

**МІНІСТЕРСТВО ОСВІТИ І НАУКИ УКРАЇНИ КИЇВСЬКИЙ
НАЦІОНАЛЬНИЙ ЛІНГВІСТИЧНИЙ УНІВЕРСИТЕТ**

Кафедра германської і фіно-угорської філології

імені професора Г.Г. Почепцова

**Кваліфікаційна робота магістра з лінгвістики
на тему: «Етикетна мовленнєва поведінка британців й українців у
типових комунікативних ситуаціях (вербальний та невербальний
аспекти)»**

студентки групи МЛа 53-18
факультету германської філології
освітньо-професійної програми
Сучасні філологічні студії
(англійська мова і друга іноземна
мова): лінгвістика та
перекладознавство
за спеціальністю 035 Філологія
Карпенко Лілії Володимирівни

Допущено до захисту
«__» _____ року

Науковий керівник:
к.пед.н., доцент Соколець І.І.

В.о. завідувача кафедри
германської і фіно-угорської
філології імені професора
Г.Г. Почепцова

Національна шкала _____
Кількість балів _____
Оцінка ЄКТС _____

Алексієвець О.М.

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE OF UKRAINE
KYIV NATIONAL LINGUISTIC UNIVERSITY
Professor G.G.Pocheptsov Chair of Germanic and Finno-Ugrian Philology

Master's Qualification Paper

ETIQUETTE SPEECH BEHAVIOUR OF THE BRITISH AND UKRAINIANS
IN TYPICAL COMMUNICATIVE SITUATIONS (VERBAL AND
NONVERBAL ASPECTS)

LILIA KARPENKO

Group MLa 53-18

Department of Germanic Philology

Research Adviser

Assoc. Prof. Sokolets I. I.

PhD (Pedagogics)

CONTENT

INTRODUCTION.....	4
CHAPTER I. SPEECH ETIQUETTE AS OBJECT OF LINGUISTIC RESEARCH	7
1.1. Speech Etiquette: its essence and features.....	7
1.2. Speech Etiquette Functions	13
1.3. Speech Etiquette and Communicative Situation	17
CONCLUSIONS TO CHAPTER I.....	22
CHAPTER II. SPEECH BEHAVIOURAL PATTERNS OF THE BRITISH AND UKRAINIANS IN TYPICAL COMMUNICATIVE SITUATIONS	23
2.1. Greeting Communicative Situation	23
2.2. Leave-Taking Communicative Situation.....	38
2.3. Communicative Situation of Address.....	48
2.4. Communicative Situation of Apology.....	58
CONCLUSIONS TO CHAPTER II	68
GENERAL CONCLUSIONS	70
RÉSUMÉ.....	72
LIST OF REFERENCE MATERIALS	74
LIST OF ILLUSTRATION MATERIALS	79
LIST OF INTERNET RESOURCES	82

INTRODUCTION

Modern linguistics, having placed the linguistic personality in the centre of its study with all the linguocognitive competencies inherent in it, opened a wide scope of the search of new objects of research and, not least, allowed a new look at traditional, long-established cultural and linguistic phenomena and concepts. In turn, the communicative-pragmatic approach as the main methodological tool of the anthropocentric paradigm allows elucidating deeper the linguistic nature of linguistic units of different levels, to more fully reveal their pragmatic potential and functional possibilities in various speech acts with different communicative intentions.

Speech etiquette (SE) is among the means that help make communication successful and achieve its pragmatic effect. Therefore, the phenomenon of speech etiquette is constantly in the focus of attention of the rhetoricians, philosophers, linguists, ethnographers and other scientists.

The concentration of linguistic research on the solution of key questions of the effectiveness of verbal and nonverbal communication enhances the interest of specialists in the study of speech etiquette. In connection with the general orientation of linguistic studies of the XXI-st century on the problems and prerequisites of interpersonal communication in the context of globalization processes that occur in the world, the problem of a deeper study of modern communicative discourse has arisen.

The problem of analysing speech etiquette in the context of the communicative-discursive paradigm is of paramount importance in modern linguistics. Researchers cover various aspects of this concept, in particular linguocultural, sociocultural, syntactical, stylistic, lexicographical, and pragmatic.

However, the current state of linguistic science makes it possible to describe speech etiquette from updated linguocognitive and communicative-pragmatic positions.

In verbal interaction, the task of its participants lies not only in the implementation of specific communicative intentions, but also in their adequate cultural and verbal transmission, therefore there is a need for a multidimensional analysis of speech etiquette in linguocultural and communicative-pragmatic areas. The achievements of communicative pragmatics help to solve the problems of communication theory concerning the identification of the postulates of polite of successful communication and the identification of global and local strategies for the amiable speech behaviour of communicants, among which speech etiquette is of primary importance.

So, **the aim of the work** is to identify, analyse and compare means of speech etiquette in English and Ukrainian, indispensable for successful cross-cultural communication.

Achieving this goal involves the following tasks:

- to elucidate the theoretical foundations of the study of the phenomenon of speech etiquette;
- to describe features of speech etiquette acts in stereotyped communicative situations in the English and Ukrainian languages;
- to identify the linguo-pragmatical means of expressing speech etiquette in typical communicative situations in English and Ukrainian;
- to investigate lexico-grammatical and pragmatic features of speech etiquette formulas used in typical communicative situations in English and Ukrainian.

The object of the study is means of linguistic politeness in crosscultural communication.

The subject of the study is formulas of English and Ukrainian speech etiquette, which are used in typical communicative situations.

To achieve the goal, the following methods were used: descriptive, ethnopsychological and sociolinguistic analyses of the synchronous state of speech etiquette, semantic and stylistic interpretation, comparative and pragmatic analyses of speech etiquette formulas in English and Ukrainian.

The scientific novelty of the research is that the work clarifies the concept of speech etiquette as a structural component of normative speech behaviour, the communicative purpose of which is the manifestation of courtesy in a specific communication situation. The main linguopragmatic means of expressing speech etiquette in typical communicative situations in English and Ukrainian are identified.

The theoretical and methodological background of the research was a complex of domestic and foreign studies on the theory and history of speech etiquette by N. I. Formanovskaya, S. Bohdan, V. E. Goldin, M. Kocherhan, L.A. Karpenko, Y. K. Radevych-Vynnytsky, R. Jakobson, S. Ervin-Tripp, B. Horodetsky and other scientists.

The theoretical significance of the research is the analysis of the dynamic development of speech etiquette and speech formulas in typical communicative situations.

The practical value of the study is the possibility to use its results in the courses on linguoculturology, ethnolinguistics, theory and practice of teaching English as a foreign language.

The structure of the Diploma Paper is determined by the purpose and objectives of the study. The Diploma Paper consists of Introduction, two Chapters, Conclusion to each of them, General Conclusions and Résumé.

Introduction outlines the topicality, aim, main tasks, theoretical and practical value of this research.

Chapter I deals with the main theoretical approaches to the study of speech etiquette as a general language category, highlights SE features and functions.

Chapter II is devoted to the determination and distinguishing national peculiarities of etiquette speech behaviour of the British and Ukrainians, the analysis of etiquette speech acts in typical communicative situations and the main means implementing communicative strategies of positive and negative politeness by the Ukrainian and English people.

General Conclusions summarize and generalize the obtained results.

CHAPTER I. SPEECH ETIQUETTE AS OBJECT OF LINGUISTIC RESEARCH

1.1. Speech Etiquette: its essence and features

An important indicator of human culture is the culture of the language of communication. Usually, linguistics interprets this term as adherence to the stable linguistic norms of spoken and written literary language, as well as conscious, unforced, purposeful, skilful use of linguistic and expressive means, depending on the purpose and circumstances of communication. The basis of any communication is spoken language. Speech is a form of existence of the language, and language functions in speech are in constant development. Human language can be linguistically perfect, though very poor in content or aesthetic. The speech of an individual speaker can help understand his/her moral personality and intellectual development. Therefore, it would be appropriate to include behaviour of the speaker, his/her linguistic tact and etiquette in this concept.

Modern linguistics pays great attention to the issues of the language of communication, principles of modeling communicative acts, and functioning of the language in all spheres of social activity. In this context, the study of speech etiquette, the rules of speech behaviour is of great importance. These rules are enshrined in the system of sustainable expressions adopted by native speakers of the language at a certain stage of the development of the society in typical situations of communication (Манакић, 1995: 20).

The main feature of communication as a process is interaction. The process of communication encompasses social interaction of the members of the society in their joint activity. Orderliness is achieved through rules and regulations that govern communication, depending on its purpose and means (Олійник, 2013: 267).

The society produces certain standardized norms of social behaviour (including speech) that are defined by perceptions of models of behaviour in a

particular situation. In order to function as a complex social system, society must establish such a framework for the behaviour of individuals in which this behaviour becomes stable and repetitive. This is the very framework of etiquette – established standards of behaviour and rules of politeness in any society (Герцогська, 2013: 85).

The word “etiquette” is known to have derived from French – fr. *etiquette* – label (Богдан, 1998: 6). The concept of “etiquette” was started to be explored in the context of interpersonal interaction of representatives of one ethnoculture (Маслова, 2001: 12; Павловская, 2001: 145) and later – as a coordination of speech behaviour in intercultural communication (Дорда, 1996: 113; Корольов, 2011: 287). As a rule, etiquette is defined as “a set of rules of conduct that relate to the outward manifestation of people’s attitudes (behaviour, forms of treatment and greetings, behaviour in public, manners, etc.)” (Богдан, 1998: 220).

The history of SE is quite ancient. Rules of behaviour of people during communication have been formed since ancient times. The first references to SE (communication culture, speech ethics) are found in the ancient world – Egypt, India, China, and Greece. Thus, the ancient Chinese philosopher Confucius taught four concepts: “culture, behaviour, devotion and trust” (Беседы и суждения Конфуция, 1999: 344). He developed the concept of an ideal person who must possess such qualities as humanity, justice, and love for people, courtesy and respect for the elder.

An international standard of education was Greek etiquette, which relied on the softness and delicacy of linguistic behaviour.

Medieval philosophers continued to develop and refine behaviours during communication. Illustrative in this regard was a treatise “*Disciplina clericalis*”, which outlined the rules of conversation, treatment of guests, etc.

Domestic linguistic etiquette relied on observance of human moral norms and development of peculiar ethnic rules of education. Volodymyr Monomakh was among the first to develop the norms of Ukrainian speech etiquette. His

“Instruction” is a philosophical basis of personal education, a code that includes the rules of conduct for people (Пентилюк, 2011: 212).

Nowadays, the role of SE is particularly important, as its universal and national characteristics are interpenetrating and converging, and becoming increasingly widespread. However, at its core, SE has a national identity, since it has been formed since childhood by means of the mother tongue.

Modern researchers are trying now to uncover the multidimensional and complex essence of the concept of “speech etiquette”.

If etiquette, as a set of rules in society, governs our external behaviour in accordance with social requirements, then SE are rules that govern our speech behaviour.

By speech etiquette, N. Formanovskaya understands the system of “stable communication formulas recommended by society for establishing the voice contact of the interlocutors, maintaining communication in a distinct tone according to their social roles and role positions relative to each other in formal and informal circumstances” (Формановская, 1990: 413). Such stable communication formulas or stereotypes of communication are typical, repetitive constructions used in frequent situations. Selection of frequent situations leads to the emergence of a set of speech means indispensable in such situations. The degree of standardization of a unit is directly dependent on the frequency of its use.

S. Bohdan considers that “speech etiquette is a nationally specific code of conduct that is implemented in a system of stable formulas and expressions that are recommended for use in various situations of polite contact with the interlocutor” (Богдан, 1998: 18).

Speech etiquette, M. Kocherhan emphasizes, is characterized by “striking national specificity related to the unique speech behaviour, customs, rituals, non-verbal communication of representatives of a certain ethnic group (Кочерган, 2003: 163).

The nation’s speech etiquette system is a complex of all possible formulas. Its structure is defined by the following basic elements of communicative

situations: appeal, greeting, forgiveness, apology, gratitude, wishes, request, acquaintance, congratulation, invitation, offer, advice, consent, refusal, sympathy, compliment, oath, praise, etc. Among them are the ones used for establishing contact between the speakers – formulas of address and greetings; for maintaining contact – formulas of apology, request, and gratitude; are used for the termination of contact – formulas of farewell and wishes.

The diversity of definitions of SE gives the right to say that the problem of speech etiquette requires analysis of the essence of its elements, which, ultimately, should lead to the unification of the terminological apparatus within this topic.

Despite the apparent differences in the interpretations of the term, almost all researchers note the systematic character of SE units, and consider SE as a set of rules governing human behaviour in a given situation depending on the communication environment.

Standardized speech behaviour has a number of typical features, among them are situational, regulatory, and coherent (Стернин, 1996: 4).

Situational feature is manifested in the focusing SE on a specific person, at a certain moment of communication, which occurs at a certain time and in a certain place; communicants are in certain relationships, and the situation of communication itself requires a certain behavior and, accordingly, the use of certain formulas of speech etiquette (Формановская, 1989: 37). That is, in each communicative situation, a number of situationally determined formulas of SE can be used.

Another feature of SE is *regulatory*. Speech etiquette “distributes communicative roles, establishes the status of interlocutors and determines the tonality of communication” (Стернин, 1996: 4). Adherence to the norms of speech etiquette puts the addressee/addresser of speech in one or another position in the hierarchy (relative to the interlocutor) and refers not only to the situation of manifestation of speech etiquette, but to certain characteristics of interlocutors (social background, age, etc.).

Coherence of SE assumes that etiquette is at least known to all participants of communication and, as a maximum, is implemented by them all. The formulas of speech etiquette are conventional; otherwise there would be mutual misunderstanding of both sides, which would lead to a communicative failure (Стернин, 1996: 4).

There are certain elements that organize speech etiquette, for example, a greeting at a meeting, *“Hello”* or *“Yes, I am listening”* at the beginning of a telephone conversation, etc. Getting involved in communication, the participants give a corresponding verbal sign that will identify the speakers as “their friend”. Of course, this feature is also characteristic of folklore etiquette, but it can be realized in a slightly different way. In Ukraine they often say *“break a leg”* (a phrase used to wish someone good luck). The history of this expression deserves special attention, but in this case we only note that this formula is not used alone, it is usually implemented in dialogue unity – *“break a leg”/“dash it all”*. It is worth saying that this unity is not a marker of any single, strictly defined situation. Rather, it is universal, like a wish for success in a risky or complex situation, the outcome of which depends not only on the knowledge and experience of the person, but also on luck. In any case, the replica stimulus *“break a leg”* always requires a specific replica reaction *“dash it all”* as an answer. And only in combination, the dialogical unity will fit into the framework of the communicative situation of desire.

The listed features are important, but they may be implemented differently. The same cultural knowledge of the communicants often affects the completeness/incompleteness of a particular formula, and some verbal components may be replaced by the nonverbal ones (for instance, a bow of greeting or communicatively justified and motivated silence) (Киселюк, 2014: 91).

The national specificity of SE was formed in each nation on its own national basis, however, under the influence of three main factors characteristic of speakers of any language: psychological, social, and cultural (Шутова, 2013: 138).

The psychological factor is generally related to the communicative behavior of a person, which is a component of speech etiquette, because without the knowledge of the accepted forms of etiquette, without verbal forms of cooperative relations between people, they cannot effectively benefit from the process of communication (СТЕЛЬМАХОВИЧ, 1996: 54).

The concept of cooperative relations, the so-called tenets of speech communication, was formulated by H. P. Grice in 1975 as “principles of cooperation” (Грайс, 1985: 221). These tenets are based on the following principles: quality (communication should not be false); quantity (the message should not be too short or too long); relations (the message should be relevant to the addressee) and linguistic means (should be precise, clear, not contain unintelligible words and expressions). Violation of one or more tenets entails a communicative mistake, or failure, or worst of all, conflict (interpersonal, intergroup, and even intercultural).

Other important requirements, for instance, politeness (any message should be polite and tactful), H. P. Grice does not consider fundamental, since the purpose of communication is the effective transmission of information. However, even with such a purely utilitarian function, the rules of speech etiquette are still worthy of adherence. Labeling requirements are significant for messages that are intended to convince the addressee of his or her opinion. In this case, the tenets of politeness are inevitably updated.

