

TO THE HISTORY OF STUDYING THE COMMUNICATIVE CATEGORY OF POLITY

PARA A HISTÓRIA DO ESTUDO DA CATEGORIA COMUNICATIVA DA POLÍTICA *

ZILOLA KHUDAYBERGENOVA

PROFESSOR, DOCTOR OF SCIENCES, BARTIN UNIVERSITY, TÜRKIYE

zkhudaybergenova@bartin.edu.tr

NAZ PENAŞ

DR, BARTIN UNIVERSITY, TÜRKIYE

aloliz74@mail.ru

Abstract: Politeness is a flexible system of strategies, since in the process of communication due to the changing communicative context, communicants are forced to adjust their communicative behavior, trying to make the most optimal choice of strategies and linguistic means in order to make the most favorable impression on their partner. Among the initial major works on the problems of politeness, it is worth noting studies of politeness in sociological and philosophical aspects. In foreign linguistics, a multifaceted study of the category of politeness began in the second half of the 20th century. With the emergence of new linguistic trends at the turn of the 20th and early 21st centuries, such aspects of the study of politeness as cognitive, linguocultural, pragmalinguistic, etc. are actualized. This article analyzes such approaches to the category of politeness, the Grice / E. Goffman paradigm, the semantic rule of R. Lakoff "Be polite!", politeness theory by P. Brown and S. Levinson, The principle of politeness and interpersonal maxims of G.N.Leech.

Keywords: Linguistics. Communicative category. Politeness. R. Lakoff. P.Brown. S.C.Levinson. H.P.Grice. E.Goffman. G.N.Leech.

Resumo: Polidez é um sistema flexível de estratégias, pois no processo de comunicação devido à mudança do contexto comunicativo, os comunicantes são forçados a ajustar seu comportamento comunicativo, tentando fazer a melhor escolha de estratégias e meios lingüísticos, a fim de causar a impressão mais favorável em seu parceiro. Entre os principais trabalhos iniciais sobre os problemas de cortesia, vale ressaltar os estudos de cortesia em aspectos sociológicos e filosóficos. Na lingüística estrangeira, um estudo multifacetado sobre a categoria de cortesia começou na segunda metade do século XX. Com o surgimento de novas tendências lingüísticas na virada do século 20 e início do século 21, aspectos do estudo da cortesia como cognitivo, lingüístico-cultural, pragmalingüístico, etc. são atualizados. Este artigo analisa tais abordagens da categoria de cortesia, o paradigma Grice / E. Goffman, a regra semântica de R. Lakoff "Seja educado!", a teoria da cortesia de P. Brown e S. Levinson, O princípio da cortesia e as máximas interpessoais de G.N.Leech.

Palavras-chave: Lingüística. Categoria comunicativa. Educação. R. Lakoff. P. Brown. S.C.Levinson. H.P.Grice. E.Goffman. G.N.Leech.

* Artigo recebido em 12/05/2021 e aprovado para publicação pelo Conselho Editorial em 15/07/2021.

1. INTRODUCTION

In foreign linguistics, a multifaceted study of the category of politeness has begun in the second half of the 20th century. There is a tendency to single out politeness as a separate problem, which is of interest to specialists from various humanities, such as philosophy, psychology, sociology, anthropology, etc (Larina, 2009 : 10--11).

Among the initial major works on the problems of politeness, it should be noted the study of politeness in the sociological and philosophical aspects. In the works of such areas, the concepts of a person, rituals of interaction were developed(Goffman, 1972 : 319-346), the behavior of the court society was analyzed, as well as the phenomenon of the "threshold of modesty"(Elias 1970 : 184-190), the philosophical foundations of social communication were studied, etc.

