

**Masculinity as an Indication of Power and Dominance in A
Streetcar Named Desire by Tennessee Williams: A Pragma-
Stylistic Approach**

A paper in Linguistics

Submitted by

Islam Refaat Mohamed

Helwan University

Faculty of Arts

English Department

Linguistics and Translation Section

1. 1- Introduction

2. 1.1 Context of the study

Since the field of Pragmatics is concerned with uncovering the hidden meanings in dramatic discourse, among other types of discourse, a pragmatic study of *A Streetcar Named Desire* by Tennessee Williams is conducted. It is investigated using Brown and Levinson's politeness and Culpepper's impoliteness principles; and how they are achieved through face saving and face threatening acts. In *A Streetcar Named Desire* by Tennessee Williams, Stanley, the mere male character who is full of violent masculinity, attempts to express his animalistic desire through seizing the chance of being the only breadwinner of the family. Therefore, this research employs the pragmatic tools of politeness and impoliteness to investigate how masculinity is distinctly expressed in *A Streetcar Named Desire* by Tennessee Williams as there is a sort of a husband-wife conflict.

3. 1.2 Objectives of the Study

This study aims to:

1- Reveal the politeness and impoliteness strategies used in in some scenes of *A Streetcar Named Desire* by Tennessee Williams.

2- Focus on the presented figures of masculinity in the scenes under study and how their interactions with other characters are affected by the

manipulation of power and dominance and the use of politeness and impoliteness of face saving and face threatening acts.

4. 1.3 Research Questions

- 1- What are the strategies of politeness and impoliteness used in the play?
2. How is masculinity expressed in the play through the use of implicature and face saving and face threatening acts?
3. To what extent do the pragmatic tools of speech acts and implicature as well as politeness and impoliteness used contribute to the exposure of masculinity?
4. To what extent does the concept of masculinity have such an effect on character interactions?

5. 1.4 Rationale of the Study

This study is an attempt to explore the power of masculinity in the play, as manipulated by Stanley, the brute male character, who impinges his control on the female characters in the play through dominance and submission. Therefore, the study explores the unsaid meanings through different generated implicatures and inferred assumptions, brought about by the use of politeness and impoliteness principles and positive and negative face threatening acts.

6. 1.5 Scope of the Study

The current study adopts a pragma-stylistic approach to the investigation of Tennessee Williams's *A Streetcar Named Desire*. This approach draws on analytical tools derived from Grice's Cooperative Principle (1975), Searle's speech act theory (1976), Brown and Levinson's politeness theory (1987), and Culpepper's model for the study of impoliteness (1996). These tools are utilized to unveil the underlying meanings of the characters' utterances and their interactions in the play under investigation.

7. 1.6 Significance of the Study

The proposed study fills a gap in the area of research on politeness / impoliteness because masculinity has been rarely studied using tools of pragmatic analysis in general, and particularly, the models of politeness / impoliteness. This study sheds light on the distinct ways in which

masculinity is realized, either through abuse or through practicing control. Therefore, female characters can be viewed in Tennessee Williams's *A Streetcar Named Desire* as a means for revealing how women are dominated.

8. 2 Theoretical Background

9. 2.1 Definition of Pragmatics

The field of Pragmatics has long been there in conveying the different aspects of language meanings. As first stated by Leech (1983), pragmatic meaning has a relation to the speaker or the user of the language (Leech, 1983, p.11). Also, it relates the grammatical meaning of an utterance to its illocutionary force (ibid, p.14). Pragmatics as a field has to do with the meaning in use rather than the meaning of the dictionary. According to Thomas's definition of Pragmatics, there are different levels of meaning: abstract meaning and contextual or utterance meaning. Abstract meaning is what the dictionary gives of a meaning while contextual is what the speaker wants to convey in a certain context (Thomas, 1995, pp. 2-4). Moreover, Peccei argues that Pragmatics concentrates on the various levels of meaning that cannot be produced by such linguistic knowledge, but knowledge of the outer world (Peccei, 1999, pp. 1-2).

