Ljiljana Šarić
University of Oslo
Ljiljana.Saric@ilos.uio.no

Tatjana Radanović Felberg
Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences
Tatjana-Radanovic.Felberg@hioa.no

Means of Expressing and Implying Emotions and Impoliteness in Croatian and Montenegrin Public Discourse

ABSTRACT: Šarić Ljiljana, Felberg R. Tatjana, *Means of Expressing and Implying Emotions and Impoliteness in Croatian and Montenegrin Public Discourse*. "Poznańskie Studia Slawistyczne" 9. Poznań 2015. Publishing House of the Poznań Society for the Advancement of the Arts and Sciences, pp. 123–148. ISSN 2084–3011.

This article addresses means of expressing and implying emotions (Langlotz, Locher 2012) in realizations of impoliteness in written discourse thematizing language and identity in Croatian and Montenegrin media in 2010 and 2011. Realizations of impoliteness often relate to communicating an emotional stance that can trigger emotional responses in readers. Our discourse sample can be described as "disputes about language and identity" (cf. Felberg, Šarić 2013), which is largely characterized by conflictual disagreements. Conflictual disagreements, as Jones (2001) or Langlotz and Locher (2012) put it, do not leave one cold in face-to-face interaction: they arouse feelings of annoyance, irritation, anger, or contempt directed to the communicative partner. These observations are relevant in our context, although we deal with written discourse. The main participants in our data include well-known intellectuals, journalists, and editors. They all defend or attack a 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". These participants clearly position themselves in relation to other participants. Their positioning of the self and the other person involves negative identity-ascribing practices. Taking into consideration parameters such as the role of participants in discourse and society, context, co-text, and activity types in which discourse participants engaged, we identified various highly context-dependent types and functions of impoliteness realizations (cf. Šarić, Felberg 2015). Contrary to our expectations, the participants in the media discourse in both countries frequently use impoliteness both strategically and systematically while defending their positions. The impoliteness realizations point to emotively significant places in discourse. Their use has several functions: a prominent one is coercion through legitimizing one's own standpoints and delegitimizing those of one's opponents.

KEYWORDS: Croatia; Montenegro; identity discourse; emotions; impoliteness

1. Introduction

This study analyzes the relation between impoliteness realizations and emotional means, as well as functions of these realizations and means in language and identity discourse[1] characterized by conflictual disagreements in Croatian and Montenegrin public space. Impoliteness realizations point to emotively significant places in discourse. Our assumptions about emotions are based on written data only because we have no access to discourse participants' actual emotional reactions. However, in line with Dynel (2012) we claim that readers and researchers as metarecipients[2] can also conjecture the impact of discourse samples and their elements and even underlying intentions of discourse sample producers. Nevertheless, we are aware that "probing the speaker's intentions is a problematic task, which never produces certain results" (Culpeper, Bousfield, Wichmann 2003: 1552), and one cannot reconstruct speakers' actual intentions or emotions. However, "plausible" intentions or emotions can be reconstructed, given adequate evidence.

"Language and identity discourse" refers to discourse that includes various online and print texts. The discourse participants in our data-linguists, other well-known professionals from the humanities, and representatives of state institutions (e.g., ministries) belong to a professional "community of practice" that interacts in particular ways (Paltridge 2012: 56). These specialists are automatically members of an elite that influences how people communicate (cf. Čupić 2009: 340). "Normal" linguistic behavior within this community of practice is formal[3]. This includes using polite address for "you", *Vi* instead of informal *ti*, addressing a person as "colleague", using professional titles such as "professor" and "doctor", and focusing on professional issues in discussions related to the profession. One would not automatically think of this elite group's discourse

---

[1] We do not judge the content of that discourse as "right" or "wrong", nor do we support or criticize any discourse participant's views.

[2] A "metarecipient" is an informed recipient (e.g., an academic) that watches a film as if from a privileged position, consciously analyzing its discourse and making observations about the meaning conveyed and methods employed to achieve this by the collective sender (Dynel 2012).

[3] "Normal" linguistic behavior within the community of practice can change over time.

as a typical platform for impoliteness and emotional display. In formal linguistic behavior, strong expressions of emotions are not expected. However, the discourse sample discussed here is often exactly such a platform.

One of the main ideas in recent (im)politeness research is that what is considered polite or impolite greatly depends on the specific culture, context, and genre (Culpeper 2011: 12–13, 21, 125). Some social situations such as military interaction sanction or neutralize face-threatening acts, and some genres are grounded in impoliteness[4]. The text types analyzed here sometimes involve confrontation and conflictual disagreements, but impoliteness is still not part of the genre's expectations of behavior; most of our texts do not sanction or neutralize face-threatening acts. Our material consists of various discourse genres that relate to different expectations and "norms" related to impoliteness and expressing an emotional stance by using emotional means: these genres include not only newspaper commentaries and interviews with linguists in print newspapers, but also commentary sections of online newspapers, and internet forums.

Certain strategies in this discourse can be perceived as impolite when some features of linguistic expression do not conform to the culturally shared notions of appropriateness for a given genre and situation[5]; for example, such a strategy is observable when a first name is used instead of a surname or professional title. Admittedly, the "intensity" of impoliteness in communicative acts may vary in perception by different discourse participants and readers in the same culture[6].

We examine discourse related to the macro-context of the breakup of Yugoslavia in 1991, followed by wars. The violent nature of that breakup, armed conflicts, and overall presence of hate speech in the 1990s (cf., e.g., Đerić 2008, Kolstø 2009) increased the impoliteness threshold in all spheres of communication, including communication among intellectuals.

---

[4] 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 (Culpeper 2005: 66).

