's ability to observe and dissect everyday life, mainly that of the landed gentry, which Austen is said to portray realistically with subtle irony and in low tones. 'Orientismos kai protestantiki ithiki' (Orientalism and Protestant morality), by Katerina Shina, is a translation of excerpts from Edward Said's reading of *MP* in *Culture and Imperialism* (published in Greek as *Koultoura kai imperialismos* by Nefeli in 1996), as well as of excerpts from Harold Bloom's appraisal of *P* in *The Western Canon* (1994). Undoubtedly, both Said's argument that Austen's attitude towards imperialism is ambiguous and Bloom's views of her heroines as representatives of Protestant ethics provide for the readers of Austen ample material for consideration; the writer who signs the article, however, makes no attempt to elaborate on these perspectives.

Although we have been quite critical of the translations published by Smili editions over the last ten years, especially regarding their inaccuracy and lack of sophistication, we wish to emphasize the positive implications of these editions. On the one hand, Greek readers now have access for the first time to all Austen's novels and can gain a complete picture of her writings; on the other hand, they become aware of the fact that Austen has inspired an immense body

¹⁰ ????????

of criticism and is not a mere fairy-tale or romance writer. Even if the excerpts that appear in these editions are fragmentary, they at least provide a glimpse of what has been written about her and may instigate further research. For the moment, unfortunately, all scholarly research and criticism on Austen is conducted by Greek academics who study and write in English and publish almost exclusively abroad.

Conclusion

We have endeavoured in the first part of this article to elucidate the reasons why Austen remained unknown in Greece throughout the nineteenth century. For the Greek readers and scholars of the time, her novels failed to fulfil any of the presuppositions that rendered a book worthy of being translated. They lacked adventure or references to historical events, they were not preoccupied with familiar societies and customs, they had no moral lessons to teach. When in the mid-twentieth century Austen was translated into Greek for the first time, she was to a large extent misunderstood as a writer of easily read domestic novels, while the translations failed to convey the wit and spirit of the originals. Lacking the background information, indispensable to someone who belongs to a different culture and age, confronted with a mixture of bookish and colloquial language that characterizes the translations of the 1960s and, most importantly, missing the pleasure that the original guarantees, the Greek reader was too often discouraged to continue with Austen. The interest in her remained less than lukewarm over the next two decades, and it was almost certainly the screen adaptations of her novels that mark the mid 1990s as a watershed in the history of Austen's reception in Greece. The vividness of the scenes, the excellent casting, the accuracy of the costumes and the setting, and the countryside vignettes transfer modern spectators to early nineteenth-century England and allow them to enjoy the stories – a point in which all translations had failed. However, although these adaptations created an increased interest in Austen's texts, their inability to transmit the polyphony of the written text has in many cases given the false impression to the average reader that Austen's novels are nothing but modern fairy tales. Indicative of this last tendency is the 2004 adaptation for children and teenagers of *PP*, which reconstructs the novel to a moral fable instructing on love.

An important contribution to Greek letters are the translations of her six novels by Smili, completed in 2003 – in the sense that they urge the reader to see beyond the surface marriage plot of her novels. The notes that accompany the texts, the illustrated plates, along with the collections of critical essays in most of these volumes provide a great aid to the reader. As we have seen, however, there are a great number of discrepancies even in these carefully compiled volumes. When the nuances of Austen's language are misinterpreted, the reader and the critic who base their approach merely on the translation can be led to false conclusions.

It is encouraging to note, however, that when Jane Austen is studied in the original such misconceptions can be avoided. In academia, where Austen has been taught for at least half a century, in the English departments of the

Aristotle University of Thessaloniki and the University of Athens, over five hundred students are annually supplied with the latest Oxford World Classics or Penguin Classics edition of Austen's novels, and enjoy the privilege of reading and writing about the original English texts. More emphasis has been given to Austen since the 1980s, when her novels appear in syllabi of core courses on the nineteenth-century English novel, as well as in elective courses on realism and the English novel, or even in courses that focus on Austen's writing exclusively. Along with her texts, the students examine the historical, social and cultural background of the time, they are exposed to the most recent critical approaches, and frequently compose short or longer essays on issues concerning the themes and narrative techniques of Austen's oeuvre, as well as their closeness to realism (so far, there have been no longer theses or doctoral dissertations on Austen in Greece). We hope that these aspects of the reception of Austen in academia will not always be limited to a small circle of instructors and students, but will soon spread to the wider public, initiating translations that would do better justice to the original, while instigating fresh and scholarly critical approaches.

13 Jane Austen in Hungary

Nóra Séllei

Jane Austen took a long time to reach Hungary: the translation of her novels commenced in 1934, with the serialized publication of *PP*, while the first critical comment on her had preceded this by only five years. Given the social, political and cultural history of Hungary, however, what we can trace from this moment on is not a linear and continuous presence of Austen in Hungary, but a process very much influenced by the social and cultural policy of the country. The publication of the Hungarian translation of her novels in book format between 1958 and 1986 is a milestone in Hungarian Austen reception because this is what made her texts accessible to the general public (which, until the last decade, was traditionally not very well versed in the English language – and I am genuinely wondering how many Hungarians read Austen in English). Belated as this appearance of Austen's may be, from the early 1970s onwards, her presence is more than obvious.

This rather late appearance and availability to the wider reading public, however, does not mean that no earlier trace of Austen is visible in Hungary. This visibility can be divided into three categories. First of all, copies of Austen's novels were already in the possession of some Hungarian families during the nineteenth century: in some cases first editions, in some cases French translations. Lajos Kossuth, for example, had a copy of both *SS* and *E*, now both in the National Széchényi Library: he must have obtained these books while living in Britain between 1852 and 1859, after the collapse of the 1848–49 revolution and Hungarian war of independence which he had led. David Gilson also points out that there is a copy of the first French translation (1816) of *MP* in the Helikon Castle Library, Keszthely, whereas a first edition of *E* has a 'well-preserved copy in original boards with stamps of a Budapest Library' (Gilson 2003, 33, 44, 36, 39).

The second indication of Austen's relatively early visibility in Hungary is the serialization of *PP* in a monthly journal, *Budapesti szemle* (Budapest review), from February 1934 to January 1936, in twenty-four parts. Published by the Hungarian Academy (Magyar Tudományos Akadémia), the journal's policy was

to inform the Hungarian public of the ideas that interest the contemporary mind, and it intends to be a mediator between sciences and scholarship and the educated

reading public on the one hand, whereas, on the other hand, between literature in Hungary and abroad.¹

Within this framework, Austen obviously belongs to the latter kind of mediation, and the translation can be read as a long-due obligation fulfilled, or, at least, started. Translated by Sándor Hevesi (perhaps the most famous director of the Hungarian National Theatre, 1922–32), and bearing the uninspired title *A Bennet család* (The Bennet family), we can assume that Austen did reach the *educated* reading public, but we can also suppose that this journal, because of its intended audience and high-prestige publisher (the Academy), could not make Austen available to a wider audience.

As for the quality of translation, the text is not very accurate, amply indicated by the translation of Austen's famous opening sentence: 'It is a widespread and acknowledged truth that an unmarried man, particularly if he happens to be master of a good fortune, feels, by all means, the lack of a wife.'² The multiplication of synonyms for 'acknowledged' (instead of adding a modifier), particularly in the clumsy way that the two words contain the same stem (*ismert*), the addition of a modifier where it is not needed (*mellesleg*: 'incidentally', 'happens to be' relating to 'in possession of a good fortune') and the two verbal phrases influenced by the German language (*vagyon ura, híját érzi*) greatly reduce the wit of the Austenian original, even if the syntax truly follows its logic. Whether the claim that this is not a translation of the text but rather that it is 'after Jane Austen' (*Austen Jane után*) is an admission of failure, self-effacement or the lingering of a long tradition of indicating that translations are not equivalent to the original is difficult to decide. Nevertheless, the text seems rather to be a *resemblance* of Austen than a Hungarian *equivalent*. This translation should not, however, be dismissed out of hand. As Albert Gyergyai points out, this early translation belongs to the protest against the vogue for the naturalist novel, a phenomenon not unlike that to be seen in the *Revue des deux mondes* at the turn of the century (1978, 1380).

The third sign of Austen's presence before the publication of her novels in book format lies in four critical references written between 1929 and 1947, by three significant men of letters: the novelist Antal Szerb (1929, 1941), the poet Mihály Babits (1935) and the critic Lajos Hatvany (1947). Szerb, Babits and Hatvany were central figures in Hungarian literature during the first half of the twentieth century, belonging to the circle around the most prestigious Hungarian literary journal *Nyugat* (The west, 1908–41), committed both to social progress and to the 'Europeanization' of Hungarian literature, partly by exploring what a world/European literature would mean, and partly by modernizing Hungarian literature. Hatvany is one of those literati without whom

¹ 'A Budapesti Szemle tájékoztatni igyekszik a magyar közönséget azon eszmékről, melyek világszerte foglalkoztatják a szellemeket és mintegy közvetítő kíván lenni egyfelől a szaktudomány és a művelt közönség, másfelől a hazai és külföldi irodalom között' (this policy statement can be read on the inside front cover of each issue).

² 'Közismert és elismert igazság, hogy nőtlen ember, ha mellesleg szép vagyon ura, okvetlenül híját érzi a feleségnek' (Hevesi 1934–36, 232.675:212).

generations of writers would have been starved of publication: he was one of the two financial backers for *Nyugat*. Babits was not only a regular contributor to the journal, but also editor between 1929 and 1941 (and with his death, the journal ceased to exist). Szerb published his first poems in *Nyugat*, and then was a regular contributor as well; the cessation of the journal was quite tragic for him for, as a Jew, it served as a final place of publication after he was denied access to several other forums (journals and radio; some of his books were even banned). As *Nyugat* is a major point of reference in the history of Hungarian letters, the discovery of Austen by *these three* writers clustering around the journal carries a meaning that points beyond Austen and characterizes the cultural direction of *Nyugat* as well.

By cultural orientation an anglophile, Szerb first engaged with English literature when he received a scholarship to study in England in 1929–30. This coincided with the publication of his slim volume, *Az angol irodalom kis tükré* (The small mirror of English literature, 1929). A tiny work indeed, it nevertheless devotes almost as much space to Austen (half a page) as his later monograph on world literature. His analysis begins with a witty paradox at the end of a chapter on Romanticism: 'The best novelist of the period of Romanticism was not a Romantic, hence her age hardly knew her: *Jane Austen* (1775–1817), the great realist writer, the link between Fielding and Dickens.'³ In one stroke, this paradox solves the question of how to locate Austen both in chronological and stylistic terms. Szerb goes on to comment on Austen's oeuvre in terms of irony, sharp-sightedness, lack of pretension and her focus on gossip and the marriage market. He claims that her art is colourless compared to that of the great Romantics, and declares it to be 'the small-scale description of small-scale life'.⁴ But he concludes that it 'does, however, include what Romanticism was not aware of: the great love of the English for life, for simple and practical life, which is, at the same time, Chaucer's and Dickens's basic attitude to life'.⁵

Whereas in 1929, Szerb only had to locate Austen in terms of English literary history, in his *A világirodalom története* (The history of world literature, 1941), he had to position her in the process of 'world literature' as he understood it in Goethe's sense: 'The history of world literature is the process by which writers and texts that bear a significance beyond the nations fertilize, and give direction to, each other by crossing state borders and centuries.'⁶ In this context, one appreciates that Austen is present, even if, again, it is only for a flimsy half-page. Here, she is discussed as the last item in the sub-chapter on the first generation of British Romantics, more as a parallel, or rather a counterpoint, to Walter

³ 'A romantikus korszak legjobb regényírója nem volt romantikus, és ezért kora alig ismerte: Jane Austen (1775–1817) a nagy realista regényírónő, az összekötő kapocs Fielding és Dickens között' (Szerb 1993, 96).

⁴ 'a kisszerű élet kisszerű rajza' (Szerb 1993, 97).

⁵ 'de benne van az, amit a romantika nem ismert: az élet, az egyszerű praktikus élet nagy angol szeretete, Chaucer és Dickens életérzése' (Szerb 1993, 97).

⁶ 'A világirodalom története az a folyamat, amelyben a nemzetekfölötti jelentőségű írók és művek országhatárokon és évszázadokon átemelkedve megtermékenyítik és irányítják egymást' (Szerb 1973, vi).

Scott. Her placing in this chapter is rather dubious, clearly a consequence of Szerb's double-impulse of combining chronology and his *Geistesgeschichte* approach to his topic. He discusses most of the eighteenth-century novelists (Fielding, Sterne, Smollett, Richardson) under the heading 'Enlightenment', with a subheading 'English Neoclassicism', into which Austen obviously does not fit. Nor does she find her real place under 'Romanticism' either. The next possible choice would have been 'realism' (with Dickens, Thackeray, Trollope, Meredith, the Brontës and George Eliot): this, however, seems to be far away chronologically. This misplacement of Austen in Romanticism is ironic, for Szerb's basic statement on her oeuvre is that

with her realism, and as the representative of the English psychological novel, she stands on her own in the world of Romantic towers and mist. Her world is almost grotesquely narrow, her novels can take place around a tea-table. They are about hardly anything but young ladies who should really marry, and secretive young men whose secret consists in their not wanting to marry those young ladies [. . .] But these trifles, which are ultimately more eternal issues than Sir Walter Scott's armours and Gothic sideboards, are presented with a woman's unsurpassable cleverness and kindness. It is the old maid's sharpness and love of talking that is turned into art in Jane Austen's case. Whoever loves gossip and the so-called humane things will always find pleasure in these stories.⁷

In addition, Szerb states that although Austen was far less popular in her time than her contemporary, Scott, her works did not become old-fashioned or outdated (1973, 499).

Szerb does not seem to have been aware of the serialized publication of *PP* in *Budapesti szemle*: he refers to the title in English, and makes no reference to any Hungarian translation, a fact also indicating the limited distribution of the journal, particularly as Szerb was a highly erudite man. Mihály Babits was aware of the serialization, however: he makes a vague and passing reference that, at the time of writing his history of European literature (*Az európai irodalom története*, 1935), Austen's works were just beginning to be published – and the vagueness may also imply his opinion of the translation. In conceptual terms, he holds a position quite similar to that of Szerb, with the basic distinction that he takes Goethe's idea of world literature as a process, an interaction or intertextuality, even more seriously, or perhaps presents it more effectively by his constant

⁷ 'aprólékos és minden szentimentalizmustól mentes realizmusával egyedül áll a romantikus ködök és tornyok világában, mint a lélektani regény angol képviselője. Világa szinte groteszken szűk; regényei úgyszólván helyet foglalnak a teázó asztal körül. Alig esik szó bennük másról, mint ifjú hölgyekről, akiknek már igazán férjhez kellene menniük, és titokzatos fiatalemberekről, akiknek titokzatossága abból áll, hogy mégsem akarják elvenni az ifjú hölgyet [. . .] De ezeket az apróságokat – amelyek végeredményben sokkal örökebb dolgok, mint Sir Walter páncéljai és gótikus pohárszékei – utolérhetetlen női okossággal és kedvességgel adja elő. Az öreg kisasszonyok éleslátása és beszélőkedve válik művészetté Jane Austenben. Aki szereti a pletykát és az ún. emberi dolgokat, mindig örömet fog találni ezekben a történetekben' (Szerb 1973, 499–500).

allusions back and forth, and across cultural boundaries. On one hand, he connects Austen to the realist tradition represented by Fielding, Smollett and even by revolutionary thesis novels such as those by William Godwin. On the other, he places Austen in the tradition of the Romantic poets and claims that she belongs with Wordsworth rather than Byron or Scott: not because she shares Wordsworth's worldview or interest in nature, but because she is involved in simplicity and the world on a small scale, abhorring rhetoric and poses (Babits 1957, 304).

Furthermore, Babits claims that Austen assisted in establishing a genre that women writers seem to have a special talent for: what he calls the 'naturalist novel' ('a naturalista regényt'; 1957, 304). In his view, women live in a narrower circle, and so are more interested in the human relationships that surround them: 'And what else is a certain type of the modern novel than the elevation of gossip into art?'⁸ On this basis, Austen is considered by Babits as George Eliot's predecessor, whereas he claims it as no surprise that Austen did not want to meet Madame de Staël when she could have done so, since Staël's type of 'loud Romanticism, liable to end up in politics or metaphysics is not proper for a woman',⁹ and is, therefore, alien to the feminine Jane Austen, who falls under his heading 'women and realism' ('asszony és realizmus').

Whereas both Babits's and Szerb's texts appeared during the mid-war period, Lajos Hatvany, who belongs intellectually to the same era and to their circle, wrote his essay on Austen only after his return from the West (France), where he lived from 1938 to 1947, and after the death of the other two essayists (Szerb: 1945, in a labour camp; Babits: 1941, of cancer). Hatvany left Hungary disappointed (after two years' imprisonment in 1927–28 for 'vilification of the nation'), and apparently returned with some hope that he could start again where he had left off. The year 1947 marked his return and some intellectual freedom as well: this is the last year before the Communist takeover. Written for the journal *Új idők* (New times) – which ceased in 1949, following the coup – and republished in his collection of essays *Öt évtized* (Five decades, 1961), Hatvany's text breathes the sense of a new discovery, and not without Keatsian resonances:

Much have I travelled and talked around all the regulars' tables of literary cafés in Budapest, Vienna, Berlin, Munich and Paris, over which each and every writer and book is being discussed; yet did I never hear Jane Austen's name and works mentioned.¹⁰

He remarks that it is only after crossing the Channel that one can encounter this

⁸ 'S mi egyéb a modern regény egy bizonyos fajtája, mint a pletyka művészetté emelése?' (Babits 1957, 304)

⁹ 'a nagyhangú s könnyen politikába vagy metafizikába lendülő romanticizmus nem női dolog' (Babits 1957, 304–05).

¹⁰ 'Végigjártam és végigbeszéltem Budapest, Bécs, Berlin, München, Párizs összes kávéházainak irodalmi tőrszasztalait, amelyek fölött minden író és könyvet meg-tárgyalnak, de Jane Austen nevét és műveit nem emlegette senki' (Hatvany 1961, 172).

woman's name, but, then, one is faced with it in all the bookshop windows, primarily attached to *PP*. (He does not seem to be aware of the 1934–36 translation either and invents his own translation for the title – *Gőg és előítélet*, a title closer to the original, meaning 'vanity and prejudice' – and he does not allude to the fact that it is available in Hungarian.) What he does emphasize is the melodramatic-sounding title of *PP*, which, at first sight, alienated him from reading it. But the more austere *E* made him change his mind. Reading the chapter in which Emma explains to her father that all she wants is to marry off her friends, Hatvany draws the conclusion that the limited life of a parson's daughter launches Austen onto the infinite route to artistic perfection. Providing some biographical details (her anonymous publication, rejection of the request that she should devote a book to a member of the Hanoverian royal family), he also repeats some clichés of Austen criticism: she neglects the French Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars, but he recasts these omissions in a positive light, claiming she was simply not interested in them. She did not care about *Society*, but about *society*, social life, and did it in a way that led Macaulay to compare her to Shakespeare twenty years after her death. Hatvany calls her a 'micro-Shakespeare', whose works may invite some snobbery in the readers; whose sophisticated language and true-to-type English characters may also exclude non-English readers; who was writing her texts in the common drawing-room with all her family around her. Nevertheless, her peaceful tales, in which there is not a word on anything related to the world, contain the history of humankind (Hatvany 1961, 173–75).

After 1948, however, none of these three men of letters could participate in the literary scene, as their aesthetic views were not congruent with the cultural policy and politicized literature of mid-century Communist Hungary (the most strictly Stalinist phase being 1948–56). Nor could Austen offer much in this era (with Mátyás Rákosi as party leader), which was saturated with the ideas of the working class struggling against the bourgeoisie and with the achievements of the Stakhanovite working-class hero, also commemorated in literature and other modes of artistic representation.

The first years after 1956, however, saw, among others, the publication of Austen's *PP* in a new translation (Szenczi 1958) – and in book format. The publication of this and the subsequent translations can be interpreted within the framework of the general, post-Stalinist (and its Hungarian equivalent, *posztrákosi*) cultural policy, which meant a certain opening up in ideological and cultural terms. This resulted in a high-quality translation industry, focusing on politically 'safe' and 'reliable' classics, particularly from the late 1950s to the 1970s. The translations also functioned as safety-valves for intellectuals for whom writing and publication were still problematic.

The Hungarian texts, particularly at the beginning of this period, were usually provided with a preface or postscript, and were often annotated, creating an apparatus that established the ideologically proper context and guidelines for reading specific texts. In this way, the translations initiated a critical discourse on texts, including those of Austen. This critical discourse, however, also has to be considered in the social and literary context of the period that is also known as 'soft dictatorship' or 'existing socialism', which gives a special edge to the history of Austen reception in Hungary. From the very first essay (the preface to the

Hungarian translation of *PP*, 1958), great emphasis was laid on the realist and social aspects of the texts, since critics made (or, rather, had to make) their points in a double bind and in a double code. Partly, they had to conform to the existing parameters of anglophone criticism of Austen and to speak about the texts as literature. To a greater extent, however, they simultaneously had to conform to the dominant approach in Hungarian literary criticism, which allowed only certain kinds of discourse – obviously from the perspective of classic Marxism.

At the same time, one must admit that this approach did not depart widely from the terms of Anglo-American criticism, with its emphasis on and categorization of Austen as a minor realist, a predecessor of Victorian classic (or, in Hungarian terminology, 'critical') realism. In this perspective, she was the writer of a limited textual world, far removed from both Romanticism and major historical events. In Hungarian evaluations, this limitation also surfaces as the negative and unsurmountable constraint of a writer hermetically sealed in her own social class. Despite the constant emphasis on this class-based limitation, Austen has taken her place in the Hungarian canon of English literature as a classic English author in the realist tradition.

Although she has never been taught in secondary schools, nor was she on their reading lists, she has been taught at universities for decades, even if in a limited way. She has not entered departments of comparative literature (open to a larger student population), but has always been taught in English departments (when there were any: during the 1950s, several 'western-language' departments were closed down). Yet, her impact upon students is more tangible from the 1970s onwards, and has become quite sustained since the late 1980s, with undergraduate dissertations treating a range of topics: the structure and style of Austen's fiction, gender politics, feminist interpretations, education, the intertextual relationships between Austen and other female novelists, and the film adaptations. Also, she has entered all the comprehensive monographs and encyclopaedias treating English and world literature.

The post-1956 series of readings of Austen was launched by a new translation of *PP* (by Miklós Szenczi) in the series 'A világirodalom klasszikusai' (World literature classics). Launched in 1954, the series was first published by Új Magyar Könyvkiadó (New Hungarian publishing house), then from 1956 on by Európa Kiadó (Europe press), which is even today the most prestigious Hungarian publisher of world literature. The existence of the series is a clear indication of the limited opening up of Stalinist Hungary, and a sign of the transition into what is called the Kádár era, with its image of Hungary as the most cheerful of barracks and the implication of a certain intellectual freedom. In the series, *PP* seems to have occupied a privileged position. In anglophone literature, it was preceded only by Dickens's *Pickwick Papers* (1955), Hawthorne's *The Scarlet Letter* (1955), Whitman's *Leaves of Grass* (1955), Defoe's *Moll Flanders* (1956), Sterne's *Tristram Shandy* (1956) and Mark Twain's *The \$1,000,000 Bank-note and Other Writings* (1957); and it was published in the same year as Fielding's *Tom Jones*, Cervantes's *Exemplary Stories*, Flaubert's *Madame Bovary*, Stendhal's *The Charterhouse of Parma*, Anatole France's *The Revolt of the Angels*, Chekhov's *Short Stories* and Lessing's *Plays, Poems and Tales* – prestigious company indeed. Furthermore, the value of the book is increased by the inspired translation of Szenczi (himself an Austen scholar), the quality of which is well indicated by a

title that at once catches the meaning, the rhythm and the alliteration of the original: *Büszkeség és balítélet* (*Pride and misjudgement*).

Like several other translations, this 1958 edition has a preface, written by Miklós Szentkuthy, representing the first substantial article on Austen in Hungarian. Whereas one can clearly detect certain rhetoricized ideological gestures that obviously had to be made at that time, Szentkuthy's twenty-page text remains an honest and valuable evaluation of both Austen and *PP*. By providing biographical, historical and stylistic contexts, Szentkuthy emphasizes the apparent discrepancy between Austen's uneventful life and the richness of her works, between the quietness of the countryside where she lived and the wider historical context. Ironically, however, Szentkuthy goes against the grain of general Austen criticism and claims that, in spite of this apparent discrepancy, her oeuvre is deeply rooted in her age. Even if this vein of reading, which tends to surface in Anglo-American criticism of Austen only later, was highly influenced by the obligatory Marxist-socialist injunctions, Szentkuthy takes a step beyond the clichés of Austen criticism. One can only smile when he states that

this minister's daughter in the countryside is obviously very far from understanding and depicting heavy historical facts in her novel. Not only are the capitalist relations of her age beyond her scope, but so are the workers, the people. Not even in the role of 'the crowd' can we see a worker in this world of the gentry.¹¹

Similarly, one cannot help smiling when he labels Austen as a reforming conservative, who 'cannot even dream of the radical abolishing of this world of the gentry: she can imagine the amelioration of society only *within the bounds* of her own social class. She desires these changes for moral and sentimental reasons only.'¹²

The moment Szentkuthy is done with these obligatory rhetorical moves, however, he starts analysing the novel in literary and sociocultural terms. Placing her into the Neoclassical tradition, he praises the consistency of Austen's tone, her character formation, her sense of proportion, but also points out the social relevance of what can be called Austen's 'dark comedy': the potentially tragic effects of the 'marriage market', which is revealed in Austen's text 'by the ludicrous contrasts, and at the same time correlations, between the shameless hunt for riches and the almost altar- or ballet-like etiquette'.¹³ On this basis, he

¹¹ 'természetesen a vidéki paplány még nagyon is távol áll attól, hogy ezeket a súlyos történelmi konkrétumokat felfogja és regényében ábrázolja. Nemcsak kora kapitalistáinak viszonyai maradnak szemhatárán kívül, de a dolgozó ember, a nép is. – Jane Austen dzsentri világában szinte statisztaként sem találkozunk dolgozó emberrel' (Szentkuthy 1958, iii).

¹² 'a nemesi világ radikális felszámolása álmaiban sem szerepel, a nemesi osztály javítását csakis a nemesi osztályon belül tudja elképzelni. Ezeket a javításokat csupán morális és szentimentális okokból kívánja' (Szentkuthy 1958, iv).

¹³ 'a szemérmetlen pénzhajszá és a szinte oltári vagy balettszínpadti etikett kacagtató ellentétét és összefüggését' (Szentkuthy 1958, v).

argues for Austen's rootedness in English history: 'Market, money, politics, knighthood and minute formalities observed: [. . .] a piece of English history' and of a world in which love withers within 'the desert of money'.¹⁴

Szentkuthy devotes long passages to the ironic presence of Lydia and her elopement in the text: how effectively it disrupts the almost seamless surface of this world based on appearances (Szentkuthy 1958, xi), and detects Elizabeth's disgust at Collins, whom he metaphorically labels a 'parson-reptile' (*tiszteletes hüllő*; p. xiii). Whereas there must be a touch of the obligatory Communist anti-clericalism in this phrase, we cannot deny the relevance of the image and the satirical tone of the text that he calls our attention to when analysing Collins's letter in *PP*, 3.6. In the remainder of the preface, Szentkuthy contemplates the possible identification between Elizabeth and Austen, 'their' rational humour and the almost programmatically defined 'healthy' love at the end. He also draws the parallel between Elizabeth and her father (both being clever and rational), but before this evaluation would declare Elizabeth a daughter of eighteenth-century rationality, Szentkuthy adds that this fictional world is also coloured by Rousseauvian and Wordsworthian Romanticism. In his final sentence he claims: 'With the proper, humble self-confidence, as she usually does, our Jane can shake hands with the English radicals of the eighteenth century.'¹⁵ This is an evaluation that may well have been greatly influenced by Communist ideology; nevertheless, this perspective brings to the surface several disruptive aspects of Austen's text that have only recently been emphasized in Anglo-American criticism.

After the 1958 publication of *PP*, a decade passed before another trace of Austen could be detected; but then, almost each year produced either the translation of a novel, a scholarly reference or an article. As for the translations, all the six novels were originally published (and republished several times) by the same press, Európa – either as part of the 'world literature classics' ('A világirodalom klasszikusai') or 'masterpieces of world literature' ('A világirodalom remekei') series. Further, between 1976 and 1983, given the success of the individual volumes, all of Austen's novels came out as an 'author series', cloth-bound and with stylistically similar but individualized dustjackets designed by Viola Berki – at the special request of Mária Borbás, the translator of both *SS* and *NA*.¹⁶

All are very good translations, by excellent translators, in carefully proofread, quality publications. In 1968, *MP* was translated by Ádám Réz as *A mansfieldi kastély* (Mansfield mansion/castle), followed directly by *E* in 1969, translated by Dóra Csanak. Seven years passed without any translation of the remaining three novels, which then appeared between 1976 and 1983: *SS*, translated by Mária

¹⁴ 'Piac, pénz, politika, lovagi cím és precióz formaságok: [. . .] [e]gy darab angol történelem'; 'a pénz sivatagja' (Szentkuthy 1958, vii).

¹⁵ 'Jane-ünk a tőle megszokott szerény önérettel nyújthatja kezét a XVIII. század angol radikálisainak' (Szentkuthy 1958, xx).

¹⁶ The author would like to record her gratitude to Mária Borbás for this verbal information on the Austen series.

Borbás, with the corresponding title *Értelem és érzelem* (1976); Ilona Róna's *P*, as *Meggyőző érvek* (Convincing arguments, 1980) and Borbás's *NA*, as *A Klastrom titka* (The secret of the cloister, 1983). In this way, by 1983, that is, well before the political changes of 1990, Hungarian readers could read all of Austen's finished novels. Hence, Európa Press – in terms of Austen – had completed its mission by opening up Hungarian world and literary culture, and by making these texts available to the wide reading public in the form of high-quality products at unimaginably low prices: in 1979, *PP* was republished in 75,000 copies, while *SS* was republished in 1980 in 65,000 copies – these days, publishers hardly dare to publish books in 3,000 copies.

The years following and parallel with the translations (1970–87) saw the relative proliferation of Austen's presence in critical works as well. In 1970, perhaps one of the most monumental enterprises of its kind was launched with the publication of the first encyclopaedia of world literature, *Világirodalmi lexicon*, in nineteen volumes. An encyclopaedia entry on Austen was written by the translator of *PP* and university professor Miklós Szenczi. Published by the Akadémiai Kiadó (Academy Press), the series is of a high scholarly standard and provides a uniform format for each entry: biographical details, chronology of works, evaluation of the oeuvre and critical references. In the evaluation, Szenczi emphasizes that Austen is a successor of the Enlightenment, who makes fun of the excesses of Gothic Romanticism in *NA*, and that she deemed herself a miniaturist, which, in Szenczi's view, nevertheless exposes a complex richness of social absurdities, human follies and snobbery. Echoing Arnold Kettle's opinion, he claims that Austen's works have a proportionate structure and that her psychological realism anticipates Victorian fiction. He also refers to Virginia Woolf's statement that the apparently trifling and superficial things in her texts always hide a deeper meaning (Szenczi 1970, 566–67).

Szenczi also co-authored the first substantial monograph on the history of English literature, *Az angol irodalom története* (The history of English literature, 1972). This 700-page study covers English literature from Old English to the 1950s. Austen can be found in a chapter written by Tibor Szobotka, covering the period between 1789 and 1830, and fourteen pages devoted to fiction are divided between Walter Scott (six) and Austen (eight). The contrast between Romanticism and Austen is again established, including the limited sphere of her works, which Szobotka attributes to her circumstances in life. What he emphasizes, however, is the representative quality of the texts: the ways of thinking during the period, its manners and social relations (Szobotka 1972, 418–19). He focuses on the asexual, social, moral and intellectual aspects of how young couples are matched in Austen's texts; social convenience holds the upper hand over passion in this world of the aristocracy, the landed gentry and the bourgeoisie (420–21). In Szobotka's view, Austen's language and style create an intimacy that makes this fictional world perfect: she is a master of dialogue and concise sentences – so that we can only regret she did not write plays (422).

After a short introduction to the chronology of her works, Szobotka turns to Austen's novels, and establishes a parallel between the Tristan and Isolde myth and *PP* in that Elizabeth and Darcy hate each other before they know each other. He emphasizes what he calls a rather rare feature in the case of women writers and female protagonists: Elizabeth Bennet's intellect resisting

humiliating or hopeless love (423). Szobotka also discusses the typical discourse of the age in 'good' society: that is, everybody says something different from what they think, which contributes to further misunderstandings. Whereas Szobotka evidently appreciates *PP*, he offers a more devastating opinion of, and comment on, *SS*, which he deems mediocre and considers the weakest-structured of Austen's novels.

The commentary on *NA* is introduced by a witty sentence: 'If Austen had not written *Northanger Abbey*, we would think she did not even notice that she was a contemporary of the Romantics.'¹⁷ He points out Austen's ironic relation both to the Gothic castle and to romantic behaviour, which either does not exist in his opinion or is in contrast with reality. Finally, he calls the novel anti-romantic in that nightmares are caused not by demons but by evil human instincts. As for *MP*, Szobotka calls it a slightly sentimental Cinderella-story, whereas *E* is a comedy of errors and a 'sensible' novel at that. *P*, in his evaluation, is a conventional story, which nevertheless has a richness by showing the reverse sides of everyday life. As a conclusion to the chapter on Austen, Szobotka refers to Lionel Trilling's claim that Austen is the first recorder of the modern individual, paving the way for Lawrence, Joyce, Proust and Gide. Szobotka, in the proper politico-ideological fashion, and with a typical double move of the age adds that we consider her an excellent example of 'critical realism' (1972, 426).¹⁸ The full significance of this term is clearer when defined against its binary, social realism: whereas critical realist texts could represent society with a critical edge and demonstrate social problems, social realist texts could even show the way out of the social problems.

Chronologically, the next publication, written for the bicentennial of Austen's birth in 1975, is in Hungarian but it is doubtful how much relevance it had to, and in, Hungary at the moment of its publication. László Cs. Szabó's

¹⁷ 'Ha a *Northanger Abbey*-t nem írja meg, azt hihetnők, észre sem vette, hogy a romantikusok kortársa' (Szobotka 1972, 424).

¹⁸ Szobotka's definitions of critical realism derive in part from Georg Lukács's seminal Marxist studies (1920, 1937); however, it is doubtful whether this resulted from Lukács's direct influence. While Lukács was undoubtedly committed to the socialist project, his position within the Hungarian Communist establishment was an ambiguous one. Although the original concepts of 'socialist realism' and 'critical realism' can be attributed to Lukács, by the mid-century they were no longer associated with him, having been appropriated and authorized by the Communists as their own terminology. By this time, Lukács's own highly contested conception of 'realism' had been extended to include not only socialist and critical realism, but also Modernism (see Lukács 1955). As it was *this* model of realism that Lukács represented to Communist Hungary, his theories were not welcome, and neither was he. Although, by the early 1970s, when Szobotka was writing, Lukács had posthumously regained some of his former prestige in Hungary (along with his own school of adherents), it nonetheless becomes clear that, at precisely the moment when Austen's reception in Hungary was beginning in earnest, Lukács's own critical presence in Hungary was virtually non-existent. Ironically, then, while Lukács represented the archetypal Marxist critic to post-war literary critics in the West, in his Hungarian homeland his status was less than tangible.

essay 'A csípős nyelvű kisasszony' (The sharp-tongued lady) was published by *Új látóhatár* (New horizon), a journal edited in Munich, which functioned as a political and literary forum for Hungarian émigrés between 1958 and 1989. Cs. Szabó, originally belonging to the *Nyugat* circle and after leaving Hungary in 1949 a central figure of the emigrant intellectual community, lived in Rome and Florence first, then in 1951 settled down in Britain. He worked for the BBC for two decades, and was a regular contributor to *Új látóhatár*, but for this very reason, his writings could reach Hungary only after 1981, with the onset of a more tolerant political era and the publication of his essay collections. His article on Austen was republished (and first published in Hungary) in his 1985 anthology *Őrzők* (Keepers).

Cs. Szabó approaches Austen with his erudition and two decades of immersion in British culture, but his perspective keeps oscillating between Hungarian and British references. In excellent style, he presents Austen as the quintessence of Englishness, with the central image of the spacious and comfortable country house. Claiming her one of the writers most 'alive' today, he relates her to Victorian women writers like the Brontës and George Eliot, and states that whereas they were more popular and well known by their contemporaries, Austen gained the upper hand after the decline of Romanticism. Cs. Szabó argues that because she preceded Romanticism, she did not fall prey to its excesses, and whereas she was an avid reader of Gothic novels, the result was rather a parodic anti-Gothic novel (1985, 352–53). He gives a memorable, even if, at some points, debatable image of Austen's life and times. Cs. Szabó is a great essayist, whose impressionistic text abounds in enjoyable metaphors and anecdotes, but sometimes at the expense of what he means to say: his argument is difficult to grasp. Nevertheless, he genuinely appreciates Austen, and as he has a great number of devoted readers, his essay obviously contributed to Austen's Hungarian canonization.

Parallel with the continuing edition of the nineteen-volume *Világirodalmi lexikon*, a smaller dictionary of world literature (*Világirodalmi kisenciklopédia*) was also published in 1976. Consisting only of two volumes, it has less space (one column) to devote to Austen, but supplies a brief biography and enumerates the works, including the Hungarian translations of all the novels. In the evaluation, the writer of the entry, Ágnes Péter, emphasizes Austen's limited perspective, her own admission of being a 'miniaturist' and how she could depict mediocrity in a charming way. She also adds that Austen's irony is linked to the Enlightenment, whereas her psychological realism points forward to the Victorians (Péter 1976, 84). This is a very brief entry, but as this two-volume dictionary of literature was quite cheap and published in 50,000 copies, it was also accessible to a relatively wide public: the first volume of the *Világirodalmi lexikon* came out in 42,800 copies, but apparently there was not sufficient demand, so the number of copies for the later volumes was gradually, and radically, reduced to 1,500.

In 1978, Albert Gyergyai (a scholar of French literature and translator of Proust) wrote a short article in *Nagyvilág* (Wide world), the monthly of world literature even today, which was launched significantly in October 1956, indicative of the parallels between political and cultural widening access. The article entitled 'Austen nálunk' (literally meaning 'Austen with us', but implying 'Austen in Hungary') begins with the words: 'A kind of belated discovery, quite

like a fruit left behind on the leafless tree'.¹⁹ He poses the question of why Austen is so successful 'with her romanceless novels'.²⁰ He diagnoses the enormous success of the translated novels, which (together with John Glenister's 1972 serialization of *E*) turned Austen into a topic of both private and public discussion in Hungary. As some of these discussions seem to have identified Austen and her texts with the film versions, and on that basis considered her a second- or third-rate novelist, Gyergyai takes issue with this position. Advised by two of his 'counsellors', Miklós Szenczi and the erudite British prophet of English literature in Hungary, Vernon Duckworth-Barker, he occupies the opposing pole and declares Austen a first-rate writer (1978, 1382).

Gyergyai champions Austen's 'romanceless novels' because they embody the type of novel Gide could only dream of later, but never bring about. While aware of how Austen's world is implicated in the darker sides of English history (industrialization, class conflict, the slave trade and colonization), he nevertheless claims that, no matter how ambivalent, the sense of good society prevails in Austen's text. While one can feel at home in this closed society, the codes of which are dictated by good manners and a comfortable lifestyle, this apparently smooth fiction has an 'undercurrent' (Gyergyai 1978, 1383: he even uses the English term). This is tangible in both her ironic style and her moral aims, and Austen's significance can be understood through the widespread recognition of her stylistic achievements and her significance in literary history, in that she posed a conscious resistance to contemporary Romanticism, as articulated through her 'miniaturist' style and quotidian subject matter.

The translation of her works, however, inspired not only comments that relate to her position in literary history, but also raised the question of how to translate her. It is Mária Borbás, the translator of *SS* and *NA*, who shares her dilemmas with the public in her article on translating *SS*, which appeared in the anthology *A műfordítás ma* (Literary translation today, 1981). She finds that the greatest difficulty in translating Austen is her 'cleansed, puritanical style',²¹ which is quite close to the discourse of today's English prose. However, translating her into Hungarian using the very same code would result in impoverishing Austen (Borbás 1981, 469). At the outset, Borbás considered adopting a late eighteenth-century style, and she found a Hungarian counterpart that could have provided a matching equivalent: József Kármán's *Fanni hagyomdnaiu* (Fanny's testament, 1843), the story of a seventeen-year-old girl from the gentry living in the countryside, rather like Marianne Dashwood. The styles of the two novels, as she illustrates in several examples, however, are worlds apart: Kármán is 'beautiful, elevated, moving', whereas Austen is 'reasonable, factual, concise'.²² Thus, to avoid the 'flattening out' of Austen in translation, Borbás opted for a

¹⁹ 'Afféle kései felfedezés, mint egy maradék gyümölcsé a lombtalan fán' (Gyergyai 1978, 1380).

²⁰ 'regénytelen regényeivel' (Gyergyai 1978, 1380): as one can see, the Hungarian phrase for 'novel' carries the meaning of romance or romantic; in this way, in Hungarian the 'romanceless novel' is almost an oxymoron.

²¹ 'stílusának letisztult puritánsága' (Borbás 1981, 465).

²² 'Gyönyörű, fennkölt, megható'; 'józan, tárgyilagos, tömör' (Borbás 1981, 466–67).

modulated syntax at certain points, and for the use of some less modern phrases to add a 'shade of patina' ('patinásabb árnyalatot'; 469) – a reason why she was criticized for the overly archaic language by a Hungarian Austen scholar (470). Yet, as she argues, and I can only agree with her, she considered the atmosphere of the text to be of utmost importance: this is why she introduced the informal mode of address between the four female members of the Dashwood family, including the daughters' address of their mother. Her point is that their bond seems to be a lot closer than the mother–daughter relationship in other novels from that age, which can be represented through this informal mode. In the final note, she admits that the translation of *SS* is more archaic and stylized, indeed, than the others; however, she claims that its atmosphere and its central themes are more sombre, which, in turn, requires a more responsible voice.

The next critical commentary on Austen continued the tradition of the postscripts: by 1986, however, the major impetus behind the postscript was no longer the politico-ideological education of the reading public, but rather to provide some general literary and cultural guidelines for the reading of Austen. In this instance, the postscript was to a new, Hungarian–Czechoslovak joint edition of the Hungarian translation of *SS*. Written by Erzsébet Zombory, the postscript does not offer much new in its evaluation of Austen, but it remains an astute and appreciative summary. Starting off with the ambiguity of Austen as a female Shakespeare, it points out both the difficulty of this comparison and its positive aspects: Austen's involvement in the general human condition and how she turns it into a *comédie humaine* like Shakespeare – but in an incomparably limited way (Zombory 1986, 299). The postscript puts emphasis on the publication history of the texts, on Austen's biography (whilst acknowledging that most of what we know of Austen is based on a reconstruction fifty years after her death) and its potential relevance to *SS*, whose presentation of the two sisters may have been modelled on Cassandra and Jane Austen. In the final remark, Zombory concludes that *SS* is much less popular than *PP*, yet, she deems it a paradigmatic Austenian text.

Apart from some passing references to Austen in a monograph on Defoe, Richardson and Fielding in Gizella Kocztur's *Regény és személyiség* (The novel and the individual) that relate Austen to liberal humanism and realism, and point to the moral and ethical aspects of the texts (1987, 36, 51, 92, 202, 240), a decade passed before another essay appeared: this time on *PP*. In 1996, *Huszonöt fontos angol regény* (Twenty-five important English novels) was published: a collection of essays whose target audience is primarily university students, but also the educated general reader. The essays thus balance between the scholarly and generally informative, in that they are interpretations, but without the 'alienating effect' of scholarly references and notes. Austen's inclusion in this volume is a sign of canonical prestige, as these twenty-five novels also include one Canadian and seven American novels.

Written by Ágnes Péter (1996), the essay gives a general evaluation of Austen in the light of some often-quoted sentences by her, followed by a brief overview of Austen's reception in Hungary. Péter then raises the question of how both postmodern novels and women writers, in discovering the female tradition in their search for women's identity, have found some of their roots in Austen. The essay also supplies a cultural context for *PP*: a scholar of Romantic poetry,

the author surveys the major Romantic poets and which phase of their life and oeuvre they were in when *PP* was published in 1813. The interpretation of *PP* relies on the aesthetics of Neoclassical composition and claims that the first part is built on comic misunderstandings, while the second part is a travel narrative, which provides the opportunity for the characters to reflect on their inner life, whereas the third is a return to the first fictional space. In this way, the internal and the external can be balanced. This structural analysis is followed by Péter's comments on how the characters represent various social types, how they are embedded or, in some cases, fatally entangled, in the social network, except for Elizabeth Bennet – the only independent character in her evaluation: hovering between the eighteenth century and Romanticism, in Elizabeth's character common sense precedes emotions. There is only one moment when the heroine bursts out in romantic fashion: when she is invited to the Lake District by her aunt; but as Péter wittily observes, instead of the Lake District she takes a walk in a Neoclassical park. Yet, Elizabeth is a rebel against conventions four times: when walking over to the Bingleys, when refusing two marriage proposals, and when opposing Lady Catherine's will (59–61). In the concluding comments, Péter evaluates Austen's mode of characterization through language, and her witty dialogues are related to Restoration comedy (61–62).

Where Anglo-American reception differs substantially from Hungarian approaches is in the appearance of feminist literary criticism, a tendency which has gained small purchase in Hungary. In anglophone literary criticism, gender studies and feminist literary theory have inspired numerous monographs, revealing how Austen's oeuvre can be read as a part of the female literary tradition and how much her novels are implicated in the gender politics of the age. Contrastingly, in Hungary, until now, only one essay has been devoted to a feminist rereading of an Austen text in this vein. Written by Nóra Séllei (1999c), the title of the essay on *NA*, 'Otthon a regényben' (At home in the novel) identifies a basic movement of the text via its self-reflexivity: the intention to establish domesticity in the novel as a genre. The basic point of argument is that 'the narrator seems to be dissatisfied with both the tradition of the novel as inherited from her predecessors and with the contemporary novelistic forms',²³ which is why she rewrites the elements of the genre, in a complex dialogue with the traditions of both male and female writing.

Considered in this light, the 'fault' of *NA* mentioned so often by critics – that its structure is split into two separate parts (located in Bath and in the Abbey respectively) – can be better understood: in the two parts, Austen's narrator explores the fictional spaces (in the widest sense of the word) offered by the sentimental novel and by the Gothic romance (Séllei 1999c, 53). From this perspective, the famous 'Northanger defence of fiction' is an affirmation of an alternative female tradition that is elaborately and intricately present at several levels of the text, in the form of intertextual references which deny and refute the

²³ 'Az mindenesetre nyilvánvalónak látszik, hogy a narrátor elégedetlen mind az elődöktől örökölt regényhagyománnyal, mind pedig a kortárs regényformákkal' (Séllei 1999c, 43).

images of women created by male fantasy (Séllei 1999c, 72). Catherine Morland steps out of prescribed texts and scripts, returns home safe and sound on her own, where, on native ground, she can transform even the 'hero' – that is, Henry Tilney's vision of her. As a conclusion, Séllei claims that '[b]y deploying a complex metafictional and intertextual framework, [Austen] consciously takes stock of the contemporary paradigms of the novel, of the plot structures used by male and female writers'. This in turn leads to an analysis of the conservative aspects of the Austenian fictional world (Séllei 1999a, 59). This interpretation is rooted in Hungarian literary discourse, with its focus on the genre, and developed by introducing the notion of gender in literature. As another new element to Austen's presence in Hungary, the appendix of the volume contains the translation of Henry Austen's 'Biographical Notice of the Author' and Austen's 'Advertisement, by the Authoress, to *Northanger Abbey*' (Séllei 1999b, 371–77).

More recent times have seen a shift in the evaluation of Austen not in literary criticism, but rather in how Austen can be, or is, marketed, and in this respect the post-socialist market (reading public) and publishing conditions play a crucial role. The series in which Austen was first published, 'A világirodalom klasszikusai' (World literature classics), and the later 'A világirodalom remekei' (Masterpieces of world literature), 'Európa klasszikus regények' (Classic novels by Europe Press) and 'Austen series' – all from Európa Kiadó (Europe press) – connoted high culture and erudition, as did the Hungarian–Czechoslovak and Hungarian–Romanian joint editions of Austen's texts in Hungarian, which preserved the sense of quality and prestige. These latter editions were extremely significant as they made the texts available for the Hungarian minorities in Czechoslovakia and Romania (this cooperation was not restricted to Austen: many classics appeared in this form).

Parallel with the fairly extensive publishing of the novels, John Glenister's 1972 dramatization of *E* for the BBC created further – and widespread – awareness of Austen. The series was broadcast on Hungarian television Channel 1 (one of the *two* channels of the time) from 11 April to 16 May 1978, at 9pm on Tuesday nights – that is, during peak-time viewing. The response to the series in three national weeklies, however, was far from flattering. *Élet és irodalom* (Life and literature) simply makes a vicious comment that the series is entertaining on account of the fact that it parodies itself, and very amusingly at that (Váncsa 1978). *Nők lapja* (Women's magazine) shares this opinion, and rates the film two out of six (Galsai 1978). The most positive review is one disguised as 'the talk of the town' quoting both hostile and more favourable remarks from randomly selected people. The 'review' concludes with a dialogue between a librarian and a teacher, who begin by commenting how boring all those conversations about the weather are, but finish by saying that the more they think about the film, the more they feel that Austen's world is not as distant as it first seems ('T.K.' 1978). In spite of these ambivalent responses, owing to the dramatization, *E* and Austen became common knowledge in Hungary. A clear indication of this was evidenced when Hungary's most famous stand-up comedian, Géza Hofi, poked rather nasty fun at Englishness and English women in one of his most memorable shows, also broadcast on television (even the reviewer of the 1996 film adaptation of *E* recalls this parody in his review).

Although six years elapsed before the BBC production of *E* reached

Hungary, later film adaptations have found a quicker route to us: Ang Lee's *SS* (1995) was released in Hungary in 1996 (subtitled), followed by Simon Langton's *PP* (BBC, 1995) on Hungarian TV1 in 1997 and again in 2003 (dubbed). Douglas McGrath's *E* (1996) was shown in 1998 (subtitled), while Patricia Rozema's *MP* (1998) was broadcast in 2000 (subtitled). All of these film adaptations have been evaluated in a more positive light than the 1972 *PP* mini-series. In the magazine *Cinema*, the review claims that *SS* is a 'surprising and effective movie cooperation' between Ang Lee and Emma Thompson, creating a witty and lively comedy from this more than 200-year-old material. It emphasizes that the film gives 'a modern and intellectual analysis of human relationships' and praises the concise script that even kept the rhythm of the dialogues. Overall, the film is rated 80 per cent ('kd' 1996).

One of the reviews of McGrath's *E* emphasizes that Emma has become one of the favoured characters of Austen's novels for her very faults as matchmaker (Anon. 1998). Another reviewer locates the film in the tradition of Austen adaptations, praising its clear structure, conciseness, rhythm, its intimate, and for that reason effective, style. He comments negatively only on the far too meticulous and pristine evocation of the age, while appreciating the film as an illustration of English literary history (Takács 1998).

Rozema's *MP* is described by a reviewer with a memorable metaphor: as a 'slowly rolling brook, with piranhas': that is, a sweeping film adaptation of an innocent-seeming but sharp social satire ('R.W.' 2000). The other review provides a more literary context, emphasizing that Austen's narratives can be transformed into excellent soap-opera scripts, in the best sense of the word, and that the Fanny Price of the film can be read as an alter ego of Austen, since the script incorporated some of her letters and diaries (Kis 2000).

As the film adaptations have been favourably received, they clearly contributed to Austen's presence in Hungary, even to the extent of having inspired a wave of Austenmania. A further boost was the translation of Helen Fielding's *Bridget Jones's Diary* (1996; *Bridget Jones naplója*, 2001) and *Bridget Jones: The Edge of Reason* (1999; *Mindjárt megőrülök!*, 2001), in both of which the young, primarily female reading public easily identified the intertextual presence of Austen. The release and Hungarian presentation of the film adaptation of *Bridget Jones's Diary* in 2001 (released on video in Hungary in 2003) with Colin Firth starring as Darcy (reprising his role in the BBC adaptation of *PP*) was yet another impetus to establish intertextual links.

More recently, *PP* was included in the one hundred runners-up in the Hungarian equivalent of *The Big Read* (TV1 licensed the original English programme). It was also included among the twenty-four novels that populated the 'Battle of the Books' series. Whereas *PP* beat Pál Závada's contemporary Hungarian novel *Jadviga párnája* (Jadviga's pillow), it did not make the top twelve in the end. Nevertheless, its presence among the top one hundred and in the Battle of the Books is significant. I was one of its 'witnesses', the other being the writer of 'the Hungarian Bridget Jones', *Állítsátok meg Terézanyut* (Stop Mother Teresa), Zsuzsa Rácz, whose presence as a witness for *PP* offers yet another suggestive element, when considering the intertextual relationship between the British *Bridget Jones* and *PP*.

This widespread popular presence of Austen on the Hungarian cultural scene

found its response in the book market, which itself has undergone certain changes. After the political transformations of 1990, the publishing industry opened up and new presses arrived wanting to reach their audience by catering for different tastes. In this process, Austen seems to return to the register she belonged to in her lifetime: she is marketed as middle- or even lowbrow literature. The first sign of this (preceding the real Austen vogue) was the republication of *P* under a different title. Fortuna Press, apparently for marketing reasons, changed the far too rational title (Convincing arguments) to a more emotive one: *Tartózkodó érzelem* (Coy sentiments). The new title calls into play a Hungarian intertext, Mihály Csokonai Vitéz's poem 'Tartózkodó kérelem' (A coy request, 1803). In this way, the new title appeals both to the popular register and, owing to its intertextuality, to the highbrow.

In 1996 and 1997, Európa still had a hold on Austen: *PP*, *SS* and *MP* were reprinted, but in 1997 new presses also started to publish Austen, although, with different aims and in editions of varying quality. Esély Kiadó (Chance press) published *SS* in 1996 and 1998, and *MP* in 1997; as the translator of *SS* informed me, the primary aim was to capitalize on the financially promising atmosphere created by the film adaptation of the novel, but the translator did not see the text that went into print, and was unable to proofread it. The print itself is of poor quality: as a result, this edition is far from how Austen first appeared in Hungary. From 1999 onwards, Magyar Könyvklub (Hungarian bookclub) has published Austen's works, in a series whose connotations diverge widely from those of Európa: Austen is published in the 'Szerelmes világirodalom' (Amorous world literature) series, a name that seems to stand between high culture (world literature) and the tastes of romance readers. The cover designs of the series place Austen on a par with Harlequin romances: the harsh, pinkish colours and the contemporary sentimental and erotic images appeal to a readership quite different from that of literary classics. Nevertheless, we must not overlook the significance of republishing Austen in this format (*PP* 1999 and 2001, *SS* 2000, *MP* 2001): together with the republication of *NA* by another press, they have sustained Austen's presence and wide readership in Hungary.

As an absolutely new phenomenon, in 2003 an audio version of *P* was released on eleven cassettes by Magyar Vakok és Gyengénlátók Szövetsége (Hungarian association for the blind and visually impaired). Since the audio version of classic texts is not yet very widespread in Hungary, Austen's availability in this form is a clear sign of her popularity. Austen's presence and our awareness of her is also increased by other witty intertextual references, such as the translation of Barbara Pym's *Jane and Prudence* (1953) under the title *Barátnők és ballépések* (1988), a title which recalls the rhythm, alliteration and even a word of the translation of *PP*, *Büszkeség és balítélet* (just as the English title echoes Austen's). Hungarian Austenmania invited the translation of yet another recent writer, Julia Barrett, whose two Austeniania are available in Hungarian: *Charlotte*, a completion of *S*, and Barrett's 2000 'continuation' of *SS*, that is, the story of Margaret Dashwood, in *The Third Sister* (*A harmadik nővér*, 2002).

On the basis of her unmistakable presence on the Hungarian cultural scene, in all its complexity, reaching not only the erudite reading public but more popular registers as well, it can be said that Hungarian readers have certainly gained a new awareness of Jane Austen as 'our contemporary'.

14 A Hidden but Prestigious Voice: Jane Austen's Fiction in Slovenia

Vanesa Matajč

The first complete Slovene translation of a work by Jane Austen, *Prevzetnost in pristranost* (*PP*), appeared as late as in 1968; *E* was first translated in 1968–69, with a new translation appearing in 1997; *SS* appeared (as *Razsodnost in rahločutnost*) in 1996. The Slovene reception of Austen, then, is significantly belated. Nevertheless, in the Slovene reading consciousness, Austen has not been a neglected author, either in the field of popular fiction or as a representative of world literature. This double reception of her work in Slovenia up to the year 2004 will be outlined chronologically in the present chapter.

With the exception of the 2004 reprint of *PP*, translations of Austen's works in Slovene bookstores are sold out, while public library records place her among the most frequently borrowed authors. On one hand, both facts demonstrate the widespread popular reception of her oeuvre in Slovenia since 1968. On the other, Austen is also numbered among the canonical authors of world literature: something attested to by the academic study of her writings, scholarly treatises, Slovene periodical pieces and the accuracy of the translations themselves. By contrast, Slovene reception provides no empirical evidence of Austen's direct influence on native writers. The reason behind this absence, as well as the belated Slovene reception of Austen, it will be argued, lies in the specific cultural and sociopolitical history of Slovenia.

Slovene cultural and sociopolitical context

For many centuries, Slovene lands were part of larger political entities (before 1918, in German linguistic territory; from 1918 to 1945, in the Yugoslav kingdom; and from 1945 to 1991, as a constituent republic in the federal socialist state of Yugoslavia). Slovene national consciousness was preserved according to the Western European model of national identity that developed from the middle of the eighteenth century onwards, especially in the writings of Jean-Jacques Rousseau and Johann Gottlieb Herder – namely, that the essence of a people is expressed through its national language and literature. In the view

of Romantic thinkers such as Friedrich Schlegel and Johann Gottlieb Fichte, as well as France Prešeren (the most influential Slovene poet of the period), a nation achieves its cultural and political emancipation with the help of its language and literature, which express the national spirit; this eventually leads to the establishment of the sovereign national state (see Smith 1998, 121–23). The Slovenes established their national state only in 1991. This achievement, indeed, came about partly through Slovene literature, which had made readers aware of the unique features of their cultural and historical community. From the late eighteenth century on, then, Slovene writers adapted themselves to nationally engaged goals for literature, intended to realize, with the help of all Slovenes, the political programme of a ‘United Slovenia’, thus ensuring an independent Slovene state.

Thus, it is no coincidence that of the two major British novelists of the period, Jane Austen and Walter Scott, Slovene writers chose to emulate Scott, whose historical novels introduced a literary model that could inform readers about their national (historical, cultural and linguistic) identity.¹ Scott was instrumental in the creation of the first Slovene novel, Josip Jurčič’s *Deseti brat* (The tenth brother, 1866). For the same reasons, he also influenced a number of Slovene historical novelists towards the end of the nineteenth century (Kos 2001, 161–68). Even the Slovene women’s popular novel could fulfil literature’s function of national engagement by employing a historical setting: this was true up to World War II, and the novels of female writers, such as Ilka Vašte (1891–1960), depict important figures from Slovene cultural history.

During the first half of the twentieth century, Slovene literature often combined national engagement with socialist ideology, while after World War II Communism held a state monopoly on ideology between 1948 and 1989. Since its philosophical basis was derived from Karl Marx, the officially recognized literary aesthetic in Slovene literature became ‘critical realism’, as established by the Marxist aesthetic theory of Georg Lukács. In his Marxist phase, Lukács argued for the socially critical function of literature: the presentation of the historically progressive conflict between the classes (see Lukács 1920, 1937). This ideological context divided Slovene literature across two poles: realist novel writing and explicit opposition to Marxist aesthetics (through Modernism and Existentialism). In contrast to the Marxist–realist aesthetic, according to which literature was to present the individual’s subordination to the laws of society, these movements portrayed the ‘asocial individual’ and thus represented an unacceptable literature for socialist collectivism. Nevertheless, after 1955, Modernism and Existentialism began gradually to take precedence over realism in Slovene literature.

Given the ideological context of Slovene literature from the nineteenth century to around 1960, there was no real opportunity for the reception of Austen’s novels: her body of work offers no model for a nationally engaged historical literature nor does it represent a realistic presentation of the historical

¹ For further information on Scott’s influence on emergent nationalism in the Baltic states, see the relevant chapters in Pittock (2007).

dynamics of class struggle. Austen's understanding of the person is also too distant from Modernist and Existentialist views of human individuality to have any influence on Slovene literature post-1945. While Austen's novels are indeed set in a recognizable historical period, what they primarily describe is *private* life: the sociohistorical transformations of her age that might engage a Marxist ideological reception of literature are only indirectly indicated. Consequently, post-war literary criticism in Slovenia registered the unsuitability of Austen's novels for the socialist reader and the Marxist aesthetic. To illustrate this point, we may make an exception to the chronological presentation of facts pertaining to Austen's reception and cite an example of such criticism: the critic Andrijan Lah (1969c, 11), reviewing the first complete Slovene translation of *PP*, stressed that 'no great social movements or political issues' were to be found in this novel. Lah's opinion can serve as a representative example, explaining why Austen lacked interest for Slovene readers and their ideological context, and was accordingly somewhat neglected. A second block to her influence was the fact that Slovene literature was receptive primarily to influences from the German linguistic and cultural territory (see Kos 2001): until 1918, the Slovene ethnic territory had been largely subsumed under state formations with German as the official language. As a result, educated Slovenes tended to be most familiar with German (in addition to Slovene) or were even bilingual. Even after the political exit of the Slovenes from the disintegrating Habsburg monarchy in 1918, the influence of German literature – fostered by the long history of coexistence, by the former literary contacts and by geographical proximity – flourished at least until 1941.