10.2.2 Speech Acts Theories

It is noteworthy that Austin is the first language philosopher who gives full concentration to the underlying meanings of performing actions in his book *How to Do Things with Words* (1962). As a language philosopher, Austin has expressed his utter concern with the fact that actions are performed successfully or unsuccessfully, (i.e., 'felicitous' or 'infelicitous').

Austin makes a difference between saying and doing things (Austin, 1962, p.94). He proposes that by saying things, we make statements ; whilst by doing things, we perform actions. On the other hand, he distinguishes this from a 'constative' utterance which is only true or false. It follows that performative acts result in what is called 'speech acts' which are actions performed by speakers through utterances such as apology, complaint, compliment, invitation, promise and request. Austin(1962) and Peccei (1999) point out subsequently that a performed action consists of 3 related acts: locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary; each of which has a different function. A locutionary act is the utterance we utter, and an illocutionary act is the implied meanings we produce. An illocutionary act is mostly known as the conventional act which is culturally-dependent. A perlocutionary act is the effect of the

speaker's words. Furthermore, according to Leech, speech acts are like a football match event, where a ball is kicked, a goal is scored, and a match is won (Leech, 1983, p.202). This is how locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts are understood and how they have different forces. Moreover, Austin (1962) makes a distinction between 'performative' and 'constative' utterances (p.47). He argues that performative acts can be felicitous or infelicitous. Being felicitous means that there should be some appropriate circumstances of performing speech acts. Therefore, Austin lays down some rules for the felicity conditions. He holds that "there must exist an accepted conventional effect, the procedure to include the uttering of certain words by certain persons in certain circumstances"(Austin, 1962, p.26). For instance, the statement 'I divorce you' is said to a wife in a Christian country (ibid, p.27). Thomas (1995) also sets another example for this rule, referring to 'Rituals' which are considered culture-bound. Then, the speakers must have the required feelings, thoughts, and intentions. Austin (1962) classifies performative acts into explicit and implicit acts. Examples of explicit acts include: 'I order', 'I apologize', 'I bet'; while implicit performative acts have instances like 'clean up the table'. Eventually, it is clear that Austin has shed some light on this arena in the field of Pragmatics which has later brought about a revolutionary movement in the field.

2.3 Grice's Cooperative Principle

In his account of the Cooperative Principle, Grice (1975) states "Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged" (Grice, 1975, p.102). Grice argues that "the cooperative principle" is the means by which there might be a better verbal communication between speakers. However, his theory has been supported by Brown and Levinson in his distinction between what is said and what is meant, i.e. types of implicatures and non-observance of the maxims (ibid, pp.90-102).

Getting from what is said to what is meant is what generates implicature. According to Grice (1975), there are two important types of implicature: conventional and conversational (cited in Chapman, 2005, p.91). A conventional implicature operates to get the same implicature away from the context, whereas conversational implicature has its implied meaning generated according to the context itself. Thus, What underlies the conversational implicature is what Grice (1975) calls 'the cooperative principle' which he categorizes into four basic maxims: quantity, quality, relation, and manner. The maxim of quantity operates by making the

speaker's contribution as informative as it should be, the maxim of quality holds by telling the truth, and the maxim of relation follows to be relevant to whatever answer you are asked to convey. The function of the maxim of manner is to be clear, short, and organized (ibid, pp.90-91). Hence, this is what is called observance of the maxims. If speakers fail to observe the maxims, this results subsequently in the non-observance of the maxims (ibid).The maxims are non-observed in a number of ways including: flouting, violating, infringing, opting out of, and suspending. Likewise, this is what Short (1996) calls breaking the maxims overtly, that is, publicly. On the other hand, violating the maxim often happens with the intention of misleading the hearer. Consequently, this procedure spells an implicature. Short similarly argues that breaking or violating the maxim can be still done covertly (Short, 1996, p.241). Infringing the maxim is another way of non-observing the maxim as it arises when some cognitive impairment is found. The last two ways of the non-observance are therefore opting out and suspending a maxim. Opting out arises from legal, ethical problems, or hurting someone's feelings. Nonetheless, suspending a maxim occurs to the quantity, quality, relation and manner maxims.

