

University of Jyväskylä

“Oh, that is just such crap, you cowardly, dysfunctional little schmuck!”

- Impoliteness in the dialogues of H. Fielding’s novels

Bridget Jones’s Diary and
Bridget Jones – The Edge of Reason

A Pro Gradu Thesis in English

by

Suvi Välikangas

Department of languages

2005

Humanistinen Tiedekunta

Kielten laitos

Suvi Välikangas

”Oh, that is just such crap, you cowardly dysfunctional little schmuck!”

- Impoliteness in the dialogues of H. Fielding’s novels

Bridget Jones’s Diary and *Bridget Jones – the Edge of Reason*

Pro Gradu - tutkielma

Englannin kieli

Elokuu 2005

76 sivua

Tässä Pro Gradu työssä tutkittiin epäkohteliaisuutta Helen Fieldingin romaaneissa *Bridget Jones’s Diary* ja *Bridget Jones – the Edge of Reason* sekä erityisesti niiden dialogeissa. Analysoinnissa käytettiin Culpeperin (1996) epäkohteliaisuusteoriaa, joka perustuu Brownin ja Levinsonin (1978/1987) kohteliaisuusteoriaan. Fieldingin novellit kuuluvat populaarifiktioon ja dialogit ovat olennainen osa tämänkaltaisia romanttisia romaaneja. Vaikka dialogit imitoivat todellista puhetta, niiden päätarkoitus on kuitenkin edistää tarinan juonta. Nashin (1990) mukaan dialogit voidaan jakaa kolmeen luokkaan, jotka ovat välienselvittely- (confrontational dialogue), yhteistyö- (collaborative dialogue) ja opettavat dialogit (instructional dialogue). Tämän tutkimuksen kohteena ovat pelkästään välienselvittelydialogit, koska välienselvittelyihin yleensä kuuluu epäkohtelias käyttäytyminen. Välienselvittelydialogeiksi Nash listaa riidat, väittelyt ja jopa haastattelut, jos henkilöt eivät pidä toisistaan. Epäkohteliaisuus on erottuvampaa kuin kohteliaisuus, koska se on tahallista, usein sanallista hyökkäämistä toista kohtaan ja se on myös hyväksytyjen käytöstapojen rikkomista. Aineistona tutkimuksessa on käytetty 73 välienselvittelydialogia, joista etsittiin eri strategioita. Tutkimuksen tuloksena voidaan todeta, että aineistosta löytyi eniten positiivisia epäkohteliaisuusstrategioita ja vähiten kohteliaisuudesta pidättäytymistä. Useissa tapauksissa yhdestä dialogista löytyi monia eri strategioita, jotka voimistivat epäkohteliaisuutta. Epäkohteliaisuuden tulkinnassa vaikuttivat dialogin lisäksi sitä ympäröivä kerronta, joka tarjosi tietoa kertojan reaktioista epäkohteliaisuuteen ja taustatietoja esimerkiksi henkilöiden suhteista. Analyysissä otettiin myös huomioon miten henkilöt reagoivat epäkohteliaisuuteen. Henkilöt joko puolustautuvat, tekivät vastahyökkäyksen tai jättivät epäkohteliaisuuden huomiotta. Romaanien dialogit olivat usein humoristisia ja epäkohteliaisuuden käyttäminen oli oleellinen osa sen luomisessa. Epäkohtelias kielenkäyttö oli ominaisempaa joillekin hahmoille, esimerkiksi kirosanojen käyttö, kun taas toiset hahmot eivät käyttäneet epäkohteliaista kieltä tai epäkohteliaisuusstrategioita ollenkaan.

Asiasanat: Impoliteness, literary dialogue, confrontational dialogue

Table of contents

1	Introduction	4
2	Popular fiction and its dialogue	6
2.1	Romantic novels	6
2.1.1	Fielding's Bridget Jones	6
2.2	Dialogue in popular fiction	7
3	Literary pragmatics	12
4	Politeness theories	14
4.1	The concept of politeness	14
4.2	Review on politeness theories	15
5	Brown and Levinson's politeness theory	17
5.1	Definitions of politeness and face	18
5.2	Bald on strategy	19
5.3	Positive politeness	20
5.4	Negative politeness	21
5.5	Off record strategy	22
6	Impoliteness theory	23
6.1	The concept of impoliteness	23
6.2	Culpeper's impoliteness theory	24
7	Methodology	32
7.1	Research questions	32
7.2	Data	34
7.3	Analytic framework	36
8	Results	39
8.1	Bald on record impoliteness	39
8.2	Positive impoliteness	49
8.3	Negative impoliteness	55
8.4	Sarcasm and mock politeness	62
8.5	Withholding politeness	67
9	Discussion	70
9.1	Impoliteness in literary dialogues	70
9.2	Culpeper's theory in analyzing impoliteness	71
9.3	Functions of impoliteness in literary dialogues	72
	References	74

1 Introduction

Impoliteness is a fairly new area of research and it has not yet gained as much attention as its counterpart politeness. Politeness phenomena have been studied for over thirty years but studies on impoliteness have been carried out only during the last decade and their popularity is still growing. Impoliteness is part of social interaction just as politeness but from a different point of view. Everything that interrupts the interaction and causes social disharmony can be connected to impoliteness. Studies on impoliteness have mostly examined spoken data and a minority deals with written data. This study uses Helen Fielding's Bridget Jones novels *Bridget Jones's Diary* and *Bridget Jones – the Edge of Reason* as a source of data and concentrates only on the dialogues of her novels. The aim and the main research question of this study is to find out what kind of impoliteness appears in the dialogues of these two novels. It is also interesting to know what kind of forms and functions impoliteness has in the dialogues.

Impoliteness and its counterpart politeness belong to the field of pragmatics. I will also discuss some characteristics of popular fiction and literary dialogues as types of discourse. Literary pragmatics will be useful for my study because it concentrates on pragmatic issues that are found in literature. When we communicate with other people we usually want to get along with the person whom we are speaking to. Sometimes the situation might be different when we start a conversation or it might change along the way from friendly to unfriendly, from cooperative to uncooperative. The situation or the context of the conversation is critical because both participants of the conversation interpret each other's words according to it. An innocent misunderstanding can turn a good conversation into a heated argument where the speakers end up saying impolite things, for example calling each other names or mocking each other. Interpretation of impoliteness depends a lot on the context and it is possible that a certain utterance is interpreted as polite in one situation and in another it can be very impolite. In the context, the factors that affect interpretation are, for example, the relationship of the speakers, the topic of the conversation and the behaviour of the speakers. In my analysis I am able to

look at these features when trying to find impoliteness in the dialogues because of the surrounding narrative.

Spoken and written conversations are different in their form and function but that does not have to mean that impolite features in conversations would be different because of this fact. Written conversations are reader friendly since they do not have constant interruptions, hesitations and false starts which are common for spoken conversations. Real spoken conversations which are transcribed are hard to read and understand. If authors wanted their written dialogues to resemble their spoken equivalents, it would reduce the pleasure that people get from reading books. In novels and books the main purpose of dialogues is to carry the plot onwards and develop the characters. When we are reading a dialogue the characters become alive in our minds because they seem to act on their own even though the author controls what happens to them.

The novels I intend to analyze can be said to be popular fiction. Before writing these novels Fielding wrote a column for a magazine and the main character Bridget was introduced to the audience in these columns. Popular fiction is mainly considered to be a type of literature that is not taken very seriously or valued very highly. Romantic novels, thrillers and detective stories are a part of popular fiction and Bridget Jones novels are an example of romantic novels. These novels are probably not the most traditional type of romantic novels because the author has obviously written these books for a “new generation” of women but still typical themes of a romantic story can be identified. The most typical theme in romantic novels is the finding of a spouse and it is an important theme also in the two novels that are used as data in this study. However, Fielding brings out a kind of a new perspective to the issue and shows that it is not a bad thing to be single and actually it is quite trendy even in real life. Modern women of today are allowed to be more interested in making a career than starting a family. In Bridget’s case Fielding portrays a single woman in her early forties who is quite desperate to find a man even though she tries to act otherwise.

2 Popular fiction and its dialogue

2.1 Romantic novels

Romantic fiction is found in women's magazines and as paperbacks and the majority of the readership consists of women but also of men. There are certain social and linguistic constraints that determine the form of women's magazine fiction. Romantic fiction is controlled by a manner of thinking where everything that happens is meant to happen because of destiny. In Nash's (1990:22-23) opinion, romantic fiction portrays women's role in society and her place in relationships, which can be described as struggling towards a happy ending. Even though women might be shown as submissive in romantic novels, they are always more powerful than their men because of this submission and almost without exception they get the last laugh when they have achieved their goal. The goal of a romantic novel's heroine are the institutions of our society: marriage, family and home.

2.1.1 Fielding's Bridget Jones

Fielding's novel about Bridget Jones is claimed to be one of the most important novels of the 1990s. The novel's sales figures are huge both in Britain and in the USA but also in other parts of the world. Gilbert (no date available) discusses in his book review the new fictional voice that Fielding has started and he calls it the "thinnist fiction" referring to the female characters who are obsessed with their weight and to the novel's light comic tone. According to Gilbert the success of the novel can be explained by the fact that women are no longer satisfied with traditional romantic novels. They want the fiction settings to be more realistic but at the same time they do not want to lose the basic narrative elements of the romantic novel. Readers are satisfied when after a long search for happiness the protagonist realizes who is Mr. Wrong and who is Mr. Right. In Gilbert's opinion (no date available), the most interesting thing in "thinnist fiction" is the war that the protagonist has against herself and her body. For instance in Fielding's novel Bridget is constantly counting calories,

cigarettes and alcohol units and it makes her feel bad if she has not been able to cut them down. Fielding's phenomenal popularity has inspired many imitations of this kind of new fictional style.

2.2 Dialogue in popular fiction

Nash (1990:2-3) describes popular fiction as a disposable article because a popular fiction book is usually read only once and even though it is interesting and amusing it does not matter if one leaves it on a bench in the park or in the train. A classic or a piece of real literature might be read several times and every time the reader will get new information and a deeper understanding about the characters and the book's themes. Nash (1990:3) states that popular fiction is easily read and just as easily forgotten. The reason for its predictability is that popular fiction is built according to simple and fixed patterns in its narrative. In Nash's (1990:4-9) opinion, the most predictable genres of popular fiction are romantic stories and thrillers. Almost all romantic stories have the same "goal" in their plots; to make a marriage and a home for the main character.

According to Nash (1990:23-24), romantic stories have three main structural elements: dilation, dialogue and relation. Relation means description of the book's characters, the actions and events in which they are. Dialogue is conversation which usually takes place between two people. Dilation connects the other two concepts, widens the field of the narrative and takes the plot onwards. The narrator who is part of the tale makes comments or speculations about events that belong to a time preceding the narrative or to current situation. Dilation is expressed through certain verbs of cognition and inner perception (*think, know, wonder, believe, feel*) in the past perfective form, for example "*She had known that another son did exist but Tom had never talked about him.*".

For my research the role of dialogue is the most central. According to Nash (1990:29-34), dialogue is indispensable for the romantic stories because of its

role as a promotor of the narrative. Dialogues try to mimic everyday talk but still they are very far off from a naturally-occurring conversation. Dialogues are well formed, complete and logical, and interruptions occur very rarely, which is not usual for real speech. Also Toolan (1989: 195) notes “tidying up” of the talk in fiction and points out that fictional dialogue is governed by particular structural and functional principles which the reader must recognize in order to understand how the dialogue is different from everyday talk. Nash (1990:31-32) adds that turn-taking in dialogues is usually signaled with small expressions of an activity or a response, for example “*I should have known it was you*”, *Sheila frowned*. “*No, I’m innocent!*”, *Tom lashed back at her*. The verb *frowned* indicates that a turn-over takes place and also that something else happens along with the conversation. These commentary sentences tell about the atmosphere of the conversation and the relationship of the two characters. At the same time the plot develops through the responses and actions of the characters along with the commentary sentences leaving no room for misunderstandings of the words that have been uttered.

When comparing the dialogues in romantic novels and in thrillers, Nash (1990: 75) points out that they have different positions in them. In thrillers the writer uses dialogues just to get some information that is important to get the plot across to the reader, but in romantic novels dialogues have a more important role since it is an ideological assumption that women are more talkative by nature. Nash assumes that interaction through dialogues is not as important for men as it is for women. Dialogues in thrillers and in romantic novels are formed differently because men usually read thrillers and women read romantic novels. It is likely that women read more romantic novels than men do but the reasons for this might be very different from what Nash suggests. It is even stereotypical to claim that women like to read dialogues because they are more talkative than men. Women’s preference for romantic novels could be more ambiguous than what Nash assumes.

When it comes to the function of dialogues in a novel researchers have different opinions about it. In Page’s (1988:55) opinion the dialogue has a multifunctional role in a novel but Nash (1990:98-102) sees its role as narrower

and claims that it only has two main functions. Nash's categories of dialogues are useful for this study even though he does not acknowledge all possible functions of dialogues. Both of these views are going to be introduced in the following paragraphs. However, in this study it is essential to acknowledge that dialogues have a multifunctional role in novels. If all possible functions of dialogues are not taken into consideration in the analysis it might narrow down the results of this study and some important factors might be left unnoticed.

Nash's (1990:98-102) view of dialogue's function is quite narrow and he thinks that they only have two functions in a text. A dialogue can be in a form of commentary when it usually follows a description and tells the same story but in a dialogue form. A dialogue can also have a more significant role when it represents a total shift of scene and reference after a description. Furthermore, dialogues can be divided into three categories: a confrontational, an instructional and a collaborative dialogue. A confrontational dialogue can be about quarrels, challenges, disputes or interviews, but the important thing is that the characters disagree with each other on some crucial issue or they do not even like each other for one reason or another. The second type, instructional dialogue, conveys information from one character to another, but more importantly from author to the reader. The information that is given is essential to the understanding of the plot and it could be written as prose without any major changes in its form. This type is more characteristic for thrillers than for romantic novels. The third type, collaborative dialogue, is an alternative to a descriptive summary and the characters discuss in the dialogue about events, history, relationships or another character's personality. Also in this type the author is revealing important information for the reader about the characters and sometimes the dialogue seems very artificial because the characters are discussing things that are not normal for conversations. For example when the characters meet for the first time they immediately start to talk about small details about their lives.

What is important for this study is that dialogue has a multifunctional role in a novel. Page (1988:55) states that dialogue develops the plot and the character, describes settings and atmospheres and presents moral arguments or discussion

on some topic. It can have a combination of any of these functions at the same time. In Page's (1988:55) opinion, in modern fiction the dialogue is used to substitute explicit analysis of a character done by the author and the analysing is left to the reader entirely without a chance to compare his or her interpretations with the author's view. Page's (1988:1-3) general view on literary dialogues is that they are the most memorable and interesting parts in a novel and they have not got enough attention among researchers. Dialogue is referred to as "the mirror of life" but according to Page this is a misleading metaphor since literary dialogues have a definite purpose and their content is selected carefully compared to real speech, which is often haphazard. When reading a dialogue we might feel that we are 'listening' to a conversation of some people who are close to us. However, Page (1988:4-9) reminds us that the resemblance between dialogues and everyday speech is exaggerated. In spoken language there are some features that are unacceptable in literary dialogues such as repetitions and hesitations. Then again dialogues are filled with information and details which are not usual for everyday speech. In real speech the phonological component carries much information, not to mention the context of the situation which is significant for the interpretation.

Malcolm (1991:39-41) separates spoken discourse and dialogue quite strictly and says that it would be unacceptable to use spoken discourse in the written media. Dialogue imitates real speech but it is very different from spoken discourse. At the same time dialogue has to appear as spontaneous as real speech even though it is not. While reading the reader receives an illusion of spontaneity in speech which he or she knows to be untrue. In order to be effective a dialogue has to be self-explanatory and self-contained, shorter, surer of its effects, denser and more memorable than everyday talk. When writing dialogues the author has to make up ways to write out the features that spoken discourse has, for example tempo, stress, pauses, intonation and volume of voice. Possible ways to show them are hesitation, pauses, unfinished sentences, sudden changes of direction, the cutting in of one speaker on another's words, etc. However, it is not meaningful to use too much of these because the reader might get distracted from the plot.

