



Impoliteness in Arab Talk Shows:

A case study of Insult in

The Opposite Direction

Haitham Omar Abdelkawy

Assistant Lecturer Faculty of Al-Alsun

Beni Suef University





Abstract

This study aims at analyzing impoliteness as a sign of impoliteness in Arab television political talk shows. Two episodes of *the Opposite Direction*, a famous talk show broadcast on Al-Jazeera Channel, have been selected. Culpeper's (2011) model for analyzing impoliteness is used. Hamed (2014:218) argues that Arabs use positive impoliteness strategies (i.e. "seek disagreement" and sarcasm or mock) which aim to damage the positive face of the addressee. But impoliteness can have other manifestations than the ones that are stated by Hamed. The study revealed that there are many instances of insult in the episodes covering all the categories of insult in the model, and this reflects impoliteness in interaction.

This study is concerned with linguistic 'politeness' and 'impoliteness' as technical pragmatic terms. Politeness and impoliteness phenomena are intersecting and strongly related phenomena in contemporary pragmatic, however, politeness is more popular and more extensively studied than impoliteness. In addition, impoliteness can not be studied without referring to the literature of politeness as a starting point to understand and study impoliteness.



Subject of the study

This study tackles a major Arab talk-show program with the aim of discussing insult as a sign of impoliteness. It tries to answer the following question:

- 1- What are some of the impoliteness strategies employed by guests in Arab?talk shows?
 - 2- Does the interaction in the Opposite Direction involve insult?
 - 3- What are the common categories of insult used in the interaction between interlocutors in the Opposite Direction?
- 1.1. Hypotheses

The study hypothesizes that Arab debate programs are rich in impoliteness. Thus they can provide much material for studying insult on the linguistic level because of the quarrels that occur between interlocutors supporting contradicting points of view.

2. Significance of the study

The significance of this study lies in the fact that it can draw the attention of Arab citizens to what leads to conflict and stands as an obstacle to fruitful and polite interaction. It is expected to shed light on insult in Arab TV debate programs so that it may be avoided. Moreover, as impoliteness studies lack applied research, this study is intended to be a contribution to the applied research of impoliteness. Besides, it can be considered one of the earliest studies to examine insult in the discourse of Arab talk shows.

3. Review of the Literature

Compared to politeness, impoliteness has received little



attention from researchers; very few models have been developed for studying it. A prominent one is Culpeper's (1996). Al-Shlool (2016) states: "Culpeper (1996) considers the impolite linguistic behavior as speech acts that attack the face of another" (p. 43). He differentiates between inherent impoliteness and mock politeness. The first refers to the acts that inherently threaten the face of the addressee regardless to the context of the act, while the second "stays on the surface and is not intended to insult anyone" (Al-Shlool, 2016, p.43). Culpeper (1996) introduces "an impoliteness framework which is parallel but opposite to Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory of politeness" (Culpeper, 1996, p. 349). Brown and Levinson's (1987) strategies are intended to maintain and enhance the addressee's face while Culpeper's represent the other extreme of attacking the addressee's face. The addressee's face is saved if the addresser does not interfere with his freedom (Brown & Levinson, 1987), but the addressee's face is attacked if he is insulted; Culpeper (1996: 8) says: "Instead of enhancing or supporting face, impoliteness super-strategies are a means of attacking face." This model consists of five impoliteness strategies -namely; Bald on record impoliteness, Positive impoliteness, Negative impoliteness, Sarcasm or mock politeness, and Withhold politeness.

- *Bald on record impoliteness*: "the FTA is performed in a direct, clear, unambiguous and concise way in circumstances where the face is not irrelevant or minimized" (Culpeper, 1996, p. 356). This strategy differs from Brown and Levinson's in that it is used deliberately to attack the other's face. In Brown and Levinson's model a bald-on record strategy involves almost no consideration to the addressee's face, but, most of the time; this involves no insult because the requirements of the situation itself, and sometimes the addresser-addressee relationship, dictate the use of a bald-



on record strategy. As for the bald-on record in Culpeper's model, the strategy is intended to effect a threat to the addressee's face.

- *Positive impoliteness*: The utilization of techniques intended to damage the recipient's positive face needs. '*Positive face*' refers to a person's desire of being liked and appreciated by others and *positive impoliteness strategy* works on depriving the person of achieving this desire. This strategy is realized through something like ignorance, seeking disagreement, disassociation from the other, using inappropriate identity markers, etc.

