CULPEPER'S IMPOLITENESS STRATEGIES IN NEIL SIMON'S *BILOXI BLUES*

ÖMER ŞEKERCİ

Suleyman Demirel University, Turkey

Abstract. Impoliteness has recently been of interest to scholars as a linguistic study in the field of pragmatics. It has emerged as the opposite orientation to politeness strategy, theory and studies. This paper explores how the impoliteness strategies mapped out by Jonathan Culpeper (1996) are employed in dramatic texts. It examines Culpeper's impoliteness strategies designed to investigate face in the dramatic text. This paper tests the strategies through Neil Simon's *Biloxi Blues* (1985). This dramatic comedy is used for three reasons: (1) as a drama, it is a mirror of life and real-life speech events; (2) impoliteness strategies provide a resource to analyse impolite interactions between the characters in dialogic discourse; (3) dramatic texts provide a rich context to interpret and analyse verbal and non-verbal impoliteness strategies. Impoliteness strategies can cause disharmony and conflict between characters in a dramatic text. The interactions exchanged by the characters in *Biloxi Blues* are analysed according to Culpeper's five impoliteness strategies: bald on record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, sarcasm or mock politeness, and withhold politeness. This study employs a descriptive qualitative method to determine how face-threatening acts are incorporated into the play in line with Culpeper's impoliteness strategies propounded in his article entitled *Towards an Anatomy of Impoliteness* (1996). The paper also examines how the characters react to face-threatening acts. In the twelve selected dramatic extracts of positive impoliteness, ten cases of bald on record impoliteness, eight cases of sarcasm or mock politeness, and four cases of negative impoliteness have been observed. Moreover, it has also been observed that the characters use taboo words and abusive and strong language. The bald on record impolite acts are aggravated mainly by abuses, sexual insults and name-calling strategies. Racial slurs have also been identified as a part of positive impoliteness.

Key words: Culpeper's impoliteness strategies, Biloxi Blues, face, dramatic text, face-threatening acts, Neil Simon

INTRODUCTION

Impoliteness as propounded by Jonathan Culpeper in 1996 has recently been of interest to scholars as a linguistic study in the field of pragmatics. It has emerged as the opposite orientation to politeness strategy, theory and studies. The concepts

of politeness and impoliteness fall into the field of linguistic pragmatics. According to Leech, 'pragmatics can be usefully defined as the study of how utterances have meanings in situations' (1983: x). Politeness theories have appealed to several scholars over the last forty years. These theories inherently focus on utilising communication strategies to sustain and promote interactions and harmony in social interactions in particular contexts. Moreover, they focus on creating harmonies in interactions while ignoring the strategic use of impoliteness.

It is worth briefly explicating politeness theories before focusing on Culpeper's impoliteness strategies. The concepts of politeness and impoliteness have been an issue of debate for many scholars over the years, and there is no single agreed definition. Brown and Levinson's Politeness Theory (PT) is one of the most essential politeness theories. PT rests on Erving Goffman's face notion and Herbert Paul Grice's conversational cooperative principle. Goffman states:

> Face may be defined as the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact. Face is an image as self-delineated attributes-albeit an image that others may share, as when a person makes a good showing for his profession or religion by making a good showing for himself. (Goffman, 1967: 5)

According to Brown and Levinson's PT (1987), it can be contended that any act or behaviour aiming to save the face of the interlocutor is polite, while any act or behaviour attacking the face of the interlocutor is impolite.

Brown and Levinson's PT is 'the recognition and linguistic acknowledgement of much subtler threats to self-image that a person presents publicly' (Birner, 2013: 217). Leech (2014) names PT as 'Politeness Principle' (PP) and introduces as follows:

(I)   TACT MAXIM (in impositives and commissives)

    (a)   Minimize cost to other [(b) Maximize benefit to other]

(II) GENEROSITY MAXIM (in impositives and commissives)

    (a)   Minimize benefit to self [(b) Maximize cost to self)

(III) APPROBATION MAXIM (in expressives and assertives)

    (a)   Minimize dispraise of other [(b) Maximize praise of other]

(IV) MODESTY MAXIM (in expressives and assertives)

    (a)   Minimize praise of self [(b) Maximize dispraise of self]

(V) AGREEMENT MAXIM (in assertives)

    (a)   Minimize disagreement between self and other

    [(b) Maximize agreement between self and other]

(VI) SYMPATHY MAXIM (in assertives)

    (a)   Minimize antipathy between self and other

    [(b) Maximize sympathy between self and other]. (Leech, 2014: 132)

Leech states that 'PP might be formulated in a general way: Minimise (other things as being equal) the expression of impolite beliefs and there is a corresponding positive version maximise (other things being equal) the expression of polite beliefs' (Leech, 2014: 81). In brief, it can be stated that there are two aspects of face: positive face and negative face. Positive face is the wish and desire to be approved and accepted by others, while negative face is the wish and desire to be unimpeded and left alone (Brown and Levinson, 1987).

WHAT IS IMPOLITENESS?

