The Forms of Slavic Politeness vs. Categories of Slavic Mentality: Semantics, Pragmatics, Sociolinguistics [Формы славянской вежливости и категории славянского менталитета: семантика, прагматика, социолингвистика]

Аннотация
Оценить
Содержание публикации
Библиография
Комментарии

Поделиться

Метрика

Аннотация

Код статьи S294939000028974-0-1

DOI 10.18254/S294939000028974-0

Тип публикации Статья

Статус публикации Опубликовано

Авторы Кульпина Валентина Григорьевна Связаться с автором

Аффилиация: Московский государственный университет имени М.В. Ломоносова
Адрес: Российская Федерация, Москва

Выпуск Номер 2 (2)

Аннотация Статья посвящена описанию средств выражения вежливости Говорящего как прагматической категории в ряде славянских языков: русском, польском (наиболее детально), чешском, болгарском, македонском. Проводится сравнение категорий вежливости в славянских языках с грамматическими категориями вежливости в японском языке, в котором эти категории охватывают как знаменательные части речи, так и служебные языковые единицы. При этом описание категорий вежливости В.М. Алпатовым берется за образец в связи с полнотой представленности и разветвленностью категорий вежливости в японском языке, а также в связи с их детальной разработанностью В.М. Алпатовым. Рассматриваются особенности выражения вежливости в указанных славянских языках в зависимости от основных социолингвистических параметров, отмечаются некоторые нынешние и предыдущие тенденции в развитии этой сферы. Демонстрируется категориальная специфика форм вежливости в разных славянских языках. Этому способствует анализ материала с точки зрения наличия/отсутствия какого-либо параметра форм вежливости в каком-либо славянском языке. Показывается связь правил вежливости с некоторыми аспектами менталитета славянских народов. Подчеркивается, что формы вежливости для носителей данного языка естественны и органичны; их структура и иерархичность ими не замечается и не рефлексируется. Описываются принципы вежливой коммуникации в польском языке. Сравниваются польские и русские формы вежливости как принципиально различные. В то время как формы вежливости русского языка характеризуются демократичностью (как результат свершившихся в этой сфере процессов демократизации), структура польских форм вежливости характеризуется большей иерархичностью и разветвленностью по многим параметрам. Затрагиваются лингводидактические аспекты проблематики как весьма важные для процессов обучения славянским языкам.

Ключевые слова категории вежливости, контрастивный анализ, славянские формы вежливости, демократизация общения, «языковое барокко», славянский менталитет, славянские языки, японский язык

Классификатор

Получено 08.12.2023

Дата публикации 08.12.2023

1 The article concerns the means of expressing politeness of the Speaker in Slavic languages: Russian, Polish (the most detailed description), Check, Bulgarian and Macedonian. The aspects of study of the forms of politeness and the names of politeness types, precise from the point of view of thought and form are analyzed. The forms of politeness of Slavic languages are considered comparatively with the forms of politeness of Japanese language as they are presented in the works of V.M. Alpatov. V.M. Alpatov worked out the theory of Japanese forms of politeness which is useful for the researches of etiquette in the Slavic languages and it is showed in the article. Changing in the rules of the politeness, caused by the democratization of communication, is also mentioned. The connections between rules of the politeness and the mentality of Slavic nations are revealed. The categorical specificity of forms of politeness in different Slavic languages is showed. The material is analyzed from the point of view of presence / absence of some parameters in above mentioned Slavic languages. There is underlined that the forms of politeness are for native speakers natural and organic; their structure and hierarchy they do not observe and reflect. The didactic aspects of the subject are analyzed as very important ones.

2 The categories of politeness appear at all levels of the language, covering a huge area of communication. The knowledge of these categories is extremely important for adequate communication in a foreign language. It seems that within the study of the Slavic languages forms of politeness should be studied both in the field of research (many segments here have not been investigated) and in linguodidactics. Considering the aforementioned it seems scientifically and didactically appropriate to establish the correlation of the forms of politeness in the various Slavic languages with the Japanese forms of politeness on the basis of a number of parameters presented in the works of V.M. Alpatov. These works include the book “The category of politeness in the modern Japanese language” [Alpatov, 1973] (which was published five times already (see [Alpatov, 2015a]) as well as his articles devoted to various aspects of presentation of politeness in the Japanese language on the basis of different parts of speech and constructional linguistic units. The most important issue in his works is that the Japanese forms of politeness are analyzed in correlation with the European languages and cultures. The aforecited book provides the readymade successful formulations of the aspects of study of the forms of politeness and the names of politeness types, precise from the point of view of thought and form. This book quickly became a well-known literary work in the field of speech etiquette and the starting point for many researchers. It became a matrix which serves as a reliable tool for reconciliation with the correlating material of the other languages and allows revealing the working model of the forms of politeness of almost any language.

3 The categories of politeness appear in the language as an important means of regulating the human speech behaviour, as an indicator of communiqués within a society. Not occasionally they belong to the category of linguistic pragmatics. The Japanese language in view of its vivid verbal expressiveness of politeness forms and their extreme branching (we can call them figuratively the linguistic baroque) occupies a special place among the most spread world languages.

