

Ableist Violence: Impoliteness Strategies in The Dramatic Discourse of Ola Rotimi's *Hopes of the Living Dead*

Udoh Chinwe, PhD

Department of English and Literature,
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka
vc.udoh@unizik.edu.ng

&

Vivian Kaoaisochukwu Ejiaso

Coal City University, Emene
vivian@gouni.edu.ng

Abstract

This study examines face threatening comments on persons with disability as violence. It investigates the impoliteness strategies in dialogic discourses of characters in the play, *Hopes of the Living Dead* by Ola Rotimi. The study argues that persons with disability are face threatened and attacked in their language exchanges with able characters in the play. The qualitative and quantitative analysis are adopted for the study. Ten sentence extracts were purposively sampled for analysis. Adopting Jonathan Culpeper's impoliteness theoretical framework, the findings reveal that five impoliteness super-strategies: bald on record impoliteness super-strategy, positive impoliteness super-strategy, negative impoliteness super-strategy, withhold impoliteness strategy and sarcasm impoliteness super-strategy are deployed in the violence against persons with disability in the play. The researchers recommend that regardless of people's embodiment, "face" should be saved and not threatened to maintain the integrity of their humanity. The study, therefore, concludes that the play is a critique of the violating impoliteness in discourses with and about people with disability.

Keywords: impoliteness strategies, discourse, face, disability, face attack, face threat

Introduction

Violence manifests both in tangible and intangible forms. On the aspect of tangible forms of violence, its manifestation is seen in physical ways such as physical injuries, whereas intangible forms include all forms of violence that are non-physical. It could be emotional, psychological, oral/linguistic and so on.

In human society, *homo sapiens* are known to possess interactional trait; as such, they live by interacting with one another. In such oral/linguistic interaction, people are bound to 'threaten' or 'save' the other in such discursive situations. In cases where to "threaten" the other/hearer is obtainable, the 'speaker' employs certain strategies that harms 'face' such that the hearer interprets such utterance or act as threatening. Impoliteness strategies are tools employed for the realization of threats or harms in interactional situations. Most form of human communication medium is language. That is why Ricoeur (1974, p.34) asserts that "language as speech is such that it is the place where violence reaches expression...". Thus, one could say that impoliteness could be seen as a form of violence meted to another person through linguistic acts. Impoliteness is seen as interactional strategies employed by interlocutor(s) to cause harm or threaten another's face resulting to friction and crisis. Language as a form of violence, Olorunsogo (2020) as cited in Udoh and Ejiaso (2022) "involves emotional consequences for the target [victim]". For Taiwo (2020: 122), impoliteness "attacks somebody's identity or rights, thereby causing specific emotional reactions (e.g. hurt, anger)".

Over the years, scholars have investigated impoliteness strategies use in certain contexts to ascertain its usage and impacts. Anyanwu and Udoh (2021) investigated the use of impoliteness strategies in cyber-bullying utterances on social media; Ononye, Ikenwa and Ugwuagbo (2021) studied the impoliteness in online reaction on media reports on 2019 Nigerian presidential election victory declaration and Igwebuikwe and Eburuaja (2020) examined the use of impoliteness strategies in the satirical song of Falz, 'This is Nigeria'.

The play, *Hopes of the Living Dead* by Ola Rotimi depicts various ways 'able' characters go violent on 'disabled' ones, here they are lepers, by deploying the use of impoliteness strategies in their communicative interactions. Little or no studies have been done on this play using pragmatic research framework. Thus, the researchers' objectives to investigate the forms of impoliteness strategies, which are viewed as violent, that 'able' characters use on 'disabled' ones.

The Concept of Impoliteness

Impoliteness refers to the act of using face-attacking linguistic strategies to harm another person. For Culpeper, impoliteness means communicative strategies that are used to attack face, thereby cause social conflict and disharmony (2016). It is the use of strategies that are designed to have opposite effect – social disruption or

disharmony and these strategies are oriented towards attacking face (Goffman, 1967; Brown & Levinson, 1987, as cited in Culpeper 1996). The act of being impolite results in disharmony of interaction. This could be seen when a particular interlocutor, a speaker, for instance, who intentionally employs certain communicative strategies to harm either the positive or negative face of another interlocutor, say a hearer, in a particular discursive context. Interestingly, both participants in interaction, say a speaker and hearer, have the tendency to infer that a particular utterance made is said with the intention to hurt or harm face (of the hearer), invariably creating friction or discontinuance of interaction. At times impolite utterances which more or less could impact on the 'victim' emotionally or psychologically, could also lead to physical fight. Because of this understanding of politeness from this dimension, Culpeper revised the definition of impoliteness. For him, "impoliteness comes about when: (1) the speaker communicates face attack intentionally, or (2) the hearer perceives and/or construes behaviour as intentionally face-threatening, or a combination of (1) and (2)," (2005: 38).

