



Males and Females' Presentation in Jane Austen's *Pride and Prejudice*: A Critical Discourse Analysis Study

A Lecturer Dr. Shaymaa Abid Abdulameer Kareem Alkhafagy
(Ph.D. in Linguistics)

University of Alameed / College of Basic Education for Women/ Department of English
shama-abd-alameer@alameed.edu.iq

The services have been loaned from:

University of Kerbala/ College of Education for the Humanities/ Department of English
shayma.a@uokerbala.edu.iq

Mobile: 07713216589

Abstract in English

The stereotype context of men and women in *Pride and Prejudice* by Jane Austen is the specialty in this research. Remarkably, the analysis involves that language, conversation, and narrative strategies which mirror and refrain gender performances in early nineteenth-century English culture. Based on Critical Discourse Analysis (henceforth CDA) theory, the study analyses of power, ideology, and social norms manifested in the conversation interaction of the characters. There is both an analysis of women through the lens of marriage, morality, and agency (and constraint by society) and men vis-à-vis power relations, the economy, and social mobility. The detective work demonstrates that, subversively, Austen's female characters refuse to be contained by a patriarchal design and instead possess their own discursive subjectivity and set of values even in the constraints of choate social bodies. It also exposes the gendered gaps that are perpetuated in social institutions and speech so far. Findings suggest that *Pride and Prejudice* functions as a reflexion of women's gender power relations in Jane Austen's contemporary world suggesting modern novelist-discoursing on questions related to issues of discourse.

Paper Info

Keywords

Gender, Patriarchal ideology, Hierarchy, Marriage, Victorian Society, CDA.

1. Introduction and Background of the Study:

Pride and Prejudice (1813) by Jane Austen is a widely examined within the study of English literature since its significance for social class, gender relations, and language planning maintains up to date. The book is a projection upon the English society of the early 19th century and, as such reflects how cultural patterns, moral values, and power structures shape male/female identities. The design rotates around the following two topics: they are romance and marriage, but it is much more powerful in its analysis of the roles of gender, class disparities, and social expectations. In dialogue, narration, and character interaction the author constructs special styles for men and women that lend themselves to detailed linguistic ideological investigation.

This paper analyzes the presentation of male and female in *Pride and Prejudice* through the paradigm of CDA. CDA as it is known absorbed in the relationship between language, power, ideology, and society. Fairclough mentions that speech can reflect social structures, in addition, it also “contribute to the reproduction and transformation of those structures” (Fairclough, 2010, p. 2). Applying CDA on Austen’s novel, the present study aims to display how gender identities are constructed and upheld, as well as, the times disrupted through the use of language protocol in its approach.

Various studies of the novel have tended to focus on its central themes, including marriage, morality, irony, and social class. As Johnson argues, Austen “uses irony to expose the contradictions in a culture that denies women autonomy while demanding moral authority from them” (Johnson, 1988, p. 73). Less work, however, has been done to date on the systematic CDA analysis of the novel in revealing how discourse contributes to construction of male and female characters. This study attempts to bridge that gap by employing literary analysis and linguistic and social theory in association.

There was no question of equality in England in the early 1800s: Men commanded and women obeyed. It was men who wielded the attributes of authority, reason, inheritance, and public life and women who were defined by modesty, emotionality, domesticity, and dependence. Poovey observes that women are positioned as “morally influential yet socially powerless” (Poovey, 1984, p. 6). These were not simply only behaviours but they were enshrined in language and common parlance. Austen’s novel predicts this historical fact, as well as, it shows the tensions dancing beneath its surface. The centre characters of women like Elizabeth Bennet challenge with the classical female silence and submissiveness in satire, argument, and moral judgment, while men on the other side like Mr. Darcy learns ideological change.

In the theoretical background of CDA, language is always suspected. Van Dijk demonstrates that relations of power are enacted and maintained through discourse, especially through “who is allowed to speak, how, and with what authority” (van Dijk, 2008, p. 352). Therefore, the speech of male is perceived as having good government values in such areas as property, marriage, and social status for example. On the other side, the discourse of women is often judged on moral and emotional basis as a way of evaluating propriety rather than authority. Mills states that women’s language is often interpreted as “polite, indirect, and morally charged rather than assertive or authoritative” (Mills, 2003, p. 41). Such form of discourse pattern serves to underpin gender hierarchies while at the same time affirming its contradictions.