Malcolm (1991:47-48) compares the dialogue of fictional characters to children's speech since it is economical and consistent. When speaking to someone, one can make assumptions about the other participant but the author of a book does not know any of the readers and he has to prepare for the worst. Dialogues have to be straightforward and almost everything has to be spelled out like in children's speech. Writers' do not want to take risks by producing long and complicated sentences in a dialogue because the readers might misunderstand the whole book. Malcolm (1991:58-59) also makes conclusions about the distribution of power between characters by saying that characters do not share power equally in a dialogue. The speaker who has more power introduces new topics and completes the old ones. In my opinion, dialogues can offer a lot of information about the characters' personalities and their relationships to other characters. Through dialogues the reader can make interpretations about the power relations of the characters and even what they feel towards each other.

The differences of real speech and fictional speech have been an issue also for Leech and Short (1981:160-166). They state that real speech and conversation have particular features that fictional speech and conversations do not have such as hesitation pauses, false starts and syntactic anomalies. Ungrammatical constructions and other inconsistencies which are not accepted in writing are called syntactic anomalies. These features affect the fluency of the speech negatively but they appear in speech constantly. The reason why people's speech is non-fluent is simple: we have to speak at the same time as we plan our next utterance and non-fluency occurs when our planning falls behind. Therefore, according to Leech and Short (1981:163-164), it is not an author's main goal to produce a realistic presentation of an ordinary conversation. In literary dialogues the author creates an illusion of a real conversation but every detail in a written dialogue is considered very carefully beforehand.

Herman (1995:4-6) talks about the differences between conversational language and the language of plays. Dramatic speech cannot ever quite resemble authentic speech but dramatists exploit underlying speech conventions, principles and rules of use which people are supposed to use in

their everyday interactions. Like prose, plays can only mimic real everyday speech because naturally occurring speech has so little possibilities for expressions of strong emotions and passion which are important for dramatic dialogues. Personally, I think that strong emotions can be expressed in real everyday speech but they might not be emphasized as much as in dramatic dialogues.

Describing speech in a written form, according to Hutchinson (1989:120-121), is a fundamental problem. Speech in novels should be written in the same style as the narrative or descriptions in a novel or a short story. It is also problematic that all the characteristics of speech cannot be expressed in a written form. In Hutchinson's opinion, intonation, stress, tone, gestures, facial expressions and eye contact are features of speech that are difficult to show in writing. Speech presentation in fiction is usually idealized and it is necessary because of the reading fluency. Hutchinson (1989:130-132) discusses the novel as a triangular relationship between author, characters and reader where the author has the power to decide about things. When speech is presented as a dialogue which is written as direct speech the characters are acting on their own and the author and the reader are left as bystanders. The speech in the novel's dialogue is not like natural speech but the reader must use his or her knowledge on natural speech in order to understand what he or she is reading. In this study all interpretations about the characters, the plot, relationships and behaviour are done on the basis of the dialogues and when the analysing was done I had to rely a lot on information about real speech but I could not ignore the narrative which in some cases could offer additional information for the analysis.

3 Literary pragmatics

Mey (2001:236-238) introduces pragmatics as a way to investigate conversations which are spoken but it can also be used to study written conversations in literature. The point of view of the user is important in pragmatic analysis and when it comes to literature, we think of the reader as a user of the text. However, the situation is a bit more complicated because we

must not forget the role of the author. Mey suggests that the relationship between the reader and the author could be seen as collaborative where the author has produced a text and the reader re-creates it when reading it. Pragmatic analysis that is performed on literary activities is focused on the text as an author-originated and –guided and at the same time reader-oriented and –activated process of wording. The reader creates with the help of the author a textual universe where the events of the text take place but at the same time, the text limits the interpretations that the reader can make about it. Pragmatic analysis can focus on the author, narrator, textual mechanisms, voice and point of view in a book.

In the process of reading, the reader follows author's instructions in the interpretation of the text. According to Mey (2001:253-255), the linguistic competence of the reader is an essential part of reading and it means the ability to “assign the correct reference to textual elements such as pronouns, deictics, subjects of verbs and other features”. We can use our knowledge of rules of language usage when we need our linguistic competence in interpretation processes. We can also use a technique called conversational implicature or we can rely on syntactic and semantic continuity. Mey (2001:46-47) clarifies that conversational implicature refers to the way we understand an utterance in a conversation on the basis of what we expect to hear. Our expectations are a part of our interpretation process. Leech and Short (1981:288-290) point out that a major part of novels are conversations between characters but if we analyze these conversations we receive a better understanding of the conversation between the author and the reader. When interpreting the conversations of the characters we can rely on our knowledge on syntax and lexis but at some points, we find out more if we use pragmatic interpretative strategies. Leech and Short (1981:290-299) discuss speech acts and conversational implicatures as ways to interpret dialogues and to receive a better understanding of the plot.

Mey (2001:193-194) discusses the ‘making up’ of a literary world and points out that when an author is creating a story and the world where it takes place the process is similar to the setting up conditions for a conversation and

language use in it. Both situations are controlled by certain constraints, which have to be accepted by the participants if they want to get involved in these situations. On the other hand, the constraints that control the happenings have to take into consideration the idiosyncrasies or characteristics of the participants in order to guarantee a successful use of language. The author sees to it that these constraints are kept constant and consistent in a literary piece and if they are not, there can be misunderstandings and the reader can eventually lose his or her interest. Mey (2001:193-194) states that “literary constraints function as necessary and sufficient conditions on writing and reading”. When we start to read a book, we accept the constraints that the author has created for the story and through this acceptance of the constraints, the cooperation between the reader, the author and the text begins. The constraints in a literary text are used as explanatory devices but the reader can manipulate them and they can also manipulate the reader. However, pragmatics does not offer clear answers how to interpret these constraints. Interpretation depends on the culture of the reader and the author, the moment in time when the text is written and when it is read and in which part of the world it is written and read.

4 Politeness theories

4.1 The concept of politeness

In spite of the fact that this study concentrates on impoliteness, it is still important to acknowledge politeness because impoliteness is in a way its other half. Politeness could be seen as “the icing on the cake” of social interaction as Blum-Kulka (1992:257-258) describes it. This metaphor has a slightly negative connotation and politeness is seen as external, hypocritical and unnatural in people’s behaviour. However, politeness is also associated positively with tolerance, restraint, good manners, showing deference and being nice. Blum-Kulka has performed her study in Israeli society and her definitions for politeness have been formed on the basis of that study. Definitions of politeness depend a lot on the cultural background of the person who is making

the definition. Watts, Ide and Ehrlich (1992:1-3) acknowledge the effects of cultural frameworks and point out that politeness could be seen as a constraint on human behaviour which is a tool for us to achieve effective social living. They have also concluded that in many studies proper definitions for politeness have not been given. Wardaugh (1992:274-275) describes politeness as socially prescribed and argues that it shows our awareness of social customs. When being polite we can express different things towards others such as solidarity, power, distance, respect and intimacy.

Linguistic politeness can be seen as a part of general linguistic behaviour, which is used to maintain the equilibrium of interpersonal relationships within the social group, according to Watts (1992:43). He calls this phenomenon politic verbal behaviour. Watts (1992:47) continues that on the surface level politeness might be altruistic but it still is a mask, which conceals a person's true intentions. This mask is used to avoid conflict, tone down aggression and to ensure smooth interaction. In the eighteenth century the mask of politeness was more concrete because then it was seen as a way to enhance one's social position and signal belonging to a social elitist class. Sell (1992:112) notes that in those days politeness was described with a metaphor of "velvet glove hiding an iron fist" but nowadays people think more of politeness. He (1992:115) emphasizes that politeness is an overall style of behaviour, which is approved of and it is not considered as dangerous compared to the eighteenth century view.

4.2 Review on politeness theories

Richard Watts has written critical reviews on renowned politeness theories and the most crucial points of politeness research will be introduced according to his studies in this chapter. The reason for introducing also other politeness theories is that though Brown and Levinson's politeness theory is a part of this study as the basis of Culpeper's impoliteness theory, theirs is not the only possible way of looking at politeness and analyzing it. Watts (2003:9-10) divides politeness and also impoliteness into two groups: first-order

(im)politeness and second-order (im)politeness. First-order politeness is the actual polite or impolite behaviour in a verbal interaction. Second-order politeness is defined as polite language use in the study of verbal interaction. In other words, Watts (2003:4) defines first-order politeness as a folk term and second-order politeness as a technical definition in sociolinguistic theory. Watts presents his criticism of politeness theories by analysing how they have defined these concepts and if they have been able to avoid mixing them. According to Eelen (1999:166), in the politeness literature, the relationship between first-order politeness, which he calls commonsense ideologies of politeness and second-order politeness, which he calls scientific ideologies of politeness has been ambiguous and it has never been looked at from the perspective of the ordinary users of language.

Watts (2003:47-84) reviews some of the most central theories on politeness, including Brown and Levinson's, which will be discussed in more detail in chapter 5, such as Lakoff's, Leech's and Fraser and Nolen's. He also discusses their flaws. In Watt's opinion (2003:49), the theories describe second-order politeness but they are still affected by first-order politeness, and therefore, the attempt to create a cross-cultural theory on politeness has not been successful.

Lakoff sees politeness as conflict avoidance but according to Watts (2003:58-62), she still fails partly to define what politeness means. Lakoff made use of Grice's Cooperative Principle and created a set of pragmatic rules based on this principle to cover the use of politeness. Lakoff divided pragmatic competence into a set of rules namely 1) Be clear and 2) Be polite and their subcategories. Another major dilemma in Lakoff's theory is that following the politeness rules means eventually breaking the rules of conversation.

According to Watts (2003:50), Leech defines politeness as “ strategic conflict avoidance which can be measured in terms of the degree of effort put into the avoidance of conflict situation and the establishment and maintenance of comity” Leech also uses Grice's CP and introduces a concept of his own, the politeness principle. Again according to Watts (2003:65), “the main purpose of the politeness principle is to establish and maintain feelings of comity within

the social group". Leech (1983:79) claims that the goal of his theory is to show how the cooperative principle and the politeness principle interact in the interpretation of indirectness. In order to describe and explain the asymmetries of politeness Leech has created a set of maxims of politeness and politeness scales. The maxims of politeness are the maxims of tact, generosity, approbation and modesty. The main criticism that Watts (2003:69) has to offer for Leech's politeness theory is that it considers linguistic politeness from the point of view of speech act types instead of giving information to participants of a conversation what kind of politeness is required in order to produce some speech act.

Watts (2003:78-81) introduces also a different kind of approach to politeness which is Fraser and Nolen's conversational contract of politeness. Fraser and Nolen see politeness as a property associated with a voluntary action and in Watts's (2003:52) opinion, it is the least clear definition of all the theories he has discussed. The conversational contract means an understanding of some set of rights and obligations, which are brought into an interaction by a certain party and they also set the limits for the interaction. Politeness in interaction is noticed only when the participants fail to use the set of rights and obligations correctly and therefore act impolitely. Watts (2003:81) points out that these rights and obligations might be negotiated again during the conversation but Fraser and Nolen have not clarified what kind they are and under what social conditions they can be changed.

5 Brown and Levinson's politeness theory

The first significant theory about politeness was put together by Brown and Levinson in 1978 and the revisited version in 1987 and it is still considered to be valid even today. In their theory (1978:64-65) it is thought that everyone can choose the ways in which they try to achieve their personal goals. A person needs to act verbally and communicate with another person in order to get what they want but it is important to try to maintain both participants' face. When a speaker tries to achieve some particular personal goal through communication

he is forced to threaten some other person's face to some extent with his speech. According to Watts (2003:50), Brown and Levinson explain politeness to be a complex system for softening face-threatening acts (FTAs) and that is why they formed five different categories which can be used to make spoken utterances softer for the addressee. The reason for introducing this particular politeness theory is due to the fact that the impoliteness theory which is used in this study is based on Brown and Levinson's politeness theory. It is easier to receive a better understanding of Culpeper's impoliteness theory if one has first got to know Brown and Levinson's politeness theory because the basic concepts are the same in both theories.

5.1 Definitions of politeness and face

Brown and Levinson (1978:66) have adopted the concept of *face* from Goffman and from an English folk term. "Losing one's face" means that someone is embarrassed or humiliated. The concept of face can also be understood as a public self-image of a person. A face can be lost, maintained or enhanced and it cannot be left without attention in interaction because it is in both participants' interest to try and maintain each other's face. The purpose of cooperation in maintaining face is based on the mutual vulnerability of face. A person has two faces: a positive and negative one. According to Brown and Levinson (1978:67), positive face is a person's need to be appreciated and approved by others. Negative face is the freedom to act and freedom from impositions. When talking about politeness people usually think of formal politeness which is directed to a person's negative face but acts that are directed to positive face are not as visible as the acts towards negative face. A speaker can address either of the two faces. Positive face is addressed with positive politeness, which means that the speaker tries to give the impression that he wants the same as the addressee. Negative face is addressed with negative politeness and in this case the speaker tries to convince the addressee that the addressee has the freedom to act how he chooses without the risk of losing his face.

During a conversation it is hard to avoid the use of utterances that are threatening to the other's face either verbally or non-verbally because often participants in a conversation have different personal goals and interests but they want to achieve them without a clash and to maintain a smooth interaction. Brown and Levinson (1978:70-75) call these acts face threatening acts (FTAs). When it is in both participants' interest to maintain each other's face, it is vital to try to minimize and soften these face threatening acts. These softening strategies form the core of politeness. Brown and Levinson have compiled five strategies which are used in conversations to convey politeness: bald on record, positive politeness, negative politeness, off record and avoiding doing the FTA and they will be introduced in the following chapters in more detail.

5.2 Bald on strategy

The bald on record strategy is the most effective way for the speaker to get his message through to the hearer, but then the speaker ignores the hearer's face and its wants according to Brown and Levinson (1978:99-106/1987:94-101). This strategy is in accordance with Grice's Maxims which describe maximally efficient communication. However, Brown and Levinson want to emphasize that most natural conversations do not follow these maxims but instead it is more motivating for the speakers to pay attention to the face wants and avoid conflict. Speaker's motivations for doing a FTA bald on record fall into two categories. In the first class the face threat is not minimized and the face is ignored or it is irrelevant and in the second class face threat is minimized by speaker's implication.

Brown and Levinson (1978:100-103) state that in a case where face minimization happens both the speaker and the hearer know that it is necessary. For example situations of great urgency (real or metaphorical) or desperation require the use of direct imperatives, which are clear examples for bald on usage eg. *Help!*, *Watch out!* Another example of face minimizing is a situation where the speaker is more powerful than the hearer, e.g. master to a

servant “*Take my coat, James.*”. Sympathetic advice or warnings can also be baldly on record because then the FTA is done in the hearer’s interest, e.g. “*Your nose is bleeding.*”. In these cases other demands are more important than preserving face but in the other category of using bald on record the face is taken into consideration, for example welcomings (“*Come in.*”), farewells (“*Drive carefully.*”) and offers (“*Have another cup of tea.*”). Brown and Levinson (1978:104) call them functional categories where the hearer expects from the speaker pre-emptive invitations but they all are potential FTAs because it is always possible that the speaker misinterprets the situation and the hearer does not want to be asked to come in or offered another cup of tea. However, if the invitation is firm, the hearer is not so reluctant to accept it and even considers it to be polite.

