Pragmatics of Impoliteness and Rudeness

Hiba Nassrullah Mohammed
College of Education for Women
Baghdad University

Nawal Fadhil Abbas
College of Education for Women
Baghdad University

Abstract

There is a great deal of overlap between the two concepts of impoliteness and rudeness. Despite the fact that both refer to the offensive behavior, there is a main difference between the two terms. This paper is devoted to reveal that difference, which is a matter of intentionality, clarifying which one of them is intentional and which is not. Besides, it is intended to examine these two pragmatic concepts in a specific extract chosen carefully from George Bernard Shaw's Pygmalion (1913) by applying Culpeper's (2005) model of impoliteness especially his types of impoliteness 'affective impoliteness, coercive impoliteness and entertaining impoliteness', on one hand, and Segarra's (2007) classification of rudeness types including: rudeness of word, rudeness of action and inaction rudeness, on the other hand. Therefore, the researchers will provide an adequate account of impoliteness and rudeness as spic-and-span linguistic phenomena highlighting their meanings, definitions and types, as well as the difference between them. Taking into account the fact that understanding politeness is indispensible to comprehend impoliteness, the researchers of this study will also explicate politeness with its prominent theory 'Brown and Levinson's (1987) face-saving theory'.

Index terms: Pragmatics, politeness, impoliteness and rudeness.

1. Introduction

The modern concept of pragmatics was first introduced by the philosopher, Charles Morris, in 1938. He gave the following well-known definition of pragmatics: "The branch of semiotics which studies the origin, the uses, and the effects of signs. It is distinguished from semantics and syntax (Cherry, 1974, p.1). While Carnap (1939) proposed to call pragmatics "the field of all those investigations which take into consideration… the action, state, and environment of a man who speaks or hears a linguistic sign" (cited in Akmajian, et al., 2001, p. 361). Pragmatics includes the study of deixis, presupposition, speech acts, implicative, cooperative principle, politeness, impoliteness and rudeness. The last three phenomena 'politeness, impoliteness and rudeness' will be the essence of this paper. Before elaborating on these topics, an account of Grice's maxims is of value, especially to the readers of politeness. In other words, Grice's Co-operative principle of verbal interaction (1975) was the starting point of these theories of politeness. His principle says "Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged" (Barron, 2003, p. 14). Grice claims that in order to make the process of linguistic communication easier and gain the purposes of verbal interaction between interlocutors, a speaker is supposed to be committed to Grice's maxims. He states them (in Simerka, 1996, p. 54) as follows:

1. **Maxims of quantity**
- Make your contribution as informative as required.
- Do not make your contribution more than is required.
2. **Maxims of quality** (the Super maxim): Try to make your contribution one that is true.
- Do not say what you believe to be false.
- Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.
3. **Maxim of relation**
- Be relevant.

4. Maxims of manner

- Avoid obscurity of expression.
- Avoid ambiguity.
- Be brief.
- Be orderly.

The theorists of politeness phenomenon, including Leech (1983) and Brown and Levinson (1978,1987), found out the deficiency of Grice's Co-operative principle which was represented by his focus only on one function of language, the referential function, without any consideration for politeness and its important role in facilitating the process of personal interaction. Therefore, politeness was considered as a mere flouting of Grice's maxims. For example, if there is a co-operative request like "I've heard that you bought a new phone. Show it to me! ", the polite form of the same request will be something like "Could you show me your new phone, please?" (flouting the maxim of manner, which says that a person should be brief, orderly, and avoid ambiguity and obscurity). Thus, politeness researchers attempt at filling the gap of Grice's account by concentrating on the relational function of language, unlike Grice who limited his focus to the referential function of language (Barron, 2003, p. 15).

2. The Concept of Politeness

Before the researchers embark on studying and showing what is impoliteness, an account of politeness seems necessary for the understanding of impoliteness. Many people think that politeness is just a matter of language and of course this is not true. The word 'polite' is used to refer to a person whose behavior is respectful irrespective of the way he or she talks and writes. Besides, the exact meaning of politeness varies among cultures. In Japan, as an example, bowing respectfully is considered a polite behavior, while in Samoan culture; politeness is linked to the social class and political power. Thus, the word 'polite' can be used to refer to both verbal and non-verbal behavior (Mey, 2009, p.711). Politeness is one of the purposes that language fulfils and it has been the main concern not only of pragmatics but also of sociolinguistics. The general definition of linguistic politeness is offered by Boyer (1702) as follows "Politeness is a dexterous management of our Words and Actions, whereby we make other People have better Opinions of us and themselves" (cited in Culpeper & Kadar, 2010, P. 88). Boyer embraces both the linguistic and non-linguistic sides of politeness and this is shown clearly with capitalized words he uses in his definition 'Words' and 'Actions'.

