

A Pragmatic Study of Dysphemism in Steven Berkoff's Play East

Muhammad Hussain Hamza¹, Nur Rasyidah binti Mohd.
Nordin², Husam Ahmed Abboud³

Abstract

The present study pragmatically explores categories and functions of dysphemisms in Steven Berkoff's play East. The objective of the paper is to explore the characters' use of dysphemism; its categories and functions and apply Allan and Burridge's (2006) classification of dysphemism, Goffman's (1962) notion of face, and Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory of politeness to the play. To gather and examine the text, the researcher adopts a qualitative descriptive approach which involves the researcher himself being the instrument who does everything. The data are taken from the script that is read and re-read to identify the dysphemistic expressions and then coded to be analyzed by using a qualitative discourse analysis method. The results of the paper reveal that all characters use all the categories of dysphemism; insult is the most used followed by profanity and obscenity. In addition, they utilize dysphemism to express hatred, anger, and disrespect, ridicule, and insult each other. Besides, they do not mitigate their expressions and attack each other positive face and the audience's positive face too. The findings of the study are beneficial to pupils, teachers, writers, journalists, TV producers, footballers, orators, filmmakers, and politicians who are anticipated to be familiar with the dysphemistic terms in order to avoid them and use neutral ones as alternatives.

Introduction

Hutton considers the totally unrestricted and unrestrained speech illogical claiming in all communities, language is exposed to censorship which, according to Boireau, is used to defend themselves from the offensiveness of the theatre and bad language; profanity, swearing, and obscenity. These are deemed taboos, which are engendered by all communities; they are incorporated and safeguarded by those who

¹ Imam Al-Kadhum College, English Department, Iraq,
muhammadhussain@alkadhum-col.edu.iq

² The School of Languages, Civilisation & Philosophy, at Universiti Utara
Malaysia (UUM), Malaysia.

³ Imam Al-Kadhum College, English Department, Iraq.

profit from the forcing of the rules . Allan and Burrridge state that taboos customarily appear due to public restrictions on the person's demeanour or where their actions make embarrassment or damage themselves and others. Thus, this is anticipated to be liable to taboo, whether it is holy, metaphysical, hints to people of authority, or anxieties related to perilous creatures. Lastly, a person's public demeanour could break taboos on politeness. In general, people are able to and do evade tabooed demeanour, unless a taboo violation is intended .

According to the Licensing Act of 1737, the Lord Chamberlain of the Royal Household should review all plays before the actors perform them. Therefore, British Theatre was subject to censorship at the beginning of the 20th Century. However, in 1968 the censorship was lifted leading to the appearance of a gust of freedom in British theatre . So, after this period, an advantaged territory is opened up for thinking of this topic offering a number of archetypal taboo-violating playwrights like Jean Genet, Joe Orton, and others . In the period of the sixties, freedom in the theatre increased, and consequently, more plays triggered severe arguments. Most of the plays in this period are called dirty plays written by Alex Sierz. Arguments extended to the seventies and eighties to witness many dramatists who wrote such kinds of plays among them was Steven Berkoff who intentionally and explicitly utilized exaggerated taboo expressions to naturalize the audience to surprise in his 1975 play *East*. This play made them shocked by its obvious sexual and offensive words .

Allan and Burrridge mention that talking about the topics of taboo and censorship in language gives rise to politeness that is interacted with euphemism and impoliteness that is interacted with dysphemism. In other words, when someone avoids taboos and uses polite words, they are speaking euphemistically while when they use offensive language, they are speaking dysphemistically. This paper focuses on dysphemism which is "a word or phrase with connotations that are offensive either about the denotatum and/ or to people addressed or overhearing the utterance" . It is prohibited as the rude option, or regarding the word 'bleed' maybe only dispraising; this word is to be anticipated to be offensive. They add that dysphemism causes face loss and therefore impolite. Thus, this paper pragmatically tackles dysphemism in Berkoff's play *East* to accomplish the following aims; (1) exploring the characters' use of dysphemism; its categories and functions (2) applying Allan and Burrridge's (2006) classification of dysphemism, Goffman's (1962) notion of face, and Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory of politeness to the play. Thus, this research addresses the following questions; (1) How is dysphemism used by the characters, what are the categories, and for which reasons? And (2) How can Allan and Burrridge's (2006) classification of dysphemism,

Goffman's (1962) concept of face, and Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory be applied to the play *East as far as dysphemism is concerned*?

