

**A Socio-Pragmatic Study of Impoliteness
in William Wycherley's Comedy : *The Plain Dealer***

.....
Eman Mudafar Abdulrahman
Asst. Prof. Hussein Hameed M. Al-Juburi

Abstract

Impoliteness is a linguistic aspect that has been seen as an opposite in orientation to politeness. It is unpleasant and rather minor in conversations. Nevertheless it is central and important in some discourses as in drama. The use of impoliteness in dramatic dialogue, especially in historical data, is important to know the social fabric of a society at that time. This study focuses on the investigation of impoliteness in historical data; a Restoration comedy entitled *The Plain Dealer* (1676) by William Wycherley. The current study also focuses on other functional types of impoliteness which are: affective impoliteness, coercive impoliteness and entertaining impoliteness.

1. Introduction

The concept of 'impoliteness' may seem too simple, but in fact it is complex since it is in some way affected by society, and culture in particular. So, this is a point that will be shown in this study. Concerning drama, impoliteness is not just used randomly, but it is used intentionally for entertainment purposes as well as showing the author's perspective towards society. Conflictive talk between characters is shown either as a symptom, or as a cause of, social disharmony. Such type of interaction could further the plot and the characters. Moreover, the major function of impoliteness is reinforcing or attacking particular aspects as for example social norms and certain qualities of a person in a given society. In addition, this study will focus on other functional types of impoliteness like: *affective impoliteness, coercive impoliteness and entertaining impoliteness*. The study aims at: (i) shedding light on the changes of impoliteness formulae uses that took place in dramatic texts across time, (ii) showing whether a certain linguistic norm of a period can denote impoliteness or not and why, (iii) examining the way how impoliteness in a work of fiction can be used as a means to reflect the playwright's perception towards a given society, and using impoliteness expressions in historical data that can be useful in understanding the society of that time.

To achieve these aims, the study hypothesizes that: (i) the play uses different types of conventionalised impoliteness formulae and impoliteness functions to support and develop the main ideas and themes

of the play, (ii) impoliteness plays an important role in furthering the plot and characters.

The model adopted in this study is: Culpeper's (2011) model of impoliteness. Furthermore, the study is necessary for English language learners and for those who are interested in drama to show how social principles change over time. Also it is important for the researchers who are interested in examining and analysing impoliteness in historical data. This study can also be a sample guide in recognizing impoliteness as a very important aspect of linguistic interaction and its relation to and influence on society.

2. Socio-Pragmatics and Impoliteness

Sociopragmatics is a subfield of pragmatics and a field that involves many areas particularly interaction investigations. Accordingly, all events included in pragmatics are social. Sociopragmatics may sound to be repetitive unless considering the fact that it is subfield of pragmatics that highlights social issues (Culpeper, 2011:1). Thus, the principal area for impoliteness investigations is sociopragmatics. One reason for considering sociopragmatics as the ideal place for the investigation of impoliteness is that most works of politeness were traced in this field, so it is necessary to gear impoliteness studies towards this field. Also, a fundamental point is that impoliteness matches the investigation issues of sociopragmatics. So, examining impoliteness requires the investigation of specific contact actions in social relations. Moreover, impoliteness is involved in many fields of study. It can be studied according to "social psychology", "sociology", "conflict studies", "media studies", "history", "literary studies" and some others (ibid: 3). The investigation of politeness and impoliteness implies the study of social processes, especially social change of people relations. It concerns the way in which an individual's emotions are maintained or attacked in communicative exchange (Kádár and Culpeper, 2010:9).

3. Politeness and Impoliteness

Culpeper (1996:355) claims that impoliteness is "very much the parasite of politeness". This means that the main approaches and frameworks to impoliteness are formed and developed from models that are designed to investigate and analyse politeness (Bousfield, 2008:43).

So, it is important to study the main approaches to politeness in order to understand impoliteness. Regarding politeness, there are two main approaches. First, the traditional politeness approach which is geared towards pragmatic view of politeness. The most familiar views of this approach are:

(i) Leech (1983:82) states that:

[Politeness Principle] "has a higher regulative role than this: to maintain the social equilibrium and the friendly relations which enable us to assume that our interlocutors are being cooperative in the first place."

(ii) Brown and Levinson (1987:1) state that:

"... politeness, like formal diplomatic protocol ... presupposes that potential for aggression as it seeks to disarm it, and makes possible communication between potentially aggressive parties."

The second approach is related to *social norms*. Fraser (1990:220) states that "each society has a particular set of social norms consisting of more or less explicit rules that prescribe certain behaviour, state of affairs, or way of thinking in a context." In social norm approach, politeness is used to generate appropriate "social conduct, rules for speech and behaviour" originated from those who belong to a higher rank in the social hierarchy. Politeness, in this approach, traditionally is trended towards particular linguistic utterances, such utterances as 'please' and 'thank you' that can be instructed to children and may vary across cultures (Brown, 2017:385).

