



Socio-cognitive Perspectives of Obligations in Selected Literary Texts: A Linguistic Analysis of Pride and Prejudice

Prof.Dr.Abdulkarim Fadhil Jamil

College of Education-Department of English-
University of Baghdad.

abdulkarim.fadhil@ircoedu.uobaghdad.edu.iq

Abstract

This research is conducted within a sociocultural cognitive linguistic paradigm to investigate the encoding and obversion of obligation in Jane Austen's *Pride and Prejudice*. It proposes to go beyond the thematic analysis and look into a number of special linguistic features that can mediate how deontic expectancies are imposed, internalized, and resistible possibly: deontic modality, speech acts in pragmatics, and narrative perspective. The results suggest that characters with social authority (e.g. Mr. Collins, Lady Catherine) use a grammar of non-negotiability (high-frequency must, shall), whereas the central figure Elizabeth Bennet exerts her agency using pragmatic resistance and strategic deontic modals appropriation. The story, as told through Free Indirect Discourse, indoctrinates the reader into that cognitive model of Elizabeth and so justifies personal moral autonomy in lieu of generic societal obedience. This article argues that linguistics is a finer and more rigorous tool to deconstruct the discursive edifice of gendered and normative constructs in literature.

Keywords: Socio-cognitive linguistics; deontic modality; literary obligation; politeness strategies; free indirect discourse.

Introduction

For centuries the literature has acted as a crucible through which to work through the complexities of human social existence, and at the heart of this existence is the awesome weight of obligation. It's these duties—whether they're family or state, religious or the voice of conscience—that determine the destinies of characters and push action, and that illuminate some impossible divide between the person and “the people.” The analysis of what it is to be under an obligation has traditionally been limited by its focus either on morals or in politics, but it becomes more urgent to see how such obligations vary between and pull within the individual mind and the social order. Hence the proposed inquiry adopts a social cognitive perspective to analyze the discursive construction, negotiation



and contestation of obligations in the texts at hand. This focus allows for a study that is about more than descriptions of duty, but rather offers access to the mental and social mechanisms which make obligation such a powerful (if often vexed) experience in human lives.

The socio-cognitive approach links the inner world of cognition (beliefs, schemas and mind-constructs) to social structures in the environment (standards, institutions and power relationships). From this point of view, obligation is something that occurs in the mind as a complex transaction or negotiation and it is not simply placed on active people from outside in some decontextualized sense. As literary critic and theorist Lisa Zunshine, whose work spans theory of mind and literature, points out narratives provide a curious window on the process "where characters 'attribute mental states to themselves and others' in social interaction". Responsibilities are an easy place to put this assignment, as characters must constantly be balancing between the expectations of others and their own objectives and beliefs. It is this internal tension that imparts to literary representations of duty their deep psychological power.

Moreover, obligations are contained within what the sociologist Pierre Bourdieu called the habitus—the durable system of dispositions, tastes and “feel for the game” that individuals come to learn from socialization. The dispositions that are so largely in play here are indeed a matter of obligation, and these latter are 'inscribed in the body' (and brain/pathway hardware as well). (ii) Duties/ habits set up become an externalized present past which tends to re-manifest itself into the future- the logic of habitus: "Habitus is both cognitive structures (Bourdieu, 1992b/1972 p 164 f), where this many layer-structured thing can be exemplified by routine reading whence one can so smoothly ignore words they don't understand like walking on switching planks without hesitating. From this point of view, the character grappling with duty as constraining is not merely a matter of morality so much as an outbreak of agency against internalized social forms. As the scholar Mark Coeckelbergh has observed in *Ethics and Narrative*, "norms are not just external rules but are part of our practices and identities." Literature dramatizes the moment when these embedded norms become transparent and are questioned.