Speech etiquette is social by nature because it reveals social roles of the communicants. In other words, the choice of a particular unit of speech etiquette is influenced by the social role of the individual – normatively endorsed by society a way of behaviour, usually expected from anyone who occupies a given social position (Шутова, 2013: 138).

Speakers of the language easily identify the units of speech etiquette and feel the need to use them, because socially-defined situations require functionally-defined characters. Therefore, speech etiquette should also be considered as a system of linguistic means capable of providing etiquette relationships. Speech

etiquette is a holophrastic system. The elements of this system generally may be realized at different language levels:

- on the lexical level these are phraseological units, special words and expressions, address forms such as *Thank you, Excuse me, See you later; Дякую, До побачення*. Euphemisms used instead of words that indicate indecent phenomena, use instead of *To be in the family way*; укр. *Бути при надії* (Демина, 2004: 110);
- on the morphological level question forms, imperative forms can be used to express politeness such as *Could you give me your pen, please? – Give me your pen, please; Чи не могли б Ви дати мені свою ручку? – Дайте мені, будь ласка, свою ручку*;
- on the stylistic level it is the rejection of the use of abusing words;
- on the prosodic level it may be realized by different intonation patterns, for example some phrases can have different meanings depending on intonation pattern. For instance, the same sentence can be a direct order or a polite request e.g. *Could you carry my bags?* (polite request), *Carry my bags* (direct order);
- on the level of organization of communication, it is not polite to interrupt the interlocutor (Демина, 2004: 122)

Speech etiquette as a social norm of behaviour is an important component of a humanitarian culture in which humane relationships between people in society are reflected directly in the system of etiquette.

1.2. Speech Etiquette Functions

Speech etiquette is a structured functional system; accordingly, it has a certain set of functions. Units of speech etiquette primarily perform a communicative-pragmatic function. N. Formanovskaya considers the functions of speech etiquette and its units in the framework of the functions of the language in

general, and identifies two interrelated functions: communicative function and cognitive. If the manifestation of the first function is undeniable, the second manifests itself to a lesser extent (Формановская, 1979: 72).

On the basis of the communicative function contact, conative, regulatory, imperative, emotionally-expressive functions are distinguished.

Contact (contact establishing, fatic) function manifests itself in situations where the interlocutor tries to attract attention, and begin communication with the interlocutor. Contact function is “the intended use of language tools for establishing and maintaining social, mass and individual contact, to a certain extent determining the behaviour of the addressee” (Киселёва, 1978: 45). Contact function is implemented in thematic groups of speech etiquette, in the situations of establishing, maintaining and terminating contacts. Despite the fact that the majority of SE formulas are tied to the situation and the number of these formulas depends on successive situations, “we need information on the boundaries of the collective and on the distribution of roles in it all the time, and it is not allowed to continuously obtain it with the help of nonverbal means of communication” (Гольдин, 1978: 46). Etiquette in such cases acts as a factor of “social identification”, a marker of the hierarchical and other structures of the communicative environment. The absence of speech etiquette formulas in this case indicates either a person’s lack of integration into this social environment or the termination of his relationship e. g. *He doesn’t greet me; Він зі мною не вітається.*

Conative (politeness) function is primarily associated with the traditional courteous form of communication among team members. Depending on the social parameters of the interlocutors and the communication environment, the speakers resort to the use of strictly defined units of speech etiquette. As N. Formanovskaya notes, the choice of the “wrong” formula can destroy the desired tonality of communication and even the contact itself (Формановская, 1987: 13). During the process of communication, an important role is played by both the choice of the necessary, situationally determined etiquette formula, and the fact of desire itself.

Silence in a situation where the manifestation of verbal etiquette is necessary (often appropriate) is perceived as a violation of cultural rules and norms of behaviour. The absence of a greeting at a meeting or parting can be interpreted as an indicator of a negative attitude towards the interlocutor, which will lead to misunderstanding, resentment.

Regulatory function coordinates the relationship between the addressee and the addresser, taking into account both the status differences (boss/subordinate, senior/junior), and the degree of familiarity (familiar/unfamiliar). The regulatory function is closely related to the politeness function, which can be traced on the examples of greetings in the folk speech culture, which historically was perceived as a marker of politeness and respect (Приветствие. Словарь научной и народной терминологии, 1993: 280-281). В. Lomov notes that through communication, people regulate not only their own behaviour, but also the behaviour of other people and react to their actions. There is a process of mutual adjustment of actions. Here the phenomena inherent in the joint activity are revealed; in particular the compatibility of people, their work, mutual stimulation and correction of behaviour, for instance imitation and suggestion perform this function (Гриценко, Ищенко, Мельничук, 2007: 46).

In *imperative, voluntary (influence) function*, the formulas of speech etiquette are designed to have an effect on the interlocutor in order to provoke a certain reaction (verbal, gestural). The two functions are interconnected, since contacting the interlocutor and drawing his attention is already having some effect.

According to *emotionally-expressive (emotive) function*, some units of speech etiquette have additional emotionally expressive elements, for example: *I am so glad to see you!* The function is not typical of all thematic groups of speech etiquette, therefore this function is considered optional.

Conflict prevention is defined by some scholars as SE function. “Compliance with the rules of speech etiquette prevents possible conflicts germs. Nobody will come into conflict with the person who observes etiquette rules. And if the conflict nevertheless broke out due to some reason, the observance of

communication of etiquette will allow him/her to get out of it, or prevent it from flaring up even more” (Стернин, 1996: 4).

In the framework of folk speech etiquette L. Zorina singles out a special optional function – aesthetic, which is “the reflection by means of the language of the surrounding reality and its individual phenomena from the positive, aesthetic, attractive side” (Зорина, 2012: 180).

There are other classifications of communication functions. In particular, depending on the purpose of communication, L.A. Karpenko defines the following communication functions (Гриценко, Ищенко, Мельничук, 2007: 47):

- informational – exchange of information, opinions, decisions;
- stimulating – stimulating the communication partner;
- coordinating – mutual orientation and coordination of actions in the organization of interaction;
- understanding – not only adequate perception and understanding of the content of the message but also understanding of partners’ intentions, emotional states, etc.;
- emotional – arousal of the partner with the necessary emotional states (“exchange of emotions”) or change of their own under the influence of the partner;
- establishing – fixing one’s place in the system of roles, status, business relations in the society in which the individual needs to act;
- influencing – the change of state, behaviour, personality-shaped formations (intentions, attitudes, decisions, needs, actions, etc.).

Speech etiquette is social by nature because it reveals social and role side of communication. That is, the choice of a particular unit of speech etiquette is influenced by the social role of the individual – a normatively endorsed by society way of behaviour that is expected of anyone who occupies a given social position.

When changing the role structure of the communication situation, the individual switches from one stereotype of behaviour to another, and uses different

styles of speech and different units of speech etiquette, etc. That is, the social roles of the linguistic personality are among the key factors for choosing necessary speech etiquette formulas.

1.3. Speech Etiquette and Communicative Situation

Speech etiquette as a set of nationally specific stereotypes of communication involves self-realization in the framework of a particular communicative situation. A communicative situation is understood as “a complex set of external conditions of communication and internal reactions of those communicating that find expression in some statement directed to the addressee” (Формановская, 2005: 55).

A standard communicative situation includes five or six of its components, but often the same components get different names in given by interpretations.

Different researches, thus, according to R. Jakobson, a standard communicative situation has six components, such as:

- addresser;
- addressee;
- contact (the process of interpersonal interaction between communicants, the peculiarities of its flow);
- message;
- context (message or context provides certain information that is transmitted from one subject to another, that is, they perform a purely informative function);
- code (provides a specific language (or speech variety), through which a statement is made that facilitates the design of the judgment into a frame (Jakobson, 1980: 81).

In the psychological literature, which studies the aspects of the speech acts theory, it is noted that the components of the speech act are the speaker, the listener, the statement, the circumstances, the purpose and the result.

Meanwhile Susan Ervin-Tripp offers the following structure of the act of speech interaction:

- local or situational situation;
- communicants, their personal qualities, and characteristics;
- theme, that is, the content of the speech act;
- functional aspects or the effect on the sender of his own actions;
- form of communication, which consists of four components: communication channel (oral or written); code (a set of speech signals); socially predetermined speech variants within a particular code; and nonverbal signals (Ervin-Tripp, 1976: 46)

Also it should be mentioned that in each communicative act the speaker creates a kind of communicative-pragmatic space, which includes: the speaker, his addressee, the statement, the subject of the statement, time, place and environment of the act of interaction. Moreover it includes theme, time and place, participants of communication, motive and purpose (Сыков, 2007: 78)

Among themes are “Greetings”, “Farewell”, “Appeal”, “Congratulations”, “Complaint”, “Request”, “Gratitude”, “Praise”, and others. Each group has its own set of speech formulas. “Thematic groups do not form a finite row – this is an open sphere, moving into a wider area of sustainable communication formulas” (Формановская, 1987: 13).

The main classifications of speech etiquette formulas are based precisely on the principle of distribution of SE by thematic groups.

Equally important component of speech interactions is the circumstances of communication (environment). Of course, we can have certain caution referring to “contact” (in the understanding of R. Jakobson) to the circumstances of communication, but, probably, the contact involves the mandatory existence of certain conditions, in which the act of communication takes place. When choosing a particular formula of speech etiquette, it is important to take into account the locus, place, environment in which communication takes place, as well as time. Each such place requires reference to specific speech formulas. In addition to the

fact that communication takes place “here” and “now” that is at a certain point in time and space, the specific place and time of the event is also taken into account: in the morning, during conversation, during a meal, etc. In a folk environment, especially in sacred situations (wedding, birth, pronouncing a plot, etc.), the importance of time and place in the choice of one or another SE formula is multiplied. Communication situations are generally standard, which leads to the use of a standard, limited set of speech etiquette formulas.

Consequently, the central link of the standard communicative situation is the speaker and the listener (the addresser and the addressee, or communicants). Therefore, the first component of the structure of a communicative act is communicants who are characterized by certain intentions. Both the speaker and the listener have a number of social features (age, gender, place of residence, level of education, etc.), and temporary or situational ones (buyer, passenger, teacher, etc.). Social status and roles are reflected in the speech behaviour of a person, and first of all, this affects the choice of SE formulas that he/she uses in the framework of a particular speech situation. They are also important components of the communicative situation when using SE. In the framework of speech etiquette, the motive is expressed by the need to use the SE formula for establishing in contact, its maintenance and termination. The purpose of using speech etiquette is dictated by the desire to create the necessary, desirable, favorable tonality of communication, to show respect, to express a certain attitude to the interlocutor.

Taking into account the peculiarities of the organization of cognitive activity, B. Horodetsky offers the following scheme of the communicative situation (or communicative act): communicants; communicative text; processes of verbalization and understanding; the circumstances of this communicative act; practical goals; and communicative goals (Городецкий, 1990: 42).

Understanding between communicants is necessary for successful communication, and it occurs when interlocutors use the same linguistic code, if the communication channel is not blocked, and the communicants have the ability

to encode and decode information correctly, that is, they have the same system of codification and decoding of speech units and signals.

When several communicants interact with each other, understanding of their behaviour depends on the very general knowledge they have, and the dominant role is played by the idea of individual knowledge of everyone. Communication between two partners involves two aspects: the belief that they both understand the meaning of their information and confidence that the information has been transmitted. The second aspect includes the peculiarities of not only transferring information from one communicant to another, but also deepening general knowledge of communicants (Attardi, Simi, 1998: 64). Observance of these conditions by the communicants is directly related to the process of verbalization and understanding, and their nonfulfillment can lead to an embarrassing, uncomfortable or even conflicting situation for both partners of the communication.

If the communicant chooses a wrong line of behaviour, communication will deviate from the ideal scheme, the communicants' intentions will lose their mutual agreement, and if they cannot neutralize the negative impact of their actions on the communicative act, the latter may end up in a communicative failure (either complete or incomplete) and this leads to communicative conflicts.

The communicative roles of participants are interdependent: on the one hand, they are determined by their sexual and social roles, and on the other, they are a function of the communicative act itself. The beginning of communication precedes the stage of orientation, when each partner chooses his tactics of behaviour. In order to make this choice, it is necessary to consider a number of parameters of the communicative situation, and, first of all, to correlate the speaker's status with the status of a partner.

Features such as gender, age, social status, national and religious affiliation, family ties, and some others define the communicative status. In each case, some features are actualized, others are neutralized. It is clear that differences are actualized and coincidences eliminated. Therefore, etiquette is always a

compromise made on mutually acceptable terms. The origins of this psychological factor of communication in general, and of etiquette in particular, are revealed in the cultural traditions of the ethnos represented by the communicants (Aacama, 1972: 25).

In etiquette of many peoples the system of coordinates of interpersonal communication is organized in the same way. The point is that in all societies there are established forms of greetings and goodbyes, forms of respect for the elders and more. The rules of etiquette have a unifying (coordinating) character, they seem to imply an agreement on what is considered acceptable in the behaviour of people and what is unacceptable. But with regard to the rules of etiquette and the means of their expression in different cultures, it should be noted that there is a remarkable diversity, due to special conditions of historical development, cultural traditions, and beliefs of representatives of certain ethnic communities.

On this basis, it can be argued that the nation's speech etiquette system is a relation and link between all possible etiquette communications. Its structure is defined by basic elements of communicative situations (appeals, greetings, forgiveness, apologies, gratitude, wishes, requests, acquaintances, congratulations, invitations, offers, advice, consent, refusals, condolences, compliments, oaths, praise, etc.), which differ depending on the system of coordinates of interpersonal communication (when establishing contact between speakers – formulas of address and greetings; while maintaining contact – formulas of apology, request, gratitude, etc. ; upon termination of contact – formulas of forgiveness, wishes and means of expression in different languages).

CONCLUSIONS TO CHAPTER I

Speech etiquette is a system of socially defined and nationally specific language units and the rules for their use, adopted in the society with the aim of making voice contact between the interlocutors and maintaining communication in an emotionally positive manner in accordance with the communicative situation.

Speech etiquette is characterized by the following features: situational, regulatory, and coherent. Speech etiquette is as a structured functional system: contact, conative, regulatory, imperative, emotionally-expressive functions are distinguished.

Speech etiquette is social by nature; it reveals social roles of the communicants. It was formed on the national basis of each nation with the account of psychological, social, cultural factors.

Among the components of the communicative situation that influence the choice of speech etiquette formulas are: participants of communication, the motive and purpose, time, place of the speech act.

CHAPTER II. SPEECH BEHAVIOURAL PATTERNS OF THE BRITISH AND UKRAINIANS IN TYPICAL COMMUNICATIVE SITUATIONS

Interaction is successful when the communicants follow the rules of speech etiquette established in different cultures. Since the English and Ukrainians belong to different ethnocultures and their languages to different groups of Indo-European family of languages, we will analyse their use of SE clichés in typical communicative situations. We will examine semantic, syntactic, stylistic, pragmatic and extralinguistic features of SE formulas and factors which influence their choice in such communicative situations as greeting, leave-taking, address, and apology.

2.1. Greeting Communicative Situation

Any successful conversation is impossible without a good beginning, which starts with greetings, because conversation begins greeting a person. Therefore, it is important to make the first positive impression on the partner with the first words, based on the salutation. Greetings show that people want to contact with each another. Greeting is a gesture, phrase, or other ritual for getting in touch with another person (Ларина, 2009: 323). Usually greetings precede the beginning of communication.

In the greeting formulas, the phatic function of speech etiquette is clearly manifested, since greeting is used for the establishment of contact (Веремьев, 2000: 36). In addition to the main function, it also performs several other functions: *“removes the potential hostility of silence in situations where verbal communication is supposed, establishes contact, is a signal of social solidarity, shows the social role of participants in communication”* (Ларина, 2009: 190).

Greeting refers to those elements of speech etiquette, which, first of all, are intended for marking relations established in the framework of the communicative act. It can also express the feeling, for example, of a personal, kind attitude.

Universally, communication starts with greetings. Both in Ukraine and Britain greetings are very important. This signifies that a person has or wants contact with another person. While choosing the standard of speech behaviour, a person should take into account social characteristic features of the speakers (age, sex, social state, level of education and nationality) and their roles in communication (a student – a teacher, a parent – a child) and, whether the situation is formal or informal.

