

Eurasian
Research Bulletin

The Principle of Politeness in the English and Uzbek Languages

**Yuldasheva Feruza
Erkinovna**

An assistant teacher of BSU, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

Politeness is the practical application of good manners or etiquette so as not to offend others. It is a culturally defined phenomenon, and therefore what is considered polite in one culture can sometimes be quite rude or simply eccentric in another cultural context. While the goal of politeness is to refrain from behaving in an offensive way so as not to offend others and make all people feel relaxed and comfortable with one another, these culturally defined standards at times may be manipulated. The relevance of the study is due to the growing interest of linguists in the problems of interpersonal verbal interaction and the psychology of speech behavior of native speakers. Much attention is paid to the study of speech etiquette, the functioning of conventional phrases and the degree of their clichés, especially in cultural and comparative terms. However, these aspects are only the essence of explicit or conventional politeness (R. Ratmayr). Implicit or individual politeness, consisting in respecting the maxim of politeness, implemented by various strategies of courtesy and diplomacy, has not been studied enough and, undoubtedly, should be the object of closer attention of linguists.

Keywords:

politeness, communicant's speech, flattery, hypocrisy, rudeness, insolence, positive and negative, politeness maxim system, individual interests

I. Introduction

Adequate use of conventional cliché phrases and observance of the rules of politeness are the norm and, therefore, are considered neutral, unmarked politeness. The opposition is "polite" vs. "impolite" marked, and therefore easily identifiable will be a deviation either in the direction of excessive politeness (flattery, hypocrisy), or in the direction of insufficient politeness (rudeness, insolence). Indeed, the communicant's speech behavior is not always determined by the desire to be polite, sometimes their own interests' conflict with the requirements of the principle of politeness [1]. Of great interest, therefore, is also the study of cases of violations of maxim politeness.

II. Literature review

Due to the fact that some linguists have suggested that the principles of Grice and Leech correspond to the peculiarities of communication exclusively in the Anglo-American environment, it seems relevant to compare the speech strategy in different language cultures and establish the validity of this assumption.

In connection with the foregoing, the formulation and solution of the problem of functioning of the principle of politeness in dialogic speech involves the consideration of a number of issues: a description of the mechanisms for implementing polite modality; determination of the causes and methods of violation of the principle of politeness; identification of a set of maxims of the principle

of politeness relevant for the languages being compared; establishing the consistency of the requirements of various maxims; identification of the order of preference of maxims present in the minds of communicants.

The speech behavior of communicants in the English-language speech environment is determined by the set of maxims proposed by J. Leech [2]. However, this politeness maxim system must be modified as follows:

- abandon the mandatory division of each maxim into positive and negative maxims, since the maxim of Tact and Nobleness have no way out into the sphere of positive politeness;
- restructure the composition of the maxims: to exclude the positive maxims of the maxim of the Nobleness as not complying with the Principle of Politeness; consider the negative maxims of the maxim of Nobleness as one of the strategies for implementing the maxim of Tact; consider the positive maxims of politeness to be the maxim of Nobleness;
- to differentiate between the spheres of functioning of maxims, securing only appositives to the maxim of Politeness, to maxims of Approval and Sympathy, expressions to maxims of Approval and Sympathy, and assertive to maxims of consent and modesty;

III. Analysis

In the set of speech strategies for implementing the principle of politeness, proposed in the Brown - Levinson theory, two basic types can be distinguished - propositional and modus strategies. Propositional strategies prescribe the expression of some content (proposition), for example, attention to the interests of the addressee, an indication of extraordinary circumstances, etc., which can be done using speech etiquette formulas as well as in any form. Fashionable strategies determine how to convey arbitrary content that is commensurate with the requirements of politeness. Propositional and modus strategies stand out in strategies and positive, politeness and negative.

The whole space of polite communication is divided into two areas: the establishment and maintenance of friendly relations, on the one

hand, and the mitigation of damage caused by various speech acts to the "face" of the addressee, on the other. The use of various mitigating strategies is required only in the second case. The establishment of friendly relations is achieved through the action of positive maxims, which have less weight compared to negative maxims. The field of negative politeness, on the contrary, is tightly regulated by all maxims. It can be concluded that the Principle of Politeness to a greater extent functions precisely in the field of negative politeness, where mitigation and compensation of damage from various speech acts are required.