The voice of Jane Austen is important in the construction of gender. Her adoption of free indirect discourse and speaking styles enables readers to gain insight into the minds of characters (including female) and gives her characters more depth

development and narrative independence. Watt explains that this technique allows Austen to “blur the boundaries between narrator and character consciousness” (Watt, 1957, p. 298). Such a narrative approach enables for the revolution of power towards female awareness, despite a patriarchal social demand in which we are still rooted. However, CDA concentrates on how these narrative approaches function ideologically in the writing.

Marriage is perhaps the primary focus of *Pride and Prejudice*, as it is a major site of gender portrayal. Marriage is seemingly depicted as a volition or financial matter in the case of male characters, yet with survivalism, respectability, and social assurance in relation to female figures. Stone (1977, p. 58) remarks marriage in Austen is considered as both “a romantic ideal and a social necessity.” Even the language in which marriages are spoken betrays this unequal situation. Charlotte Lucas’s practical characterization of marriage stands in stark contrast to Elizabeth Bennet’s emphasis on emotional resonance and exposes conflicting concepts of “womanhood” within a shared culture.

CDA also notices how power functions by politeness, irony, and indirectness in the narrative. Brown and Levinson illustrate that “politeness functions to manage social hierarchy and maintain face” (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p. 67). It is, nonetheless, the verbal assurance of Elizabeth Bennet to deviates the most from classical female talk and objectifies her as an ideological rebel. Her voice is a protest against male supremacy without either fully repudiating to social norms.

The characters of male in *Pride and Prejudice* too are determined by the expectations of the discourse. From there, the novel connects masculinity with possessing property, self-restraint, and social class. The pride and self-importance of Mr. Darcy at the first, is a masculine best or elite discourse on distance and superiority in the top - end masculinity broadly applicable throughout his character further presented. Butler states that gender identity is not innate but “produced through repeated acts and discourse” (Butler, 1990, p. 34). His metamorphosis is accompanied by a change in language from strength to humility and emotional openness, which reinforces the idea that masculine identity as “historically constructed and open to change” (Connell, 2005, p. 71).

Social class is overlaid with gender in the novel. As television, film and fashion both shape and reflect expectations for American girlhood, girls of lower economic standing experience more linguistic and social prohibitions than wealthy or successful female characters. Mrs. Bennet is one such example because of her anxious tendency to say too much and for fear that others hold the power, and Lady Catherine de Bourgh naturally assumes a position of privilege as an aristocrat herself (Austen, 2008, p. 184). “CDA is helpful to uncover how the class power reinforces or constrains gendered discourse.”

Feminist Critical Reading of Austen Before now, feminist readings have noted Austen’s critique of the sidelining of women, but CDA enables a more specific examination of how that critique works at a linguistic level (Mills, 2004). Though rather than focusing on character as symbolic figure, CDA analyses acts of speaking, narrative description, and lexical choices that make up characters who voice their gender identities. Van Dijk asserts that ideology is “*embedded in routine language use*” (Van Dijk, 2008, p. 365).

The gender depiction in the novel is formed by historical understandings of what it denotes to be masculine or feminine. To indicate that examining *Pride and*

Prejudice via CDA is relevant to wider debates about how literature contributes to the social construction of masculine and feminine identities. It also shows how traditional texts can be read through contemporary interdisciplinary lenses.

Over the last decades, CDA has been also used to analyse literary texts with a view to power and identity and ideology. But despite the popularity of these novels, they are undertheorized within this theory. The present study seeks to bridge this gap by providing a CDA analysis in terms of male/ female representation, looking specifically at *Pride and Prejudice*. It reflects the discourse through which the character is constructed and through which the gender hierarchies are recycled or contested.

The inheritance and class bias of the day is represented in *Pride and Prejudice* but with the strategy of language and narration that showing some resistance required resubmit through CDA. This study tries to discover the ideological operation of discursive strategies in men's and women's presentation and this acknowledges the exploration of Austen studies and gender related literary criticism. The inquiry is at the cusp of literature, linguistics, and social theory providing a grand view into the ways language constructs gendered realities in an iconic literary text.

Males and Females Presentation in *Pride and Prejudice*: A CDA Study

The novel of Jane Austen *Pride and Prejudice* is a description of the men in women in the confined society of early 19th century England. Through conversation, depiction, and social intercourse, as well as, narration Austen shapes gender images that embody power, expectation, and ideological norms of her time. A CDA approach to this novel illustrates how language constructs gender identities and reinforces classical roles, while simultaneously challenging and implicitly resisting patriarchy. The language of Austen portrays women as restricted by society while also intellectually capable and men as cosseted and morally culpable.