Both Ukrainian and English greetings are classified into formal and informal according to contextual factors, such as age and level of formality (Формановская, 1987: 126).

Formal greetings are commonly used in formal contexts, in business situations, with colleagues, and interlocutors of higher status and age. Also they might be used between people who do not know each other well. Formal greetings are more restrictive in their usage, and often reflect time of the day. Informal greetings are more flexible and variable; they are used between family members, friends, peers, and in informal situations in general. Both formal and informal greetings are reciprocal.

Greeting speech etiquette formulas are classified according to their syntactical structure (Соколец, 2006: 42). As sentences they may be affirmative, interrogative and exclamatory, for instance:

affirmative: *Good morning, Hello, Hey, Hi, Доброго дня, Привіт;*

exclamatory: *Hello!, Hi!, Дай, Боже, здоров'я!, Добридень, Доброго здоров'я;*

interrogative: *How do you do? How's it going?, Як здоров'ячко? Як справи?*

According to their syntactical structure, constructions may be simple (one-member, two-member), complete/incomplete; elliptical; complex sentences of different types and equivalents:

complete two-member: *I am happy to welcome you; Я радію Вас вітати;*

complete one-member: *Happy to welcome you; Радію Вас вітати;*

elliptical: *Welcome; Вітаю.*

All these constructions may substitute each other and are considered as syntactical synonyms. The choice of syntactical synonyms is predetermined by: socio-psychological characteristics of communicants, terms of communication, subject and aims of communication. The syntactical microsystem of speech etiquette units serves for neutral, formal and informal levels of communication (Соколець, 2006: 41)

Both Ukrainian and English greetings include three major components: greeting phrases, address terms, and elements of phatic communication. Special greeting phrases or “greetings proper” are interjections such as “*Hello*”, “*Hi*”, «Привіт» or affirmations such as “*Good morning*”, «Доброго дня» (Greere, 2005: 18). The category of “greetings proper” in English demonstrates variability depending on the context and characteristics of the interlocutors.

Greetings differ in stylistic coloring, the degree of prevalence and the spheres of functioning. The most common greeting formula is also the *How do you do* form, which is used in a situation of formal communication or when meeting people who have not met each other before. The expected answer to it is the same *How do you do* (Приветствие на английском/Greeting).

According to the time of the day, people greet each other with “*Good morning*”, “*Good afternoon*”, “*Good evening*”; «Доброго ранку» «Доброго дня» «Доброго вечора». Temporal greetings are among the most frequently used formulae of greeting in both languages and have certain advantages as they can be used at any level of communication, whether formal, informal or neutral. This kind of greetings is stylistically neutral. Y. Radevich-Vinitsky noted: “*In appropriate time they can be used by addresser of all categories to addressees of any social-*

communicative status” (Радевич-Винницький: 2006: 29). But there is difference in the tone. Formal greetings are pronounced with the low fall (e.g. □How do you do Mr. Jonson?), less formal greetings are pronounced with the low rise (e.g. How are you, to day David?) and greetings pronounced with the fall-rise (e.g. Good morning, children!) sound very friendly.

Nowadays greeting etiquette has become simpler. A lot of greeting expressions disappeared. The whole variety of Ukrainian greeting phrases reduced mostly to the single formula «Добрий день!». This greeting is the functional equivalent of «Здрастуйте!» (Формановская, 1987: 130; Формановская, 1989: 78).

Its recurrence is somewhat lower than the latter, but it has a wider scope of use. The usage of the greeting formulas «Доброго ранку!» and «Здрастуйте!» is demonstrated in the following communicative situation.

- *Доброго ранку, друже. Дивовижний краєвид – чи не так? Такого внизу не побачиш!*
- *Здрастуйте, – відповів Гриць. – Правда ваша, я вже милувався всім ЦІМ ... але, пробачте...*
- *Вас хвилює мій вигляд?*
- *Та ні, – розгубився Гук, – але мені здалося... що вам потрібна допомога... (Бердник, 2006: 97).*

The example shows that the greeting «Доброго ранку» is used by people who do not know each other, but they communicate with each other politely, kindly and amiably. There is a certain distance between them, which can be explained by the fact that they are not familiar; secondly, seeing a strange unfamiliar man, Guk and Grits' were at a loss, even though that a stranger needed help. Both the stranger and the boys express polite attitude and courtesy to each other, but do not overstep the limit of familiarity. In this conversation one more greeting formula «Здрастуйте» is used. This example shows that the greeting «Здрастуйте» can be used in conversation with unfamiliar people, those who do not have familiar or friendly relations. Another example:

- *Good morning!* – he said, hesitating before Mrs. Morel, in doubt as to whether she was a customer or not.
- *Good morning. I came with my son, Paul Morel. You asked him to call this morning* (Lawrence, 2006).

This conversation shows that the greeting “*Good morning*” is used in a business setting. From the conversation we can guess that the speakers were already familiar and had some common affair. The speakers communicated at a formal business-like level. One more example:

- *Good morning, my dear friend,* – she said, smiling, but it was not sincere.

The greeting formula in this example contains the wish for a good morning, but it does not sincere. The speaker greets her friend that is why it becomes clear that the setting of conversation is informal. This example shows that this formula can be used not only in official atmosphere, but also in the conversation between friends. In the following example: “*Good morning, darling, how is my sweetheart this morning?*” the greeting “*Good morning!*” is used by the couple in love. It is possible to make such a conclusion due to the addressing formula “*Darling*”, which is typical of familiar relationship.

The greeting formula “*Good morning!*” can be used at all levels of communication. Thus the marker of formality/informality of the situation is the addressing formula. The examples show that this greeting formula can be used not only in official atmosphere, but also in the family circle.

In communication between friends it is possible to use reduced forms of temporal greeting: “*Morning!*”, “*Afternoon!*”, “*Evening!*”. The usage of such formula is observed in the following example:

- *Morning, guys.* – Jack said to Kate, Bill and me.
- *Morning, babe.* – She said to Nick, making his smile widely.

This communicative situation shows that the formula “*Morning*” is used by close friends in the informal setting. The usage of this expression signals that the people have good and friendly relations. Such greeting is typical of informal communication and it helps to create light and friendly atmosphere.

In the English culture an adjective is subjected to a reduction/contraction, but in Ukrainian a noun is usually contracted:

- *Доброго дня. – Чоловік, відчувши рідну кров, відповів. – І Вам доброго!*
(Бердник, 2006: 93).

This contraction is optional and typical of situations with a dimly expressed officiality, which allows syntactic freedom in some greetings. For example, in the Ukrainian culture, transformation is allowed: «*Добрий день!*» in «*Добрідень*», «*Добрий вечір*» in «*Добривечір*». The English language does not allow such transformations in general.

Emergence of contracted forms of greetings is explained by the fact that these forms are used in situations without any manifestation of formality in everyday and friendly situations:

- *Добривечір тобі, моя люба матусю!*

These examples show that such temporal greetings are used in informal situations among relatives, close friends and familiar people.

Since the constructions of SE are stereotypical communication units, it is necessary to take into account the peculiarities of their communicative realization: standardization, elliptization and phraseologization.

In the elliptical etiquette statements, less important components that do not violate semantic completeness of etiquette structures, are reduced, which is caused by the automated use of speech etiquette formulas in standard communicative situations. First of all, performative structures may be elliptized: *I wish you good morning – Good morning; I wish you good luck – Good luck; Я бажаю Вам (тобі) доброго ранку – Доброго ранку; Я бажаю Вам (тобі) удачі – Хай щастить, Бажаю удачі.*

The frequent use of etiquette expressions in standard communicative situations also contributes to their phraseologizing. In most cases elliptical structures, such as “*Good Morning!*”, «*Доброго ранку!*», «*Доброго здоров'я!*» may be phraseologized. Such expressions are characterized by the stability of the

structure and reproducibility in speech in the unchanged form *Формановская*, 1987: 106-108).

The national specificity of SE manifests itself in its general phraseological character (phraseological statements), as well as in the presence within the microsystem of proper phraseological units, proverbs, sayings. In the Ukrainian speech etiquette the most frequently used phraseological units with the connotation of greeting are *«Ласкаво просимо»* and *«Хліб-сіль»*. Such utterances are typically Ukrainian; they cannot be translated word for word in any other languages. In English there are also phraseological units with the connotation of greetings: *“Welcome”*, *“Nice to see you”*. The phraseologically related usage of the adjective *«добрий»* in the formulas *«Доброго дня»*, *«Доброго здоров'я»*, *«Доброго ранку»* also belongs to this group of greetings. In English there are similar formulas, which contain the adjective “good”: *“Good afternoon”*, *“Good morning”*, *“Good evening”*. Semantically, in this case, the adjective “good” has the meaning: pleasant, beneficial, nice or favourable.

Considering the lexical, semantic and grammatical features of the SE greeting formulas, it should be noted that the verbal forms of temporal greetings are internationally similar: *«Доброго ранку!»*; *“Good morning!”*; *“Guten Morgen!”*; *“Salute!”*. The content of greetings is good wishes: *(I wish you) Good morning! Good evening! Good afternoon!* The usage of these phrases as greetings, obviously, can be explained by the faith of primitive people in the magical power of words: it is only necessary to pronounce the phrase and it immediately comes true (Миронюк, 2006: 65). Although there is difference on the lexical level: representatives of the Slavonic culture prefer a more specific adjective *«добрий»*, while in the Franco-Germanic culture a more common and neutral adjective “good” is used (Кулішенко, Чечота, 2013: 271). Taking into account grammatical peculiarities of greeting formulas, it should be noted that both in Ukrainian and in English there are elliptical constructions, which were formed from the formulas of wishes that were contracted but retained their semantic

centre. Thus, the greeting formulas are a means of implementing positive politeness strategies.

From the point of view of syntax, greetings are not sentences in a grammatical sense. They are devoid of the grammatical meaning of predicativity. They do not serve to convey any information to the interlocutor or induce someone to act and to request information, but are a reaction to the situation or the words of the interlocutor (Формановская, 1989: 44).

In general, the grammatical categories that are characteristic of speech etiquette units embrace syntactic modality, syntactic time and the syntactic person. But such clichés of speech etiquette as «Привіт», «Добрый день», “Hello”, “Good afternoon” have no morphological forms of modality, time and person. They can be considered as functional and semantic synonyms of such speech etiquette units as «Вітаю Вас», “I wish you to have a good day”. They have a semantic speaker and semantic addressee (who, however, can be explicated: *Привіт тобі*), the semantic reality and the semantic moment of speech. These units belong to semantic performatives. Thus, “I wish you to have a good day” and “Hello” are performative statements in which semantic and grammatical signs coincide (Формановская, 1989: 42-50).

Since the content of greetings is good wishes, Ukrainian people can greet a person wishing him/her health: «Доброго здоров'я!» or «Дай, Боже, здоров'я!», «Здоров був!», «Здоровенькі були!», etc. These greeting formulas cannot be translated into English word for word; they are typical only of the Ukrainian language and can be considered national linguistic peculiarities. These greeting forms are very rarely used since they have become archaic but they can be found in the Ukrainian literature, especially in the folklore sources, for instance:

- *Доброго здоров'я, браття-отамани, військо Запорізьке! – привітався він.*
- *Доброго здоров'я батьку кошовому! – гукнули козаки* (Бердник, 2006: 97).

This example shows that there is a trusting relationship between communicants; it is indicated not only by a greeting formula, but also by the address *«батьку кошовому»* and *«браття-отамани»*. We feel that these people know each other for a long time and now they share some special relations, a special code of communication. In this case the greeting formula *«Доброго здоров'я»* is used as an expression of respect and wish of health.

Speech etiquette units form rich synonymic series in thematic groups. They undergo stylistic and sociolinguistic differentiation, for example: *“Hi”*, *“How do you do?”*, *“What’s happening?”*, *«Дозвольте Вас вітати»*. Stylistic synonyms, fixed in the use by these groups of speakers in the given communication environment, testifies to the bright social nature of speech etiquette.

In the Ukrainian speech etiquette a group of stylistically marked greetings, used in an official communication, is formed from the verb *«Вітати»*: *«Вітаю»*, *«Радий Вас вітати»*, *«Дозвольте Вас вітати»*. In contrast to the English language, in Ukrainian such greetings are expressed by syntactically complete constructions, such as *«Дозвольте мені Вас вітати»*, *«Вітаю Вас»*. In this case, the syntactic completeness of the utterance is a formal indicator of official style (Соколець, 2006: 42).

«Вітаю Вас!» is a form of official greeting in Ukrainian. It is a somewhat archaic greeting formula with a touch of solemnity. This expression is suitable for official atmosphere. *«Дозвольте Вас вітати!»* is used in official and solemn situations, especially when a speaker addresses a large audience. *«Моє шанування»* is a very polite greeting formula which is full of dignity, but it is used mostly by the elderly people (Радевич-Винницький, 2006: 230).

There are SE formulas of greetings in both languages, which are not used by literary language speakers even in a relaxed atmosphere of communication and with close friends, for example: *«Салют»*, *«Чао»*, etc. These greetings can be considered as youth jargon or youth slang, that emphasizes the social “kinship” of communicants, affiliation to a closed group, and sometimes a swagger in relationships.

The compatibility of the concepts “*polite communication*” and “*stylistically lowered units*” is determined by the tonality of communication, as well as by the low colloquial language of the addressee, whose educational level does not allow him to use the literary language in all cases, but who is polite at his level. On the other hand, the symmetrical socio-linguistic units used in an informal situation also lead to the selection of similar units with expressive coloring (Формановская, 1987: 72).

Informal and neutral greeting formulas in the Ukrainian language, such as «Привіт», «Здоров!» and «Салют!» refer to stylistically marked formulas. Such jargonic greetings as «Салют!», «Хей!» and «Хелло!» are often used by teenagers and young people, as have already been noted. «Привіт» is the most neutral of them. This greeting is typical of informal communication of familiar people, people of the same age, friends, familiar people or relatives, for example:

– *Привіт тобі, мій друже. Як твої справи?*

Here «Привіт» is used among close friends. We feel that these people share some special, informal relations. In this case «Привіт» expresses gentle attitude to each other and from the very beginning creates pleasant and easy atmosphere of the talk.

– *Привіт, Марина! – гукнув вона на ходу.*

This is one more example that proves definitively that the greeting formula «Привіт» is used in neutral or informal conversations. Here this expression is used in a conversation between quite familiar people who know each other for a long time and have informal relations.

Foreign elements gradually infiltrated in the system of traditional Ukrainian expressions, such as «Хай», «Хеллоу» and «Салют!», the usage of which is often on the verge between familiar and vulgar tone of communication. They are relevant in an informal setting, in informal relations between speakers. Let us look at the following example:

– *Салют, друзі! – це в нього вийшло так несподівано, щиро, що ми перервали нашу розмову та кинулися обіймати його.*

In this communicative situation the greeting «*Салюм!*» is used, which shows that the conversation takes place between close friends, who know each other for a long time. Although this formula belongs to slang vocabulary, in this case, it does not sound vulgar or provocative; moreover, a friendly and easy atmosphere of communication is created. This greeting is popular among young people; older people do not use it. So it becomes clear that the speaker is a young person.

In informal conversations, among friends, the most popular English greetings are “*Hello!*”, “*Hi!*”, “*Hey*”, “*Salute!*”, and the most frequently used phatic expressions are “*How’s it going?*”, “*How are you?*” and “*What’s happening?*”. “*Hello*” and “*Hi*” are simple and the most common forms of greeting. They are associated with a vocative exclamation, which primary task was, apparently, attracting someone’s attention. These formulas are usually used in everyday communicative situations. “*Hi*” is an Americanism, but nowadays this greeting formula is very popular among young people in Great Britain. The most common form of greeting is “*Hello*” which is used both in official communication situations and in the family circle. The greeting “*Hi*” is used in conversation with relatives and friends. In the English communicative culture there is a significant simplification and desemantization of greeting norms. Desemantic greeting formulas “*Hello*” and “*Hi*” have acquired a wide range of uses. If earlier they were used mostly by young people, today they have lost familiarity, are used to greet people who are well-known and signal about the closeness of relations. The following example demonstrates the usage of the formula “*Hello*”:

- *Well, hullo boyo, – she said with a stagey Irish accent. – How are things? I haven’t seen you for ages.*

“*Hello*” is used by close friends, who know each other for a long time. Such a conclusion can be made, given that the speaker uses “*Hullo*” instead of “*Hello*”, violating the norms of speech etiquette at the level of orthoepy. These people share some special, informal relations that are expressed in their manner of greeting.