Unlike the previous definition, Lakoff's (1975) definition of politeness is specific to the social form of behavior. He interprets politeness as "those forms of behaviour which have been developed in societies in order to reduce friction in interpersonal interaction." (Cited in Watts, et al., 2005, p. 45). Fraser and Nolen suggest that politeness is "the result of a conversational contract entered into by the participants in an effort to maintain socio-communicative verbal interactional-free." According to them, politeness is a bunch of constraints on verbal behavior and the nature of these constraints depends on the social setting of interaction, the relationship of participants, and the language used (Ibid., p. 46). Hill (cited in Bax and Kadar, 2012, p.105) defines politeness as "one of the constraints on human interaction, whose primary purpose is to consider others' feelings, establish mutual comfort, and promote rapport." In accordance with his definition, it will be difficult to decide which one is achieved 'mutual comfort' or 'rapport' in a certain polite action. Both the early-eighteenth-century scholars and modern scholars share the same conception of politeness viewing it as a linguistic means used by all speech communities to avoid social aggression, reduce conflict, refine the ego, prevent or at least minimize friction, and eventually make the process of social interaction work smoothly (Watts, et al., 2005, p. 47).

3. Brown and Levinson's (1987) face-saving theory

Face saving theory, proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987), is regarded as the most well-known theory of politeness. Brown and Levinson view politeness phenomena as a 'Universal principle of human interaction' (Malmkjar, 2004, p. 426). Their theory of politeness has two main assumptions:

1. **The first assumption**: It is related to the idea of Model Person (MP). Brown and Levinson see conversationalists as rational agents who think in a strategic way to select the available language choices of which they are conscious.

2. **The second assumption**: It is related to Goffman's (1967) notion of face upon which Brown and Levinson based their theory and later on they developed it to be the central part of their theory (Locher, 2004, p. 66).

Brown and Levinson define face as "the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself." They suppose that face is "something that is emotionally invested, and that can be lost, maintained, or enhanced, and must constantly be attended to in interaction" (cited in Friess, 2008, p. 113). They distinguish two aspects of face:

1. **Negative face**: It represents the person's desire to be independent and free from imposition of others.
2. **Positive face**: It represents the person's desire to be liked and appreciated by others (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p. 62).

Although Brown and Levinson agree with Goffman's suggestion which implies that participants act in ways to preserve and honor face, their concept of negative face does not suit Goffman's view of face. In other words, while Goffman's view of face concentrates on the interactional factor, Brown and Levinson's view focuses on the rational factor (Haslett, 2012, p. 262). It is known that when a verbal or non-verbal act runs against the hearer's or the speaker's face, the act is named "face-threatening act" (FTA). A request, for example, is seen as a FTA to the hearer's negative face because the hearer, in this case, will be impeded by the speaker to do what the speaker wants rather than what he wants. A contradiction, on the other hand, is considered as a FTA to the hearer's positive face, that is to say, the speaker's opinion will be misunderstood by the hearer. FTAs, as mentioned above, can also be against the speaker's negative or positive face. For example, an apology threatens the speaker's positive face, while an offer threatens the speaker's negative face (Longcope, 1995, p. 2).

Brown and Levinson's view is speech-act based. They use the term face-threatening act (FTA) to refer to any kind of linguistic act has a relational dimension. According to their view, every face-threatening act is supposed to be equilibrated by a certain degree of politeness (Walkinshaw, 2008, p. 47). In their book, *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage* (1987, p.60), Brown and Levinson state: "Unless S's want to do an FTA with maximum efficiency(defined as bald on record) is greater than S's want to preserve H's (or S's) face to any degree, then S will want to minimize the face threat of the FTA." In term of their theory, both the speaker and hearer tend to maintain each other's face, but sometimes FTAs are committed between them. These FTAs menace the independence aspect of the hearer's face and the involvement aspect of both the hearer's face and the speaker's face. In accordance with Brown and Levinson's view, a set of strategies are employed by the speaker to redress FTAs. The speaker takes into his consideration the rated risk of loss when choosing a strategy (Locher, 2004, p. 66). Brown and Levinson (1987, p. 74) propose three sociological variables to account for the risk of loss of face:

1. The 'social distance' (D) between a speaker and a hearer (a symmetric relation).
2. The relative 'power' (P) of the speaker and the hearer (an asymmetric relation).
3. The absolute ranking (R) of imposition in a particular culture.