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

[6] Discourse participants in the material analyzed deem some phenomena impolite: this is confirmed in texts in which they comment on impoliteness or rudeness. Cf., e.g., *Uvrede pseudolingvistice* (IS7). The word *uvrede* "insults" in this text title refers to a previous insulting event.

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[7]. All of these standard languages retain same dialect base. However, the linguists responsible for language standardization and the ethnic groups using these languages have promoted language segregation (Haarmann 1999: 64).

Yugoslavia's breakup caused new disputes[8] about language and identity in the former Yugoslav countries where Serbo-Croatian was an official language.

Before analyzing means of expressing and implying emotions in our material in Section 4, we present our data, methodology, and theoretical issues in Section 2. Section 3 outlines the micro-context of the discourse analyzed, and Section 5 offers concluding remarks and suggestions for further research.

2. Data, methodology, and theoretical approach

Our data are drawn from written Croatian and Montenegrin print and online media discourse discussing language issues 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 internet portals "Hrvatsko kulturno vijeće" (HKV), "Hrvati AMAC", and "H-alter"[9].

---

[7] Serbo-Croatian was the official language in four Yugoslav republics: Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, Montenegro, and Serbia. Different attitudes to the standard language existed in these former Yugoslav republics: some linguists, institutions, and speakers considered standard varieties used in individual republics to be separate standard languages. Moreover, language names other than Serbo-Croatian/Croato-Serbian (e.g., Croatian, Serbian) were used to a certain extent in unofficial and official contexts at local levels (i.e., republic levels) before the Yugoslav breakup. A historical survey of the language name's use in Croatia is provided by Zelić-Bučan (1971).

[8] As correctly emphasized by a reviewer, similar disputes were a constant ingredient of public and professional discourse throughout the existence of Yugoslavia (e.g., the discussions about the Matica Srpska and Matica Hrvatska dictionary, and the banishment of the Croatian normative guide published in London 1971).

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

Some books, book chapters, and reviews are "triggers" of Croatian media discourse, and are thus also part of it. The Montenegrin and Croatian material consists of approximately 50 000 words each. For internet sources, we searched several keywords: the equivalents of *Serbian language*, *Montenegrin language*, *Croatian language*, and *Serbo-Croatian*. From print newspapers we manually extracted thematically relevant texts based on information in headlines, subheads, and leads.

Written media discourse has some specific features. It involves several groups of interactants: text producers (journalists and editors), discourse participants (linguists discussing language and identity), and readers of print and online editions (some online readers act as commentators)[10]. The readers as the recipients of media messages are numerous and unknown, including both supporters and opponents of the discourse participants' views. Some elements in the interaction are delayed (asynchronous) responses related to previously published texts, and some are (almost) synchronous, thanks to possibilities such as online comments. Online comments are often written by professionals. These comments have a specific status regarding impoliteness and communicating emotional stance (cf. Langlotz, Locher 2012)[11].

We understand linguistic impoliteness as language use intended to cause offence or language use 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[12] in a (dyadic) face-to face interaction is the prototype of the category. Atypical impoliteness instances, such as unintended impoliteness, are extensions from the prototype. We interpret "interaction" broadly (cf. Spencer-Oatey 2007: 653); interaction applies not only to face-to-face communication, but also to asynchronous communication in public space.

---

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

[11] Langlotz and Locher (2012: 1592) argue that the commentary sections of online newspapers can attract highly emotionalized or even offensive comments. Impoliteness and emotions in online commentaries in South Slavic media is a complex topic that deserves a separate in-depth analysis.

[12] In defining impoliteness, views on the importance of the speaker's intention to be impolite (and recognition of that intention by the hearer) differ (cf., e.g., Haugh 2007; Culpeper 2008; Bousfield 2008a; Holmes, Marra, Schnurr 2008; Locher, Watts 2008; Hutchby 2008).

Many definitions of impoliteness (for an overview, cf. Culpeper 2011: 19) include notions of face, identity, power, 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 *obraz* can be translated as 'honor', 'pride', 'reputation', 'shame', or 'impudence'. The notion of face is closely related to emotions.

The relation between emotions and impoliteness has been recently scrutinized (Kienpointner 2008; IIşık-Güler, Ruhi 2010; Culpeper 2011; Langlotz, Locher 2012, 2013). Researchers seem to agree on a connection between impoliteness and negative emotional reactions, although the exact nature of that connection is still elusive. Culpeper (2011: 21) mentions emotions as a key notion (in addition to face, social norms, and intentionality) in impoliteness definitions, indicating that "emotions are evoked for both the producer and target of impoliteness" (Culpeper 2011: 60). He terms some instances of impoliteness "affective impoliteness": it is characterized by overt expressions of strong emotions in its prototypical instances. This impoliteness type is relevant for some of our discourse samples. Our analysis does not distinguish between affect and emotion (cf. Bülow-Møller 2003: 2).

Edwards (1999: 282–283) emphasizes that emotions are not just irrational, but are an integral part of rational accountability. Furthermore, in some contexts emotions are cognitively grounded (i.e., imply prior cognitive assessments) and have cognitive consequences (insights and understandings). Emotions are not only dispositional (e.g., dispositional jealousy) but also event-driven (e.g., reactive anger). Reactive emotions play an important role in the production of the discourse analyzed. Emotions are temporary states and dispositions. Emotional behavior as controllable action has its counterpart in emotional behavior as passive reaction. We assume that some pieces of our discourse relate to emotional behavior as controllable action. An emotional state has possibly influenced the production of a particular discourse sample. That production as such relates

to a number of well-elaborated steps and is part of the controlled action scenario. When a discourse participant feels, for instance, angry or hurt but does not accountably do anything (e.g., does not produce a discourse sample), his anger is a passive reaction. However, we cannot account for that aspect because we are dealing with written data, not participant observation[13].

