

## **Integrity, Pride, and Love as Power in Jane Austen’s Novel: “Pride and Prejudice”**

Ratna Padmi Trihartanti, Sri Dewiyanti, Muhammad Yazidus Syukri, Siti Yuliah

English Department, Bandung State Polytechnic. [Ratna.padmi@polban.ac.id](mailto:Ratna.padmi@polban.ac.id)

English Department, Politeknik Negeri Bandung. [sdewiyanti@polban.ac.id](mailto:sdewiyanti@polban.ac.id)

English Department, Politeknik Negeri Bandung. [yazidus@polban.ac.id](mailto:yazidus@polban.ac.id)

English Department, Politeknik Negeri Bandung. [siti.yuliah@polban.ac.id](mailto:siti.yuliah@polban.ac.id)

Article History: 2 December 2022 Submitted date; Accepted date 9 Februari 2023; Published date: 20 Februari 2023

### **ABSTRACT**

This study aims at finding out that variables of relative power (P) are not only social status, age, education and wealth. Another aim is to show that negative politeness strategies do not always belong to someone with higher social power. Relative power is one element of social variables which decides politeness strategies to be employed. *Pride and Prejudice* reveals that integrity, pride and love are also variables of relative power, and they are also able to prove that though someone’s social status is not high and her social distance with another participant is asymmetric, she could have power over someone else with higher social status. Power characterized with integrity, pride, belief, and freedom from being dominated is called personal power; meanwhile, power which variables determined by good personality, attractive physical appearance, and wit is called referent power. This study uses qualitative method and the data which mostly are refusal taken from *Pride and Prejudice*. The main character of *Pride and Prejudice* shows us that integrity, pride, and love could be the variables of power deriving from Personal and Referent power, and those powers could develop and deepen relative power in social variables to be applied in politeness studies.

**Keywords:** politeness, personal power, referent power, social variables

---

### **1. Introduction**

Relative power (P) is one element of social variables taking an important role to determine which politeness strategies to be applied. Relative power consists of someone’s social position, gender, age, wealth and all the elements of relative power have been agreed widely. The higher relative power of a participant is, the more dominant he /she will be, especially when social distance is also asymmetric (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p. 46, cited in Blutner, 2016). The other elements of social variables are the social distance (D) and the ranking of imposition (R). Normally, if the relative power is not symmetric, the social distance will be asymmetric and the ranking of imposition will be low. Those previous descriptions belong to Brown & Levinson’s Politeness theory (Brown & Levinson, 1987, cited in Padilla Cruz, 2007) which has been known universally, and in that situation, negative politeness strategy is used.

Some previous researchers have conducted research on politeness relating to power and two of them are (Morand & Lewin, 1996) who state that power is embedded in everyday communication among superiors and

subordinates. The other researchers who have written research on politeness are (Wessel & Steiner, 2015). They conclude that employees of a department store perceiving their customers as those who have higher power; therefore, they are sometimes treated impolitely by them. (Chunli & Nor, 2016) observe the use of refusal strategies among Chinese EFL speakers. The first finding conveys that indirect refusal strategy is the most preferred to be used as they want to minimize the imposition of their utterances to maintain their relationship well. The second finding shows that there are four factors are able to influence the use of refusal responses. Those factors are: nationality, religion and culture, social distance and social power.

The next researchers who conduct research on politeness and power are (El-dali et al., 2020) who investigate the parameters of power research on medical encounters in spoken Egyptian Arabic. Researchers focus on the aspects of discourse: speech acts especially directives that are: commands, orders and questions.

The result of observation shows that there is a communication gap between patients and doctors. Patients are considered to be passive and powerless: meanwhile, doctors with their institutional and legitimate powers as they have professional competent helps patients' need, and it makes them more powerful through social class.

From the previous research, those stress on politeness and power with the same variables of social power that consists of social status, position in society, gender and age. Indeed, (El-dali et al., 2020) introduce different type of power: institutional and legitimate power, yet they are the same as social power. Besides, the research shows the interaction between doctors and patients which means more or less all is about medical discourse that occurs in hospital. This present research aims to find out different types of power which are very different from social power used by Brown & Levinson. The powers that are different from social power are: personal and referent power. The powers are not characterized by social status, age, gender and other elements as we know so far. Another aim is to find out that participant whose social power is lower, yet he/she owns referent and personal power could influence others. This research shows that without having high social power as long as they have personal and referent powers, they could influence others who have higher social status. The personal and referent powers have never been discussed, and it is the gap between the previous and the present research. Most of the data analyze are refusals, and they are taken to show that participant who comes from lower social status could dominate utterances and steer another participant if they have referent and personal powers.

There are some major theories employed and one of them is politeness. The term 'polite' is derived fundamentally from Latin word 'poiltus' which means 'to smooth' (Blitvich & Sifianou, 2019, p. 81, cited in Jasim Betti, 2020), from the term, we know that politeness is a kind of 'a tool' to smooth communication or interaction between speaker and hearer, and it means that every participant in interaction try to avoid conflict. Politeness theory applied mostly for this research comes from Brown & Levinson (1987). They state that politeness is seen as an active serving, and it has a sharp connection with the face management. Meanwhile Foley mentions politeness as 'a battery of social skills whose goal is to ensure that everyone feels affirmed in a social interaction' (Foley, p. 317, n. d). Brown & Levinson who have given the most prominent contribution to the development of politeness theory, mainly focused on how politeness is expressed to protect participants' face (Brown & Levinson, 1987, cited in Corresponding, 2016).

Obviously, Brown & Levinson's theory of politeness (1987) consists of three basic notions: face, Face Threatening Acts (FTAs), and politeness strategies. They initially proposed a universal model of linguistic politeness and claim that politeness is realized linguistically by means of various strategies across cultures. For most people, politeness tends to be equivalent to manners and behavior, but its conception varies across cultures; what is considered polite in one culture may be perceived as rude in another (Cremona et al., 2017),

As it has been mentioned above, there are three basic notions covered in the theory of politeness, and they are: Face, Face Threatening Acts (FTAs), and politeness strategies. Face is the public self-image that every member of a society wants to claim for himself. (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Another basic notion is Face Threatening Acts are acts that infringe on the hearer's need to maintain his/herself-esteem, or it can be further explained that speech acts can destroy or threaten another person face, and these acts are well known as face threatening acts (FTA). If there might be a tendency to threaten someone's positive or negative face, we can minimize it by using politeness strategies. Brown & Levinson define them as strategies in which the interlocutors can mitigate threads carried by face threatening acts. Those strategies, then, are divided into two,

namely: negative and positive politeness. To mitigate the threat, either positive or negative politeness strategies are needed. Positive politeness strategies are used to reduce social distance and elicit friendly responses from subordinates; on the other hand, negative politeness strategies highlighted for enhancing the speaker's prestige and power (Takano, 2005, cited in Eshghinejad & Moini, 2016). Brown and Levinson also add that negative politeness strategy is a type of politeness associated with the listener's negative face, and it has to do with respecting behavior.

