

# **Elizabeth's Utterances in *Pride and Prejudice***

**of Face Theory**                      -----An Investigation of Gendered Differences from the Perspective

**Cai Yunhong  
Kristianstad University  
English Department  
The C-level of English Linguistics  
Elective course: Language and Gender  
Autumn 2010  
Tutor: Anna Ekström**

## Table of Contents

<b>1. Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.1 Aim and scope.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.2 Material.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>1.3 Method.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2. Theoretical background .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2.1 Speech Act Theory.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2.1.1 Origin of Speech Act Theory.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2.1.2 Illocutionary Acts.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2.2 Direct Speech Acts and Indirect Speech Acts.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2.2.1 Introduction of Direct Speech Acts and Indirect Speech Acts.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2.2.2 Characteristics of Direct and Indirect Speeches.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>2.3 Face Theory.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>2.3.1 The Concept of Face.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>2.3.2 Positive and Negative Faces.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>2.3.3 Face -threatening Acts (FTAs).....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>3. Analysis.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>3.1 Background of the Novel.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>3.2 Utterance Discussion.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>3.2.1 Utterances to Males.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>3.2.2 Utterances to Females.....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>4. Conclusion.....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>References</b>	

## **1. Introduction**

Language is the chief medium by which people comprehend themselves and the outside world. People can be divided into male and female, and language is also gendered. Language is the reflection of the profound and complicated consciousness about gender that is embedded in and hidden behind a language.

The relationship between gender and language is a major topic in recent years' sociolinguistic research, which is concerned with how gender affects the ways in which we use language and others use language with us. In the past several decades, more and more scholars have been attracted to this research.

In the 1970s, pioneered by Robin Lakoff's famous work *Language and Women's Place* (1975), the research of gender differences in language progressed greatly. She proposed that women's speech can be distinguished from that of men in a number of ways including: hedges, adjectives, polite forms, expletives, tag questions etc. (Lakoff, 1975: 36). From then on, linguists paid much attention to the exploration of the patterns of communication and of the role that language plays in females' position in society. They have been doing a dynamic investigation into gender differences in language use, studying female and male's different speech styles and strategies in conversations and exploring the roles people play in social interaction. What the scholars have done in this field is very significant and influential. During recent years, combination of gender differences with literature has been flourishing. This study is also dedicated in this aspect and focus on purified language of literary works.

### **1.1 Aim and scope**

The aim of the present study is to investigate Face Theory, from a gender perspective, in the 19<sup>th</sup> century's novel *Pride and Prejudice* by Jane Austen with the help of Speech Act Theory including direct Speech and indirect Speech. The special focuses of this investigation are if Elizabeth has a stereotypical use of FTAs strategies for different genders. And when face is concerned during a conversation, does she use direct speech to woman only and indirect speech to men only or not?

## **1.2 Material**

The primary material in this study is the novel *Pride and Prejudice* written by Jane Austen and first published in 1813. The novel deals with life in early 19<sup>th</sup> century Britain, particularly middle class families and especially their concern with finding husbands for their daughters. The focus of the present study is the main female character of the novel, Elizabeth Bennet, and how she speaks. The novel features rich conversations between many characters, Elizabeth Bennet being one of them. The particular focus here is the utterances made by Elizabeth Bennet with regard to whether she is addressing a male character or a female character. Her indirect speech and direct speech are differentiated and analyzed with the help of face theory.

This novel consists of 61 chapters. For this study, chapters 1 to 20 are analyzed. In those chapters only utterances by Elizabeth Bennet are included in the study. These 20 chapters are randomly chosen, and no special thought lies behind stopping after Chapter 20.

## **1.3 Method**

This study is based on the utterances made by the female main character Elizabeth Bennet. Her utterances to both men and women are collected, classified according to different genders, and then analyzed within the Face Theory framework and Speech Acts Theory, to discover if there are any similarities or differences in the language used when Elizabeth Bennet speaks to characters of different genders.

## **2. Theoretical background**

In this section, theories supporting the study are expatiated in a detailed way. Speech act theory including direct and indirect speech acts accounts for the first part. Then it comes to face theory containing fact-threatening acts and the according strategies. The two important theories are the backbones for the study.

### **2.1 Speech Act Theory**

Speech act theory was put forward by Austin and Searle in about 1960s. “A speech act is an act that a speaker performs when making an utterance” (Austin, 1962: 253).