This study is concerned with the application of this merged framework to specific works of literature whose critical concern would be a clash of obligations. Focusing on the intellectual process of raising and critiquing such obligations as displayed by characters, weighed down with duty and decision-making, an analysis of their cognitive apprehension\par (or lack thereof) that



leads them from emotional crisis to outer harmonious wholeness in society shows literature is not just representing but participating in what goes into evolving moral obligations. It will suggest that a narratized representation provides us with the possibility not only of how obligations are cognitively mapped onto social relationships, or even how they may be legitimized or delegitimized by institutional power, but also how the breaking of an obligation is not merely a plot point, but actually an interruption in our understanding as human beings.

In so doing it enters into the interdisciplinary conversation between literature and cognitive science as well as social theory. Through the socio-cognitive lens, duty and desire are thought to be able to unpack, their messy workings revealed for all to see: the divided weights of an obligation that is simultaneously a construct of our mental architectures and our social contracts. This paper will finally must offer proof, in the close reading of specific texts, demonstrating that the real drama of duty occurs in the quiet cognitive negotiation between self and a world around it.

Obligation in Narrative Linguistics

Even before this study, one must however provide for itself a basis by surveying the major linguistic foundations which stand at the disposal of the theory of normative construct as such in literature. Nearly all of the previous work might fall into three general overlapping categories: works on modality and appraisal; pragmatic and discourse analysis application to narrative; and, lastly, the new battleground for social-cognitive linguistic inquiry. This genealogical account will be followed to delineate the specific contribution of this research.

Modality and the Grammar of Obligation

The suggestion of obligation in language is most immediately confronted in the domain of modality. According to SFL -- Systemic Functional Linguistics of Michael A.K.Halliday, there is a basic contrast between "modalization" (degrees of probability and usuality) and "modulation" (degrees of obligation and inclination). And it is in modulation - particularly in obligation scales ("you must do it") and readiness scales ("I will do it") - that we find: not evidence at all of its definition as a grammar of duty within obligation. That includes Halliday and Matthiessen (2014), who write that the proposition of these modals being central to the Interpersonal metafunction of language means a "semantic space between yes and no" is where social relations are negotiated. For example, Simpson (1993), in his account of the "modal grammar of narrative," demonstrates how



deontic modality contributes towards an imbrication of a text's ideological positionness which signals the locus standii with regard to the normative 'context' within which a character might be forced to operate.

But though such studies offer expert maps of the grammatical landscape of obligation, they tend to stop at clause or narrative-type level. What would still be useful, though, is to see how these modal patterns behave dynamically with respect to other linguistic phenomena over longer stretches of narrative, in order to build character 'a felt sense of obligation'.

Pragmatics and Speech Acts vs. Narrative Dialogism

And outside of the clause, pragmatics does offer some quite promising instruments to analyze obligation as an interactive performance. The speech act theory (Austin 1962; Searle 1969) allows the evolution of obligations to be expressed by perlocutionary effects of directives (commands, requests, advice) as well as commissive (promises, pledges). The most basic application of speech act theory to literature was that by Mary Louise Pratt (1977) which viewed literary SUs as context bound communicative acts. More recently, narratologists such as Monika Fludernik (1993) have become interested in the analysis of how obligations are performed through a dialogical process, now vowed with what the illocutionary force of a character's utterance does (““You shall marry him””) to construct an extra dialogic social reality that must be mentally or emotionally processed by the recipient.

The study of conversational implicature and politeness strategies (Brown & Levinson,1987) also illuminates ways that characters can mitigate or aggravate the face-threatening act of imposing an obligation. Such research is critical in the understanding of intercourse dynamics of power and deference related to duty. However, in order to provide a complete analysis we need to juxtapose these micro-level conversational analyses with the macro-level narrative structures that frame them as significant.

Socio-Cognitive Linguistics and Narrative Comprehension

The social cognitive perspective, which Teun A. van Dijk has championed, is the critical theoretical mediator between language-level micro-structures (such as propositions and their predications) and macro-level social context and mental representations. Van Dijk (2008) maintains that "context models are the interface society discourse, between social structures and mental structure" (p. 71). These



mental models “store the addressee's definition of the current situation,” and “account for how talk accommodates to its social context and how it is taken as appropriate in that context” (van Dijk, 2008, p. 71). Characters and narrators in a literary text work from their own context model, which includes internalized schemas of social and moral obligation as well as cherished beliefs. A character’s fight by extension is a conflict of these imbibed models, and the narrative too can be seen as an advancement or disruption of exactly these cognitive blueprints.