Negative politeness strategies aim at hearer's negative face wants to describe expressions of restraint, formality, and distancing.

The utterances below employ negative politeness strategy:

A: *'Would you like to come to my garden party tomorrow afternoon?'*

B: *'Oh, I would like to, thank you for your invitation'*

The utterances above show that negative politeness is used for expressing formality because the social distance between the speaker and hearer is not close, and one of them has power over another.

Whereas positive politeness is used for expressing solidarity, informality and familiarity as it can be seen below:

A: *'Hi, guys. I am having a garden party. Come and see around. Don't forget, OK?'*

B: *'Wow..., Can't wait...let's go there'*

The above utterances prove that A as Speaker utters informal and familiar way, and it means they are close to each other.

In applying politeness strategies, speaker wants to stress on the relative power of listener. All strategy outputs help maintain social distance (Sibirian, 2016, cited in Nurul et al., 2022). Reiter mentions that politeness exists as a result of interactions between people and culture and politeness are acquired with the passage of time through the sociocultural coexistence of people with one another (Reiter, 2000, pp. 1-2, cited in Corresponding, 2016). Brown & Levinson divide negative politeness strategies into eight and those are: 1) Be conventionally indirect, 2) Question, hedge, 3) Be pessimistic, 4) Minimize the imposition, Rx, 5) Give deference, 6) Apologize, 7) Impersonalize S and H, 8) State the FTA as a general rule, 9) Nominalize, 10) Go on record as incurring a debt, or as not indebting H. All those strategies perform the function of reducing the imposition that the FTA unavoidably effects. Utterances using negative politeness are mostly found between speaker and hearer with asymmetric social distance and power, and they show formality as the social distance is not close. It can be added that negative politeness strategies point out the avoidance of imposition on the hearer and can be considered as is the desire to remain autonomous.

Whereas positive politeness strategies are divided into 15 and those are: 1) Notice, attend to H (his interests, wants, needs, goods, 2) Exaggerate (interests, approval, sympathy with H), 3) Intensify interest to H, 4) Use in-group identify markers, 5) Seek agreement, 6) Avoid disagreement, 7) Presuppose/raise/assert common ground, 8) Joke, 9) Assert or presuppose S's knowledge of and concern for H's wants, 10) Offer, promise, 11) Be optimistic, 12) Include both S and H in the activity, 13) Give (or ask for) reasons, 14) Assume or assert reciprocity, 15) Give gifts to H (goods, sympathy, understanding, cooperation). All strategies of positive politeness show free-ranging between speaker and hearer to reveal solidarity and familiarity because their social distance and social power are symmetric.

The next theory is social variables, and it is used to decide which strategies that are going to choose, there is a social variable with social power (P), social distance (D) and ranking of imposition (R). Negative politeness will be used if the power of participants is not equal, the social distance is not symmetric, and the rank of imposition mostly is not high. Whereas positive politeness strategies are chosen if participants have the same power, symmetric social distance and the rank of imposition also not high but of course negative politeness strategies has lower imposition.

Furthermore (Brown & Levinson, 1987) state that the seriousness for a FTA may be calculated using the

following formulae:

$$W_x = D(S,H) + P(H,S) + R_x$$

$W_x$  refers to the weightiness of a FTA,  $D(S, H)$  measures the degree of social distance between the speaker and hearer meanwhile  $P(H,S)$  measures the value of power that a hearer has over a speaker, or speaker has relative power over hearer. It can be said that the relative power between speaker and hearer is asymmetric and  $R_x$  is the value that measures the degree of imposition of a FTA in a particular culture.

Another theory that relates closely to politeness theory is power. Power have much more portion to discuss as so far we have only known social power according to Brown & Levinson's version with social variables such as: social status, education, age and others. There are some theories of power from different researchers often employed in studies relating to politeness. The first theory of power comes from Holmes claiming that power refers to participants' ability to influence another circumstances. (Holmes, 1995, cited in (Oktriana, n.d.)). Furthermore he claims that it is not the social differences of a person that makes one powerful or powerless, but those differences make people impolite or polite. (Menge, 2018) asserts that power is an agent's ability to have an effect on other agents' actions or on their dispositions to act. From the definitions of power, it may be concluded that power is an act to influence others, and it may be used to gain advantage for themselves from others. The other powers discussed in this research are referent and personal powers taken from Thomas (1995) and Cuddy (n.d.). Those powers commence to be familiar in social interaction, yet they are not employed in politeness discussion. Social power used by Brown & Levinson is known widely, but along with development of communication the variables of social power could not cover all kinds of communication in the present time.

This research shows how the main character in the novel of *Pride and Prejudice* bravely refuses some supporting characters' demands though they come from higher social status as she has personal and referent powers. Since most of the data analysed are refusals; therefore, they also discuss here. Refusal is one of politeness strategies that can be placed both as negative and positive. The definition of refusal is the 'illocutionary denegation of an acceptance'. Moreover, speech act of refusal can be described as 'the negative counterparts to acceptances and consenting are rejections and refusals. Just as one can accept offers, applications and invitations, so each of these can be refused or rejected' (Vanderveken, 1990, p. 195). A refusal is a complex speech act that requires not only long sequences of negotiation and cooperative achievements but also 'face-saving maneuvers to accommodate the noncompliant nature of the act' (Houck and Gass, 1999, p. 2). According to Searle who is very famous with his speech acts theory, he divides the theory into five types, namely: Representatives describe acts such as: describing, claiming, hypothesizing, insisting and predicting. The next type is Directives, and those acts are: commanding, requesting, inviting, forbidding, suggesting, and others. Another type of speech act is Expressives, and those acts belong to this type are: regretting, praising, apologizing, deploring, congratulating, and regretting. The next type is Directives, and it consists of commanding, requesting, forbidding, inviting, suggesting, and so on. Declarations is another type found in speech acts, and there are words and expressions that could make changes such as: 'I declare', 'I resign', 'I bet', 'I pronounce', 'I baptize' and others. The last type is Commissives, and some acts are: promising, offering, threatening, vowing, volunteering, and refusing. All of the types have different functions to produce utterances and one of them relating to refusal is Commissives. Commissives are acts that commit the speaker to a future course of action (Searle, 1975, cited in Bacha et al., 2021) Refusal is an act that lists in Commissives, and (Beebe et al., 1990) divide refusal in three strategies, namely: direct, indirect and adjunct to refusals.