The works of many linguists such as V.M. Alpatov (2008), E.I. Belyaeva (1990), P. Brown, S.C.Levinson (1987), O.A. Vasilyeva (2000), V.E. Goldin (1987), E.A. Zemskaya (1994), V.I. Karasik (2002), M.A. Kasper (1990), R. Lakoff (1973), T.V. Larina (2009), G.Leech (1983), I.V. Miloserdova (1991), R.Ratmayer (2009), E.Solovyev (1999ö 2001), I.A. Sternina (1996, 2003), L. Umanes (2011), T.V. Fedorova, N.I. Formanovskaya(1987, 2007), V.Goldin (1987, 1983). and others, are devoted to the study of the phenomenon of politeness. According to scientists, "politeness acts as one of the most striking and noticeable categories of communication"(Sternin, 1996 : 97-112), since "it has a cross-cutting character for communicative consciousness and integrates a number of more private categories. It plays a vital role in ensuring and organizing harmonious communication." (Larina, 2009 : 52)

Being an ethical concept, politeness falls within the sphere of interests of such a philosophical discipline as ethics, the object of study of which is morality, morality as a form of social consciousness, one of the most important aspects of human life and one of the ways of normative regulation of human actions in society. With the study of normative behavior in etiquette situations of communication, the development of a social-normative direction in the study of the communicative category of politeness is connected. This is how the theory of speech etiquette is formed (compare: the theory of social norms in foreign linguistics), presented by numerous studies by N.I. Formanovskaya (1987; 2007), V.Y. Goldin (1983; 1987), etc. It is with the works of Russian scientists that we associate

the careful development of speech etiquette as a verbal component of etiquette, as well as its non-verbal aspect.

With the advent of new linguistic trends at the turn of the 20th and early 21st centuries, such aspects of the study of politeness as cognitive, linguoculturological, pragmalinguistic have emerged.

The cognitive aspect in linguistics explores the problems of the relationship between language and consciousness, the role of language in the conceptualization and categorization of the world, in cognitive processes and the generalization of human experience, the connection of individual cognitive abilities of a person with language and the forms of their interaction. In the cognitive aspect of studying the concept "politeness" is realized in the works of many researchers, in which *politeness* is considered as a component of the national concept sphere of the people, a category of its communicative consciousness (Romanova 2003; Sternin 2003).

The linguoculturological aspect studies the manifestation, reflection and fixation of culture in language and discourse. The study of politeness in the linguoculturological aspect is directly associated with the study of the national picture of the world, linguistic consciousness, national mental characteristics. In addition, studies of politeness in the pragmalinguistic aspect are also being developed, within the framework of which the implementation of politeness in communication is closely related to the characteristics of communicative behavior and communicative consciousness of a particular linguistic and cultural community. The main line of all modern studies of politeness is the empirical definition of its functions in everyday language communication and the definition of its theoretical structure in relation to the various analyzed languages (Arndt and Janney, 1992 : 21-41; Austin, 1962 : 23), which creates a heterogeneous research base and does not allow a strict definition of this phenomenon and the parameters of its structure.

Summarizing and systematizing the existing concepts of politeness, T.V. Larina singled out the main ones from them:

- "politeness as a social norm;
- politeness as speech maxims and rules;
- politeness as "saving face";
- politeness as an agreement on the conduct of a contract;

- politeness as tact;
- politeness as an ethical and pragmalinguistic category;
- politeness as a status of a person"(2009 :11).

The communicative category of politeness as one of the objects of the study of the language in its speech embodiment in the pragmalinguistic aspect helps to reveal the mechanism of human relationships and explain the ways to achieve communicative goals in people's speech communication. It is an important and integral element of the culture of any nation.

2. METHODOLOGY

In this article, the following methods were used:

The method of logical comparison is the main method of philological argumentation. It is used in linguistic term papers, theses and other scientific papers to substantiate theoretical conclusions. It helps to compare the points of view of different researchers, find strengths and weaknesses, and prove the main hypotheses. The most interesting theories about the category of politeness in foreign linguistics were investigated in the work.

descriptive method. The descriptive method is the oldest and at the same time modern linguistic method. The descriptive method is a system of research methods that is used to characterize the phenomenon of language development at this stage. The method of descriptive study must recognize language as a structural and social unity and must focus on it and clearly define the units and phenomena that are the subject of particular studies. In this paper, we used the description method when considering various approaches to the category of politeness.

The process of scientific research can be two-sided: from facts to facts - from inductive methods or from facts to facts - from deductive methods. The inductive method used in the organization of the research process associated with the study of the category of politeness ensures the collection of certain phenomena (information), and then their generation is transferred from reality to their nature.