5.3 Positive politeness

Positive politeness’ strategies are directed to the hearer’s positive face. The speaker tries to communicate that he wants the same thing as the hearer wants and that the hearer’s wants are important and desirable to the speaker. Brown and Levinson (1978:106) claim that positive politeness strategies are common in language behaviour of friends and other people who have a close relationship. Between strangers positive politeness strategies act as metaphorical extensions of intimacy and this way the speaker tries to indicate that he wants to make a closer acquaintance. Brown and Levinson (1978:107/1987:102) have divided the super strategy first into three main groups of possible strategies and then these groups are divided even further and in the end there are fifteen different strategies that the speaker can use. They are:

1) The speaker claims common ground

1.1) Notice, attend to the hearer’s interests, wants, needs, goods (*What a beautiful hat you got! Would you happen to have some sugar you could lend?*)

1.2) Exaggerate interest, approval, sympathy with the hearer (*How absolutely marvellous!*)

- 1.3) Intensify interest to the hearer (*I look through the window and guess what I see? – A huge dog in my flower bed!*)
- 1.4) Use in-group identity markers such as jargon or dialect (generic names and terms, for example *son, honey, darling*)
- 1.5) Seek agreement, for example with safe topics (*It's awful weather, isn't it? – Indeed, it is*)
- 1.6) Avoid disagreement (*Do you like it? – Yes, but...*)
- 1.7) Presuppose/raise/assert common ground
- 1.8) Joke

2) The speaker conveys that he and the hearer are cooperators

- 2.1) Assert or presuppose the speaker's knowledge of and concern for the hearer's wants
- 2.2) Offer, promise
- 2.3) Be optimistic (*Look, I'm sure you won't mind if I borrow your car.*)
- 2.4) Include both the speaker and the hearer in the activity (*Let's have some coffee and biscuits.*)
- 2.5) Give or ask for reasons
- 2.6) Assume or assert reciprocity

3) The speaker fulfils the hearer's want for something

- 3.1) Give gifts to the hearer (goods, sympathy, understanding, cooperation)

5.4 Negative politeness

According to Brown and Levinson (1978:134-216/1987:129-210) when people think of politeness they usually come up with things that belong to the category of negative politeness strategies. The reason for this is that negative politeness can be described as respectful behaviour and rituals of avoidance. In other words, the speaker acts as if the hearer is more powerful than him and he has to use indirectness and be politely pessimistic. A FTA directed to the hearer's negative face can be done in two ways, a) on record or b) with redress to the hearer's want be unimpinged upon. The strategies are:

- 1) Be conventionally indirect (FTA is done on record) (*Could you bring me some sugar from the kitchen?*)
- 2) Question, hedge (make minimal assumptions about the hearer's wants and what is relevant for him)
- 3) Be pessimistic

- 4) Minimize the imposition R (*I just wanted to ask if you could lend me a little piece of paper.*)
- 5) Give deference (*We look forward very much to your next visit.*)
- 6) Apologize (*I hate to intrude but...*)
- 7) Impersonalize, avoid the pronouns I and you (*We feel obliged to warn you...*)
- 8) State the FTA as a general rule (*The airline requests the passengers to avoid...*)
- 9) Nominalize (*I am surprised at your failure to reply.*)
- 10) Go on record as incurring a debt or as not indebting the hearer (*I'd be eternally grateful if you would...*)

5.5 Off record strategy

Brown and Levinson (1978:216-218/1987:211-227) state that when using the off record strategy the speaker is trying to avoid the responsibility of doing a FTA. The use of off record strategies gives the hearer the power to decide how to interpret the FTA and this is what the speaker wants. In these kind of cases it is hard to find only one communicative intention for the act. Off-record utterances are indirect speech acts and by saying this Brown and Levinson mean that the speaker says something more general or different than what he actually means. The hearer must conclude what the speaker actually means with his utterance. This process of comprehension has two stages (Brown and Levinson, 1978:216):

1. A *trigger* serves notice to the addressee that some inference must be made.
2. Some mode of *inference* derives what is meant (intended) from what is actually said, this last providing a sufficient *clue* for the inference.

The clues for interpretation of off-record utterances can be intonational, prosodic and kinesic in other words non-verbal clues. A FTA can be done off record with fifteen different strategies:

- 1) Give hints (*It's cold in here.* = Shut the window.)
- 2) Give association clues (*Oh no, I've got a headache again.* = Give me a pill.)
- 3) Presuppose (*You have eaten all the biscuits yet again.*)

- 4) Understate (*It's not half bad.* = Surprisingly good)
- 5) Overstate (*There were at least million people in the party!*)
- 6) Use tautologies (*Boys will be boys.*)
- 7) Use contradictions (*I love my brother but I hate him too.*)
- 8) Be ironic (*What a lovely weather!* = It's raining cats and dogs.)
- 9) Use metaphors
- 10) Use rhetorical questions
- 11) Be ambiguous
- 12) Be vague (*Looks like it may have rained last night.* = the lawn is flooding.)
- 13) Over-generalize (*Mature people know how to clean their room.*)
- 14) Displace the hearer
- 15) Be incomplete. Use ellipsis (*Well, if one leaves a glass vase on the edge of the table...*)

6 Impoliteness theory

6.1 The concept of impoliteness

The concept of impoliteness is the opposite of politeness. When we act politely, we are trying to get along with other people and try to ensure that our communication goes on smoothly. If for some reason we want to be impolite towards other people we are deliberately attacking others with our speech or as Culpeper (1996:350) says, we want to create a social interruption. According to Wardaugh (1992:274-275), when we act impolitely we are breaking the rules of politeness and if there were no rules of politeness we could not break them, that is, be impolite. Wardaugh (1992:275) states, "Impoliteness depends on the existence of standards, or norms, of politeness". Herman (1995:240) points out that it would not be necessary to have rules of politeness, if there were not a danger of a social conflict. The rules of politeness are needed to neutralize impoliteness.

Watts (2003:5-6) points out that even though politeness has been studied a lot more than impoliteness when we are participants in verbal interaction, it is more usual that we comment on impolite features of the discussion. He describes impoliteness and politeness as a scale with a negative end with

impolite behaviour and a positive end with polite behaviour. Behaviour that is impolite, rude, discourteous, obstreperous or bloody-minded is noticed more easily than polite behaviour. When we are evaluating if someone's words are impolite we cannot base our interpretation only on the impolite linguistic expressions but we have to consider the whole behaviour of the person in that particular social interaction situation. According to Watts (2003:7), the concept of politeness and impoliteness has not been agreed upon in the past and he predicts that it will not be agreed upon in the future either. Researchers tend to look at the issue of politeness and impoliteness from various viewpoints and their interpretations are not compatible.

6.2 Culpeper's impoliteness theory

Culpeper (1996:350) questions if we even can talk about inherent politeness or impoliteness. Even though he talks about impoliteness, he relies a lot on politeness theorists such as Brown and Levinson, Leech, Fraser and Nolan. He points out that for example Leech (1983:83) has claimed in his theory that some illocutions are inherently polite and some are impolite. However, Culpeper (1996:351) considers the role of context to be most central for interpreting utterances as inherently polite or impolite. Depending on the context, impolite acts can be understood as polite or polite acts as impolite. Culpeper takes picking one's nose as an example where it is difficult to find a polite way to ask the person to stop. Surely, we can say "*Would you please stop picking your nose.*" but still this person might feel embarrassed and offended by our request. An inherently impolite act is offensive and it cannot be used in politeness work because it harms the other's positive face in any case.

Culpeper, Bousfield and Wichmann (2003:1550-1551) emphasize that the most important difference between politeness and impoliteness is speaker's intention and if he or she is going to support the hearer's face or attack against it. They consider the types of action that might lead to damaging of one's face. Firstly, the speaker might intentionally insult the hearer openly by acting maliciously and spitefully. Secondly, impoliteness might be an unplanned but anticipated

by-product of action, in other words, an incidental offence. Thirdly, the speaker might act innocently or appear to do so because the offence seems to be unintended and unwitting. This kind of incident can be called ‘faux pas’ in French or a ‘boner’, which means an embarrassing mistake. Culpeper et al. (2003:1555) also agree that impoliteness is very much dependent on context.

According to Culpeper (1996:352), mock impoliteness appears only on the surface level of utterances since these kinds of utterances are not meant to cause offence. Mock impoliteness is used to promote intimacy and it is common between close friends. It is also safer to use mock impoliteness among friends since it is more likely understood correctly than. Successful mock impoliteness is understood to be untrue but if it is taken as true, people will get offended. For example, if a person calls his or her friend *a bastard* in a gentle tone of voice and smiles at the same time it is most likely that the person does not mean it literally.

Culpeper (1996:354-355) takes a closer look at the circumstances when we are impolite. It is relevant whether the relationship between speakers is equal or unequal. When we think of equal relationships, the situations where impoliteness occurs are more complex. In close relationships, there is more impoliteness than between strangers. For example, spouses know each other so well that they know each other’s soft spots for attacks and they also know how their partner is going to react when they get offended and how they can be appeased. The concern for face is also minor in close relationships than in relationships where persons do not like each other or one of the participants is more powerful. One notable characteristic of impoliteness in equal relationships is its tendency to increase. One verbal attack can easily lead to a counter-attack and in the end even to physical attacking even though mocking might have started as harmless.

In some situations, the participants are in an unequal relationship and the motivation to cooperate is reduced. Culpeper (1996:354) notes that the person who has more power in the situation can be more impolite than the “weaker” person can. The more powerful participant can use impoliteness to reduce the

other participant's ability to retaliate and to threaten with retaliation if he or she acts impolitely. For example in courtroom situations, the relationship between the witness and the barrister is unequal. The barrister can be very impolite and try to make the witness lose his or her temper in front of a jury. Sometimes there can be a conflict of interests between participants and then it is not necessary to try to maintain each other's faces. A participant could have a particular interest to attack the other's face, for example, in a courtroom or in sport contests where only one person can win.

Culpeper (1996:355-358) has described impoliteness as the parasite of politeness and that is why he has formed his impoliteness strategies in relation to Brown and Levinson's politeness theory from the version published in 1987. Each of Brown and Levinson's superstrategies of politeness (bald on record, positive politeness, negative politeness, off-record and withholding the FTA) has its opposite impoliteness superstrategy. These superstrategies are not meant to support but to attack the other person's face.

- 1.) Bald on record impoliteness. The FTA is performed in a direct, clear, unambiguous and concise way and the speaker's intention is to attack the hearer's face. A revised version of this strategy in Culpeper et al. (2003:1554) takes into consideration that in this case there is a lot of face at stake and the speaker's intention is to attack the hearer's face.
- 2.) Positive impoliteness. These strategies are directed to attack the hearer's positive face. Possible positive impoliteness outputs: 1.) Ignore, snub the other, 2.) Exclude the other from an activity, 3.) Disassociate from the other, 4.) Be disinterested, unconcerned, unsympathetic, 5.) Use inappropriate identity markers, 6.) Use obscure or secretive language, 7.) Seek disagreement, 8.) Make other feel uncomfortable, 9.) Use taboo words, 10.) Call other names.
- 3.) Negative impoliteness. Strategies that are used to attack the hearer's negative face. Possible output strategies: 1.) Frighten, 2.) Condescend, scorn or ridicule, 3.) Invade the other's space, 4.) Explicitly associate the other with a negative aspect, 5.) Put the other's indebtedness on record. Culpeper et al. (2003:1555) add another strategy into this

category, which is hindering or blocking the other physically or linguistically.

- 4.) Sarcasm or mock politeness. The speaker uses politeness strategies, which are obviously insincere. On the surface level, the utterances sound polite but their meaning is the opposite, which is impolite. In Culpeper's view, sarcasm is mock politeness for social disharmony and it is the opposite of banter, which means mock impoliteness for social harmony.
- 5.) Withhold politeness. The speaker does not perform a politeness act where the hearer would expect one, for example, not saying thanks after receiving a gift. Being silent is also withholding politeness, according to Culpeper et al. (2003:1555).

Culpeper (1996:358) points out that there are some areas of politeness, which are not presented very well in Brown and Levinson's theory. Their theory concentrates on linguistic form and they have admitted that impolite implicatures are not included in it. For this reason, Culpeper considers Leech's theory to be a good complement for Brown and Levinson because it deals with linguistic content. Culpeper reverses Leech's politeness principle into an impoliteness principle. Therefore, being impolite is to minimize the expression of polite beliefs and maximize the expression of impolite beliefs. Brown and Levinson do not discuss paralinguistic or non-verbal politeness in their theory but Culpeper thinks that they can be used to convey impoliteness such as avoiding eye contact or shouting. In the novels analyzed in this study, it is possible to consider these issues since in books it is often described what kind of tone the speaker uses or what other things happen at the moment of speaking. These features could reveal the speaker's intended meaning and the sincerity of his or her words. In Herman's (1995:243) opinion, the implications that are left unsaid are an expressive part of conversations and they can be used for power, manipulation, deceit, tact, consideration or kindness. Herman states: "The expressive power of the not-said, the indirect, the unfinished, the elliptical, the understated is integral to the pragmatic functioning of language." (Herman, 1995:243)

In the analysis part of this study it is necessary to pay attention to what is left unsaid and what is implied between the lines in order to detect more than the surface level meaning. It is also possible that more information about the intended meaning of speakers is given in the narrative parts surrounding the dialogues.

Culpeper (1996:359-366) has tested his impoliteness theory in practice by analysing impoliteness in an army training camp and in drama dialogue in his article. The analysis on impoliteness in the army is based on a documentary film and a six-minute interview, which takes place between a female recruit and three sergeants. In Culpeper's view, the purpose of army training is to get the recruits to obey orders without hesitation and impoliteness is used in the training to depersonalize the recruits and to destroy their self-esteem and individuality. Culpeper has transcribed bits of the conversation where impoliteness occurs, and analyzed them in detail according to his set of strategies. Bald on record impoliteness is used on several occasions, for example (p.362):

S1: You've already proven to be a damn habitual liar

The sergeants can use direct and unambiguous strategies because they have the power in the situation and they do not have to fear retaliation. In addition to the bald on record impoliteness that appeared in the data, it also included examples of all other groups of Culpeper's impoliteness strategies in other words positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, sarcasm and mock politeness strategies.

Culpeper (1996:363) discusses the paralinguistic and non-verbal aspects of impoliteness by analysing the tones of sergeants' voices, which are hostile and threatening. The recruit is made to stand to attention, the sergeants yell at her directly in front of her face or her ear, and this way they are using the negative impoliteness strategy of invading the other's space. When analyzing impoliteness it is necessary to consider the other elements of a conversation besides linguistic expressions. The analysis of non-verbal aspects gives a more diverse picture of impoliteness but in my analysis it is more difficult because I can only examine written material. These aspects can only be examined through the narrator's reporting which might not always be objective.

The second piece of analysis that Culpeper (1996:364-366) introduces in his article is about impoliteness in drama dialogue and the passage he uses as data is from Shakespeare's *Macbeth*. He claims that impolite behaviour is the cause or the result of social disharmony and it is a useful way to develop the characters and the plot. In the passage, Lady Macbeth uses impoliteness strategies in order to get his husband to pull himself together in a banquet where he has seen a ghost. Lady Macbeth uses impoliteness strategies such as sarcasm (*O proper stuff*), positive impoliteness of scorning him (*Shame itself*) and ridiculing his fears. The use of impoliteness in this passage is tactics for the purpose of regaining equilibrium. This piece of Culpeper's study is most similar to my study and it is important for my analysis to notice in which way impoliteness is used to develop the characters and the plot. One of the aims of this study is to investigate what kind of functions the dialogues have and in which way they develop the characters and the plot.

In their latest article, Culpeper et al. (2003:1560-1562) have developed Culpeper's impoliteness theory further, for example by examining the use of multiple strategies and the meaning of repetition of a particular strategy. They performed an analysis on a set of data from a documentary series that dealt with clumpers and their duties. Clumpers who give parking tickets to cars have to face confrontational situations very often because car-owners usually disagree with their decision about the parking ticket. There were several occasions in the data where combinations of impoliteness strategies were used and often they were repeated. This repetition was called a parallelism and the reason why it was used was that it boosted impoliteness. In other words, it was used to increase the imposition towards the hearer and stress the speaker's negative attitude. When a combination of strategies was used it was common that the positive impoliteness strategy using taboo words was combined with another strategy, for example:

"Shut up you fucking idiot!"