Direct refusal consists of three acts such as: Performative that commonly uses 'I refuse' then the use of Direct refusal 'No' and Negative willingness ability by saying 'I could not do it'. Indirect refusal has more acts, among others: Statement of regret, for example: 'I am really sorry'. The next act is, Wish: 'I wish I could help you', and another one, is Reason/Explanation: 'I have another promise today' and Postponement is an act belongs to this strategy, and one example is: 'I will think about it'. The last strategy is adjunct to refusals. This strategy consists of Statement of positive opinion, and the example is: 'I would like to...', then it is Pause filler such as: 'Hmmm...', 'Uhm...' and the last act is Gratitude/ Appreciation by saying 'Thank you'. Below are the examples of three refusal strategies that have been described above.

Direct refusal strategies are often realized by means of a flat word 'no'. The utterances below show a direct refusal:

- A: *'Can you help me to lift these boxes?'*  
B: *'No, You see I am typing my letters'*

The utterances between A and B show that B directly refuses A's request to help him. B replies 'No' at once without employing any phrases to mitigate the imposition of his speech. This kind of refusal creates face threatening act (FTA) and it makes the ranking imposition of the utterances high. Direct refusal could occur in conversations whose participants have symmetric social distance and power. Direct refusal can threaten negative face of another participant.

Meanwhile indirect refusal conveys an indirect way to reject. The hearer usually does not apply the 'no' explicitly in order to avoid face threatening act (FTA). Therefore, he will use some phrases to mitigate the imposition. It can be seen from the utterances below:

- A: *'Will you accompany me to go to bookstore this afternoon?'*  
B: *'I am really sorry, but I have promise with my ma'am to accompany her, how about tomorrow?'*

From the utterances above, we can see that B uses the opening speech 'I am really sorry' to show the mitigation of refusal and B's answer lessens face threatening act because he apologizes for not being able to accompany A; furthermore, B also offers another alternative, that is tomorrow so that B's indirect refusal reduces the imposition of his utterances. Indirect refusal usually occurs in communication where participants have asymmetric social distance and power.

The last strategy is adjunct to refusals, and it can be seen from these utterances:

- A: *'I need a Grammar book that was recommended by our tutor'. 'Can I borrow yours?'*  
B: *'Well..., I would to, but I need it urgently for tomorrow's exam'.*

The use of discourse marker 'Well' is to mitigate the imposition of B's utterance so that it avoids face threatening act. (FTA)

## 2. Methodology

This study is about power related to social variables in politeness. Since the research's data were taken from *Pride and Prejudice*, and all the data were in the form of texts, they need correct and appropriate interpretations. Besides, researchers focused on utterances conducted by characters that could prove the aims of the research. Though the texts were taken from a novel, it was only 2 elements of the novel were taken and those were: characters and setting. The reason why there were only two elements described because from characters, readers understand texts produced by them, and it is easy to know their personality and type of power they belong to, especially the main character, Elizabeth. The second element of the novel described was setting. Setting is a place, where the story of *Pride and Prejudice* took place. It is important to be known as we will understand the situation at the time. *Pride and Prejudice* that dealt with social class in British in the 19th century, in which the traditional class system of British had rules and one of them was wealth would be passed on through family property inheritance. By knowing the setting, it is easier to choose which research methods to be chosen as setting could help to interpret the texts relate to social setting (Shipp, 1968). At the time inherited wealth considered for more status than money gained by work. It was the oldest son who would inherit the estates of family, and daughters gained smaller income. Therefore, women at that time did not inherit wealth from their fathers, and for that reason, they had to seek rich men to increase her social status and as a result, sometimes their marriages based on money not love

The data were taken from Jane Austen novel's *Pride and Prejudice*, written by a British novelist, Jane Austen. This novel consists of 351 pages, and it was published for the first time in 1813. Then it was republished several times, and for this research, it was taken from the novel of *Pride and Prejudice* published in 1985. Now, we can also read the e-book novel of *Pride and Prejudice* that was updated by (Wilson, 1985). It consists of 61 chapters and it has 311 pages. The data are in the form of dialogues and descriptions among the characters, and the most dialogues are from the main character, Elizabeth with other characters. To collect the data, the researchers read the novel several times carefully to find the data relating or supporting the aims of the research. It was difficult to seek the data appropriately because most of the data support the research. Anyhow, after being analyzed several times, researchers understood better which data that mostly lead to the research's aims.

After all the data were collected, the process of data selection could be done. The reduction of the data process would separate which data were more relevant and the most relevant related to the aims of the research. The most relevant data would be used and the more relevant data would be saved, then any irrelevant data were left out.

The qualitative method was used in this study as the results of analysis were in the descriptive forms. According to (Berg and Lune 2014, p. 8, cited in Wang, 2018), qualitative research properly seeks answers by examining various social settings and the groups or individuals who inhabit these settings. Meanwhile Slife & Melling state that qualitative methods open up all experiences to knowledge and qualitative research is concerned with non -statistical methods of inquiry and analysis of social phenomena (Slife & Meiling, 2012, p. 724, cited in Shakouri, 2014). From those definitions of qualitative methods above, it is very clear that qualitative method covers various social settings and analysis of social phenomena, and it is suitable to be applied for this study.