For our analysis, Edwards' distinction of natural versus moral emotions is also important; that is, the assumption that some emotions are automatic, unconscious bodily reactions, whereas some are social judgments. We assume both reaction types in both discourse participants and readers. Our material contains indicators that negative emotions (e.g., feeling bad or hurt after an "attack" by another discourse participant in the discursive, conflictual disagreement) relate to reactive impoliteness. The discourse participant feeling bad or hurt will presumably "respond" with an emotional argument, or will express his annoyance by using extremely negatively charged language.

Culpeper (2011: 61) emphasizes "negatively valenced moral emotions" (anger, disgust, contempt, embarrassment, shame, and guilt) as emotions relevant in the context of social norms and impoliteness. The distinction of internal states versus external behavior is also important for analyzing our material. We do not have "reports from the inner life of the mind" of the discourse participants in our data, but we assume that the existence of certain emotions as external behavior is related to production of some parts of discourse. Displaying emotions such as anger or contempt in itself does not relate to impoliteness, but can be judged as such depending on the context and participants, claims Culpeper (2011: 60). For example, if a linguist is publicly ridiculed (cf. 4.1.2.), that can cause an emotional reaction in the linguist, in other discourse participants, and in the readers.

Negative attitudes and disagreement in our material are expressed through emotional means aimed at building or sustaining language identity in two postwar societies. In emotional disagreements, discourse participants use different linguistic means that Langlotz and Locher (2012: 1602) term means of **implying, expressing**, and **describing** emotions.

---

[13] Expressed and implied emotions can be honest or fake; that is, some emotional displays are artificial performances (Edwards 1999).

Lexical implications, sarcasm, metaphors, and their connotations exemplify the first category, whereas exclamations, intensification, name-calling, and emoticons illustrate the second category. Emotion words and verbal descriptions of emotions belong to the third category. In our material, we identified two categories: means of expressing and means of implying emotions (cf. Section 4); the two categories often overlap. We did not find any examples of the third category: explicit description of emotions.

3. Micro-context: triggering events for impoliteness

Before turning to emotional means in impoliteness realizations, we outline the micro-contexts.

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 offending events that trigger discussions and intensify impoliteness. The offending events in our material relate "to particular attitudes to different language narratives" (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.

The disputes often evolve into conflictual disagreements. According to Jones (2001), events that cause conflict are events that elicit emotion. Following this, Langlotz and Locher (2012: 1595) state that the strength of a given disagreement can be signaled by correspondingly intensive emotional cues, as our examples also support.

The micro-context of the Croatian discourse mainly relates to the book *Jezik i nacionalizam* (Language and Nationalism) (Kordić 2010). The main claim of the book 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 standard language. Furthermore, the author 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 in Croatia since 1990.

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. The book *Language and Nationalism* 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 publication of the book and reactions to it became a "hot" media event, with many micro-events emerging in a chain reaction. Some discourse samples link these discussions to those about the status of Croatian in the EU: 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 trigger 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 open, even though the Montenegrin constitution proclaims that Montenegro's official language is Montenegrin, and that Serbian, Bosnian, and Croatian are also in official use (IS2). Discussions about identity, language, and politics become intertwined, allowing endless debates on different occasions. One of these occasions is EU accession. In order to continue talks about Montenegro's future EU membership, an election law had to be passed and, to ensure that, the opposition and ruling party had to agree in the parliament. The opposition conditioned its 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 (Felberg, Šarić 2013). 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, professors from the Montenegrin Language and South Slavic Literatures

Program in Nikšić (whose projects were not funded), and the Institute of Montenegrin Language and Literature (whose projects were funded). This dispute continued an old dispute with 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 Croatian.

At different stages of the disputes about language and identity, 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. Impoliteness realizations are often a reaction to a previous impolite text or event: some texts make explicit reference to other texts with potentially offending elements by another discourse participant[14].

4. Means of expressing and implying emotions

Elsewhere (Šarić, Felberg 2015) we categorized impoliteness realizations following existing models of categorization (Bousfield 2008a: 99–143; Culpeper 2011: 113–194) and identified the following dominant categories[15]: inappropriate personal identity markers; personalized negative assertions; sarcasm and mock politeness. The first two involve conventionalized impoliteness formulae (Culpeper 2011: 135) and are conventionalized impoliteness, and the last is mostly implicational impoliteness. These categories usually appear in combination with each other and thus contribute to intensification of the impoliteness effects. We also noticed the presence of emotional arguments, which is an important category in the general framework of impoliteness. In this analysis, we approach emotions through the distinction between two categories: means of expressing emotions (Section 4.1.) and means of implying emotions (Section 4.2.). We also identify a border category: a blend of the two (Section 4.3.).

---

[14] Cf. footnote 6.
[15] We have not carried out quantitative analysis because more material is needed for such analysis.

4.1. Means of expressing emotions

Means of expressing emotions in our material consist of inappropriate personal identity markers, direct and indirect personalized negative assertions, and conventionalized impoliteness.

4.1.1. INAPPROPRIATE PERSONAL IDENTITY MARKERS

Inappropriate personal identity markers are very similar to Langlotz and Locher (2012: 1602) term "name calling" and are found throughout our material. These are identity markers used by discourse participants that do not match expected language use (in a particular situation or genre), including:

  a) inappropriate use of first names, nicknames, informal short forms of first names;
  b) titles with insulting modifiers and invented titles;
  c) modified forms of women's surnames;
  d) plural forms of surnames;
  e) ideological/ethnic labels.