Analysis and synthesis, like induction and deduction, are opposite, but at the same time closely related methods of cognition. In its simplest form, analysis is the mental

division of the whole into parts and the separate knowledge of these parts as elements of a complex whole. The task of analysis is to find, to see as a whole - parts, in a complex - simple, in a single - a lot, as a result - a cause, etc.

Synthesis is the opposite process - the connection of parts into a whole, the consideration of the whole as complex, consisting of many elements. The ascent from cause to effect is a synthetic, constructive path.

Since the phenomenon under study always appears as a complex formation, its knowledge (after a preliminary general acquaintance) usually begins with analysis, and not with synthesis. To unite parts into a whole, you must first have these parts in front of you. Therefore, analysis precedes synthesis.

Logic has developed a number of rules for analytical research, which include the following.

1. Before analyzing the object (phenomenon) under study, it is necessary to clearly distinguish it from another system in which it is included as an integral element. This too is done by analysis (preceding).

2. Next, the basis on which the analysis will be carried out is established. The basis is that feature of the analyzed object, which distinguishes one component from the other. At each stage of analysis, one basis for dismemberment should be selected, and not several at once. The elements selected as a result of the analysis should exclude each other, and not enter one into the other.

3. After that, analysis is carried out, and analytical knowledge is acquired mainly by inference, i.e. based on actions performed according to the rules of formal logic.

Synthesis as a way of constructing non-inferential knowledge consists in combining and processing several knowledge systems, in combining various theoretical statements, as a result of which an intersystem transfer of knowledge is carried out and new knowledge is born.

Based on the synthesis in scientific research, the following important theoretical issues are solved:

1. The subject under study is presented as a system of connections and interactions with the highlighting of the most significant aspects and connections.

2. It turns out whether there is a single nature, common essential elements in phenomena that are studied as different, but which have something in common.

3. It is established whether there is a connection between laws and dependencies related to one object.

Synthesis, therefore, is not a simple addition of parts, but logically - a constructive operation that allows you to outline the movement of knowledge (put forward ideas, hypotheses, develop them) and carry out its movement. The results of synthetic activity should be a holistic picture that adequately reflects reality.

The advantage of the synthetic method of research is its correspondence, adequacy to the process of movement, development.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Grice/E. Hoffman's paradigm. The emergence of these theories of politeness became possible thanks to the theory or principle of cooperation formulated by P. Grice in the 60s of the last century. In 1975, his classic work "Logic and Conversation" was published, in which the author outlined the rules underlying the rational speech behavior of the individual and defining "the very essence of communication as a purposeful, meaningful targeted activity"(41 - 58).

Since the theory of P. Grice describes the principle of cooperation, or collaboration, which includes 4 categories: the category of quantity (informativeness), the category of quality (verity, honesty), the category of attitude (relevance, pertinence) and the category of method (manner of speech, clarity), each of which consists of general and several particular postulates.

These rules of speech communication by P. Grice are the essence of the rational speech behavior of the communicants. In real everyday communication, it is impossible to be guided only by the postulates of the principle of cooperation, since the goals of communication are not only the effective transmission of information. The interpersonal, psychological aspect is also important.

Researchers have noted cases when the requirement of politeness conflicts with the postulates of P. Grice. At the same time, being the central principle of cooperative communication, politeness is often manifested to the detriment of these laws.

We cannot consider the principle of cooperation as a theory dealing with problems of politeness. In this regard, modern linguists are making attempts to further improve the maxims of politeness.

R. Lakoff's semantic rule "Be polite!" The first attempt to comprehend politeness as the most important rule of pragmatic competence was the work of R. Lakoff "The Logic of Politeness" (1973). The researcher identified three rules of politeness:

- 1) do not impose yourself and your desires;
- 2) provide a choice;
- 3) behave in such a way that the interlocutor is pleased, be friendly(Lakoff 1973: 126-172).

These attitudes are correlated with varying degrees of distance and formality of communication and, accordingly, are associated with "formal", "informal" and "intimate" types of politeness. At the same time, R. Lakoff pointed out that all these rules are aimed at creating an optimal communication environment (1973).

In fact, all the postulates of the principle of cooperation of P. Grice can be brought under the first rule of R. Lakoff, since the rule of clarity of expression implies the effective transmission of information, which is possible if the postulates of quantity, quality, relationship and method are observed. The second rule - the rule of politeness - is aimed at establishing and maintaining interpersonal relationships. In everyday communication, it is politeness that plays a decisive role, since it is more important for the participants in communication to show their attitude towards each other than to convey their information, so the first rule is often violated.

