Realizations and functions of impoliteness in discourse about language and identity in Croatian and Montenegrin media

Ljiljana Šarić, Tatjana Radanović Felberg
University of Oslo, Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences

This chapter addresses realizations of impoliteness in written discourse thematizing language and identity in Croatian and Montenegrin media (online and print newspapers, and internet forums) in 2010 and 2011. The main participants in this discourse include well-known intellectuals, journalists, and editors. They all defend or attack a particular position in discussing, among other things, "how similar 'our' language (Croatian/Montenegrin) is to 'their' language" (Serbian), and "what makes this language (Croatian/Montenegrin) a distinctive and independent entity." They clearly position themselves in relation to the other. In other words, they are engaged in identity work. Because their positioning of the self and the other involves negative identity-ascribing practices, our understanding of impoliteness is linked to the notion of identity. Moreover, we connect the concept of impoliteness with power and emotions.
Contrary to our expectations, the participants in the media discourse analyzed in both countries frequently use offensive language both strategically and systematically while defending their particular positions. Taking into consideration parameters such as the role of participants in discourse, their social roles, the context and co-text, and activity types in which discourse participants were engaged at the various stages in a discourse, we identified various types and functions of impoliteness realizations. The types of these realizations predominantly include "subtle" impoliteness, such as inappropriate personal identity markers, and negative personal assertions, but taboo words are also occasionally found. Most of impoliteness realizations are highly context dependent. These realizations have several functions, the main ones being coercion through legitimizing one's own standpoints and delegitimizing those of one's opponents. Impoliteness appears in a network of intertextual relations and is not only connected to individuals' identity construction, but also to that of groups. Groups are constructed as different communities of practice within the discipline of philology, but ultimately they point to political divisions—for example, in Montenegrin society, to the political division between pro-Serbian and pro-Montenegrin political orientations.

Key words: **Croatia, Montenegro, identity, impoliteness, media discourse**

1. Introduction

This study analyzes realizations of impoliteness and their functions in language and identity discourse in Croatian and Montenegrin public space. We do not judge the content of that discourse as either "right" or "wrong", nor do we support or criticize views of any discourse participant. The label 'language and identity discourse' refers to discourse that includes various online and print texts (e.g., interviews with linguists, TV interviews, newspaper commentaries, reader's comments on online texts, and newspaper columns). The discourse participants in our data belong to a professional 'community of practice' (a group of people related by activities that interact with each other in particular ways (Paltridge 2012: 56)—in our case linguists, other well-known professionals from the humanities, and representatives of state institutions (e.g., ministries). This 'community of practice' includes specialists that are automatically members of an elite that influences how people communicate (cf. Čupić 2009: 340). Consequently, one would not automatically think of this elite group's discourse as a typical platform for impoliteness. However, this discourse is often just such a platform. Research on linguistic politeness argues for a range of norms and views on the appropriateness of certain linguistic behavior within a community of practice (Mills 2008): what is impolite within one community may not be impolite within another. 'Normal' linguistic behavior within the community of practice we

analyze is characterized by formality; for example, use of the polite form of address for 'you', *Vi* (instead of informal 'you', *ti*), addressing a person as 'colleague', the use of professional titles such as 'professor' and 'doctor', and focusing on professional issues in discussions related to the profession. However, 'normal' linguistic behavior within the community of practice can change over time.

One of the main ideas in recent (im)politeness research is that what is considered polite and impolite depends greatly on the specific culture, context, and genre (Culpeper 2011: 12–13, 21, 125). Some social situations (e.g., military interaction) sanction or neutralize face-threatening acts, and some genres are grounded in impoliteness.[1] The text types analyzed here sometimes involve confrontation, but impoliteness is not part of the genre's expectations of behavior; these texts do not sanction or neutralize the face-threatening acts.

Readers from the same culture as text producers and discourse participants perceive certain strategies in this discourse as impolite. This happens when some features of linguistic expression do not conform to the culturally shared notions of appropriateness for a given genre and situation;[2] for example, when a first name is used instead of a surname or professional title. Admittedly, the 'intensity' of impoliteness in communicative acts under scrutiny may vary in perceptions by different discourse participants and readers.[3]

This analysis examines specific discourse related to the macro-context of the breakup of Yugoslavia in 1991, followed by the wars. The violent nature of that breakup, armed conflicts, and overall presence of 'hate speech' in the public sphere in the 1990s (see, e.g., Đerić 2008; Kolstø 2009) increased the impoliteness threshold in all spheres of communication, including communication among intellectuals.

As a result of the breakup of Yugoslavia, four new standard languages—Bosnian/Bosniac, Croatian, Montenegrin, and Serbian—emerged at the state level and 'replaced' the former standard Serbo-Croatian.[4] All of the new standard languages retain same dialect base. However, the linguists responsible for language standardization and the ethnic groups using these languages have actively promoted language segregation (Haarmann 1999: 64).

This breakup has caused disputes to flourish about language and identity in the former Yugoslav countries where Serbo-Croatian was an official language, including Croatia and Montenegro. Before analyzing parts of that discourse through categorization of realizations of impoliteness and their functions in sections 4 and 5, we first present our data, methodology, and theoretical issues in Section 2. Section 3 outlines the micro-context of the discourse dealt with, and Section 6 offers some conclusions and suggestions for further research.

2. Data, methodology, and theoretical approach

Our data are drawn from written Croatian and Montenegrin media discourse discussing language and identity. The texts come from online and print issues of newspapers and some Internet portals from 2010 to 2012. The Montenegrin sources include the dailies *Dan*, *Pobjeda*, and *Vijesti*. The Croatian sources include the weeklies *Hrvatsko slovo* and *Globus*, the dailies *Večernji list, Jutarnji list,* and *Novi list*, and the following internet portals: *Hrvatsko kulturno vijeće* (HKV), *Hrvati AMAC,* and *H-alter*.[5] Some books, book chapters, and reviews as the 'triggers' of Croatian media discourse are part of the same discourse and are also included. The Montenegrin and Croatian material is approximately 50,000 words each. The search method for Internet sources was searching several

keywords: equivalents of *Serbian language, Montenegrin language, Croatian language,* and *Serbo-Croatian*. Thematically relevant texts were manually extracted from print newspapers: identification was based on information in headlines, subheads, and leads. This research is part of a larger project on language and identity discourse in all of its aspects, not only impoliteness.

Written media discourse has some specific features: several groups of interactants are involved: text producers (journalists, editors), discourse participants (linguists discussing language and identity), and readers of online editions (some are active commentators) and print editions.[6] The readers as the recipients of media messages are numerous and unknown; they include supporters and opponents of the discourse participants: both often represent not only themselves, but also groups they identify with. Some elements in the interaction are delayed (asynchronous) responses relating to previously published texts, and some are (almost) synchronous, thanks to possibilities such as online comments. We include online comments as part of online media discourse because they are often written by professionals. Online published media texts often merge with social media such as Facebook and Twitter. Often the same text appears in more than one source, or different sources interact.

Specific features of media discourse require a two-level analysis. The first level is impoliteness and its functions in the disputes. The second level is the functions of impoliteness in media framing. This article focuses on the first level.

We understand linguistic impoliteness as language use aimed at causing offense or potentially doing so. We approach impoliteness as a radial category, advocating a view on impoliteness in terms of prototypicality. Impoliteness intended by the speaker and understood as such by the hearer[7] in a (dyadic) face-to face interaction is the prototype of the category. We interpret 'interaction' broadly (see Spencer-Oatey 2007: 653); interaction applies not only to face-to-face communication, but also to asynchronous communication in public space. Atypical impoliteness instances (e.g., unintended impoliteness) are extensions from the prototype. This agrees with Archer's (2008) proposal, which advocates an intentionality scale that differentiates strong and weak intents to harm.

