



СИНХРОННЫЕ ПАРАДИГМЫ ЛИНГВИСТИЧЕСКИХ ЗНАНИЙ CURRENT SYNCHRONIC PARADIGMS OF LINGUISTIC KNOWLEDGE

DOI: 10.22363/2313-2299-2023-14-3-575-594

EDN: NRGNZR

UDC 811.161.1'271

Research article / Научная статья

Language Means of Expressing Politeness in the Context of Russian Business Communication

Vladimir N. Denisenko, Nazerke Yergazy  , Mikhail A. Rybakov 

RUDN University,
6, Miklukho-Maklaya Str., Moscow, Russian Federation, 117198

 naz_erke9898@inbox.ru

Abstract. The subject of the study is the concept of “politeness” in business communication, its lexical and grammatical ways//means of expression in Russian. Particular attention is paid to the social relationship between interlocutors in a communicative situation. The purpose of the study is to describe the concept of “politeness” and identify its linguocultural features. In accordance with the purpose and objectives of the study, the paper analyzes the features of the implementation of the concept of “politeness” in the system of language functions and considers the strategies of positive and negative politeness in speech behavior in the field of business communication. Based on the analysis of the content of the main functions of language, it was concluded that the category of politeness is realized within the framework of the communicative function of language; The study analyzed the strategies of positive and negative politeness and the peculiarities of its implementation within the framework of private//specific individual communicative functions that correspond to various areas of communication. As a result of the analysis of speech behavior strategies in accordance with the rules of politeness, it was concluded that politeness is an important component of business communication, and speech behavior strategies are based on the difference in the cultural values of a particular society and depend on the models of social behavior adopted in it. If the lines of behavior underlying the first of them are associated with the involvement of the interlocutor in the conversation, paying attention to him, then the second strategy contains lines of behavior associated with the provision of freedom to the interlocutor.

Keywords: formulas of politeness, discourse, business communication, linguoculture

© Denisenko V.N., Yergazy N., Rybakov M.A., 2023



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/legalcode>

Article history:

Received: 01.02.2023

Accepted: 15.05.2023

For citation:

Denisenko, V.N., Yergazy, N. & Rybakov, M.A. (2023). Language Means of Expressing Politeness in the Context of Russian Business Communication. *RUDN Journal of Language Studies, Semiotics and Semantics*, 14(3), 575–594. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-2299-2023-14-3-575-594>

Языковые средства выражения вежливости в контексте делового общения в русском языке

В.Н. Денисенко, Н. Ергазы  , М.А. Рыбаков 

Российский университет дружбы народов,
117198, Российская Федерация, г. Москва, ул. Миклухо-Маклая, 6

 naz_erke9898@inbox.ru

Аннотация. Предметом исследования является понятие «вежливость» в деловом общении, его лексические и грамматические способы выражения в русском языке. Особое внимание уделяется социальному отношению между собеседниками в коммуникативной ситуации. Цель исследования заключается в описании понятия «вежливость» и выявлении его лингвокультурных особенностей. В соответствии с целью и задачами исследования в работе были проанализированы особенности реализации концепта вежливости в системе функций языка и рассмотрены стратегии негативной и позитивной вежливости в речевом поведении в сфере делового общения. На основе проведенного анализа содержания основных функций языка был сделан вывод о том, что категория вежливости реализуется в рамках коммуникативной функции языка; в исследовании были проанализированы стратегии позитивной и негативной вежливости и особенности ее реализации в рамках частных коммуникативных функций, соотносящихся с различными сферами общения. В результате анализа стратегий речевого поведения в соответствии с правилами вежливости был сделан вывод о том, что вежливость является важной составляющей делового общения, и стратегии речевого поведения базируются на различии культурных ценностей того или иного общества, зависят от принятых в нем моделей социального поведения. Если линии поведения, лежащие в основе первой из них, связаны с вовлечением собеседника в разговор, оказанием ему внимания, то вторая стратегия содержит линии поведения, связанные с предоставлением свободы собеседнику.

Ключевые слова: формулы вежливости дискурс, лингвокультура

История статьи:

Дата поступления: 01.02.2023

Дата приема в печать: 15.05.2023

Для цитирования:

Denisenko V.N., Yergazy N., Rybakov M.A. Language Means of Expressing Politeness in the Context of Russian Business Communication // Вестник Российского университета дружбы народов. Серия: Теория языка. Семиотика. Семантика. 2023. Т. 14. № 3. С. 575–594. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-2299-2023-14-3-575-594>

Introduction.

The statement of the problem

Communication between people is carried out under the influence of various factors and a number of some specific individuals' characteristics. To create and build up ideal relationship there are more often used respect, appreciation and gratitude, politeness, which fulfil a vitally important role in creating friendly atmosphere among the nations of different cultures.

Politeness strategy is one of the mostly studied issues of linguistic pragmatics which has recently emerged within general linguistics. Worldwide the universality of politeness peculiarities used to be of great significance. Despite the fact that the notion of "politeness" is adopted by all members of the human society its expression varies in this or that way depending on the factual peculiarities or assigned behavior of every separate nation. Politeness is a complex and many-sided phenomenon being an integral part of people's everyday life which is realized in all spheres of human activity.

Intense interest in the studies of this phenomenon on the part of representatives of different branches of knowledge emphasizes the significance of the issue in human interrelations. From the 1970s and until nowadays, this topic forms the core of attention to make research in the disciplines connected with social interaction, such as psychology, ethno-psychology, culture studies, anthropology, pragmatics, applied linguistics and communication.

As far as politeness makes the basis to create social order and serves as a prerequisite of human communication, any theory bringing the understanding of this phenomenon simultaneously turns to the background of humans' social life [1. P. 159–212].

Nowadays there exist a number of approaches to study various aspects of the "politeness" category: politeness as asocial norm; politeness as speech maxims and rules [2. P. 292–305]; politeness as face saving [3. P. 213–216. S. 13–50]; politeness as ethical and pragma-linguistics category [7. P. 27–39].