- *Negative impoliteness*: the application of strategies designed to attack the addressee's negative face needs. '*Negative face*' refers to a person's desire of being autonomous and unconstrained i.e. freedom of action and freedom from imposition. Negative impoliteness occurs when the negative face is attacked by invading the other's space depriving him of talking or frightening him.

- *Sarcasm or mock politeness*: the FTA is performed with the utilization of politeness strategies that are clearly insincere and along these lines stay surface realizations. The strategy involves insulting the addressee indirectly via Implicature.
- *Withhold politeness*: "the absence of politeness work where it would be expected" (Culpeper, 1996, p. 357). For instance, neglecting to thank a person for a present might be taken as deliberate impoliteness.

Generally, the number of studies dealing with linguistic politeness in Arab TV discourse is far greater than those dealing with linguistic impoliteness. Reviewing the literature conducted on impoliteness in Arab television discourse in general and talk-shows, in particular, reveals a paucity of scholarly research in this domain. According to Al-Dilaimy and Khalaf (2015, p. 1571) "TV programs displaying confrontational debates that represent authentic platforms which enhance the creativity of interlocutors were very little



researched, notwithstanding Arab political debate programs that exhibit high instances of impolite interruptions. It has been noticed that studies discussing Arabic impoliteness, whether in real life or in TV programmes, are lacking (Al-Dilaimy and Khalaf, 2015; Abdel-Hafiz, 2015).

Hamed (2014) has studied the use of politeness and impoliteness strategies used by British and Egyptian participants in sports talk shows. The study, which makes use of both Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness model and Culpeper's (1996) impoliteness model, is a contrastive analysis of spoken Egyptian Arabic and spoken English. The English data is drawn from Two British TV sports shows while the Arabic is taken from three TV programs. The British English data consists of seven episodes, containing thirteen participants: four hosts and nine guests. As for the Egyptian Arabic data, it consists of five episodes including twelve participants: four hosts and eight guests. Hamed (2014:218) argues that Arabs use positive impoliteness strategies (i.e. "seek disagreement" and sarcasm or mock) which aim to damage the positive face of the addressee.).

Abdel-Hafiz (2015) tackles the impoliteness strategies used in naturally occurring Arabic interactions, analyzing selected episodes from a famous debate TV Show -namely, The Opposite Direction. Abdel-Hafiz has used a model based on Leech's (1983) Politeness Principle. Leech (1983) introduces a number of maxims dealing with polite behavior or in other words governing the polite relationship between *self* and *other*:

1 Tact Maxim: (1) Minimize cost to other.

(2) Maximize benefit to other.

2 Generosity Maxim: (1) minimize benefit to self.



(2) maximize cost to self.

3 Approbation Maxim: (1) minimize dispraise of other.

(2) maximize praise of other.

4 Modesty Maxim: (1) minimize praise of self.

(2) maximize dispraise of self.

5 Agreement: (1) Minimize disagreement between self and other.

(2) Maximize agreement between self and other.

6 Sympathy: (1) Minimize antipathy between self and other.

(2) Maximize sympathy between self and other.

(Leech 1983:131-42)

Abdel-Hafiz adapts this model to the purposes of impoliteness analysis:

1 Tact Maxim: (1) maximize cost to other.

(2) minimize benefit to other.

2 Generosity Maxim: (1) maximize benefit to self.

(2) minimize cost to self.

3 Approbation Maxim: (1) maximize dispraise of other.

(2) minimize praise of other.



4 Modesty Maxim: (1) maximize praise of self.

(2) minimize dispraise of self.

5 Agreement: (1) Maximize disagreement between self and other.

(2) Minimize agreement between self and other.

6 Sympathy: (1) Maximize antipathy between self and other.

(2) Minimize sympathy between self and other.

(Abdel-Hafiz, 2015, pp. 4,5)

Abdel-Hafiz's adaption aimed at changing the politeness strategy into an impoliteness one and he succeeded to do so.

