

Within the framework of this research work, the quantitative correlation of methods of translating phraseological units of the cycle of stories "Martian Chronicles" into Russian was also analyzed according to the classification of A.V. Kunin. As described above, in accordance with the typology of A.V. Kunin, there are two types of translation methods: phraseological and non-phraseological. The first type includes the method of full and partial equivalents, and the second type – overtone translation, literal translation (calculus) and descriptive translation. If it is impossible to translate, it is possible to omit phraseology.

As a result of the analysis, we came to the conclusion that T. N. Shinkar and L. L. Zhdanov used phraseological methods in 69% of cases (45 FE out of 65) and non-phraseological methods of translation in 31% of

cases (20 FE out of 65) when recreating the cycle of stories "Martian Chronicles".

References

1. Apresyan Yu. D., Botyakov V.V., Latyshev T.E. English-Russian synonymic dictionary. Moscow: Russkiy yazyk, 1979. 544 p.
2. Bradbury R. Martian Chronicles. Moscow: Eksmo; St. Petersburg: Domino, 2012. 304 p
3. Dmitriev D. V. Explanatory dictionary of the Russian language. Moscow: Astrel: AST, 2003. 1578p.
4. Kunin A.V. Course of phraseology of the modern English language. Moscow: Publishing center "Phoenix", 1996. 381 p.
5. Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary. Cambridge University Press: Third Edition, 2012. 1699p

INDIRECTNESS AS AN EFFECTIVE STRATEGY OF POLITE BEHAVIOUR IN W. S. MAUGHAM'S "THEATRE"

Vardanyan L.,

*PhD in Philology, Associate Professor
Chair of Foreign Languages and Literature
Vanadzor State University*

Paremuzyan A.

*EFL/ESL Instructor
Chair of Foreign Languages and Literature
Vanadzor State University*

Abstract

Nowadays, one of the key aspects of interpersonal communication is polite behaviour towards the interlocutor achieved in various ways, namely through indirect speech acts. The present paper highlights the importance of indirectness or vagueness as a manifestation of polite behaviour while telling someone to do something from a perspective of negative politeness. A considerable amount of attention is paid to indirect requests which primarily aim at saving the hearer's negative face through mitigating face threatening acts (FTAs). The appropriate degree of politeness in indirect speech acts largely depends on some social scales, more specifically, Distance, Power and Rank of imposition. The higher the weightiness of imposition is, the politer the indirect request is supposed to be.

Keywords: indirect request, 'tell-someone-to-do' utterance, positive and negative face, face threatening acts, negative politeness, vertical and horizontal distance, cost-benefit scale, optionality.

In modern world, which significantly lacks mutual understanding and compromise, the ability to convey one's thoughts, ideas or desires clearly and appropriately without any attempt of imposition on others' wishes or actions is of great significance. While interacting with others we may have various intentions the realizations of which very often depend not only on ourselves as speakers but also on a number of linguistic and extralinguistic factors which vary considerably from context to context. These two levels which are reciprocally dependent on each other are equally important to better understand different manifestations of the three metafunctions of the language (ideational, interpersonal, textual), which Halliday ascribes to grammar [4, 38-39]. These metafunctions are intricately intertwined and serve as a solid base to better perceive the world around us (ideational metafunction); to express different viewpoints, feelings, attitudes and emotions when communicating with others (interpersonal metafunction); and to arrange the propositional content

into a coherent whole (textual metafunction) [2, 4]. Accordingly, the aim of any communicative act differs, as do its manifestations and interpretations. In order to make the communication process more collaborative and effective we need to follow some basic conversational norms and principles characteristic of different situational contexts. Herein lies the importance of the Cooperative Principle with its four Maxims (the Maxims of Quantity, Quality, Relation and Manner) put forth by P. Grice [3, 42]. However, the extent to which these maxims are to be followed or violated by the participants is primarily determined and regulated by certain circumstances. Surprising though it may seem, a full or partial infringement of this or that maxim is justified when interlocutors are obliged to sound less cooperative than is required for the sake of politeness or speech etiquette, both of which act as discourse-regulating devices especially when it comes to the right use of the language and its tools in a specific situation and environment. Thus, depending on the purpose of com-

