

EMPATHY BUILDING, ERRONEOUS JUDGMENTS, AND FREE INDIRECT
DISCOURSE IN JANE AUSTEN'S *PRIDE AND PREJUDICE*

by

NIKOLAI FOMICH

A thesis submitted to the

Graduate School-Camden

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

In partial fulfillment of the requirements

For the degree of Master of Arts

Graduate Program in English

Written under the direction of

DR. RICHARD EPSTEIN

And approved by

Dr. Richard Epstein (Thesis Director)

Dr. Aaron Hostetter (Second Reader)

Dr. Ellen Ledoux (Program Director)

Camden, New Jersey 1/2015

THESIS ABSTRACT

Empathy Building, Erroneous Judgments, and Free Indirect Discourse in Jane Austen's

Pride and Prejudice

By NIKOLAI FOMICH

Thesis Director:
Dr. Epstein

This thesis will examine the precise ways in which British novelist Jane Austen uses free indirect discourse in her fiction writing, by closely analyzing a passage from her most famous novel, *Pride and Prejudice*. This analysis will be based in linguistics, looking at the technical aspects of the language she uses in this passage, such as her deictic expressions and verb usage, to determine exactly how Austen crafts this moment of free indirect discourse. This paper will also explore the reasons why Austen chose to use this particular literary technique in her fiction. Finally, this thesis will touch upon the nature of the relationship between character and third-person narrator in free indirect discourse, which has been the subject of critical debate.

In the concluding chapter to her early novella *Lady Susan*, Jane Austen writes, “This correspondence...could not, to the great detriment of the Post Office revenue, be continued longer” (101). The correspondence referred to is in fact every preceding chapter of *Lady Susan*, each of which consists of a letter written from one character to another. This abrupt new voice informing readers of this correspondence’s end is that of a third-person narrator, heretofore unheard in the novella. The reason given by the third-person narrator for this discontinuation is the “meeting between some of the parties and a separation between the others” (101), and though the plot does indeed lead to this change in narrative form, there is another, more interesting reason for Austen to suddenly employ a third-person narrator.

Austen’s disruption of her novella’s epistolary form through the introduction of a third-person narrator in the story’s conclusion introduces a narrative authority which can contain the powerful and passionate voices that had previously dominated the novella. In the epistolary form, “the reader will identify with whatever character dominates the narration” (Poovey 27), and in a novella such as *Lady Susan*, where powerful characters lacking conventional morals are given voice, this becomes a problem. Without a conservative framework with which to check these voices, “there is no moral authority because there is no narrative authority” (Poovey 27). Austen’s employment of third-person narration thus becomes essential in her effort to rein in her characters’ voices.

Yet in spite of this conservative framework, Austen is nonetheless able to give voice to her characters’ passions, desires, and fears. Through the technique of free indirect discourse, in which the viewpoint of the third-person narrator is mingled with that of character, Austen adeptly pulls readers in and out of her characters’ thoughts,

revealing their hopes and anxieties, but without running the risk of overexposing her readers to any unsavory views her characters might hold. It is said that both *Sense and Sensibility* and *Pride and Prejudice* have “epistolary origins” (Klenck 39) and that Austen rewrote early versions of both using this technique, transforming her novels-in-letters into novels told by third-person narrators. Austen wrote during a transitional phase in English fiction, during which the epistolary form was slowly being replaced by novel-writing in the third-person. Her pioneering use of free indirect discourse, recognized as “the hallmark of her mature style” (Poovey 32), allowed Austen to confidently adjust to this then new form of fiction writing.

The history of the study of free indirect discourse began in 1887, when the philologist Adolf Tobler observed ““a peculiar mixture of direct and indirect speech”” in writing (Pechey 208). Since its discovery, “there has been disagreement over its nature, definition, and function”, and “Even the *name* of this type of discourse has been unresolved” (Mezei 67). Kathy Mezei provides a good summary of the “[ideologically] charged descriptions” which many critics have used in reference to free indirect discourse; these include: “contamination (Hough; McHale; Stanzel); interference (Bal, Volosinov); intervention, colored (Hough); infiltration, tainting (McHale)...” (67). Throughout this paper, I will define free indirect discourse as a clause or clauses which exist as part of a third-person narrative frame but which also contain words that potentially reflect the direct perspective of a character.

There has also been disagreement among critics over the precise relationship between the third-person narrators of Austen’s novels and her characters themselves in instances of free indirect discourse. This relationship has been characterized by some

critics as a conflict between third-person narrator and character for narrative control of a text, a characterization which suggests free indirect discourse is a tool the author uses to enable characters to overcome the seemingly authoritative voice of the third-person narrator. The colorful language used by some in describing this literary technique, as referenced above, is evidence of the popularity of this view. Other critics suggest that instead of disrupting the narrative authority of a third-person narrator, free indirect discourse is merely a tool which the author uses to incorporate the words and thoughts of characters into a larger frame narration, the third-person narrator effectively mimicking the speech and thought of characters in moments of free indirect discourse.

Of the former, Mezei, for instance, in her essay “Who is Speaking Here?: Free Indirect Discourse, Gender, and Authority in *Emma*, *Howard’s End*, and *Mrs. Dalloway*” suggests we should “Imagine FID as an expression of the character’s bid for freedom from the controlling narrator” (68). She claims that in Austen’s novel *Emma*, as well as in the other two novels she discusses, “a struggle is being waged between narrators and character-focalizers for control of the word, the text, and reader’s sympathy” (66). Mezei asserts that the reader of *Emma* “falls under the sway of a narrator with pronounced opinions who has allied her/himself with an authoritative, masterly male protagonist and who judges Emma and observes her with irony” (72).

Yet because Austen’s use of free indirect discourse allows readers to become “privy to Emma’s thoughts and doubts”, they are “given every opportunity to be sympathetic to Emma, particularly as the novel progresses” (73), Austen “encouraging us into an “empathetic response” to her heroine” (73) through her use of free indirect discourse. The character of Emma thus breaks free from the “controlling narrator” and is

able “to resist the narrator’s own discourse and authority” (74) by being allowed to narrate her own experiences. And as Emma continues to present her own perspective on the novel’s events and as she learns from her mistakes, even the third-person narrator begins to grow sympathetic towards her. According to Mezei, “Emma is improved and reproved, gaining our and the narrator’s approval” (74).

In sharp contrast, Daniel P. Gunn in his essay “Free Indirect Discourse and Narrative Authority in *Emma*” proposes that “we imagine FID in Austen as primarily an *imitation* of figural speech or thought, in which the narrator echoes or mimics the idiom of the character for the purposes of fiction” (37). Gunn rejects the notion that Austen’s characters are vying with the narrators of her novels for narrative control, and instead proposes that “Rather than operating autonomously or *freeing* themselves from narratorial discourse, Austen’s FID passages are *embedded* in this discourse: they are instances of figural thought or speech fixed or placed by the narrator, *voiced* by her in a kind of redaction or mimicry” (43). According to Gunn, Austen’s use of free indirect discourse draws the speech and thought of characters “*into* the structure of narratorial discourse” (43).

Using the example of *Emma*, Gunn explains that the third-person narrator mimics the speech of that novel’s title character, thus providing “a gently ironic frame for Emma’s FID thoughts” (46), a frame which allows us “to derive moral instruction” (46). Austen wages no battle between her third-person narrators and her characters, because, “Rather than disappearing or suffering a diminution of authority” (50), the third-person narrator is always present and always in control, providing a “consistent discursive context” (50), a narrative frame which occasionally incorporates the thoughts and speech

of characters through the mimicking of those characters' voices by the third-person narrator in instances of free indirect discourse.

Other critics have expressed similar views, some in agreement with Mezei and others with Gunn. Though not the primary purpose of this paper, whether Austen's use of free indirect discourse does in fact allow her characters to break free from the narrative authority of a third-person narrator, or whether instead a third-person narrator merely mimics her characters' thoughts and speech and incorporates them into an all-encompassing narrative framework, is a question I hope a close reading of a passage from Austen's most famous novel, *Pride and Prejudice* – a reading based in linguistics – can help answer.

In *Pride and Prejudice*, Miss Elizabeth Bennet meets a man she first hates but grows to love, Fitzwilliam Darcy. Mr. Darcy is the mystery of Austen's novel: his ethical conduct is ambiguous, and his opinion of Elizabeth even more so. Throughout the novel, Austen constantly presents the conflicting opinions and judgments of various characters regarding Mr. Darcy, especially those of Elizabeth. Yet instead of reporting her protagonist's thinking directly, Austen presents Elizabeth's thoughts through free indirect discourse, blending an omniscient third-person narrator's perspective with the viewpoint of Elizabeth. The result is an ambiguous narrative voice that leaves readers uncertain as to the accuracy of the information being conveyed, thus allowing Austen to create ambiguity as to Darcy's true character.