Speech acts are usually discussed from three perspectives: locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary. The first one, locutionary act is the occurrence of an utterance, which includes words, phrases and clauses etc. It is an act which expresses the literal meaning through syntax, vocabulary and phonetics. The second one, illocutionary act is the real intention of an utterance. It may be the same as the literal intention, and it can also be implied intention behind the utterance. The last one, perlocutionary act is the consequences or the backwash brought about by the utterance made. In this sense, there is some time lag between the utterance and a perlocutionary act.

### 2.1.1 Origin of Speech Act Theory

In the early part of the last century there existed a major theoretical approach to language, called logical positivism. Its main concept is that the verifiability is the norm to assess an utterance. If an utterance describes something true with reality, then the utterance is well justified and has the value of existence. However, if an utterance describes something untrue or false, then the utterance is meaningless. But later John Austin put forward the objection by saying that “it is impossible to determine the truth---values of many everyday conversational utterances” (Austin, 1962:27). Under the logical positivism approach, these utterances should be considered meaningless, while in fact such utterances are understood as totally meaningful, as illustrated below:

*(1) I do. (As uttered in the course of a marriage ceremony)*

*(2) I apologize.*

*(3) I name this ship the Queen Elizabeth. (As uttered when smashing the bottle against the stem of the ship)*

(Austin, 1962:28)

To define such utterances, Austin puts forward performative utterance. Performative utterance is made in order to do something. It could not be judged meaningful or meaning less by the utterance itself. Instead, it is evaluated according to a concrete context or situation. This kind of utterance is different from constative utterance. Constative utterance is made in order to perform an act. It can be judged meaningful or meaningless by the utterance itself. Austin knows the difference between

performative utterance and constative utterance, but he could not set up a clear boundary according to the verbs used in the two utterances. He feels that “even constative utterances are subject to felicity conditions and have a performative feature.” (Austin, 1962: 239) In order to solve this problem, he adopts a middle way, claiming that every utterance could be made with the intention of making something done. Though Austin does not provide a full-fledged schema about the distinction between performative and constative utterance, he makes scholars judge utterances not entirely on true-false conditions.

### 2.1.2 Illocutionary Acts

An illocutionary act is usually the focus of speech act theory. This kind of utterance is made to request, order, beg etc. Sometimes the intention is expressed directly with words in the utterance, but sometimes the intention is implied and the listener should feel it under a particular situation. A lot of researches are made on conversations of a novel from the perspective of illocutionary acts.

Austin describes that “speech act is often meant to refer just to the same thing as the term illocutionary act.” (John L. Austin, 1962: 86). In Austin’s point of view, when the speaker says something on purpose or with emphasis, the illocutionary intention can be sensed by the listener. For example, a waitress tells a customer *No smoking!*, or when a policeman says to a suspect, *You have the right to keep silent*.

Austin assumes that an illocutionary speech act is usually made in performative utterances. For example: *I beg you not to open the window, I declare the opening of the trade fair, or I formally pronounce my resignation*. In these sentences, the speaker’s intention (bequeathing, declaration) is achieved through the performative utterance, which is very typical for an illocutionary act.

Searle classifies illocutionary speech acts as follows:

- *representative = speech acts that commit a speaker to the truth of the expressed proposition, e.g. This chair used to belong to my grandmother.*
- *directives = speech acts that are to cause the hearer to take a particular action, e.g. Would you mind closing the window?*

- *commissives* = speech acts that commit a speaker to some future action, e.g. *I will break every bone in your body.*
- *expressives* = speech acts that express the speaker's attitudes and emotions towards the proposition, e.g. *My God, that really hurts* or *Good morning!*
- *declarations* = speech acts that change the reality in accord with the proposition of the declaration, e.g. *When a referee says You are out. It means that a certain player can no longer take part in the game*

(Searle, 1969: 48).

## **2.2 Direct Speech Acts and Indirect Speech Acts**

In everyday life, people tend to use indirect speech acts a lot in order to express themselves. In a lot of cultures, indirect speech acts are more encouraged because this kind of speech has the lowest risk to offend others. Sometimes it is a verbal art to appropriately switch between direct speech and indirect speech in different situations.

### **2.2.1 Introduction of Direct Speech Acts and Indirect Speech Acts**

When people speak to each other in a conversation, the literal meaning is probably the implied meaning. For example: When a waiter in a restaurant asks: Do you want some drinks; he really means what he says.