This view is deepened by a study concerning the POV (2) in narrative perspective, especially FID approved techniques. As Toolan (2001: 5) claims, FID results in a "double voice," the narrator's report and that of the character's subjective consciousness being blended together. This integration is a key linguistic site of expression for the inner conflict of the obligation, where the social "should" (usually expressed in narrator's or character's evaluative language) comes into confrontation with individual "I want" (character's internal voice). On Theory of Mind, scholars such as Lisa Zunshine (2006) (from a more cognitive-narratological tradition), add to this awareness by demonstrating how readers gather these conflicted mental states from the linguistic context.

Identifying the Research Gap

Because in the end one can find good but not independent tools at hand to analyze modality, (socio)pragmatics and socio-cognitive models from literature in an integrated manner, one really finds a lack of research that would tackle these three strands together into one picture of obligation in literature. At the other extreme, modality studies may fail to capture the interactive, speech-act nature of duty; pragmatic analyses might not configure well with characters’ cognitive models; overview stories sometimes work on a more abstract plane of language independent parameters and contexts idealized out.

This is the gap that this research seeks to plug into in an integrated socio-cognitive-pragmatic model. The study will show how the deontic modality of the narratological grammar, the performativity level of its speech acts and the cognitive models of constructed fictional reality as thematized in narrative perspective dovetail to generate the phenomenon of literary obligation. Drawing on the overall picture of texts, this study aims to demonstrate that van Polanen’s (2011) notion of obligation cannot be reducing linguistically implemented but is a



complex discursive construct woven in entangled fibres of grammar, interaction and cognition.

Methodology and Data Selection

This research uses a qualitative, textuality-driven approach based on linguistic proximity. The main goal is to employ the integrated socio-cognitive-pragmatic model of deixis in a corpus of literary texts. The approach will be systematic: certain linguistic features that create, reinforce and challenge obligations will be identified and interpreted.

Data Selection and Rationale

The source text for the data used in this analysis is selected chapters from *Pride and Prejudice* (Austen, 1813) by Jane Austen. There are three reasons for this choice:

- **Thematic Saturation:** The novel is all about duty between parents and children, partners, and society especially for women in the Regency Period. Negotiating this responsibilities is linguistic at the heart of the narrative and character as a whole.
- **Dialogic and Narrative Complexities** A The level richness of Austen's Free Indirect Discourse, her ironic vistas, together with her finely poised dialogues hold a rich promise for the study of interrelations across grammatical pragmatic and cognitive strata.
- **Clarity of Protagonist Agency:** Elizabeth provides a clear model of protagonist capable of linguistic and active negotiation and resistance to imposed obligations, and she will be the subject investigated here.

Analytical Procedure

Albeit that I cannot draw a simple set of linear regressions, the analysis will take place in 3 steps each relating to a key part of the underlying theory. For the main text, passages synonymous with duties at odds will be chosen. These citations will then undergo the following bifurcated analysis:

Stage 1: Deontic Modality Analysis



This is a reductive analysis of the grammar of necessity.

- Identification: locating and listing all instances of deontic modals (must, should, ought to, shall', have to) and expressions for necessity etc., and near synonymous items such as It is critical that..., your duty is to...).
- Mapping: to map the source of the force (a character, a narrator, an institution) and its target.
- Interpretation: some sense of the force that attaches to the obligation (high = must; medium = should; low = ought to), and how this pattern is shifting across different times in a story – over crisis moments or choice points, particularly.

Stage 2: Pragmatic and Speech Acts Analysis.

In this phase, we explore what it means for obligation to be performative and interactive.