When having FTAs, Brown and Levinson propose five types of politeness strategies so as to redress face:

1. Bald on record

In the light of this strategy, the speaker sticks to Gricean maxims of the cooperative principle as Brown and Levinson mention (1987, p. 94): "For our purpose, we can treat the bald on-record strategy as speaking in conformity with Grice's maxims." This strategy does not minimize the threat to the hearer's face; it is used when the speaker's desire to do the FTA with maximum efficiency is more than his desire to satisfy the hearer's face (Ibid, p.95).

2. Positive Politeness:

This strategy minimizes the threat to the hearer's face, thus, the speaker, when applying this strategy, focuses on the hearer's satisfaction and conviction rather than his desire to do the FTA. This strategy is not only used to redress the FTA, but also to create a kind of social and intimate relation between the speaker and the hearer (Friess, 2008, p. 115).

3. Negative Politeness

This strategy is the most common in use among other strategies. It is characterized by Brown and Levinson (1987, P. 70) as "self-effacement, formality and restraint, with attention to H's (the hearer or redressed) self-image centering on his want to be unimpeded." This strategy minimizes the threat to the hearer's face and attempts to satisfy his negative face.

4. off record

It is considered the most face-repressive strategy. In compliance with this strategy, there is more than one possible intention so that the speaker is not able to stick himself to particular intent (Friess, 2008, p.116). This strategy is regarded the most indirect form of speech acts. In other words, it is practiced to perform unconventionally indirect speech acts such as hints, metaphors, and ironies (Cheng and Kong, 2009, p. 95).

5. Don't do the face-threatening act

This strategy is performed when the risk of threat to face is very big and thereby the speaker keeps silent without using any speech act (Ibid.) despite its importance, Brown and Levinson's theory was criticized by many linguists due to many factors. First and foremost, it is criticized as being individualistic and focuses only on the speaker who is regarded, in conformity with this theory, as a relational agent. Accordingly, it may not be applicable in non-Western cultures, like Igbo and Japanese cultures, where a group, rather than an individual, dominates the behavioral norms (Brasdefer, 2008, p. 19). Furthermore, Slugoski and Turnbull (1988) criticized Brown and Levinson's theory as it restricted itself to certain variables (social distance, power, and absolute ranking). Concerning the same point, Watts (1992) stated that the theory of politeness did not clarify the relation between these variables. Eventually, Meier (1997) argued against the lack of clear definition of impoliteness in Brown and Levinson's theory (Jordà, 2005, p. 60).

4. The Concept of Impoliteness

Brown and Levinson's model of politeness (1987) paved the way for linguists to explore the phenomenon of impoliteness. Meanwhile, Brown and Levinson dealt with politeness as a knotty framework applied to soften face threatening acts, other linguists including, Culpeper, Bousfield and Eelen, headed for the opposite direction of politeness. In other words, they studied the communicative situations where the speaker's purpose is to damage a hearer's face rather than softening face threatening acts (O'keeffe, Clancy & Adolphs, 2011, p. 71). Both Eelen and Culpeper noticed that all the theorists of politeness refer to impoliteness superficially while, in practice, their deep focus was on politeness and, thus, their comments on the notion of impoliteness were insufficient and to some extent prejudiced. In a nutshell, the reason behind the recent interest in impoliteness was the inability of politeness approaches to explain amply the confrontational interaction in the impolite discourses (Bousfield, 2008, p. 71). Watts (in Lambrou and Stockwell, 2007, p. 211) states " … (im)politeness is a term that is struggled over at present, has been struggled over in the past and will, in all probability, continue to be struggled over in the future." Watts' definition implies the continuity of disagreement over the notion of impoliteness among scholars. . The most well-known definition of impoliteness is mentioned by Culpeper (1996) in which he described impoliteness "as the use of strategies designed to attack face, and thereby cause social conflict and disharmony" (cited in Bousfield and locher, 2008, p. 131). Culpeper (1996) made a good use of Brown and Levinson's model of politeness to introduce his theory of impoliteness which he considered a "parasite of politeness". Consequently, and in parallel with Brown and Levinson's strategies (bald on record, positive politeness, negative politeness, off-record, and don't do the FTA), Culpeper set up five super strategies which will be explained in the coming section (Thielemann and Kosta, 2013, p. 238).

