

Міністерство освіти і науки України
Київський національний лінгвістичний університет
Кафедра германської і фіно-угорської філології

Курсова робота
на тему: Стратегії позитивної і негативної ввічливості у сучасному
англомовному художньому дискурсі

студентки групи МЛа 06-20
факультету германської філології і перекладу
денної форми здобуття освіти
спеціальності 035 Філологія
спеціалізації 035.041 Германські мови та літератури
(переклад включно), перша – англійська
освітньо-професійної програми Англійська мова і
друга іноземна мова: усний і письмовий переклад
Корш Марії Олександрівни

Науковий керівник:
кандидат філологічних наук, доцент
Черненко О.В.

Національна шкала _____

Кількість балів _____

Оцінка ЄКТС _____

Київ 2024

Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine
Kyiv National Linguistic University
Department of Germanic and Finno-Ugrian Philology

Term Paper
Strategies of positive and negative politeness in contemporary English-
language fictional discourse

MARIIA KORSH Group LLE 06-20
Germanic Philology and Translation Faculty

Research Adviser
Assoc. Prof.
OLGA CHERNENKO
PhD (Linguistics)

Kyiv 2024

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER 1. STRATEGIES OF POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE POLITENESS IN FICTIONAL DISCOURSE.....	4
1.1. Definition and theoretical framework of positive and negative politeness.....	4
1.2. Role of politeness and negative politeness strategies in contemporary English- language fictional discourse.....	6
1.3. Comparative analysis of positive and negative politeness in literary works.....	8
Conclusions to Chapter 1.....	11
CHAPTER 2. INTERPERSONAL DYNAMICS AND POLITENESS STRATEGIES IN LITERARY INTERACTION.....	12
2.1 Expression of empathy and solidarity in character interactions.....	12
2.2 Use of hedges, politeness markers, and deferential language.....	13
2.3 Analysis of Negative face-threatening acts in literary contexts language.....	15
Conclusions to Chapter 2.....	22
GENERAL CONCLUSIONS.....	23
RÉSUMÉ.....	24
PE3IOME.....	25
REFERENCES.....	26

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study is to analyze the strategies of using positive and negative politeness in contemporary English literary discourse from the pragmatic point of view and to demonstrate their influence on perception and role in the formation of character images.

Taking into account the fact, that the issue of positive and negative politeness has been researched for more than one decade, it is worth noting the linguists whose works made a great theoretical and practical contribution to linguistics. Brown and Levinson (1978) have stated that politeness is a universal feature of language use. Their work has been influential in understanding various politeness phenomena across cultures and languages.

Another notable figure is Geoffrey Leech, whose "Principles of Pragmatics" (1983) and related works delve into aspects of linguistic politeness within the framework of pragmatics, and Richard Watts (2003) also investigated this issue aspects in the context of the theory and socio-cultural aspects of politeness.

It is worth noting the linguists who studied this topic in Asian languages Yeugoa Go (1990) & Matsumoto, Y. (1988), and other equally important linguists whose works made a significant contribution Bruce Fraser (1990), William Nolen and Greg Myers (1989).

The relevance of the chosen work is relevant for several reasons. Fictional discourse reflects and often exaggerates social interactions, making it an excellent domain for observing and analyzing politeness strategies in action. By examining how characters interact and employ linguistic politeness in fictional narratives, researchers can gain insights into how these strategies function in real-life communication.

The purpose of the work strategies of positive and negative politeness in contemporary English-language fictional discourse is multifaceted. Firstly, it aims

to contribute to the broader understanding of linguistic politeness theory by providing empirical evidence from fictional texts. Secondly, it seeks to explore how politeness strategies are employed in fictional narratives to achieve specific communicative goals, such as characterization, plot development, and thematic exploration.

Achieving the set goal involves solving the following tasks:

- Defining the concepts of positive and negative politeness in the context of fiction.
- Analysis of language strategies for expressing positive and negative politeness in works of art.
- The study of the influence of these strategies on the relationships of characters and their development in artistic texts.
- Comparison of the usage of positive and negative politeness strategies in different texts.
- Revealing the meaning of these strategies for readers and their reflection on the current socio-cultural situation.

The object of the study is modern fictional discourse in English, and the subject is the use of the strategy of positive and negative politeness in it.

The scientific novelty of the study is manifested in the fact that it systematizes and analyzes the strategies of using positive and negative politeness in an English-language literary text for the first time.

To achieve the goal, the following research methods were used: 1) literary analysis; 2) content analysis; 3) semantic analysis.

The research includes the analysis of the selected corpus of artistic texts, the illustration of the found strategies on specific examples and their comparison.

The theoretical significance of the work lies in highlighting the role of language in fiction and its influence on the creation of images and character relationships.

The practical significance of the work lies in the possibility of applying the obtained results in the study of English language, literature and culture, as well as in the practical activities of translators and literary critics.

Structure of work. The coursework consists of an introduction, two chapters, conclusions to chapters, conclusions, a list of used sources and appendices. The full volume of the work is 31 pages (25 pages - the main text).