Austen also utilizes free indirect discourse in order to build readers' empathy for Elizabeth. Towards the end of the novel, after Elizabeth has grown substantially as an individual, she looks back with embarrassment at some of her behavior and quick

judgment. By slyly mixing Elizabeth's narrative perspective and judgments with a third-person narrator's perspective, Austen ensures that readers will be less judgmental of her follies, since they will be partially perceiving Elizabeth's world through her own eyes. This sense of intimacy with the character naturally creates empathy on the part of readers, who become engaged with her growth and less critical of her mistakes.

Both of these reasons for using free indirect discourse can be seen in chapter forty-three (or chapter one of the third volume) of *Pride and Prejudice*, when Elizabeth unexpectedly encounters Mr. Darcy at his estate. Elizabeth's embarrassment upon meeting him is conveyed by Austen through the use of free indirect discourse. This paper will analyze the use of free indirect discourse in the paragraph which displays this embarrassment (pgs. 256-257 of the 1918 Charles Scribner's Sons edition), and, through a thorough examination of the deictic expressions, verb usage, and judgments present, determine exactly how Austen achieves this mingling between Elizabeth's perspective and the third-person narrator's.

After Elizabeth and Darcy meet unexpectedly at his estate and share a few awkward, but polite, words, our heroine is joined by her aunt and uncle:

(1.1) The others then joined her, and expressed their admiration of his figure; (1.2) but Elizabeth heard not a word, and, wholly engrossed by her own feelings, followed them in silence. (2) She was overpowered by shame and vexation.

No free indirect discourse is present in these first two sentences, Elizabeth's perspective instead relayed through pure third-person narration. Sentences one and two are told in the past tense, using the verbs "joined" (1.1), "expressed" (1.1), "heard" (1.2), "engrossed" (1.2)", "followed" (1.2), and "was" (2). Past tense verbs are not used to demonstrate Elizabeth's deictic perspective in the novel except in the cases where she herself is

remembering her past; thus these verbs reflect the third-person narrator, as they reflect a moment that Elizabeth would have thought about in the present tense, describing actions and feelings occurring in her deictic present. Similarly, the adverb “then” in sentence one points to a speaker or thinker whose temporal deictic center is further ahead in time relative to the moment being described in the sentence. Thus “then” does not reflect Elizabeth’s perspective, as the moment described by sentence one occurred in her deictic present, a moment which Elizabeth would have described by thinking “The others now join me” instead of “The others then joined her”.

Furthermore, the narrator refers to Elizabeth in the third-person in sentences one and two, both through the use of personal pronouns and through the use of her name, instead of using the first-person deictic expressions Elizabeth would have used. Thus the paragraph uses “her” instead of “me” (1.1), “Elizabeth” instead of “I” (1.2), “her” instead of “my” (1.2), and “She” instead of “I” (2), directly pointing to the presence of a third-person narrator. The use of the noun phrase “The others” may also be an indication of the third-person narrator’s perspective, as the word “others” lacks the intimacy alternatives such as “relatives” or “family” suggest, and such an intimacy would have pointed to Elizabeth’s perspective. Finally, that “The others...expressed their admiration of his figure” (1.1) is explicitly unknown to Elizabeth, as it says in sentence one that “Elizabeth heard not a word” (1.2). This means that the information relayed in the second verb phrase in sentence one can in no way come from Elizabeth, who has no knowledge of that information, and must instead come from the third-person narrator.

The remaining words in sentences one and two (words such as “them in silence” (1.2) and “by shame and vexation” (2)) do not explicitly point to either Elizabeth or the

narrator. However, there are two reasons to regard these words as indirectly contributing to the third-person narrative perspective. First, some of these remaining words help form phrases with words that do point to the third-person narrator (“followed them in silence” (1.2)). And second, all of the words in these two sentences help form a tone suggestive of the third-person narrator, a tone distinct from the one found in sentences three through eight, the latter of which contains striking features not found in one and two (the particulars of these features and the two resulting tones will be discussed later).

Though Elizabeth *could* have used these remaining words and phrases to describe the moment relayed by sentences one and two (such as “by shame and vexation”), nowhere is free indirect discourse in any way suggested in these two sentences. Nowhere in sentences one and two is Elizabeth’s presence ‘felt’. Hence, though these remaining words lack direct evidence of the third-person narrator’s perspective, they do not contribute to ambiguity regarding the speaker or thinker’s identity. Instead, these words help convey a tone representative of the third-person narrator, and some even exist as parts of phrases which do directly point to the third-person narrator’s perspective.

Austen uses these two sentences to prepare the reader for the free indirect discourse used to describe Elizabeth’s thoughts in sentences three through thirteen, alerting readers to the subjectivity of those thoughts. That “Elizabeth heard not a word” (1.2) suggests that her viewpoint is isolated from the others; that she was “engrossed by her own feelings” (1.2) and “overpowered by shame and vexation” (2) suggests her viewpoint on the matter to be extremely subjective. Sentence one states Elizabeth has feelings on the matter, which are isolating her from participating in conversation; sentence two describes what those feelings are, and states that they “overpowered” her,

alarming readers to the validity of her coming observations; and sentences three through thirteen demonstrate why she feels shamed and vexed, describing her fears through free indirect discourse.

Looking first at sentences three through eight, we find the presence of Elizabeth's perspective made clear by Austen's use of emotive expressions, which the third-person narrator, who is not "engrossed" or "overpowered" by troublesome feelings, would not have had any reason to make:

(3) Her coming there was the most unfortunate, the most ill-judged thing in the world! (4) How strange must it appear to him! (5) In what a disgraceful light might it not strike so vain a man! (6) It might seem as if she had purposely thrown herself in his way again! (7.1) Oh! why did she come? (7.2) or, why did he thus come a day before he was expected? (8.1) Had they been only ten minutes sooner, they should have been beyond the reach of his discrimination; (8.2) for it was plain that he was that moment arrived – that moment alighted from his horse or his carriage.

Sentences three through six all are all exclamative, being emphatic expressions of emotion and ending with exclamation marks, while sentence seven contains an emotive word, "Oh!" Further, sentence seven also asks two direct questions in succession, the subject and verb being switched each time as is characteristic of free indirect discourse and thus pointing to Elizabeth's perspective's presence. The novel's omniscient third-person narrator (whose narrative omniscience will be touched upon further below) would have had no reason to ask questions. Additionally, sentences three through eight lack reporting clauses, and that lack also suggests the use of free indirect discourse. These sentences immediately present what will be shown to be Elizabeth's thoughts, instead of using reporting clauses like "she thought" or "she wondered".

Elizabeth's evaluations, or judgments, are also present in these sentences, as many of these judgments are erroneous and Austen's third-person narrator is omniscient. It is Elizabeth who thinks that her coming there was "the most unfortunate, the most ill-judged thing in the world" (3) and she who believes that Darcy views the matter as "strange" (4) and "[in] a disgraceful light" (5). These worries are found to be groundless later on in the novel. In chapter fifty-eight (chapter sixteen of book three), after Elizabeth has accepted Darcy's second proposal, she says: "I am almost afraid of asking what you thought of me when we met at Pemberley. You blamed me for coming?" (pg. 381). Darcy replied: "No, indeed, I felt nothing but surprise." (381). He viewed the encounter as neither "strange" (4) nor in a "disgraceful light" (5). In fact, he saw it as a chance to "obtain [her] forgiveness" and "lessen [her] ill-opinion" (381), which makes Elizabeth's coming to Pemberley far from "the most unfortunate, the most ill-judged thing in the world" – indeed, it makes it quite the opposite.

Another judgment made by Elizabeth regards Darcy's character: she fears that Darcy will view the visitation in "a disgraceful light" because he is "so vain a man" (5). Whether this is Elizabeth's judgment, the third-person narrator's, or both, is unclear at first. Darcy's vanity and his pride are central to the novel, the two traits often conflated by Elizabeth. Earlier, when Darcy mentions that he tries to "avoid...weaknesses", Elizabeth retorts: "Such as vanity and pride." Darcy readily admits that "vanity is a weakness indeed" but maintains that "where there is a real superiority of mind, pride will be always under good regulation" (pg. 58). Whether Darcy truly is "so vain a man" remains ambiguous, the third-person narrator making no direct claims regarding his

vanity. Thus Austen leaves open the possibility that Elizabeth may at times be mistaking his pride for vanity.