5.1 Culpeper's (1996, 2005) Model of Impoliteness

The most notable model of impoliteness was introduced by Jonathan Culpeper in (1996). As maintained by his model, impoliteness is intended to produce disharmony between interlocutors in social interactions (Walaszewska and Piskorska, 2012, p. 246). Although his model is based on Brown and Levinson's (1987) PT, Culpeper refutes their view of impoliteness as 'marginal' to everyday conversation. He asserts that understanding the notion of politeness is impossible without comprehending impoliteness phenomenon and, thereby, the analytical framework of impoliteness needs to be improved and receive the due consideration (Mullany and Stockwell, 2010, p. 71). Culpeper's model has an advantage over others as it is built on real life data. It tackles with different types of discourses starting with conflictive and impolite illocutions in U.S. army training discourse and ending with impolite interaction within bilingual Spanish/English children's discourse. Therefore, the variety of verbal and written data used by Culpeper empowers his model and makes it more reliable (Bousfield, 2008, p. 90). Furthermore, Culpeper depends on media data in general and television programs in particular to testify how his impoliteness model functions.

Films, documentaries and quiz programs, in which there is a continual conflict between interlocutors, are his favorite sources where impoliteness is embodied differently and can be interpreted from various perspectives (Mullany and Stockwell, 2010, p. 72). Culpeper distinguishes five super strategies by which impoliteness can be created and received. They are:

1. Bald on record impoliteness

This strategy is employed when there is much face at risk and when a speaker intends to damage the hearer's face and thus the impolite utterance will be performed directly and clearly (Bousfield, 2008, p. 92). Culpeper uses here the concept of face-attack-act (FAA), in opposition to FTA, in order to identify the face attack where there is a deliberate intention on the part of the speaker (Mullany and Stockwell, 2010, p. 71). Wieczorek (2013, p. 46) elucidates the difference between Brown and Levinson's bald on record politeness and Culpeper's bald on record impoliteness. While the former is applied in particular situations where the risk to face is minimal without any attention to attack the hearer's face, the latter is used when there is much risk to the face and the speaker intends to damage the other's face.

2. Positive impoliteness

This strategy is used to damage the hearer's positive face want (his desire to be accepted) (Bousfield and Locher, 2008, 134). In the incarnation of his model (2005), Culpeper adds a range of sub-strategies to positive impoliteness including (cited in Mullany and Stockwell, 2010, p. 72):

- ignoring or snubbing the other
- denying common ground with the hearer
- selecting a sensitive or undesirable topic to talk about
- using inappropriate identity markers
- being disinterested and unsympathetic with the hearer
- looking for disagreements
-using obscure language and inserting secretive words within the discourse
-using taboo words

3. Negative impoliteness

This strategy is designed to attack the hearer's negative face want (his desire to be free from imposition) (Thielemann and Kosta, 2013, p. 239). Negative impoliteness, in accordance with Culpeper's (2005) incarnation, involves the following sub-strategies (cited in Mullany and Stockwell, 2010, p. 72):

- scorn
- frighten
- ridicule
- And invade the hearer's space literally or metaphorically

4. Sarcasm or mock impoliteness

In his strategy, the speaker performs the FTA using politeness strategies which are clearly insincere (Thielemann and Kosta, 2013, p. 239). In other words, sarcasm means the use of one or more sub-strategies which are superficially suitable and accepted but deeply they have the opposite meaning (Bousfield, 2008, p. 95).

5. Withhold politeness

This strategy occurs when the speaker does not perform politeness where is it expected as in keeping silent when the speaker is supposed to thank the hearer (Thielemann and Kosta, 2013, 239).

5.2 Impoliteness Types

Culpeper proposes three types of impoliteness in his up-to-date book*, Impoliteness: Using Language to Cause Offence* (2011). These types share the function of contradicting interpersonal relationships, identities, and social norms. They are:

1. Affective impoliteness

In this kind of impoliteness, the speaker exposes his anger towards the hearer and this consequently generates a negative emotional atmosphere between the speaker and the hearer (Huang, 2014, p. 150). For example:

-You made me crazy!

In the above example, the speaker uses such an impolite utterance to express the passive effect of the hearer on him and inform him that he is unwanted anymore.

2. Coercive impoliteness

This variant of impoliteness raises realignment between the speaker (the producer) and the hearer (the target) so that the speaker gains profits at the expense of the hearer.

Culpeper believes that this impoliteness type takes place, to a greater extent, in situations where the producer belongs to a higher and more powerful social level than the hearer's level. In a nutshell, coercive impoliteness is a means of getting power via language (Culpeper, 2011, 252). The following is an example of this type of impoliteness:

-Shut up or I'll smash your head! (Huang, 2014, p. 150)
Here, the speaker puts an end to the addressee's behavior by warning him not to speak. Such an utterance is produced when the speaker has a command over the hearer.