In this example, there is a taboo word *fucking* and it acts as intensifier for the word *idiot*. The whole utterance can be identified as bald on record impoliteness because the speaker is rudely commanding the hearer to stop

talking. The impact of the command is intensified with the positive impoliteness strategy of calling the hearer names. It is possible to combine several strategies and this finding strengthens significantly Culpeper's earlier theory, but as Culpeper et al. (2003:1561) note, Brown and Levinson do not accept the mixing of strategies.

Research that has been done on both impoliteness and politeness has concentrated on the actual impolite or polite utterances but it has not paid much attention to the responses of the hearer. In their article Culpeper et al. (2003:1562-1568) take a closer look at the responses to impolite utterances and analyze more closely what kind of patterns can be identified from their data. Basic pairs in confrontational situations are offensive – defensive and offensive – offensive. However, the hearer has more options after an impolite utterance. He or she can avoid responding at all, respond by accepting the utterance, or make a counter attack. The counter attack can be offensive or defensive. Culpeper et al. (2003:1563-1567) concentrate only on these counter attacks. There were no clear examples of offensive – offensive pair in their data because the clamper does not have the power to respond with unambiguous impoliteness to the car owners due to his or her socio-discoursal role. They have the power to give a parking ticket and tow a car away but they still have to act civil and curb their tongue in the presence of an angry car owner. The pattern of offensive – offensive can turn into a conflict spiral where impoliteness escalates, for example:

“Oh, shut up you cow!”

“Shut up yourself you stupid cow!”

“If you don't shut up right now I'm going to shut you up myself!”

“Oh, go ahead and try. You're going to get a black eye if you come near me!”

Impoliteness escalates when each speaker uses a stronger strategy than the previous speaker does.

According to Culpeper et al. (2003: 1564-1568), there are several alternatives in the offensive – defensive pair, which can be chosen to respond to an impolite face attack. A direct contradiction is one of them but Culpeper et al. describe it as an unsophisticated strategy. The first speaker makes an impolite

accusation about something and the other one denies it but then the first speaker repeats his or her accusation and the other person denies it again, for example:

“Your mum is fat.”
 “No, she’s not.”
 “Yes, she is.”
 “No, she’s not.”
 “Yes, she is.”
 “No, she’s not.”

Another strategy is abrogation, which was found in the data of Culpeper et al. (2003:1565). When the clamper used abrogation, he or she was trying to switch his or her social role or discursal role. By the switching of the social role the clamper was trying to signal that he or she is not a public servant but merely a private citizen who is doing his or her job, for example by saying “*I’m not to blame, I’m just following orders*”. Then again, when the discursal role was switched, the clamper was emphasizing that he or she is acting as a representative of some higher level. They could have said, for example “*Don’t shoot the messenger*”.

Culpeper et al. (2003:1566-1567) introduce yet a few more strategies such as opt out on record, insincere agreement and ignore the face attack. In the cases where the clamper opted out on record, he or she was trying to seal off the face threatening act by trying to end the conversation and refusing to talk about the matter further. In the data, the clampers might have agreed with some angry car owner, but the agreeing was true only on the surface level. When the clamper did agree with the impolite car owner, he or she was allowed to release all the angry feelings. The strategy of ignoring the implied face attack is somewhat similar to the preceding strategy. If the speaker makes an implied face attack instead of a clear, unambiguous one, the hearer can respond only to the surface meaning of the utterance, for example:

“Have a nice day.” (a car owner)
 “Yes, I will.” (the clamper)

This example is taken from Culpeper et al’s (2003:1567) analysis and in their opinion, the car owner is being sarcastic because he has just gotten a parking ticket and he is not sincere in the situation. However, the clamper responds to

the surface meaning of the utterance and leaves the implied meaning unnoticed. In conclusion, Culpeper et al. (2003:1568) note that there might be other defensive strategies besides the ones they have identified and they admit that have completely ignored the resolving process of confrontational situations.

Culpeper's impoliteness theory is based heavily on Brown and Levinson's politeness theory but it exploits also Leech's politeness theory in cases where Brown and Levinson's theory does not provide satisfying answers. Culpeper (1996) and Culpeper et al (2003) have used this impoliteness theory with different kinds of data and widened the area of research by investigating not only impolite utterances but also on responses to the impoliteness and its consequences. What is beneficial for this current study is that Culpeper has also tested the impoliteness theory on written data and proven that it is possible to study impoliteness in written material. The impoliteness strategies can be applied to this study quite straightforwardly without major changes in analysing of the data. In the following sections, Culpeper's impoliteness theory has an important part when the research questions are introduced and the analytic framework is set.

7 Methodology

7.1 Research questions

The aim of this study is to investigate dialogues in Bridget Jones novels written by Helen Fielding to find out how impoliteness is presented in them, and on the basis of the analysis to draw some outlines on how they are presented in written texts generally. It is also interesting to find out what kind of functions impoliteness has in *Bridget Jones* – novels and whether they are significant to the development of the plot and characters. The main research question of this study is:

What kind of impoliteness appears in the dialogues of the novels Bridget Jones's Diary and Bridget Jones – the Edge of Reason?

The main question can be divided into smaller subquestions:

- 1.) What forms does impoliteness take?
- 2.) Can impolite utterances be divided and analyzed according to Culpeper's (1996:355-358) impoliteness strategies? Is there a need for new categories when analyzing this data or are Culpeper's strategies comprehensive?
- 3.) Does knowledge of the narrative, background or the characters affect the interpretation of impoliteness in the dialogues?
- 4.) What kind of functions do the impolite dialogues have?

Impoliteness research is still a developing area of research and it is seen almost as an extension of politeness research. In my opinion, impoliteness is just as significant a research area as politeness is and it deserves more attention in the future. This study focuses on impoliteness in literary dialogues. In dialogues, it is easy to direct the impolite act towards someone because dialogues almost without exceptions take place between more than one person. I investigated the context of situations where impoliteness occurred and how it affected the interpretation. It is possible that any information about the character's background and the previous events could affect the interpretation of their words in a certain way. Knowledge about the relationship of the characters is also an important factor when analyzing their use of impoliteness. There was also a need to consider literary dialogues that are not meant as impolite but they are interpreted as such. Impolite acts are supposed to be premeditated attacks towards the hearer's face but what happens when the hearer interprets some utterance as impolite even when the speaker had no intention to attack? The possibility of a misunderstanding is always present and since the author has deliberately written it in the dialogue, it probably has some significance just as all other forms of impoliteness connected either to the speaker or to the hearer.

7.2 Data

Helen Fielding's novels *Bridget Jones's Diary* and *Bridget Jones – the Edge of Reason* published in 1996 and 1999. The primary data consists of confrontational dialogues, which are only a small part of all dialogues in these two novels since the total amount of dialogues is 256 in both novels. The number of confrontational dialogues is 73 in total, 31 in the first novel and 42 in the second. The term confrontational dialogue is adopted from Nash (1990:99-100) along with collaborative and instructional dialogue which are also used in this study to divide dialogues into different groups. It was necessary to narrow down the number of dialogues since the majority of them did not include any kind of impoliteness and therefore did not fit into the scope of this study. The measures that were done in order to specify the data are discussed in the following paragraphs along with general discussion of the structure of the novels and the dialogues.

The novels are constructed like a diary and Bridget is the narrator which is obvious because of the diary form of the book. The chapters in the first book are divided according to each month of the year, twelve in total, but in the second book there are fifteen chapters. Each chapter is then again divided to days but there are fewer of them than 365 because Bridget's diary includes only those days when something important has happened to her. Furthermore, most of the days in the diary is sectioned according to time, for example *9 a.m.*, *9.05 a.m.* or *midnight*. The more precise the time is, the more important the event is in Bridget's life.

In the text there are pieces of dialogue which can also be called literary dialogue. Usually when dialogue is used Bridget is remembering what had happened earlier in more detail. The events cannot be told at the present moment since the story is in a diary form and diaries are written after something worth writing about has happened. In the dialogues Bridget is often one of the participants who are speaking. Other characters who appear in the novels and in dialogues are her parents, her friends (Jude, Tom, Sharon, Magda), boyfriends (Mark, Daniel) and others, for example relatives, her boss

and fellow workers, acquaintances and strangers. There are also dialogues where Bridget is not speaking and the conversation happens between other people besides her.

The length of the dialogues varies and there can be dialogues that are several pages long and short dialogues that have only one utterance in them in such a way that some other character's words are written in dialogue form and Bridget's answer is written in narrative. Dialogues are surrounded by narrative and there can be narrative also in between dialogues. Small patches of narrative in between dialogue are called "pictures", according to Nash (1990:88), and it is typical for a romantic novel to consist of conversations and pictures. In long dialogues the plot can change quite a lot and there can be several characters included in the conversation. It is possible that dialogue and narrative alternate, for example, when a new character is introduced in a dialogue and then narrative immediately interrupts the dialogue giving the narrator a chance to tell background information about the new character.

There are 105 dialogues in the first novel and 147 dialogues in the second one, 256 in total. I have gone through the books picking out all the dialogues, which have more than one turn. In the dialogues I chose there is a conversation at least between two speakers and some of it is separated from the narrative text with a dash in front of the utterance and the words that are spoken are indicated by quotation marks. This is also called the quoting of conversation. These novels are written in a diary form and there can be quoting of conversation and narrative mixed together. I came across quoting of some character's words but since they were not whole conversations, I did not include them in the data. It would be too difficult to analyze such short dialogues because it is not indicated what is said before and after the line that is written and Bridget gives only her interpretation of the events.

When I had picked out all the dialogues, I had to separate them into different groups according to what kind of dialogues they were because a quick browse through the data showed that not all of them included impolite features. I have used Nash's (1990:99-100) categories confrontational, collaborative and

instructional in order to divide the dialogues into smaller groups. According to Nash's research, the collaborative dialogue is the most common for romantic novels but I am more interested in the confrontational dialogue since I am looking for impolite behaviour on linguistic level in the novels. All dialogues that include challenges, quarrels, disputes, interviews or other kind of situations where the participants do not agree with each other are considered confrontational.

I went through both novels and it appeared that the biggest category in the data is indeed the collaborative dialogue. The majority of the 256 dialogues were collaborative and there were 73 dialogues which were confrontational. The small group of confrontational dialogues is the main interest of this study and therefore the primary data, which is taken into closer analysis. There were 31 confrontational dialogues in the first novel and 42 in the second novel. It is not surprising that there were so few confrontational dialogues since disagreements are not wanted in conversations but instead speakers want their interaction to go on smoothly and satisfy their facewants. I could not find any instructional dialogues from the two novels but this was not a surprise since they are not typical for romantic novels. However, in some cases it was not possible to put a whole dialogue into a certain group since the plot changed quite quickly, and the beginning of the dialogue could be analyzed as collaborative and the end as confrontational. In these cases I analyzed the part of the dialogue where impoliteness appeared and classified the whole dialogue as confrontational despite the fact that there were also collaborative features.

7.3 Analytic framework

All 73 dialogues were analyzed using Culpeper's approach in order to find out what kind of impolite features they included. Most importantly, I tried to identify features that would correspond with Culpeper's impoliteness strategies, which are bald on record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, sarcasm or mock politeness and withholding politeness. I began by looking at each dialogue individually and tried to identify what kind

of impoliteness strategies it included. Usually at the first sight, one of the strategies stood out more clearly than the others but deeper investigation revealed the other strategies as well. Most of the dialogues included more than one strategy of impoliteness and it was somewhat problematic to categorize them in the results section. Culpeper et al's (2003:1560-1562) studies were useful because they had already shown that strategies tend to be combined. In some cases, there were features that did not fit into Culpeper's strategies but I could not leave them outside the analysis because there were definite traces of impoliteness.

Culpeper's impoliteness strategies were the most important tool in the analysis. However, the clues which led to the identifying a particular strategy were found also from the surrounding narrative. The narrative gave information about the relationship of the speakers, previous events and about the activities that take place before the conversation, for example the location, tones of voices, eye contacts, etc. Every detail that is mentioned around dialogues has some meaning since the author wants to direct and control the reader's attention during the reading. If it was mentioned that the characters were angry at each other before the dialogue, it was likely that some kind of impoliteness appeared during the conversation. It was also necessary to pay attention to the responses to impoliteness. Impolite behaviour causes more impolite behaviour or in Culpeper et al's (2003:1562-1568) terms, offensive utterances can cause more offensive utterances. The other possible response for offensive utterances is defensive verbal behaviour. With the help of these pairs of confrontational situations, it was possible to analyze the structure of the dialogues. In some cases, impoliteness is left unnoticed by the hearer probably because of a misinterpretation or ignoring but an impolite utterance was still obvious to the reader. It was also possible that the hearer interpreted the speaker's words as impolite even though they were not meant as such and this caused the hearer to make an attack towards the speaker who did not even realize having been impolite to the hearer.

The results of the analysis are presented according to Culpeper's strategies. Some examples are chosen from each category and they are introduced in

detail. As a reminder for the reader, I will list here the main strategies of Culpeper's impoliteness theory:

- Bald on record impoliteness. The speaker's clear intention to attack the hearer's face.
- Positive impoliteness. Strategies that are used to damage the hearer's positive face such as:
 - Ignore, snub the other*
 - Exclude the other from an activity*
 - Disassociate from the other*
 - Be disinterested, unconcerned, unsympathetic*
 - Use inappropriate identity markers*
 - Use obscure or secretive language*
 - Seek disagreement*
 - Make the other feel uncomfortable*
 - Use taboo words*
 - Call the other names*
- Negative impoliteness. Strategies that are used to damage the hearer's negative face such as:
 - Frighten*
 - Condescend, scorn or ridicule*
 - Invade the other's space*
 - Explicitly associate the other with a negative aspect*
 - Put the other's indebtedness on record*
 - Hinder or block the other*
- Sarcasm or mock politeness. The use of politeness strategies, which are clearly insincere.
- Withhold politeness. Be quiet or fail to use politeness where it is expected.

8 Results

8.1 Bald on record impoliteness

The confrontational dialogues that could be analyzed to include bald on record impoliteness strategies were various and it is not simple to generalize them. In this category, it was common that the impoliteness was clear, unambiguous and direct.

The following dialogue, which is a phone conversation between Bridget and her mother, shows bald on record impoliteness strategies. Bridget's mother wants to know what her daughter wants for Christmas and this is a bit odd because it is only August at that moment (the first novel, p.8):

Example 1

(Mother) "Would you like a surprise, darling?"

(Bridget) "No!" I bellowed. "Sorry. I mean..."

(Mother) "I wondered if you'd like a set of wheels for your suitcase?"

It is clear from Bridget's words that at first she turn downs the offer very rudely. She uses just the plain word *no* and it is described that she said it by bellowing, which is hardly polite behaviour in a phone conversation. The apology that follows shows that she understands that she has been rude and tries to explain but then her mother continues to speak. Her intention was not necessarily to be impolite but she reacted to her mother's question accidentally with a strict denial and a bellowing tone of voice because she might have been afraid of any crazy ideas her mother has come up with this time. In this case, the linguistic form of the utterance is impolite but its meaning is not meant to be since it could be seen as an innocent slip. Moreover, there is no harm done because her mother does not even seem to notice what Bridget has said and continues with her idea. She ignores or does not even notice Bridget's offensive comment and turns down the opportunity to defend herself or to make an offensive counter-attack which would be possible according to

Culpeper et al (2003:1562-1568, discussed in the section 6.2). These kinds of phone conversations are typical for Bridget and her mother and usually her mother is so excited to tell what has happened that she does not even notice if she tries to end the conversation. Bridget knows her mother's habits quite well and she gets irritated very easily when talking to her mother on the phone because her mother ignores her opinions and does not take no for an answer.