There has been no agreed definition of literary genres and text types since Aristotle because a literary work is a cultural product of a certain culture. It is thought that personal tendencies and worldviews play a significant role in determining and defining the types of literary texts. Accordingly, Farneste (2013) points out that 'the four rhetorical patterns narration, description, exposition and argumentation are known since Aristotle's time. However, depending on personal views, there is a tendency to introduce other classifications of text types or patterns' (Farneste, 2013: 34). How a literary work is apprehended helps to determine its type and genre. It can be contended that identifying literary texts causes difficulties as a text may have metaphysical and epistemological traits. It is a fact that almost all major literary genres have also subcategories. The same goes for linguistics and drama.

As a linguistic study in the field of pragmatics, impoliteness has many definitions, but none is solid and commonly accepted. To many scholars, rigid categorisation and clear-cut definition of major literary and linguistic terms and notions pose challenges. The notion of impoliteness has various definitions as well. Some definitions offered by scholars for the notion of 'impoliteness' are: 'impoliteness comes about when: (1) the speaker communicates face-attack intentionally, or (2) the hearer perceives and/or constructs behaviour as intentionally face-attacking, or a combination of (1) and (2)' (Culpeper, 2005: 38). This definition emphasises intentionality, purpose and aggravation to the interlocutor's face.

Politeness and impoliteness are context-dependent notions. Karapetjana and Rozina contend that 'the illocutionary force of imperatives is clear enough as they possess a very high level of directness, which makes them acceptable only in a very restricted set of circumstances' (Karapetjana and Rozina, 2012: 67). For instance, in emergencies or close relationships, imperatives can be uttered between the interlocutors without them being of impoliteness at all. However, in formal circumstances, imperatives are regarded as impolite acts because the interlocutor's face is completely ignored and the priority is attributed to the task at hand. As Locher and Bousfield state, 'Impoliteness is behaviour that is face-aggravating in a particular context' (2008: 3). The perception of the utterances as polite or impolite is context-dependent. The relationship, distance and hierarchical status between the interlocutors can play a role as determinants in perception.

Lakoff defines impoliteness as '[It] does not utilise politeness strategies where they would be expected, in such a way that the utterance can only almost plausibly be interpreted as intentionally and negatively confrontational' (Lakoff, 1989: 103). According to Lakoff's definition, impoliteness combines the speaker's intention and the hearer's expectation if they disagree. Impoliteness constitutes the communication of intentionally gratuitous and conflictive verbal face-threatening acts (FTAs) which are purposefully delivered: (1) unmitigated, in contexts where mitigation is required, and/or, (2) with deliberate aggression, that is, with the face threat exacerbated, 'boosted', or maximised in some way to heighten the face damage inflicted (Bousfield, 2008: 72).

Again, here can be observed that FTAs are delivered intentionally to the interlocutor's face. They do 'damage to the social identity of target persons and a lowering of their power or status. Social harm may be imposed by insults, reproaches, sarcasm, and various types of impolite behaviour' (Tedeschi and Felson, 1994: 171).

Tedeschi and Felson draw attention to the social identity of the target person and the conflict of interest between interlocutors who aim to gain short or long-term benefits (ibid.). The diversity of approaches and definitions of impoliteness reveals how difficult it is for scholars to have a unified, clear and satisfactory definition of impoliteness. Culpeper's (2011) definition of impoliteness is much more inclusive and attempts to integrate some of the above definitions.

> Impoliteness is a negative attitude towards specific behaviours occurring in specific contexts. It is sustained by expectations, desires and/or beliefs about social organisation, including, in particular, person's or group's identities 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. (Culpeper, 2011: 23)

These definitions exhibit that scholars use different terms for the same concept of impoliteness. For example, Goffman calls it *aggressive facework*, Locher and Bousfield call it *face-aggravating*, and Culpeper uses the term *face-attack*. Culpeper takes *face-attack* to be synonymous with *face-aggravating*. Culpeper's impoliteness strategies (1996) have been developed as the opposite orientation to Brown and Levinson's PT (1987). While PT aims to save the face of the hearer, Culpeper's impoliteness attacks the face of the hearer. He argues, in his chapter *Politeness and Impoliteness (2011):*

> Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory of the mutual vulnerability of the face is insufficient as an explanation of cooperation in facework. People are actively involved in maintaining and enhancing their faces and not merely hoping for reciprocal facework. Also, self-interest motivates cooperative behaviour for a number of reasons, not just mutual vulnerability. For example, cooperative social behaviour can promote an image of friendliness, kindness, helpfulness, etc., and this may well be an important identity claim of the self. (Culpeper, 2011: 395)

Concerning Culpeper's impoliteness strategy, power plays an important role. In terms of social rank, status, etc., a powerful and superior participant is likely to be impolite, because s/he can reduce the ability of the less powerful participant to counterattack with impoliteness (e.g., through the denial of speaking rights). Thus, impoliteness is more likely to occur in situations where social structural power is imbalanced (Culpeper, 1996: 354). The disparity between the powerful one and the less powerful one can occur under different circumstances when face is prone to vulnerability. Furthermore, a conflict of interest may create unequal situations for the participants. Orders, criticisms, threats, complaints, dismissals, silencers, curses and unwanted intrusions can be direct attacks to face (Brown and Levinson, 1987).