3. Entertaining impoliteness

This kind of impoliteness is generated when the speaker pokes fun at the hearer and utilizes the target's feelings to obtain amusement (Ibid.). The following example which is taken from Charles Dicken's novel *Great Expectations* shows this type of impoliteness: (in response to Miss Havisham's invitation to play cards with Pip)

-Young Estella: with this boy! Why, he is a common laboring boy (Johanson, 1994, p. 25).

6. The Concept of Rudeness

There are lots of definitions of the term 'rudeness', but the researchers have selected only few ones which are adopted mostly by scholars and linguists. Rondina and Workman (2005, p. 3) state a general definition of rudeness which reads: "Rudeness is basically anything you say or do— or don't say or do— that offends someone else, making them feel uncomfortable or inconvenienced". It is also defined by DuBrin as "insensitive or disrespectful behavior engaged in by a person displays a lack of regards for others" (2011, p. 87). The most common definition is introduced by Beebe (1995) who says: "… rudeness is defined as a face threatening act (FTA) - or feature of an FTA such as intonation- which violates a socially sanctioned norm of interaction of the social context in which it occurs" (cited in Culpeper, 2011, p. 19). What is special in Beebe's definition is that he deals with rudeness not only as a personal offense, but also as a violation of the norms followed in the society. In other words, he views rudeness from both personal and social perspectives.

Rudeness is always intentional as Segarra mentions: "The message behind rudeness is one of ignorance and indifference of good social manners and intentional discourtesy" (2007, p. 141). While impoliteness, on the other hand, is either intentional or accidental and this is what Culpeper implies in his second definition of impoliteness (2005): "Impoliteness comes about when: (1) the speaker communicates face-attack intentionally, or (2) the hearer perceives and/or constructs behavior as intentionally face-attacking, or a combination of (1) and (2)" (cited in Bousfield and Locher, 2008, p. 131). Although Culpeper links impoliteness to intentionality in the first part of his definition, the rest of it refers to the opposite and especially the word 'or' by which he means that a speaker may not have the intention to attack the hearer's face, but his behavior is perceived as impolite by the hearer. Terkourafi (2008) also confirms this main difference in his definition of impoliteness and rudeness which views impoliteness as intentional and sometimes accidental due to the hearer's linguistic incompetence unlike rudeness which is constantly intentional (cited in Arendholez, 2013, p. 95). The minor difference between impoliteness and rudeness is that impoliteness is more used in academia than rudeness. Besides, rudeness is related to humanities and especially history, while impoliteness is associated with linguistics and communication (Culpeper, 2011, p. 79).   The following are two examples supplied with photos to clarify the difference between impoliteness and rudeness:

Example (1):

As shown in photo (1), while a secretary is asking her boss to attend the meeting room, he gets a call and immediately puts his hand in front of her face as an implied order to keep silent. The boss's behavior is considered as impolite rather than rude, because we do not know which type of calls he has received. It might be an urgent call and he is forced to order her to stop talking in such a tactless way.

Photo (1): An example of impolite behavior

Example (2):

This example, as demonstrated in the photo below, illustrates the rude behavior of a girl in an airplane. The girl is singing loudly neglecting the fact that she is in a public place and she may bother the other passengers with her singing.

Over and above, she puts her feet on the seat of the passenger sitting next to her which makes him annoyed. She evidently violates the rules of etiquette intentionally; therefore, her behavior is regarded as rude.

Photo (2): An example of rude behavior

6.1. Rudeness Types

In his book entitled, *How to Become a True Professional*, Segarra classified rudeness into three types (2007, p. 141):

1. Rudeness of word

   This type of rudeness takes place when someone curses; uses street language; keeps interrupting others while they are talking; says very dirty jokes; or asks people he does not have an intimate relation with personal questions.

2. Rudeness of action

   This type covers those actions (verbal or non-verbal) used to disdain and belittle people like disregarding others' feelings and opinions; being uncivil with others; or neglecting the basic rules of etiquette.

3. Inaction rudeness

   This type is about what a person does not do rather than what he does. It includes the omission of necessary behaviors like neglecting people while they are talking; not responding to help requests from others; or being indifferent and careless.

7. *Data Analysis*

One of the challenges that the researchers face when conducting the present paper is selecting a suitable literary work to show the difference between impoliteness and rudeness. Consequently, this requires them to think of a play, in which they can find a large amount of exchanges, rather than a novel or a short story. Among all other plays, they pick *Pygmalion* (1913), by the Irish playwright George Bernard Shaw, as it has all the qualifications that they seek for in a literary text including:

1. The astounding astuteness of the playwright who is described by Burt as "the greatest English dramatist since Shakespeare" (Burt, 2009, p. 164)
2. The fertile text of the play which is full of various impolite and rude utterances.
3. Language, in this play, represents a fundamental theme; a transition point in the heroine's character, Eliza Doolittle; and the hero's obsession, Henry Higgins who is specialist in Phonetics.