It is only after Elizabeth and Darcy are engaged that Darcy does indeed admit to “[his] vanity” (pg. 381), particularly during his failed first proposal to Elizabeth. He explains to her: “You taught me a lesson, hard indeed at first, but most advantageous. By you I was properly humbled.” (380). By the time of Elizabeth’s chance encounter with him at Pemberley, Darcy says that her “reproofs had been attended to” (381), meaning he was no longer arrogant and vain, and thus we learn that it was indeed Elizabeth who thought Darcy “so vain a man” in sentence five, not the third-person narrator, who does not make erroneous mistakes in Austen’s novel.

There is also a judgment made which is likely Elizabeth’s in sentence six: “It might seem as if she had purposely thrown herself in his way again!” Though this judgment is never disproved, that the sentence is exclamative means that the sentence is *at least* partially told from Elizabeth’s perspective, and therefore the judgment in the sentence is more likely to be hers. Further, even if Darcy had believed that Elizabeth had come to Pemberley to see him, it is doubtful that he would have conceptualized the visitation as her having “thrown herself in his way”, as he saw her visit as a chance to gain her good favor. The third-person narrator would therefore have no reason to describe her visit in such a negative manner, and this suggests that the judgment in sentence six is coming from Elizabeth.

There are two other judgments present in sentences three through eight that are likely Elizabeth’s, connected together in sentence eight. This sentence is broken into two clauses which are linked by the coordinating conjunction “for”. The first part of sentence

eight provides a belief (“Had they been only ten minutes sooner, they should have been beyond the reach of his discrimination...”) and the second part the reason for that belief (“for it was plain that he was that moment arrived – that moment alighted from his horse or his carriage”).

Because of the repetition present in the second part of the conjoined sentence (which will be expanded upon further below) and the uncertainty over whether Darcy had alighted from “his horse” or from “his carriage”, it is clear that this part of sentence eight is told mostly through Elizabeth’s viewpoint, and that it is she who has judged that “it was plain...he was that moment arrived...” The third-person narrator shows omniscience regarding immediately relevant facts throughout *Pride and Prejudice*, as, for example, in sentence one, where the third-person narrator says that the Elizabeth was “overpowered by shame and vexation”, even though Elizabeth does not say so through speech. There is, therefore, no reason why the third-person narrator would not know whether Darcy had alighted from his horse or from his carriage.

The clear presence of Elizabeth’s perspective in the second part of sentence eight calls into question the accuracy of the first part of that sentence, as the accuracy of the first part is dependent upon the reliability of the reasons given in the second part. Therefore, the assertion that “Had [Elizabeth and her party] been only ten minutes sooner...they should have been beyond the reach of [Darcy’s] discrimination” is likely made by Elizabeth, because the reason provided as evidence for that assertion is dubious, and throughout the novel the third-person narrator makes no erroneous judgments, while Elizabeth does.

Further, the use of the down-toner “only” in the first part of sentence eight is even more clearly indicative of Elizabeth’s perspective. While the third person-narrator has no reason to qualify “ten minutes” as “only”, Elizabeth does. This is because devaluing “ten minutes” displays her regret by showing how close (“only ten minutes”) she felt she was to avoiding “his discrimination” and, therefore, avoid being viewed in “a disgraceful light”, as she thought he would see the matter. This judgment of ten minutes as “only” and the disproved or dubious assertions made in sentences three through eight, as discussed above, indicate Elizabeth’s perspective’s strong presence.

Another indication of her perspective’s presence is repetition. “the most” is repeated twice in sentence three, each time before an adjective, each adjective negatively describing the same noun phrase (“thing in the world”); three different combinations of the modal auxiliaries “must” or “might” with “it” occur (4-6); the question “why did she come?” is followed by the question “why did he thus come...?” (7.1-7.2); “Had they been” is followed by “they should have been” (8.1); and “that moment” is repeated twice, followed each time by a past tense, intransitive verb (“arrived”, “alighted”), each verb beginning with the sound [ə] and describing the concluding of Darcy’s travel (8.2). Sentences four through six are also repetitive in the sense that they all involve Elizabeth’s worries over how Darcy might negatively perceive her (“appear”, “disgraceful light”, “seem”).

Austen’s liberal usage of repetition and exclamative expressions in sentences three through eight, as well as her inclusion of multiple evaluations or judgments made by Elizabeth in those sentences, is especially striking when considering the preceding two sentences. Sentences one and two, which begin the paragraph, read comparatively

straightforward and simple, containing none of these features. Two distinguishable tones thus result from these differences, suggesting that they represent two different perspectives; sentences one and two are written solely from the novel's third-person narrator's point of view, and three through eight from mostly Elizabeth's viewpoint.

Austen's use of an em dash in "for it was plain that he was that moment arrived – that moment alighted from his horse or his carriage" (8.2) may also be indicative of Elizabeth's perspective. The separation formed by the elliptical use of the em dash is stronger than the separation which occurs when using a comma, which Austen uses frequently elsewhere. Austen *could* have used a comma here ("that moment arrived, that moment alighted..."), but that she chooses to use an em dash instead suggests she intended to signify a stronger break between these two adverbial phrases, this visual cue forcing readers to recognize these phrases as more distinctly separated than they would have been if separated with a comma. This use of the em dash signifies an abrupt break on the part of the speaker or thinker, which therefore suggests that the speaker or thinker is emotional. As the third-person narrator stated earlier in the beginning of the paragraph, Elizabeth "was overpowered by shame and vexation" (2) and "wholly engrossed by her own feelings". The use of the em dash in the second part of sentence eight is likely another way in which Austen is conveying Elizabeth's overwrought perspective

Further, it is possible that the em dash may even be intended to represent a break in the syntax of the sentence, as em dashes are sometimes used to mark aposiopesis, or the breaking off of a sentence when a speaker or thinker is overcome with emotion. The part of the sentence after the em dash is reliant upon the part of the sentence before the em dash for its subject noun phrase, "he". If there truly is a syntactic break, this would

indicate incomplete syntax after the em dash, and, therefore, Elizabeth's perspective's presence in the sentence, as the formal third-person narrator never shows signs of incomplete syntax throughout the novel.

Another typographical feature may also point to Elizabeth's perspective. This is the lack of capitalization of the letter "o" in sentence seven: "or, why did he thus come...?" (7.2). The lowercase "o" follows the punctuation mark "?" (7.1), which would normally mark the end of a sentence that is a question. But Austen chooses not to mark the beginning of a new sentence through capitalization in the second part of seven, instead leaving the "o" lowercase and indicating that the sentence has continued. This lack of a clearer separation between what would otherwise be two distinct sentences is suggestive of a "stream of consciousness", a narrative tone which points more towards Elizabeth than the third-person narrator. The third-person narrator never displays this kind of stylistic mode, instead narrating in a formal literary manner that follows the conventions of literary fiction.

The time-specifying adverbial word "before" also demonstrates Elizabeth's perspective, in the sentence "...why did he thus come a day before he was expected?" (7.2). Elizabeth, her aunt, and her uncle had been told by Darcy's housekeeper "we expect him to-morrow" earlier in the chapter (pg. 251). "before" thus grounds the sentence in Elizabeth's temporal deictic perspective, as the orientational point of time in the second part of sentence seven is "a day before" Elizabeth had expected Darcy to arrive, not a day before the third-person narrator had expected him to.

The gerund "coming" in the noun phrase "Her coming there" (3) and the infinitive "come" in the verb phrase "did...come" (7.1, 7.2) are also deictic. "coming" and "come"

each suggest a deictic center relative to Elizabeth. From Elizabeth's spatial orientation, she is currently located on Darcy's estate. His estate is her deictic center (or origo) at the time of these sentences, where both Elizabeth and Darcy had recently arrived. The past 'comings' of both Elizabeth (3, 7.1) and Darcy (7.2) had been *towards* Elizabeth's current deictic center in sentences three through eight, in which she is reflecting upon her immediate past. Austen could have used "going" and "gone" instead, in which case the deictic center would have been oriented towards a spatial point *away* from Elizabeth's location in sentences three through eight. That Austen chooses to use "coming" and "come" orients the reader towards Elizabeth's perspective and thus reflect her point of view.

Turning to the verb tenses, aspects, and moods of sentences three through eight, we find that these verb phrases either reflect Elizabeth's temporal perspective or are ambiguous in that they might reflect her perspective, the third-person narrator's, or both. Unlike sentences one and two, nowhere do the verbs in these sentences unequivocally represent the third-person narrator's perspective. Sentences one and two are told in the past tense from the third-person narrator's temporal deictic perspective, using the verbs "joined" (1.1), "expressed" (1.1), "heard" (1.2), "engrossed (1.2)", "followed" (1.2), and "was" (2). In sentences three through eight, however, Austen maintains Elizabeth's sole temporal perspective through the verbs of four sentences (4, 5, beginning of 6, 7). The other verbs in sentences three through eight (in 3, end of 6, 8) may or may not be backshifted, creating narrative ambiguity as to whose perspective they reflect.