munication, the speaker's intent and the relations between the interlocutors, thoughts and intentions may be expressed directly or indirectly. However, deciding on the appropriate level of indirectness and formality is not as easy as it seems to be especially when it comes to making orders and requests. A small unintentional and careless overestimation or underestimation of polite behaviour required for a specific context may turn an intended request into an unacceptable order or vice versa. An excessively polite request may indirectly imply a tinge of irony or sarcasm, thereby having a more adverse effect on the hearer than an explicitly expressed order. Hence, developing 'the art of making appropriate requests' is vitally important since it serves as a powerful engine that 'regulates and guides' any 'tell-someone-to-do' utterance.

The purpose of the present article is to discuss some aspects of indirectness as a key ingredient of polite behaviour the different expressions of which will be analysed in speech acts drawn from Maugham's "Theatre". The theoretical basis for our analysis is the Politeness Principle proposed by Leech and the Politeness Theory put forth by Brown and Levinson. Politeness is a culture-specific phenomenon which serves as a 'behaviour-measurement tool' the right application of which determines the level of acceptable behavior conducive to the circumstances and conditions of a specific situation or event. Politeness is culture-specific as something that is considered to be polite in one culture may be looked upon and perceived as absolutely impolite or unacceptable in another. Though it is not easy to draw a clear-cut demarcation line between polite and impolite behavior, the former generally presupposes a tactful, modest and kind attitude towards others. However, politeness should be 'handled' carefully and purposefully because any inadvertent use of it may arouse surprise, disapproval or may even lead to misunderstanding between interactants. To this end, deciding on the right amount of politeness appropriate to a certain situation comes to the fore. For instance, in cases of emergency, politeness should take a back seat since the message conveyed directly can be far more important and appropriate than politely and rather tentatively expressed warning or urgent advice.

As regards indirectness, it is a way of conveying messages through hints and can therefore serve as a means of achieving politeness. The higher the level of indirectness, the politer the interlocutor may seem. The main concept underlying polite behaviour is that of 'face'. According to Goffman 'all competent adult members of a society possess 'face' – the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself' [qtd. in 1, 61]. They differentiate between negative face and positive face. Negative face presupposes the desire of an individual that his actions not be hindered by others, whereas positive face is the wish of a person that his actions be approved of by others. Any type of communication between interactants may contain threats to a person's negative or positive face, thereby violating their expectations of not being impeded or approved of. Hence, depending on the fact whether they threaten a person's positive or negative face, face threatening

acts (FTAs) can correspondingly be positive or negative. Speech acts that may threaten a person's negative face include, but are not limited to, orders, requests, suggestions, threats, and warnings. Those that threaten one's positive face may include expressions of disapproval, criticism, disagreements, etc. Thus, in order to make communication efficient it is preferable to avoid doing FTAs or mitigate those acts by following some strategies. So, a speaker can do the FTA baldly on record (with no redress) or off record (indirectly). One way of avoiding doing an FTA baldly on record is the use of a redressive action which can be achieved through positive and negative politeness. We will mainly focus on negative politeness throughout our analysis since it is more related to indirectness in communication. The main purpose of negative politeness is to save the hearer's (H's) negative face. It aims at making the utterance more 'respect-oriented' and maximizes social distancing. Brown and Levinson distinguish the following linguistic realizations of negative politeness:

- Conventional indirectness
- Hedges on illocutionary force
- Polite pessimism
- The emphasis on H's relative power [1, 130].

Conventional indirectness aimed at saving H's negative face may be achieved through indirect speech acts in which the syntactic structure of an utterance with its semantic representation and pragmatic interpretation may vary. Hence, interrogative sentences can be used to make assertions, and imperative forms can be used to make requests.