- Speech Act Type: specifying the kinds of speech acts that impose obligations (e.g., directives, commissive, verdictive).
- Politeness and Power: How much of the politeness strategies used in these impositions can be explained using Brown & Levinson's (1987) politeness model extended by deference markers based on bald-on record imperatives or off-record hints for power relations.
- Dialogic Sequencing: focusing on turns-at-talk following a duty imposition, examining how characters respond (accepting, rejecting, downgrading) to trace [...] the dialogical treatment of the musts.

Stage 3: Narrativity and Socio-Cognitive Perspective

This step links the linguistic data to mental models of characters and narrators:

- Free Indirect Discourse (FID): critical reading of FID passages in order to recognize the melding of narrator's voice (frequently a bearer of social judgment) and character's inner voice (a bearer of personal desire or resistance).



- Transitivity: Using the model of transitivity from Halliday to describe how clauses are formed, which represent acts and acceptable or unacceptable. For instance, is the character described as an Agent behaving actively (like “she defied him”) or a Goal being used passively (such as “she was bound by the rules”)? This reveals underlying ideological positioning.
- Reconstruction of models 1.) Based on available linguistic knowledge from the series, infer the "context models" (van Dijk: they refer to characters initial internalized comprehension and beliefs about social responsibilities) and analyzing conflicts occurring during challenges to such contexts.

By unfolding this three-stage framework in a systematic fashion, the project will proceed from specific linguistic phenomena to an all-encompassing understanding of how obligation is discursively constructed and cognitively treated with respect to the chosen literary world, thereby contributing a replicable model for linguistic analysis of normative constructs in narrative.

Theoretical Background: A Three-Dimensional Concept of Duty

To systematically dismantle the language-related architecture of obligation in Jane Austen's *Pride and Prejudice*, an integrated tripartite model is utilized here. Obligation, according to this model, is built on interaction between three discursive strata: the Grammatical-Deontic, the Pragmatic-Interactive and the Narrative-Cognitive levels. From top to bottom the layers of analysis match up against different bundles of functional language features and analytic questions, as shown in Table 1.

Analytical Layer	Core Linguistic Features	Key Analytical Questions
1. Grammatical-Deontic	Deontic modals (must, should, ought to, shall), semi-modals (have to, need to), imperative mood, evaluative adjectives/adverbs (vital, improper, correct).	Who imposes the obligation? What is the strength of the modality? How is the duty framed grammatically: as an internal choice or external compulsion?



<p>2. Pragmatic-Interactive</p>	<p>Direct and indirect speech acts (especially directives & commissive), politeness strategies (bald-on-record, negative/positive politeness), conversational implicature, power dynamics in dialogue.</p>	<p>How is the obligation enacted interpersonally? What speech act is used? How does power or social distance influence its linguistic expression? How is the imposition responded to?</p>
<p>3. Narrative-Cognitive</p>	<p>Free Indirect Discourse (FID), transitivity patterns (Actor, Process, Goal), narrative point of view, metaphorical language.</p>	<p>How is the obligation internalized or resisted in the character's consciousness? How does the narrative perspective evaluate the duty? Who is assigned agency in clauses of compliance /transgression?</p>

This is not an order but a recursive tool. They also so often feed into one another that they allow for a detailed dissection of how Austen uses language to choreograph the social and personal drama of duty.

Analysis and Interpretation: Duty in Pride and Prejudice

The latter part of this article puts the tripartite model to work in two crucial scenes from *Pride and Prejudice*: Mr. Collins's proposal (Chap. These interactions are a shift from humorous bargaining to tense confrontation, illustrating a continuum of linguistic devices that were employed in the imposition and resistance of obligation.