Literature Review

There are some recent papers that have been done on dysphemism (Jumaa & Ghailan, 2021; Kadoorly & Mugair, 2021; Mulya et al., 2021; Sitanggang & Ganie, 2020). These papers are discussed below to compare them with the present study.

Kadoorly and Mugair conducted a pragmatic study to explore the types and uses of euphemistic and dysphemistic expressions in former US President Donald Trump's political language. The researchers adopted Leech (1983) politeness principle model and Grice's (1975) model of cooperative principle. A qualitative approach to gather and examine the discourse that includes five political speeches was used. They find that Trump used types of euphemism (metaphor, hyperbole, circumlocution, and positive euphemism) and dysphemism (general and conventional) . Although the researchers adopted Grice's and Leech's models, yet they did not apply them to Trump's speeches.

Similarly, Jumaa and Ghailan attempted a pragmatic study to examine euphemism and dysphemism in "J.M. Coetzee's novel *Waiting for the Barbarians*". The aim of the paper was to apply the appraisal theory to the novel and examine judgment, appreciation, affect, graduation, and feeling that are found in euphemism and dysphemism expressions. The researchers qualitatively and quantitatively collect and examine the literary text. They argue the characters used judgment followed by affect and appreciation. Also, the characters used dysphemism words more than euphemism ones. Furthermore, they claim that context plays an essential role in interpreting the evaluation .

Mulya et al. investigated the uses and kinds of dysphemism in an Indonesian high school. The aim of the paper was to identify the kinds and uses in dialogues applying Allan and Burridge's (2001) classification of dysphemism. The adopted method was qualitative. The instrument was a questionnaire of ten questions given to sixty-eight pupils. The findings of the study reveal that four kinds of dysphemism were found; homosexual dysphemism followed by dysphemistic euphemism, dysphemistic epithet, and euphemistic dysphemism. Besides, the pupils used dysphemism to swear, humiliate, insult, condemn, and show anger toward individuals .

By the same token, Sitanggang and Ganie did a study to analyze the types and functions of dysphemism in the film *Deadpool*. The researchers aimed to discover the kinds of dysphemistic expressions

and the reasons behind utilizing them by the characters. They adopted Rawson's (1989) classification of dysphemism (profanity, obscenity, and insult) and followed a qualitative approach. Ninety-five data were elicited and examined. The findings of the paper reveal that all types of dysphemism were used in the movie; obscenity was used the most followed by insult and profanity. In addition to that, the researchers find that the characters used dysphemism to humiliate, show anger, intimacy, amazement, and excitement, and represent a bad condition.

The four studies discussed above have focused on the types and functions of dysphemism in different areas. They qualitatively gather and examine the textual information. However, they have not applied any pragmatic model to analyze the data. Therefore, the current study endeavors to pragmatically address this gap and apply Goffman's (1962) notion of face and Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory of politeness to show how the characters in Berkoff's play use dysphemistic expressions. Moreover, the researcher qualitatively analyzes the play and classifies the dysphemistic expressions according to Allan and Burridge's (2006) classification to see how the characters use them (Basheer et al., 2022).

What is Dysphemism?

Allan and Burridge argue that people usually avoid dysphemism in dialogues because of the offensiveness it causes to others. Sometimes, it appears due to anxiety and disfavour, hatred, and dissatisfaction. It is resorted to talk about individuals and matters that irritate, annoy, belittle, degrade, and demean them. It connects with style to give rise to stylistic disharmony, for example, saying "I'm off for a piss", instead of "excuse me for a moment", will be offensive .