Early Slovene reception of Austen: articles and periodicals

For the reasons outlined above, the Slovene reception of Austen before 1951 is confined to periodical references in articles summarizing American, French and English articles. Austen was first mentioned in 1928 in the newspaper *Jutro* (Morning), in an anonymous article evidently paraphrasing a longer text from the *Yale Review*, without, however, mentioning the date or author of the original. This Slovene summary, entitled 'Veliki ameriški roman' (The great American novel), describes Edith Wharton's distinction between the diversity of the European novel and the mediocrity of the American novel. The same year also saw a second reference to Austen in *Slovenec* (The Slovene), in an anonymous article entitled 'Stare veličine pred novimi kritiki' (Old greats before new critics). This text, which paraphrases an unacknowledged anglophone article in *The Bookman*, lists Austen among other 'unreadable' writers (such as Spenser, Milton, Scott, Dickens and George Eliot).

In 1939, an anonymous article 'Kulturni pregled' (A cultural overview), published in *Jutro*, summarized the responses to a survey conducted by the Paris weekly *Les Nouvelles littéraires* (Literary news) as to how an author's gender might influence the character of a literary work. Again, this article supplies a somewhat more precise description of Austen's role in literature, in that it places her among the pioneers of the women's novel: in the view of the writer Edmond Jaloux, 'from Jane Austen and Frances Burnett to

today's female writers, Virginia Woolf [...], there extends an unbroken line'.²

The year 1951 saw the first, partial translation of Austen into Slovene. It was made by Olga Grahor-Škerlj for the school anthology *Izbor iz angleške proze* (Selections from English prose). Grahor-Škerlj translated the entire second chapter of *SS* and used as the excerpt's title the name of novel itself, which she translated as *Razum in čustvenost*. In this formulation, the title of Austen's novel lost the original alliteration as well as its connotations. The word *razum* (intellect, sense, reason) is an extremely general term and thus can serve only provisionally as the Slovene translation of the word 'sense'; meanwhile, the word 'sensitivity' is here translated as *čustvenost*, which would better suit the English word 'sentimentality' (or 'susceptibility to emotion'). The translation of the title thus emphasizes the opposition between rationality and sentimentality: it fails to take account of the various connotations of the word 'sensitivity' (human emotional sensitivity, the ability to empathize with the feelings of others, consideration for others) or of the word 'sense' (prudence, common sense).³

Grahor-Škerlj's translation was intended as a tool for teaching English in Slovene secondary schools: the anthology in which it appeared was published as part of the series 'Klasje' (Ears of corn), which consisted of supplementary textbooks with annotated literary texts. Grahor-Škerlj calls Austen 'the first renowned English female writer' and mentions her excellent use of dialogue for characterization, as well as the way she parodies both sentimental and Gothic novels. Grahor-Škerlj describes the subject matter of Austen's novels – the everyday country life of the middle and upper classes – and places the writer correctly in her literary-historical context: 'although she was a contemporary of the Romantics, she was not one of them, and indeed, does not belong to any school at all'.⁴

In 1954, Janez Gradišnik, a distinguished Slovene translator of English literature, ascribed to Austen the status of a classic in a short article called 'Deset najboljših romanov' (The ten best novels), which he wrote for the newspaper *Naši razgledi* (Our perspectives, 1954). He summarized a number of articles by the English writer Somerset Maugham, who counts Jane Austen as one of the best novelists: for Slovenes, however, she remained (according to Gradišnik) one of the lesser-known or still untranslated writers. In the Slovene ideological context of the 1950s, however, the label of 'classic' literature could also carry slightly pejorative undertones, when contrasted with writing depicting the modern world. This somewhat derogatory implication of being out of date was highlighted in a second (anonymous) Slovene article of 1954, 'Nezadovoljni

² 'Od Jane Austen in Frances Burnett do današnjih pisateljic V. Woolf [...] drži nepretrgana linija' (Anon. 1939).

³ These connotations were better captured by the title of the complete Slovene translation of *SS*, *Razsodnost in rahločutnost* (Miklavc 1996), which preserves both the alliteration and the meaning of the original title.

⁴ 'čepprav je bila sodobnica romantikov, ne spada mednje in sploh ne pripada nobeni šoli' (Grahor-Škerlj 1951, 220).

Angleži' (Unhappy Englishmen), published in the magazine *Knjiga* (The book). Again summarizing an English article (without mentioning the date or the author of the original), the text states:

[Modern Britain] is now a land of prosperity; social barriers are rapidly being pulled down, and readers are tired of the meticulous examination of the relationship between morality and nobility, which is characteristic not only for Richardson and Jane Austen, but also for such later authors as E. M. Forster and D. H. Lawrence.⁵

Similarly, in a 1955 article published in *Knjiga*, Gradišnik indirectly ascribed this classic literary quality to Austen: dealing with writers influenced by Austen, the article mentions, among other current English writers, Elizabeth Bowen, describing her (without explanation) as a disciple of Jane Austen and Henry James. Published a year later, Gradišnik's article 'Henry James' in the biweekly *Naši razgledi* distils (without mentioning its anglophone source) the opinion of F. R. Leavis, who places Henry James together with Jane Austen among five representatives of the 'Great Tradition' of British fiction.

Another proof of the as-yet uncertain Slovene reception of Austen's classic value can be found in another *Knjiga* article (Anon. 1956), which also places her (without comment) among the 'five great' English novelists. But this affirmation is hardly persuasive, since the author declines Austen's and George Eliot's names in a form that Slovene grammar uses only for masculine nouns (the genitive case ending in *-a*: 'tok, ki teče od Janea Austena preko Georgea Eliota' – 'the current that runs from Jane Austen through George Eliot'). Thus, the author of the article does not even know that these two writers are women!

In 1958, Sisir Chatterjee, Professor of English Literature at the University of Calcutta, mentioned Austen's influence while discussing Virginia Woolf. The text was translated for the magazine *Naša sodobnost* (Our times, 1958) from the English by Janez Gradišnik. In the same year, Austen was also singled out for special and popularizing treatment: Rapa Šuklje, ranking with Gradišnik as a prominent late-twentieth-century Slovene translator of English literature, was at the time employed by the cultural and literary programming department of Radio Ljubljana. She translated three excerpts from *PP*, forming the second (partial) translation of Austen into Slovene. Šuklje supplemented her translation with a fictional interview between the novelist and a 'reporter' as a way of presenting Austen's works and biography to readers. This 'interview' mentions the author's inimitable gift for storytelling, her detailed depiction of place, time and character, and her sense of irony.

The quality of Austen's writing is demonstrated by the translated excerpts, which comprise the opening dialogue between Mr and Mrs Bennet, Collins' proposal to Elizabeth (*PP*, 1.19) and the confrontation between Lady Catherine

⁵ '[Sodobna Britanija] je zdaj dežela blaginje, družbene pregrade se naglo podirajo in bralec se je naveličal skrbnega raziskovanja odnosa med moralnostjo in plemenitostjo, ki je značilno tako za Richardsona in Jane Austen, kakor za novejša avtorja E. M. Forsterja in D. H. Lawrence' (Anon. 1954).

and Elizabeth (*PP*, 3.14). The translation and 'interview' were broadcast by Radio Ljubljana on 28 August 1958 in a programme entitled '*Ponos in predsodki Jane Austen*' (Jane Austen's *Pride and Prejudice*), honouring the 140th anniversary of the writer's death. The translation was then adapted as a radio play, omitting the narrator's commentary. The roles in the dialogue were performed by some of the foremost actors of the Slovene theatre. In the radio translation, the name Elizabeth/Lizzy was changed to its Slovene equivalent, Liza/Lizika (in the printed translation of the entire novel in 1968, however, the heroine's original name was preserved). An announcement in the radio listings of the newspaper *Ljubljanski dnevnik* (Ljubljana daily, Anon. 1958) designates Austen as a writer 'in the best English tradition between Fielding and Dickens, less poisonous than the former and less critical than the latter, but not at all a bad observer of custom and character'.⁶

Nevertheless, an awareness of Austen's position in the canon of world literature was only established effectively by two departments at the University of Ljubljana: the Department of Germanic Languages and Literatures and the Department of Comparative Literature and Literary Theory. The views held by F. R. Leavis (already cited by Gradišnik 1956), were again brought into the discussion of important English novelists in 1964 by a future professor of English literature at the University of Ljubljana, Meta Grosman-Dokler (1964). The article briefly describes Leavis's selection of five English novelists (Austen, George Eliot, Henry James, Conrad and Dickens), who were able to combine aesthetic quality with moral analysis, stating that Austen's 'interest in composition does not transcend her interest in life; similarly, she does not supply any "aesthetic" value that might be separated from moral significance'.⁷ This affirmation of Austen derives, then, from the (apparent) stylistic and compositional simplicity of her novels. Austen's novels and Leavis's critical stance, as summarized by Grosman-Dokler in 1964, represent an opposition to that Slovene Modernism which valued the literary presentation of the psyche through alogical associations and even pure linguistic games that showed no real interest in human psychology.

In 1965, Olga Grahor (as her name now appears) compiled a second anthology for secondary schools – *Angleška literarna čitanka: An Anthology of English and American Literature* – but here neither the excerpts nor the commentary is translated. Austen's writing is represented by a summary of the plot of *PP*; this summary is followed by an excerpt entitled 'Mr Collins' Proposal' (*PP*, 1.19). Given its presence in this anthology and Šuklje's 1958 broadcast, 'Collins' Proposal' presents, in a clearly typical and ironized way, the English socio-economic and moral values that regulated private life in Austen's time through the filter of socialist ideology around 1960.

⁶ 'označi Austen kot pisateljico, ki je del najboljše angleške tradicije med Fieldingom in Dickensom, manj strupena kot prvi, manj kritična kot drugi, a nič slabša poznavalka pravi in značajev' (Anon. 1958).

⁷ 'Njeno zanimanje za kompozicijo ne presega njenega zanimanja za življenje; prav tako tudi ne nudi neke "estetske" vrednosti, ki bi jo bilo mogoče ločiti od moralne pomembnosti' (Grosman-Dokler 1964, 24).

More information about Austen's life and works was supplied in an anonymous translation of an article by Angus Wilson, 'Portreti iz književnosti: genialnost Jane Austen' (Literary portraits: the genius of Jane Austen, 1967), which appeared in the major Slovene newspaper *Delo* (Labour). The translated article summarizes Austen's biography and her chief values (prudence and good sense, over impulsive motivations; positive value on individual feeling). Such unromantic values, along with the 'very English atmosphere' of her novels, help to explain Austen's poor international reception. Nevertheless, despite such a long and informative article, Austen appeared just a year later in the anonymous 'New Books' listing of the *Ljubljanski dnevnik* (1968, 23) with the designation 'an American writer'.

1968: a watershed in the Slovene reception of Austen

In 1968, Austen was finally and indisputably placed within the Slovene canon of world literature. Commencing in 1964, Slovene scholars began systematically translating classic works of world literature, with a series of 'One hundred novels' (*Sto romanov*) targeting educated readers. According to Jože Snoj, the series aimed to open up for Slovene readers 'new and deeper horizons for European narrative literature'.⁸ The series was edited by Anton Ocvirk, who had founded the Department of Comparative Literature at the University of Ljubljana, and the novels were translated by scholars from the fields of literary and language studies.

Thus, the first complete Slovene translation of a work by Austen, *Prevzetnost in pristranost* (*PP*), appeared in 1968 as part of a series of classic works. The translator was Majda Stanovnik, who holds a degree in comparative studies and literary theory, is a respected translator of many English and American works and the author of a number of studies on translation theory. For the 1968 publication, Stanovnik changed the previous translation of the title, *Ponos in predsodki* to *Prevzetnost in pristranost*. At a presentation for the third reprinting of her *PP* in May 2004, she expressed her rationale behind this change: the title captures the events of the whole novel – the characters' feelings of disinclination are transformed into ones of mutual inclination. The title, too, must preserve these ambivalent emotional developments. The initial translation of the word 'pride' (*ponos*) carries in Slovene an exclusively positive moral connotation and thus cannot properly convey the ambivalent valencies of the English word ('elation', but also 'arrogance' or 'haughtiness'). Given the novel's content, the appropriate translation for the word 'pride' would, then, be *prevzetnost*, which in Slovene connotes emotional distance and aloofness. The English word 'prejudice' has a decidedly negative moral connotation, whereas the initial Slovene translation, *predsodek*, also carries a certain comic value. For this reason, Stanovnik decided on the more neutral *pristranost*.

A distinctive feature of the 'Sto romanov' series was its inclusion of extensive commentaries, which analysed the novels and their cultural contexts. The essay

⁸ 'nova in poglobljena obzorja za evropsko pripovedno literaturo' (Snoj 1967, 637).

accompanying *PP* was written by Rapa Šuklje, and presents specific information about the economic, political and social structures of England as Austen might have seen them. Šuklje's discussion also offers a lexical analysis of ways of designating social standing that are unknown in the Slovene language, owing to divergent sociohistorical traditions: the vocation of pastor was preserved only in a small part of the Slovene cultural space (most Slovene clerics are Catholic priests and therefore have neither their own family nor their own income). Similarly, in the Slovene cultural space of Austen's times, while class conflict did occur between the peasantry and bourgeoisie on the one hand and the nobility on the other, it was caused by economic differences alone, rather than by differences of birth.

Hence, the fine distinctions in social status characteristic of English society around 1800 were alien to Slovene society, resulting in difficulties in translating certain words. Thus, translations might preserve a foreign term (for example, the title 'Lady') or translate it with such words as *gospa* (which is also the Slovene equivalent of the English title 'Mrs') or *dama* (a lady), both of which can refer to a woman either of noble birth or of honourable character. In the translation of *PP*, the word designating Lady Catherine's social status ('Lady') remains untranslated. Also, 'gentleman' remains for the most part untranslated, since this foreign term is often used in Slovene, although it usually refers to a thoughtful and cultured man of character, and does not necessarily possess the English connotation of high birth – thus, this term also requires commentary. Šuklje takes special pains to explain two other words in Austen's novels: 'vulgar' (a person who does not know how to set reasonable limits on his individualism) and 'elegant' (in Šuklje's opinion this word refers to a member of the nobility but can also refer to a 'spiritually noble' person: the meaning of the Slovene *eleganten* refers only to an attractive appearance and smooth manners).

Šuklje's literary–sociological interpretation also attempts to explain Austen's diminished social prestige, in the context of an expanding publishing industry. Šuklje notes that the number of new novels published between 1740 and 1790 rose from around twenty to more than eighty per year, which meant that it became possible to make a living from writing (of course, provided one's works were well received). Austen was one of these successful authors, though Šuklje makes no mention of her income from writing. Although Šuklje mentions the literary–historical importance of women writers to the English novel, she primarily stresses women's social limitations and underscores the fact that, as a woman who wrote books, Austen was professionally unrecognized. Despite the Prince Regent's enthusiasm, Austen's work was published without her name until her death: 'the life and death of this woman were anonymous'.⁹

The biographical facts about Austen's family are also partly interpreted from the perspective of the non-emancipation of unmarried women in early nineteenth-century Britain. In Šuklje's view, British society of the time saw a woman's place as confined to private family life: writing was something she did for her own personal amusement. Šuklje finds that Austen was indeed able to

⁹ 'sta bila življenje in smrt te ženske anonimna' (Šuklje 1968, 21).

transform these social limitations into one of the strengths of her writing: Austen described superbly the only environment she was able to learn about at first hand: that of private family life. Nevertheless, compared to contemporary male writers, Austen had no access to the public, social environment, which would enable her to depict it in her novels from her own experience (and in this way approach the ideal of the realist novel, which thematizes historically important social and ideological conflicts). Here, Šuklje's social analysis and aesthetic defence of the writer clearly approaches feminist–Marxist literary criticism (see Moi 1991, 99–103), in all likelihood deriving from socialist ideology (dominant in Slovenia between 1945 and 1990), which advocated in theory, and realized in practice, women's professional equality.

Šuklje's literary–sociological interpretation is followed by an attempt to locate Austen's novels in the framework of British and European literary history. Within this context, Austen's novels represent something new, replacing the active picaresque hero (Tom Jones) with a heroine who is active primarily in her psychological and emotional life (Anne Elliot) or who decides on action from an emotional motive (Emma Woodhouse). In Šuklje's view, this change modernizes the English novel, expressing an invigorated, if still rationally controlled, subjectivism. Austen makes two innovations. Firstly, she develops her own restrained variant of the individualistic, romantic hero, whose actions often conflict with the demands of society, and whose consciousness is continually suspended between the social and the individual ego. Secondly, Austen's fiction, though certainly different from Scott's historical novels, nevertheless derives from the same historical awareness, which developed in a consistent way only in realist literature. Austen's novels depict the tension that arises between the individual values (freedom) of various people and within the novels' specific sociohistorical community. Despite the Tory allegiance of the Austen family, Šuklje finds that Austen must have sympathized with the slogans of the French Revolution: the values in her novels are borne not by aristocrats, but rather by individuals who attain respect through knowledge, talent and work. This is the ideology of bourgeois progressivism. With it is linked the writer's awareness of the historical specificity of her own society: 'The harnessing of themes around marriage [is] one of the arteries on which one can take the pulse of the entire society.'¹⁰

Šuklje points to Austen's irony, which is viewed as explicitly *female* writing, arising from her choice to restrict her writing to the domestic world available to a woman of her time: 'and anything female is, as we know, considered to be, at least in the cultural realm, inferior'.¹¹ Using the criterion of literary mimesis, Šuklje praises Austen's use of irony: Gothic and sentimental stories are mocked because they do not develop according to the causal logic of events but rather by means of improbable coincidences. Aristotle's criterion of probability and

¹⁰ 'Naprežanje okoli poroke [je] ena izmed žil utripalko kateri lahko meri pulziranje celotne družbe' (Šuklje 1968, 26).

¹¹ 'ker je ženskega, pa velja, kot je znano, vsaj na duhovnem področju za manjvredno' (Šuklje 1968, 32).

necessity in literature is also defended by Marxist literary criticism, with realist literature as the ideal. Of course, Austen's irony does not stop merely at literary stereotypes: through her mild ironization of idioms and stereotypes, the writer presents the differences between the social mask and the moral truth of society.

In Šuklje's view, the aesthetic quality of Austen's novels also derives from the writer's narrative technique: the substitution of monologue by witty dialogue that creates the 'dramatic' relationships between the characters; the novels' chronotope is concrete mundane reality; the novels present, simultaneously and in a balanced way, both social and individual (psychological) reality; Austen replaces the subjectivist epistolary form of the novel with objective, observational third-person narrative. Thanks to the classic balance between their aesthetic qualities and their literary-historical specificity, Austen's novels have become, in Šuklje's opinion, an important part of the canon of world literature. Austen's novels also satisfy Marxist aesthetic theory, demonstrating 'the importance of the social context and the material basis for the functioning and psychology of her characters; she brought into literature the everyday world, life dressed in work clothes'.¹²

The response in the periodical press to the translation of Austen's novel was a modest one: only three reviews, in the weekly *Nedeljski dnevnik* (Sunday daily), the newspaper *Delo* and the magazine *Knjiga*, all written in 1969 by the same reviewer, Andrijan Lah (Žnidaršič 1987, 12). In *Nedeljski dnevnik*, Lah (1969c) describes the novel as a literary bridge between the realisms of the eighteenth century (for example, Fielding) and the nineteenth (for example, Dickens). Nevertheless, he goes on to say that Austen 'belongs more to the climate of the rationally oriented eighteenth century',¹³ finding the novel somewhat old-fashioned. Nonetheless, despite its depiction of daily life in the 'petty-bourgeois' and 'bourgeois provincial world', it is 'an excellent novel'.¹⁴ To explain why the novel's subject matter is confined to private life, Lah uses a sociological argument: at the time when Austen was writing, a woman 'did not have many options because women's emancipation was still undeveloped'.¹⁵

The Slovene reception of Austen has similarly been twofold: as previously noted, public-library statistics show that her novels are read primarily by women as a form of popular fiction. Such reception was anticipated, too, by the first Slovene translation of *E*, by Franci Prajs, which appeared in serial form in the popular magazine *Antena* (1968–69). Despite its target audience, this was not an adaptation of the novel, but rather a translation that aimed for completeness (aside from the seemingly unintentional omission of *E*, 2.10). Even so, Prajs's translation remains problematic from a scholarly perspective, inasmuch as

¹² 'pomembnost družbenega konteksta in materialne baze za delovanje in duševnost junakov; vpeljala v literaturo vsakdanjost, življenje v delovni obleki' (Šuklje 1968, 39).

¹³ 'še bolj sodi v klimo razumsko usmerjenega 18. stoletja' (Lah 1969c).

¹⁴ 'navadnega življenja'; 'malomeščansko' in 'meščansko podeželskem svetu' dejansko 'prav očarljiv' (Lah 1969c).

¹⁵ 'ni imela veliko možnosti zaradi še nerazvite ženske emancipacije' (Lah 1969c).

it is based in part on the Serbian translation of *E* (Stojanović 1954). Here is an example, as analysed by Žnidaršič (1987, 13–15) and supplemented with the corresponding passages from the second Slovene translation of the novel, by Zoja Skušek (1997):

English: '[Emma] seemed to unite some of the best blessings of existence' (*E*, 1.1: 5).

Serbian: 'da raspolaže s ono nekoliko najvećih blagodati koje život može, da pruži' (Stojanović 1954, 13).

Slovene: 'da združuje največje blagodati, ki jih lahko prinese življenje' (Prajs 1968, 25: 43).

Slovene: 'združuje nekaj najimennitnejših blagoslovov, ki jih lahko ponudi življenje' (Skušek 1997, 11).

The Slovene equivalent for the word 'blessings' is *blagoslov* (which Skušek uses); the Serbian equivalent is *blagodati*: Prajs's Slovene translation obviously copies the word *blagodati* from the Serbian translation, which in Slovene is stylistically archaic, meaning 'good fortune' or 'blessing'. It becomes clear from the entirety of Prajs's translation, however, that this archaic stylization is unintentional, especially given the popular audience being targeted.

Not only did Prajs borrow from the Serbian translation, but his command of Slovene syntax is also rather weak:

English: 'one [Miss Taylor] to whom she [Emma] could speak every thought as it arose' (*E*, 1.1: 6).

Slovene: 'kateremu je lahko povedala vsako misel takoj ob nastanku' (Prajs 1968, 25: 43).

The Slovene translation of the syntagm 'as it arose' ('takoj ob nastanku': literally, 'immediately upon arising') is quite clumsy; some explanation is needed as to what this 'arising' refers to, and Prajs's translation offers none. The English sentence explains things through the pronoun 'it', which refers to 'thought'. Skušek's accurate Slovene translation of this phrase ('kakor se ji je porodila': literally, 'as it was born to her') respects the rules of Slovene syntax, with the explanation ('it') implied by the verbal ending *-a* (*porodila*), which designates the gender of the subject and so indicates the subject that the verb 'arise' refers to: 'kateri je lahko zaupala vsako misel, kakor se ji je porodila' (Skušek 1997, 12). The magazine in which Prajs's translation of *E* appeared was a popular tabloid: its readers would not have expected linguistic and stylistic accuracy in a translation of a classic novel. The most they would have been interested in was the love story and plot complications: that is, the same elements that lead people to read Austen's novels as popular fiction. Hence, the Slovene reception of Austen's oeuvre has developed on two levels: she has been treated as an author of classic literature and as a writer of popular women's literature.

In 1977, Rapa Šuklje provided additional information about the author for Radio Ljubljana's fifteen-minute programme 'Spomini in pisma' (Memories and letters). Šuklje translated passages from five letters by Austen to her sister Cassandra, describing various aspects of life in Steventon and Bath. The translation omits certain elements and abridges others, at times freely transposing passages and phrases into a new order, in order to present Austen's social life and

interests in a concise way. The adapted translation of these letters was then followed by a brief synopsis of Austen's life.

Since 1977, Austen's novels have been treated both as a regular and a special subject in Meta Grosman's classes on the English novel at the University of Ljubljana.¹⁶ The treatment of Austen's novels in Grosman's courses are part of the specialist subject of the English novel during the Victorian age. With this exception, however, Slovene comparative studies written during the 1980s and 1990s omit Austen, despite the fact that the Slovene encyclopaedia of world literature numbers her novels among the best European works of the genre (*Svetovna književnost* 1984, 37). Slovene comparative literary scholarship defines literary realism in terms of the Hegelian approach known as *Geistesgeschichte*: the realistically conceived person is entirely subject to the general laws of psychological, social and natural (objective) reality. By contrast, Austen's heroines articulate the free will of their emotion (and in this way show that they are romantically conceived persons), although emotion is subject to the limits of reason. Such limits are not forced on Austen's heroines; rather, they themselves accept these limits for the sake of harmonious relations between man and society, as the legacy of eighteenth-century Enlightenment ideals. Consequently, Slovene comparative literary scholarship would situate the conceptual foundation of Austen's novels (if it dealt with Austen at all in its academic courses) as part of the transition between the Enlightenment and realist novels. Austen becomes, then, merely a contemporary of Romantic authors, which is the way she has been understood by Slovene scholarship ever since Grahor (1951, 1965).

The fact that Austen is considered a contemporary of Romantic writers may have contributed to her additional treatment in the context of popular reception, since 'many Romantics [. . .] promoted a sentimentally oriented conception of art, which in turn opened the road to various kinds of aesthetic escapism' (Calinescu 1987, 237). In 1981, Miran Hladnik, a lecturer in the Department of Slovene Language and Literature at the University of Ljubljana, included a reference to Austen in his treatise 'Slovenski ženski roman v 19. stoletju' (The Slovene women's novel in the nineteenth century), speculating that she may have indirectly influenced the production of popular women's literature in Slovenia:

The history of popular literature avoids naming the famous authors Charlotte Brontë, George Sand and Jane Austen, although they certainly did help shape the writing of Eugenie Marlitt (1825–1887) and Hedwig Courts Mahler (1867–1950), well-known [German] authors of the women's novel.¹⁷

¹⁶ English studies in Slovenia gained recognition as an independent academic discipline as late as 1945, with the opening of the first English department at the University of Ljubljana; a special programme in English literature was established only after 1966.

¹⁷ 'Zgodovina trivialnega se sicer izogiba temu, da bi imenovala znane avtorice Ch. Brontë, G. Sand in J. Austen, čeprav so prav gotovo pomagale oblikovati pisanje Eugenie Marlitt (1825–1887) in Hedwig Courts-Mahler (1867–1950), znamenitih [nemških] avtoric ženskega romana' (Hladnik 1981).

Marlitt's work was published (from 1853) in the German literary magazine *Gartenlaube* (Arbour), which was also read by bilingual Slovenes and had a direct influence on the Slovene women's popular novel (Hladnik 1983, 40–41), especially those by Pavlina Pajk (1854–1901).¹⁸ It is possible, then, that Austen did have an influence on popular women's fiction in Slovenia, but only through German literary mediation. Nevertheless, Austen's novels and the novels of Pajk have something else in common as well: as with Austen, Pajk's heroines are distinguished by a certain sensibility, an awareness of their duty as women, of diligence and of education. According to Hladnik, this sort of female character was typical of British literature popular during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (1981, 264). The key difference between Austen's classic novels and Slovene popular women's fiction lies in characterization: Austen does not idealize her heroines; they achieve moral value only after undergoing many difficulties, which are not infrequently caused by their own disposition, temperamental particularities or social expectations. Another key distinction that explains why twentieth-century literary criticism regards Austen as a writer of classic literature and not popular fiction is the way the writer ironizes patriarchal stereotypes surrounding a certain female ideal (Moi 1991, 35).

In Slovene criticism, Austen's subtle ironic commentary on her heroines' emotional responses, their expectations and prospects within the context of social and literary convention is especially stressed (Šuklje 1968, 30–32). Similarly, Katarina Bogataj-Gradišnik (1984, 1991) attributes classic value to Austen's oeuvre on account of its irony and transcendence of popular sentimentality. The romantic subject matter of Austen's novels, which encouraged the popular reception of her fiction, also prompted the first philosophical treatment of the author by a Slovene scholar. Slavoj Žižek, an internationally acclaimed professor of philosophy, takes Austen's romantic fiction as an example in his analysis of 'desire', where he applies the Hegelian dialectic of subject-object to theoretical psychoanalysis (1985, 76).

Since 1986, the Slovene popularization of Austen has also been stimulated by the television broadcast on Televizija Slovenija of a number of British mini-series and films based on her novels (*PP*, *MP*, *SS* and *E*). Films based on Austen's novels appear in English with Slovene subtitles; the film translations have preserved the established Slovene translations of the titles of the novels. During the mid 1980s, then, Austen was firmly established as a classic canonical author, but also as a popular women's writer. Both factors may have led to the 1986 reprinting of the Slovene translation of *PP*, which was to elicit a powerful response in 1989, in the field of Slovene translation theory.

Translation theory and the Slovene *Pride and Prejudice*

Contemporary Slovene translation theory advocates the view that a translation must also preserve the sociocultural context of the translated work. This

¹⁸ For more on Marlitt and women writers of German domestic fiction, see Kontje (1998).

approach has been argued on the basis of, among other things, an analysis of the translation of *PP*. Grosman (1989, 61–68) finds that the Slovene translation of *PP* has unduly domesticated the particularities of the English novel: namely, through the use of an inappropriate lexicon. The semantics of such notions as ‘gentleman’ or ‘gentlemanliness’, for instance, imply the class, temperament and behavioural attributes associated with the position of the aristocracy within the strict stratification of English society. Thus, the lexicon is determined by the sociohistorical context of *PP*, which Grosman argues is not rendered consistently by the translator, resulting in uncertainty regarding characters’ social positions and resulting motives. The Slovene translation sometimes replaces the original term ‘gentleman’ with the Slovene word *gospod*. This is not only a temperamental–social designation for a member of the aristocracy or bourgeoisie; in Slovene, it is primarily, in established linguistic usage, the general honorific that precedes a last name (equivalent to the English ‘Mr’). *Gospod*, then, will not necessarily convey to the reader any connotation of a higher social status or moral excellence in a man so designated.

In Grosman’s view, one consequence of such inconsistency in translation is, first of all, deficient information about the original’s different sociohistorical context. A second ramification is that it hampers the reader’s understanding of how events unfold in the novel. For example, Elizabeth Bennet declares her social equality with Darcy: ‘“He is a gentleman; I am a gentleman’s daughter; so far we are equal”’ (*PP*, 3.14: 356). But the translation typically leaves readers unable to perceive the importance attributed by Elizabeth to social status, since it does not employ precise class designations. Grosman’s critique of the Slovene *PP* urges consistent preservation of the term ‘gentleman’ in the novel: in this way, the reader can perceive the specificity of the English sociohistorical setting, which took strict account of social differences in a way that substantially affected human relationships and thus influenced the entire content of Austen’s novels.

Grosman also criticizes the translation for failing to consider the Slovene reader’s own sociocultural context: in a socialist society the term *gospod* could well refer to a person who belongs to a bourgeois society. For a socialist society, which from the perspective of social equality rejected middle-class distinctions between a bourgeois (a *gospod*) and a worker,¹⁹ the connotations associated with the word *gospod* may even have a negative meaning that is at odds with the morally positive designation ‘gentleman’ in Austen’s novels (Grosman 1989, 67). Of course, the term ‘gentleman’, with its connotation of high birth, may itself have a similar negative colouring for readers in a socialist society, but Grosman fails to mention this. Nevertheless, socialist Yugoslavia’s sporadic censorship did permit the translation of novels with subject matter drawn from an aristocratic–bourgeois environment, so that Slovene translations of Austen

¹⁹ Slovene socialist society between 1945 and 1989 was relatively successful in the official replacement of socially differentiating honorifics with the levelling title ‘Comrade’ (*tovariš* for men, *tovarišica* for women), which was borrowed from Russian.

did not leave the 'ideologically controversial' parts out of her novels: they are translated without any adaptational abridgements.

The influence of feminism and film

Further Slovene responses to Austen as a classic author may have been partly prompted by feminist research, which aimed to recover the value of neglected women writers and thus reshape the canon of classic world literature. These methods include explorations of the stylistic and compositional characteristics of 'women's writing', as well as sociological examination of women writers, their social context, and the motifs, themes and ideas in 'women's literature' explicable by this context. The Slovene translation of Toril Moi's *Sexual/Textual Politics*, which analyses such attempts in feminist literary criticism, was published in 1991 and may have reinforced the treatment of Austen as a classic author: an approach first established in Slovenia by Grahor and developed primarily by Šuklje and Stanovnik (the translator of *PP*).

Women's involvement in organizing private affairs may be exaggerated and ironized in Austen's novels or it may be kept within reasonable limits; in either case, her heroines express strong female individuality, deriving from a subjective impulse to organize actively their patriarchally structured society. Austen's heroines, using intelligence and emotional engagement (Emma Woodhouse, Elizabeth Bennet) and rational concern for their family (Elinor Dashwood), transform society at least in the domain of private life: thus, they establish, at the very least, a compromise between the 'imposed' patriarchal role for women and woman's true nature. This is, perhaps, along with recognition of Austen's irony, the reason why these 'love stories' have been rehabilitated by feminist literary scholarship. While Šuklje had already in 1968 identified this quality, as illustrated by Austen's irony, analyses of the relationship between the patriarchal stereotypes of women and their 'true nature' in literature by women writers began appearing in earnest in Slovene literary scholarship around 1990 (however sporadically), and traces of this approach are also to be found in contemporary Slovene philosophy.

In 1992, Dragana Kršić used *PP* as an example for interpreting the process of awareness: she compared the 'love strategy' in the novel with Hegel's triad (consciousness, self-consciousness, mind) from *Phänomenologie des Geistes* (Phenomenology of the mind, 1807). Marriage initially seems impossible for Darcy and Elizabeth because of the differences in their social class and temperaments (pride and prejudice). They recognize their mutual love only gradually, in keeping with the principle that only the process of awareness itself makes possible the development of our apperceptive abilities, which are not something given in advance. The logical developmental sequence of the event of love/awareness can be seen only in retrospect (Kršić 1992, 9–26).

In 1993, Austen was placed among the classics by Mirko Jurak, although he does not consider her a sufficiently representative writer to include any excerpts from her novels in his expansive anthology of English and American literature; instead, he devotes only five lines to her in his literary–historical survey (listing 'her masterpieces' as *PP*, *MP* and *E*).

The surge in Austen's popularity triggered by the Miramax adaptation of *E* was followed in 1996 by a translation of *SS*, by Ferdinand Miklavc, a translator of classic and popular English literature. His semantically adequate rendition of the title as *Razsodnost in rahločutnost* also preserves the original alliteration; the translation, however, was published without any accompanying essays.

In 1997, a new Slovene translation of *E* was provided by philosopher and editor Zoja Skušek, soon after the film version of *E* appeared in Slovene cinemas, and both were symptomatic of a new pan-European enthusiasm for the novel. The Slovene translation of *E* aimed at a popular readership, especially among those who had seen the movie (Slovene critics did not find any particularly high aesthetic value in the film version). Also, the material accompanying the novel was limited to only the most necessary information: a short sociohistorical commentary by Skušek (1997) describes, in ironically critical terms, the social role of women in Austen's novels:

Unmarried women, and especially those with no wealth of their own, were socially and economically endangered: [. . .] they would have to find work as governesses in families richer than their own – like Jane Fairfax – and then in their later years would become silly old fools – like Miss Bates. That is why there was a need [. . .] to find them husbands who were rich enough to allow them to live in a fashion suited to their gifts (both physical and intellectual), produce offspring and, now that they themselves were looked after, engage in marital meddling for the next generation of brides and grooms.²⁰

Austen's irony towards Emma's 'prideful good sense' is noted in a short comment by Skušek (1997, 10), who, like Šuklje, views irony as the means by which Austen rises above popular women's literature. Austen's body of work was summarized in a short note and emphasis was placed, for the most part, on the novel's witty dialogue and the happy endings of the love stories.

The translation of the title *PP* as *Prevzetnost in pristranost* was also recorded in Skušek's introduction to *E* (1997, 7–10), despite the Slovene inconsistency in referring to the translated title. Emma's temperament was described using the two concepts *prevzetnost* (pride) and *razsodnost* (sense): a reference to the other two Slovene translations of Austen. Skušek also apprises the reader of two untranslatable aspects in the original: the Slovene reader is made aware of the way the character and social status of one of the heroes were semantically implied by his surname ('Knightley': 'a noble man with a knightly name') and in the name of his estate ('Donwell': 'done well').

²⁰ 'Neporočene ženske, še zlasti tiste, ki nimajo svojega premoženja, so družbeno in ekonomsko ogrožene: [. . .] kot vzgojiteljice se bodo morale zaposliti pri bogatejših od sebe – kot Jane Fairfax – in na stara leta bodo postale smešne prismode – kot gospodična Bates. Zatorej jih je [. . .] treba preskrbeti, jim najti moža, ki ima dovolj pod palcem, da bodo lahko živele svojim darovom (telesnim in umskim) primerno, poskrbele za progenituro in se, same preskrbljene, lotile ženitnega mešetarjenja za naslednji rod nevest in ženinov' (Skušek 1997, 8).

In 2004, Cankarjeva Založba, the publishing house of the series 'One hundred novels' issued the third printing of the translation of *PP*, but this time it appeared as part of a new series of classic literature, *Dediščina* (Heritage). Also, probably owing to financial considerations, the original accompanying essay was not reprinted nor was a new one written. There was also a serious mistake made by the designer of the reprinted edition: on the cover, Austen's first name was misspelled as 'Jeane'. But the series editor promised that the book would not be delivered to bookstores until the covers had been replaced with ones bearing the correct spelling of the author's name.

Conclusion

Austen had no recognizable direct influence on original Slovene literature: such influence was precluded by the ideological and sociohistorical specificity of the Slovene cultural context. Slovene criticism of Austen deals with her in terms of literary history (Romanticism, realism, the Gothic, sentimental novel) and later as an example of two possible translation strategies (Grosman, Stanovnik). At the same time, it rehabilitates Austen's value (her sense of irony in particular) in the canon of world literature in feminist terms.

It appears that Austen's oeuvre has been considered classic from the very beginning, primarily by the Slovene scholars and translators with an academic grounding in the English language and literature (Grahor, Grosman, Stanovnik, Jurak, Bogataj-Gradišnik and especially Šuklje). After 2000, Slovene reception still appears to place Austen both in the canon of classic world literature and in the ranks of popular writing. Austen's novels are continually borrowed from libraries, mostly by women. Also, the 2004 reprint of Stanovnik's *PP* aside, the three respected translations of Austen's novels (Stanovnik 1968; Kos 1997; Skušek 1997) have sold out completely. Perhaps her simultaneous reception as both a classic and popular author explains why this is the case. Whether or not someone reads Austen as classic literature or popular fiction depends, of course, on the reader's level of education and culture; this was noted already in a review of the first Slovene translation of *PP* (Lah 1969a): here the novel is described both as 'pleasant entertainment' and as a narrative that will satisfy also 'the more demanding and more knowledgeable reader'. The reviewer's opinion encapsulates the twofold Slovene reception of Austen's novels even today.

But how is Austen viewed by critics in today's Slovene press? One of the leading Slovene literary critics, Matevž Kos, proclaimed Austen's corpus to be made up of boring novels, even though he summed up his own critical position with a quotation from *Prevzetnost in pristranost* (*PP*) and further used this paraphrase as a title for his collection of essays on literature (1997). An opposing critical position (Matajc 2000) was encapsulated by another Austen quotation: 'razsodnost in rahločutnost' (sense and sensibility). Although Sabina Žnidaršič, who carried out factual research on the Slovene reception of Austen up to 1987, placed the author among the 'venerable but uninteresting classics' (1987, 22), Jane Austen has, at the very least, had some influence on Slovene critical phraseology.

15 Between Bath and Bosnia: Jane Austen and Croatian Culture

Tatjana Jukić

In *Black Lamb and Grey Falcon*, a 1942 travelogue invoking a journey through Yugoslavia, Rebecca West supplies a telling trope of Jane Austen's placement within Croatian culture. When describing Jajce, a town in central Bosnia, West speaks of

a vital tradition of elegance strangled by poverty [which] was still alive in certain houses which in their decent proportions and their unpretentious ornament, kept trim by cleanliness and new plaster, recalled, strangely enough, some of the more modest and countrified dwellings in Jane Austen's Bath. (1993, 433)

A page later, West remarks on 'a prosperous Moslem house, bright as a Christmas present just off the tree, with a garden where the plants grew with a decorative precision we expect only from cut flowers in a florist's vase' and 'a pavilion on the water's edge'; this reminds her, 'for the second time, of Jane Austen's Bath'.

Austen thus provides the British traveller with a serviceable rhetoric, which facilitates a mapping of foreignness that might otherwise defy representation. At the same time, West's comparison of Jajce to Austen's Bath traces the uncanniness of this comparison: the specific historical makeup of Jajce recalls Austen's Bath 'strangely enough', a strangeness subsequently doubled by the second invocation of Austen and her Bath. This presents Austen, within the description of Bosnia, as an index of exclusive Englishness, a figure in effect resistant to border-crossing. Yet, Austen's *exclusive* Englishness is contingent on her uncanny *inclusion* within foreignness; conversely, foreignness can be recognized as such only after it has helped produce the *strangely enough* of the Austen trope. As a result, the Austen-figure in West's travelogue foregrounds and dynamizes not only the processes of inclusion/exclusion, but also the concept of boundary itself: be it the one productive of cultural identities and national literatures, or the one productive of figures and tropes.

Strangely enough, these processes reflect in turn various cultural and historical symbolisms of Jajce itself, equally in terms of a reciprocal inclusion/exclusion. For centuries before the Ottoman expansion, Jajce was alternately a seat of high-ranking Croatian and Bosnian noblemen (even kings). Jajce remained

within the Ottoman Empire for three centuries, and was then part of Austria–Hungary and, later, of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, only to enter what was to become the history of Tito’s Yugoslavia as its birthplace: conveniently multi-ethnic and multicultural, Jajce in 1943 hosted a conference at which the new Yugoslavia was constituted. Over the past sixty years, West’s Austenesque Jajce, with its interactive Bosniac, Croat and Serb genealogies, has thus effectively metaphorized into an originating trope of the overall Yugoslav cultural and ethnic makeup, effecting at the same time the metaphor productive of its name: because *jajce* denotes ‘a little egg’, ‘an ovum’.

West’s Austen traces a more general impasse of border-crossing: she is a foreign body sustaining the symbolic violence of West’s tropes, in which *Moslem* houses derive from *Christmas* trees, yet (strangely enough) within a cultural geography of Jajce, itself reduced to interactive foreign bodies and (their) borders. This in turn supplies an adequate ovum out of which a discussion of Croatian Austen is likely to hatch and develop: since Croatian cultural history contains Jajce, but only through a serial displacement, West’s Austenesque Jajce indicates both the entry of Austen into Croatian culture and her deferral within the process of bordering.

The nineteenth century

Croatian cultural history is premised on a series of displacements and deferrals, and a difficult genealogy of interactive borderlands. Croatian literary history is therefore largely comparative, but, as such, traces in effect a condition *sine qua non* of the very concept of national literature, since the national identity of any literature (like the Englishness of Austen) is contingent on the various foreignnesses that it constitutes, to be constituted in return. In the nineteenth century, when Croatia was part of the Habsburg monarchy, and later, of Austria–Hungary, the Croatian intelligentsia depended for the most part on their knowledge of German and Hungarian (and of Italian and French, especially in the coastal regions). In fact, most nineteenth-century Croatian intellectuals spoke German and Hungarian better than Croatian. It was not until the 1830s that, within the Illyrian movement, the Croatian language was instituted as a precondition of national identity (to be banned from official use in consequence). As a result, Austen’s entry into Croatian culture was likely to entail an already translated (German and French) knowledge of her novels.

Though the ease with which Austen’s name is later used suggests that this might have been the case, I could retrieve no archival trace of her novels in the Croatian libraries of the time: a retrieval all the more ineffective in view of the loss, damage and general mismanagement of archival material in the intervening years. A symptomatic example here is the catalogue of the library of the Basiljević and Gučetić families in Dubrovnik, one of the few undamaged catalogues of old private collections. It records entries until the early 1820s, but the record discontinues at the time of likely inclusions of Austen; still, the catalogue shows that the library contained French translations of Maria Edgeworth, Frances Burney and Caroline Lamb, indicating local knowledge of British women writers and of the social and the narrative structures formative of

Austen's novels.¹ Nevertheless, this knowledge of and the consequent readiness for, if not the actual consummation of, Austen in Dubrovnik were likely to perish, owing to the self-imposed extinction of Dubrovnik gentry at the time of the Napoleonic conquests, because the local aristocrats refused to sustain the traditions and the knowledge of the old Ragusan Republic once it could no longer maintain its political independence. The Republic, a maritime city-state, had existed on the site of modern-day Dubrovnik from the fourteenth century, until it was overwhelmed by Napoleon's forces in 1808. When the town was taken by the French, the gentry in Dubrovnik agreed that their sons and daughters were never to marry – an agreement that was honored and that eventually resulted in the dying-out of the Ragusan aristocracy.

There is no nineteenth-century Austen in the catalogues of the National and University Library in Zagreb either. The first of Austen's works recorded there is the Serbian translation of *P* (Janković 1929), though the library holds many early nineteenth-century German translations from English by Wilhelm Adolf Lindau, who in 1822 translated Austen's *P*. Another likely point of access was the reference catalogue of the national Institute of Lexicography, covering local publications from the eighteenth century until after World War II. The fact that this catalogue generates no trace of Austen implies that no Croatian publications featured articles on Austen during this period. Still, these gaps do not necessarily indicate the absence of Austen, but rather the likely loss or misplacement of the trace, which in themselves are equally constitutive of the unruly narratives of literary history. Such a formative misplacement of the meandering traces of Austen is perhaps best exemplified by the Croatian recognition of the work of French critic Hippolyte Taine, whose criticism operated as a yardstick against which Croatian critics measured local literature and their own critical parameters during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Their knowledge of English literature also derived largely from Taine's *History of English Literature* (originally published in France as *Histoire de la littérature anglaise*, 1863–64). Taine's *History*, however, does feature 'Miss Austen', but misplaces her chronologically as a *follower* of Walter Scott (1880, 530). As a result, Austen's literally understated entrance into the Scott-crazed Croatian literary criticism of the later nineteenth century was as low-key and misplaced as her presence within Taine, tracing once again not the scope of historical knowledge but rather the processes of its construction.

Mid-twentieth-century criticism

The same low-key surfacing characterizes Austen in the writings of Tin Ujević, the most eminent Croatian poet of the twentieth century. In his 1952 essay on George Meredith, Ujević 'writers like Jane Austen, Charlotte Brontë (and her sisters) and George Eliot are so significant that "women's novels" have come to

¹ *Indice alfabetico della Biblioteca di Casa Gozze* (1819), Dubrovnik, State Archive, RO-157.

symbolize the era'.² Unlike other British writers, whom Ujević wrote about and translated into Croatian, this is the only time that Austen surfaces, presented within Ujević's rhetoric as a peripheral figure, a marginalization which derives its added value from his canonical position in twentieth-century Croatian literature. It is as telling, however, that Austen surfaces in Ujević as an interpretative given, operating within an assumption that Croatian readers were as acquainted with her novels as with the works of the Brontës and George Eliot. Austen's (historically accurate) placement as the first in the line of (subsequent) Victorian women novelists configures her accordingly as a strangely visible point of origination of the very novels that later, according to Ujević, standardize Victorian narrative production.

Miroslav Beker (1966) sees Austen as sustaining the boundary between pre-nineteenth- and nineteenth-century practices of representation, and she appears to hold the same structural value as the Renaissance. Nevertheless, Beker's Austen remains suspended from the very frame she helps to constitute, almost replicating the *strangely enough* of West's Austenesque Jajce. Beker closes his survey of 'plain honesty' in English literature by remarking (paradoxically) that 'Austen's world is too urbane for clear outlines of plain and stern honesty', only to add (even more paradoxically) that '[t]he fact that this essay winds up with Jane Austen does not mean that thereafter this ideal disappeared in English literature' (1966, 286). Though evidently a concluding *structural* element of Beker's survey of a *theme*, Austen here provides a position from which to interrogate both structural and thematic closures, as well as questioning any positive differentiation between the two.

1962: the first Croatian translation of Austen

The first Croatian translation of Austen, *Emma* (1962), proposes the same uneasy positioning and reinforces the uncanniness of rhetoric that Austen symbolizes in West's travelogue. Published as part of a grand-scale series that was to provide translations of 'world classics of the eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries' and facilitate, however belatedly, their smooth passage into Croatian culture, this *E* foregrounds the very act of translation. Information about the translators and a comparative reading of Serbian and Croatian translations reveal that the 1962 *E* is a Croaticized revision (by the experienced translator Franjo Hartl) of the 1954 Serbian translation (by D. and J. Stojanović).

Interestingly, this practice of twofold translation was at odds with Yugoslav cultural policy at the time and consequently exposes the otherwise invisible mechanisms of its construction. Since the Croatian and Serbian languages were officially perceived as a linguistic reciprocation throughout the former Yugoslavia, Serbian translations of Austen published in the 1950s were marketed

² 'spisateljice kao Jane Austen, Charlotte Brontë (i njene sestre), George Eliot došle su do takvoga značenja da "ženski roman" upravo i obilježava tu epohu' (Ujević 1965, 58).

equally throughout the former Yugoslav republics, rendering Croaticized versions of Serbian translations redundant (and vice versa).³ The Croaticized *E*, however, establishes this seeming redundancy as a faultline in the construction of Yugoslav cultural identity, which actually depended on a controlled production of ethnic and linguistic difference. As a result, the first Croatian Austen provoked no public scandal, but created a position from which to critique assumed structures and relations: just as the theft of Mrs Weston's turkeys in *E* poses no threat to 'the system', but activates 'the operation of the same system in another way' (*E*, 3.19: 483).

This 'operation' of the 1962 *E* effected at the same time another social positionality in and of the novel: it was produced within a culture dominated by socialist realism. However, this socialist realism was itself operating at a remove from the dominant socialist realist regimes of representation, just as the cultural and the political identity of Yugoslavia at the time was organized as and at a remove from the dominant socialisms of the Eastern bloc. Hence, Yugoslavia was perceived as a shifting contact-zone between the socialist East and the capitalist West. This actively produced the symbolism of contact and borderland, which foregrounded difference as a necessary precondition of autonomous identity construction. Entering this zone, Austen's novels, premised on social conditioning of language and narration, provide a reciprocating remove within which to address both the representation of class interests (itself the defining interest of socialist realism) *and* the social interests invested in representation and interpretation (entailing a critique of the position which generates socialist realism in the first place). Though all Austen's novels engender these operable loops, *E* could be described as their synecdoche, since the discourse of courtship is foregrounded as an obsessive interest in matchmaking and the consequent exaggeration of blindness and insight; while their social scope extends accordingly to incorporate its own limits (the figures of farmers, governesses and illegitimate daughters of tradesmen). This consequently highlights the logic of various narrative structures and exchanges, which would otherwise remain inaccessible to analysis – just as the theft of Mrs Weston's turkeys, however ironically, exposes the logic of transgression underlying the narrative order.

The scope of all these operations in the 1962 *E* comes out sharply when it is set against the 1997 Croatian translation, produced when the rhetoric of socialist realism was renounced as a repressive, state-induced regime of representation. Since *E*, with its systemic irony and an equally systemic use of free indirect discourse, affords hardly any unsubverted positions, the two translations are in no position to afford much difference unanticipated by the novel. The difference that they do evince, however, is then as indicative of the operation of

³ The majority of Serbian linguists consider Serbian and Serbo-Croatian to be the same, while their Croatian counterparts discount the notion of a unitary language, arguing instead for the historical overlap between two different languages. The entanglement of the political-nationalist agenda with this linguistic issue has done little to address the controversy.

socialist realism in 1960s Croatia (and, by association, in Croatia of the 1990s), as it is of the undefended points of Austen's narrative realm.

The figure that betrays the faultlines of translation (and of Austen's narrative act) is Robert Martin: the only figure in the novel with no adequate access to narrative self-representation or autonomous discourse-production. Within the translations, the very entrance of the Martins into the story disrupts their otherwise non-partisan reproductions of Austen's discourse. Austen describes Emma's being 'amused by such a picture of another set of beings' (*E*, 1.4: 27). While the post-socialist Croatian *E* renders 'another set of beings' as 'another sort of people' ('druga vrsta ljudi'), 'sort' here synonymous in Croatian with 'species' (Balén-Heidl 1997, 28), the 1962 translation uses a syntagm which significantly reduces the class difference and the symbolic violence of its representation: 'another set of beings' is here 'a different world' ('drugačiji svijet'), 'world' synonymous in Croatian with 'people' generally (Stojanović 1962, 26). In the same chapter, the faultline deepens when Emma instructs Harriet Smith about the multiple limits of Emma's own social interactions, which exclude yeomanry, and Robert Martin as their narrative representative. In 1997, 'yeomanry' is translated as the 'smallholders' class' ('maloposjednički stale'; Balén-Heidl 1997, 30), accentuating Martin as the figure of possession, against the 1962 translation's 'self-supporting peasant' ('samostalni seljak', 'nezavisni seljak'; Stojanović 1962, 28), which devalues the concept of possession favouring the concept of labour, and leading to social and economic emancipation of the subaltern. Thus conflicted, however, the two translations actually retrace the negotiable correlation of possession and valuation that informs Austen's stories and is informed by them in return.

This conceptual interdependence of possession and valuation resurfaces in Martin's first proposal to Harriet. Having secured Harriet's rejection, Emma says she is secure of her forever (*E*, 1.7: 53). While the post-socialist realist translation configures this statement as Emma's 'this way I have secured your society for ever' (Balén-Heidl 1997, 51), the 1962 one configures the poor Harriet as the rich Emma's possession: 'I am now sure I have you for ever' (Stojanović 1962, 49). Equally, Robert Martin stages the rift between the 1997 'farmer' (*farmer*) which preserves the contingency of the English word and its signal of class and possession, against the 1962 'peasant' (*seljak*), which translates Martin into a socialist realist symptom of declassing and dispossession. This potential for discontent and contention in Martin expands further when Knightley, in order to reinforce his argument against Emma, reaffirms Martin's claims to class and possession by describing him as a 'gentleman-farmer' (*E*, 1.8: 62). The 1997 Croatian Robert Martin is suspended in his Englishness as a gentleman-farmer, yet half-Croaticized into *džentlmen-farmer* (Balén-Heidl 1997, 58). Though meant to Croaticize the figure, this phonetic transcription accentuates the difference and contingency of Austen's narrative (and of the frame it now enters), just as West's Austen in Jajce, instead of easing out the representation of another culture, accentuates difference and contingency as the uncanny proviso of any representation, be it of Bath or Bosnia.

The value of this signal increases with the route that it traces to the symbolic violence of its counterpart in the 1962 translation. In an attempt to accommodate the 'gentleman' of the 'gentleman-farmer' within the 'peasant', Hartl

and the Stojanovičs translate Austen's 'gentleman-farmer' as 'agriculturalist' (*poljoprivrednik*): a term generated within the local socialist rhetoric to describe loosely the new category of small landowners in an officially classless society. The deliberate novelty and imprecision of this term, meant to reduce the symbolic violence sedimented in the class-conscious rhetoric of capitalism, nonetheless generates the same kind of unease when transferred to the discourse it aimed to deactivate, accentuating only its impotence to deactivate the historical contingency of all production – production of discourse included.

The 'agriculturalist', moreover, nearly paralyses the narrative production when it is used to describe the figure of Mr Knightley. Austen describes Knightley as a 'magistrate' and a 'farmer' (*E*, 1.12: 100), to distinguish him from his London-based brother. The 1997 Croatian *E* overclasses the 'farmer' here into a 'landowner' (*zemljoposjednik*; Balen-Heidl 1997, 92), but this linguistic emphasis on the discourse of class reciprocates in effect the declassing and the dehistoricizing of the 1962 Knightley 'agriculturalist', because the Croatian Knightley is in both cases represented not as different from his brother, but as a reciprocating metonym of Robert Martin. The difference between Knightley and Martin thus threatens to collapse into a paradoxical symptom of a socialist realist politics of representation, which intermittently paralyses the very historical operation (of various capitalist economies) that it recognizes as its own genealogy.

The traces of this latent paralysis surface once again near the end of the novel, in the paradox that the two translations develop when the narrative needs to resolve the marital positions of Knightley and Martin: both the 1962 and 1997 Croatian versions of *E* devalue Knightley's rhetoric when, breaking to Emma the news of Harriet Smith's eventual engagement, he defines Martin's social position as 'an evil' and Harriet Smith's as even 'worse'. In an attempt to undo the rhetorical unclassing brought about by socialist realism and by socialist practices of representation in general, and to produce a markedly *gentlemanly* Knightley, the 1997 translation renders 'an evil' as 'humble' (*neugledan*), so that the 'worse' used on Harriet comes out as a comparative of 'humble' rather than 'evil'. The reticent socialist realism of the 1962 *E* effects, however, the same rhetorical devaluation in its attempt to sustain Knightley as an achievable social metonym of Martin and therefore an embryonic trope of *unclassing*: 'an evil' here comes out as 'inconveniencing' (*smeta*). Both the 1962 rhetoric of unclassing and the early post-socialist effort to undo it have by now been consumed by a more general genealogy of Croatian culture. Thus, their politics are retrievable (and effective) only as a kind of cultural archaeology, exploding local cultural history (of which they are part) as an unstable structure of representation.

The seminal position of the 1962 *E* is further charted in the 'Afterword' by Breda Kogoj-Kapetanić. Addressing the paradox of Austen's relevance to, yet reticence in, literary history, Kogoj-Kapetanić says that this testifies to Austen's lack of a fixed position in literary history: an anomaly all the more telling in view of the fact that, before the twentieth century, there was no 'proper interest' in Austen, though she issues from the middle-class tradition of English fiction. While duly noting Austen's paradoxical position in literary history, however, Kogoj-Kapetanić fails to comment on Austen as a likely challenge to any history that fails to address its own historicity: she merely notes that Austen, thus

strangely positioned within yet outside history, 'lives in time' (1962, 413). Nonetheless, for Kogoj-Kapetanić Austen is a figure that invites analysis of the various histories it enters and produces, so her Afterword reads in effect not only as the first comprehensive Croatian account of Austen, but also as a comment on the historical operation of the very translation of which it is part.

Equally symptomatic is the kind of 'negative theology' that Kogoj-Kapetanić employs to describe this oblique historicization of Austen. The Afterword constructs its Austen by recording what it claims Austen does *not* do: her fiction does not feature political or military history; it is carefully underplotted; though character-centred, its characters are generally devoid of 'disturbing manifestations of life', such as passion, death, evil and crime, *and* of the 'abstract world of ideas' (*and* of disturbing rhetoric). When Kogoj-Kapetanić notes that Austen enters her novels 'burdened with class and morality', she hastens to add that Austen is not primarily interested in the moral education of her readers and does not communicate her interpretation of the narrated events to them (1962, 414–16).

While aiming to describe Austen, this account, with its negative definition, delineates the kind of literary history that cannot accommodate Austen within its bounds, but incorporates her as a foreign body, which traces not so much this history's alleged contents as its formative interests and structural faultlines. It is a history premised on socialist realism, more specifically on the criticism of Georg Lukács. A Lukácsian literary history cannot exclude Austen, because the novel is its constituent genre. In their subversion of interpretative certainty, however, Austen's novels provide a position from which to question any such system attempting a closure, both in terms of class and rhetoric, especially when it fails to address its own social, historical and rhetorical contingencies.

Kogoj-Kapetanić analyses dialogue as a narrative procedure representative of Austen, which – while endorsing the preceding negative definition of her work – supports at the same time a narrative economy. In Kogoj-Kapetanić's words, 'it takes a lot of skill to leave out description and, after only a brief introduction, represent a character in dialogue'.⁴ Though such 'parsimony when it comes to representing details' might have resulted in 'poorly nuanced characters', in the dialogic Austen they all stand out as distinct. What is more, though 'her characters talk all the time' (which contributes to the dramatic effect of Austen's fiction), Austen is careful to 'economize on language in dialogue' too, thus recovering the meaning that many words 'have lost through constant use'.⁵

Kogoj-Kapetanić's dialogic construction of character, singled out as the formative feature of Austen's narration, prefigures Bakhtinian theorizing as an interpretive position likely to bring together the social and the rhetorical in

⁴ 'treba umjeti izostaviti opisivanje i odmah nakon kratkog uvoda dijaloški prikazati neki lik. Upravo ovakva škrtost u iznošenju detalja mogla bi se očitovati u slabo izraženoj diferencijaciji likova, ali svaki se od njih izdvaja ipak svojim osobinama' (Kogoj-Kapetanić 1962, 416).

⁵ 'U dijalozima ona veoma ekonomično troši jezičnu građu, a riječi koje su neprestanom upotrebom izgubile dio svoga značenja blistaju tu u svom prvotnom i jedino pravom ruhu' (Kogoj-Kapetanić 1962, 417).

Austen (which socialist realism, with its denial of Russian formalism, could not achieve).⁶ Nevertheless, Kogoj-Kapetanić's structural combination of language and economics charts another position from which to read Austen. Although Kogoj-Kapetanić only adumbrates this position, she nonetheless identifies production of symbolic capital, in its many guises, as the determining aspect of the study of Austen. In view of recent developments of critical theory, Kogoj-Kapetanić's account of language, economics and production in Austen seems to pre-produce the Croatian Austen as a figure of later theorizing. Moreover, in the context of Croatian literary and cultural history, Kogoj-Kapetanić anticipates the local consumption of Austen in the decades to follow, when Austen was used to figure the uneasy negotiation between symbolic and financial capital that was to underlie the crisis of socialist politics, economics and culture, and the subsequent reintroduction of capitalism.

The 1970s: Croatian abandonment of socialist realism

By the late 1970s, when the first Croatian translation of *SS* was published, the rhetoric of socialist realism was largely abandoned as obsolete and inadequate. As a result, Croatian critics in the 1970s were wary of overtaxed socialist realist terms like class, capital and value, and largely abstained from theorizing mimesis in terms of class and economics. The regulation of the exchange between symbolic and financial capital was relegated instead to the expanding realm of popular culture and to the intervening institutions of the state. The Croatian Austen of the 1970s and the early 1980s exposes these faultlines in the local cultural history, just as, in the early 1960s, it demarcated the construction of national identities in the former Yugoslavia and in the socialist realist concept of literary history.