Impoliteness can be employed to achieve one's goal if a conflict of interest arises. In such cases, an individual knows how to save face or may cope with a counterattack that might occur. It can be contended that loud voice, tone of voice and pitch may play a significant role in determining the interpretation and perception of the utterance, whether it is polite or impolite. It should be noted that whatever one utters cannot be considered polite or impolite without taking into consideration the context. Fraser and Nolan (1981) argue that 'no sentence is inherently polite or impolite. I often take certain expressions to be impolite, but it is not the expressions themselves but the conditions under which they are used that determine the judgement of politeness' (Fraser and Nolan, 1981: 96). When one is faced with an impoliteness or face-attack or (FTAs), the hearer/recipient can opt either to respond or not to respond to the utterance. The hearer/recipient can stay silent to defend their face. Moreover, the hearer/recipient can stay silent when they do not hear the utterance or do not know about the context in which an utterance is made. If there is a power disparity or imbalance of power between the interlocutors in certain circumstances, a participant may not choose to respond to the utterance to avoid possible conflict. In a nutshell, while politeness aims to protect or save the face of the interlocutor, impoliteness directly attacks the face of the interlocutor.

CULPEPER'S IMPOLITENESS STRATEGIES

Culpeper's impoliteness strategies are listed as follows:

(1) *Bald on record impoliteness* – the FTA is performed in a direct, clear, unambiguous and concise way in circumstances where face is not irrelevant or minimised.

(2) *Positive impoliteness* – the use of strategies designed to damage the addressee's positive face wants.

(3) *Negative impoliteness* – the use of strategies designed to damage the addressee's negative face wants.

(4) *Sarcasm or mock politeness* – the FTA is performed with the use of politeness strategies that are obviously insincere, and thus remain surface realisations

(5) *Withhold politeness* – the absence of politeness work where it would be expected. (Culpeper 1996: 356, original emphasis)

Culpeper elaborates on his positive and negative impoliteness strategies as follows:

Positive impoliteness output strategies:

Ignore, snub the other – fail to acknowledge the other's presence.

Exclude the other from an activity.

Disassociate from the other – for example, deny association or common ground with the other; avoid sitting together.

Be disinterested, unconcerned, and unsympathetic.

Use inappropriate identity markers – for example, use title and surname when a close relationship pertains, or a nickname when a distant relationship pertains.

Use obscure or secretive language – for example, mystify the other with jargon, or use a code known to others in the group, but not the target.

Seek disagreement – select a sensitive topic.

Make the other feel uncomfortable – for example, do not avoid silence, joke, or use small talk.

Use taboo words – swear, or use abusive or profane language.

Call the other names – use derogatory nominations, etc. (Culpeper, 1996: 357-8)

Negative impoliteness output strategies:

Frighten – instill a belief that action detrimental to the other will occur.

Condescend, scorn or ridicule – emphasize your relative power. Be contemptuous.

Do not treat the other seriously. Belittle the other (e.g. use diminutives).

Invade the other's space – literally (e.g. position yourself closer to the other than the relationship permits) or metaphorically (e.g. ask for or speak about information which is too intimate given the relationship).

Explicitly associate the other with a negative aspect – personalize, use the pronouns 'I' and 'you'. Put the other's indebtedness on record, etc. (ibid.: 358)

Drama, as one of the major genres of literature, is closest to life. A typical dramatic text is based on conflict which propels the plot. The plot of a play develops on verbal and non-verbal conflicts involving characters. The characters situated in a kind of equilibrium have to fight when the equilibrium is destroyed by disequilibrium.

Impolite behaviour of a character causes disequilibrium which is reconciled at the end of a typical comedy, whether high comedy or low comedy. Only a few studies apply impoliteness strategies to dramatic texts, and there is no systematic study utilising impoliteness strategies in drama except for Roger Brown and Albert Gilman's *Politeness Theory and Shakespeare's Four Major Tragedies* (1989).

This paper aims to apply Culpeper's impoliteness strategies to *Biloxi Blues* (1985) by Neil Simon, an American playwright, television joke writer and one of the most well-known playwrights artistically and commercially in the history of American theatre (Berkowitz, 2013). *Biloxi Blues* examines the conflict and problems experienced by Sergeant Merwin Toomey, Arnold Epstein and the recruits in the US Army. The choice of this play for the present analysis suits Culpeper's impoliteness strategies as Culpeper also uses real-life data, obtained from a US Army training camp and the Weakest Link TV Quiz Show for his analysis of the concept of 'impoliteness' in *Towards an Anatomy of Impoliteness* (1996). *Biloxi Blues* has been chosen as a dramatic example of a US Army training camp to observe how impoliteness is incorporated into a dramatic text. The twelve chosen extracts display the blatant aggressive remarks and behaviour of the characters. Furthermore, the interactions exchanged by the characters in this play are analysed according to five impoliteness strategies: bald on record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, sarcasm or mock politeness, and withhold politeness (Culpeper, 1996: 356).

ANALYSIS OF *BILOXI BLUES*

Extract 1

(1) SELRIDGE. (Waking) Hey! What the hell's with you?

(2) WYKOWSKI. Get your foot out of my mouth, horse-face.

(3) SELRIDGE. Up your keester with a meathook, Kowski.

(4) CARNEY. Knock it off, pissheads.