The degree of politeness in indirect speech acts, more specifically in indirect requests, heavily depends on some extralinguistic factors, which are out of the realm of linguistics. Such factors include the following social dimensions or scales proposed by B&L: D (Distance), P (Power) and R (Rank of imposition) with the help of which the weightiness of imposition can be estimated. Leech offers the following terms for the above-mentioned parameters: vertical distance (P), horizontal distance (D) and cost-benefit (R) [7, 138]. Vertical distance indicates the social status relationship between the interlocutors. The language used shows whether the person the speaker addresses to is seen as superior or equal. Horizontal distance stands for social distance which indicates the degree of familiarity between the interlocutors based on some social factors such as social class, gender, age, etc. As far as the cost-benefit scale is concerned, it estimates the benefit for or the cost to S (speaker) or H brought by the utterance. Politeness suggests minimizing the cost and maximizing the benefit to S or H. According to Leech 'the more power O (other person) holds over S (speaker), the more socially distant O is from S and the more costly E/A (event/action) is to O, the more tact (i.e. imposition-mitigating politeness) is required by the situation.' [7, 139].

There are two other scales proposed by Leech that can also serve as operators of polite behaviour. These include optionality and indirectness scales. Optionality scale estimates the degree of choice that the addressee is given. The politer the utterance is, the more choice the person involved in it has.

Thus, the appropriateness of any polite indirect request depends on the weightiness of imposition in terms of D, P and R. If the conversation is between people who know each other very well and have close relations, it is not always appropriate to be very indirect. On the other hand, being negatively polite and indirect can be vital if the distance and power between interlocutors is considerably great.

Another point requiring attention is the fact that requests may be not only O-oriented but also S-focused. In the latter case, some action by S is proposed. This kind of utterance can be considered a request for permission [7, 140]. Such cases occur for the sake of politeness and indirectness by excluding O's role as an agent, though this can serve as an implicit way of having O perform the action for S.

On-record indirect strategies proposed by Leech can be carried out not only through questions but also through statements. However, if S uses a statement to convey a directive, he gives O less optionality compared to the cases when S uses a question for the same purpose. Accordingly, when a question is used to have O do A, more optionality is given to O; as a result, the politeness scale is higher, too.

Another way of mitigating a directive speech act and making the utterance more polite is the use of pragmatic modifiers which are different means of 'hedging the illocutionary force on H'. As Leech puts in: "Pragmatic modifiers increase the complexity of the request, and also its optionality factor". The more optionality factors are applied, the more polite a request will sound. Pragmatic modifiers are divided into internal and external. In our paper, we will mainly touch upon internal modifiers including, but not limited to, downtoners (*perhaps, maybe, possibly* etc.), deliberative openings (*I wonder*'), appreciative openings (*I'd be grateful if...*, *We'd really appreciate it if...*), hedged performative openings (*May/Could I ask/beg...*), negative bias, use of unreal past tense, use of progressive aspect, tag questions.

As can be seen from the points discussed above, politeness may be achieved through indirectness in various ways depending on the strategies used and the pragmatic scales applied to measure 'the amount of politeness' that is required or appropriate for a certain social interchange. Some of the aspects of indirect polite behaviour will be analysed more thoroughly in the following examples.

(1) (*Michael/Julia/Accountant-young man (Tom) at Julia and Michael's house*)

JULIA: "**I wonder if we could persuade you to come and eat a chop with us.**

Michael will drive you back after lunch."

(The young man blushed again and his Adam's apple moved in his thin neck.)

TOM: "*It's awfully kind of you.*"

(He gave his clothes a troubled look.)

TOM: "*I'm absolutely filthy.*"

JULIA: "*You can have a wash and brush up when we get home.*" [9, 4]

(2) (*Tom at Julia and Michael's house*)

TOM: "**I was wondering if I might have a piece of bread.**"

JULIA: "*Of course.*" [9, 6]

(3) (*Tom/Julia on the phone after she had received flowers from him and written him a note*)

JULIA: "*It was very sweet of you,*" she answered in her own voice.

TOM: "**I suppose you wouldn't come to tea with me one day, would you?"**

The nerve of it! She wouldn't go to tea with a duchess; he was treating her like a chorus girl. It was rather funny when you came to think of it.