The relationship between Bridget and her mother is intriguing because it seems that her mother treats her daughter still as a little girl even though she is an adult. The mother gets into situations where her daughter often feels embarrassed and Bridget cannot understand her mother's mindless behaviour. The following example shows what kind of behaviour can be expected from Bridget's mother and it also includes a bald on record impoliteness strategy (the second novel, p. 95-96):

Example 2

Were just standing in the arrivals hall looking for the taxi sign when voice said:

(Mother) "Darling! You shouldn't have come to meet me, silly billy. Geoffrey and Daddy are waiting for us outside. We've just come to get Daddy a present. Come and meet Wellington!"

Was my mother, tanned bright orange, with her hair in Bo Derek braids with beads on the ends and wearing a voluminous orange batik outfit like Winnie Mandela.

(Mother) "I know you're going to think that he's a Masai but he's a Kikuyu! A Kikuyu! Imagine!"

I followed her gaze to where Una Alconbury, also orange and dressed in head to toe batik but wearing her reading glasses and carrying a green leather handbag with a big gold clasp was standing at the counter in Sock Shop with her purse open. She was gazing up delightedly at an enormous black youth with a loop of flesh hanging from each ear with a film canister in one of them and dressed in a bright blue checked cloak.

(Mother) "*Hakuna Matata*. Don't worry, be happy! Swahili. Isn't it smashing? Una and I have had the most super time and Wellington's come back to stay! Hello, Mark", she said perfunctorily acknowledging his presence. "Come along, darling, why don't you say *Jambo* to Wellington!"

(Bridget) "Shut up, Mother, shut up", I hissed out of the corner of my mouth, looking from side to side nervously. "You can't have an African tribesman to stay. It's neo-colonialist and Daddy's only just got over Julio."

(Mother) "Wellington is not", said my mum, drawing herself up to her full height, "a tribesman. Well, at least he is, darling a proper tribesman! I mean he lives in a dung hut! But he wanted to come. He wants to do worldwide

travel just like Una and I.
Mark was a bit uncommunicative in taxi home. Bloody Mother.
Wish I had a normal round mum like other people, with grey hair,
who would just make lovely stews.

Bridget's mother and her aunt Una have been on a trip to Kenya and when they arrive, they have brought a guest with them. The mother presumes that Bridget and her boyfriend have come to greet them but actually, they have been on a trip of their own on the Alps. The unexpected meeting at the airport is almost shocking for Bridget because she obviously has lost her ability to talk. Her mother does most of the talking and we as readers are able to read Bridget's thoughts, which are surprised and even embarrassed because of her mother's behaviour and her appearance. The piece of dialogue which is shown above is long but impoliteness has only a minor role in it. The impolite act is performed by Bridget when she tells her mother to be quiet (*shut up*). The strategy that is used is bald on record impoliteness since Bridget is commanding her mother to be quiet and she does not consider if her mother is willing to do that. The same tone of commanding continues in the next sentence where Bridget continues that her mother cannot bring strange black men home with her. Bridget seems to think that her mother does not know what appropriate behaviour is and she seems to believe that her mother might have racist opinions or that her behaviour could be interpreted as racist. Bridget says her opinion about her mother's African visitor aloud and states that it is neo-colonialist, which means that she suspects that her mother might try to treat him as unequal and maybe even oppress him. These accusations are just Bridget's suspicions because she believes that her mother is capable of doing all sorts of crazy things. She also suspects that her mother might be romantically interested in Wellington and Bridget reminds her mother that her husband has gone through a lot because of her first affair and has just gotten over it. Bridget's mother does not accept her daughter's complaining and she makes a counter-attack. As mentioned in section 6.2, Culpeper et al. (2003: 1562-1568) have defined the basic pairs of verbal attacks which are offensive – defensive and offensive – offensive and these pairs can now be applied to this example. Bridget makes the offensive comment and then her mother makes a defensive comment instead of an offensive comment when she defends Wellington by saying that he is a real tribesman who wants to do world traveling. The interesting thing that appears

at this point in the example is that Bridget's mother does not respond to the accusations that Bridget has made towards her but she defends Wellington instead of herself. Bridget has told her mother to be quiet, accused her of bringing a black man as a souvenir from Africa and hinted that she might have an affair with him. However, her mother responds defensively that Wellington is real tribesman and that he has come voluntarily. Bridget's mother ignores Bridget's command of being quiet and presumes that Bridget suspects Wellington's authenticity. In other words, she completely ignores the things that might suggest that she has done something wrong or inappropriate. This kind of dodging behaviour is typical for Bridget's mother and she seems to believe that she is perfect.

In the following example, the speaker's, Jude's impolite intentions are shown clearly in the narrative paragraph and she behaves very rudely towards Magda when the girls are having a night out (second novel, p. 40):

Example 3

*Was just pouring a glass of Chardonnay when Jude reappeared,
looked from Magda's stomach to me, and gave me a filthy look.*

(Jude) "Hi, Magda", she said gruffly. "When's it due?"

(Magda) "I had her five weeks ago", said Magda chin wobbling.
*Knew it was a mistake to combine different species of friends,
knew it.*

(Magda) "Do I look that fat?" Magda whispered to me, as if Jude
and Shaz were the enemy.

(Bridget) "No, you look great", I said. "Glowing."

(Magda) "Do I?" Magda said, brightening. "It just takes a bit of
time to... you know... deflate. Also, you know I had
mastitis..."

As mentioned above Bridget, Jude and Sharon are having a girls' night out and Bridget has invited her friend Magda who is married and has had a baby a short while ago to join them. Jude and Sharon do not like the fact that Bridget has brought Magda with her because in their opinion she does not understand the lifestyle of singles and is completely dependent on her husband. Jude comes out of the bathroom and sees Magda at the table, and as Bridget describes, notices that Magda has not yet recovered physically from the delivery. When

opening a conversation, one would expect that participants would start by saying something nice to each other. Bridget realizes that Jude is going to say something nasty to Magda before she says it because she interprets Jude's filthy look. Jude asks if Magda is going to have her baby soon, even though she already knows that she has had it five weeks ago. She directs her attack towards Magda's appearance and that is a very sensitive area for insults especially with women. Jude is acting impolitely, even rudely intentionally because she does not want her to be there with them. She is also impolite to Bridget because Magda is her friend. Magda is very much offended by Jude's question and she turns to Bridget for comfort. This dialogue resembles mock politeness but in my opinion, it is bald on record impoliteness since Jude's rude intentions are obvious and she does not try to cover her impolite tone of voice or apologize for her mistake after Magda's reply. If this dialogue's impoliteness had been mock politeness, Jude would have used a different kind of tone and expressed somehow that she did not intend to make that kind of mistake. Mock politeness would be more indirectly expressed.

Jude is getting married and Bridget and Sharon are her bridesmaids but the girls are not sure if she should do it. Sharon expresses her opinions very strongly and in this case, it leads into a serious conflict (second novel, p. 230):

Example 4

(Sharon) "Can I just say something?" said Shaz.

(Jude) "Yes", said Jude.

(Sharon) "DON'T BLOODY MARRY VILE RICHARD. He's
an unreliable, selfish, idle, unfaithful fuckwit from hell.
If you marry him, he'll take half your money and run off
with a bimbo. I know they have the pre-nuptial
agreements but..."

Jude went all quiet.

The girls are planning Jude's wedding and Sharon interrupts their conversation. In her opinion, Jude should not marry Richard because he has not treated Jude very nicely in the past. The wedding announcement came rather quickly and Bridget and Sharon were quite shocked about it. Sharon is a very strong-

mindful person and she speaks very bluntly but her friends usually ignore her foul use of language. She often disagrees with her friends but she does not offend them except for this particular dialogue. The situation is very sensitive because Jude expects her friends to support her decision and when Sharon speaks her mind and criticizes her fiancée, she is offended as can be seen from the ending of the text where Bridget has added the comment of the happenings *Jude went all quiet*. Sharon attacks against Richard even though he is not present but since he is in a relationship with Jude, she is impolite also towards her. Jude does not respond to Sharon's outburst but her quietness can be interpreted as a negative reaction. Sharon boosts her words with a positive impoliteness strategy of calling names when she uses the bald on record impoliteness strategy.

The same dialogue discussed above continues and Sharon's outburst is just "calm before the storm". Another confrontation takes place shortly after the first one (second novel, p. 231):

Example 5

(Jude) "You see", Jude was going on, "with the guest list it says, don't feel you have to invite guest's new partners – but the minute I mentioned it she said, "Oh we'd love to come.""

(Bridget) "Who?" I said.

(Jude) "Rebecca."

I looked at Jude, dumbstruck. She wouldn't. She wouldn't expect me to walk down the aisle dressed as a sofa while Mark Darcy sat with Rebecca, would she?

(Jude) "And I mean they have asked me to go on holiday with them. Not that I would go, of course. But I think Rebecca was a bit hurt that I hadn't told her before."

(Sharon) "What?" exploded Shazzer. "Have you no concept of the meaning of the word "girlfriend"? Bridget's your best friend joint with me, and Rebecca has shamelessly stolen Mark, and instead of being tactful about it, she's trying to Hoover everyone into her revolting web so he's so woven in he'll never get away. And you're not taking a bloody stand. That's the trouble with the modern world – everything is forgivable. Well it makes me sick, Jude. If that's the sort of friend you are you can walk down the aisle with Rebecca behind you wearing Ikea curtains and not us. And then see how you like it. And you can stuff your yurd, gurd, turd or whatever it is up your bum!"

So now Sharon and I are not speaking to Jude. Oh dear. Oh dear.

In the preceding dialogue, Sharon attacked Richard, Jude's boyfriend, but now she lashes out on Jude. Rebecca is going out at the moment of speaking with Bridget's ex-boyfriend Mark and it would be expected that Bridget's friends would not tolerate Rebecca's behaviour. In Sharon's opinion they should not have anything to do with her but apparently Jude has been in contact with her and even invited Rebecca and Mark to come to her wedding. Sharon's line is bald on record impoliteness and she is very angry at Jude about the way she has behaved towards Bridget. Sharon is accusing Jude of being a disloyal friend. Sharon's outburst could also be seen as a counter-attack because she reacts to Jude's behaviour, which is also impolite. However, Jude has been impolite towards Bridget because she has been on friendly terms with Bridget's worst enemy. Jude's impoliteness is probably not bald on record because she is not intentionally impolite to Bridget. Her behaviour resembles more of the positive impoliteness strategy of ignoring the other. She is excited about the wedding and talks about everything connected with them and perhaps momentarily forgets that it is not wise to talk about Rebecca around Bridget. She might have also made the mistake of thinking that Bridget has no romantic feelings towards Mark anymore and is ready to accept that he is going out with Rebecca.

Bridget thinks that her life is usually misfortunate and uneventful but to us as readers her life seems very exciting and full of happenings and we often find ourselves smirking at her unfortunate mishaps. Bridget is the kind of person who thinks more with her heart and emotions than with her brains. The following example takes place in an art gallery where there are installations, which are connected to bathrooms and their equipment. Bridget is not on a cheerful mood at that moment and when she is looking at an installation portraying a toilet roll inside out with the cardboard outside the paper she almost bursts into tears (the first novel, p.193):

Example 6

(Bridget) "Just going to the loo", I blurted, rushing away past a configuration of sanitary-towel bags. There was a queue outside a Portaloo and I joined it, shaking.

Suddenly, just when it was almost my turn, I felt a hand on my arm. It was Daniel.

(Daniel) “Bridge, what are you doing here?”

(Bridget) “What does it look like?” I snapped. “Excuse me, I’m in a hurry.” I burst into the cubicle and was just about to get on with it when realized the toilet was actually a moulding of the inside of a toilet, vacuum-packed in plastic. Then Daniel put his head round the door.

(Daniel) “Bridge, don’t wee on the Installation, will you?” he said, and closed the door again.

When I came out he had vanished.

In this situation Bridget is about to make an embarrassing mistake by assuming that she is queuing to a real bathroom (Portaloo) instead of a fake one. She does not realize that the portable toilet is not genuine until she goes inside it and gets ready to do her business. It was easy to make this kind of mistake in an art gallery where they are showing things that are part of bathroom equipment. Bridget is feeling sad and depressed because she is convinced that she will end up alone for the rest of her life. Her friend Tom has taken her into the gallery so that she would cheer up and they meet Gav who is a very good-looking young man even in Bridget’s eyes. However, Bridget bursts into tears in front of Tom and Gav and she tries to run away to the toilet. Unfortunately, Daniel happens to see her in the queue and comes to talk to her. The last time they saw each other Daniel had cheated on her with another woman and broke up their relationship with her because of it. Bridget has not forgiven Daniel for that and she does not want to have anything to do with him. It cannot be concluded from the dialogue what kind of tone Daniel uses when she asks Bridget what she is doing there. It is not typical to start conversation in such a direct way but it cannot be interpreted as impolite without other clues of impoliteness. Daniel is not the person who uses a bald on record impoliteness strategy but it is Bridget. In the underlined part of Bridget’s utterance, she answers Daniel’s questions with another question very bluntly. Obviously, Bridget’s negative feelings towards Daniel affect her way of answering him. Instead of saying “what do you think” she could have said, for example, “it’s none of your business” because she does not want to talk to him. When answering with a question Bridget means that she does not want to tell Daniel

what she is doing and at the same time implies that it is obvious what she is doing. Bridget tries to give the impression that Daniel must be dumb not to realize what she is doing. Her tone of voice also emphasizes the effect of minding one's own business. When thinking about the relationship between Bridget and Daniel, Bridget's words could be seen as a counter-attack to Daniel's words. It is possible that Bridget is offended that Daniel dares to talk to her after the way he has hurt her feelings. The interpretation of this situation depends on the point of view which is chosen, whether it is Bridget's or Daniel's. If Daniel's point of view is chosen, Bridget is the one who is impolite to him by answering to his question by snapping at him. Then again if Bridget's point of view is chosen and her words are seen as a counter-attack, Culpeper et al's (2003:1562-1568) basic pairs of verbal attack can be applied also in this case. Daniel's question is then an offensive utterance and Bridget's is defensive because her question is in a way an explanation for her benefit.

Above the examples that have been introduced have included bald on record impoliteness strategies that have been verbally expressed. In the following example, the bald on record impoliteness strategy is expressed in a nonverbal way when Bridget is in an awkward situation where she has to prove that she is not as stupid as her ex-boyfriend claims (the second novel, p. 246-247):

Example 7

(Tom) "Bridge?" said Tom. "Are you alright? I was only laughing because it's so... ridiculous. I mean of course you know where Germany is... Bridge? Don't you?"

(Bridget) "Yes", I whispered weakly.

There was a long awkward pause while I tried to come to terms with what had happened i.e. Daniel had chucked me because he thought I was stupid.

(Tom) "So, then", said Tom brightly. "Where is it... Germany?"

(Bridget) "Europe."

(Tom) "Yeah, but, like, where in Europe?"

Honestly. In the modern age it is not necessary to know where countries actually are since all that is required is to purchase a plane ticket to one. They do not exactly ask you at the travel agent's which countries you will be flying over before they give you the ticket, do they?

(Tom) "Just give us a ballpark position."

(Bridget) "Er", I stalled, head down, eyes flicking round the room to see if there might be an atlas at large.

(Tom) "Which countries do you think Germany might be near?" he pressed on.

(Bridget) I thought about it carefully. "France."

(Tom) “France. I see. So Germany is ‘near France’, is it?”
Something about the way Tom said this made me feel I’d made some cataclysmic gaff. Then it occurred to me that Germany is of course connected to Eastern Germany and therefore it is far more likely to be close to Hungary, Russia or Prague.

(Bridget) “Prague”, I said. At which Tom burst out laughing.
 “Anyway, there’s no such thing as general knowledge any more”, I said indignantly. “It has been proved by articles that the media has created such a great sea of knowledge that everyone cannot possibly have the same selection of it.”