Many researchers claim that in order to present a sufficient description of conversational interactions, the models of politeness ought to consider threatening as well agreeable behaviours, and such threatening behaviours ought to be considered interdependent to politeness (Bousfield, 2008:71). Culpeper et al (2003), like Eelen (1999, 2001), state that the main approaches to politeness, at the minimum, refer briefly to the concept of impoliteness but in action they all focus on politeness, so consequently their description of impoliteness is insufficient. Eelen (2001 cited in Mills, 2003:121) claims that politeness approaches, directly or indirectly, pay particular attention to politeness and recognize impoliteness as a departure; this is a problematic issue because the involved methods are unable to describe impoliteness in the similar way as they do with politeness. Eelen (2001:245-246) mentions some issues regarding politeness models. He claims that these models do

not produce a sufficient description for impoliteness by using the same notions that describe politeness. He goes on by stating two issues:

- 1- The traditional models of politeness consider impoliteness as unsuccessful or "absent politeness."
- 2- These models consider impoliteness as a contrast of politeness, yet only evolving items for describing and analysing politeness.

Culpeper (2011:28) points out that what Eelen mentioned above does not cover all politeness models. Yet, there is no full and adequate framework for explaining interactional behaviour used by the interactants to permit impoliteness.

Furthermore, politeness studies presuppose that impoliteness is minor and can be dealt within these frameworks without the need for a new model (Bousfield 2008:71). Beebe (1995:154) argues that instead of observing impoliteness like an absence of politeness, it can be observed like consideration of practical abilities , which means that impoliteness ought to be observed as a means to accomplish specific goals as: 1) to acquire authority , 2) to find an outlet to opposed feelings. Moreover, politeness and impoliteness can be seen only in interactions between participants, they cannot be evaluated only according to the "speaker's intentions". Impoliteness is comprehended and explained linguistically only if it is regarded in communication within given society and how that society comprehends certain utterances and also with regard to overall communication strategies of the participants (Mills, 2003:139). Eelen (2001:39) thinks that impoliteness is supposed to be a "norm" related to the action of members of a given society not to the behaviour of an individual.

4. Models of Impoliteness

This section presents the main models of impoliteness: Culpeper (1996), Culpeper et al. (2003), Culpeper (2005), Bousfield (2008) and Culpeper's (2011). In these models, the emphasis is on certain issues as; *impoliteness can be entertaining, creative as well as can cause offence in direct or indirect ways* (Toddington, 2015: 10).

4.1 Culpeper's (1996,2003) Model of Impoliteness

Culpeper's model (1996) followed Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory of politeness. Yet, it is concerned with attacking face instead of supporting it (Bousfield, 2008:82). Culpeper (1996:350) defines

impoliteness as “the use of strategies that are designed to have the opposite effect – that of social disruption.” Such strategies are intended to damage someone’s image rather than supporting it. This model is not only an adjunct to Brown and Levinson’s (1987) model, but it is a counterpart construction. Culpeper (1996) introduces impoliteness strategies. These strategies according to Culpeper are used in an “opposite” way, to “attack face” and cause disruption rather than promote face and foster relations (Culpeper et al, 2003: 1554). Culpeper suggests five impoliteness super strategies which are as follows:

- 1- **Bald on record impoliteness:** the FTA is done in a direct, explicit, concise way where the face is not irrelevant or minimized.
- 2- **Positive impoliteness:** the use of strategies is intended to harm the recipient’s “positive face”.
- 3- **Negative impoliteness:** the use of strategies is intended to harm the recipient's "negative face”.
- 4- **Sarcasm or mock politeness:** the use of politeness strategies which are clearly false to threaten the face. It is a superficial impoliteness. This type is for disagreement while banter (or mock impoliteness) is for cooperation and used in close relations.
- 5- **Withhold politeness** – the lack of politeness behaviour in the position it is supposed to be.

Moreover, Culpeper et al. (2003: 1545) re-call impoliteness definition and state that impoliteness is: “the use of communicative strategies designed to attack face, and thereby cause social conflict and disharmony.”. Also, this model takes into account the importance of prosody in determining whether certain behaviour or utterance is impolite (ibid). Beebe (1995:165) recommends that “intonation” is very essential; she classifies a certain kind of disrespectful tone like “You Stupid Intonation” in which it is utilised with the intention of misunderstanding and disrespectful glances, the expression may be recognized as impoliteness by the target.