### 3. Result and Discussion

*Pride and Prejudice* takes place in rural England around the beginning of the 19th century, where the social class takes as an important role for their power. The center of story is about the Bennet family, especially, their second daughter, Elizabeth. As the main character, Elizabeth plays dominantly her role and from the beginning of the story, Austen has revealed Elizabeth's characters clearly. Austen depicts Elizabeth as a strong woman who always does not easily fall in love with a man though he is rich and has a good social position in society. For her, women must have integrity, pride so that nobody will underestimate them. The story starts when Elizabeth overhears that Mr Darcy does not want to dance with her because she is not attractive enough to attempt him. Then from that moment, Elizabeth is sure that Mr Darcy is arrogant and he refuses her because she comes from lower social status. Her prejudice against him grows bigger and bigger and it makes her hate him. In fact, Elizabeth has interest in Mr Darcy, but her pride and integrity make her not want to be closed to him though he proposes her. Since the story is about Elizabeth with her pride, consistent integrity, and her prejudice; therefore, Austen entitles her novel *Pride and Prejudice*. Prejudice does not come only from Elizabeth but it also comes from Mr Darcy.

The previous title of *Pride and Prejudice* is *The First Impression* as from the first, both Elizabeth and Mr Darcy, misjudge each other that emerges Elizabeth pride and prejudice stronger. The social background of the novel is about the difficulties of women at the time to gain their role in society. They marry solely to increase their social status, yet Elizabeth believes that women should be intelligent, witty and have pride, and integrity. Thus, they marry only for love.

After reading the novel and analyzing some utterances among Elizabeth as the main character with the other characters, it is very obvious that integrity, pride and love could be other variables of power. Elizabeth is the second daughter of The Bennet family, and she has strong integrity that makes her different not only from her sisters but also from other women in her society. Her integrity could be seen when Mr Collins proposes her, and he confidently believes that Elizabeth will receive it, but Elizabeth interrupts his speech before he finishes his proposal:

Elizabeth: 'You are too hasty sir' ... 'You forget that I have made no answer. 'Let me do it without

*further loss of time. Accept my thanks for the compliment you are paying me. I am very sensible of the honour of your proposals, but it is impossible for me to do it otherwise than decline them.'*

Mr Collins: *'My reasons for marrying are,*

*first, that I think it a right thing for every clergyman in easy circumstances (like myself) to set the example of matrimony in his parish; secondly, that I am convinced it will add very greatly to my happiness; and thirdly which perhaps ought to have mentioned earlier, that it is the particular advice and recommendation of the very noble lady whom I have the honour of calling patroness ... to fortune I am perfectly indifferent, and shall make no demand of that nature on your father, since I am well aware it could not be complied with; and that one thousand pounds in the four percents, which will not be yours till after your mother's decrease, is all that may ever be entitled to. On that head, therefore, I shall be uniformly silent; and you may assure yourself that no ungenerous reproach shall ever pass my lips when we are married...' Your portion is unhappily so small that it will in all likelihood undo the effects of your loveliness and amiable qualifications. As I must therefore conclude that you are not serious in your rejection of me, '...*

Elizabeth: *'...I do assure you that I am not one of those young ladies 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. ... I thank you again and again for the honor you have done for me in your proposals, but to accept them is absolutely impossible. My feeling in every respect forbid it. Can I speak cleaner? Do not consider me now as an elegant woman, intending to plague you, but as a rational creature, speaking the truth from her heart'*

(Austen, 1985, pp. 239-249)

Elizabeth employs an indirect refusal by not saying 'no' in her speech; however, she shows her gratitude and honour to Mr Collins before expressing her direct refusal by saying 'I decline them'. Knowing Elizabeth refusal, Mr Collins does not give up easily, and thinks that Elizabeth's refusal is not serious. He knows well that she will accept him because he is the only one who is going to inherit all Mr Bennet's wealth. Elizabeth does not accept Mr Collins proposal because she thinks that Mr Collins does not have integrity at all; besides, he is snobbish, pompous and dull. He wants to get married because Lady Chaterine insists him on doing that and not because his own will. This is very contradictive with Elizabeth's commitment that marriage must be decided by loving couple and not by others. Elizabeth is also disappointed with Mr Collins when he says that he can be her commodity after they are married, so she will be happy as she should not think of money anymore; moreover she could increase her social status. To convince Mr Collins that she is serious to refuse him, Elizabeth replies that *'Can I speak cleaner? Do not consider me now as an elegant woman, intending to plague you...'* Her last utterances express that she is not interested in Mr Collins's wealth, and she does not want to plague him because of his money as the other women do.

All Elizabeth's responses also show us that she has power over Mr Collins though he has a good position as clergyman, besides, he is also the only inheritance of Mr Bennet, her father since he is his nephew in the first line. All his wealth does not make Elizabeth interested because she does not love him. Elizabeth's integrity strongly refuses him. This condition reveals that Brown & Levinson's theory on politeness strategy relates to social variables is not applicable.  $W_x = D(S,H) + P(H,S) + R_x$  could not work though social distance between Elizabeth and Mr Collins is not close which means they are not familiar, each other. From social power point of view, Mr Collins have power over Elizabeth, but she refuses him several times and her last refusal is by saying *'I am perfectly serious in my refusals...'* that makes Mr Collins upset and lose his face, so this situation creates face threatening act as the ranking of imposition is high.

Elizabeth's strong integrity could be seen also from her utterances when she shares her opinion to her sister, Jane.

'...

Elizabeth: *'Nay, 'This is not fair, you wish to think all the world respectable and are hurt if I speak ill of anybody. I only want to think you perfect and you set yourself against it. Do not be*

*afraid of my running into any excess, of encroaching on your privilege of universal good-will. need not. There are of people whom I really love and still fewer of whom I think well. The more I see of the world the more am I dissatisfied with it; and every day confirms my belief of the inconsistency of all human characters, and of the little independence that can be placed on the appearance of either merit or sense. I have met with two instances lately; one I will not mention; the other Charlotte's marriage. It is unaccountable! In every view it is unaccountable.'*

Jane : *'My dear Lizzy, do not give way to such feelings as these. They will ruin your happiness. You do not make allowance enough for difference of situation and temper. Consider Mr. Collins's respectability, and Charlotte's prudent, steady character. Remember that she is one of a large family; that as to fortune, it is the most eligible match; and be ready to believe, for every body's sake, that she may feel something like regard and esteem for our cousin.'*