Brown mentions that in CDA, "language is not only a reflection of social order but also constructs and sustains ideology" (Brown, 1987, p. 1). In dialogue and commentary and irony Austen is inscribing a gendered self that hides the order of power men exercise over other men under an orderly guise of early-century England. And marriage is not just some personal affair rooted in emotional love; it is instead a financial and social necessity especially, as we will see, for women. The women spoke as though they knew of the financial insecurity and dependency. And it too often comes in the voice of fretful respectability, and legibility, and opportunity for a life that within the pantheon of patriarchal control will rob them of more than their freedom but also economic independence. Men, however, speak from connected places of power in property and line. Language grants them the right to pick, choose, and make or break women in marriage.

Austen demonstrates this discrepancy in belief early in the book. The most celebrated first sentence, "it is a truth universally acknowledged, that a single man in possession of a good fortune, must be in want of a wife" (Austen, 2008, p. 1), appears to make an empirical assertion but it travels through ironic scorn. The word may match "Big men love marriage," but in the context of the larger narrative, it describes women and their families who are running after all those big men. It is through this ironic structure that Austen shows us how women's aspirations are driven by male-managed wealth, thus presenting women as also entering a marriage market ruled by an economic force rather than mutual feel.

Talking about decency and properness also extends gendered nations. Women have to speak softly, even if they feel overwhelmed by emotion or not, and they have

to act morally. Surely, society will make examples of all the ones that these things had led so far astray. Men, after all, can say and do anything. There is no moral centre against which we are ever weighed. It is this ironic distance from Austen that allows her to admit the hypocrites without preaching. They are meaningful, she says, in her cool, ironic narrator voice, because they make a reader wonder about themselves, were those norms ever fair anyway?

Irony is the most effective great gory discursive weapon which has been used by Austen. She undermines it by highlighting its contradictions, instead of jumping up and down about patriarchal ideology. This separation between what characters convey with their words and that which is confessed or displayed in the narrative, additionally, offers readers a platform for turning toward inequality. For instance, the redeeming virtues of fatherly masculinity are presented as Janus-faced: outwardly confident but ultimately corrupt, or socially unjust.

From a critical discourse analysis perspective, the language which is used in the context of the novel *Pride and Prejudice* serves as both ways of preserving gender order and anti-hegemonic struggle. Irony, narrative control, and dialogue in Austen's novel will reveal that gender roles are not biologically determined but created through discourse. Austen implores her readers to challenge cultural conventions and recognize the extent to which language mediates between the sexes by unveiling the discursive foundations of marriage and money.

The women in the novel of Jane Austen *Pride and Prejudice*, some had a similar character to Mrs Bennet who is more than just eligible are an honest imitation of social pressure from patrilineal succession laws. In conversation, Austen brings to light how women's speech betrays financial instability and social dependence. The only reliable thing in Mrs. Bennet's verbiage is that it is quicker (instantaneous), repetitive (ditto, ditto...) and more emotional than anything ever heard before or since; no doubt there has been so much criticism from other characters and also by readers about this. But from a CDA point of view, her speech represents not individual failing but structural weakness. The Bennet estate being entailed away from the female line means that Mrs. Bennet also has a significant amount to lose if her daughters go unmarried or if Jane and Elizabeth settle somewhere with little room for them even once they marry as is Rosings Park, Darcy's country home. Her wedding anxiety reflects her own financial vulnerability and especially the limited options offered to women in a male-inherited society.

Moreover, that Mrs. Bennet is so curious to find rich husbands for her daughters, only exemplifies how deeply rooted misogyny is in women in order to survive the patriarchy somewhat intact. Marriage is thus her only real solution to the instability of monetary pressures. Her recurring refrain of promising connections, social calls, and eligible beaux demonstrates that she understands that a woman's security is in exchange for male wealth. Though her talk sounds exaggerated and clownish, CDA explains it as formed in fear and dispossession of property. Her speech is a model of the way in which women's language and behaviour are constructed by patriarchal structures. Here, Austen employs irony to emphasis the perversity of a system that obliges women to act out desperateness as a means of survival.

By contrast, the speech of Mr. Bennet is indicative of the privilege of male and the emotional distance. He is ironic and sarcastic rather than urgent, as he does not carry the same social cost. His legacy is assured while he lives, and his being male shields him from financial ruin. His banal and distant speech serves to remove him from the

sense of responsibility as he enjoys watching his wife in despair. The reason Mr. Bennet can be detached is that he is protected by the patriarchy; the reason Mrs. Bennet cannot be is that it endangers her future.