In sum, Grice makes a noticeable change since ever he starts off his journey of delving more into the field of Pragmatics which yields his cooperative principle theory in which the quantity, quality, relation and manner maxims are highlighted as highly significant tools of analysis in pragmatics.

2.4 Searle's Speech Act Theory

In contrast to Grice's Cooperative Principle theory, Searle (1976) categorizes speech acts that have the illocutionary force of a proposition into two types: direct and indirect speech acts(cited in Peccei, 1999, p.55). Black (2006) contends that a direct speech act is observed and has a direct relation between the utterance a speaker spells and its force. On the contrary, an indirect speech act has no direct relation as the hearer can hardly interpret it (Black, 2006, p.19). He adds that Searle classifies speech acts into five categories: representatives, expressives, directives, commissives, and declarations (ibid, pp.20-23). Representative speech acts are statements and descriptions in which speakers give a view of the outer reality by giving statements that fit this outer reality. Expressive speech acts occur when speakers express their feelings by making their utterances fit their inner selves. Directive speech acts are subsequently those acts which take place when the speaker summons the hearer to do some act, that is, a command, order, or request. Commissive speech acts

are represented when the speaker promises the hearer to do a future act. Finally, declaration speech acts have a noticeable effect that is shown in the real world (ibid). Peccei introduces the felicity condition which Searle(1976) sets for each category of a speech act (Peccei, 1999, p.50).The preparatory condition is a condition where a promise has to be about an act that would hardly happen and of such a benefit to the hearer. The content condition has to do with what a promise states. For instance, in case of directive speech acts, the speaker gives the hearer an order to do; while in case of commissives, the speaker assigns himself to a future act. The sincerity condition operates when the speaker is sincere about giving a promise. Finally, in the case of directives, the essential condition works when the speaker asks the hearer to do an act; whereas in commissives, it is the speaker who undertakes himself/herself to do the act (ibid, p.51).

11.2.5 Politeness and impoliteness theories

Politeness has been tackled by a number of scholars with different models of analysis.

Leech (1983) states that there are six maxims to his politeness principle: tact, generosity, approbation, modesty, agreement, and sympathy. The tact maxim "applies to Searle's directive and commissive categories of illocutions, which refer in their propositional context x, to some action to be performed, respectively, by the hearer or the speaker" (Leech, 1983, p.107). In other words, the more direct an illocution is, the greater the amount of politeness it will be. Also, there is a negative and a positive side to the Tact Maxim: "minimize the cost to h, and maximize the benefit to h". The second maxim is 'Generosity'. There are two aspects for that maxim to work properly. "Minimize benefit to self. Maximize cost to self". For example, you can lend me your jacket, and I can lend your jacket; both examples are different as the first is a request while the second is an invitation. The 'Generosity Maxim' is generally less powerful than the 'Tact Maxim'. 'Approbation' is the third maxim. It states: "Minimize dispraise of other. Maximize promise of other". It is frequently used in assertives, for example, congratulating someone. The fourth maxim is 'modesty' and it says: "Minimize praise of self. Maximize dispraise of other". This maxim can be used in apologizing to someone. 'Agreement' is the fifth maxim and it means to lessen the disagreement between self and other. "Maximize agreement between self and other". Finally, the 'Sympathy Maxim' states: "Minimize antipathy between self

and other. Maximize sympathy between self and other” (ibid, pp. 132-138). Hence, the six maxims proposed by Leech (1983) represent the first steps in research on politeness in pragmatics.

Brown and Levinson (1987) state that the word 'face' is "the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself" (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p.61). This face consists of two aspects: positive and negative. The positive face is the speaker's desire to have his wants accepted by others; whereas negative face is the want of the speaker that his actions should not be prevented by other people. Thus, there are two 'kinds of face threatening': those acts that threaten positive and negative face and those acts that threaten the speaker's face (ibid, pp. 62-68).