Many definitions of impoliteness (for an overview, see Culpeper 2011: 19) often include notions of face, identity, and emotion in addition to intentionality. Impoliteness, identity, and language use are all related to the notion of face, understood as 'our sense of public worth' or 'value that we claim for ourselves' (Spencer-Oatey 2007: 644). The successor languages of Serbo-Croatian use the noun *obraz* (literally, 'cheek') as a near-equivalent to *face* in many collocations and idiomatic expressions (e.g., *okaljati obraz* 'lose face', *osvjetlati obraz* 'win honor'; *obraz okiđeni, nema obraza* 'lose face', *crn obraz* 'loss of reputation'), in which it can be translated as 'honor', 'pride', 'reputation', 'shame', or 'impudence'. Face as a subcategory of identity is addressed in the following section.

The concept of impoliteness has not been used or analyzed in research on Croatian and Montenegrin.[8] However, the overlapping concept of *govor mržnje* 'hate speech', defined as verbal aggression, was analyzed in the context of the wars in the 1990s (Bugarski 1995, 1997). In some studies, verbal aggression functions as a near-synonym to impoliteness (e.g., Bousfield 2008: 128–129, 148), whereas Archer (2008: 192) emphasizes a need to distinguish the two, stressing that linguistic impoliteness is motivated by 'some personal sense of *spite*.' The difference between hate speech and impoliteness is blurred in many cases. Hate speech frequently leads to discrimination and physical aggression (Vukobrat

2013: 2).

2.1 Impoliteness, identity, power, and emotions
Our understanding of impoliteness is connected to the notion of identity and relates to that of Garcés-Conejos Blitvich (2009), who links impoliteness to the notion of identity rather than face. Identity is the social positioning of the self and other (Bucholtz & Hall 2005). Our material uses impolite communicative actions as negative identity-ascribing practices, defined by Bucholtz (1999: 211) as '. . . linguistic indexes that individuals employ to distance themselves from a rejected identity . . . negative identity practices define what their users are NOT, and hence emphasize identity as an intergroup phenomenon.' Impoliteness as a negative identity practice is used by some discourse participants to position themselves with respect to others, in most cases their peers. Much of our material is responses to some previous, 'triggering' communicative acts. Thus, we deal with identity co-construction in interaction, albeit of a different type than 'live' face-to-face interaction. Confrontation and impoliteness ensue when certain asserted subject positions (the positions discourse participants choose to assume) are questioned and delegitimized by other participants in order to undermine the worldview that comes with these positions.

Commenting on the 'new' news in America with strong, opinionated hosts that seek to confirm the target audience's beliefs, Garcés-Conejos Blitvich (2009: 276) emphasizes the strategic use of impoliteness '. . . against those interviewees who represent the [sic!] "secular progressive views . . . ."' This use of impoliteness is also seen in our material.[9]

Bousfield's (2008b: 141) definition relates to exercising power: '. . . linguistic *im*politeness is (an attempt) to exercise power over one's interlocutors whilst simultaneously ensuring that one's interlocutors are (overtly) offended in the process.' Our material shows how power relations are negotiated in language and identity discourse.

Negative attitudes are expressed through building or sustaining language identity in two post-war societies. Different participants contribute with their various (sometimes contradictory) expectations about how this process should be expressed in language, which may lead to emotional consequences for and from some participants. The more intentional a behavior is perceived, the more hurt the person feels.

3. Micro context: triggering events for impoliteness
Section 1 outlined the macro-context for the discourse analyzed. Before turning to the categorization of impoliteness realizations, we comment on the micro-contexts necessary for understanding impoliteness realizations (sections 4 and 5).

Disputes about language and identity in Croatia and Montenegro have intensified since the 1990s, with clearly defined sides and points of views. These disputes can be called offending situations because they are '. . . wider, cumulatively offensive sequences of events which are separated from the present moment, in space and time' (Bousfield 2007: 2193). These offending situations include individual offending events that trigger discussions and intensified impoliteness. The offending events in our material relate to particular attitudes to different language narratives by discourse participants (Felberg & Šarić 2013) Supporters of a specific narrative (e.g., the narrative about Croatian and Montenegrin as separate standard languages) engage in public discussions with supporters of a different narrative (e.g., the narrative about Croatian and Montenegrin as variants of the same, pluricentric standard language), trying to disqualify their opponents. Different

realizations of impoliteness emerge in these discussions.

The micro-context of the Croatian discourse mainly relates to the book *Jezik i nacionalizam* (Language and Nationalism, 2010) by Snježana Kordić, a Croatian linguist. The main claim is that people in Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, Montenegro, and Serbia speak the same, pluricentric language. This opposes the dominant narrative in Croatian linguistics (supported by official Croatian politics since the 1990s), maintaining that Croatian is a separate language. Furthermore, Kordić supports the name *Serbo-Croatian* as a common label for all of the standard languages in Croatia, Bosnia, Montenegro, and Serbia. She is very critical towards the purism tendencies since 1990 in Croatia, comparing these to purism attitudes under Nazism.[10] The author has engaged in polemics with many Croatian linguists since 2000 in the literary journal *Književna republika*. Polemics as a genre is more 'tolerant' to impoliteness than other genres. Media discourse seems to 'borrow' some features from polemics. This book publication became the triggering event for numerous other media events, such as publications of news items about the book, interviews with the author, and book reviews. The interviews with the author provoked 'counter-interviews' and media commentaries involving proponents of similar and different ideas about language identity (e.g., linguists, writers, and journalists). Overall, the publication of the book and reactions to it became a 'hot' media event, with media micro-events emerging in a chain reaction. These discussions are also linked to the discussions about the status of Croatian in the EU in some discourse samples; some participants in the discussions have related the book's publication to Croatia joining the EU and democratization (IS1).

The micro-context of Montenegrin discourse consists of several interconnected events; Montenegro's referendum on independence from Serbia in 2006 was the initial triggering event for the ongoing discussions. The main questions discussed are: What should the name of the language in Montenegro be: Montenegrin or Serbian? Does a Montenegrin language exist? What languages should be official? These questions are still unsettled, even though the Montenegrin constitution proclaims that Montenegro's official language is Montenegrin, and that Serbian, Bosniac, and Croatian are also in official use [IS2]. Discussions about identity, language, and politics become intertwined, allowing endless debates on different occasions. One of those occasions is the process of joining the EU. In order to continue talks about Montenegro's future EU membership, an election law had to be passed—and, in order to ensure that, the opposition and ruling party had to agree in the parliament. The opposition conditioned their support in 2011 by demanding that Serbian be the official language in Montenegro. The discussion about Serbian as an official language was also connected to choosing the name of the school subject. Political discussions resulted in renaming the school subject from *maternji jezik*, 'native language' to *crnogorski – srpski, bosanski i hrvatski jezik i književnost* 'Montenegrin – Serbian, Bosnian, Croatian language and literature' in 2011. Both parties interpreted this as a victory because the dash can be interpreted as both synonymy and contrast. The final offending event in our material is the Ministry of Education's funding of projects whose topic was language and identity. In 2012 there was a media dispute involving the ministry, the professors from the Program for Montenegrin Language and South Slavic Literatures in Nikšić (hereinafter, the program), whose projects were not funded, and the Institute of Montenegrin Language and Literature (hereinafter, the institute), whose projects were funded. This dispute continued an old dispute that boils down to different, competing

narratives of Montenegrin (Felberg & Šarić 2013). All of these events triggered heated discussions in the Montenegrin media in much the same way as in Croatia.