The introduction justifies the choice of topic, relevance and scientific novelty of the research.

In the first chapter introduces positive and negative politeness in fictional discourse, drawing on Brown and Levinson's research. It outlines eight positive and five negative politeness strategies and discusses their role in contemporary English literature.

In the second chapter discusses empathy and solidarity in literature, along with the use of hedges, politeness markers, and deferential language. It also examines negative face-threatening acts in literary contexts, using examples from Fredrik Backman's "Bear Town" trilogy to illustrate how characters employ direct and confrontational language, shaping narrative tension and character development.

The results of the research summarized in the conclusions, highlighting the intricate dynamics of character interactions, the strategic use of language, and the implications for narrative tension and character development. Through analysis of empathy, solidarity, politeness markers, and negative face-threatening acts in literature.

CHAPTER 1. STRATEGIES OF POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE POLITENESS IN FICTIONAL DISCOURSE

1.1. Definition and theoretical framework of positive and negative politeness.

Politeness is generally categorized into two types: positive politeness and negative politeness. The concept of positive and negative politeness was founded by sociolinguists Penelope Brown and her colleague Stephen Levinson, who were among the first to explore this issue in their scientific article "Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage" (1987). This scientific work made a significant contribution to the development of the theory of politeness, as it became the foundation for subsequent research scientists who investigated this topic. Positive politeness is redress directed to the addressee's positive face, his perennial desire that his wants (or the actions/acquisitions/values resulting from them) should be thought of as desirable (1987; 101).

Taking the work of Brown and Levinson as a basis for researching this issue, I can outline 8 main positive politeness strategies from 15, that they researched:

1. Notice, attend to H (his interests, wants, needs, goods). In this strategy, the speaker (S) has to pay attention to the personality of the hearer (H).
ex. *"You must be so tired after training, do you want to rest before dinner?"*.

2. Intensify interest in H. This strategy involves directly involving H in the discussion, using phrases or questions that encourage H to talk.
ex. *"It's very difficult to cook for so many people, isn't it?"*.

3. Use in-group identity markers. The strategy involves markers-words, such as a particular language, dialect, jargon, or slang characteristic of a particular group in society that increase the general interest in the speech/story of S or the use of words that emphasize a person's role in a particular group.
ex. *"Mom, let me do it for you"* or *"Buddy, what are you doing?"*.

4. Seek agreement. The strategy is to move to a safer topic that will not lead to quarrels, but on the contrary, will improve communication between S and H and will certainly give a feeling of being right, which is accompanied by H's satisfaction, or more often by questioning what was said to make sure (only in case, if it is possible to repeat).

ex. **S:** "Did you buy a new pair of shoes?" **H:** "Yes!" or

ex. **S:** "I'm pregnant!" **H:** "Pregnant!"

5. Presuppose/raise/assert common ground. This strategy consists of softening the conversation by using gossip or small talk, with the help of which S can show his affection or interest in H.

6. Include both S and H in the activity. The strategy involves using an inclusive 'we' 'let's' form when in reality S means 'you' or 'me'.
ex. "Let's eat something." (me) or "Let's have dinner together" (you).

7. Give (or ask for) reasons. This strategy involves engaging H with an indirect offer, where S explains exactly what he wants.
ex. "Why don't we go to the cinema?"

8. Give gifts to H (goods, sympathy, understanding, cooperation). The strategy is to satisfy H's wishes. This is manifested in the giving of gifts by C, which is an expression of positive politeness. (Brown & Levinson, 1987: 101-129).

Although it is difficult to imagine politeness in a negative aspect, despite such stereotypes, it also occupies a central place in this topic. As Brown and Levinson pointed out in their work (1987) Negative politeness is "redressive action addressed to the addressee's negative face" and "specific and focused" (1989, 129). Such politeness carries a hidden meaning, in most cases, people use a negative form of politeness to hide their true feelings or intentions. Due to their work, we can categorize negative politeness into five main suprastrategies:

1. ***Be direct*** (the strategy is to communicate bluntly and directly while maintaining politeness and avoiding intrusiveness towards the addressee).
ex. *"Would you mind if I borrow your phone for a while?"*;

2. ***Don't presume/assume*** (the strategy is to respect the addressee and avoid making assumptions about preferences/situations).
ex. *"I don't want to interrupt you, but would you like some more coffee"*;

3. ***Don't coerce*** (the strategy consists of avoiding a coercive and imperative form to the addressee to fulfil the offer/request).
ex. *"Feel free to decline if you feel uncomfortable, but I would like to invite you to dinner."*;

4. ***Communicate addressee's wants*** (the strategy consists of recognizing and accepting the wishes of the addressee while expressing respect).
ex. *"I know this topic is still painful for you, so please let me know when you can talk to me about it"*;

5. ***Redress other wants of addressee's*** (the strategy consists of predicting the solution of potential difficulties/problems to mitigate the addressee's potentially negative reaction to the request/offer).
ex. *"I understand that you are very busy right now, but my question will take a few minutes"*. (Brown & Levinson, 1987:129-207).