According to Brown and Levinson (1987), some of the acts that threaten positive and negative face predict some future acts which the speaker wants the hearer to do by putting some pressure on the hearer 'H'. Furthermore, there are other acts that predict some positive future act of the speaker 'S' toward H; and by doing so, there is some pressure imposed on H (ibid, p.66). Examples of positive future acts of S addresses toward H include: offers and promises. In other words, "those acts that predicate some desire of S toward H" have instances like compliments, expressions of envy or admiration and expressions of strong negative emotions(ibid). On the contrary, there is what threatens the positive face wants by signifying the speaker's lack of attention toward the hearer's wants. This includes the speaker's negative assessment toward the hearer such as criticisms, accusations and disagreements. Also, those expressions that show the speaker's carelessness toward the hearer's positive face include: the speaker's attempts toward the hearer to fear or embarrass him. Other expressions have instances like taboo topics, bad news about h and redressive terms (ibid, p.67).

The second type of face threatening occurs when the speaker's face is threatened: offending the speaker's negative face such as expressing thanks and accepting H's apology, excuses, unwilling promises and offers (ibid). Also, damaging S's positive face is another way such as apologies and compliments. Thus, Brown and Levinson (1987) argue that face Threatening Acts are either with or without redressive. Acts without redressive action operate directly and clearly in situations such as offers, requests and suggestions which are in the interest of the hearer. On the other hand, acts with redressive action operate to 'give face' to the hearer and show blatantly no intention for threatening the face (ibid, p. 69).

Brown and Levinson (1987, pp. 101-129) hold that there are 15 strategies of positive politeness. The necessity of the speaker to notice H's wants is the first strategy; e.g., "what a beautiful vase this is! Where did it come from?". The Second strategy is to 'exaggerate' in an overreacting manner over H's interest; e.g., "what a fantastic car you bought!" The third strategy is to show interest to H to a great extent; e.g., by making a 'good story'. The fourth strategy operates by using in-group identity markers. Examples of identity markers include: some jargon words such as 'mac', 'mate', 'buddy', and 'pal'. Subsequently, 'seek agreement' operates to the enrollment of the speaker in some topics and his seek of agreements with H, as well. This will lead to H's desire to be right. Another way of seeking agreement also operates by looking for those topics that people can be right about. Finally, repetition is another way of seeking agreement which has instances like repeating part or all of what the speaker has said. The sixth strategy is to 'avoid disagreement' when you appear to agree with the hearer. For example, when H asks 'you hate your teacher?' S replies 'sometimes'. The seventh strategy is to presuppose. The eighth strategy is to 'joke'. A joke is always in H's interest and for the easiness he/she feels. The 'joke' is also a basic technique of positive politeness. The ninth strategy holds to imply your realization of H's wants to reach the speaker's own wants. An example is the statement: I know you love chocolate but I got you some biscuits. Offer or promise is the tenth strategy to be optimistic; e.g., I've come to borrow a cup of sugar. 'Be optimistic is the eleventh strategy. The twelfth strategy includes both S and H in an activity. An example of this strategy is: let's have some fun. The thirteenth strategy operates by asking for reasons; for instance, why don't we go to the cinema? The fourteenth strategy is assuming help; for instance, when S tells H I will get you water if you let me use your mobile phone. Finally, the fifteenth strategy holds by giving gifts to H.

They also propose that there are 10 strategies of negative politeness (1987, pp.131-210). The first strategy is to be "conventionally indirect"; for instance, "can you please pass this bottle of water?" The second strategy holds by being 'hedge'. This is a word or phrase that adds to the degree of membership of a noun phrase. "Mark is a true friend" is a clear example of this strategy. "Hedges on illocutionary force" is another type of hedging. This type is realized in this example: "take this out, will you?". "Be pessimistic" is another negative strategy. An instance of this strategy could be: "could you get me that pen?" The fourth strategy holds to reduce the imposition. This strategy has instances like 'I would merely like to ask you if I can borrow your pen'. Similarly, that to "give

deference" is another strategy which operates when H is in a higher position than S. An example would be: "I feel ashamed to ask you to do me this favour". To 'Apologize' means to show reluctance to an FTA in a number of ways including: S's confession that there is an impingement on H's face, S's disagreement to impose on H with the use of certain expressions, S's reasons for doing the FTA, and S's asking for H's forgiveness."Using another agent other than the speaker" is the seventh negative strategy. This entails the deletion of the pronoun I and you (ibid, pp.90-91). Brown and Levinson(1987) argue that to "state the FTA as a general rule" is the eighth strategy. The statement "Passengers will please refrain from flushing toilets on the train" clearly instantiates this negative strategy. Nominalization is the ninth strategy. Finally, admitting the debt to the addressee is the tenth and last strategy.