Using this model, Abdel-Hafiz reached the following results: "three strategies are used to produce impoliteness: (1) tactlessness, (2) disapprobation, and (3) disagreement" (Abdel-Hafiz, 2015, p. 1). *Tactlessness* means maximizing cost and minimizing benefit to the other. *Disapprobation* is maximizing dispraise and minimizing praise of other. *Disagreement* is maximizing disagreement and minimizing agreement between self and other.

Migdadi, Badarneh, and Abbas (2013) examine the conflict strategies used in The Opposite Direction. The study identifies the conflict strategies and verbal conflict expressions and approaches them in the light of Interactional Sociolinguistics. The study presupposes that knowing he is being recorded, a speaker would adopt politeness strategies, such as face-saving and mitigation. The purpose of the study is to show that because of the conflict with the other interlocutor the speaker would forget the politeness strategies he adopted



before -namely, face-saving and mitigation for the sake of minimizing face threat. The data analyzed in this study consists of three episodes of *The Opposite Direction* handling three different topics. The results show that the disputants used several types of strategies including 'impoliteness', 'aggravated impoliteness', 'topic restriction', 'lengthy holding of the floor', and 'sarcasm'.

Hamrita (2016) studies how political debates between Tunisian well-known politicians in TV talk shows turn out to be a violent discourse. He analyses the transcript of two long extracts taken from two different Tunisian political TV shows widely viewed by Tunisians. He adopts Van Dijk's (2004) framework. In this framework, Van Dijk introduces 27 strategies among which stands out the dichotomy of 'self positive-representation' and 'other negative representation'. The two main strategies in this framework are:

Emphasize *Their*bad things

De-emphasize *Ourbad* things

De-emphasize *Their*good things (qtd. In Hamrita, 2016, p. 383)

These are called Van Dijk's ideological square. Depending on this model, the researcher tries to pinpoint the structures conveying verbal violence between politicians representing two opposite political ideologies in the chosen talk show episodes. The results of the analysis "revealed that Tunisian politicians tend to be communicatively violent while attending a political talk show with politicians who belong to the opposite ideological background" (p. 389). While defending their ideas, politicians use discourse structures all of which can be classified under positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation. In addition, Van Dijk's (2004) framework



proved to be appropriate for shedding light on the techniques used by the politicians to control the minds of the audience to reach their goal.

The literature shows that impoliteness in general and impoliteness in Arab television discourse, in particular, are less researched than politeness. This study applies a new model of impoliteness analysis which is Culpeper's (2011) model.

4. Methodology

4.1. Data collection

Real-life situations are used as a guarantee of spontaneity, which cannot be achieved if such traditional methods of data collection as using discourse completion tasks, questionnaires, etc. are used. The data of the study consist of two episodes from an Arabic well-known TV talk show -namely *the Opposite Direction*, hosted by Faysal al-Qassem, and broadcast on Aljazeera, a Qatari satellite channel.

The rationale behind choosing this program, in particular, is that the guests invited in it have contradicting ideological inclinations, which leads to conflict between interlocutors. As Migdadi, Badarneh, and Abbas (2013, p. 94) state: "[t]he main reason for the occurrence of disagreement is that people usually have different opinions and ideas, the expression of which is likely to result in opposition and confrontation". One can say that this is the main idea upon which the selected program relies and this is the criterion according to which the targeted show was chosen. In fact, TV programs such as 'The Opposite Direction' that focus on unconventional discourse represent an ideal source for depicting impoliteness in conversation because they represent a unique manifestation of face-to-face interaction in real-life



situations" (Al-Dilaimy&Khalaf, 2015, p. 1578) and they are rich in linguistic and nonlinguistic confrontations. In addition, show presenters in most cases try to intensify the disagreement between the guests by discussing sensitive and argumentative subjects to add suspense to the shows and to interest the audience.

Al Jazeera website provides recorded, downloadable episodes of the Opposite Direction. Two episodes have been selected; the first is entitled "Arab revolutions and Palestine" broadcast in 20/12/2011 and the second is entitled "How do Syrians accept an internationally rejected president?" broadcast in 18/12/2012. The first episode is about forty-four minutes long and the second is about forty-seven. These episodes have been selected randomly, the third episode in December. It is; for the sake of cohesion, transcribed in such a way as to be suitable for the purposes of this research paper.