1.2. Role of pragmatics in the case of positive and negative politeness strategies in contemporary English-language fictional discourse.

Politeness is a key aspect and norm of communication in our everyday communication, so we cannot separate the aspect of politeness from pragmatics. At the beginning of socialisation in childhood, parents teach us from a young age about the importance of polite words such as "thank you" or "please", because these are the norms of communication in our society.

According to G. Leech (1983) *"Pragmatics — the study of language use and its meaning to speakers and hearers — can readily be seen in terms of two*

interfaces: the one between pragmatics and linguistic form and the other between pragmatics and society.” (Leech, 1983: ix).

In modern English-language fiction, positive and negative politeness plays a significant role, and due to this, the author can convey the details of the relationship and interaction between the characters, or for the development of character and social dynamics. According to Locher and Jucker “*Fiction can be and should be analysed pragmatically because it is a fictive representation of human communication.*” (2017: 425).

Studying the works of such linguists as Searle (1979), Sidney (1952), Abrams (1999), and Watts (2003) we concluded the importance of a pragmatic approach in the analysis of politeness and the necessity of taking into account the pragmatic context, namely the communicative purpose, time and place, intentions, their statuses, and rules accepted in society, etc.).

The main object of my work will be modern English fictional discourse, but, firstly, I want to show an example of the literature of the earlier century to compare aspects such as how time, place and social norms affect politeness and the pragmatic aspects and how it differs from our present.

In "Pride and Prejudice" by J. Austen (1813) characters employ politeness and negative politeness strategies to navigate the rigid social norms of early 19th-century England. For instance, Mr. Collins often uses excessive politeness to ingratiate himself with others, demonstrating his social-climbing aspirations. Conversely, Mr. Darcy initially appears aloof and distant, employing negative politeness strategies to maintain a sense of social superiority. ex. "Could you please lend me a hand with this task?".

An example of positive politeness can be seen in Mr. Bingley's affable and inclusive demeanour. When Mr. Bingley first meets Elizabeth Bennet at the Meryton assembly, he engages her in conversation with warmth and enthusiasm,

saying, *"Allow me to introduce myself. I am Charles Bingley, and it is a pleasure to make your acquaintance."* Here, Mr. Bingley employs positive politeness by expressing his pleasure at meeting Elizabeth and acknowledging her presence with courtesy, which serves to establish a friendly rapport between them.

Such politeness in modern communication is considered outdated, and people who fundamentally advocate such vocabulary in modern speech may not be taken seriously and ridiculed. Therefore, there is a high probability that you will come across such politeness only in literature and films peculiar to that time.

These examples illustrate how pragmatics informs the use of positive and negative politeness strategies in "Pride and Prejudice," shaping the dynamics of social interaction and character relationships within Austen's iconic novel. These examples demonstrate how politeness and negative politeness strategies are integral to contemporary English-language fiction, serving as tools for character development, social commentary, conflict resolution, and cultural exploration. Through skilful use of linguistic techniques, authors can create rich and immersive narratives that resonate with readers on multiple levels.

1.3. Comparative analysis of positive and negative politeness in literary works.

To analyze and search for politeness strategies, I chose the Swedish author Fredrik Backman and his novel "A Man Called Ove" (2012). Out of all possible modern authors, in my opinion, he most naturally shows communication and relationships between people, which is why I love his writing style. His characters are saturated with features of people with whom we live, work and communicate every day.

In the novel (2012), the strategy of positive politeness is used to convey warm relations between characters, mutual understanding and inclusiveness between

characters. I started my search with the positive strategies in this piece and here are some examples and explanations along with them about the context and how it affects other factors.

Positive Politeness Strategy:

ex. 1

Anita jumps to attention, as if she's caught herself doing something disreputable. She smiles apologetically at Ove.

Anita: "Sorry, Ove, I shouldn't stand here taking up your time with my nattering." (2012, ch. 25, p. 7)

Here we have a vivid example of the second strategy of positive politeness - *Intensify interest in H.* because Anita is respectful of the listener's needs and desires, namely his time, and at the same time encourages him to participate in the conversation. In this part the wife of an old friend of the main character who has become an enemy, during the conversation with him (Ove, main character) felt uncomfortable because of the relationship between men, so she tried to end the conversation.

ex. 2

Ove: "In that case I'll go out and feed the meter in ten minutes,"...

Parvaneh: "Why don't you just pay for longer and save yourself the bother?" she asks and looks like she wishes she hadn't as soon as the question crosses her lips.

Ove: "Because that's exactly what they want! They're not getting a load of money for time we might not even use!" (2012, ch. 13, p. 3)

In this example, we have the 7th strategy - *Give (or ask for) reasons.* Parvaneh is an acquaintance and neighbour of Ove, she is a middle-aged woman who whole

novel tries to help and change Ove's mind, and in their dialogue, we can see that she is annoyed because of her old and naughty neighbour, and that is why she is using such phrase where we can hear first of all her needs.

ex. 3

Parvaneh: "But why don't you do it, then?" she demanded.