“*Hullo*” expresses friendly attitude towards each other. It helps create free and easy atmosphere of the talk from the very beginning.

“*Hey*” is also very popular, but it is used mostly by close friends. “*Hey*” focuses more on the solidarity of interlocutors, whereas “*Hello*” has a function of respecting negative face of the interlocutor. The greeting formula “*Salute!*” is French borrowing and an element of the youth’s slang.

In the English culture, there is also the *Hiya* greeting formula, which arose from the merger of the two “*Hi*” and “*How’re you*” formulas. It does not carry the meaning of the question about the state of affairs of the interlocutor and does not require a specific answer. This form of greeting is most often used with an address by name: *Hi-ya, Din* (Приветствие на английском/Greeting).

At an unexpected meeting of interlocutors, especially those who have not met for a long time, often used formulas that have emotional coloring are: *Good to see you/What a nice pleasure/Fancy meeting you here/What a nice surprise* (Приветствие на английском/Greeting).

In greetings there may be remarks showing that the interlocutors have not seen each other for a long time: *Haven’t seen you for a long time (for ages)/It’s been ages/It’s been a long time/It’s a long time (since we’ve seen each other)/Long time no see* (Приветствие на английском/Greeting).

In phatic communication greetings include “*more elaborate linguistic elements, which contain additional information than those enclosed in pure greetings*” (Greere, 2005: 16). Phatic expressions can be formal: “*How do you do?*”, informal: “*How’s it going?*”, and slang: “*What’s up?*”.

“*How’s it going?*” can answer someone’s “*Hi*”, even if you are just walking past and are not going to wait for an answer. “*What’s up?*” is a widely used greeting among young people, which means something like “*What is new?*” or “*What’s going on in your life?*”. “*What’s up?*” is a conversational and fashionable expression. It is, in fact, a question form but it does not expect an answer.

“*How are you?*” is a “*phatic expression*”, which has a social function rather than a referential one. It produces initial attention and establishes contacts, but

does not require an honest answer as there is no intention to listen to it. It does not convey a message; however, “*How are you?*” is a necessary component of a social encounter (Halliday, 1970: 137). The phrase “*How are you?*” is an example of lexicalization and grammaticalization of conversational routines when certain phrases with specific language meaning are used (Greere, 2005: 16)

In Ukrainian, there are several phrases corresponding to the English greeting “*How are you?*”. The most common are «*Як справи?*», «*Як живеш (те)?*», and «*Як життя?*». Such questions are ritualized; however, their ritualized nature is different from English. The question «*Як справи?*» is not universally asked. Asking such a question depends on social variables of age, distance, and power. It is usually used among friends, close people, or in-group participants, in other words, when there is a rapport and close relationships between participants or such rapport and relationships are being established. The ritualized response is usually neutral, e. g. “*OK*”, “*Nothing special*”, «*OK*», «*Нічого особливого*». Besides, there is a tendency to downgrade the response and answer “*Not bad*”, “*Don’t ask*”, «*Непогано*», «*Краще не запитуй*», etc. Moreover, such responses require some elaboration which often leads to further talk. Of course, this is not to say that «*Як справи?*» always leads to an extended conversation. The response might be brief depending on the context and such factors as age, distance between interlocutors, and social status. Finally, contrasting with English, the question cannot have an answer.

In English, just like in Ukrainian, there are obsolete greeting formulas. Greetings with the concept of “*God*” belong to the oldest ones in terms of functioning. It is advisable to single them out in a separate group: “*God bless you*”, “*God save you*” and «*Господь із Вами*». The existence of such greeting expressions is explained by the faith of people in higher powers. The communicative formula «*Бог із Вами*» had a semantic meaning: God is here; therefore he protects and helps the people. The greeting “*God bless you*” had a meaning: *God saves and protects you*. Earlier this formula used to be a greeting

form, but later it changed its meaning. In modern English it is a common expression, used as a response to sneeze.

Nonverbal gestures and greetings vary across countries, cultures, and religions. Handshakes are common in many parts of the world, including Britain and Ukraine. Handshaking is generally the way of men's greeting. In Ukraine, males grasp other men's hands very strongly during the handshake. It is considered a bad sign when the communicants shake hands, standing on different sides of the doorstep.

A firm handshake, accompanied by a direct eye contact, is the standard greeting in the English-speaking society. The British don't often shake hands when greeting each other. They may shake hands with people whom they meet for the first time or again after a long time (Соколец, 2006: 45).

When a gentleman is introduced to a lady, she sometimes puts out her hand. It is she, who offers her hand first. A woman may not remove her gloves when handshaking, but it is inadmissible for men. Handshaking must be short and aspire energetic. If one of the participants is sitting, he has to stand up and respond to the hold out hand – otherwise it would be impolite and even rude.

It is widely believed that English people are not very warm. They tend to observe a very reserved greeting procedure in comparison with many other cultures, which may emphasise kissing, prolonged handshakes, etc. This socio-cultural habit (worsened by the highly individualised, impersonal, technologised nature of the society) is opposed to the Ukrainian greeting warmth and friendliness.

Kissing and embracing are not accepted in the English culture, though in the 18th century in England, according to the etiquette rules, a guest had to kiss the host and the hostess of the house, and their children. Now it is only allowed to kiss a woman's hand (Соколец, 2006: 42-45).

If a man wears a hat he should take it off or touch its brim, greeting a person. He can do it with a free hand. Nodding is the best way to greet somebody in case another person is too far-shouting is a sign of impoliteness.

British people usually greet each other in an informal way. Occasionally, among very good friends who have not seen each other for a long time, women may briefly hug other women, and men may quickly kiss the woman's cheek. Males rarely hug each other. Sometime men may shake hands with the left hand.

Thus, both in Ukrainian and English cultures, the communicative act of greeting is presented as a short-term communicative action, reflected in lexemes вітати, привітатися; to greet, to welcome, to meet. Greeting as an act of goodwill is associated with the good wishes.

Men are introduced to women unless they are much older and senior. Young men are introduced to older men and young girls to older women.

Greeting is often accompanied by a small talk, a short neutral conversation, typical of the English speakers.

In a small talk the preference is given to neutral topics, weather being the most classical one. Having discussed this subject, the English interlocutors usually proceed to complimenting each other, while the Ukrainians may almost immediately proceed to personalities or gossip about their acquaintances.

The English small talk is always friendly, though unemotional, in which neither argumentation nor contradiction is expected, while the Ukrainians are inclined to discuss things more emotionally, often ending with disputes.

Since the English speakers do not wish to embarrass an interlocutor in case he/she is unaware of some facts, they do not demonstrate their intelligence and erudition. On the contrary, in order to win the interlocutor's favour, they tend to overstate merits of other people and understate their own, while the Ukrainians aspire to impress an interlocutor with their attainments in all possible spheres. According to the Ukrainian speech etiquette norms, the topics discussed at the initial stages of conversation predominantly depend on the communicants' education, age and sex, while the English small talk in most cases is not influenced by the above-mentioned factors (Соколець, 2006: 45).

So, we may conclude that in the communicative behaviour of the Ukrainians and the British, there are both similarities and significant differences.

2.2. Leave-Taking Communicative Situation

Important part of speech etiquette is the ability to terminate communication timely, correctly and successfully. The final part of communication is leave-taking. Leave-taking formulas are substantially opposed to greetings. They may be any words or phrases pronounced when leaving someone (Советский энциклопедический словарь, 1979: 614). Pronouncing the leave-taking formula at the end of conversation, people do not break any relations, because it is only a temporary separation after which communication will be resumed. The structure of the leave-taking expressions with preposition «до» in Ukrainian and such words as “*soon / tomorrow*” in English indicates the time limit of separation.

Leave-taking and greeting contain a lot of relative and in some cases antonymic speech patterns and expressions. As well as greetings, leave-taking formulas are elliptical constructions, which were formed from the formulas of wishes that were contracted but retained their semantic centre. From the point of view of syntax, leave-taking formulas are not sentences in a grammatical sense. They are devoid of the grammatical meaning of predicativity. They do not serve to convey any information to the interlocutor, or induce someone to act and to request information, but are a reaction to the situation or the interlocutor's words.

Leave-taking as the end of conversation is the usual passage of etiquette, a certain act that completes a communicative contact. It summarises conversation and gives the guarantee that everything said is the subject of further consideration. Termination of the contact is necessarily accompanied by the leave-taking formulas (Дмитрук, 2016: 276).

The most commonly used leave-taking expression in Ukrainian is «*До побачення!*» since it is stylistically neutral and can be used at any level of politeness. It is also possible to use intensifiers «*До скорої зустрічі!*». It is appropriate to make appointments, accurately specifying the location and time: «*До зустрічі о третій годині!*», «*До завтра!*», «*До неділі!*». There is a special leave-taking formula for the night: «*На добраніч!*», «*Доброї ночі!*» or

«*Приємних снів!*». Here you can trace a certain similarity; for example, *Good night* in English and the wish of *Солодких снів* in Ukrainian, in both cases, it is both a wish for a calm, sound sleep, and a leave-taking remark in the late hour. Also in English culture, wishing good night, you can just say *Night* or *Night, night!* (Английские и русские категории вежливости, различия в стратегиях общения). The usage of such expressions is demonstrated in the following communicative situation:

- *Аж у неділю?*
- *Що ж, до зустрічі у неділю* (Чайковський, 1957: 43).

This communicative situation shows that the speakers saying goodbye, appoint a meeting for a certain time. The usage of such a formula shows the desire to continue communication in the future.

In English communication, the replicas used in the leave-taking situation are more diverse than in the greeting. There are speech formulas that can be used both at as greetings and leave-taking: “*Good morning*”, “*Good afternoon*”, “*Good evening*”.

Good bye is the most neutral formula from the point of view of stylistics. It historically originated from the greeting formula *God be with you* (Ступин ,1980: 33). Not so long ago *Good bye* was the most common leave-taking formula used at any stylistic level: official, neutral and familiar (Ступин, 1980: 126). However, the process of democratization of communication has influenced it. Nowadays, it is increasingly being supplanted by familiar “*Bye*” and even “*Bye-bye*”, which has become neutral formulas for widespread use.

Official formulas are used more often by the representatives of the older generation: «*Дозвольте попрощатися!*», «*Дозвольте відкланятися!*», “*Let me tell you Goodbye*” (Фабіан, 1998: 39). In this case, the syntactic completeness of the utterance is a formal indicator of high style, which testifies to both sociolinguistic features of communication and official situation, for instance:

- *А тепер – дозвольте відкланятися, – сказав він* (Шевченко, 2013: 69).

The usage of this formula signals that communication takes place in a formal setting. The speaker expresses the desire to terminate communication. It would be impolite to say “*Goodbye*” right away, so the speaker uses this formula.

According to V.E. Goldin, leave-taking formula should never sound unexpectedly for the interlocutor, otherwise he/she may think that the addressee was offended or dissatisfied and for this reason he abruptly interrupts the conversation (Гольдин, 1983: 75). Therefore, it is important to use the formula, which precedes leave-taking and indicates that conversation is coming to an end, for example: “*I was very happy to see you*”, “*We had a great time, but...*”, for instance:

- *Jane, I was pleased to see you, but I don't want to be late for the train. I'm terribly sorry.*

This communicative situation shows that the speaker expresses the desire to terminate the conversation and say goodbye. The speaker politely apologizes and indicates the reason why it is impossible to continue communication. The usage of such a formula is a polite way to finish conversation.

Similar leave-taking formulas include “*Bye-bye!*”, “*See you!*”, and «*Щасливо!*», «*До зустрічі!*». There are also crude, non-literary formulae such as «*Бувай!*» and «*Давай!*». It is also possible to say: “*See you later!* / *See you soon!*” or “*See you tomorrow!*”. The usage of the parting formula “*Bye-bye*” is demonstrated in the following communicative situation:

- *Bye-bye, Kate.*
- *Bye-bye, darling.*

This etiquette formula belongs to the informal ones. It shows that people have friendly relationship and part for a short time. Another marker of formality / informality of communication the addressing formula “*Darling*”, usually used in conversation with relatives and friends.

- *Бувайте, друзі! Щасливої дороги!*

This communicative situation takes place in an informal setting. It becomes clear that the etiquette formula is used by friends who know each other for a long

time. Also the formula is supplemented by a wish, which creates a warm, friendly and easy atmosphere.

The choice of leave-taking formulas depends not only on awareness of the status marker of the partners, but also on the time of separation. For example, parting for a short time, it is possible to say “*See you later! / See you soon!*” or “*See you tomorrow!*”.

- *See you soon, sweetheart.*

This communicative situation shows that the people have close relations and part for a short time. The usage of this speech formula expresses the desire to continue communication in the future.

“*Farewell*” and «*Прощавай (me)*» are said when you are parting for long or forever, for example:

- *Farewell, my darling, Don't worry about me, I'm not lacking for love, I'm young and I'm free* (Anderson, 2014:109).

This communicative situation shows that the leave-taking formula is used by the couple in love who separate forever.

In general, speech etiquette units of leave-taking formulas are characterised by such grammatical categories as syntactic modality, time and person. But such units of as «*До побачення*», «*Бувай*», “*Goodbye*”, “*Bye*”, “*Bye-bye*” have no morphological forms of modality, time and person. They can be considered as functional and semantic synonyms of such speech etiquette units as «*Я хочу попрощатися з Вами*», “*I want to say goodbye to you* “. They have a semantic speaker and semantic addressee (who, however, can be explicated: «*Бувай (me)*», «*Прощавай*», “*Bye*”), the semantic reality and the semantic moment of speech. These units belong to semantic performatives. Thus, “*I want to say goodbye to you*” is a performative statement in which semantic and grammatical signs coincide, and *Bye* belongs to semantic performative constructions (Формановская, 1982: 42-50).

Despite the fact that stable formulas are not produced by structural schemes and are only reproduced in speech acts as ready blocks, among them there are

model units, for example: “*Have a nice day!*”, “*Good luck!*”, «*Гарного Вам відпочинку!*», «*М’якої посадки!*». Examples of model units are Ukrainian leave-taking formulas, constructed with the help of a noun in the genitive case with the preposition *до*: «*До зустрічі*», «*До завтра*», «*До літа*», «*До канікул*», «*До вихідного*» (Формановская, 1982: 46).

To express a high degree of respect and/or attention in English and Ukrainian, a ritual of twofold and threefold farewell is used, in which the phrase of leave-taking can be accompanied by (Вежливые и ласковые обращения на английском языке; Английские и русские категории вежливости, различия в стратегиях общения):

- the evaluation of the meeting: *We had a great time; I was very happy to see you; Були раді бачити;*
- thanks for the hospitality : *Дякуємо за все; Thank you for coming; Thank you for inviting;*
- wishes and expression of care: *В добру путь!; Хай щастить!; All the best; Success in exam; Good luck!; Take care of yourself;*
- expressions of desire to continue communication in the future: *See you at work (at the university); See you soon!; Приходь (те) частіше!; Побачимось!*

In this case, positive politeness strategies are realized with the help of leave-taking formulas, since positive politeness is aimed to show interest and approval of the interlocutors, the reciprocity of their duties, their desires and friendly relations. For instance, leave-taking formulas may contain the speaker’s appreciation: “*Nice to have met you*”, “*I was pleased to see you*”, «*Я був радий бачити Вас* (Рыченкова, 2008: 145). These formulas may be combined with the formulas of gratitude: “*Thank you for coming*”, “*Thank you for inviting me*”, «*Дякую, що прийшли*», «*Дякую за запрошення*».

- *Дякую за чудове свято, яке ти влаштувала* (Чайковський, 1957: 51).

In this communicative situation the speaker thanks the host for the warm welcome. It shows the speaker’s gratitude and warm attitude to the interlocutor.

- *The meal was excellent, Mr. Jackson. Thank you for inviting me to dine with you this evening. – He grinned.*
- *It was a pleasure for me* (Anderson, 2014: 341).

