

REALIZATION OF NOMINAL FORMULAS OF ADDRESS BY NEGATIVE POLITENESS STRATEGIES

Shamahmudova Aziza Furkatovna (PhD)

Xayrullayeva Dildora Shavkatovna

Samarkand State Institute of foreign languages Department of Spanish and Italian languages

ABSTRACT

This article defines politeness as a set of conversational strategies aimed at avoiding or mitigating conflicts that may arise between interlocutors as a result of social factors such as age, social position, sex, gender, hierarchy, levels of education, etc. Thus, politeness should not be understood alone from the level of social norms, but also from the implications that has on the linguistic plane. In any case, when it comes to politeness as a set of conversational strategies we are emphasizing verbal politeness, a term proposed by Brown and Levinson (1978) and based on in concept image.

Keywords: verbal politeness, nominal treatment formulas, social factors, implications, interlocutors, pragmatics.

According to authors such as Eelen (2001: i), Escandell Vidal (1996 a: 136-137), Fraser (1990, 2002), Kasper (1998: 677) or Thomas (1995: 149), since the term polite was asserted in the lexical inventory, one of its most common meanings has been to refined ways, to behavior based on following series of norms and social conventions that each sociocultural group establishes to prescribe the behaviors that are expected in certain contexts, that is, to the good ways. This traditional view of politeness as a social norm (Fraser, 1990), or courtesy, as Eelen (2001: 30) calls it, has long been linked to time to the use of certain registers or linguistic styles, which has had as consequence that a behavior based on formality was considered courteous of language. However, as Kasper (1998: 677) well explains, the concept of courtesy in pragmatics should not be applied exclusively to the use of the language they make some social classes or some people in very specific contexts, but rather it should expand to include the linguistic behaviors of any individual. A.F. Shamahmudova fairly insists "that language learning should pay attention to these differences and possible pragmatic errors, especially when there is a risk of cultural misunderstanding or evaluating other unfamiliar factors with the help of prejudices. For this, the communicants should be offered clear, pragmatic detailed information detailing the contexts of using the most important speech acts and the means of expression most appropriate to these contexts" Following the appearance of the works of philosophers of language such as Grice (1975) and Searle (1969), several studies arose that conceive courtesy as motivation principal that drives the subjects to behave linguistically in a concrete way, deepening in the causes of that motivation and trying to offer a vision. Scientist of the use of the language, in which its social and interactive side premises. Position that these works offer a very different scientific conceptualization and analysis of the phenomenon in question, Eelen (2001: 30) employs the term of courtesy for refer to them. However, most linguists or pragmatists who have tried politeness scientifically demonstrate great confusion when talking about her.

Thus, for example, several authors from oriental cultures (Hill, Ik, Ikuta, Kawasaki, Ogino, 1986; IDE, 1982, 1989; IDE, HORI, KAWASAKI, IKUTA, DO, 1986; Matsumoto, 1989) have associated it with deference, that is, with respect that some individuals show towards others due to their superior status, to the difference of age, etc. through numerous grammatical

resources, such as, for example, the forms of treatment. In clear relationship with this is the vision of the politeness that associates it with the use of certain linguistic records, that is, with the linguistic variations that individuals carry out according to their perceptions of the communicative situation in which they are immersed (Smith, 1992).

In other works, politeness has been considered an inherent property of the statements and speech acts, by what has been analyzed their diverse realizations with the purpose of establishing a hierarchy of acts plus or less courteous, comparing even their encodings in two or more languages to establish systematic correlations between them (Ogino, 1986; Smith, 1992). However, Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987), Fraser and Nolen (1981: 98) and Thomas (1995: 152-157) argue that deference, registration or certain speech acts of only awaken the interest of pragmatic if your choice and use are understood as a result of strategic behavior oriented to maintain or change the situation or status of the interlocutors.