(Austen, 1985, p. 253)

From the utterances above, we know that Elizabeth is disappointed with some people whom she thinks have strong integrity as hers, yet they do not. Her first disappointment happens when Mr Collins proposes her as it is described above. He considers that his good social position, his good relation with Lady Catherine and his status as the only one heir of the Bennet family will change Elizabeth's mind. The reason of Mr Collins' to marry her make Elizabeth feel insulted as he is sure that she should not think about money anymore. Her second disappointment that makes her very shocked when her dear friend Charlotte receives Mr Collins' proposal. Charlotte is her best friends, and she knows Mr Collins will grant the stability of Charlotte's economy after they get married, but Elizabeth thinks that Charlotte should not receive his proposal as she knows that Charlotte does not love him. However, Charlotte's age chases her to get married soon, so she accepts Mr Collins' proposal and forgets her integrity. Elizabeth's commitment never to sacrifice her values that she would not get married just simply for income or status; therefore, she is very disappointed with the inconsistency of Charlotte. Her sister, Jane only advises her that not all people have the same commitment as hers, yet Elizabeth keeps the values of her integrity.

Not only has integrity, Elizabeth also has pride that makes the other characters in the novel respect her. Being prejudiced that Mr Darcy has separated Mr Bingley with her sister, Jane because she comes from lower-class society, Elizabeth feels that Mr Darcy has ruined her dignity. Her pride, integrity and dignity emerge together; therefore, she refuses Mr Darcy's proposal as we can see below:

*'From the very beginning—from the first moment, I may almost say—of my acquaintance with you, your manners, impressing me with the fullest belief of your arrogance, your conceit, and your selfish disdain of the feelings of others, were such as to form the groundwork of disapprobation on which succeeding events have built so immovable a dislike; and I had not known you a month before I felt that you were the last man in the world whom I could ever be prevailed on to marry.'*

(Austen, 1985, pp. 360-361)

Elizabeth applies a direct refusal to Mr Darcy who proposes her. Indeed, she does not employ the word 'no' but her utterances are very sharp and there is no phrase or sentence to minimize the imposition of her refusal. She directly scolds him and her last sentences: *'...I felt that you were the last man in the world whom I could ever be prevailed on to marry...'* really build face threatening act (FTA). Elizabeth does not accept Mr Darcy's proposal because she thinks Mr Darcy underestimate people with lower social status. She knows that Mr Darcy is very rich, yet his wealth does not intimidate her. Elizabeth considers that Mr Darcy has underestimated her by not wanting to dance with her. Elizabeth's pride, integrity lead her to humiliate Mr Darcy by saying that she will not marry him though he is the last man in the world whom she meets. Elizabeth's refusal reveals that she has strong pride and integrity. The relative power between Elizabeth and Mr Darcy is asymmetric. Elizabeth is the daughter of a country gentleman, Mr Bennet and they are not rich,



meanwhile Mr Darcy is very wealthy, the son of well-established family and the owner of the great estate of Pemberley. Elizabeth's refusal is also caused by her prejudice against Mr Darcy that he has separated her beloved sister from Mr Bingley, his best friend who is also rich. Elizabeth considers that Mr Darcy does not like her family because they come from lower social status.

Feeling that Mr Darcy has insulted her family, Elizabeth's integrity and pride lead her to have power over Mr Darcy. Her integrity and pride create high imposition of her utterances and make face threatening act (FTA). Thus, the theory of Brown and Levinson on Hierarchical politeness system [+P, +/-D], which establishes an asymmetrical relationship between interlocutors because one of them has more power than the other (Brown & Levinson, 1987, cited in Padilla Cruz, 2008) is not applicable. Generally, participant who has power over another dominates utterances and he will steer the flow of communications, and each participant whether they like it or not, should obey what he says. However, this theory does not work in this novel as the main character, Elizabeth has pride as her power, and it strengthens her though she comes from middle-class of society. Actually Elizabeth's pride emerges strongly when Mr. Darcy refuses to dance with her in the ball held by Mr Bingley, Mr Darcy's best friend at Netherfield. After his refusal, Elizabeth promises Mrs Bennet that she does not want to dance with him and it can be seen from Mrs Bennet, and Elizabeth's utterances below:

Mrs Bennet: *'Another time Lizzy, I would not to dance with him, if I were you'*

Elizabeth: *'I believe ma'am, I may safely promise you never to dance with him again'*

(Austen, 1985, p. 7)

Elizabeth knows that Mr Darcy has refused to dance with her, and it is known by some guests who come to the ball. Seeing Elizabeth's disappointment, her mother, Mrs Bennet advises her not to dance with him. Elizabeth feels that Mr Darcy has humiliated her in front of public, and she promises not to dance with Mr Darcy again. Mr Darcy's refusal has threatened Elizabeth's negative face. She thinks that her pride/dignity have been torn by him. It can be seen clearly from her responses to Miss Lucas's statement:

Elizabeth: *'...and I could easily forgive his pride if he had not mortified mine'*

(Austen, 1985, p. 7)

Having been refused by Mr Darcy, Elizabeth thinks to take revenge on what he has done to her and it is clearly seen from the her utterances with Mr Darcy: :

Mr Darcy: *'Do you feel a great inclination, Miss Bennet, to seize such an opportunity of dancing a reel?'*

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

Elizabeth: *'Oh!, 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*

Mr Darcy: *'Indeed I do not dare'*

(Austen, 1985, p. 211)

In the above utterances, Elizabeth uses a direct refusal not to dance a reel with Mr Darcy. Actually her refusal has threatened Mr Darcy's negative face for their relative power and social distance are asymmetric. His love to Elizabeth is very deep though his relative power is higher, he does not want to confront with her by not showing his relative power over her. On the other hand, Elizabeth refuses Mr Darcy because she does

not want to be declined by him, and she wants to show that her pride must be respected no matter how rich he is.

