Impoliteness Theory in a Literary Text: A Pragmatic study

Submitted by: Jinan Abdulrazaq Mohammed

Dedication

To my parents for their encouragement and support

Acknowledgment

I want to express my gratitude and appreciation to my God for his help, guidance and support.

Abstract

Linguists can now explore impoliteness thanks to Brown and Levinson's politeness model (1987). Other linguists, such as Culpeper, Bousfield, and Eelen, adopted the opposite approach to politeness, treating it as a complex framework for easing face-threatening acts. In other words, they looked at circumstances where the speaker's purpose is to injure the listener's face rather than moderating face-threatening acts. This research paper will look at the 'impoliteness phenomena' in George Bernard Shaw's Pygmalion in the opposite direction of politeness (1913). It also emphasizes the characters' varied impoliteness methods. It's worth mentioning that the current study is qualitative in nature because it's focused on defining a specific pragmatic occurrence, namely, impoliteness, using Culpeper's model of impoliteness as a theoretical framework for identifying impoliteness in a carefully chosen literary text. As a result, it is hoped that by applying pragmatic analysis to the conversations of fictional characters, a better understanding of the characters will be acquired.

المستخلص

يمكن لعلماء اللغة الآن استكشاف مفهوم "قلة الأدب" (الفظاظة) بفضل نموذج اللياقة لبراون وليفنسون (1987). وقد تبنّى عدد من اللغويين، مثل كولبيبر، وباوسفيلد، وإيلين، توجهاً معاكساً لمفهوم اللياقة، حيث اعتبروها إطاراً معقداً لتخفيف الأعمال المهددة للوجه .(Face-threatening Acts) بعبارة أخرى، ركزوا على الحالات التي يكون فيها هدف المتحدث إيذاء صورة المستمع (وجهه الاجتماعي) بدلاً من التخفيف من حدة الأعمال المهددة لها. ستتناول هذه الورقة البحثية "ظاهرة قلة الأدب" في مسرحية جورج برنارد شو بيغماليون (1913) من منظور معاكس لمفهوم اللياقة. كما تسلط الضوء على الأساليب المتنوعة التي يستخدمها الشخصيات للتعبير عن

قلة الأدب. وتجدر الإشارة إلى أن هذه الدراسة نوعية (Qualitative) بطبيعتها، لأنها تركز على تحديد ظاهرة تداولية محددة، وهي "قلة الأدب"، باستخدام نموذج كولبيبر كإطار نظري لتحليل هذه الظاهرة في نص أدبي مختار بعناية. ومن المأمول أن يساهم هذا التحليل التداولي لحوارات الشخصيات الخيالية في فهم أعمق لهذه الشخصيات

Section One

1.1 Introduction

Impoliteness is noted by Culpeper (1996) who mentioned impoliteness as the use of techniques to attack one's face, resulting in social conflict and disharmony. Impoliteness has been found to be a very important part of human communicating behavior in society. Impoliteness has been found to be a very important part of human communicating behavior in society Impoliteness, then, appears to be pervasive in today's entertainment industry. It can be found not only in the media, but also in fictional writings for a wide range of audiences, where it serves a variety of purposes. Impoliteness is regarded as one of the most appealing topics for language specialists. Several studies have been conducted to examine the impoliteness strategies used by people in various ways. Watts (2003) said that impoliteness is a term that is currently being debated, has been debated in the past, and will, in all likelihood, continue to be debated in the future. Impoliteness is regarded as one of the most appealing topics for language specialists. Several studies have been conducted to examine how people u impoliteness methods in various ways.

1.2 Problems of the Study:

.1 Limited Application of Impoliteness Theory in Literature:

Although impoliteness theory has been widely applied in conversational and media discourse, its application in literary texts remains relatively underexplored. This study addresses the gap by applying pragmatic tools to fictional dialogue, where impoliteness can reflect deep social and psychological dimensions.

