

A Study of Face Threatening Act Damage in Shakespeare's Julius Caesar

Asst. Lect.

Abdullah Abbas Al-Jashami

College of Education - Department of English Language

nce2020012@iunajaf.edu.iq

دراسة في الضرر الحاصل من فعل الخطأ من المقام في مسرحية القيص
يوليوس لشيكسبير

المدرس المساعد

عبد الله عباس علوان

الجامعة الإسلامية - النجف الأشرف

ABSTRACT:-

This research sheds light upon the notion of face threatening act in general and its implementation in terms of some specific aspects of a literary work. It highlights the significance of face threatening act which results in face damage to the interlocutors in a speech group and according to a speech event. More specifically, the study focuses upon the idea of self as composing of the physical aspect and the private psychological aspect. The research method approach is qualitative so as to provide in-depth explanation of face damage and the data collection is a selective one in order to cover specific aspects of face threatening act damage. The discourse analysis method is adopted in this research in order to account for how communication in language is used to achieve effects in specific contexts. One of the key points to conclude is that the desire for appreciation on one hand, and to remain autonomous on the other hand can be judgmental in making damage to the participants. Moreover, dynamism of face work is proved and interpreted via the communicative strategies of some participants in the discourse.

Key words: face threatening act, face damage, social distance, context, interlocutors

المخلص:-

يسلط هذا البحث الضوء على مفهوم فعل الخط من المقام بشكل عام و تطبيقه بلحاظ بعض الجوانب في عمل أدبي معين. إنه يُبرز أهمية فعل الخط من المقام والذي ينتج عنه الضرر الحاصل لمقام المحاورين في الكلام ضمن مجموعة معينة و حدث معين. على وجه الخصوص، تركز هذه الدراسة على فكرة الذات التي تتألف من الجانب الفيزيائي و الجانب النفسي الخاص. إن المنهجية العامة لأسلوب البحث في هذه الدراسة هي المنهجية النوعية لغرض تقديم شرح و بيان مفصل و عميق لظاهرة الضرر الحاصل للمقام. طريقة جمع البيانات في البحث هي الطريقة الإنتقائية لأجل تقطية جوانب محددة فيما يخص الضرر الحاصل من فعل الخط من المقام، كما أن الطريقة المعتمدة في أسلوب التحليل هي طريقة تحليل الخطاب من أجل تفسير كيفية توظيف التواصل في اللغة لتحقيق نتائج في سياقات محددة. واحدة من النقاط الرئيسية للخروج باستنتاجات في خضم هذه الدراسة هي أن الرغبة في التقدير من ناحية، والبقاء مستقلاً من ناحية أخرى، يمكن أن يكون حاسماً في إلحاق الضرر بالمشاركين في الكلام. بالإضافة إلى ذلك، تم إثبات نشاطية عمل المقام وتفسيره من خلال الأساليب التواصلية لبعض المشاركين في الخطاب.

الكلمات المفتاحية: فعل الخط من المقام، ضرر المقام، المسافة الاجتماعية، السياق، المحاورين

1. INTRODUCTION

At the beginning of literature review chapter, general ideas are presented about the concept of face by some pioneer linguists in the field of pragmatics (Goffman, 1967; Lakoff 1973; Leech 1983; Brown and Levinson 1987) and their worthwhile commentaries on face and politeness. It has been also phrased how face is considered as a wide-spread notion among people of diverse social environments around the world. There are cultural factors that have to be taken into consideration as they presumably play an apparent role in face threatening acts and politeness. The scope of this study is specifically dedicated for detecting the states that face threatening acts can bring about. To do so, the cultural factors of face threatening act and politeness as well as the impact of positive and negative face are well presented. Moreover, the phases of face threatening acts damage are thoroughly discussed in a separate section in terms of the positive and negative face. It is important to mention here that the context is taken into consideration for both the speaker and the hearer in the discourse. The chosen type of data that is analyzed is of a literary field; Shakespeare's Julius Caesar play, as a case study to look for the face threatening acts and the damage they bring about. As a requirement for obeying the contextual factors that surround the collected samples and to give a reliable contextual background to the reader, the main character sketches of the play are supplied in the literature review as well as an overview about the plot. At last, the main principles and cases of face threatening acts damage have been applied to some quotations from Shakespeare's Julius Caesar in the results and discussion chapter. The quotations were adopted due to the hearer's positive face, hearer's negative face, speaker's positive face and speaker's negative face to make the face threatening act so overt and workable.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2. 1. Face in pragmatics

The idea of "face" is basically derived by Erving Goffman (1967) which relates face to the notion of embarrassment humiliation in different contexts of speech, and, therefore, to the concept of face losing. As cited in Leech (2014: 24), Goffman (1967) defines face as

“the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact”. Moreover, face, according to Brown and Levinson (1987: 61), is “a process that can be invested emotionally, and it happens to be lost, maintained, or even enhanced, and must be permanently present in most verbal interactions”.

