

EVERYDAY LIFE IN DISCOURSE PRACTICES

MARINA RYABOVA

PROFESSOR, DOCTOR OF PHILOLOGY
AT KEMEROVO STATE UNIVERSITY, KEMEROVO

RUSSIA

MRIABOVA@INBOX.RU

ABSTRACT: THE CULTURE OF CONTEMPORANEITY PRESENTS ITSELF THROUGH VARIOUS CONCEPTS AND DISCOURSES THAT CONSTITUTE THE CATEGORY OF EVERYDAY LIFE, WHICH THEY REVEAL AND PORTRAY. IN LINGUISTIC TERMS, THE CATEGORY OF EVERYDAY LIFE IS MANIFESTED IN DIFFERENT FORMS OF COMMUNICATION, AND FIRST OF ALL IN THE SYSTEM OF NORMS AND MODELS OF SPEECH BEHAVIOR, KNOWN AS SPEECH ETIQUETTE. THE GOAL OF THE ARTICLE IS TO ANALYZE THE USE OF SOME MODELS OF ENGLISH SPEECH ETIQUETTE, SPECIFICALLY THE USE OF POLITENESS FORMS TYPICAL OF THE ENGLISH.

KEY WORDS: EVERYDAY LIFE, CULTURE, COMMUNICATION, SPEECH ETIQUETTE, POLITENESS RULES.

THE culture of contemporeneity, reflected in discourse practices of daily communication, functioning in various forms, ways and genres, correlates with the category of everyday life, which in its turn, generates discourses and their concepts. Thus, the analysis and description of the category of everyday life through analyzing its discourses and concepts, enables to better understand the nature of today's language culture, the nature and tendencies in the developments of culture in general.

THE culture of everyday life includes the whole complex of human relations: the culture of communication and behavior, the culture of mass media communication and the culture of life styles. In linguistic terms, the category of everyday life presents a system of all processes of language functioning, all forms and types of communication, manifested in forms of individual or collective discourses.

THE interest of modern science to the problem of everyday life is connected with such questions as: perception of world picture by naïve consciousness, archetypes of mass communication as a regulatory system of human behavior, as a correlation of high and everyday forms of culture.

EVERYDAY life in a form of common opinion reveals itself specifically in an ability to learn some cultural codes that allow to rise a personal social status. A system of fixed behavioral reactions to the environment presents itself in the existence of various cultural codes of behavior, which exist in a language as a special set of speech formulae of social etiquette, regulating the choice of communicative forms, structures and set phrases. In this respect it is interesting to analyze communicative behavior of the people of Great Britain, which is regulated by the so called speech etiquette.

SPEECH etiquette is an essential part of culture, behavior and human communication. Social relationships and norms of behavior are fixed in speech etiquette formulae. Etiquette norms are encoded in sayings, proverbs, idioms, set phrases such as: Welcome! How do you

do! Farewell! Thank you! etc. Being an element of national culture, speech etiquette has a clear national coloring.

In linguistics etiquette is understood as a system of rules and conventions that regulates social and professional behavior. In any social unit there are accepted rules of behavior upheld and enforced by legal codes, or by customs and enforced by group pressure. Regardless of the type of national culture, any society possesses the etiquette, and every person knows the behavior expected from him towards others and from others toward himself [1].

THE word “etiquette” came from French and entered the English language about 1740-1750. In French it meant memorandum, derivative of étiqu(i) (- to attach, stick) [op.cit.]. The sense developed in French from small cards written or printed with instructions how to behave properly at court and/or from behavior instructions written on a soldier’s billet for lodgings.

AT the beginning of the XVIII century etiquette norms were mostly written in periodicals such as The Spectator, The Tatler, where readers could learn what kind of conversations to have and what subjects to talk about, if they wanted to look like educated gentlemen of a society. As Henry Hitchings, a famous British writer, critic and researcher assumes the first appearance of the word “etiquette” can be found in the collection of letters written by the fourth earl of Chesterfield Philip Stanhope to his son, in which he gave instructions how to become a gentleman [3]. As Hutchings put it, the word “etiquette” was then understood as a code of conduct, as an idea of self-control, as a virtue.

