

## ДҮЙНӨЛҮК АДАБИЯТТАГЫ “СЫЛЫКТЫК” КОНЦЕПТИ

## КОНЦЕПТ “ВЕЖЛИВОСТИ” В МИРОВОЙ ЛИТЕРАТУРЕ

## THE CONCEPT OF "CIVILITY" IN WORLD LITERATURE

**Аннотация:** Учурда тил илиминде тил жана маданият проблемасына кызыгуу күч алууда. Тил илими бара-бара адам жөнүндө, анын психикасынын түзүлүшү жөнүндө, анын айланадагы дүйнө жана башка адамдар менен болгон мамилеси жөнүндөгү илимге айланып баратат. Тил илиминде сылыктык категориясынын келип чыгышы 20-кылымдын 2-жарымындагы англо-америкалык окумуштуулардын изилдөөлөрү менен байланышкан. 60-70-жылдары сылык кайрылуунун формаларын изилдөөгө арналган фундаменталдык диссертациялар И.Гофмандын, ошондой эле П.Браундун, С.Левинсондун эмгектеринде жарык көргөн. Сылыктык категориясы салттуу түрдө сүйлөмдөрдүн жана сөз айкаштарынын алкагында каралып келген чет элдик тил илиминде изилдөөчүлөр учурда аны дискурс деңгээлинде изилдөөгө умтулууда [Mills 2003; Mullany 1999].

**Аннотация:** В настоящее время в лингвистике растет интерес к проблеме языка и культуры. Наука о языке постепенно становится наукой о человеке, о структуре его психики, о том, как он взаимодействует с окружающим миром и другими людьми. Зарождение категории вежливости в лингвистике связано с исследованиями англо-американских ученых второй половины XX века. В 60-70-е годы в работах И. Гофмана, а также П. Брауна и С. Левинсона были опубликованы фундаментальные диссертации, посвященные изучению форм вежливого обращения. В зарубежной лингвистике, где категория вежливости традиционно рассматривается в рамках предложения и фразы, в настоящее время исследователи стремятся изучать ее на уровне дискурса [Mills 2003; Mullany 1999].

**Annotation:** Nowadays in linguistics there is a growing interest in the problem of language and culture. The science of language is gradually becoming a science of man, of the structure of his mentality, of the way he interacts with the world around him and with other people. The origin of the category of politeness in linguistics is connected with the studies of Anglo-American scientists of the second half of the XX century. In the 60's and 70's in the works of I. Goffman, as well as P. Brown and S. Levinson published fundamental theses on the study of forms of polite address. In foreign linguistics, where the category of politeness is traditionally considered within the framework of a sentence and a phrase, nowadays researchers tend to study it at the level of discourse [Mills 2003; Mullany 1999].

**Негизги сөздөр:** Сыпайылык, фантастика, образ, сылыктык, рефлексивдүүлүк, “позитивдүү” жана “терс” сылыктык.

**Ключевые слова:** Вежливость, художественная литература, имидж, вежливость, рефлексивность, «позитивная» и «негативная» вежливость.

**Key words:** Civility, fiction, image, politeness, reflectivity, "positive" and "negative" politeness

Speech communication is known to be one of the most important types of human activity. It is the subject of study of various scientific disciplines: sociology, linguistics, psychology and others. At present, in linguistic research a special place is given to the issues of interpersonal

interaction. Courtesy is one of the obligatory elements of communication, ensuring its smooth, successful and conflict-free flow.

The different content of the concept "politeness" in the national consciousness of the English and Russians, conditioned by the type of culture, is manifested in the peculiarities of their communicative behavior, in different communicative actions performed in similar communication situations, in the choice of different communicative strategies and linguistic means by which the goals are realized.

In this study politeness is considered as a communicative category. Communicative categories are understood as the most general communicative concepts that organize human knowledge about communication and norms of its realization [Sternin 2002]. Communicative categories reflect human communicative consciousness, they contain conceptual knowledge about communication, as well as norms and rules of communication.

Among the communicative categories regulating communicative activity, researchers emphasize communication, tolerance, communicative inviolability, communicative evaluability, communicative pressure, etc.

In our opinion, one of the most important communicative categories is politeness, which provides and organizes harmonious communication.

Like communicative awareness in general, the category of politeness has a national-cultural specificity, and it can be considered only through a comprehensive approach to this problem: through the type of culture and the structure of social relations - to the main cultural values and accepted norms and rules of communication. This approach has great explanatory power and allows us to understand the reason for the differences in communicative behavior, to see and trace a certain logic in the actions of representatives of another culture. The type of culture determines the structure of social relations that are most acceptable for a certain community, life values that dictate the norms and rules of interpersonal communicative behavior.

Norms form a certain system of relations based on rights and duties, a system of social interaction, which includes motives, goals, direction of action subjects, the action itself, expectations, evaluation and means [Kravchenko 2001: 91].

At the same time, a norm is not necessarily a law to be enforced. Depending on the strictness of their observance, there are habits, customs, traditions, mores, laws, taboos (listed in ascending order). As mentioned earlier, the principle of correctness in communication should not contradict another important linguistic-communicative principle - the principle of appropriateness.

In order to comply with the norms of linguistic communication, there are certain strategies that are fixed in the consciousness of representatives of a particular linguistic culture, which regulate their verbal behavior in accordance with the communicative context and the expectations of the partner. Politeness, in our opinion, is first of all compliance with the norms of communication through the use of culturally specific communicative strategies that reflect socio-cultural values and meet the communicative expectations of the partner.