It is a common phenomenon that the real meaning of an utterance is different from the literal words. If one person wants to stop another one speaking, he might say *Stop!* Or he can do it indirectly by saying, *It is so noisy now.* In a lot of cases, people usually utter a sentence which features both locutionary act as well as illocutionary act. For example, if a waiter in a restaurant says, do you want some drinks? He is actually asks your order. No special meaning is contained in the utterance. But if a boy says that to a girl whom he likes, do you want some drinks? He is likely to mean more than asking if the girl is thirsty. Actually, he says that as an invitation to her to spend some time with him. This is an indirect speech acts used to extend an invitation.

People use indirect speech acts more when they want to decline a suggestion or respond to a demand. Take the above example still as example. The boy wants to invite the girl to have some drinks with him. But the girl says, I have to go home to

prepare for the exam tomorrow. The girl's utterance achieve the aim to refuse without contain *no*. It is a typical indirect speech of refusal. The refusal intention of the indirect speech in the example is easy to be sensed. But sometimes, the real intention of an indirect speech is too difficult to be understood.

In *How to Do Things with Words*, Austin describes indirect speech acts as “one performative utterance can be used as all indirect means to perform another act” (Austin, 1962: 7). Austins assumes that the listener is able to find out the implied meaning in an indirect speech based on the knowledge of common sense. but how uptake is secured when an ordinary speech act involving no extra-linguistic convention is performed indirectly?

However, what if an indirect utterance does not contain some familiar knowledge? Now can the listener distinguish the real meaning under the lines? Searle resolves the problem. He argues that some kind of speech acts is made in disguise of another kind, which is known as indirect speech act. He says that “an indirect speech act involves the performance of two distinct speech acts, each having a different illocutionary point” (Searle, 1969: 48). For example, a father can order his child to do something by saying a sentence of expectation such as *I really hope you to study medicine*.

However, Searle does not expatiate on the context for a listener to understand an indirect speech. He thinks Grice's cooperative principle can help in this aspect. Grice mentions that “the mutually shared factual background information of the speaker and the hearer's ability to make inferences” (Grice, 1969: 48).

He claims that two things are crucial: “first, a strategy for establishing the existence of another illocutionary point beyond the illocutionary point contained in the meaning of the sentence; second, a device for finding out what this illocutionary point is. The first is established by the Cooperative Principle shared by the speaker and hearer and the second is derived from speech act theory together with the background information” (Seale, 1965: 265).

Searle summarizes the skills to discern the intention of an indirect speech. The listener should combine the context in which the conversation takes place, with the actual words spoken. Through practice of a period, it is not difficult to notice the implied meaning of an indirect speech.

### **2.2.2 Characteristics of Direct and Indirect speech acts**

The relationship between structure and function is the criterion to distinguish direct speech and indirect speech. When the structure of an utterance is exclamative, and the speaker use this utterance to express surprise or praise, then the relationship between the function and structure is direct, and the utterance is a direct speech. For example, if a speaker says, *what a nice skirt*, and he really wants to praise, then it is a direct speech.

However, as for an indirect speech act, the relationship between the function and structure is indirect. In other words, when a speaker uses an interrogative sentence, and his intention is to satirize, then it is an indirect relationship between the function and structure. For example, if a father says *why you still haven't done your homework? Do you want me to do it for you?*, then the father does not really wish to come to help. On the contrary, he is ironic, and the utterance is an indirect speech. Uttering a sentence while meaning something else happens everyday in human communications.

Geis (1995) elaborates on the way to classify direct and indirect speech as follows: For an utterance or speech, the relationship between the function and structure is the criterion to distinguish a direct speech or an indirect speech. If the relationship between the funktion and structure is direct, then the utterance or speech is a direct speech. If the relationship between the function and structure is indirect, then the utterance or speech is a direct speech.

One thing which should be paid attention to in distinguishing direct speech from indirect speech is that if there are performative verbs in an utterance, then the utterance must be a direct speech act. Performative verbs are used to declare,

pronounce or promise something. For example, a minister says to a couple that I declare that you are married. In contrast with performative verbs, ordinary verbs just express certain kind of action. For example, in the utterance I eat vegetables every morning, eat is not a performative verb.

There is also one way to identify the performative verbs clearly. Insert the word hereby into the sentence to see whether it is still logic and grammatically meaningful. For example, *I order that every student must hand in the paper before Friday*. If the word hereby is inserted, the sentence becomes *I hereby order that every student must hand in the paper before Friday*. The utterance is still correct. But if hereby is inserted into *I eat vegetables every morning*, the utterance becomes *I hereby eat vegetables every morning*. It is really awkward and can not be accepted as a meaningful utterance.

