

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF
WORLD LANGUAGES

ДОБРЕДОЉОВТЕ WÈLLKOMM स्वागत छ
VÄLKOMMEN FÀILTE VÍTEJTE HERZLICH KΑΛΩΣ ΗΡΘΑΤΕ
Laipni lūdzam ك ب ال ه أ WILLKOMMEN
BEM VINDA ÜDVÖZÖLJÜK 歡迎 환영
आपले स्वागत आहे 歡迎 ようこそ
WELCOME DOBRODOŠLI स्वागत हे
BIENVENUE HOŞGELDİNİZ FÀILTE
BENVENUTO VELKOMINN Tuhiŋga o mua SELAMAT DATANG
wɪlujeung sumping
SALUTATIO வரவறேல் BI XÈR HATÌ
BINE ATI VENIT ಸೆವಾಗತೆ

International Journal of World Languages

Volume 1, No. 2, June 2021

Internet address: <http://ejournals.id/index.php/IJWL/issue/archive>

E-mail: info@ejournals.id

Published by ejournals PVT LTD

Issued Bimonthly

Requirements for the authors.

The manuscript authors must provide reliable results of the work done, as well as an objective judgment on the significance of the study. The data underlying the work should be presented accurately, without errors. The work should contain enough details and bibliographic references for possible reproduction. False or knowingly erroneous statements are perceived as unethical behavior and unacceptable.

Authors should make sure that the original work is submitted and, if other authors' works or claims are used, provide appropriate bibliographic references or citations. Plagiarism can exist in many forms - from representing someone else's work as copyright to copying or paraphrasing significant parts of another's work without attribution, as well as claiming one's rights to the results of another's research. Plagiarism in all forms constitutes unethical acts and is unacceptable. Responsibility for plagiarism is entirely on the shoulders of the authors.

Significant errors in published works. If the author detects significant errors or inaccuracies in the publication, the author must inform the editor of the journal or the publisher about this and interact with them in order to remove the publication as soon as possible or correct errors. If the editor or publisher has received information from a third party that the publication contains significant errors, the author must withdraw the work or correct the errors as soon as possible.

OPEN ACCESS

Copyright © 2021 by Thematics Journals of Applied Sciences

EDITORIAL BOARD

Ambreen Safdar Kharbe,
Najran University,, Saudi Arabia

Erdem Akbaş,
Erciyes University, Turkey

Oksana Chaika,
National University of Life and Environmental
Sciences of Ukraine, Ukraine

Fatma Kalpakli,
Selçuk University, Turkey

Zekai Gül,
University of Minnesota, Islamic College of
Languages and Translation

Birsen Tütüniş,
Kültür University, Turkey

Nurdan Kavakli,
Izmir Democracy University, Turkey

Anette Ipsen,
University College Copenhagen, Denmark

Lotte Lindberg,
University College Copenhagen, Denmark

Miriam Eisenstein,
New York University, United States

Boudjemaa Dendenne,
University of Constantine I, Algeria

Ismail Hakki Mirici,
Hacettepe University, Turkey

Lily Orland Barak,
University of Haifa, Israel

Maggie Sokolik,
University of California, Berkeley, United States

Manana Rusieshvili-Cartledge,
Tbilisi State University, Georgia

Maryam Zeinali,
Urmia University, Iran Islamic Republic

Mehmet Demirezen,
Ufuk University, Turkey

Sejdi M. Gashi,
Institute of Albanology-Pristina(Kosovo), Albania

Priti Chopra,
The University of Greenwich, Greece

Rome Aboh,
University of Uyo, Nigeria

Salam Yusuf Nuhu Inuwa,
Kano State College of Arts and Sciences, Nigeria

Zelege Arficho Ayele,
Hawassa University, Ethiopia

Mustafo Zhabborovich Bozorov
Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

Martaba Numonovna Melikova
Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

Mastura Mizrobovna Oblokulova
Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

Erkinov Sukhrob Erkinovich
Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

Eko Susanto
Menegment of journal Indonesia

Shirinova Inobat Anvarovna
Guliston State University

Akramjon Abdikhakimovich Shermatov
Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

Akhmedova Shoira Nematovna
Professor of the Department of Uzbek Literature,
Bukhara State University

Hafizov Abror Alisher o'g'li

An English teacher at International Islamic Academy of Uzbekistan

E-mail: mail4me2018@mail.ru

Abstract: Trying to describe the category of politeness as fully as possible, the researcher proposes different approaches, different models for studying politeness. Politeness stands out as a separate problem in which specialists in a number of humanitarian sciences are interested, such as linguistics, sociology, psychology, ethnography, cultural studies, social anthropology, pragmatic linguistics, sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, applied linguistics, etc.