Also, Culpeper's et al (2003) work reveals that even when an impoliteness strategy is used, this does not mean that impoliteness will be recognized in all contexts. They suggest that impoliteness strategies can be raised and yet could not be considered as impolite in certain contexts.

This means that impoliteness as politeness is context dependent (Culpeper et al, 2003:1576).

4.2 Culpeper's (2005) Model of Impoliteness

Continuing and progressing impoliteness framework, Culpeper (2005) introduces new definition of impoliteness and understandings towards notions as *intentionality*, *context*, and *prosody*, and how these aspects can help in determining impoliteness. Also, he introduces a new function of impoliteness which is *entertaining impoliteness*. He suggests that impoliteness can create a kind of entertainment as well as cause offence.

Culpeper (2005:38) sees that the first definition is not very sufficient since it takes into account impoliteness only to cause offence. The reason for this is that the linguists think of impoliteness as the contrast of politeness since politeness is used to support a person's self-image. In addition, the formal definition neglects the target's role. So, Culpeper tries to give a new vision of impoliteness. Tracy and Tracy (1998:227) describe "face attack as communicative acts perceived by members of a social community ... to be purposefully offensive."

Culpeper (2005:38) reissues the definition above and states that impoliteness arises when (1) the addresser interacts deliberately to damage the face of the addressee, and (2) the addressee recognizes and/or constructs behaviour with the intent to damage face, or a blender of the two points. This definition suggests that a hearer can now consider an action as impolite without taking into account the speaker's intention. Culpeper's (2005) work reveals that even when the speaker's intention could be ignored; hurt to a hearer's face possibly arose. In this model he adds another super strategy as an alternative to the category of sarcasm which is ' *off record impoliteness*'. In this type of strategy, the FTA is performed in an indirect way by means of implicature (Bousfield, 2008:93). Also, his focus turns from the speaker's intentionally impoliteness to other factors as '*context*' and '*prosody*'. Moreover, Culpeper suggests other types of *face* than that of Goffman (1967) and builds little on Spencer – Oatey's (2002) rapport management approach. He revises the ideas concerning "negative and positive face", and introduces Spencer-Oatey's categories of face on which he depends in his further work.

4.3 Bousfield's (2008) Model of Impoliteness

Bousfield presents and develops an approach to impoliteness which is based on solid empirical verifications. Bousfield model (2008) is concerned with investigation and examination of the use of impoliteness in the interactive spoken discourses. Bousfield tries to show how participants handle impoliteness “offensively and defensively” (Bosufield,2008:2). Furthermore, this work is an attempt to show how impoliteness can be triggered in particular discourses. Bousfield goes on and states that to consider impoliteness as a “successful impoliteness” the deliberateness of the producer to cause hurt must be recognized or comprehended by the target (ibid:3). Also, he distinguishes between “genuine” and “ritual or mock impoliteness and stresses on features such as “context”, “co-text”, conversational part of the members, “activity type”, influence among participants, and power (Bousfield, 2008:72-74). Bousfield restructured Culpeper's (1996,2005) super strategies into two : “on record impoliteness” and “off record impoliteness” . Sarcasm and withholding come under the label of “off record impoliteness.” (ibid:95).

4.4 Culpeper's (2011) Model of Impoliteness: the Current Study Model

Culpeper in this model introduces the most advanced model of impoliteness and provides an extensive perception of impoliteness types and functions. He revises all the definitions made by different scholars concerning impoliteness including his. Culpeper introduces his new definition concerning impoliteness:

Impoliteness is a negative attitude towards specific behaviours occurring in specific contexts. It is sustained by expectations, desires and/or beliefs about social organization, including, in particular, how one person's or a group's identity are mediated by others in interaction. Situated behaviours are viewed negatively – considered ‘impolite’ – when they conflict with how one expects them to be, how one wants them to be and/or how one thinks they ought to be. Such behaviours always have or are presumed to have emotional consequences for at least one participant, that is, they cause or are presumed to cause offence. Various factors can exacerbate how offensive an impolite behaviour is taken to be , including for example whether one understands a behaviour to be strongly intentional or not.

Culpeper (2011) minimizes the role of *intentionality* and maximizes the role of *emotion*. Also in this new model of impoliteness, Culpeper

adopts Spencer- Oatey rapport management approach and her classification of face. The reason for such a shift is that this approach has been favorably used in experiential investigation covering many societies or communities, and has been favorably utilised in impoliteness. She bases her description of face on “identities in social psychology and communication studies” (2007:642).She classifies ‘face’ into three types:

1. **Quality face:** is involved with the benefit the humans sufficiently maintain for themselves with regard to individual features as abilities, appearance, self-confidence etc (Spencer-Oatey, 2002: 540).
2. **Social identity:** is involved with benefit that humans sufficiently maintain for themselves with regard to acts of social member, and is nearly related to human belief of community virtue. It refers to an essential need for people to know and maintain social status, roles (ibid).
3. **Relational face:** Spencer-Oatey (2007: 647) states that: “[s]ometimes that can be a relational application. Then She justifies what she means by ‘relational’ as follows: ‘the relationship between the participants (e.g. distance-closeness, equality-inequality, perceptions of role rights and obligations), and the ways in which this relationship is managed or negotiated.