Generally, people collaborate to maintain face in interaction, such collaboration being dependent on a mutual vulnerability of face. In other words, usually everyone's face depends on his/her face whether or not maintained, and because people are predicted to defend their faces if they are threatened when defending their own faces to threaten others' faces, it is presumably expected for participants to maintain one another's face (ibid). Relating the concept of face to society, Gu (1990), comments that face belongs to society rather than to the individual himself/herself. This standpoint was also reinforced by Hofstede (2005: 89) when he maintains that face is to be joined with the collectivist societies.

Another sense of understanding face is relating it to the ability of an individual of evaluating how he/she appears from the view of other participants in a speech according to Arundale (2006). This point of view is more maintained fortified later on by Leech (ibid: 25) believing that face is a person's positive self-image or self-esteem that he/she enjoys its reflection by other people. To give some considerations for the eastern idea of face, a well-known Chinese concept of face is that face can be defined as a public layer. It is built in a situation by the virtue of the interpersonal relations of the interlocutors (Lim & Ho, 1994). Moreover, the Japanese concept of face, regardless of the relation to others, plans the individual rights of speakers, whereas the African as well as the Islamic thinkers assert the idea of the group at the expense of individual face interests (Villki, 2006).

According to Goffman's (ibid: 6) observations, a person's attachment to a certain face, along with the ease with which disconfirming information can be offered by herself or others, gives a reason why participation in any contact with other individuals is regarded as a commitment. Even though one's feelings regarding the face of a stranger are vastly different from one's own in terms of both amount and direction, the engagement one experiences with the faces of others is just as immediate as the engagement one feels

with their own. Faces, according to Goffman, are composed of the same elements that are arranged in the same order. Choosing one's feelings about a face and how those feelings should be distributed among the faces involved is entirely up to the individuals in the group and the circumstances in which they find themselves at the time of the decision (ibid).

2. 2. Face and politeness

The differentiation between the linguistic concept and plain concept of politeness, Kedveš (2013: 432) asserts, is highly salient. In this regard, Kasper (1990: 320) distinguishes between the commonsense of politeness; the sufficient and appropriate social behavior towards other, and the pragmatic viewpoint; "ways in which the relational functions in linguistic action is expressed". The difficulty of putting a distinctive border between the popular notion and the theoretical notion of politeness comes, in some part, from the multiple perspectives and stimuli that rest behind it across cultures (Dimitrova-Galaczi: 2002: 1). Furthermore, Watts (2003) differentiates between first-order politeness like polite behavior on one hand, and second-order politeness like politic behavior on the other hand.

Fraser (1990) believes that there are four distinct sorts of politeness that can be distinguished between the concept of face and the concept of face labor. The social standard of politeness, which demonstrates politeness as socially desirable behavior and as being interesting to other people, is defined as follows: The conversational-contract point of view incorporates civility into the templates of the conversational contract between the interlocutors and posits that politeness is contingent on appropriate context interpretation on both sides. The conversational-maxim aspect, proposed in the work of Lakoff (1973) and Leech (1983), has its origins in the work of Grice (1975), who offered a cooperative principle, which assumes the cooperation of the interlocutors during the conversation. Grice outlines four conversational maxims: number, quality, relevance, and manner, all of which must be met in order for a dialogue to be successful. The face-saving perspective, on the other hand, describes politeness as a verbal activity with the goal of conserving and/or enhancing one's facial appearance.

2. 3. Universality of face

There are components of the concept of "self" that are universal and aspects that are distinctive to each individual. When it comes to establishing oneself as distinct and independent from others, there are two approaches that one might take (Hallowell, 1955). The other side is a term widely used in psychology to refer to one's inner "selves." A person's inner self, such as sentiments, dreams, and ideas are also not permitted to be recognized or acknowledged by him or her. The fact that other people are unable to see or hear what you are doing inwardly contributes to the development of an inner "self." Although the concept of a "self" as a mix of one's physical self and one's private "self" appears to be universal, research conducted by psychologists and anthropologists has revealed that people from different cultures have varying ideas of "self" and "self-identification" (Geertz, Hall, Hofstede, Hsu, Markus, and Kitayama, 1991; Triandis, 1989). Many Asian, African, Latin American, and many southern European societies (Hall 1976; Markus & Kitayama 1991) include numerous feudal and monarchic systems, which support the interdependent construal. This social responsiveness arises from the individual's need to find the optimal means of expressing or confirming the internal features of 'self' in Fiske (1984), according to Markus & Kitayama (1991: 226).