JULIA: "*I don't know why not.*"

TOM: "*Will you really?"* his voice sounded eager. [9, 65]

(4) (*Michael/Julia*)

(She knew that it was no good suggesting that he should come back to

Middlepool. Jimmie Langton would not have him.)

MICHAEL: "**You wouldn't like to come with me, I suppose?"**

(Julia could hardly believe her ears.)

JULIA: "*Me? Darling, you know I'd go anywhere in the world with you.*" [9, 37]

In the examples mentioned above, the indirect requests, though different in form, are manifestations of formal requests varying in 'the portion of polite behaviour' preconditioned by the use of pragmatic modifiers and contextual factors. However, one aspect that all these examples share is the use of different degrees of politeness. Another point worth mentioning is that in all the four cases the act of telling someone to do something is carried out by either asking or persuading H to do A.

In example 1, Julia makes an indirect request with the deliberative opening (*I wonder*) to make the suggestion politer as Julia and Tom aren't in close relationship. There is a vertical and horizontal distance between them, as Julia is a co-owner of a theatre as well as an outstanding actress, whose fame and wealth cannot be compared to those of Tom's, who is an ordinary accountant and rents a rather poor apartment. If viewed from the cost-benefit perspective, having dinner at Michael and Julia's place is, first and foremost, to Tom's benefit. However, the fact that Tom blushes and starts feeling awkward because of his filthy clothes presupposes some cost to Tom, too. So, Julia is somehow indirect in her invitation to a rather social dinner party for the sake of Tom's negative face. Julia uses a declarative sentence (syntactic level) which expresses an indirect request (semantic level) and the FTA is mitigated in order to give Tom more optionality (pragmatic level). As is seen from the response, Tom accepts the invitation indirectly, too. Another point worth mentioning here is the fact that Julia is being far too polite while trying to 'persuade' someone from a low social class to have dinner with them as if it were more beneficial to her than to Tom himself. On the one hand, her "marked" polite behaviour may be explained by the fact that she is a really good actress or someone demonstrating extremely good manners irrespective of the fact with whom she is interacting. On the other hand, it can be inferred that she probably expects to have some benefit from Tom, too, which becomes obvious in the course of time, when they start meeting more often.

The conversation in example 2 takes place at the dinner table. Tom makes an indirect request through a statement (*I was wondering if I might have a piece of bread*) in which FTA is mitigated with the aim of giving Julia more optionality. As regards the cost/benefit scale, the act supposes more benefit to Tom with more cost on Julia. However, Tom tries to convert the benefit to himself and the cost to Julia by being politely indirect in his request, thus giving more optionality to her and eliminating the cost to her. Politeness is enhanced through a deliberative opening in the past progressive (*I was wondering*), thus creating rather a distancing effect and redressing the FTA addressed to S's negative face. The use of a subjunctive form (*I might have...*) immediately following the past progressive also serves the same objective, thus making the FTA less imposing. The main reason for being indirect and polite is the existing distance and power between Tom and Julia already discussed above. This speech act can be viewed as a request for permission in which the 'tell-someone-to-do' utterance presupposes a request for 'letting-someone-do-something'.

Example 3 is another conversation between Tom and Julia when they still don't know each other well. Here we can see a sample of an indirect request whose politeness is ensured by means of the use of a hedge on the illocutionary force (*I suppose*), negative form (*wouldn't*) and a tag (*would you?*). Tom follows the strategy of being pessimistic assuming that Julia is unlikely to be willing to have tea with him. Some of the reasons for this can be the social distance between them (Julia is famous and wealthy, whereas Tom is a middle-income person), the length of acquaintance which may serve as an indicator for the depth of friendship and close relationship (they have met only once or twice) and also the power that Julia has over Tom. Thus, Julia's negative face preservation by means of negative politeness is mandatory in order to give more optionality to Julia through decreasing the weightiness of the imposition on her, thereby giving her an opportunity to say "No". Tom is undeniably acting in compliance with the politeness rules which Lakoff [5, 293] considers as key ingredients of polite behavior.