With the canonizing 1962 edition of *E* and the earlier Serbian translations, Austen's discourse enters local formalist criticism as a figure of legitimate and legitimizing literariness. As marketable narratives of capital and courtship, however, her novels enter the expanding popular culture as its own legitimate merchandise and genealogy. Symptomatic of this development is the route of Austen's surfacing in Milivoj Solar, whose writings determined the scope of literary theory in Croatia during the 1970s and the 1980s. In his 1976 essay on the structuring of female characters, Solar analyses the stream of consciousness of Woolf's and Joyce's women within a complex genealogy of realism that should no longer be addressed through Lukács but is exemplified by Austen's introductory representation of Emma Woodhouse (2000, 73–74).

The 1979 Croatian translation of *SS* as *Razum i osjećaji* (Reason and feelings), by Mignon Mihaljević and Berislav Grgić, maps these new interests and investments. Unlike the 1962 *E*, it is a direct translation from English; still, it was published only two years after Austen's complete works had appeared in Serbian, indicating not only a positive interest in Austen, but also, like the 1962

⁶ For a sustained account of dialogic nature of the text, see Bakhtin (1981).

E, a faultline in the construction of a unified Yugoslav cultural identity and an increase in the production of linguistic-as-cultural difference.

Razum i osjećaji (SS) was also published in a canonizing series of 'World classics'; the author of the preface is Ivo Vidan, then known for his book on unreliable narrators in modern fiction. His preface, however, seems suspended between two conflicted regimes of value, much like the novel itself. Vidan introduces Austen as a 'classic', suggesting a seminal (and therefore valuable) impact on literary history. The rhetoric of valuation, however, implies a paradox: this historically formative Austen is formative because her 'novels live as rare ageless classics of English literature' (unlike the historical sway of Walter Scott's novels and reception), and though 'her world is narrow' (unlike the worlds of Shakespeare, to whom she is 'faultily compared').⁷ Also, her narration epitomizes the classicist narrative craft, though conceived from within the nineteenth century, placing her strangely next to Molière and Dickens. The conceptual unease of this negative definition, reminiscent of Kogoj-Kapetanić's account of Austen's fiction, finds its resolution in Vidan's attempt to describe what ultimately constitutes Austen's stories, only to detect that 'in their beginning was money' and that 'inherited property' determines her characters – not 'earnings or speculation, or even swindle or theft'. Since inherited capital determines Austen's narratives – excluding 'merchants, bankers, artisans, agriculturalists' and implying servants – Austen produces no 'realist social picture or the reality of the historical process [. . .], though she does speak of the classes'; in other words, it is the *structure* of money that determines 'who gets to become an active character in Austen's novels'.⁸

Marriage, in Vidan's view, is a social institution that epitomizes financial security, and thus regulates the emotional interests of Austen's heroines. Indeed, it is the highly structured practice of premarital courtship that organizes Austen's novels as 'conceptual', 'abstract' and therefore 'neoclassicist'. Nonetheless, his remark that Austen's characters discuss banal subjects, while her women think exclusively about marriage, coupled with his profiling of the narrative interest in money, identifies Austen as a product marketable as popular (cheap) romance. Vidan's very attempt to account for Austen's value consequently registers an inability to accommodate symbolic capital and the market economy of popular

⁷ 'Scottovi povijesni romani [. . .], kojima svi priznaju neprolazne zasluge, pripadaju povijesti književnosti, a djela Austenove žive meu malim brojem neprolaznih engleskih klasika. Usporeivati je sa Shakespeareom, kao što neki čine, prilično je promašeno' (Vidan 1979, 5).

⁸ 'moglo bi se i za djela Jane Austen reći "u početku bijaše novac". Imutak, ono što se nasljeuje, odredit će, vrlo čvrsto i trajno, životni stil neke osobe ili obitelji. Ne, meutim, zarada ili speculacija ili čak prijevara ili kraa, nego naslijeena kuća, imanje, renta. [. . .] Trgovci, novčari, obrtnici, poljoprivrednici – ti se u njezinim romanima javljaju rijetko i u sasvim sporednim ulogama. [. . .] Usprkos važnosti novca i njegova stalnog mjesta u pozadini zbivanja, ne radi se u Jane Austen dakle o realističkoj slici društvene cjeline, o zbiljnosti historijskog procesa [. . .]. Ali jest riječ o klasama; točno se zna tko može, a tko ne može postati aktivan lik u romanu Austenove' (Vidan 1979, 6).

culture within a single dynamic, finally exposing the conceptual limits of his own analysis. Symptomatically, Vidan concludes that Austen's 'value' emerges best as irony: indeed, it is her 'rich' irony and her interest in the relations *between* the characters, rather than *in* characters themselves that is 'most modern' and that thus appeals to the readers educated to appreciate formal virtuosity in literature – not the historical contingencies of marital and financial ties.

Thus prefaced, the translation itself rather ironically deflates the very value that Vidan identifies as representative of Austen. Austen's terms and syntagms (indicating an intricate social and emotional structuring of the story, formative of the relational quality of her fiction) are here replaced by comparatively few and mismatched Croatian equivalents. The title itself signals such a mismatch: 'sense' is translated as *razum*, implying 'mind' and 'reason' rather than 'sense', while 'sensibility' is translated as *osjećaji*, the equivalent of 'feelings', rather than 'sensibility'. The Croatian title thus structures an opposition where the original, playing with the alliterative and etymological twinship of sense and sensibility, was aiming at its deconstruction.⁹ As a result, Austen's sense of the relational is reduced to a concrete opposition, which in its foregrounding of undifferentiated 'feelings' facilitates the consumption of the Croatian SS as a popular romance.

The same is true of the rest of the translation: 'love', or *ljubav*, is used as a blanket term to cover Austen's 'affection', 'love', 'preference', 'attachment', 'tenderness', 'regard', 'fondness', 'affectionate sensibility', 'warmth', and is at one point thrown in with 'happiness' (*sreća*), even though Austen records only the 'happy hours' – in Lucy Steele's account of the time she spends with Edward Ferrars (Mihaljević and Grgić 1996, 229; SS, 3.2: 277). Another such replacement effecting the romanticization of Austen is 'feelings' (*osjećaji*), a term which covers not only the 'sensibility' of the title but also Austen's 'feelings', 'affection', 'sentiments', 'sense' (of fatigue), 'sensation', 'spirits', 'regard', 'implication', 'impulse', 'consciousness', 'attachment'. At one point Austen's 'impenetrable calmness' is rendered as 'unfeeling peace' (*neosjećajnim mirom*; Mihaljević and Grgić 1996, 19; SS, 1.3: 18), and once 'feelings' intrude when Austen records only an elusive augmentation of 'good-will' (Mihaljević and Grgić 1996, 185; SS, 2.10: 216). Most of Austen's concepts indicative of sense or sensibility are handled in similar fashion: 'reason' (*razum*) covers the scope of Austen's 'sense', 'prudence', 'reason', 'understanding'; 'sense' (*razboritost*) encapsulates 'prudence', 'wisdom' and 'sense'; while 'soul' (*duša*) colonizes Austen's 'mind', 'spirits' and 'spirit'. In addition, the translation grossly intervenes in Austen's syntax, often chopping long sentences into shorter ones: this effectively blocks the production of irony that in Austen often depends on a co-positioning of different voices and interpretative positions within a single sentence. This too contributes to a relative domestication of Austen's discourse and facilitates its entrance into popular culture as romance.

⁹ A number of different translations of the title persist in various Croatian studies: *Razum i osjećajnost* (Mind/reason and emotionality, in Kogoj-Kapetanić 1962, 418), *Razum i osjetljivost* (Mind/reason and sensitivity, in Šoljan 1982, 74), *Razbor i osjećajnost* (Sense and emotionality, in Jukić 2001, 66).

Perhaps the most evident symptom of this repositioning of Austen in the 1970s is an amusing one-time intrusion of socialist rhetoric into a conversation between Elinor and Edward, which ultimately exposes both the official discourse of the time and the romanticizing of Austen as rhetorical excess, generating irony where the original did not intend it. When Edward describes his social 'judgment' as opposed to his 'practice' of social skills (SS, 1.17: 94), the translation renders it as an opposition of 'theory' (*teorija*) and 'practice' (*praksa*; Mihaljević and Grgić 1979, 88), which was a fundamental syntagm of Yugoslav socialism at the time – a socialism unique for its combination, in economy, of the theory and the practice of socialist self-management. Ironically, it was precisely the economy based on the so-called socialist self-management that generated the conceptual frame for the propagation of marketable popular culture and the comparative deflation of canonized rhetoric, including that of socialism.

The 1980s: the collapse of socialism

Austen in the Croatian 1980s – the decade of the collapse of socialist politics, economy and ethnic structures – further exposes the paradoxes underlying the local management of value and cultural identity. In 1982, Antun Šoljan edited a volume presenting the hundred best novels of world literature. Šoljan, a canonical author of Croatian Modernism and Postmodernism, had early challenged the poetics of socialist realism and adopted T. S. Eliot's concept of authorship and literary history. He recognizes the significance of Austen as the author of *Ponos i predrasude* (*PP*); the volume features the episode of Lady Catherine de Bourgh's conversation with Elizabeth Bennet as representative of the novel, with a note saying that Nada Šoljan had prepared a new translation of the segment specially for the volume, though the novel was already translated, as *Gordost i predrasuda* (*PP*), in Belgrade in 1953.

The episode chosen to represent *PP* traces once again a socialist Austen: it focuses on a dialogue which, more overtly than any other scene, exposes the intricate structuring of class and capital in the novel, and the unresolved exchange between the symbolic and the financial. In a short essay introducing the translated segment, Šoljan foregrounds Austen's exclusive dialogism and her 'idiosyncratic wit, intellectual discipline and constraint' as the properties that earn her a modern-day inclusion among the hundred best novelists. In the very next sentence, however, Šoljan subverts his own critical position by remarking that Austen owes her 'greatness' partly to her ability to cater to 'most different levels of taste', which implies both Austen's unselective marketability and the market-value of the segment that is to serve as an illustration of his argument.¹⁰

The same kind of relaxation is evident in the heavily advertised 1983 broadcast on national television of Cyril Coke's BBC's *PP*, scripted by Fay Weldon.

¹⁰ 'književno podneblje postaje prijemljivije za njenu specifičnu duhovitost, intelektualnu disciplinu i suzdržanost. [...] Njezina prava veličina možda djelomice i jest u tome što može zadovoljiti najrazličitije razine ukusa' (Šoljan 1982, 73).

Adapted from English by the Belgrade federal television division, with subtitles in Serbian, it was entitled *Gordost i predrasuda*, like the 1953 Serbian translation. As it was broadcast nationally, the Croatian press advertising the series used both *Gordost i predrasuda* and *Ponos i predrasuda* to refer to its title.¹¹ This confusion of naming suggested, on the one hand, that the title commonly used in Serbian culture and the one commonly used in Croatia were interchangeable, therefore conforming to the politics of regulated difference. Yet the very collocation of two seemingly interchangeable translations signals the kind of redundancy that regulated difference cannot sustain. The dehiscence thus created in the economy of regulated cultural difference was further expanded by the representation of Austen in the press.

While Šoljan, an eminent author, identifies part of Austen's 'true greatness' in her marketability, the press produced their Austen as markedly literary, effecting, through Austen's literariness, an evaluation of press and television in terms of symbolic capital. Nataša Smaić's representative account of 1983 states that the BBC made use 'of the treasury of rich British literature, reminding us that we too could use our literary legacy to make up for the lack of good stories in television productions'.¹² The title of the article is 'U klasnim okovima' (In the shackles of class), which suitably accumulates and foregrounds the overclassed rhetoric of the text. The class shackles seem to apply equally to Austen and the rhetoric of her advertisement, producing Austen as a metaphor of the class and the labour invested in its representation. The shackles here also signal that the rhetoric of socialist realism is exposed as *rhetoric*, inviting analysis, critique or an ironic dismissal against other types of discourse, because the title, 'In the shackles of class', is printed between two large publicity stills depicting the Bennet girls with their suitors and having tea at Longbourn, which subverts the *class* of the title in favour of a more positive *classiness* and the shackles as a synecdoche of the regime of socialist realism rather than that of Austen's fiction.

The 1990s: Austen in post-socialist Croatia

Austen in the Croatian 1990s continues to operate as a symptom of the shifts in domestic cultural history, often premised on negotiating different concepts of capital and value. Conveniently grafted onto film-provoked Austenmania, this Austen transforms the *classedness* of socialist realism into an imagined *classiness* of reintroduced capitalism. Representative of this new classiness is the 1997

¹¹ A third (and the most adequate) translation of the title of *PP* was offered by Breda Kogoj-Kapetanić (1968): *Oholost i predrasuda*. Unlike *ponos* or *gordost*, that is, *oholost* focuses on the narcissism and the overbearingness of pride. This variant, however, has not been accepted by other Croatian literary historians, who as a rule use *Ponos i predrasuda* or *Ponos i predrasude*, probably because of the alliteration akin to that of the original title.

¹² 'BBC, posegavši tako još jednom u riznicu bogate engleske književnosti i podsjetivši nas da i sami možemo na sličan način, koristiti djela iz naše književne baštine, nadoknaditi manjak dobrih tekstova za drame i serijale' (Smaić 1983, 27).

translation of *E*, by Vjera Balen-Heidl. Organized at a remove from the 1962 translation, it traces the structure of the remove as much as it does Austen's novel. The comparative analysis of Balen-Heidl's translation and the 1962 *E* has shown how the post-socialist Austen represses its socialist realist genealogy. It is equally important, however, that this repression reproduces the very strategy of the repressed: the post-socialist classiness is produced through a repression of the presumed unclassedness of socialism, just as this unclassedness was produced through a repression of pre-socialist, Austenesque capital and class, ultimately revealing not so much the class or the capital as a history of repression constitutive of both.

Since Austen's irony pre-empts any such flawed or forced history of classifying (most evidently in the narrative performance of the Eltons), the translation alone could not sustain the intended effect. This function is taken over by the paratext: the book's dust jacket features a number of stills from Douglas McGrath's 1996 film version of *E*, suggesting that Austen is interchangeable with Hollywood period pieces and the structuring of finance as glamour (and vice versa), which was in turn to legitimize a similar production of classiness in post-socialism. The same is true of the dust-jacket design for the 1996 reprint of the 1979 translation of *SS*, which displays the publicity stills for Ang Lee's film adaptation and a golden 'stamp' saying that the film won an Academy Award for the Best Adapted Screenplay: adaptation echoing ironically the kind of interaction necessary to translate Austen into an icon of the new, market-oriented elitism.

Miroslava Vučić, the editor of the series of Austen translations, launched an advertising campaign for the novels as part of a marketing strategy for the films, stimulating a dual consumption of both. In 1997, Vučić published an article entitled 'Pošast Jane Austen: mrtva kraljica Hollywooda' (A Jane Austen epidemic: the dead queen of Hollywood). At its outset, it issues a warning, which indicates most succinctly the new, iconic status of Austen: '*Delo*, the otherwise serious Slovene daily, features the slogan "If you've never read Austen's *E*, don't admit it in public."¹³ Vučić goes on to record the details of the global consumption of Austen; it is her first sentence, however, that provides a telling perspective on how the local consumption of Austen is modified in the process. It recognizes Austen as a legitimizing trope of an interpenetration of symbolic capital and market economy: a classic transformed into a popular (and therefore profitable) must-read. Nevertheless, this new economy is exposed as a faulty concept, dependent on self-censorship: it implies that *not* reading (and buying) Austen is acceptable, as long as one does not talk about it in public. Ironically enough, this was one of the basic rhetorical strategies of cultural consumption in socialism: the publicly advertised discourse was critiqued in the private sphere, so that public silence was often symptomatic of the critical activity at a remove. That the quotation was taken from the post-socialist *Delo* supports the

¹³ 'Ako niste pročitali *Emmu* Jane Austina [*sic*] to nemojte javno priznati, savjetovao je čitateljima vodeći slovenski dnevnik *Delo* u jednom od naslova na svojim, inače ozbiljnim stranicama' (Vučić 1997, 60).

argument, since Slovenia was until 1991 part of the former Yugoslavia, sharing and often initiating the rhetoric of subversion. That the quotation was taken six years after the break-up of the former Yugoslavia, which was still perceived as functional in Croatia signals, however, the ongoing formation of separate cultural identities of the former Yugoslav republics that had for seventy years been organized in such a way as to stress their interrelatedness. Austen, presented here as a trope of lasting English historicity, publicizes therefore not only its marketability but also a desire of its local readers (and buyers) for a narrative, within a national culture, of historical and rhetorical continuity: a desire that was to shape the official cultural politics in Croatia in the 1990s.

Consequently, Austen in post-socialist Croatia surfaces as a trope of soothing historicity: soothing because she seems to provide an unconflicted, if not immediate, dialogue with the past. This perception initiated a series of hastily produced translations of her novels, mostly based on old (and mostly inadequate) Serbian versions, which flooded the domestic market and pre-empted the existing plans to produce a high-profile complete Austen in Croatian. As a result, the scholarly interest in Austen remained dependent on the English originals, producing Austen as the paradox of a desirable foreign body within Croatian culture, while implying positions and historicities that the local cultural identity failed to sustain.¹⁴

Conclusion

Local yet foreign, recent yet old, the Croatian Austen has in the past decade accrued a potential to figure and domesticate precisely the kind of paradox that structures her position within Croatian culture. Two examples from 1997 serve as a useful indication. The author of the 'Afterword' to *Zašto sam vam lagala* (Why I lied) – a bestselling hybrid of fiction and autobiography by Julijana Matanović, and a landmark of the new genre of confessional fiction extremely popular in the Croatian 1990s – describes the fiction of this autobiography 'as if invented by a modern-day Jane Austen'.¹⁵ Austen thus figures the fictional positionality of the text and the genre, which precludes an immediate access to 'life', 'truth' or 'authenticity' of the narrated events. In other words, Austen surfaces here as a trope of defamiliarization, figured twice within the 'as if' of literary ontology, yet a trope that most readers are evidently *familiar* with. In

¹⁴ Croatia in the 1990s registers a number of studies focusing on Austen. In his monographs on the literary canon (1997) and the eighteenth-century novel (2002), Miroslav Beker uses Austen as a formative author for both these concepts and, ultimately, for his own analysis. For the convergence of illocution and perlocution in Austen's representation of marriage, see Jukić (1998b); for the dialogue between literature and the visual in recent films based on Austen, see Jukić (1999a, 1999b); for *P* as a trope of translating Austen, see Jukić (1998a); for a Croatian take on Austenmania, see Jukić (1997); for Austen as a proto-feminist, see Čačinović (2000).

¹⁵ 'biografiju s iznimno mnogo romanesknh elemenata koji se doimaju kao da ih je izmislila neka suvremena Jane Austen' (Maković 1997, 191).

March of the same year, an article entitled 'Sense and sensibility' featured an in-depth analysis of Croatian political and military ties with the United States, in view of the international pressure exerted on the Croatian government to cooperate with the Hague International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia. Used as a trope for the illusory American allegiance to the Croatian cause, and for a need to analyse both the illusion and the allegiance rationally, Austen once again operates as a figure of defamiliarization and detachment – yet a figure familiar enough to allow a ready interpretation. Finally, when interviewed about her writing *modus operandi*, Lucija Stamać (a writer dividing her time between Vienna and Zagreb) said in 2003 that her writing necessitated Zagreb just as Jane Austen needed the country, a kind of microcosm with conveniently small-scale specimens to study and write about (Jindra 2003, 84). Here too, Austen figures the quaint, familiar foreignness of writing, deconstructing both foreignness and recognition as comparative and relational.

Strangely enough, Austen has traced a similar route in the mapping of contemporary British fiction. Using *PP* and *P* as narrative tropes of *Bridget Jones's Diary* (1996) and *Bridget Jones: The Edge of Reason* (1999), Helen Fielding has produced a marketable topography whose conceptual boundaries include references to the recent war in Bosnia, which yields an uncannily comic effect. As in West's travelogue, foreignness can be recognized as such only after it has helped produce the morbid, uncanny comedy within Bridget Jones's tropes, just as her Englishness is exposed as contingent on its inability to repress its constituent cultural 'others'. Fielding's novels were promptly translated into Croatian and were widely read and reviewed. Nevertheless, Croatian reviewers failed to acknowledge and critique Fielding's representation of their own constituent proximity, though sharing with Bosnia the memory of the war and centuries of genealogy: as if the remove itself were enough to deconstruct both the foreignness and the familiarity.

16 Jane Austen in Serbia, 1929–2000

Svetozar Koljević

In Jane Austen's provincial English society, the techniques and aims in the arena of matchmaking are not, of course, universal, but they have some fundamental things in common with the assumptions and practices of very different historical times and settings. Hence their wide appeal, and hence the first step in the appearance of Jane Austen in Serbia was taken in the middle-class, patriarchal and not yet fully urban Belgrade circles in which the first translation of *P* was published around 1929, under the title of *Pod tuim uticajem* (Under alien influence).¹ 'Suitable' matchmaking, the slyness and the hypocrisy involved in the apparent observance of the rules of decency, the disgrace of elopement, the search for a financially reliable and socially desirable partner could have hardly failed to arouse some response in the much cruder Serbian social landscape in the 1920s, even if the literary interest could not have been shared by very many people in Serbia at the time.

To begin with, it is significant that the first translator of a novel by Jane Austen was Danica S. Janković (1898–1960), a highly educated woman, who graduated in Yugoslav and comparative literature, French and English, from the University of Belgrade (1918–22), studied in London and Oxford (1922–24), published her works on folk dancing in leading Yugoslav and foreign journals, ran a private folk-dancing school and translated books from English and French. With one or two exceptions, this set the elitist academic, social, publishing and feminine patterns for several succeeding decades.

Janković also wrote a perceptive and well-informed introduction (1929, 9–25), in which she pointed out that Austen was a writer whose 'strong individualism' ('snažni individualizam'; 1929, 9) placed her outside her time, as a lonely figure without predecessors or followers. Moreover, Austen was perceived as a writer 'with no thesis and no prejudice, without any pose or any axe to

¹ There is no date of publication in the book itself: 1929 is given in *Srpska bibliografija knjige* (The Serbian bibliography of books; Živanov 1989, 184), although the catalogue of the oldest Serbian library of Matica Srpska in Novi Sad gives this as 1928. In a preface to her translation of *PP*, the translator, Danica S. Janković, claimed that the book was published in 1930 (1953, 5).

grind, and yet a writer who feels a great deal and is a sharp critic'.² After a short survey of Austen's life and her favourite authors (Johnson, Cowper, Richardson, Crabbe), Janković adds that 'the main features of her character were tenderness and modesty' and that 'her novels are a fine study of the manners and a sharp criticism of the society of her time'.³ They are distinguished by their social range and by an impartial view of people belonging to different classes of society. Moreover, 'the simplicity of their subject matter is amply balanced by the richness and the harmony of detail'.⁴ Janković positions *P* as a work that marks the final phase of Austen's spiritual development, manifesting a full literary maturity in which her earlier techniques achieve ultimate perfection.

In her conclusion, Janković quotes Walter Scott's classic judgement of Austen's gifts:

The Big Bow-wow strain I can do myself like any now going, but the exquisite touch which renders ordinary commonplace things and characters interesting from the truth of the description and the sentiment is denied to me. (*CH*, 106; Janković 1929, 24)

She also mentions Macaulay's estimation that in her portrayal of character, Austen is among those writers who have approached nearest to the manner of Shakespeare (*CH*, 122; Janković 1929, 23–24). Finally, she makes an interesting point of contrast between Slavonic and English character, claiming that Austen's characters do not parade, or even show, their suffering:

It is a feature which is highly characteristic of the English nation, it should be respected, it makes them, as a nation, more normal than other nations, and puts them on a higher level, particularly, above the Slavs. The strength of will, stoicism – without affectation or theatrical poses. This is something innate, indigenous, something specifically English. [. . .] This is what makes Jane Austen an indigenous English writer.⁵

This statement explains the appeal of Jane Austen to an educated and refined woman from the Serbian middle classes, like Janković, during the 1920s. However, such women must have been few and far between at the time.

This perhaps indicates why the first publication of *P* in Serbia was not a commercial success and did not attract any attention. The book was announced

² 'bez teze i bez predrasude, bez poze i bez pristrasnosti, pa ipak pisac koji mnogo oseća i koji oštro krtikuje' (Janković 1929, 10).

³ 'da su glavne crte njenog karaktera blagost i skromnost'; 'Njeni romani su fina studija i oštromna kritika društva njenog vremena' (Janković 1929, 11, 12).

⁴ 'uprošćenost predmeta obilno je nadoknaena bogatstvom i skladom detalja' (Janković 1929, 14).

⁵ 'To je crta koju kod Engleza skoro uvek nalazimo, koja je za poštovanje, koja čini da su oni, kao nacija, normalniji od mnogih drugih nacija, i koja ih, naročito, uzdiže nad Slovenima. Jačina volje, stoicizam – bez afektacija i teatralnosti. – To je nešto što im je uroeno, nešto rasno, nešto specifično englesko. [. . .] Po tome je ona engleski pisac, rasni pisac' (Janković 1929, 24–25).

as the first volume of 'Selected Works' (*Izabrana dela*), but no second volume appeared and, surprisingly, this translation was not reviewed in the leading Serbian periodical, *Srpski književni glasnik* (Serbian literary herald), in spite of the fact that the editorial board of the renowned publisher, Narodna Prosveta (Popular education), included leading figures of Serbian literary life at the time: Bogdan Popović, the founding father of comparative literary studies in the University of Belgrade, and Isidora Sekulić, the most renowned and best-educated Serbian woman writer of the period.

There are, of course, occasional slips and some old-fashioned elements in this translation. For instance, at the very beginning of the first chapter, 'the Baronetage' is translated as 'the history of his baronetage' ('istorije svog baronstva'; Janković 1929, 7); some English toponyms and family names, such as 'Somersetshire' or 'Musgrove', are rendered into Serbian as *Somersetšajr* instead of *Somersetšir* and *Musgrov* instead of *Mazgrov*. Some English personal names are Serbianized in a thoroughly antiquated way, so that we get *Jelisaveta* instead of *Elizabeta* or *Elizabet*. This creates fictional confusion, not only because all English personal names could not be replaced by Serbian ones, but also because the text combines Serbian personal names and English surnames (for which approximate equivalents would sound absurd).⁶ Finally, some English idioms have been both misunderstood and translated literally. For instance, Admiral Croft says, 'the baronet will never set the Thames on fire' (P, 1.5:32), which is rendered as '“Why should the baronet take the trouble of setting the Thames on fire!”', which is meaningless in Serbian.⁷ Nevertheless, on the whole, the translation reads well and is surprisingly reliable, particularly in view of the fact that English was not even taught at high schools at this time and that there were no adequate dictionaries, or pronouncing dictionaries, to help the translator. Finally, for various, mainly sociocultural reasons, it took almost half a century after the publication of this translation for Austen to find a proper audience in Serbia.

PP was the next novel to appear in Serbia, published by the Belgrade firm Rad (Work) in 1953. The publisher was well known for its paperback editions of classic fiction and poetry, widely read by students and secondary-school pupils. This novel was again translated and introduced by Janković. In her short preface, Janković makes it quite clear that this is the masterpiece of a classic English writer, repeats some of the points that she made in her introduction to *P* – such as Scott's judgement – and points out that Austen's favourite writer was Crabbe, 'the poet of the poor' ('pesnik sirotinje'; 1953, 5). This stress on Austen's allegedly sympathetic view of poverty was in perfect harmony with the prevailing aesthetic, or ideological, code of social approaches to literature at the time. The translation is on the whole meticulous, even if some English

⁶ During the early twentieth century, some translators substituted Serbian names for fictional English characters, when they could find appropriate etymological equivalents. Phonetic transcription is now the rule, but equivalence remains unstable, so that even recent dictionaries often give alternative possibilities (see Prčić 1998).

⁷ 'Što bi se taj baronet mučio da zapali Temzu!' (Janković 1929, 43).

names have been again Serbianized in an archaic manner, so that we get *Jelisaveta* for ‘Elizabeth’ and even *Jovanka* for ‘Jane’. Finally, some English idioms are not accurately translated: for instance, when Mrs Bennet tells Elizabeth during their visit at Netherfield Park, ‘“do not run on in the wild manner that you are suffered to do at home”’ (*PP*, 1.9: 42), this is rendered as: ‘“do not be so impolite as if you were at home”’.⁸

In 1954, *E* was issued by the same publisher in a translation by two female translators, D. and J. Stojanović (in a 1977 edition of what was virtually the same translation, only Jelena Stojanović is signed as the translator). Jelena Stojanović was born in Geneva in 1916, graduated in the Faculty of Law in Belgrade and was a professional translator from French and English (Jovanović 1970, 92). In her ‘Foreword’, Janković shows herself again to be a knowledgeable and perceptive reader of Austen. She quotes Austen’s letter of 11 December 1815 to James Stanier Clarke, the Prince Regent’s librarian:

My greatest anxiety at present is that this 4th work sh^d not disgrace what was good in the others. [...] I am very strongly haunted with the idea that to those Readers who have preferred P&P. it will appear inferior in Wit, & to those who have preferred MP. very inferior in good Sense. (*LJA*, 306)

This is an important statement, ‘not so much for the evaluation of the novels in question, as for our understanding of a precious feature of this great artist: her desire to be impartial in her judgement on herself’.⁹ Janković also mentions Richard Whately’s review of 1821, which compared Austen’s characterization to that of Shakespeare – the review that ‘takes its point of departure from Scott’ and ‘ranks’, together with Scott, ‘as the most important early nineteenth-century statement on Jane Austen’ (*CH*, 87). However, the most pertinent comments Janković makes can be fully understood only in the contemporary literary context of the ‘battle of books’ that took place between the socialist realists and Modernists. The Soviet-oriented socialist realists demanded politically committed writing, the denouncing of class enemies, optimistic pictures of socialist realities and plain language that all people could easily understand. Between 1945 and 1948, their political exponents were Milovan Djilas and Radovan Zogović. The greatest Serbian writer, Ivo Andrić, later a Nobel Prize winner, found it expedient to publish several short stories in the socialist realist manner, while some of the greatest names of Serbian letters (Miloš Crnjanski, Jovan Dučić, Slobodan Jovanović) disappeared in a total hush about their work (see Palavestra 1991). But after the Yugoslav Communist Party distanced itself from Soviet Union in 1948, the situation changed. Miroslav Krleža’s address to the Yugoslav Association of Writers in 1952 brought an end to the era of socialist realism which, even in its heyday, was more a political and social milieu of intolerance than an aesthetic doctrine (Bošković 2003, 9). The Modernists

⁸ ‘nemoj biti tako neuljudna kao da si kod kuće’ (Janković 1953, 56).

⁹ ‘ne toliko za ocenu samih romana, koliko za upoznavanje jedne dragocene osobine kojom je ova velika umetnica raspolagala: želje da bude nepristrasna prema sebi’ (Janković 1954, 5).

included some of the greatest pre-war left-wing writers, such as Dušan Matić in Serbia and Krleža in Croatia, who had been severely attacked by party hard-liners before World War II. Unlike the Soviet avant-garde writers following the October Revolution, they were officially resurrected after 1948 and their attitudes opened possibilities for many younger writers and critics – such as Zoran Mišić, Miodrag Pavlović, Jovan Hristić and others – to plead for free choice of subject and the freedom to experiment in any way that the artist found necessary.

In this context, Janković's statements in her 'Foreword' to *E* touched on some hot literary and political issues. For instance, when she insisted that 'Jane Austen could not be said to advocate the case of only one class against another', and that she was 'by her temperament not a fighter, and by her literary inclinations not a polemicist', this would have been as welcome to the Modernists as it would have sounded odious to the surviving hard-liners among the socialist realists.¹⁰ The Stojanović's translation is again meticulous – even if their phrasing is sometimes more delicate than Austen's, so that at the very beginning of *E*, 'caresses' are translated as 'affection' (*milošća*) and an 'indulgent father' becomes a 'broad-minded father' (*širokogrud otac*). The transliteration of English place names is sometimes shaky, so that we always get *Sarej* instead of *Sari*, for Austen's 'Surr[e]y'.

MP was published in Belgrade in 1955 and translated by Nada Ćurčija-Prodanović (1919?–92), who graduated from the Law School and Musical Academy in Belgrade. Ćurčija-Prodanović was the author of *Yugoslav Folk Tales* (1957) and *Ballerina* (1963), an internationally renowned writer of radio dramas and a translator of many famous British and American authors into Serbian (Jovanović 1970, 36–37). This is how Ćurčija-Prodanović defines Austen's literary aims in her afterword:

To write spontaneously, as a bird sings, enjoying its own crystal-clear voice, to speak frankly about what she knows and likes, without affectation or pretension, and, above all, to be aware of one's own possibilities and never reach for anything beyond them – those were [...] her literary principles which she never betrayed.¹¹

In an allusive reference to the raging literary debates of the 1950s, Ćurčija-Prodanović points out that Austen was 'not much interested in politics and so considered it wiser not to talk about it'.¹² Moreover, she never 'peeps behind

¹⁰ 'ne bi se moglo reći da je zastupnik samo jedne izvesne klase protiv druge'; 'po svojoj prirodi ona nije bila borac, a po svom spisateljskim sklonostima nije bila polemičar' (Janković 1954, 8).

¹¹ 'Pisati spontano, kao, što ptica peva, radujući se svom kristalno čistom glasu, govoriti iskreno o onome što se dobro poznaje i voli, bez usiljavanja i bez pretenzija, i, iznad svega, biti svestan svojih mogućnosti i ne poduhvatati se ničega što je iznad njih – to su [...] bila načela koja Džejn Ostin nikad nije izneverila' (Ćurčija-Prodanović 1955, 423).

¹² '[Nju] mnogo ne zanima politika, i ona smatra da je onda pametnije ne govoriti o njoj' (Ćurčija-Prodanović 1955, 423).

the curtain which divides her from the people who belong to high nobility', and neither does she 'introduce into her work peasants and people from the lower classes'.¹³ By remaining within the borders of her own experience of the life of the gentry and their intimate feelings, she paints a vivid picture of her own milieu: or, as Austen herself put it, 'the little bit (two Inches wide) of Ivory on which I work with so fine a Brush, as produces little effect after much labour' (*LJA*, 323). Ćurčija-Prodanović also mentions that a barn was turned into an amateur theatre by the Austens and thus dramatic performances formed an apprenticeship for Austen's masterly fictional dialogues: 'In her works the prevailing atmosphere is that of the eighteenth century, in which everything is subservient to the comedy of manners.'¹⁴ The high praise of Scott and Macaulay is again invoked and the essay ends with a reference to Richard Church, who compared Austen's conciseness and precision to that of Mozart's music.

The translation is very good, with the English original being rendered extremely well into Serbo-Croatian idiolect. There are, however, one or two exceptions. Thus at the very beginning of the novel, commenting on 'the greatness of the match' when Maria Ward married Sir Thomas, the narrator informs us that 'her uncle, the lawyer, himself, allowed her to be at least three thousand pounds short of an equitable claim to it' (*MP*, 1.1: 3). This is translated as if he 'let her be deprived of at least three thousand pounds, without leaving her a possibility of ever laying claim on them'.¹⁵ Later, Lady Bertram's dilemma whether Whist or Speculation "will amuse me most" (*MP*, 2.7: 239) is rendered as "will interest me most" ('šta će me više zanimati'; Ćurčija-Prodanović 1955, 216) – possibly to avoid the repetition of the word 'amuse' ('bilo naročito zabavno'), which is correctly translated a few lines down. On the whole, this translation is more accurate and reads better than most Serbian translations of Jane Austen. The rendering of English names and toponyms is reliable, even if 'William' would be now rendered as *Vilijam* rather than *Viljem*.

Janković's translation of *P* was published again in 1957 (*Pod tuim uticajem*), with slight corrections in the way the pronunciation of some English names and toponyms is indicated, but with an occasional slip and the same mistakes in the translation of English idioms. Thus some English names are again thoroughly Serbianized, so that we get *Jelisaveta* instead of *Elizabeta* or *Elizabet*. The orthography of some English toponyms and names has been corrected, so that 'Somersetshire' and 'Musgrove' are rendered as *Somersetšir* and *Mazgrov* (and not *Somersetšajr* and *Musgrov*). Nevertheless, some of the aforementioned inaccuracies of the first edition remain. Finally, instead of a lengthy 'Introduction' we get a shorter 'Note on the Writer' at the end, in which the translator points

¹³ '[zato ona i] ne zaviruje iza zavese koja je deli od ljudi iz visokog plemstva'; 'ne uvodi u svoja dela ni seljake ili ljude iz naroda' (Ćurčija-Prodanović 1955, 423).

¹⁴ 'u njenim delima vlada atmosfera osamnaestog veka u kojoj je sve potčinjeno komediji ljudskog ponašanja' (Ćurčija-Prodanović 1955, 424).

¹⁵ 'dopustio joj je da bude lišena bar tri hiljade funti, ne ostavljajući joj mogućnost da ikada docnije polaže pravo na njih' (Ćurčija-Prodanović 1955, 9).

out that Jane Austen is not ‘a writer of novels of wide social range, or novels with a revolutionary germ’; moreover, she is not a writer with an ideological thesis, she does not represent life through ‘black-and-white techniques’ and she is not an adherent of ‘one front against the other’.¹⁶

In 1959, SS appeared as *Razum i osećanje* (Reason and feeling), translated by Milica Simeonović (b. 1902), who studied architecture at the University of Belgrade, worked as a librarian in the Faculty of Economics (1947–52) and later as a professional translator from English, French and German (Jovanović 1970, 86). Simeonović’s translation is followed by a short ‘Note’ at the end, signed by ‘M.K.’. The ‘Note’ makes several rather obvious points: for instance, that Austen’s ‘popularity goes on with undiminishing passion, that her works are translated and printed all over the world, which is a sign that they are valuable’.¹⁷ The judgements of Scott and Macaulay are once again invoked, while only basic information about the writer’s life and work is provided, resulting in one reviewer pointing out that ‘lack of a more extensive and studious article on the writer is a serious shortcoming of this publication, particularly as this work appears for the first time in our language’.¹⁸ In an extensive review of this translation, Svetozar Koljević (1960) contrasts the social settings and the literary techniques of Jane Austen and Virginia Woolf. In Austen’s ‘solid’ world, money and matchmaking are the ultimate measure of every human endeavour, whereas in the quivering outlines of Woolf’s *The Waves* monetary issues as well as marriages, husbands and wives disappear into a distant background. Koljević also points out that Austen’s ironic perspective functions as her way of pushing beyond the world described in her novels (1960, 357–62).

The translation reads very well and is more reliable than any published before, but – apart from an occasional slip of the pen – it sometimes raises the question of the lost nuances, the question of whether they would sound artificial in the Serbian language and its cultural environment. Thus, for instance, in the translation of the phrase ‘rejoicing in their own penetration at every glimpse of blue sky’ (SS, 1.9: 41), the words ‘in their own penetration’ are omitted (Simeonović 1959, 39). Similarly, in the sentence ‘she thought Mrs Jennings deficient either in curiosity after petty information, or in a disposition to communicate it’ (SS, 1.21: 126), ‘either/or’ is translated as ‘neither/nor’ (Simeonović 1959, 115). When Mrs Jennings whispers to Elinor, ‘“Get it all out of her, my dear”’ (SS, 3.2: 271), this sentence is rendered into Serbian as ‘“Try to get as much out of

¹⁶ ‘pisac socijalnih romana koji zahvataju široko područje, ili koji nose revolucionarnu klicu’; ‘[ne pada u pogrešku da stvari vidi samo] u crnoj boji s jedne, ili samo u svetloj boji s druge strane’; ‘nije pristalica jednog fronta protiv drugog’ (Janković 1957, 271–74).

¹⁷ ‘[njena] popularnost traje nesmanjenom žestinom, a njena dela svuda se prevode i štampaju, što je znak da imaju vrednosti’ (Simeonović 1959, 347).

¹⁸ ‘Jedan opširniji i studiozniji napis o piscu ozbiljan je nedostatak ovog izdanja, pogotovu što je u pitanju delo koje se prvi put pojavljuje na našem jeziku’ (Jovanović 1959, 10).

her as possible”¹⁹ while the following sentence, ““She will tell you anything if you ask”” is omitted – obviously not because there could be any difficulty in translating it in Serbian.

PP (*Gordost i predrasuda*, 1964) was the first translation by a man, and a very distinguished man at that: Živojin Simić (1896–1979), whose translations from English into Serbian gained the highest sales figures of their era. He was the co-author of the *Encyclopaedic English–Serbo-Croatian Dictionary* (1956), and the leading modern Serbian translator of Shakespeare (Jovanović 1970, 87–89). His translation of *PP* is more up-to-date than that of Janković. English personal names are not Serbianized: Elizabeth is *Elizabet* and not *Jelisaveta*, Jane is *Džejn* and not *Jovanka*. The spelling of other names and toponyms comes nearer to their English pronunciation: Bingley is *Bingli* and not *Binglej*, Derbyshire is *Dabišir* and not *Derbišir*. But we are here on very tricky ground: the most recent dictionary of the transcription of English names into Serbian suggests *Darbišir* (Prcić 1998, 36). Nevertheless, English idioms are sometimes still a weak point: Mrs Bennet’s advice to Elizabeth, “remember where you are, and do not run in the wild manner that you are suffered to do at home” (*PP*, 1.9: 42) is rendered into Serbian as “do not forget where you are and do not parade as a wiseacre as you do at home” (Simić 1975, 1).

The ‘Foreword’ to *Gordost i predrasuda* was also written by a man, Dušan Puhalo, Professor of English Literature at the University of Belgrade and a distinguished Marxist scholar. This explains perhaps why he claims that during Austen’s lifetime and the Industrial Revolution ‘a modern England was created [. . .] such as we know, more or less, today’²⁰ – probably on the grounds that there was no socialist revolution in England and thus no dictatorship of the proletariat to erase class distinctions! He also points out that we shall ‘look in vain in her novels for the echoes of war, industrialization or new ideas’,²¹ which may be, with some exceptions, partly true, but comes as a surprise only for those who are keen on looking for what is not in the foreground. He complains that Austen’s ‘social and ideological horizons were inevitably narrow’, because ‘the life of such a girl passed between this and that ball, between this and that visit, between this and that party or entertainment’.²² Jane Austen, in short, ‘remains within the boundaries of the life setting of a provincial girl’, and it should not come as a surprise that she ‘allows too much room for the appearances of the stupid and perverse characters’.²³ This obviously represents a point of confluence between Puhalo’s Marxist approach and later feminist complaints about the characterization of women by male writers; but Marxist assumptions, in

¹⁹ ‘Gledajte da što više izvučete od nje’ (Simeonović 1959, 243).

²⁰ ‘Nastajala je moderna Engleska kakvu uglavnom znamo i danas’ (Puhalo 1964, 8).

²¹ ‘u njenim romanima uzalud tražiti odjeke rata, industrijalizacije ili novih ideja’ (Puhalo 1964, 8).

²² ‘njen društveni i idejni vidokrug ipak bio nužno uzak’; ‘Život takve devojkje prolazio je izmeu jednog i drugog plesa, jedne i druge posete, prijema ili zabave’ (Puhalo 1964, 8–9).

²³ ‘ostaje uvek [. . .] u granicama životne sadržine provincijske devojkje’; ‘[zato katkad] daje suviše mesta istupima glupih i izopačenih osoba’ (Puhalo 1964, 11, 15).

their cruder versions, and less refined feminist attitudes often have points of close contact (Moi 1991, 2–8). Moreover, Puhalo claims that Austen's normality may be refreshing to the modern reader who is used to so much perversity and moribundity in twentieth-century avant-garde literature; in this context, her fiction may seem at the first glance 'a very diluted drink compared to the strong cocktails he is used to'.²⁴ Such a claim tells us as much about Marxist literary attitudes to Modernism in 1960s Serbia, as it does about the possibilities and limitations of Marxist–feminist interpretations of Austen.

Many of these points are repeated, in different wording, in Puhalo's *Istorija Engleske književnosti XVIII veka i romantizma (1700–1832)* (History of English literature from the eighteenth century to Romanticism (1700–1832), 1966), which was one of the standard textbooks for Serbian students of English. In this work, however, some instructive Marxist points are more sharply worded. Thus we are explicitly told:

the limitations of Jane Austen have distinct class roots; only 'gentlemen' are people worth describing, that is the people of a certain financial status who make their living out of their property or in a 'decent' profession – ecclesiastical, military or in the civil service.²⁵

But Puhalo also adds: 'if Jane Austen is, from the outside, a class conformist, she is so sincerely and quite unconsciously, by instinct and not by choice'.²⁶ Moreover, 'she is an outstandingly perceptive, always a critical and often an ironic observer of human nature'.²⁷ In his analysis of *PP*, Puhalo points to

the very interesting conflict between the arrogant Lady Catherine de Bourgh and Elizabeth Bennet; we could call it the conflict of two prides, one immoral, rooted in the title, money and social power, and the other moral, rooted in the consciousness of one's own purity and human dignity.²⁸

His final conclusion is that if Austen had been given an opportunity of insight into 'social and political realities', of observing human beings in their public and

²⁴ 'vrlo vodnjikavo piće u poreenju sa žestokim koktelom na koji je navikao' (Puhalo 1964, 12).

²⁵ 'Ograničenost Džejn Ostin ima očito klasne korene; za nju je dostojan opisivanja samo svet "džentlmena", tj. onih koji imaju određeni novčani standard i koji žive od poseda ili neke "pristojne" profesije – sveštenečke, vojničke ili državno-službeničke' (Puhalo 1966, 288).

²⁶ 'Ako je Džejn Ostin u tom spoljašnjem pogledu klasni konformista, ona je to iskreno i sasvim nesvesno a ne po izboru' (Puhalo 1966, 288).

²⁷ 'izvanredno oštroman, uvek kritičan i često ironičan posmatrač ljudskih naravi' (Puhalo 1966, 289).

²⁸ 'vrlo zanimljiv sukob izmeu arogantne plemkinje Katarine de Burg i Elizabete Benet; mogli bismo ga nazvati sukobom dva ponosa, jednog nemoralnog, oslonjenog na titulu, novac i društvenu moć, i drugog moralnog, zasnovanog na svesti o vlastitoj čistoti i ljudskom dostojanstvu' (Puhalo 1966, 291).

professional performances, she might have been compared to Turgenev and, who knows, possibly even to Tolstoy (1966, 295).

In her chapter on Jane Austen in the second volume of the student textbook, *Engleska književnost II* (English Literature II, 1983), Ivanka Kovačević provides a fuller description of Austen's works, pointing out that, despite having her admirers in the nineteenth century, Austen was only inducted into the 'Great Tradition' in the first half of the twentieth century (234). Kovačević also notes that Anglo-American criticism is 'focused on the difference [. . .] between the social norms of behaviour and the moral problem of an individual'.²⁹ She also repeats many of the points made in previous Serbian approaches to Austen: her mastery of plot, characterization and dramatic dialogue, or her concentration on the world which she knows well. There are also some clear Marxist overtones:

Considering that she belonged to the class of landowners, which was the most conservative of all the privileged classes of the British society, she accepted and supported the ideological premises of the ruling class. [. . .] Material goods and the nobility of birth are never questioned, and they go hand-in-hand with the culture of highly civilized classes – outside this circle all is rough and vulgar.³⁰

In her conclusion, Kovačević claims that the common reader today is

especially enchanted by the setting of rich country houses and their parks in south England, so that the present popularity of Jane Austen is certainly also due to escapism [partly because] the world described by Jane Austen seems calm and stable, unlike the world we live in.³¹

NA (*Nortengerska opatija*, 1969) was translated by Smiljana and Nikola Kršić, with an afterword by Milica Mihajlović. Nikola Kršić was an engineer, who spent some time in the Soviet Union, just before the Soviet attacks on Yugoslav political leadership in 1948. In collaboration with his wife Smiljana, he translated various books from English, Czech and Russian into Serbian (Jovanović 1970, 185–86). Milica Mihajlović (1926–86) graduated in English Language and Literature from the University of Belgrade, studied for a year in England (1949–50), taught English in the School of Journalism and Diplomacy and, later, in the Faculty of Philosophy. She was married to Borislav Mihajlović, one of

²⁹ 'usredsreena na proučavanje razlike [. . .] izmeu normi ponašanja koje društvo diktira i moralnog problema pojedinca' (Kovačević 1983, 234).

³⁰ 'Budući da je pripadala zemljoposedičkom sloju koji je bio najkonzervativniji deo privilegisanih klasa engleskog društva, ona je i sama prihvatala i podržavala ideološke premise vladajućeg poretka. [. . .] Materijalna dobra i otmenost roda nikad ne dolaze u sumnju, a uz njih ide kultura ponašanja visoko civilizovanih slojeva – van tog kruga su grubost i prostota' (Kovačević 1983, 235–36).

³¹ 'Posebnu draž im daje ambijent gospodskih domova i vlastelinskih parkova na jugu Engleske, tako da u današnjoj popularnosti Džejn Ostin sigurno izvesnu ulogu ima i eskapizam [delimično stoga što] svet o kome piše Džejn Ostin čini se spokojan i stabilan, nasuprot onome u kome mi živimo' (Kovačević 1983, 244).

the most eminent literary critics in post-war Yugoslavia. She translated many different English and American writers into Serbian, amongst them, London, Faulkner, Virginia Woolf, Cary, Churchill and T. S. Eliot.

Originally, the Kršić translation had appeared in 1959 in Sarajevo under the title of *Katarina* (Catherine), probably because the word 'abbey' in the original title, with its religious connotations, was considered politically incorrect by the publisher, Svjetlost. However, in order to show that the publishers were not Stalinists, 'abbey' was tolerated in the subtitle. In the Belgrade edition, titled *Nortengerska opatija* (1969), the editor often improved phrasing: at the beginning of *NA*, 1.11:82, for the original 'a very sober looking morning', we get 'veoma tmurno jutro' ('a very dark morning'; Kršić 1969, 56), instead of 'jutro veoma tmurnog izgleda' ('a morning of very dark appearance'; Kršić 1959, 82); and for the original 'its being a very fine day', 'prolepšanje vremena' ('the brightening of weather'; Kršić 1969, 56) instead of 'prolepšavanje vremena' ('the gradual brightening of the weather'; Kršić 1959, 82). Sometimes, corrections are a matter of linguistic purity: *igra* (Kršić 1969, 49) instead of *pleše* (Kršić 1959, 72). In her 'Afterword', Mihajlović apparently feels what some other grand ladies of Serbian letters felt about Austen: that she 'wrote for her own sake, spontaneously like a child', that she 'never overreached herself by a single step', and that this 'is why there is no sniffing for a thought or an affected phrase, nothing is borrowed or seen through a window of learning and intellect'.³² In spite of the fact that her experience is limited to the life of three counties in England, 'each of her characters speaks from his/her own soul in his/her own language'.³³

The translation reads quite well, in spite of the fact that very often only approximate and sometimes inadequate equivalents are given for the English words or phrases. Thus at the beginning of *NA*, 1.1, 'disposition' is translated as 'talent', 'respectable' as 'dignified', 'a woman of useful plain sense' as 'a simple woman, practical and sincere' (Kršić 1969, 3); '“since you make such a point of it”' (*NA*, 2.1: 130) is rendered into Serbian as '“since I make such a point of it”' (Kršić 1969, 92). Some English names, such as 'Hughes' and 'Pulteney' are rendered into Serbian as *Hjuz* instead of *Hjuz* and *Pelteni* instead of *Paltni* or *Poultni* (Kršić 1969, 49, 55).

A year or two after the bicentenary of Jane Austen's birth in 1975, her *Sabrana dela* (Collected works) were published in Serbia in six volumes of 10,000 copies each.³⁴ The 'Foreword' by Ileana Čura (b. 1930), Professor of

³² 'Pisala je sebe radi, spontano kao dete'; 'Ni za korak nije prelazila granice svojih moći'; 'stoga kod nje ne postoji tražena misao ni usiljen izraz, ništa pozajmljeno i vieno kroz prozore znanja i saznanja' (Mihajlović 1969, 185).

³³ 'ličnosti [...] od kojih svaka govori svojom dušom i jezikom' (Mihajlović 1969, 187).

³⁴ They were published in the order of their first appearance in English, with one exception in the translations which appeared earlier: *SS* (Simeonović); *PP* (Simić); *MP* (Curčija-Prodanović); *E* (in the earlier edition two translators were given: in this one only Jelena Stojanović, although the text remains the same, with only very

English Literature in the University of Belgrade, provides a short survey of critical approaches to Austen during the twentieth century, quoting Q. D. and F. R. Leavis (*The Great Tradition*), as well as Arnold Kettle. (Kettle's *Introduction to the English Novel* (1951) was translated into Serbo-Croatian by Ivo Vidan in 1962, and was widely used in Serbian universities as an illuminating Marxist assessment of the history of the English novel.) Čura also cites the judgement of Charlotte Brontë: Jane Austen's 'business is not half so much with the human heart as with the human eyes, mouths, hands and feet' (*CH*, 128; Čura 1977, 11). After quoting Louis Cazamian's opinion that Austen's literary technique was so classical and subtly nuanced that it was reminiscent of the French analysts,³⁵ Čura repeats some earlier pronouncements of *les grandes dames* of Serbian letters, such as those on the spontaneity of Austen's writing and of her never trespassing beyond the borders of her own experience. There follows a detailed analysis of the individual novels, starting with Austen's previously cited claim regarding 'the little bit (two Inches wide) of Ivory' (*LJA*, 323; Čura 1977, 10). The analysis, following F. R. Leavis and Kettle, centres on *E* and discusses *PP*, *MP* and *SS* at some length. In short, this 'Foreword' introduces some twentieth-century British views of Austen into the Serbian literary context. It also makes a culturally interesting – if perhaps not literally true – point that Austen, 'as a typical Englishwoman, never complained or bewailed' her lack of recognition during her lifetime.³⁶

This edition was extensively reviewed by Sonja Paligorić in *Književne novine* (Literary newspaper) in August 1977. The reviewer claims that the edition has already sold out, repeating many points made about Austen in the various commentaries that accompanied the earlier translations of her novels: that Austen had no predecessors and no successors, the focus of her novels is on courtship and matrimony, she writes only about what was within the range of her experience, she eschewed subjects outside her personal range, and so on. Paligorić also points to the perennial interest of her major themes, such as pride, prejudice, persuasion and the conflicting claims of sense and sensibility. She then discusses various approaches to *MP* in which Austen demonstrates her abilities within the sphere of social comedy and points to *E* as the 'technical triumph of her form'.³⁷ Paligorić finally concludes that Austen's happy endings are not just a form of concession to popular taste but a major, optimistic feature

minor editorial changes). *NA* was based on the Kršićs' Belgrade edition of 1969: like the other translations in this edition, it was not collated with the original English text, but only edited by persons competent in Serbian orthography and phrasing. *P* was translated by Ljubica Bauer-Protić (1909–99), and is the only new translation in this collection. It does not repeat the mistakes of the earlier translations, in translating English idioms and in rendering English names and toponyms into Serbian.

³⁵ Emile Legouis and Louis Cazamian's *History of English Literature* (1926–27) was for years one of the basic textbooks for Serbian students of English literature.

³⁶ 'kao tipična Engleskinja, [ona se] nikada nije prepuštala gunanju, jadikovanju' (Čura 1977, 14).

³⁷ 'pravo tehničko savršenstvo forme' (Paligorić 1977, 9).

of her realism, 'so characteristic of the temperament of this great writer who knew that prejudice is a vice which must be eradicated because it has always repressed human nature'.³⁸

Austen's reception in Serbia evidences a large variety of responses. To begin with, she was highly acclaimed by some educated women writers, who found her literary output a great monument to English civility and self-control, often in contrast to Slav ideals of spontaneity, sincerity and personal warmth bordering on emotional outbursts. She was also praised for not venturing beyond the borders of her own experience, but some Marxist critics found the tight borders of her experience a serious handicap to her art. Such critics often ran into difficulties – attempting to highlight the critical and ironic attitudes of her art towards the world she described, while simultaneously demonstrating the limitations of her setting and her own class-consciousness, even if this was unconscious.

Nevertheless, in the post-war context of the Serbian 'battle of books' between socialist realism and Modernism, while the Marxists claimed that Austen's class-consciousness was a significant limitation, other critics proudly proclaimed that in her art Austen did not share the prejudices of her social milieu, that she was independent in her vision, views and judgement, and never supported one class against another. Finally, she was appreciated as a torch of intelligence, which illuminated every form of mistaken thinking as unworthy of human nature. The power of her art and her mastery of the miniature were not only appreciated by nearly all who wrote about her in Serbia, but also by the general reading public: the edition of her *Collected Works* apparently sold out quickly.

Besides this, her works have been studied in all the English departments in Serbian universities: in the third-year course on Nineteenth-Century English Literature at Belgrade, in the second-year survey course on the History of English Literature (1750–1980) at Novi Sad and in the second-year survey course on the History of English Literature (1700–1900) at Niš. In all these courses, *PP* is on the required reading list.

Several of Austen's novels were published again in the most critical years of war in the former Yugoslavia: *SS* (Simeonović 1996), *PP* (Simić 1997) and *E* (Ančić 1998/99). Of these, Vojin Ančić's translation is the only new one. English place names are the only old-fashioned feature in this translation (*Sarej* again instead of *Sari*), but it is more up-to-date in its phrasing. For instance, when Emma says that the 24-year-old Robert Martin is '“too young to settle”', Stojanović's translation – '“too young to start his own home”' ('suviše mlad da se okući') – is something few young people would say today (*E*, 1.4: 30; Stojanović 1976, 36). Ančić's translation – 'too young for marriage' ('premlad za ženidbu') – is an exact equivalent in modern Serbian idiom (1998/99, 35). Ančić's translation is also much more masculine than Stojanović's: in it Austen's 'caresses' are not turned into 'affection' ('milošte'; Stojanović 1976, 5), but into

³⁸ 'da su predrasude porok koji treba iskoreniti, jer bezobzirno tlači pravu ljudsku prirodu' (Paligorić 1977, 9).

‘embraces’ (‘zagrljaji’; Ančić 1998/99, 7) and Emma’s governess is not just ‘an excellent woman’ (‘krasna žena’; Stojanović 1976, 5) but ‘an energetic woman’ (‘otresita žena’; Ančić 1998/99, 7). However, the way the book is advertised on the back cover reflects the fact that we have entered the era of television series and cliffhangers:

What Emma kindly intended for her friends happened to herself – she fell in love for the first time, passionately and tenderly. But her trance was overshadowed by doubt – Emma was not sure that her love would be reciprocated.³⁹

Who could resist buying a book which promises so much innocence, passion and mystery? Evidently, the blurb was not addressed to students but to the common reader.

Finally, Austen’s growing popularity has also been encouraged by the two film adaptations of her novels which were broadcast in Serbia: Ang Lee’s *SS* (1995) in 1995–96 and Douglas McGrath’s *E* (1996) in 1997. According to data available at the Film Institute in Belgrade, they were both classified as ‘art hits’ (15,000–40,000 viewers by Serbian standards) – *SS* near the top and *E* near the bottom of these figures. They were listed among the thirty, but not among the first fifteen, most successful films in their respective years of presentation, and were both available on videotape. *SS* was also shown on several television channels, including the most popular Pink (at prime time, 9pm). It has kept its popular appeal on television to the present day: it was broadcast on Serbian Radio Television as recently as 17 January 2004 (again at prime time, 8pm). If the initial appearance of Jane Austen on the Serbian literary horizons was ladylike and elitist, the response seems to have grown more and more popular, if not universal. And this may be the ultimate test of Jane Austen’s survival in Serbia. After all, as Dr Johnson put it:

by the common sense of readers, uncorrupted by literary prejudices, after all the refinements of subtlety and the dogmatism of learning, must be generally decided all claim to poetical honours. (1953, 382)

³⁹ ‘ono što je [Ema] dobronamerno namenila svojim prijateljima, dogodilo se njoj samoj – zaljubila se prvi put u životu, strasno i nežno. Taj zanos pomutila je sumnja – Ema nije bila sigurna da će joj ljubav biti uzvraćena’ (Ančić 1998/99).

17 Jane Austen: Persuading Romanian Readerships and Audiences

Mihaela Mudure

As a discipline, reception studies explore the contacts, ties, affinities, likes and dislikes between cultures, scholars and literary movements, all of which point to ideological and cultural configurations far larger than the individuals involved in the actual transmission–reception process. The extent to which a writer from one culture arouses interest in another may reveal both new aspects in the source writer’s work and hidden aspects of the receiving culture. In a word, the reception process is like a matrimonial connection: both participants give and take, while character and personality decisively influence the quality of the relationship. Such considerations are especially valid for Jane Austen, that delicate architect of matrimonial constructions, which are supposed to embellish lives, save reputations and acquire fortunes.

When compared to other British writers, Austen is a belated love of Romanian readers. After the great ‘Will’, whose unique linguistic twists and profound philosophical perceptions fascinated Romanians at an early stage, it was Milton who caught the eye of translators. His revolutionary and republican views were of great interest during the first half of the nineteenth century, when Romania sought to reconnect with Western civilization following several centuries of Ottoman domination. During the same period of initial Anglo-Romanian literary contact, the British Romantics were also influential (via French models), because Romanian literature contains its own, belated Romanticism, encapsulated through the genius of the Romanian national poet, Mihai Eminescu, a great admirer of Byron, Shelley and Coleridge.

Within this context of attractions and fascinations, Austen entered the territory of British–Romanian literary contact at a late stage. Her first appearance in Romanian occurred in 1943, with Gheorghe Nenișor’s translation of *PP, Surorile Bennet* (The Bennet sisters). In his paratextual apparatus, Nenișor states that he translated directly from the English; however, there is evidence of the influence of a French translation, Leconte and Pressoir’s *Les Cinq Filles de Mrs Bennet* (Mrs Bennet’s five daughters, 1932), which was in Romanian circulation at the time. We do not know whether Nenișor modified his title for commercial reasons or because he was influenced by the French translation,

which would have been known to the francophone elite of Romania and circulated in the bookshops of the capital.