To define what the politeness means the authors mainly focus on the pragmatic view of politeness principles which is: "to maintain social balance friendly relations which would let us imply that our interlocutors primarily intend to collaboration" [8. P. 167–206]; to serve as "the means to minimize confrontation within a discourse and any possibility of confrontation in general as well as a possibility to perceive a confrontation as a threat" [9. P.159–212]; to rely on "specific national strategies of behavior, aimed at harmonic, non-conflict communication and the satisfaction of a partner's expectations" [10. P. 144–163]; to be "the means to express respect to the others" [11. P. 684–697], or to choose a great many of various kinds: *what* we'd like to tell, *how* we'd like to tell something, and also using definite types of sentences, words and sounds which in the best possible way could connect those "what" and "how".

Specifics of realizing the concept of “politeness” in the system of linguistic functions

Being a subject of linguistic studies, politeness attracts attention of many Russian and foreign linguists. Terms of reference of politeness as a linguistic phenomenon includes such issues like the development of the conception of politeness, the study of social-and-psychological factors of polite behavior, the description of linguistic expression of politeness, the establishment of interconnection between the category of politeness and the type of discourse. Peculiarities of the rules of politeness are defined by the specifics of various channels of modern business communication (phone talks, social nets; e-mail: s).

Modern linguistics hasn't yet possessed a unified opinion on the category of politeness. In most linguistic cultures politeness is interpreted as a respect towards other participants of communication. It's the main constituent of the given notion. V.I. Karasik underlines that above all, politeness represents the ways and means to express respect to some other person though it doesn't amount itself to the expression of respect [12. P. 70–71].

However, every tradition brings along its own shades of understanding the essence of the mentioned category. While comparing the peculiarities of understanding the essence of politeness in Russian, oriental and western cultures, A.K. Shaban states, in particular, that in accordance with the Russian tradition, politeness is the ethic, moral quality of a man connected with his speech behavior and providing for the harmonizing of social interaction; in oriental cultures, e.g., in the Arabic culture, politeness means softness both interior, intuitive and exterior caused by the rules of social behavior; according to the English speaking tradition, politeness makes the “face” which is used by the participants of communication, its interlocutors to attain their pragmatic targets [13. P. 86].

Further on let's analyze the place of the concept “politeness” in the system of linguistic functions. The main function of language is the communicative one. In his work, Prof. V.G. Gak states the inherent connection of language with communication [14. P. 3]; and S.Yu. Drofa distinguishes general communication and particular communicative functions, the content of which is stipulated by a definite sphere of communication [15. P. 73].

Classifications of linguistic functions could be divided into two main groups: linguistic proper and those belonging to cultural studies. We'd start our analysis with discussing linguistic classifications while considering as the most significant classifications by R.O. Jakobson and A.A. Reformatsky. In the basis of R.O. Jakobson's classification there lies the model of speech communication including integral components of informational process. Each function specified by Jakobson correlates to some component, e.g., the expressive function correlates to the addressor, the referential function is stimulated by a referent, the cognitive function is oriented to the addressee. The poetic, metalinguistic and phatic functions are correspondingly oriented on the message, code and channel of communication.

It seems that in accordance with the classification mentioned above the realization of the concept “politeness” could be determined as being principally implemented in the frames of the conative function. According to N.A. Kobrina, the essence of the conative function consists in arguing the interlocutor into something [16. P. 101]. The use of linguistic means of politeness in business communication primarily aims at influencing an addressee as well as to strive him in the polite attitude.

The classification of linguistic functions put forward by A.A. Reformatsky includes three main functions: nominative (to give a name; to nominate); communicative which reflects the main target of language as a means of communication; expressive which main content is to express emotions and feelings of a speaker (addressor). In accordance with the given classification the realization of the category of politeness in the business communication could be referred to the communicative function of language.

Having described linguistic classifications of language functions, let’s get down to their classifications within the cultural studies. Austrian scholar K. Bühler speaks about the main language functions realized in the context of culture, which are expressive function; appellative function while its essence lies in the appeal, intake and strife to influence a listener (an addressee); and representative function, or the function of representation. As is seen from the said above, K. Bühler’s classification doesn’t mention cognitive function among the three presented, but there’s specially emphasized the function of an appeal (Appellfunktion), which serves to influence an addressee/listener, and in fact it embodies conative function. It should be mentioned that many researchers who discuss classifications of language functions speak about the conative function using some other terms to signify it [17. P. 192].

The author of the next classification of linguistic functions in the context of culture is Ch. Ferguson. In his classification the communicative function occupies the first place according to the main target of language as a means of communication. In the opinion of the scholar, second significant place belongs to the cognitive function. Its designation is to fix the results of mental activity and cognition of the outward world. According to him, it’s necessary to single out the emotional-and-expressive function because language doesn’t limit itself just meaning to be a means of communication or serves to develop mental activity and helps learn the outward world. Language allows express feelings, emotions. Finally, Ch. Ferguson distinguishes one more important aspect of language functioning that is the ability to express request, order, to persuade, to educate, or in some other way, to influence upon an interlocutor. The function reflecting the expression of the elements mentioned above, Ch. Ferguson calls voluntative function. In its core there lies an appealing-incentive component. The given function singled out in the researchers’ classification is a conative in its essence [17. P. 192].

The Russian researcher A.N. Sokolov who distinguished four types of language-and-speech functions, characterizes the functions of the fourth type as social-and-

speech functions, which include regulative, magic and contact establishing functions [18. P. 71–73]. As is supposed, according to this classification, one can mean the realization of the category of politeness within this complex of functions presented by a researcher because the content of functions enumerated principally correlate with the aims to realize the category of politeness in business sphere, i.e., the aims to realize the process of interaction, establishing and maintaining the contact and influence of an interlocutor.

M. Halliday's classification includes the conceptual function which allows express the content and also the textual and interpersonal functions. In the frames of the interpersonal function, a speaker-addressor maintains relations with a listener-addressee [19. P. 330–368]. The interpersonal function includes the expressive and conative functions. Thus, the researcher determines the conative function as a subtype of the interpersonal function.

The S.Yu. Marmushkina's definition of the conative function specifies the variety of researchers' approaches to its essence and differences in terminology on the part of an addressee-listener [20. P. 84–87]. She remarks that the conative function aims at persuading an addressee could be also defined as an incentive appellative or persuading function.