4 The forms of politeness in the Slavic languages in comparison with the same in the Japanese language reveal themselves less vividly, however, the undoubted specificity of each of them has a categorical nature. Their parameterization directs the attention (we can call it a “sense of smell”) to the sphere of expression of the forms of politeness, and, on the basis of another language material, helps to establish the set of forms of politeness in this particular language. On the basis created by V.M. Alpatov one can already identify the new discrepancies in the sphere of politeness in comparison with the Japanese language.

5 Let us consider the individual parameters of the forms of politeness in the Japanese language and match them against the Slavic language material in terms of presence / absence of the similar parameter. Analyzing the language material through the prism of the parameter ***highest – equal – lowest,*** highlighted by V.M. Alpatov, I will refer primarily to the Polish language material which is professionally close to me, although in every Slavic language one can find a lot of specifically interesting forms of politeness.

6 The Polish researchers were always interested in the problem of speech etiquette, but in the XXI century their interest especially in the forms of politeness significantly increased. In the work of M. Marcjanik “Primer of linguistic politeness” [Marcjanik, 2015: 231-310] the Polish speech etiquette is described in details by sections in terms of normativity: Methods of addressing people; Offer of assistance; Etiquette errors; Starting formula of public speaking; Responsibilities of women and men in the field of politeness; Non-linguistic politeness. The book describes the etiquette in business, in the street, in media, in trade and services, in public transport, hospitals, social institutions, in relation to people with special needs; line of politeness *priest – parishioners, teacher – pupil, boss – subordinate*, in interaction between the neighbours. The book contains the following sections: compliments, refusal, gratitude, instructions, greetings, farewells, requests, self-representations and representations of other people, turn from *You* to *you* (to the first name basis), apologizing, polite questions, expressions of compassion; politeness strategies. The Annex contains the address and honorific forms used in relation to the President of the Republic of Poland, representatives of his office, the prime minister and his staff, members of the Senate, diplomatic personnel, employees of the local governments, university and research workers and other. The book also covers the communication in schools, including the schools of creative professions.

7 For the native Polish speakers the Polish forms of politeness are familiar and organic; they have a reputation of being democratic. At the same time an outside view through, for instance, the prism of forms of the Russian and Japanese speech etiquettes – clearly demonstrates the unquestionable hierarchy of these forms, the lack of egalitarianism in most spheres of public communication of their ethno-linguistic specificity and social conditionality. As indicated V.M. Alpatov, the forms of politeness constitute a repository of different communicative important information units (see [Alpatov, 2015a]). Due to the processes of democratization of the Russian language, which were especially intensified in the XX century in connection with the social changes, the hierarchy of forms of speech etiquette, constituting extremely rich structure (see [DRE, 2007]), leveled to a certain extent. One of the areas representing the branching of the forms of etiquette in the Russian language is the modern military titulature. The attempts to activate the forms such as *господин* ‘*Mr.*’, *госпожа* ‘*Mrs.*’, *господа* ‘*Messrs.*’ do not fundamentally change the picture of politeness. One of the priorities in the modern Russian language is the desire to identify the addressed person; in other words, for us it is important to know the name and patronymic of the communication partner, or perhaps only the name, if the person is young. If we do not know the name, most likely we will refer to the person using some not too personally oriented syncretic forms: *Be so kind...; could you ...*, etc.

8 The Polish politeness is totally different, full of hierarchical constructions reflecting the communiques, existing in the Polish extra-linguistic reality. The rules of the Polish politeness in particular inspire the need to observe the rules of politeness between the communicants according to the social, professional, age and many other features described below.

9 1. The most common politeness in Polish language (which in Russian corresponds to addressing the communicant by *Вы* ‘*You*’ and can be called ***neutral***) assumes addressing the communicant using the pronominalized forms of nouns *pan, pani* in the singular and *państwo, panie, panowie* in the plural. The regulatory combination of these forms with the 3^{rd} person of the verb is e.g.: “*Pani pozwoli, że ...*” – literally ‘*Will madam allow me ...*’ [Marcjanik, 2015: 233]. It is interesting to note that in the Japanese language “the honorable persons are also addressed in the 3^{rd} person” [Alpatov, 2015a].

10 Description of polite forms used with respect to the relatives in the Japanese language in the book “Japan: Language and Culture” [Alpatov, 2008] in the section “Japanese terms of relationship and addressing the family members” encourages the search of peculiarities in the Slavic areal. Thus, the addressing *term designating relationship + 3^{rd} person of the verb* to father, mother, grandparents, uncles and aunts is a signal of a special politeness with respect to the close relatives. The book “Practical Polish language course” [PPLC, 2012] does not explicate the semantic nature of these forms but gives the examples: “Kochana Ciociu! Myślę, że mój telegram Ciocia już otrzymała ...” [PPLC, 2012: 211] ‘*Dear Aunt! I think that my telegram (literally.) * aunt has already received.*’ In order to avoid the confusion one has to bear in mind that the addressing *name + 3^{rd} person of the verb* (“*Niech Marysia wytrzepie dywan*” ‘*Let Marysia shake out the carpet*’) is extremely impolite. Just in this way the maidservants were addressed in the past and this survived in the memory of the native speakers of Polish. In the contrary, they perceive totally differently – as a rule – addressing *pan, pani + name + 3^{rd} person of the verb* (e.g. “*Pan / Pani chwilkę poczeka*?” ‘*Will Pan / Pani wait a minute*?’).