Staying silent (Bousfield 2007: 2196) is not an option for academics in Montenegro and Croatia. Not answering seems to be equal to accepting defeat.[11]

As the disputes related to language and identity continued, the impoliteness realizations increased and reaction to impoliteness was more impoliteness. This phenomenon is attested in our material and corresponds to Culpeper's (2011: 203 ff.) reactive impoliteness. Our material indicates that impoliteness realizations in a concrete text are a reaction to a previous impolite text or event; for instance, some texts make reference to texts with potentially offending elements by another discourse participant.[12] Culpeper (2011: 205) suggests that initial impoliteness may be a strategy to coerce the target, which involves loss of face on the part of the target, whereas countering with impoliteness may restore lost face and block the coercive strategy.[13]

4. Categorization of realizations of impoliteness

The basis for our categorization is existing models of categorization of impoliteness (Bousfield 2008a: 99–143; Culpeper 2011: 113–194). Within the context of the media analyzed, we identified the following dominant categories:[14] use of inappropriate personal identity markers, personalized negative assertions, and sarcasm and mock politeness. The first two, involving conventionalized impoliteness formulae (Culpeper 2011: 135), are conventionalized impoliteness, and the last are implicational impoliteness, even though implicational impoliteness can also be found in the first two categories. Most often, these categories appear in combination with each other and thus contribute to intensification of the impoliteness effects.

4.1 Use of inappropriate personal identity markers

Throughout our material, discourse participants used inappropriate personal identity markers. We label identity markers that do not match expected language use as inappropriate. This includes:

  a) Inappropriate first names / nicknames / informal short forms of first names;
  b) Titles with insulting modifiers, or invented titles;
  c) Non-standardized forms of women's surnames;
  d) Plural forms of surnames;
  e) Ideological/ethnic labels.

4.1.1 *Inappropriate first names / nicknames / informal short forms of first names*

Our material contains many third-person references to professionals by their peers or by journalists. As mentioned, the 'norm' of communication between intellectuals in both countries includes 'proper' forms of address. These proper forms are titles with a full name or only a last name, or a combination of the name and the title. Example (1) illustrates the normal/proper forms of address [IS5]:

  (1) *upozorava Sanda Ham*
  'Sanda Ham claims'
  Sanda Ham, profesorica hrvatskoga jezika, odgovara . . .
  'Sanda Ham, a professor of Croatian, replies . . .'
  Nedavno je . . . *ustvrdila dr. Snježana Kordić*
  'Dr Snježana Kordić recently claimed'
  Teza je S. Kordić . . .

'S. Kordić's hypothesis is . . .'
suautorica . . . pravopisa (s Babićem i Mogušem)
'coauthor of the normative guide (together with Babić and Moguš)'.

Aberrations are occasionally observable when only first names are used in references to female professionals:

(2) *Snježanina mudrolija*
'Snježana's caprice'

Example (2) appears as a subtitle in an interview in *Večernji list*. The possessive adjective *Snježanin*, occurs a few times in this phrase, as well as in *Snježanina teza*, 'Snježana's hypothesis' [IS3].

The first name is also used in Montenegrin material in a context when an ex-teacher quasi-directly addresses his female student (now a professional in her own right) [IS4]:

(3) *Rajka, nije Crna Gora najmlađa evropska država*
'Rajka, Montenegro is not the youngest European country'

(3), using the vocative case (*Rajka*) imitates face-to-face communication and is also an example of condescension. When using first names and adjectives derived from these names, the qualities and professional identity of persons are relativized and questioned. When researchers are referred to by their first names, this is a clue to readers suggesting that they should not conceptualize these individuals as serious researchers.

Another tendency of using first names or nicknames in article titles was noted in the Montenegrin newspaper *Dan*.

(4) **Ranka** *kudi, a* **Borisu** *ruku nudi* [IS5]
'Scolds Ranko [Krivokapić], and offers a hand to Boris [Tadić]'
(5) **Migo** *krši sporazum o jeziku* [IS6]
'[Slavoljub] Migo [Stijepović] violates agreement on language'
(6) **Rifatu** *smeta srpski jezik* [IS7]
'The Serbian language bothers Rifat [Rastoder]'

Our first impression is that the intimacy achieved in similar cases by using first names or nicknames is not a sign of democratization of the media, but rather of newspapers' evaluation of the persons referred to, contrary to Kuna (2009: 89–90), who explains the use of first names as a sign of democratization. The evaluation is negative because similar use of first names of state officials (e.g., Boris Tadić) sounds condescending. However, more research is needed in order for firmer conclusions about possible gender, ethnic, or political biases.

4.1.2 *Titles with offending modifiers, or invented titles*

We found some impolite labels together with offending modifiers of the titles (e.g., *pseudo-* in *pseudolingvistica* [IS8]), combinations of nouns referring to professions and gender (*dama-naučnica* [IS4] 'lady researcher'), combinations of titles and current function, sometimes very complex ones (*direktor-lingvista* 'head of the institute and linguist', *direktor-lingvista-književnolog-bibiotekar - pravi crnogorski multipraktik* [IS9] *'head of the institute and linguist and literature "specialologist" and librarian—a real Montenegrin food processor),* invented titles (*prvosvještenica hrama nauke* 'high priestess of the science cathedral', *profesoresa*[15] 'professoress'), and ironic use of address forms that would be polite in another context (e.g., *gospođa, gđa* [IS10]; this use illustrates implicational impoliteness).

Inappropriate indirect references to female professionals are used instead of names or standard professional titles. *Pseudolingvistica* is a direct denial of professionalism. The

person (a linguist) using the term is assuming a superior position of an evaluator with power to judge others. By denying a linguist's knowledge, her work and its effects are denied.

The joke in the term *dama-naučnica* connects two seemingly incongruous identities and 'occupations'—being a lady and being a researcher. This relation implies an underlying doubt that women can be researchers. Another example, but referring to a man, is *direktor-lingvista* 'head of the institute and linguist'. A similar joke is achieved because the two identities are also deemed incongruous, but this time two 'professions' are evaluated, the first as a temporary administrative function, and the other of performing academic work. As a way of intensifying offence, the term is expanded in another media text with two more (real and invented) professions *direktor-lingvista-književnolog-bibliotekar, pravi crnogorski multipraktik* 'head of the institute-linguist-literature "specialologist"-librarian'. This long sequence presents a condescending comparison of a person to a food processor that indiscriminately processes everything. This comparison has negative connotations. The ethnic label *Montenegrin* might be understood as implying that such a combination can happen only in Montenegro. *Književnolog* (literally, 'literatureologist') is a neologism for an invented profession because literature specialists are usually referred to as *književni naučnici/istraživači* (literally, 'literature researchers').