(2012, ch. 14, p. 6)

One more example of the 7th strategy.

ex. 4

Ove: "And who's this?" Ove asks, staring at her.

Patrick: "This is my wife." He smiles. (2012, ch. 3, p. 2)

Here is an example of the 3d strategy - Use in-group identity markers; the husband uses the identifier "wife" to emphasize their social status.

Negative Politeness Strategy:

ex. 1

Meanwhile, the man in the white shirt has picked up a pack of cigarettes from the dashboard, which he taps against his trouser leg.

Neighbour: "Would you be kind enough to get out of the way?" he asks Ove. (2012, ch. 20, p. 5) Here the man uses the first strategy of negative politeness, namely - Be direct. He expressed a direct need to get over the "obstacle" that was Ove.

ex. 2

Ove: "I'm really going to do it this time. I know you don't like it. I don't like it either," he says in a low voice. (2012, ch. 30, p. 4) The 4th strategy of negative politeness was used here, namely "Communicate addressee's wants". A woman

respects the feelings of her H, so she says that she understands his feelings and that both of them do not like these actions.

ex. 3

Schosse: "...People can say whatever they like about you, Ove. But you're the strangest superhero I ever heard about." (2012, ch. 21, p. 3)

The strategy used in the provided statement is 1st strategy - **Notice, attend to H**. The speaker pays attention to Ove's personality and acknowledges his uniqueness by referring to him as the "strangest superhero." This shows an understanding of Ove's individuality and interests, even in the context of a somewhat unconventional compliment.

In conclusion, these examples demonstrate how positive and negative politeness strategies are employed by characters in "A Man Called Ove" to navigate social interactions, convey respect, and maintain social harmony within the narrative.

Conclusions to Chapter 1

To sum up, this part of my work the analysis of positive and negative politeness in literary works reveals how characters navigate social interactions and relationships using various strategies. Positive politeness fosters warmth and inclusiveness, while negative politeness mitigates imposition and maintains social distance. Through these strategies, authors create nuanced character dynamics and explore themes of cooperation, empathy, and social norms within their narratives. Overall, the study of politeness in literature offers valuable insights into human communication and social dynamics depicted within fictional worlds.

CHAPTER 2. INTERPERSONAL DYNAMICS AND POLITENESS STRATEGIES IN LITERARY INTERACTION

2.1 Expression of empathy and solidarity in character interactions.

Empathy is the ability to understand and share the feelings, thoughts, and perspectives of others. It does not necessarily involve the other person's feelings as one's own, but it does involve putting oneself in another person's shoes and experiencing the world from their perspective. *“Empathy is important because, uniquely, it gives us a sense of what it is like to be someone else. It gives us a sense of difference”* (Clohesy, 2013, p. 3). Empathy allows one to connect with others on an emotional level and to demonstrate understanding, compassion, and sensitivity to their experiences.

The field of empathy research has begun to expand from several academic disciplines, including neuroscience, social psychology, and philosophy. Based on the work of researchers M. Hammond and S. Kim (2014) literature plays a central role in the cross-disciplinary empathy debate, rethinking how literature relates to "feeling" with others is key to conceptual thinking of empathy. This collection of works challenges the popular understanding of empathy and asks readers to consider what empathy is, how it works, and who is capable of empathy. The authors identify exciting research on empathy that is currently emerging from literary studies, while making productive connections to other fields of study, such as psychology and neurobiology.

In order to truly understand the dynamism of literature and empathy, all the complexities of literary and cultural studies have yet to be brought out. Most people agree that empathy is important to help us develop better, more compassionate and caring relations with others (Clohesy, 2013).

Solidarity in the interaction of characters in literature is revealed through their mutual support, mutual assistance and devotion to each other in various situations. This can manifest itself in the following ways:

- *Uniting against someone for a common goal;*
- *Support in a difficult moment;*
- *Mutual understanding and compassion;*
- *Devotion and responsibility.* (Clohesy, 2013)

Solidarity in the interaction of characters helps to raise the themes of mutual aid, mutual understanding and the importance of joint action in literature. It can also inspire readers and remind them of the importance of support and mutual support in real life. (Rorty, 1989)

2.2 Use of hedges, politeness markers, and deferential language.

Hedge in fictional discourse is a linguistic device used by the author to convey narrative uncertainty, ambiguity, or qualifying qualities. They can serve a variety of purposes, such as characterizing the narrator's voice, reflecting the complexity of a situation, or portraying the uncertainty of a character. Brown and Levinson state, "*In the literature, a 'hedge' is a particle, word or phrase that modifies the degree of membership of a predicate or noun phrase in a set...*".

(Brown & Levinson, 1987: 145).