On another scale, impoliteness is used in everyday conversation by different age groups such as adults, over-aged, or old people. Culpeper (1996) goes on investigating the different types of impoliteness like "inherent impoliteness and mock politeness". 'Inherent impoliteness' is categorized into relative politeness and absolute politeness. Relative politeness represents those acts that are relevant to a particular context." On the other hand, 'absolute politeness' has no relation to a certain context (Leech, 1983, cited in Culpeper, 1996, pp.350-352) .

On the contrary, Culpeper (1996), points out that "mock impoliteness", is meant not to cause offence (p.352). He also states that the more close a relation is, the less polite a person will be. The more people are on good terms, the more they would be caring for each other. Hence, Culpeper (1996) states that "Banter, of course also exists in a more ritualized form as a kind of language game" (ibid, p.353).

12.2.6 Masculinity

As masculinity has been rarely studied, this study sheds light on the distinct forms of masculinity-one of which-is not only dominating women, but also men. Connell (1987) contends that power can be practiced on men. He argues that:

The concept of 'male power' is then dislodged by the notion of 'hegemonic' or hierarchical' masculinities, perhaps best characterized as those forms of masculinity able to marginalize and dominate not only women, but also other men, on the grounds of say, class, race and/or sexuality (Connell, 1987, cited in Johnson & Hanna, 1997, p.20).

Hence, this study fills a gap in the area of research because masculinity has been studied in such ways that focus more on men's practicing power over women and not the opposite.

Simpson (1994) argues that 'patriarchy' is intrinsically a system in which the Western society is organized (Simpson, 1994, p.161). In this patriarchal society appears what is called men's dominance and control over women (ibid). Hence, this reflects and perpetuates ideas about what is called 'androcentrism'. According to Coates (1986), 'androcentrism' approves men's activities; whereas it disapproves women's activities. For instance, women's used words are less considered than those words that are used by men (Coates, 1986, cited in Simpson, 1994, pp. 161-162).

Also, Johnson and Hanna(1997) argue that there are two main approaches that have considerably taken a great attention in the arena of gender discourse. The first is based on the theory of dominance; whereas the second is based on the theory of difference (Johnson & Hanna, 1997, p.9).

The 'dominance theory' is when men talk too much, interrupt, and generally have a full control in conversations with women. In contrast, the difference theory shows women as powerless and devalued by men (pp.10-11).

Johnson and Hanna (1997) also argue that men are represented as hegemonic due to the controlling nature they have. Men also tend to be more assertive than women in the sense that they have far better chances in controlling the floor and shifting from a topic to another than women (ibid, p.13).

On the other hand, Johnson and Hanna (1997) view men and women differently because they use different lexemes. They believe that men are reluctant to express their emotions as openly as women. Therefore, it is more of a societal constraint for men (ibid, pp.14-15).

13.3 Methodology

14.3.1 Data

The current study sets out to analyze some scenes extracted from *A Streetcar Named Desire* by Tennessee Williams. Tennessee Williams's play has first been published on December 3, 1947. Moreover, the play

portrays masculinity and how it is manifested in Stanley, the only male figure in the play who always wants to have everything under his control with his animalistic desire. Hence, his desire drastically affects his wife and his sister-in-law from different perspectives.

15.3.2 Procedures of Data Analysis

Analysis is done on a Prgama-Stylistic level using the following tools: First; Grice's cooperative principle and its maxims (1975), then Searle's speech act theory (1976). Second; Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness (1987). Third; Culpeper's theory of impoliteness (1996).

4- Analysis and Discussion

Extract 1, scene 3, pp. 81-82

Stella and her sister come back home whilst Stanley plays poker with his friends and feels tense for his bad luck.