This communicative situation is very similar to the previous one. The speaker thanks the hosts for the warm welcome and well-spent time, as well as for the treatment. In this way the speaker expresses his gratitude and positive attitude to the hosts. In contrast to Ukrainians, the British always thank the hosts for the treatment.

There are formulas that express the desire to continue communication in the future: “*We’ll be in touch*”, “*See you soon (later)*”, «*До скорої зустрічі!*» and «*Незабаром побачимось!*», for instance:

- *До скорої зустрічі, люба Марто Савівно. Бувайте здорові й хоч трішки згадуйте про мене* (Гнатко, 2017).

This communicative situation includes both formulas of request and wish. The speaker asks the interlocutor to remember him/her and wishes health to the interlocutor. The usage of such leave-taking formulas create pleasant and harmonious atmosphere, which indicates that people have close relationships.

- *Прощавайте! В мене роботи не по шию, а просто з головою!* (Нечуй-Левицький, 2017: 73).

This communicative situation is opposite to the previous one, because people part for a long time. The speaker expresses the desire to terminate communication, explaining the reason why it cannot be continued. The speaker also makes it clear that he/she does not want and cannot continue communication in the near future.

There are leave-taking formulas containing invitations: “*Come again when you have time*”, “*Let’s go somewhere this week*”, «*Приходьте ще!*», for instance:

- *Раптом що, дзвони.*
- *Домовились. Бувай.*
- *Бувай.*

The usage of leave-taking formula «*Бувай*» indicates that the communicative situation is informal. The speaker and the interlocutor have friendly relationships and part for a short time. The formula is combined with request that expresses care about the interlocutor. The speaker expresses the desire to continue communication in the future.

A common feature for both languages is accompanying of leave-taking formulas with different kinds of requests and invitations: “*Come again!*”, “*Call me!*”, «*Приходь (те) ще!*», «*Приїжджай (те)!*», «*Телефонуйте!*». The following example demonstrates the usage of the leave-taking formula containing invitation:

- *Навідуйтеся частіше, Ніночко. Навідуйтесь удвох, дружіть собі, – легко сказала тітка* (Шевченко, 2013: 169).

This communicative situation indicates that the leave-taking formula is used by familiar people. It contains request and expresses the speaker’s desire to continue communication in the future.

- *Bye, Grandma, – said Jane.*
- *Bye. Come again.*

The usage of such a formula shows the desire to continue communication in the future, since it contains invitation.

Leave-taking formulas can be followed by wishes, which intensify them: “*I wish you good luck!*”, “*Have a good trip!*”, “*Have a safe journey!*”, “*Good luck!*”, “*All the best!*”, “*Good luck!*”, “*Good-bye!*”, «*Дай, Боже, у добрий час!*», «*Гарної поїздки!*», «*Щасту тобі (Вам)!*», «*Бажаю удачі!*», «*Всього найкращого!*».

Despite the general similarity of communicative actions of the British and Ukrainians, there are some differences. For instance, the expression of care for a partner in Ukrainian communication is typical of certain communicative contexts (travel, long separation, etc.):

- *На все добре, сину. Бережи себе* (Шевченко, 2013: 69).

In this communicative situation the speaker is talking to his mother. The formula «*На все добре*» expresses good wishes. This communicative formula is combined by the request «*Бережи себе*» that expresses concern. This example shows that the speaker sincerely takes care about the interlocutor and wishes him good, which creates a pleasant and warm atmosphere.

In English *Take care (Take care of yourself)* is used very often and regardless of the communicative context, which indicates its desemantization. For example, let us consider the dialogue between a passer-by and a street musician:

- *Bye, good man.*
- *Bye-bye. See you later. Take care.*

The passer-by says *Bye-bye* to a street musician, whom he probably will not meet again. That is why the formula “*See you*” is characterized by semantic emptiness. In this case the request “*Take care*” is a formal expression of politeness.

Formulas that express care and wishes are popular too: “*Take care*”, “*Have a nice day*”, “*Enjoy your holiday (weekend)*” (Рыченко, 2008: 147).

- *Bye-bye. Have a nice day.*

In this communicative situation the informal leave-taking formula is used, which shows that people are friends. The formula is combined with wish. It helps express the speaker’s friendly attitude to the interlocutor.

The main difference between the communicative behaviour of the English and Ukrainians during leave-taking lies in the number of replicas and, correspondingly, the length of the whole speech act. English leave-taking is always longer than the Ukrainian one. Let us consider the example of a dialogue between a clinic patient and a doctor:

- *Thank you. And thank you for seeing me this evening – it’s very kind of you. I’m sorry to have made waiting you.*
- *Not at all, don’t worry. That’s what we’re here for. I’ll see you out. Don’t hesitate to get back in touch if you need me. I’ll always be happy to see you* (Aijmer, 1996: 82).

The dialogue is very verbose: the patient thanks the doctor (twice), gives an assessment of his actions, and apologizes for having detained him. The doctor, in turn, asks not to worry, assures that it is his duty, invites to address more, assures that he will always be glad to see her again (in this situation, it is not entirely appropriate for the Ukrainian culture, since people come to the doctor when they have problems).

Let us cite one more dialogue as an example of the completion of communication:

P.: I must go... have a nice day tomorrow.

C.: Oh, thanks and thanks again for the gift– this is lovely – cyclamen isn't it?

P.: Yeh, cyclamen. I think it is.

C.: It's gorgeous – have a lovely time.

P.: All this evening to look forward to.

C.: Enjoy it.

P.: I will.

C.: Have a lovely time and thanks again.

P.: Thanks. Bye.

C.: Bye.

P.: Bye (Ларина, 2009: 91).

In this example, as in general in the final phase of communication, the communicants summarize their meeting. Repetitions are actively used, which is typical of such a situation. Wishing a good pastime is used 4 times (*have a nice day, have a lovely time, enjoy it*). Gratitude is also expressed 4 times: mutual gratitude for good wishes and gratitude for the gift. As for other communication strategies, here we should note a hint, in which the evaluation of the gift is given. It enhances gratitude of the communicant and at the same time is a manifestation of attention to the partner. Assessment is also repeated (*It's lovely, It's gorgeous*). If we take into account that both replicas with explicit gratitude and evaluation of the

gift have certainly been expressed at the meeting, then here we are dealing with their repetition.

This dialogue is a good example of how English interlocutors generously endow each other with communicative gifts in the form of gratitude, compliment, good wishes, numerous appraisal replicas in which each of them alternately expresses his attitude to the interlocutor and to his actions.

The main purpose of these formulas is to demonstrate mutual disposition, attention, friendly attitude of the interlocutors to one another, and interest in continuing communication in the future.

The behaviour of the English communicants in the situation of leave-taking indicates that combinations and repetitions are one of the main strategies for enhancing courtesy. When the distance between the interlocutors is shorter, there is no need for such an emphatic demonstration of their goodwill. Maybe that's why Ukrainian leave-taking, as a rule, is shorter and more restrained.

Thus, when saying goodbye, the English are more verbose than Ukrainians. Because of the marked differences in greeting and leave-taking situations, Ukrainians seem to the English to be talkative, verbose in the initial phase of communication and too harsh in its final phase. On the other hand, the British in the eyes of Ukrainians look very friendly and affable, but often insincere.

As well as in the greeting situation, nonverbal signals can accompany SE units. Interlocutors can exchange hand shake as a sign of leave-taking, but it is admissible only in spontaneous relations.

Partings are usually accompanied by gestures – bowing, a waving hand (for distanced communicants), a smile, handshaking, kisses, and embracing (in informal situations) (Соколец, 2006: 74).

As the formulas of this thematic group are very often accompanied or even substituted by a waving movement of a hand (the expression *to wave goodbye* has been conceptualised in English). A kiss is one more nonverbal means, which often occurs in the situations of farewell and, eventually, it has resulted in another expression *to kiss goodbye*.

2.3. Communicative Situation of Address

Address is the most striking and frequently used component of speech etiquette. It is used at any stage of communication and is its integral part. Address is one of the most common means of both positive and negative politeness in both languages, since it expresses the speaker's attitude toward the interlocutor, acts in the language as stable etiquette codes that allow to identify the addressee, making a primary verbal contact with the interlocutor and identifying the position of the communicants in the system of social hierarchy, so the formulas are socially marked. Therefore, the main factors which influence the choice of the address formula are the social status of communicants and the communicative situation.

Formulas of address are lexicalized and phraseological units, which semantics and functions in speech are far from being exhausted only by naming and attracting the attention of the addressee.

In syntax theory, address traditionally occupies a peripheral place: it is neither a sentence nor a word combination or even a word form in the accepted sense, its semantics is reduced mainly to naming "*to whom the speech is addressed*" (Формановская, 1982: 44). Address is considered to be a component of the sentence, a word or a combination of words grammatically independent from the sentence, which refers to the one to whom the speech is addressed.

Address, as any other unit of speech etiquette, is characterized by performativity. When the speech act is real, having no grammatical signs of modality, time, person, address, nevertheless, projects the components of the situation in the form of a semantic speaker, semantic addressee, semantic reality and semantic moment of speech. In other words, address is a semantic performative. However, address differs from other performatives of speech etiquette: it cannot form a self-contained text of social communication.

Both in English and in Ukrainian, address is expressed by:

- personal names;

- respectful and formal terms or honorifics such as “*Mr.*”, “*Mrs.*”, “*Sir*”, “*Madame*”, “*Пане (і)*”, «*Шановний (а)*»;
- titles such as “*Doctor*”, “*Professor*”, “*Major*”, “*Лікарю*”, “*Вчителю*”;
- kinship terms which can be used literally and metaphorically;
- terms of endearment in addressing children or close and intimate people such as “*honey*”, “*sweetie*”, “*buddy*” “*kitty*”, «*любий(а)*», «*милий (а)*»;
- colloquial or slang addresses, such as “*dude*”, “*bro*”, «*братан*», «*бро*»;
- nicknames derived from proper names or personal characteristics of the addressee, such as “*Mr. Know-all*”, “*Mrs. Perfection*”, “*Tiny kitty*”.

The use of certain address terms depends on a variety of contextual factors, relationships between interlocutors, and individual characteristics of interlocutors such as age, gender, education, social status, etc (Акишина, 1978: 89).

Many forms of address are model units, which are produced by structural schemes, for instance: *Товариш (громадянин) + surname*; *Товариш + the name of the profession/position/occupation*; *name* (including diminutive names); *Mr./Mrs. + name/surname*; *name and patronymic*, etc (Засоби вираження ввічливості при звертанні).

Addresses are frequently used in the English language and serve as a productive means of expressing courtesy, esteem and respect, therefore, in foreign scientific literature, “honorific” is used to denote this term. Honorific accentuates not only the fact of direct address to the interlocutor, but also parallel transmission of respectful connotation. In English honorific addresses are usually placed before the name of the addressee or act as an absolute substitute for the name. Honorifics that can be used when referring to any adult person of the appropriate sex include *Miss*, *Missis*. *Mister* is a common English honorific used to address men. It is derived from the word *master*, while feminine equivalents of the addresses *Mrs* and *Miss*, come from the archaic word “*Mistress*”.

The addressing etiquette system in the Ukrainian language has undergone in its historical development great changes related to the social organization of the society. Earlier such addressing formulas as «*Товаришу*», «*Добродію*»,

«Громадянин» were popular. Formulas «Громадянка» and «Громадяни» are limited to legal, juridical sphere:

- *І тому мені здається, що надалі нам з вами часто прийдеться зустрічатися, громадянка Яременко. Саме тому, поки я остаточно не увійду в курс справ, дуже – і я просто по-людські! – прошу вас з міста нікуди не зникати* (Кацай, 2017).

The formula «Громадянка» helps emphasize the equality of all members of the society to the law as people enjoying civil rights and having certain responsibilities.

The address «Товаришу» appeared in the Ukrainian language at the end of the XIX and the beginning of the XX centuries. It was used in the intellectual environment and meant “*a person connected with anyone by friendship*” or “*a man, ideologically connected with others*” (Радевич-Винницький, 2006: 29). In Soviet times, the word replaced all other addresses and functioned for naming party colleagues.

- *Вам би вчиться на юридичному, товаришу Голод, – сказав він. – З такими глибокими знаннями законів можна піти далеко* (Шкляр, 2015).

This communicative situation takes place in the official atmosphere. The usage of the addressing formula «Товаришу» indicates that the speaker and the interlocutor communicate at a formal level.

«Добродію» («Добродійко», «Добродії») is the ancient honorific form of address to people who do good deeds (Вєтрова, 2007: 78). It was widespread mostly in Eastern Ukraine and used in combination with etiquette attributes «Вельмишановний» and «Вельмиповажний», as in at the following example:

- *Я розумію. Дуже дякую, добродію, дуже дякую* (Винниченко, 2014).

This communicative situation shows that the speaker and the interlocutor are not familiar, but they communicate with each other politely. As this example shows, the formula «Добродію» is used as polite address to the unfamiliar person.

The address «Товариство!» is more frequently used, especially, to a group of people that are associated with some communion (interests, position in society, etc.), for instance:

- *Шановне товариство! – гукнув він з порога, обступлений з боків старшиною. – Раду малисьмо скликати завтра, та коли ви захотіли скоріше зібратися, я готовий служити вам* (Іваничук, 2006: 31).

This communicative situation shows that this etiquette formula is used in public speech to address the group of people. The formula «Товариство» is accompanied by the adjective «Шановний» that adds a shade of officiality to the utterance.

The English use “*Dear sirs*”, “*Dear colleagues*” and “*Dear friends*”. “*Your Majesty!*”, “*Father Jack!*” or “*Colonel Johnson!*” as a form of address to a large audience, an indication of a person’s position in a society (Делик, 2016: 190). In some cases address is used just in order to show appreciation. There are special forms of address for the expression of respect to people of a certain social class, for example: “*Ladies and Gentlemen*”, “*Your Excellency*”, “*Your Highness*”, “*Mr. President*” and “*Prime Minister*”.

- *Ladies and gentlemen, I’m happy to see so many of you here to share in this momentous occasion* (Warren, 2015).

In this case the address is expressed by respectful and formal words “*Ladies and gentlemen*”. This communicative situation shows that this etiquette formula is used in public speech to address a large audience. It helps to emphasize the status and high social class of interlocutors.

The choice of the address formula largely depends on the style of communication. In official communication «Пані» and «Панове» are used (Березович, 2007: 78). «Пан» is used addressing a man; «Пані» is used addressing a woman. In official communication these addressing formulae are combined with the surname of the person. In this way the strategy of negative politeness is realized, since it is typical of negative politeness to emphasize the

importance of the addressee. There is one more formula of formal address in Ukrainian: *Шановний/Вельмишановний* + *name and patronymic*.

This communicative situation demonstrates the usage of the addressing formula «Пані»:

- *Як живете, пані Олено?*
- *Як стара самотня жінка, викинута твоєю владою на смітник*
(Мейгеш, 1996).

The speaker appeals to the interlocutor with great respect. This becomes evident due to the usage of two markers of politeness. The first marker is the usage of the honorific «Пані», which is a respectful form of addressing a woman. The second marker is the use of the respectful plural form of the pronoun «Ви».

At the same time, in English there is a similar rule: the strategy of negative politeness is realized with the help of *Sir/Madam/Mr/Mrs* + *surname*. In communication between friends, names are usually used, but in conversation with less close people they use “*Miss*”, “*Mrs*”, “*Mr*” and the last name. “*Miss*” is used, referring to a girl or an unmarried woman; “*Mrs*” is used, addressing a married woman; “*Mr*” is used when addressing a man (Березович, 2007: 230).

- *You’ll have to forgive us, Mr. Jackson, – John offered.*

This communicative situation shows that the speaker’s etiquette formula is very polite and official. It becomes clear thanks to the usage of honorific “*Mr.*”. The speaker and the interlocutor are not close friends, most likely they communicate in official atmosphere.

In modern English addressing by name is acceptable in such relationships: children – adults (if they are relatives); subordinates and their chiefs, students – teachers, indicating the equality of communicants, regardless of their age and status. Such addressing formulas demonstrate friendly relationship between people and friendly attitude to each other. In this way the positive politeness strategy is implemented.