Keywords: politeness, Gricean maxims, speech acts, locution, illocution, perlocution, representations, directives, commissions, expressives, declaratives sociology, psychology, ethnography, cultural studies, social anthropology, pragmatic linguistics, sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, applied linguistics

Politeness as a specific strategy of communicative behavior is associated with the pragmatic theory of speech communication. Consideration of speech communication as an activity found its expression in the development of the theory of speech acts (TSA), which played a significant role in the study of linguistic politeness.

Interest in a speech act as a minimal unit of speech activity, as a purposeful speech action performed in accordance with the principles and rules of speech behavior existing in a given society, is one of the manifestations of the general turn observed today from the study of language as an ideal, consistent system, which is used by the ideal speaker and ideal listener, to the study of language as a complex and often inconsistent system, from the study of language as a system in itself to the study of language as a system that functions and changes in the conditions and for the purposes of social interaction of people [1].

TSA can be considered as one of the ways of realizing the active nature of language. This theory reveals the content of speech acts and is aimed at identifying and systematizing the means of their expression. Representatives of TSA understand by speech action or speech act "a way of achieving a certain goal by a person ..." [2], and this communicative goal (intention, intention) is realized through the illocutionary act, which is considered as a unit of normative socio-speech behavior within the framework of a certain pragmatic situations.

Verbal communication is usually defined as a complex communicative phenomenon that includes situational, psychological, social factors that determine its content and understanding. A speech act is a purposeful speech action performed in accordance with the principles and rules of communicative behavior adopted in each given society. According to J. Austin, performing a speech act means uttering articulate sounds belonging to a generally understandable sound code, constructing an utterance from words of a given language according to the rules of grammar, providing the utterance with meaning and reference, that is, correlating it with reality, having carried out locution, giving speech purposefulness, transforming it into an illocutionary act, causing the desired consequences (perlocution), that is, affecting the consciousness and behavior of the addressee [3].

In modern linguistic literature, various taxonomic attempts are widely represented, in which various classes (categories) of speech acts are subjected to detailed analysis, such as statements, orders, demands, requests, advice, suggestions, invitations, promises,

questions, beliefs, etc.

At the origins of the classification description of speech act lies the scheme of J. Austin, which he developed on the basis of explicit performative verbs, i.e. such verbs that determine the performative status of the utterance and its illocutionary power [3]. These verbs help to highlight the types of speech actions (request, gratitude, greeting, etc.), which were previously considered in the literature according to the rules of good manners as specifically polite. Performatives, associated to one degree or another with reactions to behavior and with behavior in relation to other people, are intended to express interpersonal relationships and feelings.

From the point of view of their illocutionary function, J. Austin divided speech acts into five classes: expositions, verdicts, acts of obligation, acts of motivation and acts of etiquette behavior. The illocutionary purpose of the speech act of etiquette behavior is to express the speaker's attitude to the actions or qualities of the listener - praise, censure, gratitude, disgust, etc.

Etiquette statements, the so-called 'behabitives', include concepts - reactions to the behavior of other people, as well as attitudes towards their behavior in the past or the future and the explicit expression of this attitude. Although the behabitives show an obvious connection both with the statement or description of our feelings, and with their expression (in the sense of the outpouring of emotions), they are still different from both [3, p. 126].

According to some researchers, the fundamental disadvantage of J. Austin's position on this issue is that he does not distinguish between the concepts of "illocutionary act" and "illocutionary verb" [2, p. 14]. The modern typology of speech act is based mainly on the classification of J. Searle, who distinguishes between five basic types of illocutionary acts: representations, directives, commissions, expressives and declaratives [4, p. 181-188].

It should be noted that at present, researchers do not have a common point of view regarding the attribution of one or another speech act to a certain pragmatic type, and therefore the number of distinguished types of speech act varies depending on the illocutionary function.

So, G. G. Pocheptsov identifies the following types of speech acts: constative, promissive, change, directive, quesitiv [5, p. 271]. As can be seen, the allocated speech acts are equated to pragmatic types of proposals. In another classification, given by V.V.Bogdanov, 10 types of speech act are distinguished: declaratives, interrogatives, directives, verdicts, promissives, permissives, performances, commissions, expositions, satisfacts.

This list of illocutionary acts provides for the possibility of further dividing the established speech act classes into subclasses: for example, within directives, inunctives, requisites, etc. are allocated [6, p. 53-58].