4.1.2. INAPPROPRIATE USE OF FIRST NAMES, NICKNAMES, INFORMAL SHORT FORMS OF FIRST NAMES

The communication norm between intellectuals in both countries includes "proper" forms of address: titles with a full name or only a last name, or a combination of the name and the title. Rarely, only first names are used in references to female professionals, as in (1):

 (1)   *Snježanina mudrolija.*
       'Snježana's outlandish idea'.

Example (1) is a subhead in an interview in the newspaper "Večernji list". The possessive adjective *Snježanin* occurs a few times in the interview (e.g., 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):

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

Example (2) uses the vocative (*Rajka*). It imitates face-to-face communication and is also an example of condescension. Referring to researchers by their first names suggests that the individuals referred to are not serious researchers. This means presumably stems from the discourse participants' emotions: it can trigger emotions of powerlessness or anger in addressees and emotions of feeling powerful and satisfied in addressers[16].

4.1.3. TITLES WITH OFFENDING MODIFIERS, OR INVENTED TITLES

This subcategory corresponds to Langlotz and Locher's (2012: 1602) "name calling". We found offending modifiers of some titles (e.g., *pseudo*-in *pseudolingvistica* [IS7]), combinations of nouns referring to professions and gender (*dama-naučnica* 'lady researcher' [IS4]), and combinations of titles and current function (*direktor-lingvista* 'head of the institute and linguist', and sometimes very complex combinations *direktor-lingvista-književnolog-bibliotekar – pravi crnogorski multipraktik* [IS8] 'head of the institute and linguist and literature "specialologist" and librarian – a real Montenegrin food processor'). We also identified invented titles (*prvosvještenica hrama nauke* 'high priestess of the science cathedral', *profesoresa* 'professoress') (cf. Felberg, Šarić 2013: 25) and ironic use of forms that would be polite in another context (e.g., *gospođa, gđa* 'Mrs.') (IS9). The invented titles and ironic use of address forms can illustrate implicational impoliteness, which corresponds to means of implying emotions. However, some of our examples use intensification devices as well, and so we included them in this section.

Inappropriate indirect references to female professionals instead of names or standard professional titles (e.g., *pseudolingvistica*) imply a direct denial of professionalism.

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.

---

[16] We have commented elsewhere on the issues of intimacy and democratization possibly related to these forms (cf. Šarić, Felberg 2015).

A similar example referring to a man (*direktor-lingvista* 'head of the institute and linguist') also implies that the two identities referred to are incongruous. However, in this case two "professions" are evaluated, the first one, *direktor*, is an administrative function, and the other, *lingvista*, specifies an academic profile. To intensify offence, the term *direktor-lingvista* is expanded in another media text with two more (real and invented) professions, resulting in *direktor-lingvista-književnog-bibliotekar, pravi crnogorski multipraktik* 'head of the institute-linguist-literature "specialologist"-librarian'. The long phrase condescendingly compares a discourse participant to a food processor. The food processor indiscriminately processes everything, and so this comparison has negative connotations. *Književnolog* (literally, 'literatureologist') is a neologism for an invented profession because literature specialists are usually referred to as *književni naučnici/istraživači* (literally, 'literature researchers').

Titles with offending modifiers and invented titles can be results of emotional states, either natural or moral, and/or can cause honest or fake natural or moral emotions. Many articles in our material containing similar offending means provoked even more impolite answers from the persons addressed. This shows that using emotive linguistic means can create a chain reaction.

4.1.4. MODIFIED FORMS OF WOMEN'S SURNAMES

This category is a subtle, euphemistic form of "name calling": it relates to causing or expressing discourse participants' emotions.

Morphologically modified forms of women's surnames in *-ka* and *-ova*/*-eva*[17] are widely used in the Croatian material. We argue elsewhere (Šarić, Felberg 2015) that impoliteness with these forms is highly context-dependent. In disapproving contexts, surname modifications co-occur

---

[17] 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). As pointed out by a reviewer, in language practice there are justified reasons for using non-standard forms of females' surnames in *–eva* and *–ka* when language users want to disambiguate persons' gender. Similar surname modifications can be understood as a consequence of a latent requirement of the language system; that is, an overall tendency to an unambiguous morphological marking of nouns referring to females. This particular non-equal use of noun phrases indicates gender inequality (we owe this observation to an anonymous reviewer).

with other impoliteness realizations and other means of expressing emotions; for example, the surname modification 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' (Pandžić 2009). Alternatively, a contextual contrast between reference to a woman by her modified surname and references to men by their titles and full names reveals an impoliteness strategy related to the use of surname modification, as in (3):

(3) *Stanje u kroatistici Kordićeva smatra nepodnošljivim, a glavnim krivcima predstavlja akademike Stjepana Babića, Radoslava Katičića i Dalibora Brozovića.*
'*Kordićeva* considers the situation of Croatian philology unbearable, and presents academy members Stjepan Babić, Radoslav Katičić, and Dalibor Brozović as the main culprits' (IS7).

In (3), one can notice an unequal use of the noun phrases: *Kordićeva* versus *akademici Stjepan Babić, Radoslav Katičić i Dalibor Brozović*.

Modifications of women's surnames indicating inequality were noted in the Croatian material only. Modified forms of women's surnames in *-ka* were not found in the Montenegrin material, whereas a few surnames in *-eva* were found (*poručila je Stojanovićeva* '*Stojanovićeva* said'; *dodaje Bojovićeva* '*Bojovićeva* adds'[18]). These instances were not connected to impoliteness, and so it is not possible to determine if these forms were strategically used (Felberg, Šarić 2015).