4.1.3 *Non-standardized forms of women's surnames*

Currently non-standardized, morphologically modified forms of women's surnames such as *Kordićka* and *Kordićeva*[16] are widely used in the Croatian material. Interestingly, impoliteness with these forms is highly context-dependent: these forms are used in endorsing and disapproving contexts, and their connotations are not the same in both. In endorsing contexts, the degree of impoliteness is low, and can probably be attributed to the colloquial style of a newspaper column.[17] In disapproving contexts, the name modifications co-occur with other impoliteness realizations; for example, the name modification ending in *-eva* co-occurs with phrases such as *jezikoslovna diletantica* 'linguistic dilettante', *neupućena gospođa* 'ignorant Mrs.', and *njezine paraznanstvene nebuloze*, 'her quasi-scientific nebulous thoughts'.[18] Alternatively, there is a contextual contrast between the reference to a woman by her modified surname and references to men by their titles and full names, and that contrast reveals an impoliteness strategy related to the surname modification in (7):

> (7) Stanje u kroatistici *Kordićeva* smatra nepodnošljivim, a glavnim krivcima predstavlja *akademike Stjepana Babića, Radoslava Katičića* i *Dalibora Brozovića*. [IS8]
> '*Kordićeva* considers the situation of Croatian philology unbearable, and presents academy members Stjepan Babić, Radoslav Katičić and Dalibor Brozović as the main culprits.'

This tendency was noted in the Croatian material but not in the Montenegrin material. Modified forms of women's surnames ending in *-ka* were not found, whereas a few surnames ending in *-eva* were noted (. . . poručila je Stojanovićeva '*Stojanovićeva* said'; dodaje Bojovićeva '*Bojovićeva* adds'[19]). These instances were not connected to impoliteness, and so it is not possible to determine whether these forms were strategically used. This observation is in line with the observations at the roundtable about gender-sensitive language in Podgorica (Marjanović 2006: 97), where it was pointed out that the use of the endings *-ka* and *-eva* has been undergoing a change. However, the nature of that change is inconclusive because there is a need for more research.[20]

4.1.4 *Plural forms of surnames*

Example (8) illustrates how the alleged subject positions of individuals are denied by putting their surnames in the plural. In addition, some surnames in the plural refer to ethnic, religious, and political groups placed in opposition to Croats (e.g., Goldstein is Jewish, and Jovanović is typically Serbian), and so plural forms of names preceded by the contextually driven pejorative modifier *razni* and linked to negatively evaluating nouns (*trbuhozborci, trbuhoborci*) and assertions can be markers of ethnic and religious discrimination:

> (8) . . . *razni Goldsteini, Ivini, Kordići i Jovanovići kao i drugi slični jezikoborci, trbuhozborci i trbuhoborci iz nove vlasti spremaju se Hrvate nahraniti novim pravopisom* . . . [IS11]
> '. . . various Goldsteins, Ivins, Kordićs, and Jovanovićs as well as other similar language fighters, ventriloquists, and people with self interests from the new government have been preparing to feed Croats a new normative guide . . . .'

4.1.5 *Ideological/ethnic labels*
Proponents of views different from one's own are accused of defending aggressive Yugoslavism and a greater Serbian idea. [IS12]

> (9) . . . *cijela priča i ne spada u područje jezikoslovlja ili jezikoslovne provokacije, nego u područje politike koja je odnjihana u krilu militantnoga jugoslavenstva i velikosrpstva.*
> '. . . this entire story does not belong to linguistics or to linguistic provocation; it belongs to politics nurtured in the bosom of militant Yugoslavism and Greater Serbianism.'

Some collocations widely used in the 1990s, such as *velikosrpska ofanziva* 'greater Serbian offensive' [IS4], evoke the danger of views different from one's own. The strategy of qualifying opponents as dangerous or ignorant is related to their real or invented ethnicity, as in *neki zadrti Jugoslaveni u Zagrebu* 'some bigoted Yugoslavs in Zagreb' [IS13].[21] The function of such usages is disqualification of persons with different political views or ethnicity.

4.2 Use of direct and indirect personalized negative assertions
We include direct negative assertions (e.g., X is Y, where Y is an offensive noun or adjective) and indirect ones (e.g., positively connoted words placed in quotation marks) in personalized negative assertions. In addition to general negative assertions, specific assertions related to ideology, ethnicity, gender, and knowledge appear in our material.

In the world of academics and the educated elite, power is preserved by maintaining the construction of one's own identity as knowledgeable and sane. Knowledge and sanity are thus goods that justify one's right to participate in public debates. If one is judged ignorant, his right to participate might be revoked. Consequently, the strategy of delegitimizing the other due to lack of knowledge is extensively used. This strategy relies on direct and indirect negative assertions.

Examples (10) and (11) are extremely offensive, given the standard circumstances in which university departments and professors are supposed to have relevant knowledge in carrying out their duties. In example (10), a linguist evaluates her opponents, university professors in Croatia. She directly asserts that they do not educate. In example (11), the head of the institute qualifies his opponents as ignorant:

> (10) *Naši domaći profesori lingvistike na fakultetima uopće ne obrazuju i ne prosvjećuju, nego ciljano zamagljuju.* [IS14]
> 'Our domestic professors of linguistics at the universities do not educate and enlighten at all; instead, they blur things on purpose.'
> (11) . . . *Umjesto izigravanja žrtve u cilju prikrivanja sopstvenoga nerada, neznanja i nesposobnosti, bilo bi dobro kad bi Studijski program za crnogorski jezik i južnoslovneske književnosti zakupio štand pored štanda Instituta za crnogorski jezik i književnost* . . . [IS15] '

> Instead of playing victims with the aim of covering up their own inactivity, ignorance, and inability, it would be good if the Program for Montenegrin Language and South Slavic Literatures rented a stand next to the stand of the Institute of the Montenegrin Language and Literature . . .'

Examples such as (11) imply less direct assertions and thus require more cognitive effort by readers. However, similar examples entail presuppositions with clearly negative content. The presuppositions in example (11) are that the program: a) is playing a victim, b) is not working, c) does not have knowledge, and d) is unable to do what it is supposed to do. These presuppositions lead to the implication that e) the program and professors running it have no right to exist. By qualifying his colleagues as not knowledgeable, the institute head places himself in a higher position of having knowledge that others do not share.

Another method of making indirect negative assertions is using quotation marks to express ironic or derisive meaning,[22] as in example (12), where the knowledge of specialists is questioned by putting the word *experts* in quotation marks:

> (12) *. . . kod "eksperata" za sve i svašta u Komisiji, od psihologije i pedagogije do ustavnog prava, jasna je tendencija da svima nametnu crnogorski jezik*. [IS16]
> '. . . there is a tendency among "experts" for all and everything in the committee—from psychology and pedagogy to constitutional law, to impose Montenegrin on everybody.'

In example (12), the immediate context (*za sve i svašta*) disambiguates the ironic use of the word: experts are usually experts in a particular field; *sve i svašta* (for all and everything) carries negative connotations.

Newspapers also typically use quotation marks to mark somebody else's voice (e.g., the words put into quotation marks in example (13) could theoretically be quotes). Thus, in some cases dual interpretations are possible. In these cases, context helps readers decide.

> (13) *. . . ili bi se trebala zaposliti mimo natječaja, isključivo na temelju "hrabrosti", "zasluga" i "kvaliteta" koje su kao "korisne" "prepoznale" pojedine ovdašnje priopćajnice i novinari.* [IS8]
> 'Or should she be employed without a job announcement, exclusively on the basis of her "courage," "accomplishments," and "qualities" that some media and journalists here "recognized" as useful.'

Most often, various impoliteness realizations are present in the same text, and this reveals if a particular realization is impolite.