4. 2. Methods of analysis

This study shall apply Culpeper's (2011) impoliteness model to study insult in The Opposite Direction talk-show. There is one thing very important to bear in mind regarding this model which is context. The addresser must have the intention to insult the target, who in turn must perceive the utterance as an offense. If the utterance is taken as friendly banter, it cannot be regarded as impoliteness.

The following section is a summary of the model, but it must be noted that only the part of the model that deals with insults shall be used in this study:



Insults

According to Culpeper, the addresser's speech is considered insults in four cases:

The first is '*Personalized negative vocatives*'

This is concerned with the way the speaker addresses the hearer. In order to be regarded as an insult the addresser's contribution has to be something like: you bastard/loser/bloody bugger, etc.

The second is '*Personalized negative assertions*'

In this strategy, the addresser emphasizes negative meanings and attaches them to the addressee using the following sentence pattern: Subject+ Verb Be+Subject Complement. E.g. you are (so) gay, you are nuttier than a fruitcake, etc. Moreover, the addresser may insult the addressee by humiliating him as disgusting such as [you] [disgust me]/ [make me] [sick/etc.]. In addition, the addresser can deny the addressee some of his good traits through negation, such as in: You can't do anything right, etc.

- The third is '*Personalized negative references*'

This is accomplished via using modifiers with negative associations, such as "stinking" in your stinking breath, etc. This means that the speaker uses modifiers with negative associations to modify something related to the listener with the intention to insult him.

- The fourth is '*Personalized third-person negative references*' (in the hearing of the target)

This time the speaker does not direct his speech directly to the addressee but he speaks to somebody else or even to himself referring *negatively* to the person he wants to insult using the third person pronoun.



–[the daft bimbo]

– [she's nutzo]

There are other impoliteness strategies in the model such as *Pointed criticisms/complaints, Unpalatable questions and/or presuppositions, Condescensions, Message enforcers, Dismissals, Silencers, Threats, Negative expressives (e.g. curses, ill-wishes)*. The difference between these and insult is that insult is personalized and direct in the way that it touches the opponent's person.

(Culpeper, 2011, pp. 135,136). This analysis will include only the part concerned with insult because it is direct and full of personalization which is the main difference between insult and the other impoliteness triggers.

5. Analysis

The interlocutors in the episode entitled "Arab revolutions and Palestine ", here on *the first episode* are Sherif Shehadah, a Syrian political analyst, and Saleh Almsnouk, a Lebanese writer. The participants in the episode entitled "How do the Syrians accept an internationally rejected president?" here on the *second episode* are: Habib Saleh, an oppositionist, and Nabil Fayyad, the Founder of the Syrian Party Adl (Justice). Surveying the two episodes the researcher found instances of insult representing its different types:

Table (1): instances of impoliteness in the two episodes

Categories	Episode one	Episode two	Total	Rate



Personalised vocatives	negative	0	12	12	15.8 %
Personalised assertions	negative	2	40	42	55.3 %
Personalised references	negative	2	11	13	17.1 %
Personalised person references	third-negative	4	5	9	11.8 %
Total		8	68	76	100%

5.1. Personalized Negative Vocatives

The first episode has no examples for *personalized negative vocatives* while the second has twelve.

Example (1): (HabibSaleh: O damned)

- حبيب صالح: ايها اللعين

Example (2):(Nabil Fayyad: There is no university for Mormons in Berlin, O ignorant)

- نبيل فياض: لا توجد جامعة للمرمون في برلين يا جاهل.

Example (3):(HabibSaleh: You say that you are against the mullahs in Tehran, O little one say, say that, speak up)

- حبيب صالح: أن تقول انك ضد الملالي في طهران أيها الصغير قول ذلك
قل قل انطق



Example (4):(Nabil Fayyad: Sarabiun denies your belonging to it, O traitor.)

• نبييل فياض: سرابيون تتبرأ منك يا خاين

The previous examples show how both interlocutors insult each other using humiliating vocatives. In examples (1) and (3) HabibSaleh calls Nabil Fayyad as 'damned' and 'little one'. In examples (2) and (4) Nabil Fayyad insults HabibSaleh using the same strategy calling him 'ignorant' and 'traitor'. Personalized Negative Vocatives represent 18.2 of the total insult instances in the two episodes. All these examples are taken from the second episode because the first contains none of this type.