N.A. Kurakina analyzes peculiarities of realizing various functions of language, and the conative function as well, on the materials of English-American fiction literature discussing the pragmatic aspect of complementary utterances. On the basis of studying speech communicative peculiarities of complements, N.A. Kurakina comes to a conclusion that American complement fulfils the phatic function combining it with the emotive and conative functions. The emotive function to a greater extent characterizes the American linguo-culture where is observed the intention to level social disparity in communication. The English complement along with the conative function often fulfils the phatic function [21. P. 11–12].

So, the realization of language functions takes place through their interconnection. For example, in the given discussion of analyses of the speech communicative peculiarities of complements the researcher made a conclusion that in the English linguo-culture the phatic function is fulfilled predominantly together with the conative function.

Proceeding from the carried out analysis of the basic functions of language, one could conclude that the category of politeness is being realized in the frames of the communicative function of language. The peculiarities of its realization in the frames of other particular communicative functions depending on various spheres of communication are reflected in various researchers' classifications. The majority of linguists assign the concept of politeness to the sphere of conative function of language the core of which includes the intention to influence an interlocutor, in this case, to persuade him into respectful attitude. While nominating the function of the type, researchers use various terms (e.g., volutative, appealing and persuading function of language or influencing function, etc.). It's also essential to stress the

fact that the realization of the concept of politeness could be connected with the phatic function (oriented to the contact), and the appellative and regulative functions, because all language functions are interacting with one another.

Strategies of negative and positive politeness of the speech behavior in the sphere of business

In linguistics, the category of politeness is studied in the framework of speech behavior strategies or in course of analyzing speech acts (excuses, thanks, complements, expressions of condolence, etc.). S.Yu. Turina defines politeness as a speech-behavior category having the main target to be reaching the achievement of positive communicative efficiency [22. P. 2]. S.Yu. Turina's study determines the meaning of both — positive and negative politeness. According to the definition of the researcher, negative politeness is connected with sparing liberty of behavior to an addressee, while positive politeness means to express solidarity with him/her. The content of the notions of positive and negative politeness determines peculiarities of developing the strategies of speech behavior depending on this or that type of politeness.

The strategies of positive politeness could be expressed in the following ways of speech behavior:

- 1) paying attention and showing interest towards a listener-addressee, involving him/her into a dialogue;
- 2) creating the atmosphere of internal group identity (slang, “you” as a form of addressing and the like).

Let's give some examples reflecting positive politeness, meaning to express attention to the addressee, involving him/her in a dialogue. They are collected in Table 1.

It should be specified that in the situation of business communication not every and all strategies mentioned above could be accepted. For example, the analysis of peculiarities realizing strategies of positive politeness in the pedagogical communicative sphere of between teachers and students allowed us make a number of conclusions. Under the conditions analyzed, the teachers' speech contained the so-called “irrelevant” words which nevertheless bear a certain meaning besides their main function — to fill in sense lacunas. They allow accentuate the attention of a listener-addressee on certain speech aspects, render several emotions, serve to express the attitude of a speaker to his/her utterance. In course of the study we came across vocalizations, self-interjections, repetitions (partial and full), non-verbal pauses, i.e., all the phenomena which are typical and natural for the oral speech. We also have to mention that the realization of the strategies of positive politeness aiming to create the inside-group identity atmosphere hasn't always been successful. In this way realizing the strategy of positive politeness aimed at creating the inside-group identity, a teacher could use certain linguistic means providing

for the atmosphere of easy informal communication in natural environment. The strategies could even individualize a definite image of a teacher. But it's crucial that their use correspond to the criteria of appropriateness and rationality.

Table 1

**Paying attention and rendering interest towards an addressee,
involving him/her in a dialogue**

Context	Function
«А-а-а, так она все-таки говорила с тобой об этом?» (In Russian). — lit.: "A-a-a! Well, she has talked with you about it?" — [A teacher addressing a pupil]	Involving in a dialogue
«Да-а-а, ты сегодня на высоте» (In Russian). — lit.: Well-well, you are smart today!" [A teacher addressing a pupil]	Paying attention
«– Я там был вчера – Да ну?» (In Russian). – lit.: Well, I was there yesterday/ Really? [A dialogue with a pupil]	Paying attention Involving in a dialogue
«А ты, Миша, как считаешь?» (In Russian). – lit.: "And you, Misha, what do you think?" [A teacher addressing a pupil]	Paying attention
«Как твои успехи в спорте?» (In Russian). lit.: "Have you got any sports records?" [A teacher addressing a pupil]	Paying attention Involving in a dialogue
«Очень приятно познакомиться с Вами» — — lit.: "Nice to meet you!" [A teacher addressing a parent]	Paying attention
«Как Ваши дела?» — lit.: "How are you doing?" [A teacher addressing a colleague]	Paying attention Involving in a dialogue
«О, вы даже об этом читали!» — lit.: "Oh, you even haven't read it!" [A teacher addressing pupils]	Paying attention

The strategies of negative politeness consist of presenting the independence of addressees' action and confine to the following types of behavior:

- 1) eliminating direct requests and using indirect speech acts;
- 2) formulating utterances in a soft (polite) manner;
- 3) demonstrating respect by means of diminishing self-esteem and raising an addressee's esteem, readiness to ask an excuse;
- 4) impersonification of communication interlocutors.

Here come examples reflecting the strategies of negative politeness/ The given examples are presented in Table 2. The majority of them is connected with the realization of a type of behavior expressed in the utterance formula in a soft (polite) form.