MANNERS are different from etiquette: etiquette in this modern age is a quaint set of rules for the socially insecure – as old-fashioned as debutantes. Manners, conversely, might be taken to mean natural grace, and treating all with equal consideration. Hitchings sees it more formally: manners, a word suggesting broad principles of behavior, and ‘etiquette’, which denotes the actions that articulate those principles [6].

SPEECH etiquette in a narrow meaning of the term, can be defined as a system of language means where etiquette relationships are revealed. The elements of this system can be actualized at various linguistic levels. At the lexical level etiquette relationships are marked with the help of special expressions and set phrases (Thank you; Please; excuse me; Good-bye; etc.), special forms of address (Mr., Miss, Mrs., Madame, Ms, etc). At the level of grammar organization it is supported by polite forms of the language (the use of pronouns in plural form: vous, вы); the use of interrogative sentences instead of imperative ones (Could you possibly help me?) At stylistic level it is expressed in the use of literary high flown language forms of official standard, and the ban of obscene lexis which are replaced by euphemisms [5]. Etiquette is also marked at phonetic and prosodic levels of language which means that a special intonation is used (of polite model). At the communicative level it presupposes a prohibition to interfere into a conversation or to interrupt it, etc.

SPEECH etiquette can be analyzed from the point of view of language norm. Thus, understanding of right cultural normalized types of speech includes in itself the definite speech etiquette.

SPECIFICATION of speech etiquette means that it does not only characterizes everyday life practices, but also it determines speech norms. Elements of speech etiquette are present in everyday discourse practice of any person, who easily recognizes these norms and expects from the communicator to use them in special contexts. Elements of speech etiquette are set so deep that they are perceived by naive consciousness as a part of everyday natural behavior.

If a person doesn't know these norms or deliberately breaks them, it is interpreted as a wish to insult somebody, or as a breach of breeding, or as his/her attribution to other culture, or to a different social class.

ON the other hand, speech etiquette can be assessed in the aspect of language norm. E.g., every person whose native language is English, knows some conversational formulae, expressing excuse; though some expressions are regarded as language norm (*sorry, excuse me*), while others are rejected, like for e.g. "*pardon*". The fact of avoidance in the use of some expressions can already be regarded as an object of standardization: e.g. formulae of excuse are adequate when the speaker disturbs his conversational partner, though to ask for an excuse too often is not advisable, since the partner is put in an awkward position by this. Besides, the breach of norms and rules of literary language, when it looks like carelessness, is a breach of etiquette in itself.

THE borderline between an everyday speech discourse and a norm in speech etiquette is flexible. Practical implementation of speech etiquette usually differs from standard models not only because of non-acquaintance of the communicants with the rules. The deviation from the rule as well as strict adherence to it can testify the speaker's attitude to the hearer or his/her perception of a situation.

SPEECH etiquette is tied with the communicative situation as such and with its parameters: personality, time, place, theme and motive of communication and its purpose. Speech etiquette presents a complex of linguistic phenomena, that is connected with the addressed, though the speaker's personality is also important. This can be illustrated by the *tu* – *vous* forms of address. A general rule says that *vous*-forms are used as a sign of respect and greater formality of communication, while *tu*-forms are a sign of less formal style of communication, a communication between equals. Though realization of this principle can be actualized in different variants depending on the age, race, or rank factors, or whether communicants are relatives, friends, or of the same or different social status.

RULES of etiquette can vary depending on the fact whether the theme of conversation is sad or happy events. There are special rules of speech behavior connected with the place of conversation (dinner, office, business meeting). Speech etiquette has different functions such as: establishing contact between people; attracting attention to the hearer; individualization of a communicant; expressing reverence to a communicant; revealing the status of the event (friendly, official, businesslike, etc.); forming a favorable atmosphere to a conversation; playing a positive influence on a communicant, etc.