.2 Interpretation Challenges in Literary Dialogue:

Literary dialogue often includes layers of meaning, irony, and cultural context that may obscure straightforward interpretations of impoliteness. Identifying and categorizing impoliteness strategies in such texts poses methodological challenges.

.3 Lack of Contextual Pragmatic Analysis:

Many literary analyses focus on thematic, symbolic, or stylistic aspects while overlooking the pragmatic implications of character interaction. This study aims to bridge that gap by focusing on how impoliteness constructs relationships, power hierarchies, and narrative conflict.

1.2 Aim

The primary goal of this research is to look into the employment of impoliteness techniques and sub-strategies in accordance with Culpeper's Impoliteness Theory 1996.

1.4 Hypothesis

The study hypothesized that a practical instrument like the Impoliteness theory can be applied to literary discourse to explain distinct dynamics in dramatic characters' conversations in literary texts.

1.5 Limit of the study

The study is limited to the analysis of impoliteness in an English-language literary work written by British dramatist. This is "The Dumb Waiter" by Harold Pinter.

1.6 Value of the study

The study focuses on Culpeper's (1996) impoliteness theory's relevance to literary text and how it might be used to explain character dynamics in literary discourse. Impoliteness in literary works is a field worth studying, according to this study, because it can improve people's comprehension of language usage in a literary setting.

1. Improving Literary Interpretation: This study provides a new perspective on character interactions by utilizing impoliteness theory, revealing deeper meanings in character development, conflict, and power struggles.

2. Interdisciplinary Contribution: By demonstrating how pragmatic notions may be applied as literary analysis tools, the study combines linguistics and literary criticism, benefiting both disciplines.

3. Comprehending Social Dynamics in Fiction: This research shows how fictional speech can reflect social behavior in real life, providing insights into identity formation, violence, and human communication.

4. Pedagogical Utility: Teachers and students studying language and literature may find the results helpful in examining how language use in literary contexts reflects intention, emotion, and interpersonal interactions.

Section Two

2.1   Im/politeness Definitions

Politeness, according to Lakoff (1990), is a strategy to make interactions simpler by lowering the possibility of conflict in interpersonal relationships. There are various studies that apply politeness theories to real-world data because politeness is such a crucial concept in interpersonal communication. Urbanova (2002) provided a simple rule: "the more words you use, the more polite you are". Despite the fact that it isn't a comprehensive account of politeness, it accurately reflects how politeness is utilized in pragmatics. According to Brown (2005) politeness can be defined as modifying one's words in a specific way to express one's thoughts about the feelings of the addressee. Language politeness is described as the use of linguistic methods to express communicative meaning while taking explicit account of the interlocutors' feelings and faces in the structure of the discourse.

According to many linguists, impoliteness is a distinct phenomenon that should be addressed on its own terms rather than in terms of politeness theory. Unlike linguists like Bousfield, Wieczorek, and Bassis, Leech believes that "the best way to begin thinking about impoliteness is to build on a theory of politeness, which is clearly a closely connected phenomenon, in fact, the polar opposite of politeness" (Leech, 2014). Culpeper acted in this manner. Culpeper's definition connects impoliteness to intentionality, claiming that impolite behavior can be deliberate, in contrast to Yan Huang, who claims that "if intentions and knowledge of intentions are involved, rudeness rather than impoliteness occurs". Culpeper's thesis regarding impoliteness and intentionality was underlined by Bousfield. "Impoliteness constitutes the communication of intentionally gratuitous and conflictive verbal face-threatening acts which are purposefully delivered: (i) unmitigated, in contexts where mitigation is required, and/or (ii), with deliberate aggression, that is, with the face threat exacerbated, 'boosted,' or maximized in some way to heighten the face threat

eacebated, 'boosted, or maimized in some way to heighten the face damage inflicted (Bousfield, 2008).