Another Elizabeth's pride could be seen when Lady Catherine de Bourgh comes to her house. Lady Catherine is Mr Darcy's aunt, and she does not want her nephew to get married to Elizabeth because she wants him to be her daughter's husband. Being afraid of the marriage between her nephew and Elizabeth, Lady Catherine tells Elizabeth that she does not deserve to be Mr Darcy's wife. She insults Elizabeth's mother, Mrs Bennet and the other Elizabeth's families as we can read from the utterances below:

Lady Catherine: *'True, you are gentleman's daughter. But who was your mother? Who are your uncles and aunts? Do not imagine me ignorant of their condition'*

Elizabeth: *'Whatever my connections may be,' 'If your nephew does not object to them, they can be nothing for you' ... You can now have nothing further to say,' Elizabeth resentfully answered, 'You have insulted me in every possible method, I must return to the house' ... 'Lady Catherine, I have nothing further to say. You know my sentiment,'*

Lady Catherine: *'You are then, resolved to have him?'*

Elizabeth: *'I have said no such thing. I am only resolved to act in that manner which will, in my own opinion, constitute my happiness, without reference to you, or to any person....'*

(Austen, 1985, pp. 360-361)

Knowing that Lady Catherine comes to her house merely to separate her from Mr Darcy, Elizabeth's pride arises and she does not want to be dictated by her. Elizabeth shows her pride by asking Lady Catherine to leave her house as she feels that Lady Catherine has ruined her pride and dignity of her family as human being. Elizabeth employs an indirect refusal to express her rejection. She does not say 'no' explicitly, but she conveys that she will do anything for her happiness without reference to Lady Catherine or anybody else as she wants to decide her future by herself.

The relative power between Elizabeth and Lady Catherine is asymmetric or it describes as P (H,S) which means that social power of Lady Catherine is higher than Elizabeth. Lady Catherine is very rich and powerful. All what she says must be obeyed because she comes from high-class society; thus, she has power to influence others. She wants Elizabeth to do what she wants, yet Elizabeth dares not to accept her demand bravely. Elizabeth's confrontation with Lady Catherine is scandalous as she has been disobeyed strongly by Elizabeth. The situation creates face threatening act (FTA) that makes both lose their face as their impositions are high, for examples: how Lady Catherine insults Elizabeth's family, and how Elizabeth refuses all her wants. The dialogue between lady Catherine and Elizabeth which is full of tension led by the first participant is contradictive with Brown and Levinson's politeness theory that participants must save another participant's negative and positive face to avoid conflict, yet it is not found. Furthermore, social power of Lady Catherine which is higher than Elizabeth's could not force Elizabeth to do what she wants whereas, Brown & Levinson' theory states that a participant with higher power could force another to obey her/him. Conflict starts when Lady Catherine insults Elizabeth's family. Here, she impinges to some degree upon Elizabeth's face, and this action is called a face threatening act (FTA) ( Brown & Levinson, cited in Cutting & Fordyce, 2020). As humans, Lady Catherine and Elizabeth need social interaction in order to get comfortable social bond, yet, they create conflict. Without effective communication and cooperative behaviour, effective interaction is impossible (Wahab, 1998, cited in Bacha et al., 2021). Elizabeth's pride becomes her power not to follow Lady Catherine's instruction and it results in humiliation or embarrassment of her that she never gets during her life.

The last element of power found is love. Both Elizabeth and Mr Darcy commence to have interest in each other step by step. Elizabeth having taken down Mr Darcy's proposal feels guilty after Mr Darcy sends her a letter telling that all her prejudice on him is not true. Mr Darcy's has helped Elizabeth's family secretly within the elopement of Lydia, Elizabeth's sister, with Wickham. Mr Darcy gives a lot of money to Wickham as long as he wants to get married to Lydia legally; otherwise a big scandal will come to the Bennet's family. Mr Darcy asks the couple not to tell to Elizabeth and the other families for what he has done. Unluckily, Lydia

tells it to Elizabeth unintentionally. Seeing that all her prejudice to Mr Darcy is wrong, Elizabeth's love to him grows. Her love to Mr Darcy shows when Lady Catherine asks her to promise not to get married with Mr Darcy.

Lady Catherine: *'Tell me once more are you engaged to him?'*

Elizabeth: 'I am not'

Lady Catherine: *'And will you promise me never to enter into such an engagement?'*

Elizabeth: *'I will make no promise of the kind.'....; 'but you have no concern yourself in mine. I must beg, therefore, to be importuned no further on the subject'*

(Austen, 1985, p. 360)

The utterances above show that Elizabeth states her direct refusal to disobey Lady Catherine's demand. Elizabeth clearly points out that she could not promise not to engage Mr Darcy. Though Lady Catherine insists her to do that, she strongly does not want to and she asks Lady Catherine to stop talking on that point anymore. her love to Mr Darcy is her power to disobey Mr Darcy's aunt and it impinges to some degree upon Lady Catherine's face. The higher relative power that Lady Catherine has over Elizabeth is obvious; however, it cannot avoid face threatening act as Elizabeth does not want to be dominated by her. Again, Brown & Levinson theory of politeness, especially negative politeness could not be applicable. Brown & Levinson point out that if the social distance between speaker and hearer is asymmetric, and where P (H,S) means that Lady Catherine who has power over Elizabeth could control her, yet Elizabeth is against her strongly.

Love can function as variable of power also could be seen clearly from Mr Darcy's utterances when he secretly helps Lydia, Elizabeth's sister who elopes with Mr Wickham. Without being known by Elizabeth and her family, he gives a lot of money to Mr Wickham to marry Lydia legally. However, Lydia happens to let it slip and Elizabeth knows it. Lydia asks Elizabeth not to tell other because Mr Darcy has begged Mr Wickham and his wife to keep it strictly. Getting the information about Mr Darcy's help, Elizabeth realizes that she has made prejudice against him; therefore, she sincerely expresses her gratitude to him.

Elizabeth: *'Mr Darcy, I am a very selfish creature; and for the sake of giving relief to my own feelings, care not how much I may be wounding yours. I can no longer help thanking you for your unexampled kindness to my poor sister....'*

Mr Darcy: *'If you will thank me, let it be for yourself alone. That the wish of giving happiness to you might add force to the other inducements which led me on, I shall not attempt to deny. But your family owe me nothing. Much as I respect them, I believe I thought only for you'*

(Austen, 1985, p. 365)

Mr Darcy who has relative power over Elizabeth, actually could take revenge on what Elizabeth has done to him. However, he tries hard to prove that he is not as bad as she thinks. His love could not show off his power; on the other hand, he uses his power wisely that makes Elizabeth realize her mistakes. Mr Darcy does everything only for her as he states in his last statement.