(5) WYKOWSKI. Go take a flying dump, Carney.

(6) CARNEY. Yeah. In your mother's hairnet, homo! (They all return to sleeping). (Simon, 1986: 7-8)

In the opening scene, a group of newly recruited soldiers is on a train riding to Biloxi, Mississippi. They have been ordered to fulfil their ten-week basic training at the military camp preceding deployment in the Second World War. They are all sleeping in a coach. Upon the discomfort of the circumstances and disturbance of getting stuck in the coach, they attack each other's faces blatantly as there is no hierarchical structure. The recruits, Selridge, Wykowski and Carney, each take two turns in the extract. Their utterances are direct and clear impolite acts to the maximum level of offence. Selridge's turns (1-3), Wykowski's turns (2-5) and Carney's turns (4-6) belong to a strategy of bald on record impoliteness as the turns

exhibit imperatives with no mitigating device or hedge. Their FTAs are blatant and the recruits ignore each other's face wants. They fiercely yell at each other to gain room to lie more comfortably. In addition, Selridge, Wykowski and Carney employ a positive impoliteness strategy to maximise the aggravation of the face-attack. Selridge's taboo words 'hell' and 'keester' in turns 1 and 3; Wykowski's name-calling strategy 'horse-face' and 'flying dump' in turns 2 and 5; and Carney's name-calling strategy 'pissheads' in turn 4 and 'homo' in turn 6 as well as the swear 'in your mother's hairnet' in the same turn 6, are strategies of positive impoliteness. Each baldon-record impoliteness act is aggravated by the attack on the positive face want (wish to be approved, accepted and liked) and personal value.

Extract 2

(SGT. TOOMEY enters with clipboard)

(1)   TOOMEY. Dee-tail, attenSHUN!! (The boys slowly get to their feet)

(2)   SELRIDGE. Hi, Sarge.

(3)   TOOMEY. I think it's in your best interests, men, to move your asses when I yell ATTENSHUN!! MOVE IT!!! I want a single line right there! (They all jump and line up in front of their bunks. TOOMEY paces up and down the line, looking them over.) Until the order 'At Ease,' is given, gentlemen, you are not 'At Ease,' is that understood? 'Tenshun! (They snap to attention. He looks at them a moment) At Ease! (They stand 'At Ease' ... TOOMEY looks them over, then consults his clipboard.) Answer when your name is called. The answer to that question is 'Ho.' Not yes, not here, not right, not sir or any other unacceptable form of reply except the aforementioned Ho, am I understood? Wykowski, Joseph T.

(4)   WYKOWSKI. Ho!

(5)   TOOMEY. Selridge, Roy W.

(6)   ROY. Ho!

(7)   TOOMEY. Carney, Donald J.

(8)   CARNEY. Ho!

(9)   TOOMEY. Jerome, Eugene M.

(10) EUGENE. Ho!

(11) TOOMEY. Epstein, Arnold B.

(12) EPSTEIN. Ho Ho! (TOOMEY looks at him)

(13) TOOMEY. Are there two Arnold Epsteins in this company?

(14) EPSTEIN. No, Sergeant.

(15) TOOMEY. Then just give me one God damn Ho.

(16) EPSTEIN. Yes, Sergeant. (Simon, 1986: 12-13)

Sergeant Toomey is an aggressive, abusive and intimidating military officer in charge of the company at the training camp. His purpose is to cast the recruits in the mould of the ideal soldier enduring every physical and psychological hardship. Aiming to fulfil the task, he regards depersonalisation as the first step. With Sgt. Toomey's turns 1 and 3, his loudness of tone and voice determines how his orders are to be strictly obeyed. Face is irrelevant in military service because of the extreme hierarchical power structure. Toomey's precise and concise command (bald on record impoliteness) in turn 1 serves this purpose naturally. In turn 3, Sgt. Toomey also employs a positive impoliteness strategy, because he orders the recruits to reply to his every question with 'Ho'. His command in turn 3 exhibits his lack of concern and interest in the soldiers' answers. He attributes no value to those who line up in front of him and manifestly ignores their faces. As he tests the soldiers as to whether he is understood or not in his turns between 4-12, Epstein, one of the recruits, replies with 'Ho Ho' in turn 12. Toomey immediately employs a sarcasm or mock politeness strategy in turn 13. He asks a rhetorical question by flouting the Maxim of Quality (Grice, 1975) to implicate that Epstein has not managed to receive the command yet. After Epstein submissively replies with 'No, Sergeant' in turn 14, Toomey uses bald on record impoliteness in turn 15. However, he uses the taboo word 'God damn' (positive impoliteness strategy) to aggravate the face-attack. He exerts all his hierarchical superiority to depersonalise the soldiers in the camp and diminish each of their social and personal values.

Extract 3

(1) TOOMEY. Where are you from, Jerome?

(2) EUGENE. 1427 Pulaski Avenue.

(3) TOOMEY. In my twelve years in the army, I never met one God damn dogface who came from 1427 Pulaski Avenue. Why is that, Jerome?