Allan and Burridge classify dysphemistic words into three main types: profanity, obscenity, and insults. They are explained as follows :

1. Profanity misuses holy credence; it is sacrilegious . Put it in other words, it is incautious disrespect for the Divinity or other sacred things (blasphemy belittles or mocks the Divinity) . Allan points out that dysphemism comes from profanity is awfully potent. In addition, profane swearing such as God damn X, Shit on X, Fuck X, Bugger X, and etc., presents a prototype for more strong curses . Thus, according to Allan and Burridge such exclamatory swear expressions that show disappointment or irritation can be considered dysphemisms .
2. Obscenity misuses the human body . It is related to sexual content and includes filthy expressions for the parts of the body such as the word 'cunt' .
3. Insult misuses other individuals . Similarly, Allan and Burridge believe that insulting, which is directly directed at the person,

someone means abusing them by attacking them with scornful and rude language. The addresser ordinarily uses insults to harm and disrespect the addressee or/and any third party. Therefore, they are inherently offensive and naturally tabooed and liable to censorship. According to Allan and Burridge, dysphemistic terms of insults include:

(A) people are compared to animals such as bat, pig, rat, cow, dog, etc.,

(B) Epithets came from the tabooed parts of the human body (prick, asshole), unpleasant aroma (shit, urine, semen), lustful demeanour (poofert, fucker, mucker ass-licker), and real physical characteristics (Baldy! Fat! Short-ass! Big eyes),

(C) Swearwords and epithets that refer to defect in the mind or madness such as Silly!, Airhead!, Stupid!, etc.,

(D) Sexism, ethnicity, racism, speciesism, and others that are considered dysphemistic. For example, some names of the Jewish were explicitly ridiculed and so abandoned by them,

(E) The persons are slurred (bastard, dick, cunt, asshole),

(F) Ritual insults, basically, flyting and playing the dozens are face-to-face witty and degraded verbal clashes, in which individuals attempt to surpass each other in the wealth of their oratorical contempt by mocking another individual from the family or relatives before an audience.

Allan and Burridge, Gómez, Jay, and Rawson agree that the meanings of dysphemistic expressions highly depend on context, in which they are uttered and the speaker's intentions and hearer's comprehension. To illustrate, when lovers mention body organs, this is not offensive at all. However, if the situation is in a doctor's clinic, it will be dysphemistic. Generally, male soldiers use the word 'shithouse' which is deemed inoffensive, but if one of them uses the euphemistic term loo, it will be deemed offensive as if using baby language .

Moreover, Allan and Burridge believe that dysphemism violates common norms without experiencing hostile penalties. Individuals' demeanours are censored in order not to show an affront, but sometimes they intentionally use dysphemism to hurt others by mentioning tabooed expressions overtly . Similarly, Al-Ameedi and Hussein and Wardhaugh claim that people avoid referring to tabooed words for they are hurtful and cause anxiety and humiliation to others. Therefore, there are things that should not be uttered explicitly and just mentioned in a specific context. So, taboos are awfully powerful politeness restraints .

Conceptual Framework

Brown and Levinson's Politeness Model

Broadly speaking, politeness is deemed as a shape of informative demeanour found naturally in human communications and between societies. Indeed, pragmatists deem politeness a global phenomenon of humanity and cultural life. If a person wants to show politeness, they have to provide cost to themselves and others, especially the one they are talking with. Cutting (as cited in Hamza et al.) believes that politeness is a pragmatic phenomenon which does not appear in the form of expressions, nevertheless, it appears in function and purposeful common meaning of these expressions. Besides, Yule claims "politeness is the means employed to show awareness of another person's face. Showing awareness for another person's face when that other seems socially distant is often described in terms of respect or deference". Goffman, who proposes the notion of face that is a crucial portion in studying communication, writes:

The term face may be defined as the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact. Face is an image of self delineated in terms of approved social attributes – albeit an image that others may share, as when a person makes a good showing for his profession or religion by making a good showing for himself.

Brown and Levinson comment that "face is the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself", adding two associated parts of face (1) "negative face": the fundamental privilege to territories, individual maintains, and privileges to non-diversion and (2) "positive face": "the positive consistent self-image or personality" (meaningfully covering the need for the "self-image" to be esteemed and recognized) necessitated by conversationalists.

Moreover, Brown and Levinson adopt Goffman's (1962) face concept and that of the English traditional word, which relates face to the notions of feeling unpleasant, degraded, or face lost. Consequently, "face" is sensitively covered, harmed, sustained, or enhanced, and has to frequently occur in interaction. People commonly cooperate and assume cooperation between each other in maintaining each other face in a conversation, this kind of cooperation is dependent on the shared readiness to preserve "face".