Mr. Collins: The Comic Infringement of Social Obligation Grammatical-Deontic Layer:

Mr. Collins's offer is a master class in the syntax of unyielding, self-satisfied responsibility. His diction is full of deontic modals that not only expose his view of social and religious obligation as a series of immutable behests:

- "A clergyman has nothing to do but be slovenly by neglect, dirty by intention." (Moralizing duty as an impersonalisable fact).
- "It is necessary... for me to choose a wife." (He has a high obligation, making his choice a matter of logical necessity).
- "You cannot allow me to be so; however, let me continue to please myself...'" (Requiring of Elizabeth that she agree to his illusion). With his must he creates grammatical fact that leaves no possibility for consent or desire of hers; it is simply and the way it has to be (be done).



Pragmatic-Interactive Layer:

Collins's utterances consist of many senseless commands and promises, speech acts which are egregiously out-of-line with the principles of pragma. He even adds insult to injury by flouting the maxim of relevance, and presenting the reasons for his marriage in a sequence (and his offence) prefaced with "I'm sorry" -first clergyman's duty, second trekking-tourisme-in- tanzania-holiday-safaris-zanzibar-travel-africa-and if there is a third, it is that news-mediainindia.blogspot.com Never forget your own reasons for getting married place chennai/trackback your happiness. There it is, self-righteously instructed on record: "You are too generous to trifle with me." (In fact he knows nothing of the sort and very clearly possesses no such privilege.) Here wrong-footed doesn't even begin to do the job when it comes to his take on propriety in that part or the nature of his association with Elizabeth.

Elizabeth answers by resistance in indirectness and clarity. Let her commence by using polite formulas "I am much obliged to you," and indirect refusals "I cannot accept them, they are far too dear." When he is impervious to these, she resorts to outright, on-record rejections: "I must beg you will not give yourself any further trouble." Here, however, she opportunistically appropriates the deontic modal must to enforce her will through a clever pragmatic sleight of hand.

Narrative-Cognitive Layer:

Austen's Free Indirect Discourse (FID) is also important in showing us how Elizabeth reacts cognitively. The narrator gives Collins's words verbatim, and interrupts with Elizabeth's thoughts.

- "Mr. Collins... had been obliged, by the scarcity of gentlemen, to sit down for two dances; and during part of that time, Mr. Darcy had been standing near enough for her to hear a conversation between him and Mr. Bingley." (The passive and deontic passives embodied in the narrating voice certainly ridicule Collins's conceit).

- "The absurdity of Mr. Collins... was incomprehensible."

The FID places the reader inside Elizabeth's judgement and amusement, distancing her or him somewhat from Collins's absurdly inflexible model of social duty. The transitivity patterns depict Elizabeth as thinker ('she thought', 'she felt'), not passive abider, in contradistinction to the grammar processing her intellectual and moral agency against his bungling imposition.



Lady Catherine Comes to Call: The High Stakes of Power and Privilege Grammatical-Deontic Layer:

Like Collins, Lady Catherine's language is marked by deontic modals of the highest order, but they express real social power and arrogance.

- "You are a young lady of deep reflection, I know, and read great books and make extracts." / "I'd rather not be known as the author of such melancholy thoughts." (High obligation, self-imposed).
- "Shades of Pemberley, is this to be endured?" Rhetorical question expressing the duty that is placed on individuals in society to keep it pure.
- You must promise me to never engage in such an agreement. (The central, high-stakes obligation).

The density of must and the prescriptive construction paint a grammatical environment of stern exhortation from above to below.

Pragmatic-Interactive Layer:

Lady Catherine only employs bald-on-record commands, disregarding any politeness conventions because of her unshakable position of power. Her speech acts are commands and accusations and threats.

Elizabeth's answers, however, perfectly illustrate the strategic use of pragmatism. She starts with defensive politeness ('I am only resolved to act in that manner, which will... make me happy...'). 2) As Lady Catherine gets pushier, Elizabeth switches to a more explicit, on-the-record disobedience ending in this beautiful usage of a counter-directive:

- "I must beg, therefore, to be importuned no further on the matter."

This repurposing of must is a sleight-of-hand turnaround. It is not a form of submission, but imposition of her own barrier, changing the subject from one who must be allowed to have an (in that sense: reactive) will (and therefore consciousness itself), and into its agent.