The direct conversationalists, an addressee, perceives if an utterance from a speaker, direct conversationalist, is face-threatening. Thus, could react in order to express feeling from the impact of such utterance that is made by a speaker. However, it is quite unclear what the reaction of direct addressee (Conversationalist A) could be when an impolite utterance made by a speaker (Conversationalist B) to him (Conversationalist A) is not seen as impolite but a third interlocutor, an indirect hearer, (Conversationalist C) perceives such as face-threatening. This creates room for further researches.

Types of Impoliteness

According to Culpeper, three forms of impoliteness exist: coercive, affective and entertaining impoliteness.

1. **Coercive Impoliteness:** is a type of impoliteness seen when a particular interlocutor gains power through the use of language. This could be seen in acts such as commands or orders. For example, "Stand still!", "Shut the door!"
2. **Affective Impoliteness:** is seen in a speaker's expressions of anger towards the other interlocutor/hearer and consequently creates negative atmosphere for them.
3. **Entertaining Impoliteness:** a type of impoliteness that creates amusement from the victim's feelings of hurt. That is to say that it occurs when the speaker makes fun of the hearer and utilizes the target's feelings to cause laughter.

Face

Face refers to self-image or social value one has created for oneself in interaction, which could be tampered with by either protecting or damaging it. For Udoh and Ejiaso (2022), "face could be lost or damaged if it is threatened". Face is saved by respecting or protecting it. For every individual, there are two faces: positive and negative in their possession, just like a two-faced coin. One's negative face demands non-imposition, non-interference nor intrusion into one's privacy. It demands respect and shows independence. Udoh and Ejiaso (2022) refers to negative face as face independence or non-interference on somebody's face. Positive face demands acceptance, agreement and solidarity.

These faces could be threatened as well as saved. Either of this could result to disharmony or conflict and harmony or successful conversational situations. Power, social distance and rank or size of imposition of acts are major ways faces could be affected.

For each of these faces lies certain 'wants' they need, which protecting such wants, that means saving face, whereas, harming such face means depriving the face its wants. Positive face wants seeks for acceptance, agreement, friendship/relationship and solidarity whereas negative face wants seeks for non-imposition nor intrusion. It demands avoidance and utmost respect.

Power

Power as a force of dominance and authority exist in every society. In human society, for instance, power exists imbalanced in that certain individuals or groups enjoy "force of dominance" through their different channels of authorities, whereas others, 'ordinary people' are left with no power. Power changes in certain situations. For instance, in a classroom, teacher has power over student. The same teacher could be less powerful in another context. For instance, in the church, a pastor/priest has power over the teacher who is a church member. The person, who is powerful, tends to control discourses and navigate its direction.

Impoliteness has greater chances of occurrence where there is asymmetrical existence of power relations between interlocutors. That is not to say that where there is symmetrical power relations or intimate relationships between interlocutors, that there is no use of impoliteness because intimacy or people that like themselves, naturally, show concern for each other's face. Even insults are likely not to be taken seriously, because they could be seen as "banter when directed at targets liked by the speaker (Culpeper, 1996: 353). For Culpeper, "in a familiar relationship, one has more scope for impoliteness: one may know which aspects of face are particularly sensitive to attack, and one may be able to better predict and/or cope with retaliation that may ensue (1996:354)

A. The Synopsis of the play, *Hope of the Living Dead* by Ola Rotimi

The play *Hope of the Living Dead* by Ola Rotimi, depicts the life of struggle littered with enormous challenges that persons with disability, those with leprosy disease, face especially in the hands of able characters. The play which is based in Nigeria spotlights the rebellion. Ikoli Harcourt Whyte, who is at the center of the play, and having been made leader by the group, fights the British administration that include the senior medical officer, the superintendent of police, the matron and many others in the administration.