The first postulate of politeness ("Do not impose yourself") R. Lakoff connects with *Formal Politeness*. The second postulate ("Give a choice") is consistent with *Informal Politeness*. The postulate "Make the interlocutor feel good, be friendly" is characteristic of *Intimate Politeness*. It is possible that the last two postulates prompted G.Leech, the author of the theory of the maxims of verbal communication, to distinguish between negative and positive politeness. If⁵⁵ negative politeness is associated with providing freedom of choice to the addressee (the postulate "Give a choice"), then positive politeness is aimed at expressing sympathy and love for the interlocutor (the postulate "Make the interlocutor feel good, be friendly"). Thus, with the advent of the concept of R. Lakoff in studies on

politeness, the emphasis shifted from the logical analysis of this category to the consideration of socio-psychological factors in the implementation of politeness.

Politeness theory by P. Brown and S. Levinson. In the sixties and seventies of the twentieth century, in the works of E. Hoffman, as well as P. Brown and S. Levinson, the fundamental theses on the study of forms of polite address were published (1987 : 101-210).

Classical in this respect is the theory of "saving face" by P. Brown and S. Levinson, in which G. Leech develops the idea that politeness has two poles: negative and positive. In accordance with this, two types of politeness are distinguished, each of which represents a certain system of communicative strategies aimed at maintaining a "negative/positive face". If positive politeness strategies are associated with demonstrating the unity and solidarity of the speaker with the listener, with showing attention and interest in the interlocutor, with the desire for mutual understanding and agreement with him, with creating an atmosphere of intra-group identity, then negative politeness strategies are implemented in order to provide freedom of action to the addressee, satisfaction his need for privacy.

The general provisions of the theory of politeness are presented in the work of P. Brown and S. Levinson. Let us dwell on this theory as the most complete and consistent. The main concept of this theory is the concept of "person" (publicself-imageface), which means the positive social value that every member of society has. Any action is performed in order to save "face" or to avoid "losing face".

Using the concepts of "preservation/loss of face", P. Brown and S. Levinson develop a general theory in which they substantiate the predictability in the implementation of the category of politeness, based on the assessment of the "weight" of a speech act.

This weightiness is determined by the following factors:

- the difference in social distance and power distance between the speaker;
- and the listener, and the complexity of performing an action associated with the threat of "losing face".

The main idea of this theory is the position according to which, the more the speaker creates a threat of loss of face for the listener (Face Threatening Acts), the more politely he will speak.

A distinction is usually made between "negative" and "positive" forms of politeness (positive and negative politeness). Negative politeness is associated with granting freedom to a person, positive politeness is associated with a demonstration of unity and solidarity.

Positive politeness strategies consist in expressing solidarity between the speaker and the listener and are expressed in the following lines of speech behavior:

- manifestation of attention and interest in the listener, i.e. direct quoting, engaging the listener in a dialogue, striving for agreement, taking into account the desires and inclinations of the listener;
- creating an atmosphere of intra-group identity, i.e. the use of dialect, jargon, appeal to "you", elliptical formations.

Negative politeness strategies consist of giving freedom of action to the listener, which is accepted in the traditions of Western culture and is usually understood as a norm of politeness. These strategies boil down to the following lines of conduct:

- avoidance of direct requests and use of indirect speech acts;
- formulation of statements in softening modal packaging;
- showing respect by belittling one's own position and raising the position of the addressee, readiness to apologize;
- impersonalization of participants in communication, i.e. the use of passive and impersonal constructions, indefinite personal pronouns.

These works usually distinguish between a "negative form of politeness", which is aimed at courtesy and unloading a conversation partner, and a "positive form of politeness", which manifests itself in expressing sympathy, attention and curiosity towards a conversation partner. The scientific community is also aware of the norms for conducting a conversation, as set out in the article by Levinson.

Differences in the choice of forms of the category of politeness by men and women are also considered in the work of Chris Christie "Politeness and the Linguistic Construction of Gender in Parliament: An Analysis of Transgression and Apology Behavior" (2005), in which the author analyzes the features of speech communication in Parliament. In his article "Politeness in Task-Oriented Dialogue" Andrew Merrison introduces the concept of "threat to the goal of communication" as an analogue of the concept of "threat to a person" in the theory of the category of politeness by P. Brown and S. Levinson.