Finally, within this set of studies that analyze politeness scientifically there are the works that consider it as a purely pragmatic phenomenon for being a strategic behavior with which individuals try to avoid the interpersonal conflict (Kasper, 1990) or reach a wide range of interactive purposes, among which are the establishment, maintenance, improvement, change or destruction of their social relations (Thomas, 1995: 157-158). Fraser (1990, 2002) distinguishes three groups within these studies:

a) Lakoff's politeness rules (1973, 1977) and Leech's principle of courtesy (1983), whose common starting point is the principle of cooperation of Grice (1975), and in which their respective authors do not offer a definition exact of what they understand courtesy. In spite of this, it is intuited that for Lakoff (1973: 297) politeness is to avoid offense, while for Leech (1983: 104) politeness is "[...] the necessary bond between the" principle of cooperation "and the problem of how to relate the meaning of an enunciation with its illocutive strength »;

b) Brown and Levinson model (1978, 1987), for whom politeness presupposes a potential for aggressiveness towards the image of one or more interlocutors, so this is to reduce it, so that it is possible communication between two potentially aggressive parts;

c) the authors that relate the concept of politeness with that of adaptation or appropriation of behavior to a given context, among which there is to mention Chandell Vidal (1996 B, 1998), Fraser (1990, 2002), Fraser and Nolen (1981), Jary (1998 A, 1998 B), Meier (1995) or Zimmin (1981).

Considering what Escandell (1993) proposed when dealing with the subject of verbal politeness, it is worth mentioning that one of the aspects in the subject of verbal politeness, it is worth mentioning that one of the aspects in which the relationship between politeness and language use is most clearly seen is in FAs. Given, then, that FAs reflect to a large extent the relationship between language use and politeness, in this article we analyse the relationship between NFA and politeness.

No doubt for the analysis of the relationship between politeness and NFAs, we should maintain the classification of NFAs into NFAs of positive politeness and NFAs of negative politeness. However, within the analysis we show examples in which an NFA, which in principle can be classified as a positive or negative politeness treatment, may perform a different type of politeness or may even appear to accompany discourteous acts.

For this purpose, in principle, we put forward some methodological considerations that we have followed in the study we have carried out, particularly those related to the pragmatic analysis of NFAs. Subsequently, we present the analysis of negative politeness and NFAs, on the

basis of the formulation of some examples of actual speech usage. Finally, we present some conclusions on the analysis carried out.

The relationship between NFA and negative politeness is established from the fact that one of the discursive uses that NFAs have is to serve as a means to convey courtesy (Edeso, 2005: 129).

That is, NFAs may appear reinforcing polite speech acts (reinforcing acts of the positive image), or attenuating acts not polite (threatening acts of the negative image), through which conveys positive and negative politeness, respectively. However, we consider, in line with what is proposed by Blas Arroyo (1995), that the type of courtesy that can appear in a certain NFA depends to a large extent on the evaluations that the speakers make of the different situations they face and the relationships they establish with their interlocutors, where the context fulfills a relevant role especially in the processes of understanding and interpretation of the uses of NFAs. That is, an NFA is not necessarily determined by connotations or by conditions of formality or communicative informality, but that its appearance depends on the various sociocultural evaluations that make speakers, which does not always correspond to the expected behaviors for verbal politeness is determined by the specific character of the context and of the communicative situation (Haverkate, 1994: 109).

Negative politeness represents the highest degree of linguistic elaboration and conventionality to mitigate the risk of acts that threaten the image of the interlocutor and is considered to be the form of politeness. Negative politeness includes the presence of strategies of deference or distancing (Haverkate, 1994).

The negative politeness strategy arises when the speaker has to formulate unpolite speech acts or acts that threaten the image of the interlocutor, such as exhortative acts or direct statements. In this connection, Haverkate (1994: 22) highlights four strategies for performing a speech act that potentially threatens the interlocutor's freedom in acting. In the examples below we see that the speakers can use some of the strategies mentioned by Haverkate. Consider the following example:

(1) A: *¿Su razón principal para solicitar el crédito?*

B: *...ay, doctor, pues será por exceso de liquidez...* (El Colombiano, 30-05-2008).

What we note in these examples is the presence of negative politeness, because there is a difference in status or power of interlocutors, and this is evident in the use of asymmetrical treatment. The use of *usted* by the person who has a higher status than his or her interlocutor corresponds to the fact that the interlocutor is abiding by the first politeness maxim proposed by Lakoff (1975): "don't impose yourself"; Thus, by using *usted* instead of *tú* or *vos*, the higher status speaker avoids showing an authoritarian image which could result from more conservative treatment norms, while the interlocutor in a hierarchically lower position is compelled to submit with the first maxim of politeness and show his respect for the superior speaker through an NFA respect doctor; even in (1) a phonetic variation in the NFA (doctor) can be seen which implies a distance from the superior speaker.