An analysis of the language material, selected by sampling from the works of art by contemporary writers, showed that all the maxims considered that determine the polite speech behavior of English-speaking communicants are also applicable to the description of the speech behavior of Uzbek communicants.

The strategies of negative politeness, highlighted by Brown and Levinson, satisfying the desire of the individual for individual freedom and self-determination, are widely and almost equally represented in both compared languages. Positive strategies that emphasize the individual's belonging to a collective are more quantitatively and quality represented in the Uzbek language, which probably reflects the influence of the traditions of community life.

Various strategies are presented in the most diverse ways, while observing maxim of politeness, which is most likely associated with a large degree of imposition of speech acts that fall within its scope. The prevailing negative modus strategies can be considered the indirect nature of the speech act, polite pessimism and the semantic minimization of the imposition. The Uzbek language is also characterized by the widespread use of a direct strategy with politeness actualizers.

Maxim of Nobility determines the behavior of the communicants in connection with commissions bearing a smaller share of the imposition. Therefore, a great place here is given to direct strategies in both English and

Uzbek dialogue. Negative modus strategies are also widely represented in dialogues in both languages: indirect expression of speech acts, polite pessimism, semantic minimization. It should be noted that the indirect speech act of the offer in the form of an assertion is characteristic of the Russian language and is practically not represented in English. A major role here is played by propositional strategies — denial of the recipient's debt (negative strategy) and rational arguments (positive strategy). Of the positive modus strategies, one should note the widespread use of the strategy of combining the speaker and the addressee into a single deictic center of utterance ("Let's", "come on").

According to the requirements of Maxim of Approval, modest strategies of understatement, use of modifiers of evaluative modality, reduction of categorization, as well as a propositional strategy of indicating subjectivity of opinion are used to mitigate criticism. Sincere approval, on the contrary, is expressed directly or even with exaggeration. These strategies are presented in dialogues in both matching languages [3].

Maxim Modesty orders to lower the praise of one's own address. To do this, strategies are used to underestimate the amount of the sign when it is true (modus strategy), to limit the scope of the compliment, to reject it (propositional strategies). In case of gratitude - denial of the interlocutor's debt (propositional strategy). The application of these strategies is almost the same in both Uzbek and English dialogues.

According to Maxim Concord, sincere consent is expressed directly, with dissemination and exaggeration, as well as by repeating the initiating remark [4]. This is characteristic of both English-speaking and Uzbek-speaking communicants. The main modal strategies for alleviating disagreements are the use of modality modifiers, pseudo-consent (increment of meaning), denial of one component of the initiating replica, or replacing it with the opposite in meaning, personalization of failure; propositional strategies - an expression of regret over refusal, an indication of the subjectivity of opinion [5].

Compliance with the maxim of Sympathy is largely associated with speech etiquette, which is also confirmed by the stereotypic expression of such speech acts as apology, gratitude, congratulations, condolences, etc. Each of these expressive has its own set of prepositional strategies, which have certain differences in matching languages.

Maxim Consent, manifested in replicas of the addressee, may conflict with other maxims. In the perception of Uzbek -speaking communicants, Maxim Concord has less weight than the maxim of Approval and Modesty. English-speaking communicators put Maxim Accord above Maxim Modesty, but below Maxim Approval [6].

IV. Discussion

This study is a comparison of strategies for implementing the principle of politeness in English and Uzbek. Despite the fact that a significant number of studies have been devoted to the problem of politeness, there is no consensus among linguists about the very concept of "politeness". It is defined as "the relevance of behavior" (Meyer), actions that meet the conditions and requirements of the current communication contract (Fraser), "the desire to create comfortable conditions for the interlocutor" (R. Lakoff, J. Leach) or "the exclusion of discomfort" (Brown and Levinson). It is quite accurate to define politeness as a type of social interaction, which is based on respect for the personality of the interlocutor, on his opinions, interests and desires, and which is aimed at preventing possible conflict situations [7]. Since the concept of politeness is close to the concept of speech etiquette, or rather includes it, then, based on the definition of speech etiquette formulated by N. I. Formanovskaya, we give the following working definition: politeness is a specific verbal and non-verbal behavior accepted in society for maintaining contact with the interlocutor in a selected socially approved tone. There is an opinion that the Principle of politeness, formulated by Leech, functions only within the Anglo-American speech environment and cannot claim to be a universal. In this regard, comparing the

functioning of politeness in English and Uzbek dialogues as a reflection of national cultures is especially relevant. English is a representative and native speaker of Western culture, traditionally opposed to the culture of the East, but the Uzbek language is one component of Central-Asian culture. It is considered, on the one hand, a buffer mitigating the clash of two cultures, on the other hand, a bridge from the West to East. Being influenced by these two world cultures, Uzbek, however, does not mechanically combine their features [8].