- 1- Stella: [with girlish laughter]: You ought to see their wives.
- 2- Blanche[laughingly]: I can imagine. Big, beefy things, I suppose.
- 3- Stella: You know that one upstairs? [More laughter.] One time [laughing] the plaster [laughing] – cracked –
- 4- Stanley: You hens cut out that conversation in there!
- 5- Stella: You can't hear us.
- 6- Stanley: Well, you can hear me and I said to hush up!
- 7- Stella: This is my house and Ill talk as much as I want to!
- 8- Blanche: Stella, don't start a row.
- 9- Stella: He's half drunk! – I'll be out in a minute.

[She goes into the bathroom. Blanche rises and crosses leisurely to a small white radio and turns it on.]

- 10- Stanley: Awright, Mitch, you in?
- 11- Mitch: What? Oh! – No, I'm out!

[Blanche moves back into the streak of light. She raises her arms and stretches, as she moves indolently back to the chair.

Rhumba music comes over the radio.

Mitch rises at the table.]

12- Stanley: Who turned that one in there?

13- Blanche: I did. Do you mind?

14- Stanley: Turn it off!

1- Grice and Searle

In utterance number 4, Stanley uses a direct directive act which explicitly shows Stanley's imposed power over Stella and Blanche by giving some order of cutting out their conversation.

In number 5, Stella flouts the relevance maxim when she gives an irrelevant answer which shows her reaction towards Stanley's order of asking her to cut out the conversation as he cannot hear them. In addition, Stella uses a direct representative act which reveals her disapproval of Stanley's imposed order as he cannot already hear them.

In number 6, Stanley flouts the quality maxim by stating the opposite of what Stella says so long as she replies back to him. Moreover, Stanley uses an indirect representative act functioning as a direct directive when he does not politely ask her to 'hush up'.

In number 7, Stella manages to practice some control over Stanley and goes on talking as she wants, which results in the flouting of the relevance maxim as this is not the relevant answer that should have been given to Stanley. Also, Stella stresses the fact that she has to talk as freely as she wants because this is her house. Then, it ends with a direct representative that is used by Stella to impose her power over Stanley by stating these words.

In number 12, Stanley poses the question of who turned the music on again by exploiting a direct directive act to get an answer for his question.

In number 13, Blanche minimizes Stanley's imposition over herself and her sister when she asks Stanley if he minds whether to turn the music on or off. Hence, she uses a direct directive act to get an answer for the question she raises.

In number 14, Stanley makes Blanche feel uncomfortable and orders her to turn the music off which reveals his use of a direct directive to order her to turn the music off.

2- Politeness: Negative Politeness

13- Blanche: I did. Do you mind?

In utterance number 13, Blanche attempts to minimize Stanley's imposition over her, which is a face threatening act (FTA) that damages Stanley's positive face because she disobeys him.

3-Impoliteness: Positive Impoliteness

4- Stanley: You hens cut out that conversation in there!

5- Stella: You can't hear us.

6- Stanley: Well, you can hear me and I said to hush up!

7- Stella: This is my house and Ill talk as much as I want to!

12- Stanley: Who turned that one in there?

14- Stanley: Turn it off!

In utterance 4, this is a positive impoliteness strategy 'use inappropriate identity markers' when Stanley calls his wife and sister-in-law as 'hens' which reveals Stanley's disrespect to them. This is also a face threatening act (FTA), which damages Stella and Blanches' positive and negative faces because he calls them as 'hens' and imposes his power over them.

In number 5, this is a reddressive FTA performed by Stella which threatens Stanley's positive face as she ignores his request of stopping the conversation between herself and her sister which is a positive impoliteness strategy.

In number 6, Stanley uses 'well' as a hedging marker to reduce the imposition over himself, which is a negative impoliteness strategy. Likewise, this is a reddressive FTA, which threatens Stella's positive face as Stanley performs this FTA off record when Stella states that Stanley cannot already hear them. Hence, he orders her at the end of the utterance to 'hush up' which threatens her negative face. In the second part of the utterance, Stanley tends to perform a bald, non reddressive FTA because he orders Stella to 'hush up' through using an obscure or secretive language which realizes a positive impoliteness strategy.