(Tom) “Never mind, Bridge”, said Tom. “Don’t worry about it. Do you want to see a movie tomorrow?”

Tom had run into Daniel, Bridget’s ex-boyfriend, and had asked him why he had broken off with her. Daniel had answered that it is hard to date someone who does not know where Germany is and this is very upsetting information for Bridget. Tom believes that Bridget knows where Germany is and asks her about it but Bridget does not seem to know the exact location. Bridget tries to play time so that she would get a chance to find some help somewhere, but she has to rely on her knowledge about Germany, which is not much. Tom does not give her any clues and when she says that it is near France she is correct, but she starts to doubt herself because of Tom’s tone of voice. After this, she connects Germany to Eastern Germany, Hungary and Prague, which is not even a country. After she has said that it is near Prague Tom realizes that she does not have a clue where Germany is. Tom reacts suddenly by laughing at Bridget’s answer and this is very offensive towards Bridget. This incident is a good example that impoliteness can be nonverbal and it still can be offensive towards the hearer. From the tone of Bridget’s voice that is described as indignant we can see that she might be even angry at Tom for laughing at her. According to Culpeper et al’s (2003:1562-1568) basic pairs of verbal attack, Tom’s laughter is offensive and Bridget’s talk about general knowledge is defensive. It is possible that Tom did not mean to laugh at Bridget because he consoles her that it is not important information and invites her to see a movie the day after that. Tom and Bridget are friends and friends do not usually laugh at the other’s expense, but in this situation, Bridget’s answer is wrong in such a funny way that even her friend cannot help laughing. Tom’s consoling is a gesture of apology to Bridget.

8.2 Positive impoliteness

The majority of the dialogues had positive impoliteness strategies (approximately 31), especially the strategies of calling the other names or using taboo words. It was also common that there were many different positive impoliteness strategies in the same dialogue. The use of multiple strategies is a way to emphasize impoliteness and create a bigger offense towards the hearer.

Bridget and her friend Sharon meet their acquaintance Alex in a bar. Sharon is angry that men use women and as the women get old, the men leave them for younger women. In her opinion, it is disgusting that men are not able to make a commitment to women and stay loyal. At that moment, Alex walks in with a gorgeous blonde, stops to say hi to the girls and Sharon gets her opportunity to strike back (the first novel, p.21):

Example 8

(Sharon) “Is this your new girlfriend?” asked Sharon.

(Alex) “Well. Huh. You know, she thinks she is, but we’re not going out, we’re just sleeping together. I ought to stop it really, but, well...” he said, smugly.

(Sharon) “Oh, that is just such crap, you cowardly, dysfunctional little schmuck. Right I’m going to talk to that woman”, said Sharon, getting up. Jude and I forcibly restrained her while Alex, panic-stricken, rushed back, to continue his fuckwittage unrumbled.

Sharon attacks Alex by calling him names mainly because she does not accept that men use women and will not make a commitment to them. Sharon is trying to be as impolite as possible and she might think that Alex has deserved to have a piece of her mind. You could assume that Alex would be offended by these words and maybe even make a counter-attack but he gets scared of Sharon and disappears quickly. Sharon’s outburst is so powerful that Alex does not even try to defend himself. It could also be thought that Sharon has been offended by Alex’s words and her utterance is a counter-attack. Alex is not trying to be impolite but he could not have known that Sharon would not understand his behaviour. Alex might have made the mistake of talking about

his girl in a way, which would have been acceptable and normal in men's interaction. In other words, he was boasting with his newest conquest and this can be interpreted of his tone of voice, which is smug. Sharon directs her insults towards Alex as a person and towards his behaviour too. She claims him to be a schmuck, a coward and dysfunctional because she is letting her date think that they are a couple even though they are not in Alex's opinion. Sharon also lets him know that his behaviour towards the girl is wrong by saying that it is crap. In this piece Sharon's name-calling is quite creative and it is very typical for her to use a lot of swear words and insult other people. Even though her rude use of language is impolite, her friends are accustomed to it and they do not interpret it as impolite every time.

There is also another example from the same kind of situation between Bridget and Daniel who is dating her at that moment. They are just about to have sex when Daniel says that she should not expect any kind of commitment from him. Bridget gets very angry with him for using her that way (p.33):

Example 9

(Daniel) "This is just a bit of fun, OK? I don't think we should start getting involved."

(Bridget) "That is just such crap," I slurred "How dare you be so fraudulently flirtatious, cowardly and dysfunctional? I am not interested in emotional fuckwittage. Goodbye!"

Daniel's words spoil the intimate moment they are about to have offending Bridget very badly. In this case, Bridget's use of calling Daniel names could be seen as a counter-attack to Daniel's words. It is offending for Bridget that he only wants to have sex with her but he does not want to make any other commitments to her, for example to be her boyfriend. Throughout the whole novel Bridget and her friends have problems with men who have commitment problems, in other words Daniel hits a nerve in this dialogue and the consequences are terrible. Bridget lets him know what kind of person he really is and that she is not going to stand for it. Also in this piece of dialogue, the name-calling is not ordinary but more creative especially when you look at the words *fraudulently flirtatious*, *cowardly* and *dysfunctional*. These words are

directed at Daniel describing him as a person who is afraid to commit and at his behaviour which is insincere and deceitful. However, I do not think that these kinds of names would be used often in real speech and they are more suitable for literary use. In the novel the girls meet only wrong men who cannot make the kind of commitment they would hope for and this is conveyed also through their use of language in the situations where they have been let down by men.

Below is another example of positive impoliteness from dialogue between Bridget and her mother where she has problems with Bridget's father and she is complaining to Bridget (p.53):

Example 10

(Mother) "Darling, it's merely a question of realizing, when your father retired, that I had spent thirty-five years without a break running his home and bringing up his children –"

(Bridget) "Jamie and I are your children too", I interjected, hurt.

(Mother) " – and that as far he was concerned his lifetime's work was over and mine was still carrying on, which is exactly how I used to feel ..."

Although Bridget's mother is angry with her father, she manages to hurt Bridget too. Bridget's mother talks about Bridget and her brother as if they were not her children at all. Bridget's mother is using a positive impoliteness strategy disassociating from the other when she is talking about her children as only her husband's children. Bridget is offended by her mother's words but I believe that her mother did not intend to hurt her because she is angry at her father. Bridget's mother is talking to Bridget like she was her friend and not her daughter since she does not realize that Bridget gets offended by her distancing herself from her own children.

Bridget has many single friends but she also has friends who are married and they are usually very curious about her love life. For Bridget there is nothing worse than people who cannot understand why she is not married. An example

of positive impoliteness strategy from a discussion between Bridget and Cosmo (the first novel, p.41):

Example 11

(Cosmo) “You really ought to hurry up and get sprogged up, you know, old girl”, said Cosmo, pouring a quarter of a pint of ’82 Pauillac straight down his throat. “Time is running out.”

By this time I’d had a good half-pint of ’82 Pauillac myself.

(Bridget) “Is it one in three marriages that in end in divorce now or one in two?”, I slurred with a pointless attempt at sarcasm.

(Cosmo) “Seriously, old girl!, he said ignoring me. “Office is full of them, single girls over thirty. Fine physical specimens. Can’t get a chap.”

The dialogue takes place at a party and Cosmo opens up the conversations immediately by recommending that she should get married. Cosmo also implies quite directly that Bridget is getting too old to find a man. Bridget tries to be sarcastic and point out that getting married does not guarantee happiness but Cosmo ignores her comment, which is a positive impoliteness strategy and continues to talk about women who are not able to find men as if it were a big mystery to him. Bridget’s sarcastic remark is a counter-attack to Cosmo’s offensive comment, but it fails because Cosmo does not change the subject of the conversation but instead continues of the same topic. Culpeper et al’s (2003:1562-1568) basic pairs of verbal interaction can be applied here and this example differs from the previous ones because it is clearly structured as offensive – offensive. Bridget does not try to defend herself or her marital status and tries a different kind of approach in order to change the subject of the conversation. It is also possible that she is being sarcastic since she is annoyed that people often ask or comment on her private life. The power relations in this example are interesting because it appears that Cosmo is the more powerful participant because he can ignore Bridget’s question without answering it and even implying that Bridget was not serious when she said it. Bridget is vulnerable in this situation because she is the only single person

there and the married people are the majority. When the relationship is unequal, according to Culpeper (1996:354), the more powerful participant is not motivated to act politely and he or she can even limit the weaker participant's speaking rights. When Cosmo ignores Bridget's question he is trying to hold the floor and the right to choose the topic of the conversation. If you think of the meaning of calling Bridget an *old girl*, it could be interpreted as name calling, which is also a positive impoliteness strategy, because Cosmo might be hinting that Bridget will end up as a spinster. Even though Bridget seems to be all right in the situation, she is actually offended because she bursts into tears in the taxi. In this example, the power relations are shown clearly: the married people are the majority and they attack Bridget who is in the minority.

Bridget's and her mother's relationship is very complicated at least in Bridget's opinion. Her mother succeeds in embarrassing her on several occasions and Bridget does not like this, but when she tries to reason with her mother, she does not seem to understand her. Bridget and her mother are talking about Mark, Bridget's new boyfriend, in the second novel (p.7):

Example 12

(Mother) "Anyway. How's it going with Mark?"

(Bridget) "Lovely" I said moonily, at which she gave me a hard stare.

(Mother) "You're not going to you-know-what with him, are you? He won't marry you, you know."

(Mother) "You know what they say afterwards", she was going on. "'Oh she was easy meat' I mean when Merle Robertshaw started going out with Percival her mother said, 'Make sure he keeps that thing just for weeing with.'"

(Bridget) "Mother —" I protested. *I mean it was a bit rich coming from her. Not six months ago she was running around with a Portuguese tour operator with a gentleman's handbag.*

(Mother) "Oh, did I tell you", she interrupted, smoothly changing the subject, "Una and I are going to Kenya."

Before Bridget and Mark started dating, Bridget's mother had tried to get them together because she thought that Mark would be an excellent catch. Now they are finally together and in this dialogue her mother gets worried that they might be having sex together. Bridget's mother is old-fashioned and in her opinion, her daughter should not have sex with him because he might not marry her

because she was easy. The mother's underlined words can be seen as a positive impoliteness strategy because she is making Bridget feel very uncomfortable by talking about sex and asking about her daughter's sex life. She is old enough to make her own decisions about sex but her mother does not see it that way. Bridget also thinks that her mother is not the right person to talk about celibacy in a relationship because she herself had had an affair with a Portuguese man even though she did not admit it. The mother changes the subject quite quickly before Bridget has a chance to make a counter-attack. Her intention was not to be impolite but she was acting like a worried mother. Bridget's mother as a character is presented very well in this dialogue because she is always talking very quickly, gossiping and sticking her nose into other's business. However, it is not her business if her 30-year-old daughter is having sex with her boyfriend or not.

Inappropriate identity markers were not very common in my data but one was found in a conversation between Bridget, her parents, Aunt Una and Wellington who is a guest from Kenya. The dialogue is taken from the second novel (p. 129):

Example 13

(Una) "Geoffrey!" said Una, adding as if making light conversation, "Do you have older women who can't get married off in your tribe, Wellington?"

(Bridget) "I am not an older woman", I hissed.

(Wellington) "That is the responsibility of the elders of the tribe" said Wellington.

(Mother) "Well, I've always said that was the best way, haven't I, Colin?", said Mum smugly. "I mean didn't I tell Bridget she should go out with Mark?"

Bridget is offended because her aunt calls her an *older woman*. Her aunt is also suggesting that she cannot get married because she is already too old. Bridget protests aloud that she does not want to be called an older woman and in fact, she is denying that she is old. The impoliteness strategy of inappropriate identity markers concentrates mainly on titles, surnames, nicknames and their misuse according to Culpeper (1996:357), but in this case, it is obvious that Una is describing Bridget with characteristics that offend her. In addition to that, Una's description is incorrect since Bridget is only thirty and in modern

society, unmarried women in their forties are not considered unusual. Una is not deliberately trying to hurt or mock Bridget but she sees the issue from a different point of view than Bridget. Una and Bridget's parents are old-fashioned and in their youth it was normal to marry at a young age, but the situation has changed a lot in a few decades. They are worried that Bridget will end up as a spinster even when there is no need for such worries. It should also be noted that impoliteness appears even though Una is not talking directly to Bridget and she is just a bystander.

8.3 Negative impoliteness

The range of negative impoliteness strategies is smaller than positive impoliteness strategies. Culpeper has defined six different negative impoliteness strategies but I was able to find examples of only three of them. However, the negative impoliteness strategies were quite noticeable.

In the same dialogue used in the previous chapter, there is a negative impoliteness strategy in the beginning between the same characters. The subject of a potential boyfriend is a soft spot for Bridget and she gets very annoyed by her friends questions at least in her mind (the second novel, p.40):

Example 14

(Cosmo) "So", bellowed Cosmo, pouring me a drink. "How's your love life?"

(Woney) "Yes, why aren't you married yet, Bridget?", sneered Woney with a thin veneer of concern whilst stroking her pregnant stomach.

Because I don't want to end up like you, you fat, boring, Sloaney milch cow, was what I should have said, or, Because if I had to cook Cosmo's dinner then get into the same bed as him just once, let alone every night, I'd tear off my own head and eat it, or, Because actually, Woney, underneath my clothes, my entire body is covered in scales. But I didn't because, ironically enough I didn't want to hurt her feelings. So I merely simpered apologetically...

Bridget thinks very rude replies to these questions but she does not say them out loud because she does not want to hurt their feelings. However, she thinks it is impolite to ask intimate questions about her love life. Her thoughts are even aggressive, which we are able to see from the text, and she probably would not feel so strongly if the questions about her love life had not offended her. The negative impoliteness strategy that is used here is invading the other's space metaphorically by asking or commenting things that would not normally come up because the friendship is not so close. Cosmo and Woney are not very close friends of Bridget's. They are not trying to be mean to Bridget but they are probably trying to make her feel uncomfortable. Cosmo asks his question in a loud voice (*bellowed*) so that everybody could hear it and maybe his intention is to embarrass her. It is also possible that in this situation there are people who have such different opinions on this subject that they cannot understand each other without a conflict. If Bridget spoke her mind, the situation would get worse because her thoughts are very offensive. However, she answers their question with an apologetic smile without defending herself in any way. She knows that they would not understand her anyway.

The characters have such different opinions about being single that conflicts are unavoidable. The same negative impoliteness strategy of invading the other's space is used in the next example where Bridget's uncle asks about her love life (the first novel, p.10):

Example 15

(Geoffrey) "... How's your love-life, anyway?"

Oh God. Why can't married people understand that this is no longer a polite question to ask? We wouldn't rush up to them and roar 'How's your marriage going? Still having sex?' Everyone knows that dating in your thirties is not the happy-go-lucky free-for-all it was when you were twenty-two and that the honest answer is more likely to be, 'Actually, last night my married lover appeared wearing suspenders and a darling little Angora crop-top, told me he was gay/a sex addict/ a narcotic addict/ a commitment phobic and beat me up with a dildo', than , 'Super, thanks'.

(Bridget) *Not being a natural liar, I ended up mumbling shamefacedly to Geoffrey, "Fine" at which he boomed, "So you still haven't got a feller!"*

(Una) “Bridget! What are we going to do with you!” said Una.
 “You career girls! I don’t know! Can’t put it off for ever,
 you know. Tick-tock-tick-tock.”