Furthermore, Yule remarks that in everyday discourse, people regularly perform something in case their expectations about their common "self-image", or the desire of their face, should be respected. certain conducts might be deduced as harm to the face of others causing a face-threatening act or the talker may diminish the probable harm resulting in saving the face.

Brown and Levinson believe when participants want to threaten each other face in the interaction, they can choose between performing or not performing this threat. When they plan to make it, this could be direct, such as “on record” or indirect, such as “off record”. When the speaker does this act in an attempt to ignore the listener, this can be made “baldly”. While the speaker tries to soften the effect of that harm for the listener, the speaker uses either “positive politeness” that designates the talker endeavours to keep the hearer’s “positive face” by diminishing the hole between them or “negative politeness” that indicates the speaker tries to keep the hearer’s “negative face” by esteeming their personal matters.

Allan and Burridge argue that there are certain factors upon which language demeanour can be considered good; the relationship between talkers, to whom they are talking, the subject of the dialogue, and the situation it occurs. In other words, politeness is extremely dependent on the situation in which the conversation occurs. So, what is polite is at least harmless and at best pleasurable while what is impolite is harmful and dysphemistic. By the same token, Brown and Levinson claim that when the addresser mentions taboo subjects together with those that are unsuitable in the context, s\he attacks the addressee’s positive face. This shows the addresser has no respect to others’ feelings and wants.

Methodology

Because this paper deals with words and expressions, the researcher adopts a qualitative descriptive method to gather and examine the textual information that are extracted from Berkoff’s play *East* which has various dysphemistic words and expressions used by the characters to achieve different purposes. Benson (as cited in Hamza et al.) claims a qualitative method requires “research that relies mainly on the reduction of data to words (codes, labels, categorisation systems, narratives, etc.) and interpretative argument” . Correspondingly, Vanderstoep and Johnston argue the aim of a qualitative method is “more descriptive than predictive”. The objective is to comprehend deeply a study participant’s perspective . The researcher analyzes dysphemistic expressions and discusses the characters’ use of this concept which goes against Goffman’s (1962) notion of face and Brown and Levinson’s (1987) politeness model. The setting of this research was the script of the play *East* by Steven Berkoff. It was published in a collected volume in 2014. This volume includes Berkoff’s plays; “*East, West. Greek, Sink the Belgrano, Massage, Lunch, The Bow of Ulysses, and Sturm and Drang*”. The play *East*, which is the focus of the study, is comprised of forty pages and divided into nineteen scenes.

Participants

The participants are all the five characters of the play; Dad, Mum, Mike, Les, and Sylv. They relay stories about their fuzzy lives in a cruel area. They talk about love, friendship, manhood, and family. Mike, Les, and Sylv, who represent the younger generation, make an inconvenient love affair where Sylv is trapped between two strong men. Mum and Dad, who represent the older generation, see the young and begin to feel nostalgic about their youth and the past old days .

Instrumentation and Data Collection Procedures

According to Lincoln and Guba (as cited in Vanderstoep & Johnston), the best instrument for the qualitative realistic study is human. They caution that the instruments that are nonhuman can merely benefit from the layers made in the instrument . Similarly, Creswell argues that the researcher applying a qualitative approach is the instrument himself\herself. The researcher does a lot of things; collecting and examining the textual information by reading the script and coding the expressions. Therefore, examining the data that are used in the paper is built on the researcher's viewpoints regarding the theory applied. In sum, the researcher organizes, collects, analyzes, and presents the findings of the paper. Furthermore, the researcher chooses a pre-existing material; a literary text by Berkoff as an instrument to answer the research questions.

The researcher does the following procedures; (1) the researcher reads and rereads the play thoroughly, (2) then, the researcher codes the data by labelling dysphemistic expressions using the Microsoft office Word program, (3) next, the researcher classifies and selects the data that will be analyzed along with Allan and Burridge's (2006) classification, (4) the researcher applies Goffman's (1962) notion of face and Brown and Levison's (1987) politeness model to the coded data, and (6) finally, the researcher draws discussions, implications, and conclusions based on the findings of the study.