2. 4. The cultural factors of FTA and Politeness

Brown and Levinson (1978) recognized three social traits as being crucial in detecting the ways of face-threatening acts across cultures. These qualities are as follows: Among the sociological elements that can vary are social distance, which refers to how close the speaker and hearer are in relation to one another; relative power, which refers to how strong both the speaker and the hearer are; and the absolute ranking of imposition in a specific cultural environment. According to Brown and Levinson, the effect of a face-threatening act can be attributed to three factors. According to Lakoff (1973: 292-305), there are three rules for being courteous. It is the most formal regulation to say "don't impose." As a function of Brown and Levinson's three social variables, this rule applies to the speaker's ability to be courteous to the hearer due to the fact that there is an acknowledged discrepancy in power and status between them. In accordance with this rule, a courteous speaker should avoid pushing

his or her interlocutor to do something he or she does not want to do, or should ask permission or apologize for doing so.

The second rule of Lakoff is to "provide options." For lack of a better term, it indicates that a speaker expresses his or her views in such a way that the audience is not forced to agree with or reject the speaker. It is permissible to use this arrangement if both the speaker and the listener have nearly similar status and power, but are not tight in their social circles. A good illustration of this type of relationship is the one that exists between a businessperson and a potential new client. Hedges and indirect acts may be appropriate in this situation. In this circumstance, it is preferable to say "I wonder if it might be beneficial for you to get a haircut," rather than "You should get a haircut," as Greenbaum (1996: 150) proposes. The second sentence raises the possibility of something happening. In this way, it is analogous to Brown and Levinson's negative politeness method, in that both demonstrate awareness of another's right, regardless of whether they are engaging in a face-threatening behavior (ibid).

Last but not least, follow Lakoff's guideline about being polite to others. "Encourage feelings of camaraderie" is part of this regulation. As a result of this, the speaker makes the recipient happy. Intimate friends can use this guideline to demonstrate their closeness. In this situation, it looks that any topic of conversation is appropriate, implying that a close buddy can chat about anything. In general, this approach suggests that the speaker and listener should be expected not to mince words. It is expected that they will talk clearly and without ambiguity. It's possible that people in this situation could be interpreted as putting themselves at risk by conversing openly with each other (ibid).

2. 5. Positive and negative face

Leech (2014: 25) attempted to redefine the boundary between negative and positive face in a different way, dubbing them "neg-politeness" and "pos-politeness" as a result of his research. Face, however, is the positive self-image or self-esteem that a person enjoys as a reflection of that person's estimation by others and thus, to Leech, it is of two impacts:

- a. The goal of avoiding losing one's face is referred to as the negative face goal. A loss of face is a reduction of one's own self-esteem as a result of one's own estimation of one's own worth in the eyes of others.
- b. In order to gain or increase face, one must first raise or maintain one's self-esteem as a result of raising or maintaining one's own estimation by others. This is referred to as a positive face goal.

There are three crucial things to consider while posing facial acts, according to Leech's opinion (ibid) (ibid). Despite Brown and Levinson define 'face' as a trait of a "model person," Leech believes that 'face' must be considered a psychological property of persons, while being abstract and substantially influenced by social conditions. Aside from these two aspects, it is vital to remember that "face" is a psychological feature of an individual, but one that is modified by social conditions. Politeness, according to Brown and Levinson, can be used to protect one's reputation in the face of face-threatening actions. For example, a request like "Fetch me that book" is a face-threatening conduct that puts the freedom of the addressee at danger (ibid) (ibid).

2. 6. Face threatening act damage

2. 6. 1. Damage in negative face threatening act

As was made abundantly clear, when an interlocutor's freedom of action is restricted, his or her positive face is jeopardized. Because of this frightening behavior, one of the parties may be obliged to concede to the other's demands. When a person's reputation is threatened, their ability to make decisions and take action is curtailed.

A. Damage to the hearer: positive face

FTAs threatening the hearer's self-image include:

First, expressions negatively evaluating the hearer's positive face, e.g. disapproval, criticism, complaints, accusations, contradictions, disagreements etc.

Ex: "I don't think your report was short enough," says the critic. The hearer's positive image is threatened since s/he is accused of doing something wrong, i.e., his/her self-image is deemed negative.

Second, emotional outbursts, such as yelling or yelling at the audience or interrupting during a speech to demonstrate that the speaker doesn't care about H's happy face.

Ex: Expression of emotions: "You're feeling sad because of your ex-boyfriend, aren't you?". Rather than worry himself or herself with his or her listener's "public self-image," the speaker chooses to speak about a subject that puts him or her in peril.

b. Damage to the hearer: negative face

FTAs restricting the hearer's personal freedom include:

First, instructions, requests, recommendations, advice, and threats/warnings/dares that set the hearer up to perform an action in the future.

"Please get that book delivered to me," says the order. Excuse me while I explain what I mean. The speaker limits the listener's personal freedom by conveying an expectation of what the listener will do in the future.

Second, actions that indicate that the speaker will take a future action in regard to the hearer, such as offers and commitments, are examples of predictive actions.

"I promise I'll be there tomorrow," for example. The speaker encourages the listener to engage in a future activity that will be announced later.

Third, behaviors that express the speaker's want for the listener or his/her commodities, such as compliments and emotional displays, are examples of a desire for the speaker.