For the purpose of making the analysis process highly organized and directed to achieve comprehensible results, the researchers follow a particular procedure in accordance with the aims they try to achieve and the literary text they select to be analyzed. This procedure includes certain steps namely: identifying the impolite and rude utterances within the selected extract; and specifying the extract in terms of Culpeper's impoliteness types on one hand, and in terms of Segarra's rudeness types, on the other hand. The researchers have chosen on purpose the following extract from Act Two of the play, *Pygmalion*, to apply the steps of the analysis procedure mentioned above.

7.1 –The Selected Extract

HIGGINS   [brusquely, recognizing her with unconcealed disappointment, and at once, babylike, making an intolerable grievance of it] Why, this is the girl jotted down last night (1). She's no use (2): Ive got all the records I want of the Liss   Grove lingo; and I'm not going to waste another cylinder [To the girl] Be off with you: I dont want you (3).

THE FLOWER GIRL. Dont you be so saucy (4). You aint heard what I come for yet.[To Mrs Pearce, who is waiting at the door for further instructions] Did you tell him I come in a taxi?

MRS PEARCE. Nonsense (5), girl! What do you think a gentleman like Mr. Higgins cares what you came in (6)?

THE FLOWER GIRL. Oh, we a r e proud! He aint above giving lessons not him: I heard his say so. Well, I aint come here to ask for any compliment; and if my money's not good enough I can go elsewhere.

HIGGINS. Good enough for what?

THE FLOWER GIRL. Good enough for yə-oo. Now you know, don't you? I'm coming to have lessons,   I am. And to pay for em tə-oo: make no mistake (7).

HIGGINS. [stupent] Well!!![Recovering his breath with a gasp] What do you expect me tosay to you?

THE FLOWER GIRL. Well, if you was a gentleman, you might ask me to sit down, I think (8). Dont I tell you I'm bringing you business?

HIGGINS. Pickering: shall we ask this baggage to sit down or throw her out of the window (9)?

THE FLOWER GIRL. [running away in terror to the piano, where she turns at bay] Ah-ah-ah-ow-ow-ow-oo(10)! [Wounded and whimpering] I won't be called baggage when Ive offered to pay like any lady.

(Laurence, 1957, p. 27-28)

7.2 – Cognizing the Extract

This extract, which belongs to Act Two of *Pygmalion*, takes place in the morning inside Higgins's laboratory in Wimpole Street. While Higgins is talking to Pickering about his phonetic researches, Mrs. Pearce, Higgins' house keeper, interrupts them announcing the arrival of a newcomer, Eliza, who has come to make a deal with Higgins. She wants him to give her lessons in order to enhance her language which may help her to achieve her dream of being a real lady working in a flower shop (Morgan, 1980, p. 27). Once again Eliza is referred to, in this extract, as 'the flower girl', unlike the note taker who has already introduced himself to Pickering, at the end of Act One, as Henry Higgins a professor of Phonetics.

7.3 – Analyzing the Extract

In this extract, the researchers identify five impolite utterances produced by Higgins, Eliza and Mrs. Pearce as well as five rude utterances mentioned only by Higgins and Mrs. Pearce as shown in table (1). It is worth mentioning that tables are used in the analysis process for the sake of ease of reference**.**

Table (1): The impolite and rude utterances in the selected extract

No.	Utterance	Form	Producer	Type
1.	Why, this is the girl I jotted down last night.	sentence	Higgins	Rudeness
2.	She's no use.	sentence	Higgins	Rudeness
3.	Be off with you: I dont want you.	sentence	Higgins	Rudeness
4.	Dont you be so saucy.	sentence	Eliza	Impoliteness
5.	Nonsense	Word	Mrs Pearce	Rudeness
6.	What do you think a gentleman like Mr Higgins cares what you came in?	sentence	Mrs Pearce	Impoliteness
7.	Good enough for yǝ-oo. Now you know, dont you? I'm coming to have lessons, I am. And to pay for em tǝ-oo: make no mistake.	paragraph	Eliza	Impoliteness
8.	Well, if you was a gentleman, you might ask me to sit down, I think.	sentence	Eliza	Rudeness
9.	shall we ask this baggage to sit down or throw her out of the window?	sentence	Higgins	Impoliteness
10.	Ah-ah-ah-ow-ow-ow-oo!	expression	Eliza	Impoliteness