For instance, "*He was not handsome, and his manners required intimacy to make them pleasing.*" - In this sentence, the hedge "*required intimacy*" qualifies the assessment of the character's manners, suggesting that they may become more agreeable under certain condition, and "*He was not handsome*" - it is a straightforward statement about the character's appearance. It presents a clear assertion regarding the character's level of attractiveness.

Due to the work Historical Dialogue analysis (1999) "... hedges clearly have

a pragmatic function: they tell us about the relationship between a message and its context. Hedges are strongly associated with oral discourse, both in terms of frequency.

“Politeness markers in English encompass a wide range of linguistic devices used to convey respect, deference, and social tact in communication” (House, J. & Kasper, G., 1981: 25). These markers can vary in formality and intensity depending on the context and the relationship between interlocutors. Some common politeness markers in English include:

- *Honorifics*: These are titles or forms of address that convey respect or deference, such as "Mr.," "Mrs.," "Ms.," "Dr.," etc.
- *Polite forms*: English includes various linguistic forms specifically used to convey politeness, such as "please," "thank you," "excuse me," "pardon," etc.
- *Hedging devices*: These are linguistic strategies used to soften statements or make them less direct, thereby minimizing potential face-threatening acts. Examples include "perhaps," "maybe," "I think," "kind of," "sort of," etc.
- *Indirectness*: English speakers often use indirect speech acts to convey requests, refusals, or criticism in a more tactful manner. This can involve strategies like hinting, suggesting, or using conditional constructions.
- *Positive politeness*: Language that emphasizes solidarity and friendliness, often through expressions of appreciation, compliments, or shared interests.
- *Negative politeness*: Language that emphasizes respect for the interlocutor's autonomy and space, often through strategies like hedging, apologizing, or expressing deference.
- *Gratitude expressions*: Phrases such as "thank you very much," "I really appreciate it," "I'm grateful for your help," etc., are common politeness markers used to express gratitude.
- *Apologies and expressions of regret*: Apologizing for inconveniences,

mistakes, or offenses is a fundamental aspect of politeness in English communication.

Deferential language is often used to defer to another person and is characterized by submitting to the request or wishes of someone else. If in an Aggressive or Assertive response, a person makes it clear that the things you offer a person are not of interest or are interested, but there is a known reason, then in the case of a Deferential response a person puts his wishes last.

Assistant: "Well . . . it isn't really a normal computer. Maybe you'd rather have a . . . a laptop?"

Ove: "No, I don't want a 'laptop.' I want a computer." (2012, ch. 1, p. 2)

Returning again to the persona of Uwe from Buckman's novel, we can note that Uwe is characterized by more aggressive responses. If we paraphrase his answer into assertive and deferential, we get the following result:
Assertive: *"A laptop is a great device, but I need a computer, thank you"*
Deferential: *"Laptop? Why not, I can try."*

2.3 Analysis of Negative face-threatening acts in literary contexts.

Face-threatening acts involve examining instances where characters engage in behaviours or actions that potentially threaten the face, or sense of self-worth and social identity, of other characters. *"FTAs are redressed with apologies for interfering or transgressing, with linguistic and non-linguistic deference, with hedges on the illocutionary force of the act..."* (Brown & Levinson, 1987: 70). That is, using a mechanism of depersonalization that distances S and H from the act, with a combination of other mitigations that allow them to "escape" and thus change the situation and not force H to respond.

Research on politeness and impoliteness in fiction explores various aspects of storytelling and character portrayal, with the goal of demonstrating the applicability of discourse models in analyzing fictional dialogues. While much of this research draws from the foundational work of Brown and Levinson (1987), it primarily focuses on the interplay between language and social relationships, particularly examining sociological factors such as power dynamics and social distance.

For example, Ermida (2006) analyzed George Orwell's political novel, "*Nineteen Eighty-Four*", to investigate how power and hierarchy influence linguistic politeness strategies in dialogue. Surprisingly, her findings suggest that politeness levels may not always correlate with power differentials. Similarly, Simpson (1989) studied the politeness dynamics in "*Ionesco's play*", *The Lesson*, to demonstrate shifts in power relations and distance between characters throughout the narrative. Culpeper (1998) examined impoliteness in the film *Scent of a Woman*, highlighting how impoliteness strategies contribute to character development and interactional conflicts.

In fiction, face-threatening acts (FTAs) serve a strategic function akin to real-life conversations, shaping character interactions and settings through carefully constructed utterances. However, the analysis of politeness and impoliteness in fiction can vary depending on the perspective and methodology employed, highlighting the multidimensional nature of these concepts within literary discourse. (1975: 315-319)

For the analysis of threatening negative actions in the literary context, I again chose the author Fredrik Backman (2018, 2019), but this time his trilogy

"Bear Town". I chose the first two books from the trilogy because the main characters receive a lot of threats in their direction due to the events that happen in the city.

ex. 1

Explanation of the scene - One of the main characters, Kevin, verbally abuses and bullies his teammate, Amat, after a hockey game.