"I genuinely like you," a compliment says. As a result of the speaker's optimism, there may be an anticipation of a favorable response from the audience (such as an expression of gratitude or positive thoughts toward the speaker).

2. 6. 2. Damage in positive face threatening act

As soon as a speaker or listener expresses disinterest in the thoughts or wishes of their interlocutor, or expresses a desire for something different than what the other wants, their positive demeanor is jeopardized. A positive face-threatening behavior can

be detrimental to both the speaker and the listener at the same time. When a person's well-being is regarded as less important than the well-being of others, the person's ability to maintain a cheerful attitude is compromised.

a. Damage to the speaker: positive face

The speaker's self-image is put at risk when he or she apologizes, accepts a compliment, loses physical or emotional control, self-humiliates, confesses, or engages in any of these face-threatening behaviors. This is an example of an apology: "I believe I made a significant error." Because the speaker has made a remark regarding his or her own weaknesses, the speaker has 'damaged' his or her own favorable self-image/face.

b. Damage to the speaker: negative face

Personal independence is threatened by expressions of gratitude, acceptance of thanks/offers/compliments, apologies, and justifications, among other things.

Thank you very much for your assistance, for example. This person appreciates the speaker because they feel compelled to do so. The instant he speaks, his freedom of action is in jeopardy because of it.

2. 7. Plot overview of Shakespeare's Julius Caesar

The two officially elected individuals to stand for people's rights in Rome, Marullus and Flavius, adjourn a rally for people of Rome who wanted to party the triumphal return of Julius Caesar from war. The victory is located by popular games in which Caesar's protégé, Mark Antony, takes part. The Ides [15th of March] are approaching, and Caesar is advised by an anonymous stranger to "Beware the Ides [15th] of March." Caesar's fellow senators, Caius Cassius and Marcus Brutus, are wary of Caesar's attitude toward the Republic's sovereignty, and they express their reservations in writing. They are concerned about whether or not he will accept the Emperorship offers. Because of his recent rise to notoriety, he is revered as a divinity by a large number of people. Cassius finds it difficult to shake the notion that he is not good enough for Brutus, who has a more objective perspective on things. Despite the fact that he (Caesar) has turned down the crown three times, the conspirators (Brutus)

continue to be apprehensive of his ambitions. Brutus is informed of this by Casca. Cassius, Casca, and their allies break into Brutus' home late at night in an attempt to persuade him of the truths that they believe. Afterwards, they hatch a plan to assassinate Caesar by detonating forged documents in his residence. However, Portia, Brutus' faithful wife, is well aware that he is not content with his life. She advises Caesar not to travel to the Senate on March 15th because she has had severe visions and is afraid of the portents of the nightly storms, which she believes will come true. This does not deter him from carrying out the plot and being stabbed repeatedly at point blank range by each of the other conspirators; as they conclude their attacks and give the fatal blow, Caesar asks, "At what point do you think you'll die?"

Even though Brutus goes against Cassius' counsel, he allows Mark Antony to make a funeral oration in the marketplace, but only after Brutus has addressed the people of Rome to explain the conspirators' intentions and concerns about Caesar's ambition. After Brutus speaks, the audience falls silent and becomes supportive of his cause. With his speech, Antony calls into question the motives of the conspirators while also reminding his audience of Caesar's humanitarian actions and refusal to ascend to the throne. His reading also includes the reading of Julius Caesar's testament, in which he bequeaths money and public land to each Roman citizen. Anthony's speech causes a deadly uproar among the audience, which forces the conspirators to abandon their plans and leave town. With an army amassed in Northern Greece, Brutus and Cassius prepare to launch an attack on the forces of Mark Antony, who has joined forces with Caesar's great-nephew, Octavius, and a man named Lepidus to take on Caesar's forces. Brutus and Cassius, regardless of their allegiance to Rome, are plagued by fears about the future, and they engage in a fierce battle over the payment of their soldiers' salaries. In spite of Cassius' doubts about the chosen location, they are preparing to assault Antony's army at Philippi following the completion of reparations. The night before the combat, Brutus is awakened by the news of his wife's suicide in Rome and has a vision of Caesar's ghost while attempting to sleep. First, it appears like the Republicans (under the leadership of Brutus) are on the verge of victory; however, as Cassius' messenger's horse appears to be overtaken by the enemy, he fears the worst and tells his servant to

aid him in a speedy death. Once Cassius' body is discovered, Brutus decides that suicide is the only honorable alternative left to him.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3. 1. Methodological approach

Due to the focal issue of this study of how face threatening act can cause damage for the interlocutors' positive or negative face, the research methodological approach is a single method one, and the qualitative method approach is specifically adopted. The aim of adopting this methodological approach is to provide the readers more, as Litosseliti (2010: 33) explains, "in-depth" and rich data analysis.