11 Along with general addressing *pan* and *pani* the so-called individualizing addresses have been developed (see: [Marcjanik, 2015: 232]). These forms together with a polite form *pan / pani* + name in the vocative case (full name or hypocoristic name, the differentiation of which carries a certain sense) e.g. *Pani Zofio / Pani Zosiu, Panie Tadeuszu / Panie Tadku* are very common and represent a sign of a ***communication on the equal footing*** or communication directed ***from the older to the younger***. In other words, the attribute of communication ***on the equal footing*** and the ***age attribute*** highlighted by V.M. Alpatov is clearly seen in the Polish politeness structure.

12 The forms of politeness using essentially the pronominalized pronoun structures *pan / pani* or *pan / pani + name* – are the common types of addressing throughout the whole area of distribution of the Polish language. At the same time it is just the basic “every day” level of politeness. In order not to acquire the reputation of homespun, unsocialized person one should consider in communication a parameter of social position: “When assessing the individual as a higher, equal or lower in position, the decisive role is the relation of the persons based on their social status...” [Alpatov, 2015a: 17]. In the Polish language the social status parameter is extraordinary relevant and has to be fixed in the speech, otherwise a person which neglects the social aspects of communication will not be taken seriously by the other people. I believe that the parameter of social status is underestimated in the study of Slavic languages. However, there are many nuances: the address forms may contain fine details which are extremely important from the point of view of pragmatics of their translation. The reason of it is because for the native speakers of those languages in which there are no such structures of politeness, it is psychologically difficult to understand the importance of social status parameter. And it is just with this parameter the socially adequate communication in the Polish language is conducted.

13 2. Now, let us refer to the ***parameter of dominant differences in the social and professional sphere***, highlighted by V.M. Alpatov, which helps to properly distribute the language material depending on the factor “to whom the form of politeness is used; who is considered as a superior, equal or subordinate” [Alpatov, 2015a: 139]. It so happened that in the Polish language each socio-professional environment requires its own forms of politeness which are wrapped in the appropriate vocative form (masculine and feminine).

14 Although the native speakers of Polish often proclaim their desire to get rid of the “ballast” of forms of politeness, the Polish academic environment does not have a sufficient prospective for such processes. Restructuring of communication to *polite pan + name* (*Pani Barbaro, Panie Zbyszku*) is not so common, even on the ***level of equal***. In the academic environment the addressing is primarily made according to the scientific degree; getting a university, master’s degree assumes that such person should be addressed properly: *Pani magister* (addressing a woman) and *Panie magistrze* (addressing a man). Accordingly, a person with a higher scientific degree is addressed *Pani doktor, Panie doktorze* (the doctoral degree correlates with the Russian first doctoral degree) and Ph.D. The highest degree Doctor of Science (*doktor habilitowany* (*dr habil.*)) is addressed: *Pani Profesor, Panie Profesorze* (the title of professor in this case is not mandatory). In correspondence the forms of polite addressing oscillate from the most polite form “*Wielce Szanowny Panie Profesorze*” ‘*Dear much-esteemed Mr. Professor*’ to neutral polite academic form “*Szanowny Panie Profesorze*” ‘*Dear Mr. Professor*’.

15 3. The Polish forms of politeness clearly tend to differentiation on the basis of ***professional affiliation***. In the journalistic environment, for example, addressing *redaktor* is used; in a vocative form – *Panie Redaktorze*, ‘*Mr. Editor*’. The sports coach is addressed *Panie Instruktorze*, ‘*Mister Instructor*’, the engineer is addressed *Panie Inżynierze!* The lawyers are addressed *Panie Mecenasie* ‘*Mister lawyer*’: this is the most common generalizing addressing (however, there are more specialized addresses, e.g. with respect to the prosecutor and the judge *Panie Prokuratorze; Panie Sędzio*) (see [Kulpina, 1997: 58-63; Kulpina 2018: 122-132]).

16 V.M. Alpatov highlighted the importance of social and professional differences as follows: “The use of personal pronouns is also affected by the social and professional differences (but probably to a lesser extent than the sex or age differences). One can mark certain peculiarities in e.g. the military sublanguage. The use of personal pronouns in town and country has differences which do not always come down to the dialectal differences.” [Alpatov, 2015a: 110].

17 In the Polish language the military and paramilitary language for special purposes significantly stands out from the other language subsystems.

18 At the same time the *socio-professional hierarchy* “is interrupted” by the *social and job hierarchy* assumed to be more important: “If the differences of certain parameters are in conflict with each other the main role is played by the difference which is perceived as the most significant” [Alpatov, 2015: 18]. As noted above with respect to Professor / Doctor of Science the form *Panie Profesorze* is used. However, in case the professor occupies a higher position, in oral and written communication one should discard the academic title and address him using the lexeme *dyrektor: Panie Dyrektorze* or the other lexeme corresponding to a rank. Thus, the *parameter of the leading position* in this combination of features appears to be more important than the *parameter of academic title of this person.* The deputy director in the Polish environment should be addressed: *Panie Dyrektorze!* ‘*Mr. Director!*’.