Another means of demonstrating intergroup affiliation in English communication is diminutive names, that is, abbreviated forms of complete names,

for example, *Robert – Rob, David – Dave*, and names with diminutive suffixes such as *Tommy, Eddie* (Некоз, 2017: 415). It is believed that using diminutives when referring to other people is a way to get closer to them.

In the Ukrainian culture, addressing by name to a senior person or a person higher in rank is impolite. It is considered familiar and not allowed by the rules of speech etiquette. Diminutive names are often used in the Ukrainian language too but, their use demonstrates close relationships between people.

To show respectful attitude in the Ukrainian language, the name and patronymic and the pronoun «*Ви*» are used. However, it is appropriate to address by name a subordinate or a younger person. In modern English such an opposition does not exist, because the pronoun “*thou*” which used to be a second person singular pronoun in English, was replaced by “*you*” in New English Period (Веремьєв, 2000: 83). In the live communication the respectful plural form of the pronoun you «*Ви*» may be used, addressing a single interlocutor, if he/she is unfamiliar, older or higher in rank. This emphasizes respect to the interlocutor. «*Ви*» expresses close relationship between people. It conveys respect, which is based on friendship, sociability or love. Friends, colleagues, employees, siblings, spouses use «*ти*», communicating with each other, for instance:

- *Грiх тобi такe говорити, моя люба подруго. Мої батьки люблять тебе, мов рiдну дитину, i нiчого тобi не жалiють* (Чайковський, 2017).

This communicative situation shows that communication takes place between close friends. It becomes clear thanks to the usage of the addressing formula «*Подруго*» and the personal pronoun «*ти*». Also the formula contains the term of endearment «*люба*». It signals that people have close and trusting relationships and have known each other for a long time.

- *На жаль, я нiчим не можу Вам допомогти* (Чайковський, 2017).

This communicative situation, unlike the previous one, is characterized by the formal style of communication. The personal pronoun «*Ви*» indicated it. Communicants are not familiar, but communicate politely. In addition, in this example mitigation is used. It is a means of negative politeness, which helps to

avoid categorical statements. In this case, mitigation is expressed by using «*На жаль*».

So, it can be concluded that the usage of the personal pronoun «*ти*» indicates a close relationship between people, and the personal pronoun «*Ви*» is a marker of courtesy in dealing with unfamiliar or older people or with people, occupying a higher position in the society. «*Ви*» is an allomorphic means of implementation of negative politeness strategy, which aims to emphasize the status and importance of the addressee.

Taking into account the lexical-semantic characteristics of address, it is worth noting that in the Ukrainian language «*діду*», «*бабо*», «*дядьку*», «*тітко*» can be used addressing both relatives and people who are not related by kinship. In English the formulas “*grandmother (grandma)*”, “*grandfather (grandpa)*”, “*uncle*”, “*aunt*” are used only in relation to relatives (Березович, 2007: 345). Let’s compare the following communicative situations in English and Ukrainian:

- *Oh Auntie Em, I was caught in a cyclone that hurled me into another land. Yet, all I kept saying was, I wanna go home. – cried Dorothy* (Anderson: 2014: 341).

In this situation, using the formula “*auntie*”, the speaker refers to a relative, which is typical of the English language.

- *Все, тітко, злазьте!*
- *Як все? Ти що, в Човновицю не завезеш?* (Драч: 2010: 374).

This example shows that the speaker refers to an older person. This becomes obvious because of the usage of address «*Тітко*», which can be used only to a familiar older person and with a shade of confidence. But the communicants are not relatives. This conclusion can be made due to the usage of the personal pronoun «*Ви*». Such addresses are used only in informal communication situations, because it is vernacular and contains a shade of familiarity.

But both in Ukrainian and in English some names of professions are used as addressing formulae (Березович, 2007: 425). For example, “*Teacher*” is not used as a form of address, but “*Doctor*” and “*Nurse*” are used, for example:

- *Рятуйте, лікарю... Я вже не можу!*
- *Навроцький, тепер Ваша черга!* (Волошин, 2016: 57).

In a given communicative situation, two addressing formulae are used together: first, «*Лікарю*», is address to a doctor. As it was already mentioned both in the English and Ukrainian languages it is appropriate to address a person according to the nature of his/her activity; the second addressing formula is the naming of a person's surname, which is also considered to be a polite form of address, because the speaker appeals to his familiar person – his colleague. A marker of politeness, in the given situation, is also the usage of the polite addressing form expressed by the personal pronoun «*Ви*».

An important characteristic of address is that it can give an evaluative characteristic, have an expressive coloring and show the attitude of the speaker to the interlocutor (Радевич-Винницький, 2006: 248). In both languages, diminutive and caressing words are used as an address to relatives and close friends. The English most often call their relatives “*sweetheart*”, “*sweetie*” and “*darling*”. Ukrainian people use such caressing words and terms of endearment as «*Любий*», «*Милый*», «*Серденько*» and «*Дорогий*». But there is a difference between the English “*Dear*” and the Ukrainian «*Дорогий*». To identify this difference it is necessary to demonstrate two communicative situations.

- *Дорогий мій, золотий мій Михайлику!* (Хвильовий, 1989: 372).

This communicative situation is informal. The speaker uses the term of endearment «*Дорогий*» to address her relative (son). The usage of such address indicates close, confidential and warm relations between people. It creates the atmosphere of love and harmony. The use of this formula indicates the implementation of positive politeness strategies, which is characterized by emphasising warm and friendly attitude to the addressee. Also the informal atmosphere of communication and close relations between communicants is indicated by the use of the address «*Михайлику*». This address contains a diminutive and affectionate suffix and has meliorative and pejorative connotations.

Such formulas are used by friends, relatives and familiar people, combined with *mu*-forms of communication.

- *Dear Sir, I should go with pleasure, – said David.*

In contrast to the previous communicative situation, this one is formal. The speaker is the knight who addresses the king. The usage of formal addressing “*Dear Sir*” points to the official tone of communication. It is a sign of respect. The use of this formula indicates the implementation of negative politeness strategies, which is characterized by emphasising the status and importance of the addressee.

So, we can conclude that the address with the adjective “*Dear*” is an allomorphic feature of English communication. The formula *Dear + name/title/title + surname* is a standard etiquette construction both in personal and in business communication in English. It is used in a formal setting and is a sign of respect to a person and implements negative politeness strategies. In the Ukrainian language, the formula «*Дорогий*» is used to refer to relatives and close friends and demonstrates love and warm feelings, in other words, to implements positive politeness strategies.

- *My sweetest, loveliest child. May God bless your sweet pure spirit* (Toynbee, 2012: 86).

This communicative situation is similar to the previous one in that the speaker refers to his/her child. In this case address is expressed by the term of endearment “*My sweetest*”. Both in English and in Ukrainian, this addressing formula is used by close friends or relatives in an informal setting, in contrast to the formula “*Dear*”/«*Дорогий*», which in English is used in formal communication.

There also exists such address as “*Loveliest*”, the superlative degree of comparison of the adjective “*lovely*”. The category of the degree of comparison is an isomorphic grammatical means of ethno-cultural reproduction of positive politeness strategies. Both in English and Ukrainian languages, this category may be realized by the superlative degree of comparison of adjectives, which have a

positive connotation. The following example demonstrates the usage of the address «Любий» in the Ukrainian language:

- *Мій хлопчику любий, до мене сюди. На луки зелені ти гратись іди; В моєї матусі є пишні квітки, Гаптовані злотом тобі сорочки* (Кобилянська, 1994: 66).

In this case the term of endearment «Любий» is used by the mother to refer to her son. This communicative situation shows that the speaker and the interlocutor have relations, characterized by love, warmth and care. The formula of address is used to express warm feelings to the interlocutor and helps create the atmosphere of love and harmony. Also the informal atmosphere of communication and close relations between communicants is indicated by address «*мій хлопчику*». This address contains a diminutive and affectionate suffix. Such formulas are used by friends and relatives, combined with *tu*-forms of communication.

The fact that the Ukrainian formulas of address are more numerous and diverse, that they convey different emotional shades and carry more information about the relations between communicants, is predetermined by the collectivist type of culture. The Ukrainian communicative style is affective, or emotionally-intuitive, while the English one is instrumental (Ларина, 2009: 112).

To express address, one can use phraseological units, such as: *angel of light, and broth of a boy, my cabbage*. Basically such formulas are used by close people in informal communicative situations. Let us consider the examples:

- *But shake me a cocktail, angel, would you? I need a good kick-you angel of light!* (Lawrence, 2006: 108).

This phraseological unit can be used only by relatives, for example, a husband with a wife or a mother with a son.

- *Oh, you're a broth of a boy, aren't you? Returned Miss Moocher shaking her head violently* (Snow, 2006).

Most often this phraseological unit of address is used in everyday life. For example, a teacher can use this formula, addressing a student.

- *This wasn't the drawing – room, my cabbage, at least not in my time* (Dickens, 2006: 283).

This expression can be used only by very close people, for example, husband and wife.

Address is always accompanied by a friendly look and often with a smile. These nonverbal means show friendly intentions and respect towards an interlocutor.

2.4. Communicative Situation of Apology

Apology is an important expression of tactfulness and politeness. Y. K. Radevych-Vynytsky defines apology as “*request to reveal indulgence, forgive the trespass*” (Радевич-Винницький, 2006: 29). In other words, it is a “*verbal expiation of guilt*”. An apology is used when social norms have been violated, whether offence is potential or real (Стельмахович, 1996: 20). The main function of the formulas of an apology is the restoration of social balance or harmony between participants of communication. They are often used to maintain contact in a communicative act. On the one hand, apologies belong to the group of means of negative courtesy, because the speaker focuses on his/her guilt that is, assumes all responsibility, and thus leaves the interlocutor out of the face threatening act. On the other hand, this speech act is directly related to the observance of the distance and should also be considered in connection with positive politeness strategies, since its main pragmatic goal is to assure the addressee that he/she has been noticed, respected and he/she is wanted to maintain a non-conflict relationship. Thus, apology is a sign of attention and goodwill.

The formulas of apology are classified according to their syntactical structure. As sentences they may be affirmative, interrogative and exclamatory, for instance:

affirmative: *I am sorry; I beg your pardon, Пробачте; Вибачте; Перепрошую;*

exclamatory: *Sorry!; I am sorry!; I beg your pardon!; Пробачте!; Вибачте!; Перепрошую!;*

interrogative: *Allow me to apologize to you?; Приймете мої вибачення?*

According to their syntactical structure, constructions may be simple (one-member, two-member), complete/incomplete; elliptical; complex sentences of different types and equivalents:

complete two-member: *I am sorry; I beg your pardon; Я прошу Вас мене пробачити;*

complete one-member: *beg your pardon; Радий Вас вітати; Прошу Вас мене пробачити;*

elliptical: *Sorry; Pardon; Пробачте.*

All these constructions may substitute each other and are considered as syntactical synonyms. The choice of syntactical synonyms is predetermined by: socio-psychological characteristics of communicants, terms of communication, subject and aims of communication. Syntactical microsystem of speech etiquette units serves for neutral, formal and informal levels of communication (Соколиця, 2006: 23).

According to the form and semantics there are three types of apologies: performative, imperative or requestive and “pseudo-apologies”.

The expressions with *apology, apologies, apologize, regret, be sorry, beg pardon* belong to performative apologies and are used to emphasize formality of the relationship and to avoid ambiguity (Телия, 1991: 86). These formulas are used in the spoken language very rarely, for instance for a public apology in cases of delays of trains, planes, cancelled flights, delayed constructions, changes in the schedules. In such cases the predicative structure *Pron. Vb. Adj.* is frequently used, for instance: “*We regret to announce that tonight’s performance of “Hamlet” has been cancelled*” (*announcement at the theatre*) (Aijmer, 1996: 89).

In this communicative situation, the management of the theatre apologizes for cancelling the theatrical performance. In this example impersonalization is used. It is an important grammatical means of negative politeness, which is

realized through identification of the speaker with the group or its metonymic identification with the institution, which he/she represents (Penrose, 1989: 229).

Impersonalization is achieved by using “we” instead of “I” or the name of the institution instead of a pronoun, as in the following example: “*Aerkianta apologizes for any inconveniences arising from the phased enlargement of the passengers terminal at Dublin airport*” (announcement at the airport) (Aijmer, 1996: 86).

In this communicative situation the management of Air Company apologizes for inconveniences. It can have a double reference: on the one hand, to point out the official institution that is represented by the speaker, on the other, to be a marker of corporativity.

Imperative or requestive apologies include *excuse, pardon and forgive*. Speech constructions that express request of the speaker to forgive him/her any offense combine with the words *to excuse, to forgive, to give, pardon* in the imperative mood. Apologies in the imperative mood are pragmatically requestives, more tentative than commands. In combination with “*Please*” the semantics of the verbs “*Excuse*” and “*Forgive*” is strengthened, therefore the formulae sound more polite. Imperatives with the verbs “*Excuse*” and “*Pardon*” express an attempt to reach forgiveness. They are pragmatically expedient and deferential.

Like other elements which have a fixed form, apologies can be irregular. “*Sorry*”, “*Pardon*” and “*Forgive*” can be considered as “radically elliptical” or fragmentary since they can be related to full forms such as “*I beg your pardon*” and “*I am sorry*”.

The pragmatic cliché “*I’m afraid*” belongs to pseudo-apologies. It is commonly used for giving unfavourable information in response to a prior question, for example:

- *I’m afraid he’s gone out the back door, – she said ruefully* (Anderson, 2014: 37).

In this communicative situation the speech formula does not sound like apology but rather a polite sign of attention to the hearer without expressing real feelings of the speaker.

Taking into account lexico-semantic characteristics apologies can be subdivided into three groups:

- apologies used as the spontaneous expression of sympathy and compassion to the interlocutor about some trouble: *I'm sorry; Я вибачаюсь;*
 - apologies for inconvenience, committed to interlocutor: *Excuse me; Pardon me; I beg your pardon; Вибачте мене;*
 - address with apology for some serious actions against the interlocutors: *Forgive me; Пробачте мені.*
- *Oh, I beg your pardon! –she exclaimed in a tone of great dismay, and began picking them up again as quickly as she could, for the accident of the gold – fish kept running in her head, and she had a vague sort of idea that they must be collected at once and put back into the jury-box, or they would die* (Carrol, 2003: 61).

This communicative situation shows that the formula “*I beg your pardon*” is used for apologizing for inconvenience, committed to interlocutor. The fault of the speaker is not serious enough to use the formula “*Forgive me*”. But it is not a spontaneous expression of sympathy to the interlocutor about some trouble, that's why the formula “*I am sorry*” is not used either.

The formula “*I beg your pardon*” can be used to ask someone politely to explain or clarify something. On the other hand, it is used to apologize for and correct a slip of the tongue that the speaker has made. Foregoing is confirmed by the following example of using the formula “*Forgive me*” in the communicative situation:

- *Forgive me, Elizabeth, – he whispered again. – I never meant to hurt you* (Jeffers, 2009).

This communicative situation shows that the speaker apologizes to the interlocutor not for inconvenience, but for a more serious fault.

It should be noted that in English mostly two forms of apology are used: “*Excuse me*” and “*I’m sorry*”. These language clichés are widely used in the English language as a form of address to strangers. Even in cases where the forms “*Excuse me*” and “*I’m sorry*” are interchangeable, each of them has its own shade of meaning. Let’s look at the examples.

“*Sorry*” is the most often used phrase in English [6, p.81]. This cliché for offering apologies has several modifications: “*I am sorry*” and “*Sorry*”. Expressions that include a first-person pronoun emphasize the sincerity of the speaker’s feelings (Васильев, 1962: 70), for example: “*I’m sorry, baby, I didn’t mean to snap like that*” (Jeffers, 2009).

This example shows that the formula of apology “*I am sorry*” is used to express sympathy to the interlocutor about the trouble. Its main pragmatic purpose is to keep harmony between the communicants.

These pragmatic clichés can be used not only to apologize, but also as a request of the speaker to repeat his words or for attracting attention (Penrose, 1989: 70). Let us look at the examples:

- *I beg your pardon?*
- *It is not respectable to beg, – said the King.*
- *I only meant that I didn’t understand, said Alice* (Carrol, 2003).

Using clichés with *pardon/I beg your pardon* in British English is a conventional way of asking the speaker to repeat his/her words.