Table 2

Types of behavior in the frames of realizing the strategies of negative politeness

CONTEXT	FUNCION
«А успеваемость его при этом снижается, вот что получается» — lit.: “And at this the academic progress lowers: this is the outcome” [From a talk with a parent]	An intention to soften the utterance
«Ну как Вам сказать, конечно, это немного бестактно» — lit.: “Well, what could I tell you, of course it’s a bit tactless” [From a dialogue of a teacher and a parent]	Softening the utterance
«Понимаете ли, какое дело, он иногда бывает груб» — lit.: “Could you imagine that sometimes he behaves rude” [From a dialogue of a teacher and a parent]	Softening the utterance
«Это был глупый поступок, мягко выражаясь» — lit.: “Softly speaking, it was a silly act” [A teacher addressing to a pupil]	An intention to underline his own reticence in evaluating somebody’s else behavior
«Он, безусловно, очень способный. Но, к сожалению, мало старается» — lit.: “Of course, he’s very smart, but, it’s a pity, he makes little effort” [From a dialogue of a teacher and a parent]	Softening the utterance
«Конечно, Вам это лучше знать» — lit.: “Of course. You’d know it better” []	Raising of an addressee’s position
«Разумеется, Вы это представляете себе лучше» — lit.: “Certainly, you’d imagine it better” [From a dialogue of a teacher and a parent]	Raising of an addressee’s position
«Конечно, Вы правы» — lit.: “Of course, you’re right” [From a dialogue of a teacher and a parent]	Raising of an addressee’s position
«Я с Вами совершенно согласна» — lit.: “I absolutely agree with you” [From a dialogue of a teacher and a parent]	Raising of an addressee’s position

And the examples of Table 2 reflect the realization of different types of behavior in the frames of the negative politeness strategies, namely: formulating utterances in a soft (polite) forms; demonstrating respect by lowering self-esteem and raising an addressee’s position; intending to underline self-reticence in the evaluation of somebody’s else behavior.

Establishing the relations of cooperation to a larger extent depends on the understanding of national-and-cultural specifics of the category of politeness and the strategies of its realization in the business discourse. It’s worth mentioning that the category of politeness and the rules to use it are rather complicated in various

cultures. However, the principle of politeness is applied in any situation, e.g., while interrupting a talk in business communication. At present there are two approaches to describe the situation of interrupting talks in business communication. In the first case, the interrupting is treated as an impolite speech act. S.Yu. Turina stresses the fact that according to the opinion of western researchers a party interrupting communication is viewed as an aggressor, and an interlocutor being interrupted is a party which suffered [23. P. 222].

N.H. Hien remarks that to establish the rules politeness, just a fact of interrupting talks one should possess the following data about the interlocutors and situation: the topic and length of the talks, their interrelations and the attitude to the fact of the interrupting, and most important, what's the aim of the one interlocutor to interrupt the other (s) [24. P. 125–126].

From the point of view of T.P. Tretyakova, the interrupting could mean a strategy to control a dialogue [25. P. 18]. It's useful to turn to the discussed in the study of I.E. Petrova situation which is connected with the description of some problems of a communication of a social worker with his client. Listening attentively to his client, the social worker doesn't always have a chance to direct a free talk into the necessary course. Sometimes such situation is due to a fear of offending a person just interrupting his story. I.E. Petrova proposes to solve such situations by asking direct questions about what a client expects of the meeting with a social worker; in particular: *What do you think, what kind of aid we could render to you? Or: Tell us, please, what the reason is you've come to us? How could we help you?* [26. P. 92–108].

The answers to such questions help clear out the essence of the problem concerning which a client has turned up, because, according to the opinion of the researcher, the interrupting of a dialogue in this situation is appropriate.

Anyway, the issue of interrupting a talk in business communication is ambiguous. In accordance with the general rule of politeness, carrying out business talks should be maintained on the basis of demonstrating mutual correctness of the parties involved while a speaker is given ample possibility to speak out his point of view. In other words, the interrupting of talks both in business or interpersonal communication is a fact of rudeness and breaking the rules of politeness. However, business communication has got its own specifics, and the fact of the situation of active discussion of a problem could give the evidence of the interest of all the participants of the talks. Besides, a lot of things depend on the context of communication. For example, sometimes it's absolutely necessary to interrupt an interlocutor to direct the talks to a proper course which could be primarily of the interest of an interlocutor himself.

While solving the issue of appropriateness or non-appropriateness of interrupting the talks, one should take into consideration the specifics of cultural environment as well as the specifics of behavioral models adopted in the society. Finally, and it's

worth mentioning, that in any situation the interrupting of the talks in the business communication sphere should be accompanied with the use of linguistic means of expressing politeness. Let's give some examples of politeness formulas which could be useful in course of interrupting the talks: *I beg your pardon, Excuse me for interrupting you, Please, excuse me, Let me precise, please, etc.*

So, politeness is an important constituent of business communication, and the strategies of speech behavior are determined by cultural specifics. Various approaches to understanding politeness are based on different cultural values of this or that society and depend on the adopted models of social behavior.

Lexical means to express politeness

The analysis of linguistic means to verbalize politeness was carried out by applying the systematization and classification methods. According to the structure of main language domains, linguistic means to verbalize politeness could be divided into lexical, morphological and syntactic ones. We'd start to analyze linguistic means to express politeness in business papers written in Russian from the lexical language layer. As E.P. Ryashevskaya states, the most typical lexical means to express politeness are lexemes with the meaningful components of request, respect, and acknowledgement in their semantic structure.

In correspondence with the etiquette norms of business letters, while addressing to a few people, e.g., representatives of a company there are used addressing "Уважаемые господа!" in Russian and "Dear Sirs" in English. When there is a common sphere of business and mutual professional interests the addressing is "Уважаемые коллеги!"/"Dear colleagues!". In case business relations are well maintained, it's proper to address using names and patronymic names (In Russian) obligatory adding the adjective "уважаемый"/"dear". More official variation is the addressing by surname also adding the adjective "уважаемый"/"dear" and the noun "господин" or "Госпожа"/"Sir" or Ms.

If the addressing refers to an official and concerns his official regulations and the surname of the official is not known for an addresser of a business letter it's appropriate addressing him by the name of the position occupied [27. P. 32].

The addressing is followed by the main part (see the following example):

Уважаемый Иван Федорович!

Позвольте прежде всего поблагодарить Вас за интерес, проявленный к продукции, производимой нашим предприятием. Надеюсь, что Вы будете полностью удовлетворены ее качеством. В соответствии с условиями поставки первая партия продукции, объем которой предусмотрен п. 5 заключенного между нами договора, будет доставлена Вам 5 декабря 2021 года. Заверяю Вас, что все оговоренные условия поставки будут неукоснительно соблюдаться в течение всего периода действия договора.