The NFA doctor is an example of the processes of stereotyping to create different effects, including the humorous ones. Thus, the elision of the phoneme [k] does not involve an idiolectal aspect but connotes a series of social traits which establish the speaker's inferiority.

This condition of inferiority is generally associated with illiteracy or with belonging to a low social class. Another group of examples shows an inclination of the speaker to use other strategies mentioned by Haverkate. One of them is to give recognition to the listener by means of an honorific NFA or by means of an exaltative NFA, as shown in the examples given below:

(2) *Mi señora, ¿desea donar \$40 al minuto de Dios?* (conversación espontánea).

(3) *Caballero, ¿lleva algún equipo para registrar?* (conversación espontánea).

The examples are considered as negative politeness acts insofar as they correspond to non-polite acts, specifically exhortative acts, as they correspond to non-courteous acts, specifically exhortative acts, as they all invade the interlocutor's space and the exhortation issued by the speaker is intended for the listener to perform the action manifested in the propositional content. Now, in relation to the NFAs that accompany these acts, we observe that they function as the pre-consequence of the exhortative act and that they have function to mitigate the direct exhortative act.

However, this attenuation of the imposition is possible thanks to the effect created by the NFAs, since the NFAs in the examples we are considering are intended to grant recognition (exaltation) to the hearer. This exaltation is achieved by using honorific titles, which may even be considered as disused or archaic NFAs, but which are only admissible.

Haverkate considers exhortative acts as macro-acts, since they are represented by 'a member pattern, consisting of a pre sequence, an exhortative nucleus and a post sequence' (Haverkate, 1994: 149). We consider these exhortative speech acts to be direct insofar as, according to those proposed by Haverkate (1994: 159), they contain a complete exhortation of the exhorted act as well as an explicit reference to the interlocutor. This explicit reference is marked by the use of NFAs:

(4) A: *-Bienvenido, caballero, bien pueda siéntese.*

B: *-Señorita, me hace el favor y me da un café* (conversación espontánea).

(4) has as a frame a relationship between customer and waitress; that is, there is an asymmetrical relationship where speaker B, due to the relationship established, has an asymmetrical relationship where speaker B, has a condition of power, which justifies the use of the honorific by the waitress (speaker A); nevertheless, the interlocutor maintains the courtesy of distancing by employing a treatment also of acknowledgement.

In other situations, the use of NFA does not imply politeness. On the contrary, there are NFAs which appear because the speaker does not know or has forgotten the name of his interlocutor. Thus, the NFA chosen by the speaker to the listener's defining social characteristics: age, physical trait, etc. In the case of (5), the speaker does not know the name of his interlocutor so he resorts to an NFA which is determined by listener's age (older person), which to a certain extent implies a respectful treatment, corresponding to a strategy of respectful treatment, corresponding to a negative politeness strategy.

(5) A: *-Venga, don, me da ese este chorizo.* B: *- ¿Para llevar?* (conversación espontánea).

In (6), the speaker also forgets the listener's name and resorts to a kind of lexical exchange in order to make the appeal. However, the NFA connotes some values, one of them is affective represented in the appreciative suffix, also because this NFA establishes a co-occurrence relationship with the treatment pronoun *Tú*, in *ve*, and *Vos*, in *servile*, which in this context also expresses affection:

(6) *Ve, Cusiampirita, servile el algo a Pacheco* (Orduña et al., 2012).

To conclude this section, it must be said that the expression of negative politeness in direct and indirect acts is determined by a series of conditions that the speaker establishes. Thus, for example, the allusion to the listener's ability and willingness to realize the speaker's intention allows the expression of negative politeness in direct acts. On the other hand, the condition of obviousness and reasonableness allow for the appearance of politeness in indirect exhortative

acts. It should also be noted that within the framework of negative politeness, NFAs have as their main function the attenuation of the threat posed to the listener's image by the formulation of an exhortative utterance, either directly or indirectly.

Likewise, we can assert that some of the NFAs exalt the listener, but unlike the exaltation by means of positive politeness strategies, the exaltation carried out in negative politeness marks the distance between the interlocutors.