The East is characterized by a tendency toward stability, respect for traditions, and respect for ancestors. The main form of life is the community, which creates a special worldview, the idea of equality of community members. In the East, the collective always prevails over man, individual interests are subordinate to the community.

The West lives on the idea of individualism. Individualism is the recognition of a personal priority over the state, personal responsibility for one's destiny, the right to an identity of development, and the affirmation of internal freedom.

V. Conclusion

A comparative study of linguistic phenomena with a cultural background helps to determine the degree of two diverse cultures. The work is based on the politeness theory of J. Leech and the theory of "face conservation" by Brown and Levinson. An analysis of the main theoretical provisions of the two concepts made it possible to establish that they do not contradict, but complement each other, since J. Leech offers a prescriptive model of the rules for verbal behavior of communicants, and Brown and Levinson provide a descriptive picture of existing strategies and tactics of polite behavior. At the same time, both of these theories are correlated with the theory of speech acts. The study of the functioning of maxim politeness on the material of English and Uzbek dialogues required as a refinement of a number of provisions. The principle of politeness of J. Leech and the theory of "face preservation" by Brown and Levinson, as well as the study of

macro strategies and private strategies that implement the maxim of politeness in the speech of English-speaking and Uzbek-speaking communicants.

References:

1. Расулов, З. И. (2010). Принцип контекстуального анализа эллиптических предложений (на материале английского языка). Вестник Челябинского государственного университета, (21), 91-94.
2. <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/print-sip-kontekstualnogo-analiza-ellipticheskikh-predlozheniy-na-materiale-angliyskogo-yazyka/viewer>.
3. Erkinovna, Y. F. Negative Politeness. *Journal of Critical Reviews*, 7(6), 1249-1255. <https://media.neliti.com/media/publications/344146-negative-politeness-c55f7abc.pdf>.
4. 3.Yuldasheva Feruza Erkinovna. (2021). POLITENESS MARKERS IN SPOKENLANGUAGE. *Euro-Asia Conferences*, 37-40. Retrieved from <http://papers.euroasiaconference.com/index.php/eac/article/view/528>.
5. Zarina Habibovna Usmonova. (2021). THE PECULIARITY OF FANTASTIC WORKS (ON THE EXAMPLE OF THE WORKS OF RAY BRADBURY, ISAAC ASIMOV AND STEPHEN KING). *European Scholar Journal*, 2(4), 499-503. Retrieved from <https://scholarzest.com/index.php/esj/article/view/684>.
6. Usmonova, Z. H. (2016). Ingliz va o'zbek tillarda so'z birikmalarining grammatik xususiyati va sintaktik (binar) tahlili. *International scientific journal*, (4 (2)), 58-60.
7. [http://www.irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/cgi-bin/irbis_nbuv/cgiirbis_64.exe?C21COM=2&I21DBN=UJRN&P21DBN=UJRN&IMAGE_FILE_DOWNLOAD=1&Image_file_name=PDF/mnj_2016_4\(2\)_18.pdf](http://www.irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/cgi-bin/irbis_nbuv/cgiirbis_64.exe?C21COM=2&I21DBN=UJRN&P21DBN=UJRN&IMAGE_FILE_DOWNLOAD=1&Image_file_name=PDF/mnj_2016_4(2)_18.pdf).
8. Тошназаровна Э. М., & Акбаровна, Б. М. (2021). Метафора « Собака-