Techniques of Data Analysis

The investigator adopts a qualitative discourse analysis approach to examine the data of the play. Vanderstoep and Johnston comment when the researcher uses a documentary or pre-existing textual information like movies, texts, speeches, journal reports, or videotapes, several research approaches are available. A discourse analysis method is one of them. Johnstone and Merriam and Tisdell agree that when the researcher analyzes discourse, s\he, essentially, examines spoken or written language that is used in context. Therefore, the researcher pragmatically examines some excerpts of the play according to context by adopting Allan and Burridge's

classification of dysphemism, Goffman's notion of face, and Brown and Levinson's politeness theory to answer the questions of the study and achieve the objectives of the study.

Findings

Analyzing the characters' dialogues in the play and adopting Allan and Burridge's (2006) classification of dysphemism, the researcher has found two hundred thirty-one dysphemistic expressions (profanity, obscenity, and insult). Ninety-five insults, which are the most used by the characters, are found, followed by obscenity (eighty-one) and profanity (fifty-five) as shown in Table 1:

Table 1. The occurrences of dysphemistic categories

Dysphemistic category	Occurrences
Profanity	55
Obscenity	81
Insult	95
Total	231

The researcher has found that the characters utilize dysphemistic expressions for many reasons; they may use them to frighten, ridicule, humiliate, displease, and show hatred and disrespect to others. Also, they employ them to talk about individuals and anything that upset and bother them.

The chief objective of the current paper is to pragmatically analyze dysphemism following Goffman's (1962) face concept and Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness model. Thus, all the five characters are found impolite and attack each other face and the audience's positive face as well. Some data of the play are elaborated in some detail about each category and their subcategories.

A) Profanity

Situation (1) Les: "Jesus Christ – up Charing Cross passed that cinema showing I was A Go Go Dancer in a Saigon Brothel"

Here, Les is talking with his friend Mike about a girl known as Doris whom he met on a bus and what he did with her. Les uses a blasphemous expression, "Jesus Christ" which is considered as one of the highest taboo expressions. He seems upset and disappointed that the girl he dated has another date with others that is why he tells her to go to a whorehouse. From Goffman's and Brown and Levinson's perspectives, Les does not observe face and threatens the hearer's and the audience's positive face.

Situation (2) MIKE: "Fuck! What can I do..."

LES: "Nothing, just go with it. I'll tell your mum and Sylv."

Mike and Les are talking about acting on the stage and the difficulty of seeing each other when Mike says "I'm caught in a time-space trajectory" and asks Les what to do. Mike uses the swearing word "fuck!" which is extremely dysphemistic because he is angry and annoyed. Uttering this offensive word on the stage before the audience, he attacks their positive face that could be saved if he utilizes euphemistic expressions such as feck (remodelling) or f..k (omission).

Situation (3) Dad: "(Waking up) Shut your gob. Can't ya let me bleeding sleep?"

The dad is in his bed sleeping and hears his wife talking about him. She is very frustrated and bored with her life with her husband who wakes up and insults her by ordering her to stop talking and letting him sleep. Being furious and disturbed, he utters the swearing word "bleeding", therefore, he does not observe his wife's and the audience's positive face.

B) Obscenity

Situation (4) MIKE: "I disagree with Les. We always found good cunt at the Lyceum. Friendly cunt, clean cunt, spare cunt...nice juicy hairy cunt, handfuls of cunt, palmful grabbing the cunt by the stem, ...infantile memories of cunt...slithery oily cunt..."

Mike's soliloquy is full of the obscene word "cunt" which is repeated twenty-seven times in this monologue. Allan and Burridge claim that the word 'cunt' is the most tabooed expression in English. Mike disagrees with his friend Les who says "there was not much good quality cunt..." (Berkoff, 16.27) and shows his anger and contempt by uttering a series of these dysphemistic words. This speech, according to Gofman (1962) and Brown and Levison (1987), is extremely rude and causes face loss of the audience.

Situation (5) MIKE (to Sylv): "Hallo darlin... fancy thee a chat, a meal, a stroll, a drink in the Cock and Bull surrounding a Babycham" (Berkoff, 6.4-5)

Mike talks to the prostitute, Sylv endeavouring to seduce her to persuade her to make a love relationship. He offers his "cock" for eating and sucking like "a babycham". Here, he uses the obscene word "cock" which is an equivalent rude word for the neutral word penis to disrespect and humiliate her. Consequently, Mike's utterance is impolite and threatens Sylv's and audience's positive face.