4.4.1 Conventionalised Impoliteness Formulae

Culpeper (2011:124-125) states that impoliteness is somewhat “inherent” in verbal utterances. Here, he follows Leech (1983) who marks two types of politeness: “ABSOLUTE POLITENESS” and “RELATIVE POLITENESS”. Leech (1983: 83) defines the former “as a scale, or rather a set of scales, having a negative and a positive pole”, whereas the latter as politeness “relative to some norm or behavior”. Also, he states that in terms of absolute politeness, certain speech acts (e.g. threats or orders) are naturally impolite, and others as (e.g. offers) are naturally considered polite (ibid). Furthermore, Culpeper (2011:124) points out that impoliteness cannot be considered totally “inherent” or “context dependent”. This means that impoliteness is partly set by verbal utterance and partly by certain context, yet both the utterance and context may not confirm the understanding of impoliteness. Actually it is the contact between these which consider certain expressions as impoliteness (ibid).

Then he presents a list of conventionalised impoliteness formulae which are:

- **Insults**
 1. Personalized negative vocatives.
 2. Personalized negative assertions.
 3. Personalized negative references
 4. Personalized third-person negative references.
- **Pointed criticisms/complaints.**
- **Unpalatable questions and/or presuppositions.**
- **Condescension.**
- **Message enforces.**
- **Dismissals.**
- **Silencers**
- **Threats.**
- **Negative expressive (e.g. curses, ill-wishes)**

4.4.2 Functions of Impoliteness

Culpeper (2011) presents three functional types of impoliteness: i) *affective impoliteness* ii) *coercive impoliteness* iii) *entertaining impoliteness*. The sort of impoliteness Culpeper concentrates on is what Beebe (1994) names “instrumental impoliteness” (Culpeper, 2011: 220).

4.4.2.1 Affective Impoliteness

Generally, impoliteness possesses the common task of supporting or conflicting particular personal features, social connections, regularities of a given society either/or doctrine. Affective impoliteness includes the intended manifestation of intensified or deep feeling, typically “anger” regarding that the victim is responsible for making emotive condition. Affective impoliteness is distinguished actually as a type that is caused or determined by feelings rather than reason (Culpeper, 2011: 221). The main characteristic of instrumental affective impoliteness is attacking others. Culpeper states that people face feelings as an answer to disappointment, and provide an outlet to feelings through hostility (ibid:225).

4.4.2.2 Coercive Impoliteness

Fairclough (1989 cited in Culpeper, 2011: 225) presents two types of power: “power in” and “power behind” conversation. The former type concerns the practice of power in speech, how we use power in

conversation, whereas the latter refers to the construction of social convention and communities by means of authority connection. Brown and Levinson (1987) and some scientists were concerned with issues regarding “power behind” discourse, such as “participant’s status”. Coercive impoliteness is the impoliteness that searches a transmission of beliefs among the speaker and the hearer in that the speaker gains advantages or possesses their advantages supported (ibid: 226). Tedeschi and Felson (1994: 168) state that coercive behaviour is a behaviour impressed with the aim of forcing hurt on someone or obliging dissatisfaction. Participants occupied in coercive behaviours believe that their conduct will hurt the victim or cause dissatisfaction. Culpeper (2011:226 -227) claims that coercive impoliteness tends to appear in environment where there is an imbalance of social construction of power. More powerful member owns the liberty to act impolitely in order to minimize the potential of the ineffective interactant to counterattack with impoliteness.

4.4.2.3 Entertaining Impoliteness

Entertaining impoliteness involves amusement at the expense of the victim of impoliteness. It includes, like the other types, a target or at the minimum a probable target. This functional type of impoliteness is described as “exploitative entertainment” . The essential point is that the probable impoliteness effects of the target can be understood by others. Furthermore, Culpeper suggests five types of pleasure which can be involved in entertaining impoliteness;

Emotional pleasure

A state of arousal in the observer can be created by observing impoliteness, and this type of arousal can be amusable (ibid). Myers (2001: 183) points out that “the thrill is in the potential for violence”

Aesthetic pleasure

This type of pleasure is taken from the “socially negative uses of verbal activity.” (Culpeper, 2011: 234). Literary types flourish on disagreement which enables the elaboration of the plot and the characters, and producing “dramatic entertainment” (Culpeper, 2005: 46).