In number 7, this utterance threatens Stanley's positive face baldly and without redress because Stella strongly shows her disapproval of Stanley's given order which realizes a positive impoliteness strategy: 'be disinterested, unconcerned, unsympathetic'.

In number 12, Stanley manages to sustain his level of imposition in comparison to Stella's about turning on the radio. However, it is Blanche who turns the radio on where Stanley appears to be coercive when he performs a non redressive FTA through posing such a question. This way, Stanley threatens Blanche's positive face as he disagrees with her about turning the radio on and excludes her from the activity of enjoying her time and listening to the radio which realizes a negative impoliteness strategy as well.

In number 14, this is a bald on record FTA, which damages Blanche's negative face because Stanley imposes his power on her by asking her to turn the music off instead of letting her listen to the music she likes. Meanwhile, this utterance realizes a positive impoliteness strategy: "Exclude the other from an activity".

Extract 2, Scene 8, pp.150-151

In this extract Blanche's situation of Mitch's proposal is worsened as she feels that he uncovers her disreputable past. As a consequence, everybody is tense and on the verge of a bitter quarrel.

- 1- Blanche: Apparently Mr Kowalski was not amused.
- 2- Stella: Mr Kowalski is too busy making a pig of himself to think of anything else!
- 3- Stanley: That's right, baby.
- 4- Stella: Your face and your fingers are disgustingly greasy. Go and wash up and then help me clear the table.
- 5- Stanley: That's how I'll clear the table! Don't ever talk that way to me! 'Pig -- Polack -- -- disgusting -- vulgar -- greasy!' -- them kind of words have been on your tongue and your sister's too much around here ! What do you two think you are? A pair of queens? Remember what Huey Long said -- 'Every Man is a king!' and I am the king around here, so don't forget it! My place is cleared! You want me to clear your places?

[STELLA begins to cry weakly. STANLEY stalks out on the porch and lights a cigarette.]

- 6- Blanche: What happened while I was bathing? What did he tell you, Stella?

7- Stella: Nothing, nothing, nothing

8- Blanche: I think he told you something about Mitch and me! You know why Mitch didn't come but you won't tell me! [STELLA shakes her head helplessly.] I'm going to call him!

9- Stella: I wouldn't call him, Blanche.

10- Blanche: I am, I'm going to call him on the phone.

11- Stella: [miserably] I wish you wouldn't.

13- Blanche: I intend to be given an explanation from someone!

14- Stella: I hope you're pleased with your doings. I never had so much trouble swallowing food in my life, looking at the girl's face and the empty chair. [She cries quietly.]

1- Grice and Searle

In utterance number 4, Stella observes a direct representative act when she states how she disgustingly sees Stanley's face and fingers. She also uses a direct directive act when she directly orders him to go and wash up.

In utterance number 5, Stanley uses a hybrid act between a direct representative and directive when he states that this is his way of clearing the table. Moreover, he gives a very direct warning to Stella not to call him by such words as 'disgusting', 'vulgar', 'greasy' and so on. Stanley reveals his utter power and says that he is the only king in this house, so Stella should give this her utter attention.

In number 7, Stella flouts the maxim of quality as she is reluctant to give Blanche any subtle details about Stanley's loud voice that she heard while bathing. In other words, Stella knows very well that she is sensitive to such matters.

2- Politeness: Negative Politeness

7- Stella: Nothing, nothing, nothing

In utterance number 7, Stella performs a face threatening act (FTA) with redress to Blanche's negative face, which realizes a negative politeness strategy through minimizing the imposition over Blanche as she knows well that she is sensitive to such matters.

3- Impoliteness

A- Positive Impoliteness

4- Stella: Your face and your fingers are disgustingly greasy. Go and wash up and then help me clear the table.

In utterance number 4, Stella performs a bald non redressive face threatening act (FTA), which damages Stanley's negative face because she gives Stanley direct orders to go and wash up his face. Furthermore, Stella uses a positive impoliteness strategy 'use taboo words – swear, or use abusive or profane language' when she calls Stanley's face and fingers as 'disgustingly greasy'.