Another example of personalized negative assertions relates to evaluating the reason/intellect/sapience of the discourse participants, a regular element of the discourse participants' argumentation. Social esteem is thus achieved by attacking the other by claiming his insanity (White 1999). Reason/rationality is a highly valued characteristic in academic circles in both countries and is aligned with positive values. What is considered negative is evaluated as irrational, abnormal, and deviant. In example (14), the politics that a discourse participant does not approve of is stamped as defeating or diminishing reason. Consequently, the persons behind them are also considered deviant.

> (14) *Nakaradna politika nadvladala razum.* [IS17]
> 'Ugly politics overpowered reason'
> (15) *Crnogorska-dukljanska redukcija razuma u udžbenicima za crnogorski jezik, "Avetna lingvistika" za mlade mozgove* [IS18]
> 'Montenegrin-Doclean reduction of reason in the Montenegrin language textbooks, "Stupid linguistics" for young brains'
> (16) *. . . hrvatska lingvistika koja se dala sramno zajašiti od dnevnopolitičkih potreba, jest jedan skandal pameti*[23]
> '. . . Croatian linguistics disgracefully dominated by daily politics is a scandal of sanity'

In line with these examples are contexts in which the foundation of someone's education is questioned:

> (17) *. . . to je znak elementarne sociolingvističke nepismenosti* [IS19]

'That is a signal of an elementary sociolinguistic illiteracy'
Denying someone's common sense and literacy is a final step in delegitimization strategies.

4.3 Irony/sarcasm/mock politeness

Irony as conveying a meaning opposite of a literal meaning and sarcasm[24] as a harsher form of irony is used in parts of the discourse analyzed and as a main structural principle of some texts. Irony and sarcasm are sometimes achieved by mock politeness. For example, calling an opponent an 'excellent linguist' may sound positive but, when followed by an assertion about a lack of knowledge, as in example (18), exactly the opposite is realized:

(18) *Vrla jezikoslovka* nikako dakle da shvati da su i jezici, a ne samo nacije, nastali u diskursu određenih ljudi . . . [IS13]
'By no means can this *excellent linguist* understand that languages, and not only nations, emerged in a discourse by particular people.'

In example (19), one side in the conflict is seemingly polite by offering to help the other, whereas this offer is an indirect putdown of the opponents:

(19) *mi ćemo biti voljni da vama, u granicama raspoloživog slobodnog vremena, pružimo besplatne usluge mentorstva kako ne biste više brukali crnogorsku filologiju.* [IS19]
'we will be willing, within the limits of our available free time, to offer you our services as mentors so that you will no longer embarrass Montenegrin philology'

We have also noted that irony and sarcasm are the main structural principles of some texts [IS9, IS20]. These texts rely on intertextual references to world literature and knowledge of history and philosophy. Creativity is also at work; the texts are entertaining for some readers. In both cultures in professional humanities circles, elaborate style is an extremely important mode of expression.

4.4 Use of conventionalized impoliteness (taboo, abusive, or profane language) (Bousfield 2008a: 110)

Typical impoliteness formulae in Croatian and Montenegrin include cursing. Cursing is a general phenomenon; the difference between educated people and others is that educated people more successfully employ mechanisms for controlling their language in public spaces (Savić & Mitro 1998: 32). Therefore, this category is not as prominent as others. Online comments resemble more direct interaction, as illustrated in (20). Very often, cursing is removed from online comments, which makes it difficult to collect such material. However, we have identified some examples. In an online comment, a female linguist is referred to by the neologism *vucaralica*, a euphemism for 'slut'.

(20) *Nigdje ni bila ni ozbiljna ni znanstvenica (zaista), već najoibičnija vucaralica - uokolo se klatari.* [IS21]
'She was neither serious nor a researcher (really), but a simple rambler/slut—she wanders around.'

Still, there are some rare examples of abusive language in the rest of the material, not only in online comments. For example, a linguist supporting a different language narrative from the official Croatian one (i.e., the separate language narrative) is called a *nedoučena glupača* 'half-educated fool'.[25] Both 'fool' and 'slut' are very abusive.[26]

4.5 Specific features of impoliteness realizations: Creativity and intensification

Creativity was not studied in relation to impoliteness prior to Culpeper (2011). Creativity is often connected with literary language (Culpeper 2011: 240), but not exclusively confined to it. It is not surprising that creativity is a feature of our material because the discourse participants are language specialists trained to creatively use language.

According to Culpeper, there are at least four types of creativity, two of which are more applicable to face-to-face interaction than to our material type: the pattern-forming type (2011: 240) and unusual implicitness (2011: 241). Our material shows many instances of what Culpeper terms *pattern re-forming*. This pattern is realized in modifications of sayings, idioms, the use of rhyme, and other modes of expression typical for poetry. These modifications attract attention, entertain readers, and show the author's superiority. Sayings are usually rhymed. Example (21) is a modified version of *Kad nema mačke miševi kolo vode* 'when the cat's away the mice will play'. Example (22) is used to comment on the argumentation of a female linguist. The example modifies the saying *Trla baba lan, da joj prođe dan* 'it's all fiddle-faddle', 'it's just talking against time' (literally, 'an old woman crushed flax in order to get through the day'). The (modified) idiom contains the negatively evaluative noun *baba* 'old woman'. Example (23) modifies the idiom *podmetnuti* (komu) *klipove pod noge* 'put a spoke in somebody's wheel' by adding some new partly antonymic elements (*silne političke; slabašne lingvističke*); the evaluative phrase *slabašne lingvističke noge* negatively evaluates the linguistic knowledge of a female linguist.

(21) *Kad nema mačke miševi su lavovi* [IS6]
'when the cat's away the mice are lions'
(22) *Trla baba lan, da joj prođe dosadni jugounitaristčki dan* [IS19]
'An old woman crushed flax in order to get through a boring Yugo-unitary day'
(23) *. . . ona si je sama podmetnula silne političke klipove pod svoje slabašne lingvističke noge* [IS19]
literally, 'she planted many political clips for herself under her weak linguistic legs'[27]

Culpeper's creativity type *situational deviation* (creativity as an interaction between language and context) is also present in our material. In example (24), traditional twelve-syllable verse is used in a newspaper text dealing with political alliances, a situation in which poetic expression is unexpected.

(24) *Ranka kudi, a Borisu ruku nudi* [IS5]
'Scolds Ranko [Krivokapić], and offers a hand to Boris [Tadić]'

Situational deviation is also observable in using elements of administrative language register when unexpected; see example (19). These deviations occur at the sentence level, whereas in some cases a text in its entirety illustrates creativity. [IS4, IS20]

Impoliteness is a scalar phenomenon, not a fixed one. This implies the existence of different intensity degrees of impoliteness. Intensification of impoliteness is achieved through various linguistic means, some of which are commented on below.

Exaggeration through negative nouns and adjectives has already been noted in research on hate speech in the media (Bugarski 1997; Jakšić 1996). In our material, in addition to chains of negatively evaluating nouns in examples (26), (27) and (28) combinations of both negatively evaluating adjectives and nouns are found in example (25). Some of the nouns and adjectives in an 'impoliteness chain' are near-synonyms—*sakat* and *nakaradan* in example (25), *izdajstvo, kolaboracija i četništvo* in example (27)—and some are semantically less related or unrelated: *rabota, šaka mediokriteta, književničići, bura u čaši vode* in example (26), or *licemjerje, laž i groteska* in example (28).