This situation is embarrassing for Bridget because her aunt and uncle are asking intimate questions and seem to know best what Bridget should do with her life especially when it comes to finding a man. Her relatives obviously do not understand that they are being impolite to Bridget by asking about her love life and seems like they are still talking to her like to a child. What makes the situation more impolite is that uncle Geoffrey starts the conversation by asking about Bridget’s love matters which is not a usual thing to do. Geoffrey is using a negative impoliteness strategy of invading the other’s space metaphorically. We are able to read Bridget’s inner reaction to her uncle’s question and there she says it directly that it is impolite to ask these kinds of questions from single people over thirty. Her uncle interprets Bridget’s answer that she is not dating anyone even though she does not say so but as she answers she has a shameful look on her face which reveals the truth. Bridget’s aunt suggests that she should hurry up because she should start having children soon and she does it by imitating the sound of a clock. Her relatives probably see her as a hopeless case and a failure. They are embarrassing Bridget and they do not even believe that she could find anyone. Bridget makes her own situation worse and enforces her relatives’ opinions about her because she does not do anything to defend herself. However, it is possible that she wants to change the subject as quickly as possible and keep her private life to herself even if she has to bear offensive comments from the relatives.

Bridget and Daniel took a vacation in the first book and they eventually got on each other’s nerves because they did not have anything to do in the hotel. A negative impoliteness strategy is used in this dialogue (p.159):

Example 16

(Daniel) “I’ve got a new diet for you”, he said.
 (Bridget) “So you *do* think I’m fat.”
 (Daniel) “OK, this is it. It’s very simple. All you do is not eat any food which you have to pay for. So at the start of the diet you’re a bit porky and no one asks you out to dinner. Then you lose weight and get a bit leggy and

shag-me hippy and people start taking you out for meals. So then you put a few pounds on, the invitations tail off and you start losing weight again.”

(Bridget) “Daniel!” I exploded. “That’s the most appalling sexist, fattist, cynical thing I’ve ever heard.”

(Daniel) “Oh, don’t be like that, Bridge”, he said. “It’s the logical extension of what you really think. I keep telling you nobody wants legs like a stick insect. They want a bottom they can park a bike in and balance a pint of beer on.”

Daniel makes a joke about a new diet that Bridget could try out. Bridget interprets Daniel’s remark in a way that in his opinion she is fat and needs to lose weight. Daniel’s words could be seen as a negative impoliteness strategy of explicitly associating the other with a negative aspect. Bridget’s response to Daniel’s joke (*you do think I’m fat*) supports this conclusion. In Culpeper’s view this kind of impoliteness strategy should include personalizing and the use of the pronouns “I” and “you”. However, in this dialogue, Daniel does not claim Bridget to be fat straightforwardly but he implies it indirectly by suggesting a diet for her. Why would a person need a diet if he or she were not fat? Bridget is very insecure about her weight and a suggestion like this hurts her feelings. In Bridget’s reply (*So you do think I’m fat.*), the word *do* is emphasized and it reveals that Bridget has already suspected that Daniel might consider her to be over-weighted and her fears have come true. Throughout the novel, it becomes clear that Bridget’s body image is not healthy and she is always on a diet. Daniel proceeds with his joke and describes the diet and Bridget gets more offended. Bridget expresses her negative opinion about the diet very clearly and Daniel realizes that he has hurt her feelings and tries to make amends. Bridget’s reaction can be interpreted as bald on record impoliteness because she rejects the diet very roughly, but it is a counter-attack to Daniel’s suggestion. This dialogue is a good example of escalating of impoliteness since it includes two different impoliteness strategies and it corresponds with the offensive – offensive confrontational pair introduced by Culpeper et al. (2003:1562-1563). Bridget could have replied to Daniel’s implication by denying that she is in need of a diet and then the dialogue pair would have been analyzed as offensive – defensive. Bridget uses a bald on record impoliteness strategy when replying to Daniel’s indirectly offensive comment and this way the level of impoliteness increases and moves from indirect to direct in this dialogue.

The third impoliteness strategy that I could find in the data was condescending, scorning or ridiculing the other. This strategy appears, for example, in this dialogue where Bridget is in a meeting with her colleagues and her boss, Finch, and they are trying to come up with ideas for a TV program (second novel, p.195):

Example 17

(Bridget) “Tony Blair should introduce a code of Dating Practice for Singletons”, I said eventually.

There was a jealous pause from all other researchers round the table.

(Finch) “That’s it, is it?” said Richard Finch.

(Bridget) “Yup”, I said confidently.

(Finch) “You don’t think”, he said, “that our potential new Prime Minister might have better things to do with his time?”

In this situation, Finch is the boss and he has more power than others who are just plain employees. The purpose of this meeting is to come up with ideas for a television program and all the workers are supposed to present their ideas to their boss who either accepts or refuses them. Earlier Bridget has come up with good ideas and now Finch expects more from her than from the other employees. Bridget says her idea aloud and even though her colleagues seem to be impressed by it, Finch is not. Finch had obviously expected more because he uses a tag question in order to question if Bridget has told the whole idea. Even though the tone of Finch’s voice is not told, the reader can imagine that it could be a bit condescending and contemptuous. When you think of his answer (*That’s it, is it?*) it appears to be belittling. If he had considered Bridget’s idea to be good, he would have probably said some compliment to her and would not have used a tag question for confirmation. Finch’s next line after Bridget’s affirmative reply enforces the contemptuous effect and could even be seen as sarcastic. If Finch’s first line is analyzed as condescending and the other as sarcastic, then this example also includes more than one impoliteness strategy. According to Culpeper et al. (2003:1560-1562), when several impoliteness strategies are used in the same conversation, the impact of the impoliteness

increases significantly compared to conversations where only one impoliteness strategy is used. Bridget does not react to Finch's impoliteness because she has got accustomed to it and knows to expect this kind of behaviour from him. She is also very confident about her idea. Even in this conversation, Finch eventually accepts Bridget's idea after belittling it.

Bridget's relationship with her mother is not equal and usually her mother bosses Bridget around. The negative impoliteness strategy of condescending, scorning and ridiculing is found in a couple of occasions in dialogues between Bridget and her mother (first novel, p.211):

Example 18

(Mother) "Malcolm and Elaine are having the ruby wedding in London now, on the twenty-third, so you will be able to come and keep Mark company."

(Bridget) "I don't want to keep Mark company", I said through clenched teeth.

(Mother) "Oh, but he's very clever. Been to Cambridge. apparently made a fortune in America..."

(Bridget) "I'm not going."

(Mother) "Now, come along, darling, let's not start", she said, as if I were thirteen. "You see, Mark's completed on the house in Holland Park and he's throwing the whole party for them, six floors, caterers and everything... What are you going to wear?"

...

(Mother) "Anyway, I'll tell Elaine you'd love to come, shall I?" she said picking up the inexplicable sewing machine as she headed for the door. "Must fly. Bye!"

Bridget's mother is assuming that Bridget would love to come to Mark's parents' ruby wedding and she is not going to accept Bridget's objections. The mother's use of language appears to be very polite on the surface level, but if it is looked at on the level of meaning, the situation is different. In the first line of the mother, she assumes that Bridget does not object to coming to the party and she does not give her any other choices. However, Bridget objects and she has to use another kind of strategy to persuade her to go. She tries to praise Mark's good qualities in order to get Bridget's interest. Not at any point does the mother accept Bridget's refusal and she stays in her first assumption that she will go to the party. In the parent – child relationship the parent usually has more power, at least when the child is not yet an adult and the parent makes all the decisions for him or her. Bridget is an adult but her mother still treats her as

a child who is not able to make decisions for herself. The mother's behaviour is irritating for Bridget and she cannot understand why she wants her to get together with Mark. Bridget's irritation is shown in her responses, which are impolite as well. She speaks through clenched teeth and this could refer to an annoyed or even an aggressive tone of voice. Bridget does not give reasons why she does not want to go and her refusals are direct without any softening effects, for example apologies. Her mother's words can be interpreted as condescending because she has more power since she is the mother in their relationship. She does not take her daughter's refusal seriously and belittles her (*Now, come along, darling, let's not start*). These are all typical for this negative impoliteness strategy.

There is also another example of Bridget's and her mother's unequal relationship, which can be analyzed as negative impoliteness strategy in the first novel. Bridget is spending Christmas at home and her family has gathered there to celebrate together (p. 300):

Example 19

(Mother) "Oh, hello darling", said Mum noticing me. "Now, what are you going to put on for Christmas Day?"

(Bridget) "This", I muttered sulkily.

(Mother) "Oh, don't be silly, Bridget, you can't wear that on Christmas Day. Now are you going to come into the lounge and say hello to Auntie Una and Uncle Geoffrey before you change?" she said in the special bright, breathy isn't-everything-super? voice that means "Do what I say or I'll Magimix your face".

Bridget interprets her mother's words and especially her tone of voice as a threat. Bridget's mother does not give her daughter a choice in this situation and she uses again her power as a mother to force her daughter to do things she does not want to do. In this situation, she also uses her tone of voice to emphasize that she is serious. Others might not notice anything threatening in this situation but since Bridget knows her mother, she is able to interpret her bright and cheerful tone, which means something entirely different.

8.4 Sarcasm and mock politeness

This impoliteness strategy is quite difficult to describe on a general level because all the situations including this strategy are distinctive and tightly linked to the context, which makes them quite long pieces of dialogue. Sarcasm and mock politeness are used to promote disharmony in conversations without openly insulting or acting impolitely towards the hearer.

The following example is a part of a longer conversation where Bridget and her friends have run into Rebecca who is not a pleasant person in Bridget's opinion. She often says things that make the others feel uncomfortable in her presence (First novel, p. 146-7):

Example 20

(Rebecca) "And she's amazingly young looking – I mean she could easily pass for twenty-four or twenty-five. You were at school together, weren't you, Bridget? Was she three or four years below you?"

(Bridget) "She's six months older", I said, feeling the first twinges of horror.

(Rebecca) "Really?" said Rebecca, then left a long, embarrassed pause. "Well, Magda's lucky. She's got a really good skin."

I felt the blood draining from my brain as the horrible truth of what Rebecca was saying hit me.

(Rebecca) "I mean, she doesn't smile as much as you do. That's probably why she hasn't got so many lines."

I grasped the table for support, trying to get my breath. I am ageing prematurely, I realized. Like the time-release film of a plum turning into a prune.

Bridget has met Rebecca when she and her friends are enjoying a night out in a bar. Bridget is not very keen on Rebecca and she describes spending time with her, which is like swimming in the sea with jellyfish. They are having a pleasant conversation when suddenly Rebecca starts asking questions about Magda, who is Bridget's friend too but not there at the moment. On the surface level, Rebecca is complimenting Magda's youthful appearance but at the same

time, she is implying that Bridget has aged prematurely. By complimenting Magda and connecting Bridget to her on the basis of their age, and assuming that Bridget is older than Magda, she is comparing them to each other. Rebecca's words can be interpreted as mock politeness because she is being polite towards Magda who is not even present in this conversation and does not show the same kind of politeness towards Bridget. After Rebecca has made the mistake of presuming Bridget to be older than Magda, one would think she would correct the situation by making a similar compliment for Bridget in order to avoid hurting her feelings. However, she does not make any kind of compliments or apologies and even continues by mentioning that Magda has a good skin and fewer lines than Bridget does. Therefore, she has compared them again and now explicitly points out that Magda's skin has fewer flaws than Bridget's. The pause shown in the conversation, which is reported by Bridget, emphasizes that the listeners and Rebecca herself have time to understand the implied meaning of her words. Bridget's thoughts reveal that she understands exactly what Rebecca is trying to say to her and thinks that it is intentional. This kind of behaviour can be expected from Rebecca in Bridget's opinion. In this conversation, it is hard not to understand the underlying meaning of Rebecca's speech. She is obviously implying that Bridget looks older than her friend does and that she has lines on her face since she smiles too much. Mock politeness develops in the conversation through complimenting another person and turns into impoliteness towards the hearer. Bridget's thoughts reveal more clearly, what is the hidden meaning in Rebecca's speech so that the readers would understand the point of this conversation. Culpeper's basic pairs of verbal interaction cannot be applied here because Bridget does not respond to Rebecca's implying.

With mock politeness, speakers can imply even rude things in a polite manner and sometimes the hearer does not seem to understand thoroughly what is being implied. The following dialogue is taken from the second novel and it is a telephone conversation between Bridget and Michael who is an editor in the *Independent* (p. 167):

Example 21

(Michael) “So did you do it, then?”

(Bridget) “Yes”, I said hoity-toitily.

(Michael) “And you remembered to take your tape recorder, not your Sony Walkman?”

Honestly. Do not know what Tom has told him about me but something in his tone suggests may not have been particularly respectful.

(Michael) “Well, you’ve got till 4 o’clock. So get on with it.”

Bridget has done an interview with Colin Firth, the real actor, and has promised to write an article about it for a magazine. The editor of the magazine Michael is calling to make sure that she has succeeded in the interview and reminds her that she has a deadline at four o’clock. Michael asks first if the interview has taken place and Bridget answers affirmatively. Then he asks if she remembered to use a tape recorder. The first part of the question is not mocking and if Michael had not said anything else he would have appeared only as a concerned editor worrying about the deadline. However, he implies that Bridget might have tried to record the interview with a Sony Walkman and this remark makes Michael’s line mock politeness. The author of the novel expects the readers to know what a Sony Walkman is and that it cannot be used for recording. By implying that Bridget would have taken the wrong device it could also be assumed that Michael does not consider Bridget to be very smart with technical devices or as a person either. Michael’s question raises Bridget’s suspicion about his opinion of her but she does not seem to get offended by his mocking. It is possible that Bridget does not understand Michael’s mocking at all. She starts to suspect that her friend Tom who got her the interview opportunity might have told Michael something about her that has given the wrong and negative impression to him.

Bridget’s boss, Finch is not a very pleasant man and he uses a lot of mock politeness, sarcasm and bald on record impoliteness. In this next dialogue, Finch is clearly behaving more oddly than before and appears almost to be aggressive with his words. He aims his words at Bridget in the beginning of a morning meeting. The example is taken from the second novel (p.345):

Example 22

(Finch) “Ho!” he said as I walked in. “Ho! Ahahaha! What’ve we got in the bag, then? Opium, is it? Skunk? Have we got crack in the lining? Have we brought in some Purple Hearts? Some E for the class? Is it poppers? Is it some Is it some nice speedy speed? Hasheeeeesh? Some Rokey-cokey cokey? OHHHHH okeecokeycokeee”, he started to sing maniacally. An idiotic gleam in his eye, he grabbed the two researchers next to him and started rushing forwards, yelling, “Knees bent, arms stretched, it’s all in Brid-get’s bag, Ra-Ra!”

Realizing our executive producer was coming down from some drug-induced frenzy, I smiled beatifically and ignored him.

(Finch) “Oh, little Miss Hoity-toity today, are we? Oooh! Come on, everybody. Bridget Hoity-bottom-just-out-of-prison is here. Let’s start. Let’s startitdeedoodaa.”

...

(Finch) “Right then, Brrrrridget! Ideas. What ideas have we got today to delight the breathless nation? Ten Top Smuggling Tips from the Laydee in the Know? Britain’s Best Bras for stashing Charlie in the booster pads?”

Before this dialogue took place in the novel, Bridget had been in prison because she was suspected of smuggling drugs from Thailand. Of course, she was innocent but she had to spend some time in a Thai prison before she was allowed to fly back to Britain. Finch has acted strangely in the book for some time and Bridget suspects that he is high on drugs because this kind of behaviour is unordinary even for him. Finch obviously knows about Bridget’s trip to prison and makes fun of her in front the whole staff when Bridget returns to the office. Finch keeps asking Bridget what kind of drugs she has brought with her to the office and even sings a little song about cocaine dancing at the same time. The beginning of this dialogue could almost be bald on record impoliteness but because Finch uses tag questions and talks in plural, it fits better in the category of mock politeness. The use of tag after a question can be seen as more polite than forming a question without it. According to Collins Cobuild grammar book (1990:434), when a speaker uses tag questions,

he or she is trying to elicit confirmation from the hearer. However, the context is crucial in the interpretation of the use of tag questions. More information about the functions of tag questions see, for example, Holmes (1992) or Cheng and Warren (2001). This dialogue was not the only case of mock politeness where tag questions appeared. The use of the plural pronoun (we-form) in Finch's speech is also notable. When he uses the we-form, he is not as insulting as he would be if used the pronoun you. If he had directed his hints directly at Bridget this dialogue could have been analyzed as bald on record impoliteness. By using the we-form Finch decreases the impact of his words and the impoliteness becomes more indirect. Bridget does not react to Finch's words, this probably irritates him a bit, and he continues his mocking. All the mocking that he does refers to Bridget's drug smuggling charges. Finch's last words are most clearly mock politeness because he wants to elicit some kind of reaction from her. It seems like it is Finch's goal to get Bridget to react to his mocking.