Another point that shows love is also power can be read from his second proposal to Elizabeth:

Mr Darcy: *'You are too generous to trifle with me. If your feelings are still what they were last April, tell me so at once. My affections and wishes are unchanged; but one word from you will silence me on this subject for ever'*

(Austen, 1985, p. 365)

From Mr Darcy's proposal, it is clear that he does not insist Elizabeth to accept it. His love is sincere, yet he will leave Elizabeth if she does not love him. Seeing his true love, Elizabeth feels very delighted and she does not want to lose him anymore. Without feeling hesitation, she accepts his proposal. Mr Darcy's love expresses power that can change Elizabeth's prejudice against him.

All the utterances that have been discussed above show that Elizabeth, who comes from middle-class

society, has power over those who come from upper classes, for example: Mr Darcy, Lady Catherine and Mr Collins. It is a fact that Elizabeth does not have higher social power in every aspect such as: education, wealth, age than them, but she shows her power through her integrity, pride and love. Even though Elizabeth comes from lower social status, she shows her power when she refuses Mr Collins' and Mr Darcy's marriage proposal; moreover she does the same thing when Lady Catherine asks her to be way from Mr Darcy. Indeed some of her refusals are not direct, but some words she uses could create high imposition that could not avoid face threatening act (FTA). Here, it also proves that negative politeness strategy does not belong to those whose social power is over another, but those who have consistent integrity and pride might do the same thing. Unlike Brown & Levinson, Thomas mentions some types of powers and those are: reward, coercive, legitimate, expert and referent, but in this research there is only one type of power relate to the present research, namely: referent.

Referent power determined by the figure of someone admired by others and they want to be like him/her, and Elizabeth is the main character who has referent power. Although her social status is not high, many people like and respect her as she is witty, she has integrity and pride; moreover, her physical appearance is attractive. Yet, referent power is rarely to be discussed or applied in politeness theory. There are also other kinds of power taken from (Cuddy, 2019), a psychology stating that there are two kinds of powers, namely: social power and personal power, but it is personal power that has not been discussed yet.

Magee & Smith who are experts on power, point out, 'Personal power is all about having the confidence to act based on one's own beliefs, attitudes, and values, and of having the sense that one's actions will be effective' (Magee & Smith, 2013). From the statements mentioned by Thomas (1995), Cuddy (2019), and Magee & Smith (2013) they are likely to widen or develop some variables that determine power such as: position in society, age, gender, education into the other kinds of power: referent power and personal power. Elizabeth, the main, has both referent power and personal power as mentioned by Thomas and Magee. Seeing all Elizabeth utterances, they show that Elizabeth is a woman who does not want to be dominated as she realizes that her beliefs in many things are true, for example: Someone's life or marriage should not be influenced by others, everybody must have integrity, pride to be respected. Therefore when Lady Catherine asks her not to marry to Mr Darcy, she objects it. She also believes that if someone gets married, the reason is because of love not only money.

From the discussion above, it can be seen that the present research is totally contrast from the previous research. (Morand & Lewin, 1996) show how dominance, deference and egalitarian work in structure of organization. Those who have low power are most likely to use linguistic politeness behaviors as such behaviors to mitigate the possibility of conflict with superiors. Power applied in the research is social power characterized by social position, age and gender. Meanwhile, the use of politeness by superiors reveals consideration to intimate social familiarity and camaraderie. Morand & Lewin want to express that people with low social power try to minimize the conflict with those who have high social power. Though the research takes place in an organization, the researchers only use social power. Another previous research done by (Wessel & Steiner, 2015). They conclude that employees of the department store perceiving their customers as those who have higher power; therefore, they are sometimes treated impolitely by them. Wessel & Steiner use social power to describe asymmetric social distance and social power between them, and politeness strategies mostly used are negative. The last previous research to be compared with the present research was conducted by (El-dali et al., 2020). They observe that Doctors have asymmetric relationship with their patients because doctors have institutional and legitimate powers and they help their patients with their professional knowledge. The research discusses institutional power that belongs to doctors as they have power in hospital to give medical consultations and cares. The researchers also introduce legitimate power. However, legitimate power is another term for social power, and it is well known in organization structure ( Thomas, 1995, cited in Kurniawan 2015). From the comparisons above, it is very clear that none of the previous research discusses referent and personal powers as the present research does. All of them use social power to show the asymmetry of social distance and power.

Referent and personal powers mostly used in management or business areas. Since the development of politeness widely grows, some researchers seek for the other forms of powers; however, they usually relate them to leadership. Using referent and personal power can make the use of politeness strategies especially

negative politeness is different from Brown and Levinson's theory as we can see from the present research. The difference is, the variables of referent and personal power are not characterized by wealth, social position, age and gender; therefore, participants who have referent and personal powers might act as those who have power over other participants though their social positions are lower.

People with referent and personal power could have their power to influence many people. The use of referent and personal powers is the findings that make this research different from the previous ones, and it is the novelty of the present research.

#### 4. CONCLUSION(S)

From the discussion above, it can be concluded that referent and personal powers are powers not characterized by social status, wealth, gender and age. Referent power relates to someone with good personality and physical appearance. Those who have referent power will be admired and will inspire others; therefore, people usually make him /her as their idol. Meanwhile, personal power is determined by someone's freedom not want to be dominated because she/he has a strong belief that what she/he says and believes is true. Usually personal power belongs to those persons with consistent integrity, pride and dignity. The referent and personal powers are possessed by Elizabeth, as the main characters in the novel of *Pride and Prejudice*. Elizabeth's good personality invites many people admire her especially young men though her personal power sometimes creates some troubles for her. Elizabeth keeps the values of her integrity, no matter that she must fight the power of some people who are very powerful especially, Lady Catherine. The referent and personal power of Elizabeth could develop the theory of politeness especially the elements of social variables that states people with higher social power could dominate others. Meanwhile negative politeness strategies that show formality, distancing and only a participant whose social power is higher than another could dominate utterances do not always work as participant with referent and personal powers could dominate another. By having referent and personal powers, Elizabeth is able to dominate, make refusals bravely and strongly to those with higher social power that creates face threatening acts (FTA). Using referent and personal powers can make the map of politeness studies more challenging because it can reveal that Brown & Levinson's theory on politeness strategy relates to social variables could be added with other powers. For years, it known well that  $W_x = D(S,H) + P(H,S) + R_x$ , but with the use of referent and personal powers can make politeness theory develop more interesting as it is not only social power that can decide who can dominate or influence other participants. It will be better for the next research, we observe some famous people who have referent and personal power in their social media because in general they have many followers so we can analyze what they post and how they can influence netizens.