С уважением, директор ООО «Пластпром» О.А. Вишняков.

(In English:

Dear Ivan Feodorovich!

Let us primarily thank you for the interest in the production manufactured by our enterprise. I hope that you'd be completely satisfied with its quality. According to the shipment conditions, the first block of the produce of the volume previewed in p.5 of the agreement concluded between our parties will be shipped to your company 5, Dec., 2021. I assure you that all the shipment condition discussed before would be observed to the letter during the whole validity term of the agreement/

Sincerely Yours,

OOO "Plastprom" Director

O.A. Vishnyakov).

The closing part of the business letter contains a Russian lexeme ‘С уважением’ (*Sincerely Yours* — in English). It's the most widely spread variations among the similar type of cliché expressions. It also has some variations in Russian: «искренне Ваш», «с уважением и благодарностью», «заранее Вас благодарю».

To sum up, business letters in Russian consist of three main sections: addressing, main part and signature. Each of the sectors named above is characterized by a proper set of lexical means which, firstly, have to correspond to the topic of the letter; secondly, they might be used in variations. Proceeding from the said above one could conclude that in Russian the category of politeness is realized on the basis of various lexical means.

Morphological means to express politeness

As was said above, the realization of the concept of politeness is essentially revealed in the frames of the cognitive function. In a number of classifications this function is named the appellative or persuading function. At this, the cognitive function could interact with the emotive and phatic functions. The mentioned peculiarities exert the influence on the content and structure of grammatical constructions by means of which the concept of politeness is realized. Quite a largely used morphological means to express politeness in Russian language business communication is the Imperative Mood of verbs. For example, «*решите вопрос*» (*Solve the problem!*), «*рассмотрите эту проблему*» (*Review the question!* As I. Zamani and J.N. Sheikhi mention, the Imperative Mood in Russian has a vast range of meanings and in particular the motivation for an action (radical, neutral and softened); request, to fulfil some action, order, vocation, advice, etc. [28. P. 176].

Let's emphasize the fact that the realization of politeness is made in the frames of the language cognitive function and the mostly widely used form to render the conative function is the use of verbs in the Imperative Mood, because the content of the conative function contains the intention to influence an interlocutor.

However, proceeding from the carried out analysis of business letters of request, T.V. Khomutova, A.K. Shaban and B.G. Fatkulin made a conclusion that for letters on requests isn't typical to use verbs in the Imperative Mood without accompanying

lexical or syntactical means due to the fact that verbs in the form of the Imperative Mood more often express an order [29. P. 27–29]. Using additional lexical and syntactical means softens the expression transforming an order into a request. The most widespread variation is the use of the word «пожалуйста» (please) as a consensual to a verb in the Imperative, e.g., expressions like «не сочтите за труд» (*it'd be so kind of you*), «будьте добры» (*Be so kind*), etc.

To a more greater extent, the doubling of lexical means to express politeness make milder the form of the Imperative Mood rendering the order, e.g., «будьте так добры, пожалуйста» (*be so kind, please*); «будьте любезны» (*be so gracious*), etc. However, N.A. Karban' stresses the fact that the pattern matching politeness and categoricalness sometimes doesn't work in the Russian communicative culture because there categoricalness doesn't always contradict the rules of politeness. For example, the invitation «очень буду ждать» (I'll be looking forward to it), «отказа не принимаю» (please, no refusals) are polite and at this, categorical and insisting [30. P. 13–16].

T.V. Larina even remarks that the Russian communicative style is characterized with a greater degree of informality, with a lesser degree of social distancing to compare with those European ones. Within such a style of interrelations the categoricalness doesn't break the rules of politeness [31. P. 205].

Let's give following examples:

«А после напишете проверочную работу» [Обращение учителя к классу].
(*And afterwards, please, write a test* [Teacher's addressing to the class];

«После третьего урока пройдете в зал. Вот таким образом» [Обращение учителя к ученикам] (*After the third period, please, go to the hall. Just like this.* [Teacher's addressing to the pupils];

«А сейчас вы выполните самостоятельное задание. Поехали!» [Обращение учителя к классу] (*And now, please, make an individual task. Come on!*) [Teacher's addressing to the class];

«Я прошу тебя больше этого не повторять. Вот так вот» [Обращение учителя к ученику]. (*I ask you don't repeat it once again, please. This is that*) [Teacher's addressing to a pupil]

So, the mentioned above peculiarity is determined by the specifics of the Russian tradition and social behavioral models. The politeness of a request could be emphasized by the conventionality of action previewed, e.g., «если Вас не затруднит, сделайте, пожалуйста» (*If it's of no problem to you, please, do it*); «если Вы сможете выполнить это задание к пятнице, буду Вам очень признателен» (*If you could fulfil the task by Friday, I'll be really grateful to you*); «если Вы будете так любезны, Вы окажете мне большую услугу» (*If you'd be so kind, please, you'd do a great favor to me*).

One more morphological means to express politeness is the use of verbs in the Subjunctive Mood, e.g., «было бы прекрасно, если бы Вы это сделали»

(*It would be so nice of you if you'd do it*). The Subjunctive Mood adds to a request the semantics of desirability thus lessening the categoricalness of ordering.

In this way, in Russian the main morphological means to express politeness in business communication are verbs in the Imperative and Subjunctive Mood forms combined with additional lexical and syntactical means of politeness.

Syntactical means to express politeness

The formation of syntactical constructions to express the category of politeness is also taking place in accordance with the place of the concept of politeness in the system of linguistic functions. At the syntactical level the linguistic means to express politeness are represented by the combinations of modal verbs with the infinitives of meaningful verbs and various types of sentences. T.N. Khomutova, A.K. Shaban and B.G. Fatkulin underline that the semantic structure of modal verbs used to include a component of “permitting physical or mental ability” which makes the meaning of politeness relevant [29. P. 27–29]. These researchers give an example of syntactical means to express politeness speaking about the combination of a modal verb «*мочь*» (*can*) and a meaningful verb infinitive in question sentences, e.g., «*я могу попросить Вас выполнить это?*» (*Could I ask you to make it?*); «*я могу надеяться на Вас?*» (*Could I rely on you?*); «*я могу попросить Вас прийти к семнадцати часам?*» (*Could I ask you to come by 7 pm?*).