For example, according to the theory of P. Brown and S. Levinson (Brown, Levinson 1987), the negative person of the addressee is threatened by such speech acts as an order, advice, warning, threat; to the negative face of the speaker - acceptance of the offer, gratitude, reluctant promise. The positive face of the addressee is threatened by the following speech acts: self-complaint, criticism, disagreement. To the positive face of the speaker - apologies, acceptance of compliments, admission of guilt. These speech acts, according to R. Ratmair (2009 : 431-449), have a completely different gradation in Russian culture.

At the end of the 20th century and at the beginning of the 21st century, there are tendencies for a slightly different interpretation of this category. The widely known theory of politeness by P. Brown and S. Levinson, created in the second half of the 20th century, was not only further developed over the next two decades, but also underwent a critical rethinking. Researchers believe that this category should be studied not within the framework of a sentence or phrase, but at the level of discourse. Since in the theory of P. Brown and S. Levinson forms of politeness are analyzed in an informal speech situation, it is suggested to consider this category in formal speech communication.

The principle of politeness and interpersonal maxims by G.Leech. G.Leech (1983 : 109) continued the study of politeness as a principle of verbal communication, which underlies the strategy of verbal behavior aimed at avoiding conflict situations, since the observance of politeness aims to achieve the most successful social interaction by establishing friendly relations. Since the observance of courtesy is intended to achieve the most successful social interaction through the establishment of friendships (Leech 1983 : 82).

In the concept of the scientist, the principle of politeness is focused on preventing conflict and comes down to reducing negative and exaggerating positive judgments.

The author, similarly to R. Lakoff, starting from the same methodological and theoretical premises, namely, the principle of cooperation of P. Grice with indirect linguistic behavior in imperative situations, introduces a competing principle - the "principle of politeness" (Leech 1983 : 79-84). Its wording acts as a call to "Minimize the expression of impolite statements!", which is similar to "Maximize the expression of polite statements!".

The principle of politeness consists of six "interpersonal maxims"(Leech1983:132):

- I) the maxim of tact:
 - (a) minimize the costs of others and
 - (b) increase the profits of others;
- II) maxim of generosity:
 - (a) minimize your profits,
 - (b) increase your costs;
- III) maxim of approval:
 - (a) minimize the disapproval of others,
 - (b) increase the approval of others;
- IV) maxim of modesty:
 - (a) minimize self-approval/praise,
 - (b) increase self-disapproval;
- V) maxim of agreement:
 - (a) minimize disagreement with others and
 - (b) increase agreement between yourself and others;
- VI) sympathy maxim:
 - (a) minimize antipathy and
 - (b) increase sympathy between yourself and others.

Maxims are not absolute rules. When comparing “self” and “other”, i.e. speaker and addressee, politeness towards the addressee is more important. Therefore, the first submaxim (a) is more significant than the second (b)): negative politeness, aimed at avoiding problems, is more important in the process of communicative interaction than positive politeness, focused on harmony. Impolite statements are those that are unfavorable or disapproving for the addressee, and polite statements are those that are preferable for the addressee.

Despite the fact that there are some contradictory provisions in the theory of politeness by G.Leech, it as a whole: explains the polite speech behavior of those who communicate, taking into account psychological factors and thus represents a fruitful attempt to comprehend the category of politeness from new positions; In addition, the principle of politeness, according to the fair remark of M.V. Koltunova, is universal "from the point of view of systematic ethical postulates illuminated by the cultural tradition of mankind" (Koltunova 2005: 60).

Compliance with the maxims of all at once, in our opinion, does not solve the problem of successful communication in full. Most of the maxims are, from a historical perspective, scientifically stylized reformulations of the rules of conduct found in the old books of etiquette. The simultaneous complexity and simplicity of working with such definitions as seek understanding or avoid disagreement lies in the absence of time and space boundaries that are continuously drawn in every society.

G.Leech's maxims are fundamental for an ideal communicative situation, which is very rare in everyday communication, since communicative processes are infinitely diverse in form and meaning for different types of relationships. By itself, G.Leech's maxim "Be polite!" is devoid of situational, cultural conditioning: this maxim will have completely different content within the framework of a particular culture and a particular situation.