B- Negative Impoliteness

5- Stanley: That's how I'll clear the table ! Don't ever talk that way to me ! 'Pig -- Polack -- -- disgusting – vulgar – greasy !' – them kind of words have been on your tongue and your sister's too much around here ! What do you two think you are? A pair of queens? Remember what Huey Long said – 'Every Man is a king!' and I am the king around here, so don't forget it! My place is cleared! You want me to clear your places?

In number 5, this utterance threatens Stella's negative face as it is performed directly when Stanley aggressively replies to what Stella has previously said and acknowledges her that she and her sister keep on rebuking him. Consequently, a negative impoliteness strategy is realized 'condescend scorn, or ridicule – emphasize your relative power'. This reveals how Stanley practices his power heavily on Stella even when she merely expresses her annoyance over his way of eating.

5- Conclusion

In Tennessee Williams's *A Streetcar Named Desire*, I aimed at investigating the effect of masculinity throughout the play and how women are suppressed in one way or another. Thus, a pragmatic approach is utilized to achieve this investigation through using Searle's speech act theory, Grice's cooperative principles, Brown and Levinson's politeness principle and Culpeper's model of impoliteness. There are several results that finally appear from my research analysis:

- (1) Stanley, the mere dominant masculine character controls all the female figures in the play to a great extent that he affects the two sisters' life.
- (2) Throughout the play, it is very prominent that Stella tries to make a balance between her husband and her sister. Meanwhile, she knows fully well that her sister is in so much need of her help, especially after her lover's death.
- (3) Stanley does not only over control his wife but also he attempts to control his sister-in-law. In other words, he manages to discover her bad reputed past and he considers this the only way to damage her positive and negative face.
- (4) Impolite strategies are more used by Stanley whenever he wants to impose his control over Stella and her sister Blanche.

Finally, politeness and impoliteness analysis make it clear that the person in power as the masculine figure of Stanley is always the one in control and domination.

7- References

Primary Sources

Williams, Tennessee (1947). *A Streetcar Named Desire*, England: Cox and Wyman.

Secondary Sources

Austin, J.L.(1962). *How to Do Things With Words*. London: Oxford University Press.

Bennison, N. (1993). "Accessing character through conversation." In J. Culpeper, M. Short & P. Verdonk (Eds.), *Exploring the Language of Drama* (pp. 67-82). New York: Routledge.

Black, E.(2006). *Pragmatics Stylistics*. London: Edinburgh University.

Brown, P. and S. Levinson(1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in language usage*. Cambridge: CUP.

Chapman, S. (2005). *Paul Grice, Philosopher and Linguist*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Coates, J. (ed.) (1998) *Language and Gender: ARTeader*. Blackwell: Oxford, Malden Masc.

Cooper, M. (1981). "Implicature, convention and The Taming of the Shrew." In J. Culpeper, M. Short & P. Verdonk (Eds.), *Exploring the Language of Drama* (pp.54-66). New York: Routledge.

Culpeper, J. (1996). "(Im)politeness in dramatic dialogue." In J. Culpeper, M. Short & P. Verdonk (Eds.), *Exploring the Language of Drama* (pp. 83-95). New York: Routledge.

Culpeper, J. (1996). "Towards an anatomy of impoliteness." *Journal of Pragmatics*, 25-26(0378-2166), pp.349-367.

Johnson, S. (1997). "Theorizing Language and Masculinity: A Feminist Perspective." In S. Johnson & U. Meinhof (Eds.), *Language and Masculinity* (pp. 8-25). Oxford: Blackwell.

Lall, R. (2006). *Death of A Salesman (A Critical Study)*. New Delhi: Rama Brothers India Pvt. Ltd.

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

Peccei, J. (1999). *Pragmatics Language Workbooks*. London and New York: Routledge.

Short, M. (1996). *Exploring the Language of Poems, Plays and Prose*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman.

Simpson, P. (1994). *Language, Ideology and Point of View*. London and New York: Routledge.

Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in interaction: an introduction to pragmatics*. London: Longman.

Yule, George (1996). *Pragmatics*. George Yule. New York: Oxford University Press.

<http://www.history.com/this-day-in-history/a-streetcar-named-desire-opens-on-broadway>