4.1.5. IDEOLOGICAL/ETHNIC LABELS

Using ideological and ethnic labels is also an instance of "name calling". We found some examples in which some discourse participants accuse proponents of ideas different from their own of defending aggressive Yugoslavism and a greater Serbian idea (IS11).

(4) *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'.

---

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

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 some opponents as dangerous or ignorant is related to these opponents' real or invented ethnicity, as in *neki zadrti Jugoslaveni u Zagrebu* 'some bigoted Yugoslavs in Zagreb' (IS12)[19]. The function of such means of expressing emotions is to disqualify persons with different political views or ethnicity by evoking fear.

4.1.6. DIRECT AND INDIRECT PERSONALIZED NEGATIVE ASSERTIONS

This frequent subcategory belongs to means of expressing emotions. Direct negative assertions have the form "X is Y" (where Y is an offensive noun or adjective). Indirect assertions include positively connoted words in quotation marks. In addition to general negative assertions, we found specific assertions related to ideology, ethnicity, gender, and knowledge.

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

In example (5), the head of the institute qualifies his opponents as ignorant:

(5) *Umjesto izigravanja žrtve u cilju prikrivanja sopstvenoga nerada, neznanja i nesposobnosti, bilo bi dobro kad bi Studijski program za crnogorski jezik i južnoslovenske književnosti zakupio štand pored štanda Instituta za crnogorski jezik i književnost.*
'Instead of playing victims with the aim of covering up their own inactivity, ignorance, and inability, it would be good if the Montenegrin Language and South Slavic Literatures Program rented a stand next to the stand of the Montenegrin Language and Literature Institute' (IS13).

Examples such as (5) contain less direct assertions (realized, e.g., through the nominalizations *izigravanje* and *prikrivanje*) and thus require

---

[19] *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' (IS15).

more cognitive effort by readers. However, (5) implies that 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 have.

Indirect negative assertions relate to using quotation marks in expressions of ironic or derisive meaning (cf. Perović, Silić, Vasiljeva 2010: 100––102), as in (6): specialists' knowledge is questioned by putting the word *eksperata* 'experts' in quotes:

(6) *kod „eksperata" za sve i svašta u Komisiji, od psihologije i pedagogije do ustavnog prava, jasna je tendencija da svima nametnu crnogorski jezik.*
'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' (IS14).

In (6), the immediate context (*za sve i svašta*) disambiguates the ironic use of the word "experts": experts are normally experts in a particular field.

4.1.7. CONVENTIONALIZED IMPOLITENESS (BOUSFIELD 2008A: 110): TABOO, ABUSIVE, OR PROFANE LANGUAGE

This subcategory, rare in our material, illustrates the prototype of "name calling" that belongs to the means of expressing emotions (in addition to exclamations, intensification, verbalization of emotional reaction, emoticons, interjections, and emotional construction [cf. Langlotz, Locher 2012] on online comments).

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). In our specific discourse type (written media discourse representing indirect interaction) and with specific discourse participants, this category is less prominent. However, online comments resemble direct interaction (see [7]). Cursing is often 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'.

(7) *Nigdje ni bila ni ozbiljna ni znanstvenica (zaista), već najobičnija vucaralica – uokolo se klatari.*
'She was neither serious nor a researcher (really), but a simple rambler/slut – she wanders around' (IS18).

There are a few examples of abusive language outside the 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'[20]. Both 'fool' and 'slut' are very abusive[21].

4.2. Means of implying emotions

Irony and sarcasm (together with conceptual implications, lexical connotations, metaphors, and wordplay) are means of **implying** emotions (Langlotz, Locher 2012: 1602). However, because our data are entire texts, and because they are parts of the broader contexts, means of implying emotions are usually followed by means of expressing emotions. The category "means of expressing emotions" prevails in our material, contrary to our expectations.

In 4.2.1. and 4.2.2. we exemplify irony and wordplay. Section 4.3. discusses a category that merges means of expressing emotions and means of implying emotions.

4.2.1. IRONY, SARCASM, MOCK POLITENESS

Both irony as conveying a meaning opposite from a literal meaning and sarcasm[22] as a harsher form of irony can be found in parts of the discourse

---

[20] *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' (IS11).

[21] It has frequently been emphasized that (im)politeness does not exist in the lexicon or in grammatical structures taken out of context (cf., 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).

[22] In this article we cannot go deeper into the differences between irony and sarcasm.

analyzed and are a main structural principle and cohesive device of some texts[23]. Irony and sarcasm are sometimes achieved by mock politeness. For example, calling an opponent an "excellent linguist" may sound positive, but if an assertion about a lack of knowledge follows (cf. [8]) the meaning conveyed is the opposite:

(8) *Vrla jezikoslovka nikako dakle da shvati da su i jezici, a ne samo nacije, nastali u diskursu određenih ljudi.*
'By no means can this *excellent linguist* understand that languages, and not only nations, emerged in a discourse by particular people' (IS12).

In (9), one side in the conflict is seemingly polite by offering to help the other. However, that offer is an indirect putdown of the opponents:

(9) *mi ćemo biti voljni da vama, u granicama raspoloživog slobodnog vremena, pružimo besplatne usluge mentorstva kako ne biste više brukali crnogorsku filologiju.*
'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' (IS16).