It worth mentioning that there are some instances of vocatives in the data normally used to show intimacy in Arabic and English, but in Arabic, they can be used ironically to insult the listener and lessen his status.

Example (5):

O uncle, go away

صالح المشنوق: يا عمي روح

Example (6):

Nabil Fayyad: My Dear, you are living in Germany, and know nothing of that is happening is in the country.

نبييل فياض: يا حبيبي انت قاعد بالمانيا وماتك عارف شو صاير بالبلد.

Example (7):

Nabil Fayyad: Those who have been displacedthese people are your allies, Jabhat An-nusrah and Al-Qaeda, my



friend.

نبيل فياض: من شرد هذا الشعب هؤلاء هم حلفاء كجبهة النصرة والقاعدة يا صديقي.

In the previous three examples 'O uncle', 'my dear', and 'my friend' are all face intimate vocatives full of irony and their context shows impoliteness instead of intimacy. This shows a shortage in Culpeper's model in studying impoliteness in Arabic interaction.

5.2. Personalised negative assertions

Example (8):

(SherifShehadah: His shoe is by your head and you are the gang and your father is an agent for Israel, this is your father's record.)

شريف شحادة: صرمايته براسك, أنت العصابة وأبوك عميل لإسرائيل, هذا هو سجل أبوك..

This is an utterance taken from episode one in which SherifShehadah insults Saleh Al-Mashnouq asserting the shoe of the Syrian president is better than Shehadah's head and that he is belonging to a gang. Episode two as well contains examples of personalized negative assertions:

Example (9):

HabibSaleh:...you are one of the Freemasons

حبيب صالح: أنت تدافع عنها وأنت واحد من الماسونيين

In this example, HabibSaleh asserts that Nabil Fayyad is a Freemason which is considered as an insult to him.

The quantitative analysis shows that episode one has



only two instances for this type of insult while episode two contains forty. The total number for this type is forty-two which represents 56.3% of the total insults found in the two episodes.

5.3. Personalized Negative References

Example (10):

(SalehAl-Mashnouq: One like you and your boss, Bashar al-Assad, head of the gang..)

صالح المشنوق: واحد مثلك ومثل معلمك بشار الأسد رئيس العصابة.

Example (11):

HabibSaleh: I wrote thousands of articles against your dictatorship ...

حبيب صالح: كتبت آلاف المقالات ضد دكتاتوريتك..

Example (12):

HabibSaleh:Masonic like you..

حبيب صالح: اصحاب الماسونية امثالكم..

Example (13):

Nabil Fayyad: Those who have been displaced this people are your allies.

نبيل فياض: من شرد هذا الشعب هؤلاء هم حلفاءك.

The third category of insult in Culpeper (2011) is personalized negative references and there are thirteen instances of it in the two episodes which equals 17.1% of the total insult instances. Episode one contains only one example but the rest



is in episode two.

In example (10), Saleh Al-Mashnouq talks to Sherif Shehadah regarding him as a member of a gang headed by the Syrian President Bashar al-Assad "*One like you and your boss, Bashar al-Assad, head of the gang..*". He refers to them as a gang, not as politicians.

Example (11) shows how Habib Saleh sticks dictatorship to Nabil Fayyad saying '*your dictatorship*' as if he is not a supporter of democracy but he belongs to dictatorship. Again in Example (12), Habib Saleh refers negatively to Nabil Fayyad as a Masonic when he says '*Masonic like you*'.

In Examples (13) Nabil Fayyad responds to Habib Saleh's insult using the same strategy and refers to him negatively as an ally of terrorists who displaced the Syrian people.

The above examples show how each interlocutor refers to the other negatively to humiliate and insult him, which is understood by the other who tries to respond to this insult.

Personalized Third-Person Negative references

This time the speaker does not direct his speech to the other partner, but he refers to him negatively while talking to the moderator as if he is talking about an absent person using the third person pronouns or talk to himself negatively about the listener on his hearing. This category is the least of the four representing 11.8 with three instances occurred all in episode one.

Example (14):



SherifShehadeh: First, Dr. Faisal you called me and told me that there is an opponent and you did not say to me an enemy, the difference between the opponent and the enemy is that you respect the opponent but the enemy has his reasons and violations.