After Dr. Fergusson's departure to London, the leprosy patients have their hope of being cured declining by day because the doctor has brought them to use as experiment in bringing the medicine to cure them. Harcourt Whyte, infected with skin leprosy, fights for the rights of the other inmates by approaching the authority with their current and future plights. At the end, the Senior Medical Officer, SMO, brought hope to the inmates that they (the inmates) were to be moved to Uzuakoli, their 'promise land' according to the dictates of authority. Upon this, Harcourt Whyte maintains that they are going to do things themselves henceforth and be ready to face and combat any challenges that may come their way as against what they saw in the hands of the authority after Dr. Fergusson left for London earlier in the play. He made the other inmates seek for independence because their dependence on the authority harms them.

Theoretical Framework:

The Jonathan Culpeper's impoliteness pragmatic theoretical framework is adopted in this study.

Impoliteness has strategies of their output which show the realizations of face-attack in utterances of speakers.

Impoliteness Strategies

Impoliteness strategies are acts that are used to face threaten or face-attack others. They are communicative forms that are concerned with attacking or harming face. There are five impoliteness strategies: bald-on-record, positive, negative, sarcasm or mock politeness and withhold politeness.

On the aspect of Bald on-record impoliteness, it involves a situation where a face-threatening act is performed in the most conspicuous, direct, brief and unambiguous way where face is relevant or maximized. Much face is at stake here and the speaker intentionally employs this strategy to attack the face of the hearer. In this strategy, cooperative principle "must be adhered to" (Culpeper, 2016, 42) he further added that "to be impolite, one still needs to cooperate in the exchange of information, i.e. uphold the cooperative principle at some level, in order to get one's impoliteness message across" (42).

Positive impoliteness super strategy refers to communicative strategies that are employed to attack and damage the addressees' or hearers' positive faces wants. Such positive impoliteness output strategies, as proposed by Culpeper, include: ignore/snub the other; exclude the other from activity; disassociate from the other; be disinterested, unconcerned, unsympathetic; use inappropriate identity markers; use obscure or secretive language; seek disagreement by selecting a sensitive topic; make the other feel uncomfortable; use taboo or profane words; call the other names etc.

On the aspect of negative impoliteness, it involves the use of interactional strategies to damage the addressee's negative face wants. Negative impoliteness output strategies include: frighten/instill a belief that action detrimental to the other will occur; condescend, scorn or ridicule; do not treat the other seriously; invade the other's space; explicitly associate the other with a negative aspect; put the other's indebtedness on record; violate the structure of conversation/interrupt conversation etc.

In sarcasm or mock politeness or banter here, the speaker performs FTA by using politeness strategies that are insincere and thus its meaning is deduced only from superficial realization. No deep meaning is given to it because in the context where it is used, given the clues of politeness strategies employed, the hearer deduces that such utterances is untrue as used in that context. For Culpeper (2005) "banter or mock impoliteness remains on the surface, because it is understood in particular context not to be true" (37). Sarcasm impoliteness or banter is interpreted as with no intention to cause offence (Culpeper, 1996: 352) rather amusement and fun. Through this, one could say that impoliteness is entertaining as it creates light and fun-filled atmosphere.

Withhold politeness involves the non-use of politeness strategies in contexts where they are expected to be employed. For example, failing to appreciate someone for a favor done for one or failing to thank someone for a present. These failures are withheld politeness thus could be taken as a deliberate impoliteness.

Methodology

This study employs qualitative and descriptive research designs. This is considered appropriate given the samples of data collected from a literary masterpiece, a play, in order to uncover forms of impoliteness used by able characters on disabled characters which are seen as violence, as it goes with emotional results on the hearer(s).

Ten instances of conversations are purposively extracted from the play so as to examine impoliteness strategies employed by able characters in their language exchanges to face threaten and attack the face of persons with disability.