- *Excuse me. I would like to ask something. If I have to meet my husband, will he be changed?* (Leupp, 1997).

In this communicative situation the speech formula is used for attracting attention. Another example:

- *Excuse me for talking to you this way, master, but isn’t your bottom hard to please* (Leupp, 1997).

This communicative situation is very similar to the previous one, but in this case the formula of apology is used to draw attention to the negative effect, expressing dissatisfaction.

It can be concluded that “*Sorry*” is the most frequently used formula for apology in English everyday life. Its main pragmatic purpose is to keep harmony between the communicants. “*Excuse me*” is a speech formula, most often used for attracting attention. Each of these formulae carries its own shade of meaning: “*Excuse me*” expresses, above all, the attitude of the speaker to certain social rules adopted in a particular society, and the expression “*I’m sorry*” denotes attitude towards another person. Both these formulae can be used as signals of attention, but “*Excuse me*” is used before disturbing someone and “*Sorry*” is used after it has already been done.

Although these expressions are forms of expressing apology, they are not always used by native speakers for such purpose. First of all, the British use these forms to express regret, sorrow, etc., and therefore such language constructions are quite appropriate even in those cases when the speaker has nothing to apologize for. In the English communicative culture apology is not only an expression of regret, but also a commonly used courtesy to the addressee, an official marker of politeness. The following communicative situation demonstrates the usage of the formula “*Sorry*”:

- *I’m looking for Kimbra. She was really upset when she left the courthouse. I was hoping she’d come here.*
- *I haven’t seen her. Sorry* (Stevens, 2015).

This communicative situation shows that apology is formal. In this case the speaker has nothing to apologize for. But using “*Sorry*” is quite appropriate in this case, because it is the most formalized ritual formula for apology in which its semantic significance is lost to the greatest extent, and it is often used automatically as a signal of attention.

The grammatical categories of the formulas of apology are syntactic modality of sentences, syntactic time and person.

The category of the syntactic person in these formulas is predetermined by the fact that communication takes place between immediate interlocutors address to which may be expressed by pronouns *I*, *we*, and *you*. In the unit of speech

etiquette the category of person may be represented explicitly, for example: «Дякую», «Прошу вибачення», «Перепрошую»; by the first-person pronoun: *I would like to apologize to you*; *Я хотів би вибачитися перед Вами*; can reflect the apology to the addressee and be expressed by the imperative form of the verb, for example: “*Sorry*”, “*Accept my apologies*”, “*Allow me to thank*”, “*Allow me to devote myself*”, «Вибачте», «Прийми мої вибачення», «Дозвольте подякувати», «Дозвольте відкланятися».

Syntactic time in the etiquette formulas is the actual present moment of speech. In the act of communication, the units are always pronounced at the time of speech, therefore, regardless of whether the category of time is explicated in the morphological structure of the predicate or not, the very logic of situational communication “here and now” relates these formulas to the plan of the syntactic present time. In such units as, «Прошу вибачення», “*I’m sorry*”, “*I beg your pardon*”, the syntactic present time is expressed explicitly, as in classical performatives.

Modal verbs in English and modal words in Ukrainian as means expressing negative politeness may emphasise or soften apology. The modal verb “*must*” and modal word «Повинен» or «Маю» are used to express obligation of apology and to emphasize its necessity: *Я маю вибачитися перед Вами*. Such formulas of apology refer to the stylistically marked. Both in English and Ukrainian they have a similar structure (Цивьян, 1965: 42-46). They are expressed by syntactically complete sentences, containing a modal verb *must/маю* or request *let me/дозвольте мені*: “*Let me apologize to you*” or «Дозвольте мені вибачитися перед Вами».

- *I must apologize to you as well. I had formed a mistaken idea of your character early in our acquaintance, and treated you according to it* (Naterop, 1997: 35).

In the example given, the apologizing formula is used in a formal setting by people who are not familiar. It is clear thanks to the use of the stylistically elevated

formula “*I must apologize*”. In this case, the syntactic completeness of the utterance is a formal indicator of official style.

Different modality markers, showing uncertainty (*possibly, perhaps*), hedges (*kind/sort of, somehow*), mental state predicates (*I suppose, I think, I believe*), or intensifiers (*I’m so/very/really/awfully/terribly sorry*), can be used for either emphasizing or softening the violation or offense (Габелко, 2012: 40).

Amplifying particles, adverbs, qualifiers and exclamations (*so, very, awfully, terribly, dreadfully, really, oh, oh my god, oh no, geez, oops*) are used as lexico-morphological means of intensification of apology. The intensifiers “*very*” and “*really*” can be used interchangeably, but actually there is a difference between them: “*really*” implies regret and “*very*” is an etiquette word (Васильев, 1962: 89).

Among the syntactic means of intensifying the illocutionary force of apology, there are parallel structures, for example:

- *Linda, where are those cookies I baked yesterday?*
- *Oh, I’m sorry. Bob. I was really hungry.*
- *Oh, I was really looking forward to eating them!*
- *Oh, I know... I’m sorry. Bob, but you know, when I tasted the first cookie it was so good I couldn’t help eating all of them* (Aijmer, 1996: 206).

In this communicative situation the effect of apology is amplified by the parallelism of the replica “*I’m sorry, Bob*” and the explanation of the causes of offense (the wife politely admits that she has eaten cookies for two reasons: because she was hungry and the cookies were extremely tasty).

In response to apology English communicants emphasize the insignificance of the damage or inconvenience caused and assure the addressee that the balance of the relationship is restored. The most conventional responses to accept apologies in English are: *OK/It’s OK/That’s (It’s) all right/No problem/Don’t worry/Never mind*.

In the treasury of the Ukrainian speech etiquette there are a lot of apologizing formulas. Usually, in the Ukrainian literary discourse request for forgiveness is expressed by:

- verbs «*вибачати*», «*пробачати*», «*прощати*» in the imperative mood: *Якщо ж бо в розпачі ти проклинатимеш мене і всіх, що кинули тебе і на Дніпрі не вмерли, простив я тебе наперед, така вже наша доля, і ти мене прости*, – сказав схвильовано Василь (Винниченко, 2014);
- verbs «*сердитися*», «*ображатися*», «*гніватися*» with negative particle «*не*»: *Не гнівайтесь, почула вашу згадку!* (Винниченко, 2014);
- descriptive clauses: *Ви ж на нас серця не майте... Так воно уже склалося* (Винниченко, 2014);
- etiquette phrases «*прошу пробачення / вибачення*»: *Тоді я прошу пробачення: мені здалося чомусь, що ти багато відважніший самого себе* (Хвильовий, 1989: 174).

The expression “*Pardon*”, borrowed from French, is hardly used in modern Ukrainian language. It is usually used to apologize for inconvenience committed to the interlocutor, for instance:

- *Пардон, професоре, я... як би Вам сказати...*
- *Будь ласка, будь ласка! Я розумію* (Хвильовий, 1989: 174).

«*Вибачте!*» is a neutral expression. The researchers identify it as a Polish borrowing, which meant “*look around, see, recognize*”. The Formula «*Пробачте!*» appeared under Polish influence, in which this word meant “to miss”. But in the Ukrainian language it developed a new lexical meaning and began to be used as a formula of apology.

In case of a small fault the formulas «*Прошу вибачення (пробачення, вибачити, пробачити)*» are used. Etiquette formula «*Вибачте, будь ласка*» is used as a declarative question, which expresses polite re-asking. In such situations the Ukrainians often use «*Перепрошую*» as an equivalent for «*Вибачте, будь ласка*». «*Перепрошую*» is often used as an address to strangers. Both these formulae (*Вибачте* and *Пробачте*) can be used as signals for attention, but

«Пробачте» is used before disturbing someone and «Вибачте» is used after it has already been done. The usage of these formulae is demonstrated in the following examples:

- *Пробачте за те, що турбую вас, але Ви, випадково, не знаходили днями чорний шкіряний жіночий гаманець?* (Луа, 2017).

In the given situation the etiquette formula is used as a signal of attention. The speaker apologizes to the interlocutor for disturbing him/her.

- *Пробачте мені, Насте, за всі мої погані слова. Накипіло на серці. Пробачте, прошу Вас...* (Луа, 2017).

In contrast to the previous example this communicative situation shows that the speaker uses the apology formula not to attract attention, but to ask for forgiveness for a particular offense.

- *Даруйте мені всі, кого я чи то словом образив, чи сам чим-небудь укривдив, чи від чужої кривди не захистив!* (Франко, 2017: 804).

This communicative situation is one more example of the usage of the speech cliché as an apology for a serious fault. «Даруйте мені» is a peculiar formula of apologies in the Ukrainian speech etiquette that is not translated literally into any other language. The semantic meaning of this formula is “*to give forgiveness*” since this cliché comes from the Ukrainian word «дарувати».

In addition to a number of linguistic means, which the speaker resorts to with the aim of asking for forgiveness, there are also nonverbal means. Usually, in the English-speaking culture, one can smile at the person. This phenomenon is called “*an apologizing smile*”. In Ukrainian culture, putting a hand to heart is used as a nonverbal means of apology.

The most conventional expression of confessing the guilt in both cultures is a directed downward glance and a winey facial expression: “*He blushed and averted his eyes. Sorry?!*” (Owen, 1983: 32). In some situations, a person who asks for forgiveness can get on his knees: “*They dropped to their knees and begged forgiveness*” (Owen, 1983: 34).

CONCLUSIONS TO CHAPTER II

Speech behavioural patterns of the English and Ukrainians implemented in SE formulas have been analyzed in the situations of greeting, leave-taking, address, and apology. Their similarities and differences have been identified.

Both in English and Ukrainian there are universal speech etiquette formulas that can be used in different communicative situations. Grammatical categories of speech units embrace syntactic modality, syntactic time and the syntactic person (e.g. greeting and leave-taking), but there are speech etiquette formulas that do not have grammatical signs of modality, time, while their components can project a semantic speaker, semantic addressee, semantic reality (e.g. address). In these languages, there are elliptical constructions, which were formed from the formulas of wishes that were contracted but retained their semantic centre. The syntactical structure of SE formulas that were investigated may be expressed by affirmative, interrogative and exclamatory sentences; according to the syntactical structure they can be simple (one/two-member), complete/incomplete; elliptical; complex sentences of different types and equivalents.

In the English communicative culture there is a significant simplification and desemantization of greeting norms and some leave-taking formulas. In contrast to Ukrainians, the British use phraseological units to express address more often.

The main difference in the use of leave-taking formulas by the English lies in the number of replicas and, correspondingly, the length of the whole speech act. The Ukrainian language, in most cases, has longer SE formulas and is rich in synonymic forms (e.g. apology). National specificity of SE manifests itself in its general phraseological character. It is abundant in phraseological units, proverbs, and sayings. The communicative situation of greeting is characterised by the largest number of phraseological units.

Ukrainians tend to use positive politeness strategies, which are implemented in the use of numerous and diverse speech etiquette formulas and stylistic devices

that convey different emotional shades and carry more information about the relations between communicants.

The British tend to use negative politeness strategies, which are implemented in impersonalization, various interrogative sentences, modal verbs which can soften questions, the repetition of SE formulas.

Verbal means may be accompanied by the nonverbal ones which complement substitute, repeat a verbal message, contradict other messages, and regulate communication.

The choice of speech etiquette formulas depends on various factors, social being among the most important, since speech etiquette is social by its nature. The individuals are bearers of certain social features and when communicating they realize social relations, representing a unity of different social roles, predetermined by their social position, professional activity, and specific situation.

Thus, analysis of the use speech etiquette formulas in the English and Ukrainian communicative situations showed that they are characterized by both universal traits and national and cultural peculiarities.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

Communication is a complex multidimensional process of establishing and developing contacts between people that is accompanied by the needs of joint activities and includes information exchange, elaboration of unified strategy of interaction, perception and understanding of another person.

Etiquette belongs to those phenomena of culture that are determined by social norms, situationally determined character and national peculiarities. Usage of ready-made formulas and clichés is interrelated with speech etiquette that accompanies communication at each stage. The choice of speech etiquette formulas by which interlocutors seek to begin, continue and successfully complete verbal interaction, are regulated by the knowledge of speech norms of communication. And this, in turn, gives grounds to assert that speech etiquette is an important communicative and pragmatic characteristics of speech in any linguistic culture.

Speech etiquette is an important component of communication, established by the society order of communicative behaviour in a particular situation, manners of interpersonal interaction, accepted in a certain environment. Due to the repeated usage etiquette formulas are formed in the language of a society in sustainable etiquette expressions resembling clichés. Since the dominant role in expressing respectful attitude towards people belongs to speech, speech etiquette is an integral part of interpersonal interaction.

Speech etiquette is a spiritual, cultural and moral specimen of behaviour. As part of the national culture, it has its own functions, is fixed but sometimes changes in a manner acceptable to the members of the community, since it does not exist beyond time and space.

Speech etiquette is a stereotyped phenomenon; it implies the repetition of the same structures in typical situations. Stereotypical mental model of linguistic etiquette is based on the triad “ethnos – language – culture”. Since each nation has

its own mentality and hence different culture and values, speech etiquette of each nation is different.

The concept of speech etiquette is closely connected with politeness, which affects the conventions of communicative behaviour of the English and Ukrainians, whose interpretation of politeness is sometimes different. The English believe that politeness is a manifestation of attention to the feelings and needs of all people and the Ukrainians understand politeness as a manifestation of obeisance only to those whom they know and who they communicate with.

Ukrainians tend to use positive politeness strategies, evaluation of the wishes of the addressee and affirmation of the interests of the communicants, which is expressed by lexical, syntactic and grammatical means, such as names, diminutives and degrees, for instance, the superlative degree of adjectives.

The British tend to use negative politeness strategies, which are implemented in interpersonal pragmatic presupposition of communicants regarding their social status and social roles, level of formality, expressed by vocatives, hedges, mitigation, indirect speech acts, means of normalization and impersonalization.

In general, communicative politeness in English and Ukrainian is expressed both lexically and grammatically or by their combination. The English use more grammatical means, such as Subjunctive mood, modal phrases, tag-questions which involve the interlocutor into discussion, adverbs, modal words, direct address, etc.

English etiquette formulas mostly do not carry any lexical load, but have a purely formal character, while the Ukrainian clichés include more polite words and expressions, among them there are those which semantic centre contains the root *добр*, *здоров*, *ласк*, that cannot be translated word by word in the English language. The English language is rich in temporal forms, which help to express different shades of meaning. The language is clearly structured and the choice of etiquette formula depends entirely on the communicants and communicative situation.

RÉSUMÉ

Дипломна робота досліджує проблему етикетної мовленнєвої поведінки, яка регулюється правилами мовленнєвого етикету в типових комунікативних ситуаціях англійської та української культур. Ця проблема є актуальною сьогодні в умовах виходу України на міжнародну арену та встановлення і розвитку культурних зв'язків з іншими країнами. Знання формул мовленнєвого етикету інших країн та правила їх вживання сприяє успішному міжкультурному спілкуванню.

Об'єктом даної роботи виступають засоби мовленнєвої ввічливості у міжкультурному спілкуванні. Предметом – мовленнєвий етикет та формули англійського та українського мовленнєвого етикету, які вживаються в типових комунікативних ситуаціях.

В ході написання роботи ці цілі були досягнуті. Був здійснений аналіз етикетних формул та їх семантичні, синтаксичні, стилістичні, прагматичні та екстралінгвістичні ознаки, які впливають на їх вибір, що забезпечує успішне міжкультурне спілкування.

Дипломна робота складається зі вступу, двох розділів та висновків до кожного з них, загальних висновків, списку використаних джерел. У **першому розділі** розглянуто основні теоретичні підходи до вивчення мовленнєвого етикету. Проаналізовано функції мовленнєвого етикету, а також особливості поведінки мовців в комунікативних ситуаціях спілкування.

Другий розділ присвячено вирізненню національних особливостей етикетної мовленнєвої поведінки англійців та українців, аналізу етикетних мовленнєвих актів в типових комунікативних ситуаціях та визначенню основних засобів вираження мовленнєвого етикету в реалізації комунікативних стратегій позитивної та негативної ввічливості у міжкультурному спілкуванні.