7.4 Culpeper's Types of Impoliteness and Segarra's Types of Rudeness in the Selected Extract

The three types of Culpeper's impoliteness, affective impoliteness, coercive impoliteness and entertaining impoliteness, are available in this extract while only two types of Segarra's rudeness are found, rudeness of word and rudeness of action. The second type of rudeness 'rudeness of action' is used by Higgins to disdain and belittle Eliza in: the first utterance "*Why, this is the girl I jotted down last night*" when Higgins welcomes Eliza's arrival involving the verb 'jot down', that always comes with objects, to describe what he has done to her in the previous day; in the second utterance "*She's no use*" as he uses the idiom 'no use', which exclusively comes with objects, to attack her face directly; and in the third utterance "*Be off with you: I dont want you.*" when Higgins drives Eliza out of his house without giving her any chance to justify her coming. After receiving such an unexpected rude welcome, Eliza on her part refuses to obey Higgins's rude command 'going away'; instead she faces him using the second type of impoliteness 'affective impoliteness' in the fourth utterance "*Don't you be so saucy*". She describes him as being 'saucy' in front of Mrs. Pearce and Pickering who become astonished at her gutsy reaction. Then, she asks Mrs. Pearce whether Higgins has been informed that she has come in a taxi or not. Mrs. Pearce does not take Eliza's question seriously and answers her using the first type of rudeness 'rudeness of word' in the fifth utterance "*Nonsense*".

In addition to this, Mrs. Pearce treats Eliza carelessly as she adopts the coercive type of impoliteness utilizing her high social level to attack Eliza's face directly and clearly in the sixth utterance "*What do you think a gentleman like Mr. Higgins cares what you came in?*" Eliza points out angrily in the seventh utterance "*Good enough for yǝ-oo. Now you know, dont you? I'm coming to have lessons, I am. And to pay for me to-do: make no mistake*" the reason of her visit employing affective impoliteness for the second time. She does not bother herself to use any polite form in her request to Higgins. On the contrary, she exercises the second type of rudeness 'rudeness of action' when she implies, in the eighth impolite utterance "*Well, if you was a gentleman, you might ask me to sit down, I think*", that Higgins lacks generosity since he does not ask her to sit down. That is to say, she uses 'rudeness of action' to criticizes Higgins's inaction rudeness as he neglects the necessary behavior, asking her to sit down.

With a dazed expression upon his face, Higgins answers Eliza using the third type of impoliteness 'entertaining impoliteness' in the ninth utterance "*shall we ask this baggage to sit down or throw her out of the window?*". In his utterance, Higgins pokes fun at Eliza calling her '*baggage*' in front of his friend, Pickering, with whom he shares his joke of throwing her out of the window. After getting Higgins's impolite utterance, Eliza produces in the last utterance her famous obscure expression "*Ah-ah-ah-ow-ow-ow-oo!*" as an affective impoliteness by which she expresses her indignation and protestation towards Higgins's inappropriate behavior. The tables (2) and (3) clarify the types of both impoliteness and rudeness in this extract:

Table (2): Impoliteness types in the selected extract

No.	Utterance	Producer	Impoliteness type
1.	Don't you be so saucy?	Eliza	Affective
2.	What do you think a gentleman like Mr. Higgins cares what you came in?	Mrs Pearce	Coercive
3.	Good enough for yo-yo. Now you know, don't you? I'm coming to have lessons, I am. And to pay for me to-do: make no mistake.	Eliza	Affective
4.	Shall we ask this baggage to sit downor throw her out of the window?	Higgins	Entertaining
5.	Ah-ah-ah-ow-ow-ow-oo!	Eliza	Affective

Table (3): Rudeness types in the selected extract

No.	Utterance	Producer	Rudeness type
1.	Why, this is the girl I jotted down last night.	Higgins	Rudeness of action
2.	She's no use.	Higgins	Rudeness of action
3.	Be off with you: I dont want you.	Higgins	Rudeness of action
4.	Nonsense	Mrs Pearce	Rudeness of word
5.	Well, if you were a gentleman, you might ask me to sit down, I think.	Eliza	Rudeness of action

8. Conclusion

The researchers of the present paper have employed Culpeper's impoliteness types and Segarra's types of rudeness in a selected extract from the play, *Pygmalion*, as a literary background to expose the main difference between impoliteness and rudeness taking into consideration not only the linguistic context of the impolite and rude utterances but also the encyclopedic context. After stating the most prominent definitions of the two terms, elaborating on their meaning, and analyzing the selected literary extract, the researchers have come up with the conclusion that rudeness is always intentional while impoliteness, on the other hand, is either intentional or accidental. Furthermore, impoliteness sometimes emerges as a reaction to a rude behavior. Accordingly, rudeness, for example, is when a person steps on someone's foot without apologizing even when he realizes his mistake. Consequently, the second person will use impoliteness to respond to the first person's rudeness by saying: "Why'd you step on my food and not fucking apologize, asshole?"(Penzler, 2013, p. 28).