(4) EUGENE. Because it's my home. Only my family lives there. I'm sorry. I meant I live in Brighton Beach, Brooklyn, New York. (Simon, 1986: 15)

Sgt. Toomey keeps on asking questions to the lined-up recruits about their prior civil lives. Toomey, in turn 3, uses sarcasm or mock politeness. He asks a rhetorical question by breaking the 'sincerity condition' thus flouting the Maxim of Quality (Grice, 1975) to implicate his disbelief at Eugene's answer about his hometown. Toomey's response expresses an impolite act imposed intentionally to attack Eugene's positive face want. Moreover, Sgt. Toomey aggravates his utterance with a positive impoliteness strategy accompanied by a taboo word ('God damn') and a name-calling strategy ('dogface'). As an ordinary inferior recruit in the hierarchical power structure, Eugene accepts the face-attack and submissively answers that he knows nobody from his hometown in his turn 4.

Extract 4

(1) TOOMEY. I may be looking at you but I am talking to the soldier from Bridgeport. (He looks into ROY's face) Now what did you do there, Wykowski? (They all look confused.)

(2)   WYKOWSKI. I drove a truck. A moving van. I was a furniture mover.

(3)   TOOMEY. That's just what they need in the South Pacific, Wykowski. Someone who knows how to move furniture around in the jungle. (EPSTEIN half raises his hand) I believe Private Epstein has a question. (Simon, 1986: 16-17)

In this exchange, Sgt. Toomey employs a positive impoliteness strategy by ignoring the physical presence of the recruits in the line-up. In turn 1, he asks questions to one while looking at another recruit. It is positive impoliteness to the most extreme level delivered to the recruits' positive faces. He ignores them by failing to acknowledge their presence to purposely attack in turn 1. Wykowski answers the question posed about his occupation in his civil life in turn 2. Upon his relevant answer, Sgt. Toomey uses a sarcasm or mock politeness strategy to attack the recruit's positive face in turn 3. On the surface, Toomey states his appreciation of Wykowski's profession, and thus, he utters a favourable response in turn 3. However, Toomey ridicules him and implicates the opposite of what he says. Toomey implies that Wykowski is of no use in military service. He uses a mock politeness strategy by flouting the Maxim of Quality (Grice, 1975) to make fun of Wykowski. Toomey makes the recruit uncomfortable by using irony, thus damaging his positive face want.

Extract 5

(1)   TOOMEY. What is the highest total of push-ups you ever achieved in one session, Private Carney?

(2)   CARNEY. I'm not too strong in the arms. About ten… maybe fifteen.

(3)   TOOMEY. Congratulations, Carney. You are about to break your old record. I want one hundred push-ups from you, Carney, and I want them now. AM I UNDERSTOOD?

(4)   CARNEY. One hundred? Oh, I couldn't possibly do one hu—

(5)   TOOMEY. HIT THE FLOOR, SOLDIER!!!

(6)   CARNEY. I could do, say, twenty a day for five days—

(7)   TOOMEY. Count off, God dammit and move your ass!

(8)   CARNEY. (He starts doing push-ups) One... two... three... four... five… (Simon, 1986: 18)

Toomey employs a sarcasm or mock politeness strategy to attack Carney's face. The words 'Congratulations' and 'break your old record' in turn 3 convey a favourable judgement, and it seems to satisfy Carney's positive face want (positive politeness), but Toomey's sole purpose is to attack Carney's face by emphasising his ultimate power on his company. When faced with the command, Carney is shocked and immediately appeals to Toomey's negative face with a negative politeness strategy with the mitigating modal 'couldn't' and hedge 'possibly' in turn 4 (Brown and Levinson, 1987). However, his negative

face is attacked by the interruption. Carney is denied speaking rights and is verbally forced to do one hundred push-ups. He is interrupted and faced with a negative impoliteness strategy employed by Sgt. Toomey. Toomey employs a bald on record impoliteness strategy in turn 5. Face is, in this case, entirely out of the question. The command is given directly and concisely by Toomey. However, Carney is still hesitant about fulfilling the command. Upon hesitation, Toomey uses positive impoliteness to the recruit's face by employing the taboo words 'God dammit' and 'ass' in turn 7. Carney is desperately obliged to obey in turn 8.

Extract 6

(1) EPSTEIN. I have a legitimate excuse, Sergeant. I have a digestive disorder, diagnosed as a nervous stomach.

(2) TOOMEY. Is that right? And how come you passed the army medical examination?

(3) EPSTEIN. It only gets nervous while I'm eating food. I wasn't eating food during the examination. I brought a chicken salad sandwich along to show them what happens when it enters the digestive tract ...

(4) TOOMEY. Are you a psycho, Epstein? You sound like a psycho to me. That's a psycho story. (Simon, 1986: 26-27)

In the barracks at the camp, the meal is disgusting, and all the recruits are willing to remain hungry to death. Epstein, one of the recruits, delivers his exceptional case regarding his health issue to Sgt. Toomey in turn 1. Then, the sergeant asks how Epstein has been accepted into the military service by the authority in turn 2. Upon his relevant answer in turn 3, Toomey attacks Epstein's face baldly on record in turn 4. His response to Epstein's excuse is using a bald on record impoliteness strategy. Toomey hurls direct insults at Epstein's positive face and blatantly and aggressively mental capacity. He aggravates his bald on record impoliteness accompanied by solid language with the abusive word 'psycho'. He ignores Epstein's positive face want in turn 4. Moreover, Toomey interrupts the recruit's explanation and denies him his speech turn to complete his sentence. This is a strategy of negative impoliteness. Toomey impedes his speech and damages Epstein's positive face want with apparent disrespect to his story and him in person.