Elizabeth's perspective is clearly present in the verbs of sentences four and five, and in the beginning of six. The verb phrases "must...appear" (4), "might...strike" (5),

and “might seem” (6) are in the present tense, reflecting the temporal perspective of Elizabeth and not the third-person narrator. The third-person narrator, removed from the immediacy of Elizabeth’s situation, would have used the present perfect combination of tense and aspect to form the verb phrases “must have appeared”, “might have struck”, and “might have seemed”, as the events of the story happen at some point in time in the past relative to the third-person narrator.

The verb phrase “did...come”, combining the past tense auxiliary “did” with the infinitive verb form “come” is used twice in sentence seven, where Elizabeth rhetorically asks herself why she had come to Pemberley and why Darcy had arrived early. “did” is used to allow the inversion of the subjects (“I” (7.1), “he” (7.2)) with auxiliary verbs to take place so that interrogative expressions can be formed. The past tense form of the auxiliary “do” is used to reflect the temporal perspective of Elizabeth, who is stressing over the past actions of herself (her deciding to go to Darcy’s estate) and of Darcy (his arriving early). The third-person narrator would not have any reason to form interrogative expressions, since that narrator shows omniscience. Further, the third-person narrator would have used the pluperfect tense and aspect combination “had” in place of “did” both times in the sentence, because the completed actions being considered in sentence seven occurred even earlier than the past events the third-person narrator is recounting. Thus “did” reflects the perspective of Elizabeth.

Sentence three and the second half of sentence eight are ambiguous as to whose perspective the verb “was” (3, twice in 8.2) reflects. If in sentence three “Her coming there” refers only to her *actual journey* to Pemberley or her *decision* to journey there, then she would have thought of her journey in the past tense and “was” could reflect

Elizabeth's perspective. But if "Her coming there" refers to Elizabeth's *entire trip* to Pemberley, which was continuing on into her present at the time of these thoughts, then she would have used the present tense verb "is" in her thinking, and the verb "was" in sentence three would not in fact reflect her thoughts. The verb "was" in sentence three might easily be reflecting the third-person narrator's perspective, because both Elizabeth's *actual journey* and her *entire trip* are in the past relative to the third-person narrator.

Similarly, if in the second part of sentence eight the "moment" Elizabeth is considering is her actual encounter with Darcy, which took place in the past, then the two uses of "was" in that sentence may be reflecting her perspective. But if she is considering that "moment" as something which is continuing on into her present, while she is still visiting Pemberley, then the verb cannot reflect her perspective, as she would have used "is". Elizabeth makes the judgment that it is/was "plain" that Darcy is/was at that "moment arrived". But whether *the moment of his arrival* constitutes for Elizabeth *only her actual meeting with him*, or whether she considers the moment as having extended *into her present*, which was only seconds later, we cannot say for certain, making the verb "was" ambiguous as to whose viewpoint it reflects.

Ambiguity is also present in sentence six's verb phrase "had...thrown". In the sentence, Elizabeth frets about the encounter she has just immediately had with Darcy and how he perceived it. It is possible that in the moment related by sentence six Elizabeth herself had been actually thinking in the subjunctive mood and in the present tense, and would have thought "have...thrown". This is because she could have been conceiving her "[throwing] herself in his way again" as her entire visit to Pemberley, an

action that began in the past but has continued on into her present (hence the present tense), while she was speculating how that action might seem to him (hence the subjunctive mood, creating the subjunctive present form “have...thrown”). The verb phrase “had...thrown” in sentence six could therefore reflect the third-person narrator instead of Elizabeth.

But if Elizabeth had been thinking in the pluperfect combination of tense and aspect, considering her “[throwing] herself in his way again” as only *her actual encounter with Darcy*, a completed action that had occurred further in her past, then she would have thought “had...thrown”, as the passage is written. The third-person narrator would have used the verb phrase “had...thrown” as well, using the pluperfect for the same reason. As with “was” in sentences three and eight, we cannot be certain then whether the verb phrase “had...thrown” represents only Elizabeth’s perspective, only the third-person narrator’s perspective, or both of their perspectives simultaneously.

Both of the verb phrases in the first part of sentence eight, “Had...been” and “should have been”, are also ambiguous. The pluperfect is used again in the beginning of sentence eight, in the condition clause “Had they been only ten minutes sooner”, this time describing a hypothetical action that could have had occurred in the past but didn’t. Sentence eight continues with the condition clause’s consequence, “they should have been beyond the reach of his discrimination”, which combines the conditional mood and the perfect aspect to create an unfulfilled hypothesis about the past. Notwithstanding the probability that the *assertions* made in this sentence are Elizabeth’s, as argued above, nothing about *the verbs* of the first part of sentence eight clearly indicates the viewpoint

of either, and thus Austen maintains ambiguity as to whose perspective is being represented.

The third-person narrator retains a more definite presence in sentences three through eight through the presence of third-person pronouns and the use of deictic expressions oriented toward the third-person narrator. The third-person pronouns “Her” (3), “she” (6, 7.1), “herself” (6), and “they” (twice in 8.1) are used to describe the people Elizabeth is thinking about, reflecting the perspective of the third-person narrator. Elizabeth herself would have thought using the first-person pronouns “my”, “I”, “myself”, and “we”. The deictic expression of place “there” (3), used to mean Darcy’s estate Pemberley, also reflects the third-person narrator. Elizabeth would have used the deictic word “here” to reflect her proximity to Pemberley, in which she was located during the moment reflected by sentence three.

Several deictic expressions are ambiguous in terms of whose perspective they reflect. In sentences three through eight, Elizabeth’s coming to Darcy’s estate is referred to as “the most unfortunate, the most ill-judged thing in the world” (3) and “it” (4, 5, 6). While the judgments in these four exclamative sentences are all Elizabeth’s, as argued above, “it” is ambiguous as to whose perspective the word reflects. “it” in sentences four through six is an anaphor, representing the noun phrase “Her coming there” (3), and shows no evidence of a particular narrative perspective.

Additionally, the demonstrative “that”, used twice in the later part of sentence eight, does not clearly indicate either Elizabeth’s or the third-person narrator’s perspective: “...he was that moment arrived – that moment alighted...” (8.2). If Elizabeth is reflecting about her immediate past in sentence eight, considering that “moment” to be

only her actual encounter with Darcy, and not having extended on into her present, she would have used the distal demonstrative “that”, as is written. Of course, the third-person narrator would also use the distal demonstrative “that”, as this story takes place in the past from the third-person narrator’s perspective. Therefore, along with “it”, “that” could reflect either’s perspective.

But if, as considered earlier, Elizabeth had viewed “Her coming there” as her *entire trip* to Pemberley, which was continuing on into her present, she could have easily used the demonstrative “this” to refer to her current situation. The conceptual metaphor of TIME IS SPACE is present here, as a deictic word of *space*, the demonstrative “that”, is being used to indicate a past moment in *time*; hence the spatial demonstrative “this” could have been instead used to refer to a “moment” ‘close’ to Elizabeth. Similarly, the use of “it” (3, 5, 6) to refer to “Her coming there” could have also been replaced with “this” as well, if Elizabeth had viewed “Her coming there” as extending into the ‘close’ present. Thus, though present in sentences which clearly contain Elizabeth’s judgments (3, 4, 5, 6, 8) and verb tenses (at least 4, 5, 6, possibly 3 and 8), Austen allows for ambiguity by choosing not to use “this” in place of “it” and “that”.

The paragraph concludes:

(9) She blushed again and again over the perverseness of the meeting. (10) And his behavior, so strikingly altered,—what could it mean? (11) That he should even speak to her was amazing!—but to speak with such civility, to inquire after her family! (12) Never in her life had she seen his manners so little dignified, never had he spoken with such gentleness as on this unexpected meeting. (13) What a contrast did it offer to his last address in Rosings Park, when he put his letter into her hand! (14) She knew not what to think, or how to account for it.

Sentence nine returns to the tone of sentences one and two, as it is concise and contains almost nothing pointing to Elizabeth's perspective. Only one word, "perverseness", suggests Elizabeth. It is Elizabeth who judges her "meeting" with Darcy as having had the quality of "perverseness", believing such an encounter contrary to what is proper and good. The third-person narrator, as mentioned earlier, does not make erroneous judgments in Austen's novel. Because this encounter in fact results in happiness for Elizabeth, as Darcy viewed the moment as a chance to "obtain [Elizabeth's] forgiveness" and "lessen [her] ill-opinion" (pg. 381), after the achievement of which he successfully proposes a second time, "the meeting" was not in fact perverse. This erroneous judgment points to the perspective of Elizabeth.