When defining politeness, we should start from the purpose of polite behavior, which, as V. I. Karasik notes, is "to persuade a partner to adopt a friendly attitude towards him and to induce a friendly attitude in return" [Karasik 2002: 83]. [Karasik 2002: 83]. Based on this, polite behavior can be defined as the demonstration of a friendly attitude towards the interlocutor, a manifestation of disposition, benevolence and sympathy. This definition seems to be the most general and therefore acceptable for intercultural studies. It should be noted that the ways of demonstrating a friendly attitude can be different, they are determined by the type of culture,

socio-cultural relations and values. Thus, the content of the politeness category is a nationally specific system of communicative strategies and tactics aimed at harmonious communication.

Politeness is related to etiquette. However, as noted above, these two important phenomena in communication are not completely congruent. Speech etiquette reflects politeness; politeness includes etiquette, but these concepts do not completely cover each other. Civility is broader than etiquette. Etiquette is a set of communicative norms and rules. Civility is a system of communicative strategies and tactics used in real communication and aimed at achieving harmony and mutual understanding. Politeness includes everything that contributes to harmonious, conflict-free communication, although some of its elements (at a certain stage or in a certain communicative situation) may not be the norm established by etiquette, i.e., as noted above, it is possible to be polite in an impolite way.

Since politeness strategies, the goals and conditions of communication corresponding to them, and conventional linguistic means are assigned to specific communicative roles, we can say that they are ritualized.

Thus, we assume that politeness, despite its universality, has a relational character, its specific content is nationally specific. This specificity manifests itself not only in the peculiarities of the use of different etiquette formulas, but above all in different communicative strategies, communicative actions, the orientation of which is determined by socio-cultural parameters: the nature of social relations and prevailing cultural values.

Ignorance of strategies specific to another communicative culture leads communicators to construct utterances using their own strategies, which becomes the cause of interlocutors' misperception of their communicative intentions and, as a result, communicative failure.

Comparative analysis of communicative actions performed by representatives of different linguo cultures in the same communication situations allows us to identify the most typical communicative strategies for each of them and on their basis to formulate recommendations or communicative rules that should be followed when communicating with representatives of another linguosocioculture.

P. Brown and S. Levinson call negative politeness the basis of respectful behavior ("heart of respectful behavior"). It is a well-developed set of conventional strategies aimed at demonstrating to the interlocutor the recognition of his independence, personal autonomy, assuring that the speaker does not intend to violate the existing boundaries between him and the addressee and, if it is necessary to violate the addressee's freedom, to minimize imposition, direct influence on him. These strategies are aimed at social distancing, creating communicative barriers, boundaries, preventing rapprochement, demonstrating the presence of distance between the interlocutors and thus demonstrating mutual respect.

Positive politeness, or politeness of approach, is aimed at reducing the distance, eliminating interpersonal boundaries, reciprocity, cooperation, mutual understanding, satisfying everyone's desire to be seen, understood, heard. According to P. Brown and S. Levinson, the linguistic realization of positive politeness in many respects represents the verbal behavior of close people who show interest in each other in everyday communication. Based on shared knowledge and experiences, they have information about mutual obligations and mutual desires. The only difference, according to the authors, is exaggeration, which is a marker of positive politeness and is absent in ordinary everyday communication of close people.

The question of what exaggeration is, what its pragmatic significance is, and why it is an integral part of English communicative behavior deserves special attention. It is well known that exaggeration contains an element of insincerity. Therefore, in the eyes of representatives of many other cultures, including Russians, English people who constantly exaggerate appear

insincere. To understand the nature of this stereotype and to see its falsity, it is necessary to consider separately the semantic and pragmatic meanings.

The element of exaggeration is contained in the semantic meaning of the speech formula, but since its main function is to "satisfy the positive face" of the communication partner, in the pragmatic aspect it cannot be considered insincere. By resorting to exaggeration, the communicator is trying to achieve exactly the pragmatic result, and in this desire he is quite sincere.

#### **References:**

1. Agapova S.G. Basics of interpersonal and intercultural communication. Rostov n.d., 2004.
2. Belyaeva E.I. Principle of politeness in speech communication Ways of making declarative statements in English colloquial speech // Foreign languages in school. - 1985. - № 2. - C. 13-16.
3. Great academic dictionary of the Russian language. In 17 vol. T. 2. / ed. K. Gorbachevich. M., 2005. 4. Vezhbitskaya A. Language. Culture. Cognition. M., 1997.
5. Gorlovko E.V. Linguistic politeness [Electronic resource] // Elitarium. 2011. URL: [http://www.elitarium.ru/2011/12/15/lingvisticheskaja\\_vezhlivost.html](http://www.elitarium.ru/2011/12/15/lingvisticheskaja_vezhlivost.html)
6. Karasik V.I. Language of social status. Moscow, Volgograd State Pedagogical Institute, 1992.
7. Haugh M. Revisiting the conceptualization of politeness in English and Japanese / M. Haugh. Haugh // Multilingua, 2004. - NO. 23 - PP. 85-109.
8. Holmes J. Women's language: A Functional Approach / J. Holmes // General Linguistics. Holmes // General Linguistics. - 1984. - № 24/3. - PP. 149-178.
9. Lakoff R. Language and Women's Place. New York, 1975.
10. Leech G. Principles of Pragmatics. London, 1983.
11. Mills S. Gender and politeness. Cambridge, 2003.
12. Mullany L. Linguistic politeness and gender differences in BBC Radio 4 broadcast interviews [Electronic resource] // School of English. University of Leeds, 1999. URL: <http://www.leeds.ac.uk/linguistics/WPL/WP1999/mullany.pdf>