Extract 7

(1) EUGENE. Hey, Arnold, it was incredible. You missed it. We were in the swamps up to our necks. There were water snakes and big lizards that crawled up your pants and swooping swamp birds that swooped down and went right for your eyeballs ... What's wrong, Arnold? ... Arnold? …

(2) EPSTEIN. Leave me alone!

(3) EUGENE. What is it? Are you sick?

(4) EPSTEIN. Get away from me. You're like all the rest of them. I hate every God damn one of you.

(5) EUGENE. Hey, Arnold, I'm your friend. I'm your buddy. You can talk to me.

(6) EPSTEIN. (He sits up and looks around) ... I'm getting out. I'm leaving in the morning. I'm going to Mexico or Central America till after the war ... I will not be treated like dirt, like a maggot. I'm not going to help defend a country that won't even defend its own citizens ... Bastards! (Simon, 1986: 29)

Sgt. Toomey has punished Epstein by making him clean the latrines. The other recruits have just returned from the military drill outside the barracks. In the exchange, Eugene approaches Epstein with the positive politeness strategy notice/pay attention to the hearer's interests, wants, needs or goods' in his utterance in turn 1 (Brown and Levinson, 1987). Epstein reacts with bald on record impoliteness by denying common ground as he feels himself an outcast from the rest of the company. In turn 2, Epstein's bald on record impoliteness is delivered to Eugene's positive face. As Eugene behaves in a friendly way in turn 3, Epstein resumes his impoliteness baldy on record in turn 4 and uses the abusive taboo words 'every God damn one of you' to the recruit's positive face. Epstein, in a great depression, takes Eugene's approach as a presumptuous intrusion, i.e., negative impoliteness because of being driven by depression, thus, counterattacking Eugene's positively polite act with bald on record impoliteness as the faces of the others are irrelevant to him.

Extract 8

(1) EUGENE. If I fell in love with her, she'd be perfect.

(2) WYKOWSKI. I told you. Jewish guys are all homos.

(3) CARNEY. Incredible!. Okay, the game is over. Tell him what he got, Roy, and we'll all take our money back. (They look at SELRIDGE). (Simon, 1986: 38)

The fellow recruits decide to play a game to pass the time in the barracks. They decide to choose the best fantasy maker, supposing what they would do if they had a week-long lifetime before being killed in the impending war. After Eugene says his last wish in turn 1, Wykowski turns to Carney and damages Eugene's positive face want in turn 2. He is, in fact, a racist soldier. He disassociates Eugene because he is of Jewish origin, and he employs a name-calling strategy by using the word 'homo' to aggravate the positive impoliteness. Wykowski insults Eugene by talking about him in the third person, so he ignores his presence within earshot. Wykowski's utterance is an example of an extreme positive impoliteness act. Carney, in turn 3, reacts with approval by uttering 'incredible'. Thus, Carney employs a positive politeness strategy towards Wykowski by agreeing with the racist view. They both claim a common ground against those of Jewish origin.

Extract 9

(1) SELRIDGE. I'm sorry. I'm not gonna let him beat me with that pissy story. I came up with something 'hot,' I'm not gonna give him an A-plus for 'Love in Bloom.'

(2) WYKOWSKI. Jesus, you are a moron. Go look in the latrine and see where you dropped your brains.

(3) SELRIDGE. I couldn't help it. I couldn't.

(4) EUGENE. You win, Arnold. It's your money. (EPSTEIN starts for the money)

(5) WYKOWSKI. It never fails. It's always the Jews who end up with the money. Ain't that right, Roy?

(6) SELRIDGE. Don't ask me. I never met a Jew before the army.

(7) WYKOWSKI. They're easy to spot. (To EPSTEIN) There's one … (To EUGENE) … And there's another one. (To all) They're the ones who slide the bacon under their toast so no one sees them eat it. Ain't that right, Jerome?. (Simon, 1986: 38-39)

In the fantasy game the recruits play, Selridge calls Eugene's dream a 'pissy story' in an abusive way, so he attacks his positive face (wish to be approved, accepted, liked). Selridge makes him uncomfortable while reviling him and naming his story 'pissy' in turn 1. It is the story that Eugene holds dear to himself in turn 1. Furthermore, he attacks Eugene's positive face by ignoring his presence in person there. Selridge's face-attack is positive impoliteness. In turn 2, Wykowski employs bald on record impoliteness by directly insulting Selridge and his value with the abusive word 'moron' in turn 2. That is why Wykowski finds Selridge's point higher than he supposes for Eugene's dream fantasy. Moreover, he flouts the Maxim of Manner (Grice, 1975) by implicating the positively impolite belief that Selridge is brainless. In his turns 5 and 7, Wykowski uses positive impoliteness strategies in regard to Eugene and Epstein, who are of Jewish origin. Each of his turns includes extreme positive impoliteness. He uses third-person pronouns while talking about them and, therefore, ignores their presence within earshot. He uses volatile racist slurs towards Jews and denies common ground or association with them in turns 5,6 and 7. Racist slurs result from positive impoliteness as they are a blatant denial of common ground.