From the point of view of the problem of politeness, other studies within the framework of TSA are of interest. Thus, eight illocutionary types were proposed by the German researcher D. Wunderlich: directives (requests, orders, requirements, instructions, etc.); commissions (promises, threats, etc.); interrogative (questions); representations (statements, messages, etc.); satisfaction (apology, wishes, etc.); retractives (cancellation of a promise, refusal of approval, etc.); declarations (announcements, appointments, etc.); vocatives (calls, appeals, etc.) [7, p. 183]. It is noteworthy that D. Wunderlich emphasizes the special role in the dialogue interaction of communicants of those illocutionary types who perform an initial function, i.e. Cause the recipient's response, for example, directives and erotic. D. Wunderlich pays special attention to the study of the problem of changing illocution by various formal means, which are not explicit

performatives, and the discrepancy between the linguistic form of the utterance and its illocutionary force.

It should be noted that along with different classifications, there are also discrepancies in the names of the speech act. So, the same type of speech act is called differently by different authors: behabitives [3], expressive [4], etiquette speech action [8], cliché of speech etiquette [9], the formula of speech etiquette [10].

A certain interest from the point of view of the problems of this work is aroused by the classification of speech acts proposed by G. Leech, in which four classes of speech acts are singled out "in accordance with how they are related to the social goal of establishing and maintaining polite contact." this taxonomy is compiled according to the principle of correlation of the illocutionary power of the speech act and the social goals of establishing and maintaining polite interaction. The following classes of speech act are distinguished in the classification of G. Leech:

1. "Competitive" speech acts (competitive type): their illocutionary goal does not coincide with the social goals of the communicants. Almost all directives can be referred to these speech acts.

2. "Holiday" speech acts (convivial type): their illocutionary purpose fully coincides with the social goals of the communicants. This group includes formulas of etiquette and some other speech act, for example, proposals.

3. "Collaborating" speech act (collaborative type): illocutionary goal is indifferent to social goals. Representatives and declarative acts are ranked among these speech acts.

4. "Conflicting" speech act (conflictive type): illocutionary goal is in conflict with social goals. These include some commissions [11, p.104].

In the taxonomy of G. Leech, the category of politeness directly correlates with the first two groups of speech act - "competing" (incentive speech act) and "verbal act" (etiquette speech act). However, in these groups the speech act, the principle of politeness functions in a speech act. If in the case of the etiquette speech act, its observance increases the degree of politeness of communication, then in the incentive speech act its task is reduced to "smoothing", "reducing their impoliteness." in the "cooperating" speech act, the functioning of the principle of politeness is flawed, and the illocutionary goal of the "conflict" speech act practically excludes the observance of politeness.

Obviously, the above classifications, with a speech act of different terminology and speech act of the degree of detail, reveal a number of common speech act characteristics. However, despite this, the problem of the speech act typology has not yet received an unambiguous solution, and today the speech act does not have a single generally accepted classification of the speech act. Without setting ourselves such a task, let us single out only those types of speech act, which seem to "react" to politeness.

These are, first of all, incentive (or, in another terminology, "directive") speech act. At the syntactic level, linguists consider them a speech act as incentive sentences. And the speech act model of incentive utterances can be represented by a scheme based on the classifications of speech acts by J. Searle [4], G. G. Pocheptsov [5], as well as the models of the directive speech acts identified by A.V. Doroshenko [12] and L.P. Chakhoyan [13] - these are actually directives, which, in turn, the speech act falls into two subgroups:

- A) injections (order, prescription, prohibition),
- B) requisites (request, entreaty), and
- Pre-directives (proposal, invitation, advice).

Let us dwell in more detail on the general act of motivation speech act. It is indicative that incentive speech acts are called 'hazardous communicative activities'. This is explained

by the following doom act. If you give an order to someone or act with a request, you are a speech act that the addressee will do it.

This means that either you believe that you are in a higher social position sufficient to force the interlocutor to fulfill the order or request, or the degree of your closeness (solidarity) is such that he (the addressee) is ready to do it for you. If your premises are incorrect and the interlocutor does not accept your superiority or thinks that your closeness is not enough, he may refuse to fulfill the order or request [14, p.58].

This explanation shows that the degree of risk of rejection depends on both vertical (status) and horizontal (social) distance. Since, in English communication the social distance between communicants is historically long and, consequently, the degree of closeness (solidarity) is low, it becomes necessary to use speech acts that minimize the imposition, the threat of the speech act [14].