Situation (6) SYLV: "can I help if my proud tits should draw their leery eyes to feast on them ..." (Berkoff, 3.10)

Sylv is alone on the stage talking about Les and Mike and how they are trying to get her. She utters the obscene word "tits" which is deemed dysphemistic by English people. She is upset and begins to speak about them who disturb and insult her. Speaking about the unspeakable, she is impolite and does not mitigate the offensiveness of this word, leading to the loss of the positive face of the audience.

C) Insults

Situation (7) LES: "the manager's...looked-forward-to-tea break in a day that poured down boredom like yellow piss ... his frog's eyes bulging in case you didn't sell the shop... he rushes out of the back room like a great huge dirty spider"

Les is alone on the stage talking before the audience about his work at a clothes shop. Disappointed and bored with his job, he begins to insult the manager comparing his eyes with those of a frog and his walk like a spider. Hence, the positive face is threatened by these dysphemistic terms.

Situation (8) LES: "I thought of Doris and I thought of all the fat scrubbers I get with soggy tits- I thought of all those dirty scrubbers"

Les speaks to Mike about Doris and what he did for her. Then, he depicts her and other whores with different offensive words such as "soggy tits", "fat scrubbers", and "dirty scrubbers" to describe their physical appearance. These insults are targeted at women because Les tries to humiliate and ridicule them. Extremely rude, he does not observe the positive face of the audience.

Situation (9) MIKE: "Smash."

LES: "Hit."

MIKE: "Shithead ..."

Mike and Les are talking about the fight against a gang that assaults Mike's girl, Sylv. Mike insults them by using the dysphemistic term "shithead" which is related to mental subnormality to insult and express his anger. Not only does he use the offensive term, but he insults the gang. So, according to Allan and Burridge, such kind of words is deemed double-dysphemistic. Here, Mike does not preserve others' positive face and his utterance causes face loss.

Situation (10) Dad: "...those long-nosed gits, those evil-smelling greasy kikes had barricaded up...the land"

Dad talks about what was happening in the streets of London in 1936 in which antisemitic Fascist Oswald Mosley and his supporters marched through the East End to frighten the Jewish (Haynes, 2016). Dad is insulting the Jewish with a series of awfully dysphemistic expressions; "long-nosed gits" and evil-smelling greasy kikes". Here, the offensive term "kikes" is used to denigrate and derogate the Jewish. Being racist, Dad threatens the audience's positive face and the Jewish community.

Situation (11) MUM: "He's a dirty bastard at his age"

Mum feels sorry for herself beginning to lament her situation. She talks about her relationship with her husband and how she is alone and neglected. Being furious, she shows no respect for him and begins to insult him with the extremely offensive word "bastard". Thus, she is very rude and attacks her husband's and the audience's positive face.

Situation (12) Mike: "...a drink in the Cock and Bull surrounding a Babyham or two and plethoras of witty verbiage spewing from my gutter mouth ..."

Sylv: "Piss off thou lump. Though hast no style for me get lost ... too old ... too young... too slow...thou slob and street-corner embellishment"

Mike: "So thou, bitch, seeks to distress my johnny tool with psychological war...thou planet of delights fleshy ... advance my antennae...I'll chart thy surfaces until thou criest from within thy depths, subterranean and murky and foetid swamps"

Mike and Sylv are insulting and taunting each other in this ritual insult before the audience. They use different dysphemistic expressions to insult, ridicule, and show anger and disrespect. They are very rude and show no glimpse of courtesy to each other or to the audience. Indeed, they do not use any kind of Brown and Levinson's strategies to mitigate threats to positive face.

Discussion

Analyzing the data of the play reveals that all Allan and Burrige's categories of dysphemism are found in the play. The researcher has found two hundred thirty-one dysphemistic expressions (profanity, obscenity, and insult). Ninety-five insults with their subcategories, which are the most used by the characters, are found, followed by obscenity (eighty-one) and profanity (fifty-five). This study is similar to the one done by Sitanggang and Ganie who found these three categories in the film *Deadpool*, but the actors used obscenity more than insult and profanity .