The rest of sentence nine is told from the perspective of the third-person narrator, as is indicated by the use of the third-person personal pronoun "She" in place of "I". The third-person narrator's perspective is also present by the use of the past tense verb "blushed" to indicate an expression Elizabeth was making in her deictic present at the time of these events; Elizabeth would have used the present progressive combination of tense and aspect "am blushing" to indicate an 'action' she was continuing to engage in during the moment reflected by sentences one through fourteen.

There are multiple assertions and judgments made throughout sentences ten through thirteen. Only a judgment made in sentence eleven is *unquestionably* Elizabeth's: "That he should even speak to her was amazing!" Again, as evidenced by Darcy's comments referenced above, that Darcy spoke to her is not "amazing" but expected, as he saw the moment as an opportunity. Only to Elizabeth, who does not yet possess knowledge of his perspective, is this moment "amazing". The third-person narrator has

no reason to make such an erroneous claim. Additionally, this sentence is exclamative, further signifying Elizabeth's perspective's presence.

While multiple indications of Elizabeth's point of view's presence can be found throughout sentences ten through thirteen, four of the remaining judgments themselves are nonetheless ambiguous as to whose narrative perspective they represent. Ambiguity regarding narrative perspective is present in sentence eleven through the adjective "such": "but to speak with such civility". The judgment that Darcy is speaking to Elizabeth with "such", or with a great degree of, civility might be made by either Elizabeth or the third-person narrator. There is nothing in this paragraph, the preceding paragraph, or the following one that contradicts the assertion that he spoke with civility; on the contrary, there is a mention of "his civil inquiries" (pg. 256) two paragraphs earlier. Further, Elizabeth's aunt and uncle pay a compliment to Darcy (they "expressed admiration of his figure" (1)) and make no contradictory statements regarding his civility. This all suggests that Darcy was indeed speaking with "such civility", and as it is not an erroneous judgment, it is ambiguous as to whose perspective "such" indicates.

The judgment in the beginning of sentence twelve is also ambiguous as to whose perspective it represents: "Never in her life had she seen his manners so little dignified" (12). Darcy has less 'dignity' in the encounter both because he has at this point changed, having lost his vanity and arrogance (as detailed earlier above), and because during this encounter he "felt nothing but surprise" (pg. 381). Further, as readers have been privy to all previous encounters between the two characters, we have ample evidence that Darcy had indeed been, as the third-person narrator previously explained, "haughty, reserved,

and fastidious” (pg. 15) in his earlier meetings with Elizabeth, when “his manners, though well-bred, were not inviting” (15).

Thus his “manners” now, when compared to the “well bred” manners of before, are “so little dignified” not only from Elizabeth’s perspective, but also from the third-person narrator’s and the reader’s, meaning both Elizabeth and the third person narrator could have made this judgment. Similar reasoning can be applied to the judgments made in sentence ten and thirteen. The claims that “his behavior” during this chance encounter was “so strikingly altered” (10), in comparison to Elizabeth’s previous meetings with Darcy, and that this encounter “did...offer” “a contrast...to his last address in Rosings Park” (13) are undeniably true.

Having lost his vanity and arrogance, Darcy’s “behavior” has certainly been “strikingly altered” since “his last address in Rosings Park”, during which, after receiving her rejection to his proposal, he “[struggled] for the appearance of composure” and said “in a voice of forced calmness” “And this is all the reply which I am to have the honor of expecting!” (pg. 196). Indeed, it was during this last encounter that Darcy demonstrated the very qualities of vanity and pride over which Elizabeth had earlier chastised him, as Darcy admits that he “did everything in my power to separate my friend from your sister” and “that I rejoice in my success” (197). Further, he even rhetorically asks whether Elizabeth could expect him to “rejoice in the inferiority of your connections” (199).

The second part of sentence twelve contains a judgment likely Elizabeth’s: “never had he spoken with such gentleness as on this unexpected meeting”. This judgment excludes the prepositional phrase “in her life” that is present *in the middle* of the earlier judgment made in this sentence, where it modifies the verb phrase “Never...had” in the

first part of sentence twelve. It is possible that the prepositional phrase “in her life” is left out but meant to be inferred in part two of sentence twelve, which if so would indicate Elizabeth’s perspective, as the sentence then would be incompletely rendered.

The other possibility is that the judgment is unqualified, meaning that the judgment being made is that “never had [Darcy] spoken with such gentleness” *in his entire life*. If the latter, this would almost certainly be a judgment made by Elizabeth, an unsubstantiated hyperbolic assertion, as it is unlikely he had never before “spoken with such gentleness”. Only a few pages earlier, Darcy’s housekeeper says that she has “never had a cross word from him in [her] life, and [she has] known him ever since he was four years old” (pg. 253). She also adds that “Whatever can give his sister any pleasure is sure to be done in a moment [by Darcy]” (254). There are therefore at least two people that Darcy would have spoken to with great kindness, making the veracity of such a judgment all the more improbable.

There are three emotive expressions present throughout sentences ten through thirteen, each typographically represented as ending with an exclamation mark: “That he should even speak to her was amazing!” (11), “...but to speak with such civility, to inquire after her family!” (11), and “What a contrast did it offer...!” (13). Additionally, an emotive word, the exclamative determiner “What”, is used in thirteen. These emotive expressions (11, 13) and the emotive word “What” (13) obviously reflect strong emotion and point to Elizabeth’s perspective. The direct question in sentence ten, “...what could it mean?”, in which the subject and verb are switched as characteristic of free indirect discourse, also points to the presence of Elizabeth’s perspective. Furthermore, the lack of reporting clauses in sentences ten through thirteen indicates the use of free indirect

discourse, thoughts and judgments presented without the thinker or judge being introduced.

The uncertainty over what Darcy's "strikingly altered" "behavior" could mean (10) indicates Elizabeth's perspective, as the omniscient third-person narrator would know such information and therefore have no reason to ask about it. Elizabeth's perspective is also present in sentence ten through the use of the em dash, which marks a strong emphatic break in the sentence: "And his behavior, so strikingly altered, –". As explained earlier above in regards to sentence eight, the em dash suggests strong emotion on the part of the thinker of these words. This points to Elizabeth, who "was overpowered by shame and vexation" (2). Further, the em dash may represent a break in syntax in sentence ten, as the part of the sentence before the em dash lacks a verb for the noun phrase "his behavior".

Sentence eleven more clearly contains incomplete syntax: "– but to speak with such civility, to inquire after her family!" This 'speech' – or thought – also lacks a finite verb. Further, it occurs immediately after a part of the sentence that ends with an exclamation mark, which is used to *complete* an exclamative expression: "That he should even speak to her was amazing! –". Interestingly, however, "but" is not capitalized, indicating a continuation and suggesting both expressions are part of the same sentence. Thus the latter part of sentence eleven is strongly separated from the earlier part of that sentence by both the exclamation mark and the em dash, yet is not able to stand on its own as a completed sentence because of its lack of a finite verb and, typographically, because of its lack of capitalization. This shows that the later part of eleven contains incomplete syntax, and therefore marks Elizabeth's perspective.

The use of “And” in sentence ten is curious. “And” here is a conjunction which is introducing an additional comment, or interjection, specifically “his behavior, so strikingly altered, – what could it mean?”, while also beginning a new sentence. Yet the previous sentence is, “She blushed again and again over the perverseness of the meeting” (9). There is no immediately preceding comment or interjection regarding Darcy in sentence nine, meaning there is no relevant comment in sentence nine for the conjunction “And” to logically tie sentence ten to.

However, sentence eight makes three references to Darcy, referring to “his discrimination” (8.1) and alleging that “he was that moment arrived” and “that moment alighted from his horse or his carriage” (8.2). As detailed earlier, sentences eight and ten are told mostly from Elizabeth’s narrative perspective, sentence eight containing assertions likely made by Elizabeth, repetition (“that moment”), and uncertainty (“his horse or his carriage”), and sentence ten containing a judgment likely made by Elizabeth, an em dash, and a direct question. The conjunction “And”, therefore, serves to connect Elizabeth’s thoughts in sentence ten to her previous thoughts in sentence eight. Because sentence nine contains only one indication of Elizabeth’s perspective (the word “perverseness”), Austen’s use of “And” is a signal to readers that the narrative perspective in the paragraph is returning to Elizabeth after the break in sentence nine, where the third person narrator’s perspective is dominant.