3. 2. Data collection

It is worthy to mention that the data under analysis in this study is collected in the light of a content analysis. This is fulfilled by the virtue of extracting some quotations out of Shakespeare's Julius Caesar and analyzing them in terms of positive and negative face as well as showing the face damage between the interlocutors of the quoted samples. Picking up the samples of analysis is focused on the quotations that achieve the aim of the study which is providing in-depth analysis and explanation for the face damage.

3. 3. Data analysis

It is significant to refer here that the data under scrutiny in this qualitative research is exposed, collected and analyzed in a discourse analysis way. This data analysis method is fulfilled via extracting some quotations that are related to Shakespeare's Julius Caesar that cover the different types of damage in face threatening act. More specifically, the data analysis of this study is dedicated for the purpose of studying the communication and language use that underlies the face threatening act in terms of positive and negative face and its damage. It is important to emphasize here that this type of analysis is achieved by the virtue of obeying the effects of the specific contexts which fundamentally relate to the data analysis.

4. RESULTS AND DISSCUSSION

Highlighting some quotes that are regarded as remarkable in Shakespeare's Julius Caesar, I will shed lights upon the face

threatening act they carry and how does it act with consider to the hearer or speaker. Most importantly, I will focus on how face threatening acts cause damage to the negative or positive face of the hearer and speaker throughout the quotes that reflect the very plot of this play.

4. 1. Quotations of damage to hearer's positive face

-Face threatening acts that threaten the hearer's self-image include:

Criticism

"You blocks, you stones, you worse than senseless things!

O you hard hearts, you cruel men of Rome"

The first stem to analyze this quotation is to give a considerable and detailed account for its literary details and contextual factors. Marullus' scathing outburst is directed at two specific individuals: a carpenter and a cobbler. "Worse than dumb things," as he refers to the plebeians or commoners, suggests that they do not have a high social standing. He is dissatisfied with the fact that Pompey has been forgotten and Caesar has been elevated to the status of a deity. Because the plebeians are untrustworthy, Marullus believes they should be avoided. This quotation is critical in understanding the socioeconomic stratification depicted in the play. Also shown is the fact that the residents of Rome are prone to changing their minds. This quotation serves as the opening quotation for the play's exposition, or introduction.

As the tale progresses, we are learning more about the characters and their conflicts. We gain a feel of the relationship between the plebeians and the emperor from both Caesar's and the soldiers' points of view in this play. A parallel can be drawn between this quote and the Roman people's proclivity to change their thoughts. When it comes to who they want to be their leader, the plebeians are continually changing their views. They praised Pompey when he was in power, but now they favor Julius Caesar. In their condemnation of the carpenter and cobbler, Marullus and Flavius are simply pointing out the fickleness of their subjects.

In act 1 (P. 7), Marullus, a tribune who condemns the plebeians for their fickleness in cheering Caesar when once they cheered for

Caesar's enemy Pompey, used these words as an expression that negatively evaluates the hearer's positive face (Rome plebeians's faces). What makes Marullus utter this speech is the changeable and insincere loyalty of the general population of Rome at that meanwhile.

Boasting

"I could be well moved if I were as you.

If I could pray to move, prayers would move me.

But I am constant as the Northern Star,

Of whose true fixed and resting quality"

The following are Julius Caesar's final comments before he is assassinated in Act III, scene I of the play. The conspirators have addressed Caesar in the Senate under the pretence of requesting for the release of Metellus's exiled brother, Publius Cimber, who has been imprisoned for his crimes. Caesar reacts by stating that he will stick to his word and will not change his mind about his original decision. Caesar, known as the North Star, takes pride in his uncompromising dedication to the law and his refusal to be swayed by any other influence in his life. In addition to conveying stability, the parallel emphasizes that the North Star is the one by which sailors have navigated since antiquity, the star that directs them on their voyages. A similar distinction may be made for the North Star, which is the only star in the sky that does not move at any point in time. As a result, Caesar asserts that he is the greatest Roman of all time, which is incorrect. He asserts that he is the only guy who is "invincible," and his strictness in dealing with Publius Cimber's condition is evidence of this claim.

Following a speech in which he boasted that he was "invincible," Caesar is promptly attacked and killed by a group of senators who were there at the time of his speech. As soon as Caesar professes himself to be "constant," he suggests that he is also eternal. The assassins, on the other hand, quickly demonstrate that Caesar is not invincible. Even while Caesar's power and immortality are clearly visible, as the subsequent events of the play demonstrate, Brutus and Cassius attribute the majority of their sorrow on Caesar's ghostly deeds by the end of the play, which has changed his name from a

personal name to a term referring to an institution—the empiric rule of Rome. The significance of Caesar's high self-esteem is demonstrated in these more significant ways.