Researchers have repeatedly pointed out the plurality of incentive intentions in communication [11; 8]. So, the verbal actgmatic meaning 'I want you to do this' ('I want you to do x.') is realized by verbal acts speech act: it can be a command, order, request, supplication, invitation, advice, proposal, etc. Scientists call them verbal classification and propose verbal classification. B. Fraser, in particular, classifies a request, a command, an order, an invitation, an instruction, a plea to the category of requisites, which are often acted upon as desires doomed to the listener to perform an action [15, p.75]. J. Searle includes a request in the directive speech act along with an order, demand, entreaty, advice, proposal, invitation, speech act of permission and others, since the illocution of all these speech acts consists in an attempt to get the listener to perform an action ("the illocutionary point of these acts consists in the fact that they are attempts by the speaker to get the hearer to do something ") [4, p.11]. By such a doom act, the same speech act are combined under speech act names - directives or requisites.

Thus, U. Labov and D. Fanschel include in the category 'request for action' an order ('come home!'), a request ('will you please come home?'), a proposal ('isn't it about time you came home ') and a hint (' it's getting late! '). Noting that, despite the speech and language design, in each of these utterances the speaker conveys one desire - to induce the addressee to return home [16].

In the literature, we meet different points of view on the status of the Politeness Principle in relation to the Cooperation Principle [17].

In a number of works, the Politeness Principle is seen as a complement to the Cooperation Principle, and among the first to use Grice's theory in relation to the phenomenon of politeness was Robin Lakoff. So, one of the earliest theories of politeness, proposed by R. Lakoff, is precisely some additional set of rules for the behavior of communicants [18].

The main difficulty in classifying speech act is caused by the fact that speech acts linguistic units can convey the same verbal pragmatic meaning, and vice versa, utterances having the same linguistic form, the same language design can have speech acts illocutions, perform speech acts verbal pragmatic functions, i.e. represent speech acts speech act. That is why it is possible, for example, to obsessively act with a request, asking a question, and give an order in the form of a proposal to perform an action.

References.

1. Parret H. Discussing language. The Hague-Paris: Mouton, 1974
2. Кобозева И.М. Теория речевых актов как один из вариантов речевой деятельности // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике, вып.17: Теория речевых актов. М.: Прогресс, 1986а. - С. 7-21
3. Austin J.L. How to Do Things with Words. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962.
4. Searle J.R. A taxonomy of illocutionary acts // Language, mind, and knowledge. Minnesota studies in the philosophy of science, 7, 1975b. - Pp. 344-369.
5. Почепцов Г.Г. Предложение // Теоретическая грамматика современного английского языка. М.: Высшая школа, 1981. - С. 164-281.
6. Богданов В.В. Речевое общение: Прагматические и семантические аспекты. Л.: Изд-во Ленингр. ун-та, 1990.
7. Wunderlich D. Meaning and context-dependence // Semantics from different points of view. Berlin, 1975. - Pp. 183-208.
8. Формановская Н.И. Коммуникативно-прагматические аспекты единиц общения. М.: Ин-т рус. яз. им. А.С. Пушкина, 1998.
9. Ступин Л.П., Игнатъев К.С. Современный английский речевой этикет. Л.: Изд-во ЛГУ, 1980.
10. Третьякова Т.П. Английские речевые стереотипы: функциональносемантический аспект. Санкт-Петербург: Изд-во Санкт.-Петерб. ун-та, 1995.
11. Leech G. The Pragmatics of Politeness. New York: Oxford University Press, 2014.
12. Дорошенко А.В. Побудительные речевые акты и их интерпретация в тексте (на материале английского языка). Автореф. дис ... канд. филол. наук. М., 1986.
13. Чахоян Л.П. Речемыслительные процессы и значение высказывания // Предложение и текст; семантика, прагматика и синтаксис / Отв. ред. В.В. Богданов. Л.: Изд-во Ленингр. ун-та, 1988. - С. 10-15.
14. Fasold R. The Sociolinguistics of Language. Cambridge: Basil Blackwell, 1990.
15. Fraser B. "Whither politeness" // Lakoff R & Ide S. (eds.) Broadening the Horizon of Linguistic Politeness. Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2005. - Pp. 65-83.
16. Labov W., Fanshel D. Therapeutic discourse: Psychotherapy as Conversation. New York: Academic Press, 1977.
17. Ларина Т.В. Категория вежливости в английской и русской коммуникативных культурах. М.: Изд-во Рос. ун-та дружбы народов, 2003.
18. Lakoff G. Thinking Points: Communicating Our American Values and Vision. N.Y.: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2006.