#### REFERENCES

- Bacha, M. S., Rustum, R., Umer, M., & Khan, K. A. (2021). The Pragmatic Concept of Politeness and Face Work by Different Linguistic Scholars. *Multicultural Education*, 7(1), 312–320. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5068670>
- Beebe, L., Takahashi, T., & Uliss-Weltz, R. (1990). "Pragmatic Transfer in ESL Refusals." In Robin Scarcella, Elaine Andersen, and Stephen Krashen (eds.), *Developing Communicative Competence in a Second Language*. *Developing Communicative Competence in a Second Language*, January, 55–73.
- Blitvich, P. G. C., & Sifianou, M. (2019). Im/politeness and discursive pragmatics. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 145, 91–101. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2019.03.015>
- Blutner, R. (2016). Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage. *STUF - Language Typology*

- and Universals*, 42(1). <https://doi.org/10.1515/stuf-1989-0124>
- Chunli, Z., & Nor, S. N. B. M. (2016). The Realization of the Speech Act of Refusals Among Chinese Efl. *Journal of Education and Social Sciences*, 4(9), 244–251.
- Corresponding, H. Y. A. (2016). A Critical Review of Prominent Theories of Politeness. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 7(6). <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.all.v.7n.6p.262>
- Cremona, M., Assimakopoulos, S., & Vella, A. (2017). the Expression of Politeness in a Bilingual Setting: Exploring the Case of Maltese English. *Russian Journal of Linguistics*, 21(4), 767–788. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2312-9182-2017-21-4-767-788>
- Cutting, J., & Fordyce, K. (2020). Politeness and Impoliteness. *Pragmatics*, 5, 36–46. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003010043-5>
- El-dali, H. M., El-Moety, D. M. A., & El-Seidi, M. A. (2020). Language and the Parameters of Power in Medical Discourse in Spoken Egyptian Arabic. *Journal of Critical Studies in Language and Literature*, 1(4), 28–40. <https://doi.org/10.46809/jcsll.v1i4.40>
- Eshghinejad, S., & Moini, M. R. (2016). Politeness Strategies Used in Text Messaging: Pragmatic Competence in an Asymmetrical Power Relation of Teacher–Student. *SAGE Open*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244016632288>
- Foley-Anthropological Linguistics\_ An Introduction \_ Wiley.* (n.d.).
- Houck and Gass\_ Interlanguage Refusals\_ A Cross-cultural Study of Japanese-English - Noël Houck, Susan M.* (n.d.).
- How to Build the Confidence YoPersonal power\_u Need to Be an Effective Leader, According to Body-Language Expert Amy Cuddy \_ Inc.* (n.d.).
- Jasim Betti, M. (2020). Politeness and Face Threatening Acts in Iraqi EFL learners' Conversations. *Article in Glossa a Journal of General Linguistics*, 3(8), 2020. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/344637114>
- Kurniawan, N. (2015). *An Analysis of Positive and Negative Politeness Strategies in An Interview of Mark Rutte on Metro Tv'S Face 2 Face With Desi Anwar Program. Positive and Negative Politeness*, 1–66.
- Magee, J. C., & Smith, P. K. (2013). The Social Distance Theory of Power. In *Personality and Social Psychology Review* (Vol. 17, Issue 2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868312472732>
- Menge, T. (2018). The role of power in social explanation. In *European Journal of Social Theory* (Vol. 21, Issue 1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368431017714426>
- Morand, D. A., & Lewin, A. Y. (1996). Dominance, interaction : Of and in egalitarianism organizational politeness sociolinguistic analysis and power. *Organizational Science*, 7(5), 544–556. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2635290>
- Nurul, N. A., Djatmika, Sumarlam, & Diah Kristina. (2022). Negative Politeness Strategy on Expressive Act of Rosiana Silalahi Talk Show. *Surakarta English and Literature Journal*, 5(2), 132–153. <https://doi.org/10.52429/selju.v5i2.26>
- Oktriana, T. T. (n.d.). *Politeness Strategy and Power in an Organization : Orders / Requests From the. 2010.*
- Padilla Cruz, M. (2008). Phatic utterances as face-threatening / saving acts or politeness strategies : A pragmatic reflection for their teaching in the L2 class. *25 Años de Lingüística Aplicada En España: Hitos y Retos, April 2008*, 799–804.
- Rasmussen, G. (1997). Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics. In *Journal of Pragmatics* (Vol. 28, Issue 2, pp. 253–261). [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0378-2166\(97\)84203-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0378-2166(97)84203-8)
- Ratih, G. K. (2014). Robin Lakoff ' S Politeness Principles. *English Language Teaching*, 21(13), 3.
- Shakouri, N. (2014). Qualitative research: incredulity toward metanarrativeness. *Journal of*

- Education and Human Development*, 3(2), 671–680.  
[http://jehdnet.com/journals/jehd/Vol\\_3\\_No\\_2\\_June\\_2014/40.pdf](http://jehdnet.com/journals/jehd/Vol_3_No_2_June_2014/40.pdf)
- Shipps, A. W. (1968). Pride and prejudice. *Notes and Queries*, 15(4), 146.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/nq/15.4.146-c>
- Vanderveken, D. (1990). *Meaning and Speech Acts: Volume I: Principles of language use*.
- Wang, J. (2018). Qualitative Research in English Language Teaching and Learning. *Indonesian EFL Journal: Journal of ELT, Linguistics, and Literature*, 4(2), 116–132.  
<http://ejournal.kopertais4.or.id/mataraman/index.php/efi>
- Wessel, J. L., & Steiner, D. D. (2015). Surface acting in service: A two-context examination of customer power and politeness. *Human Relations*, 68(5), 709–730.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726714540731>
- Wilson, R. (1985). Pride and Prejudice by Jane Austen. In *Pride and Prejudice by Jane Austen*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-07480-8>