This speech was said by Caesar in Act III, scene i, just before he had been assassinated. He sees himself as a guiding light, and he takes great satisfaction in his unyielding commitment to the rule of law and his refusal to back down when pressured for time or information. To put it another way, this link represents more than just tenacity and steadfastness: Historically, sailors have relied on the North Star for navigation, just as Caesar directed the Romans. Because it is the only star in the sky that never changes position, the North Star is presumably unique in its stability. As a result, Caesar considers himself to be the sole Roman who is unequaled among his contemporaries. According to Caesar, Cimber's rigidity explains why Caesar remains untouchable in the eyes of the rest of the world. In terms of the boasting as a face threatening act that has much to do with causing damage to the hearer's positive face, damage is achieved to the hearers' positive face which are the senates that were sitting around him and listening to his speech in the capitol. This significantly threatens the hearers' (senates) self-image as long as Caesar's speech included expressions that negatively evaluate the hearer's positive face being classified as a clear and evident act of boasting.

Expressions of emotions (positive face)

"If this were true, then should I know this secret.

I grant I am a woman; but withal

A woman that Lord Brutus took to wife:

I grant I am a woman; but withal"

Given Brutus's mental health difficulties, Portia encourages him to open up to her about them in light of their marriage. Brutus is convinced that Portia is strong enough to keep his secret, and this is a significant component of Portia's emotional attraction. It's a drastic step, but it demonstrates Portia's understanding that she will have to go to extremities in order to persuade her own husband to listen to her. She even stabs herself in the leg to prove her point. After hearing a knock on the door, Brutus orders Portia out of the house,

despite her best efforts to convince him otherwise. Despite the fact that Brutus recognizes Portia's power and worth as his wife, he will not tell her about his intentions. The actions of Brutus' wife reveal that women have little significance in Roman civilization, and they also demonstrate the power of men over women in society.

In the first scene of act 1 (P. 44), Portia; Brutus's wife acts presenting expressions which show that the speaker does not care about H's positive face. This rough type of blaming that underlies Portia's speech is an outcome of her emotional backlash against Brutus's refusal to tell her the secrets of capitol and what is going on inside the palace and what conspiracy is being made. This refusal of Brutus inevitably left a bad attitude in Portia's mind that he (Brutus) is just using her to satisfy his sexual needs and not to consider her as a partner in every field of life.

4. 2. Quotations of damage to hearer's negative face

-Face threatening acts restricting the hearer's personal freedom include:

Suggestion

"I was born free as Caesar; so were you:

We both have fed as well; and we can both

Endure the winter's cold as well as he"

The rhetorical devices of ethos, pathos, and logos can be observed throughout Cassius' speech. These are also crucial aspects that can be recognized in the aristotelian model and should be taken into consideration. Cassius, for example, makes an argument for his trustworthiness when he says, "I was born free as Caesar." You were in the same boat. We've both been fed, and we're both able to withstand the bitter cold of winter just as well as he is." It is possible to discern ethos in this proclamation because Cassius is persuading Brutus that both he and Cassius have endured the same difficulties that Caesar has endured. As a result, both Cassius and Brutus are considered plausible candidates for the leadership role currently held by Caesar. The torrent roared, and we did buffet it with lusty sinews, flinging it aside and stemming it with hearts of debate; the torrent roared, and we did buffet it with lusty sinews, throwing it aside and stemming it with hearts of conflict But before we could get

to the point that had been discussed, Caesar screamed out, "Help me, Cassius, or I'm going to drown!" Cassius was able to convey a wide range of emotions through this one section of his speech: Caesar was apprehensive, and Cassius was enraged because Caesar was supposed to be his courageous commander who was unafraid of anything. As a result, Brutus expressed his unhappiness with Caesar in a number of different ways. Last but not least, Cassius makes numerous allusions to logos throughout his discourse. He made several notable statements, the most notable of which was "Did I the exhausted Caesar?"

It is clear that Brutus's method incorporates a variety of distinct types of rhetoric, which can be observed throughout. For example, Brutus' acknowledgment of the speaker, subject, and audience can be seen as an example of the Aristotelian paradigm. Furthermore, Brutus's assertions of opposition, understanding, and position can be used to illustrate the Rogerian paradigm of leadership. Finally, the Toulmin model can be demonstrated by the use of Brutus's eloquent remark. The capacity to understand that Brutus' speech contains elements of all three models is what makes it so memorable.

Brutus addresses the entire city, which includes all of the citizens who agree with him that Caesar must be killed, in accordance with the Aristotelian model. As a result, his target audience is disclosed. The Rogerian model, as well as Brutus's speech, can be viewed and dissected to a significant degree. Take, for example, Brutus' statement to the men in which he declares that he is persuaded that executing Caesar is in their best interests rather than his own. The expression "statement of position" refers to this.

At the second scene of act 1, the plot is being sparked through this very speech of Cassius to Brutus. Taking into account that Brutus is Caesar's adopted son as well as he is regarded as Caesar's closest and sincerest friend and commander, the speaker (Cassius) expresses an anticipation of some future action of the hearer (Brutus) and thereby restricts his personal freedom. Through this speech that underestimates Caesar's character and accuses him of being tyrant and ambitious, Cassius tries to lessen the personal freedom of Brutus; the clear and loyal idea towards Caesar and the true sincerity between the both that cannot easily be restricted by Cassius who anticipates breaking this personal freedom in the future action of Brutus.