Voyeuristic pleasure

This type can be achieved through observance of members of society in disagreement context. (Culpeper, 2011: 234) Richardson and Meinhoff (1999: 132) state that chat shows operate in the utilization of people defect as a result of voyeuristic pleasure.

The pleasure of being superior

This type of pleasure is achieved through being superior. Theories concerning superiority view that “there is self-reflexive pleasure” in viewing a member in a bad condition rather than oneself (Culpeper 2005: 45).

The pleasure of being secure

This type is interrelated with the above one. To be superior on others means you are more powerful and secure (Culpeper, 2011: 235).

5. Impoliteness in Drama

Impoliteness is supposed to be unpleasant and irregular activity, as much as language is regarded. It can be considered as an offensive and unpleasant aspect in a given society. It frequently appears in real life as something unusual, while in fiction works and in entertainment shows, it usually appears as something amusing and interesting (Culpeper, 2011: xii). Culpeper (1998:86) states that impoliteness is a kind of “aggression”, and “aggression” has been marked as a type of amusement for a long time. Also, Culpeper suggests that hostile language is somehow central in drama. Verbal conflict was a material of amusement for a long time (Culpeper, 2001:247).

Impoliteness does not take place randomly in drama just for amusing the crowds but also to show the author’s own perspective. Clashes in interaction can be considered as an indication, or as a cause of "social disharmony" (Culpeper,1998:87). He also emphasises the role of impoliteness in developing the plot as well as characters in dramatic work. And points out that it is essential to know that people’s understanding of (im)politeness actions in imaginary work must contradict with those in real contexts. This is due to two main points: first, particular character or characters are made of a complete set of behaviours, in real life this is not possible. Second, which is more essential, in that, the character’s action is not just decided by the

imaginary nature that creates it, but also by “the motivated choice” of the writer. In real world, impoliteness is marginal or rare because of the restrictions and social standards of a society. In drama, impoliteness is central because the author uses it to send a message to the audience in order to understand what will be done in the future as the play work progresses and also to reveal the real motivations and intentions of the character (ibid).

6. William Wycherley: A Biography (1640-1716)

William Wycherley was one of the best dramatists of the Restoration time. He was born about 1640 in London. His father, Daniel Wycherley, was employed to the marquis of Winchester. In 1665, he wrote his first play titled *Love in a Wood*. In 1672, he wrote another play called *The Gentleman Dancing-Master* which was published in 1673. Then he wrote one of the best Restoration comedies, *The Country Wife* 1675, in addition to *The Plain Dealer* 1676. The main theme in his plays especially *The Plain Dealer*, which was first performed in 1676, was satire. He criticised the community he lived in by using humour, irony, or ridicule to scorn and reveal the greed and bad manners of people. He implicitly criticized the court and the given society. William Congreve considered Wycherley as a man designated “to lash this crying age” (Hunt, 1840: x).

6.1 The Plain Dealer: The Plot

The Plain Dealer is a five-act Restoration comedy written by William Wycherley and was performed in 1676. It is a satirical comedy. Wycherley criticizes the hypocrisy and the materialism of the world he lived in. *The Plain Dealer* shows a change in the type of comedy introduced at that time. Jensen (1996: 182-183) states that the play is also a play of morality. It shows the bitterness of life filled with hypocrisy. Furthermore, it shows Wycherley's society, a society filled with hypocrisy and contrasts. The play, as a satirical comedy, is rich in features of duplicity, dishonesty, brutality, power, materialism and greed.

The play opens in Captain Manly's lodging, the central figure of the play. He is a forthright and honest man who intends to leave England to West Indies. He hates the hypocrisy of the society that he partially

finds at the court. He tells Lord Plausible that after his ship has sunk he prefers to leave London and. Lord Plausible tries to convince him to ask for help from rich men in the town but he refuses. Manly rudely dismissals Lord Plausible (www.enotes.com). Then he orders his sailors not to allow anyone to enter the room except Freeman, the ship's lieutenant . Manly and Lieutenant Freeman then talk about his crisis and how his ship has sunk. He and Freeman discuss the merits of plain dealing and hypocrisy. Manly believes that there is no true friendship in this world except that with his friend Vernish. Freeman tries to convince him that there are also others who care about him and also try to persuade him that one cannot have a successful career without being hypocritical, but he fails in doing that. After a while, Widow Blackacre (Olivia's aunt) enters Manly's room with no permission. Manly welcomes her and asks her about her cousin Olivia. He tries to get information concerning Olivia from the widow but with no result (ibid).