A lot of researchers of the English communicative behavior assume, that politeness is, evidently, a most typical feature of their behavior. As a famous English social anthropologist Kate Fox remarked, although many of the foreign visitors complained about English reserve, they all tended to be impressed by our courtesy [2]. The author gave a detailed description of English politeness which the English demonstrate in the road, in transport, on the way. The etiquette regulating this behavior is called the negative politeness rule, meaning that it is concerned with other people's need not to be intruded or imposed upon (as opposed to 'positive politeness', which is concerned with their need for inclusion and social approval). The restraint, cautiousness and contact-avoidance of English public-transport passengers – the stand-offishness that foreigners complain about – are all characteristic features of 'negative politeness'. What looks like unfriendliness is really a kind of consideration: they judge others by themselves, and assume that everyone shares their obsessive need for privacy – so they mind their own business and politely ignore them [3].

THE rule of negative politeness is part of a general communicative strategy of politeness or tact maxim, which means that the communicant respects the desire of the other not to communicate, not to interfere. Consequently, the speaker prefers to use indirect speech acts, allowing "to keep the face", i.e. instead of the forms of imperative mood interrogative constructions are preferred, or declarative statements, that express requests implicitly. For e.g. instead of strict order, in the form of imperative mood "*Shut the door*", the preference will be given to interrogative constructions with "*please*": "*Will you shut the door, please?*" The degree of politeness can be higher with the usage of subjunctive mood forms: "*Would you shut the door, please?*" "*Could you shut the door please?*" The highest form of negative politeness is a form of implicit request in an affirmative statement: "*There's a draught here*", expressing a presupposition "*Shut the door, please*".

TOGETHER with the negative politeness rule the English use the positive politeness rule in their communicative behavior, which means that the speaker shows to the hearer that he understands his interests, approves and shares his needs and goals. The form of this strategy is the use of inclusive pronoun "*we*": "*Let's shut the door*". Or "*We really should close the door*". Inclusive "*we*" can be used in speech acts of prohibition: "*We don't want to park here, do we?*" As positive politeness the plural form of pronoun, denoting address can be used: "*Give us a hand, son*" [4].

WHEN the English bump into each other they automatically say "sorry", no matter whose fault was that. The older people were slightly more likely to apologize than younger people. K. Fox explains this phenomenon as the reflex apology: a reflex – an automatic, knee-jerk response, not a considered admission of guilt. This is a deeply ingrained rule: when any inadvertent, undesired contact occurs (and to the English, almost any contact is by definition undesired), they say 'sorry'.

IN fact, the English, due to K. Fox, think that any intrusion, impingement or imposition of any kind, however minimal or innocuous, generally requires an apology. They use the word 'sorry' as a prefix to almost any request or question: '*Sorry, but do you know if this train stops at Banbury?*' '*Sorry, but is this seat free?*' '*Sorry – do you have the time?*' '*Sorry, but you seem to be sitting on my coat.*' They say 'sorry' if an arm accidentally brushes against someone else's when passing through a crowded doorway; even a 'near miss', where no actual physical contact takes place, can often prompt an automatic 'sorry' from both parties. They often say 'sorry' when they mean 'excuse me' (or 'get out of my way'), such as when asking someone to move so they can get past them. An interrogative 'sorry?' means 'I didn't quite hear what you said – could you repeat it?' (or 'what?'). Clearly, all these "sorries" are not heartfelt, sincere apologies. Like 'nice', 'sorry' is a useful, versatile, all-purpose word, suitable for all occasions and circumstances. When in doubt, say 'sorry'. Englishness means always having to say you're sorry [2].

THUS, etiquette norms in speech behavior of the English is a characteristic feature of their communicative culture, that determines the choice of formulae and models of their every day communication, revealing their class and social status.

REFERENCES

1. **Etiquette**: URL: <http://dictionary.com.reference.com/browse/etiquette> (18.03.2015).
2. **Fox, K., 2004**: Watching the English: The hidden rules of English behavior. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 2004.
3. **Hitchings, Henry, 2013**: Sorry! The English and Their Manners. London: Farrar Straus and Giroux, 2013.
4. **Renkema, J., 1993**: Discourse Studies: an Introductory Textbook. Amsterdam: Jonh Benjamins Publishing Co, 1993.
5. **Ryabova, Marina, 2013**: Euphemisms and Media Framing. European Scientific Journal. Nov. 2013, vol.9, № 32. P. 33-45.
6. **Sorry. The English and Their Manners.** : <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/books/bookreviews/9793044/Sorry-The-English-and-their-Manners-by-Henry-Hitchings-review.html>].