If you are the “rest of her sex,” as Elizabeth Bennet notes, then yeah. Unlike her mother, Elizabeth is not toting these anxiety-fueled patriarchal values all over the place. There are far too much wit, practicality, and moral self-assurance within her for that. Her language endangers male power and is disobedient to a social ordering that demands silence from women or gratitude. The way in which Elizabeth can take a stand against something singles her out as an object of discursive resistance. Moreover, it means that she will not marry, but it is not marriage itself that she is turning down and this indicates it is a marriage for money or status alone.

Elizabeth is indeed one of the most unthinking girls in existence, but there is no baseness as much as what she did in refusing him. She has no problem handling his arrogance, class snobbery, and emotional obtuseness. Her answer is direct, no-nonsense, and an echo of her own self-respect and vanity by saying “But do not distress me by the idea. I am not such a fool as to imagine that.” (Austen, 2008, p. 48) Echoing that slightly let’s cut the crap tone, Elizabeth here rants against the patriarchy, the setup demanding women quietly eat it with a grin when they are served something pragmatic and commercially useful but bilious from an emotional standpoint. As a method of study, CDA is merely an instance of how her rhetorical winking “knowing women” substitutes for big G in Goodness, in this case “secure womanhood,” not “submissive politeness.”

In contrast, the male voice of Darcy is assumed at the expense of personal repression. There is a charming undercurrent of personal hierarchy and entitlement to judge others running through his words from the start. In particular, his flippancy at the Meryton assembly, “She is tolerable, but not handsome enough to tempt me” (Austen, 2008, p. 3) this saying reveals how men’s speech functions to objectify women and re-enforces class divisions. From the perspective of a CDA, such evaluative language “sexualizes” male domination of female worth and it presents women as object property for men’s evaluation rather than subjects themselves.

But the speech of Darcy alters dramatically in the story. His subsequent self-criticism and readiness to use new terms reflect ethical development and ideological adaptation. Darcy responds to Elizabeth’s critique by growing humbler and this is considered self-aware. His change of the language discovers that male power in the novel is not inflexible, but instead open to ethical change. Austen takes advantage of this transformation to indicate for the fact that genuine masculinity is about “being accountable and respectful” rather than control.

Charlotte Lucas is presented as a sympathetic adult perspective confused by social constraint. Whereas Elizabeth offers no direct attack on patriarchy, Charlotte certainly does not. “Now, she takes marriage simply as business and not a token of affection. She declares, “Happiness in marriage is entirely a matter of chance” (Austen, 2008, p. 6), surrendering to the battle of sex-bias. From a CDA viewpoint, however, the discursive ideologies of the stronger group manifest themselves on how they are used as targets of exclusion. She assumes the patriarchal values, regards them as normal but she does not so much overcome them as to extract the power process and learn that what works through normalization is technique of power; it is not a matter of coercion either.

Charlotte's speech highlights how little homeless women, who are not pretty, or rich, or family beneficiaries, must work with and her entrapping of Mr. Collins by literally doing nothing, save being herself, and waiting is not a character flaw but as reasonable and possibly strategic response to (astronomically) limited social options. Austen in the novel *Pride and Prejudice* is not ridiculing the character of Charlotte; she is an outcome of structural inequality. CDA also can participate in revealing how much Charlotte's words is a symbol or icon of the logic of survival.

Collectively, this a small number of female/ male discourses refer to gendered roles in *Pride and Prejudice*. Women speak out as a result of scare or bargain or disobedience; men speak because they have the privilege to judge, as a form of self-knowledge or discovery. Austen employs dialogic and narrative irony to reveal these discrepancies while also fantasizing the impossible: discursive salvation. Through characters like Elizabeth, Austen suggests that language can be a site of resistance to patriarchy.

Accordingly, CDA informed reading of *Pride and Prejudice* reveals how Austen forms gender identities through power, inheritance, and the idea of social demand. The fretful Mrs. Bennet's chattering, Elizabeth's saucy articulation, Darcy's evolving dialogue, and Charlotte morning with an urgent chorus the truth that language reflects and supports gender oppression, convincingly so. Austen's quiet subversion of patriarchy is still instructive as an example of how ideology functions at the discourse level and social practice.

The marriage dialogue in *Pride and Prejudice* seems to imply that the relationship cannot belong to both sexes at once, and, as I described earlier, this is true for Britain in that time. Marriage is not portrayed as an act of love by Jane Austen, but one more of patriarchy, money, and male dominance. This is a dialogue between men who get to be proposer and decider on the terms, and women, as grateful and kneeling humbles. Language is the key for establishing power relations, and overturning them.