(25) *. . . ta knjiga . . . zbog sakate, odnosno nakaradne lingvističke nazoviteorije, ne bi dobila potporu nigdje drugdje u svijetu . . .* [IS22]
'. . . that book . . . because of its lame, i.e. deformed, linguistic so-called theory, would not receive support anywhere else in the world'
(26) *. . . tko to imenom i prezimenom podupire takvu rabotu, onda je to zaista u intelektualnom smislu šaka medikriteta [sic!], odreda književničići stasali u Socijalističkome savezu ili u Titinoj gardi na Topčideru (svi pišu po malo proze, po malo poezije, a ponajviše politike), sve skupa dakle bura u čaši vode . . .* [IS22]

'whoever supports such doings under his full name, such people are in an intellectual sense a handful of mediocre, small book-men that grew up in the Socialist alliance or in Tito's guard at Topčider (all of them write a bit of prose, a bit of poetry, but mostly politics), all in all storm in a glass of water'.

(27) *Izdajstvo, kolaboracija i četništvo* [IS23]
'betrayal, collaboration, and Četnik activities'

(28) *Predstavnici opozicije poručili su sinoć Đukanoviću da njegovo najnovije gostovanje u javnosti predstavlja "paradu licemjerja, laži i groteske".*[IS24]
'The representatives of the opposition parties sent Đukanović a message yesterday evening that his latest visit to the public sphere represents a "parade of hypocrisy, lies, and the grotesque"'.

By combining different language resources, the overall impression of impoliteness is intensified. As already indicated, impoliteness realizations are most often combined in the same article (e.g., inappropriate identity markers occur with quotation marks, personalized negative assertions, and irony).

5. Functions of impoliteness

The impoliteness realizations seen here are systematic because they are constantly present in discussions about language and identity. They are strategic because they are used to incur offence to individuals or groups and because that offence is aimed at delegitimizing the other discourse participants' social standing (whose subject positions are questioned and negated), and thus downgrading or totally removing their 'voices' as relevant in a debate (Felberg & Šarić 2013). This aggressive language behavior in media texts is more common than expected.

The functions of impoliteness differ if seen from the media standpoint as opposed to the discourse participants' standpoint: the media aim to attract readers, and certain impoliteness realizations in prominent parts of texts may serve that function. Discourse participants aim to defend their views and coerce the audience. Both functions are realized as attacking others' views by all means, including impoliteness. Although the primary function at the level of the discourse participants is coercion, an affective function is also present in some cases, specifically in cases of reactive impoliteness. Affective impoliteness as 'the targeted display of heightened emotion, typically anger, with the implication that the target is to blame for producing that negative emotional state' (Culpeper 2011: 223), however, seems more constructed than genuine because our material consists of written texts, and the reactions of discourse participants are mainly postponed and well-planned. In many instances, affective impoliteness actually seems to be strategic. On the other hand, readers' comments on online articles seem to be impulsive. This is in line with Culpeper's (2011: 222–223) suggestions about the complex nature of affective impoliteness.

5.1 Media-related functions: attracting and entertaining

Common strategies observed in both Croatian and Montenegrin media are that the media frame the stories by:

a) Choosing the events with most offending potential;
b) Framing articles by choosing offending headlines and subheads that use language to cause offence;
c) Prominent placement of the article in the newspapers and on the page;
d) Choice of focus in articles and choice of photographs illustrating the article.

Because the media use the realizations of impoliteness in the most prominent text parts such as headlines, subheads, and leads, the function of impoliteness seems to be attracting and entertaining readers. Culpeper (2011: 234) proposes five sources of pleasure involved

in entertaining impoliteness: emotional, aesthetic, voyeuristic, the pleasure of being superior, and the pleasure of being secure. We deal with written discourse, and we believe that emotional (arousal), aesthetic pleasure, and the pleasure of being superior are most relevant. The discourse analyzed contained many instances of verbal creativity; see examples (21)–(24). From the perspective of the media, a creative text is possibly more attractive, at least for some readers.

The frequent use of impoliteness realizations in the media may be part of tabloidization (e.g., choosing headlines with shock potential), elements of which are observable even in serious newspapers.

5.2 Coercion and delegitimization of discourse participants
Discourse participants use impoliteness strategically, as a weapon when positioning themselves as representing rational, well-grounded, and justifiable views, and when simultaneously positioning other participants as the opposite: supporters of ignorant and implausible views. Impoliteness is strategically used against discourse participants that represent values and views different from those of a text author or certain discourse participants.

Our impression is that the producers aim less at coercion of the target (which is often the case in a face-to-face interaction) and more at coercing the audience regarding the rightness of their view on language identity, and persuading the audience to join the right view. When the views of producers and/or discourse participants match the ideological perspective of part of the audience, their impoliteness strategies towards other discourse participants contribute to establishing group cohesion.

Culpeper (2011: 234) relates verbal creativity to a frequently competitive nature of impoliteness: if one is attacked, one tries to respond with a superior attack. It is obvious that the writers of some of our texts invested much time and effort into very creative impoliteness realizations [IS4, IS20]. Creativity is a positive characteristic and as such can be considered a sign of the producer's superiority. From a media text author's perspective, the more creative the text, the more superior the author.

Discourse participants use impoliteness realizations to legitimize their own positions and delegitimize those of their opponents. By doing this, they build their own versions of power relations by constructing their own identity as true, better, and more knowledgeable, and by trying to inflict social harm on others. They criticize their opponents, their actions or inactions, or some entity in which they invested face or identity (Bousfield 2008a: 126). As Bousfield (2008b) states, when being impolite, interactants create or (re)activate some aspects of their own relative power, or challenge someone over their assumption of power. Bousfield concentrates on settings with strict and concrete hierarchies, whereas our settings—public discussions with professionals as the main actors—do not have such a strict power hierarchy.

6. Concluding remarks
We identified various realizations of impoliteness in media discourse about language and identity in both Croatian and Montenegrin material: inappropriate personal identity markers, negative personal assertions (direct and indirect), and even conventionalized impoliteness realizations (e.g., taboo words). The majority of our examples illustrate non-conventionalized, highly context-dependent impoliteness. The infrequency of the conventionalized impoliteness realizations relates to the discourse type and the profile of

discourse participants engaged in language and identity discussions. The frequency of impoliteness is higher and its forms more diverse than one would expect in discourse by the intellectual elite in the public sphere. In almost all texts in which discourse participants are given some space to express their views, one or more different realizations of impoliteness appear. Another less surprising finding is a high level of creativity at different levels (e.g., lexical creativity in neologisms, syntactic creativity in modification of idioms, and creativity at the textual level in situational deviation and creative genre uses).

Many instances of impoliteness in our material are reactive impoliteness: the discourse of one participant influences that of the next. Impoliteness realizations seem to appear in identity discourses in which one individual or group constructs its own identity as 'right' in terms of having the right knowledge or supporting the right political option. Simultaneously, the identity of the other is constructed as 'wrong', which motivates the other discourse participant to react with intensified impoliteness.

Impoliteness appears in intertextual relations and is connected to identity construction of the individuals as well as groups of people. Groups are constructed as different communities of practice within the philology sphere, but ultimately they point to political division: in Montenegrin society, to the political division between the pro-Serbian political option and pro-Montenegrin political option.

In the Croatian material, impoliteness seems to relate to intertextual relations of various genres: some features of polemics (which presumably has a high impoliteness threshold) have entered media genres in which these features are not expected.

The realizations of impoliteness in both countries have several functions. At the level of the media, the most prominent functions are attracting and entertaining readers, whereas at the level of the discourse participants the main function is coercion through legitimizing their own standpoints and delegitimizing those of their opponents.