2.2 Leech's Politeness Maxims and Principles

Leech (1983) established three pragmatic scales, for example. The cost-benefit scale evaluates an action's cost or benefit to the hearer: the higher the cost (or benefit), the less polite the illocutionary act is; the lower the cost (or benefit), the more polite it is. The indirectness scale assesses how indirect an act is in relation to its illocutionary objective. According to Leech (1983) indirectness leads to optionality while simultaneously lowering the illocution's beneficial influence. As a result, the more ambiguous a viewpoint is, the more polite it is. This, however, is not a categorical statement. It is for this reason that the concept of optionality is required. Sympathy is the final maxim. "Minimize antipathy between self and other" and "Maximize sympathy between self and other" are two submaxims of this maxim.

2.3 Culpeper's Impoliteness Model

Jonathan Culpeper proposed the most famous model of impoliteness in 1996. Impoliteness, according to his paradigm, is intended to create discord between interlocutors in social encounters (Walaszewska & Piskorska, 2012). Despite the fact that Culpeper's model is built on Brown and Levinson's PT, he rejects their view of impoliteness as "marginal" in everyday speech. He claims that understanding the concept of politeness is impossible without first appreciating the reality of impoliteness, and that, as a result, the impoliteness analytical framework must be enhanced and given proper respect . Culpeper also relies on media data in general, and television shows in particular, to demonstrate how his impoliteness model works. His favorite sources where impoliteness is embodied differently and may be perceived from numerous angles are films, documentaries, and quiz shows in which there is a constant confrontation between interlocutors. Culpeper's model is superior to others because it is based on accurate data. As a result, Culpeper's model is strengthened by the range of verbal and written material he uses (Bousfield, 2008).

2.4 Lachenicht's model of aggravation

Brown and Levinson's concept of politeness serves as the basic point of origin for both Lachenicht and Culpeper. The use of 'aggravating language,' according to Lachenicht (1980) is an attempt to harm or damage the listener. Hurt is created by:

(a) conveying that the speaker is disliked and unwelcome (positive aggravation), and (b) interfering with the hearer's ability to behave freely (negative aggravation). Impoliteness, according to Culpeper (1996) is the use of words or actions that are directed towards one's interlocutor and produce disharmony and/or social disturbance rather than creating social peace.

2.5 Impoliteness as a Concept

Brown and Levinson's politeness model 1987 allows linguists to investigate the problem of impoliteness. While Brown and Levinson deal with politeness as a tangled framework for softening face-threatening acts, other linguists such as Culpeper, Bousfield, and Eelen took the opposite approach. In other words, they look at cases in which the speaker's goal is to hurt the listener's face rather than mitigating face-threatening acts (O'keeffe et al., 2011). Impoliteness is a concept that is currently being debated, has been debated in the past, and will, in all likelihood, continue to be debated in the future. Watts (2003) suggested that researchers continue to dispute about what constitutes impoliteness. Brown and Levinson's model of politeness is well-used by Culpeper to explain his idea of impoliteness, which he deems a "parasite of politeness." As a result, in addition to Brown and Levinson's strategies (bald on record, positive politeness, negative politeness, off record, and don't do the FTA), Culpeper establishes five super strategies (Thielemann & Kosta,2013).

Culpeper (1996) gave the most well-known explanation of impoliteness, describing it as the deployment of methods aimed to assault face, and therefore produce social conflict and discord. Both Eelen and Culpeper point out that all theorists of politeness merely allude to impoliteness on the surface, focusing instead on politeness in practice, and therefore their comments on the concept of impoliteness were insufficient and biased to some degree. In conclusion, the current interest in impoliteness stems from the inability of politeness strategies to fully explain the confrontational interaction in impolite discourses (Bousfield,2008).