It is only because this proposal of Mr. Collins to Elizabeth Bennet is the very apogee of patriarchal marriage rhetoric and it is rudely implied that, women cannot make decisions; they just rely on those who rush to propose to them and guarantee them certain type of economic and social protection. He does not see in the institution of matrimony a union between two who love, but only an obligation to himself; and this obligation he can propound dogmatically and egoistically. His language is all about obligation, inheritance and social sanction not mutual understanding or affection. This account foregrounds the fact that exclusive property and religious authority are among some of the institutional leverage of (patriarchal) power in supporting entitlement from musty male- power as regards reproducing kin. Collins refuses to take Elizabeth at her word, reducing her remarks to typical female indecisiveness but not a complete denial of the plea, highlighting how women are often left with no voice in the patriarchy.

In its language of entitlement, it is noticed, there is always another layer of reading with this man, how male power operates by assumption. So here is Elizabeth, never asked at all. It is written in a way that makes him appear as the rational, nice guy and its women who are depicted as either overemotional or going too far. This type of talk only validates the belief that women exist in marriages in a dependent role to meet men's needs, and meet social standards as well.

The rejection of Elizabeth Bennet to the proposal of Mr. Collin, on the other side, is an example of one sort of an overt act of discursive resistance. That is a challenging and obvious answer that she also deserves to be happy and to be loved

despite what society thinks of her. Marriage in Elizabeth Bennet's point of view is not a business deal; she just wants some respect and compatibility for what she puts out. When she declares, on departing from his house to return to her father "You would not make me happy, and I am the last woman in the world who could make you so" (Austin, 2008, p. 19), Katherine rejects a form of ruling class ideology that prioritizes economic utility over emotional contentment for its female subjects.

Moreover, Metaphor is what gives the speech of Elizabeth its "get," it releases her words from patriarchal control, enabling her to divert normative judgments more empirically. Therefore, she is still proper and rational character and she will not shut up. Austen in this manner creates a voice for women that is strong and rational, but also feminine, appropriate, and responsible morally though independent intellectually. In Elizabeth, the story transforms the marriage conventions that reduce women to possessions and creates a new language of female independence and equivalence. She feels that marriage or commandeering a mate should be about respect, not societal obligation and, by doing so, she has demanded a woman to man relations bound by language and vasculature!

In the novel of Austen *Pride and Prejudice*, the politeness of women, however, is less a group of social graces than it is a tool of power. Women are to speak plainly and demurely by using few words as possible, control their feelings and perform according to norms and traditions of decorum and good manners that determine what is deemed acceptably feminine. In polite talking, a disciplinary technology works to govern the conduct of women and their expressive freedom. Women in daily talk are trained to repress their anger, desire, and assertiveness if they want to be liked by others. Austen deploys politeness as a social mandate rather than an inherent characteristic to show the role of language in buttressing a gendered hierarchy.

This expectation is most apparent when compared to the way Lydia Bennet, for example, talks. Lydia is speaking unrestrainedly and without all the niceties. Her language is characterised by enthusiasm, flirtation and recklessness which positions her beyond the confines of what can be spoken by women. In this society, her unchecked discourse is seen as immoral, and when she elopes it becomes public scandal. The social response to Lydia shows how feminine discourse is closely connected with categories of moral evaluation. Through her actions she supports the discourse that women's language must be controlled in order to maintain social and moral discipline. However, Austen treats this response satirically, and reveals how society falsely reprimands women who misbehave without getting to the root of why they do.

Austen also pokes fun at what she sees as patently unfair differences in the expectations for men and women's behaviour and while Lydia does receive very serious hits, male dereliction is somehow let off even more pliantly still. These characters coalesce around patriarchal discourse purported male privilege and mobility that duncy male characters can traipse around with little or no social gravity. That is the underhanded injustice of how this sort of gendered division of labour seeps through language: Women's speaking will be policed for a too agreeable tone, while at the same time we all end up exhausted by policing them. Austen does all this double standard in her readers' faces because it is hypocritical, ugly, all laced up and hanging out there.

That is to say there are economic reasons to support the dominance of men in the novel. Land holding, inheritance law is masculine and women are not allowing for both protection and independence. The entail on the Bennet estate is just an old contrivance to prevent land and money from being inherited in any line but that of

males, and daughters are to be too poor to live. This is language from the law books but it serves as an effective discourse not of men's ownership of women, but rather of women's dependence. However, there is no female inheritance, and these women are also pushed this way with great pressure to make a good marriage.