4.2.2. WORDPLAY AND OTHER CREATIVE LANGUAGE MEANS

Creativity was not studied in relation to impoliteness prior to Culpeper (2011). Creativity is often connected with literary language (Culpeper 2011: 240), but it can be a feature of non-literary genres as well. It is not surprising that creativity is a significant 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 these are more applicable to face-to-face interaction than to our material: the pattern-forming type (Culpeper 2011: 240) and unusual implicitness (Culpeper 2011: 241). Our material shows many instances of what Culpeper terms **pattern re-forming**. This pattern is realized in modifications of sayings, idioms, rhyme, and other modes of expression typical for poetry. These modifications attract attention, entertain readers, and show

---

[23] E.g., (IS8) and (IS17). These texts rely on intertextual references to world literature, knowledge of history and philosophy, and creativity: these texts are entertaining for some readers. In both cultures in professional humanities circles, elaborate style is an extremely important mode of expression.

the authors' superiority. Example (10) is a modified version of *Kad nema mačke miševi kolo vode* 'when the cat's away the mice will play'. Example (11) is used to comment on the argumentation of a female linguist. It 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 in (11) contains the negatively evaluative noun *baba* 'old woman'. Example (12) modifies the idiom *podmetnuti* (*komu*) *klipove pod noge* 'place stumbling blocks for somebody' by adding some new partly antonymic elements (*silne političke – slabašne lingvističke*). The evaluative phrase *slabašne lingvističke noge* 'weak linguistic legs' denigrates the female linguist's knowledge.

(10) *Kad nema mačke miševi su lavovi.*
 'when the cat's away the mice are lions' (IS6).

(11) *Trla baba lan, da joj prođe dosadni jugounitaristički dan.*
 'An old woman crushed flax in order to get through a boring Yugo-unitary day' (IS16).

(12) *ona si je sama podmetnula silne političke klipove pod svoje slabašne lingvističke noge.*
 'she placed many political stumbling blocks for herself under her weak linguistic legs' (literally) (IS16)[24].

We also identified Culpeper's creativity type **situational deviation**: creativity of this type is understood as an interaction between language and context. In (13), traditional twelve-syllable verse is used in a newspaper text dealing with political alliances. Poetic expression is unexpected in similar text types.

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

Situational deviation is also observable in the unexpected uses of elements from the administrative language register. These deviations occur at the sentence level, whereas in some cases a text in its entirety illustrates creativity (IS4, IS17).

We assume that creative devices (idiom modifications, rhyme, or other devices) illustrate means of implying emotions.

---

[24] Examples (11) and (12) are taken from comments on an online text.

4.3. Combination of means of expressing and implying emotions:
Plural forms of surnames, irony, and intensification

In some examples, we observed a combination of different categories. Example (14) illustrates how the alleged subject positions of individuals are denied through plural surnames. The plural forms of surnames additionally refer to ethnic, religious, and political groups placed in opposition to Croats (e.g., Goldstein is Jewish, and Jovanović is typically Serbian). These plurals can indicate ethnic and religious discrimination when preceded by the pejorative modifier *razni* and linked to negatively evaluating nouns (*trbuhozborci, trbuhoborci*):

(14) *razni Goldsteini, Ivini, Kordići i Jovanovići kao i drugi slični jezikoborci, trbuhozborci i trbuhoborci iz nove vlasti spremaju se Hrvate nahraniti novim pravopisom.*
'various Goldsteins, Ivins, Kordićs, and Jovanovićs as well as other similar language fighters, ventriloquists, and people with vested interests from the new government have been preparing to feed Croats a new normative guide' (IS10).

Example (14) illustrates a combination of creative wordplay with irony and intensification.

Intensification of impoliteness is achieved through various linguistic means[25]. In our material, we found chains of negatively evaluating nouns (cf. [15], [16], and [17]). Some of the nouns and adjectives in an "impoliteness chain" are near-synonyms – for instance, *sakat* and *nakaradan* in [15], *izdajstvo, kolaboracija i četništvo* in [16] – and some are semantically less related or unrelated: *licemjerje, laž i groteska* in [17].

(15) *ta knjiga (...) zbog sakate, odnosno nakaradne lingvističke nazoviteorije, ne bi dobila potporu nigdje drugdje u svijetu.*
'that book (…) because of its lame, i.e. deformed, linguistic so-called theory, would not receive support anywhere else in the world' (IS19).

(16) *Izdajstvo, kolaboracija i četništvo.*
'betrayal, collaboration, and Četnik activities' (IS20).

(17) *Predstavnici opozicije poručili su sinoć Đukanoviću da njegovo najnovije gostovanje u javnosti predstavlja „paradu licemjerja, laži i groteske".*

---

[25] Exaggeration through negative nouns and adjectives has already been noted in research on hate speech in the Serbian media (Jakšić 1996; Bugarski 1997).

'Yesterday evening the representatives of the opposition parties sent Đukanović a message that his latest visit to the public sphere represents a "parade of hypocrisy, lies, and the grotesque"' (IS21).

As already indicated, different impoliteness realizations, as well as means of expressing and implying emotions, are most often combined in the same article (e.g., inappropriate identity markers occur with quotation marks, personalized negative assertions, and irony).

In another analysis (Šarić, Felberg 2015) we discussed how discourse participants use impoliteness strategically, as a weapon when they position themselves as representing rational, well-grounded, and justifiable views, and when they simultaneously position other participants as supporters of ignorant and implausible views. Because various impoliteness realizations are closely related to and interwoven with means of expressing and implying emotions, these means also play a role in coercion and delegitimization. However, the question that remains open to further research is whether means of expressing and implying emotions contribute to effective coercion and delegitimization, and at what levels.

5. Concluding remarks

In media discourse about language and identity in Croatian and Montenegrin material we identified various means of expressing and implying emotions related to realizations of impoliteness. These are: inappropriate personal identity markers, negative personal assertions (direct and indirect), and conventionalized impoliteness realizations (e.g., taboo words). We assume that there is a relation between impoliteness realizations and discourse participants' and recipients' emotions. The evidence for this assumption can be exemplified by extremely negatively charged nouns and adjectives that potentially signal discourse participants' emotional states.