2.6 Contextual Norms and Impoliteness

Impoliteness can be understood as any sort of linguistic behavior that is assessed as attempting to endanger the hearer's face or social identity, or as transgressing the hypothesized Community of Practice's appropriacy norms. This means that whether

or not speakers consider an utterance or non-linguistic behavior impolite is dependent on the interactional context, i.e. the social norms that a particular Community of Practice holds for a given situation or activity type. Speakers have built "cognitive conceptualisations of forms of suitable and forms of appropriate and inappropriate behavior through their own histories of social practice" before going into an engagement, so they know what to do. So, any behavior that goes beyond what is expected in these formats   and is open to a negative classification can be described as potentially impolite (Watts, 2003). Context is defined as a holistic, dynamic construct made up of a variety of interconnected components, such as linguistic context, cognitive context, and social and sociocultural context. Linguistic context encompasses not only the use of language in a communicative situation, but also text type categories such as genre.

 The forms of information, beliefs, and frames elicited by and linked with specific communicative contexts and texts are referred to as cognitive context. "Participants, the immediate concrete, physical surrounds, including time and location, and the macro contextual institutional and non-institutional domains" are all part of the social context (Fetzer, 2017). Participants (or viewers and readers) see behavior that does not comply to contextual expectations, i.e. behavior that is deemed inadequate or inappropriate for the given social and interactional context, as "negatively marked" and "in-appropriate" (Watts,2005). "Rudeness could be termed inappropriateness of communicative behavior relative to a particular context" (Kienpointner,1997).

 Culpeper (2015) demonstrated a clear link between the metalinguistic labels for impoliteness and those for inappropriateness. Interactional norms can also affect how a participant acts as a member of a group: Group membership necessitates adherence to group norms and expectations, and failure to do so. For example, there are places where using foul language is encouraged, such as a tavern or a sports arena   Non-participation in swearing, or actively discouraging others from doing so, may be interpreted as inappropriate in these situations, and one's group membership may be called into question. There are specific preconditions for a behavior to become the standard. The most critical is saliency, this means that it is not enough for a behavior to just occur in conjunction with a circumstance or activity; it must also be a significant component of it: "'Norms' and 'probable/possible occurrences' are two different animals."

According to Watts (2003) there are some discourses where impoliteness is now considered the norm. This is true, for example, of radio call-in shows. In discourse contexts where at least one person perceives it to be advantageous, conflictive discourse might appear – or become – suitable (Lakoff,1989). This also demonstrates that, if frames are prone to change and variation, and in-group norms are available to negotiation in every contact, even if members have already agreed on them, impoliteness cannot be intrinsic in language but must be context-dependent.

2.7 Intentionality and impoliteness

Speakers can choose to deliberately breach contextual norms in a given interaction, i.e., they can choose to deploy impoliteness methods to achieve certain conversational aims (Mills,2005). The concept of intentionality is significant for analyses because a listener's comprehension and reaction to an utterance would differ depending on whether she believes facial injury was produced deliberately or accidently.The more probable the hearer is to assign an intention to the utterance, the more free she will feel to respond in kind. Furthermore, the greater the harm caused by a particular act, the more free a listener feels to express an angry response and counterattack with impoliteness.

Intonation is another component to consider when determining speaker meaning, since the right intonation can turn'son of a bitch' into a term of endearment . When you say the term with a lowering intonation and a loud tone of voice, you're implying that it's not meant to be interpreted positively as a term of fondness. As a result, impoliteness is in the eyes and ears of the observer (Culpeper, 2011).   As a'side-effect' of an utterance or action, accidental face-damage to the hearer may also occur, for example when delivering criticism or feedback on student performance. When a hearer perceives a threat to face, he or she is likely to experience negative emotions such as being angry at oneself or others, feeling ashamed, or being upset. This means that an offensive condition or event frequently triggers a speaker's attack on the listener. If the answer to an attack becomes a new offending event that is replied to in turn, this can lead to conflict spirals in a conversion.

2.8 Emotions and Impoliteness

Impolite behavior can have "emotional consequences for at least one participant," according to Culpeper's definition. However, the nature of these emotional effects isn't specified in this term. Previous research, particularly on the relational

dimensions of politeness, has also highlighted the importance of emotions in impoliteness. What these models have in common is that politeness is defined in terms of good feelings or the avoidance of aggressive, confrontational behaviors and associated negative emotions. Goffman (1967) took it a step further by addressing both positive and negative sentiments associated with one's face, such as happiness, sadness, and embarrassment. Emotionality is also important for comprehending impoliteness in literary works.