In example 4, Michael indirectly asks Julia to join her by biasing the request toward negativeness (the strategy 'Be pessimistic'), which suggests that he doesn't compel Julia to do A. Moreover, Michael assumes that Julia is not likely to do A, thus minimizing the imposition on cost to her and giving her more optionality. The use of negative bias is appropriate in this context as Michael is not always eager to do things that would make Julia really happy as he is not as much in love with her as she is with him. On the syntactic level, this utterance seems absolutely polite since there is no sign of imposition. However, taking into account Michael's real intentions, it can be inferred that on the pragmatic level the 'tell-someone-to-do' utterance presupposes 'making someone do something' as, in fact, Michael politely tries to make Julia give a negative answer.

Based on the above-mentioned analyses it can be stated that on-record FTAs having the form of requests mitigated by different degrees and means of politeness

may imply various manifestations of 'tell-someone-to-do' utterances where they can express persuasion, imposition and even a request for permission. But does this suppose that the same can be asserted about off-record FTAs? Let us consider the examples that follow, where some implicitly expressed speech acts are observed. They are manifestations of off-record FTAs achieved through hints.

(5) (*Michael/Julia- not married yet*)

JULIA: "What is it?"

(*He gave a little laugh of embarrassment.*)

MICHAEL: "Well, dear, you know, my father's rather old-fashioned, and there are some things he can't be expected to understand. **Of course, I don't want you to tell a lie or anything like that, but I think it would seem rather funny to him if he knew your father was a vet. When I wrote and asked if I could bring you down I said he was a doctor.**"

JULIA: "Oh, that's all right." [9, 25]

(6) (*Julia's mother, aunt and Julia*)

(*Julia showed them her clothes, and on the first Thursday after her arrival they discussed what she should wear for dinner. Aunt Carrie and Mrs. Lambert grew rather sharp with one another. Mrs. Lambert thought that since her daughter had evening dresses with her she ought to wear one, but Aunt Carrie considered it quite unnecessary.*)

MRS LAMBERT: "**When I used to come and visit you in Jersey, my dear, and gentlemen were coming to dinner, I remember you would put on a tea-gown.**"

AUNT CARRIE: "**Of course a tea-gown would be very suitable.**"

(*They looked at Julia hopefully. She shook her head.*)

JULIA: "I would sooner wear a shroud." [9, 150]

(7) (*Joan Denver (Roger's friend)/ Julia*)

JOAN: "My greatest ambition is to be in your theatre, Miss Lambert, and **if you could see your way to giving me a little something, I know it would be the most wonderful chance a girl could have.**"

JULIA: "Will you take off your hat?"

(*Joan Denver took the cheap little hat off her head.....*)

JULIA: "What made you think of asking my son to give you a letter to me?"

(*Joan grew red under her make-up and she swallowed before she answered.*)

JOAN: "I met him at a friend's house and I told him how much I admired you and he said he thought perhaps you'd have something for me in your next play."

JULIA: "I'm just turning over the parts in my mind."

JOAN: "I wasn't thinking of a part. **If I could have an understudy - I mean, that would give me a chance of attending rehearsals and studying your technique. That's an education in itself. Everyone agrees about that.**" [9, 127]

What can be inferred from Michael's hesitating and rather evasive answer in example 5 is that Michael wants Julia not to tell his parents that her father is a vet, but doesn't say it directly to avoid doing the FTA baldly on record. The use of a subjunctive form gives redress

to the FTA addressed to Julia's negative face. The reason for avoiding being direct is that Michael and Julia don't have very close relationship with each other yet. As a representative of a family belonging to a higher social rank, Michael understands that her father's 'humiliating or degrading' occupation might somehow hinder Julia from making a good impression on his parents, and, since he wants to marry her and it is her first meeting with his parents, he wants everything to be perfectly favourable for their further relations. From the cost/benefit scale perspective, this might seem beneficial to Michael, yet it is undoubtedly beneficial to Julia, too, as she is madly in love with Michael and it is her who is more excited about marrying him. Analysed from the syntactic point of view, Michael uses a statement, though in fact, he makes an indirect order/request (*Don't tell them that your father is a vet*) and it serves its aim: Julia decodes what is implicated (*Oh, that's all right*) (pragmatic level). Although the FTA is relatively off-record and provides Julia with more optionality, it can be inferred that if we go deep into the matter, we can see that, in fact, Julia is almost unlikely to refuse him for some reasons already discussed above.