### **2.3 Face Theory**

In 1987, a theory with regards to politeness came into being. It deals with the frequently occurring indirect speech acts in people's daily life. It is the research result of the famous linguists Brown and Levinson. From Brown and Levinson's point of view, "politeness refers to various rational acts that a Model Person does in order to meet the needs of face, including positive and negative faces of both the speaker and the hearer" (He Z.X., 2000: 225) . And the politeness theory is often called Face Saving Theory.

#### **2.3.1 The Concept of Face**

The American sociologist Erving Goffman (1967) is the one who first discussed the concept of face from the linguistic perspective. He assumes that the face must be studied in a communicative situation which features social intercourse. Goffman defines faces as "the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact." (Goffman, 1967: 82)

In Goffman's opinion, everyone has his own face and face is very personal. But face is not a stagnant concept. People's attitudes toward face vary from time to time and in

different situations. In some culture, certain utterance is considered to be offensive to one's face, while in another culture, this utterance is supposed to have a positive effect on one's face. So face is variable, not constant.

Brown & Levinson further develop the concept of face and define face as "the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself." (Brown & Levinson 1987: 58). They believe that people certainly have some wishes or requests. Through social intercourses, these wishes or requests can be fulfilled or be rejected. In either case, their face will get involved. It is easy to understand that in all conditions, people want to reduce the loss of their face as possible as they could. If a person wants others to save his face, he should learn to respect others' face. Therefore, face-saving tactics are very important in dealing with personal relationships.

### **2.3.2 Positive and Negative Faces**

Brown and Levinson classify face into two kinds: positive face and negative face. "Positive face is the positive consistent self-image or personality (crucially including the desire that this self-image be appreciated and approved of) claimed by interactants" (Brown & Levinson, 1987: 61), and negative face is "the basic claim to territories, personal preserves, rights to non-distraction, i.e. to freedom of action and freedom from imposition" (Brown & Levinson, 1987: 61).

In George Yule's opinion, "negative face is the need to be independent and positive face is the need to be connected" (Yule, 2000: 61). And Foley also mentions that "the two aspects of face as the basic wants of any individual in a social interaction--- to be affirmed in her or his positive self-esteem by at least some others and to be unimpeded in her or his action." (Foley, 2001: 271).

### **2.3.3 Face -threatening Acts (FTAs)**

Although rational people all have face wants in conversations, certain kinds of acts, according to Brown and Levinson, intrinsically threaten face, which means "whose acts by their nature run contrary to the face wants of the hear and/or the speaker." (Brown & Levinson 1987: 127). Those acts are described as face threatening acts

(FTAs).

It is natural that everyone wants his face to be maintained and respected under all circumstance. But in reality, there many speech acts which makes one's face hurt. So another concept will be introduced here: face threatening acts (FTAs). According to Brown and Levinson, FTAs refer to "Acts like orders or requests threaten hearers' negative face by indicating (potentially) that the speaker does not intend to avoid impeding hearer's freedom of action. Or acts like contradictions or disagreements threaten hearer's positive face by indicating that the speaker does not care about the hearer's feelings, want, etc." (Brown & Levinson 1987: 127).

Face-threatening acts can hurt not only the listener's face, but also the speaker's face as well. The speaker's face can be hurt by making an apology, acceptance of an apology, self-irony, making an offer, being praised etc.

In order to make the hurt brought about by face-threatening acts less, Brown and Levinson (1987) put forward a few strategies as follows:

Bald on-record: It is the most straightforward way of making the speaker understood. The speaker using this strategy does not consider if the utterance will hurt, bother or annoy others. Generally people tend to use this strategy to the audiences who are familiar with them or who have a close relationship with. The speaker does not fear that his words will offend or damage the listener's face. For example: *Give me the salt; Don't open the window; You are so careless!*

Positive Politeness: This strategy is often used when the speaker is having a conversation with someone in the same social class. Their status is very similar and their conversation is set on an equal footing. The strategy has the function of bringing the speakers closer or more intimate to each other. It also helps to create a friendly talking environment. For example: *I can help you with your mathematics, if you wish; Shall we solve the problem together? Do you mind if I keep the light on when you sleep?*

Negative Politeness: This strategy is used to conversation between people of different social status such as boss and staff, teacher and student or policeman and criminal. It can keep the psychological distance between the two speakers or even enlarge it. So if a person applies this strategy to the listener, the listener knows the speaker is trying to keep a seemingly agreeable conversation. For example: *No entrance by this door; I respect you as a boss, but I have to say that...; I did not expect the hurt would be so serious.*

Off-Record (indirect): This is a roundabout way of expressing oneself. People using this strategy do not want to create any embarrassing situation during the conversation. For example: *I wonder if it is possible for you to show me the way to the railway station? Do you mind telling me what size of shoes you wear?*

Among the four strategies, each one is more polite than the previous one. If the speaker cares a lot about the listener's face, he will probably adopt the last strategy, and if he spares no efforts to save the listener's face, he will choose the first one.