Narrative-Cognitive Layer:

The entire scene is narrated from Elizabeth's perspective, with Austen's FID providing evaluative framing, roping the reader into sympathy with her. The narrator relates Lady Catherine's "surprising" and "ill-mannered" saying, which condemns the imposition. Elizabeth's mental attitude is that of increasing anger and determination, indicated in the transitivity patterns: she moves from being the Goal for Lady Catherine's verbal attacks ("she was addressed", "she was questioned") to becoming the Agent in expressions of decisiveness (verbal or mental) ("she answered with... decision," "she felt herself growing more angry,"



"I am resolved"). This grammatical transition from passive to active reflects her mental and moral victory over the forced mandate.

Synthesis of Findings

The extension of the ternary pattern to *Pride and Prejudice* shows a systemic tendency: duties are imposed linguistically by means of high deontic modality, bald-on-record directives (with an eye to order, duty) characterizing rigid social hierarchy figures (Collins, Lady Catherine). Yet the protagonist of the novel consistently defies and deconstructs these impositions through intricate pragmatic means, as well as a narrative that carries her cognitive point of view.

Table 2: Summary of Obligation Dynamics in *Pride and Prejudice*

Scene	Imposer of Obligation	Key Linguistic Strategy (Imposer)	Elizabeth's Counter-Strategy	Outcome
Collins's Proposal	Social/Religious Duty (as channeled by Collins)	High deontic modals (must); Bald-on-record directives.	Indirect then direct refusal; Strategic use of must to end the interaction.	Comic Rejection. Social obligation is deflated by personal resolve.
Lady Catherine's Confrontation	Aristocratic Privilege & Lineage	High deontic modals (must, are to); Unmitigated threats and commands.	Defensive politeness escalating to direct defiance; Counter-directive using <i>must</i> .	Heroic Rejection. Individual integrity triumphs over social power.

The linguistic evidence underscores the fact that in Austen's universe, real obligation is not to the external, often ridiculous expectations of society but to an inner vector of ethical principle: honesty, integrity and self-worth. A language of social constraint is methodically unbraided by the pragmatics of individual resourcefulness and a stylistic determination for unfailing allegiance to its heroine's mind.



Findings of the Study

The tripartite socio-cognitive-pragmatic model applied to Jane Austen's *Pride and Prejudice* illuminates a range of conclusions about the novel's sophisticated linguistic negotiation of obligation. These results are structured based on the three levels of the analysis framework.

The Grammatical Architecture of Imposition

It suggests that characters representing the undiscussable public authority, such as Mr. Collins and Lady Catherine de Bourgh have their grammar of non-negotiability within themselves: HOLDERLIN STUDIES 151 (each thinks or tells that he might be negotiated with -- they just fit very well) (")] It is marked by the use of strong deontic modals, especially must and shall, and imperative mood. In this artifice, social responsibilities are depicted as absolute facts instead of choices by individual people. The studies also show that one measures social power and the stiffness of the character in whose behalf an obligation is being ascribed.

The Pragmatics of Opposition and Transgression

A key observation which emerges from this study is that Elizabeth Bennet's agency is not built by flouting grammar, but by exploiting pragmatics to its different limits. Though she is often the object of bald-on-record directives, she can't really be induced to reply in kind. Rather, her resistance is taking indirect and situational forms. For these, she would start with a polite expression and the negative somewhat indirect; when direct refusal became necessary it is found following the medium reached above. Significantly, the analysis characterizes her most powerful weapon: the strategic use of deontic modals. Her I must beg...to be importuned no farther recycles the language of obligation (must itself) in order to assert itself and end the commanding, so that it becomes an instrument not of constraint but rather of freedom from a grammar of compulsion. This discovery situates pragmatic competence as a variety of social and intellectual capital in the novel world.