As is perceived from example 6, Mrs. Lambert's request is off record, too, and is accomplished by hints. Julia's mother and aunt want her to wear a tea-gown but don't say it directly. They do the FTA indirectly with the aim of imposing on Julia a lot less and giving her more optionality. The use of subjunctive (*would*) makes the utterance more polite. Their indirectness is reasonable owing to the fact that Julia is a famous and independent woman who neither needs nor wants to be given any directions even by her mother. This supposes that irrespective of their good relations the prevalence of horizontal distance between them does not let even her own mother be as demanding as she might be if Julia weren't the person she is now.

In example 7, Joan indirectly asks Julia to give her a chance to play in her theatre or at least be an understudy. She does it somehow off-record to be more polite as the scales of vertical and horizontal distance between them are great; consequently, the rank of imposition should be as low as possible. The great social distance between the interlocutors requires that a lot of optionality be given to Julia. The use of the if-clause with a subjunctive makes the utterance more indirect and polite. The indirect request itself presupposes some cost to Julia, which is lowered as much as possible through indirectness. However beneficial the outcome may seem to Joan, in fact it is more costly on her, which can be explained by the fact that, first of all, Julia is not being polite with her when she tells her to take off her hat. Another proof of this is that she blushes when Julia makes her understand that the fact that she involved Julia's son in the realization of her intentions annoys her. Hence, it becomes apparent that the request is not certain to serve its objective. Thus, an important aspect

to consider here is to distinguish between a "logically well-formed answer" and a "pragmatically appropriate response" to a question [8, 94]. All of these linguistic and extralinguistic regularities of polite behavior analysed above have made it possible to conclude that it is somehow obvious that off-record polite requests also suppose some 'tell-someone-to-do' utterances and if in examples 6 and 7 they infer persuasion, example 5 is apparently a case of imposition which is achieved through carefully constructed polite indirect statements. Another factor worth noticing in example 5 is that the conversation is between Michael and Julia, and the latter is obsessed with Michael, so she would do whatever he said even if he weren't polite in his implicit request. The same cannot be said about her relations with her mother or a young actress of a lower social rank, so she wouldn't even care to think about their requests.

As can be seen from the analyses of the examples, polite behaviour can be expressed through indirectness. The reasons for being indirect and polite can lead to the need for mitigating some FTAs or acting off-record for the sake of the interlocutor's negative face. As far as 'tell-someone-to-do' utterances are concerned, they may infer persuasion, request or imposition depending on the way they are expressed syntactically and deciphered pragmatically.

References

1. Brown, Penelope and Steven C. Levinson, *Politeness: Some Universals in Language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987:129-227.
2. Butt D., Fahey R., et al., *Using Functional Grammar, An Explorer's Guide*, National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research, Macquarie University, 2000:4-5.
3. Grice, H. P., *Logic and conversation*. Syntax and semantics 3: Speech acts, ed. By Peter Cole and Jerry L. Morgan, New York: Academic Press, 1975:41-8.
4. Halliday, M.A.K., *Explorations in the Functions of Language*, London: Edward Arnold, 1973: 38-39.
5. Lakoff, R. T., *The logic of politeness; or, minding your Ps and Qs*. In *Papers from the Ninth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 1973: 292-297.
6. Leech, G. N., *Principles of Pragmatics*. Longman Group Limited. Longman Inc., New York, 1983:8-141
7. Leech, G. N., *The Pragmatics of Politeness*. Oxford University Press, 2014:134-179.
8. Smith, N., and Wilson, D., *Modern Linguistics: The Results of Chomsky's Revolution*, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1979:94.
9. <https://avidreaders.ru/book/theatre.html>