The Data and Analysis

Tabular Presentation of the Data and Location in the Text

| S/n | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Frequency |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|-----------------|
| Positive Impoliteness Strategies | “No one is seeking your opinion” (p.6) | ... “that while your festivity lasts, there might be other patients- I mean <i>regular</i> patients....” (p.11) | ... “the order from the Department of Health that all patients in Wards G and H vacate the hospital premises by 5 a.m. tomorrow, is in the interest of the public health.” (p.43) | “Gentlemen, let me ask a question would you like a leprosy epidemic in the land?” (p. 44) | “You are talking of catfish, croaker, mudskippers – still in the waters!- (p.75) | Five (5)times |
| Bald on Record Impoliteness | “As you were! ...Don’t move. I say!” ... (p.4) | | | | | Once (1 time) |
| Negative Impoliteness Strategies | “Gentlemen, let me ask a question would you like a leprosy epidemic in the land?” (p. 44) | ... “People like you!” ... (p.69) | “Trust? H-a-r-c-o-u-r-t! you- my teacher! Just when I’m becoming an expert in your ‘trust nobody’ philosophy, my own teacher is ...” ... (p.93) | | | Three (3) times |
| Sarcasm or Banter (Impoliteness) | ‘Well. Just to show you much the people appreciate our work with you’ (p.12) | | | | | Once (1 time) |
| Withhold Impoliteness | ... “since when did you become the spokesman for the ...” (p.6) | | | | | Once (1 time) |

Positive Impoliteness Strategies

Excerpt 1

(A Part of Conversation where the Matron is addressing Catechist in Happenings I)

CAT: You asked a simple question, and he gave you a simple answer.

Matron: **No one is seeking your opinion.** (*turns again to the Editor*) In the first place, I was addressing him...

Analysis

In excerpt 1, the Matron uses positive impoliteness output strategy of disassociation to exclude the Catechist. She employed this strategy in order to hurt his positive face wants. This act of exclusion could be credited to the position of power or authority she enjoys in the hospital. Because of the bilateral power relationship that exists between the 'disabled' inmates and the Matron, who is a representative of the British administration, she more or less gives little or no care to the kinds of utterances she made to the inmates and it is worthy to note that such power she wields gives her the privilege to want to hurt the 'face' of the inmates every now and then.

Excerpt 2

(A Part of Conversation Where the SMO, addressing the inmates in wards D and G)

Hannah: We were only... trying to keep ourselves happy. That's all.

SMO: It wasn't curfew time, and you were entertaining yourselves. Fair enough. But have you ever – this is a general question everybody; have you tried to think for a second, **that while your festivity lasts, there might be other patients – I mean, regular patients,** who are being disturbed?

Editor: those 'regular' patients, as you call them, sir – they receive regular visitors. Daily. Wives visit them, bringing food; husbands stop by, bringing fruits. Friends cheer them; children hug them. We are, well, you know...

SMO: That's no reason why your pleasures should disturb their peace when they need it.

Analysis

Here, the disabled characters are excluded from the rest of the patient's in the General hospital by the SMO's use of address term, 'regular patients' for 'able' patients. The SMO's use of 'regular' address term for the able inmates further shows the exclusivist approach of the 'authority' on leprosy inmates, which denies the inmate's positive face wants, that seeks for solidarity and acceptance. One could also see that the position of authority which gives him the power he controls, gave him the right to care less about the 'other'. The asymmetrical power relation between the SMO and the inmates resulted in the inappropriate terms used on the inmates, because, obviously, the inmates cannot do anything regarding what they are addressed as. Through this avenue, the SMO creates a marginalized atmosphere that relegates and degrades the 'disabled' characters. This marginalization is an aspect of violence that restricts, as such has negative impacts on the victims.

Excerpt 3

(A Conversation between the SMO, HW, Nweke, Superintendent of Police, SUPT. in the office of the SMO in Happenings III)

SUPT.: ... **The order from the Department of Health that all patients in Wards G and H vacate the hospital premises by 5 p.m. tomorrow, is in the interest of public health.** And that order is final. Having made that clear, I need to add that we do sympathize with your situation. No doubts about that. All the same, we trust, you too will understand that personal sentiments have no place in the exigencies of service to the people. That is all...

Analysis

In excerpt 3, the positive face wants of the inmates are attacked by the superintendent's use of positive impoliteness strategy of being disinterested and unconcerned. Through the superintendent's address to the leprosy inmates at the hospital, we could see that the 'interest' of the leprosy inmates, who are disabled by their various physical impediments, are not considered. The government showed that 'they' are not part of the public even their health status. Thus, are ordered to vacate the General Hospital where they were being given medical treatment but halted after Dr. Fergusson left.