In act II, Olivia appears in her lodging with her cousin Eliza. She tells her that she has no interest in clothes, balls or even men. Olivia is a cunning and shallow girl and all the time behaves in artificial way in which her words and actions do not reveal her real character. After a while Mr. Novel, enters the room and Olivia welcomes him. Then Lord Plausible enters. He is an honourable man, contrary to Mr. Novel who is cunning and talkative man. Act III occurs in Wesmister hall .Manly confesses in a soliloquy that he is still in love with Olivia. Fidelia enters and tries to convince him the Olivia is not the kind of woman that deserves his love. Then widow Blackacre and Major Oldfox arrive to visit Olivia. Freeman argues with Oldfox who wants to marry the Widow and tells him that he has no right to marry her because he is very old. Freeman tries to persuade the Widow to marry him instead of Oldfox, but the Widow refuses them both. So Freeman convinces Jerry (Widow's son) to agree so that Freeman may become his guardian and Jerry agrees in return (ibid). In Act IV, Manly decides to go to Olivia to get back his fortune. Olivia declares that she is married and she cannot return the money because she gave it to her husband. At act V, Manly decides to revenge upon Olivia and sends his pageboy, Fidelia, to seduce Olivia and avenge himself. At the end, he discovers that the pageboy is a girl and married her instead. (www.enotes.com).

7. Data Analysis

This section involves the analysis and investigation of impoliteness in *The Plain Dealer* (1676).

Extract (1)

“Sailor. No man; Sir; but a Woman then, an’t, like your Honour___.”

“Manly. No Woman neither, you Impertinent Dog. Wou’d you be Pimping? A Sea Pimp is the strangest Monster she has.

(Act I, Scene I, p. 4)

The dialogue between the sailor and Captain Manly is impolite for two reasons: Manly does not allow them to continue speaking (Equity rights). Then, he uses conventionalised impoliteness formula – personalized negative vocatives ‘*you impertinent Dog*’, ‘*a sea pimp*’ to assert the idea that they are unimportant and unrespected. He addresses the sailor with second person pronoun ‘*You*’ and negative vocative insult words ‘*impertinent Dog*’. The speaker, Manly, attacks and belittles the sailor by calling him ‘*impertinent Dog*’ (Social identity face). Here, Wycherley criticises the world that he lives in. Here in this extract impoliteness functions as affective impoliteness. Manly expresses his highest emotion (anger) by using such words as ‘*impertinent*’, ‘*dog*’. The main feature of instrumental affective impoliteness is attacking the others and there must be a target to be blamed. Furthermore, another category is involved here - coercive impoliteness. The main feature of coercive impoliteness is that there is an imbalance in power structure between participants. Manly, the captain of the ship is more powerful and has the authority upon those sailors. So, he has more freedom to be impolite. Manly uses power through impoliteness to show difference in social class. Wycherley uses language as a mirror that reflects the culture and social structure of a given society. The expressions as ‘*you Impertinent Dog*’, ‘*A sea Pimp*’ are examples of the type of language used at that time.

Extract (2)

“Manly. Rogue, Rascal, Dog.”

[Kicks the Sailors out.]

“Freeman. Nay, let the poor Rouges have their Forecastle jests; they cannot help’em in a Fight, scarce when a Ship’s sinking.”

“Manly. Dam their untimely jests; a Servant’s jest is more sauciness than his counsel.”

(Act I, Scene I, p. 4)

Manly continues attacking the sailor's quality face by using conventionalised impoliteness formula - personalized negative vocative. Word as '*rascal*' regularly refers to class, it is a class-term. He attacks the sailors social identity face by calling him '*dog*', also he uses non-verbal impoliteness behaviour by kicking the sailor out. In the second line, Freeman suggests that those sailors are unlucky, unfortunate by using the word '*poor*' and at the same time they are disrespected within the society.

Another type is used in this extract is conventionalised impoliteness formula - negative expressive '*Damn their untimely jests*'. The word '*damn*' is used here as harmless expletive. So Manly uses taboo intensifiers '*Damn*' to express his emotions and attitudes towards the sailors. Again, Manly attacks the social identity face of the sailor by calling him (*a Servant*). Furthermore, Manly stresses the idea that those sailors are unimportant, unrespectable people that even their jokes are trivial and disgraceful '*sauciness*'. Society is affected by the changes that occurred after King Charles II has restored the throne. This period was a reversal of the strict Puritan morality. All social restrictions and limits were broken.

Impoliteness functions as affective impoliteness. Manly expresses his anger through impoliteness utterances. Moreover, coercive impoliteness is also used. Captain Manly is more superior and more powerful than the sailor. So, he has absolutely the whole power and authority to be impolite. Here, again power is used to show the difference in social class. Here, the use of coercive impoliteness is for social harm. Through language in general and impoliteness in particular, Wycherley shows the societal perspective of the court towards other classes.