Promise

"I shall recount hereafter; for this present,
I would not, so with love I might entreat you,
Be any further moved. What you have said,
I will consider"

The rhetorical devices of ethos, pathos, and logos can be observed throughout Cassius' speech. These are also crucial aspects that can be recognized in the aristotelian model and should be taken into consideration. Cassius, for example, makes an argument for his trustworthiness when he says, "I was born free as Caesar." You were in the same boat. We've both been fed, and we're both able to withstand the bitter cold of winter just as well as he is." It is possible to discern ethos in this proclamation because Cassius is persuading Brutus that both he and Cassius have endured the same difficulties that Caesar has endured. As a result, both Cassius and Brutus are considered plausible candidates for the leadership role currently held by Caesar. The torrent roared, and we did buffet it with lusty sinews, flinging it aside and stemming it with hearts of debate; the torrent roared, and we did buffet it with lusty sinews, throwing it aside and stemming it with hearts of conflict But before we could get to the point that had been discussed, Caesar screamed out, "Help me, Cassius, or I'm going to drown!" Cassius was able to convey a wide range of emotions through this one section of his speech: Caesar was apprehensive, and Cassius was enraged because Caesar was supposed to be his courageous commander who was unafraid of anything. As a result, Brutus expressed his unhappiness with Caesar in a number of different ways. Last but not least, Cassius makes numerous allusions to logos throughout his discourse. He made several notable statements, the most notable of which was "Did I the exhausted Caesar?"

It is clear that Brutus's method incorporates a variety of distinct types of rhetoric, which can be observed throughout. For example, Brutus' acknowledgment of the speaker, subject, and audience can be seen as an example of the Aristotelian paradigm. Furthermore, Brutus's assertions of opposition, understanding, and position can be used to illustrate the Rogerian paradigm of leadership. Finally, the

Toulmin model can be demonstrated by the use of Brutus's eloquent remark. The capacity to understand that Brutus' speech contains elements of all three models is what makes it so memorable.

Brutus addresses the entire city, which includes all of the citizens who agree with him that Caesar must be killed, in accordance with the Aristotelian model. As a result, his target audience is disclosed. The Rogerian model, as well as Brutus's speech, can be viewed and dissected to a significant degree. Take, for example, Brutus' statement to the men in which he declares that he is persuaded that executing Caesar is in their best interests rather than his own. The expression "statement of position" refers to this.

This quotation is said by Brutus to Cassius in the second scene of act 1 (P. 16). Brutus's speech here acts as predicting a future act of the speaker towards the hearer. The speaker Brutus states a future action in which the hearer Cassius should be involved after Cassius has suggested the idea of conspiracy against Caesar. Brutus literally says "What you have said, I will consider", meaning that he has made a commitment for himself that commits him to do an action in the future course in which the hearer (Cassius) is involved.

Expressions of emotions (negative face)

"You are my true and honorable wife;

As dear to me as are the ruddy drops

That visit my sad heart."

Portia and Calpurnia are compared and contrasted. You've probably wondered how similar two people are to one another. Have you ever pondered how much they differ from one another? The Tragedy of Julius Caesar, written by William Shakespeare, is the book on which I'm here to speak. The plot of the novel revolves around the death of Julius Caesar. But I'm not here to talk about Julius Caesar; rather, I'm here to talk about how Portia and Calpurnia are both the same and distinct from one another. (You should clarify who Portia is and who Calpurnia is in the next sentence.) Portia is distinct in that she is self-sufficient, respected, and helpful, when the other women are not. Calpurnia is less autonomous, less respected, and less helpful than she used to be.

Despite the fact that these women are very different, they nevertheless have a great deal in common.

She had a strong attachment to her husband. Portia is concerned about Brutus' health, and she believes that it is not in very good shape. "Every man has his hour," Portia observes, "and every man has his hour." It will not allow you to eat, speak, or sleep, and if it were to exert as much influence over your physical appearance as it does over your physical condition, I would not recognize you as Brutus. "Please, my lord, make me aware of the source of your distress." The phrase was chosen because it appears in the text: "dear my lord, make me acquainted with your source of suffering." That is to say, dear husband, please tell me what is bothering you. She wants to know what is wrong so that you may assist him, whether it is with his health or with his personal troubles. She has shown concern for his health, and now we will see how she is married to a man of substance and determination.

The first scene of act 1 (P. 44) contains this quotation of Brutus to his wife Portia. Brutus' speech is unmistakably an expression of the speaker's desire for the person who is listening. It is possible for the speaker (Brutus) to display positive emotions towards the hearer (Portia), which may include an anticipation of a positive reaction by the hearer, such as giving thanks, or the hearer to express pleasant emotions towards the speaker.