More often than expected, we encountered different ways of communicating emotional stances interwoven with impoliteness in the subtype of identity discourse analyzed. Emotional arguments interwoven with diverse impoliteness realizations also appeared more frequently than anticipated: in almost all texts in which discourse participants express their views, one or more different realizations of impoliteness appear.

Another less surprising finding is a high level of creativity at different levels, such as lexical creativity in neologisms, syntactic creativity in modification of idioms, and creativity at the textual level in situational deviation and creative genre uses. Creativity relates to some potential emotional reactions in some readers, one of them being (aesthetic) pleasure.

Many instances of impoliteness in our material are reactive impoliteness: the discourse of one participant (and emotional means used by him/her) influences that of the next participant. This aspect is related to emotions: we assume that reactive anger influenced certain forms of emotional display in our data, and/or the general tone in some discourse samples. We further assume that many examples in our material relate to what Culpepper (2011: 221–225) terms "affective impoliteness": the "targeted display of heightened emotion, typically anger, with the implication that the target is to blame for producing that negative emotional state".

Impoliteness realizations seem to appear in identity discourses in which individuals or groups construct their identity as "right" in terms of having the right knowledge or supporting the right ideology. Simultaneously, they construct others' identity as "wrong". In response, the other discourse participant reacts with intensified impoliteness. In this cyclic process, affective impoliteness is present. As Culpeper observes (2011: 231–232), that impoliteness type is often combined with other types: in our sample affective impoliteness is combined with strategic, instrumental impoliteness that aims to delegitimize. Identity construction in our contexts seems to involve many different emotions.

Elsewhere (cf. Šarić, Felberg 2015) we link the realizations of impoliteness to attracting and entertaining readers, which directly relates to emotional arousal in readers. Another function we identified related to discourse participants is coercion: legitimizing one's own standpoints and delegitimizing opponents. An open question is how "successful" a legitimization strategy can be if it largely relies on impoliteness and emotional arguments. Our discourse samples show a tendency noticed in online disagreements (Langlotz, Locher 2012: 1597): argumentation frequently shifts from an argumentative discussion level toward displaying disagreement centered on negative emotional display and impoliteness realizations.

An interesting question for further research is whether the high frequency of means of expressing and implying emotions in public discourse is a new(er) development, whether it is related to media tabloidization, and whether it is related to thematically specific discourse subtypes.

More research is needed to answer these questions and determine how impoliteness realizations are related to emotional means. This analysis is only a first step. Its scope is limited because it focuses on a very specific discourse type. Further analyses should include a broader sample of public discourse with different thematic orientations.

Literature

Archer D.E., 2008, *Verbal Aggression and Impoliteness: Related or Synonymous?*, in: *Impoliteness in Language: Studies on its Interplay with Power in Theory and Practice*, eds. D. Bousfield, M. Locher, Berlin, p. 181–210.

Bousfield D., 2007, *Beginnings, middles and ends: A biopsy of the dynamics of impolite exchanges*, "Journal of Pragmatics" no. 39, p. 2185–2216.

Bousfield D., 2008a, *Impoliteness in Interaction*, Amsterdam.

Bousfield D., 2008b, *Impoliteness in the Struggle for Power*, in: *Impoliteness in Language: Studies on its Interplay with Power in Theory and Practice*, eds. D. Bousfield, M. Locher, Berlin, p. 127–154.

Bugarski R., 1997, *Jezik u društvenoj krizi*, Beograd.

Bülow-Møller A.M., 2003, *Second-hand Emotion: Interpreting Attitudes*, <http://hdl.handle.net/10077/2466>, 18.10.2014.

Culpeper J., Bousfield D., Wichmann A., 2003, *Impoliteness revisited: with special reference to dynamic and prosodic aspects*, "Journal of Pragmatics" no. 351, p. 1545–1579.

Culpeper J., 2005, *Impoliteness and 'The Weakest Link'*, "Journal of Politeness Research" no. 1, p. 35–72.

Culpeper J., 2008, *Reflections on Impoliteness, Relational Work and Power*, in: *Impoliteness in Language: Studies on its Interplay with Power in Theory and Practice*, eds. D. Bousfield, M. Locher, Berlin.

Culpeper J., 2011, *Impoliteness: Using Language to Cause Offence*, Cambridge.

Čupić Č., 2009, *Politička kultura i mediji*, „Godišnjak Fakulteta političkih znanosti" no. 3, p. 339–353.

Đerić G., 2008, *Intima javnosti*, Beograd.

Dynel M., 2012, *Setting our House in order: The workings of impoliteness in multi-party film discourse*, "Journal of Politeness Research" no. 8, p. 161–194.

Edwards D., 1999, *Emotion Discourse*, "Culture and Psychology" no. 5, p. 271–291.

Felberg T.R., Šarić Lj., 2013, *Discursive Construction of Language Identity through Disputes in Croatian and Montenegrin Media*, „Scando-Slavica" no. 59, p. 73–31.

Haarmann H., 1999, *History*, in: *Handbook of Language and Ethnic Identity*, ed. J.A. Fishman, New York, p. 60–76.

Haugh M., 2007, *The discursive challenge to politeness research: An interaction alternative*, "Journal of Politeness Research" no. 3, p. 295–317.

Holmes J., Marra M., Schnurr S., 2008, *Impoliteness and ethnicity: Māori and Pākehā discourses in New Zealand workplaces*, "Journal of Politeness Research" no. 4, p. 193–220.

Hraste M., 1953, *O ženskim prezimenima*, „Jezik: časopis za kulturu hrvatskoga književnog jezika" no. 2, p. 136–140.