In the opinion of N.I. Formanovskaya, an indirect polite request could be rendered by means of various question structures which could contain modal verbs, e.g., «*Вам не трудно выполнить это?*» (*Would it be normal for you to do it?*), «*Вы не сделали бы это?*» (*Could you possibly do it?*) and the like. [32. P. 67–72].

It should be important to precise the role of exclamatory sentences which, in particular, help forming an addressing to an addressee in the sphere of business communication. Characterizing the potential of exclamatory sentences in the plane of expressing the concept of politeness, one should underline that one of their meaningful constituents makes a communicative purpose to influence upon an addressee which is to realize the intention to persuade him in your own respectful attitude towards him/her.

Let's give some examples:

«*Уважаемый Иван Сергеевич!*» (Dear Ivan Sergeevich!)

«*Уважаемые коллеги!*» (Dear colleagues!)

«*Уважаемые господа!*» (Dear Sirs!)

«*Уважаемый господин Кравцов!*» (Dear Sir Kravtsov!)

«*Уважаемый руководитель предприятия!*» (Dear Head of the Enterprise...!).

In such a way, the Russian language on its every level possesses characteristic means to express politeness. Lexical means to express politeness include lexemes with meaningful components of respect, request, and acknowledgement. The

morphological means to express politeness contain verbs in the Imperative and Subjunctive Moods in combination with various lexical and syntactical means depending on the topics of business communication. The syntactical means to express politeness involve combinations of modal verbs with infinitives and rely on syntactical types of sentences (questions, conditional phrases, etc.) which help express in a letter of request a shade of politeness.

As the analysis revealed, the Russian language typically and regularly uses complexes of means to express politeness, and as a rule, involves linguistic means of all the three levels — lexical, morphological, and syntactical. This evidence is caused by interrelation and interconnection of all language's levels. Thus, the phonetical level determines the physical presentation of meaningful units of all the levels. Lexical structure involves the whole bulk of words and word collocations. The grammar structures bring together the regularities to construct utterances in course of any act of speech.

Conclusion

According to the aim and tasks of the study, there were analyzed the peculiarities of the realization of the concept of politeness in the system of linguistic functions, and observed the strategies of speech behavioral negative and positive politeness in the sphere of business communication. There were also analyzed lexical, morphological and syntactical means to express politeness in the sphere of business communication in the Russian language.

On the basis of the carried out analysis of the content of the main language's functions there was made a conclusion that the category of politeness is realized in the frames of the linguistic communicative function. Peculiarities of its realization in the frames of more special communicative functions correlating with the spheres of communication are reflected in various researchers' classifications. The majority of linguists refer the concept of politeness to the sphere of the cognitive function of language the essence of which lies in the intention to influence an addressee, in this case — persuade him/her in respectful attitude to him/her. Researchers naming the function of this essence use different terms (e.g., the volutative function of language or the influencing function, etc.). It's worth to underline that the realization of the concept of politeness could be connected both with the phatic (oriented to the contact) and appellative, and regulative functions because all the functions of language exist as interconnected.

Proceeding from the analysis of the strategies of speech behavior and according to the rules of politeness there was made a conclusion that politeness is the important constituent of business communication, and the strategies of speech behavior are based on the differences and varieties of cultural values of this or that society, and depend on the social behavior models adopted by it. We have analyzed strategies of positive and negative politeness which in their cores are opposite to one another.

If the courses of behavior lying in the basis of the first type of politeness and are connected with involving an interlocutor in the talks, rendering attention to him/her, the second strategy contains the behavioral courses connected with giving an interlocutor independence of communication. In the study we have analyzed a number of examples of the strategies named.

According to the results obtained in course of the analysis of linguistic means used to express politeness in the sphere of business communication for the Russian language the conclusion was made concerning the fact that the Russian language on its every level contains typical means to express politeness. Lexical means to express politeness involve lexemes with meaningful components of respect, request and acknowledgment. Morphological means to express politeness contain verbs in the Imperative and Subjunctive Moods in combination with various lexical and syntactical means depending on the topics of business communication. As to syntactical means to express politeness, they are the combinations of modal verbs with infinitives and syntactical types of sentences (questions, conditional phrases, etc.) which help a letter of request to attain the shade of politeness. It's also necessary to mark the role of exclamatory sentences which, in particular, are used to formulate an addressing to an addressee in the sphere of business communication. It's worth mentioning to be one of the constituents of their content a specific communicative purpose to influence on an addressee, i.e., to realize the intention to persuade him/her in your own respectful attitude to him/her.

In course of the analysis of linguistic means to express politeness we emphasized once and again that their peculiarities to a greater extent are motivated by the peculiarities of realizing the concept of politeness in the system of language's functions, that the category of politeness is closely connected with the conative (persuading) function of language.

As the carried our analysis shown, for the Russian languages more characteristic is a complex use of linguistic means to express politeness, and, as a rule, there are involved linguistic means of all the three language's levels — lexical, morphological, and syntactical.

References

1. Brown, R. & Gilman, A. (1989). Politeness theory and Shakespeare's four major tragedies. *Language in society*, 18(2), 159–212.
2. Lakoff, R.T. (1973). The logic of politeness: Or, minding your p's and q's. *Proceedings from the Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 9(1), 292–305.
3. Goffman, E. (1955). On face-work: An analysis of ritual elements of social interaction. *Psychiatry*, 18(3), 213–231.
4. Brown, P. & Levinson, S. (2009). Modelling linguistic politeness (II): Brown and Levinson and their critics. In: *Politeness*, R.J. Watts (Ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 85–116.
5. Fraser, B. (2005). Wither politeness. In: *Broadening the horizon of linguistic politeness*, R.T. Lakoff & S. Ide (Eds.). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. pp. 65–83.