It is worth considering the circumstances in which the translation was published. During the 1930s, Romanian readers became better acquainted with British literature by women, either directly or through French translations: Virginia Woolf, Katherine Mansfield, Rosamund Lehman, the Bröntes and George Eliot became new landmarks on the British literary map for both the intelligentsia and the general readership in Romania. Consequently, there was an increasing interest in other women writers and it seemed somehow timely that Jane Austen should enter Romanian literary circles. Nevertheless, in the political context of the time (the rise of the extreme right, and of sympathies for German and Italian fascism), the first translation of Austen's work marked discreetly, but convincingly, the maintenance of traditional Romanian contacts with all things French or English. Nenişor's translation demonstrated that these contacts had persisted at the cultural level and that they were no less important for that matter. By 1940, Britain had severed all diplomatic ties with Romania, as the Romanian leadership strengthened its links with Germany, Italy and Japan. As a result, the genteel Jane Austen acquired some subversive significance and her translation signalled much more than a cultural act.

Nenişor was a minor representative of the Romanian republic of letters, and seems to have been connected with theatrical life in Romania. In 1945, he published a translation of Ivor Novello's play *A Queen's Full House*; he also wrote the preface to an undated book *Acolo departe* (There, far away) by Mircea Ştefănescu, an important Romanian playwright; in 1966, he co-authored a book about Maria Ventura (1886–1954), a famous Romanian actress. Nenişor was also the author of the first significant analysis of Austen, marking the beginning of Austenian scholarship in Romania. In his preface, Nenişor positions Austen through comparisons with other famous writers who were already familiar to Romanian readers. He fixes Austen within the comic tradition of Caragiale in Romania and Molière in France, notably through the power of her satire. Nenişor also locates her among other British women writers (Eliot, Woolf, Mansfield, Lehman), stating that she is the first female novelist: 'the first from the chronological point of view – and especially through artistic value'.¹ As the last thirty years of scholarship have established, Austen was clearly not a token female novelist, a singular and isolated figure in British literary history, but continued a centuries-old tradition of women's fiction. In this light, Nenişor's statement is obviously representative of the level of scholarship during the 1940s. At the end of his preface, Nenişor warns us that *PP* is not an 'ordinary novel' ('roman de serie'; 1943, 8), only suitable for simple consumption. Following Nenişor's *PP*, it took three decades for Austen to be translated again into Romanian, during the 1970s: an equally wide gap can be perceived as far as the Romanian scholarship of Austen is concerned.

¹ 'Prima în ordine cronologică – şi mai ales prin valoare artistică' (Nenişor 1943, 3).

Encyclopaedia entries, 1898–1993

Prior to Nenişor's translation of *PP*, Austen can be located in several works of reference, which supplied cultural information to a very wide readership. The first reference book to discuss Austen was Cornel Diaconovici's *Enciclopedia română* (Romanian encyclopaedia, 1898), which mentions her simple, fluid and unique craftsmanship, as well her interest in the emergent middle classes. As a final proof of value, Austen is connected to her famous male contemporary, whose place in the canon was beyond doubt: 'Her talent was much appreciated by Walter Scott.'² In the 1929 Minerva *Enciclopedia română* (Romanian encyclopaedia), Austen is presented as an English novelist who described the morals of the gentry, and among her novels *MP* and 'Emona' [*sic*] are singled out. It is interesting that the compiler seems somehow uncomfortable with a female novelist, using the masculine form of the Romanian word for 'novelist' ('romancier'; Peteanu 1929, 121). Austen does not appear in Candrea and Adamescu's *Dicţionarul enciclopedic ilustrat* (Encyclopaedic and illustrated dictionary, 1931), although Aurel Candrea was among the most knowledgeable Romanian specialists in English during the early twentieth century.

After World War II and the consolidation of the Communist regime, a new encyclopaedia appeared: Chioreanu and others' *Dictionar enciclopedic roman* (Romanian encyclopaedic dictionary, 1962). Here, Austen is represented as a gifted satirist, whose ability to depict certain social milieux (the bourgeoisie, the country gentry) is hard to surpass. In Chioreanu and Radulescu's *Mic dicţionar enciclopedic* (Small encyclopaedic dictionary, 1972), the new national and global cultural values supported by Nicolae Ceauşescu's Communism are put forward, in supposed defiance of the former Soviet-inspired Communism. Many of the Russian and Soviet entries from the 1962 encyclopaedia were deleted. Austen is presented as a 'female English novelist' ('romancieră engleză'; 1978, 1090). Her novels are 'realist–classical' ('realist–clasice'), they evoke 'the provincial universe' ('universul provincial') and they excel through their 'irony and analytical finesse' ('ironie şi fineţe analitică'). Exactly the same text appears in the *Dicţionar enciclopedic* (Encyclopaedic dictionary), which has been published in Romania since 1993: apparently, most of the compilers are the same as for the 1972 encyclopaedia. Such 'continuity' is relevant in contextualizing the resistance of some of the Romanian elites to rejuvenation and innovation after 1990.

Translations

Following Nenişor's *PP* of 1943, Romanian translators of Austen were obliged to take rather long respite from further publication for political reasons. The 1950s and even the early 1960s were dominated by aggressive ideological commandments, which enjoined Romanian readers to acquaint themselves with Soviet and Russian literature valorized according to very strict ideological

² 'Talentul ei fu mult apreciat de Walter Scott' (Diaconovici 1898, 321).

criteria. A genteel woman writer from England was hardly to the taste of the guard dogs of Romanian letters, who were interested in proletarian literature that would rouse the people's anger against the bourgeoisie. This goes some way towards explaining why the next translation of Austen did not appear until 1968: again, the chosen work was *PP* (*Mîndrie și prejudecată*), translated by Ana Almăgeanu and prefaced by Anda Teodorescu. The book was very successful and two further editions appeared in 1969 and 1970 (as well as three during the 1990s). It would seem that Romanian readers were tired of the eternal couple of proletarians who divided their time between party tasks (overwhelmingly) and a very limited, sober personal life. Consequently, Austen's delicacy and exquisite humour were relished by Romanian readers.

In 1972, *SS* was translated by Carmen-Liliana Mareș, under the title *Elinor și Mariane* (Elinor and Marianne). The early 1970s represented a period of apparent relaxation and political thaw: Nicolae Ceaușescu, Communist leader of Romania since 1965, still feigned an open spirit and a desire to move away from the *proletcult* dogma that had stifled any independent spiritual manifestation during the previous decades. But in 1973, upon his return from a visit to China and North Korea, Ceaușescu initiated the so-called Petty Cultural Revolution. The Romanian leader had been deeply impressed by the propaganda machine in the two countries and the mass celebrations organized in his honour. Unsurprisingly, he wanted something similar in his country, and the ideological grip tightened on the Romanian intelligentsia once again: literature had to express the ideals of the working people – of course as defined by the Party and not the people themselves. Only 'progressive' writers were to be translated, and once again translation policy was subject to serious ideological censorship. Under these circumstances, classics considered to be a safe 'refuge' from the brutal interference of censorship seemed to the Communist Party to be 'without problems'. This explains the increased frequency of translations of Austen: in 1976, *NA* was translated by Costache Popa as *Mănăstirea Northanger*; while, in 1977, *E* was translated by Anca Roșu; and in 1980 Popa translated *P* as *Persuasiune*.

In this context, we must emphasize the value of the first Romanian translation of Austen: Nenișor was a competent and careful translator, and his interpretations are among the best when compared with subsequent versions of *PP* (Almăgeanu 1968; Florea 2004). Nenișor is extremely good at rendering the continuous flow of dialogue, as well as the phatic formulas meant to reinforce the comprehension of the message by the characters. Occasional omissions of certain phrases which add details to the atmosphere do not, however, diminish the significance of Nenișor's pioneering work. Below are some examples taken from the first chapter of *PP*:

English: "Oh! single, my dear, to be sure!" (3).

Nenișor 1943: "Burlac mai e vorbă!" (6).

Almăgeanu 1968: "Oh! Burlac, dragul meu, sigur!" [almost identical to Nenișor] (1992, 22).

Florea 2004: "E necășătorit, firește!" [too modern a rendering of 'single'] (18).

English: "Is that his design in settling here?" (4).

Nenișor 1943: "Și de aceea a venit tânărul?" [the problem here is the translation of

the word 'design', which is rendered by Nenişor with a familiar expression for 'scope'] (6).

Almăgeanu 1968: "‘‘Cu scopul ăsta se stabileşte oare aici?’’" [the translator uses a noun for 'design' which makes this version closer to the original although this Romanian word is more formal] (1992, 22).

Florea 2004: "‘‘Cu scopul ăsta se stabileşte oare aici?’’" [identical to Almăgeanu] (22).

English: 'but Lizzy has something more of *quickness* than her sisters' ['quickness' is very difficult to translate because of different ways of forming nouns from adjectives in the two languages and the figurative meaning of the root-adjective 'quick' in this context] (5; my emphasis).

Nenişor 1943: 'dar Lizzie parcă are mai multă *vioiciune*' [maintains the physical and moral connotations of the original] (7).

Almăgeanu 1968: 'Lizzie e însă mai *îsteaţă* decât surorile ei' [the meaning of the adjective is entirely transferred to the intellectual sphere] (1992, 23).

Florea 2004: 'în schimb, Lizzie e *mult mai inteligentă* decât surorile ei' [the worst variant, the adjective is entirely intellectual and the degree of comparison is not accurate] (19).

The 'chaise and four' (*PP*, 1.1:3) from which Bingley descends at Netherfield is translated by Nenişor as 'poştalionul cu patru cai' (1943, 1), also becoming 'cupeu cu patru cai' (Almăgeanu 1992, 21) and 'şaretă cu patru cai' (Florea 2004, 17). Nenişor's version is inadequate because it suggests that Bingley doesn't possess his own means of transportation. The best translation is Almăgeanu's, which accurately indicates Bingley's social status and wealth. Despite this, the most recent translations are not necessarily the best: among the three Romanian translations of *PP*, Florea (2004) is the least able to combine modern, late-eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century Romanian – something absolutely necessary to supply the historical flavour of Romanian idiolect during Austen's era.

Among Austen's translators, Popa (1976, 1980) renders most effectively the nuances of Austen's irony and the subtle shades of the originals. Popa is also the most accurate translator, both quantitatively and qualitatively. At the other extreme, Roşu's translation of *E* (1977) actually offers us a 'new' Austen, quite removed from the original. Roşu takes a lot of liberties with Austen's syntax, often cutting complex sentences into shorter units, while changing or omitting conjunctions. The result is a text lacking the continuity of Austen's stylistic flow, which expresses linguistically the pace of provincial life that the author depended so much on.

An idiosyncrasy of the Romanian reception of Austen during the later twentieth century was the translation of some of her works into Hungarian, the language of the largest ethnic minority in the country. *P* was translated into Hungarian in 1984 (Róna) and *PP* in 1988 (Zsenczi): both translations were issued by Kriterion in Bucharest, which specialized in literature for minorities in Romania. The existence of Kriterion and the translations into minority languages were highly advertised by the officialdom of the time as proof that minorities enjoyed all the cultural liberties in Romania.

After 1990, the liberalization of the book market led to a real explosion of translations of Austen, while a more recent phenomenon is the publication of her works in English (for instance, see Austen 1995). This accounts for the

appearance of an emergent anglophone readership interested in the original, both for reasons of accuracy and eager to improve its English. The Romanian canon of Austen's works came to incorporate *LS* and her letters, which were translated and competently prefaced by Virgil Lefter (1991), as well as the juvenilia (translated by Silvia Constantin 2003). In 1993, Daniela Elena Radu published the first Romanian translation of *MP*, while a new translation of the same novel by Adina Ihora appeared in 2004. Both the general public and specialists in comparative literature can now read the majority of Austen's works in Romanian. More recently, new editions of the pre-1990 translations have resurfaced: *NA* had been very well translated by Popa, but it received a facelift with newer versions (Sadoveanu 1993; Oanță 2004); *PP*, translated by Ana Almăgeanu (1968), was also recently retranslated (Florea 2004). Popa's *P* of 1980 was reissued in 1992, and was followed by Silvia Constantin's version in 2004. *SS* changed its Romanian title from *Elinor și Mariane* (Elinor and Marianne) into *Rațiune și simțire*, which captures the published title accurately, in both the translations of the already highly reputed Carmen-Liliana Mareș (1995) and a newcomer, Lidia Grădinaru (2004).

As a rule, this efflorescence of recent translations – many of them prepared by new and rather inexperienced translators – is not necessarily accompanied by any improvement in quality or accuracy. For instance, if we compare *NA*'s first chapter in Popa's 1976 and Oanță's 2004 translations, we notice that Popa is much better at combining modern and older Romanian variants, in order to give a suitable historical flavour. Occasional mistakes in Oanță's version also point to the translator's insufficient knowledge of English.

English: 'He had a considerable independence, besides two good livings' (13).

Popa 1976: 'Era, am putea spune, foarte înstărit, având pe deasupra și două parohii' [the translation does not adhere to the literal form of the original but renders the meaning very well] (5).

Oanță 2004: 'Avea mijloace financiare considerabile și două case bune' [the language of the translation is too modern and the syntagm 'two good livings' is translated inaccurately] (5).

In the original, Catherine Morland's appearance is 'plain' (*NA*, 1.1: 13); it becomes 'urâtă' in Popa (1976, 5) and 'ștearsă' in Oanță (2004, 5), which is less brutal but more remote from the original shade of meaning. It is interesting that Catherine's favourite game, cricket, maintains its spelling in Oanță (2004, 5) but is rendered as 'cricchet' in Popa (1976, 5) – indicative of a recent tendency in Romanian translation to retain the original orthography of English words, although Romanian is a phonetic language (where, in most cases, there is no difference between spelling and pronunciation). The most significant difference between the two translations, however, lies in the occasional mistakes made by Oanță, who does not seem to have done enough lexicological research in order to understand the original. For instance, Austen tells us that Catherine 'was very fond of tinkling the keys of the old forlorn spinet' (*NA*, 1.1: 14). Popa translates accurately, with a slightly archaic note: 'îi era drag să zdăngănească pe clapele bătrânei și jalnicei spinete' (1976, 6). By contrast, Oanță mistakes 'spinet' for 'spinner' and makes an entirely inappropriate translation, which uses

anachronistically modern Romanian and provides a technical touch that is completely out of place: ‘o amuza foarte mult să ciocnească şplinturile vechii şi oropsitei maşini de tors’ (2004, 6).

Criticism, 1969–2006

In a similar manner to the translations, Austen scholarship in Romania also suffered from the imposition of ideology and the straitjacketing of momentary understandings through the obligations of ‘progressive’ literary criticism. Consequently, there was a gap of twenty-five years between Nenişor’s preface and the next Romanian contributions to Austenian scholarship. Anda Teodorescu’s 1969 preface to Almăgeanu’s translation of *PP* offered the first competent scholarly approach to Austen’s work that could be expressed publicly in Romanian literary criticism, following many years of bitter and violent anger towards bourgeois culture. Teodorescu contextualizes Austen’s work within the history of world fiction and the value systems of the eighteenth century. She acknowledges that Austen’s purposeful limitation of social scope does not necessarily entail a limitation of moral and philosophical engagement: ‘At a certain level, indeed, novels can be interpreted in terms of moralizing allegory [. . .] but this aspect does not exhaust the complexity of the Austenian issues’.³ Teodorescu also connects Austen with other female writers (Charlotte Smith, Ann Radcliffe, Frances Burney), and insists upon the values of Austenian irony and the dramatic qualities of her novelistic universe. Teodorescu offers a very lucid analysis, which does not suffer the erosion of time, and concludes persuasively by noting that Austen ‘escapes from any rigid classification [. . .] and the reader, after reading the book, continues to have a feeling of wholeness, of re-living some eternal relations and situations, in fact, achieving permanence’.⁴

In 1970, a group of scholars from the University of Bucharest published *Dicţionar al literaturii engleze* (Dictionary of English literature). The Austen entry was written by Ioan Aurel Preda, who emphasizes her scalpel-like satire, the miniaturist quality of the novels and the harmonious balance of her narrative structure. He concludes that ‘the sure execution suggests a jeweller’s hand’.⁵ A minor error (according to Preda, *MP* was published in 1714, over sixty years before Austen’s birth!) does not diminish the quality of the entry and Preda’s capacity to encapsulate the essence of Austen’s writing with extreme eloquence.

After 1970, the climate of relative openness in Romania facilitated the appearance of other critical contributions to the study of Austen’s work. Ligia Doina Constantinescu (1974, 1977) notes the novelist’s predilection for mul-

³ ‘La un anumit nivel, într-adevăr, romanele sunt interpretabile în termeni de alegorie moralizatoare [. . .] dar acest aspect nu epuizează nici el complexitatea problematicii austeniene’ (Anda Teodorescu 1992, 8).

⁴ ‘această scriitoare scapă oricăror încadrări rigide [. . .] iar cititorul după terminarea lecturii, reţine o senzaţie de întreg, de retrăire a unor relaţii şi situaţii eterne, de fapt, realizând permanenţa’ (Anda Teodorescu 1992, 18).

⁵ ‘siguranţa execuţiei sugerează mâna unui meşter giuvaergiu’ (Preda 1970, 25).

multiple negations ‘corresponding to moral ambiguity’,⁶ as well as the frequent use of antiphrasis. Tudor Olteanu’s 1974 monograph on the eighteenth-century European novel omits Austen, although her work does, at least partly, belong to the century under inspection. Olteanu makes some very interesting and subtle distinctions between what he calls the ‘femininity of the novel’ – novels, in which the narrative voice is feminine – and the ‘feminine novel’ – novels authored by women (1974, 86–98). His conclusion is that ‘the feminine novel is a narrative formula and not a segment of an impossible and ridiculous feminine literary history’.⁷ Olteanu’s dissatisfaction arises from more than intellectual disagreement, expressing acute discomfort with the possibility of an alternative tradition of women’s literature, which says a great deal about the misogyny and patriarchal spirit which abounded in the Romanian republic of letters. Nicolae Balotă’s nuanced essay, ‘Un roman pe plăcuțe de ivory’ (A novel on little bits of ivory, 1978), employs Austen’s own formulation of her narrative art in order to describe her correspondence. Balotă describes Austen as an old spinster who had a gift for literature, but nevertheless points to the writer’s ‘severe modesty towards herself’ and her ‘extremely fine hearing’, which adds new elements to her exquisite, descriptive art.⁸

Dan Grigorescu’s 1980 review of Popa’s translation of *P* contains rich literary references that locate Austen in the wider context of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century world literature. It is interesting that Grigorescu assessed Austen in the tradition of realism, a favourite trope for literary criticism in Communist countries particularly in the 1950s. This pattern can be explained by Ceaușescu’s 1973 Petty Cultural Revolution (discussed earlier), which meant that socialist realism was again hovering threateningly on the writers’ guild. Grigorescu employed Austen’s realism in order to challenge silently the imposition of a literary aesthetic which demanded that every detail should ‘mean something’, something far removed from the genuine realism represented by Austen. His strategy is emblematic of the ways in which critics had to re-present their true ideas in order to help them over the stiles of censorship. Grigorescu’s review is symptomatic of the ways in which a certain timid, but nonetheless significant, aesthetic dissidence could be expressed in 1980s Romania. Popa’s translation

sounds too ‘literary’ sometimes. However, this does not cast a shadow on its qualities of clarity, its tender tone, full of discreet warmth, characteristic of this book by a female author whom we considered forgotten, but who proves to be still capable of posing questions to her readers.⁹

He who has ears, should listen and take heed!

⁶ ‘corespunzând unei ambiguități morale’ (Constantinescu 1974, 11).

⁷ ‘romanul feminin este o formulă narativă și nu o latură a unei imposibile și ridicole istorii literare feminine’ (Olteanu 1974, 95).

⁸ ‘o severă modestie față de sine’; ‘auz extrem de fin’ (Balotă 1978, 205, 207)

⁹ ‘uneori sună prea “literar”. Ceea ce nu-i umbrește însă calitățile de claritate, tonul tandru, plin de o căldură discretă, caracteristic acestei cărți a unei autoare pe care o credeam uitată, dar se dovedește că e capabilă încă să pună întrebări cititorilor ei’ (Grigorescu 1980, 8).

In addition to general literary criticism, Austen's writing was employed by several researchers as privileged territory for putting sophisticated linguistic tools to use for the study of literature. In 1969, Liliana Matache analysed the oblique narration and the free indirect style (a very recent field of enquiry at the time) in two articles. Matache reaches three important conclusions regarding Austen: 'The calming effect of the narrator's omniscience is replaced by the tension created through free indirect style'; Emma is 'the "point-of-view" character'; and Austen's style anticipates 'the linguistic innovations of the modern novel', in spite of being classical.¹⁰ In 1986, Ecaterina Popa applied speech-act theories to a short fragment from *PP*, arguing that the inability to communicate becomes a narrative function illuminating the characters, and the novel becomes 'a merry-go-round of flirtations, apparently superficial character relationships' (1986, 131). Although the article is rather declarative and the amount of textual corpus under perusal is not extensive, it represents a significant example of Romanian scholars' efforts to rejuvenate approaches to Austen and to apply new linguistic techniques to the study of literature.

In the absence of political imposition, post-1990 Austen scholarship flourished, benefiting from the freedom of speech finally granted to the Romanian people. In 1991, Virgil Lefter prefaced his translation of Austen's letters and *LS* with a study in which the delicacy of his expression competes with a subtle understanding of Austen's work: 'perfection', 'lace-like quality' and 'filigree' are some of Lefter's qualifications. Lefter's intimate knowledge of Austen's literary craft and personality eventually turns into near-lyrical confession, exceeding traditional critical detachment: 'Everywhere in Austen's world, a soft golden light and mild concord are spreading, which does not prevent her, however, from looking at the realities of life with lucidity.'¹¹ Nonetheless, Lefter cannot escape the obsession of so many Romanian male scholars with Austen's spinsterhood, positing her creativity as a sort of subliminal pregnancy, which indirectly points to her abnormality as a female creator of literature. In Lefter's own words, towards the end of Austen's life, 'her main concern from now on would be the baby she feeds at her breast – as she would call her work'.¹² Lefter also insists on Austen's conviction that it is only the balanced concord between reason and sensibility that can bring genuine happiness in life. Commenting on the preference of Austen's female contemporaries to sign their novels as 'by a lady', Lefter clearly understands the gendered construction of authorship at a time when such a signature was 'a convention, but not only'.¹³

¹⁰ 'Efectul liniștitor al omniscienței naratorului e înlocuit de tensiunea creată prin tehnica stilului indirect liber'; 'personajul "punct de vedere" '; 'inovațiile lingvistice ale romanului modern' (Matache 1969b, 159, 161, 168)

¹¹ 'Pretutindeni în lumea lui Austen se prefără o dulce lumină aurie și o blândă concordie ceea ce n-o împiedică totuși să privească cu luciditate realitățile vieții' (Lefter 1991, 14).

¹² 'principala sa preocupare va fi de-acum încolo pruncul ce-l alăptează la piept – cum își va numi opera' (Lefter 1991, 20).

¹³ 'o convenție în epocă, dar nu numai atât' (Lefter 1991, 5).

In 2004, Grigorescu published a preface to Anca Florea's translation of *PP*, which summarizes the most important international scholarship on Austen and contextualizes her work within different traditions of eighteenth-century fiction. Grigorescu also mentions the conflict of values as Austen's most important theme, noticing that the central female character is ascribed the very prestigious role of being the '*raisonneur*' (2004, 11).

Since the 1990s, Romanian studies of Austen have also included the attempts of several scholars to offer students comprehensive literary histories of Britain. The development, without precedence, of British studies and the exponential increase of student numbers in all Romanian university cities have ensured a constant and faithful readership for such works. It is interesting that Romanian researchers tend to associate Austen with Victorianism and the realist tradition although, historically speaking, Austen is a Georgian. The Georgian period was an age of capitalist consolidation in Britain, which also left its indelible architectural mark: the same sense of proportion tends to characterize the literature of the time, and particularly Austen's fiction, but the term 'Georgian architecture' nevertheless remains more common than 'Georgian literature'.

In her 1995 *Outline of Victorian Fiction*, Anca Bădulescu includes Austen without any comment, while in both editions of her *Victorianism and Literature* (1996, 2000), Ileana Galea notes that Austen was 'the last novelist to write before the effects of the Industrial Revolution were fully visible' (1996, 60–61). Furthermore, Galea adds that Austen was very much read by Victorian audiences. It is uncertain whether this tendency to place Austen in the context of Victorianism arises from a distant echo of past efforts by Romanian scholarship to bestow on Austen a place in the academic syllabus, according to the strict and simplistic literary classifications of Communist requirements. Nonetheless, this strategy does have some affinities with the efforts of mid-century Romanian commentators, who attempted to save writers from exclusion by placing them under the umbrella of realism.

The second volume of *Istoria literaturii engleze și americane* (History of English and American literature; Levițchi, Trifu and Focșăneanu 1998) discusses Austen in terms of both her private, secluded personal life and her literary achievements. We're told that she was a 'confirmed old maid' and she '[h]ad not wanted to enter the literary circles or to be known by the public'.¹⁴ Austen's efforts to publish and her rejection by publishers interested in other types of women's writing are not mentioned. Instead, the authors emphasize her moral sense, as well as her indebtedness to the classical spirit. Moreover, they identify the force hidden behind Austen's apparent feminine fragility:

The 'few ivory centimetres' she used to compare her work with and over which she bent with the minuteness and the labour of a jeweller, although, at first sight, can look

¹⁴ 'celibatară convinsă'; 'Nu dorise să pătrundă în cercurile literare și nici să fie cunoscută de public' (Levițchi, Trifu and Focșăneanu 1998, 331).

like a lady's fan, if examined closely, they look, according to a critic, 'like a solid elephant's tusk'.¹⁵

The authors of the entry seem reluctant to acknowledge the variety of female-authored novels published during this period, although they do consider Austen the acme of eighteenth-century fiction. If a woman were not among the authors, one could say that there lurk behind these lines traces of some form of chauvinistic anxiety underlying the recognition of an all-too-remarkable female tradition of writing.

George Volceanov discusses Austen's role as a subtle ironist, specifically pointing to 'a perfect balance between telling and showing' in her work (2000, 167). The Austenian novel is 'an economical novel in terms of literary means and devices', while her genius lies in depicting 'a cozy environment of sofas, armchairs and rest at leisure' (167, 166). As in previous Romanian assessments, a certain tendency towards minimizing her literary achievement is apparent in this study: 'Like Marlowe and Keats, Jane Austen died young. She did not have time to evolve as an artist' (167).

In response to this deeply embedded patriarchal opposition to female achievement, Gabriela Chefneux (2001) adopts a feminist perspective, relating Austen to Eliza Haywood and other eighteenth-century female writers. The study is thematically structured, borrowing a great deal from cultural studies in its exploration of issues such as education, economic independence, matrimony and female empowerment. However, it is only very recently that Austen has received the most comprehensive analysis in Romania: Ligia Doina Constantinescu's 117-page analysis, *Jane Austen as a Woman Novelist: Her Narrative Art from a Structuralist Perspective* (2005). Constantinescu explores irony, plot, the central intelligence (a character who guides or judges the behaviour of another), Austen's didacticism, her understatement and use of antiphrasis. Constantinescu's study contains several 'Annexes', which offer very interesting graphical illustrations of the spatial and characterological relations in *PP*, *E* and *P*. Despite the originality of this approach, her attempt to translate the dynamics of Austen's novels into symbolic illustrations needs more explanation in order to be fully understood by the reader. Nevertheless, Constantinescu's study is representative of an increasing sophistication in Austen scholarship in Romania.

Since the 1990s, a wide and diverse series of articles on Austen has been published: Virgil Lefter, Magda Teodorescu, Mihai Fulger and Ștefan Oprea reviewed both the recent translations of Austen's works and the screen adaptations, which are still very popular in Romania. Thanks to the post-1990 changes, Romanian audiences were able to watch the films as soon as they were released, providing them with a sense of immediacy and engagement with contemporary events, which is particularly emblematic of the post-Communist world.

¹⁵ 'Cei "câțiva centimetri de fildeș" cu care obișnuia să-și compare opera și asupra cărora s-a aplecat cu migală și truda unui bijutier, deși pot să semene la prima vedere cu avantajul unei doamne, priviți îndeaproape, arată, după cum se exprima un critic "a colț trainic de elefant"' (Levițchi, Trifu and Focșăneanu 1998, 335).

Lefter has published two articles reviewing international scholarship on Austen. It is significant that these publications appeared after 1990, in the absence of any ideological or political censorship and in the context of Romania's efforts to participate in international scholarly exchanges. In his article, 'Jane Austen și mirifica artă a memoriei' (Jane Austen and the mirific art of memory, 1991), Lefter reviewed Jocelyn Harris's book *Jane Austen's Art of Memory* (1989). Austen's numerous readings and her intertextual relations with such glorious predecessors as Chaucer, Shakespeare, Milton and Richardson are emphasized through her position at the crossroads of Neoclassicism and Romanticism. Lefter's conclusion exonerates Austen of any possible suspicion of literary fraud, offering subtle and convincing distinctions between plagiarism and influence:

In the case of Jane Austen, there is rather a prodigious memory-defying imitation, the vigorous appropriation of tradition, a complex transfer of sap from one stalk to another, after which, thanks to an unusual artistic alchemy, new and wonderful blooms appear.¹⁶

In 1998, Lefter published 'Penel plăcut și plăcuțe de ivoriu' (Pleasant paintbrush and bits of ivory), another review, this time of Valerie Grosvenor Myer's *The Obstinate Heart: Jane Austen, a Biography* (1997). Firstly, Lefter discusses the tradition of biography in British literature, commencing with Sir Fulke Greville's book on Philip Sidney and James Boswell's life of his friend Samuel Johnson. Lefter appreciates the richness and the variety of information about Austen's life in Myer's biography, which he considers 'a monography on the Austens' ('o monografie a familiei Austen'; 1998, 23). He makes a comparison with Sir David Cecil's biography, concluding that what distinguished Austen was her 'ample consciousness as a writer, her feeling of artistic responsibility'.¹⁷

In 1992, Madga Teodorescu mercilessly critiqued Lefter's translation of Austen's letters and *LS*, noticing minor errors and emphasizing the literary value of the letters as an 'old family album' ('vechi album de familie'; 21). In Teodorescu's opinion, the letters offer a 'rhetoric of the insignificant' ('retorică a nesemnificativului') and reinforce the idea that the real biography of a writer is offered by his or her books. In Teodorescu's words: 'Lady Susan has won, long live the story!' ('Lady Susan a învins, trăiască povestirea!')

The film adaptations inspired by Austen's novels were also discussed in Romanian journals. Ștefan Oprea (2002) discusses Ang Lee's *SS*, noticing the implicit feminist critique in the script:

¹⁶ 'În cazul lui Jane Austen ar fi mai degrabă vorba despre o memorie prodigioasă ce sfidează imitația, de o asumare viguroasă a tradiției, de un transfer complex de seve de la o tulpină la alta, în uram căruia, grație unei insolite alchimii artistice, prind viață noi și minunate eflorescențe' (Lefter 1991, 14).

¹⁷ 'conștiința scriitoricească deplină, sentimentul unei responsabilități artistice' (Lefter 1998, 23).

Emma Thompson, the scriptwriter, considers that the world has not changed too much, that nowadays women have almost the same problems as in Jane Austen's time, which makes her consider *Sense and Sensibility* not a period film, but a contemporary one.¹⁸

It is interesting to note that Oprea does not examine the contribution of Lee, the film's director, from the post-colonial perspective (which would have been almost inevitable in contemporary Western approaches), but entirely from an aesthetic point of view. He talks about Lee's 'Asian refinement', his 'extraordinary feeling for the detail' and the 'finesse with which he catches the subtle essence of a world that seems to keep its secrets to itself'.¹⁹ In this aestheticizing approach, there is the subliminal refusal or neglect of any perspective that dangerously approaches politics. This attitude must be understood in the context of Romania's recent history, in which the Communist regime succeeded in 'convincing' Romanian scholars and readers that approaching art with political tools was the appropriate method: best avoided in the post-Communist era, then!

In February 2006, Mihai Fulger reviewed the 2005 cinema release of *PP*, complimenting Keira Knightley's performance and the cinematic virtues of the new version, especially the ball scene at the beginning of the film. Fulger offers a short history of all the cinema adaptations of the novel, including the 1940 version to which Aldous Huxley also contributed, as well as other versions in which the influences of Broadway and multiculturalism did not lead to very impressive artistic effects. In Fulger's opinion, the 2005 version is a return to the original when compared with other adaptations, while also taking into account the sensibility of the MTV generation; however, 'the new cinema adaptation is not very respectful to the spirit of the book, emphasizing the sensibility and neglecting the characters' reason'.²⁰ He also appreciates the scene of Darcy's first proposal to Elizabeth: 'Here, the director seems to mock us, reminding us that we are watching a film based on Jane Austen, and not one with Bridget Jones'.²¹

There are three particularly interesting aspects of the post-1990 reception of Austen in Romania: the publication of her novels in English, the influence of the film adaptations and the growth of Romanian websites on Austen. As the screen adaptations of Austen's novels have become very readily and speedily

¹⁸ 'scenarista Emma Thompson socotește că lumea nu s-a schimbat prea mult, că femeile de azi au cam aceleași probleme ca pe vremea lui Jane Austen, ceea ce face să considere *Sense and Sensibility*, nu un film de epocă, ci unul contemporan' (Oprea 2002, 133).

¹⁹ 'Rafinamentul asiatic'; 'extraordinary simț al detaliului'; 'fineața cu care surprinde esența subtilă a unei lumi ce pare a-și ține tainele doar pentru sine' (Oprea 2002, 134).

²⁰ 'noua ecranizare nu prea respectă spiritul cărții, scoțând în față simțirea și neglijând rațiunea eroilor' (Fulger 2006, 19).

²¹ 'Aici, regizorul pare a ne da cu tifa, reamintindu-ne că, totuși, ne uităm la un film după Jane Austen și nu la unul cu Bridget Jones' (Fulger 2006, 19).

available to Romanians since the mid-1990s, an increasing number of young people are of the opinion that reading the original novels has become unnecessary. The consequence is a shallow but (unfortunately) self-sufficient acquaintance with a number of great writers, and Austen is no exception. At the same time, a significant amount of Romanian scholarship is becoming increasingly concerned with analysing the relationship between fiction and cinema.

Austen on the screen has also provided an opportunity for commentators to focus more specifically on gender issues: in this respect, it is worth mentioning the preface by Maria-Sabina Draga to Helen Fielding's novel, *Bridget Jones's Diary* (1997). The preface, entitled 'Între Elizabeth Bennet și Ally McBeal? Despre eternul feminin în "Jurnalul lui Bridget Jones"' (Between Elizabeth Bennet and Ally McBeal? On the eternal feminine in *Bridget Jones's Diary*, 2003), emphasizes postmodern rereadings of Austen's novel in the film industry, as well as the enduring popularity of Elizabeth Bennet, one of the first British literary characters who dares to question the rules governing marital felicity. According to Draga, Fielding employs the Austenian plot and creates Bridget Jones, a sort of Everywoman for the twenty-first century; however, she achieves much more than a 'historiographic metafiction, of re-situating a classic novel in a contemporary context'.²² Draga insists upon the more explicit feminist message of Fielding's novel, which is posed in relation to the television character, Ally McBeal, who symbolizes the successful late twentieth-century career woman's longing for family and fulfilment in her personal life. In spite of the chronological separation, Draga argues that the same personal issues appear in both Austen and Fielding: 'the lack of communication, the need for genuine human relations, the fear of solitude, which, in spite of the humour of the novel, does not seem at all to be less important nowadays than in Jane Austen's time'.²³ She also emphasizes Fielding's perceptive understanding of *PP*, which constructs both *hypotext* and *hypertext* in an intertextual relationship characterized by never-ending games of literary influences, echoes and responses:

The role of Jane Austen's novel in the literature of the time – i.e. to approach, with subtle irony and fine humour, British society full of behavioural rules and guilty of the sin of having taken itself too seriously – was not missed by the contemporary author.²⁴

Owing to her satirical and penetrating eye, Austen has provided an opportunity for critics to draw attention to various gender issues. Focusing on the figures

²² 'metaficțiune istorică, de re-situare a unui roman clasic în context contemporan' (Draga 2003, 344).

²³ 'lipsa comunicării, nevoia unei relații umane adevărate, frica de singurătate care, cu tot hazul romanului, nu pare a fi deloc mai de neglijat astăzi decât pe vremea lui Austen' (Draga 2003, 346).

²⁴ 'Rolul romanului lui Jane Austen în literatură vremii – acela de a aborda, cu ironie subtilă și umor fin, societatea britanică, plină de reguli de conduită și vinovată de păcatul de a se lua pe sine în serios – nu i-a scăpat autoarei contemporane' (Draga 2003, 346).

of Elinor and Marianne, Mihaela Mudure (2000) offers a discussion about young people's attitudes to gender in post-Communist Romania. The relaxation of sexual mores has led to gross behaviour and almost animalistic insensitivity:

Have we, women, really evolved from being an object, a more or less dissimulated commodity? Or isn't it that in the much more mature market economy of the end of this twentieth century, it is only the exchange velocity that has increased, and the price of the commodity is dwindling even more because of its availability?²⁵

Conclusion

The Romanian reception of Austen now also manifests itself on the internet (Graham 2006; Preda 2006), and criticism appears both in the written press and on the worldwide web (Gîrbea 2006). Austen also offers an opportunity for philosophizing: in his tripartite article 'Andrei Pleșu și filozofia mersului pe jos; A suferi; Favorul de a te fi născut' (Andrei Pleșu and the philosophy of walking; To Suffer; The favour of having been born, 2004), Alex-Mihai Păun talks about the uniqueness of the Austenian atmosphere: 'everything that should have had the heavy virulence of screaming, is now spread in the thin air of soft sounds'.²⁶ For the Romanian playwright Horea Gîrbea, Austen's work offers a world that is unique because of its poetic, retrospective character. What kind of planet is Austen? 'Alien, bizarre and heavy, the poet would say', is Gîrbea's answer.²⁷ Even more bizarrely, Austen's latest manifestation in Romanian culture is intertwined with the latest technological advances: according to some internet advertisements in Romanian, like Austen, the electronic product 'Lisp' seems difficult before it is learnt, but easy afterwards (Graham 2006).

We can only conclude this pageant of Austen's versatility and significance to Romanian culture with a sincere wish: 'Long life, Jane Austen, and let us hope for ever more interpretations, reinterpretations and counter-interpretations of your exquisite and delicate work for Romanian readerships and audiences!'

²⁵ 'Oare chiar am evoluat, noi, femeile, cu adevărat de la stadiul de obiect, de marfă mai mult sau mai puțin disimulată? Sau nu cumva în economia de piață mult mai matură a acestui sfârșit de secol al XX-lea, doar viteza de efectuare a schimbului a crescut față de secolul al XVIII-lea, iar marfa își pierde tot mai mult din [. . .] preț datorită disponibilității ei?' (Mudure 2000, 124).

²⁶ 'tot ceea ce trebuia sa aiba virulența grea a strigătului e aici pulverizat în aerul ușor al surdinei' (Păun 2004).

²⁷ 'Străină, bizară și grea, ar zice poetul' (Gîrbea 2006).

18 The Reception of Jane Austen in Poland

Grażyna Bystydzieńska¹

There seems to be no evidence of the reception of Jane Austen's works in nineteenth-century Poland. By contrast, there are many translations of Austen's contemporaries, such as Lord Byron and Sir Walter Scott, some of which were translated into Polish by very prominent Polish writers such as Adam Mickiewicz and Kazimierz Brodziński during the early 1820s. After 1826, there were many translations of Scott's novels into Polish in cheap editions and in not very accurate translations, mainly by F. S. Dmochowski. However, the November uprising for independence in 1831 stopped the activities of Polish translators and publishers for some time.

The complicated history of Poland had the greatest impact on the reception of foreign literature from the late eighteenth century to the 1990s. During this period, Poland was under partition (occupied by Russia, Prussia and Austria: the first partition of Poland took place in 1772, the second in 1793, the third in 1795; Poland did not regain its independence until 1918, after World War I) and did not exist formally as a country. The major Polish writers wrote as exiles in France, grouped round the Hôtel Lambert in Paris, and were interested in more 'revolutionary' ideas, both politically and aesthetically. They expressed their opinions in French or Polish journals published in French, such as *La Tribune des peuples* (The people's tribune) by Adam Mickiewicz or *La Pologne pittoresque* (Picturesque Poland). In this context, it is probable that Austen's works simply did not seem 'revolutionary' enough to be of interest.

Publishing policy inside the partitioned Poland was shaped by various members of aristocratic families, who took the responsibility for maintaining cultural life in Poland. In the Congress Kingdom of Poland (1815–61), with its centre in

¹ I would like to express my gratitude and thanks to Jakobina Kowalczyk, MA, and Dorota Traczewska, MA, the librarians from the British Studies Centre in Warsaw, for their generous and highly efficient help, especially with bibliographical research to this chapter. I am also grateful to Professor Emma Harris, the Head of the English Department in Warsaw for her kind help in bringing this article to its present shape. Last but not least, I would like to express my thanks to Brian Southam for his inspiring comments and help in forming this chapter.

Warsaw under Russian suzerainty, publishing activities were undertaken by Tadeusz Mostowski and Walerian Krasiński; in Poznań, under Prussian occupation, by Edward Raczyński, and Tytus and Jan Działyński; in Austrian-occupied Galicia, by Józef Ossoliński (Bieńkowska and Chamerska 1987, 268). Publishing policy focused mainly on the books regarded as useful for the nation: for instance, propagating Polish history, the lives of distinguished Poles and a better knowledge of various districts of Poland. At the same time, one can identify some attempts to publish cheaper books for an expanding reading public (Ślōdkowska 1982, 36–37).

The reasons for the late reception of Austen in Poland (the first translation appeared in 1934) seem to be complex. Much of the English literature of earlier epochs came to Poland through France, as French was the chosen language of the educated classes in Poland and, as Chapters 1 and 2 of this volume make clear, the French reception of Austen's works was unspectacular and translations of her novels rather poor, although translations of her novels into French were almost contemporaneous. The novel as a literary genre was not very popular during the Romantic period in Poland, the leading genres being poetry, verse drama and the verse tale.

The best Polish literature was created in exile, in France, and much of its interest concentrated on various ways – frequently presented in a symbolic manner (owing to censorship) – of achieving the independence, both of the country and of its individual countrymen oppressed by foreign domination. Polish literature of the period carried patriotic overtones and displayed a rather elevated, sometimes even slightly pompous, character. Owing to such interests, both Byron and Scott had a very powerful influence on Polish Romantic literature. This is visible in the Polish reception of Byron, where translators exposed the 'revolutionary' elements of his works – the need for sacrifice and the fight for freedom – at the cost of the psychological insight of his heroes or the oriental setting (Krajewska 1980; Bystydzieńska 2004). Both British writers also had a significant impact on the formation of new literary genres in Polish Romantic literature: the romantic tale and the digressive poem (Treugutt 1964; Maciejewski 1970). The interest in English literature at that time in Poland, rather than in French literature, which was more inclined to classical patterns, offers clear evidence of the more Romantic and innovative tendencies of Polish literature during the early nineteenth century. Austen probably did not suit the interests of Polish Romanticism with her seemingly 'trivial' topics, humorous tone and well-structured novels, which appeared present an orderly, harmonious universe.

There also seemed to be a different presentation of women in Austen's novels from that in Polish Romantic literature. The 'liberation' of women in Polish literature was achieved rather through various patriotic tasks and sacrifices undertaken together with men, as in the narrative poem *Grażyna* (1823) by Mickiewicz, than through the presentation of intelligent, witty, independent heroines as in Austen's novels (Janion 1996, 98).

It was only after 1918, when Poland gained independence, that there was a gradual shift of interest from France to England. British imperialism was esteemed by the conservative press, while liberal journals praised its democratic parliamentary system. Later on, Britain would be viewed as an anti-Nazi ally of

Poland. This period also saw the beginning of English studies as a discipline in Poland, with the first English departments opening at the Jagiellonian University in Cracow (1911) and in the University of Warsaw (1923). During the 1930s, English language and culture were still not well known in Poland, with its long-standing francophile traditions, alongside which German language and tradition took second place. Nevertheless, there was a considerable increase in the number of translations from the English in comparison with those from French (Kurowska 1987, 9). The political situation in the 1930s provoked a great interest in politics and contemporary literature, especially the novel, whereas classic English literature remained rather neglected. There was some interest in novels of manners that offered psychological insights by women writers. Among them, Emily Brontë's *Wuthering Heights* had been translated in 1929, before Austen's novels, by Janina Sujkowska, a later translator of Austen, and Charlotte Brontë's *Jane Eyre* by Róża Centnerszwerowa in 1930. It is no wonder that, except for Aniela Zagórska, an outstanding translator of Joseph Conrad's novels, there were no prominent translators from English at that time.

From the very beginning of Austen's reception in Poland, two trends can be identified: one treats the novels as old-fashioned, trivial romances, while the other, represented mainly by university critics, considers them to be subtle and masterfully written novels. Although Austen was not translated until 1934, she was already known to literary scholars. Roman Dyboski, founder of the English Department in Cracow, mentions Austen briefly but praises her subtlety, unostentatious mastership and irony, which in his opinion, is a sign of true genius (1935, 94, 102). Andrzej Tretiak (1928), the first professor and head of the English Department at the pre-war University of Warsaw, devotes more space to Austen and treats her thoroughly. Tretiak points out that the plots of Austen's novels are close to everyday life, drawing on observation, noting that her novels do not refer, like contemporary poetry to 'national' and 'revolutionary' topics, and it is only in her last novel that Byron and Scott are themselves mentioned. Tretiak argues that this results from Austen's youth when she wrote her first novels and her lack of interest in 'revolutionary' topics. Later, in *MP* and *P*, Austen introduces the war in a way that would have been familiar to her: through the appearance of naval officers (1928, 217). Tretiak pays close attention to the contrast in Austen's presentation of clergymen, between characters who seem to lack genuine religious conviction (Mr Collins, Henry Tilney, Edward Ferrars, Mr Elton) and Edmund Bertram in *MP*, who has a real belief in the moral value of his profession (218–19). Tretiak emphasizes the fact that marriages in Austen's novels are based on love and mutual understanding, and that Austen's heroines are never passive, but struggle against the inadequate partner imposed on them by social conventions (222). He evaluates Austen's novels highly, placing them alongside Shakespeare's comedies (228); his criticism reveals a sound knowledge of Austen's literary output and most of his observations still remain valid today. It seems characteristic that Tretiak feels obliged to explain to Polish readers educated on 'revolutionary' literature the reasons for Austen's disinterest in 'revolutionary' ideas.

Translations

One of the better-known translators of that time was Janina Sujkowska, the translator of Austen's first novel in Polish, *SS (Rozsądek i uczucie, 1934)*. Sujkowska, as the translator of both Jane Austen and Emily Brontë, may have had a particular interest in English women writers. She had also considered translating Virginia Woolf, although she never accomplished this (Kurowska 1987, 39); she did, however, translate works by D. H. Lawrence, H. G. Wells, Hugh Walpole and Somerset Maugham and some American literature, including Melville's *Moby Dick*. Sujkowska was believed to have had a fairly crucial impact on the translation and publishing policies of the period (Helsztyński 1933, 3). She admits herself that she had to yield to the taste of a popular readership and translate many sensation and detective novels for financial reasons. Sujkowska admits her admiration for Austen and talks about preparing *SS* for Wydawnictwo Współczesne (Contemporary publishers), who specialized in publishing literature for light entertainment and addressed readers expecting such books (Kurowska 1987, 15).

Although *Rozsądek i uczucie* is the first translation of an Austen novel into Polish, it carries no preface. Close analysis reveals it to be a fairly faithful rendering, although some significant tendencies in the translation can be identified. As it is addressed to the Polish reader, the translator is more explicit in revealing certain cultural nuances: for instance, 'Miss Dashwood' or 'Miss Steele' are always rendered as 'Elinor' or 'Anna Steele', in order to preclude confusion about their identity, while Brandon's 'attendance in town' is always translated as travelling to London. Sujkowska omits geographical details that might possibly be irrelevant to the Polish reader: 'From Cleveland, which was within a few miles of Bristol, the distance to Barton was not beyond one day' (*SS*, 3.3: 280) is shortened to a phrase, 'from Cleveland it is easier to return to Barton',² and the Polish inflection is applied to place names: *Clevelandu*, *Bartonu*.

The Polish reader is sometimes given additional explanations: for instance, the remark about 'that resemblance between Marianne and Eliza' (*SS*, 3.10: 340) becomes 'but also sad reminiscences from the past when he visited the dying Eliza'.³ Similarly, Austen's concise phrase about Edward that he 'was not too happy' (*SS*, 3.12: 359) becomes 'and he did not look like a happy young husband at all'.⁴ Polish readers' responses are guided by a more explicit naming of certain attitudes, which are not so emphatic in the English text: Marianne is described as 'egzaltowana' ('affected') and Willoughby's situation is called 'romantycznym położeniem' ('romantic circumstances') (Sujkowska 1934, 4, 5, 65). Marianne and Edward's discussions on the picturesque are labelled 'aesthetic': he talks about his 'ignorancją estetyczną' ('aesthetic ignorance'; p. 87),

² 'z Clevelandu będzie łatwiej wrócić do Bartonu' (Sujkowska 1934, 250).

³ 'lecz i smutnym wspomnieniem z przeszłości, kiedy to odwiedzał umierającą Elizę' (Sujkowska 1934, 306).

⁴ 'i nie wyglądał wcale na szczęśliwego młodego małżonka' (Sujkowska 1934, 322).

while she is called an aesthete: 'Prawda – potwierdziła estetka' ('It is true – confirmed the aesthete'; 88). The famous conversation about dead leaves in Norland is made more explicit by detailing Marianne's feelings, which are not so directly expressed in the original: 'How I do love autumn!' or 'Declining nature evokes a tempest of feelings in my heart.'⁵

The character of Mrs Jennings is exaggerated and made more vulgar in the Polish translation. In the original text, she describes Fanny's reaction on hearing about Edward and Lucy's engagement: '“She fell into violent hysterics immediately, with such screams as reached your brother's ears”' (SS, 3.1: 259). This is translated into Polish as '“Mrs John Dashwood screamed so loudly that everybody in the house could hear her. She screamed as if she were being flayed alive.”'⁶ Similarly, Mrs Jennings' '“I have no pity for either of them”' becomes '“I have no pity for these stupid women.”'⁷

Sometimes, Sujkowska adds expressions which do not exist in the English original to emphasize certain attitudes of the characters for the Polish reader. For instance, Willoughby's behaviour towards Marianne in Barton is defined as that of a fiancé ('zachowywał się jak narzeczonny'; Sujkowska 1934, 63). In chapter 49, the translator adds a description of Lucy's character, stating that Edward 'was fortunate to be saved from such a really evil person, capable of the worst deeds, and most of all, rapaciously greedy'.⁸

On the whole, however, there are more omissions than additions. Sujkowska seems concerned to develop the plot and so shortens the descriptions of characters' emotional states, however brief they were in the original: for instance, Elinor's feelings on learning about Lucy's engagement to Edward (SS, 3.7) or Mrs Dashwood's emotions after Edward's proposal to Elinor (SS, 3.13). SS, 1.6–7 are combined into one chapter. Sujkowska omits indications – sometimes brief, though important in the original – about the change of seasons, such as that stating 'as a showery October would allow' (SS, 1.11: 53). Some details about ordering meals, which build up the atmosphere in Austen's original, become generalized: 'nor extort a confession of their preferring salmon to cod, or boiled fowls to veal cutlets' (SS, 2.4: 160) is rendered as 'and they don't want to order dinners at inns by themselves and say what they prefer'.⁹ Similarly, details are omitted: 'to cure a disappointment in love, by a variety of sweetmeats and olives'; or the name of wine in '“the finest old Constantia wine in the house”' (SS, 2.8: 193, 197).

Austen is more concrete than Sujkowska when discussing financial matters: 'they may all live very comfortably together on the interest of ten thousand

⁵ 'Jak ja kocham jesień!'; 'Zamierająca przyroda budzi zawsze w moim sercu burzę uczuć' (Sujkowska 1934, 79).

⁶ 'pani Janowa narobiła krzyku na cały dom. Zupełnie jakby ją obdzierali ze skóry' (Sujkowska 1934, 231).

⁷ 'Nie żałuję tych głupich bab' (Sujkowska 1934, 231).

⁸ 'że szczęśliwy los uratował go od kobiety naprawdę złej i zdolnej do najgorszych postępów, a przede wszystkim drapieżnie interesownej' (Sujkowska 1934, 330).

⁹ 'i nie chcą same dysponować obiadów w zajazdach i nie chcą mówić co wolą' (Sujkowska 1934, 143–44).

pounds' (SS, 1.2: 10) is generalized into 'they may live comfortably on it'.¹⁰ The translator omits expressions concerning landscape gardening such as 'pleasure-grounds', 'shrubbery' and 'wood walk', probably having encountered difficulty in finding Polish equivalents. Sujkowska is not consistent in translating names into Polish: some are left in the original English (Elinor, Marianne, Fanny), whereas most are translated into Polish, frequently in diminutive forms. Even Elinor's name is sometimes abbreviated to *Eli*, as also are names referring to children (Willie: *Wilus*, Harry: *Henryś*, Mary: *Marynia*). Other diminutive names sound awkward, such as the constant reference to Edward as *panie Edku* (Eddie) and Willoughby as *panie Janku* (Johnny). In the Polish translation, English surnames are given Polish endings: *Dashwoodowa*, *Jenningsowa*.

Sujkowska often employs colloquial and idiomatic language: for instance, Mrs Jennings's estimation of Edward, 'for he is one of the modestest, prettiest behaved young men I ever saw' (SS, 2.2: 148), becomes 'as silent and modest as a mouse'.¹¹ When we are told that Robert Ferrars 'walked off with an happy air of real conceit' (SS, 2.11: 221), this becomes 'and walked off ruffling his feathers like a peacock'.¹² Marianne's attitude to Willoughby 'which recommended him to her affection beyond every thing else' (SS, 1.10: 48) is more idiomatically rendered in Polish: 'He absolutely suited her expectations of a prince from a fairy tale'.¹³ By contrast, the language is occasionally elevated in the Polish translation. In SS (1.12: 62), 'much was said on the subject of rain by both of them' becomes 'he started a meteorological discussion with her'.¹⁴ Similarly, the phrase 'no poverty of any kind, except of conversation, appeared' (SS, 2.12: 233) is rendered more pompously as 'no poverty of any kind, except of intellectual scope'.¹⁵

Sujkowska's translation slightly misrepresents Austen's novel. She shortens some passages that she considers irrelevant to the plot, consequently losing some of Austen's subtle renderings, both of emotions and of environment. She slightly exaggerates Marianne's character, and Mrs Jennings is a little more vulgar. Her use of diminutive forms of names is awkward. Nevertheless, Sujkowska guides the Polish reader fairly well through the various cultural intricacies of the text, despite occasionally omitting those references she has problems with, such as landscape gardening. A brief note in *Przewodnik literacki i naukowy* (A literary and scientific guide, Anon. 1933–35) mentions Sujkowska's translation of SS, giving a brief summary and a one-sentence evaluation of the translation, accurately stating that Sujkowska's translation does not capture the entire charm of Austen's original.

Jane Austen has been more fortunate with her later translators, who have

¹⁰ 'to będą miały z czego żyć w zupełnym dostatku' (Sujkowska 1934, 7).

¹¹ 'cichy i skromny jak myszka' (Sujkowska 1934, 134).

¹² 'i wyniósł się, nastroszony jak paw' (Sujkowska 1934, 200).

¹³ 'W ogóle odpowiadał pod każdym względem jej ideałowi królewicza z bajki' (Sujkowska 1934, 41).

¹⁴ 'i wszczął z nią dyskusję meteorologiczną' (Sujkowska 1934, 53).

¹⁵ 'Niedostatek dał się odczuwać tylko w zakresie intelektualnym' (Sujkowska 1934, 239).

created accurate and fluent renderings of her fiction. Five of her novels were prepared by a prominent Polish translator, Anna Przedpelska-Trzeciakowska, while *E* was translated by Jadwiga Dmochowska (1893–1962). Among Przedpelska-Trzeciakowska's other translations are George Eliot's *The Mill on the Floss* (1960), Scott's *Guy Mannering* (1962), Dickens's *The Old Curiosity Shop* (1963), Hogg's *Confessions of a Justified Sinner* (1969) and a few American novels including Faulkner's *The Reivers* (1966) and London's *White Fang* (1984).

The first of Austen's novels to be translated into Polish after World War II, Przedpelska-Trzeciakowska's *Duma i uprzedzenie* (*PP*), appeared in 1956. Such a late translation may again be explained by the complicated history of Poland, when, during the worst Stalinist period (1948–56) foreign, particularly Western, literature was not promoted. Examining the publishing and translation policy regarding English literature during the Stalinist period in Poland, one notices the presence of British writers who are associated with satirical modes of expression or social criticism. These include H. E. Aldridge, Defoe, Dickens, Fielding, Galsworthy, Shaw, Swift and Wilde; there are also some novels by Conrad, owing to his Polish origin, but more of his works appeared after 1956. It is interesting to observe who does *not* appear at the time: Milton with his religious epics, experimental writers like Joyce and Virginia Woolf, major poets such as Yeats and T. S. Eliot (who was published only in fragments), Huxley, Lawrence (moral censorship was also operating at that time), Gothic novelists with their supernatural paraphernalia, hardly any novels of manners dealing with the theme of love (no Brontës, excepting Emily's *Wuthering Heights* in 1950, which may be a result of an earlier pre-Stalinist policy), no George Eliot, excepting *Silas Marner* (1950), no Meredith. This policy of exclusion explains why Austen's novels were not promoted during the mid twentieth century. The state controlled all spheres of life and publishing policy as well: as Lenin claimed, proletarian government interpreted 'freedom of the press' as the liberation of the press from the dictatorship of capital, the nationalization of paper mills and printing works.¹⁶ Indeed, the state control of paper became an instrument for controlling publishing enterprises. In 1948, the Komitet Upowszechniania Książki (Committee for disseminating books), whose aim was the control of the publishing and translation policy, was established. The classic writers from Western Europe were excluded from publication: it was claimed they would be difficult to grasp because of their different social background. In 1949, Centralna Komisja Wydawnicza (The central publishing committee) was founded, which eliminated all the publishers not controlled by the state and the Communist Party, or the university press. The world depicted by Austen would have been similar to pre-war Poland among the landed gentry. In post-war Poland, there was no longer a landed gentry and their estates were parcelled out to peasants in 1944–45. Similarly, the subject of love was not very popular at that time, when compared to 'serious' ideological themes.

It is worth considering some prefaces to the English novels published during this period in order to observe how critics attempted to justify publication. It is

¹⁶ For a full account, see Kondek (1992, 202–13).

also worth looking at the titles of some short studies from the Stalinist period to notice the subjects of interest at the time: for instance, *The Conditions of Living of the Working Class in the Social Novels of Charles Kingsley* (Dobrzycka 1955). In the preface to a 1953 translation of Dickens's *Great Expectations*, there is a great deal of discussion about the life of Dickens in a merciless capitalistic society and about the struggle between the proletariat and bourgeoisie. Dickens is presented as the bourgeois ideologist, who does not realize that the cause of evil is inherent in the social system, although his attitude is seen to be more critical by the time of *Great Expectations*. Dickens is credited for his realism but fails as a social reformer, although the aim of his output is the struggle for social justice. *Hard Times for These Times* (Cieężkie czasy na te czasy, 1955) is described as a novel containing criticism of the social system; however, Dickens does not want to overthrow it (Dickens 1955, 5–8). The word 'proletariat' is frequently mentioned in the preface to the Polish edition of *David Copperfield* (Dickens 1956) written by Grzegorz Sinko, which states that Dickens believes that true value is hidden among the working classes, who represent the real human values in the novel.

In October 1956, a few years after Stalin's death in 1953, there was a softening of the political situation in Poland, which resulted in a more liberal attitude towards both foreign literature and publishing policy. It resulted in the appearance of the first Austen novel in Polish after World War II: *Duma i uprzedzenie* (PP), translated by Anna Przedpeńska-Trzeciakowska in 1956. As in all recent translations of Austen's novels, the translator is not consistent in translating names, apart from Filipczuk (2003), where the names are left in English. 'Elizabeth' is sometimes rendered as *Lizzy* and sometimes in Polish as *Elżbieta*. Most of the names retain English forms, but some are translated into Polish: so 'Lady Catherine' becomes *Lady Katarzyna*, 'Caroline Bingley', *Karolina Bingley* and 'Charles Bingley', *Karol Bingley*. Przedpeńska-Trzeciakowska does not employ typographical distinctions such as italics, which Austen sometimes uses to indicate emphatic qualities in her characters' speech. Otherwise, *Duma i uprzedzenie* offers a reliable translation: the slightly old-fashioned character of the novel is skilfully conveyed by sprinkling the text with some archaic Polish vocabulary such as *obiadować* for 'having dinner' (Przedpeńska-Trzeciakowska 1956, 25).

The book is followed by an epilogue by Zygmunt Kubiak, a literary critic and translator himself, who points out that Austen had initiated a new style of European novel, which would be followed by the great novelists of the nineteenth century. He probably means nineteenth-century realism and the development of the novel of manners. Kubiak mentions the limited scope of Austen's fictional world, emphasizing Elizabeth's struggle against social restrictions regarding a suitable marriage. He praises the perfect composition of the novel, and his critical comments demonstrate an admiration for and agreement with, for instance, Tretiak's interwar estimation of Austen's novels and with the general direction of anglophone criticism on Austen.

Przedpeńska-Trzeciakowska's second translation of an Austen novel, *Perswazje* (P) was published in 1962; however, this appeared with neither introduction nor preface. In 1963, the first Polish translation of *E* appeared, by Jadwiga Dmochowska, another distinguished translator from the English, French, German and Russian. Her translation of *E* reflects Austen's original well. Again,

there was no introduction to the novel, which might serve as an indirect indication that the novel was considered as undemanding reading.