Hutchby I., 2008, *Participants' orientations to interruptions, rudeness and other impolite acts in talk-in-interaction*, "Journal of Politeness Research" no. 4, p. 221–241.

Ilşık-Güler H., Ruhi Ş., 2010, *Face and impoliteness at the intersection with emotions: A corpus-based study in Turkish,* "Intercultural Pragmatics" no. 7, p. 625–660.

Jakšić B. (ed.), 1996, *Ka jeziku mira*, Beograd.

Jones T.S., 2001, *Emotional communication in conflict: essence and impact*, in: *The Language of Conflict and Resolution*, eds. W.F. Eadie, P.E. Nelson, Thousand Oaks–London–New Delhi, p. 81–104.

Kienpointner M., 2008, *Impoliteness and emotional arguments*, "Journal of Politeness Research" no. 4, p. 243–265.

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

Kordić S., 2010, *Jezik i nacionalizam*, Zagreb.

Locher M.A., Watts R.J., 2008, *Relational Work and Impoliteness: Negotiating Norms of Linguistic Behaviour*, in: *Impoliteness in Language: Studies on its Interplay with Power in Theory and Practice*, eds. D. Bousfield, M. Locher, Berlin, p. 77–79.

Langlotz A., Locher M.A., 2012, *Ways of communicating emotional stance in online disagreements*, "Journal of Pragmatics" no. 44, p. 1591–1606.

Langlotz A., Locher M.A., 2013, *The role of emotions in relational work*, "Journal of Pragmatics" no. 58, p. 87–107.

Paltridge B., 2012, *Discourse Analysis*, London.

Pandžić Z., 2009, *Od Galileja do zlatne ptičice*, „Republika" no. 7, p. 138–164.

Perović M.A., Silić J., Vasiljeva Lj., 2010, *Pravopis crnogorskoga jezika*, Podgorica.

R.T. Sad imaju viška slova, „Dan", <www.dan.co.me>, 18.09.2010.

Šarić Lj., Felberg T.R., 2015, *Realizations and functions of impoliteness in discourse about language and identity in Croatian and Montenegrin*, in: *Impoliteness in Media Discourse*, ed. A. Bączkowska, Frankfurt.

Savić S., Mitro V., 1998, *Psovke!!!*, Novi Sad.

Spencer-Oatey H., 2007, *Theories of identity and the analysis of face*, "Journal of Pragmatics" no. 39, p. 639–656.

Zelić-Bučan B., 1971, *Narodni naziv hrvatskog jezika tijekom hrvatske povijesti*, „Jezik" no. 1, p. 38–48.

Internet sources

All Internet sources (if not stated otherwise) last accessed in February 2013.

IS1: *Rat za hrvatski jezik i pravopis* (*I. dio*), <http://www.hkv.hr/izdvojeno/tribine/kultura/7171-dr-sc-mario-grevi-rat-za-hrvatski-jezik-i-pravopis-i-dio.html>.

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://cetinjanin-mozaik.blogspot.no/2011/02/novak-kilibarda-velikosrpska-ofanziva.html>, 12.09.2014.

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: *Uvrede pseudolingvistice*, <http://www.matica.hr/Vijenac/vijenac466.nsf/AllWebDocs/Uvrede_pseudolingvistice>.

IS8: *Prvosvještenica hrama nauke*, <http://www.arhiva-medija.com/docs/Arhimed_prvosvjestenica-hrama-nauke.pdf>.

IS9: *Kad je već sve isto, neka gđa Snježana Kordić uvjeri Srbe da priječu na hrvatski jezik*, <http://www.vecernji.hr/index.php?cmd=show_clanak&clanak_id=193504&action=print_popup>.

IS10: *Oživljavanje novosadskog pravopisnog Frankensteina*, <http://www.dnevvol.hr/kolumne/zvonimir-hodak/48301-ozivljavanje-novosadskog-pravopisnog-frankensteina.html>.

IS11: *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>.

IS12: *Jezik srpski, nacionalizam hrvatski*, <http://www.poskok.info/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=23352:pismo-koje-globus-nije-htio-objaviti-jezik-srpski-nacionalizam-hrvatski-&catid=97:novo&Itemid=221>.

IS13: *Čirgić odgovorio kolegama: Podsjećamo na naučni sterilitet*, <http://www.vijesti.me/kultura/cirgic-odgovorio-kolegama-podsjecamo-naucni-sterilitet-clanak-69037>.

IS14: *Plan za jezik pišu ekstremisti iz DPS-a*, <http://www.dan.co.me/?nivo=3&rubrika=Povodi&datum=2012-01-30&clanak=317912>.

IS15: *„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%238220%3B%20za%20mlade%20mozgove>.

IS16: *Otrovne laži o jeziku*, <http://www.h-alter.org/vijesti/kultura/otrovne-lazi-o-jeziku>.

IS17: *Ugovor s đavlom*, <http://globus.jutarnji.hr/komentari/boris-dezulovic/hitrec-prijavio-rudera-boskovica-bajicu>.

IS8: *Snježana Kordić izgubljena u lingvistici & europeiziranoj Hrvatskoj*, <http://amac.hrvati-amac.com/index2.php?option=com_content&do_pdf=1&id=3941>.

IS19: *Razgovor: Zvonko Pandžić filozof i filol*og, <http://amac.hrvati-amac.com/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=3765&Itemid=192>.

IS20: *Mugoša: Medijska scena je gadluk*, <http://www.dan.co.me/?nivo=3&rubrika-=Podgoricom&clanak=327201&datum=2012-04-10>.

IS21: *Parada licemjerja, laži i groteske*, <http://orianomattei.blogspot.no/2012/04/parada-licemjerjalazi-i-groteske.html>, 12.09.2014.