شريف شحادة: يعني أولاً دعنتني دكتور فيصل وقلت لي أنه في خصم أنت لم تقل لي عدو، الفرق بين الخصم والعدو الخصم يحترمه العدو له أسبابة ومخلفاته

In this example SherifShehadeh is speaking to Faisal Al-Qassim, the moderator, about SalehAl-Mashnouq referring to him negatively as '*an enemy*' not an opponent who is respected but the enemy, is not.

Example (15):

SherifShehadeh: Palestine Branch exists in Syria and we do not deny Palestine branch exists for spies and killers and terrorists like this person her.

شريف شحادة: فرع فلسطين نعم موجود في سوريا ولا ننكر فرع فلسطين موجود لجواسيس وقتله وإرهابيين موجودين أمثال الأخ هون

Again Al-Mashnouq is referred to negatively by SherifShehadeh as similar to '*spies and killers and terrorists*'

Personalized Negative Assertions, which represent direct insult, represented most of the insults in the data of the study by 55.3% and *personalizes third-person negative references*, which represents indirect insult, figured the least by 11.8%. This shows that participants tend to direct to indirect insult. In addition, seventy-six insults in two episodes are big which should not come out from people who are looked at as cultured and civilized watched by millions of audience. This means that Arabs Arab people even the elites do not have re-



spect for other's opinion and have a He has a tendency to personalization than objectivity.

6. Conclusion

This study handles insult in Arab talk shows and takes the Opposite Direction as an example. The aim of the study is to answer the following questions: What are some of the impoliteness strategies employed by guests in Arabic talk shows? Is the interaction in the Opposite Direction involves insult? What are the common categories of insult used in the interaction between interlocutors in the Opposite Direction? The study hypothesizes that Arab political talk shows are rich in impoliteness. The significance of the study is to show the impoliteness strategies employed by interlocutors in Arab talk shows so that they can be avoided. The study depends on Culpeper's (2011) model of impoliteness analysis.

The study reached the following result: one of the common impoliteness strategies used is insult. The participants applied all the categories of insult mentioned by Culpeper in his model -namely; 'Personalized negative vocatives', 'Personalized negative assertions', 'Personalized negative *references*', and 'Personalized third-person negative references' but by different rates. The study showed that there are seventy-six instances of insult in just two episodes which is a big number to come out of cultured and civilized people watched by millions of audience on TV. Half of the rate of insults 55.3% is direct -namely; *personalized negative assertions*. *Personalized negative references* come in the second place by 17.1%, followed by *personalized negative vocatives* 15.8% and finally comes personalized third-person negative references by 6.8% which is an indirect insult. This means that insults are intended not accidental. Moreover, one



of the study's results is that there are some vocatives that seem to be normal or show intimacy and love, but in fact, they are used ironically to insult the listener. Culpeper's model fails to show this but the context exposes it. It worth mentioning that, as the analyzed data came from only two episode of one TV show more research needs to be done, on a larger and more representative sample taken from various talk shows, to find out whether impoliteness is typical of Arabic talk shows or not. In addition, the study proves that Culpeper's (2011) model is suitable for studying insult in Arabic data.

Hamid (2014) argues that , Arabs use positive impoliteness strategies (i.e."seek disagreement" and sarcasm or mock) which aim to damage the positive face of the addressee. It seems that impoliteness can have other manifestations than the ones that are stated by Hamed. As n example for that is insult represented in its four elements: personalized negative vocatives, personalized negative assertions, personalized negative references, personalized third-person negative references.

References

Abdel-Hafiz, A.-S. (2015). Impoliteness in Arabic discourse: evidence from Aljazira talk show. *Journal of Politeness Research: Language, Behaviour, Culture*.

Al-Dilaimy, H. H., & Khalaf, A. S. (2015). A Pragmatic Analysis of Impolite Interruptions of Selected Debates in the Opposite Direction of Al-Jazeera Channel. *American Journal of Educational Research*, 3(12), 1570-1578. doi:10.12691/education-3-12-14

Al-Shloul, S. (2016, June 12). (Im) Politeness and Gender in the Arabic Discourse of Social Media Network



Websites: Facebook as a Norm. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 8(3), 31-58. doi:10.5296/ijl.v8i3.9301

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

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

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

Hamed, A. M. (2014). *A Contrastive Study of Politeness and Impoliteness Strategies in British and Arab Sports Media Discourse*. Fayoum: Fayoum University.