NA was translated by Przedpełska-Trzeciakowska as *Opactwo Northanger* in 1975. Again, it is a good translation, which employs a slightly archaic vocabulary at times to maintain the old-fashioned atmosphere of the novel: 'he could weary Catherine's attention' (*NA*, 1.10: 76) is translated through the old-fashioned verb *inkomodować*, literally 'to incommode' (Przedpełska-Trzeciakowska 1975, 68); 'great-coat' is rendered by *paltot*, an archaic noun for 'coat' (74); '“the most absent creature in the world”' (*NA*, 2.3: 144) is given as 'Niesamowity ze mnie dystrakt' (Przedpełska-Trzeciakowska 1975, 132), *dystrakt* being an archaism for 'an absent-minded person'; 'she hastily snuffed it' (*NA*, 2.6: 170) is rendered as 'bohaterka śpiesznie objaśniła świecę' ('the heroine hastily snuffed the candle'; Przedpełska-Trzeciakowska 1975, 157), where *objaśnić świecę* is an archaic form for 'snuffing a candle'. This time, the translator does use italics to convey the peculiarities of Austen's characters' speech. She also provides numerous footnotes to aid the Polish reader, owing to her understanding of Austen's meta-textual games and intertextual allusions: for instance, by attaching the titles of books mentioned to their authors (Frances Burney, Maria Edgeworth, Samuel Johnson, Robert Blair). Przedpełska-Trzeciakowska also discusses the cultural context of the novel: for instance, explaining the Upper Rooms, the Pump Room and the Crescent in Bath. These numerous footnotes indicate that the novel is no longer considered to be a trivial romance.

SS was translated for a second time into Polish, as *Rozważna i romantyczna* (The sensible and the romantic), by Przedpełska-Trzeciakowska in 1977; once again, no introduction was included. Przedpełska-Trzeciakowska's most recent translation from Austen is of *MP* (1995), and it is the only one of her Austen translations to be prefaced by the translator herself. She believes this novel is the most difficult one for the Polish reader to engage with; hence, some explanation may be necessary. We learn about the difficulties anticipated in the reception of the novel in Poland only as an indirect result of the problems Przedpełska-Trzeciakowska focuses on. First of all, she discusses the situation of the Church of England at the time (its secularization on the one hand and the emergence of the evangelical movement on the other) and the need for change which is implied by the figure of Edmund. The explanation of the religious context of the novel may be helpful for a Polish reader, coming from a different religious background (Catholicism) and unlikely to be acquainted with the Anglican context of the period. Przedpełska-Trzeciakowska also focuses on the symbolic treatment of Mansfield Park as a microcosm of the world, in which the collapse of order holds a more universal dimension, making *MP* more than simple romance. In this translation, almost all the names are left in English, except for the Polish spelling of *Rebeka*. A footnote provides a summary of the plot of Kotzebue's *Lovers' Vows*, in order to clarify the disturbance the play evokes in the novel.

The Polish translations of Austen's novels have been reprinted several times, mainly during the 1990s: with the impact of the film adaptations of the mid 1990s, there was renewed interest in Austen's novels. The film reviews subscribe to the first trend in the Polish reception outlined earlier, treating Austen as a writer of old-fashioned romances, arguing that the film adaptations 'improve'

the original texts of the novels. For instance, Katarzyna Turaj-Kalińska (1995) believes that Emma Thompson's script of *SS* makes the film more attractive than the novel: by building up the character of the third sister Margaret; by introducing more dramatic scenes, such as Elinor bursting into tears in front of Edward in the proposal scene; and introducing more wit than in the original. Turaj-Kalińska believes Austen to be a marginal writer, while treating the film script as a successful parody of Austen's novel. Alicja Helman (1996), a well-known film critic, also believes that old-fashioned novels are generally 'improved' by film adaptations. Contextualizing *SS* against other film adaptations of fiction, Helman praises Thompson's acting and her dialogue, which she sees as being wittier and more concise than in the original.

Both critics provide different reasons for the popularity of the film in Poland. Turaj-Kalińska identifies Austen's way of writing as *literatura trwania* (literature of duration), and she believes that a typical Pole – educated via the nineteenth-century novelist Henryk Sienkiewicz's historical sequence, *Trylogia* (Trilogy, 1884–88) – may find Austen's novels boring. Although Austen resists film adaptation according to Turaj-Kalińska, and it is only owing to the 'improvements' of the script that the film is popular in Poland. By contrast, Helman argues that the film provides a late-twentieth-century perspective on the interpretation of Austen's novel. It is a nostalgic look at an old-fashioned world and its values, which are already lost but still desirable, depicting a harmonious, stable and orderly world, where everybody and everything has its place and whose rules are clear and coherent: a world where the good are rewarded and the bad punished.

The very titles of reviews suggest that critics consider the film adaptations to be love stories addressed mainly to a female audience and treat them in a slightly patronizing way. For instance, the reviews of *SS* are entitled 'Kobiety zakochane' (Women in love, Kałużyński and Raczek 1996), 'Rok kobiet w kapeluszach' (The year of hat-wearing women; Królikowska 1996), 'Bądźmy romantyczni!' (We should be romantic!, Ciapara 1996), 'Szczęśliwe związki' (Happy relations, Wertenstein 1996). The reviews of *E* carry similar resonances: 'Manewry miłosne' (Love manoeuvres; Szczerba 1996), 'Portrety uczuć' (Portraits of emotions, Terlecka-Recknis; 1997). This perception resulted in the publication of Austen's novels in covers resembling the Harlequin Romance series: immediately suggesting to their prospective readers their function as romances written for the entertainment of a female audience.

Reviews and criticism

After the pre-war acknowledgement of Austen's significance by the first professors of English (Dyboski and Tretiak) and after a long period of silence resulting from World War II and the Stalinist period in Poland, the first reviews of *PP* appeared in 1957, soon after the 1956 translation. In his review 'Klasyka zniesiona ze strychu' (A classic brought down from the attic, 1957), Hieronim Michalski argues that the praise of the English critics is exaggerated, providing an example of chauvinism in *PP*, which consequently fails the test of time: 'The exaltation of the Englishman is contagious for the Polish critics of English

literature, who pass the same attitude on. Hence, the fame of Austen as a great star of literature preceding the translation.¹⁷ Michalski treats *PP* as a stereotypical sentimental romance, lacking realistic observation. He also believes that Austen had nothing essential to say about everyday provincial life, commenting: 'This plot, idyllic on paper, as in a stereotypical romance and sprinkled with a tender, sentimental sauce, did not leave room for realistic observation, in which Austen, describing everyday provincial life had nothing to say on her own.'¹⁸ To depreciate Austen's novel, he compares it with the Polish popular melodrama *Trędowata* (The leper, 1909) by Helena Mniszkówna, an example of a very popular but unskilled writer of romances directed at female readers. Nevertheless, Michalski notices Austen's ironic and satirical approach, and praises her aphoristic style. He admires Przedpelska-Trzeciakowska translation of *PP* for its accurate rendering of the old-fashioned style. Michalski also comments on Kubiak's epilogue, regarding it as an informative yet rather conventional evaluation of Austen's novel, which repeats the same favourable opinions on her writing.

This misreading of the novel, in my opinion, probably derives from the Marxist perspective, which can be inferred from Michalski's short review. Although the language of the review is very different from earlier prefaces of the Stalinist period and is not so directly ideological and propagandistic, nevertheless it appears that Michalski, in addition to his own dislike for Austen's novel, remains influenced by the Marxist perspective (in its primitive version). The theme of love seems trivial to Michalski and he criticizes Austen's lack of realism: what he probably means is the lack of a broader social panorama and commentary on social problems. It is also characteristic that he accepts the labelling of Austen as the mother of the non-ideological realist novel, which does not sound like a consistent point of view on realism on his part.

Other short reviews of the novel published at the same time ('J.K.' 1957; Anon. 1956) are definitely more positive and offer a better reading of the novel; however, they do not move beyond certain generalizations about Austen's splendid characterization or her sense of humour.

Duma i uprzedzenie (*PP*) was reviewed again in 1996 (after the reprinting of the novel in the same year) by Piotr Kebut. His review is entitled 'Romans po angielsku' (Romance, English-style): again, Kebut refers to Austen's novel as a love story, although his evaluation of the novel is positive. He fixes Austen within an eighteenth-century tradition and notes her use of the conventions of the comedy of manners. Austen's ambivalence towards her fictional world is observed as being critical and ironic on the one hand, and tolerant and lenient

¹⁷ 'Egzaltacja zaś Anglików udziela się w trybie zaraźliwym anglistom, którzy przekazują ją gorliwie dalej. Stąd wyprzedzająca przekład fama o Austen jako wielkiej gwiazdzie na firmamencie literatury' (Michalski 1957, 7).

¹⁸ 'Ten papierowo-idylliczny wątek, wymyślony na modłę stereotypowych romansów i odpowiednio do wymagań wiadomego typu odbiorców podlany ckliwo-sentymentalnym sosem, rozpostarł się tak szeroko, że właściwie nie zostawił miejsca na realistyczną obserwację, w której Austen, opisująca powszednie życie prowincji miała coś istotnie własnego do powiedzenia' (Michalski 1957, 7).

on the other. Kebut comments that Austen avoids extremes in her evaluations but underlines generosity and a sense of duty as important in her moral estimation of characters. He concludes his review by describing *PP* as a good novel offering deep psychological insights.

Soon after the publication of the Polish translation of *P* (*Perswazje*, 1962) and *E* (1963), two short anonymous notices appeared in *Literatura piękna*. Both commentators praise the psychologically convincing presentation of characters, and the splendid rendering of English life and manners at the beginning of the nineteenth century. In the same year, a review of *E* by Zdzisław Najder (a prominent Conrad critic) was published; this piece definitely falls within the second category of Austen's reception in Poland. Najder tries to convince Polish readers that *E* is not a charming trifle but one of subtlest masterpieces of English literature. He goes into some depth to discuss Austen's means of creating her characters, through indirect characterization, dialogue and ironic narratorial comments. Najder emphasizes the fact that the fundamental process of obtaining truth about the various characters is achieved without didacticism and moralizing, but the reader is also engaged in the process of observation and evaluation. He notices the classical composition and style of the novel, devoid of extremes, while revealing good manners. At the same time, Najder identifies the defence of Romantic values: the freedom of an individual who can be guided both by feeling and reason, even if it is against the accepted social conventions. In Najder's opinion, Austen had an impact on novels by the Polish writer Józef Korzeniowski (1797–1863), especially on *Spekulant* (*Speculator*, 1846) and *Kollokacja* (*Collocation*, 1847): this fact has not been noticed by other critics and merits further research (see Bachórz 1979; Korzeniowski 1958). Although it is only a concise piece, Najder's review abandons general remarks about *E* (for instance, about Austen's splendid characterization), attempting instead to show how such characterization is achieved. His review anticipates later analytical approaches to the reception of Austen's works, based more on theoretical foundations, which have become characteristic of reception studies of Austen in Poland since the 1970s.

Following Przedpeńska-Trzeciakowska's translation of *NA* in 1975, Zbigniew Lewicki, a scholar of American literature, wrote a brief review of the novel entitled 'Pseudogotycki romans Jane Austen' (The pseudo-Gothic romance by Jane Austen, 1976). Lewicki introduces Austen as both a great and a popular writer, focusing on the parodic elements in *NA* (of the Gothic and sentimental modes). Lewicki criticizes the abundance of footnotes in the translation as an unnecessary burden for the reader, which again signals his treatment of the novel as undemanding reading.

SS was translated again into Polish in 1977, generating three not very favourable reviews. In 'Zdrowa młoda mateczka' (Healthy young mother, 1978), Anna Bojarska treats Austen as the epitome of old-fashioned literature, whose books one can read with pleasure and relaxation but with little interest or emotion. She points to the slow rhythm of *SS* and lack of events in the plot as evidence of this. The novel is also treated as a stylish, but old-fashioned, trifle in a review published in *Kultura* (Culture, Anon. 1978). Finally, a more recent review of the novel written by Stefania Bugajska (1996), following a reprint of the translation in the same year, does not contribute much to the interpretation of the novel.

Bugajska provides a plot summary and pays attention to the creation of a new type of English heroine: emotional but also sensible and possessing a sense of humour.

In 1971, Irena Dobrzycka, a professor at the University of Warsaw, wrote a comprehensive entry on Austen for *Mały słownik pisarzy angielskich i amerykańskich* (A concise dictionary of English and American writers). She provides basic data on Austen's life, as well as a brief but essential representation of her novels: her scope of interest, typical plot motifs, means of characterization, and concise and logical structuring.

In 1976, Zofia Kozarynowa, a Polish critic living in Britain, wrote an article on Austen in *Wiadomości* (Newsletter), a London-based Polish newspaper. The piece describes the British celebrations of the 1975 bicentenary of Austen's birth. In a slightly patronizing tone, Kozarynowa presents Austen as a writer of limited scope and restricted imagination. Nonetheless, she praises Austen's gift for observation, presentation of everyday life and splendid style, and regards *MP* as Austen's best novel. Kozarynowa compares Austen with the French writer Paul Bourget, as they both present life as a social game. Referring to the history of Austen's reception, she admits she does not share Scott's admiration for Austen's sensitive psychological insights, thinking the praise bestowed on Austen by Whately, Macaulay and Disraeli to be exaggerated, and is unable to understand Edmund Wilson's high evaluation of Austen's works.

The reception of Jane Austen in Poland since the 1970s has been characterized by the prevalence of a theoretical approach to her novels, indirectly implying higher regard for her artistry and serious treatment of her novels. The publications are written by critics coming from various English departments in Poland and establish the popularity of literary theory in Poland. This is symptomatic of the global impact of literary theory during the last quarter of the twentieth century. More specifically, it is also a result of the political situation in Poland during the 1970s and 1980s, while the country was still under the Communist regime: restricted access to books, especially to source materials, made the theory of literature an attractive area of scholarly activity. This theoretical interest is present in literary studies in Poland to the present day.

Various aspects of Austen's novels became the subject of interest for the Polish critics. In 1973, Wanda Lipiec wrote a thorough review of Norman Page's book *The Language of Jane Austen*. Following Page, Lipiec presented Austen as an innovator of narrative form, although conservative on a lexical level, and she revealed in detail various intricacies of Austen's linguistic registers.

The function of the summary and scenes in Austen's novels is examined by Anna Spittal (1977), while the category of space is discussed and analysed by Urszula Tempańska (1987), who bases her analysis of space in the novels on the theoretical assumptions of Jurij Lotman, Gérard Genette, Mikhail Bakhtin, Bronisława Bałutowa and Ernst Cassirer. The article deals with the spatial complexes of the novels at large, seen from a bird's-eye view rather than with their specific details. More recently, Bystydzieńska (2002) has discussed a similar aspect of Austen's fiction, but considers the smaller components of space, arguing that houses in her novels constitute 'universes' in miniature and that the

ways in which they are represented reveals a great deal about Austen's fictional reality as well as her aesthetic, moral and social views. Ilona Dobosiewicz (1989) deals not only with narrative strategies and the role of Emma as a focalizer, but with many other aspects of *E*: characterization, objective and personal treatment of time, verisimilitude of time and place, and the myth of Pygmalion.

A further theoretical interest in *E* is revealed in a translation of an article by the American critic Joel Weinsheimer (1994), entitled 'Teoria bohatera literackiego: *Emma*' (The theory of a literary character: *Emma*). Weinsheimer employs the theory of semiotics in his analysis and deals with the allegorical meaning of names in the novel, the changing the roles of Miss Taylor and Mr Knightley, and the interchange of roles between the characters (for instance, Emma and Harriet).

To this theoretical line of interpretation predominant in Poland since the 1970s, one may also add an interesting article by Agnieszka Zieja (2003), in which the author argues that although film and literature use different techniques and codes to generate meanings, it does not mean that film texts are inferior to literary texts. She establishes her case by examining Ang Lee's 1995 adaptation of *SS*. Zieja uses Vladimir Propp's theory presented in his pioneering work on *The Morphology of the Folktale* (1927) as a tool for examining plot patterns in the novel and the film version. There are a few recent publications of different character, not belonging to the theoretical trend. Marek Błaszak deals with the naval aspects of Austen's novels in a series of articles (Błaszak 2002, 2003, 2004) based on biographical facts concerning Austen's brothers and some details pertaining to the navy present in her later novels (*MP* and *P*).

In 1997, Dobosiewicz published the only Polish monograph on Austen to date: *Female Relationships in Jane Austen's Novels: A Critique of the Female Ideal Propagated in 18th-Century Conduct Literature*. Dobosiewicz draws upon Western feminist criticism, and she can be classified as one of the leading feminist critics of English studies in Poland. Firstly, Dobosiewicz establishes the eighteenth-century ideal of womanhood – as presented by conduct literature, mainly James Fordyce's *Sermons to Young Women* (1794) and Thomas Gisborne's *Enquiry into the Duties of Female Sex* (1798) – as the model of womanhood from which Austen departs. She then discusses the role of mother–daughter relationships in Austen's fiction: because mothers are either dead, absent or inadequate, there is a mother-substitute for the heroine. Dobosiewicz also analyses the importance of sororal bonds for the development of the heroine and female friendships as crucial to the heroines' emotional and intellectual development. Such friendships subvert patriarchal ideology by contributing to the heroines' independence and expanding the scope of their world, and are consequently crucial to their identity formation. Dobosiewicz presents Austen as a novelist who challenges the patriarchal ideology of womanhood. Sororal bonds in Austen's novels were also discussed in detail in an earlier piece by Dobosiewicz (1996). The article is written from a perspective similar to that of her book, analysing those novels that strongly emphasize the importance of sororal bonds (*SS*, *PP*, *MP*), as well as the consequences of a lack of strong sororal bonds in *NA*, *E* and *P*. At the present time, Austen's novels seem to be more firmly established in the critical tradition of Poland.

Recent developments in the Polish reception of Austen

In 2003, Wydawnictwo Zielona Sowa (Green owl publishers), a new publishing firm which aims to publish masterpieces of world literature, issued *Rozważna i romantyczna* (SS) in a new translation by Michał Filipczuk, with an epilogue by Monika Handzlik. The epilogue sheds some light on Austen's life and the situation of women at the time (see Filipczuk 2003, 266–71). *E* has recently appeared in a new translation by Tomasz Tesznar (2005). Tesznar's translation is accompanied by an epilogue by Krystyna Zabawa, which treats Austen's novel thoroughly, particularly from a psychological perspective, emphasizing Austen's interest in the presentation of human nature. In Zabawa's opinion, *E* is not only a book about love, but primarily a study of difficult human relations, of self-knowledge and the knowledge of other people, and of understanding between men and women (see Tesznar 2005, 317–28). The best proof that Austen's novels have finally become well established in Polish literary life is the allusive use of the titles of her novels in Polish contemporary writings: for instance, the obvious allusion to SS in the title of a recent novel by Monika Szwaja *Stateczna i postrzelona* (The sober-minded and the dotty, 2005) or the title of the review of the film version of Tolkien's *Lord of the Rings*, 'Rozważny i romantyczny' (The sensible and the romantic; Chaciński 2005).

Jane Austen is very much present in the curricula of English departments in Poland nowadays. For instance, at the University of Warsaw one of her novels is discussed in a survey course of the history of English literature or from a theoretical point of view in a course on Introduction to Literary Studies (usually *PP*). Austen's novels are also discussed in courses on the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century English novel or on the Romantic novel. Over the last decade, the substantial number of MA dissertations on Austen's works has established the interest in her literary output that has finally taken hold among scholars in Polish academic circles, with promising prospects.

19 Jane Austen in Russia: Hidden Presence and Belated Boom

Catharine Nepomnyashchy¹

Any consideration of Jane Austen's reception in Russia must begin by acknowledging the seemingly remarkable fact that the first Russian translation of her works occurred only in 1967, with the publication of *PP* in the Soviet Union. In this chapter, I wish to argue that such a belated response, almost a century and a half after her death, may well conceal a more complex reality of Russian contacts with the British novelist, which have so far eluded the official record. Nevertheless, the fact remains that Austen's fiction came to the Russian public very late for a variety of reasons. In this context, the response to her writing provides us with a particularly illuminating case study of the complex transactions between Western and Russian culture over the past two centuries: transactions shaped by the vagaries of history, politics, shifting tastes, values, everyday realities and gender.

Austen in nineteenth-century Russia? The case of *Eugene Onegin*

The first, indeed the only, published mention of Jane Austen in Russia during her lifetime appeared in a brief notice headed 'Kratkie vypiski, izvestiya i zamechaniya' (Short excerpts, news and comments), in the journal *Vestnik Evropy* (European herald) in June 1816. Opening with a comment on the extent to which the British novel is dominated by women writers, the note points out that: 'Apart from the magic names *Edgeworth*, *Opie*, *Morgan*, *Burney*, *Hamilton*, who have an incredible power over the pockets of buyers, there are many more women novelists, whose talent is known only by the titles of their works.'² The

¹ I would like to thank Jared Ingersoll of Columbia University, Christopher Condill of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Edward Kasinec of New York Public Library and Lisa Knapp for their invaluable help with the research for this chapter.

² 'Krome magicheskikh imen *Edzhsvort*, *Opi*, *Morgan*, *Byurnei*, *Gamil'ton*, imeyushchikh neveroyatnuyu vlast' nad karmanami pokupatelei, est' eshche mnozhestvo bez'izvestnykh sochinitel'nikov, kotorykh znayut po odnim tol'ko titulam proizvedenii ikh talanta' (Anon. 1816, 319).

author then observes: 'Now one novel is garnering true praise: *Emma*, a Novel by the Author of *Sense and Sensibility*, *Pride and Prejudice* 3 Vols', adding that '[t]he unknown woman writer successfully depicts here pictures of quiet family life'.³

Despite Austen's seeming anonymity and the absence of further mention of her works during the early nineteenth century, a number of Western scholars of Russian literature have since mentioned her in comparative studies of the period, most persistently with regard to Russia's most eminent poet and early prose writer Aleksandr Pushkin, and his masterwork, *Eugene Onegin* (hereafter, *EO*, 1823–31).⁴ Maurice Baring, writing in 1910, was certainly among the first, if not the first, to posit a rather general comparison between Pushkin and Austen in suggestively gendered terms:

Pushkin is remarkable because he combines gifts that are rarely met with in conjunction: the common sense, the reality, the detachment, and the finish of a Miss Austen; the swiftness and masculinity of a Byron; and the form, the lofty form, easy withal and perfectly natural, of a Racine; reaching at times, and should it be necessary, the sublimity of a Milton. (1960, 196)

Baring waxes similarly eloquent on the subject of *EO*:

'Oniegin' [*sic*] is a story of contemporary life told in verse, a novel in verse, the first Russian novel and the best. It has the ease of Byron's 'Don Juan'. The reality of Fielding and Miss Austen, and nevertheless, when the situation demands it, it rises and takes on radiance and expresses poetry and passion. (1960, 197–98)

While Baring's hyperbole undoubtedly tells us more about the state of Austen's reception in the West at the time he was writing and about the lengths to which early Slavists would go in conveying their sense of Pushkin's greatness to an anglophone audience, his perception that Pushkin and Austen adopt

³ 'Teper' ves'ma odobryaetsya novyi roman: *Emma*, a Novel by the Author of *Sense and Sensibility*, *Pride and Prejudice* 3 Vols'; 'Neizvestnaya pisatel'nitsa udachno izobrazhaet zdes' kartiny tikhoi semeistvennoi zhizni' (Anon. 1816, 319–20).

⁴ An important and apparently unique exception to this focus on Pushkin is to be found in Masing-Delic (2000), which argues, convincingly if not conclusively, for the dependence of Ivan Goncharov's *Oblomov* (1859), one of the undoubted classics of the Russian nineteenth-century canon, on *E*. Quite a number of Slavists, in both oral and written communications, have expressed the belief that Tolstoy, probably the Russian master of the family novel, must have been acquainted with Austen's works. However, I am grateful to Galina Alexeeva, Research Director of the museum at Tolstoy's Yasnaya Polyana estate, for having confirmed that there are no works by Austen in Tolstoy's library, nor is there any mention of Austen in Tolstoy's diaries, letters or published writings. By the same token, Austen does not figure at all in the volume *Tolstoi and Britain*, despite W. Gareth Jones's opening affirmation that 'No Russian writer has responded so keenly to English culture as Lev Tolstoi' (1995, 1). Given Tolstoy's general knowledge of and interest in English literature, his ignorance of Austen speaks eloquently of her absence in Russia during his lifetime.

compatible approaches to the representation of reality nonetheless strikes a resonant chord.

John Bayley, following Baring, as he himself acknowledges, throws out a number of tantalizing statements:

Though many were written, the novel in verse never achieved real status in the west – Pushkin’s is the only masterpiece in the genre – and *Evgeny Onegin* is further compromised in western eyes by the impression that it is in some sense a variant of Byron’s *Don Juan*, though a closer parallel would be one of Jane Austen’s masterpieces [. . .] (1971, 6)

As with Jane Austen (whom Maurice Baring perceptively invoked in connection with Pushkin) we are poised between two centuries and their fictional expectations. The eighteenth-century novel retains much of the bravado of opera, stage, and poem; and D’Arcy [*sic*] and Elizabeth Bennet are happy relations of Onegin and Tatyana on the same kind of stage. It would be ridiculous to follow them to Pemberley; excited by the glitter of the novel’s crescendo we play with the idea, only to dismiss it with a smile and a shrug. And yet Jane Austen’s earliest critics were struck, and not always favorably, by her faithful imitation of daily living. Pushkin’s novel has it too, though neither he nor Jane Austen was concerned to record life in the methodical fashion of the nineteenth-century novel, the novel of realism and naturalism. The stylization of their art conveys the real as part of its *insouciance*. (1971, 241)

In like manner, Paul Debreczeny comments on the similarity between the narrative stances of these British and the Russian writers, while recognizing that it is unlikely that Pushkin had read Austen (1983, 5, 28, 305).

More recently, Western commentators have drawn specific attention to parallels between the two novels. Richard Tempest (1993) juxtaposes close readings of the scenes from *PP* and *EO* respectively, in which Elizabeth visits Pemberley in Darcy’s absence and Tatiana visits Onegin’s estate after his departure. While acknowledging that there is no hard evidence that Pushkin read Austen, Tempest suggests that the problem is worthy of further study. Amateurs, assumedly because less constrained by conventional niceties, have been more willing to underscore the kinship between the two works. In this regard, a letter by John Bury published in the *Times Literary Supplement* for 20 September 2002 opens with the announcement, ‘Sir, I don’t believe that *Pride and Prejudice* has hitherto been identified as a principal source for *Eugene Onegin*.’ The author then points to a series of (not always accurate) parallels between the two novels. To give something of the letter’s flavour, I will quote here the passage most relevant to my own argument:

Subsequent to the ball both heroes go through the classic process of withdrawal and return; and for both absence makes the heart grow fonder. While the hero is away, the heroine in both novels visits his country house, and is shown round by the housekeeper – at Pemberley Mrs Reynolds and at Onegin’s house Anisia. The favourite room, or window seat, of the former master (Darcy’s father, Onegin’s uncle) is shown to the visitor, and she leaves, in both stories with an entirely new, and unexpected, apprehension of the hero’s real nature. (Bury 2002, 15)

A response by Charles Countinho (2002) points out that Vladimir Nabokov’s ‘Commentary’ to his translation of *EO* glosses several echoes of Austen in

Pushkin's work, seeming to impute them, however, to 'descriptive formulas [. . .] common to the European novel of the time, whether the locale was Muscovy or Northamptonshire' (Pushkin 1964, 4: 222). In fact, Nabokov appears to have overlooked the parallels between *EO* and *PP*, further raising the question of whether Pushkin knew Austen in his noncommittal observation that '[i]t is curious that Jane Austen was not popular in Tatiana's Russia' (4: 393). Nabokov goes on to point to the existence of early French translations of *SS* and *MP*: Coutinho argues that Nabokov had previously spotted the parallels between *PP* and *EO*, but had dismissed the possibility that Pushkin had read Austen. In fact, Nabokov only mentions *PP* once in his commentary, and that in a decidedly equivocal fashion, commenting that Pushkin uses the word *mashinal'no* to describe Onegin's gesture following his sermon to Tatiana, and Austen writes that Elizabeth answers her aunt 'mechanically' during their visit to Pemberley.

The similarities between *EO* and *PP*, some of which have been pointed out by earlier commentators and others which have hitherto remained unnoted, are indeed striking. In both works the tale, told by an ironic narrator, largely takes place on a modest country estate, and is structured around the paired and contrasted relationships between two sisters from a modest gentry family, a male neighbour and his aloof friend. The men are bruited about by local gossip as eligible suitors, although the friend, out of overweening *amour propre*, actively hinders the relationship between his friend and the sister he appears destined to wed. The highly symmetrical plot largely turns on an exchange of letters, and pride is the primary hindrance to the consummation of romance. The true heroine of the novel cedes to her sister in beauty and conventional attractions, and is plagued by a silly mother who ill understands her. Reading, writing, marriage and the *mœurs* of everyday life rather than epic historical events occupy centre-stage. The male protagonist is a prideful aristocrat who undervalues the heroine at their first encounter, only to be forced through a painful process of re-evaluation to come to an understanding of her true worth. The heroine herself misconstrues the hero on first meeting and must learn to understand him better in the course of the novel. At a key moment in the novel, the heroine visits her innamorato's estate in his absence and, from her examination of it, gains a truer vision of his character. In the final analysis, the central intrigue of the novel lies precisely in the process of self-reflection the heroine undergoes in the course of the plot, a process initiated by the hero's initial disdain. The heroine emerges a winner in the marriage market and ends the novel in a far higher social station than the one in which she began, having attained the amorous admiration of the suitor who initially disdained her.

As already noted, even those critics who have pointed out parallels between the works of both authors have tended to discount the possibility that Pushkin might have read Austen. There is, after all, no extant trace of Austen in Pushkin's library nor is there any mention of her in his correspondence. I will contend, however, that closer scrutiny of the evidence at hand indicates, at least circumstantially, that Pushkin may have had both the opportunity and the inclination to familiarize himself with Austen's works. While Pushkin's command of English, especially before the 1820s, remains a topic of speculation, there is no question of the fluency of his French from childhood. By 1824, all of Austen's

novels had been translated into French, including two 1822 renditions of *PP* (see Chapter 1 of this volume). The latter date is particularly tantalizing, since Pushkin began writing *EO* only a year later. While he was at the time in exile in the south of Russia, it is perfectly plausible that one of the poet's acquaintances, perhaps Countess Vera Vorontsova,⁵ the wife of his superior and Pushkin's probable paramour, brought a copy to the cosmopolitan Odessa, where Pushkin began work on his masterpiece. Yet another, even earlier possibility exists that Pushkin might have read the 121-page publication of excerpts from *PP* in French that appeared in the Swiss periodical, *Bibliothèque britannique*, in 1813 when Pushkin was a student at the *lycée* at Tsarskoe Selo.

Perhaps the most compelling evidence of the relevance of *PP* to *EO* is the resonance between the two texts, the fact that placing Pushkin's novel in dialogue with Austen's enriches our reading of his text. Let me suggest, in this context, what I believe to be two particularly interesting aspects of *EO*, which are thrown into sharp relief by this juxtaposition. The first is that *EO*, like *PP* and in the spirit of conventional comedy, results in two marriages; however, this is a 'happy ending' from which the eponymous protagonist is emphatically excluded at the end, having himself doubly 'derailed' the marriage plots in the course of the narrative through his initial rejection of Tatiana's love and his murder of Lensky in a duel. Second, the very construction of the work hinges on the problem of 'reading' character, both in life and art, gaining much of its import from the meta-literary play between the two, while, at the same time, vividly posing the problem of the representation of character, and particularly of character change, in the nascent realist novel.

Let us take the two points together, because they are intimately related. As we have already seen, critics have called attention to the resemblances between two episodes in particular: Elizabeth's visit to Darcy's Pemberley estate and Tatiana's visit to Onegin's estate, and these two analogous scenes serve as touchstones in their similarities and differences. In the first instance, although we have earlier heard much of the wonderful library at Pemberley, it is not the library which draws Elizabeth's attention; rather it is the family portraits and the praise of the housekeeper for Darcy that will predispose her to reconstrue his character in the light of his future actions, especially his 'rescue' of her sister Lydia's reputation. This will pave the way further to a final interview in which man and woman, Darcy and Elizabeth, reach a verbal and emotional understanding leading to marriage. In the case of Tatiana's visit to Onegin's estate, on the other hand, the heroine seeks answers in Onegin's books (and the portrait and bust, not of the man himself or of his family, but of Byron and Napoleon). Given Onegin's vexed on-again-off-again relationship to reading throughout *EO*, it is hardly surprising that the narrative presents this encounter between Tatiana and Onegin's library as a problem in interpretation, a riddle – and a riddle, moreover, that is significantly recapitulated with Onegin's reappearance in the eighth and final book of his eponymous novel:

⁵ I am grateful to my colleague Irina Reyfman for having suggested this possibility.

What was he then? An imitation?
An empty phantom or a joke,
A Muscovite in Harold's cloak,
Compendium of affectation,
A lexicon of words in vogue? . . .
Mere parody and just a rogue? (Pushkin 1990, 177)⁶

In what new guise is he returning?
What role does he intend to fill?
Childe Harold? Melmoth for a while?
Cosmopolite? A Slavophile?
A Quaker? Bigot? – might one ask?
Or will he sport some other mask? (198)⁷

As the final interview between Tatiana and Onegin amply demonstrates, the two never seem to attain the ability to communicate, nor is it at all clear that the rather flat reading of Onegin's character at which the prideful Tatiana arrives at the end is indeed accurate or stable.

In this context, what is perhaps most striking – and heartrending – in Tatiana's reproaches to Onegin at their final meeting is her accusation that he is responsible for their missed chance: ' "And happiness was ours . . . so nearly! / It came so close!" ' (Pushkin 1990, 220).⁸ Especially viewed in the light of the somewhat amazing second chance Austen vouchsafes Elizabeth and Darcy, the impossibility for Tatiana and Onegin of stepping over Lensky's corpse and back through time is palpable. It focuses vividly both the generic problem of comedy and the narrative problem of character construction I posed above. Do the characters in either novel truly change in the course of the plots and, if so, how does the reader 'read' this change? More important, though, is how change, the passage of time, is thematized in both works. The 'comedic' ending of *PP* offers both reader and characters balance and stability, the satisfaction that they have arrived at a correct 'reading' of character, at true meaning, which is a gauge of the possibility of union and continuity. At the end of *EO*, by contrast, we do not truly know which Tatiana is real – the irretrievably lost provincial maiden or the society *grande dame* – or whether her final reading of Onegin is correct or not. Have either of them truly changed? What we do know is that what stability (the marriages) is attained at the end is attained at the cost of the exclusion of the eponymous protagonist (and of Lensky as well) from the 'comedic' structure. The forms of propriety – and pride – are maintained, but at the terrible expense of recognizing the irrecoverability of the passage of time and the instability of

⁶ 'Chto zh on? Uzheli podrazhan'e, / Nichtozhnyĭ prizrak, il' eshchë / Moskvich v Garol'dovom plashche, / Chuzhikh prichud istolkovan'e, / Slov modnykh polnyĭ leksikon? . . . / Uzh ne parodiya li on?' (Pushkin 1937, 149)

⁷ 'Skazhite, chem. on vozvratil'sya? / Chto nam predstavit on poka? / Chem nyne yavitsya? Mel'motom, / Kosmopolitom, patriotom, / Garol'dom, kvakerom, khanzhoĭ, / Il' maskoĭ shchegol'net inoi?' (Pushkin 1937, 168)

⁸ 'A schast'e bylo tak vozmozhno / Tak blizko!' (Pushkin 1937, 188)

character such a passage entails. I cannot, willy-nilly, help hearing in Tatiana's response something of an answer to Austen, a vindication of pride, if not of prejudice:

'And happiness was ours . . . so nearly!
It came so close! . . . But now my fate
Has been decreed. I may have merely
Been foolish when I failed to wait;
But mother with her lamentation
Implored me, and in resignation
(All futures seemed alike in woe)
I married . . . Now I beg you, go!
I've faith in you and do not tremble;
I know that in your heart reside
Both honor and a manly *pride*.
I love you (why should I dissemble?);
But I am now another's wife,
And I'll be faithful all my life.' (Pushkin 1990, 220; my emphasis)⁹

Here, Tatiana, having suffered the fate of a marriage without love, which Elizabeth so disdains in her friend Charlotte, ends with what is certainly her kindest 'reading' of Onegin: that his heart contains both pride and honour. What reading *EO* through, or as a response to, *PP* suggests, then, is that it is not Onegin's pride that shipwrecks the marriage plot between Onegin and Tatiana, but Onegin's 'English *spleen*',¹⁰ his inability to seize the moment, to staunch the passage of time.

Whether in the end we attribute the convergences between *EO* and *PP* to the common moment in the evolution of the novel or to a more direct (albeit unverifiable) influence, what is certainly telling is the fact that – at least until very recently – only critics writing from the perspective of the West have drawn comparisons between Austen and Pushkin. As I turn my argument from the possibility of Austen's hidden presence in nineteenth-century Russian literature to consider the reasons for her 'prolonged absence from the Russian literary scene' (Imposti 2004, 374), we need to move beyond the question of historical accident to that of the comparative function and status of the novel in Russia, and its ambivalent relationship to gender and marketplace.

The exclusive 'maleness' of the novelists who achieved canonical status in

⁹ 'A schast'e bylo tak vozmozhno, / Tak blizko! . . . No sud'ba moya / Uzh reshena. Neostorozhno, / Byt' mozhet, postupila ya: / Menya s slezami zaklinaniĭ / Molila mat'; dlya bednoi Tani / Vse byli zhrebii ravny . . . / Ya vyshla zamuzh. Vy dolzhny, / Ya vas proshu, menya ostavit'; / Ya znayu: v vashem serdtse est' / I *gordost'* i pryamaya chest', / Ya vas lyublyu (k chemu lukavit'), / No ya drugomu otdana; / Ya budu vek emu verna' (Pushkin 1937, 188).

¹⁰ 'Angliiskomu *splinu*' (Pushkin 1937, 21; Pushkin's emphasis).

Russian literature stands in particularly sharp relief when viewed in relation to the crucial role played by women in the history of British fiction. The stakes are clear in *EO* itself: a work in which a woman – who is not only formed by the reading of novels, but who aggressively takes up the pen to control her own fate – competes with the title character for pride of place in the novel, as well as with the chatty narrator who repeatedly digresses into touch-in-cheek, yet nonetheless condescending, disquisitions on women readers and writers. For Pushkin, who was making the transition from poetry to prose, from the rarefied realm of the gentleman-poet to the scruffier literary market of journals, the novel as the province of women writers and readers, as a means of diversion and a commodity for sale, was certainly a risky undertaking. This may be why, after a number of false starts, Pushkin only succeeded in completing one prose novel before his death. That novel, *Kapitanskaya dochka* (The captain's daughter), moreover, following in the openly acknowledged footsteps of Walter Scott, addressed the important enterprise of portraying the nation's history, to which Pushkin had increasingly directed his energies in non-fiction prose during the final years of his life. By the same token, much of the effort of Russian critics and writers throughout the nineteenth century and even into the twentieth would be expended on establishing the novel as serious business in the life of the nation, in the shaping of Russian society and political destiny, 'man's work' – or in renouncing the novel, as did Gogol and Tolstoy, as too unreliable or entertaining for the weighty tasks they set for themselves of transforming society and the soul. It is therefore hardly surprising that the major nineteenth-century Russian novelists would look elsewhere from Austen's 'pictures of quiet family life' for models to engage and emulate.

In this context, it is perhaps telling that the only two other published traces of Austen in nineteenth-century Russia, aside from the appearance of cursory encyclopaedia entries beginning in 1897,¹¹ occur in journal articles focusing on British women writers. The first of these mentions of Austen figures in a series of five extensive essays on British literature and journalism in the journal *Otechestvennye zapiski* (Fatherland notes, 1854), written by Aleksandr Druzhinin: a major critic, the author of one of the earliest Russian literary works devoted to the 'woman question', *Polinka Saks* (1847), and an anglophile. Druzhinin asks toward the beginning of the section in question:

For what reason do English letters boast such an abundance of women writers (and first-class writers), while in the remaining countries of Europe, despite all the efforts of diverse persons and the benevolence of male critics, women write little, and if they write, then they write only badly?¹²

¹¹ See Imposti (2004, 371–73) for a survey of Austen entries in Russian and Soviet encyclopaedias.

¹² 'po kakoi prichine angliiskaya slovesnost' gorditsya takim izobiliom zhenshchin-pisatel'nits (a pisatel'nits pervoklassnykh), mezhdru tem kak v ostal'nykh stranakh Evropy, nesmotrya na vse usilii raznykh lits i lyubeznost' muzhchin-kritikov, zhenshchiny pishut malo, i esli pishut, to pishut dovol'no plokho' (Druzhinin 1865, 334).

Having responded that this phenomenon is owing largely to the education afforded women in Britain, he ends this piece with a virulent attack on 'blue-stockings' who have, Druzhinin believes, usurped the journal of the Lake Poets, mentioning Austen in passing as a positive counter-example:

These women, who, however, we shall better call not women writers, but rather writing women, are a sort of plague, a misfortune for British belles-lettres. We will not equate them with Miss Austen, Miss Baillie, Currier-Bell [*sic*] and the whole pleiad of old and new English writers for anything in the world. They are not women, but dragons, England is not to blame for their existence.¹³

Despite Druzhinin's professed admiration for British women writers, including Austen, gender is clearly not a neutral category in his understanding of the role of women in national literary traditions.

The second mention of Austen presents an apposite counterpoint to Druzhinin's article. It appeared in 1871, in an article entitled 'Anglichanski romanistki' (English women novelists), also published in *Otechestvennye and written by Mariya Konstantinovna Tsebrikova, a prominent female literary critic and progressive advocate of the 'woman question'. Tsebrikova opens her article by castigating English fiction in general for upholding the social inequality of class structures, partly in the guise of the heroine ever submissive to duty:*

That is why despotic husbands and all mothers jealous of their daughters' naivety so love to give their wives and daughters English novels to read. In these novels everything is so moralistic and orderly; they will not arouse either in wives or daughters any restless strivings, will not summon them to a broad, active life beyond the walls of their native home.¹⁴

In turning her attention specifically to women authors, Tsebrikova continues in the same vein, as her passing reference to Austen shows:

Behind the novels of Miss Burney trails an endless round of novels very long, moralistic and orderly, with very moderate novelistic plots; the novels of Miss Austen, Miss

¹³ 'Eti-to zhenshchiny, kotorykh vprochem, my luchshe stanem nazyvat' ne zhenshchinami-pisatel'nitsami, a zhenshchinami pishushchimi, est' svoego roda chuma, bedstvie dlia velikobritanskoi slovesnosti. Ravnyat' ikh s miss Osten, miss Beili, Korrier-Bellem i vsei pleyadoi starykh i novykh angliiskikh pisatel'nits my ne stamen ni za chto v svete. Eto ne zhenshchini, a drakony. Angliya ne vinovata v ikh sushchestvovanii' (Druzhinin 1865, 345–46).

¹⁴ 'Bot otchego vse muzh'ya despoty i vse mamen'ki, revnuyushchie o naivnosti dochek, tak lyubiat davat' i zhënam i docheryam chitat' angliiskie romany. V etikh romankh vsë tak nravouchitel'no i chino; oni ne probuyat ni v zhënakh, ni v docheryakh nikakikh bezpokoinykh stremleniya' (Tsebrikova 1871, 408). I am grateful to Marianna G. Muravyeva for having brought this reference to Austen to my attention.

Edgeworth, which educated our hearts and developed our minds in the first years of youth, miss Edgeworth especially for the common sense of her novels.¹⁵

As both her criticisms and her discussions of those English women writers she considers exceptions make clear, Tsebrikova favours novels that are in the spirit of contemporary Russian literature: that is, novels that adopt strong social and political stances. It is therefore unsurprising, perhaps, that Austen would not make her way to Russia for almost a century after Tsebrikova wrote these words, until a time when the values of private life and intimate relations would again become the province of the novel in Russia.

Austen and Nabokov

Austen remained all but invisible in Russian culture until well into the second half of the twentieth century, receiving mention only in scattered encyclopaedia articles and passingly in surveys of English literature. Austen's quiet brilliance, her preoccupation with the life of the British gentry would hardly seem suited to early twentieth-century Russia, a country wracked by dramatic social change, war and revolution – its culture dominated, at the high end, by rival groups of Symbolist, Futurist and Acmeist poets and, at the newly emerging low end, by boulevard romances, 'pinkertons' and glossy magazines. The ascension of the Bolshevik government after the October Revolution of 1917 resulted in a hitherto unprecedented degree of state interference in literature. The Stalinist years (1922–53) were clearly an uncongenial time for Austen to have been discovered in Soviet Russia in earnest, although, as in case of the early nineteenth century, her works may have been known to an elite few.¹⁶

Vladimir Nabokov, in this connection, may be seen as the single, extraordinary exception that proves the rule. Nabokov's extended discussion of Austen's *MP* published in his *Lectures on Literature*, based on his teaching at Cornell University beginning in 1948, signals what is certainly the most profound

¹⁵ 'За romanami miss Бэрней потянулася' neskonchaemaya verenitsa romanov otmenno dlinnykh, nravouchitelnykh i chinnykh s ochen' umerennymi romanicheskimi zateyami; romany miss Austen, miss Edzhevort, kotorymi obrazovyvali nashi serdtsa i razvivali um v pervye gody molodosti, osobenno miss Edzhevort za zdravyy smysl' eë romanov' (Tsebrikova 1871, 422). I would again like to thank Marianna G. Muravyeva for having told me that Anna Filosofova, a relative of Serge Diaghilev who was born in 1835, had an English governess and mentions in her diary reading Austen for her English lessons.

¹⁶ William Mills Todd III has told me that he saw a well-thumbed one-volume edition of Austen's works at Boris Pasternak's dacha at Peredelkino, and his observation was confirmed to me in conversation with Pasternak's son, Evgeny Borisovich Pasternak. Pasternak, born in 1890 and therefore of the generation that came of age before the 1917 Revolution, had an excellent command of English and was well versed in British literature and Western European cultural trends. Furthermore, Pasternak's sister and parents emigrated to Britain before World War II.

trace left by Austen on twentieth-century Russian culture, albeit in American emigration. While it might be argued that by the time Nabokov wrote his appreciation of Austen, he belonged more to American than to Russian culture, I would counter that, as in approaching the works and legacy of Nabokov in general, it is more fruitful to examine his response to Austen as shaped by and a function of his cultural hybridity.

Thus, when we look at the documented history of Nabokov's decision to include Austen in his 'Masters of European Fiction' course, we find that he apparently did not discover Austen in the United States, but was there prompted to a reconsideration of Austen by the urging of his friend Edmund Wilson. In fact, Simon Karlinsky attributes Nabokov's initially negative response to Austen to his Russian background:

With Jane Austen, who for Wilson shared with James Joyce 'the almost unique distinction in English novels of having a sense of form', it was his particular triumph to overcome Nabokov's typically Russian prejudice against women novelists. [...] there was also the fact of Jane Austen's total lack of reputation in Russian culture. Other English women novelists had done quite well in Russia. Ann Radcliffe and the Brontë sisters enjoyed considerable renown throughout the nineteenth century. Mary Elizabeth Braddon's pot-boiler *Lady Aurora Floyd* was not only unaccountably liked by Tolstoy, but even served as a model for certain episodes in *War and Peace*. Austen, however, was and remains an unknown. The first Russian translation of *Pride and Prejudice* did not come out until the 1960s and it was received without much enthusiasm. (Nabokov 2001, 20)

In fact, Nabokov's original response to Wilson's suggestion that he include Austen in his syllabus was less than enthusiastic, to say the least: 'Thanks for the suggestion concerning my fiction course. I dislike Jane, and am prejudiced, in fact, against all women writers. They are in another class. Could never see anything in *Pride and Prejudice*' (2001, 268). Here, we should note that Nabokov already admits to familiarity with *PP*, which is not surprising when we remember that he grew up in an English-speaking household with an anglophile father and attended Cambridge after his emigration from Russia.

Nabokov's most eloquent response to Wilson's persistence in suggesting that he try *MP* is, of course, his inclusion of Austen's novel as required reading in his course. Moreover, when we look more closely at Nabokov's lectures on *MP*, we find an intriguing resonance with his own writing. Thus, roughly in the middle of his essay, Nabokov engages in an extensive discussion of the aborted staging of August von Kotzebue's play *Lovers' Vows* adapted by Elizabeth Inchbald, which occupies roughly the middle of Austen's *MP*: 'The whole play theme in *Mansfield Park* is an extraordinary achievement. In chapters 12 to 20 the play theme is developed on the lines of fairy-tale magic and fate' (Nabokov 1980, 30).

Nabokov's presentation of the failed production of *Lovers' Vows* as the structural centrepiece of *MP* resonates suggestively with the construction of his own novel *Lolita*, which he was writing at the same time as he was rereading Austen and composing his class lectures. Whether it be a case of what Nabokov himself terms a 'literary reminiscence' (1980, 26) of *MP* in *Lolita* or, conversely, a case of Nabokov finding his own artistic practice in his exegesis of Austen, the parallel

between the function of *Lovers' Vows* in *MP* (as read by Nabokov) and the function of the fictional play *The Enchanted Hunters* in *Lolita* is striking, if devious in a characteristically Nabokovian manner. It is not the play itself that occupies the geographical centre of Nabokov's novel, but the Enchanted Hunters Hotel, where Humbert Humbert consummates his affair with Lolita; however, the play does serve as a commentary on the roles of the characters, and the coincidence of the names of the hotel and the names of the play underscores the role of artistic fate (Aubrey McFate) in Nabokov's novel. And it would be a 'knight's move' worthy of the ludic Nabokov to have taken the spelling of the surname of Lolita's 'precursor', Annabel Leigh, from the maiden name of Austen's mother, Cassandra Leigh, thereby sneaking Austen along with Poe into the genealogy of his nymphet and his novel. There is, finally, a tempting irony in the fact that Nabokov was working on his 'Commentary' to *EO* at the very time when he was composing *Lolita* and his *Lectures on Literature*, and there are enough resonances between Nabokov's novel and Pushkin's novel in verse to have led Priscilla Meyer to suggest that

Lolita represents a translation through space and time of a Russian literary monument of the 1820s into an American one of the 1950s, a parody of 'paraphrastic' translation at its most extreme, which Nabokov wrote concomitantly with his literal one. (1984, 180)

The intertextual charge thus comes full circle, and we are left only to wonder that the pedantically vigilant Nabokov failed to see, or acknowledge, the possibility of Pushkin's debt to Austen.

Austen in Soviet Russia and beyond: the return of the everyday

As the essays in this volume have made clear, the posthumous response to Austen's works across Europe has followed a rough pattern of discovery and appreciation by an educated elite and later adoption by a popular audience. This has made Austen's reception a bellwether for rival claims both by keepers of high culture and by devotees of mass culture. As Deirdre Lynch has observed:

Austen's example can also make orthodox ways of accounting for cultural reproduction – our concepts of influence, tradition, literary legitimacy, and canon; our schemes for segregating the literary from the popular strange and skewed [. . .] As the disputes about how best to like Austen and the ideas about rescuing her suggest, popularity and marketability appear in some way to threaten Austen's canonicity. (2000, 9–10)

Arguably, albeit in a belated fashion, the Russian reception of Austen has followed a similar trajectory, peaking later and more precipitously in Soviet and post-Soviet Russia in no small part because of the inter-implication of politics and cultural institutions in the USSR and their subsequent implosion in the wake of its collapse.

In the light of the historical context, the timing of the publication of *PP* in the USSR, first in English in 1961 and then in Russian translation in

1967 – accompanied by the first relatively extensive article on Austen to be published in the Soviet Union, by N. M. Demurova, which appeared as the introduction to the 1961 English-language *PP* – makes sense. (The significantly longer introduction to the Russian translation was also written by Demurova.)¹⁷ These publications may be seen as part of what may be termed a gradual return to normality during the Khrushchev and Brezhnev years, after the horrific toll taken on the Soviet population by Stalinist terror, labour camps and World War II. Despite the fact that socialist realism remained the official aesthetic in the USSR, in Soviet literature during the decades following Stalin's death there was a preoccupation with the everyday, the individual and the private – concerns compatible with the fictive world Austen creates in her novels. Moreover, during the post-Stalin years, there proceeded a gradual reclamation and discovery of foreign and Russian literary works that had been largely inaccessible under Stalin.

The fact that the anglophone *PP* appeared in 1961 at the height of the Khrushchev cultural thaw, while the Russian translation of the novel was published in 1967, after the beginning of the crackdown under Brezhnev which ushered in the so-called 'Era of Stagnation', may perhaps be taken as evidence of how little these larger trends were affected by the cultural politics of the moment. Of course, neither version of *PP* published in the USSR during the 1960s could be considered as a 'mass' phenomenon; furthermore, as we have seen, Karlinsky later observed that the translation 'was received without much enthusiasm' (Nabokov 2001, 20). Austen's by-then secure status as a 'classic' in the West certainly facilitated the publication of the Russian translation, as indicated by the fact that it appeared in the prestigious 'Literaturnye pamiatniki' (Literary monuments) series from the Academy of Sciences of the USSR. In the wake of these publications, Austen remained largely the property of the hide-bound Soviet scholarly establishment: very much, that is, in the realm of the academic. It is perhaps telling in this regard that the translation of *PP* reportedly took twenty years to complete and was therefore begun in the post-war years, apparently inspired by Somerset Maugham's naming *PP* one of the ten greatest novels of all time (Marshak 1967a). The translator, moreover, was Immanuel Marshak, a prominent Soviet physicist and son of the renowned writer of children's stories Samuil Marshak, who edited the translation-in-progress until his death in 1964.

In her introduction to Marshak's translation, Demurova presents a solid overview of Austen's life, works and reception based on anglophone sources. While heralding the Russian translation of *PP* as filling, 'true, only in part, an irritating gap which existed up to the present time in Russian translated literature',¹⁸ Demurova remains silent about the reasons for Austen's neglect in Russia, although she does supply a list of the previous, meagre mentions of Austen in

¹⁷ I have been unable to obtain a copy of the anglophone edition in order to compare the two Demurova articles and am therefore basing my observations on Ekaterina Genieva's bibliography of Austen's Russian reception (1986, 75).

¹⁸ 'pravda, tol'ko otchasti, dosadnyi probel, sushchestvovavshii do sikh por v russkoï perevodnoï literature' (Demurova 1967, 583).

Russia in a footnote (1967, 583–84). Her silence on this point is particularly striking, since she devotes much of her argument to explaining why Austen has enjoyed such popularity in Britain during the twentieth century.

This silence, read as circumspection, licenses us to draw inferences concerning Austen's belated appearance in Russia from those arguments which Demurova does make. Thus, she is at pains to demonstrate that Austen's works not only transcend the time and social milieu into which their author was born, but look at both with irony. Aside from implicitly smoothing over the issue of Austen's seemingly 'alien' class background, Demurova supplies Austen with an excellent pedigree by assigning her a pivotal role in the evolution of the realist novel and by citing a stellar array of British writers in praise of Austen's talent, including those drawing comparisons between Austen and Shakespeare. Thus, despite the fact that it is remarkably free of the political jargon of the day, Demurova's article clearly speaks to its immediate context – both in making a case for Austen's respectability as a world literary figure and in holding Austen and her works up as a standard against which to judge the Soviet present. In the first instance, Demurova discusses at length pressures exerted by the Prince Regent, the future George IV, to influence Austen's writing, about which Demurova concludes: 'It required no little courage to stand up to such an attempt.'¹⁹ In the second, Demurova finds in Austen's "mixed" characters [...] the key (or, more likely, one of the keys) to an understanding of why the twentieth century "discovered" Jane Austen for itself.'²⁰ These points could not but take on a particular resonance in late-Soviet society, in which writers were routinely subjected to political pressures and where literary characters were to be cast in decidedly black-and-white terms. Finally, we are left with the question of the target audience for Demurova's essay and, by implication, for the translation of *PP*. In this context, it is perhaps telling that on at least one occasion Demurova refers her readers to anglophone sources for more on Austen's critical reception (1967, 582). Not only does this underscore the almost complete absence of Russian scholarship on Austen at the time, but it also presupposes a readership of above-average erudition and library access.

While the next two decades witnessed the appearance of a small coterie of Austen scholars in the USSR, Austen remained far from the mass phenomenon she was in the West. The years 1967–84 saw some sixty Soviet publications, including two dissertations (Amelina 1973; Chechetko 1979) in which Austen received some mention (see Genieva 1986). While this seems to be a relatively impressive number, especially taking into account Austen's virtually complete absence from the USSR earlier, a closer look shows that Austen's reception still remained within a fairly circumscribed circle. The figure above includes only twenty substantial, scholarly works devoted exclusively to Austen, almost all of them written by Amelina, Bel'skii, Chechetko, Demurova and Ivasheva, and

¹⁹ 'Trebovalos' nemaloe muzhestvo, chtoby protivostoiat' takoi popytke' (Demurova 1967, 572).

²⁰ '“smeshannykh” kharakterov [...] klyuch (ili, vernee, odin iz kliuchei togo, pochemu XX vek “otkryl” dlya sebya Dzhein Ostin' (Demurova 1967, 564–65).

many of which appeared in highly specialized university publications. Some sixteen considerations of Austen appeared in books on the history of English literature or realism, of which five were written by Bel'skii or Ivasheva. Fifteen publications were reviews of the Russian translation of *PP* or of Anglo-American studies on or mentioning Austen, while five were translations of comments on Austen by British writers. The remaining items include an encyclopaedia article by Bel'skii, a news note on the sale of an Austen manuscript in Britain and an excerpt of a piece by Austen included in a school anthology. Clearly, Jane Austen was far from a household name in the USSR – at least, until the mid-1980s.

A watershed moment in the reception of Austen's works in the USSR came in the late 1980s, perhaps only coincidentally at the height of *glasnost*. The years 1986 and 1988 respectively witnessed the publication of two major Austen projects, both spearheaded by the energetic General Director of the Library of Foreign Literature (Biblioteka inostrannoi literatury), Ekaterina Genieva. The first of these projects was a bibliography of Austen's works and of foreign and Russian-language publications on Austen, *Dzhein Osten: biobibliographicheskii ukazatel'* (Jane Austen: a bio-bibliographical index) in the 'Pisateli zarubezhnykh stran' (Writers of foreign countries) series, edited and with an introduction by Genieva. The second project, the publication of which extended into 1989, was a three-volume collection of Austen's six completed novels in Russian, compiled and introduced by Genieva, with commentaries by Genieva and Demurova (Austen 1988–89). Thus, by a strange twist of literary history, Jane Austen's works finally became available to the Soviet reading public in the same years as did such long-banned books as Boris Pasternak's *Doctor Zhivago* (1957), Evgeny Zamyatin's dystopian novel *We* (1921–21) and Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn's *Gulag Archipelago* (1962–73).

It was, however, only in the wake of the collapse of the USSR in 1991 and the consequent demise of the Soviet cultural establishment, with its attendant artificial inflation of high culture and discouragement of mass entertainment, and the resulting emergence of a market-driven popular culture in post-Soviet Russia, that Austen and her works became a phenomenon in Russia analogous to and fed by Western 'Austenmania'. By the early twenty-first century, not only were all of Austen's works available in Russian, but Anglo-American film adaptations of her fiction had aired on Russian television and websites, while chat-rooms devoted to Austen had appeared on the internet. Austen 'chat' in Russia, as in the West, is highly repetitive, emotive and dominated by a female audience, discussing the relative merits of Austen's novels and of the novels versus the film adaptations, of Colin Firth (a hands-down favourite) and Keira Knightley, of *The Diary of Bridget Jones* as an adequate or inadequate update of *PP*, and, most importantly, appropriating Austen in a very personal way as a guide to life and love. Tellingly, a bestseller list published in 2003 in the *Ezhenedel'nyi zhurnal* (Weekly journal), under the heading 'Chto chitayut domokhoziaiki' (What housewives read) placed *PP* eighth, within a field consisting largely of detective fiction by the popular writer Dar'ya Dontsova, non-fiction accounts of women's fantasies and relationships, and the Russian translation of Helen Fielding's *Bridget Jones: The Edge of Reason* (2001).

Perhaps the most revealing indicator of the sea-change in post-Soviet cultural

attitudes in Russia is that, while it rarely occurred to Soviet scholars to draw parallels between Austen and Russian writers, and certainly not with her near-contemporary Pushkin, at least two Russian-language reviewers of the 2005 film adaptation of *PP* highlight the parallels between Austen's plot and the plot of *EO*. Alina Rudya quips that '[t]he plot of the film like that of the book takes us back to the age of the beginning of the nineteenth century – a sort of *Eugene Onegin* on British soil'.²¹ Another reviewer, Svetlana Evsyukova (2006), draws attention to the similar narratives of *PP* and *EO*, while nonetheless suggesting that there is more at work than simply parallel plots:

It is not just a matter of the similarity of the plots and characters of *Pride and Prejudice* and *Eugene Onegin* – both Pushkin and Austen employ the clichéd plots of sentimental novels, which at the turn of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries multiplied in great number. It is a matter of the common, mocking view on literature and life, in good-natured irony and an almost supernatural lightness of style and thought.²²

Thus, after nearly two centuries, the obvious affinities between Austen and Pushkin can finally be acknowledged – at least in the popular press. And why not, when one creative genealogist has given Austen the most impeccable of Russian pedigrees, tracing her back to the legendary first ruler of ancient Rus, Rurik (Anon. 2006)? Austen, it would seem, has at long last found a home on Russian soil!

²¹ 'Siuzhet fil'ma kak i knigi perenosit nas v epokhu nachala 19 veka – takoi sebe Evgenii Onegin na britanskoj zemle' (Rudya 2006).

²² 'Predubezhdaya vozmozhnye voprosy: Pushkin ne byl znakom s Dzhejn Osten, oni prinadlezhal k raznym pokoleniyam. No nam legko predstavit', kakoe udovol'stvie oni poluchili by ot vzaimnoj perepiski. Delo ne tol'ko v skhodstve syuzhetov i kharakterov "Gordosti i predubezhdeniya" i "Evgeniya Onegina" – i Pushkin, i Osten ispol'zuyut syuzhetnye shtampy sentimental'nykh romanov, kotorye na rubezhe XVIII–XIX vekov plodilis' vo mnozhestve. Delo v obshchem nasmeshlivom vzglyade na literaturu i zhizn', v dobroj ironii i pochti sverkh"estestvennoj legkosti stilya i myshleniya' (Evsyukova 2006).