Of course, the adoption of one strategy also depends on other factors such as mood, the personality of the speaker and the particular context. According to Brown and Levinson, there are two major factors: "The first one is the payoffs or benefit brought by each of the strategies. The second one is the circumstances---sociological variables." (Brown & Levinson 1987: 132) Anyway, having certain knowledge of the strategies stated above is conducive in understanding others and in better communicating with different people.

### **3. Analysis**

As this research is based on the novel *Pride and Prejudice* and the utterances of the main character Elizabeth Bennet, the basic information and the character of Elizabeth will be introduced generally.

#### **3.1 Background of the Novel**

The novel describes the how an English middle-class family of 19th century marries

the daughters. Mr. and Mrs. Bennet live in a peaceful village with their five daughters, whose marriages worry Mrs. Bennet very much, because daughters are not entitled to inherit their father's legacy as the law dictates. So when Mr. Bennet dies, the mother and daughters will be homeless and left forlorn. In order to escape from the miserable fate, Mrs. Bennet tries her best to create chances for her daughters to meet rich men. Soon a good-tempered and honest man named Bingley falls in love with the eldest daughter Jane. Their love develops fast and smoothly without major obstacles, which of course is not the focus of the novel. The main characters are the second daughter Elizabeth and her future husband Bingley. They do not fall in love at first sight, while on the contrary, they show dislike toward each other in the beginning. Darcy is from a wealthy and noble family, who looks down upon people who pursue money eagerly. He is naturally reluctant to behave interested toward them. However, some people distort his character as being arrogant and impassionate. Elizabeth is unsatisfied with his attitudes and believes others' opinion about him. As Darcy is not a person who likes to defend himself, Elizabeth has great trouble in finding out his lofty quality inside and becomes mentally attached to him. At the same time, Darcy also finds himself in love with Elizabeth after several conversations and incidents. The story ends up with the removal of prejudice against each other and marriage between them.

The main character Elizabeth is not a typical woman of that time. Most women then obeyed the social rules imposed on them, which advocated submission, silence, diligence into housework and no opinion about social affairs. But Elizabeth is very special. Her distinctive personality is bravery. She dares to air her own thoughts about everything and everybody including Darcy, and her own mother. She never echoes with incorrect practices of her mother and does not give herself up into a loveless marriage with her brother. She is calm inside and knows what she wants. She dislikes vulgarity as well as arrogance. So when she misunderstands Darcy, she uses her verbal swords to express her dissatisfaction towards him, not afraid of displeasing a man who is in higher social class.

Elizabeth is the character who utters the most in this novel. Her ready-tongue enables

herself to have an upper hand in almost all conversations, no matter who she is speaking to. Most of the time, she is ironic and direct. However, she can also be indirect and roundabout. She usually criticizes injustice and sympathizes with the weak. When she is challenged by snobbish and pretentious people, she is neither servile nor overbearing, responding skillfully to safeguard her own dignity, as well as to make her stance clearly understood. Therefore, her utterances are the most valuable to be studied in the whole novel.

### **3.2 Utterance Discussion**

In this sub-section, the utterances of Elizabeth will be discussed according to which gender she talks to, male or female.

#### **3.2.1 Utterances to Males**

Ex 1

*"You excel so much in the dance, Miss Eliza, that it is cruel to deny me the happiness of seeing you; and though this gentleman dislikes the amusement in general, he can have no objection, I am sure, to oblige us for one half hour."*

*"Mr. Darcy is all politeness," said Elizabeth, smiling.*

(Pride and Prejudice, Chapter 6)

This conversation is made by Elizabeth and Sir William at a large party at Sir William Lucas's. As Darcy's social rank is very lordly, when he comes to Netherfield Park, he is cold and pride in his behavior towards his new acquaintances. He is unwilling to relate to the people whose social position is lower than his and hates the way of their enjoyment. When Darcy meets Elizabeth at the ball for the first time, his higher-class pride makes him unable to identify Elizabeth's lovely nature. He rejects to dance with Elizabeth. The big difference in aspect of social position and family background make Elizabeth produce deep prejudice on Darcy's pride. Here Sir William has managed to raise Mr. Darcy's positive face by lots of praises and encourages Miss Elizabeth to dance with Darcy. Yet Miss Elizabeth turns down Darcy bravely. Her answer forcefully attacks Darcy in return, winning her dignity and proving her personality.