Excerpt 4

(A Part of Conversation where the SMO, interrogates, HW and Nweke, in Happenings III)

SMO: Just to clear any misconceptions... (*addressing Harcourt Whyte and Nweke*) **Gentlemen, let me ask a question would you like a leprosy epidemic in the land?**

NWEKE: The Heavens forbid!

Harcourt Whyte shakes his head.

Analysis

Here, the positive face wants of Nweke and Harcourt Whyte are attacked by the SMO's use of positive and negative impoliteness strategies; seek disagreement by selecting a sensitive topic and frighten (instill a belief that action detrimental to the other will occur). On the aspect of positive impoliteness strategy, the SMO's selection of a sensitive topic as 'leprosy epidemic' if the 'disabled' inmates do not leave the general hospital kicks against the request of Harcourt Whyte and his fellows, who seeks to stay back and be accepted.

Excerpt 5

(Conversation between HW and the SUPT. In Happenings VI)

HW: And what about the others: Nweke, Hannah, Court Clerks, Mallam, Editor Catechist –

SUPT.: My dear fellow, our talk is about you. Your well-being. The crayfish is in your basket now. **You are talking of catfish, croakers, mudskippers – still in the waters!** Anyway...

Analysis:

In Excerpt 5, the positive face want of Harcourt Whyte is denied him by the superintendent's use of derogatory terms equating to animals on human beings. The superintendent's calling the other friends and family of Harcourt Whyte in the hospital as 'catfish', 'croakers' and 'mudskippers', expresses the way he actually sees the 'disabled' inmates at the hospital. Such derogatory terms used harms the acceptance and agreement code of positive face that Harcourt Whyte wants. Thus, violence manifestation which invariably contributes to HW bad feels and continuous degradation of their personalities by those in power.

Bald on-Record Impoliteness Strategy

Excerpt 6

(Matron of the General Hospital addressing the inmates'/leprosy patients in Happenings I)

Matron: **As you were!** Everybody. **Don't move. I say!** Hannah// that's it. now, **as you were...**// Hands under the mattress, Miss Hannah; head turned to the dancer- **as you were!**

Analysis

In this excerpt, the Matron of the General Hospital, who is an able character in the play and also enjoys a position of power as seen in her title 'matron' gives orders to the inmates in Wards H and H, who are leprosy patients, as such 'disabled' characters. These orders clearly and blatantly damage the face wants of the inmates. These orders as instantiated in the Matron's response, such as "Don't move!", "As you were!" are short, concise and direct way of attacking the faces of the inmates that are at stake. Further on in the utterance, the Matron, specifically orders Miss Hannah, who is one of the inmates at the hospital, to 'hands under the mattress'. It could be interpreted that the speaker, who has asymmetrical power relations with the 'others', uses such powerful disposition to order and face-attack the inmates, who are at their mercy. Thus, such is impoliteness is considered violent on the addressees as the deployed impolite utterances of the speaker invariably results in impacting both on the psychological and emotional beings of the addressees.

Negative Impoliteness Strategies:

Excerpt 7

(A Part of Conversation where the SMO, interrogates, HW and Nweke, in Happenings III)

SMO: Just to clear any misconceptions... (*addressing Harcourt Whyte and Nweke*) **Gentlemen, let me ask a question would you like a leprosy epidemic in the land?**

NWEKE: The Heavens forbid!

Harcourt Whyte shakes his head.

Analysis

Here, the negative face wants of Nweke and Harcourt Whyte are attacked by the SMO's use of positive and negative impoliteness strategies; seek disagreement by selecting a sensitive topic and frighten (instill a belief that action detrimental to the other will occur). The negative impoliteness strategy of frightening used by the SMO to instill fear into Harcourt Whyte and Nweke that their staying back could lead to an epidemic of leprosy, which their reactions showed that they would not want such. Such frightening damaged their negative face want of not to receive any form of imposition on their personalities.

Excerpt 8

(A Conversation between CC, HW and Superintendent in Happenings VI)

CC: We are right like this, sir.

SUPT.: ... Government is proposing to build a hospital for people ... **people like you.** That's what I've been discussing with SMO. They had a meeting on the matter last night. Now, in the meantime, the decision is that you remain in Port Harcourt. (pause). Well, not in the General Hospital, of course – your present wards are needed for regular patients.