Bibliography

Introduction

- Barfoot, C. C. (ed.) (1997) *Beyond Pug's Tour: National and Ethnic Stereotyping in Theory and Literary Practice*, Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Burke, Henry G. (1985) 'Seeking Jane in Foreign Tongues', *Persuasions* [Victoria, BC; New York], 7: 16–20.
- Cossy, Valérie and Diego Saglia (2005) 'Translations', in Todd, Janet (ed.) *Jane Austen in Context*, The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Jane Austen, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 6: 169–81.
- Donini, Filippo (1977) 'Jane Austen in Italy' [1971], in *Collected Reports of the Jane Austen Society, 1966–1975*, Folkestone: Dawson, pp. 155–67.
- Garside, Peter and Anthony Mandal (1999) 'Jane Austen', in Shattock, Joanne (ed.) *The Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature*, 3rd edn, vol. 4: 1800–1900, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, cols 869–83.
- Gilson, David (1974) 'Serial publication of Jane Austen in French', *The Book Collector* [London], 23: 547–50.
- Gilson, David (2003) 'Jane Austen and Europe', *The Book Collector* [London], 52: 31–45.
- King, Noel (1953–54) 'Jane Austen in France', *Nineteenth-Century Fiction* [Berkeley; Los Angeles], 8: 1–26.
- Lynch, Deidre (ed.) (2000) *Janeites: Austen's Disciples and Devotees*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- MacDonald, Gina and Andrew (eds) (2003) *Jane Austen on Screen*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Parrill, Sue (2002) *Jane Austen on Film and Television*, Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Co.
- Pittock, Murray (ed.) (2007) *The Reception of Sir Walter Scott in Europe*, The Athlone Critical Traditions Series: The Reception of British and Irish Authors in Europe, series ed. Elinor Shaffer, London; New York: Continuum.
- Robbins, Ruth (1977) 'Without the Gift of Tongues' [1968], in *Collected Reports of the Jane Austen Society, 1966–1975*, Folkestone: Dawson, pp. 66–75.

- Rowland-Brown, Lilian (1925) 'Jane Austen Abroad', *Nineteenth Century and After*, 98: 778–89.
- Troost, Linda and Sayre Greenfield (eds) (1998) *Jane Austen in Hollywood*, Lexington: University Press of Kentucky.
- Wright, Andrew (1975) 'Jane Austen Abroad', in Halperin, John (ed.) *Jane Austen Bicentenary Essays*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 298–317.

Chapter 1: The Reception of Jane Austen's Novels in France and Switzerland: The Early Years, 1813–1828

- Austen, Jane (1813) *Orgueil et préjugé*, selected excerpts of *PP*, trans. anon., in *BB*, vols 53–54.
- Austen, Jane (1815a) *Mansfield-Park*, selected excerpts of *MP*, trans. anon., in *BB*, vol. 59.
- Austen, Jane (1815b) *Raison et sensibilité, ou les deux manières d'aimer* (*SS*), trans. Isabelle de Montolieu, 4 vols, Paris: Arthus Bertrand.
- Austen, Jane (1816a) *La Nouvelle Emma, ou les caractères anglais du siècle* (*E*), trans. anon., 4 vols, Paris: Arthus Bertrand; partially repr. 1817.
- Austen, Jane (1816b) *Le Parc de Mansfield, ou les trois cousines* (*MP*), trans. anon., 4 vols, Paris: Dentu.
- Austen, Jane (1821) *La Famille Elliot, ou l'ancienne inclination* (*P*), trans. Isabelle de Montolieu, 2 vols, Paris: Arthus Bertrand.
- Austen, Jane (1822a) *Orgueil et prévention* (*PP*), trans. Eloïse Perks, 3 vols, Paris: Maradan; actually publ. 1821.
- Austen, Jane (1822b) *Orgueil et préjugé* (*PP*), trans. anon., 4 vols, Geneva; Paris: Paschoud.
- Austen, Jane (1824) *L'Abbaye de Northanger* (*NA*), trans. Hyacinthe de Ferrières, 3 vols, Paris: Pigoreau.
- Bibliothèque britannique* [*BB*] (1796–1815), ed. Marc-Auguste and Charles Pictet, Geneva: Imprimerie de la Bibliothèque Britannique.
- Bickerton, David (1986) *Marc-Auguste and Charles Pictet, the 'Bibliothèque britannique' (1796–1815) and the Dissemination of British Literature and Science on the Continent*, Geneva: Slatkine Reprints.
- Chénier, Marie-Joseph (1821) *Tableau historique de l'état et des progrès de la littérature française, depuis 1789* [1816], 3rd edn, Paris: Baudoin.
- Cossy, Valérie (1996) 'A Study of the Early French Translations of Jane Austen's Novels in Switzerland (1813–1830)' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Oxford).
- Cossy, Valérie (2006) *Jane Austen in Switzerland: A Study of the Early French Translations*, Geneva: Slatkine.
- Craufurd, Q. (Quintin) (1803) *Essais sur la littérature française, écrits pour l'usage d'une dame étrangère, compatriote de l'auteur*, 2 vols, [Paris: author].
- Emma; or, the Child of Sorrow* (1776) 2 vols, London: Lowndes; French trans. Mlle Haudry (1788) and anon. (1788, 1792).
- Ferrières, Hyacinthe de (trans.) (1824) *L'Abbaye de Northanger* (*NA*), 3 vols, Paris: Pigoreau.

- Gilson, David (1974) 'Serial publication of Jane Austen in French', *The Book Collector* [London], 23: 547–50.
- Harpe, Jean-François la (1798–1804) *Lycée, ou cours de littérature ancienne et moderne*, 23 vols, Paris: Hiard.
- King, Noel (1953–54) 'Jane Austen in France', *Nineteenth-Century Fiction* [Berkeley; Los Angeles], 8: 1–26.
- Lambert, José (1975) 'La Traduction en France à l'époque romantique: à propos d'un article récent', *Revue de littérature comparée* [Paris], 49: 396–412.
- Marc, Antoine (1819) *Dictionnaire des romans anciens et modernes, ou méthode pour lire les romans d'après leur classement par ordre de matières*, Paris: author.
- Marc, Antoine (1828) *Supplément au dictionnaire des romans*, Paris: author.
- Montolieu, Isabelle de (trans.) (1815) *Raison et sensibilité, ou les deux manières d'aimer* (SS), 4 vols, Paris: Arthus Bertrand; repr. 1828, 1996.
- Montolieu, Isabelle de (trans.) (1821) *La Famille Elliot, ou l'ancienne inclination* (P), 2 vols, Paris: Arthus Bertrand; repr. 1828.
- Moody, Ellen (2003) 'A Review of Moreland Perkins's *Reshaping the Sexes in Sense and Sensibility*', in *Reviewers' Corner* <<http://mars.gmu.edu/dspace/html/1920/1012/Reviewers.Corner.Perkins.html>> [accessed 20 October 2006].
- Noël, François-Joseph-Michel (1817–19) *Leçons anglaises de littérature et de morale sur le plan des leçons françaises et des leçons latines*, 2 vols, Paris: Le Normant.
- Pigoreau, Alexandre-Nicolas (1821a) *Petite Bibliographie biographico-romancière, ou dictionnaire des romanciers, contenant le catalogue des romans qui ont paru depuis sa publication*, Paris: Pigoreau.
- Pigoreau, Alexandre-Nicolas (1821b) *Premier Supplément à la petite bibliographie biographico-romancière*, Paris: Pigoreau.
- Pigoreau, Alexandre-Nicolas (1822a) *Second Supplément à la petite bibliographie biographico-romancière*, Paris: Pigoreau.
- Pigoreau, Alexandre-Nicolas (1822b) *Troisième Supplément à la petite bibliographie biographico-romancière*, Paris: Pigoreau.
- Robbins, Ruth (1977) 'Without the Gift of Tongues' [1968], *Collected Reports of the Jane Austen Society 1966–1975*, Folkestone: Dawson, pp. 66–75.
- Trunel, Lucile (2002) 'L'histoire éditoriale des traductions françaises de *Sense and Sensibility*', *Cahiers Charles V* [Paris], 32 (December): 221–39.

Chapter 2: The Reception of Jane Austen in France: The Later Nineteenth Century, 1830–1900

- Austen, Jane (1882) *Persuasion*, trans. Mme Letorsay, Paris: Hachette.
- Austen, Jane (1898) *Catherine Morland* (NA), trans. Félix Fénéon, in *La Revue blanche* [Paris], 9th series, 16.123–17.132.
- Austen, Jane (1899) *Catherine Morland* (NA), trans. Félix Fénéon, Paris: Editions de la Revue blanche.
- Austen-Leigh, J. E. (2002) *A Memoir of Jane Austen and Other Family Recollections*, ed. Kathryn Sutherland, Oxford: Oxford University Press; *Memoir* originally publ. 1870.

- Boucher, Léon (1878) 'Le roman classique en Angleterre: Jane Austen', *Revue des deux mondes* [Paris], 3rd series, 29: 449–67.
- Bougeault, Alfred (1876) *Histoire des littératures étrangères*, 3 vols, Paris: Plon.
- Champion, Georges Hardinge (1849) *Etudes littéraires, ou cours complet de littérature anglaise à l'usage des maisons d'éducation*, Paris: author.
- Chasles, Émile (1877) *Extraits des classiques anglais, accompagnés d'une histoire de la littérature anglaise et de notices biographiques*, Paris: Fouraut.
- Chasles, Philarète (1842) 'Du Roman en Angleterre depuis Walter Scott', *Revue des deux mondes* [Paris], 4th series, 31: 185–214.
- Chasles, Philarète (1850) *Etudes sur la littérature et les mœurs de l'Angleterre au XIXe siècle*, Paris: Amyot.
- Coquerel, Charles (1828) *Histoire abrégée de la littérature anglaise, depuis son origine jusqu'à nos jours*, Paris: Janet.
- Demogeot, Jacques (1880) *Histoire des littératures étrangères*, Paris: Hachette.
- Devonshire, M. G. (1929) *The English Novel in France 1830–1870*, London: University of London Press.
- Duret, Théodore (1898) 'Miss Austen', *La Revue blanche* [Paris], 16 (May–August): 278–82.
- Fénéon, Félix (trans.) (1899) *Catherine Morland (NA)*, Paris: Editions de la Revue blanche; collected reissue of 1898 periodical edn.
- Filon, Augustin (1883) *Histoire de la littérature anglaise depuis ses origines jusqu'à nos jours*, Paris: Hachette.
- Forgues, Eugène (1882) 'Les Femmes de lettres en Angleterre: Jane Austen', *Revue britannique* [Paris], new series, 2 (April): 429–56.
- Jusserand, Jean-Jules (1896) *Histoire abrégée de la littérature anglaise*, Paris: Delagrave.
- Lafforgue, Théodore [T. Robertson] (1840) *Cours de littérature anglaise; ou choix de morceaux tirés des meilleurs prosateurs contemporains*, Paris: Derache.
- O'Sullivan, D. (1830) *Elegant Extracts from the Most Celebrated British Prose Writers*, Paris: Belin and others.
- Pichois, Claude (1965) *Philarète Chasles et la vie littéraire au temps du romantisme*, 2 vols, Paris: José Corti.
- Rachilde [i.e. Marguerite Vallette-Eymery] (1899) review of Fénéon 1898, *Mercure de France* [Paris], 30: 182.
- Rendu, Victor (1829) *Nouvelles leçons anglaises de littérature et de morale*, Paris: Bruno-Labbé.
- Saint-Fargeau, Eusèbe Girault de (1839) *Revue des romans, recueil d'analyses raisonnées des productions remarquables des plus célèbres romanciers français et étrangers*, 2 vols, Paris: Firmin Didot.
- Taine, Hippolyte (1863–64) *Histoire de la littérature anglaise*, 4 vols, Paris: Hachette.
- Testard, Henri (1882) *Histoire de la littérature anglaise depuis ses origines jusqu'à nos jours*, Paris: Bouhore.

Chapter 3: The Reception of Jane Austen in France in the Modern Period, 1901–2004: Recognition at Last?

- Angel-Perez, Elisabeth (1994) *Histoire de la littérature anglaise*, Paris: Hachette.
- Anon. (1917) 'Jane Austen', *Le Mercure de France* [Paris], 1 August, 767.
- Anon. (1996) 'La Folie Austen', *Libération* [Paris], 12 September, 10.
- Anon. (1997a) 'Emma l'entremetteuse' [film review], *La Croix* [Paris], 4 June, 21.
- Anon. (1997b) 'Raison et sentiments' [film review], *Le Point* [Paris], 20 December, 105.
- Anon. (1998) 'Calamity Jane Austen', *Libération* [Paris], 24 December, 6.
- Austen, Jane (1910) *Emma*, trans. Pierre de Puliga, in *Journal des débats* [Paris], 122nd year, nos 161 (11 June) – 233 (23 August).
- Austen, Jane (1932) *Les Cinq Filles de Mrs Bennet (PP)*, trans. Valentine Leconte and Charlotte Pressoir, Paris: Plon.
- Austen, Jane (1933) *Emma*, trans. P. and E. Saint-Segond, Paris: Plon.
- Austen, Jane (1979) *Emma*, trans. P. and E. Saint-Segond, afterword Ginevra Bompiani, biographical note Jacques Roubaud, Paris: Christian Bourgois; reissue of 1933 edn.
- Austen, Jane (1945a) *Emma*, trans. Eugène Rocart, Brussels: Editions La Boétie.
- Austen, Jane (1945b) *Mansfield Park*, trans. Léonard Bercy, Brussels: Editions La Boétie.
- Austen, Jane (1945c) *Orgueil et préjugés (PP)*, trans. Eugène Rocart, Brussels: Editions La Boétie.
- Austen, Jane (1945d) *Persuasion*, trans. André Belamich, Paris: Edmond Charlot.
- Austen, Jane (1945e) *Raison et sensibilité (SS)*, trans. Eugène Rocart, Brussels: Editions La Boétie.
- Austen, Jane (1946a) *Emma*, trans. Sébastien Dulac, Brussels: Editions de la sixaine.
- Austen, Jane (1946b) *Orgueil et préjugés (PP)*, trans. Jean Privat, Paris: Editions des Loisirs.
- Austen, Jane (1946c) *Orgueil et préventions (PP)*, trans. R. Shops and A.-V. Séverac, Brussels: Le Carrefour.
- Austen, Jane (1947) *L'Orgueil et le préjugé (PP)*, trans. Jules Castier, pref. Louis Cazamian, Paris: Stock.
- Austen, Jane (1948a) *Le Cœur et la raison (SS)*, trans. Jules Castier, Lausanne: Marguerat.
- Austen, Jane (1948b) *Marianne et Elinor (SS)*, trans. Jean Privat, Paris: Editions des Loisirs.
- Austen, Jane (1948c) *Orgueil et préjugés (PP)*, trans. Germaine Lalande, illus. M.-L. Blondi, Paris: Hazan.
- Austen, Jane (1954) *Orgueil et préjugés (PP)*, trans. Luce Clarence, Paris: Tallandier.
- Austen, Jane (1980a) *Lady Susan, Les Watson, Sanditon*, trans. Josette Salesse-Lavergne, Paris: Christian Bourgois.
- Austen, Jane (1980b) *Northanger Abbey*, trans. Josette Salesse-Lavergne, Paris: Christian Bourgois.
- Austen, Jane (1980c) *Persuasion*, trans. André Belamich, afterword Henri Plard, Paris: Christian Bourgois; reissue of Belamich 1945.
- Austen, Jane (1981) *Mansfield Park*, trans. Denise Getzler, Paris: Christian Bourgois.
- Austen, Jane (1982) *Emma*, trans. Josette Salesse-Lavergne, Paris: UGE.
- Austen, Jane (1984) *Juvenilia et autres textes (Juvenilia)*, trans. Josette Salesse-Lavergne, Paris: Christian Bourgois.
- Austen, Jane (1996a) *Raison et sentiments*, trans. Isabelle de Montolieu (1815), rev. Hélène Seyrès, Paris: Omnibus.
- Austen, Jane (1996b) *Romans*, Paris: Omnibus; vol. 1: *Raison et sentiments*, trans. Jean Privat (1948); *Orgueil et préjugés*, trans. Valentine Leconte and Charlotte Pressoir (1932); *Emma*, trans. Josette Salesse-Lavergne (1982); *Lady Susan*, trans. Josette Salesse-Lavergne (1980); vol. 2: *Northanger Abbey*, trans. Josette Salesse-Lavergne (1982); *Mansfield Park*, trans. Denise Getzler (1981); *Persuasion*, trans. André Belamich (1945); *Les Watson, Sanditon*, trans. Josette Salesse-Lavergne (1980).

- Austen, Jane (1997a) *Emma*, trans. Pierre Nordon, Paris: Librairie générale française.
- Austen, Jane (1997b) *Emma*, trans. Hélène Seyrès, Paris: L'Archipel.
- Austen, Jane (2000) *Œuvre romanesques complètes*, ed. Pierre Goubert, 'Collection La Pléiade' part 1: *La Cœur et la raison*, trans. Pierre Goubert; *Orgueil et préjugé (PP)*, trans. Jean-Paul Pichardie; *L'Abbaye de Northanger (NA)*, trans. Pierre Arnaud, Paris: Gallimard.
- Austen, Jane (2001) *Orgueil et préjugé (PP)*, trans. Béatrice Vierende, Monaco: Editions du Rocher.
- Baignères, Claude (1997) 'Emma l'entremetteuse, la critique, autour d'une tasse de thé', *Le Figaro* [Paris], 28 May, 30.
- Béhar, Henri (1997) 'Emma l'entremetteuse' [film review], *Le Monde* [Paris], 29 May, 32.
- Béloeil, Marie (2004) 'Le Net littéraire avec *Le Monde*: à la recherche de Jane Austen', *Le Monde* [Paris], 8 October, 2.
- Bernard, Catherine (2001) *Jane Austen, 'Pride and Prejudice', dans l'œil du paradoxe*, Paris: Ellipses.
- Blanzat, Jean (1946) 'Les Romans de la semaine: *Persuasion* et *Catherine Morland* de Jane Austen', *Le Figaro littéraire* [Paris], 22 June, 4.
- Bouzet, Ange-Dominique (2004) '"Bollywood" fait la noce', *Libération* [Paris], 22 December, 5.
- Castex, Peggy and Alain Jumeau (1992) *Les Grands Classiques de la littérature anglaise et américaine*, Paris: Hachette.
- Clarence, Luce (trans.) (1954) *Orgueil et préjugés (PP)*, Paris: Tallandier.
- Colombani, Florence (2004) 'Coup de foudre à Bollywood, de Gurinder Chadha: rêves de mariage et soleils couchants déployés sur trois continents. Une comédie musicale tournée vers l'Amérique', *Le Monde* [Paris], 22 December, 22.
- Coppermann, Annie (1996a) 'Raison et sentiments, d'Ang Lee, les peines de cœur de deux demoiselles anglaises' [film review], *Les Echos* [Paris], 28 February, 47.
- Coppermann, Annie (1996b) 'Emma, de Douglas McGrath: marivaudages dans un jardin anglais' [film review], *Les Echos* [Paris], 28 May, 47.
- Cornu, Francis (2003) 'Orgueil et préjugés' [film review], *Le Monde, supplément télévision* [Paris], 1 February, 8.
- Coustillas, Pierre, Jean-Pierre Petit and Jean Raimond (1978) *Le Roman anglais au XIXe siècle*, Paris: Presses universitaires de France.
- Danchin, Fernand (1949) *Jane Austen: Chapters from Her Novels*, Paris: Didier.
- Delatte, F. (1934) 'La Traduction de *Pride and Prejudice* de Jane Austen', *Revue de l'enseignement des langues vivantes* [Paris], 51: 213–14.
- Dottin, Paul (1931) *La Littérature anglaise*, Paris: Armand Colin.
- Dupont, Victor (1968) *Cinq Leçons de littérature anglaise*, Toulouse: Faculté des lettres et sciences humaines.
- Gide, André (1996) *Journal 1887–1925*, Paris: Gallimard.
- Gide, André (1997) *Journal 1926–1950*, Paris: Gallimard.
- Ginestier, Paul and John Hoyles (1965) *Littérature anglaise*, Paris: Bordas.
- Goubert, Pierre (1975) *Jane Austen: étude psychologique de la romancière*, Paris: Presses universitaires de France.
- Goubert, Pierre (trans.) (2000) *Le Cœur et la raison (SS)*, in *Œuvres romanesques complètes*, Paris: Gallimard.
- Grassin, Sophie (1996) 'Emma, c'est elle' [film review], *L'Express* [Paris], 29 February, 109.

- Green, Julien (1961) *Journal*, 2 vols, Paris: Plon.
- Grellet, Françoise and M.-H. Valentin (1984) *From Sidney to Sillitoe: An Introduction to English Literature*, Paris: Hachette.
- Guibillon, Georges (1925) *La Littérature anglaise par les textes*, Paris: Hatier.
- Hernandez, Brigitte (2001) 'Le Journal de Bridget Jones' [film review], *Le Point* [Paris], 5 October, 132.
- Koszul, André (1921) *Anthologie de la littérature anglaise: extraits traduits des principaux poètes et prosateurs, Introduction historique et notices*, 2 vols, Paris: Delagrave.
- Laffay, Albert and H. Kerst (1960) *Initiation à la littérature anglaise*, Paris: Masson.
- Lalou, René (1944) *La Littérature anglaise des origines à nos jours*, Paris: Presses universitaires de France.
- Larbaud, Valéry (1971) 'Diary entry, summer 1919', *Cahiers des amis de Valéry Larbaud* [Vichy], 7 (May): 51–54.
- Laroque, François, Alain Morvan and Frédéric Regard (1997) *Histoire de la littérature anglaise*, Paris: Presses universitaires de France.
- Legouis, Emile and Louis Cazamian (1924) *Histoire de la littérature anglaise*, Paris: Hachette; trans. (1957) *A History of English Literature* [1926–27], London: Dent.
- Letellier, Catherine (1999) *Lectures d'une œuvre: 'Pride and Prejudice', Jane Austen*, Paris: Editions du Temps.
- Mercier, Michel (1976) *Le Roman féminin*, Paris: Presses universitaires de France.
- Mérigaud, Pascal (1996) 'Le feu des passions sous l'éteignoir des convenances: *Raison et sentiments*' [film review], *Le Monde* [Paris], 29 February, 27.
- Métral, Isabelle (ed.) (1982) *An Anthology of English Literature*, general ed. Michel Viel, vol. 3: *From 1798 to 1901*, Paris: SEDES.
- Pascal, Michel (1996) 'Les Demoiselles d'Angleterre' [film review], *Le Point* [Paris], 24 February, 88.
- Pascal, Michel (1997) 'Emma l'entremetteuse' [film review], *Le Point* [Paris], 2 June, 120.
- Peron, Didier (1996) 'Le dernier Jodie Foster, et le dernier Ang Lee: hystérie convenue et camomille. Ni sucrés, ni salés' [film review], *Libération* [Paris], 2 March, 33.
- Privat, Jean (trans.) (1946) *Orgueil et préjugés (PP)*, Paris: Editions des Loisirs.
- Privat, Jean (trans.) (1948) *Marianne et Elinor (SS)*, Paris: Editions des Loisirs.
- Rague, Kate and Paul (1914) *Jane Austen*, 'Les Grands Ecrivains étrangers' series, Paris: Bloud et Gay.
- Raimond, Jean (1986) *La Littérature anglaise*, Paris: Presses universitaires de France.
- Rancès, Maurice (1948) *Through English Literature: An Anthology of the Chief British and American Writers with Brief Literary Sketches; A travers la littérature anglaise*, Paris: Hachette.
- Rérat, A. (1929) *'Thus Sang They': morceaux choisis de littérature anglaise; avec thèmes et sujets de composition anglaise*, Paris: Belin.
- Rocart, Eugène (trans.) (1945) *Orgueil et préjugés (PP)*, Brussels: Editions La Boétie.
- Roger, Georges (1941) *Littérature anglaise: textes choisis*, Paris: Didier.
- Roulon, Nathalie (1999) *'Pride and Prejudice' by Jane Austen*, Paris: Ellipses.
- Royer, Philippe (1996) 'Cinema', *La Croix* [Paris], 11 April, 11.
- Shops, R. and A.-V. Séverac (trans.) (1946) *Orgueil et préventions (PP)*, Brussels: Le Carrefour.

- Teyssandier, Hubert (1977) *Les Formes de la création romanesque à l'époque de Walter Scott et de Jane Austen 1814–1820*, Paris: Didier.
- Thomas, Sotinel (2001) 'Le Prix d'une livre d'acteur: *Le Journal de Bridget Jones*' [film review], *Le Monde* [Paris], 10 October, 32.
- Thomas, Walter (1909) *Littérature anglaise*, Paris: Larousse.
- Vergnas, Raymond las (1949) 'Carte du tendre et esprit de Noël', *Hommes et mondes* [Paris], 8.3 (January): 155–59.
- Villard, Léonie (1915) *Jane Austen, sa vie et son œuvre, 1775–1817*, Lyon: A. Rey; incomplete English trans. Veronica Lucas (1924), London: G. Routledge & Sons.
- Welcomme, Geneviève (2004) 'Coup de foudre à Bollywood' [film review], *La Croix* [Paris], 29 December, 15.

Chapter 4: Going Dutch: The Reception of Jane Austen in the Low Countries

- Brinkman, Sophie (trans.) (1999) *Jane Austen liefde en vriendschap: citaten uit haar romans*, Hoevelaken: Verba.
- Brinkman, Sophie and Maarten Spierdijk (trans.) (1997) *Catherine (NA)*, Groningen: BoekWerk.
- Brunt, Maria Paulina (trans.) (1953) *Het late inzicht (P)*, Amsterdam: P. N. van Kampen & Zoon N. V.
- Burke, Henry G. (1985) 'Seeking Jane in Foreign Tongues', *Persuasions* [Victoria, BC; New York], 7: 16–20.
- Carette, Bart (trans.) (1969) *Trots en vooroordeel (PP)*, Antwerp: W. Beckers.
- Conscience, Hendrik (1996) *De leeuw van Vlaanderen of de slag der gulden sporen* [1838], Louvain: Uitgeverij Davidsfonds & Clauwaert.
- Dorsman-Vos, W. A. (trans.) (1980) *Waan en eighewaan (PP)*, Utrecht: Spectrum; repr. 1995, 1996, 1997.
- Dorsman-Vos, W. A. (trans.) (1982) *Verstand en onverstand (SS)*, Utrecht: Spectrum; repr. 2000.
- Dorsman-Vos, W. A. (trans.) (1984) *Mansfield Park*, Utrecht; Wijnegem: Het Spectrum; repr. 1986.
- Dorsman-Vos, W. A. (trans.) (1987) *Overreding en overtuiging (P)*, Utrecht: Het Spectrum.
- Gilson, David (2003) 'Jane Austen and Europe', *The Book Collector* [London], 52: 31–45.
- Haan, M. H. de (1935) 'De Invloed van Richardson op Jane Austen en op Nederlandse Auteurs', *De nieuwe taalgids* [Groningen], 29: 274–80.
- Hageland, Albert van (trans.) (1971) *Rede en gevoel: roman (SS)*, Strombeek-Bever: De Schorpioen.
- Jacobs, Jean H. P. (trans.) (1956) *Heldin op hol (NA)*, Hasselt: Heideveld.
- Jong, Akkie de (trans.) (1996) *Emma*, Groningen: BoekWerk; repr. 1998.
- Jong, Akkie de (trans.) (2005) *De Watsons; Sanditon*, Leidschendam: Kepmer & BoekWerk.
- Kloos-Reyneke van Stuwe, Jeanne (1939a) 'Jane Austen: een der meest beroemde engelse schrijfsters uit den tijd van Walter Scott', *De nieuwe gids* [Amsterdam], 54.1: 268–71, 402–05, 530–53, 687–89.

- Kloos-Reyneke van Stuwe, Jeanne (1939b) 'Jane Austen: een der meest beroemde engelse schrijfsters uit den tijd van Walter Scott', *De nieuwe gids* [Amsterdam], 54.2: 148–50, 271–74, 399–402, 804–08, 984–86.
- Kossmann, E. H. (1988) *The Low Countries: 1780–1940*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Leach-Reitsma, Jenny (1980) 'Afterword' to Polderman-de Vries (1980), pp. 410–16.
- Luijters, Guus (1977) *Jane Austen*, The Hague: Horus.
- Meiborg, Elke (trans.) (1994) *Gevoel en verstand* (SS), Groningen: BoekWerk; repr. 1996 (3 times), 1997, 1998.
- Meiborg, Elke (trans.) (1996) *Overtuiging* (P), Groningen: BoekWerk.
- Meiborg, Elke (trans.) (1997) *Troots en vooroordeel* (PP), Groningen: BoekWerk; repr. 1998.
- Polderman-de Vries, Carolien (trans.) (1980) *Emma*, Utrecht: Spectrum; repr. 1996.
- Praag-van Praag, Henrietta Emma van (trans.) (1964) *De gezusters Bennet* (PP), Amsterdam: L.J. Veen; repr. 1980, 1983, 1984, 2005.
- Remoortel, Marianne van (2002) 'A Belgian Introduction', in *Jane Austen Society of Australia Newsletter*, July <<http://www.jasa.net.au/newsju02.htm>> [accessed 18 January 2003].
- Roeleveld, Annelies and Margret Stevens (trans.) (1996) *Emma*, Amsterdam: Athenaeum-Polak & Van Gennep; repr. 2000.
- Schröder, Johan Antoon (trans.) (1949) *Emma*, Antwerp; Amsterdam: Het Kompas & L.J. Veen; repr. 1963, 1978, 1996, 2001, 2005.
- Servotte, Herman (1965) 'Emma and Middlemarch: twee auteurromans', in *De verteller in de engelse roman: een Studie over romantechniek*, Hasselt: Uitgeverij Heideband, pp. 27–55.
- Uildriks, Hillegonda van (trans.) (1922) *Gevoel en verstand* (SS), Amsterdam: Maatschappij voor goede en goedkope lectuur; repr. 1950, 1952, 1954, [1959/60(?)].
- Verachtert, Frans (trans.) (1946) *Troots en vooroordeel* (PP), illus. Nelly Degouy, Diest: Pro Arte.
- Wassink, Anneke (2000) 'Jane Austen in Holland', in *Jane Austen Society of Australia Newsletter*, December <<http://www.jasa.net.au/newsdc00.htm>> [accessed 18 January 2003].
- Wellens, Oskar ([2001]) 'Jane by Any Other Name: The Dutch Translations of Jane Austen', in *The Jane Austen Magazine* <<http://www.janeausten.co.uk/magazine/index.ihtml?pid=200&step=4>> [accessed 18 January 2003].
- Zuidema, Ben (trans.) (1997) *Mansfield Park*, Groningen: BoekWerk.

Chapter 5: The Reception of Jane Austen in Germany

- Agricola, Christiane (trans.) (1980) *Die Abtei von Northanger* (NA), Leipzig: Dietrich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung; repr. 1980, 1985.
- Agricola, Christiane (2003) correspondence with author, 13 March.

- Anon. (1816a) 'Literarische Nachrichten: Kurze Übersicht der neuesten englischen Literatur', *Jenaische Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung* [Jena; Leipzig], June.
- Anon. [Therese Huber] (1816b) 'Englische Litteratur', no. 9, Beilage: *Übersicht der neuesten Literature*, pp. 33–36, *Morgenblatt für gebildete Stände* [Stuttgart], 137 (7 June).
- Anon. (1822a) 'Wegweiser im Gebiete der Künste und Wissenschaften' [review of Lindau 1822], *Dresdener Abend-Zeitung* [Dresden], 4 September, 292.
- Anon. (1822b) review of Lindau 1822, *Morgenblatt für gebildete Stände* [Stuttgart], 21 December, 407–08.
- Anon. (1822c) review of Lindau 1822, *Zeitung für die elegante Welt* [Leipzig], 1 August (p. 1182) and 16 November.
- Anon. (1831) review of Marezoll 1830, *Blätter für literarische Unterhaltung* [Leipzig], 408.
- Anon. (1832) *Brockhaus der Zeit und Literatur*, vol. 1, Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus.
- Anon. (1864) *Brockhaus Conversations-Lexikon: allgemeine deutsche Real-Encyclopädie*, 11th edn, Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus.
- Anon. (1965) 'Emma', *Volksmacht* [Jena], 9 December.
- Anon. (1966) '18. Jahrhundert', *BZ am Abend* [Berlin], 20 January.
- Anon. (1973) 'Gefühl und Verstand', *Der Morgen* [Berlin], 31 March.
- Anon. (1998) 'Zwischen Lammkeule und Rhabarber', *Der Spiegel* [Hamburg], 1 June, 228–31.
- Arnstein, P. (1897) 'Der Anteil der Frauen an der englischen Romanliteratur', *Die Frau* [Leipzig], 4: 296–303.
- Baadke, Friedrich (2003) correspondence with author, 16 February.
- Baadke, Friedrich (2004a) correspondence with author, 5 November.
- Baadke, Friedrich (2004b) correspondence with author, 10 November.
- Barck, Simone, Martina Langermann and Siegfried Lokatis (eds) (1997) *Jedes Buch ein Abenteuer: Zensur-System und literarische Öffentlichkeit in der DDR bis Ende der sechziger Jahre*, Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Bautz, Annika (2007) *The Reception of Jane Austen and Walter Scott*, London: Continuum.
- Beck, Angelika (trans.) (1991) *Verstand und Gefühl* (SS), Frankfurt a.M.; Leipzig: Insel Verlag; repr. 1994, 1996 (4 times), 1997, 2002 (twice).
- Beck, Angelika (trans.) (1993) *Mansfield Park*, Frankfurt a.M.; Leipzig: Insel Verlag; repr. 1997, 2000.
- Beck, Angelika (1995) *Jane Austen*, Frankfurt a.M.: Insel-Verlag.
- Beck, Angelika (trans.) (1997) *Emma*, Frankfurt a.M.; Leipzig: Insel Verlag; repr. 1998.
- Beck, Angelika (2001) 'Nachwort', in *Verstand und Gefühl* (SS), trans. Helga Schulz, Düsseldorf; Zurich: Artemis & Winkler Verlag, pp. 415–25.
- Beck, Angelika (2002) 'Nachwort', in *Stolz und Vorurteil* (PP), trans. Helga Schulz, Düsseldorf; Zurich: Artemis & Winkler Verlag, pp. 453–65.
- Berger, Friedemann (2003) correspondence with author, 18 February.
- Bergmann, Fabian (1999) 'Nachwort', in *Emma*, trans. Horst Höckendorf, Stuttgart: Verlag Das Beste, pp. 473–79.
- Beyer, Werner (trans.) (1965) *Stolz und Vorurteil* (PP), Leipzig: Paul List Verlag; repr. 1967, 1970, 1978, 1982, 1983, 1984, 1986 (twice), 1987, 1988, 1990, 1991, 1992, 1993, 1995.
- Bosshard, Rosemarie (trans.) (1998) *Vernunft und Gefühl* (SS), Munich: Goldmann Verlag.
- Brosch, Renate (1984) *Eleganz und Autonomie: Die Auffassung vom Weiblichen bei Jane Austen*, Heidelberg: Winter.

Caws, Mary Ann and Nicola Luckhurst (eds) *The Reception of Virginia Woolf in Europe*,

- The Athlone Critical Traditions Series: The Reception of British and Irish Authors in Europe, series ed. Elinor Shaffer, London; New York: Continuum.
- Chambers, Helen (2000) 'Nineteenth-Century German Translations of Jane Austen', in Bachleitner, Norbert (ed.) *Beiträge zur Rezeption der britischen und irischen Literatur des 19. Jahrhunderts im deutschsprachigen Raum*, Amsterdam; Atlanta: Rodopi, pp. 231–37.
- 'D.B.' (1973) 'Gefühl und Verstand', *Sächsisches Tageblatt* [Dresden; Leipzig], 12 May.
- Emmerich, Wolfgang (1989) *Kleine Literaturgeschichte der DDR*, Frankfurt a.M.: Luchterhand Literaturverlag.
- Emmerich, Wolfgang (1997) *Kleine Literaturgeschichte der DDR* [1996], Leipzig: Gustav Kiepenheuer Verlag.
- Engel, Eduard (1883) *Geschichte der englischen Literatur von ihren Anfängen bis in die neueste Zeit*, Leipzig: Wilhelm Friedrich.
- Ersch, J. S. and J. G. Gruber (eds) (1844) *Allgemeine Encyclopädie der Wissenschaften und Künste*, Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus.
- Fahnestock, Mary Lane (1982) 'The Reception of Jane Austen in Germany: A Miniaturist in the Land of Poets and Philosophers' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Indiana).
- Fein, Trude (trans.) (1993) *Mansfield Park*, epilogue Max Wildi, Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag; reissue of 1968 Manesse (Zurich) edn.
- Findeisen, Helmut (1965) 'Nachwort', in Beyer (1965), pp. 499–506.
- Frankenberger, Julius (1910) 'Jane Austen und die Entwicklung des englischen bürgerlichen Romans im 18. Jahrhundert' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Jena).
- Franz, Wilfried (1950) 'Jane Austen und George Eliot: Zwei Antipoden im englischen Frauenroman' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Kiel).
- Grawe, Christian and Ursula (trans.) (1977) *Stolz und Vorurteil (PP)*, Stuttgart: Philipp Reclam, jun; repr. 1981, 1984, 1985, 1992, 1996, 1997, 2000, 2001.
- Grawe, Christian and Ursula (trans.) (1980) *Emma*, Stuttgart: Philipp Reclam, jun; repr. 1985, 1985, 1986, 1988, 1996, 1997, 2001.
- Grawe, Christian and Ursula (trans.) (1981) *Kloster Northanger (NA)*, Stuttgart: Philipp Reclam, jun; repr. 1984, 1985, 1992, 1996, 1998.
- Grawe, Christian and Ursula (trans.) (1982) *Verstand und Gefühl (SS)*, Stuttgart: Philipp Reclam, jun; repr. 1996 [twice], 1997, 1997, 2001.
- Grawe, Christian and Ursula (trans.) (1983) *Überredung (P)*, Stuttgart: Philipp Reclam, jun; repr. 1983, 1996, 2002.
- Grawe, Christian and Ursula (trans.) (1984) *Mansfield Park*, Stuttgart: Philipp Reclam, jun; repr. 1985, 1988, 1996, 1997, 2000, 2002.
- Grawe, Christian (1988) *Jane Austen*, Stuttgart: Philipp Reclam, jun.
- Grawe, Christian (2003a) correspondence with author, 20 March.
- Grawe, Christian (2003b) correspondence with author, 5 June.
- Gröger, Erika (trans.) (1972) *Gefühl und Verstand (SS)*, Berlin; Weimar: Aufbau-Verlag; repr. 1978, 1982, 1984, 1985, 1986, 1988, 1989, 1996, 1998.
- Heftrich, Eckhard (1984) 'Belohnte Tugend einer schönen Seele: "Mansfield Park" – der Abschluß einer Werkausgabe von Jane Austen', *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* [Frankfurt a.M.], 18 December.
- Henze, Helen (trans.) (1961) *Emma*, Frankfurt a.M.; Hamburg: Fischer Bücherei; repr. 1979 (twice), 1982, 1984, 1985, 1986, 1998, 1989, 1991 (twice), 1993, 1994.

- Höckendorf, Horst (trans.) (1965) *Emma*, Berlin; Weimar: Aufbau-Verlag; repr. 1976, 1980, 1996, 1999, 2001.
- Höckendorf, Horst (2003) correspondence with author, 12 March.
- Holscher, Helmut (trans.) (1951) *Stolz und Vorurteil* (PP), Wilhelmshaven: Hera Verlag.
- Jehmlich, Reimer (1995) *Jane Austen*, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Klinckowstroem, Charlotte Gräfin von (trans.) (1979) *Emma*, Frankfurt a.M.: Insel Verlag; repr. 1984, 1985, 1987, 1989, 1990, 1991, 1993, 1994 (twice).
- Klose, Dietrich (2003) correspondence with author, 4 June.
- Kohl, Norbert (1985) 'Essay', in *Stolz und Vorurteil* (PP), ed. Elfriede Beyvers-Kern, trans. Margarete Rauchenberger, Frankfurt a.M.: Insel Verlag, pp. 403–18.
- Körting, Gustav (1899) *Grundriss der Geschichte der englischen Literatur* [1887], Münster: Schöningh.
- Krämer, Isle (trans.) (1993) *Stolz und Vorurteil* (PP), epilogue Mary Hottinger, Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag; reissue of 1948 Manesse (Zurich) edn.
- Krause, Ursula (2003) correspondence with author, 19 February.
- Kreß, H.-J. (1983) 'Jagd nach Besitz und Macht', *Liberal-Demokratische Zeitung* [Halle; Magdeburg], 12 March.
- Leisi, Ilse (trans.) (1995) *Anne Elliot* (P), epilogue Max Wildi, Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag; reissue of 1966 Manesse (Zurich) edn.
- Leisi, Ilse (trans.) (1996) *Emma*, epilogue Max Wildi, Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag; reissue of 1981 Manesse (Zurich) edn.
- Leupold, Dagmar (2000) 'Das Taschenbuch. Jane Austen: Verstand und Gefühl', *Die Welt* [Hamburg], 30 September.
- Lindau, Wilhelm Adolf (trans.) (1822) *Anna: Ein Familiengemälde* (P), Leipzig: Christian Ernst Kollmann.
- Links, Roland (2003) correspondence with author, 14 March.
- Lukács, Georg (1920) *Die Theorie des Romans*, Berlin: Cassirer.
- Lukács, Georg (1955a) *Der Historische Roman*, Berlin: Aufbau-Verlag; 1st pub. 1937 in Russian.
- Lukács, Georg (1955b) *Probleme des Realismus*, Berlin: Aufbau-Verlag.
- Maes, Elke (2003) correspondence with author, 17 January.
- Maletzke, Elsemarie (1997) *Jane Austen*, Frankfurt a.M.: Schöffling.
- Mander, Gertrud (1981) 'Feine Spiele: Jane Austen erprobt sich', *Rheinischer Merkur* [Bonn], 4 December.
- Marezoll, Karoline Louise Friederike (trans.) (1830) *Stolz und Vorurtheil* (PP), Leipzig: C. H. F. Hartmann.
- Martynkewicz, Wolfgang (1995) *Jane Austen*, Reinbek-bei-Hamburg: Rowohlt.
- Meyer, Margit (trans.) (1989) *Mansfield Park*, ed. Klaus Udo Szudra, Berlin; Weimar: Aufbau-Verlag; repr. 1990, 1992, 1994, 2000.
- Meyer, Margit (2003) correspondence with author, 28 March.
- Münch, Detlef (2005) bibliography, *Rezension & die schönsten Zitate der deutschsprachigen Ausgaben von Jane Austen 1822–2005*, Dortmund: Synergen-Verlag.
- Neubert, Albrecht (1955) 'Die entwicklung der "Erlebten Rede" im bürgerlichen englischen Roman von Jane Austen bis Virginia Woolf' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Leipzig).
- Nohl, Andreas (1992) 'Jane Austen', *Die Zeit* [Hamburg], 24 January.
- Nünning, Ansgar and Vera (2002) 'The German Reception and Criticism of Virginia

- Woolf: A Survey of Phrases and Trends in the Twentieth Century', in Caws and Luckhurst, pp. 68–101.
- Oesterreich, Helga (1965) 'Das Gespräch im Roman: Untersucht im Werk von Defoe, Fielding und Jane Austen' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Münster).
- Rauchenberger, Margaret (trans.) (1948a) *Anne Elliot (P)*, Cologne: Schaffrath; repr. 1988, 1990, 1994.
- Rauchenberger, Margaret (trans.) (1948b) *Die Abtei von Northanger (NA)*, Cologne: Schaffrath; repr. 1986, 1987, 1990, 1992, 1994.
- Rauchenberger, Margaret (trans.) (1948c) *Stolz und Vorurteil (PP)*, Cologne: Schaffrath; repr. 1983, 1985, 1988, 1989, 1991, 1994, 1997, 2000.
- Reichel, Gisela (trans.) (1968) *Die Liebe der Anne Elliot (P)*, Weimar: Gustav Kiepenheuer Verlag; repr. 1971, 1974.
- Rohmann, Gerd (1970) 'Jane Austen: *Pride and Prejudice*: Auktorialer Kommentar und Perspektivtechnik', *Die neueren Sprachen* [Frankfurt a.M.], 69: 455–61.
- Schab, Karin von (trans.) (1939) *Elisabeth und Darcy (PP)*, Berlin: Frundsberg; repr. 2001.
- Schneidenbach, Elfi (1980) 'Nachwort', in *Emma*, trans. Horst Höckendorf, Leipzig: Philipp Reclam, jun., pp. 459–72.
- Schrick, Annegret (1986) *Jane Austen und die weibliche Modellbiographie des 18. Jahrhunderts: Eine strukturelle und ideologiekritische Untersuchung zur Zentralfigur bei Jane Austen*, Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag.
- Schulz, Helga (trans.) (1997) *Stolz und Vorurteil (PP)*, Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag; repr. 1999, 2002.
- Schulz, Helga (trans.) (2000) *Verstand und Gefühl (SS)*, Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag; repr. 2001, 2002.
- Schulz, Helga (trans.) (2002) *Mansfield Park*, Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag.
- Stegmaier, Edmund (1970) 'Die Auflösung der Szene im Übergang vom traditionellen zum modernen englischen Roman: Dargestellt an Hauptwerken Jane Austens, Joseph Conrads und Virginia Woolfs' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Tübingen).
- Steuhl, Wolfgang (1988) 'In Kürze. Christian Grawe: Jane Austen', *Die Zeit* [Hamburg], 11 November.
- Sühnel, Rudolf (1961) 'Nachwort' to Henze, pp. 348–51.
- Szudra, Klaus Udo (1965) 'Nachwort' to Höckendorf, pp. 521–32.
- Szudra, Klaus Udo (1989) 'Nachwort' to Meyer, pp. 513–34.
- Thompson, Emma (1996) *Hinter den Kulissen von Sinn und Sinnlichkeit*, trans. Sonja Funke, Munich: Heyne; trans. (1995) *The Sense and Sensibility Screenplay and Diaries: Bringing Jane Austen's Novel to Film*.
- Voigt, Amalie von (1831) review of Marezoll 1830, *Jenaische Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung* [Jena; Leipzig], 52 (March): 413.
- 'W.R.' (1982) 'Jane Austins [*sic*] erster Roman', *Coburger Tageblatt* [Coburg], 1 November.
- Whately, Richard (1821) unsigned review of *NA* and *P*, *Quarterly Review* [London], January, 352–76.
- Wicht, Wolfgang (2002) 'Installing Modernism: The Reception of Virginia Woolf in the German Democratic Republic', in Caws and Luckhurst, pp. 102–26.
- Winter, Helmut (1982) 'Spannung aus dem Nichts: Zwei Romane von Jane Austen in neuen Übersetzungen', *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* [Frankfurt a.M.], 7 January.

Winter, Helmut (1983) 'Kühle Präzision: Jane Austen Roman "Verstand und Gefühl"', *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* [Frankfurt a.M.], 5 February.

Chapter 6: 'Unconditional surrender'? Jane Austen's Reception in Denmark

Auring, Steffen and others (1984) *Dansk litteraturhistorie*, vol. 5, Copenhagen: Gyldendal.

Bagger, Carl (1834) *Smaadigte*, Copenhagen: [n. pub.].

Bergsøe, Flemming (1950) *John Bull og hans nabo: indtryk fra en rejse i England og Eire 1949*, Copenhagen: Thaning & Appel.

Bodelsen, C. A. (1929a) *Engelske essays*, Copenhagen: Gyldendal.

Bodelsen, C. A. (1929b) *Moderne engelsk skønlitteratur*, Copenhagen: Gyldendal.

Brandes, Georg (1966) *Hovedstrømninger i det nittende århundredes litteratur*, vol. 4, Copenhagen: Jespersen & Pio.

Brusendorff, Ebba (trans.) (1928–30) *Stolthed og fordom (PP)*, Copenhagen: Gyldendal.

Davidson-Nielsen, David, Erik Hansen and Pia Jarvad (eds) (1999) *Engelsk eller ikke-engelsk? That is the question*, Copenhagen: Gyldendal.

Even-Zohar, Itamar (2001) 'The Position of Translated Literature with the Literary Polysystem', in Venuti, Lawrence (ed.) *The Translation Studies Reader*, London: Routledge, pp. 192–97.

Grell, Helge (1992) *England og Grundtvig*, Aarhus: Aarhus University Press.

Grosen, Uffe (1945) *Danmark og England: mod vinduet i vest*, Copenhagen: Nyt Nordisk Forlag.

Haberland, Helmut and others (1991) 'Tak for mad! Om sprogæderi med dansk som livret', in Jørgensen, J. Normann (ed.) *Det danske sprogs status år 2001: er dansk et truet sprog?*, Copenhagen: Danmarks Lærerhøjskole, pp. 111–38.

Hellstrom, Ward (1965) 'Francophobia in *Emma*', *Studies in English Literature 1500–1900* [Texas], 5: 607–17.

Hemmer Hansen, Eva (trans.) (1974) *Fornuft og følelse (SS)*, Copenhagen: Hernov; repr. 1996.

Hemmer Hansen, Eva (trans.) (1975) *Kærlighed og svaghed (P)*, Copenhagen: Hernov; repr. 1996.

Hertel, Hans (2003) 'Armstrong, Bogart, Churchill . . . Penguin: The Danish Turn to Anglo-American Cultural Values from the 1920 to the 1950s', in Sevaldsen, Jørgen, Bo Bjørke and Claus Bjørn (eds) *Britain and Denmark: Political, Economic and Cultural Relations in the 19th and 20th Centuries*, Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, pp. 431–75.

Jensen, Johannes V. (1901) *Den gotiske renæssance*, Copenhagen: Gyldendal.

Karup, Carl (trans.) (1855–56) *Forstand og hjerte (SS)*, 3 vols, Køge: Ludvig Jordan.

Kastor Hansen, Johanne (trans.) (1958) *Emma*, Copenhagen: Martin.

Kastor Hansen, Johanne (trans.) (1974) *Mansfield Park*, 2 vols, Copenhagen: Hernov.

Knudsen, Helge (1950) *Det nye England*, Copenhagen: Gyldendal.

Knudsen, Mogens (1945) *Dr Johnson og hans muntre England*, Copenhagen: Asa.

- Kruuse, Jens (trans.) (1945) *Lady Susan*, Copenhagen: Carit Andersen.
 Kruuse, Jens (1955) *Mesterværker*, Copenhagen: Hasselbalch.
- Mansfield, Katherine (1930) *Novels and Novelists*, ed. John Middleton Murry, London: Constable.
- Mikkelsen, Aslaug (1942) *Foreganskvinder i engelsk litteratur*, Copenhagen: Haase, pp. 90–116.
- More, Hannah (1799) *Strictures on the Modern System of Female Education*, London: T. Cadell & W. Davies.
- Mortensen, Peter (2004) *British Romanticism and Continental Influences: Writing in an Age of Europhobia*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Nielsen, Jonna Wennerstøm (2001) *Jane Austen: hendes liv og forfatterskab*, Copenhagen: Hernov.
- Nielsen, Jørgen Erik (1977) *Den samtidige engelske litteratur og Danmark, 1800–1840*, 2 vols, Copenhagen: Nova.
- Ørum, Tania (1985) *Pamelas døtre: romanen og kønnet*, Copenhagen: Tiderne Skifter.
- Østergaard, Claus Bratt (1987) *Romanens tid: om køn og civilisation i det 18. og 19. århundredes fiktion*, Copenhagen: Basilisk.
- Petersen, Per Serritslev (ed.) (1979) *On the First Sentence of 'Pride and Prejudice': A Critical Discussion of the Theory and Practice of Literary Interpretation*, Aarhus: Aarhus University Press.
- Pihl, Louise (trans.) (1975) *Catherine: Northanger abbedi (NA)*, Copenhagen: Hernov.
- Pihl, Louise (trans.) (1978) *Emma*, Copenhagen: Hernov; repr. 1996, 1997, 1998.
- Plon, Lilian (trans.) (1952) *Stolthed og fordom (PP)*, Copenhagen: Hirschsprung; repr. 1962, 1970, 1976, 1988, 1996, 2000.
- Rasmussen, Steen Eiler (1952) *Rejse i England: en dagbog i tegninger og ord*, Copenhagen: Carit Andersen.
- Ringsted, Henrik (1949) *En have i London*, Copenhagen: Thaning & Appel.
- Sørensen, Knud (2000) *Dickens på Dansk: L. Moltkes og Eva Hemmer Hansens oversættelser af 'Bleak House'*, Odense: Odense University Press.
- Trilling, Lionel (1966) 'Emma and the Legend of Jane Austen', in *Beyond Culture: Essays on Literature and Learning*, London: Secker & Warburg, pp. 31–55.
- Troost, Linda and Sayre Greenfield (eds) (1998) *Jane Austen in Hollywood*, Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky.
- Wollstonecraft, Mary (1987) *A Short Residence in Sweden, Norway and Denmark [1795]*, ed. Richard Holmes, London: Penguin.

Chapter 7: Jane Austen and Norway: Sharing the Long Road to Recognition

- Aasen, Elisabeth (1993) *Driftige damer: lærde og ledende kvinner gjennom tidene*, Oslo: Pax.
- Alfsen, Merete (trans.) (1996) *Emma*, Oslo: Aschehoug.
- Alfsen, Merete (trans.) (1997) *Fornuft og følelse (SS)*, Oslo: Aschehoug.
- Alfsen, Merete (trans.) (1998) *Overtalelse (P)*, Oslo: Aschehoug.

- Alfsen, Merete (trans.) (2000) *Mansfield Park*, Oslo: Aschehoug.
- Alfsen, Merete (trans.) (2003) *Stolthet og fordom (PP)*, Oslo: Aschehoug.
- Anderssen, Otto (1902) *A Short History of English Literature*, Christiania: Det Norske Aktieförlag.
- Arpas, Inger Helene (1996) 'Stolthet og fordom', *Familien* [Oslo], 9: 4–16.
- Austen-Leigh, Mary Augusta (1920) *Personal Aspects of Jane Austen*, London: John Murray.
- Autenrieth, A. (1844) *The English Reader: A Selection of Prose and Poetry from the Best British Authors; For the Use of Schools and Private Tuition*, Christiania: Peter Tidemand Malling.
- Barnard, M. R. (1862) *Sketches of Eminent English Authors, with Extracts from their Works, Adapted for Use in Schools, and for Advanced Pupils in the English Language*, Christiania: Peter Tidemand Malling.
- Baugstø, Line (1996) 'Jane Austen: topp underholdning fra 1700-tallet', *KK* [Oslo], 52: 44–45.
- Bendeke, J. F. (1879) *Kort oversigt over den engelske literatur*, Trondhiem: Jacob Andersens Enke.
- Bing, Just (1929) *Verdens-litteraturhistorie: grunnlinjer og hovedverker*, vol. 2, Oslo: Aschehoug.
- Böök, Fredrik (1929) *Romantikken i Tyskland og England: Bonniers illustrerede litteraturhistoria*, vol. 3, Stockholm: Albert Bonniers Forlag.
- Bull, Francis (1947) *Verdenslitteraturens historie* [1941], Oslo: Gyldendal.
- Caplex (2006) 'Austen, Jane', in Caplex <<http://www.caplex.no/Web/ArticleView.aspx?id=9300849>> [accessed 15 May 2006].
- Clausen, Julius (ed.) (1898–1901) *Illustreret verdens-litteraturhistorie: under medvirkning af en kres af fag- og videnskabsmænd*, 3 vols, Copenhagen: Gyldendal.
- Ek, Grete (1975) 'Mistaken conduct and proper "feeling": A Study of Jane Austen's *Pride and Prejudice*', in Røstvig, Maren Sofie (ed.) *Fair Forms: Essays in English Literature from Spenser to Jane Austen*, Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, pp. 178–202.
- Eliassen, Knut Ove (2004) '“Money Makes the World Go around . . .”: noen betraktninger om penger og kvinner i Jane Austens *Sense and Sensibility* 1811', *Motskrift* [Trondheim], 2: 3–10.
- Fehr, Drude von der (1983) 'Integritet eller naiv akseptasjon? Om kjønnsforskjeller i litteraturen: en sammenlignende analyse av Stendhal Rødt og sort, Flaubert Fru Bovary, Austen Emma og Brontë Jane Eyre', *Edda* [Oslo], 6: 349–70.
- Hansen, Svend Einar (2002) *Verdens største forfattere*, Oslo: Norsk fakta forlag.
- Harbitz, Alf (trans.) (1930) *Elizabeth og hennes søstre (PP)*, Oslo: Aschehoug.
- Hareide, Jorunn (2002) 'Etterord', in Alfsen (2002), pp. 441–47.
- Hauge, Eivind and Elisabeth (trans.) (1970) *Stolthet og fordom (PP)*, Oslo: Samlerens Bokklubb.
- Hawthorn, Jeremy (2001) *Studying the Novel* [1985], London: Edward Arnold.
- Johannessen, Harald (2001) 'Jane Austen og "den polerte utside"', *Norsk filosofisk tidsskrift* [Oslo], 36.1–2: 39–50.
- Knutsen, Lalli (trans.) (1947) *Stolthet og fordom (PP)*, Oslo: Nasjonalforlaget.

- Krabbe, Henning (1972) 'Engelsk litteratur', in Beyer, Edvard and others (eds) *Romantikken 1800–1830: Verdens litteraturhistorie*, Oslo: Cappelen, 202–12.
- Krag, Helena (1980) 'La døren knirke: Jane Austen 1775–1817', *Sirene* [Oslo], 8: 10–12.
- Kvanvig, Gerd (1999) 'Allment aksepterte sannheter om Jane Austens forfatterskap: til opplysning: en kjærlighetserklæring', *Vinduet* [Oslo], 53.3: 43–44.
- Langholm, Odd Inge (1996) 'Etterord', in Alfsen (1996), pp. 449–59.
- Larsen, Ida Lou (1980) 'Det tok Jane Austen 14 år å finne forlegger!', *Sirene* [Oslo], 8: 12–13.
- Lid, Inger (1996) 'Jane Austens herlige Emma', *Hjemmet* [Oslo], 48: 8.
- Lodén, Eirik (2003) 'Jane Austen: "Stolthet og fordom" – litterær lekkerbiscen', *Stavanger aftenblad* [Stavanger], 5 April.
- Løkke, Jakob (1875) *Engelske forfattere i udvalg: med biografiske indledninger og oplysende anmærkninger*, Copenhagen: Gyldendalske Boghandel.
- Møller, Niels (1929) *Verdenslitteraturen: fornufttiden, romantik og naturalisme*, vol. 3, Copenhagen: Gyldendal.
- Nessheim, Ragnhild Vindhol (2003) 'Fact in Jane Austen's Fiction', in Lothe, Jakob, Juan Christian Pellicer and Tore Rem (eds) *Literary Sineus: Essays in Honour of Bjørn Tysdahl*, Oslo: Novus Forlag, pp. 147–63.
- Øhrgaard, Per (1987) 'Engelsk romantikk: natur, industrialisering, eksil', in Hertel, Hans (ed.) *Verdens litteraturhistorie*, Oslo: Gyldendal, pp. 278–79.
- Øksnevad, Reidar (1949) *Det britiske samvelde og Eire i norsk litteratur: en bibliografi*, Oslo: Gyldendal.
- Olsen, Stein Haugom (1977) 'Do you like Emma Woodhouse?', *Critical Quarterly* [Oxford], 19.4: 3–19.
- Olsen, Stein Haugom (1986) 'Appreciating *Pride and Prejudice*', in Hawthorn, Jeremy (ed.) *The Nineteenth-Century British Novel*, London: Edward Arnold, pp. 1–14.
- Ross, Immanuel (1880) *Om den engelske romans og novelles udvikling fra middelalderen til nutiden, tildels belyst ved Citater*, Bergen: Floors Forlag.
- Schmidt, Kari-Anne Rand (1980) 'Male and Female Language in Jane Austen's Novels', First Nordic Conference for English Studies, Oslo: Institute of English Studies, University of Oslo.
- Schück, Henrik (1925) *Romantiken: allmän litteraturhistoria*, vol. 6, Stockholm: Geber.
- Schüssler, Inger Johanne (2002) 'Georgette Heyer: litt Jane Austen, litt Agatha Christie', *Vinduet* [Oslo], 21 October <<http://www.vinduet.no/tekst.asp?id=291>> [accessed 15 May 2006].
- Schüssler, Inger Johanne (2003) 'Fanny Burney beredte grunnen for Jane Austen', *Bokvennen* [Oslo], 15.1: 46–47.
- Sherry, Ruth (1988) *Studying Women's Writing: An Introduction*, London: Edward Arnold.
- Sorbø, Marie Nedregotten (2003) 'Can Narrative Irony Be Preserved on Film? A Comment on Four Adaptations', *Literature and Visual Culture*, Reykjavik: Norlit, University of Iceland.
- Sorbø, Marie Nedregotten (2004) 'Portrett av ei dame: Jane Austen i skandinaviske litteraturhistorier', in Granaas, Rakel Christina, Geir Hjorthol and Nora Simonhjell (eds) *Mellom sann skrift og mytisk røynd: festskrift til Jan Inge Sorbø i høve 50 års-dagen*, Volda: Høgskulen i Volda, pp. 76–95.

- Sørbo, Marie Nedregotten (2005a) 'Can Narrative Irony Be Transferred to the Screen? A Comment on Four Adaptations', in Kristjánsdóttir, Dagný (ed.) *Literature and Visual Culture*, Reykjavik: University of Iceland Press, pp. 373–84.
- Sørbo, Marie Nedregotten (2005b) 'The Latecomer: Jane Austen in Norwegian Schools', *Språk og språkundervisning* [Oslo], 1: 29–35 and 2: 15.
- Sørbo, Marie Nedregotten (2006) *Adapting Austen: A Discussion of Some Problems of Adapting Ironic Novels for the Screen*, Work Report 197, Volda: Volda University College & Møre Research.
- Steigan, Pål (1995) *Verdenslitteraturen: minileksikon*, Oslo: Cappelen.
- Tysdahl, Bjørn (1998) 'Etterord', in Alfsen (1998), pp. 237–44.
- Ullmann, Linn (1997) 'Etterord', in Alfsen (1997), pp. 343–48.
- Undset, Sigrid (1917) 'Hundrede aar: fra Jane Austen til Henrik Ibsen', *Tidens tegn* [Oslo], 15 April.
- Vislie, Lise (1996) 'Jane Austen: den lille kvinnen som skrev de store romanene', *Familien* [Oslo], 9: 2.