Tag questions appeared also in some other dialogues, which could be connected to mock politeness or sarcasm. In the following example Bridget is in a Thai prison and she is desperate to get out of there and her only hope is that the police capture the real criminal Jed (Second novel, p. 315):

Example 23

I started on the details of the story, the flights Jed had arrived on and probably left on, the bag, the description of Jed.

(Bridget) "So surely you can trace him from this?" I concluded.

"There must be his fingerprints on the bag."

(Drug Squad Guy) "Oh, we know where he is", he said

dismissively. "And he has no fingerprints."

Ieuw. No fingerprints. Like having no nipples or something.

(Bridget) "So why haven't you captured him?"

(DS Guy) "He's in Dubai", he said dispassionately.

Suddenly I felt really quite annoyed.

(Bridget) "Oh, he's in Dubai, is he?" I said. "And you know all about him. And you know he did it. And you know I didn't do it and he made it look as though I did and I didn't. But you go home to your lovely saté sticks and wife and family in the evening and I'm stuck here for

the rest of my childbearing years for something I didn't do just because you can't be bothered to get someone to confess to something I didn't do."

He looked at me in consternation.

Bridget has been caught smuggling drugs from Thailand and she is in prison for it. She is innocent, but she cannot prove it because Jed, the real smuggler, has escaped to Dubai. Bridget is feeling quite desperate and she tries to give as much information to the Drug Squad as possible so that they would be able to prove her innocence. In this dialogue, it becomes clear to Bridget that the Drug Squad knows where Jed is but they are not doing anything to catch him. The passive attitude of the man from the Drug Squad starts to irritate Bridget and she attacks him verbally. Most of Bridget's words are direct accusations, even bald on record impoliteness, towards the man that he is not doing everything in order to get her out of the prison. Her first comment, which is underlined, is sarcastic. She repeats what the man has already said and adds a tag in the end of the sentence making a statement into a question for confirmation. The use of the tag question emphasizes the fact that Bridget is irritated by the officer's cool and indifferent behaviour.

8.5 Withholding politeness

Culpeper's last impoliteness superstrategy is the withholding of politeness and it was the smallest category in this data. I was able to find only three instances that can be described as including this strategy. From all of the other categories this was the most unnoticeable group because it is about identifying something that is not there. When we are reading a dialogue, we have some kind of presuppositions about what is going to happen next for example in familiar situations like greetings, requests, invitations and apologies when it comes to being polite. If these presuppositions do not appear in places where we expect them to appear, one possible explanation is withholding of politeness.

The first example dialogue takes place between Bridget and her close friend Sharon on the phone (p.67):

Example 24

(Sharon) “Are you coming out with me and Jude tomorrow?”

(Bridget) “Er...” I silently panicked, thinking, *Surely Daniel will ask to see me this weekend before he leaves the office?*

(Sharon) “Call me if he doesn’t ask” said Sharon drily after a pause.

When someone invites you to go somewhere, the polite thing to do is to reply politely either to accept or to refuse but in this case Bridget does not do either. She does not say anything to Sharon’s invitation and the pause is so long that Sharon guesses what is going on. Obviously, Bridget acts impolitely but she does not mean to be and since Sharon is such a close friend to her she does not get much offended. The dry tone of voice Sharon uses is most likely a result from her opinion that Bridget should not wait for Daniel’s invitation. As in some other dialogues, there is a difference between what the characters mean and what they actually say.

The second instance is from the second novel and happens in café where Bridget is having breakfast as her mother stops by to have coffee with her (p.5):

Example 25

(Mother) “Now. Let. Me. See. D’you know? I think I’ll have a coffee I’ve had so many cups of tea this morning up in Grafton Underwood with my husband Colin that I’m sick to death of tea. But could you warm me up for some milk? I can’t drink cold milk in coffee. It gives me indigestion. And then my daughter Bridget will have...”

(Waitress) “Espresso? Filter? Latte? Cap: half fat or de-caf?”, snapped the waitress, sweeping all the plates off the table next to her and looking at me accusingly as if Mum was my fault.

(Bridget) “Half fat de-caf cap and a latte”, I whispered apologetically.

(Mother) “What a surly girl, doesn’t she speak English?” huffed Mum at her retreating back.

Bridget and her mother come across with an unpleasant waitress who is behaving very impolitely. When we go to a café, we expect that the waiters are at least somewhat polite because we are paying customers and we can take our

business elsewhere if we do not like the way we are being treated. Bridget's mother is trying to be a good customer and speak slowly so that the waitress would hear her order clearly but she does not understand that the waitress is not interested to know anything else except her order. We can assume that the waitress is in a hurry because of her tone of voice which is demanding (as is indicated by the verb *snapped*) and she is clearing off the plates quickly. However, being in a hurry is not a good reason to act as impolitely as this. Bridget's mother is obviously offended by the waitress's behaviour and she did not even understand what she was saying because of the abbreviations she used for different kinds of coffee.

The third instance where a withholding of politeness was to be seen was found in a phone call between Bridget and Mark in the second novel. Bridget has just experienced a great shock when she and Mark found a naked oriental boy from Mark's bed. The situation is not as bad as Bridget suspects it to be and Mark is trying to explain for the incident (p. 68):

Example 26

(Mark) "Bridget. It's Mark. I'm so sorry. I'm so sorry. That was an awful thing to happen."

He sounded terrible.

(Mark) "Bridget?"

(Bridget) "What?" I said, trying to stop my hands from shaking so I could light a Silk Cut.

(Mark) "I know what it must have looked like. I got as much of a shock as you. I've never seen him before in my life."

(Bridget) "Well, who was it then?" I burst out.

(Mark) "It turns out he's my housekeeper's son. I didn't even know she had a son. Apparently he's schizophrenic."

Bridget is terrified about the situation that she is unable to answer to Mark's apologies. She just thinks in her mind about the way Mark sounds in the phone. Mark's apology is sincere but Bridget behaves impolitely because she does not reply to it. She does not give a proper answer for Mark whether she forgives him or not even during the rest of the phone call. Maybe it would not be suitable to say that she forgives him because the incident was not his fault but she could at least say something that signals that she does not blame Mark for it and believes that there is a rational explanation for it. Maybe this is not the clearest example of withholding politeness but when a speaker expresses an

apology, the hearer is expected to answer it by accepting the apology or giving some kind of empathy for the speaker depending on the context.

9 Discussion

9.1 Impoliteness in literary dialogues

The purpose of this study was to investigate what kind of impoliteness can be found from the dialogues of Fielding's novels *Bridget Jones's Diary* and *Bridget Jones – the Edge of Reason*. It was necessary to define what impoliteness is before it was possible to search for it from the dialogues. Dialogues were divided into three groups according to Nash's (1990:99-100) categorization and one of his categories, confrontational dialogues, included impoliteness. In confrontational dialogues, the speakers disagree with each other and there is a possibility of a conflict. At some points, impolite utterances were clear and straightforward and there was no doubt in identifying them. However, the data showed that impoliteness could also be hidden and indirect. The speaker's motivation for using impoliteness had to be taken into consideration when judging if an impolite utterance was said intentionally or unintentionally. The data proved the assumption that impoliteness is dependent of the context, for example in cases where utterances, which were impolite on the surface level, were not interpreted as impolite since the speakers were close friends and impolite language use was usual for them.

Culpeper's (1996:349-367) impoliteness strategies were useful when organizing the data into groups and they also helped to pay attention to indirect features of impoliteness, which might have been left unnoticed otherwise. This study revealed that impoliteness is much more than just an insult or a quarrel between two speakers. As I already have discussed, impoliteness can be clear or unclear and it can be intentional or unintentional. Impoliteness can also be looked from the hearer's perspective who is the receiver of the impoliteness. At some points in the data, the hearer interpreted some neutral utterance as impolite even though the speaker had not meant it as such causing an open

conflict between them. The point of view of the hearer also reinforces the fact that the interpretation of impoliteness is dependent of the context.

9.2 Culpeper's theory in analyzing impoliteness

The impoliteness theories that were used in this study were adopted from Culpeper (1996:349-367) and the revisited version from Culpeper et al. (2003:1545-1579). The impoliteness theory was formed on the basis of Brown and Levinson's politeness theory. The impoliteness theory has five different strategies for attacking the hearer's face: bald on record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, sarcasm or mock politeness and withholding of politeness. In the analysis, the primary data, which were confrontational dialogues, were examined and the impoliteness strategies, which appeared in them, were identified and categorized. Positive impoliteness strategies were the biggest category and withholding of politeness was the smallest category in the whole data.

Each confrontational dialogue included at least one impoliteness strategy but many had more than one strategy in them. Culpeper et al. (2003:1561) had already proven that combining and repeating of strategies existed and this data had similar instances. In many cases of combining of strategies, the positive impoliteness strategy of calling names or the using of taboo words was combined with some other main strategy.

The impoliteness theory suited surprisingly well for analyzing literary dialogues even though Culpeper himself and his colleagues had concentrated mostly on studying spoken data. The descriptions for each substrategy were quite broad and they left room for personal interpretation in each case. In Culpeper's own studies, there were examples of the most common strategies and they gave some ideas for what to look for in this data but some of the more unusual strategies were more difficult to identify only on the basis of Culpeper's description. Culpeper et al. (2003:1555) have admitted that they do not know for sure how hard-edged the distinctions between the strategies are.

In this study, I found out that there is no need for new strategies in Culpeper's theory but each researcher might interpret the descriptions of each strategy differently and thus get different kinds of results.

With this study, it is shown that it is possible to investigate literary dialogues with Culpeper's impoliteness theory, which has previously been used to investigate spoken discourses. Literary dialogues share some qualities with spoken discourses but they are simplified and have specified functions in the text. Further research could be done on similar literary data with the same kinds of research questions in order to find out if results would be similar when the researcher is different. The reason for this would be the fact that the impoliteness strategies can be interpreted differently. It would also be interesting to perform a deeper study on the functions of impoliteness. This way one could get information of how impoliteness is connected to the building and developing of the plot. The impoliteness research is still a new area of research and there are many possibilities for research topics.

9.3 Functions of impoliteness in literary dialogues

In many cases in the data, the author has used impoliteness in order to create comedy and humor. The situations where the confrontational dialogues appear in many cases are unusual and peculiar and when the heroine Bridget is caught up in these situations she is presented to the readers as unordinary and even as a comical character. A deeper analysis showed that impolite behaviour could be connected to certain characters more easily than to others, for example Sharon (Shaz) who used a lot of taboo words and almost constantly called other people, mostly men, names. In addition, Bridget's boss Finch had an impolite way of talking. He used sarcasm and mock politeness and even bald on record impoliteness. He was able to act like this because he had more power than his employers did and he did not have to be afraid that someone would make a counter-attack or retaliate otherwise. Impolite way of speaking, if it was common for a character, was a sign of a strong character that was not afraid to express opinions aloud. Being impolite was sometimes unintentional

especially with Bridget's mother, her relatives and her married friends who did not realize that they were impolite towards Bridget by asking too intimate questions or commenting on her love life. Describing some characters as more impolite than others is a part of the construction of their identity in the narrative and building an image of them in the reader's mind. The author has deliberately created situations where differences of each character become visible to the readers.

Confrontational dialogues build the plot and they bring variety to the story. Disharmony between characters captures the readers and brings the characters closer to real life. The fact that fictional characters have such realistic features as being able to act impolitely or even rudely towards another character makes them seem like actual persons to whom we as readers can relate. As Culpeper et al. (2003:1555) had already proven, impoliteness does not arise merely from certain strategies but it is highly dependent on the context and this became obvious also in this study. During the analysis process, previous knowledge about the characters and the narrative helped the analyzing. The surrounding narrative gave clues about the situation but they were always from Bridget's perspective since she was the narrator. In cases where the impoliteness was directed at Bridget, the narrative revealed her inner thoughts and reactions to the impoliteness. If the situation did not allow strong reactions of defense or offense, her thoughts were not censored in any way and revealed her real feelings. Bridget's inner thoughts and reactions were also a good source for humor.

References

Primary sources:

Fielding, H. 1996. *Bridget Jones's Diary*. London: Picador.

Fielding, H. 1999. *Bridget Jones – the Edge of Reason*. London: Picador.

Secondary sources:

Blum-Kulka, S. 1992. The metapragmatics of politeness in Israeli society. In R.J. Watts et al (eds.) *Politeness in language: Studies in its History, Theory and Practice*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 255-280.

Brown, P., S. Levinson. 1978. Universals in language usage: Politeness Phenomena. In E. Goody *Questions and politeness: Strategies in social interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, P., S. Levinson. 1987. *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cheng, W., M. Warren. 2001. 'She knows more about Hong Kong than you do, isn't it: Tags in Hong Kong conversational English. *Journal of Pragmatics*, Vol.33, No. 9, 1419-1439.

Collins Cobuild. 1990. *English Grammar*. Suffolk:Collins.

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

Culpeper, J., D. Bousfield, A. Wichmann. 2003. Impoliteness revisited: with special reference to dynamic and prosodic aspects. *Journal of Pragmatics* 35, 1545-1579.

Eelen, G. 1999. Politeness and ideology: A critical review. *Pragmatics* 9, 163-174.

Herman, V. 1995. *Dramatic discourse: Dialogue as interaction in plays*. London: Routledge.

Holmes, J. 1992. *Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. London: Longman.

Hutchinson, T. 1989. Speech presentations in fiction with reference to *The Tiger Moth* by H. E. Bates. In M. Short (ed.), *Reading, Analysing and Teaching Literature*. London: Longman, 120-145.

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

Leech, G., M. Short. 1981. *Style in fiction: A Linguistic Introduction to English Fictional Prose*. London: Longman.

Malcolm, K. 1991. Prose dialogue and discourse. In E. Ventola (ed.) *Approaches to the Analysis of Literary Discourse*. Åbo: Åbo Akademis förlag, 39-59.

Mey, J. 2001. *Pragmatics: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Nash, W. 1990. *Language in popular fiction*. London: Routledge.

Page, N. 1988. *Speech in the English Novel*. Second edition. London: Macmillan Press.

Sell, R.D. 1992. Literary texts and diachronic aspects of politeness. In R.J. Watts et al. (eds.), *Politeness in language: Studies in its History, Theory and Practice*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 109-130.

Toolan, M. 1989. Analysing Conversation in Fiction: an Example from Joyce's *Portrait*. In R. Carter and P. Simpson (eds.), *Language, Discourse and*

Literature: An Introductory Reader in Discourse Stylistics. London: Unwin Hyman, p.195

Watts, R.J. 1992. Linguistic politeness and politeness verbal behaviour: Reconsidering claims for universality. In R.J. Watts et al. (eds.), *Politeness in language: Studies in its History, Theory and Practice*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 43-70.

Watts, R.J. 2003. *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Watts, R.J., S. Ide, K. Ehrlich. 1992. Introduction. In R.J. Watts et al (eds.), *Politeness in language: Studies in its History, Theory and Practice*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1-17.

Wardhaugh, R. 1992. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Second edition. Oxford: Blackwell.

Gilbert, F. (no date available) *Why I love Bridget Jones – novel by Helen Fielding*

http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_mOFQP/is_4446_128/ai_55542102/print.

New Statesman. 23.11.2004