References

Akmajian, A., Demers, R. A., Farmers, A. K., & Harnish, R. M.(2001). *Linguistics: An Introduction to Language and Communication*. Hong Kong: Massachusetts Institution Technology.

Arendholz, J. (2013). *(In)Appropriate Online Behavior: A pragmatic Analysis of Message Board Relations*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins B. V.

Barron, A. (2003). *Acquisition in Interlanguage Pragmatics*. Amsterdam: John Benjaimins B. V.

Bax, M. & Kàdàr, D. (2012). *Understanding Historical (Im)politeness: Relational Linguistic Practice over Time and Across Culture*. Amsterdam: John Benjaimins B. V.

Bousfield, D. (2008). *Impoliteness in Interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjaimins B. V.

Bousfield, D. & Locher, M. (Eds.). (2008). *Impoliteness in Language: Studies on its Interplay with Power in theory and Practice*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.

Brasdefer, J. C. (2008). *Politeness in Mexico and the United States*. Amsterdam: John Benjaimins B. V.

Brown, P. & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. (2 ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Burt, D. S. (2009). *The Literary 100: A Ranking of the Most Influentia Novelists, Playwrights, and Poets of All Time*. New York: An Imprint of Infobase Publishing.

Cheng, W. & Kong, K. C. (Eds.). (2009). *Professional Communication: Collaboration between Academics and Practitioners*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University.

Cherry, C. (Ed.). (1974). *Pragmatic Aspects of Human Communication*. Boston: D. Reidel Publishing Company.

Culpeper, J. & Kàdàr, D. (2010). *Historical (Im)politeness*. Bern: Peter Lang.

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

Dubrin, J. A. (2011). *Impression Management in the Workplace: Research, Theory, and Practice*. New York: Routledge.

Friess, E. (2008). *The User centered Design Process: Novice Designers' Use of Evidence in Designing from Data*. Eisenhower: Carnegie Mellon University.

Haslett, B. B. (2012). *Communicating and Organizing in Context: The Theory of Structurational Interaction*. New York: Routledge.

Huang, Y. (2014). *Pragmatics*. (2 ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Johanson, R. (1994). *Charles Dickens' Great Expectations: A Dramatization*. Woodstock: The Dramatic Publishing Company.

Jordà, M. P. (2005). *Third Language Learners: Pragmatic Production and Awareness*. Clevendon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Lambrou, M. & Stockwell, P. (Eds.). (2007). *Contemporary Stylistics*. London: Continuum Publishing Group.

Laurence, D. H. (Ed.). (1957). *Pygmalion*. London: Penguin Books.

Locher, M. A. (2004). *Power and Politeness in Action: Disagreement in Oral Communication.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Longcope, P. (1995). *The Universality of Face in Brown and Levinson Politeness Theory: A Japanese Perspective*. Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania.

Malmkjar, K. (2004). The Linguistic Encyclopedia. (2 ed.). London: Routledge.

Mey, J. L. (2009). *Concise Encyclopedia of Pragmatics*. (2 ed.). Kidlington: Elsevier Science.

Morgan, M. (1980). Notes on Pygmalion. London: Longman York Press.

Mullany, L. & Stockwell, P. (2010). *Introducing English Language: A Resource Book for Students*. Nottingham: Routledge.

O'keeffe, A., Clancy, B. & Adolphs, S. (2011). *Introducing Pragmatics in Use*. New York: Routledge.

Penzler, O. (Ed.). (2013). *In Pursuit of Spenser: Mystery Writers on Robert B. Paker and the Creation of an American Hero*. Dallas: Smart Pop.

Rondina, C. & Workman, D. (2005). *Rudeness: Deal with it if You Please*. Toronto: James Lorimer & Company Ltd.

Segarra, C. (2007). *How to Become a True Professional.* USA: Xulon Press.

Simerka, B. (1996). *El Arte Nuevo de Estudiar Comedias: Literary Theory and Spanish Golden Age Drama*. Lewisburg: Bucknell University.

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

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

Walkinshaw, I. (2009). *Learning Politeness: Disagreement in a second Language.* Bern: Peter Lang.

Watts, R., Ide, S. & Ehlich, K. (Eds.). (2005). *Politeness in Language: Studies in its History, Theory, and Practice*. (2 ed.). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Wieczorek, A. E. (2013). *Clusivity: A New Approach to Association and Dissociation in Political Discourse*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.