В результаті дослідження можна зробити наступний **висновок**: мовленнєвий етикет – це сукупність мовленнєвих засобів, які регулюють поведінку мовців в процесі мовлення. Він є одним із показників міжособистісних відносин у мові, важливим компонентом культури та невід’ємною частиною загальної системи етичної поведінки у суспільстві. Знання мовленнєвого етикету різних культур допомагає адекватно реагувати на сигнали іншої мови і культури та сприяє досягненню успіху в міжкультурному спілкуванні.

Таким чином, у дипломній роботі викладено комплексний підхід до вивчення мовленнєвого етикету як лінгвокультурного явища, систематизовано засоби його вираження за допомогою мовленнєвих кліше в англійській та українській мовах та продемонстровано їх комунікативно-прагматичні аспекти.

Ключові слова: етикет, мовленнєвий етикет, етикетні мовленнєві формули, учасники спілкування, комунікативна ситуація, мова, культура, ввічливість.

LIST OF REFERENCE MATERIALS

1. Аасама И. *Как себя вести*. Таллин: Валгус, 1972. 220 с.
2. Акишина А. А. *Русский речевой этикет*. Москва: Рус. яз., 1978. 183с.
3. Березович Е. Л. *Язык и традиционная культура: Этнолингвистические исследования*. Москва.: Индрик, 2007. 600с.
4. Богдан С. К. *Мовний етикет українців: традиції і сучасність: монографія*. Київ: Рідна мова, 1998. 475 с.
5. *Беседы и суждения Конфуция*. под. ред. Р. В. Грищенко. Санкт-Петербург: Кристалл, 1999. 1120 с.
6. Васильев Л. М. *К вопросу об экспрессивности и экспрессивных средствах*. Славянский филологический сборник. 1962. Вып. 9а. 118с.
7. Веремьев А. А. *Введение в культурологию: учебное пособи*. Брянск: Курсив, 2000. 248с.
8. Ветрова Е. С. Звертання пане, пані, добродію, добродійко в українському мовному етикеті . *Лінгвістичні студії: Зб. наук. праць*. Вип. 15. Донецьк: ДонНУ, 2007. 351–355 с.
9. Габелко О. М. Категорія ввічливості як складова мовного етикету в сучасній англійській мові. *Наукові записки Національного університету «Острозька академія». Серія: Філологічна*. Вип. 23. 2012. 39-41 с.
10. Герцогська Н. О. Англійський мовленнєвий етикет: комунікативно-прагматичний аспект. *Наукові записки. Серія «Філологічна»*. Острог: Видавництво Національного університету «Острозька академія». Вип. № 37. 2013. 85-86 с.
11. Гольдин В. Е. *Этикет и речь*. Саратов, 1978. 111 с.
12. Гольдин В. Е. *Речь и этикет*. Москва: Просвещение, 1983. 109с.
13. Городецкий Б. Ю. *От лингвистики языка – к лингвистике общения. Язык и социальное познание*. Москва.: Центр. совет филос. (методол.) семинаров при Президиуме АН СССР, 1990. 39-56 с.

14. Грайс Г. П. Логика и речевое общение. Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. Вып. 16. Лингвистическая прагматика. Москва: Прогресс, 1985. 218–226 с.
15. Делик І. С. Семантико-лексичні та граматичні особливості англійського мовленнєвого етикету. Актуальні проблеми філології та перекладознавства. Хмельницький, 2016. Вип. № 10. 189-194 с.
16. Демина Т.С. *Фразеология английских пословиц и поговорок: учебное пособие*. Москва: ГИС, 2004. 128 с.
17. Дмитрук Л. Особливості українського мовленнєвого етикету. *Науковий вісник Миколаївського національного університету імені В. О. Сухомлинського. Серія: Педагогічні науки*. Вип. 1. 2016. 273-277 с.
18. Дорда С. В. Комунікативно-прагматичні особливості висловлювань, що передають каяття (на матеріалі англійської мови): дис. ... канд. філол. наук: 10.02.04. Київ, 1996. 164 с.
19. Гриценко Т. Б., Т.Д. Іщенко, Т.Ф. Мельничук. *Етика ділового спілкування: навч. посібник*. Київ: Центр учбової літератури, 2007. 344 с.
20. Зорина Л. Ю. *Вологодские диалектные благопожелания в контексте традиционной народной культуры: монографія*. Вологда: ВГПУ, 2012. 216 с.
21. Киселюк Н. П. Особливості взаємодії вербальних і невербальних компонентів комунікації при маніфестації емоцій у художньому англомовному дискурсі. *Наукові записки Національного університету «Острозька академія». Серія «Філологічна»*. Вип. 46. Луцьк, 2014. 90-92 с.
22. Киселёва Л. А. Вопросы теории речевого воздействия. Ленинград, 1978. 160 с.
23. Корольов І. Р. Відображення національно-ціннісних орієнтирів у комунікативній поведінці різномовних інтерактантів. *Studia Linguistica: зб. наук. пр.* Київ: ВПЦ «Київський університет», 2011. Вип. 5. Ч. 2. 286–291 с.
24. Кочерган М.П. *Загальне мовознавство: підручник*. Київ: Академія, 2003. 464 с.

25. Ларина Т. В. Категория вежливости и стиль коммуникации. Сопоставление английских и русских лингвокультурных традиций. Москва: Рукописные памятники Древней Руси, 2009. 512с.
26. Манакін В. М. Контрастивна лексикологія і національна – мовна картина світу. *Матеріали Всеукр. конф. «Проблеми зіставної семантики»*. Київ: КДЛУ. 1995. 20-22 с.
27. Маслова В. А. *Лингвокультурология*. Москва: Академия, 2001. 208 с.
28. Миронюк О. М. *Історія українського мовного етикету. Звертання: монографія*. Ін-т укр. мови НАН України. Київ: Логос, 2006. 167с.
29. Некоз А.В. Особенности обращения в английском и русском речевом этикете. Казань: Молодой ученый. 2017. № 19. Ч. 4. 414-416.
30. Олійник В. В. Спілкування як комунікативний феномен: соціально-психологічні аспекти. *Вісник Національного університету оборони України* 2. Вип. 2 (33). Київ, 2013. 266-269 с.
31. Павловская А. В. *Особенности национального характера итальянцев, англичан, немцев, норвежцев и финнов, американцев*. Москва: МГУ имени М. В. Ломоносова, 2007. 172 с.
32. Пентилюк І. С. Мовний етикет та його роль у вихованні підлітків. *Наукові записки. Серія «Психологія і педагогіка»*. Вип. 18. 2011. 210-215 с.
33. Приветствие. Восточнославянский фольклор: Словарь научной и народной терминологии. Минск, 1993. 478 с.
34. Радевич-Винницький Я. К. *Етикет і культура спілкування: навч. посіб.* Київ: Знання, 2006. 291с.
35. Рыченкова Л. А. Социокультурная компетентность как важная составляющая профессиональной культуры учителя иностранных языков. Актуальные проблемы лингводидактики и лингвистики: сущность, концепции, перспективы: *Материалы международной научно-практической конференции: тез.конф.* Волгоград: Парадигма, 2008. 144-148с.
36. Соколец І.І. Мовленнєвий етикет як складова підготовки вчителя іноземної мови: навч. посібник. Київ: Вид. центр КНЛУ, 2006. 134 с.

37. Стельмахович М. Г. Теорія і практика українського національного виховання: посібник для вчителів початкових класів та студентів педагогічних факультетів. Івано-Франківськ: Лілея НВ, 1996. 180с.
38. Стернин И. А. *Русский речевой этикет*. Воронеж, 1996. 73 с.
39. Ступин Л. П. *Современный английский речевой этикет*. Ленинград: Изд-во Ленингр. ун-та, 1980. 143с.
40. Сусов И. П. *Введение в теоретическое языкознание*. Москва: АСТ: Восток-Запад, 2007. 379 с.
41. Телия В. Н. *Человеческий фактор в языке: Языковые механизмы экспрессивности*. Москва: Наука, 1991. 214с.
42. Фабіан М. П. Етикетна семантика в лексичних системах української, англійської та угорської мов: дис. ... доктора філол. наук: 10.02.15. Ужгород, 1998. 378с.
43. Формановская Н. И. *Вы сказали: «Здравствуйте!»*. Речевой этикет в нашем общении. 3-е изд. Москва: Рус. язык, 1989. 160 с.
44. Формановская Н. И. *Культура общения и речевой этикет*. Москва, 2005. 55 с.
45. Формановская Н. И. О функциях речевого этикета и его единиц. Русский язык за рубежом. Вып. №3. 1979. 72-74 с.
46. Формановская Н. И. *Речевой этикет*. Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь. Москва: Советская энциклопедия, 1990. 687 с.
47. Формановская Н. И. *Речевой этикет и культура общения*. Москва, 1989. 159 с.
48. Формановская Н. И. *Русский речевой этикет: лингвистический и методический аспекты*. Москва: Рус. язык, 1982. 126 с.
49. Формановская Н. И. *Русский речевой этикет: лингвистический и методологический аспекты*. Москва, 1987. 158 с.
50. Цивьян Т. В. *К некоторым вопросам построения языка этикета*. Труды по знаковым системам. № 2. Тарту, 1965. 144-149 с.

51. Шутова М. О. Мовленнєвий етикет як система координат у міжособистісній і міжкультурній комунікації. *Вісник Київського національного лінгвістичного університету*. Серія : «Філологія». Київ: Вид-во КНЛУ, 2013. Т. 16. № 1. 134-142 с.
52. Aijmer K. *Conversational Routines in English: Convention and Creativity*. London & New York: Longman, 1996. 268 p.
53. Attardi G., Simi M. Communication across Viewpoints. *Journal of logic, language and information*. Vol. 7. 1998. № 1. 53-75 p.
54. Ervin-Tripp S. *Is Sybil there? The structure of some American English directives*. *Language in Society*. № 5. 1976. 25-66 p.
55. Greere A. L. *Politeness as communicative strategy: Greetings*. *Studia Universitatis Babeş-Bolyai*. Vol. 4. 2005. 11-22 p.
56. Halliday M. A. K. *Language structure and language function*. J. Lyons ed. *New horizons in linguistics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1970. 140-165 p.
57. Jakobson R. *The Framework of language*. East Lansing: University of Michigan Press, 1980. 132 p.
58. Naterop B. J. *Telephoning In English*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997. 135 p.
59. Owen M. *Apologies and Remedial Interchanges: A study of Language Use in Social Interaction*. New York: Mouton Publishers, 1983. 192 p.
60. Penrose R. *The Emperor's New Mind. Concerning Computers, Minds, and the Laws of Physics*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989. 466p.

LIST OF ILLUSTRATION MATERIALS

61. Бердник О. *Вогнесміх*. Текст: роман-феєрія. Київ.: Тріада-А, 2006. 557с.
62. Винниченко В.К. Чорна Пантера і Білий Медвідь / В.К.Винниченко – 2014. Retrieved from: http://ukrlit.org/vynnychenko_volodymyr_kurylovych/chorna_pantera_i_bilyi_medvid
63. Волошин Б. *Політ золотої мушки*. Текст: зб. оповідань. Львів: Вид-во Старого Лева, 2016. 314 с.
64. Гнатко Д. *Душа окаянна*. 2017. Retrieved from: <https://www.litres.ru/darina-gnatko/dusha-okayanna/chitat-onlayn/>
65. Драч І.Ф. *Криниця для спраглих*. Текст: кіносценарії, вірші, інтерв'ю та ст. на тему кіно: упорядкув., прим., комент., фільмогр. та післямова С. Тримбача. Київ: Мистецтво, 2010. 478с.
66. Іваничук Р. *Журавлиний крик*. 2006. Retrieved from: <https://www.ukrlib.com.ua/books/printit.php?tid=7156&page=31>
67. Кацай О. *Зона досяжності*. 2017. Retrieved from: <http://avidreaders.ru/read-book/zona-dosyazhnost.html>
68. Кобилянська О. *Апостол черні*. Текст: повість: у 2 т.: авт. вступ. ст. та упоряд. М.Крупа. Інститут національного відродження України, Редакція книжково-журнальних видань ОП ТВПК «Збруч». – Тернопіль: Збруч, 1994. 320 с.
69. Луа Л. *Високі міні*. 2017. Retrieved from: https://andronum.com/index.php?dispatch=products.download_fragment2&product_id=13273
70. Мейгеш Ю.В. *Срібна земля*. 1996. Retrieved from: <https://books.google.com.ua/books?id=aBEYAQAAlAAJ&q=Sribna+zemli>
71. Нечуй-Левицький І. *Над Чорним морем*. 2017. URL: http://ukrlit.org/nechui_levytskyi_ivan_semenovych/nad_chornym_morem/33

72. Франко І. *Рябина*. 2017. Retrieved from: <http://www.ukrlib.com.ua/books/printit.php?tid=3804>
73. Хвильовий М. *Сині етюди*. Текст: новели, оповідання, етюди: упоряд. і передм. І.Ф.Драча. Київ: Радянський письменник, 1989. 424с.
74. Чайковський А. *Олюнька*. Текст: оповідання з життя Ходачкової шляхти. 4. вид. New York: Howerla, 1957. 319с.
75. Чайковський А. *Сагайдачний*. 2017. Retrieved from: <http://www.ukrcenter.com/>
76. Шевченко Н. *Подвійні міражі*. Текст: роман. Харків.: Книжковий Клуб «Клуб Сімейного Дозвілля», 2013. 269с.
77. Шкляр В. *Чорне сонце*. 2015. Retrieved from: <http://bukva.mobi/vasil-shklyarchorne-sonce.html>
78. Anderson G.C. *Loving Agape*. 2014. Retrieved from: <https://books.google.com.ua/books?id=3tK6AwAAQBAJ&pg=PT45&lpg=PT4dq>
79. Carrol L. *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*. 2003. Retrieved from: <http://www.literaturepage.com/read/throughthelookingglass-61.html>
80. Dickens Ch. *David Copperfield*. 2006. Retrieved from: <http://www.literaturepage.com/read/davidcopperfield.html>
81. Jeffers R. *Darcy's Temptation: A Sequel to Jane Austen's Pride and Prejudice*. 2009. Retrieved from: https://books.google.com.ua/books/about/Darcy_s_Temptation.html
82. Lawrence D.H. *Sons and Lovers*. 2006. Retrieved from: <http://www.learnlibrary.com/sons-lovers/>
83. Leupp G. P. *Male Colors*. 1997. Retrieved from: https://books.google.com.ua/books/about/Male_Colors.html
84. Snow C. P. *The New Men*. 2006. Retrieved from: https://books.google.com.ua/books/about/The_New_Men.html
85. Stevens A. *Gallagher Justice*. 2015. Retrieved from: https://books.google.com.ua/books/about/Gallagher_Justice.html

86. Toynbee W. *The diaries of William Charles Macready*. Ulan Press, 2012. 586p.
87. Warren V. *Girl On a Dolphin* . 2015. URL: <http://bigbook.online/ad/girl-on-a-dolphin-by-vic-warren.pdf>

LIST OF INTERNET RESOURCES

88. Приветствие на английском/Greeting. Retrieved from: <http://www.anglofeel.ru/>
89. Кулішенко Л., Чечота Т. Мовленнєвий етикет та ментальність українців. *Збірник наукових праць*. Вип.4. 2013. 269-274 с. Retrieved from: http://www.irbisnbuv.gov.ua/cgi-bin/irbis_nbuv/cgiirbis_64.exe?C21COM=2&I21DBN=UJRN&P21DBN=UJRN&IMAGE_FILE_DOWNLOAD=1&Image_file_name=PDF/sfr_2013_4_28.pdf
90. Английские и русские категории вежливости, различия в стратегиях общения. «Лингво Плюс». Retrieved from: <http://www.lingvo-plus.ru/>.
91. Советский энциклопедический словарь. ред. А.М.Прохоров. Москва: Советская энциклопедия, 1979. 1600с.
92. Вежливые и ласковые обращения на английском языке. Retrieved from: <http://www.study.ru/>.
93. Английские и русские категории вежливости, различия в стратегиях общения. Сайт бюро переводов «Лингво Плюс». Retrieved from: <http://www.lingvoplus.ru/>.
94. Засоби вираження ввічливості при звертанні. Retrieved from: <http://uastudent.com/zasoby-vyrazhennja-vvichlyvosti-pry-zvertanni/>