I think the way Mr. Bennet responds to that speaks volumes under a man's language. He understands that the entailment is unfair, but does not do much about this. He is a father so disinterested in his own pleasure that he does not even mind reaping the effects of it upon his daughter. That silence is eloquent about how not all knowledge, male knowledge included, translates into results. In Mr. Bennet, Austen demonstrates how patriarchal norms are upheld through more than just violent power, but also active disregard and disinterest. The language of the law and economy around inheritance therefore upholds male supremacy, yet does so as a neutral, ontological truth.

Lady Catherine de Bourgh is an oppressive authority but in a vague other sense. As a woman, she gets to share the spoils of class privilege, not equal rights among men. Her words are imperious, intrusive and dismissive and most of all when interacting with Elizabeth Bennet. Lady Catherine presumptuously takes it upon herself to dictate what Liz will do with her life, whom she will marry and how. The language she is speaking is the language of aristocracy, which propagates hierarchy, deference, and moderation. Austen uses the figure to show that women are capable of power, but only when connected to authority of a class oriented type.

What Elizabeth tells Lady Catherine is not joking and yet she is cool, collected and respectful but not flat on her back. Her talk is so strange intriguing, that she can dash herself in pieces against the pricks without outraging fashionable delicacy. This conversation is one of Austen's tirades against patriarchy and aristocracy. It does not even have to be you smashing your hand down; a firm dose of the evocative language can get the job done as Elizabeth's example illustrates. Thus, Austen provides a model of female agency that can both operate within cultural systems and also distorts them.

Voice and Gender are being influenced by how members of the opposite sex figure narratively. Through Austen's free indirect discourse, we are all inside Elizabeth. She is in our minds, and yet also our souls. This strategy endorses women's consciousness and enables the female voice. In allowing readers such close access to the narrative voice in Elizabeth's own reflections. Austen promotes an understanding of female judgment and moral reasoning. Conversely the anecdote obscurely explains how men are subverted by violence and defeat as a social structure.

Finally, Austen also demonstrates by means of the language and silence of the narrative voice that power is gendered in *Pride and Prejudice*. Women's decentness is a form of social birth control and men's power shopping are economically and symbolically legitimated but at the same time, Austen writes other characters including Elizabeth who models her own sense of dignity and intelligence and moral autonomy. In her thought through media turn, Austen takes on gender hierarchy and dreams for a few alternative scenarios of more equal and ethical social relationships.

Jane Austen, for her part, cynically reframes sexual identities: one sees this in *Pride and Prejudice* where homologous is satirically characterized with tongue in cheek expressions of early 19th century England social morality and ethics. Male emotional inhibitions initially appear as virtuous qualities associated with dignity, authority, and rationality. But Austen starts to discover the failures of such reserve, particularly when it hinders communication and moral obligation. At the same time, while female voices

are socially restricted, they use emotional and moral intelligence and resistance by employing a variety of discursive strategies. CDA is adopted to talk about how gender-stereotypical roles are created, reinforced, and changed by means of language, dialogism, and narrative voice.

The most factual instance of men's emotional self-control is displayed in the character of Mr. Darcy, but such self-control or restraint also manifests itself throughout the complexions of other male characters; these battles between giving up their feelings and expressing them reveal an internal tension which is not similar to that experienced by female voices. At the beginning of the novel Darcy's silence, aloofness, and emotional unavailability are seen as evidence of his pride and self-discipline. These attitudes and traits are acceptable definitions of manhood in society. Darcy is reticent, does not socialize with others, and keeps his emotions away from the rest. His diction and style of speech denotes class and personal pride and thus lead to prevent or restrict communication. From the CDA perspective, restraint acts as a kind of power because silence is turned into a tool for dominance. Darcy's steadfast refusal to confront aids to emphasis no significant purpose other than upholding social order and encouraging both resistance and misunderstanding.

The unwillingness of the perception of Darcy to disclose his innermost thoughts generated animosity and suffering, as Austen reveals to the readers (us). The fact is that by not letting Elizabeth Bennet know how he really feels, Darcy makes her prejudiced towards him and on the one thing I do agree with, Ivan's suggestion smacks of discursive pride, not intellectual humility. His is the language of social division, not emotional connection. Elizabeth reveals her cleavage, exclaims "I don't know how I'm going to feed the kids," and firmly says no: Right here is where we can see that a morally bereft, sadistic desire derived more from pride than acknowledging someone else exists amounts only to sound under pressure. If not, have an application to be a friend that has voice without this at his mercy he could have no arch-to the Darcy would be but completely and entirely the opposite, be even unfavourable for anybody; being impure I will say than such can keep.