The temporal word “last” in sentence thirteen also indicates Elizabeth’s perspective’s presence: “What a contrast did it offer to his last address in Rosings Park...” (13). From Elizabeth’s deictic perspective, Darcy’s “address in Rosings Park” was his “last address”, because it was his “last address” *to her*. As their encounter at

Rosings Park had occurred “last April” (pg. 377), Darcy must have spoken to people in between, for his chance encounter with Elizabeth as reflected upon in these sentences occurs months later in the “summer” (272, 276). Therefore, his “address in Rosings Park” was not the immediately preceding address, or “last address”, he made before the moment reflected upon here. Thus the temporal word “last” cannot reflect the third-person narrator’s perspective.

The spatial deictic demonstrative determiner “this” indicates the presence of Elizabeth’s perspective as well: “never had he spoken with such gentleness as on this unexpected meeting” (12). The deictic word of space “this” is being used to identify a specific experience ‘close’ to Elizabeth’s present. This is another instance in which the conceptual metaphor of TIME IS SPACE is present, as a deictic word of *space* is being used to indicate a ‘close’ moment in *time*, specifically Elizabeth’s present moment at the time of these thoughts. The third-person narrator would have used the distal demonstrative “that”, as the story takes place ‘far away’ in the past from the third-person narrator’s perspective, as evidenced by the past tense verbs the third-person narrator uses throughout *Pride and Prejudice*.

Several pronouns clearly mark the presence of the third-person narrator, anaphoric third-person pronouns used throughout the paragraph to refer back to Elizabeth. Specifically, the use of “her” (11) where Elizabeth would have used “me”; the use of “her” where Elizabeth would have used “my” (11, 12, 13); and the use of “she” where Elizabeth would have used “I” (12), all suggest the third-person narrator, as Elizabeth would have spoken, or thought, in the deictic first-person. These anaphoric

expressions of grammatical person in sentences eleven through thirteen anchor at least part of these sentences in the third-person narrator's perspective.

Looking at the verb phrases of sentences ten through thirteen, we find Elizabeth's perspective maintained in several ways. As previously stated, the inversion of the verb "could" with the noun "it" in sentence ten forms a question, therefore indicating Elizabeth's perspective. Beyond this, there are two other sentences in which Austen clearly maintains Elizabeth's perspective's presence through verbs. The first is in sentence eleven: "That he should even speak to her was amazing! – but to speak with such civility, to inquire after her family!" Elizabeth uses the simple present tense form in the verb phrase "should...speak", which forms a verbal noun that is part of the sentence's subject. This noun phrase is the subject of her expression of amazement ("was amazing"), as she is expressing her strong reaction to being addressed by Darcy, a reaction which has "wholly engrossed" (1) her and continued on into her *present*.

The third person narrator would have used the present perfect combination of tense and aspect "should have spoken" in sentence eleven, because Elizabeth's reaction to Darcy's polite address occurs at some point in time in the past relative to that third-person narrator. Elizabeth also uses the infinitives "to speak" and "to inquire" as part of a verbal noun phrase in the second part of sentence eleven, while the third-person narrator would have used the present perfect forms "to have spoken" and "to have enquired". Elizabeth and the third-person narrator would each use these respective separate forms because of the reasons just explained in regards to "should...speak."

Elizabeth's perspective is also present in the verb phrase in sentence thirteen: "What a contrast did it offer to his last address...". The verb phrase "did...offer" is a

combination of the simple past tense form of the auxiliary “do” with the infinitive form of “offer”. The auxiliary “did” is used to emphasize “the contrast” between the address Darcy had just ‘given’ Elizabeth with his “last address”, when he arrogantly proposed to her months earlier. The simple past tense form of that auxiliary is used because Darcy’s latest address occurred, from Elizabeth’s temporal deictic perspective in sentence thirteen, in her past. The third-person narrator would have used the pluperfect combination of tense and aspect “had offered”, because the *completed actions* being considered in sentence thirteen (Darcy’s offer) occurred *even earlier* than the *already past* events the third-person narrator is recounting (Elizabeth’s reaction to that offer).

The remaining verbs in sentences eleven through thirteen are ambiguous as to whose perspective is being reflected. “strikingly altered” is an adjectival passive participle, modifying the noun phrase “behavior” (10), and both Elizabeth and the third-person narrator could have described Darcy as the ‘patient’ of the ‘action’, the undergoer of being “strikingly altered”. The past progressive combination of tense and aspect “was amazing” (11) could also have been used by either Elizabeth or the third-person narrator, because that form indicates an action that was ongoing in the past time being considered, specifically the action of Darcy speaking to Elizabeth, which is in the past for both Elizabeth and the narrator.

Similarly, the past tense verb “put” (13) might also reflect either narrative perspective, as the moment under consideration (“when [Darcy] put his letter into her hand”) occurred months earlier, at a time that is past relative to both Elizabeth and the third-person narrator. Finally, the pluperfect combination of tense and aspect is used in sentence twelve: “had...seen”, “had...spoken”. Both Elizabeth and the narrator would

have used these forms, because the actions being considered are Elizabeth's seeing and Darcy's speaking during times *before* the chance encounter which is being reflected on in these sentences, completed actions that occurred even earlier than the past events which are being narrated.

Turning to parallelism, we find several moments in sentences ten through twelve where this rhetorical act is used. Sentence eleven is comprised of two similar parts: "That he should even speak to her was amazing! – but to speak with such civility, to inquire after her family!" Each half of this sentence is an exclamative expression which uses the verb "speak" and considers Darcy's polite address to Elizabeth moments earlier with bewildered amazement. Further, the second part of eleven is repetitive in that it is separated into two equal parts each beginning with an infinitive verb form relating to speech ("to speak", "to inquire").

Parallelism is also present through a pattern formed by sentences ten and eleven. These sentences are each split into two parts by an em dash, one part of which is incomplete in its syntax, as argued above. This literary technique is also used in sentence twelve where "Never...had she seen his manners so little dignified" is immediately followed by "never had he spoken with such gentleness". In each instance, "never had" is followed by a remark upon the amiability with which Darcy had just received Elizabeth ("his manners so little dignified" (meaning his lack of reserve), "gentleness"). The presence of parallel structures is an indicator of free indirect discourse and its presence here points to Elizabeth's perspective.

Finally, sentences ten through thirteen can be said to be repetitive because these sentences each express extremely similar ideas. All of these sentences focus upon

Darcy's behavior and especially his speech ("his behavior" (10), "speak" (11), "to speak" (11), "to inquire" (11), "his manners" (12), "spoken" (12), "his last address"), each utterance expressing surprise at how he behaved during his encounter with Elizabeth ("amazing" (11), "so strikingly altered" (10), "such civility" (11), "so little dignified" (12), "such gentleness" (12), "What a contrast...!" (13)).

Sentence fourteen returns to the tone of sentence nine, and shows no direct sign of Elizabeth's perspective: "She knew not what to think, or how to account for it." The third-person narrator's perspective is present here both by the use of the third-person pronoun "She", where Elizabeth would have used "I", and by the past tense verb form "knew", where Elizabeth would have used the present tense verb "know", as she felt she did not know what to think during her *deictic present* during the time reflected by this sentence.

The tone set by sentences ten through thirteen is distinguishable from the tone which immediately precedes and follows it in three ways. First, these sentences contain multiple assertions and judgments, whereas only one word ("perverseness" (9)) signifies a judgment in nine and fourteen. Second, sentences ten through thirteen contain multiple exclamative expressions. Finally, the use of the em dash and the resulting suggestion of incomplete syntax create a mode of narrative in ten through thirteen which resembles stream of consciousness. As with sentences one and two, nine and fourteen are almost exclusively presented from the third-person narrator's perspective, while sentences ten through thirteen reflect a good deal of Elizabeth's perspective. The distinct tones found in these two groupings of sentences thus mirror the distinct perspectives relayed therein: ten through thirteen conveys multiple judgments and exclamative expression and largely

reflects Elizabeth's perspective, while nine and fourteen convey a straightforward tone that lacks those elements and largely reflects the third-person narrator's perspective.