Furthermore, the researcher has found that the characters use dysphemistic expressions for many reasons; they may use them to frighten, ridicule, humiliate, displease, and show hatred and disrespect to others. Also, they employ them to talk about individuals and anything that upset and bother them. The findings of the current paper are in line with Mulya's et al. and Sitanggang and Ganie's who argue that dysphemism is used to show disrespect, anger, and humiliation and others .

The researcher, following Goffman's (1962) face concept and Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness model and examining the data of the play, reveals that all the five characters are impolite and attack each other positive face and the audience's positive face as well. This point is emphasized by Allan and Burridge who claim that using dysphemism is rude . In addition, Brown and Levinson claim that uttering tabooed words explicitly attacks the positive face of the hearer or any third party .

Analyzing the dysphemistic expressions, the researcher has found that there are some similar expressions that are used differently by the characters as obscene ("clean cunt") or insult ("you cunt") . Besides, the characters utilize some strategies such as part-for-whole (tits to refer to breasts) or reduplication (paddy daddy to refer to incestuous fucker). However, this paper has limitations and the researcher does not discuss these contexts as the attention of the study is on the pragmatic utilization of dysphemism. In addition, the researcher focuses on Goffman's (1962) face concept and Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness model. Therefore, the researcher recommends future studies on these situations applying different theories of politeness and impoliteness to other Berkoff's plays and other writers'. What is more, further research is needed to be conducted on different fields such as politics, everyday speech, and other genres of literature. Besides, the researchers are likely to conduct various studies on this sensitive topic which is usually avoided and just a few attempts addressed this issue.

The researchers hope that this study contributes to the literature related to dysphemism and its categories, (im)politeness, taboos, and drama. The findings of the study are beneficial to pupils, teachers, writers, journalists, TV producers, footballers, orators, filmmakers, and politicians who are anticipated to be familiar with the dysphemistic terms in order to avoid them and use euphemistic ones instead. It is beneficial to EFL teachers who need to be familiar with dysphemistic expressions to help EFL students avoid using such expressions in academic situations or everyday life. EFL students face a big problem when they are talking with some native speakers who use such kinds of expressions and watching movies as the translators

usually don't translate offensive expressions literally, but they use neutral words instead. This is absolutely good yet some EFL students utilize these expressions when communicating with each other or teachers or comment somewhere because they don't know the real meaning of these expressions. So, this paper bridges the gap and provides EFL students an opportunity to know the real meaning and the speaker's intention when spelling out dysphemistic expressions. What is more, EFL students will conduct research on various kinds of dysphemism in various discourses; literary text, political discourse, and everyday speech to reveal the different situations from different perspectives.

Conclusion

Educating from the findings and discussion, the implications of the study reveal that all Allan and Burridge's (2006) categories of dysphemism are found in the play. The researcher has found two hundred thirty-one dysphemistic expressions (profanity, obscenity, and insult). Ninety-five insults with their subcategories, which are the most used by the characters, are found, followed by obscenity (eighty-one) and profanity (fifty-five).

Furthermore, the researcher has found that the characters use dysphemistic expressions for many reasons; they may use them to frighten, ridicule, humiliate, displease, and show hatred and disrespect to others. Also, they employ them to speak about people and things that disappoint and disturb them.

In addition, it is concluded that all the five characters of the play do not mitigate their expressions, are impolite, and attack each other positive face and the audience's positive face too. They show no concern for what is suggested by Goffman's (1962) concept of face and Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness model that suggests different strategies to save face and avoid direct confrontation.

Bibliography

- Abdul-Azim, Nuha, "The Rise of in-Yer-Face Theatre," *Annals of the Faculty of Arts, Ain Shams University*, 42 (1), 2014: 475-485.
- Al-Ameedi, Riyadh and Hussein, Mohammed, "A Pragmatic Study of Euphemism in Shakespeare's *Measure for Measure*", *Al-Ameed Journal*, 66 (22), 2017: 18-61.
- Allan, Keith and Burridge, Kate, *Forbidden Words: Taboo and the Censoring of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