(6) *Ve, Cosiampirita, servile el algo a Pacheco* (Orduña et al., 2012).

Throughout the analysis of the aspects related to politeness and NFAs, we have tried to show the different forms of relationship that can be established between politeness and NFAs. In that sense, between FTP and NFAs there has been a generalized tendency, at the level of the address pronouns, to classify them on the basis of exclusive relations or oppositions; thus, the form *Usted* has been considered as the polite form of address par excellence, while *Tú* is pigeonholed as a treatment of confidence. However, as has been shown, both pronouns of treatment are involved in politeness, the difference that could be established points more to the type of politeness they involve.

Consequently, the use of an NFA in the context of a non-polite speech act, or between speakers who have a significant social distance, is a product of the conversational contract between the speaker and the listener in a specific communication situation who have a significant social distance, is intended to create a symbolic solidarity with the hearer by erasing the social distance that separates them. In the establishment of bonds of trust between unknown interlocutors we see that the use of NFAs creates the effect of exalting the listener, for which affectionate NFAs are used which, in principle, correspond to relations of intimacy. It should be also added that the use of these NFAs, which try to please the listener by means of exaltation, convey a strategy of persuasion. Not surprising that some of the NFAs do exalt the listener, but unlike the exaltation in the politeness strategies, some of the NFAs are exaltation in positive politeness strategies, the one performed in negative politeness marks the distance between the interlocutors.

References

1. Alonso-Cortés, Ángel. (1999). "Las construcciones exclamativas. La interjección y las expresiones vocativas". En: Bosque, I. y Demonte, V. (dirs). Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española (Tomo III). Madrid: Espasa, 4037-4050.
2. Blas Arroyo, José Luís. (1995). "Los pronombres de tratamiento y la cortesía", Revista de Estudios Hispánicos, 22, 439-466.
3. Brown, Penelope y Levinson, Stephen. (1978) Politeness. Some Universals in Language Usage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
4. Eelen, G. (2001): A Critique of Politeness Theories, Manchester, St. Jerome Publishing.
5. Ehlich, K. (1992): «On the Historicity of Politeness», en watts, R.; S. Ide; K. Ehlich (eds.) (1992): Politeness in Language: Studies in its History, Theory and Practice. Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter. 71-107.
6. Edeso, Verónica. (2005). "Usos discursivos del vocativo en español", Revista Español Actual, 84, 123-141.
7. Escandel Vidal. M^a Victoria. (1993). Introducción a la pragmática. Barcelona: Ariel.
8. Haverkate. Henk. (1994). La cortesía verbal: estudio pragmlinguístico. Madrid: Gredos.
9. Escandel Vidal. M^a Victoria. (2004). "El análisis de la cortesía comunicativa: categorización pragmlinguística de la cultura española". En: Bravo, Diana y Briz,

- Antonio. Pragmática sociocultural: estudios sobre el discurso de cortesía en español. Barcelona: Ariel, 55-66.
8. Fraser, B. (1990): «Perspectives on Politeness», *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14: 219-236.
 9. Kasper, G. (1990): «Linguistic Politeness: Current Research Issues», *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14: 193-218.
 10. Lakoff, Robin. (1975). "The Logic of politeness", *Papers from the Ninth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, Chicago, 42-58.
 11. Molina, Isabel. (2002). "Evolución de las formulas de tratamiento en la juventud madrileña a lo largo del siglo XX: un estudio en tiempo real". En: Rodríguez, F. (coord.). *El lenguaje de los jóvenes*. Barcelona: Editorial Ariel social, 97-135.
 12. Orduña López, José Luis et al. (2012). *Diccionario descriptivo del Valle de Aburrá (DEVA)*.
 13. Medellín. Pedroviejo Esteruelas, Juan Manuel. (2004). "Formas de tratamiento en dos obras de teatro del siglo XX: Historia de una escalera y Bajarse al moro". En: Bravo, D. y Briz, A. *Pragmática sociocultural: estudios sobre el discurso de cortesía en español*. Barcelona: Ariel, 245-264.
 14. Shamahmudova A.F. (2021) Verbal politeness as a regulator of verbal interactions // *Psychology and education*. 58(2): 5894-5902.