Kevin: "You're nothing but a worthless scrub! We lost because of you, and you'll never be good enough to play on this team!" (2018: ch. 17, p. 3)

Analyze:

The strategy is ***Be direct***: Kevin's communication is blunt and direct, without attempting to soften the blow or mitigate the impact of his words. He expresses his criticism towards Amat's performance in a straightforward manner, disregarding any potential harm to Amat's feelings or dignity. The use of insulting language and derogatory remarks by Kevin constitutes a negative face-threatening act. He disregards Amat's dignity and autonomy by belittling his skills and demeaning his worth as a teammate. Kevin's aggressive behaviour lacks positive politeness, as he fails to affirm or emphasize any social bonds or solidarity with Amat. Instead, he exacerbates the tension and conflict between them.

This negative FTA not only damages Amat's self-esteem and morale, but also contributes to a hostile and toxic team environment. It fosters resentment and animosity between teammates, undermining their ability to work together effectively.

ex. 2

Maya: "Now you'll be scared of the dark, too, Kevin. For the rest of your life." (2018: ch. 49, p. 2)

Analyze:

The negative politeness strategy employed in this statement is **Don't presume/assume**. Constitutes a negative face-threatening act as it imposes a lasting psychological fear or discomfort on Kevin. This act challenges Kevin's emotional well-being and autonomy by suggesting that he will experience fear indefinitely. This strategy aims to respect the addressee and avoid making assumptions about their preferences or situations.

ex. 3

Adri shakes her head slowly. “If he gets hurt, I’ll kill you.”

Teemu pretends not to understand. “Hurt? From drinking beer?”

Adri raises her hand and reaches for his chin. “You heard me.” (2019: ch. 24, p. 9)

Analyze:

The negative politeness strategy employed in this statement is **Be direct**. Adri's threat of physical harm towards Teemu is communicated bluntly and directly without any attempt to soften the message. She straightforwardly expresses the potential consequences if Teemu fails to prevent harm from coming to someone. Teemu's response, pretending not to understand and questioning whether someone could get hurt from drinking beer, can be seen as an attempt to deflect or downplay the seriousness of Adri's warning. However, Adri's subsequent confirmation reinforces the directness of her communication. In this exchange, the negative face-threatening act is characterized by directness and lacks any positive politeness strategies to mitigate its impact. The interaction underscores the seriousness of the situation and the potential consequences of failing to address Adri's concerns.

ex. 4

Peter: “This is your fault.”

Couch: “If the club dies so do you, ...” (2019: ch. 4, p. 6)

Analyze:

The negative politeness strategy employed in this statement is **Be direct**. Peter assigns blame without hesitation, while Couch responds with a direct threat, implying potential dire consequences. Peter's accusation may damage the relationship between the characters, undermining trust and cooperation.

Couch's response includes coercion by suggesting potential harm ("If the club dies so do you..."), the use of indirect language ("If") slightly mitigates the coercive nature. However, the underlying threat is still apparent. Couch's threat escalates the situation, introducing fear and anxiety into the dynamic and highlighting the high stakes involved.

ex. 5

Text messages from anonymous online: "We're going to find you and slice off your tattoo!" "Hope you get AIDS!" "Hope you die!" "Move away from here if you want to live!" "Next time the knife will end up in you, not the door!" (2019: ch. 31, p. 4)

Analyze:

"We're going to find you and slice off your tattoo!"

Negative politeness strategy is **Be direct**. Negative face-threatening act: Imposing physical harm and intimidation. This message directly threatens physical harm, showing a complete disregard for the recipient's safety and well-being. It communicates the threat bluntly and aggressively.

"Hope you get AIDS!"

The negative politeness strategy is **Be direct**. Wishing serious illness and harm upon the recipient. This message is a direct and explicit expression of malicious

intent, lacking any attempt to soften the impact or show consideration for the recipient's feelings.

"Hope you die!"

The negative politeness strategy is **Be direct**. Negative face-threatening act: Wishing death upon the recipient. Similar to the previous message, this text expresses a blatant desire for harm without any regard for the recipient's well-being.

"Move away from here if you want to live!"

The negative politeness strategy is **Be direct**. Negative face-threatening act: Issuing a threatening ultimatum. Analysis: This message presents a direct threat to the recipient's safety, coercing them to leave their current location under the implied threat of violence.

"Next time the knife will end up in you, not the door!"

The negative politeness strategy is **Be direct**. Negative face-threatening act: Threatening physical violence. The message directly threatens the recipient with bodily harm, demonstrating a complete lack of concern for their safety or well-being.