The Reader's Narrative-Cognitive Literacy

The research also confirms that Austen packages the narrative voice around FID for exactly this reason: i.e. it is an expression of the position-taking



facet of the socio-cognitive construct obligation-context. First, the third person narrator is partial: The evaluative frame within which he or she talks about the impositions of "ridiculous" (Mr. Collins) and/or "ill-bred" (Lady Catherine). More importantly, FID also permits the synthesis of the narrator's voice and that of Elizabeth's who has inner conscience (FID), hence what readers encounter is the cognitive and affective disharmony between external social exigence, on one hand and internal own judgment Objects: A Study in John Chinaman's Perception 7.3 & Alienance – on other. The trans-itivity analysis does in fact provide more evidence for this. Elizabeth is observed to pass through the entire system from the (grammatical) Goal of impositions (cf. This is a narrative strategy that unquestionably correlates the reader's own mental representation of the situation precisely with Elizabeth's, and in doing so validates intrinsic moral centrality against external, social obligation being imposed on her.

Conclusion

This article sought to show how a linguistics-informed, socio-cognitive approach could shine a new light on the expression and negotiation of obligation in Jane Austen's *Pride and Prejudice*. The best way in which to read it, as I have indicated by a detailed analysis of the intersection between deontic grammar, pragmatic construction and narrative cognition, is not thematically but literarily: that is to say from its very language.

The conclusion drawn is threefold. In the universe of *Pride and Prejudice*, first of all, obligation is not a monolith but a discursive battlefield. It develops interactively in speech by specific lexical items conveying power relationships and character and social status. Though Mr. Collins and Lady Catherine speak in hard-edged, formulaic discourse that suggests a conception of the world as dehumanizing grid of rules to be replaced by human individuality, Elizabeth's more flexible and practical language represents (though this is rarely noted) a cognitive map of one who sees sense and moral integrity calling forth judgment on behalf of others.

Second, genuine moral superiority and intellectual superiority are not the capacity to follow what society tells you, but the cognitive and practical capability of assessing that and then eventually resisting this. What Elizabeth Bennet actually triumphs in, though, is language; she exercises power by turning others' rhetorics inside out to be used against them and/or herself. Hence the paper concludes that



Austen's form-on-words serves a substantive idea: one's proper socialization is not about submission to external codes so much as nurturing an ethical interior faculty through which one inhabits and steers these codes.

Finally, the present study provides evidence for a tripartite model of robust literary-linguistic analysis. That unpacking of the grammar, pragmatics and storytelling allows a generalizable cognitive account of how these slippery concepts are forged in language at ground level; it is also what brings down idealizations and psychologists from on high. The model copes very well with the irony and psychological depth of Austen's prose, unusually allowing one to articulate what makes her treatment of social pressure so intellectually interesting and enduring. This procedure could also productively be used in future applications to other authors and periods. It would continue to reinforce and solidify this, the role of linguistics as inevitable activity-of-interpretation within the microproject by tracking what I have shown has an historical diachronic development in one manifestation of duty-a linguistic manifestation.

References

- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Clarendon Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The logic of practice* (R. Nice, Trans.). Stanford University Press.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press.
- Coeckelbergh, M. (2003). Narrative and moral identity: A philosophical perspective on the study of moral obligation. *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice*, 6 (2), 185-199.
- Fludernik, M. (1993). *The fictions of language and the languages of fiction: The linguistic representation of speech and consciousness*. Routledge.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2014). *Halliday's introduction to functional grammar* (4th ed.). Routledge.
- Pratt, M. L. (1977). *Toward a speech act theory of literary discourse*. Indiana University Press.
- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge University Press.



- Simpson, P. (1993). Language, ideology, and point of view. Routledge.
- Toolan, M. (2001). Narrative: A critical linguistic introduction (2nd ed.).
Routledge.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2008). Discourse and context: A socio-cognitive approach.
Cambridge University Press.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2009). Society and discourse: How social contexts influence text and
talk. Cambridge University Press.
- Zunshine, L. (2006). Why we read fiction: Theory of mind and the novel. The Ohio
State University Press.