19 4. Within the triad ***highest – equal – lowest*** V.M. Alpatov introduces the additional parameters: “In case of availability of the parameter ‘highest’ (...) the following pair of parameters is additionally introduced: ‘emphasized friendly attitude’ – ‘neutral friendly attitude’, and in case of availability of the parameter ‘lowest’ – the following pair of parameters is additionally introduced: ‘emphasized rude attitude’ – ‘neutral attitude’...” [Alpatov, 2015a: 19]. Let us project these parameters into the Polish language.

20 4.1. In the Polish language the politeness category is directly related to the differentiation between the forms of *ty* ‘*you*’ (sgl) **-** *pan, pani* (sgl polite), and *panie, panowie, państwo* ‘*you*’ (pl polite) and *wy* ‘*you*’ (pl, not very polite). In the Russian language in the plural these differences are neutralized. The Polish addresses *you* to the group of people are structurally similar to the Russian (e.g. imperatives in the plural like *Come here!*, compare: *Chodźcie tu!* or e.g., *Zaczekajcie!* ‘*Wait!*’ However, despite the structural similarities with the Russian plural which is not differentiating the addresses of the group of people *You* (polite) or *you* (not very polite), the importance of the Polish forms is different: it is addressing the group of people *wy* **/** *wyście* ‘*you*’ (not very polite). Usually the young communicants or friends are addressed in this manner.

21 There is a number of forms of politeness in the Polish language difficult to qualify as the addresses *You* (polite) or *you* (not very polite) (both in the singular and in the plural). Their status can be defined as an intermediate between *You* and *you*; in general they appear in the Polish language due to the desire to reduce the distance between the communicants, between the provider and recipient of some services in the broad sense. Among those forms which are very popular in the advertising sphere there are forms *you* with the lexeme *pan* assuming a priori addressing *you*. Such forms existed before and were regarded as familiarity. However, nowadays they “made a career” in advertising as a means of reducing the distance between the communicants. Compare the example from the National Corpus of the Polish language: “*Kup pan warsztat, zarabiaj pan*” [NCPL] – literally ‘B*uy Pan a workshop, earn money, pan*’ (reference date 27.09.2015). “Vis-à-vis” the plural of the above mentioned forms are those with the word *państwo* which assumes addressing by *You*, however, their use in the plural with the second person form of the verb “fixed” to addressing the group of people by *you* changes their status to a warm and friendly but also less respectful. Compare: “*Zaczekajcie państwo*” ‘** Wait Panstvo*’ instead of the traditional forms of addressing in the plural *You*: “*Niech państwo zaczekają*” ‘** Let Panstvo wait*’ (‘*Wait, please*’). M. Martsyanik indicates that the forms like “*Posłuchajcie państwo*” are the forms which do not observe the distance of politeness [Marcjanik, 2015: 243]. M. Martsyanik gives also another option of reducing the distance – a form of addressing by *you* the group of persons on the Polish TV like “*Zostańcie z nami*” [Marcjanik, 2008: 47], ‘*Stay with us*’ (during the telecast when it is “to be continued”).

22 4.2. Let us refer to the parameter ***neutral polite addressing a group of people*** *by* ***You*** which necessarily considers the gender factor. Thus, addressing with the pronoun type lexeme *państwo: Proszę Państwa!* (usual and customary) assumes the presence of at least one man in the addressed group. The form of the plural *Panie* is oriented exclusively on women and the form of the plural *Panowie* is oriented exclusively on men.

23 The official addressing a group of people assumes more forms of address when the gender is taken into account. Compare: “*Panie i Panowie!*” ‘*Ladies and gentlemen!* “*Drogie Panie i Drodzy Panowie!*” ‘*Dear ladies and gentlemen!* Such addresses can contain different pronominalized substantives, e.g., “*Koleżanki i Koledzy!*” ‘*Friends* (female) ***and friends*** (male)’ and many other both usually fixed and occasional lexical units, including, e.g. “*Czytelniczki i czytelnicy!*” ‘*Readers* (female) and *readers* (male)’.

24 When addressing a group of people in the Czech language, ladies are addressed first and then – men, compare: “*Vážené damy! Vážení panové!*” ‘*Dear ladies! Dear gentlemen!* Czech material shows the sufficient importance of the social factors. The address system (the same as in the Polish language) records the scientific degree or title and the managerial position. To be polite in Czech one should use the vocative form of address and verbal honorific form with the title and leading position of the addressed person. Compare the address forms: “*Pani docentko!*” ‘*Mrs. Associate Professor!* “*Vážená paní ředitelko, vážený pane řediteli, vážení pedagogové!*” (ufal.mff.cum.cz/cvhm/pdf) (reference date 09/28/2015) ‘*Dear Mrs. Director, dear Mr. Director, dear teachers!* Addresses in the epistolary genre in the Czech language are often supported by the epithet “*milá*” ‘*dear*’ which is emphasizing the politeness of address: “*Vážená a milá kolegyně*” ‘*Respected and dear colleague*’.

25 The forms of politeness of the Bulgarian language assume adding the scientific titles and signs of belonging to the circle of leading persons to the family name of the addressed person. In the Bulgarian language it is the most common and reliable type of addressing, compare the addressing the teacher: “*Госпожо Сакъзова*!” and addressing the young teacher: “*Госпожице Николова*!”; addressing the teachers with academic titles: “*Доцент Богданов*!”, “*Професор Стоева*!”. Compare also addressing any person in vocative: “*Господине*!” (male), “*Госпожо*!” (female), but addressing officials, also heads, the family names are used without vocative forms: “*Господин Милев*!“ (male): “*Госпожа Славчева*!” (female).