4. 3. Quotations of damage to speaker's positive face

Face threatening acts that threaten the speaker's self-image include apologies:

Apology

"O, pardon me, thou bleeding piece of earth,

That I am meek and gentle with these butchers!"

As the drama comes to a close, Antony delivers a speech to the audience all by himself. Anthony, in the course of these words, confirms his devotion to Caesar and vows his support to Caesar's cause. The men who assassinated Caesar, as well as the guy who apologizes to Caesar for dealing pleasantly with the other two, Brutus and Cassius, shall suffer a curse, according to legend.

These very touching lines of Mark Antony's speech was said to Julius Caesar in act 3 (P. 70). After the conspiracy of senators leaded by Cassius has been made against Caesar and after the awful assassination that each one of them took part in (including Brutus), the allegiant friend of Caesar reaches late to advocate and defend him against the conspirators but he finds him fallen bloody. The speaker (Mark Antony) here makes a statement about his own shortcomings that he has been late to help Caesar, thereby 'damaging' his own positive self-image face.

CONCLUSION

Across the multiple phases of face threatening act that I have tackled in this study, there were two features adherent to one another that constitute the backbone of this act: interactional and social environments. Both positive and negative face have been tackled in terms of the damage inherited to the speaker and hearer in Shakespeare's Julius Caesar. I have explained how the desire for appreciation and approval on one hand, and the desire to remain autonomous and not being imposed on the other hand can be judgmental in making damage to the participants (characters) of the play. The communicative strategies of the main characters (Caesar, Brutus, Cassius and Antony) have been manifested through certain quotations during the plot of the play showing the dynamism of face work whether it is preventing; helps to avoid face threatening act, or restorative; helps to restore the lost face.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arundale, R. (2006). Face as relational and interactional: A communication for research on face, facework and politeness. *Journal of Politeness Research* 2 (2): 193-216.
- Brown, P. & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dimitrova-Galaczi, E. (2002). Issues in the definition and conceptualization of politeness. *University Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics* 2.1.
- Fraser, B. (1990). Perspectives on politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics* 14: 219-236. Goffman, Erving (1967). *Interaction Ritual: Essay on Face to Face Behavior*. Garden City, NY: Anchor.
- Geertz, C. (1975) "On the nature of anthropological understanding". *American Scientist* 63: 47-53.

- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction Ritual: Essay on Face to Face Behavior*. Garden City, NY: Anchor.
- Grice, P. (1975). *Logic and conversation*. Cole P. and J. Morgan, eds. *Syntax and semantics*, vol. 3: *Speech acts*. New York: Academic Press, 41–58.
- Greenbaum, S. (1996). *Comparing English worldwide: The International Corpus of English*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Gu, Y. (1990). Politeness phenomena in modern Chinese. *Journal of Pragmatics* 14.2: 237–257.
- Hall, E. (1976) *Beyond Culture*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Hallowsell, A. (1955) *Culture and Experience*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Ho, D. (1994). Face dynamics: from conceptualization to measurement. Ting-Toomey, Stella, ed. *The Challenge of Facework: Cross-Cultural and Interpersonal Issues*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 3–13.
- Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. New York: McGraw-Hill. —, and G. J. Hofstede. 2005. *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*, 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hofstede, G. (1984) *Culture's Consequences, International Differences in Work-Related Values*. California: Sage Publications.
- Hsu, F. (1985) "The self in cross-cultural perspective". In *Culture and Self*, A. Marsella, G. De Vos, and F. Hsu (eds), 24–55. London: Tavistock.
- Kasper, Gabriel (1990). Linguistic politeness: Current research issues. *Journal of Pragmatics* 14: 193–218.
- Kill, A. (2013). Face threatening acts and politeness strategies in summer school application calls. *Jezikoslovlje*.
- Lakoff, R. (1973). The logic of politeness or minding your p's and q's. *Chicago Linguistic Society* 9: 292–305.
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Leech, G. (2014). *The Pragmatics of Politeness*. Oxford, Oxford University Press
- Lim, T. (1994). Facework and interpersonal relationships. Ting-Toomey, Stella, ed. *The Challenge of Facework: Cross-Cultural and Interpersonal Issues*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 209–229.
- Markus, Hazel and Kitayama. (1991) "Culture and the Self: Implications for Cognition, Emotion, and Motivation". *Psychological Review* 98 (2): 224–253.

- Reiter. R. (2000). Linguistic Politeness in Britain and Uruguay: A Contrastive Study in Requests and Apologies. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins Publishing Company
- Shakespeare. W. (2005). Julius Caesar. San Diego/USA, ICON Group International, Inc
- Triandis, Harry, Marín, Gerardo, Lisansky, Judithand Betancourt, Hector (1984) Ki "Simpatía as a Cultural Script of Hispanics". Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol. 47 (6), 1363–1375.
- Vilkki, L. (2006). Politeness, face and facework: Current issues. Special supplement to SKY Journal of Linguistics 19: 322–332.
- Watts, R. (2003). Politeness. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