Analysis

Here, the face of the inmates' representatives Court Clerk and Harcourt Whyte are attacked by the superintendent's use of negative impoliteness output strategy; explicitly associate the other with a negative aspect by use of pronoun 'you'. This strategy stands as a reminder that the 'disabled' inmates are not part of the general people and needs a separate medical establishment far from that of 'regular patients'. This further shows the marginalization violence experienced by the 'disabled' hospital inmates, which come to light through the language use punctuated by impoliteness strategies.

Excerpt 9

(A Conversation between HW, SMO and SUPT. In Happenings VIII)

SMO: Besides you never asked for such explanation, did you?

HW: (*fatigued*) No ... I ... I trusted too much.

Supt.: (*mock astonishment*) **Trust? H-a-r-c-o-u-r-t! you- my teacher! Just when I'm becoming an expert in your "trust nobody" philosophy**, my own teacher is ... (*forlornly*) A-a-a-h-h!

Analysis:

In Excerpt 9, the negative face of Harcourt Whyte is face attacked through a negative impoliteness output strategy—scorn, or ridicule. The officers, Senior Medical Officer and the Superintendent of Police, ridicule Harcourt Whyte over his unfortunate reality that resulted in his asking no questions about the offers given to them to move to IDH at Uzuakoli. The Superintendent makes mockery of Harcourt Whyte's situation and pokes fun at his letting his trust guard down as well as blames him for his sad reality.

Sarcasm or Banter Impoliteness Strategy:

Excerpt 10

(A Part of Conversation Between the Senior Medical Officer, SMO, and the leprosy inmates e.g. Editor, Court Clerk, CC, Hannah etc. in Happenings I)

SMO: Rubbish, yes! If what we'll be getting from you is ingratitude and impertinence. From the public, we get disgust and reproach. Daily. It all means that our experiment with you is all rubbish. You know what the public calls the Doctor, don't you? The mad Scotsman!

Editor: Jesus wept!

CC: Please – don't!

SMO: **Well. Just to show you how much the people appreciate our work with you!**

Analysis

In excerpt 10, the Senior Medical Officer used a positive politeness strategy that the people appreciate the hospital's work on the 'disabled' inmates, but it is obviously insincere and on the surface, thus considered a banter or sarcasm impoliteness. The SMO's employment of this strategy is as irony, which he meant the opposite of it. Thus, the sentence stretch 'well. Just to show how much the people appreciate our work with you' is a sarcasm, and his intended meaning, which his interlocutors are to infer is that the 'people' do not appreciate the inmates' presence at the hospital.

Withhold Impoliteness Strategy:

Excerpt 11

(A Part of Conversation with the Hospital Matron and 'Disabled' Inmates, Catechist and Editor)

Matron: ... **Since when did you become the spokesman for the...** (restrains herself from describing the group) or who do you think you are?

CAT: Another question.

Editor: Leper, madam. I am a leper – like the rest ... of them... (with a sweep of the arm taking in the entire inmates) Lepers, lepers all – at the mercy of the hospital authorities.

Analysis

In excerpt 11, the Matron used Withhold impoliteness strategy to face attack the face of leprosy inmates. In addressing the hospital patients, the Matron withheld uttering an address term, which is inferred as hurtful if used in that context, and the Editor, whom she is directly addressing, completed the elliptic part by saying "Leper, madam. I am a leper – like the rest....." this impoliteness is considered violent as it negatively impacts on the feelings of the inmates who feel inferior and unaccepted.

Discussion of Findings

From the analysis above, this study has shown that impoliteness strategies are used in the text. From the ten data excerpts the researchers sampled for the analysis, the results of frequency of the different types of impoliteness strategies that are used are: Positive impoliteness output strategies are used more than the others (five times), negative impoliteness (three times), sarcasm/banter (once), bald on-record impoliteness strategy (once) and withheld impoliteness strategy (once), by powerful participants in their linguistic exchanges with less powerful/less privileged participants/interlocutors. These impoliteness outputs strategies are used to hurt/damage the 'face' of the less privileged discourse participants. In excerpts 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5, the powerful participants (such as Senior Medical Officer, Superintendent of Police, Matron etc.) employ positive impoliteness strategy outputs to damage the positive face (wants) of the inmates with disability. In Excerpts 7, 8 and 9, the discursal participants in the position of authority face threatens the negative face of the inmates, thus interfering in their privacies. Banter or sarcasm (impoliteness) is evidenced in excerpt 10, while bald on-record impoliteness that is employed to directly

face attack an addressee is used in excerpt six (6). Excerpt 11 manifests the use of withhold impoliteness by certain well-placed participants in the society.