By saying that Mr. Darcy is polite, while at the same time rejecting to dance with him, Elizabeth is obviously using negative politeness strategy to hint her ridicule on Darcy's unpleasant manner. Her seemingly polite comment on Darcy not only obeys the social etiquette and manages to save Darcy's face, but also shows her mock and dissatisfaction by way of an indirect speech. This speaking skill can avoid direct conflict and counter-argument and is therefore great helpful in social occasion.

Ex. 2

*"Do not you feel a great inclination, Miss Bennet, to seize such an opportunity of dancing a reel?"*

*She smiled, but made no answer. He repeated the question, with some surprise at her silence.*

*"Oh!" said she, "I heard you before; but I could not immediately determine what to say in reply. You wanted me, I know, to say "Yes," that you might have the pleasure of despising my taste; but I always delight in overthrowing those kind of schemes, and cheating a person of their premeditated contempt. I have therefore made up my mind to tell you that I do not want to dance a reel at all -- and now despise me if you dare."*

(Pride and Prejudice Chapter 10)

At Bingley's home, Elizabeth is invited by Darcy to dance with him. The dialogue occurs between Elizabeth and Darcy. Elizabeth use direct speech acts to clearly show her attitude and reply to the invitation of Darcy. She spares no effort to save her negative face by turning Darcy down directly. In doing so, she uses bald-on record strategy, making herself clear in a very aggressive way.

Ex.3

*"I must not decide on my own performance."*

*He made no answer, and they were again silent till they had gone down the dance, when he asked her if she and her sisters did not very often walk to Meryton. She*

*answered in the affirmative, and, unable to resist the temptation, added, "When you met us there the other day, we had just been forming a new acquaintance."*

(Pride and Prejudice Chapter 18)

This is a conversation between Elizabeth and Darcy when they are dancing at a ball. Wickham talks some bad words about and attributes his unlucky fame and torment to Darcy's envy and animosity, Wickham's words make Elizabeth hate Darcy. Elizabeth is surprised by the Darcy's behavior and her prejudice to Darcy increases. She extremely believes that Darcy should be responsible for Wickham's painful living. "A new acquaintance" here refers to Mr. Wickham. Elizabeth is using indirect speech to explore the reaction of Darcy when referring to Wickham. As she imagines, Darcy is surprised by her words. Also the use of FTA off-record strategy has made Darcy uncomfortable and has succeeded in punishing Darcy tacitly instead of hurting his face directly.

Ex. 4

*"A thorough, determined dislike of me -- a dislike which I cannot but attribute in some measure to jealousy. Had the late Mr. Darcy liked me less, his son might have borne with me better; but his father's uncommon attachment to me, irritated him I believe very early in life. He had not a temper to bear the sort of competition in which we stood -- the sort of preference which was often given me."*

*"I had not thought Mr. Darcy so bad as this -- though I have never liked him, I had not thought so very ill of him -- I had supposed him to be despising his fellow-creatures in general, but did not suspect him of descending to such malicious revenge, such injustice, such inhumanity as this!"*

(Pride and Prejudice Chapter 16)

This conversation occurs between Elizabeth and Wickham. Wick tries his best cheat Elizabeth that it is Darcy who throws his life into a misery. He depicts Darcy as someone jealous and heartless. In response, Elizabeth's direct speech acts are full of

surprises and disgust towards Darcy, which greatly supports Wickham's positive face. He wishes Elizabeth to say words like this. Elizabeth uses the positive politeness of FTA to bring their relationships closer.