Extract (3)

“Olivia. On me! You little, unthinking Fob, d’ye know what you say?”

“Boy. Yes, Madam, ‘tis the Gentleman that comes every day to you, who
_____”

“Olivia. Hold your peace, you headless little Animal, and get you gone. This Country Boy, Cousin” (Act II, Scene I, p. 15)

Olivia, who represents the hypocrisy and corruption of the court, uses conventionalised impoliteness formula – personalized negative vocatives '*you little unthinking fob*', '*you headless little animal*', to belittle

and humiliate the boy (Quality face and social identity face). At the beginning of act II, Olivia tells her cousin Eliza that she hates this filthy world and dislikes everything, clothes, balls and men in particular. This shows how Olivia is a cunning and dishonest woman. Also, she uses dismissals and imperative command '*Hold your peace, get you gone*' to attack the boy's equity rights. This is done when she interrupts the boy and denies him to complete his sentence. This type of impoliteness reflects the social fabric of society at that time and how people belittle those who are lower than them. Olivia uses power to "satisfy her sexual appetites and to secure herself financially." (Jensen, 1996:183).

Also, there is a conventionalised impoliteness formula – personalized third-person negative reference '*This country boy*'. She insists on humiliating and belittling the boy. The use of conventionalised impoliteness formulae – negative vocatives, dismissals and name-calling can reflect typically how London upper-class behaved at that time.

Using impoliteness particularly by women, at that time, shows a kind of freedom which was not found in earlier eras. Also, the use of such expressions a lot through the play, either for causing offence or creating comic effect, stresses the idea that there is a breakdown in relations between the members of community. Social norms within a given society have been disrupted by the upper-class which represents English society at that time. The usage of linguistic aspects as impoliteness, for example, is so important in understanding the social fabric of any society in general and Restoration society in particular.

Extract (4)

“Manly. Be gone, I say.”

“Novel. Be gone again ! to us be gone!”

“Manly. No chattering. Baboons, instantly be gone. Or ————”

(Act II, Scene I, p.25)

This conversation is between Captain Manly, a straightforward honest man, and Novel, a coxcomb and dishonest character. Manly uses conventionalised impoliteness formula – dismissal '*Be gone*' to show his real thought towards Novel and Oldfox. He intentionally tries to create negative effect on the target (Novel) by using imperative commands. This is suggested by the use of '*Be gone*' more than one time. And also by the use of another command '*No chattering*' and comparing him to a Baboon.

Then Manly uses the word ‘Or’ which denotes a kind of warning of negative consequence as a response to Novel’s negative attitude and bizarre personality.

Here in this extract impoliteness functions as entertaining impoliteness. The personality of Novel and the way Manly addresses him raises a sort of entertainment on the stage. what is socially negative can be used to achieve a comic impact on the audience. The ridiculous character as Mr. Novel arises a sort of fun and amusement. Another function used here is coercive impoliteness. Manly uses power to neutralize Novel from behaving in a negative way. Wycherley employs impolite language to satirise the society, to show that there is a breakdown in relations between members of the community.

Extract (5)

“Manly. Hold; I understand you not.”

“Fid. So, ‘twill work I see.”

“Manly. Did you not tell me _____.”

“Fid. She call’d you ten thousand Ruffians.”

“Manly. Hold, I say.”

“Fid. Brute _____.”

“Manly. Hold.”

“Fid. Sea-monsters _____.”

“Manly. Dam your intelligence, hear me a little.”

“Nay, surely Coward she call’d you too.”

(Act IV, Scene I, p. 48-49)

This extract is impolite for two reasons; first, Fidelia does not allow Manly to complete his sentence (Equity rights). Second, she uses many conventionalised impoliteness formulae – insults as ‘Ruffians’, ‘Brutes’. ‘Sea-monsters’, ‘coward’. In act IV we witness a change in the characters’ language. Here, Fidelia’s linguistic choice is unexpectedly changed from more politeness to more impoliteness by daring to use insult words in front of her master. There is a shift or change in the type of the relationship between the two. It is seen here a sort of development

in the characters and also in the plot. Fidelia aims to convince Manly that Olivia is a bad woman and does not deserve his love. As the play progresses we see that Fidelia has more courage to face Manly with the truth. She tries to reveal the real character of Olivia. So she uses affective impoliteness to express her frustrations and anger. Olivia represents the hypocrisy of the society at that time.

Another category is involved - entertaining impoliteness. The use of language '*Damn your intelligence*' has many purposes; for laugh and to bring people closer together. Both conflict and linguistic creativity are reciprocal means which enables the furthering of plot and characters. Negative expressions.

Extract (6)

“Olivia. and the bloody Ruffin Manly here in the room, with all his awful insolence.”