26 In the Polish language addressing by the family name like “*Panie Malinowski!*” ‘*Mr. Malinowski*!’ is not considered extremely polite by the educated circles of society and belong to the *lower* stratum. At the same time the Polish addresses calling the addressed person by his family name are not considered to be disrespectful but merely indicate a certain social stratum and can be attributed to expressing the *neutral attitude.* In the Czech language reference by name is quite normal and in such way reflected in linguistics: “*Dobrý večer, paní Králová!*” ‘*Good evening, Mrs Kralova!* [CZL, 2002: 28].

27 4.3. On the basis of the Japanese language material V.M. Alpatov marked the sign of ***emphasized polite attitude to the interlocutor*** which is always relevant for the Polish language. Compare e.g. the addresses: “*Szanowny Panie*” ‘*Dear Sir*’; “*Wielce Szanowny Panie*” ‘*Much-esteemed Sir*’; “*Wielmożny Panie*” ‘**Noble sir*’. Polite attitude to the addresses in the epistolary genre, often in the abbreviated form on the envelope, has to be indicated with the letters *WP*: “*Wielmożny Pan*” ‘*Noble sir*’ or *Sz P:* “*Szanowny Pan*” ‘*Dear Sir*’. These forms are traditionally given in all dictionaries of abbreviations of the Polish language.

28 It should be noted that the Japanese nobilizing suffix -*san* has parallels in the Polish language in the form of pronominalized nouns *pan / pani* (and their extensions). Compare also a parallel in the Bulgarian language as a polite particle *бай. (colloquial)* “(honorific in addressing an older man)” [BRD, 1986: 24] which expresses the emphasized polite attitude which has the age aspect. Polite addressing a woman in the Bulgarian language may require the lexeme *леля* ‘*aunt*’ “2. *Colloquial* aunt (addressing the older women)” [BRD, 1986, 294]. Addressing a married couple – parents of my Bulgarian friend – is as follows: *Бай Марко и леля Радка*!

29 4.4. Referring to the rude forms it should be noted that in the Slavic languages, like in the Japanese, such forms are not directly related to the transfer of social relations. See V.M. Alpatov: “rude forms are not related to the transfer of social relations but they show disrespect to the addressed person regardless of whether this person is of a higher or lower status, from the inside circle or stranger” [Alpatov, 2015a: 72] Wherein the moderately impolite forms “include the use of pronouns in the 2^{nd} person form where it would be preferable to use addressing the interlocutor in the 3^{rd} person form” [Ibid].

30 The lack of social aspects is indicated by the ***emphasized rude*** Bulgarian common domestic addressing forms containing the form *бе* which is used as a substitute of the name of addressed person: (1) “*Какво бе*?” ‘*How are you?*’; (2) “*Стига бе!*” ‘Enough that*!*’ (colloquial speech) (This implies anger/irritation when asking someone to stop doing something). It is interesting to note that such Bulgarian addresses can be used twice along with the pronoun of the 2^{nd} person singular *ти* ‘*you*’: “*А бе ти какво искаш бе?*” ‘**And you, you what do you want?*’

31 It should be noted that modern researchers (as well as the native everyday language speakers) do not consider the forms of the Czech everyday language, opposing the codified Czech language, as reduced and having the social basis (see [Izotov, 2015: 115-126]).

32 In the Russian language addressing with the pronoun *ты!* ‘*you!*’ and appropriate intonation (in writing, such address is emphasized with an exclamation mark) and “clarifying” the cause of discontent: “*Ты, до чего ты озорной!*” (coloquial speech) ‘*You, you are so mischievous!*’ is considered to be impolite. Similarly, in the Polish language the pronoun of the 2^{nd} person singular *ty!* and its modification *te!* (see [Huszcza, 2006: 38]) are the emphasized rude addresses: “*Popamiętasz, ty!*” ‘*You will remember, you!*’.

33 The Slavic language forms with a preposition ***o*** indicating reverence and respect are the antipode of the forementioned forms and imply respectful and elevated address. Compare in the Russian language: “Они, о родина, корят / Тебя твоею простотою...” ‘*Homeland, they reproach you | with your simple soul...*’ [Bunin, 1985: 17]. In the Polish language, along with the respectful elevated notion (compare: “O, gwiazdy boże!” [Staff, 1955: 22] ‘*Oh. God's stars!*’) the preposition ***o*** also serves as an indicator of politeness for expressing the polite request. Compare: Proszę ***o*** pismo ‘***Please*** give me a magazine’.

34 In the Japanese language the respectful elevated semantics can be expressed by means of multifunctional prefix of piety ***o***... [GJRD I, 1970: 721], the functions of which have been analyzed in detail by V.M. Alpatov [Alpatov, 2015a: 86-92]. V.M. Alpatov shows the possibility of the use of this prefix “in an effort to make the speech more polite (...) to embellish what is said in the sentence” [Alpatov, 2015a: 90] (see also [Alpatov, 2015b: 287]). Thus, a correlation can be established between the use of the Japanese prefix ***o-*** in one of its meanings and the polite preposition ***o*** in the Slavic languages. It should be noted that the respectful, overpolite function is reflected by the lexemes possessing the ethical and aesthetic value.