Chapter 8: Jane Austen's Reception in Sweden: Irony as Criticism and Literary Value

- Algulin, Ingemar (1990) 'Kvinnliga samhällsskildrare', in Olsson, Bernt (ed.) *Litteraturens historia i världen*, Stockholm: Norstedt, pp. 332–37.
- Anon. (1772) 'Strödde anmärkningar', *Frintimmers-tidningar* [Stockholm], 12: 95–96.
- Anon. (trans.) (1857–58) *Emma: eller talangen att uppgöra partier för sina vänner (E)*, Linköping: Nytt Kabinetts-Bibliothek af Blandad Svensk och Utländsk Romanlitteratur.
- Beckman, Åsa (1997) 'En kär parkvakt: Jane Austens roman *Mansfield Park* på svenska för första gången', *Dagens nyheter* [Stockholm], 3 June, B2.
- Bergvall, Sonja (trans.) (1956) *Emma*, Stockholm: Forum; repr. 1982, 1993, 1996 (twice), 1997, 1998.
- Bergvall, Sonja (trans.) (1977) *Sanditon*, Jane Austen och en annan dam [by Jane Austen and another lady (i.e. Anne Telscombe)], Stockholm: Rabén & Sjögren.
- Björkman, Margareta (1992) *Läsarnas nöje: kommersiella lånbibliotek i Stockholm 1783–1809*, Uppsala: Skrifter Utgivna av Avdelningen för Litteratursociologi vid Litteraturvetenskapliga Institutionen; doctoral thesis, University of Uppsala.
- Björsten, Herman (1856) 'Bref till en vän i landsorten', *Svenska tidningen* [Stockholm], 20 September.
- Böök, Fredrik (1907) *Romanens och prosaberättelsens historia i Sverige intill 1809*, Stockholm: Ömannsson & Co.; doctoral thesis, University of Lund.
- Brunegård, Gudrun (1996) 'Jane Austen aktualiserar gamla ideal', *Nya dagen* [Stockholm], 7 October, 12.
- Claesson Pipping, Git (1993) *Könet som läsanvisning: George Eliot och Victoria Benedictsson i det svenska 1880-talet. En receptionsstudie*, Stockholm; Stehag: Symposium; doctoral thesis, University of Stockholm.
- Ekman, Maria (trans.) (1997) *Mansfield Park*, Stockholm: Norstedt; repr. 1998, 1999.
- Elliott, Marie-Louise (trans.) (1959) *Förnuft och känsla* (SS; 'Levande litteratur' series), epilogue Jane Lundblad, Stockholm: Natur & Kultur; repr. 1970, 1973, 1986, 1996.

- Enehjelm, Helen af (1945a) *Promenad med favoriter*, Helsinki: Schildts.
- Enehjelm, Helen af (1945b) *Vandring med favoriter*, Stockholm: Medéns Förlags Aktiebolag.
- Hallström, Per (1914) 'En klassisk fruntimmersroman', in *Levande dikt: essayer*, Stockholm: Albert Bonniers Förlag.
- Heggelund, Kjell and Per Öhrgaard (1987) 'Det stilla Livet: Jane Austen', in Hertel, Hans (ed.) *Litteraturens historia*, vol. 4 (1720–1830), trans. Sven Rinman and Jan Stolpe, Stockholm: Norstedt, pp. 278–79.
- Hughes-Hallett, Penelope (1994) *Jane Austens liv i brev och bilder*, trans. Lena Torndahl, Stockholm: Forum; trans. *My Dear Cassandra* (1990).
- Krabbe, Henning (1973) 'Jane Austen: stolthet och fördom', in Billeskov, Jansen and Frederik Julius (ed.) *Litteraturens världshistoria 7 Romantiken*, trans. Sven Rinman, Stockholm: Norstedt, pp. 196–205.
- Lauritzen, Monica (1981) *Jane Austen's 'Emma' on Television: A Study of a BBC Classic Serial*, Gothenburg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis; doctoral thesis, University of Gothenburg.
- Liljegren, Eva (trans.) (1993) *Lady Susan*, Stockholm: Fischer.
- Lundblad, Jane (trans. & pref.) (1954) *Övertalning (P)*, Stockholm: Tiden; repr. (with new pref.) 1981, 1991, 1996, 1997, 1999, 2001.
- Malling, Mathilda (1915) 'Jane Austen', *Ord och bild* [Gothenburg], 24: 273–76.
- Montolieu, Isabelle de (trans.) (1821) *La Famille Elliot, ou l'ancienne inclination (P)*, 2 vols, Paris: Arthus Bertrand; repr. 1828.
- Myer, Valerie Grosvenor (1997) *Det envisa hjärtat: Jane Austen, en biografi*, trans. Gunilla Larsson, Stockholm: Rabén Prisma; trans. *The Obstinate Heart: Jane Austen, a Biography* (1997).
- Nielsen, Rose-Marie (trans.) (1993) *Northanger Abbey*, foreword Staffan Bergsten, Lund: Studentlitteratur; repr. 2001, 2002.
- Nordisk familjebok: konversationslexikon och realencyklopedi innehållande upplysningar och förklaringar om märkvärdiga namn, föremål och begrepp (NF)* vols 1 (1876) – 4 (1881), Stockholm: Nordisk Familjeboks Förl.
- Nordisk familjebok: konversationslexikon och realencyklopedi (NF)* vols 2 (1905) – 6 (1907), Stockholm: Nordisk Familjeboks Förl.
- Olsson, Ulf (1994) 'Dolt för faderns blick: Ulf Olsson ser Jane Austen välja olydnadens väg', *Expressen* [Stockholm], 8 January, 4.
- Olzon, Gösta (trans.) (1946) *Stolthet och fördom (PP)*, pref. anon., Stockholm: Forum; rev. edn Ringenson (1920); repr. 1953, 1968, 1977, 1985, 1986, 1987, 1995, 1996, 1998.
- Östman, Hans (1983) *English Fiction, Poetry and Drama in Eighteenth-Century Sweden, 1765–1799: A Preliminary Study*, Stockholm: Kungl. Biblioteket.
- Ringenson, C. A. (trans.) (1920) *Stolthet och fördom (PP)*, pref. anon., Stockholm: Bonnier.
- Rydén, Per (1987) *Domedagar: svensk litteraturkritik efter 1880*, Lund: Avd. för pressforskning, Litteraturvetenskapliga Institutionen.
- Said, Edward (1978) *Orientalism*, New York: Random House.

- Sarrimo, Christine (1997) 'Ordning och reda mellan könen hos Jane Austen', *Svenska dagbladet* [Stockholm], 6 August, 12.
- Schück, Henrik (1982) *Allmän litteraturhistoria* [1954], 2nd edn, vols 1–7 (Svenska akademien), Stockholm: Gidlund.
- Shields, Carol (2002) *Jane Austen* [2001], trans. Maria Ekman, Stockholm: Bonniers.
- Tigerstedt, Eugen Napoleon (1961) 'Jane Austen', in *Bonniers allmänna litteraturhistoria*, vol. 4, Stockholm: Bonniers, pp. 57–58.
- Westdahl, Emilia (trans.) (1836) *Familjen Elliot: skildringar af engelska karakterer* (P), Nyköping: P. E. Winge.
- Williams, Anna (1997) *Stjärnor utan stjärnbilder: kvinnor och kanon i litteraturhistoriska översiktsverk under 1900-talet*, Uppsala: Skrifter Utgivna av Avdelningen för Litteratursociologi vid Litteraturvetenskapliga Institutionen i Uppsala & Gidlunds Förlag.

Chapter 9: The Reception of Jane Austen in Finland

- Bassnett, Susan (1991) *Translation Studies*, London: Methuen.
- Bergroth, Kersti (1966) 'Vanhoja kirjoja: ilman murhia tai ruumiita', *Helsingin sanomat* [Helsinki], 26 July, 8.
- Brotherus, Aune (trans.) (1950) *Emma*, 'Maailman suurromaaneja' series, Helsinki: WSOY.
- Brotherus, Aune (trans.) (1952) *Järki ja tunteet* (SS), 'Maailman suurromaaneja' series, Helsinki: WSOY.
- Curry, Mary Jane (1992) 'The *Do* Variant in Questions and Negatives: Jane Austen's *Complete Letters* and *Mansfield Park*', in Rissanen, Matti and others (eds) *History of Englishes: New Methods and Interpretations in Historical Linguistics*, Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 705–19.
- Haltsonen, Sulo (ed.) (1954) *Luettelo suomalaisista kirjallisuudentutkimuksista 1901–25*, Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Haltsonen, Sulo (ed.) (1959) *Luettelo suomalaisista kirjallisuudentutkimuksista 1938–50*, Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Haltsonen, Sulo (ed.) (1963) *Luettelo suomalaisista kirjallisuudentutkimuksista 1951–60*, Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Havu, Toini (1950) 'Jane Austen suomeksi' [review], *Helsingin sanomat* [Helsinki], 14 September, 8.
- Havu, Toini (1952a) 'Hauska klassikko' [review], *Helsingin sanomat* [Helsinki], 21 January, 4.
- Havu, Toini (1952b) 'Ihastuttava Jane Austen' [review], *Helsingin sanomat* [Helsinki], 23 November, 15.
- Havu, Toini (1954a) 'Terveen järjen apostoli' [review], *Helsingin sanomat* [Helsinki], 19 January, 9.
- Havu, Toini (1954b) 'Säädyläinen Jane Austen' [review], *Helsingin sanomat* [Helsinki], 21 April, 6.
- Helanen-Ahtola, Marja (trans.) (1977) *Leikkiä ja totta* (S), Hämeenlinna: Karisto.
- Hellemann, Jarl (1970) 'Suomennoskirjallisuus', in Tarkka, Pekka and others (eds) *Suomen kirjallisuus VIII: kirjallisuuden lajeja*, Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura & Otava, pp. 418–84.

- Hermans, Theo (ed.) (1985) *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation*, London: Croom Helm.
- Jansen, F. J. B., H. Stangerup and P. H. Traustedt (eds) (1976) *Kansojen kirjallisuus*, vol. 7, Finnish edn ed. Lauri Viljanen, chapter on English literature trans. Kyllikki Villa, Helsinki: WSOY.
- Joutsen, O. A. (trans.) (1922) *Ylpeys ja ennakkoluulo (PP)*, 'Mainehikkaita romaaneja' series, illus. Charles Brock, Helsinki: WSOY.
- Kajava, Jukka (1969a) 'Ylpeys ja ennakkoluulo, koreaa seurapiiriparittelua' [film review], *Helsingin sanomat* [Helsinki], 11 July, 29.
- Kajava, Jukka (1969b) 'BBC, arkemme uusi hellijä' [film review], *Helsingin sanomat* [Helsinki], 17 July, 27.
- Kajava, Jukka (1969c) 'Kartanoita kaikille' [film review], *Helsingin sanomat* [Helsinki], 14 August, 31.
- Kajava, Jukka (1981) 'Ylpeys ja ennakkoluulo englantia ja ruotsia taitaville – ja muille Austenin ystäville' [film review], *Helsingin sanomat* [Helsinki], 16 February, 45.
- Karttunen, Päivi and Lasse Koskela (eds) (1984) *Luettelo suomalaisista kirjallisuuden-tutkimuksista 1971–80*, Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Karttunen, Päivi and Lasse Koskela (eds) (1986) *Luettelo suomalaisista kirjallisuuden-tutkimuksista 1981–85*, Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Kivivuori, Kristiina (trans.) (1951) *Viisasteleva sydän (P)*, Helsinki: WSOY.
- Koivunen, Elina (2000) 'Jane Austen: piikikäs poikatyttö', *Kotiliesi* [Helsinki], 1: 36–40.
- Korhonen, Raija (1971) *Luettelo suomalaisista kirjallisuudentutkimuksista 1901–60: ulko-maisen kirjallisuuden kohdehakemisto*, Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä Library.
- Koskela, Lasse (ed.) (1997) *Luettelo suomalaisista kirjallisuudentutkimuksista 1986–94*, Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Koskimies, A. R. (trans.) (1954) *Kasvattitytön tarina (MP)*, 'Kariston klassillinen kirjasto' series, Hämeenlinna: Karisto.
- Koskimies, Rafael (1964) *Maailman kirjallisuus*, vol. 3, Helsinki: Otava.
- Lehtonen, Paavo (1978) 'Tervettä rantaelämää' [review], *Helsingin sanomat* [Helsinki], 28 April, 19.
- Lyytikäinen, Pirjo (2003) 'Kirjallisuus tienhaarassa: suomalaisuus ja nykyajan haasteet', in Nevanlinna and Kolbe, pp. 294–305.
- Mäkelä, Ritva (trans.) (1978) *Tavat ja tunteet (W)*, Hämeenlinna: Karisto.
- Mäkinen, Ilkka (2003) 'Lukemisen historia', in Nevanlinna and Kolbe, pp. 310–26.
- Möttölä, Marjatta (1996a) 'Diana Webster ohjaa suomalaisia Jane Austenin perienglantilaisen ironian pariin: elokuva poimii kirjasta vain pinnan', *Helsingin sanomat* [Helsinki], 22 November, C7.
- Möttölä, Marjatta (1996b) 'Austenia ryöstöviljellään', *Helsingin sanomat* [Helsinki], 22 November, C7.
- Nevanlinna, Anja Kervanto and Laura Kolbe (eds) (2003) *Suomen kulttuurihistoria*, vol. 3, Helsinki: Tammi.
- Niemelä, Kyösti (2003) 'Northanger Abbey: Valistusta, jännitystä, romantiikkaa', *Nuori voima: kulttuuriharrastajan lehti* [Helsinki], 4: 15–17.
- Norko-Turja, Sirkka-Liisa (trans.) (1947) *Ylpeys ja ennakkoluulo (PP)*, illus. Charles Brock, Helsinki: WSOY.
- Ovaska, Tuulevi (1992) 'Udolphon mysteereistä Lady Oracleen: naisten gotiikkaa Ann

- Radcliffestä Margaret Atwoodiin', in Savolainen, Matti and Päivi Mehtonen (eds) *Haamulinnan perillisiä*, Helsinki: Kirjastopalvelu, pp. 125–51.
- Paloposki, Outi (1999) 'Variation in Translation: Literary Translation into Finnish 1809–1850' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Helsinki).
- Pennanen, Eila (1950) 'Onko Jane Austen nero?', *Näköala: suomen kirjallisuuden vuosikirja* [Helsinki], 2: 350–56.
- Pennanen, Eila (1953) 'Jane Austenia jälleen suomeksi', *Parnasso* [Helsinki], 3: 84–85.
- Pennanen, Eila (1964) [review], *Parnasso* [Helsinki], 14: 279–80.
- Pennanen, Eila (trans.) (1953) *Neito vanhassa linnassa* (NA), 'Maailman suurromaaneja' series, Helsinki: WSOY.
- Railo, Eino (1937) *Yleisen kirjallisuuden historia*, vol. 6, Helsinki: WSOY.
- Roos, Vappu (1965) *Suuri maailmankirjallisuus: länsimaisen kirjallisuuden vaiheet Homeroksesta Seferisiin*, 3rd edn, Helsinki: Tammi.
- Schück, Henrik (1961) *Yleinen kirjallisuuden historia*, trans. Katri Ingman-Palola, Helsinki: WSOY.
- Shields, Carol (2005) *Jane Austen*, trans. Maria Lyytinen, Helsinki: Ajatus Kirjat.
- Skinner, John (2001) '“Let Other Pens Dwell . . .”: Two Stylistic Aspects of Jane Austen's *Mansfield Park*', in Hiltunen, Risto and others (eds) *English in Zigs and Zags: A Festschrift for Marita Gustafsson*, Turku: University of Turku, pp. 217–26.
- Tiitinen, Ilpo (ed.) (1975) *Luettelo suomalaisista kirjallisuudentutkimuksista 1961–70*, Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Toivanen, Erkki (1987) 'Psykologisen romaanitaiteen uranuurtaja, naimaton papintytär Jane Austen: historian merkittävät naiset, osa 6', *Kotiliesi* [Helsinki], 3: 24–27.
- Varpio, Yrjö (2002) 'Kirjallisuus, kansa ja kulttuuri', in Knapas, Rainer and Nils Erik Forsgård (eds), *Suomen kulttuurihistoria*, Helsinki: Tammi, 2: 390–403.
- Verkkola, Tuija (1996) 'Jane Austen murskaa ennakkoluulot', *Helsingin Sanomat* [Helsinki], monthly magazine suppl. 3, 46–52.
- Ylänen, Helena (1996a) 'Miten kiinalainen mies voi tehdä elokuvan englantilaisesta kirjasta', *Helsingin sanomat* [Helsinki], monthly magazine suppl. 3, 53.
- Ylänen, Helena (1996b) 'Tunteista järkevästi' [film review], *Helsingin sanomat* [Helsinki], weekly suppl. NYT, 9.
- Ylänen, Helena (1996c) 'Karkeampi Jane Austen' [film review], *Helsingin sanomat* [Helsinki], weekly suppl. NYT, 18.
- Ylänen, Helena (1996d) 'Tyttökirjojen esiäiti' [film review], *Helsingin sanomat* [Helsinki], weekly suppl. NYT, 47.
- Yleinen kirjallisuuden historia* (1900), vol. 3, trans. Otto Manninen, Helsinki: Otava.

Chapter 10: Still the Great Forgotten? The Reception of Jane Austen in Spain

- Alvarez Amorós, José Antonio (ed.) (1988) *Historia crítica de la literatura inglesa*, Salamanca: Almar.
- Anon. (trans.) (1941) *Persuasión*, Buenos Aires; Barcelona: Juventud; repr. 1958, illus. Marta Ribas.

- Anon. (trans.) (1945) *Más fuerte que el orgullo* (PP), Barcelona: Plana.
- Anon. (trans.) (1946) *La abadía de Northanger*, Madrid: Diana.
- Anon. (trans.) (1948) *Persuasión*, Madrid: Diana.
- Anon. (trans.) (1949) *Orgullo y prejuicio: novela completa* (PP), Madrid: Diana.
- Anon. (trans.) (1953) *La abadía de Northanger*, Madrid: Dólar.
- Anon. (trans.) (1965) *Hacia la dicha por la senda del amor*, Madrid: Dédalo; condensed edn SS.
- Anon. (trans.) (1970) *Orgullo y prejuicio* (PP), Madrid: Interciencia.
- Anon. (trans.) (1973) *Orgullo y prejuicio* (PP), Barcelona: Mateu.
- Anon. (trans.) (1985) *Persuasión*, Madrid: Promoción y Ediciones, D. L.
- Anon. (trans.) (1986) *Persuasión*, Madrid: SAPE, D.L.
- Anon. (trans.) (1996) *Sentido y sensibilidad* (SS), Barcelona: Orbis.
- Anon. (trans.) (1997a) *Emma*, Barcelona: Orbis.
- Anon. (trans.) (1997b) *Orgullo y prejuicio* (PP), Madrid: Alba Libros; repr. 1999.
- Anon. (trans.) (1998a) *Orgullo y prejuicio* (PP), Barcelona: Óptima.
- Anon. (trans.) (1998b) *Persuasión*, Barcelona: Andrés Bello Española.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail (1981) *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*, trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist, Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail (1984) *Rabelais and his World*, trans. Hélène Iswolsky, Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail (1986) *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*, trans. Vern W. McGee, ed. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist, Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Balil Giró, José María (trans.) (1954) *En el parque Mansfield* (MP), Barcelona: Arimany.
- Ballesteros González, Antonio (2003) 'Breve esplendor de mal distinta lumbre: las novelistas góticas', in Caporale Bizzini and Aragón Varo, pp. 65–92.
- Berenguer, R. (trans.) (1943) *Orgullo y prejuicio* (PP), Barcelona: Arimany; repr. 1944, 1946, 1952.
- Bofill y Ferro, Jaime (trans.) (1945) *Emma*, Barcelona: Arimany.
- Caporale Bizzini, Silvia (2003) 'La otra cara del romanticismo: trabajo, educación y escritura', in Caporale Bizzini and Aragón Varo, pp. 93–116.
- Caporale Bizzini, Silvia and Asunción Aragón Varo (eds) (2003) *Historia crítica de la novela inglesa escrita por mujeres*, Salamanca: Ediciones Almar
- Casellas Guitart, Jorge (trans.) (1998) *Lady Susan*, Madrid: Unidad.
- Chivite, María José (2003) 'Mary Wollstonecraft: narrativas femeninas/feministas de la ilustración', in Caporale Bizzini and Aragón Varo, pp. 45–64.
- Cohen, Marcelo (trans.) (1984) *Lady Susan*, intro. Marta Pessarrodona, Barcelona: Icaria; repr. 1989, 2000.
- Costa Clavell, Xavier (trans.) (1973) *Orgullo y prejuicio* (PP), illus. Maria Paz García-Borrón, Barcelona: Mundilibro; repr. 1986.
- Crespo Allue, María José (1981) *La problemática de las versiones españolas de Persuasion de Jane Austen: crítica de su traducción*, Valladolid: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Valladolid.
- De la Concha, Ángeles (1992) 'La sombra de la madre: un mito materno en la novela de mujeres', *Revista Canaria de estudios ingleses* [La Laguna], 24 (April): 33–48.
- Díaz Bild, Aída (1998) 'Jane Austen: Artistic Mastery as a Means of Rebellion', in Galván, Lázaro and Sierra, pp. 77–86.
- Díaz Bild, Aída (2001) 'Charlotte Smith y Jane Austen: en busca de la libertad creadora', in Sierra Falces, Marta, Mercedes Díaz Dueñas and María José Pérez Fernández (eds)

- Proceedings of the 25^o AEDEAN Conference*, Granada: Departamento de Filología Inglesa de la Universidad de Granada.
- Díaz Bild, Aída (2003) *Charlotte Smith: la literatura como liberación*, La Laguna: Secretariado de Publicaciones de la Universidad de la Laguna.
- Díaz Lage, José (trans.) (2005) *Orgullo e prexuízo (PP)*, intro. Carlos J. Gómez Blanco, Santiago de Compostela: Servizo Galgo de Igualdade.
- Durán, Fernando (trans.) (1946) *Cordura y sensibilidad (SS)*, Barcelona: Reguera.
- Durán, Fernando (trans.) (1956) *Orgullo y prejuicio (PP)*, illus. José Narro, Barcelona: Juventud; repr. 1958, 1965, 1966, 1970, 1974, 1997, 2003.
- Fernández, Z., José (trans.) (2004), *Persuasion*, Barcelona: RBA; 2nd edn, 2004, Barcelona: Juventud.
- Franco Lommers, Patricia (trans.) (2002) *Orgullo y prejuicio (PP)*, Madrid: EDIMAT; repr. 2002, 2006.
- Galván, Fernando, Luis Alberto Lázaro and Lina Sierra (eds) (1998) *Mary Wollstonecraft and her World*, Alcalá: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Alcalá
- Gómez Blanco, Carlos J. (1991) 'Marriage and Power Relations in Jane Austen's Novels', in González y Fernández-Corugedo, Santiago, Juan Tazón Salces and María Socorro Suárez (eds) *Studia Patriciae Shaw Oblata*, Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Oviedo, 3: 240–50.
- Guerra, Juani (trans.) (1997) *Emma*, Madrid: Cátedra.
- Gutiérrez, Menchu (trans.) (1998) *Amor y amistad (LF)*, Barcelona: Alba.
- Herrero, Clara Ituero (trans.) (2002) *Sentido y sensibilidad (SS)*, Madrid: EDIMAT; repr. 2005.
- Hidalgo, Pilar and Enrique Alcaraz (1981) *La literatura inglesa en los textos*, Madrid: Alhambra Universidad.
- Hidalgo, Pilar (1998) 'Wollstonecraft and Austen: *Les Liaisons Dangereuses*', in Galván, Lázaro and Sierra, pp. 1–18.
- Ibañez, María Antonia (trans.) (1987) *Orgullo y prejuicio (PP)*, ed. José Luis Caramés, Madrid: Cátedra.
- Ibañez, María Antonia (trans.) (1993) *Orgullo y prejuicio (PP)*, ed. José Luis Caramés, Madrid: Cátedra; reissue of Ibañez 1987.
- Larios, Juan Ruiz de (trans.) (1945a) *La abadía de Northanger*, Barcelona: Alejo Climent; repr. 1953.
- Larios, Juan Ruiz de (trans.) (1945b) *Orgullo y prejuicio (PP)*, Barcelona: Bruguera.
- Larios, Juan Ruiz de (trans.) (1945c) *Persuasión*, Barcelona: Bruguera.
- Lázaro Ros, Amando (trans.) (1957) *Orgullo y prejuicio (PP)*, Madrid: Aguilar; repr. 1957, 1962, 1963, 1972, 1987, 1988, 1990, 1994, 1997.
- Lázaro Ros, Amando (trans.) (2001) *Orgullo y prejuicio (PP)*, intro. Elvira Lindo, Madrid: Suma de Letras; repr. 2005; rev. edn Lázaro Ros 1957.
- Lengotita, Javier de (trans.) (1945) *Orgullo y prejuicio (PP)*, Barcelona: Reguera.
- López Muñoz, José Luis (trans.) (1971) *Emma*, 2 vols, Madrid: Editorial Magisterio Español; repr. 1996.
- López Muñoz, José Luis (trans.) (1996) *Orgullo y prejuicio (PP)*, Madrid: Alianza; repr. 2002, 2005.
- Lorenzo, Guillermo (trans.) (1983) *La abadía de Northanger*, Barcelona: Bruguera; repr. 1996, 2004.

- MacDonald, Susan Peck (1980) 'Jane Austen and the Tradition of the Absent Mother', in Davison, Cathy and E. M. Broner (eds) *The Lost Tradition: Mothers and Daughters in Literature*, London: Continuum.
- Magrinyà, Luis (trans.) (1993) *Juicio y sentimiento* (SS), Madrid: Rialp; repr. 1995.
- Magrinyà, Luis (trans.) (1996) *Juicio y sentimiento* (SS), Barcelona: Ediciones B.; reissue of Magrinyà 1993; repr. 1997, 2001, 2002, 2003.
- Martín Alegre, Sara (2003) 'La mujer escritora en un contexto dual: las novelistas victorianas', in Caporale Bizzini and Aragón Varo, pp. 117–46.
- Martín, Miguel (trans.) (1995) *Mansfield Park*, Barcelona: Rialp; repr. 1997, 1998, 2000, 2003, 2004.
- Masoliver, Maria Jesús (trans.) (1945) *La abadía de Northanger* (NA), Barcelona: M. Arimany.
- Matta, Paulina (trans.) (2000) *Sensatez y sentimientos* (SS), Barcelona: Andrés Bello.
- Misiego, Micaela (trans.) (1970) *Orgullo y prejuicio* (PP), Madrid: Iter Ediciones.
- Molino, E. (trans.) (1944) *Orgullo y prejuicio* (PP), Barcelona: Molino.
- Monnickendam, Andrew and others (1999) *Introduction to English Literature*, Barcelona: Universitat Oberta de Catalunya.
- Montenegro [i.e. Sillo Sutterolli, Heliodoro] (trans.) (1947) *Persuasión*, Barcelona: Baguñá Hnos.
- Monterrey, Tomás (2000) 'Notes for a History of English Studies in Spain', in Engler, Balz and Renate Haas (ed.) *European English Studies: Contributions towards the History of a Discipline*, London: The English Association, pp. 33–52.
- Monterrey, Tomás (2003a) 'Los estudios ingleses en España (1900–1950): legislación curricular', *Atlantis* [Alicante], 25.1 (June): 63–80.
- Monterrey, Tomás (2003b) 'Los estudios ingleses en España (1900–1950): contexto ideológico-cultural, autores y obras', *Atlantis* [Alicante], 25.2 (December): 71–96.
- Morales, María Luz (trans.) (1945) *Persuasión*, Barcelona: Surco
- Moré, María Teresa (trans.) (1942) *Juicio y sentimiento* (SS), Barcelona: Nausica.
- Nos Gray, Américo (trans.) [1952] *Orgullo y prejuicio* (PP), Barcelona: Exito.
- Ortega y Gasset, M. (trans.) (1919) *Persuasión: novela*, Madrid: Espasa-Calpe; repr. 1948, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2003.
- Oyarzábal, Isabel [i.e. Galindo, Beatriz] (trans.) (1921) *La abadía de Northanger: novela* (NA), Madrid: Espasa-Calpe; repr. 1951, 1952, 1998, 2002, 2003.
- Pareja Rodríguez, Alejandro (trans.) (2002) *Orgullo y prejuicio* (PP), Madrid: Edaf; repr. 2004.
- Pérez Gállego, Cándido (ed.) (1988) *Historia de la literatura inglesa*, Madrid: Taurus.
- Pérez Pérez, Miguel Angel (1999) 'The Un-Trollopian Trollope: Some Notes on the Barsetshire Novels', *Revista Alicantina de estudios ingleses* [Alicante], 12: 127–42.
- Pinyana, José Villalba (trans.) (1963) *Orgullo y prejuicio* (PP), Barcelona: Toray.
- Pitol, Sergio (trans.) (1972) *Emma*, 2 vols, Barcelona: Salvat; Madrid: Alianza Editorial; repr. 1986.
- Portillo, R., J. Carnero and J. A. Prieto (1981) *Guía básica para estudiantes de literatura inglesa*, Seville: Secretariado de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Sevilla.
- Pujals, E. (1984) *Historia de la literatura inglesa*, Madrid: Gredos.
- Pujol, Carlos (trans.) (1982) *Emma*, Barcelona: Planeta; repr. 1987.
- Pujol, Carlos (trans.) (1997) *Emma*, Barcelona: Planeta; repr. 2002; reissue of Pujol 1982.
- Ramos Ramos, María del Rocío (2002) *El Mock-Symposium en las novelas de T. L. Peacock*, Huelva: Universidad de Huelva.

- Rodríguez, Ana María (trans.) (1996) *Emma*, Barcelona: Plaza & Janes; repr. 1997, 2001, 2003, 2004.
- Rodríguez, Ana María (trans.) (1996) *Sentido y sensibilidad* (SS), Barcelona: Plaza & Janés; repr. 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2003, 2004.
- Rodríguez, Ana María (trans.) (1997) *Orgullo y prejuicio* (PP), Barcelona: Plaza & Janés.
- Rodríguez, Ana María (trans.) (1999) *Orgullo y prejuicio* (PP), intro. Lourdes Ventura, Madrid: Unidad Editorial; reissue of Rodríguez 1997; repr. 2000, 2002, 2003.
- Rodríguez, Kiky (trans.) (2002) *Orgullo y prejuicio* (PP), Madrid: Jorge A. Mestas.
- 'S.L.C.' (trans.) (1945) *La abadía de Northanger*, Barcelona: Editorial Selecciones Literarias y Científicas.
- Salis, Marta (trans.) (2000) *Lady Susan; Los Watson* (W), Barcelona: Alba.
- Santisteban, Héctor de (trans.) (1956) *Orgullo y prejuicio* (PP), Barcelona: Plaza.
- Shaw, Patricia (1984) 'The Pursuit of Love: A Motive for Literary Humour', in *Literary and Linguistic Aspects of Humour: VIth AEDEAN Conference Proceedings*, Barcelona: Departamento de Lengua y Literatura Inglesa de la Universidad de Barcelona, pp. 87–103.
- Shaw, Patricia (1988) 'Barbara Pym: The Jane Austen of Our Day', *Revista Canaria de estudios ingleses* [La Laguna], 17 (November): 67–95.
- Showalter, Elaine (1977) *A Literature of Their Own: British Women Novelists from Brontë to Lessing*, Princeton; Guildford: Princeton University Press.
- Socorro Suárez Lafuente, María (1992) 'The Jane Austen Tradition in Contemporary Women's Writing', in Bengoechea, Mercedes (ed.) *La huella de Virginia Woolf*, Alcalá de Henares: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Alcalá de Henares, pp. 89–98.
- Todd, Janet (1986) *Sensibility: An Introduction*, London: Methuen.
- Torres Oliver, Francisco (trans.) (1995) *Mansfield Park*, Barcelona: Alba Editorial.
- Torres Oliver, Francisco (trans.) (1996) *Persuasión; Sanditon*, Barcelona: Alba Editorial.
- Urries y Azara, José de (trans.) (1924) *Orgullo y prejuicio: novela* (PP), 2 vols, Madrid: Calpe; repr. 1952, 1976, 1981, 1986, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2003.
- Valverde, José María (trans.) (1978) *Emma*, Barcelona: Lumen.
- Valverde, José María (trans.) (1986) *Emma*, Barcelona: Lumen; reissue of Valverde 1978; repr. 1995, 1996.
- Villacañas Palomo, Beatriz (1993) 'Anne Brontë: The Triumph of Realism over Subjectivity', *Revista Alicantina de estudios ingleses* [Alicante], 6 (November): 89–99.
- Villacañas Palomo, Beatriz (1994) 'The Tenant of Wildfell Hall: The Revolt of the "Gentlest" Brontë', *Revista Canaria de estudios ingleses* [La Laguna], 29 (November): 187–96.
- Villalonga, Guillermo (trans.) (1943) *El parque Mansfield* (MP), Barcelona: Tartessos.
- Villamuera de Castro, M. (trans.) (1973) *Orgullo y prejuicio* (PP), Madrid: Autores-Editores de Obrias Proprias; repr. 1984, 1985.
- Wright, Andrew H. (1953) *Jane Austen's Novels: A Study in Structure*, London: Chatto & Windus.
- Zaro, Juan Jesús (trans.) (2003) *Persuasión*, intro. Pilar Hidalgo Andreu, Madrid: Cátedra.

Chapter 11: The Reception of Jane Austen in Italy

- Agorni, Mirella and Elena di Giovanni (2004) 'Pride and Prejudice in Italy', in Battaglia and Saglia, pp. 361–67.
- Agosti Castellani, Maria Luisa (trans.) (1952) *Orgoglio e pregiudizio (PP)*, Milan: Rizzoli.
- Agosti Castellani, Maria Luisa (trans.) (1995) *Persuasione (P)*, Rome: Theoria.
- Albertazzi, Silvia (2004) 'Scott, Austen, Mary Shelley', in Bertinetti, Paolo (ed.) *Breve storia della letteratura inglese*, Turin: Einaudi, pp. 184–89.
- Augustini, Gianna (trans.) (1999) *La storia d'Inghilterra, dal regno di Henry the 4th alla morte di Charles the 1st di uno storico parziale prevenuto e ignorante e Lesley Castle, un incompiuto romanzo epistolare* ('History of England', 'Lesley Castle'), Rome: Fahrenheit 451.
- Austen, Jane (2004) *Ragione e sentimento; Orgoglio e pregiudizio*, trans. P. Meneghelli, I. Castellini and N. Rosi, Rome: Newton & Compton Editori; reissue of Meneghelli 1995, and Castellini and Rosi 1945.
- Balboni, Maria Pia (trans.) (1968) *Orgoglio e pregiudizio (PP)*; 'I grandi della letteratura' series, Milan: Elli Fabbri.
- Banti, Anna (trans.) (1978) *Catherina (NA)*, Florence: Giunti-Marzocco.
- Bassi, Emilia (1914) *Medaglioni letterari: la vita e le opere di Jane Austen e George Eliot*, Rome: Mantegazza.
- Basso, Susanna (trans.) (2002) *Orgoglio e pregiudizio (PP)*, Milan: Sperling Paperback.
- Battaglia, Beatrice (1973–74) 'Ironia e "tecnica" narrativa nei romanzi di Jane Austen', *Atti dell'Accademia delle Scienze dell'Istituto di Bologna*, Rendiconti, 62: 132–67.
- Battaglia, Beatrice (1974) 'Complessità di Jane Austen dietro la maschera dell'innocenza', *Il lettore di provincia* [Ravenna], 22/23: 49–63.
- Battaglia, Beatrice (1976–77) 'Un personaggio di Jane Austen [Mrs Elton]', *Studi inglesi* [Bari], 3/4: 175–209.
- Battaglia, Beatrice (1983a) '“Female imagination” e romance nei romanzi di Jane Austen', in AAVV, *Atti del V Congresso dell'Associazione Italiana di Anglistica*, Bologna: Clueb, pp. 63–70.
- Battaglia, Beatrice (1983b) *La zitella illetterata: parodia e ironia nei romanzi di Jane Austen*, Ravenna: Longo.
- Battaglia, Beatrice (2002a) *Jane Austen: oggi e ieri*, Ravenna: Longo.
- Battaglia, Beatrice (2002b) 'Jane Austen's "Chameleonic" Art and A Poetics of Postmodernism', in Battaglia (2002a), pp. 37–46.
- Battaglia, Beatrice (2003) 'Le forme della "conduct literature" nell'Inghilterra di Jane Austen', in Bonaldi, Susana and Patrizia Garelli (eds) *L'educazione della donna in età romantica*, Florence: Alethea, pp. 73–88.
- Battaglia, Beatrice (2004) '“Italian Light on English Walls”: Jane Austen and the Picturesque', in Battaglia and Saglia, pp. 13–35.
- Battaglia, Beatrice (2005) 'Introduzione', in Jane Austen, *Romanzi: Mansfield Park, Orgoglio e pregiudizio, Emma*, Milan: Garzanti, pp. vii–xxiv; reissues of Buffa di Castelferro 1983, Maranesi 1975, Praz 1951.
- Battaglia, Beatrice (2006) '“Vita di Jane Austen”: realizzazioni, adattamenti e repliche di un copione inesauribile (1997–2003)', *La questione romantica* [Naples], 15/16: 185–91.
- Battaglia, Beatrice and Diego Saglia (eds) (2004) *Re-Drawing Austen: Picturesque Travels in Austenland*, Naples: Liguori.
- Bertinetti, Paolo (ed.) (2000) *Storia della letteratura inglese*, 2 vols, Turin: Einaudi.
- Bertinetti, Paolo (ed.) (2004) *Breve storia della letteratura inglese*, Turin: Einaudi.
- Bertinetti, Roberto (1987) *Ritratti di signore: saggio su Jane Austen*, Milan: Jaca Book.
- Bertolucci, Attilio (1975) 'Jane Austen', in Maranesi, pp. vii–xiv.

- Bertolucci, Attilio (1989) 'Introduzione', in Pozzi, pp. vii–xii.
- Bianconcini, Valeria (trans.) (1961) *Katherine Morland* (NA), Bologna: Capitol.
- Billi, Mirella (2000) 'Jane Austen' in Bertinetti (2000), 1: 380–83.
- Boffito Serra, Beatrice (trans.) (1961) *Senno e sensibilità* (SS), Milan: Rizzoli; repr. 1996.
- Bompiani, Ginevra (1978) *Lo spazio narrante: Jane Austen, Emily Bronte, Sylvia Plath*, Milan: La Tartaruga.
- Bonacossa della Valle di Casanova, Ester and Diana Agujari Bonacossa (trans.) (1961) *Mansfield Park*, Milan: Edizioni per Il Club del Libro.
- Bragaglia, Cristina (2002) 'Da *Pride and Prejudice* a *Bridget Jones's Diary*', in Battaglia (2002a), pp. 67–75.
- Brusasca, Clara (trans.) (1963) *Emma*, Milan: Bietti.
- Buffa di Castelferro, Simone dal (trans.) (1983) *Mansfield Park*, Milan: Garzanti; repr. 2003, 2005.
- Bussi, G. Elisa (2002) 'Jane Austen dalla pagina schermo: *Sense and Sensibility* a *Persuasion*', in Battaglia (2002a), pp. 47–65.
- Caprin, Giulio (trans.) (1932) *Orgoglio e prevenzione* (PP), Milan; Verona: Mondadori.
- Caprin, Giulio (trans.) (1957) *Orgoglio e prevenzione* (PP), Milan: Mondadori; reissue of Caprin 1932.
- Cardone Cattaneo, Giulietta (trans.) (1961) *Persuasione* (P), Milan: Rizzoli.
- Casalino, Mario (trans.) (1945) *Emma*, Milan: Ultra.
- Casalino, Mario (trans.) (1945) *Persuasione* (P), Milan: Denti.
- Castellini, Itala and Natalia Rosi (trans.) (1945) *Orgoglio e pregiudizio* (PP), 'Collezione lo zodiaco' series, Pistoia: Tariffi; repr. 2004 with *Ragione e sentimento*.
- Castellini, Itala and Natalia Rosi (trans.) (2006) *Orgoglio e pregiudizio* (PP), Rome: Newton & Compton; reissue of Castellini and Rosi 1945.
- Cecchi, Emilio (1915) *Storia della letteratura inglese nel secolo XIX*, Milan: Fratelli Treves Editori.
- Censi, Stefania (trans.) (1994a) *Amore e amicizia; Catherine, ovvero la pergola e altri scritti giovanili* (Juvenilia), ed. Malcolm Skey, Rome; Naples: Theoria.
- Censi, Stefania (trans.) (1994b) *Orgoglio e pregiudizio* (PP), 'Collezione classici' series, Rome; Naples: Theoria.
- Censi, Stefania (trans.) (1996) *Ragione e sentimento* (SS), ed. Malcolm Skey, Rome; Naples: Theoria; repr. 1997.
- Ceronne, Romano Carlo (trans.) (1961) *Persuasione* (P), Turin: Editori Associati.
- Chini, Antonella (trans.) (1962) *Ritorno a te* (P), Bologna: Capitol.
- Chini, Antonella and Valeria Bianconcini (trans.) (1965) *Villa Mansfield* (MP), Bologna: Capitol.
- Chini, Luisa (trans.) (1958) *Orgoglio e pregiudizio* (PP), Bologna: Capitol.
- Ciotti Miller, Letizia (trans.) (1979) *Amore e amicizia e altri romanzi* (Juvenilia), Milan: La tartaruga.
- Citati, Piero (1983) 'L'Occhio di Jane Austen sulla tazza di tè', *Corriere della sera* [Milan], 23 August, 7.
- Citati, Piero (1996) 'Introduzione', in Boffito Serra, Beatrice (trans.), *Ragione e sentimento* (SS), Milan: Rizzoli, pp. 5–15.
- Colaiacono, Paola (1976–77) 'Jane Austen: "nessuna speranza da Birmingham"', *Studi inglesi* [Bari], 3/4: 151–74.
- Comucci, Vittoria (trans.) (1967) *Emma*, Milan: Fr. Fabbri.
- Corsini, L. (trans.) (1969) *Orgoglio e pregiudizio* (PP), 'Collana tu e lui' series, Milan: Piccoli.
- Donini, Filippo (1977) 'Jane Austen in Italy' [1971], in *Collected Reports of the Jane Austen Society, 1966–1975*, Folkestone: Dawson, pp. 155–67.

- Fantaccini, Fiorenzo (trans.) (2004) *Persuasione (P)*, Rome: Newton & Compton Editori.
- Farrer, Reginald (1976) 'Jane Austen, ob. July 18, 1817' [1917], in Littlewood, Ian (ed.) *Jane Austen: Critical Assessments*, Mountfield: Helm Information, 4: 177–98.
- Gaia, Linda (trans.) (1982) *L'abbazia di Northanger (NA)*, ed. Malcolm Skey, Rome; Naples: Theoria.
- Gaia, Linda (trans.) (1990) *Sanditon; Lady Susan; I Watson (S, LS, W)*, ed. Malcolm Skey, Rome; Naples: Theoria.
- Gaia, Linda (trans.) (1992) *Lettere (LJA)*, ed. Malcolm Skey, Rome; Naples: Theoria.
- Grillo, Elena (trans.) (1994) *L'abbazia di Northanger (NA)*, Rome: Newton & Compton Editori.
- Groppali, Enrico (2003) 'Introduzione' [1983], in *Mansfield Park*, trans. Simone Buffa di Castelferro, Milan: Garzanti, pp. vii–xxiv.
- Harding, D. W. (1939–40) 'Regulated Hatred: An Aspect of the Work of Jane Austen', *Scrutiny* [Cambridge], 8: 346–62.
- Iginia, Dina (trans.) (1966) *Orgoglio e pregiudizio (PP)*, Florence: Bulgarini.
- Izzo, Carlo (1961) *Storia della letteratura inglese*, vol. 1, Milan: Nuova Accademia Editrice.
- Izzo, Carlo (1963) *Umoristi inglesi*, Turin: ERI.
- Johnson, Claudia L. (1988) *Jane Austen: Women, Politics, and the Novel*, Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press.
- Kotnik, Dara (1996) *Jane Austen, ovvero genio e semplicità*, Milan: Rusconi.
- Lascelles, Mary (1968) *Jane Austen and her Art* [1939], Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Levi, Evelina (trans.) (1945) *Sensibilità e buon senso (SS)*, Rome: Astrea.
- Litz, A. Walton (1965) *Jane Austen: A Study of her Artistic Development*, London: Chatto & Windus.
- Livi, Grazia (1984) *Da una stanza all'altra*, Milan: Garzanti.
- Maffi, Bruno (trans.) (1954) *Emma*, Milan: Rizzoli.
- Maraini, Dacia (1994) 'Introduzione', in Censi (1994a), pp. 7–9.
- Maranesi, Isa (trans.) (1975) *Orgoglio e pregiudizio (PP)* 'I grandi libri' series, Milan: Garzanti; repr. 2002, 2005.
- Marroni, Francesco (ed.) (1994) *Dalla parte di Jane Austen*, Pescara: Tracce.
- Maurier, Giuseppina (trans.) (1952) *Emma*, Milan: Cavallotti.
- Melchiorri, Maria Felicita (trans.) (1998) *Mansfield Park*, Rome: Newton & Compton Editori.
- Meneghelli, Pietro (2004) 'Introduzione', in Austen, pp. 11–15.
- Meneghelli, Pietro (trans.) (1995) *Ragione e sentimento (SS)*, Rome: Newton Compton Editori; repr. 2004 with *Orgoglio e pregiudizio*.
- Meneghelli, Pietro (trans.) (1996) *Emma*, Rome: Newton & Compton Editori.
- Migliarini, Alessandra (trans.) (1957) *Orgoglio e pregiudizio (PP)*, Milan: Boschi.
- Minozzi, Berto (trans.) ([1950]) *Ragione e sentimento (SS)*, Milan: Cavallotti.
- Minozzi, Berto (trans.) (1952) *Orgoglio e pregiudizio (PP)*, Milan: Cavallotti.
- Moler, Kenneth (1968) *Jane Austen's Art of Allusion*, Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Moschitta, M. (trans.) (1989) *Orgoglio e pregiudizio (PP)*, Florence: Bulgarini.
- Mudrick, Marvin (1952) *Jane Austen: Irony as Defense and Discovery*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

- Nerozzi, Patrizia (1973) *Jane Austen*, Bari: Adriatica.
- Nokes, David (1997) *Jane Austen: A Life*, London: 4th Estate.
- Orso, Francesco dall' (trans.) (1953) *Emma*, Turin: Sas, Società Apostolato.
- Page, Norman (1969) 'Categories of Speech in *Persuasion*', *Modern Language Review* [London], 64: 734–41.
- Page, Norman (1972) *The Language of Jane Austen*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Palma, Laura de (trans.) (1999) *Mansfield Park*, Milan: Rizzoli.
- Petrignani, Sandra (trans.) (1996) *Emma*, Rome; Naples: Theoria.
- Pino, Rosa (trans.) (1959) *Orgoglio e pregiudizio* (PP), 'Collana per signorinette' series, Milan: Flli Fabbri.
- Pintacuda, Teresa (trans.) (1959) *L'Abbazia di Northanger* (NA), Milan: Garzanti.
- Placido, Barbara (trans.) (2004) *Orgoglio e pregiudizio* (PP), 'La biblioteca di repubblica' series, Rome: L'Espresso.
- Pozzi, Luciana (trans.) (1989) *Persuasione* (P), Milan: Garzanti; repr. 2002.
- Praz, Mario (1960) *Storia della letteratura inglese*, Florence: Sansoni.
- Praz, Mario (trans.) (1951) *Emma*, Milan: Garzanti; repr. 2004, 2005.
- Reim, Riccardo (2004) 'Introduzione', in Austen, pp. 255–57.
- Sabbadini, Silvano (1974) 'L'avorio ideologico di Jane Austen', in *Paragone* [Florence], 249 (August): 90–112.
- Silvestri, Liliana (trans.) (1957) *Orgoglio e pregiudizio* (PP), Milan: Labor.
- Skey, Malcolm (1992) 'Questo libro', in Gaia (1992), pp. 7–15.
- Sorani, Rosanna (trans.) (1969) *L'eterno contrasto* (SS), '“Libri deliziosi” collana per signorinette' series, Milan: Fabbri.
- Virgili, Dante (trans.) (1968) *La famiglia Woodhouse* (E), Bologna: Capitol.
- Vittoria, Tedeschi (trans.) (1945) *Emma*, Rome: La caravella.
- Wright, Andrew (1962) *Jane Austen's Novels: A Study in Structure*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Zazo, Anna Luisa (trans.) (1982) *L'abbazia di Northanger* (NA), Milan: Mondadori.
- Zazo, Anna Luisa (trans.) (2002a) *Emma*, Milan: Mondadori.
- Zazo, Anna Luisa (trans.) (2002b) *Persuasione* (P), Milan: Mondadori.
- Zordo, Ornella de (1998) 'Il “prezzo” della virtù: la storia di Fanny Price e della sua perfezione', in Melchiorri, pp. 7–16.

Chapter 12: The Reception of Jane Austen in Greece

- Alexiou-Proteou, Yeorgia (trans.) ([1960]) *Anna Elliot* (P), Athens: A. Manganiias.
- Alexiou-Proteou, Yeorgia (trans.) ([1960]) *Perifania kai prokatalipsi* (PP), introduction by Sathis Proteos, Athens: Damianos Publications; repr. 1986.
- Andreou, Maria (trans.) (1994) *Iperifania kai prokatalipsi* (PP), Athens: Minoas; repr. 2000, 2001.
- Andreou, Maria (trans.) (1997) *Epiroes* (P), Athens: Minoas.
- Blythe, Ronald (ed.) (1985) 'Introduction' to Austen, Jane, *Emma*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.

- Chryssanthopoulos, Michalis (1997) 'Anticipating Modernism: Constructing a Genre, a Past, and a Place', in Tziovas, Dimitris (ed.) *Greek Modernism and Beyond*, Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, pp. 61–76.
- Delios, Yiorgos (1939) *To sinhrono mithistorima*, Thessaloniki: [n.pub.].
- Delios, Yiorgos (1963) *Dio anglides pezografi: Virginia Woolf & Katherine Mansfield. Dokimia kai metafrasis*, Athens: Fexi.
- Denisi, Sofia (1994) *To elliniko istoriko mithistorima kai o Walter Scott (1830–1880)*, Athens: Kastaniotis.
- Denisi, Sofia (1995) *Metafrasis mithistorimaton kai diigimaton 1830–1880: Isagogiki meleti kai katagrafi*, Athens: Periplus.
- Dimaras, C. Th. (1972) *A History of Modern Greek Literature*, trans. Mary Gianos, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Dragoumis, Nik. (1856–57) 'Krisis peri Pandoras', *Pandora* [Athens], 7: 136–40.
- Evangelides, Costas E. (1985) *Jane Austen: Essays*, Athens: Ermis.
- Goudelis, Tasos (2003) 'Ena nouar horis fono', *Eleftherotypia, Vivliothiki* [Athens], 31 October, 22–23.
- Hionis, Argiris (trans.) (1997) *Perifania kai prokatalipsi (PP)*, Athens: Patakis; repr. 2000.
- Houzouri, Elena (2003) 'I anatomos tis kathimerinis zois', *Eleftherotypia, Vivliothiki* [Athens], 31 October, 16–18.
- Kalofolias, Alexandros (trans.) (1996) *Logiki kai evesthisia (SS)*, Athens: Livanis–To Klidi.
- Kapetanakis, Dimitrios (1998) 'Excerpt from "Dostoevsky" in *Mithologia tou oreou: dokimia kai piimata* Limni kai Athina, 1988', in Kikizas (1998), pp. 430–32.
- Kikizas, Dimitris (trans.) (1996) *Iperifania kai prokatalipsi (PP)*, Athens: Smili.
- Kikizas, Dimitris (trans.) (1998) *Pitho (P)*, Athens: Smili.
- Kondilis, Fontas (trans.) (1988) *Emma*, Athens: Kastaniotis; repr. 1997, 2000.
- Litz, A. Walton (1998) '“Persuasion: Forms of Estrangement”' [1975], in Kikizas (1998), pp. 437–54.
- Mackridge, Peter (1985) 'European Influences on the Greek Novel during the 1930's', *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* [Baltimore], 3 (May): 1–20.
- Margarinos, N. (trans.) (1989) *Perifania kai prokatalipsi (PP)*, Athens: Kaktos.
- Moullas, P. (1993) 'Isagogi' [intro.], in Karvelis, Takis and others (eds) *I Mesopolemiki pezografia: apo ton proto os ton deftero pangkosmio polemo (1914–1939)*, Athens: Sokoli, 1: 73–78.
- Muir, Augustus (1949–50) 'Diasimes anglides mithistoriografi', *Angloelliniki epitheorisi* [Athens], 4: 8.
- 'P.V.' (trans.) ([1960]) *Perifania kai prokatalipsi (PP)*, Athens: Daremas.
- Papanikolaou, Rena (trans.) (1967) *Logiki kai evesthisia (SS)*, Athens: Gemetzopoulos.
- Papastavrou, Anna (trans.) (1993) *Jane Austen, ikononografimeni anthologia*, Athens: Papadopoulos.
- Papathanasopoulou, Alexandra (trans.) (2001a) *Logiki kai evesthisia (SS)*, Athens: Smili.
- Papathanasopoulou, Alexandra (trans.) (2001b) *Mansfield Park*, Athens: Smili.
- Papathanasopoulou, Alexandra (trans.) (2003) *To avvaio tou Northanger (NA)*, Athens: Smili.
- Papayianni, Ninila (trans.) (1950) *Perifania kai prokatalipsi (PP)*, Athens: Ikaros & British Council; repr. 1953, 1997.

- Pappas, A. (trans.) (2003) *Emma*, Athens: Smili.
- Politis, Linos (1980) *Istoria tis neoellhnikis logotehneas*, 3rd edn, Athens: MIET.
- Roidis, E. (1978) 'I ethniki vivliothiki en eti 1880', in Angelou, Alkis (ed.) *Apanta*, Athens: Ermis, 3: 33–71.
- Ruderman, Anne Crippen (1995) *The Pleasures of Virtue: Political Thought in the Novels of Jane Austen*, Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Sahinis Apostolos (1950–52) 'To angliko mithistorima', *Angloelliniki epitheorisi* [Athens], 5: 157.
- Sahinis, Apostolos (1958) *To neoelliniko mithistorima*, Athens: S. Papadoyianni.
- Sahinis, Apostolos (1964) 'O Nik. Dragoumis os logotehnikos kritikos', *Ellenika* [Thessaloniki], 18: 97–119.
- Sakellaropoulou, Christianna E. (trans.) (1996) *Emma*, Athens: Livanis–To Klidi.
- Shina, Katerina (2003) 'Orientlismos kai protestantiki ithiki', *Eleftherotypia*, *Vivliothiki* [Athens], 31 October, 18–21.
- Southam, B. C. (2001) 'Excerpt from "The Silence of the Bertrams"' [1995], in Papathanasopoulou (2001b), pp. 606–10.
- Southam, B. C. (2003) 'Excerpt from "'Regulated Hatred' Revisited"' [1976], in Papathanasopoulou (2003), pp. 360–62.
- Spiliopoulou, Maria (trans.) (2004) *Perifania kai prokatalipsi (PP)*, illus. Joseph Miralles, Athens: Modern Times.
- Svoronos, Nikos (1999) *Episkopisi tis neoellinikis istorias*, trans. Ekaterini Asdraha from French, Athens: Themelio.
- Tanner, Tony (ed.) (1972) 'Introduction', in *Pride and Prejudice*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Tomalin, Claire (2001) 'Excerpt from *Jane Austen: A Life*, Penguin Books, 1998, pp. 155, 159', in Papathanasopoulou (2001a), pp. 528–30.
- Vitti, Mario (1978) *Istoria tis neoellhnikis logotehneas*, trans. Mirsini Zorba, Athens: Odysseas.
- Vyzantios, Al. (1863) 'Vivliographia: E teleftee imere tou Ali Passa', *Chryssalis* [Athens], 1: 56–59.
- Whately, Richard (1998) 'Excerpt from unsigned review of *Northanger Abbey* and *Persuasion* in *Quarterly Review*, January 1821' in *Pitho*, trans. Dimitris Kikizas, Athens: Smili, pp. 414–17.
- Yiannopoulou, Kleoniki (trans.) (1995) *Perifania kai prokatalipsi (PP)*, Athens: Palindrom.
- Zorbalas, Dimitris (trans.) (1988) *Perifania kai prokatalipsi (PP)*, Athens: Doudoumi; repr. 1994.

Chapter 13: Jane Austen in Hungary

- Anon. (1998) 'Emma' [film review], in *Cinema* [Budapest], 78 (May): 79.
- Austen, Henry (1999) 'Életrajzi megjegyzés', in Séllei (1999b), pp. 371–77; trans. 'A Biographical Notice of the Author' (1818).
- Austen, Jane (1999) 'Írónője hirdetése *A Klastrom titkához*', in Séllei (1999b), p. 377; trans. 'Advertisement, by the Authoress, to *Northanger Abbey*' (1818).

- Babits, Mihály (1957) *Az európai irodalom története* [1935], Budapest: Európa & Szépirodalmi.
- Barrett, Julia (2002) *A harmadik nővér: Jane Austen 'Értelem és érzelem' című regényének folytatása*, trans. Ildikó Arbanász, Szeged: LAZI; trans. *The Third Sister* (1996).
- Barrett, Julia (2003) *Charlotte: Jane Austen utolsó, befejezetlen regénye, amelyet Julia Barrett egészített ki*, trans. Gerda Barcza, Szeged, LAZI; trans. *Jane Austen's Charlotte: Her Fragment of a Last Novel* (2000).
- Borbás, Mária (1981) 'Értelem és érzelem', in Rákos, Sándor and István Bart (eds) *A műfordítás ma*, Budapest: Gondolat, pp. 465–74.
- Borbás, Mária (trans.) (1976) *Értelem és érzelem* (SS), 'Austen' series, Budapest: Európa; repr. 1986 (twice), 1996, 1998, 2000.
- Borbás, Mária (trans.) (1983) *A Klastrom titka* (NA), 'Austen' series, Budapest: Európa; repr. 1983, 2003.
- Cs. Szabó, László (1975) 'A csípős nyelvű kisasszony: Jane Austen', *Új látóhatár* [Munich], 26.6 (1 March): 491–500; repr. in *Őrzők*, Budapest: Magvető, 1985, pp. 351–63.
- Csanak, Dóra (trans.) (1969) *Emma*, Budapest: Európa; repr. 1977 (twice), 1992.
- Fielding, Helen (2001) *Bridget Jones naplója*, trans. Katalin Sóvágó, Budapest: Európa, 2001; trans. *Bridget Jones's Diary* (1996).
- Fielding, Helen *Mindjárt megőrülök! Bridget Jones naplója 2*, trans. Katalin Sóvágó, Budapest: Európa, 2001; trans. *Bridget Jones: The Edge of Reason* (1999).
- Galsai, Pongrácz (1978) 'Tévékockák', in *Nők lapja* [Budapest], 30.18 (6 May): 9.
- Gilson, David (2003) 'Jane Austen and Europe', *The Book Collector* [London], 52 (Spring): 31–45.
- Gyergyai, Albert (1978) 'Jane Austen nálunk', *Nagyvilág* [Budapest], 23 (September): 1380–85.
- Hatvany, Lajos (1947) 'Jane Austen', *Új idők* [Budapest], 53.34 (13 August): 169–70; repr. 1961 in *Öt évtized: tanulmányok, cikkek*, Budapest: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó, pp. 172–75.
- Hevesi, Sándor (trans.) (1934–36) *A Bennet család* (PP), in *Budapesti Szemle* [Budapest], 232.675 (February 1934) – 240.698 (January 1936).
- 'kd' (1996) 'Értelem és érzelem' [film review], *Cinema* [Budapest], 53 (April): 58–62.
- Kis, Anna (2000) 'Mansfield Park' [film review], *Filmvilág* [Budapest], 43.8 (August): 61.
- Kocztur, Gizella (1987) *Regény és személyiség: az angol regény születése* (Defoe – Richardson – Fielding), Budapest: Akadémiai.
- Lukács, Georg (1920) *Die Theorie des Romans*, Berlin: Cassirer.
- Lukács, Georg (1937) *Literaturn'ie teorii XIX beka i marksizm*, Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stbo 'Hudozestvennaya literatura'.
- Lukács, Georg (1955) *Probleme des Realismus*, Berlin: Aufbau-Verlag.
- Péter, Ágnes (1976) 'Jane Austen', in Köpeczi, Béla and Lajos Pók (eds) *Világirodalmi kisenciklopédia*, Budapest: Gondolat, 1: 84.
- Péter, Ágnes (1996) 'Jane Austen: Büszkeség és balítélet (*Pride and Prejudice*, 1813)', in Kada, Júlia (ed.) *Huszonöt fontos angol regény*, Budapest: Lord (Maecenas, pp. 47–62.
- Pym, Barbara (1988) *Barátnők és ballépések*, trans. Gabriella Prekop, Budapest: Európa; trans. *Jane and Prudence* (1953).
- 'R.W.' (2000) 'Mansfield Park' [film review], *Cinema* [Budapest], 7 (July): 64.