The able characters, who enjoy position of authority as such privileged to control the direction or pattern of flow of their conversations with the 'disabled' characters. Through their use of impoliteness output strategies in their conversation with 'disabled' characters (leprosy inmates), the atmosphere of marginalization and inequality is created and strengthened. And the silence given off by the society/ public towards this unfair treatment to the 'disabled' characters as seen in the play, shows how the less privileged, say people with disability, for instance, in the society, are mistreated and poorly addressed in their linguistic exchanges with 'able' persons. This negative treatment and the use of impoliteness strategies on persons with disability are considered violence, as it causes great consequences on the emotional, psychological and even physical beings of the victims. On the emotional and psychological aspect, the 'victim' could develop a feeling of inferiority and also an ideology of not being accepted by the society and negative thought pattern of relating with others in the society, thus could resort to living a life a solitude. The victim could, because of the gravity the impoliteness strategy that he/she has received may injure himself/herself physically, in an extreme case commit suicide.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The forms of impoliteness super strategies used on disabled characters by able characters are the five impoliteness strategies according to Culpeper; bald on-record, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, sarcasm or banter and withhold impoliteness strategies. These impoliteness strategies are considered form of violence meted on the 'disabled' characters, which results in consequences manifesting on the emotional, psychological and physical being of the victims.

Hopes of the Living Dead by Ola Rotimi depicts how the human society, Nigeria as the setting of the play, view these set of persons with disability. This negative treatment fosters as well as widens the gap of inequality or marginalization, which hinders socio-economic and political growth of the economy.

It is recommended that every Tom, Dick and Harry, more specifically those in power, to always checkmate and censor their language use on people with disability so as to break and narrow down the inequality gap that exists in the State. Again, government should establish edifices where people with disability would be given proper treatment as well as given therapy to help them find more meaning in living. This will enhance inclusiveness in the society and further increase peace and harmony.

References

- Anyanwu, E. & Udoh, C. V. (2021). Impoliteness in Language Use: An Investigation into Cyber Bullying in Nigeria, *International Network Organization for Scientific Research, INOSRANTS & Humanities* 7 (1): 1 - 6
- Culpeper, Jonathan. (1996). Towards the anatomy of impoliteness, *Journal of Pragmatics* 25(1996) 349-367
- Culpeper, Jonathan. (2005). Impoliteness and Entertainment in the Television Quiz Show: The Weakest Link, *Journal of Politeness Research* 1, pp. 35-72. 1612-5681/03/001-0035
- Culpeper, Jonathan. (2016). Impoliteness Strategies. *Doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-126/6-6_16*
- Igwebuke, E & Eburuaja, C. (2020). Impoliteness Strategy in Falz' Satirical Song 'This Is Nigeria', In: *Applied Linguistic, Linguistic Variations and English Usage in the Nigerian Context: A Festschrift for Moses Alo*, Ibadan: University Press PLC. Pp.335-346
- Ononye, C., Ikenwa, S. & Ugwuagbo, W. (2021). Impoliteness in Online Reactions on Media Reports of the 2019 Nigeria Presidency Election Victory Declaration, *GADAU Journal of Arts and Humanities*, Vol. 4, No. 1.
- Ricoeur, P. (1974). Violence and language, *Political and Social Essays*, pp.32-41.
- Taiwo, R. (2020). Linguistic Impoliteness in Computer-Mediated Discourse. Eds: Mbisike et al. in *Trends in Semantics and Pragmatics*, Lagos State University Press, pp. 119-136.
- Udoh, V. C. & Ejiaso, V. K. (2022). Evaluation of the Variables of Paralinguistic/Sociolinguistics that Leads to the Use of Politeness Forms in Interactional/Conversational English of Undergraduates Among Undergraduates of Faculty of Arts, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, *IAA Journal of Management* 9(1):1-9.
- Udoh, V. C & Ejiaso, V. K. (2022). Politeness and Impolite Strategies in the Language Use Among the Undergraduates of Faculty of Arts, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, *IAA Journal of Social Sciences (IAA-JSS)* 8 (1):34-41