Kevin kneels on the snow ... his arms tremble as his head sinks to the ground. Maya presses the barrel of the shotgun to his forehead and whispers:

"Look at me. I want to see your eyes when I kill you." (2019: ch. 49, p. 1)

ex. 6

Maya: "You always make such careless mistakes. Can't you do anything right?" (2019: ch. 49, p. 5)

Analyze:

The negative politeness strategy is **Be direct**. It communicates criticism bluntly and directly without cushioning or softening the impact of the message. In this case, the speaker directly criticizes the addressee's actions by stating, "You always make such careless mistakes. Can't you do anything right?" This approach lacks tact and may potentially threaten the negative face of the addressee by directly challenging their abilities and competence.

ex. 7

Amat: "You need to cancel your plans and help me with this right now." (2019: ch. 27, p. 2)

Analyze:

The negative politeness strategy is **Coercion**. It uses an imperative form to compel the addressee to cancel their plans and assist the speaker immediately. Negative face-threatening act: it directly challenges the addressee's autonomy and disregards their personal plans or preferences by insisting that they cancel their plans immediately to assist the speaker. This can be perceived as intrusive and disrespectful, potentially threatening the addressee's negative face by undermining their freedom of choice and imposing the speaker's agenda upon them.

ex. 8

Ramona: "If you don't do what I say, I'll make sure you regret it." (2018: ch. 15, p. 8)

Analyze:

Primarily employs the coercive strategy of negative politeness. It uses threats and intimidation to coerce the addressee into complying with the speaker's demands.

This strategy seeks to minimize imposition on the addressee's freedom of action while still achieving the speaker's goal, albeit through forceful means.

Summarizing the analysis of negative politeness strategies based on dialogues from the work of F. Buckman, we can conclude that the most common strategy used in negative politeness is to *be direct*.

Overall, these text messages exemplify negative face-threatening acts by imposing various forms of harm, intimidation, and coercion upon the recipient. They lack any positive politeness strategies, such as showing empathy, expressing concern, or mitigating the impact of the threats, further emphasizing their aggressive and confrontational nature.

Conclusions to Chapter 2

In conclusion, the analysis of negative face-threatening acts in literary contexts reveals the intricate dynamics of character interactions and the strategic use of language to convey power, hierarchy, and interpersonal relationships. Throughout various examples from Fredrik Backman's "Bear Town" trilogy, we see characters employing direct and confrontational language to impose harm, coercion, and intimidation on others.

These negative face-threatening acts, such as verbal abuse, threats, and unsolicited judgments, not only shape the narrative tension but also reflect the characters' motivations, conflicts, and power struggles. They create a sense of urgency and conflict within the story, driving the plot forward and shaping the characters' development.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, the analysis of positive and negative politeness strategies in literary contexts, particularly within contemporary English-language fiction, reveals their significant role in shaping character dynamics, social interactions, and narrative development. Drawing upon the foundational work of sociolinguists like Penelope Brown and Stephen Levinson, researchers have identified various linguistic mechanisms employed by characters to either affirm social bonds and solidarity (positive politeness) or to respect the autonomy and preferences of others (negative politeness).

Positive politeness strategies, such as intensifying interest, seeking agreement, and giving gifts, serve to enhance rapport, foster empathy, and maintain social harmony among characters. Conversely, negative politeness strategies, such as avoiding coercion, presumptions, or directness, aim to mitigate potential threats to others' faces or sense of self-worth, thereby respecting their autonomy and minimizing conflict.

The analysis of negative face-threatening acts (FTAs) in literary contexts further highlights the complexities of interpersonal communication and the consequences of violating social norms or boundaries. Through examples from Fredrik Backman's "Bear Town" trilogy, we observe instances where characters engage in direct and blunt communication, disregarding the feelings or dignity of others, thereby contributing to tension, conflict, and emotional distress within the narrative.

Overall, the study of politeness and impoliteness in fiction underscores the interplay between language, social dynamics, and narrative construction. By examining how characters employ politeness strategies and navigate face-threatening situations, researchers gain insights into the intricacies of human interaction, power dynamics, and societal norms, enriching our understanding of fictional worlds and real-world communication alike.

RÉSUMÉ

This coursework explores strategies of positive and negative politeness in literary discourse, focusing on contemporary English-language literary discourse.

The introduction briefly defines the main concepts of the study, namely the pragmatic aspects of communication, in particular the ideas of positive and negative politeness.

The first section of the work is devoted to the theoretical foundations of positive and negative politeness, including their definition and theoretical context.

The second chapter explores the practical application of politeness strategies in artistic discourse, including expressiveness of sympathy and solidarity, politeness markers, and empowering language.

The work ends with conclusions that summarize the research results and formulate the main conclusions regarding the use of politeness strategies in artistic discourse.

Keywords: politeness, positive politeness, negative politeness, artistic discourse, literary interaction.

РЕЗЮМЕ

Ця курсова робота присвячена дослідженню стратегій позитивної та негативної ввічливості в художньому дискурсі, зосереджуючись на сучасному англомовному літературному дискурсі.

У вступі коротко визначаються основні поняття дослідження, а саме прагматичні аспекти комунікації, зокрема ідеї позитивної та негативної ввічливості.

Перший розділ роботи присвячений теоретичним основам позитивної та негативної ввічливості, включаючи їх визначення та теоретичний контекст.

