

[REDACTED]

In Norway, Jane Austen has not fallen victim to the more serious forms of censorship, such as states banning books for ideological or political reasons. Neither the receiving culture nor [REDACTED] makes such a thing likely in this case. In fact, it is rather a surprise when the suspicion arises that she has been subjected to censoring by individual translators. Intriguingly, certain aspects of her stories and characters are evidently considered unwanted or unsuitable for the intended readership.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] censoring [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

As already noted, Harbitz sets out to abbreviate *Pride and Prejudice* in order to make it fit his idea of a modern narrative. He does not openly admit to any intended censoring of the book. On closer look, however, there seems to be a pattern in some of his omissions. He clearly does not want to include remarks that either signal a rebellious [REDACTED], or words that could be taken to denigrate men. He accordingly cuts the words “an abominable sort of conceit-ed independence” in Miss Bingley’s condemnation of Elisabeth Bennet (36), although keeping the rest of what she says. He thus avoids a key concept of the novel, and a reminder of the issue of female independence.¹

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] herself for being deserted by Bingley, and defends him and all men: “Women fancy admiration means more than it does”. Therefore it is not the men’s fault. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

It is clearly not a coincidence, since the same thing occurs some chapters later. Here, Elizabeth’s anger with male unreliability is expressed in a rush of frustrated words: “[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]” (154). This highly emotional paragraph disappeared in Harbitz, although he has translated the conciliatory remark just below: “What are men to rocks and mountains?”. This then is merely a funny observation, since she has not previously rejected men.³