- Allan, Keith, "X-phemism and Creativity," *Lexis*, 7, 2012: 5-42. <https://doi.org/10.4000/lexis.340>.
- Allan, Keith, *The Oxford Handbook of Taboo Words and Language*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019.
- Basheer, Z. M., Althahabi, A. M., Ali, M. H., Wafqan, H. M., Abd Al Mahdi, R., Al-Muttar, M. Y. O., & Bkhebukh, A. S. (2022). Determinants of Financial Performance: A Case from Oil and Gas Companies listed in the Iraq Stock Exchange. *Cuadernos de Economía*, 45(128), 34-44. <https://cude.es/submit-a-manuscript/index.php/CUDE/article/view/258>
- Berkoff, Steven, *Steven Berkoff Plays 1: East, West, Greek, Sink the Belgrano! Massage, Lunch, The Bow of Ulysses, Sturm and Drang*. London, Faber and Faber, 2014.
- Boireau, Nicole, "Introduction," *Contemporary Theatre Review*, 5 (1), 1996: 1-3. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10486809608568376>
- Brown, Penelope and Levinson, Stephen, *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Creswell, John, *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among five Approaches*. London, Sage Publications, 2007.
- Goffman, Erving, *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-face Behavior*, New York, Anchor Books, 1967.
- Gómez, Miguel, "The Expressive Creativity of Euphemism and Dysphemism," *Lexis*, 7, 2012: 43-64. <https://doi.10.4000/lexis.349>.
- Hamza, Muhammad, and Abbood, Hussam, "Polysyndeton in Shakespeare's Othello: A Case of Grammatical Deviation". *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*, 11 (7), 2020: 104-116.
- Hamza, Muhammad, Mohammd, Kamal, and Mohammed, Muntadher, "Observance of Leech's Politeness Maxims in Iraqi Sports Programs", *Res Militaris*, 12 (2), 2022a: 5535-5549.
- Hamza, Muhammad, Mohammed, Haider, and Mohammed, Muntadher, "A Pragmatic Study of Circumlocution in Former Iraqi PM Al-Maliki's Political Interviews", *Res Militaris*, 12 (2), 2022b: 5550-5565.
- Haynes, Suyin, "The enduring Lessons of the Battle of Cable Street, <<https://time.com/4516276/cable-street-battle-london-east-end-80-years/>> [accessed 9 December, 2022].
- Hutton, Christopher, "Speech or Conduct? Law, Censorship, and Taboo Language", in: Keith Allan, (ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of Taboo Words and Language*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2019: 256–280.
- Jay, Timothy, "The Psychology of Expressing and Interpreting Linguistic Taboos," in Keith Allan, (ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of Taboo Words and Language*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2019: 54-74.
- Johnstone, Barbara, *Discourse Analysis*, New Jersey, Wiley-Blackwell, 2018.
- Jumaa, Haneen and Ghailan, Amin, "A Pragmatic Study of Euphemistic and Dysphemistic Expressions in Coetzee's *Waiting for the Barbarians*," *Journal of Basra Research for Human Sciences*, 46 (4), 2021: 1–16.
- Kadoori, Omar and Mugair, Sarab, "A Pragmatic Study of Euphemism and Dysphemism in Donald Trump's Political Speeches," *PJAE*, 18 (10), 2021: 2741–2753.

- Leech, Geoffrey, *The Pragmatics of Politeness*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Merriam, Sharan and Tisdell, Elizabeth, *Qualitative Research: A Guide to Design and Implementation*. San Francisco, Jossey Bass, 2016.
- Mulya, Rina, Elsa, Rizky, Guntar, Muhammad, Sartika, Dina, and Meisuri, "Dysphemism in Indonesian High School Students," *Proceeding ISLAE*, 2021: pp. 191–196.
- Potter, Nicholas, "East Plays to see", <<https://playstosee.com>> [accessed 12 November, 2022].
- Rawson, Hugh, *Wicked Words: A Treasury of Curses, Insults, Put-downs, and other Formerly Unprintable Terms from Anglo-Saxon Times to the Present*, New York: Crown, 1989.
- Sitanggang, Maria, Setia, Eddy, and Ganie, Rohani, "Dysphemism Used in Deadpool Movie Paper," *Lire Journal*, 4 (2), 2020: 126–139.
- Vanderstoep, Scott and Johnston, Deidre, *Research Methods for Everyday Life Blending Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 2009.
- Wardhaugh, Ronald, *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*, Malden, Wiley Blackwell, 2006.
- Yule, George, *Pragmatics*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1996.