35 It is important that the parameters highlighted by V.M. Alpatov indicate the combination of features (and their competition, see: [Alpatov 2015a: 18]), which emphasizes the complexity of researched material and the difficulties with establishment of the parameterization of speech etiquette [Alpatov, 2015a: 37].

36 5. The parameter ***insider – stranger*** appears in a differentiated way. For example, in Japanese “main difference in the address exists between the forms in which the attitude to the persons considered as the lowest insiders, or as equal insiders, and sometimes as *the lowest insiders* (non-address forms) is indicated, and the forms in which the attitude to the persons considered as the highest ranking strangers or equal strangers and sometimes as the lowest ranking strangers (address forms) is indicated. The main indicator of address forms of the verb is the suffix *мас-*“ [Alpatov, 2015a: 99-100]. It should be noted that such complex semantic structures fixed by means of the syntactic derivation are not present in the Slavic languages. However, if we have a look at the correlation of polite forms on the line *insider – stranger* we can see the specific manifestations of this semantic category in the Polish language communiques with the other languages.

37 It is interesting to note that the hierarchical communiques in the Polish politeness expressed in the address and honorific do not affect communication of foreigners. Foreigners, for example, may address the peers *ty* ‘*you*’ (which in the Polish student's environment is quite natural but in the other social strata is not recommended). This is a result in particular of the fact that the foreigners as a rule are not taught the Polish forms of politeness (which are very difficult). Therefore, people from outside of the Polish area can get a false impression of simplicity of the Polish politeness. However, this simplicity is imaginary.

38 Although in the Polish language addressing by family name is considered to be downcasting, in the Polish translated text (same as in the Russian translated text), the addresses Mr., sir, Ms. and Mrs. and honorifics with the forementioned indicators of politeness and the family names are quite relevant.

39 Appearance of the sign ***insider – stranger*** is interesting from the point of view of its penetration into the Russian text from the translated texts. So, in the texts translated from the Polish language or styled for the Polish realities may appear the Polish indicators of politeness *pan* and *pani*. Let us remember the TV programme “Кабачок 13 стульев” (“Pub 13 chairs”) and its heroes (*pani Monika* et al.). The Polish native speakers when speaking Russian can transfer the rules of the Polish speech etiquette using the mechanisms of interference onto the soil of the Russian language thus forming a special stylistic effect. So, the “Preface” to the Polish bibliographic dictionary “Russian lexis. Bibliographic characteristics” compiled by the well-known experts Jan Wawrzynczyk (Russian language) and Eliza Małek (Russian language and ancient literature) contains the following recommendation to the dictionary readers: “We kindly ask the (female) readers and (male) readers to read the Preface” [RVBD, 2014-2015: 5]. Due to the matter of addressing the *(female and male) readers* the “Preface” written seemingly in the “pure Russian language” becomes the Polish stylization because the readers are separated by gender. For the Russian readers such addressing appears to be quite exotic because we are not accustomed to it. In the extremely important moments for our country the citizens were addressed *Brothers and sisters!* As you can see the men in this case are addressed first. As stylization *of Polishness* with the specific addressing has been created by the well-known specialists in the Russian language and literature we can be assume that their intention is to show respect to the Russian reader. In the Russian text being written by the native Russian speaker it would be more natural to find a collective address *Dear reader!*

40 6. The parameters ***of age and gender differences*** highlighted by V.M. Alpatov in the Japanese language are also the essential attribute of the Polish communication (see above the grammatical aspects of the problems). In the Polish language there are lexical indicators of age e.g. *senior (Malinowski senior* ‘*the eldest of the Malinowskis*’). In the junior category such indicators of age are the lexemes *junior* ‘the youngest member of the family’, address “*Chłopcze!*” ‘*Boy! Guy!*’ and “*Panienko*!” ‘*Girl! Young lady!*’ (addressing the teenage girl).

41 7. Parameter ***of the differences between the forms of politeness in the urban and rural areas.*** V.M. Alpatov points out the differentiation of the Japanese forms of politeness in the urban and rural areas: “The use of personal pronouns in town and country has differences which are not always dialectal.” [Alpatov, 2015a: 110].

42 Polite forms in the Slavic languages also vary for towns and countryside. Thus, in the Bulgarian language the particle ***ле*** “*dialectal untranslatable particle in the vocative form*” [BRD, 1986: 292] provides the polite and at the same time folk-conversational character to the words without relation to any particular dialect. The significance of this form as a polite address to close people is set in the context, see e. g.: [BRD, 1986: 292]: “*Стояне **ле**!*” ‘*Stojan, Dear Stojan*’, “майко ***ле***!” ‘*Mother!*’, ‘*Mamma!*’, ‘*Dear mother!*’. The addresses formed by adding the form ***ле*** exist in the Bulgarian favourite folk songs and persist in the language giving the lyrics of folk songs the rural-peasant tinge. Compare the words of Bulgarian historical folk song, devoted to the last Bulgarian tsar Ivan Shishman “*Откак се е мила моя майно **ле** зора зазорила*” ‘*So it is, my dear mother, the dawn flared up*’. Another example from the Bulgarian folk song: “*Аз залюбих **стара ле майко** две черни очи*” ‘*My old dear mother, I fell in love with a pair of black eyes*’.