2.9 A Synopsis of pragmatic

Pragmatics is the study of language in use in general. It is the study of meaning as it is conveyed and manipulated by participants in a communication setting, rather than as it is generated by the linguistic system. Charles Morris, a philosopher, was the first to establish the contemporary notion of pragmatics in 1938. He defined pragmatics as "the discipline of semiotics that explores the genesis, uses, and effects of signals," according to the well-known Flourishing Creativity and Literacy definition. As a result, it stands apart from semantics and syntax" (Cherry,1974).

The sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic components of pragmatics are distinguished by Leech and Thomas 1983. Pragmalinguistics is concerned with the linguistic aspects of pragmatics, such as pragmatic tactics (e.g., directness and indirectness), modifying devices, and pragmatic routines that language speakers employ in communication. The intersections of linguistic action and social structure are referred to as sociopragmatics. In other words, it deals with social standing, social distance, and the degree of imposition on the language realization of a given illocution. Deixis, presupposition, speech acts, implicature, cooperative principle, politeness, and impoliteness are all studied in pragmatics. The purpose of this research is to look at impoliteness in Shaw's Pygmalio as a pragmatic feature

Section Three

Methodology

Research Design:1.

This study adopts a qualitative descriptive approach, specifically using pragmatic discourse analysis to examine instances of impoliteness in a selected literary text. The goal is to identify, categorize, and interpret impoliteness strategies used by characters and analyze their social and narrative functions within the text.

.2Theoretical Framework:

The study is grounded in Jonathan Culpeper's Impoliteness Theory (1996, 2005), which extends Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness model. The analysis focuses on the following impoliteness strategies:

• **Bald on record impoliteness**

• **Positive impoliteness**

• **Negative impoliteness**

• **Sarcasm/mock politeness**

• **Withholding politeness**

These strategies are used to identify how characters threaten each other's face (social self-image) and how these threats serve broader narrative or thematic purposes.

.3Data Collection:

• **Text Selection:** A specific literary text (e.g., a play, novel, or short story) was selected based on its rich use of dialogue and interpersonal conflict.

• **Sampling:** Relevant excerpts from character dialogues containing instances of potential impoliteness were selected for analysis. These include conflicts, arguments, insults, sarcastic remarks, and confrontational exchanges.

.4Data Analysis Procedures:

.1 Identification: Dialogues were scanned to identify utterances containing face-threatening acts (FTAs) or deviations from expected politeness norms.

.2 Classification: Each instance was categorized using Culpeper's framework.

.3 Interpretation: The context, speaker intention, and response were analyzed to understand the pragmatic function and effect of the impoliteness.

.4 Contextualization: Each example was situated within the larger narrative to determine how impoliteness contributes to character development, power relations, and thematic exploration.

.5Scope and Limitations:

• **The study focuses only on verbal impoliteness (spoken dialogue), excluding non-verbal or paralinguistic cues.**

• **Only a selected portion of the text is analyzed in-depth, not the entire work.**

• **The interpretation is influenced by the socio-cultural context of the literary setting and may vary based on the reader's perspective.**

Data Analysis

The current study is based on Culpeper's model 1996 and a previously visited version of Culpeper's model 2003. The most essential instrument in this analysis is Culpeper's impoliteness methods, which allow one to combine numerous strategies with talking. Only the strategy in question is highlighted in this study.

The Dumb Waiter : Impoliteness Analysis

Excerpt (1)

"Gus. You got any cigarettes ?I've run out .
No , I mean , I say the crockery's good . It's very nice .
But that's about all I can say for this place . It's worse than
the last one . Remember that last place we were in? Last
time , where was it? At least there was a wireless there.
No, honest . He doesn't seem to bother much about our
comfort these days .
Ben. When you are going to stop jabbering ?" (Act1,Scene1,86-93:135).