The merit of G.Leech, in our opinion, is that he created a theoretical model of politeness, which allows researchers to develop this phenomenon in relation to the factor of interpersonal relations between the speaker and the addressee (social status, social distance).

According to G.Leech, the first submaxim within each maxim is more important than the second, because it is aimed at avoiding disagreements in communication and is implemented by negative politeness strategies. with such a statement. You can agree if we are talking about observance of politeness in Western cultures. On the contrary, for Eastern cultures, including Russia, positive politeness is of great importance, i.e. desire for consent, expression of sympathy, mutual understanding, manifestation of interest and care. Thus, the priority of the maxims of verbal communication will depend on the type of culture, which was also suggested by G.Leech.

4. CONCLUSION

Currently, approaches to the study of politeness in foreign linguistics are carried out in the cognitive, linguoculturological, communicative and pragmalinguistic directions.

Politeness, according to a number of researchers, is primarily a flexible system of strategies, since in the process of communication, due to the changing communicative context, communicants are forced to adjust their communicative behavior, trying to make

the most optimal choice of strategies and language means in order to to make the most favorable impression on your partner.

Within the framework of the theoretical concepts we have considered, politeness is developed in accordance with conversion maxims or the principle of saving face. In the first case, politeness is designed to improve relations through the mechanisms of social regulation, i.e. through uncodified prescribed norms that help reduce friction between the participants in communication and guarantee the functioning of the system of social relations.

The common point for these theories is the definition of the main function of politeness as the avoidance of potentially conflict situations. In this case, the face acts as a normative center, since all strategies of verbal behavior are focused on its preservation. This allows us to put an equal sign between the dichotomies of G.Leech “costs or income of an act of communication” and “threat of losing face or face saving” by P. Brown and S. Levinson.

Based on these theories, politeness should be considered as a communicative category that regulates the communicative interaction of those who communicate, taking into account their status and role characteristics. Since, Politeness as a central category of communicative consciousness organizes a person's knowledge about polite communication and the norms for its implementation.

We see the solution to this problem in an integrated approach to research, namely, in the ratio of politeness to the normative, cultural and situational framework of communication, i.e. in relation to its permanent ambivalence between the inner and outer sides, between form and meaning, conventions and individual spontaneity, the versatility of semiotic forms of its implementation associated with ethical principles in any kind of communication.