(Act V, Scene IV, p 80)

This extract reveals the real character and personality of Olivia. Women of the court, represented by Olivia, has all the freedom to use impoliteness expressions. She uses conventionalised impoliteness formula- personalized third-person negative reference '*the bloody Ruffin*', '*his awful insolence*' to show her feelings towards man as Manly. She criticises Manly in a very rude and disrespectful way and describes him as a violent person (Quality face). She tells Fidelia that he deserves what has happened to him. According to her, he suffers the consequences of his behaviour. She reveals her aversion towards Manly by using such words as '*bloody*', '*ruffian*', '*awful*', '*insolence*'. On stage, through the use of language particularly impolite language, characters may reveal their real motives and intentions. Restoration drama is a drama written by elite playwrights to elite audience (the court) not to the whole society. So, here Olivia represents women of the court who have the freedom and power to use such words as swear or impolite words in order to express their inner feelings and actions towards people. Nevertheless it was not allowed for woman to speak in such a way in public it was restricted to the upper class or the court. Olivia expresses her emotion towards Manly through the use of words as '*bloody*' and '*awful*'. One type of pleasure that is linked to impoliteness is emotional pleasure. Culpeper (2011: 234) states that noticing impoliteness in interaction brings “a state of arousal in the observer’ which creates a state of amusement. The thrilled atmosphere



which is created by Olivia creates a sort of pleasure and enjoyment on the stage.

8. Conclusion

The Plain Dealer uses conventionalised impoliteness formulae more than any types. This indicates that impoliteness is used in a direct way. Another result is concluded in that the Restoration play, *The Plain Dealer*, uses personalized negative vocatives more than any other type of insults, this is important in knowing the type of society that has been dealt with and showing how impoliteness is important in supporting the main themes of the play. Wycherley employs language in general and impoliteness in particular as a mirror to reflect how the society of the court behaved at that time. Certain lexical items as 'rogue', 'impudent', 'rascal' are used in *The Plain Dealer*, which are not used nowadays. This shows how society and culture affect language and vice versa. Also another point is that linguistic impoliteness is used to express different functional types of impoliteness which are: affective impoliteness, coercive impoliteness and entertainment impoliteness in order to support the main themes of the play. Furthermore, linguistic aspects as politeness and impoliteness can play an important role in furthering the plot and characters.

9. References

- Bousfield, Derek (2008). *Impoliteness in Interaction*. Philadelphia and Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Brown, Penelope (2017). "Politeness and Impoliteness". Huang, Yan (ed.). *In The Oxford Handbook of Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brown, Penelope and Stephen C. Levinson ([1978]; 1987). *Politeness: some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Culpeper, Jonathan (1996). "Towards an Anatomy of Impoliteness". *In Journal of Pragmatics*. 25, 349-367.
- _____ (1998). "(Im)politeness in Dramatic Dialogue". Jonathan Culpeper, Mick Short and Peter Verdonk (eds.). *In Exploring the Language of*

Drama: From Text to Context . London and New York.

- _____ (2005) "Impoliteness and Entertainment in the Television Quiz Show: The Weakest Link". In *Journal of Politeness Research, Behaviour, Culture* 1: 35-72.
- _____ (2011) *Impoliteness: Using Language to Cause Offence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Culpeper, J., Bousfield, Derek & Wichmann, A. (2003). "Impoliteness Revisited: with Special Reference to Dynamic and Prosodic Aspects". *Journal of Pragmatics* 35:1545-1579.
- Culpeper, J & Kádár, D. (2010). *Historical (Im)politeness*. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power* (1st edn). London: Longman.
- Fraser, B. (1990). "Perspectives on politeness". In *Journal of Pragmatics* 14: 219-236.
- Fraser, B. & Nolen, W. (1981). "The association of deference with Linguistic Form". In *International journal of the Sociology of Language* 27: 93-109.
- Jensen, H. James (1996). *The Sensational Restoration*. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press:.
- Jobert, M. (2013). "Domestic and Professional Impoliteness in Fawlty Towers: Impoliteness as Pragmatic ". In Jamet, D. & Jobert ,M. (eds.)". Aspects of Linguistic Impoliteness. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Lakoff, Robin T. (1989). "The Limits of Politeness: Therapeutic and Courtroom discourse". In *Multilingue* 8 (2-3): 101-129.
- Leech, Geoffrey N. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.

Internet References

- The Plain Dealer , retrieved from www.enotes.com.
- Wycherley, W. (1676). *The Plain Dealer: A comedy as it is Acted at the Theater-Royal.* Available at: <https://scholarship.rice.edu>.

aleadad (25) aleadad alkhamis shaeban 1439 h 'ayar 2018 m

