Communicating through the Universe

Communicating through the Universe

Edited by

Nadejda L. Greidina
and Yahya R. Kamalipour

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing

Communicating through the Universe

Edited by Nadejda L. Greidina and Yahya R. Kamalipour

This book first published 2016

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Part 5: Professional Issues of Communication

INTRODUCTION

Dear colleagues and participants of the International Conference "Communicating through the Universe"!

Greetings and welcome to the 8-Conference of the Global Communication Association. My congratulations to **Dr. Nadejda Greidina**, Director of Ethnolinguistics and Communication Studies Research Centre, and President of the Russian Association of Global Communication President of the University **Dr. Alexander Gorbunov**, President of the University; **Dr. Zaur Zurumov**, Vice-President for Sciences; and the members of the organizing committee. It is because of their collective dedication, planning, and coordination that we have gathered here. Please join me in commending and applauding them.

For your information, the Global Communication Association was inaugurated at the Shanghai University, in 2007.

The GCA is intended to:

- Foster and promote academic research in global communication studies;
- Promote academic collaboration among major universities around the world;
- Facilitate joint projects and research opportunities among scholars, re- searchers, and graduate students;
- Facilitate academic collaboration, exchange programmes, and net-working;
- Facilitate joint programmes, grant opportunities, symposiums, and timely initiatives among centers, institutes, and global organisations;
- Explore the myriad opportunities and challenges in the areas of teach- ing, learning, communication development, globalisation, mass media, social media, digital technologies, and international cooperation;
- Hold annual conferences throughout the world in intimate and unique settings.

In the course of this conference, we will explore and discuss a wide range of issues related to communication, culture, language, education, economic, politic, media, new technologies, and globalisation. As you know, globalisation is a vast, dynamic, and multifaceted process that

cannot be easily defined or pinpointed. Nonetheless, it is safe to say that the evolutionary process of globalisation has resulted in the integration of commerce and communication through increased interdependence among nations, decreased trade barriers, and emergence of open markets.

Traditionally, most governmental and non-governmental affairs – at the local, national and international levels – have been conducted vertically (top-to-bottom). But, in view of the growing interdependence among the nations and cultures, we need to speed up the process of shifting from the traditional vertical structure to a horizontal – or better yet – a multidirectional structure through which governmental and non-governmental agencies and organisations can easily share and exchange ideas and information locally, regionally, nationally, and globally.

Fortunately, the internet and the new social media (e.g., Facebook, Twitter, Linkedin, blogs, and Youtube) provide efficient, rapid, and interactive channels for a multi-level (vertical and horizontal) communication structure across the globe. This possibility, in my view, is one of the major advantages of the new information technologies and infrastructures that have digitally interconnected every corner of our globe – or, according to Carl Sagan, "The Pale Blue Dot" in the universe, on which we live. Below is his famous, widely disseminated, and vivid description of the earth:

From this distant vantage point, the Earth might not seem of any particular interest. But for us, it's different. Consider again that dot. That's here, that's home, that's us. On it everyone you love, everyone you know, everyone you ever heard of, every human being who ever was, lived out their lives. The aggregate of our joy and suffering, thousands of confident religions, ideologies, and economic doctrines, every hunter and forager, every hero and coward, every creator and destroyer of civilization, every king and peasant, every young couple in love, every mother and father, hopeful child, inventor and explorer, every teacher of morals, every corrupt politician, every "superstar," every "supreme leader," every saint and sinner in the history of our species lived there – on the mote of dust suspended in a sunbeam.

Accordingly, the 8th Global Communication Association Conference at the Pyatigorsk State Linguistic University is intended to provide a collegial and intimate platform toward enhancing cross-cultural understanding and global collaboration.

Once again, I would like to express my appreciation to the members of the organizing committee, all the participants, and guests. Wishing you all a very engaging, productive, thought-provoking, and memorable conference!

Yahya R. Kamalipour, *Founder & President,*
Global Communication Association Ph.D., Professor

Dear colleagues,

I have the honour to greet all the participants and guests of the 8-th International Conference "Communicating through the Universe" on behalf of the Russian Association of Global Communication.

Firstly, it is important to underline the relevance of this scientific event that allowed us to gather leading researchers in the field of communication studies.

Every year one of the world countries hosts the Global Communication Association Conference. This year it was Russia and the city of Pyatigorsk as it is the home for a famous linguistic university.

The work of the Conference participants is going to be of multidimensional nature, considering a wide range of the issues on formation of communication field development prospects, aiming at the research of global communication questions for consideration and solution.