Ben's blatant on-the-record impoliteness strategy is clearly demonstrated in the above conversation between Gus and Ben, when Ben asks Gus, "When are you going to stop jabbering?" Ben tries to attack Gus' face directly here, but he becomes tired of Gus' blathering and urges him to stop. Furthermore, Ben's statement demonstrates his unwillingness to listen to Gus. Ben behaves in an unfriendly manner with Gus, as seen by his utterance. As a result, Ben's remark is clearly intended to be as rude as possible.

Excerpt (2)

"Ben. They're playing away
Gus. Who are?
Ben. The Spurs.
Gus. Then they might be playing here.
Ben. Don't be silly" (scene1,31-35:138).

This conversation, as reported by Ben, exemplifies his rudeness toward Gus. When Ben says, 'Don't be silly,' he is using blatant on-the-record impoliteness. Gus is already insulted by the word "silly." Even without hearing the tone of voice in this dialogue, it is evident that this term has a rising intonation, which is unfavorable in this context. Ben also wants to keep his authority by causing Gus to lose his face. Gus, on the other hand, makes a ridiculous proposition, to which Ben responds in this manner.

Excerpt (3)

"Ben. What are you sitting on my bed for?
Gus. Nothing .
Ben. You have never used to ask me so many damn questions
What's come over you?
Gus. No, I was just wondering . You've got a job to do. Why
don't you just do it and shut up"(Act1,Scene1,80-86:143).

The thing to emphasize in this encounter is that Ben is annoyed by Gus' queries and asks him why he keeps bombarding him with them, telling him to do his job and shut talking. The word 'shut up' is an unfriendly one that implies a loss of face on the listener's behalf. Ben's unpleasant behavior with Gus, in fact, exacerbates their disagreement and leads to the breakup of their partnership. Ben's hostile attitude toward Gus is expressed quite plainly in his tone of voice when commanding Gus. Furthermore, the phrase "shut up" is not so much an insult as it is a reflection of the speaker's self-deprecation. The entire exchange could be classified as blatant on-the-record impoliteness.

Section Four
Conclusion

Impoliteness is evaluated differently depending on the circumstance, according to this study. Impoliteness is therefore context-dependent. Impoliteness can be examined from both the speaker's and the hearer's viewpoints, as it is determined by

the speaker's aim and the listener's response. Impoliteness in literary works is a field worth studying, according to this study, because it can improve people's comprehension of language usage in a literary setting.

As a result of the findings. Pinter appears to use impoliteness to depict the life of a modern man who is constantly competing with himself and others for high status and respect. politeness and impoliteness are strategies of gaining, establishing, and communicating viewpoints. They serve as attempts to organize and generate views of an interlocutor's face, as well as attempts to regulate group cohesion and membership, in particular.

Reference

Bousfield, D. (2008). *Impoliteness in Struggle For Power*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Brown, H. D. (2005) *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching.* London: Croom Helm.

Culpeper, J. 2003. *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Culpeper, J. (2011). Impoliteness: Using Language to Cause Offence. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fetzer, A. (2017). *The Oxford Handbook of Pragmat-ics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press .

Goffman, E. (1967). Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior. New York: Doubleday

Lakoff, R. (1989) The Limits of Politeness: Therapeutic and Courtroom Discourse. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Leech, G. (1983) *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.

Leech,G 2014. *The Pragmatics of Politeness.* Oxford: Oxford University

Press.

Mills, S (2003). Gender and politeness. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

O'Keeffe, A., Clancy, B., and Adolphs, S. (2011). *Introducing Pragmatics in Use*. USA/ Canada: Routledge.

Thielemann, N. and Kosta, P. (2013). *Approaches to Slavic Interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Urbanová, L., Oakland. (2002). *Introduction to English Stylistics*. Brno: Barrister and Principal Publishing House.

Walaszewska, E. and Piskorska, A. (2012). *Relevance Theory: More than Understanding*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Watts, J. (2003). *Politeness*. Cambridge: University Press.