Extract 10

(1) TOOMEY. Why in the hell did you put back money you knew you didn't take?

(2) EPSTEIN. Because I knew that you did. I saw you take it. I think inventing a crime that didn't exist to enforce your theories of discipline is neanderthal in its conception.

(3)   TOOMEY. (He gets closer) I can arrange it, Epstein, that from now on you get nothing to eat in the mess hall except cotton balls. You ever eat cotton balls, Epstein? You can chew it till 1986, it don't swallow ... Men do not face enemy machine guns because they have been treated with kindness. They face them because they have a bayonet up their ass. I don't want them human. I want them obedient.

(4)   EPSTEIN. Egyptian Kings made their slaves obedient. Eventually they lost their slaves and their kingdom.

(5)   TOOMEY. Yeah, well, I may lose mine but before you go, you're going to build me the biggest God damn pyramid you ever saw ... I'm trying to save these boys' lives, you crawling bookworm. Stand in my way and I'll pulverize you into chicken droppings.

(6)   EPSTEIN. It should be an interesting contest, Sergeant.

(7)   TOOMEY. After I crush your testicles, you can replace them with the cotton balls. (He glares at EPSTEIN, then exits quickly) ... Neanderthal in its conception, Jesus Christ! (Simon, 1986: 46)

In this dialogue, Sgt. Toomey attacks Epstein's negative face (wish to be unimpeded and left alone), and he aggravates his level of attack with the taboo word 'hell' in turn 1. Epstein also attacks Sgt. Toomey's positive face, because he finds his view primitive and 'neanderthal'. It is a positive impoliteness strategy designed to attack the positive face want (wish to be approved, accepted and liked) in turn 2. In return, Toomey employs negative impoliteness by invading Epstein's personal space and attempting to frighten him with blatant threats by exerting his hierarchical power in turn 3. Epstein flouts the Maxim of Manner (Grice, 1975) to implicate that his method of instilling discipline is of no use as history witnesses in the long course of time. In turn 4, Epstein employs a 'off record politeness strategy' (Brown and Levinson, 1987). Thus, Epstein implicates his disapproval of Sgt. Toomey by applying an over-generalisation strategy to implicate that he is wrong about what he thinks and does. However, he abstains from speaking directly so not to offend him and further escalate the strained tension. In turn 5, Toomey resumes his threats explicitly by employing a bald on record impoliteness strategy. He also employs a name-calling strategy with 'you crawling bookworm', and he emphasises his relative power with threats by uttering 'I'll pulverize you into chicken droppings' in turn 5. Epstein uses a sarcasm or mock politeness strategy. Although he is fully aware of the threats hurled at him, he uses favourable words such as 'interesting contest' in turn 6 to respond to Toomey. In turn 7, Toomey attacks Epstein's face baldly on record. His speech in turn 7 is an extreme bald on record impoliteness act aggravated by the taboo word 'testicles'.

Extract 11

(1)   HENNESEY. You have no right to read that. That's like opening someone's mail.

(2) WYKOWSKI. Bullshit. It's all about us. Private things about every one of us. That's public domain like in the newspapers.

(3) EPSTEIN. (Without looking up from his book) A newspaper is published. Unpublished memoirs are the sole and private property of the writer.

(4) WYKOWSKI. I thought all Jews were doctors. I didn't know they were lawyers too. (Simon, 1986: 59)

Hennesey, one of the recruits in the group, warns Wykowski not to intrude into Eugene's privacy by reading his diary, thus impeding Wykowski's action by employing a negative impoliteness strategy in turn 1. He reminds him that he has no freedom to do whatever he wants with others' private lives. In return, Wykowski swears by using the abusive word 'Bullshit' in turn 2. His response is a positive impoliteness act exhibiting blatant disagreement and disinterest in Hennesey's stand. Upon Epstein's view in turn 3, Wykowski uses a sarcasm or mock politeness strategy to hurl racial slurs at his Jewish origin once again. He flouts the Maxim of Quality (Grice, 1975) to implicate that all Jews interfere in anything they can. In turn 4, Wykowski's utterance is a sarcasm or mock politeness to Epstein's positive face want. He also employs a positive impoliteness strategy by making him uncomfortable with his inappropriate joke.

Extract 12

(1) TOOMEY. (Puts gun to EPSTEIN 's head) Don't test me, Epstein. I'll bury you with dignity but not much compassion ... Why the hell do you always take me on, boy?... I'll outsmart you, outrank you and outlast you, you know that.

(2) EPSTEIN. I know that, Sergeant.

(3) TOOMEY. Do you know what the irony of this situation is, Epstein? Is it Epsteen or Epstine?

(4) EPSTEIN. Either one. (Simon, 1986: 79)

In this exchange, Sgt. Toomey frightens Epstein by pointing his gun at him and delivers bald on record impoliteness by blatantly threatening him to the fullest extent of offence in turn 1. He manifestly declares his ultimate power over him regarding intelligence, hierarchy and life expectancy because of the impending war in which the recruits, including Epstein, are destined to fight to their death. Epstein submissively accepts what he says and satisfies his positive face. In turn 2, Toomey continues to attack him by mispronouncing his name and asking which version is correct. He manifestly expresses his lack of sympathy and concern for him in turn 2. His ironic question is a positive impoliteness act thrown upon Epstein's positive face. Fully aware of Toomey's aggressive intention, Epstein leaves the matter to him and employs a negative politeness strategy by leaving it up to Toomey what he should call him.