Taking the paragraph as a whole, Elizabeth's perspective in sentences three through thirteen is maintained in fifteen ways, through:

1. emotive expressions, evidenced by exclamation marks (3, 4, 5, 6, 11, 13);
2. the emotive words "Oh!" (7.1) and "What" (13);
3. three direct questions, in which the subject and verb are switched (7.1, 7.2, 10);
4. the lack of reporting clauses (3-13);
5. the presence of erroneous evaluations and judgments which are *definitely* Elizabeth's (3, 4, 5, 9, 11);
6. the presence of evaluations and judgments which are *most likely* Elizabeth's (6, 8.1, 8.2, end of 12);
7. the uncertainty over relevant facts, specifically whether Darcy had "alighted from his horse or his carriage" (8.2) and what his "strikingly altered" "behavior" could mean (10);
8. the use of the down-toner "only" (8.1);
9. repetition (4-8.2, 10-13), of both very similar phrases (4-7.2, 12) and of the exact noun phrases "the most" (3) and "that moment" (8.2), as well as through sentences conveying very similar ideas (4-6, 10-13);
10. a different tone (in 3-8.2 and 10-13), created by the use of repetition, multiple evaluations, exclamative expressions, and use of the em dash, distinct from the tone found in 1-2, 9, 14;
11. the em dash indicating an abrupt break, from a likely emotional speaker, and sometimes a break in syntax (8.2, 10, 11);
12. the lack of capitalization of "or" (7.2) and "but" (11), suggesting a "stream of consciousness" and in one case incomplete syntax (11);
13. the temporal and spatial deictic words "coming" (3), "come" (7.1, 7.2), "before" (7.2), "this" (12), and "last" (13), referring to Elizabeth's orientational point;

14. the use of the conjunction “And” (10), which does not follow an immediately preceding related comment and instead connects the readers back to Elizabeth’s thoughts in sentence eight;
15. and the verb tenses of seven sentences (4, 5, beginning of 6, 7.1, 7.2, end of 10, beginning and end of 11, beginning of 13).

Ambiguity as to whose perspective is being reflected is present in these sentences through the use of: [1] verb tenses (3, end of 6, 8, beginning of 10, middle of 11, 12, end of 13); [2] the choice of “it” (4, 5, 6) and “that” (twice in 8.2) instead of “this”; and [3] four judgments (“so strikingly altered” (10), “such civility” (11) “so little dignified” (12), and “What a contrast” (13)). The third-person narrator’s perspective is definitely maintained throughout sentences three through thirteen by: [1] the third-person pronouns “Her” (3, twice in 11, 12, 13), “she” (6, 7.1, 9, 12), “herself” (6), and “they” (twice in 8.1), when referring to Elizabeth and her relations; [2] the deictic spatial expression “there” (3), not oriented towards Elizabeth; and [3] the past tense verb “blushed” (9).

The third-person narrator’s perspective is exclusively maintained in sentences one, two, and fourteen by: [1] the use of third-person pronouns and a proper noun where Elizabeth would have instead used deictic expressions, specifically the third-person pronouns “her” (1.1, 1.2) and “She” (2, 14), and the proper noun “Elizabeth” (1.2); [2] the use of the temporal deictic word “then” (1.1), which points to a narrator further ahead in time than the action being described; [3] the past tense verbs “joined” (1.1), “expressed” (1.1), “heard” (1.2), “followed” (1.2), “was” (2) and “knew” (14) ; and [4] the presence of information which Elizabeth has no knowledge of (namely, her relatives “expressing their admiration of his figure” (1.1)). As argued above, sentence nine is similar to these three sentences, also using the pronoun “She” and a past tense verb

(“blushed”), while containing only one word reflecting Elizabeth (“perverseness”). (The choice of the noun phrase “The others” (1.1), which lacks the intimacy of alternatives Elizabeth could have used, may also point to the third-person narrator.)

Additionally, sentences one, two, nine, and fourteen all convey a similar tone, as previously argued, and sentences two, nine, and fourteen all follow a similar pattern:

She + [**past tense verb**] + [adjunct (9) or complement (2, 14) relating to Elizabeth’s reaction to or judgment about her encounter with Darcy].

- (2) She **was** overpowered by shame and vexation.
- (9) She **blushed** again and again over the perverseness of the meeting.
- (14) She **knew not** what to think, or how to account for it.

Through this pattern, Austen builds a consistent tone that helps clearly maintain the perspective of the third-person narrator in this paragraph.

Looking at this evidence, we can see how Austen encloses Elizabeth’s perspective – which dominates the middle of this paragraph – with sentences that lack indications of Elizabeth’s viewpoint and contain deictic words clearly oriented towards the third-person narrator. Below is the paragraph which has been analyzed throughout this paper, in which *narration conveyed through the third-person narrator is italicized*, **Elizabeth’s perspective is in bold**, and words which are ambiguous underlined. Only words and phrases which have been previously discussed as explicitly ambiguous are underlined, including those which contain judgments either Elizabeth or the third-person narrator could have made.

Those words and phrases which have not been discussed as ambiguous, yet are not directly representative of a particular viewpoint (such as “his letter” (13)), are nonetheless grouped as belonging to Elizabeth’s perspective or the narrator’s. This is because many of these words are in fact combined with words which do directly point to

either Elizabeth or the narrator. For example, “the perverseness” contains only a single word (“perverseness”) which points directly to Elizabeth, but both words appear in bold below, because together they constitute a single noun phrase.

Further, many of the words and phrases which do not directly point to a particular viewpoint are italicized or bolded simply because they exist in sentences which contain overwhelming evidence of Elizabeth’s or the third-person narrator’s perspective. This evidence may be in the form of specific words, or even in the very structure of sentences. Regarding the latter, sentences following the “She + [past tense verb] + [adjunct or complement]” pattern represent the third-person narrator, while sentences which are exclamative and contain multiple clauses and fragmented syntax represent Elizabeth. Words in such sentences, which have not been explicitly described as ambiguous, are grouped according to whichever narrative perspective a particular sentence structure supports.

Because some words convey ambiguity in one way, and a character’s perspective in another, some lines are both underlined and bolded or italicized. An example of this is “was amazing!” (11), which contains Elizabeth’s judgment but is in a verb form that both she and the narrator would have used. Another example is “Never in her life had she seen his manners so little dignified” (12), which contains a judgment either could have made, suggests Elizabeth’s perspective because it is repetitive in its larger context, and firmly demonstrates the third-person narrator’s presence through the pronouns “her” and “she”.

Emphasizing these features demonstrates how the changes in perspective develop throughout this passage:

(1.1) *The others then joined her, and expressed their admiration of his figure;* **(1.2)** *but Elizabeth heard not a*

*word, and, wholly engrossed by her own feelings, followed them in silence. (2) She was overpowered by shame and vexation. (3) Her coming there was the most unfortunate, the most ill-judged thing in the world! (4) How strange must it appear to him! (5) In what a disgraceful light might it not strike so vain a man! (6) It might seem as if she had purposely thrown herself in his way again! (7.1) Oh! why did *she* come? (7.2) or, why did he thus come a day before he was expected? (8.1) Had they been only ten minutes sooner, they should have been beyond the reach of his discrimination; (8.2) for it was plain that he was that moment arrived—that moment alighted from his horse or his carriage. (9) She blushed again and again over the perverseness of the meeting. (10) And his behavior, so strikingly altered,—what could it mean? (11) That he should even speak to her was amazing!—but to speak with such civility, to inquire after her family! (12) Never in her life had she seen his manners so little dignified, never had he spoken with such gentleness as on this unexpected meeting. (13) What a contrast did it offer to his last address in Rosings Park, when he put his letter into her hand! (14) She knew not what to think, or how to account for it.*

Given the overwhelming presence of Elizabeth's viewpoint in sentences three through eight and ten through thirteen, we can reasonably attribute the ambiguous aspects of those sentences to her perspective. In doing so, what we are left with is a paragraph that: begins with two sentences completely reflecting the third-person narrator's perspective; continues with six sentences which overwhelmingly convey Elizabeth's perspective, with only the spatial deictic adverb "there" (3) and the pronouns "Her" (3), "she" (6, 7.1), "herself" (6), and "they" (twice in 8.1) maintaining the presence of the third-person narrator; returns to the presence of the third-person narrator in sentence nine, with only one judgment ("the perverseness") representing Elizabeth's perspective in that sentence; then returns to Elizabeth's point of view in sentences ten through thirteen, with only the pronouns "her" (twice in 11, 12, 13) and "she" (12) maintaining the presence of

the third-person narrator; and finally concludes with a sentence told from the third-person narrator's perspective.

As detailed earlier, Austen uses the first two sentences to prepare readers for the free indirect discourse that follows. She then uses sentence nine to further ground the paragraph in the third-person narrator's perspective, and finally sentence fourteen to return readers to that third-person viewpoint, which the chapter continues in. Between sentences two and fourteen, Austen extensively details Elizabeth's emotional response to her encounter with Darcy, which builds empathy for the character on the part of readers by intimately showing how she anxiously responded to her chance encounter with him, while also creating ambiguity as to Darcy's actual opinion of her.