6. Janney, R.W. & Arndt, H. (1993). Universality and relativity in cross-cultural politeness research: A historical perspective. *Multilingua — Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*, 12(1), 13–50.
7. Formanovskaya, N.I. (1998). *Communicative pragmatic aspects of communication units*. Moscow: Pushkin State Russian Language Institute Publ. (In Russ.).
8. Leech, G. (2007). Politeness: Is there an East West divide? *Journal of Politeness Research: Language, Behaviour, Culture*, 3(2), 167–206.
9. Lakoff, R.T. (1990). Talking power: The politics of language in our lives. *Language in Society*, 18(2), 159–212.
10. Larina, T.V. (2015). Pragmatics of Emotions in Intercultural Context. *Russian Journal of Linguistics*, 1, 144–163.
11. Holmes, J. (2006). Politeness strategies as linguistic variables. In: *Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics*, E.K. Brown (Ed.). Elsevier. pp. 684–697.
12. Karasik, V.I. (2002). *The language of social status*. Moscow: Gnosis. (In Russ.).
13. Shaban, A.K. & Khomutova, T.N. (2019). Semantics of Politeness in Different Linguocultures: Universal and Culture-Specific Characteristics. *Research Result. Theoretical and Applied Linguistics*, 5(1), 85–95. <https://doi.org/10.18413/2313-8912-2019-5-1-0-8> (In Russ.).
14. Gak, V.G. (1985). To the typology of functional approaches to language learning. In: *Problems of functional grammar*. Moscow: Nauka. pp. 3–15.
15. Drofa, S.Yu. (2015). To the Problem of Classification of Language Functions. *Omsk Scientific Bulletin*, 3(139), 73–77. (In Russ.).
16. Kobrina, N.A., Boldyrev, N.N. & Khudyakov, A.A. (2007). *Theoretical grammar of modern English*. Moscow: Vysshaya shkola. (In Russ.).
17. Vinogradov, V.A. (Ed.). (2001). *Introduction to linguistics*. Moscow: Aspect Press. (In Russ.).
18. Sokolov, A.V. (2002). *General theory of social communication*. St. Petersburg: Mikhailova V.A. Publ. (In Russ.).
19. Halliday, M. (1971). Linguistic Function and Literary Style: An Inquiry into the Language of William Golding's *The Inheritors*. In: *Literary style: A symposium*, S. Chatman (Ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 330— 368.
20. Mamushkina, S.Y. (2016). Communicative Relevance of Linguistic Functions. *Baltic Humanitarian Journal*, 5 (4(17)), 84–87. (In Russ.).
21. Kurakina, N.A. (2016). *The pragmatic aspect of complimentary statements (based on the material of Anglo-American fiction)* [dissertation]. Arkhangel'sk. (In Russ.).
22. Tyurina, S.Y. (2008). Discursive markers of politeness in business communication. *Vestnik IGEU*, 1, 92–95. (In Russ.).
23. Tyurina, S.Y. (2008). About polite interruption of a business conversation. *Almanac of Modern Science and Education*, 2(9), 221–224. (In Russ.).
24. Hien, N.H. (2016). Politeness and interruption of business conversation in American, Vietnamese and Russian cultures. *Proceedings of Voronezh State University. Series: Linguistics and intercultural communication*, 3, 125–129. (In Russ.).
25. Tretyakova, T.P. (1984). *Functional and semantic components of children's dialogic speech (based on the material of modern English)* [dissertation]. Leningrad. (In Russ.).
26. Petrova, I.E. (2017). Social Work Client or Recipient of Social Services: Religious and Secular View. *PNRPU Sociology and Economic Bulletin*, 2, 92–108. <https://doi.org/10.15593/2224-9354/2017.2.7> (In Russ.).
27. Rashevskaya, E.P. (2012). *Business Russian textbook*. Kostroma: KSTU Publ. (In Russ.).
28. Zamani, I. & Sheikhi, J.N. (2017). Verbal Mood As A Medium Of The Politeness Category In Russian And Persian. *SibScript*, 4, 175–180. <https://doi.org/10.21603/2078-8975-2017-4-175-180>. (In Russ.).

29. Khomutova, T.N., Shaban, A.K. & Fatkulin, B.G. (2019). Linguistic Exponents of Politeness in Business Request Letters: A Contrastive Study (English, Arabic and Russian). *Bulletin of The South Ural State University. Series: Linguistics*, 16(2), 27–35. <https://doi.org/10.14529/ling190204> (In Russ.).
30. Karaban, N.A. (2009). Interaction of the category of politeness with other grammatical categories (on the example of business letters). *Grani poznaniya*, 1(2), 29–32. (In Russ.).
31. Larina, T.V. (2003). *The category of Politeness in the Aspect of Intercultural Communication. On the material of English and Russian Communicative Cultures* [dissertation]. Moscow. (In Russ.).
32. Formanovskaya, N.I. (1984). Ways of expressing a request in Russian (a pragmatic approach). *Russian Language Abroad*, 6, 67–72. (In Russ.).