CONCLUSION

The present paper has employed Culpeper's impoliteness strategies in selected extracts from *Biloxi Blues* to reveal how Culpeper's impoliteness strategies are realised in dramatic texts. In addition, this study has tried to provide a framework for implementing impoliteness strategies in the play to interpret it from different perspectives and ascertain the impoliteness strategies that are pertinent to face-attack.

The play was chosen as it is semi-autobiographical play and renders a down-to-earth dialogic text. In addition, the plot revolves around an army training camp where a rigid hierarchical power structure plays a vitally important role. The impoliteness-driven extracts from the play concerning Culpeper's impoliteness strategies have been chosen to determine which impoliteness strategies and sub-strategies are employed, on which purposes the face-attacks are realised and how the hearer reacts. The context of the extracts at hand has also been mentioned to illustrate the operation of the impolite acts between the characters.

In twelve selected extracts, seventeen cases of positive impoliteness, ten cases of bald on record impoliteness, eight cases of sarcasm or mock politeness, and four cases of negative impoliteness have been observed. Moreover, withhold politeness is absent from the play. The characters use taboo words, abusive and strong language. Their bald on record impolite acts are aggravated mainly by abuses, sexual insults and name-calling strategies. Racial slurs as a part of positive impoliteness have also been observed. Bald on record impoliteness and sarcasm or mock politeness are mainly delivered by Sgt. Toomey while commanding, ridiculing and intimidating the recruits physically or psychologically. He also heavily uses negative impoliteness by invading the recruits' spaces to exert his power and frighten them to instill discipline. Sgt. Toomey, as an authority, employs impoliteness to a large extent as a method to depersonalise the recruits and cast them into the mould of the ideal soldier. The recruits obey the commands by desperately satisfying the face of the authority. When confronted with any impoliteness among themselves, as equals in the hierarchy, they react with impoliteness in return. This study has dealt with the extracts exhibiting aggression to make the salient point in analysing how impoliteness works within the play. Future research on impoliteness strategies combined with linguistic aspects of dramatic texts could create room for further interpretations.

REFERENCES

Berkowitz, M. G. (2013) *American Drama of the Twentieth Century.* NY: Routledge.

Birner, J. B. (2013) *Introduction to Pragmatics.* West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.

Bousfield, D. (2008) *Impoliteness in Interaction.* Philadelphia: John Benjamin's.

Brown, P. and Levinson, S. C. (1987) *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, R. and Albert, G. (1989) Politeness theory and Shakespeare's four major tragedies. *Language in Society*, 18 (2): 159-212.

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

Culpeper, J. (2011) Politeness and impoliteness. In K. Aijmer and G. Andersen (eds.) *Sociopragmatics*, Vol. 5 of *Handbooks of Pragmatics* (pp. 391-436). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Culpeper, J. (2005) Impoliteness and entertainment in television quiz show: The Weakest Link. *Journal of Politeness Research: Language, Behaviour, Culture*, 1: 35-72.

Culpeper, J. (1996) Towards an anatomy of impoliteness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 25: 349-367.

Farneste, M. (2013) What is the meaning of the school/university essay and related terms in English and Latvian? *Baltic Journal of English Language, Literature and Culture*, 3: 33-45.

Fraser, B. and William N. (1981) The association of deference with linguistic form. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language,* 27: 93-109.

Goffman, E. (1967) On face-work. An analysis of ritual elements in social interaction. In E. Goffman (ed.) *Interaction Ritual*: *essays in face-to-face behaviour* (pp. 5-45). New York: Doubleday.

Grice, H. P. (1975) Logic and conversation. In P. Cole and J. L. Morgan (eds.) *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts* (pp. 41-58). New York: Academic Press.

Karapetjana, I. and Rozina, G. (2012) Politeness strategies in electronic communication: the speech act of request. *Baltic Journal of English Language, Literature and Culture*, 2: 63-71.

Lakoff, R. T. (1989) The limits of politeness: therapeutic and courtroom discourse. *Multilingua*, 8 (2-3): 101-129.

Leech, G. (2014) *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.

Locher, M. A. and Derek B. (2008) Introduction: impoliteness and power in language. In D. Bousfield and M. A. Locher (eds.) *Impoliteness in Language: Studies on its Interplay with Power in Theory and Practice* (pp. 1-13). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Simon, N. (1986) *Biloxi Blues*. New York: Samuel French.

Tedeschi, J. T. and Richard, B. F. (1994) *Violence, Aggression, and Coercive Actions*. Washington DC: American Psychological Association.

Ömer Şekerci (Prof. Dr.) has been working at Suleyman Demirel University, Turkey, since 2000. His main research interests are modern drama studies, linguistics, literary criticism, discourse analysis and literary theory.

ⓘ https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9074-3841

Email: omersekerci@sdu.edu.tr