REFERENCES

- Alpatov, Vladimir Mihaylovich. (2008). O yazikovoy kartine mira yaponsev. *Ístoricheskaya psixologiya i sotsiologiya istorii*. 1:133-141.
- Arndt, Horst, Janney, Richard W. (1992). *Íntraculturaltact versus interculturaltact. Politeness in Language: Studies in its History, Theory and Practice*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Austin, John Langshaw. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Belyayeva, Yelena. (1990). Prinsip vejlivosti v voprositelnix rechevix aktax. *Ínostrannie yaziki v shkole* 1: 43-47.
- Brown, Penelope and Levinson, Stephen. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Christie, Christine. (2005). Politeness and linguistic construction of gender in parliament. *An analysis of transgression and. apology behavior: Linguistic Politeness and Context*. Loughborough University, UK.
- Elias, Schwartz. (1970). Notes on Linguistics and Literature. *In College English, Vol. 32*: 184-190.*
- Fedorova A.L. Pereosmislivaya G.P. (2008). Graysa, ili o nekotorig variatsiyax na temu kanona rechevogo; obsheniya. *Yazikovie yedini v paradigmatiche i sintagmatike: Sbornik nauchnix statey*: V 2 ch. Ch. ÍI. Ufa: RÍŠ BashGU, S. 116-120.
- Formanovskaya, Natalya Ívanovna. (1987). Russkiy rechevoy etiket: lingvisticheskiy i metodicheskiy aspekti. Moskva: Ízdatelstvo «Russkiy yazik».
- Formanovskaya, Natalya Ívanovna. (2007). *Obrasheniya s točki zreniya kommunikativno-pragmaticheskogo podxoda*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Goffman, Erving. (1972). *On Face-Work: an Analysis of Ritual Elements in Social Interaction. Communication in Face-to-Face Interaction*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Goldin, Valentin. (1983). *Rech i etiket*. Moskva: Prosveshenie. - 109 s.
- Goldin, Vasily Yeldovich. (1987). *Obrashenie: teoreticheskie problem*. Saratov: Ízd. Saratovskogo universiteta.
- Grice, Paul. (1975). *Logic and Conversation*. New York: Academic Press.
- Karasik, Vladimir Ílich. (2002). *Yazik sotsialnogo statusa*. Moskva: ÍTDGK «Gnozís».
- Kasper, Gabriele. (1990). Linguistic politeness: Current research issues. *Journal of Pragmatics* 14, 2: 193-218.
- Koltunova, Mariya Viktorovna. (2005). *Konvensii kak pragmaticheskiy faktor: delovogo dialogicheskogo obsheniya*. Moskva: Akad. gumanitar, issled.
- Lakoff George. (1987). Metafori, ktorimi mi jivem. *Yazik i modelirovanie sotsialnogo vzaimodeystviya*. Moskva.
- Lakoff, Robin. (1973). The logic of politeness; or minding your p's and q's.' *Papers from the Ninth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Larina, Tatyana Viktorovna. (2009). *Kategoriya vejlivosti i stil komunikasii: Sopotavlenie angliyskix i russkix lingvokulturnix tradisij*. Moskva: Yaziki slavyanskix kultur.
- Leech, Geoffrey N. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London. New-York: Longman.
- Miloserdova, Yelizaveta Vladimirovna. (1991). Kak vajno bit vejlivim, govorya na inostrannom yazike. *Ínostrannie yazike v shkole*, 4: 104-106.
- Ratmayr, Renate. (2009). Pragmaticheskie klishe «novoy russkoy vejlivosti»: ix upotreblenie i otsenka. *Stereotipi v yazike, komunikasii i culture*. Moskva: RGGU.

- Romanova, Írina. (2003). Konsept «vejlivost» i yego ob'ektivatsiya v russkom yazike. *Kommunikativnoe povedenie. Vip. 17*. Voronej: Ízd-vo «Ístoki».
- Sokovnin, Vladimor Mihaylovich. (1973). *O prirode chelovecheskogo obsbeniya (opit filosofskogo analiza)*. Frunze: Mektep.
- Solovev, Eduard Yakovlevich. (2001). *Sovremenniy etiket i delovoy protokol*. Moskva: Ízdatelstvo «Os-89».
- Solovyev, Eduard Yakovlevich. (1999). Ínterpretatsiya fenomena vejlivosti v sovremennoy lingvisticheskoy literature. *Yazik. Kultura. Deyatelnost: Vostok - Zapad*. - Naberejnie Chelni: Ínstitut upravleniya.
- Sternin, Íosif Abramovich. (1996). Kommunikativnoe povedenie v strukture nasionalnoy kulturi. *Etnokulturnaya spesifika yazikovogo soznaniya*. Moskva: Ín-t yazikoznaniya.
- Sternin, Íosif Abramovich. (2003). Problemi opisaniya vejlivosti kak kommunikativnoy kategorii. *Kommunikativnoe povedenie. Vejlivost kak kommunikativnaya kategoriya*. Voronej: Ízd-vo «Ístoki».
- Umanes, Lyubov. (2011). *Verbalnaya reprezentatsiya vejlivosti v sfere delovogo obsbeniya :na materiale sovremennogo nemeskogo*. PhD Dissertation. Ínstitut yazikoznaniya RAN.
- Vasilyeva, Oksana Aleksandrovna. (2000). *Realizatsiya maksim vejlivosti v angliyskom i russkom dialogax*. PhD Dissertation. Ínstitut yazikoznaniya RAN.
- Xarchenko, Yelena Vladimirovna. (2005). Osobennosti izucheniya yazikovogo soznaniya nositeley korporativnoy kulturi. *Obsbenie. Yazikovoe soznanie. Mejkulturnaya kommunikatsiya*. Kaluga: KGPU im. K.E. Siolkovskogo.
- Zemskaya Yelena. (1994). Kategorii vejlivosti v kontekste rechevix deystviy. *Logicheskij analiz yazika. Yazik rechevix deystviy*. Moskva: Nauka.