This analysis has shown particular tendencies of how impoliteness is realized in the chosen discourse sample; however, in order to construct a more detailed categorization system, more research is needed. One should start with a quantitative comparative analysis of a larger Croatian and Montenegrin corpus, and include Serbian and Bosnian material (belonging to the same cultural sphere). It is also important to include different types of public discourse (e.g., by politicians) and sources of different political orientations aimed at different audiences. Our hypothesis is that the 'war discourse' of the 1990s influenced the contemporary discourse among intellectuals. For more definitive conclusions, a comparative view on material from different time periods, including the period before the wars, is needed.

References

Archer, D.E. (2008). "Verbal Aggression and Impoliteness: Related or Synonymous?" In: D. Bousfield and M. Locher (eds), *Impoliteness in Language: Studies on its Interplay with Power in Theory and Practice*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 181–207.

Bousfield, D. (2007). "Beginnings, middles and ends: A biopsy of the dynamics of impolite exchanges". *Journal of Pragmatics* 39(12): 2185–2216.

Bousfield, D. (2008a). *Impoliteness in Interaction*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Bousfield, D. (2008b). "Impoliteness in the Struggle for Power". In: D. Bousfield and M. Locher (eds), *Impoliteness in Language: Studies on its Interplay with Power in Theory and Practice*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 127–155.

Bucholtz, M. (1999). "'Why be normal?': Language and identity practices in a community of nerd girls". *Language in Society* 28(2): 203–223.

Bucholtz, M. and K. Hall (2005). "Identity and interaction: a socio-cultural linguistic approach". *Discourse Studies* 7(4/5): 585–614.

Bugarski, R. (1995). *Jezik od rata do mira*. Beograd: Slovograf.

Bugarski, R. (1997). *Jezik u društvenoj krizi*. Begorad: Čigoja štampa, XX vek.

Culpeper, J. (2005). "Impoliteness and 'The Weakest Link'". *Journal of Politeness Research* 1(1): 35–72.

Culpeper, J. (2008). "Reflections on Impoliteness, Relational Work and Power". In: D. Bousfield and M. Locher (eds), *Impoliteness in Language: Studies on its Interplay with Power in Theory and Practice*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 17–45.

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

Čupić, Č. (2009). "Politička kultura i mediji". *Godišnjak Fakulteta političkih znanosti 2009* 3(3): 339–353.

Đerić, G. (2008). *Intima javnosti*. Beograd: Institut za filozofiju i društvenu teoriju.

Felberg, T. R. and Lj. Šarić (2013, forthcoming). "Discursive Construction of Language Identity through Disputes in Croatian and Montenegrin Media". *Scando-Slavica*.

Garcés-Conejos Blitvich, P. (2009). "Impoliteness and identity in the American news media: The 'Culture Wars'". *Journal of Politeness Research* 5(2): 273–303.

Haarmann, H. (1999). "History". In: J. A. Fishman (ed), *Handbook of Language and Ethnic Identity*, New York: Oxford University Press, 60–76.

Haugh, M. (2007). "The discursive challenge to politeness research: An interaction alalternative". *Journal of Politeness Research* 3(2): 295–317.

Holmes, J., M. Marra, and S. Schnurr (2008). "Impoliteness and ethnicity: Māori and Pākehā discourses in New Zealand workplaces". *Journal of Politeness Research* 4(2): 193–220.

Hraste, M. (1953). "O ženskim prezimenima". *Jezik: časopis za kulturu hrvatskoga književnog jezika* 2(5): 136–140.

Hutchby, I. (2008). "Participants' orientations to interruptions, rudeness and other impolite acts in talk-in-interaction". *Journal of Politeness Research* 4(2): 221–241.

Jakšić, B. (ed). (1996). *Ka jeziku mira.* Beograd: Forum za etničke odnose.

Kolstø, P. (2009). *Media Discourse and the Yugoslav Conflicts: Representation of Self and Other.* Cornwall: Ashgate.

Kordić, S. (2010). *Jezik i nacionalizam.* Zagreb: Durieux.

Kuna, B. (2009). "Uljudnost i njeni učinci u komunikaciji". *Lingua Montenegrina* (3): 81–93.

Locher, M.A. and R. J. Watts. (2008). "Relational Work and Impoliteness: Negotiating Norms of Linguistic Behaviour". In: D. Bousfield and M. Locher (eds), *Impoliteness in Language: Studies on its Interplay with Power in Theory and Practice*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 77–101.

Marjanović, S. (2006). "Primjeri izabrani na osnovu preporuka lingvistkinje Svenke Savić", in N. Drobnjak (ed), *On je rekla, upotreba rodno-senzitivnog jezika*,

Podgorica: Kancelarija za ravnopravnost polova Vlade Republike Crne Gore, 96–99.

Marot, D. (2005). "Uljudnost u verbalnoj i neverbalnoj komunikaciji". *Fluminiensia* 17(1): 53–70.

Mills, S. (2008). *Language and Sexism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Paltridge, B. (2012). *Discourse Analysis*. London: Bloomsbury.

Perović, M.A., J. Silić and Lj. Vasiljeva. (2010). *Pravopis crnogorskoga jezika*. Podgorica: Ministarstvo prosvjete i nauke.

Perović, S. (2011). "You want an apology? Well, I'm sorry!" In: Vasić, V. (ed), *Jezik u upotrebi. Primjenjena lingvistika u čast Ranku Bugarskom*. Novi Sad: Filozofski fakultet, 181–199.

Savić, S. and V. Mitro (1998). *Psovke!!!* Novi Sad: Futura publikacije.

Savić, S., M. Čanak, V. Mitro, and G. Štasni (eds). (2009). *Rod i jezik.* Novi Sad: Ženske studije i istražvianja i Futura publikacije.

Spencer-Oatey, H. (2007). "Theories of identity and the analysis of face". *Journal of Pragmatics* 39(4): 639–656.

Vukobrat, B. (2013). "Zurovac: Zaustavljanja širenja govora mržnje putem medija". *Radio Slobodna Evropa*, 21 Jan. 2013.

White, P.R. (1999). *Telling Media Tales: The News Story as Rhetoric*, unpublished PhD Thesis. Sydney: University of Sydney.

Internet sources

IS1: Rat za hrvatski jezik i pravopis (I. dio). http://hakave.org/index.php?option=com_content&id=7171:dr-sc-mario-grevi-rat-za-hrvatski-jezik-i-pravopis-i-dio.

IS2: The Constitution of Montenegro.

http://www.comparativeconstitutionsproject.org/files/Montenegro_2007.pdf

IS3: Ni milicije nisu od hrvatskog i srpskog napravile jedan jezik.

http://www.vecernji.hr/vijesti/ni-milicije-nisu-hrvatskog-srpskog-napravile-jedan-jezik-clanak-189062.

IS4: Novak Kilibarda: Velikosrpska ofanziva ne prestaje.

http://www.pobjeda.me/arhiva/?datum=2011-02-26&id=202262.

IS5: Ranka Kudi, a Borisu ruku nudi.

http://www.dan.co.me/?nivo=3&rubrika=Politika&clanak=325602&datum=2012-03-29.

IS6: Migo krši sporazum o jeziku.

http://www.dan.co.me/?nivo=3&rubrika=Povodi&datum=2012-03-20&clanak=324451.

IS7: Rifatu smeta srpski jezik.

http://www.dan.co.me/?nivo=3&rubrika=Povodi&datum=2012-01-10&clanak=314921.

IS8: Uvrede pseudolingvistice.

http://www.matica.hr/Vijenac/vijenac466.nsf/AllWebDocs/Uvrede_pseudolingvistice.