Ex. 5

*"Upon my word, Sir," cried Elizabeth, "your hope is rather an extraordinary one after my declaration. I do assure you that I am not one of those young ladies (if such young ladies there are) who are so daring as to risk their happiness on the chance of being asked a second time. I am perfectly serious in my refusal. -- You could not make me happy, and I am convinced that I am the last woman in the world who would make you so, -- Nay, were your friend Lady Catherine to know me, I am persuaded she would find me in every respect ill qualified for the situation."*

*"Were it certain that Lady Catherine would think so," said Mr. Collins very gravely -- "but I cannot imagine that her ladyship would at all disapprove of you. And you may be certain that when I have the honour of seeing her again I shall speak in the highest terms of your modesty, economy, and other amiable qualifications."*

(Pride and Prejudice Chapter 19)

This is a conversation between Elizabeth and Mr. Collin. Mr. has a strong desire to marry Elizabeth, though Elizabeth refuses. But he does not give up and continues to persuade her. Elizabeth never compromises in front of vulgarity and disaffection. So this time, she also does not hide her feelings and use direct speech to decline. Moreover, she is doing FTA bald-on record to make Mr. Collin thoroughly give up. Her words are so sharp and hit the nail on the head. She does not fear anything ahead, which is typical style of Elizabeth.

### **3.2.2 Utterances to Females**

Ex. 6

*When Jane and Elizabeth were alone, the former, who had been cautious in her praise of Mr. Bingley before, expressed to her sister how very much she admired him.*

*"He is just what a young man ought to be," said she, "sensible, good humoured, lively; and I never saw such happy manners! -- so much ease, with such perfect good breeding!"*

*"He is also handsome," replied Elizabeth, "which a young man ought likewise to be, if he possibly can. His character is thereby complete."*

*"I was very much flattered by his asking me to dance a second time. I did not expect such a compliment."*

*"Did not you? I did for you. But that is one great difference between us. Compliments always take you by surprise and me never. What could be more natural than his asking you again? He could not help seeing that you were about five times as pretty as every other women in the room. No thanks to his gallantry for that. Well, he certainly is very agreeable, and I give you leave to like him. You have liked many a stupider person."*

*"Dear Lizzy!"*

*"Oh! you are a great deal too apt, you know, to like people in general. You never see a fault in any body. All the world are good and agreeable in your eyes. I never heard you speak ill of a human being in my life."*

(Pride and Prejudice, Chapter 4)

This is the conversation between Elizabeth and Jane at the beginning of Chapter Four. Jane praises Mr. Bingley, and Elizabeth completely agrees with her sister by saying "He is also handsome", "Which a young man ought likewise to be, if he possibly can. His character is thereby complete." She uses positive politeness strategies to show her approval, encouragement and compliment to encourage Jane. For example, she says Jane is about "five times as pretty as every other woman in the room". Besides, she

uses many adverbs to show her approval, such as *just, so, always, certainly, a great deal*, etc. Normally, it is not necessary to use so much politeness strategies between relatives, but Elizabeth and Jane use many positive politeness strategies to meet the need of the other's face. In addition, the sentence structures and functions of Elizabeth's utterances are direct. So they are all direct speech acts. She uses direct speech acts to stress her tones of appreciation.

Ex.7

*"I dare say you will find him very agreeable."*

*"Heaven forbid! -- That would be the greatest misfortune of all! -- To find a man agreeable whom one is determined to hate! -- Do not wish me such an evil."*

(Pride and Prejudice Chapter 18)

The conversation is between Charlotte and Elizabeth at the Netherfield party. Elizabeth is worrying about her having agreed to dance with Mr. Darcy for carelessness just before the talking. Because Elizabeth is deceived by Mr. Wickham's defamation about Darcy's envy, harshness and deception, she strengthens animosity and prejudice to Mr. Darcy. She considers Charlotte's comfort ridiculous. She uses the bald-on record strategy of FTA, which shows if she found Darcy acceptable, whom she does not like very much, she would be hateful. Here, she also uses direct speech to deliver her criticism on Darcy.

Ex.8

*"No, my dear, you had better go on horseback, because it seems likely to rain; and then you must stay all night."*

*"That would be a good scheme," said Elizabeth, "if you were sure that they would not offer to send her home."*

(Pride and Prejudice Chapter 7)

This is a conversation between Elizabeth and her mother. Her mother wants Jane to go to see Bingley despite the possible rain and the possible refusal to let Jane stay.

Elizabeth talks to her mother by way of indirect speech in order to remind her of the danger to Jane. This is also a FTA off record strategy to satirize the plan of her mother without hurting her mother's face directly.