We can clearly trace the development of Elizabeth's emotional response throughout sentences three through thirteen. In sentence three, our heroine conveys her immense horror and regret at having come to Darcy's estate, exclaiming that "Her coming" to Pemberley was "the most unfortunate, the most ill-judged thing in the world". Elizabeth here casts a wide net for the extent of her misfortune, claiming both bad luck ("unfortunate") and poor judgment ("ill-judged") as reasons for her situation. This combination serves to intensify her expression of distress, since it allows her to include in its scope both horror (at her bad luck) and regret (at her misfortune).

Sentences four through six in turn divulge exactly why Elizabeth is distressed by her encounter with Darcy. Four through six first expose Elizabeth's preoccupation with how Darcy perceived their encounter, and by extension, her visitation to his estate. Throughout these sentences Elizabeth repeatedly uses words related to perception ("appear" (4), "strike" (5), "seem" (6), and "light" (5)), revealing her concern over how

he perceived her. She exclaims that their chance encounter “must...appear” “strange...to him” (4), a claim that is certainly reasonable given the animosity she had expressed towards him in person previously.

But Elizabeth immediately moves from sound observation to fearful speculation, concerning herself over the *possibility* (“might” (5, 6)) that Darcy viewed their encounter not just as “strange” but also as “disgraceful” (5). It is clear that Elizabeth’s attitude towards Darcy has changed dramatically. In their previous encounter, Elizabeth told Darcy that she has “every reason in the world to think ill of you” (pg. 197), and yet in these sentences Elizabeth now frets continuously over how he has perceived her. Her concerns over his opinion of her clearly demonstrate a substantial shift in her attitude towards him.

The paragraph continues in sentence seven with Elizabeth reiterating her deep regret over their meeting by rhetorically asking herself “why...she [had] come” and “why...he [had] thus come”. She then returns in sentence eight to both her worries over Darcy’s perception of her and to speculation, postulating that she and her relatives “should have been beyond the reach of his discrimination” had they arrived (and therefore left) sooner. In sentence nine Elizabeth again expresses her feeling of horror at the situation (“perverseness”) and the narrator’s description of her (“She blushed again and again”) underscores her embarrassment.

Sentences ten through twelve shift the focus of the paragraph from Elizabeth worrying over how Darcy perceived her to his actual behavior during their unexpected encounter, focusing especially on his speech. This change reflects the logical development of Elizabeth’s thought process, which shifts from her anxiety over his

perception of her to an examination of his behavior, presumably to see whether there was any evidence in it to warrant that anxiety. Elizabeth's 'stream of consciousness-like' ruminations in sentences ten through twelve reveal this new focus through the repeated use of words related to Darcy's behavior and speech: "his behavior" (10), "speak" (11), "to speak" (11), "to inquire" (11), "his manners" (12), and "spoken" (12).

In examining his behavior and speech, Elizabeth expresses her repeated surprise at his new and unexpected courtesy, using the word "amazing" (11) and the phrases "so strikingly altered" (10), "such civility" (11), "so little dignified" (12), and "such gentleness" (12). Finally, having finished processing the unusual attitude with which she was greeted, in sentence thirteen Elizabeth compares Mr. Darcy's behavior with "his last address", and can only exclaim in surprise "What a contrast...!" (13).

These worries, as has been previously discussed, are unfounded, for many of Elizabeth's judgments about Darcy's reaction to her are erroneous. Because of Elizabeth's misjudgments, Austen could not build the same kind of empathy using a purely third-person narrator, as we would not be so concerned for Elizabeth's situation if we already knew her worries were unfounded. And though through thorough linguistic examination we can determine much of whose perspective the words found in this paragraph reflect, the average reader of Austen's novel, reading for pleasure, would not likely take the time to analyze exactly whose perspective is being conveyed through this passage word for word.

Instead, readers of *Pride and Prejudice* would likely recognize that this paragraph contains some mixture of both the third-person narrator's perspective and the character's, the exclamative declarations clearly suggestive of Elizabeth's point of view's presence

and the third-person pronouns clearly reflective of the third-person narrator. But how much of each perspective is actually present would not be immediately apparent, and the resulting ambiguity, created through Austen's skillful use of free indirect discourse, allows readers to wonder as Elizabeth wonders about the mysterious Mr. Darcy and his secret thoughts.

Furthermore, as touched upon earlier, Austen uses free indirect discourse to create the conditions by which readers can empathize with Elizabeth, meaning that because we are able to experience the novel partially through her eyes – albeit an experience mitigated by the third-person narrative framework – we are positioned by Austen so that we identify with her protagonist. Both effects help Austen create a compelling novel, as empathizing with Elizabeth leads us to caring about her developments throughout the story, and because the ambiguity surrounding Darcy creates a mystery designed to engage readers, a mystery we care about because it matters to a character we're made to care about.

Let us return to the debate among critics over the nature of the relationship between third-person narrator and character in instances of free indirect discourse. Mezei's suggestion that we imagine free indirect discourse as "an expression of the character's bid for freedom from the controlling narrator" (68) or as part of "a struggle" (66) between character and third-person narrator makes little sense when looking closely at an instance of free indirect discourse, such as the one analyzed in this paper. Even when the narrative perspective in a novel is dominated by a character's viewpoint, as Elizabeth's perspective dominates sentences three through eight and ten through thirteen in the paragraph discussed above, the third-person narrator still maintains a consistent

presence through the use of third-person pronouns. In three through eight and ten through thirteen, third-person pronouns are used eleven times: “her” (3, twice in 11, 12, 13), “she” (6, 7.1, 12), “herself” (6), and “they” (twice in 8.1). Additionally, the spatial deictic adverb “there” in sentence three also helps to retain the third-person narrator’s perspective.

Austen’s narration, though engaging in free indirect discourse and thereby intimately revealing to readers Elizabeth’s perspective, never really breaks out of a third-person narrative framework. Indeed, the very nature of free indirect discourse requires the presence of a third-person narrator. Otherwise, what we would have without such a narrator would be first-person narration. Furthermore, if Austen is in fact giving voice to a character so that character may challenge the narrative authority of a third-person narrator, why would third-person pronouns remain a consistent exception to that character’s “bid for freedom”?

It makes more sense to think of free indirect discourse as “an *imitation* of figural speech or thought, in which the narrator echoes or mimics the idiom of the character for purposes of the fiction”, as Gunn argues (37). He correctly observes that Austen’s passages of free indirect discourse “are *embedded*” (43) in her narratives. How Austen embeds such passages in a largely third-person narrative is clear, I believe, from my analysis above. This paper has shown how Austen begins and ends a paragraph with a third-person narrator’s perspective, and readies the readers with the first two sentences of that paragraph for the free indirect discourse to come. Austen then relays the perspective of Elizabeth after sentence two, yet manages to further anchor the paragraph in the third-

person narrative voice through the use of third-person pronouns, a spatial deictic adverb, and a sentence almost completely lacking in free indirect discourse (sentence nine).

It is through these means that Austen's passages featuring free indirect discourse in *Pride and Prejudice* are embedded into a larger, intricate third-person narrative framework. These are not instances of struggle on the part of Austen's characters, as they attempt to break free from the narrative framework of a controlling third-person narrator; these are instead situations in which the perspectives of characters are conveyed, through free indirect discourse, by a third-person narrative voice, as a means to create empathy and ambiguity in the text, a dynamic perhaps best understood as a kind of "mimicry" (Gunn 43) of the characters on the part of the third-person narrator.

Bibliography

- Austen, Jane. *Lady Susan, The Watsons, Sanditon*. Ed. Margaret Drabble. Penguin, 1974.
- Austen, Jane. *Pride and Prejudice*. New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1918.
- Austen, Jane. *Pride and Prejudice: An Authoritative Text, Background and Sources, Criticism*. Ed. Donald J. Gray. New York: Norton, 2001.
- Gunn, Daniel P. "Free Indirect Discourse and Narrative Authority in *Emma*." *Narrative* 12.1 (2004): 35-54.
- Klenck, Deborah J. Knuth. "Fun and Speculation: *Sense and Sensibility* and *Pride and Prejudice* as Revisions." *Persuasions* 27.1 (2005): 39-53.
- Mezei, Kathy. "Who Is Speaking Here?: Free Indirect Discourse, Gender, and Authority in *Emma*, *Howard's End*, and *Mrs. Dalloway*." *Ambiguous Discourse: Feminist Narratology and British Women Writers*. Ed. Kathy Mezei. Chapel Hill, NC: U of North Carolina, 1996. 66-92.
- Pechey, Graham. *Mikhail Bakhtin: The Word in the World*. London: Routledge, 2007.
- Poovey, Mary. "Ideological Contradictions and the Consolations of Form: The Case of Jane Austen." *Bloom's Modern Critical Views: Jane Austen*. Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Infobase, 2009. 21-58.