43 The Macedonian folk songs often contain the form *мори* which is qualified as “*interjection* hey! listen! (addressing a female person)” [MRD, 2003: 316] and expresses a polite interest. Compare its use in the famous Macedonian folk song “Јовано, Јованке”: “*Јовано, Јованке, / Крај Вардаро седиш, **мори**, / бело платно белиш.* (...) Јас те тебе чекам, ***мори***, *дома да ми дојдеш*” ‘*Jovana, Jovanka, you sit on the bank of the Vardar, *мори, bleaching white linen, (...) I am waiting *мори, that you will come home to me.*’

44 In the Polish language the means of folk stylization and expression of polite interest are forms of Dative ethical *mi* and *ci* which are mostly used in the female speech. Compare in the folk song: “*Gdybym **ci** ja miała skrzydłeczka jak gąska*” ‘*If I had wings like a duck*’.

45 8. The wordings of V.M. Alpatov regarding ***the difference of the address and honorific forms*** can be referred to the Polish language: “It can be stated that the importance of address forms and the importance of honorific/depreciative forms from the point of view of the set of their distinctive features are slightly different” [Alpatov, 2015a: 71], at the same time “the address forms are associated with a greater number of combinations of signs than the honorific forms ...” [ibid]. The Polish material is also manifesting the significant differences of the address and honorific forms with the greater differentiation of the address, same as in the Japanese language. Thus, addressing the university rector directly sounds “*Magnificencjo!*” or “*Wasza Magnificencjo!*” However, if the rector is currently absent the honorific form sounds *rektor* thus reducing the particularly solemn *Magnificencja.*

46 In the Polish language the honorific forms are branched and linguo-specific. And the Polish language in this sphere hardly has much in common with the Russian language as well as with the Japanese language. The Japanese language “has two different grammatical categories: the address, associated with the attitude of the speaker to the interlocutor, and the honorific associated with the attitude of the speaker to the persons being discussed” [Alpatov, 2015a: 133]. In the Polish language the same categories are highlighted – address and honorific are differentiated using the graphical tools: the address forms are written with a capital letter, and honorific forms – with a lowercase letters. If, as mentioned above, the Deputy Director (and all his deputies) is to be addressed in the same manner as the Director (*Panie Dyrektorze*!), then honorific reflects the official nomenclature, therefore the absent at the moment Deputy Director is addressed *wicedyrektor*. The minister is to be addressed “*Panie Ministrze*” ‘*Mr. Minister*’ / “*Pani Minister*” ‘*Mrs. Minister*’, in the same way as the deputy minister, but the address on the envelope has to contain the exact position indication (see [Marcjanik, 2015: 291]). It is indicated that “the forms *panie wiceministrze, pani wiceminister* are unacceptable” [ibid: 291] ‘Mr. Deputy Minister’ ‘Mrs. Deputy Minister’. Thus, the mobilizing substitutes which are raising the status of the officials are required in the official communication. It can be stated that the differences of address and honorific forms of the Polish language are very important and can cause the striking breach of etiquette by the foreigners speaking Polish.

47 Studying of Japanese honorific is relevant for the existing communiqués in the Slavic languages: “Praising the speaker or those considered to be within the sphere of the speaker is unacceptable” [Alpatov, 2015a: 288]; “In the Japanese language it is not acceptable to use the honorific forms speaking about the people considered as the insiders (at least as the equal insiders or the lowest insiders). For example, in the literary language it is impossible to use the honorific forms speaking about yourself, no matter what position the speaker holds being for himself both ‘equal’ and ‘insider’” [Alpatov, 2015a: 40]; “in case the ‘hero’ is the speaker himself the Japanese etiquette prohibits using politeness with respect to him.” [Alpatov, 2015a: 122] These provisions apply to the Slavic languages as well: one should not use the respectful terms speaking about himself. It is interesting to note that those who study the Slavic languages are imbued with the forms of speech etiquette and usually have a desire to use the polite respectful forms in relation to themselves. The given wordings of V.M. of Alpatov are didactically relevant because they contain an explanation why it is not desirable to speak in this manner.

48 So, the insight into the Slavic forms of politeness through the prism of the same of the Japanese speech etiquette manifests the hierarchy of these forms in the Slavic languages, their inegalitarianism in majority of the spheres of public communication, their lingual, ethnic and social specificity. The forms of politeness of the modern Russian language appear to be the most democratized because of the special influence of social factors on the language changes. But this is the other story. The forms of politeness of the contemporary Polish language are at the other pole; they are standing out against the other Slavic languages because of their branching and social marking.

49 The basic parameters of speech etiquette in the Slavic languages are focused on the expression of politeness and delivery of the related information. The relationship between the communicants is built among the other principles on the basis of the social and occupational features (the line ***senior – junior, privileged person – non-privileged person***, etc.). The parameterization developed by V.M. Alpatov has the matrix character and on the basis of the highlighted parameters of the Japanese language allows to turn to the categorical parameters of the forms of politeness in the other languages, particularly to the Slavic languages. Many times I go back to the book “Categories of politeness in the modern Japanese language” and at some new stage I am trying to process the language material and linguistic ideas contained in it. The new editions of this book appear in an expanded format enriched with new aspects. The book is based on the different research techniques, it contains not only the theoretical and empirical data but also data of the native speakers’ linguistic questionings.