Darcy's form of transformation is itself an example of ethical masculinity. He rejects Elizabeth, so he reverts to type and polishes his speech. His letter to Elizabeth is a total about-face. He straight says it truth of what he did, no justification, or dictator. Condemnation of this eloquence of silence, Darcy replaces. Note how CDA tells us all we need to know, the language is a route of self-actualisation. Since then, he has been a lot humbler and calmer with me. Rather, as Austen makes clear, true manliness does not lie in suppressed emotions but in moral obligation and tender self-communication.

This sisterly solidarity is, of course, circumscribed by social role but it counts for something. "For as women we were not forced to view one another in a competitive light the way we are by marriage pressure, but rather seen each other in moments of emotional gift but moral overlap." Jane Bennet articulates a feminine and gentle vocabulary that has been taught to her by society. Her language is ever that of harmony, forgiveness, and self-control. Jane commonly excuses men, and dislikes calling them to exceptions; for Jane as society does not crave such a name: of being a belligerent enemy to iniquity, but one who helps to smooth it down.

In line with this shift in CDA, Jane's language use does show how patriarchy intersects with women's language. She is not critical of men because she believes it's better to be polite than to be fair. But there is a tender-heartedness to her character that Austen does not view as a lack of strength. Rather, it is a weapon of the moral kind:

She's nice about people eating whatever. "Silicon Valley" is more gentled down, a language that is benevolent and empathetic and morally lenient. Austen next questions this perception of power in female violence.

How bizarrely contrasty, that is, to Jane's Elizabeth Bennet speaking. She is brusque and has no correspondence principle that etches moral temperatures into authority. "If I get up and stand, he will know he has died." Jane wants peace; Elizabeth wants the Light. Gustat and the way he spoke were, in contrast, two tactics we all always use for being "fine" in the curtailed sense of that term demanded by patriarchy. CDA also argues that Austen does not disdain with either class. Jane's ebullience provides emotional equilibrium, while Lizzy's good sense metabolises moral growth. They make a difference obviously, in women sticking together they amount to little but it is something; It is not rivalry, only respect.

Marriage is bandied around with willy-nilly insouciance, where the sexes congregate in *Pride and Prejudice* at these altitudes. I see dating as a stand-in for courtship, and I'm not convinced it's all that modern day, unless you regard courtship as what we do to get economic support and status and the stuff of life. Women should say yes for the right reasons: because, right or wrong for her, she is about to get married. Austen is satirizing this superficial, advantageously immoral negotiation. The proposal of Mr. Collins is a purification or distillation of patriarchal structures: Less a request for acceptance than an assumption of women's acquiescence to the mandates of the patriarchy.

The marriage of Elizabeth and Darcy would be one exception, despite; it would change the conversation about matrimony. They bond over hardship, contemplation, and the value of telling it straight. The characters develop in their word picture, but they come to an agreement as well. For Elizabeth, it is the way to the discovery that she cannot trust her prejudices or feelings; for Darcy, a lesson in learning to pause and ask questions about his dogged self-certitude. It is not money or coercion, but respect for each other, emotional equilibrium, and moral kinship that take them down the aisle. The Austen quotes the Bible.

From CDA's perspective, this bond challenges hegemonic gender as it reconstitutes "voice and agency." Elizabeth did not herself believe that Darcy goes there, without waiting for his intention to be in any doubt they are received. Well, he or she is no guiltier than anyone else and enlightens us not a whit. That for Austen is what it is to hold before one a better model of some kind of ethical demand than silence and submission so that marriage matters. Morality, Austen would also tell us, has to be discussable not secreted away deep in the foggy dungeons of guilt.

The flip side of the critique above is, however, also confirmed by Austen's storytelling. It is with dizzying, delightful irreverence that she hilariously wades in and jimmys open the door of women's consciousness indeed, a door leading to morality itself. Not because women's views are a side issue along the way, but because they are essential to seeing clearly in the first place and yet to considering it as a narrative strategy that goes toward the defiance of male supremacy and validation of female voice in an oppressive and tyrannical society.

Throughout, you can read *Pride and Prejudice* as a novel that demonstrates how gender is enacted with language. A man's identity shifts from becoming quiet and arrogant to responsible and humble. Female subjectivity is constructed through different speech acts of kinship and defiance. Again, Austen never flouts those

conventions directly she just presses up against them with characters' impulses and moral conversation that mollify ours.