- Человек » В Произведениях Дж. Лондона «The Call Of The Wild» И «White Fang» И Их Переводах На Русский Язык. "ONLINE - CONFERENCES" PLATFORM, 126-130. Retrieved from <http://papers.online-conferences.com/index.php/titfl/article/view/5862>. Aznabaev 1997 Aznabaeva L.A. Non-categoricity as the norm of English dialogical speech // Communicative-functional description of the language. - Ufa: BashSU, 1997. - S. 59-61
9. O'rayeva, D. S., & Gadoyeva, M. I. (2021). Ingliz va o'zbek madaniyati olqishlarida somatizm semantikasi. *Science and Education*, 2(11), 893-900. Retrieved from <https://openscience.uz/index.php/sciedu/article/view/20705>. Alpatov 1971, Alpatov V.M. The grammatical system of formality of the modern Japanese language: Abstract. Cand. diss.- M., 1971.
 10. Akramov, I. (2021). Linguistic Culture Expressing Happiness and Contentment in The English And Uzbek. ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu.Uz), 1(1). извлечено от <https://journal.buxdu.uz/index.php/journals/buxdu/article/view/2881>
 11. Arshavskaya 1977, Arshavskaya E.A. The speech etiquette of modern Americans in the USA (based on a greeting) // National-Cultural Specifics of Speech Behavior. - M.: "Наука", 1977. - S. 268-277
 12. Astafurova 1997, Astafurova T.N. The cognitive-communicative aspect of strategy // Linguistic phenomena in the language system and in the text. Volgograd, 1997, no. 1. - S. 4-11
 13. Bakshtanovsky 1979, Bakshtanovsky V.I. The culture of moral consciousness and personality behavior. - M.: "Знания", 1979. - 64 p.
 14. Bezmenova 1989, Bezmenova N.A. Speech exposure as a rhetorical problem // Problems of the effectiveness of speech communication: Sat. scientific and analytical reviews of INION. - M., 1989. - S. 116-133
 15. Bates 1984, Bates E. Intentions, Conventions, and Symbols // *Psycholinguistics*. - M., 1984. - S. 50-103
 16. Belyaeva 1985, Belyaeva E.I. The principle of politeness in speech communication // *Foreign languages at school*, No. 2, 1985. - S.12-16
 17. Belyaeva 1987, Belyaeva E.I. The communicative situation and the speech act of a request in English // *Foreign languages at school*, No. 1, 1987. - P. 6-9
 18. Belyaev 1992, Belyaev E.I. Grammar and pragmatics of motivation: English. - Voronezh: Publishing house of Voronezh. University, 1992.- 167 p.
 19. Belyaeva 1990, Belyaeva E.I. The principle of politeness in interrogative speech acts // *Foreign languages at school*, 1990, No. 1. - P. 43-47
 20. Bern 1998- Berne E. Games that people play. SPb. M.: University book, 1998. - 398 p.
 21. Bondarenko 1987, Bondarenko E.I. Means of expressing emotional relationships in modern English. - Abstract. Cand. diss. - Pyatigorsk, 1987. - 24 p. 20. Borisova 1996, Borisova I.N. Discursive strategies in conversational dialogue // *Russian colloquial speech as a phenomenon of urban culture*. - Yekaterinburg: ARGO, 1996. - S. 21-48
 22. Buzarov 1988, Buzarov V.V. Formulas of speech etiquette in English dialogical speech // *Social and stylistic variability of the English language: Interuniversity. Sat scientific works*. - Pyatigorsk, 1988. - S. 98-107
 23. Burenina 1989, Burenina N.V. Emotional constructions of English dialogical speech. -Authorph. Cand. diss. - Pyatigorsk, 1989. -15 p.
 24. Vereshchagin, Kostomarov 1976, Vereshchagin E.M., Kostomarov V.G. Language and culture (linguistic and regional studies in the teaching of Russian as a foreign language. - M.: Russian language, 1976. - 248 p.

25. Vinogradov 1996, Vinogradov S.I. Normative and communicative-pragmatic aspects of speech culture // Culture of Russian speech and communication efficiency. 1996.-S. 121-151
26. Vinokur 1993, Vinokur T.G. Talking and listening. Variants of speech behavior. - M.: "Hayka", 1993. - 170 p.
27. Witt 1983, Witt M.V. Emotional regulation of speech behavior. - M.: MGPII, 1983.- 73 p.
28. A certain army 1990, Voyskunsky A.E. Communicative contact and means of its establishment // Optimization of speech exposure. - M.: "Hayka", 1990.-S. 128-151
29. Volovik 1988, Volovik A.V. About some features of modern English speech behavior // Ethnopsycholinguistics. M.: "Hayka", 1988.- S. 124-134
30. Wolf 1985, Wolf EM Functional evaluation semantics. - M.: "Hayka", 1985.-228 p.