Ex.9

*"Miss Eliza Bennet," said Miss Bingley, "despises cards. She is a great reader and has no pleasure in anything else."*

*"I deserve neither such praise nor such censure," cried Elizabeth; "I am not a great reader, and I have pleasure in many things."*

(Pride and Prejudice Chapter 8)

This conversation occurs between Miss Bingley and Elizabeth. Miss Bingley's remarks to Elizabeth are ironic. But Elizabeth uses indirect speech to make her reply more ironic. On the other hand, this practice is also FTA negative politeness, which enables Elizabeth to preserve her dignity without hurting Miss's Bingley's face. But at the same, she also manages to let Miss Bingley notice her displeasure.

Ex.10

*"Aye -- that is because you have the right disposition. But that gentleman," looking at Darcy, "seemed to think the country was nothing at all."*

*"Indeed, Mama, you are mistaken," said Elizabeth, blushing for her mother. "You quite mistook Mr. Darcy. He only meant that there were not such a variety of people to be met with in the country as in town, which you must acknowledge to be true."*

(Pride and Prejudice Chapter 9)

This is a conversation between Elizabeth and her mother. Her mother is attacking Darcy and Elizabeth corrects her mother's misunderstanding towards him by way of direct speech. As for the FTA strategy, she applies positive politeness. Though she thinks her mother is wrong for the remarks to Darcy and she uses direct speech to express her opinion, her words are not harsh. In this way, she makes her mother

understand that Darcy does not think there is nothing good in a town, and meanwhile keeps her mother's face successfully. As a daughter, she knows she can not criticize her mother severely in public. So she just explains to her mother in a tender and patient manner, which makes both her mother and Darcy quite comfortable.

#### **4. Conclusion**

In the wake of the utterances analyzed above, it is obvious that Elizabeth is very skillful in dealing with different conversations. She applies various approaches to make herself clearly expressed and understood. Based on the observations of the atmosphere of the specific conversation and of the person whom she is speaking to, she switches from direct speech to indirect speech, alternating between all the four FTAs strategies to support or retort. Therefore, from the perspective of face theory as well as direct and indirect speech, it could be concluded that Elizabeth does not have a stereotypical use of FTAs strategies for different genders. She does not necessarily use direct speech to women and indirect speech to men.

It is commonly seen that a lot of people are gender-biased when they are speaking. When they face a woman, they may use more direct speech acts and bald-on record or negative politeness FTAs strategy without worrying that the words will make her uncomfortable. But when they face a man, they will use more indirect speech acts and positive in fear that direct speech acts will displease him. But Elizabeth does not behave like that; she makes utterances according to her own judgments to the personal in conversation with her, in stead of the social status or property. She can be ironic and indirect when her mother fabricates a plan which might put Jane in danger, whereas she is also tender and direct when her mother takes Darcy wrong. She changes approaches in front of Miss. Bingley, Jane, and Charlotte mainly depending on the social context and her personal opinion. It is the same case when she talks to males like Darcy, Wickham, Collins, and Sir William. Therefore, in terms of Face Theory and Speech Act Theory, there is no difference in Elizabeth utterance between genders as well as within a certain gender such as male or female. She does not use fixed strategies or speech acts when speaking. In other words, her way of speaking does not change from person to person because of gender, or other social factors. Actually, Elizabeth always dares to speak her mind either ironically or directly, in

order to express her position or to turn things better. Though there are many factors which might influence the use of the speaking strategies during a conversation, they are just for references and haven't become fixed modes or rules.

Last, but not least, it comes to terms of the limit of this study. The investigation is based on one-third chapters of the whole novel. The rest two-thirds are not involved due to time limit. So if anyone who wishes to conduct a study on the same topic, he/she can include the complete novel to achieve a more detailed study.

## References

### Primary Material

Pride and Prejudice

### Secondary materials

Austin, J.L. 1962. *How to Do Things with Words*. New York: Routledge.

Austin, J.L. 1962. *Performative Utterances*. Perspectives in the philosophy of Language. Canada: Broadview Press, 2000.

Brown, E & S. Levinson. 1987. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Erving Goffman. 1967. *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behavior*. New Jersey: New Brunswick.

Foley, W. A. 2001. *Anthropological linguistics: An Introduction*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.

Grice, H. P. 1969. *Logic and conversation*. Syntax and Semantics: Speech Acts. New York: Academic Press.

Geis, M. 1995. *Speech acts and Conversational International*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

He Z.X. 2000. *New Pragmatic Outline*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.

Robin Lakoff. 1975. *Language and Woman's Place*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Searle, J. R. 1965. *What Is A Speech Act?* Perspectives in the philosophy of Language. Canada: Broadview Press, 2000.

Searle, J. R. 1969. *Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Yule, G (2000). *Pragmatics*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.