Библиографический список

1. Brown R., Gilman A. Politeness Theory and Shakespeare's Four Major Tragedies // *Language in Society*. 1989. № 18(2). P. 159–212.
2. Lakoff R.T. The Logic of Politeness: Or, Minding Your p's and q's // *Proceedings from the Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*. 1973. № 9(1). P. 292–305.
3. Goffman E. On face-work: An analysis of ritual elements of social interaction // *Psychiatry*. 1955. № 18(3). P. 213–231. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00332747>
4. Brown P., Levinson S. Modelling linguistic politeness (II): Brown and Levinson and their critics // *Politeness*. R.J. Watts (Ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009. P. 85–116.
5. Fraser B. Wither politeness // *Broadening the horizon of linguistic politeness*. R.T. Lakoff & S. Ide (Eds.). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2005. P. 65–83.
6. Janney R.W., Arndt H. Universality and relativity in cross-cultural politeness research: A historical perspective // *Multilingua — Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*. 1993. № 12(1). P. 13–50.
7. *Формановская Н.И.* Коммуникативно-прагматические аспекты единиц общения. М.: Институт русского языка им. А.С. Пушкина, 1998.
8. *Пивяк Г.* Вежливость: есть ли разделение между Востоком и Западом? // *Журнал исследований вежливости: язык, поведение, культура*. 2007. № 3(2). С. 167–206.
9. Lakoff R.T. Talking power: The politics of language in our lives // *Language in Society*. 1990. № 18(2). P. 159–212.
10. *Ларина Т.В.* Прагматика эмоций в межкультурном контексте // *Russian Journal of Linguistics*. 2015. № 1. С. 144–163.
11. Holmes J. (2006). Politeness strategies as linguistic variables. In: E.K. Brown (Ed.) *Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics*. Elsevier. pp. 684–697.
12. *Карасик В.И.* Язык социального статуса. М.: Гнозис, 2002.
13. *Шабан А.К., Хомутова Т.Н.* Семантика понятия «вежливость» в различных лингвокультурах: универсальное и культурно-специфическое // *Научный результат. Вопросы теоретической и прикладной лингвистики*. 2019. Т. 5. № 1. С. 85–95. <https://doi.org/10.18413/2313-8912-2019-5-1-0-8>
14. *Гак В.Г.* К типологии функциональных подходов к изучению языка // *Проблемы функциональной грамматики*. М.: Наука, 1985. С. 3–15.
15. *Дрофа С.Ю.* К проблеме классификации функций языка // *Омский научный вестник*. 2015. № 3(139). С. 73–77.
16. *Кобрин Н.А., Болдырев Н.Н., Худяков А.А.* Теоретическая грамматика современного английского языка. М.: Высшая школа, 2007.
17. *Виноградов В.А.* (отв. ред.). Введение в языковедение. М.: Аспект Пресс, 2001.
18. *Соколов А.В.* Общая теория социальной коммуникации. СПб: Изд-во Михайлова В.А., 2002.

19. *Halliday M.* Linguistic Function and Literary Style: An Inquiry into the Language of William Golding's *The Inheritors* // *Literary style: A symposium*, S. Chatman (Ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971. P. 330— 368.
20. *Мамушкина С.Ю.* Коммуникативная релевантность языковых функций // *Балтийский гуманитарный журнал*. 2016. Т. 5. № 4(17). С. 84–87.
21. *Куракина Н.А.* Прагматический аспект комплиментарных высказываний (на материале англо-американской художественной литературы): дисс. ... кандидата филологических наук. Архангельск, 2016.
22. *Тюрина С.Ю.* Дискурсивные маркеры вежливости в деловом общении // *Вестник Ивановского государственного энергетического университета*. 2008. № 1. С. 92–95.
23. *Тюрина С.Ю.* О вежливом прерывании делового разговора // *Альманах современной науки и образования*. 2008. № 2(9). С. 221–224.
24. *Хиен Н.Ч.* Вежливость и прерывание делового разговора в американской, вьетнамской и русской культурах // *Вестник ВГУ. Серия: Лингвистика и межкультурная коммуникация*. 2016. № 3. С. 125–129.
25. *Третьякова Т.П.* Функционально-семантические составляющие детской диалогической речи (на материале современного английского языка): автореф. дисс. ... канд. филол. наук. Л., 1984.
26. *Петрова И.Э.* Клиент социальной работы или получатель социальных услуг: взгляд профессиональный и светский // *Вестник ПНИПУ. Социально-экономические науки*. 2017. № 2. С. 92–108. <https://doi.org/10.15593/2224-9354/2017.2.7>
27. *Рацевская Е.П.* Деловой русский язык. Кострома: Изд-во КГТУ, 2012.
28. *Замани И., Шейхи Дж.Н.* Глагольное наклонение как средство выражения категории вежливости в русском и персидском языках // *СибСкрипт*. 2017. № 4. С. 175–180. <https://doi.org/10.21603/2078-8975-2017-4-175-180>
29. *Хомутова Т.Н., Шабан А.К., Фаткулин Б.Г.* Лингвистические средства выражения вежливости в деловом письме-просьбе: контрастивное исследование (на материале английского, арабского и русского языков) // *Вестник Южно-Уральского государственного университета. Серия: Лингвистика*. 2019. Т. 16. № 2. С. 27–35. <https://doi.org/10.14529/ling190204>
30. *Карабань Н.А.* Взаимодействие категории вежливости с другими грамматическими категориями (на примере деловых писем) // *Грани познания: Электронный научно-образовательный журнал ВГПУ*. 2009. № 1(2). С. 29–32.
31. *Ларина Т.В.* Категория вежливости в аспекте межкультурной коммуникации. На материале английской и русской коммуникативных культур: дис. д-ра филол. наук. М., 2003.
32. *Формановская Н.И.* Способы выражения просьбы в русском языке (прагматический подход) // *Русский язык за рубежом*. 1984. № 6. С. 67–72.

Information about the authors:

Vladimir N. Denisenko, D.Sc. in Philology, Professor, Head of the Department of General and Russian Linguistics, Philological Faculty, RUDN University; *e-mail*: denisenko-vn@rudn.ru

Nazerke Yergazy, Postgraduate student of the Department of General and Russian Linguistics, Philological Faculty, RUDN University
ORCID: 0000-0003-4346-983X; *e-mail*: naz_erke9898@inbox.ru

Mikhail A. Rybakov, PhD in Philology, Assistant Professor, Assistant Professor of the Department of General and Russian Linguistics, Philological Faculty, RUDN University; *Research interests*: linguistic typology, contrastive semantics; *e-mail*: rybakov_ma@pfur.ru
ORCID: 0000-0001-9444-388; eLIBRARY SPIN-код 6890–700; Scopus ID: 57200527717

Сведения об авторах:

Денисенко Владимир Никифорович, доктор филологических наук, профессор, заведующий кафедрой общего и русского языкознания филологического факультета Российского университета дружбы народов; *e-mail*: denisenko-vn@rudn.ru

Ергазы Назерке, аспирант кафедры общего и русского языкознания филологического факультета Российского университета дружбы народов; *e-mail*: naz_erke9898@inbox.ru
ORCID: 0000-0003-4346-983X

Рыбаков Михаил Анатольевич, кандидат филологических наук, доцент, доцент кафедры общего и русского языкознания филологического факультета Российского университета дружбы народов; *сфера научных интересов*: лингвистическая типология, сопоставительная семантика; *e-mail*: rybakov_ma@pfur.ru
ORCID: 0000-0001-9444-388; eLIBRARY SPIN-код 6890–700; Scopus ID:57200527717