Hamrita, M. (2016, May 5). Tunisian Post-Revolution Political Discourse: Freedom of Speech and Excess of Verbal Violence. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 4, 379-392.

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

Maha, L. (2014). Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Linguistic Politeness. *Cross-Cultural Communication*, 10(1), 56-60.
doi:10.3968/j.ccc.1923670020141001.4324

Migdadi, F., Badarneh, M. A., & Abbas, K. A. (2013). Conflict talk and argumentative strategies in highly adversarial talk shows: The case of Al-Jazeera's The Opposite Direction. *Lodz Papers in Pragmatics*, 9(1), 93–121. doi:10.1515/lpp-2013-0006

Van Dijk, T.A. (2004). Politics, ideology and discourse. Retrieved December 28, 2008, from



<http://www.discourses.org/OldArticles/Politics,%20Ideology%20and%20Discourse.pdf>

Appendix

Insult

Episode One

20/12/2011

عنوان الحلقة: الثورات العربية وفلسطين

Arab revolutions and Palestine

Personalized third person – negative references

- شريف شحادة: يعني أولاً دعنتي دكتور فيصل وقلت لي أنه في خصم أنت لم تقل لي عدو، الفرق بين الخصم والعدو الخصم تحترمه العدو له أسبابة ومخلفاته،
- صالح المشنوق: لفلسطينيين في سوريا شو مسموح لهم يعملوا هل مسموح لهم يحملون سلاح هل مسموح لهم يحاربون في الجولان هل مسموح لهم يطلقون طلقة على إسرائيل؟
شريف شحادة: يا دكتور فيصل، ما بيسوى هذا الكذب.
- شريف شحادة: تمام اسمعني هذا الحكي قال إسرائيل وقال محلل هذا خلي يحطوا بجيبته أنا مالي علاقة.... فرع فلسطين نعم موجود في سوريا ولا ننكر فرع فلسطين موجود لجواسيس وقتله وإرهابيين موجودين أمثال الأخ هون وعلى أمثال..

Personalized negative assertions

- صالح المشنوق: ولكم أربعين سنة ما واجهتم إسرائيل، على رقبتهك واحد مثلك.
شريف شحادة: اخرس.
- صالح المشنوق: واحد مثلك ومثل معلمك بشار الأسد رئيس العصابة.
شريف شحادة: صرمايته براسك، أنت العصابة وأبوك عميل لإسرائيل، هذا هو سجل



أبوك..

صالح المشنوق: يا عمي روح..

Personalized negative Vocatives

صالح المشنوق: واحد مثلك ومثل معلمك بشار الأسد رئيس العصابة.
شريف شحادة: صرمايته براسك, أنت العصابة وأبوك عميل لإسرائيل, هذا هو سجل
أبوك..
صالح المشنوق: يا عمي روح..

Episode two

18-12-2012

عنوان الحلقة: كيف يقبل السوريون برئيس منبوذ دولياً؟

How do Syrians accept an internationally rejected president?

Insult

Personalized negative assertions

- نبيل فياض: أنا أدافع عن الثقافة اليهودية..
- حبيب صالح: أنت تدافع عنها وأنت واحد من الماسونيين، أنت واحد ممن أشرفوا على ترجمة هذا الكتاب، الكتاب المرموني التوراة القديم اليعقوبي، أنت إسرائيلي فكيف يحق لك أن تقول أن الجيش السوري إنه جيش احتلال، جيش يببب شعبا كريما.
- نبيل فياض: أنت عندك مرض ضد النظام, انت مريض.
- نبيل فياض: انت علوي
- حبيب صالح: انت نبيل فياض وانت الصغير كيف اسمح لك انت تتناول؟
- حبيب صالح: انت عميل المخابرات وابنها وابن الصهيونية وابن اسرائيل.
- حبيب صالح: وقح
- نبيل فياض: انت وقح وقليل أدب
- نبيل فياض: من يصف أهله بالدعارة هو عاهر, انت عاهر.