IS9: Prvosvještenica hrama nauke. http://www.arhiva-medija.com/docs/Arhimed_prvosvjestenica-hrama-nauke.pdf.

IS10: Kad je već sve isto, neka gđa Snježana Kordić uvjeri Srbe da prijeđu na hrvatski jezik.

http://www.vecernji.hr/index.php?cmd=show_clanak&clanak_id=193504&action=print_popup.

IS11: Oživljavanje novosadskog pravopisnog Frankensteina.

http://www.dnevno.hr/kolumne/zvonimir-hodak/48301-ozivljavanje-novosadskog-pravopisnog-frankensteina.html.

IS12: Ministarstvo kulture RH protiv hrvatskoga jezika. http://hakave.org/index.php/
reportae/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=6713:ministarstvo-
kulture-rh-protiv-hrvatskoga-jezika&catid=93:hrvoje-hitrec&Itemid=33.

IS13: Jezik srpski, nacionalizam hrvatski. http://hakave.org/index.php?option=com_
content&id=6662:jezik-srpski-nacionalizam-hrvatski.

IS14: Kod nas ljudi robuju pogrešnom uvjerenju da se nacija i jezik moraju podudarati.
http://www.mirovna-akademija.org/rma/index.php?option=com_content&view=
article&id=218%3Akonferencija&catid=41%3Arelated&lang=bhs.

IS15: Čirgić odgovorio kolegama: Podsjećamo na naučni sterilitet.
http://www.vijesti.me/kultura/cirgic-odgovorio-kolegama-podsjecamo-naucni-
sterilitet-clanak-69037.

IS16: Plan za jezik pišu ekstremisti iz DPS-a.
http://www.dan.co.me/?nivo=3&rubrika=Povodi&datum=2012-01-
30&clanak=317912.

IS17: Nakaradna politika nadvladala razum.
http://www.dan.co.me/?nivo=3&datum=2012-
0608&rubrika=Kultura&najdatum=2012-06-
07&clanak=334164&naslov=Nakaradna%20politika%20nadvaladala%20razum.

IS18: "Avetna lingvistika" za mlade mozgove.
http://www.dan.co.me/?nivo=3&rubrika=Feljton&datum=2011-11-
18&clanak=307072&naslov=%26%238222%3BAvetna%20lingvistika%26%2382
20%3B%20za%20mlade%20mozgove.

IS19: Otrovne laži o jeziku. http://www.h-alter.org/vijesti/kultura/otrovne-lazi-o-jeziku

IS20: Ugovor s đavlom. http://globus.jutarnji.hr/komentari/boris-dezulovic/hitrec-
prijavio-rudera-boskovica-bajicu.

IS21: Snježana Kordić izgubljena u lingvistici & europeiziranoj Hrvatskoj.
http://amac.hrvati-
amac.com/index2.php?option=com_content&do_pdf=1&id=3941.

IS22: Razgovor: Zvonko Pandžić filozof i filolog. http://amac.hrvati-
amac.com/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=3765&Itemid=192.

IS23: Mugoša: Medijska scena je gadluk.

http://www.dan.co.me/?nivo=3&rubrika=Podgoricom&clanak=327201&datum=20

12-04-10.

IS24: Parada licemjerja, laži i groteske.

http://www.dan.co.me/?nivo=3&rubrika=Vijest%20dana&datum=2012-04-

28&clanak=329571.

All Internet sources last accessed in February 2013.

---

[1] Culpeper (2005: 66) states that people 'can and do take offence in those situations' in which they actually should not take offence at impoliteness because it is part of the rules of the game.

[2] The authors of this article have a thorough knowledge of the cultural conventions in the societies discussed, and specifically of the conventions within the humanities and philology.

[3] The fact that discourse participants deem some phenomena impolite is confirmed in some texts in which some discourse participants comment on the impoliteness or rudeness of other participants. See, e.g., *Uvrede pseudolingvistice* (IS8). The word *uvrede* 'insults' from the title of this quote's source also refers to a previous insulting event.

[4] Serbo-Croatian was the official language in four Yugoslav republics: Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, Montenegro, and Serbia.

[5] These sources represent different political orientations that cannot be further elaborated here.

[6] Their reactions to impoliteness cannot be analyzed here.

[7] There are different views on how important the intention to be impolite by the speaker (and recognition of that intention by the hearer) is in defining impoliteness (see, e.g., Culpeper 2008; Bousfield 2008; Holmes et al. 2008; Locher & Watts 2008; Haugh 2007; Hutchby 2008).

[8] Very few articles deal with politeness (e.g., Marot 2005; Perović 2011).

[9] On 'strategic' impoliteness, see, for example, Bousfield (2008a: 88) and references cited there, and Garcés-Conejos Blitvich (2009); on functions of impoliteness in our material, see Section 5.

[10] *Hrvatsko kopiranje nacističkog purizma* (Croatian Copying of Nazi Purism (subtitle of a book chapter); Kordić 2010: 16).

[11] Language disputes are conceptualized as battles within a war scenario; see Felberg & Šarić 2013.

[12] See endnote 3.

[13] Reactive impoliteness/rudeness is one case in which impoliteness might be appropriate; hence, Culpeper's claim that being inappropriate should not be part of a definition of impoliteness (Culpeper 2011: 206).

[14] We have not done the quantitative analysis because more material is needed for such an analysis.

[16] These forms are obsolete. They were usual in the first half of twentieth century; *X-eva* refers to a female as a daughter of X, and *X-ka* to a wife of X (Hraste 1953).

[17] E.g., 'nadam se da će *Kordićkinu* knjigu čitati mlađi i neopterećeni ljudi . . .' Lingvistička bojna, *Novi list*, 10 Oct. 2010.

[18] Zvonko Pandžić, *Od Galileja do zlatne ptičice*. *Republika* 7/8, 2009, 138–164.

[19] *Sad imaju viška slova*, Dan, 18 Sept. 2010 (pp. 1, 11).

[20] In Serbian, for example, the ending *-ka* has almost disappeared from use or is a sign of familiarity (Marjanović 2006: 97). In promoting gender-sensitive language, it is proposed that the endings *-eva* and *-ka* not be used at all because they imply belonging to a male (Savić et al. 2009: 23).

[21] . . . svoju sakatu, u Njemačkoj propalu teoriju, danas prodaje nekim zadrtim jugoslavenima u Zagrebu . . . '. . . she is now selling her maimed theory that failed in Germany to some bigoted Yugoslavs in Zagreb'. (IS18)

[22] See Perović et al. (2010: 100–102).

[23] Slobodan Šnajder, *Lingvistička bojna*, *Novi list*, 10 Oct. 2010, p. 6.

---

24 In this article we cannot go deeper into the differences between irony and sarcasm.

25 HKV (15 Sept. 2010): *ništa [hrvatski jezik] na ovome svijetu ne može pomaknuti, a kamoli provokacije jedne nedoučene glupače* 'nothing in this world can shake it [the Croatian language], not to mention provocations by a half-educated fool'.

26 It has frequently been emphasized that (im)politeness does not exist in the lexicon or in grammatical structures taken out of context (see, e.g., Bousfield 2008b: 136; Archer 2008: 190). However, it is acknowledged that there are nevertheless many words and phrases that are considered impolite both conventionally and across different discourses (e.g., taboo words); that is, that certain linguistic units do 'facework' more frequently than others (Bousfield 2008b: 151).

27 Examples (22) and (23) are taken from the comments on an online text.