Insomuch as a CDA reading of *Pride and Prejudice* will show that Austen constructs gender not so much an essential identity but as an ethical practice 'conditioned' by discourse. For a man, self-restraint is only as admired as it walks beside Morally Chaste Responsibility. Narrow as it is, women's solidarity operates on the basis of an emotional intelligence and ethical discernment. The institution of marriage is thus a place of respect, and not of repression. Austen's novel is thus an ongoing exploration of the ways in which language intervenes upon and constitutes gender, power, and ethics within the social realm.

Conclusion

Thus, *Pride and Prejudice* casts a fragile but steely picture of two sexes entirely made by language, ideology, and social power. All the same, Austen is such a deft writer that she reproduces the prejudices of an age while constantly undermining them, even if her allowance for snobbery in women's judgments makes excellent readers ache. Critical Discourse Analysis reveals that narrative is not only a representation of social reality, it also challenges the patriarchal regime of relationships, inheritance, and marriage. "Women are limited in their voice," she said, "and that's dull: When women are witty and moral, and when they're loud." Feminist resistance notwithstanding a character such as Elizabeth Bennett illustrates how language is used as a mechanism of resistance/self-assertion and control in an era that valued male conservatism.

In the very next sentence, Austen re-establishes masculine agency and subject it to a moral challenge. There is a gesture in the discourse, a most recognisable one, I think like those for men as generally and Mr Darcy specifically: from Pride to silence then on into (but not necessarily through) class superiority; back from that by way of humiliation into humility; acknowledgement of the demands of kinship, recognition that values worth having live outside his shape. The real authority does not have to be money does not have to be hierarchical social status It is a moral judgment a mutual respect. In her formulation of the ideal martial relationship as a relationship which is based on understanding and equality, Austen imagines an alternative to patriarchal values. Austen's words matter because what she says about how gender identities, power is spoken and assertion enacted through language still resonates.

References

- Austen, J. (2008). *Pride and prejudice*. Oxford: OUP.
- Brown, P. & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. London: Routledge.
- Connell, R. W. (2005). *Masculinities* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. (2010). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language* (2nd ed.). Edinburgh: Pearson Education.
- Fairclough, N. (2015). *Language and power* (3rd ed.). Edinburgh: Pearson Education
- Johnson, C. L. (1988). *Jane Austen: Women, politics, and the novel*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mills, S. (2004). *Discourse* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.
- Mills, S. (2003). *Gender and politeness*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Poovey, M. (1984). *The proper lady and the woman writer: Ideology as style in the*

- works of Mary Wollstonecraft, Mary Shelley, and Jane Austen.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Stone, L. (1977). *The family, sex and marriage in England 1500–1800.* New York: Harper & Row.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and power.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Watt, I. (1957). *The rise of the novel: Studies in Defoe, Richardson, and Fielding.* California: University of California Press.
- Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction* (pp. 173–210). London: Sage.
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (Eds.). (2009). *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.

Abstract in Arabic

ملخص:

يُركز هذا البحث على سياق الصور النمطية للرجال والنساء في رواية "كبرياء وهوى" لجين أوستن. لذا، يتناول التحليل اللغوي، والحوار، واستراتيجيات السرد التي تعكس وتُعيد الأدوار الجندرية في الثقافة الإنجليزية في أوائل القرن التاسع عشر. وبناءً على نظرية التحليل النقدي، تُحلل الدراسة السلطة، والأيديولوجيا، والمعايير الاجتماعية المُتجلية في تفاعل الشخصيات الحوارية. ويشمل التحليل دراسة النساء من منظور الزواج، والأخلاق، وحرية الاختيار (والقيود الاجتماعية المفروضة عليهن)، ودراسة الرجال من منظور علاقات القوة، والاقتصاد، والحراك الاجتماعي. ويُظهر البحث أن شخصيات أوستن النسائية، بطريقة مُخالفة، ترفض الخضوع للتصميم الأبوي، وتمتلك بدلاً من ذلك ذاتيتها الخطابية الخاصة ومجموعة قيمها، حتى في ظل قيود المجتمعات المختلفة. كما يكشف البحث عن الفجوات الجندرية التي لا تزال قائمة في المؤسسات الاجتماعية والخطاب العام. وتشير النتائج إلى أن رواية "كبرياء وهوى" تعكس علاقات القوة الجندرية للمرأة في عالم جين أوستن المعاصر، مما يُوحى بنظرة روائية حديثة إلى قضايا الخطاب.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الجندر، الأيديولوجية الأبوية، التسلسل الهرمي، الزواج، المجتمع الفيكتوري، تحليل الخطاب النقدي.