- نبيل فياض: انت عميل لجبها النصره , انت عميل قاعدة انت واحد عصابي (عنده عصبية و غضب) مريض....
- نبيل فياض: لما بتقول عن حسن نصر الله حزاء, أنت عميل أنت حزاء, انت عميل اسرائيل.
- نبيل فياض: انت مريض انت مريض.
- حبيب صالح: انت المريض انت الصهيوني انت العميل, انت العميل.
- نبيل فياض: علوي شيعي
- حبيب صالح: كذاب, انا ضد الطوائف, انا وطني سوري.
- نبيل فياض: العلويات اشرف من أن...
- حبيب صالح: لقد استخدمك أولاً وأنت العاهر الأول, انت العاهر الاول, انت الجاسوس الأول, انت الصغير الاول.
- حبيب صالح: انت المجنون, وانت التافه والمفصوم.
- حبيب صالح: ماسوني وعلوي, يعقوبي وعلوي, انت المنفصم
- نبيل فياض: طانفي
- حبيب صالح: انت طانفي قدر.
- نبيل فياض: انت واحد مجمون, فعلا قالولي انك انت عصابي.
- حبيب صالح: انت عدو الشعب السوري.
- نبيل فياض: انت واحد سفية شتمت والدي وسكت عليك.
- نبيل فياض: انت عصابي
- حبيب صالح :..... تخجل أن تقول أنت عميل هنا وعدو هناك، أنت عميل هناك وعدو هنا.
- حبيب صالح: هذا، هذا.. ولك أنت حدائي ..
- نبيل فياض: انت صغير كثير انت واحد صغير كثير.
- حبيب صالح: انت نبيل.

ersonalized negative references

- حبيب صالح: هذا تاريخك, المرمونية
- نبيل فياض: نعم المرمونية ليسو ساقطين



حبيب صالح: اليعقوبية! ليست يعقوبية.

نبيل فياض: والله انت ما تعرف راسك من سباطك

- حبيب صالح: لا تذكر السبابيط فتفوح رائحتك
- حبيب صالح: كتبت آلاف المقالات ضد دكتاتوريتك...
- حبيب صالح: اصحاب الماسونية امثالكم..
- نبيل فياض: انت ثقافتك صفر, انت لا تمتلك شئ من الثقافة.
- نبيل فياض: يا حبيبي انت قاعد بالمانيا ومانك عارف شو صاير بالبلد.
- نبيل فياض: انت مانك عارف شو صاير بسوريا.
- نبيل فياض: من يصف أهله بالدعارة هو عاهر.
- حبيب صالح: الدعارة عملك , الدعارة السياسية
- حبيب صالح: الطائفية القذرة مثلك, انا لست طائفا قذرا مثلك.
- نبيل فياض: من شرد هذا الشعب هولاء هم حلفاءك جبهه النصره و القاعدة يا صديقي.
- حبيب صالح: هالورم فششوا, هذا الورم ألقه في نفسك.
- نبيل فياض: انت تشتم يوميا في سوريا.

Personalized negative vocatives

- نبيل فياض : انت لو كنت تخجل يا ابن سراييون
- حبيب صالح: لا تمارس الشتيمة, لا تذكر السبابيط (سباطك... حذاءك)
- نبيل فياض: يا علوي
- حبيب صالح: ايها اللعين
- حبيب صالح: وهو يتحدثك بكل وقاحة انه كان في طهران ثم كان في جامعة المرمون في برلين ثم كان في دمشق يطلب المعونة كيف تكون ايرانيا وبرلينيا...
- نبيل فياض: لا توجد جامعة للمرمون في برلين يا جاهل
- نبيل فياض: يا ابني انا عم بشتغل على تاريخ القرآن يا حبيبي..
- حبيب صالح: لك أنا أبوك لا تعيدها.



- حبيب صالح: أن تقول انك ضد الماللي في طهران أيها الصغير قول ذلك قل قل قل انطق.
- حبيب صالح: وقح
نبيل فياض: انت وقح وقليل أدب
- نبيل فياض: سرابيون تتبرأ منك يا خاين سرابيون تتبرأ منك يا خاين هادول
جبهة النصره يا خاين يا وقح.
- حبيب صالح: انت تصف نفسك أيها الصغير
- حبيب صالح: لا تستخدم السخرية ايها الصغير.
- حبيب صالح: يا ابن الأسد يا عميل الأسد.
- نبيل فياض: انا ماني طانفي, انا سني عم بدافع عن العلويين.
حبيب صالح: ايها الطاغية.