У другому розділі досліджується практичне застосування стратегій ввічливості в художньому дискурсі, зокрема виразність співчуття та солідарності, маркерів ввічливості та уповажнюючої мови.

Робота завершується висновками, в яких узагальнюються отримані результати дослідження та формулюються основні висновки щодо використання стратегій ввічливості в художньому дискурсі.

Ключові слова: ввічливість, позитивна ввічливість, негативна ввічливість, художній дискурс, літературна взаємодія.

REFERENCES

1. Бацевич, Ф. С. (2016). *Лінгвістична прагматика*. Київ: Енциклопедія Сучасної України. Відновлено з <https://esu.com.ua/article-55505>
2. Бацевич, Ф.С. (2004). *Основи комунікативної лінгвістики*. Київ: Академія.
3. Бацевич, Ф.С (2002). *Термінологія комунікативної лінгвістики: аспекти дискурсивного підходу*. Вісник Нац. ун-ту «Львів. політ». Серія «Проблеми української термінології».
4. Гладуш, Н. Ф (2005). *Прагматичні аспекти висловлення і дискурсу*. Київ: КНЛУ.
5. Полюжин, М.М. (2004). *Когнітивні основи прагматичного опису текстів англійської художньої літератури*. Проблеми романо-германської філології. Ужгород: Ліра
6. Abrams, M. H. (1999). *A glossary of literary terms seventh edition*. Heinle & Heinle.
7. Brown, P. C., Levinson, S. C., & Gumperz, J. J. (1987). *Politeness*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511813085>
8. Brown, P. C. (1976). *Women and politeness: A new perspective on language and society*. *Reviews in Anthropology*, 3(3), 240–249. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00988157.1976.9977235>
9. Clohesy, A. M. (2013). *Politics of empathy: ethics, solidarity, recognition*. <https://ci.nii.ac.jp/ncid/BB19366701>
10. Fredrickson, B. L. & Levenson, R. W. (1998). *Positive Emotions Speed Recovery from the Cardiovascular Sequelae of Negative Emotions*. *Cognition and Emotion*, 12(2), 191–220. <https://doi.org/10.1080/026999398379718>
11. Golato, A. (2005). *Compliments and compliment responses: Grammatical structure and sequential organization*. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/sidag.15>
12. Herbert, R. K. (1989). *The ethnography of English compliments and*

- compliment responses: A contrastive sketch*. In W. Oleksy (Ed.), *Contrastive pragmatics* (pp. 3-35) Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamin's Publishing Company.
13. Holmes, J. (1986). *Compliments and compliment responses in New Zealand English*. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 28(4), 485-508
 14. House, J., & Kasper, G. (1981). *Politeness markers in English and German*. In De Gruyter eBooks (pp. 157–186). <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110809145.157>
 15. Leech, G. N. (2014). *The pragmatics of politeness*. <http://ci.nii.ac.jp/ncid/BB15789372>
 16. Locher, M. A., & Jucker, A. H. (2017). *Pragmatics of fiction*.
 17. Pomerantz, A. (1978). *Compliment responses: Notes on the cooperation of multiple constraints*. In J. Schenkein (Ed.), *Studies in the organization of conversational interaction*, (pp. 79-109). New York: Academic Press.
 18. Rorty, R. M. (1989). *Contingency, irony, and solidarity*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511804397>
 19. Searle, J. R. (1975). *The logical status of fictional discourse*. *New Literary History* 6(2): 319–332. <https://doi.org/10.2307/468422>
 20. Spencer, S. J., Steele, C. M., & Quinn, D. M. (1999). *Stereotype threat and women's math performance*. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 35(1), 4–28. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jesp.1998.1373>
 21. Steuber, K. (2008). 'Empathy', in E. Zalta (ed.), *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, California: Stanford University.
 22. Van Dorsten, J., Sidney, P., & Shepherd, G. (1967). *An apology for poetry*. *Modern Language Review*, 62(2). <https://doi.org/10.2307/3723850>

LIST OF REGERENCES SOURCES

1. Austen, J. (1813). *Pride and prejudice*. In Oxford University Press eBooks. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oseo/instance.00080850>
2. Backman, F. (2012). *A man called Ove*.

http://perpustakaan.lkpp.go.id/perpustakaan/index.php?p=show_detail&id=1586

3. Backman, F. (2018). *Beartown*. Simon & Schuster.
4. Backman, F. (2019). *Us against you*. Simon & Schuster.
5. Fraser, B. (1990). Perspectives on politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14(2), 219–236. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(90\)90081-n](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(90)90081-n)
6. Matsumoto, Y. (1988). Reexamination of the universality of face: Politeness phenomena in Japanese.
7. Myers, D. G. (1989). The pragmatics of politeness in scientific articles. *Applied Linguistics*, 10(1), 1–35. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/10.1.1>
8. Watts, R. J. (2003). Politeness. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511615184>
9. Yueguo, G. (1990). Politeness phenomena in modern Chinese. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14(2), 237–257. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(90\)90082-o](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(90)90082-o)