- Réz, Ádám (trans.) (1968) *A mansfieldi kastély* (MP; 'A világirodalom remekei' series), Budapest: Európa; repr. 1978, 1997 (twice), 2001.
- Róna, Ilona (trans.) (1980) *Meggyőző érvek* (P), 'Austen' series, Budapest: Európa; repr. 1980, 1984, 1993, 2001.
- Róna, Ilona (trans.) (2003) *Meggyőző érvek* (P), audio narration Éva Szoboszlai, 11 cassettes, Budapest: MVGYOSZ.
- Séllei, Nóra (1996) 'Self-Reflexive Literariness in Jane Austen's *Northanger Abbey*', *British and American Studies* [Timisoara], 1.1: 17–23.
- Séllei, Nóra (1999a) 'Jane Austen and the Politics of the Novel', in Bényei, Tamás and Péter Szaffkó (eds) *Happy Returns: Essays for Professor István Pálffy*, Debrecen: KLTE Institute of English and American Studies, pp. 39–59.
- Séllei, Nóra (1999b) *Lánnyá válik, s írni kezd: 19. századi angol írónők*, Debrecen: Kossuth University Press.
- Séllei, Nóra (1999c) 'Otthon a regényben. Jane Austen: a klastrom titka', in Séllei (1999b), pp. 33–79.
- Szenczi, Miklós (trans.) (1958) *Büszkeség és balítélet* (PP), 'A világirodalom klasszikusai' series, intro. Miklós Szentkuthy, Budapest: Európa; repr. 1975, 1979, 1989, 1996, 1999, 2000.
- Szenczi, Miklós (1970) 'Jane Austen', in Király, István (ed.) *Világirodalmi lexikon*, Budapest: Akadémiai, 1: 566–67.
- Szentkuthy, Miklós (1958) 'Előszó: Jane Austen', in Szenczi (1958), pp. i–xx; repr. as 'Jane Austen', in *A műzsák testamentuma*, Budapest: Magvető, 1988, pp. 244–58.
- Szerb, Antal (1973) *A világirodalom története* [1941], 5th edn, Budapest: Magvető, pp. 499–500.
- Szerb, Antal (1993) *Az angol irodalom kis tükre* [1929], Budapest: Holnap, pp. 96–97.
- Szobotka, Tibor (1972) 'Jane Austen', in Szenczi, Miklós, Tibor Szobotka and Anna Katona (eds), *Az angol irodalom története*, Budapest: Gondolat, pp. 418–26.
- 'T.K.' (1978) 'Emma és társasága' [film review], in *Film, színház, muzsika* [Budapest], 22 (13 May): 28–29.
- Takács, Ferenc (1998) 'Emma' [film review], in *Filmvilág* [Budapest], 41.5 (May): 59.
- Váncsa, István (1978) 'Kenyeret és tévét', in *Élet és irodalom* [Budapest], 12.18 (6 May): 12.
- Zombory, Erzsébet (1986) 'Jane Austen és az *Értelem és érzelem*', in Borbás, Mária (trans.) *Értelem és érzelem* (SS), Budapest: Európa; Bratislava: Madách (Hungarian–Czechoslovak joint edn), pp. 299–305.

Chapter 14: A hidden but Prestigious Voice: Jane Austen's Fiction in Slovenia

- Anon. (1928a) 'Veliki ameriški roman', *Jutro* [Ljubljana], 25 January, 3.
- Anon. (1928b) 'Stare veličine pred novimi kritiki', *Slovenec* [Ljubljana], 24 June, 10.
- Anon. (1939) 'Kulturni pregled', *Jutro* [Ljubljana], 24 August, 9.
- Anon. (1954) 'Nezadovoljni Angleži', *Knjiga* [Ljubljana], 12: 573.
- Anon. (1956) 'Nekaj angleških književnih novosti', *Knjiga* [Ljubljana], 1: 40.
- Anon. (1958) announcement of broadcast 'Ponos in predsodki Jane Austen', *Ljubljanski dnevnik* [Ljubljana], 23 August, 6.
- Anon. (1968) 'Nove knjige', *Ljubljanski dnevnik* [Ljubljana], 21 December, 23.

- Bogataj-Gradišnik, Katarina (1984) *Sentimentalni roman*, Ljubljana: DZS.
- Bogataj-Gradišnik, Katarina (1991) *Grozljivi roman*, Ljubljana: DZS.
- Calinescu, Matei (1987) *Five Faces of Modernity: Modernism, Avant-garde, Decadence, Kitsch, Postmodernism*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Chatterjee, Sisir (1958) 'Kako ujeti trenutek', trans. Janez Gradišnik, *Naša sodobnost* [Ljubljana], 4: 319–29.
- Gradišnik, Janez (1954) 'Deset najboljših romanov', *Naši razgledi* [Ljubljana], 16: 22.
- Gradišnik, Janez (1955) 'Pogled v nekaj svetovnih slovstev v letu 1954: Angleška knjiga', *Nova obzorja* [Ljubljana], 8: 664.
- Gradišnik, Janez (1956) 'Henry James', *Naši razgledi* [Ljubljana], 1: 24.
- Grahor-Škerlj, Olga (1951) *Izbor iz angleške proze*, Ljubljana: DZS.
- Grahor, Olga (1965) *Angleška literarna čitanka: An Anthology of English and American Literature*, Ljubljana: DZS.
- Grosman-Dokler, Meta (1964) 'Problem vrednotenja v sodobni angleški literarni teoriji in kritiki', *Problemi* [Ljubljana] 13: 17–29.
- Grosman, Meta (1989) 'The Original and its Translation from the Reader's Perspective', *Acta Neophilologica* [Ljubljana], 22: 61–68.
- Hladnik, Miran (1981) 'Slovenski ženski roman v 19. stoletju', *Slavistična revija* [Ljubljana], 21: 259–96.
- Hladnik, Miran (1983) *Trivialna literatura*, Ljubljana: DZS.
- Jurak, Mirko (1993) *Berila iz angleške in ameriške književnosti: Readings in English and American Literature*, Maribor: Obzorja.
- Kontje, Todd (1998) *Women, the Novel, and the German Nation 1771–1871: Domestic Fiction in the Fatherland*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kos, Janko (2001) *Primerjalna zgodovina slovenske literature*, Ljubljana: Založba Mladinska Knjiga.
- Kos, Matevž (1997) *Prevzetnost in pristranost*, Ljubljana: LUD Literatura.
- Kršić, Dragana (1992) 'Prevzetnost in pristranost ali znanost izkustva zavesti', *Eseji* [Ljubljana], 4: 9–26.
- Lah, Andrijan (1969a) 'Jane Austin: Prevzetnost in pristranost' [review], *Knjiga* [Ljubljana], 1–3: 40.
- Lah, Andrijan (1969b) 'Jane Austen: Prevzetnost in pristranost' [review], *Delo* [Ljubljana], 8 February, 18.
- Lah, Andrijan (1969c) 'Jane Austen: Prevzetnost in pristranost' [review], *Nedeljski dnevnik* [Ljubljana], 2 February, 11.
- Lukács, Georg (1920) *Die Theorie des Romans*, Berlin: Cassirer.
- Lukács, Georg (1937) *Literaturn'ie teorii XIX beka i marksizm*, Moscow: Gosudarstbennoe izdatel'stbo 'Hudoxestbennaya literatura'.
- Matajc, Vanesa (2000) *Osvetljave: kritiški pogledi na slovenski roman v devetdesetih*, Ljubljana: LUD Literatura.
- Miklavc, Ferdinand (trans.) (1996) *Razsodnost in rahločutnost (SS)*, Ljubljana: DZS.
- Moi, Toril (1991) *Sexual/Textual Politics: Feminist Literary Theory* [1985], London; New York: Routledge.
- Pittock, Murray (ed.) (2007) *The Reception of Sir Walter Scott in Europe*, The Athlone

- Critical Traditions Series: The Reception of British and Irish Authors in Europe, series ed. Elinor Shaffer, London; New York: Continuum.
- Prajs, Franci (trans.) (1968–69) *Emma*, *Antena* [Ljubljana], vols 25–29 (1968) and 1–15 (1969).
- Skušek, Zoja (trans.) (1997) *Emma*, Ljubljana: Založba Mladinska Knjiga.
- Smith, Anthony D. (1998) *Nacionalni identitet*, trans. Slobodan orević, Belgrade: Biblioteka XX vek.
- Snoj, Jože (1967) 'Razsežnosti zbirke Sto romanov', *Naši razgledi* [Ljubljana], 25 November, 637.
- Stanovnik, Majda (trans.) (1968) *Prevzetnost in pristranost (PP)*, Ljubljana: Cankarjeva Založba.
- Stojanović, Dragica and Jovan (trans.) (1954) *Ema (E)*, Belgrade: Rad.
- Šuklje, Rapa (1958) 'Ponos in predsodki Jane Austen' [radio broadcast, 28 August], Ljubljana: Redakcija Literarnih oddaj Radia Ljubljana.
- Šuklje, Rapa (1968) 'Jane Austen', in Stanovnik, pp. 5–43.
- Šuklje, Rapa (1977) 'Spomini in pisma' [radio broadcast, 23 November], Ljubljana: Redakcija Kulturnih in Literarnih oddaj RTV Ljubljana.
- Svetovna književnost* (1984) Ljubljana: Cankarjeva Založba.
- Wilson, Angus (1967) 'Portreti iz književnosti: genialnost Jane Austen', *Delo* [Ljubljana], 18 November, 19–20.
- Žižek, Slavoj (1985) 'Tri sklepna predavanja o Heglu in objektu iz šole Sigismunda', in *Hegel in objekt*, Ljubljana: Društvo za Teoretsko Psihoanalizo.
- Žnidaršič, Sabina (1987) 'Jane Austen pri Slovencih' (unpublished graduate thesis, University of Ljubljana).

Chapter 15: Between Bath and Bosnia: Jane Austen and Croatian Culture

- Bakhtin, Mikhail (1981) *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*, trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist, Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Balen-Heidl, Vjera (trans.) (1997) *Emma*, Zagreb: Targa.
- Beker, Miroslav (1966) 'The Theme of Plain Honesty in English Literature: From the Renaissance to Jane Austen', *Studia Romanica et Anglica Zagrabiensia* [Zagreb], 21/22 (July–December): 277–88.
- Beker, Miroslav (1997) *Od Odiseja do Uliksa*, Zagreb: Školska Knjiga.
- Beker, Miroslav (2002) *Roman 18. stoljeća : engleski, francuski i njemački romanu*, Zagreb: Školska Knjiga.
- Čačinović, Nadežda (2000) *U ženskom ključu: ogledi u teoriji kulture*, Zagreb: Centar za Ženske Studije.
- Janković, Danica S. (trans.) (1929) *Pod tuim uticajem (P)*, Belgrade: Narodna Prosveta.
- Jindra, Jelena (2003) 'Kako pišu hrvatski pisci', *Globus* [Zagreb], 14 March, 80–84.
- Jukić, Tatjana (1997) 'Ostinomanija danas', *Vijenac* [Zagreb], 5.92: 14.
- Jukić, Tatjana (1998a) 'Prevesti povijesni eho: Jane Austen', *Kolo* [Zagreb], 3: 328–34.
- Jukić, Tatjana (1998b) 'Retoričke strategije Jane Austen: *Ponos i predrasude*', *Književna smotra* [Zagreb], 30.108/109: 21–28.
- Jukić, Tatjana (1999a) 'A Lasting Performance: Jane Austen', *Links & Letters* [Barcelona],

- 6: 23–34; repr. as ‘The Visual Bodies of Jane Austen’, *S: European Journal for Semiotic Studies* [Vienna], 12 (2000): 393–407.
- Jukić, Tatjana (1999b) ‘Tijela i korpusi: vizualna Jane Austen’, *Hrvatski filmski ljetopis* [Zagreb], 5.19/20: 157–63.
- Jukić, Tatjana (2001) ‘Jane Austen’, in Detoni-Dujmić, Dunja (ed.) *Leksikon stranih pisaca*, Zagreb: Školska Knjiga, pp. 66–67.
- Kogoj-Kapetanić, Breda (1962) ‘Pogovor’ [afterword], in Stojanović, pp. 413–24.
- Kogoj-Kapetanić, Breda (1968) ‘Jane Austen’, in Žmegač, Viktor and others (eds) *Strani pisci: književni leksikon*, Zagreb: Školska Knjiga, p. 54.
- Maković, Zvonko (1997) ‘Poetika pletenja’ [afterword], in Matanović, Julijana, *Zašto sam vam lagala*, Zagreb: Mozaik, pp. 191–96.
- Mihaljević, Mignon and Berislav Grgić (trans.) (1979) *Razum i osjećaji* (SS), Zagreb: Grafički Zavod Hrvatske; repr. 1996.
- Sabalić, Ines (1997) ‘Razum i osjećaji’ [film review], *Tjednik* [Zagreb], 29 March, 12–13.
- Smaić, Nataša (1983) ‘U klasnim okovima’, *Studio* [Zagreb], 26 November, 26–27.
- Solar, Milivoj (2000) *Granice znanosti o književnosti: izabrani ogledi*, Zagreb: Naklada P. I. P. Pavičić.
- Šoljan, Antun (ed.) (1982) *100 najvećih romana svjetske književnosti*, Zagreb: Mladost.
- Stojanović, D. and J. (trans.) (1962) *Emma*, ed. Franjo Hartl, Zagreb: Naprijed.
- Taine, Hippolyte (1880) *History of English Literature* [1863–64], New York: American Book Exchange.
- Ujević, Tin (1965) ‘George Meredith’, in Ivanišević, Drago (ed.) *Sabrana djela IX: eseji, rasprave, članci II*, Zagreb: Znanje, pp. 46–64.
- Vidan, Ivo (1979) ‘Razum i osjećaji u djelu Jane Austen’, in Mihaljević and Grgić, pp. 5–9.
- Vučić, Miroslava (1997) ‘Pošast Jane Austen: mrtva kraljica Hollywooda’, *Tjednik* [Zagreb], 8 March, 60–63.
- West, Rebecca (1993) *Black Lamb and Grey Falcon: A Journey through Yugoslavia* [1942], Edinburgh: Canongate.

Chapter 16: Jane Austen in Serbia, 1929–2000

- Ančić, Vojin (trans.) ([1998/99]) *Ema* (E), Zemun: IP Book-Marso.
- Austen, Jane (1976–77) *Sabrana dela* [collected works], 6 vols, Belgrade: Narodna Knjiga.
- Bauer-Protić, Ljubica (trans.) (1976) *Pod tuim uticajem* (P), Belgrade: Narodna Knjiga; *Sabrana dela*, vol. 6.
- Bošković, Dušan (2003) *Estetika u okruženju*, Belgrade: Institut za Filozofiju i Društvenu Teoriju, Filip Višnjić.
- Čura, Ileana (1977) ‘Predgovor’, in Simeonović (1977), pp. 5–29.
- Čurčija-Prodanović, Nada (trans.) (1955) *Mansfield park* (MP), Belgrade: Nolit; repr. 1964, 1976 as vol. 3 of *Sabrana dela*.

- Janković, Danica S. (trans.) (1929) *Pod tuim uticajem* (P), Belgrade: Narodna Prosveta.
- Janković, Danica S. (trans.) (1953) *Gordost i predrasuda* (PP), Belgrade: Rad.
- Janković, Danica S. (trans.) (1957) *Pod tuim uticajem* (P), Subotica: Minerva; reissue of Janković 1929.
- Johnson, Samuel (1953) 'Thomas Gray', *Lives of the English Poets*, London; New York: J. M. Dent, 2: 383–92.
- Jovanović, Branko (1959) 'Psihološka studija', *Borba* [Belgrade], 13.8: 10.
- Jovanović, Slobodan A. and others (1970) *Savremeni književni prevodioci Jugoslavije*, Belgrade: Savez Književnih Prevodilaca.
- Kettle, Arnold (1962) *Engleski roman*, trans. Ivo Vidan, Sarajevo: Svjetlost.
- Koljević, Svetozar (1960) 'Razum ili osećanje', *Izraz* [Sarajevo], 6.8.10: 357–62.
- Kovačević, Ivanka (1983) 'Džejn Ostin', in Kostić, Veselin (ed.) *Engleska književnost II*, Belgrade: Nolit; Sarajevo: Svjetlost, pp. 234–44.
- Kršić, Smiljana and Nikola (trans.) (1959) *Katarina* (NA), Sarajevo: Svjetlost.
- Kršić, Smiljana and Nikola (trans.) (1969) *Nortengerska opatija* (NA), afterword Milica Mihajlović, Belgrade: Rad; repr. 1976 as *Sabrana dela*, vol. 5; reissue of Kršić 1959.
- Legouis, Emile and Louis Cazamian (1926–27) *A History of English Literature*, 2 vols, London: J. M. Dent.
- Mihajlović, Milica (1969) 'Džejn Ostin', in Kršić (1969), pp. 185–88.
- Moi, Toril (1991) *Sexual/Textual Politics: Feminist Literary Theory* [1985], London; New York: Routledge.
- Palavestra, Predrag (1991) 'Književnici na crnim listama', 'Srpska književnost izvan domovine', *Književnost: kritika ideologije*, Belgrade: Srpska Književna Zadruga, pp. 305–36.
- Paligorić, Sonja (1977) 'Oživljena prošlost: realizam i optimizam Džejn Ostin', *Književne novine* [Belgrade], 1 August, 9.
- Prčić, Tvrtko (1989) *Novi transkripcioni rečnik engleskih ličnih imena*, Novi Sad: Prometej.
- Puhalo, Dušan (1964) 'Predgovor', in Simić (1964), pp. 7–16.
- Puhalo, Dušan (1966) *Istorija Engleske književnosti XVIII veka i romantizma (1700–1832)*, Belgrade: Naučna Knjiga, pp. 287–96.
- Said, Edward (1997) 'Džejn Ostin i imperija', trans. Brana Miladinov, *Reč* [Belgrade], 4.33: 82–89.
- Simeonović, Milica (trans.) (1959) *Razum i osećanje* (SS), afterword 'M.K.', Belgrade: Narodna Knjiga.
- Simeonović, Milica (trans.) (1977) *Razum i osećanje* (SS), foreword Ileana Čura, Belgrade: Narodna Knjiga; *Sabrana dela*, vol. 1; repr. 1996; reissue of Simeonović 1959.
- Simić, Živojin (trans.) (1964) *Gordost i predrasuda* (PP), foreword Dušan Puhalo, Belgrade: Savremena Administracija.
- Simić, Živojin (trans.) (1975) *Gordost i predrasuda* (PP), Belgrade: Nolit; repr. 1976 as *Sabrana dela*, vol. 2, and 1997; reissue of Simić 1964.
- Stojanović, D. and J. (trans.) (1954) *Ema* (E), afterword Danica S. Janković, Belgrade: Rad; repr. 1976 as *Sabrana dela*, vol. 4.
- Živanov, Miodrag and others (eds) (1989) *Srpska bibliografija knjige*, vol. 15, Belgrade: Narodna Biblioteka Srbije.

Chapter 17: Jane Austen: Persuading Romanian Readerships and Audiences

- A., Gh. (1980) [review of Popa 1980], *Cronica* [Iași], year 15, 36/762: 8.
- Almăgeanu, Ana (trans.) (1968) *Mîndrie și prejudecată (PP)*, pref. Anda Teodorescu, Bucharest: Editura Pentru Literatura Universală; repr. 1969, 1970, 1992, 1995, 1998.
- Anon. (2006) 'Despre producție', in *Cinemagia* <http://www.cinemagia.ro/movie.php?movie_id=11794&what=article&article_id=13054> [accessed 3 April 2006].
- Austen, Jane (1995) *Pride and Prejudice* [1813], Bucharest: Prietenii Cărții.
- Bădulescu, Anca (1995) *An Outline of Victorian Fiction*, Brașov: Universitatea Transilvania, pp. 44–49.
- Balotă, Nicolae (1978) 'Un roman pe plăcuțe de ivoariu', in *Arta lecturii*, Bucharest: Editura Cartea Românească, pp. 205–08.
- Candrea, I. Aurel and Gheorge Adamescu (eds) (1931) *Encyclopaedic and Illustrated Dictionary*, Bucharest: Editura Cartea Romaneasca.
- Chefneux, Gabriela (2001) *Feminist Attitudes of the English Fiction from 1690 to 1820*, Brașov: Editura Universității Transilvania din Brașov.
- Chioreanu, Aurora and others (eds) (1962) *Dictionar enciclopedic roman*, vol. 1, Bucharest: Editura Politica.
- Chioreanu, Aurora and Gheorghe Radulescu (eds) (1978) *Mic dicționar enciclopedic* [1972], Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedică Română.
- Constantin, Silvia (trans.) (2003) *Dragoste și prietenie: o colecție de scrieri juvenile* (Juvenilia), Bucharest: Aldo Press.
- Constantin, Silvia (trans.) (2004) *Persuasiune (P)*, Bucharest: Aldo Press.
- Constantinescu, Ligia Doina (1974) 'Sensul ironiei', *Argeș* [Pitești], year 9, 2 (February): 11.
- Constantinescu, Ligia Doina (1977) 'The Living Pattern of Jane Austen's Novels', *Anale științifice Universitatea din Iași, seria literatura* [Iași], 23: 93–98.
- Constantinescu, Ligia Doina (2005) *Jane Austen as a Woman Novelist: Her Narrative Art from a Structuralist Perspective*, Iași: Timpul.
- Diaconovici, Cornel (ed.) (1998) *Enciclopedia română*, vol. 1, Sibiu: W. Krafft.
- Draga, Maria-Sabina (2003) 'Între Elizabeth Bennet și Ally McBeal? Despre eternul feminin în "Jurnalul lui Bridget Jones"', in Fielding, Helen, *Jurnalul lui Bridget Jones*, Bucharest: Polirom, pp. 337–52.
- Florea, Anca (trans.) (2004) *Mîndrie și prejudecată (PP)*, pref. Dan Grigorescu, Bucharest: Leda.
- Fulger, Mihai (2006) 'Fără prejudecăți despre "Mândrie și prejudecată"' [review], *Observatorul cultural* [Bucharest], 16–22 February, 19.
- Galea, Ileana (1996) 'Jane Austen', in *Victorianism and Literature*, Cluj-Napoca: Dacia, pp. 60–61; repr. 2000.
- Gîrbea, Horea (2006) 'Planeta Austen: cercuri în lanurile Angliei', in *Săptămîna financiară* <http://www.sfin.ro/articol_375/planeta_austen._cercuri_n_lanurile_angliei.html> [accessed 3 April 2006].
- Grădinaru, Lidia (trans.) (2004) *Rațiune și simțire (SS)*, pref. Cornel Mihai Ionescu, Bucharest: Leda.
- Graham, Paul (2006) 'Dacă Lisp e așa extraordinar', in *Goobix* <<http://ro.goobix.com/pg/iflisp>> [accessed 3 April 2006].

- Grigorescu, Dan (1980) 'Jane Austen', *Contemporanul* [Bucharest], 34/1763 (22 August): 11.
- Grigorescu, Dan (2004) 'Prefață', to Florea, pp. 5–13.
- Harris, Jocelyn (1989) *Jane Austen's Art of Memory*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ihora, Adina (trans.) (2004) *Mansfield Park*, Bucharest: Aldo Press.
- Leconte, Valentine and Charlotte Pressoir (trans.) (1932) *Les Cinq filles de Mrs Bennet (PP)*, Paris: Plon.
- Lefter, Virgil (1991) 'Jane Austen și mirifică artă a memoriei' [review], *Luceafărul* [Bucharest], 16 October, 14.
- Lefter, Virgil (1998) 'Penel plăcut și plăcuțe de ivoriu' [review], *Luceafărul* [Bucharest], 15 April, 23.
- Lefter, Virgil (trans.) (1991) *Epistolar, Lady Susan (LJA, LS)*, Bucharest: Univers.
- Levițchi, Leon D., Sever Trifu and Veronica Focșăneanu (1998) 'Jane Austen', in *Istoria literaturii engleze și americane*, Bucharest: AllEducational, 2: 329–35.
- Mareș, Carmen Liliana (trans.) (1972) *Elinor și Mariane: roman (SS)*, Bucharest: Eminescu; repr. 1992 (twice), 1993, 1995, 1998.
- Matache, Liliana (1969a) 'Metoda narativ oblică și stilul indirect liber în romanul "Emma" de Jane Austen', *Analele Universității București: literatură universală și comparată* [Bucharest], 2: 63–70.
- Matache, Liliana (1969b) 'Stilul indirect liber în romanul "Emma" (1814) de Jane Austen', *Analele Universității București: limbi germanice* [Bucharest], 18: 159–68.
- Mudure, Mihaela (2000) 'Elinor și Mariane', in *Feminine*, Cluj-Napoca: NapocaStar, pp. 123–24.
- Myer, Valerie Grosvenor (1997) *The Obstinate Heart: Jane Austen, a Biography*, London: Michael O'Mara.
- Nenișor, Gheorghe (trans.) (1943) *Surorile Bennet (PP)*, Bucharest: Socec.
- Oanță, Emilia (trans.) (2004) *Mănăstirea Northanger (NA)*, Bucharest: Aldo Press.
- Olteanu, Tudor (1974) *Morfologia romanului european în secolul al XVIII-lea*, Bucharest: Univers.
- Oprea Ștefan (2002) '“Rațiune și simțire” de Ang Lee Sense', *Convorbiri literare* [Iasi], 135.2 (February): 133–34.
- Păun, Alex-Mihai (2004) 'A suferi', *Adevărul literar artistic* [Bucharest], 13.728 (August): 3.
- Peteancu, Alexandru C. (ed.) (1929) *Enciclopedia română*, Cluj: Minerva.
- Popa, Costache (trans.) (1976) *Mănăstirea Northanger (NA)*, Bucharest: Univers.
- Popa, Costache (trans.) (1980) *Persuasiune (P)*, Bucharest: Univers; repr. 1992.
- Popa, Ecaterina (1986) 'Jane Austen's Control of Dialogue: A Pragmatic Approach to *Pride and Prejudice*', in Galea, Ileana, Virgil Stanciu and Liviu Cotrău (eds) *Studies in the Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Centuries Novel*, Cluj-Napoca: Universitatea Cluj-Napoca, pp. 130–48.
- Popa, Marcel D. and others (eds) (1993) *Dicționar enciclopedic*, vol. 1, Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedică.
- Preda, Ioan Aurel (1970) 'Jane Austen', in Cartianu, Ana and Ioan Aurel Preda (eds) *Dicționar al literaturii engleze*, Bucharest: Editura Științifică, pp. 24–25.

- Preda, Radu (2006) 'Mr. Darcy Reloaded', in *HotNews* <http://www.hotnews.ro/articol_42687-Mr.-Darcy-reloaded-de-Radu-Preda.htm> [accessed 3 April 2006].
- Radu, Daniela Elena (trans.) (1993) *Mansfield Park*, Bucharest: Florisrom.
- Róna, Ilona (trans.) (1984) *Meggyőző érvék: regény (P)*, Bucharest: Kriterion.
- Roşu, Anca (trans.) (1977) *Emma*, Bucharest: Eminescu; repr. 1992 (twice), 1999, 2004.
- Sadoveanu, Profira (trans.) (1993) *Mănăstirea Northanger (NA)*, Bucharest: Passim, Rai.
- Teodorescu, Anda (1992) 'Jane Austen' [1969], in *Mîndrie şi prejudecată (PP)*, trans. Ana Almăgeanu, Bucharest: Garamond, pp. 5–19.
- Teodorescu, Magda (1992) 'Lecturi "comode"', *România literară* [Bucharest], 21.10 (March): 21.
- Tupan, Ana Maria (1997) 'Jane Austen', in *A Survey Course in British Literature: Part I*, Bucharest: Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti, pp. 350–53.
- Volceanov, George (2000) 'Jane Austen', in *A Survey of English Literature from Beowulf to Jane Austen*, Bucharest: Editura Fundaţiei 'România de mâine', pp. 166–68.
- Zsenczi, Miklos (trans.) (1988) *Bűszkeség és balítélet: regény (PP)*, Bucharest: Kriterion.

Chapter 18: The Reception of Jane Austen in Poland

- Anon. (1933–35) 'J. Austen' [1934] *Rozsądek i uczucie* [review], *Przewodnik literacki i naukowy* [Warsaw], 42.
- Anon. (1956) 'Jane Austen (1956) *Duma i uprzedzenia*, trans. Anna Przedpełska-Trzeciakowska, Warsaw: PIW' [review], *Literatura piękna* [Warsaw], 172.
- Anon. (1962) 'Jane Austen (1962) *Perswazje*, trans. Anna Przedpełska-Trzeciakowska, Warsaw: PIW' [review], *Literatura piękna* [Warsaw], 173–74.
- Anon. (1963) 'Jane Austen (1963) *Emma*, trans. Jadwiga Dmochowska, Warsaw: Czytelnik' [review], *Literatura piękna* [Warsaw], 182.
- Anon. (1978) 'Jane Austen (1977) *Rozważna i romantyczna*, [Warsaw]: Czytelnik' [review], *Kultura* [Warsaw], 15: 4.
- Bachórz, Józef (1979) *Realizm bez 'chmurnej jazdy': studia o powieściach Józefa Korzeniowskiego*, Warsaw: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy.
- Bieńkowska, Barbara and Halina Chamera (1987) *Zarys dziejów książki*, Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Spółdzielcze.
- Błaszak, Marek (2002) 'Sailors' Register in Jane Austen's Writing', *Stylistyka* [Warsaw; Cracow; Opole], 11: 181–92.
- Błaszak, Marek (2003) 'A Nautical Reading of Jane Austen's *Mansfield Park* and *Persuasion*', *Stylistyka* [Warsaw; Cracow; Opole], 12: 123–48.
- Błaszak, Marek (2004) 'Jane Austen and the Navy: A Study of Her Letters', in Kolek, Leszek S., Aleksandra Kędzierska and Anna Kędra-Kardela (eds) *Perspectives on Literature and Culture*, Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej, pp. 17–25.
- Bojarska, Anna (1978) 'Zdrowa młoda mateczka' [review], *Nowe Książki* [Warsaw], 11: 64–65.
- Bugajska, Stefania (1996) 'Eleonora i Marianna' [review], *Wiadomości Kulturalne* [Warsaw], 20: 21.

- Bystyrdzińska, Grażyna (2002) 'Houses and Landscapes in Jane Austen's Novels', *Approaches to Literature* [Warsaw], 2: 47–57.
- Bystyrdzińska, Grażyna (2004) 'Some Remarks on 19th Century Polish Translations of Byron's *Childe Harold*', *Approaches to Literature* [Warsaw], 3: 25–37.
- Chaciński, Michał (2005) 'Rozważny i romantyczny', *Gazeta telewizyjna*, suppl. to *Gazeta wyborcza* [Warsaw], 4–10 March, 9.
- Ciagara, Elżbieta (1996) 'Rozważna i romantyczna' [film review], *Film* [Warsaw], 10: 91–92.
- Dickens, Charles (1953) *Wielkie nadzieje*, pref. Halina Brodowska-Suwała, Warsaw: Książka i Wiedza; trans. *Great Expectations*.
- Dickens, Charles (1955) *Ciężkie czasy na te czasy*, intro. Janusz Wilhelmi, Warsaw: Czytelnik; trans. *Hard Times*.
- Dickens, Charles (1956) *Dawid Copperfield*, intro. Grzegorz Sinko, Warsaw: Książka i Wiedza.
- Dmochowska, Jadwiga (trans.) (1963) *Emma*, Warsaw: Czytelnik; repr. 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2002, 2004.
- Dobosiewicz, Ilona (1989) 'Jane Austen's Narrative Art in *Emma*', *Zeszyty naukowe wyższej szkoły pedagogicznej im. powstańców śląskich w Opolu, filologia angielska* [Opole], 4: 81–95.
- Dobosiewicz, Ilona (1996) 'A Good Woman is a Good Sister: The Importance of Sororal Bonds in the Heroine's Quest for Self-Knowledge and Happiness in the Novels of Jane Austen', in Kolek, Leszek S. (ed.) *Approaches to Fiction*, Lublin: Wydawnictwo Folium, pp. 49–69.
- Dobosiewicz, Ilona (1997) *Female Relationships in Jane Austen's Novels: A Critique of the Female Ideal Propagated in 18th-Century Conduct Literature*, Opole: Uniwersytet Opolski.
- Dobrzycka, Irena (1955) *The Conditions of Living of the Working Class in the Social Novels of Charles Kingsley*, Poznań: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Dobrzycka, Irena (1971) 'Austen Jane', in *Mały słownik pisarzy angielskich i amerykańskich*, Warsaw: Wiedza Powszechna, pp. 23–24.
- Dyboski, Roman (1935) 'Wielcy powieściopisarze angielscy XIX wieku z perspektywy dzisiejszej', *Pamiętnik Literacki* [Lwów], 32: 84–109.
- Filipczuk, Michał (trans.) (2003) *Rozważna i romantyczna* (SS), epilogue Monika Handzlik, Cracow: Zielona Sowa; repr. 2004.
- Helman, Alicja (1996) 'Świat w zupełnie innym stylu' [film review], *Film* [Warsaw], 3: 22.
- Helsztyński, Stanisław (1933) 'U Janiny Sujkowskiej', *Wiadomości literackie* [Warsaw], 34: 3.
- 'J. K.' (1957) 'Targ na dziewczęta' [review], *Nowiny literackie i wydawnicze* [Warsaw], 5: 5.
- Janion, Maria (1996) *Kobiety i duch imności*, Warsaw: [n. pub.].
- Kałużyński, Zygmunt and Tomasz Raczek (1996) 'Kobiety zakochane', *Wprost* [Warsaw], 17: 86–87.
- Kebut, Piotr (1996) 'Romans po angielsku' [review], *Wiadomości kulturalne*, 45: 21.
- Kerrigan, Michael (ed.) (1998) *Mądrość i dowcip Jane Austen* (Selections), trans. Anna Przedpełska-Trzeciakowska, Jadwiga Dmochowska and Barbara Kopeć, Warsaw: Prószyński i Ska.

- Kolk-Wolańczuk, Katarzyna (trans.) (2000) *Sense and Sensibility*, Warsaw: Nasza Księgarnia.
- Kondek, Stanisław (1992) 'Kontrola, nadzór, sterowanie: budowanie państwowego systemu wydawniczego w Polsce w latach 1945–1951', in Kostecki, Janusz and Alina Brodzka (eds) *Piśmiennictwo-systemy kontroli-obiegi alternatywne*, Warsaw: Biblioteka Narodowa, 2: 201–13.
- Korzeniowski, Józef (1958) *Kollokacja* [1847], introduction by Stefan Kawyn Wrocław; Cracow: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Kozak, Jolanta (trans.) (1998) *Listy wybrane 1796–1817 (LJA)*, ed. R. W. Chapman, Warsaw: Prószyński i Ska.
- Kozarynowa, Zofia (1976) 'Aunt Jane', *Wiadomości* [London], 27 June, 3.
- Krajewska, Wanda (1980) 'Polskie przekłady powieści poetyckich Byrona w okresie romantyzmu', *Pamiętnik literacki* [Warsaw], 71.1: 153–74.
- Królikowska, Elżbieta (1996) 'Rok kobiet w kapeluszach' [film review], *Film* [Warsaw], 3: 116.
- Kurowska, Elżbieta (1987) *Recepcja literatury angielskiej w Polsce (1932–1939)*, Wrocław; Warsaw; Cracow: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Lefroy, Helen (2001) *Jane Austen*, [Warsaw]: Wydawnictwo RTW.
- Lewicki, Zbigniew (1976) 'Pseudogotycki romans Jane Austen' [review], *Nowe książki* [Warsaw], 5: 65–66.
- Lipiec, Wanda (1973) 'Norman Page *The Language of Jane Austen*' [review], *Zagadnienia rodzajów literackich*, 16.1/2: 111–15.
- Maciejewski, Marian (1970) *Narodziny powieści poetyckiej w Polsce*, Wrocław; Warsaw; Cracow: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Michalski, Hieronim (1957) 'Klasyka zniesiona ze strychu', *Nowe książki* [Warsaw], 6: 6–8.
- Myer, Valerie Grosvenor (1999) *Niezłomne serce: Jane Austen, biografia*, trans. Małgorzata Kicana, [Warsaw]: Prószyński i Ska; trans. *The Obstinate Heart: Jane Austen, a Biography* (1997).
- Najder, Zdzisław (1963) 'Małżeństwo i prawda o ludziach', *Nowe Książki* [Warsaw], 17: 845–46.
- Pietrzak-Merta, Magdalena (trans.) (1997) *Lady Susan; Watsonowie; Sanditon (LS, W, S)*, Warsaw: Prószyński i Ska.
- Pietrzak-Merta, Magdalena (trans.) (1999) *Sanditon*, as completed by Anne Telscombe, Warsaw: Prószyński i Ska.
- Przedpelska-Trzeciakowska, Anna (trans.) (1956) *Duma i uprzedzenia (PP)*, Warsaw: PIW; repr. 1975, 1992, 1993, 1994, 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2001, 2002 (twice).
- Przedpelska-Trzeciakowska, Anna (trans.) (1962) *Perswazje (P)*, Warsaw: PIW; repr. 1993, 1996, 1999, 2003.
- Przedpelska-Trzeciakowska, Anna (trans.) (1975) *Opactwo Northanger (NA)*, Warsaw: PIW; repr. 1993, 1996, 2001.
- Przedpelska-Trzeciakowska, Anna (trans.) (1977) *Rozważna i romantyczna (SS)*, Warsaw: Czytelnik; repr. 1992, 1996, 1997, 1999, 2000, 2002, 2003.
- Przedpelska-Trzeciakowska, Anna (trans.) (1995) *Mansfield Park*, Warsaw: Prószyński i Ska; repr. 1996, 1998, 2000, 2003, 2004.
- Ślódowska, Elżbieta (1982) 'Wybrane problemy ruchu wydawniczego pod zaborami', *Studia o książce* [Wrocław], 33–46.

- Spittal, Anna (1977) 'The Use of Summary and Scene in Jane Austen's Novels', *Acta Universitatis Wratislaviensis* [Wrocław], 41–55.
- Sujkowska, Janina (trans.) (1934) *Rozsądek i uczucie* (SS), Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Współczesne.
- Surówka, Katarzyna (trans.) (2005) *Duma i uprzedzenie* (PP), Cracow: Zielona Sowa.
- Szczerba, Jacek (1996) 'Manewry miłosne' [film review], *Gazeta wyborcza* [Warsaw], 16 December, 15.
- Tempska, Urszula (1987) 'The Spatial Aspects of Five Chosen Novels by Jane Austen and Charlotte and Emily Brontë: A Comparative Study of *Pride and Prejudice*, *Mansfield Park*, *Jane Eyre*, *Villette*, *Wuthering Heights*', *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* [Poznań], 20: 197–212.
- Terlecka-Recknis, Małgorzata (1997) 'Portrety uczuć' [film review], *Twój styl* [Warsaw], 1: 89.
- Teszna, Tomasz (trans.) (2005) *Emma*, epilogue Krystyna Zabawa, Cracow: Zielona Sowa.
- Tretiak, Andrzej (1928) *Literatura angielska w okresie romantyzmu (1798–1831)*, Lwów: K. S. Jakubowski.
- Treugutt, Stefan (1964) *Beniowski: kryzys indywidualizmu romantycznego*, Warsaw: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy.
- Turaj-Kalińska, Katarzyna (1995) 'Rozważna i romantyczna' [film review], *Przegląd powszechny* [Warsaw], 6: 361–63.
- Weinsheimer, Joel (1994) 'Teoria bohatera literackiego: *Emma*', trans. Dorota Gostyńska, *Pamiętnik literacki* [Warsaw], 85.1: 163–87.
- Wertenstein, Wanda (1996) 'Szczęśliwe związki' [film review], *Tygodnik powszechny* [Cracow], 11: 13.
- Zieja, Agnieszka (2003) 'Different Signs, Same Meanings: Jane Austen's *Sense and Sensibility* and Its Film Adaptation', in Wawrzyczek, Irmina and Zbigniew Mazur (eds) *Studying 'New' Britain: Popular Culture and Ideology*, Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej, pp. 201–19.

Chapter 19: The Reception of Jane Austen in Russia

- Amelina, T. A. (1972a) 'Nesobstvenno-Pryamaya rech' v romanakh Dzhejn Osten', *Uchenye zapiski Latvijskogo universiteta* [Riga], 163: 3–30.
- Amelina, T. A. (1972b) 'Parodii Dzhejn Osten', in Smulovich, M. (ed.) *Problemy teorii romana i rasskaza*, Riga: Izdatel'stvo Latvijskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta im. P. Stuchki, pp. 53–69.
- Amelina, T. A. (1972c) 'Rol' peisazha i bytovogo fona v romanakh Dzhejn Osten', in *Problema teorii romana i rasskaza*, Riga: Izdatel'stvo Latvijskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta im. P. Stuchki, pp. 70–89.
- Amelina, T. A. (1973) 'Problema realizma v tvorcestve Dzhejn Osten (metod i stil)', Leningrad: LGU im. A. A. Zhdanova.
- Amelina, T. A. and N. Ya. D'yakonova (1978) *Khrestomatiya po anglijskoj literature XIX vek*, Leningrad: Prosveshchenie.
- Anon. (1816) 'Kratkie vypiski, izvestiya i zamechaniya', *Vestnik Evropy* [Moscow], 87.12: 319–20.
- Anon. (1890) 'Austen, Dzen', in Andreevskago, I. E., *Entsiklopedicheskii slovar'*, St Petersburg: Brokgauz & Efron, 2: 471.

- Anon. (1912) 'Osten, Dzheĭn', in Zheliezov, V. Ia. (ed.) *Entsiklopedicheskii slovar'*, Moscow: Granat, 30: 69.
- Anon. (1928) 'Gerbert Uells o budushchem romana', *Vestnik inostrannoĭ literatury* [Moscow], 2: 156.
- Anon. (1967) review of Marshak 1967, *Literaturnaya Rossiya* [Moscow], 50: 23.
- Anon. (1976) 'Kto zhe avtor?', *Inostrannaya literature* [Moscow], 2: 272–73.
- Anon. (1977) 'S molotka . . .', *Literaturnaya gazeta* [Moscow], 25 May.
- Anon. (1980) 'Dzheĭn Osten', in Gvishiani-Kosygina, L. A. (ed.) *Osnovnye proizvedeniya inostrannoĭ khudozhestvennoĭ literatury: lit.-bibliograf. Spravochnik*, Moscow: Kniga, pp. 130–32.
- Anon. (1981) 'Snova: Dzheĭn Ostin', *Inostrannaya literature* [Moscow], 7: 261.
- Anon. (2003) 'Chto chitayut domokhoziaiki', *Ezhenedel'nyi zhurnal* [Moscow], 14 July, 69.
- Anon. (2006) 'Ostin, Dzheĭn', 'Potomki Rossii', in *Genalogia.ru* <<http://www.genealogia.ru/users/genfamous/descend/Austen.htm>> [accessed 18 July 2006].
- Atarova, K. N. (1968) 'Zhivye stranitsy' [review], *Inostrannaya literatura* [Moscow], 3: 266–68.
- Atarova, K. N. (1983) 'Predislovie i kommentarii', in *Radcliffe, A.: A Romance of the Forest; Austen, J.: Northanger Abbey*, Moscow: Progress, pp. 7–28.
- Austen, Jane (1988–89) *Sobranie sochinenii v trekh tomakh* (collected works), trans. Ekaterina Genieva, commentaries Ekaterina Genieva and N. M. Demurova, 3 vols, Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literature.
- Baring, Maurice (1960) *Landmarks in Russian Literature* [1910], New York: Barnes & Noble.
- Bayley, John (1971) *Pushkin: A Comparative Commentary*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bel'skiĭ, A. A. (1967) 'Nravoopisatel'nyi roman Dzheĭn Ostin (o romanakh angliĭskoĭ pisatel'nitsy "Zdravyyĭ smysl" i chuvstvetel'nost' i "Gordost' i predubezhdeniye")', *Uchenye zapiski Permskogo universiteta* [Perm], 157: 47–83.
- Bel'skiĭ, A. A. (1968a) *Angliĭskii roman 1800–1810*, Perm: [n. pub.], pp. 47–107.
- Bel'skiĭ, A. A. (1968b) 'Ostin, Dzheĭn', in Surkov, A. A. (ed.) *Kratkaya literaturnaya entsiklopediya*, Moscow: Sovetskaia entsiklopediia, 5: 486–87.
- Bel'skiĭ, A. A. (1972) 'Nravoopisatel'nyi roman S'yuzen Ferrier', in *Problema progressivnoĭ literatury Zapada XVIII–XX vekov*, Perm: [n. pub.], pp. 61–84.
- Bel'skiĭ, A. A. (1975) *Angliĭskii roman 1820-kh godov*, Perm: Permskii gos. universitet.
- Bury, John (2002) 'Pride and Prejudice and Eugene Onegin', *Times Literary Supplement* [London], 10 September: 15.
- Chameev, A. A. (1983) 'Put' Dzheĭn Osten ot parodiinogo rasskaza k romanu', in *Funktsionirovanie zhanrovyykh sistem*, Yakutsk: I Akutskii gos. universitet, pp. 71–76.
- Chechetko, M. V. (1973) 'Rannie parodii Dzheĭn Osten', *Nauch. Dokl. Vyssh. shkoly: filologicheskie nauki* [Moscow], 6: 34–35.
- Chechetko, M. V. (1974) 'Esteticheskie vzglyady i khudozhestvennye printsipy Dzheĭn Osten', in *Problemy angliĭskoĭ literatury XIX i XX vv.*, Moscow: Izd-vo Moskovskogo univ., pp. 7–38.
- Chechetko, M. V. (1979) 'Realisticheskiĭ roman Dzheĭn Osten: problema tvorcheskoi evoliutsii', Moscow: MGU im. M. V. Lomonosova.
- Chechetko, M. V. (1984) '“Bez geroya”: k voprosu o romane Dzheĭn Osten “Mensfield park” – k probleme geroya v eĭ tvorchestve', in Filiushkina, S. N. (ed.) *Obraz geroya – obraz vremeni*, Voronezh: Izd-vo Voronezhskogo universiteta, pp. 28–37.

- Chernavina, L. I. (1966) 'Elizabet Gaskell i Sharlotta Bronte: k voprosu o literaturnykh vyazyakh', *Uchenye zapiski Moskovskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo instituta im. V.I. Lenina* [Moscow], 245: 261–72.
- Coutinho, Charles Giovanni (2002) '“Pride and Prejudice” and “Eugene Onegin”', *Times Literary Supplement* [London], 11 October, 17.
- Debreczeny, Paul (1983) *The Other Pushkin: A Study of Alexander Pushkin's Prose Fiction*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Demurova, N. M. (1964) 'Osobennosti khudozhestvennoĭ manery Dzheĭn Ostin (po romanam “Gordost' i predubezhdenie” i “Razumnost' i chuvstvitel'nost'")', *Uchenye zapiski Moskovskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo instituta im. V.I. Lenina* [Moscow], 218: 85–103.
- Demurova, N. M. (1961) 'Roman Dzheĭn Ostin “Gordost' i predrassudki”', in Austen, Jane, *Pride and Prejudice*, Moscow: Progress, pp. 5–17.
- Demurova, N. M. (1967) 'Dzheĭn Ostin i ee roman “Gordost' i predubezhdenie”', in Marshak (1967a), pp. 538–89.
- Demurova, N. M. (1976) 'Predislovie', in Ostin, Dzheĭn, *Gordost' i predubezhdenie; Abbatstvo Nortenger*, Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, pp. 3–20.
- Druzhinin, A. V. (1865) 'Pis'ma inogorodnogo podpishchika ob angliĭskoi literature i zhurnatlistike' [1854], in *Sobranie sochineniĭ*, St Petersburg: Tip. Imp. Akademii nauk, 5: 333–47.
- Dzheksan, T. A. (1945) 'Razum i chuvstvo', *Britanskiĭ soyuznik* [Moscow], 1: 6.
- Elistratova, A. A. (1953) [Dzh. Osten], in Anisimov, I. I. and others (eds) *Istoriya angliĭskoi literatury*, Moscow: AN SSSR, 3: 1.
- Evsyukova, Svetlana (2006) 'Dzheĭn Osten “Gordost' i predubezhdenie” (Pride and Prejudice)', in *E-motion* <http://e-motion.com.ua/issue47/books/mansion/Dzhejn_Osten_Gordost.html> [accessed 18 July 2006].
- Foks, R. (1939) *Roman i narod*, trans. V. P. Isakov, Moscow: Goslitizdat.
- Genieva, Ekaterina Yu. (ed.) (1986) *Dzheĭn Osten: biobibliograficheskiĭ ukazatel'* Moscow: Kniga.
- Genieva, Ekaterina (1988–89a) *Gordost' i predubezhdenie (PP)*, Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura; in *Sobranie sochinenii v trekh tomakh*, vol. 1.
- Genieva, Ekaterina (trans.) (1988–89b) *Chuvstvo i chuvstvitel'nost' (SS)*, Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura; in *Sobranie sochinenii v trekh tomakh*, vol. 1.
- Genieva, Ekaterina (trans.) (1988–89c) *Dovody rassudka (P)*, Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura; in *Sobranie sochinenii v trekh tomakh*, vol. 3.
- Genieva, Ekaterina (trans.) (1988–89d) *Emma*, Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura; in *Sobranie sochinenii v trekh tomakh*, vol. 3.
- Genieva, Ekaterina (trans.) (1988–89e) *Mensfild-Park (MP)*, Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura; in *Sobranie sochinenii v trekh tomakh*, vol. 2.
- Genieva, Ekaterina (trans.) (1988–89f), *Nortengerskoe abbatstvo (NA)*, Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura; in *Sobranie sochinenii v trekh tomakh*, vol. 2.
- Gopman, V. L. (1976) review of Russian trans. of Darrell Mansell, *The Novels of Jane Austen*, London; Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1974, *Obshchestvennye nauki za rubezhom: literaturovedenie* [Moscow], 4: 158–61.
- Gopman, V. L. (1977) review of *Yubileinyĭ sbornik k 200-letiyu so dnya rozhdeniya Dzheĭn Ostin*, *Obshchestvennye nauki za rubezhom: literaturovedenie* [Moscow], 4: 107–11.
- Grazhdanskaya, Z. T. (1955) 'Sestry Bronte', in Anisimov, I. I. and others (eds) *Istoriya angliĭskoi literatury*, Moscow: AN SSSR, 2.2: 370.

- Gritchuk, N. A. (1958) 'Esteticheskie vzglyady Sharlotty Bronte', *Uchenye zapiski Moskovskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo instituta* [Moscow], 130.3: 107–17.
- Imposti, Gabriella (2004) 'The Reasons for an "Absence": Jane Austen's Reception in Russia', in Battaglia, Beatrice and Diego Saglia (eds) *Re-drawing Austen: Picturesque Travels in Austenland*, Naples: Liguori, pp. 369–76.
- Ivasheva, V. S. (1955) *Istoriya zarubezhnykh literatur XIX veka*, Moscow: MGU, 1: 591.
- Ivasheva, V. S. (1958) *Tekkerei-satirik*, Moscow: MGU, pp. 64–65.
- Ivasheva, V. S. (1968) 'Tvorcheskii put' P. Kh. Dzhonson', *Vestnik MGU* [Moscow], 1.
- Ivasheva, V. S. (1969) 'Realizm–magistral' literatury poslevoennogo perioda', *Vestnik MGU* [Moscow], 1: 3–14.
- Ivasheva, V. S. (1971) 'Dva romana Dzheĭn Ousten. ("Ubezhdenie" i "Mensfildskii park")', *Vestnik MGU* [Moscow], 6: 17–29.
- Ivasheva, V. S. (1974) 'Nesravnennaya Dzheĭn', in *Angliiskii realisticheskii roman XIX veka v ego sovremennom zhuchanii*, Moscow: Khudozh. lit-ra, pp. 41–88.
- Jones, W. Gareth (1995) *Tolstoi and Britain*, Washington, DC: Berg.
- Kharitonov, V. (1968) 'Klassika v pervye' [review], *V mire knig* [Moscow], 12: 34–35.
- Khibbin, N. (1965) 'Antoni Askvitt', *Sovetskaya kul'tura* [Moscow], 7 October, 4.
- Klimenko, E. I. (1971) *Angliiskaya literatura pervoi poloviny XIX veka: ocherk razvitiya*, Leningrad: LGU, pp. 32, 36, 118, 136.
- Lynch, Deidre (ed.) (2000) *Janeites: Austen's Disciples and Devotees*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Lyubarsky, Valentin (2002) 'Jane Austen's Influences', *Times Literary Supplement* [London], 4 October, 19.
- Marshak, Immanuel (trans.) (1967a) *Gordost' i predubezhdenie (PP)*, Moscow: Literaturnye pamyatniki.
- Marshak, Immanuel (1967b) 'Ot perevodchika na russkii yazyk romana Dzheĭn Ostin "Gordost' i predubezhdenie"', in *Literaturnyi Klub "Damskie zabavy"* <<http://www.apropospage.com/damzabava/osten/marshak.html>> [accessed 18 July 2006].
- Masing-Delic, Irene (2000) 'Peremena rolei: pigmalionovskie motivy v "Emme" Dzheĭn Osten i v "Oblomove" Ivana Goncharova', *Rossii i SSHA: formy literaturnogo dialoga*, Moscow: RGGU, pp. 96–116.
- Meyer, Priscilla (1984) 'Nabokov's *Lolita* and Pushkin's *Onegin*: McAdam, McEve and McFate', in Gibian, George and Stephen Jan Parker (eds) *The Achievements of Vladimir Nabokov: Essays, Studies, Reminiscences and Stories from the Cornell Nabokov Festival*, Ithaca, NY: Center for International Studies, Committee on Soviet Studies, Cornell University, pp. 179–211.
- Mikhal'skaya, N. P. (1964) 'Romany Virdzhinii Vul'f', *Uchenye zapiski Moskovskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo institute im. V. I. Lenina* [Moscow], 218: 323–46.
- Mikhal'skaya, N. P. (1966) *Puti razvitiya angliiskogo romana 1920–1930*, Moscow: Vysshaya shkola, pp. 74–75.
- Mikhal'skaya, N. P. (1979) 'Problema ideala v romane "Nortengerkoe abbatstvo" i esteticheskie pozitsii Dzheĭn Ostin', in *Esteticheskii ideal i khudozhestvennyi obraz*, Moscow: Moskovskii gos. pedagog. in-t im. V. I. Lenina, pp. 54–66.
- Nabokov, Vladimir (1980) *Lectures on Literature*, New York: Harcourt.
- Nabokov, Vladimir (2001) *Dear Bunny, Dear Volodya: The Nabokov–Wilson Letters, 1940–1971*, ed. Simon Karlinsky, Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Narkevich, A. (1968) 'Klassik angliŭskoŭ literatury' [review], *Novyi mir* [Moscow], 12: 260–62.
- Poyurovskaya, O. (1957) *Bor'ba za realism v angliŭskoŭ literature kontsa XVIII-nachala XIX veka* (po materialam tvorčestva Džein Osten), Khar'kov: Izdatel'stvo Khar'kovskogo universiteta im. Gor'kogo.
- Pushkin, Aleksandr (1937) 'Evgenii Onegin' [1823–31], in *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, vol. 6, Moscow: AN SSSR.
- Pushkin, Aleksandr (1964) *Eugene Onegin: A Novel in Verse*, trans. Vladimir Nabokov, 4 vols, New York: Pantheon Books.
- Pushkin, Aleksandr (1990) *Eugene Onegin: A Novel in Verse*, trans. James E. Falen, Carbondale; Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Rudya, Alina (2006) 'Gordost' i predubezhdenie (ot Aliny Rudi)' in *Kino-Teatr* <<http://prometey.kino-teatr.kiev.ua/review.php?action=review&id=516>> [accessed 18 July 2006].
- Scott, Walter (1964) 'Sent-Ronanskije vody', trans. E. A. Lopyreva and N. Ya. Rykova, in *Sobranie sochinenii*, ed. B. G. Reizov, vol. 16, Moscow: Khudozh. Lit-ry; trans. *St Roman's Well*, 1824.
- Scott, Walter (1981) review of *E* [1816], trans. K. Atarova, in *Angliŭskie pisateli o literature XIX–XX vv.*, Moscow: [n. pub.], pp. 56–69.
- Sil'man, T. I. (1948) *Dikens: očerki tvorčestva*, Moscow; Leningrad: Goslitizdat; repr. 1958, 1970.
- Suchkov, B. (1967) *Istoricheskie sud'by realizma*, Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel'.
- Tempest, Richard (1993) 'The Girl on the Hill: Parallel Structures in *Pride and Prejudice* and *Eugene Onegin*', *Elementa: Journal of Slavic Studies and Comparative Cultural Semiotics* [Los Angeles], 1.2: 197–213.
- Tiander, N. F. (1912) 'Angliŭskii roman pervoi chetverti XIX', in Batyushkov, F. D. (ed.) *Istoriya zapadnoi literatury (1800–1910)*, Moscow: [n. pub.], pp. 379–82.
- Tsebrikova, M. (1871) 'Anglichanski romanistki', *Otechestvennye zapiski* [St Petersburg], 4: 403–59.
- Vasil'eva, I. (1981) 'Spetsialist po odinochestvu', in Pym, Barbara, *Osenii kvartet*, trans. N. Volzhina, Moscow: [n. pub.]; trans. *Quartet in Autumn* (1977).
- Zhuravlev, K. (1980) 'Rastut ryady uchenykh', *Za pedagogicheskie kadry* [Ural'sk], 2 June, 2.

Additional Bibliographical Material: Austen in Portugal

- Canhoto, Maria Isabel Monteiro (1988) '“The Finest Young Women in the Country”': estudo da relação indivíduo-sociedade no romance de Jane Austen' (unpublished master's thesis, University of Lisbon).
- Cardoso, Ersílio and Alberto de Serpa (trans.) (1943) *Orgulho e preconceito (PP)*, Lisbon: Editorial Inquérito.
- Cardoso, Lúcio (trans.) (1969) *Orgulho e preconceito (PP)*, Amadora: Ibis; Portuguese reissue of Brazilian trans. (1941) Rio de Janeiro: Livraria José Olympio.
- Cidrais, Fernanda (trans.) (1955) *Persuasão (P)*, Porto: Civilização; repr. 1963.
- Clark, Robert (1994) 'Closing (with) Jane Austen', in *Actas do XIII encontro da Associação*

- Portuguesa de Estudos Anglo-Americanos*, Porto: Associação Portuguesa de Estudos Anglo-Americanos, pp. 185–202.
- Costa Pires, Mario da (trans.) (1961) *Razões do coração* (SS), Lisbon: Romano Torres.
- Costa Pires, Mario da (trans.) (1963) *Fantasia de Ema* (E), Lisbon: Romano Torres.
- Dias Correia, Mário (trans.) (1996) *Sensibilidade e bom senso* (SS), Lisbon: Edimoda.
- Donas-Boto, Madalena (trans.) (1943) *A abadia de Northanger* (NA), Lisbon: Portugália; repr. 1954, 1963.
- Fernanda, Maria (trans.) (1956) *O mosteiro de Northanger* (NA), Lisbon: Romano Torres; repr. 1963.
- Fernandes, Isabel (1993) 'Jane Austen's *Persuasion*: Testing Language(s) or Wordsworth Revisited', in *Primeira Jornada de Estudos Românticos*, no. 3: *Shelley*, Lisbon: Associação Portuguesa de Estudos Anglo-Americanos, pp. 41–52.
- Ferreira, Leyguarda (trans.) (1944) *Sangue azul: romance* (P), Lisbon: Romano Torres; described on title page as 'free version'; repr. 1949, 1954, 1961.
- Ferreira, Leyguarda (trans.) (1949) *Orgulho e preconceito: romance* (PP), Lisbon: Romano Torres; described on title page as 'free version'; repr. 1954, 1960, 1972.
- Ferreira Costa, Maria Luísa (trans.) (1981) *Sensibilidade e bom senso* (SS), Mem Martins: Europa América; repr. 1996.
- Ferreira de Lima, Maria Francisca (trans.) (1975) *Orgulho e preconceito* (PP), Mem Martins: Europa-América; repr. 1978, 1989, 1996, 2002, 2003.
- Gomes, Maria Valentina Teixeira (1959) 'Alguns aspectos dos romances de Jane Austen' (unpublished undergraduate thesis, University of Lisbon).
- Mascarenhas, Luiza (trans.) (2004) *A abadia de Northanger* (NA), Mem Martins: Europa-América.
- 'M.C.' (trans.) (1963) *O mistério de Northanger* (NA), Porto: Civilização.
- Mendes, Berta (trans.) (1943) *Razão e sentimento* (SS), Lisbon: Editorial Inquérito.
- Natividade Gaspar, José da (trans.) (1956) *Orgulho e preconceito* (PP), 2 vols, Porto: Civilização, 1956; repr. 1963, 1972.
- Parreira Alves, José (trans.) (1944) *Ema* (E), Lisbon: Inquérito; repr. 1983, 1997, 1999, 2004.
- Pereira, Graça Gouveia Pinto (1940) 'Jane Austen e Charlotte Brontë' (unpublished undergraduate thesis, University of Lisbon).
- Pina, Álvaro (1990) 'No prólogo da inovação Austeniana: *Northanger Abbey* e as convenções de setecentos', *Revista da Associação Portuguesa de Estudos Anglo-Americanos* [Porto], 1: 51–62.
- Pina, Álvaro (1993) 'Jane Austen na transição de tempos e contemporaneidades', in *Primeira Jornada de Estudos Românticos*, no. 3: *Shelley*, Lisbon: Associação Portuguesa de Estudos Anglo-Americanos, pp. 33–41.
- Pina, Álvaro, Filipe Furtado and Isabel Fernandes (eds) (1994) *Jane Austen*, Lisbon: Colibri.
- Pinto Rodrigues, Fernanda (trans.) (1997) *Persuasão* (P), Lisbon: Presença.
- Pora, Aida Amélia (trans.) (2003) *O parque de Mansfield* (MP), Mem Martins: Europa-América.
- Rocha, Josette Elbling (1956) 'Aspectos do romance de Goldsmith, Thackeray, Jane Austen, Dickens: sua relação com Júlio Dinis' (unpublished undergraduate thesis, University of Lisbon).

Romão, Maria Vitória (1968) 'A importância da mulher nos romances de Jane Austen' (unpublished undergraduate thesis, University of Lisbon).

Sequeira, Isabel (trans.) (1996) *Persuasão (P)*, Mem Martins: Europa-América.

Stern, Irwin (1976) 'Jane Austen e Júlio Dinis', in *Revista colóquio: letras*, no. 30, Lisbon: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian.

Veríssimo, Isabel (trans.) (1996) *Catharine (N4)*, Mem Martins: Europa-América.