50 Let us try to generalize the issues on which the Polish politeness depends, to which this article is mostly focused on and which served as a base material for the analysis of the forms of etiquette. The most important are configuration of two factors: (1) type of the lexeme which appears in the address or honorific and (2) person and number of the verb.

51 Among the lexical classes involved in the expression of politeness in the Polish language the following are highlighted at first:

52 1) pronominalized nouns such as *pan, pani*, and other; 2) pronominalized nouns together with the anthroponyms (full or hypocoristic name of the addressee); 3) names of occupations: *redaktor ‘editor’, inżynier ‘ingineer’, pułkownik* ‘colonel’ etc.; 4) names of the scientific degrees; 5) titles in the address and honorific; 6) terms of the nearest relationship; 7) lexemes which can express the age differences: *senior*, *panienka*, etc.; 8) lexemes which can express the gender differences.

53 It is characteristic that the classes above are overlapping categories being the combinations of features. The set of person and number features of verbs correlate with the highlighted classes and, in fact, the formed configurations of lexemes of the certain lexical classes are making the forms of politeness of the Slavic languages which can potentially be subjected to treatment on the specified parameters with the purpose of their schematization.

Библиография

1. Алпатов В.М. Категории вежливости в современном японском языке. Изд. 1-е. / Отв. ред. И.Ф. Вардуль. М.: Наука, 1973.

2. Алпатов В.М. Категории вежливости в современном японском языке. Изд. 5-е. / Отв. ред. И.Ф. Вардуль. М.: ЛЕНАНД, 2015а.

3. Алпатов В.М. Хвала и хула в японском языке и сферы говорящего и слушающего // Хвала и хула в языке и коммуникации: Сб. статей / Сост. и отв. ред. Л.Л. Федорова. М.: РГГУ, 2015б. С. 287-293.

4. Алпатов В.М. Япония: Язык и культура. М.: Языки славянских культур, 2008.

5. Балакай А.Г. Словарь русского речевого этикета: ок. 6000 этикетных слов и выражений. М.: Астрель; АСТ; Хранитель, 2007.

6. Бернштейн С. Б. Болгарско-русский словарь: около 58 000 слов. 3-е изд., стереотип. М.: Рус. яз., 1986.

7. Большой японско-русский словарь: В 2 т. / Под ред. Н.И. Конрада. М.: Советская энциклопедия, 1970.

8. Бунин И.А. Стихотворения. М.: Художественная литература, 1985.

9. Вавжиньчик Я., Малэк Э. Русская лексика. Библиографический словарь: В 10 т. Warszawa: Mila Hoshi, 2014-2015.

10. Изотов А.И. Диалект в чешском художественном тексте // Вестник Оренбургского гос. педагог. университета. 2015. № 3. С. 115-126.

11. Кротовская Я.А., Лесная Г.М., Селиванова Н.В. Практический курс польского языка. М.: Астрель, 2012.

12. Кульпина В.Г. Вежливость и ее антиподы в категориях языковой вариативности, оценочности и социальной нормы // Вежливость и антивежливость в языке и коммуникации: Мат. Межд. научн. конф., состоявшейся в Институте лингвистики РГГУ 23-24.10. 2018 / Сост. и отв. ред. И.А. Шаронов. М.: Политологическая энциклопедия, 2018. С. 122-132.

13. Усикова Р.П., Шанова З.К., Верижникова Е.В., Поварницына М.А. Македонско-русский словарь / Под ред. Р.П. Усиковой, Е.В. Верижниковой. М.: Астрель; АСТ, 2003.

14. Чешский язык: Учебник-самоучитель для начинающих / Под ред. А.И. Изотова. М.: Филология, 2002.

15. Huszcza R. Honoryfikatywność. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, 2006. (на польском языке)

16. Kulpina W.G. Oficjalne formy grzecznościowe w nauczaniu polszczyzny studentów rosyjskojęzycznych // Język polski w kraju i za granicą. T. II / Pod red. B. Janowskiej i J. Porayskiego-Pomsty. Warszawa: Elipsa, 1997. S. 58-63. (на польском языке)

17. Marcjanik M. Grzeczność w komunikacji językowej. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, 2008. (на польском языке)

18. Marcjanik M. ABC grzeczności językowej // Polszczyzna na co dzień / Pod red. Mirosława Bańko. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN. 2015. S. 231-310. (на польском языке)

19. Narodowy Korpus Języka polskiego [Электронный ресурс]. URL: https://nkjp.pl/ (дата обращения: 01.11.2023) (на польском языке)

20. Staff L. Wiersze zebrane. T. III. Warszawa: PIW, 1955. (на польском языке)

Комментарии

Учредитель / Редакция
Государственный академический университет гуманитарных наук
119049, Москва, Мароновский пер., 26
gaugn.ru

Издатель
Государственный академический университет гуманитарных наук
119049, Москва, Мароновский пер., 26.
gaugn.ru