I hope that all the problems on different aspects of communication raised at the Conference will be successfully analysed and solved. There is every evidence that the Conference will set new goals for the nearest future. No doubt the Conference of such level will promote the interaction between different countries by means of constructive and productive dialogue. The participants of the Conference will have the unique opportunity to demonstrate the new achievements in communication field and share their experiences with the colleagues.

Topical and attracting (from the research point of view) forms and means of investigation problems discussion including video bridges, round table talks, master classes, others are involved within the whole time period of the international forum.

I expect the Conference to strengthen the relations, contacts and cooperation between the Russian Association of Global Communication and Global Communication Association.

I express special gratitude to the administration of Pyatigorsk State Linguistic University, President of Global Communication Association and all the participants of the international scientific event.

I wish all of you success in your professional activities.

Nadejda Greidina
President of Russian Association of Global Communication

PART 1:

LINGUISTIC ASPECTS OF COMMUNICATION

Social Setting and Communication Tonality as Basic Parameters of Linguistic Interaction in the Context of Globalisation

N. Aristova

(Russia, Kazan, Kazan National Research Technical University named after A.N. Tupolev)

Annotation. *The research article considers the interconnection between social setting and communication tonality as key parameters of studying linguistic interaction in the context of a globalised world. It defines the speakers' pragmatic goals and behavioural patterns in a multicultural and multilingual society.*

Codified norms of literary style, present in any language, alongside with the ethical aspect of speech culture, adopted within the given linguistic community, influence the peculiarities of communication among the speakers. In the context of globalisation this assumption is acquiring a different vector, since languages are no longer viewed as static systems, but as dynamic notions, "language-in-motion", according to the spatiotemporal theory of Blommaert (Blommaert, 2010). Globalised communities present multi-layered and ethnically diverse social groups, where conventional rules and laws of language distribution, language acquisition and assimilation are not as clear-cut as most researchers would like them to appear. Drawing generalizations about immigrants' ethnic, cultural and linguistic status often appears to be problematic, as global media offer unlimited access to immigrants' native cultures/languages making the process of assimilation into the recipient cultural and linguistic environment a very uneven and unpredictable one in terms of its

distribution and temporal characteristics. Besides, the socio-economically motivated decision to master the more prestigious majority language (or language variety) offering opportunities of social advancement and other benefits is often affected by subjective factors, which makes the concept of multiculturalism quite difficult to define.

Another vital factor for understanding the concept of speech culture and communication tonality is, undoubtedly, the pragmatic aspect of speech production. According to Ozhegov (Ozhegov, 1974), "speech culture consists not only in following the language norms or in the speakers' ability to find the proper means of expressing the necessary idea", but in their ability to choose the most appropriate, understandable and stylistically adequate language units for the given communicative situation. In Bogin (Bogin, 1986) it was proved that various levels of linguistic competence predetermine the degree of conformity between the speaker's utterances and the requirements of the communicative situation, as well as compliance with the rules of word usage adopted in the given linguistic community. In this respect it is vital to realise that each communication sphere puts forward certain requirements in terms of language usage in accordance with communicative tasks to be solved. However, in the context of globalised multilingual communities the actual variety of languages spoken in the given locality may render this pragmatic choice a more multifaceted and complicated one. The general rule requiring speakers to abstain from harsh, non-motivated deviations from standard literary style in order to achieve their pragmatic goals seems to require certain addition, as a rich linguistic repertoire may be used very differently in various pragmatically-oriented communicative situations.

Tonality of communication is defined according to the relationship of the communicants to each other, to the observers of this communication situation, the setting and the topic of communication. The tonality of communication is not equal to the distance between the interlocutors, however it is largely predetermined by the social statuses of the speaker and hearer (it is basically concerned with singling out the most appropriate communicative behaviour for the given situation, such that would facilitate the process of communication between communicants of different social statuses). Strict classification of communicative tonalities in a multilingual community presents a certain problem since this phenomenon includes both situational and status-oriented parameters of the communicative situation, its setting, its participants, their linguistic repertoire, and the degree of readiness to engage in code-mixing/code-switching, to be involved in "collaborative work" (Blommaert, 2010) of helping each other reach mutual understanding.

Generally speaking, when persons come into each other's immediate presence they tend to do so as participants of a social occasion. This is a "wider social affair, undertaking or event, bounded in regard to place and time and typically facilitated by fixed equipment" (Goffman, 1999). A social occasion provides the structuring social context in which many situations and their gatherings are likely to form, dissolve and re-form while a pattern of conduct tends to be recognised as the appropriate and official and intended one.

In a multilingual sociolinguistic community it is vital to understand the motives of communicants' behaviour and take into account the range of accessible languages/variations their interlocutors can use in a social situation. Since the parameters of any communication include more than one factor (pragmatic goal, adequate choice of communication tools, matters of linguistic norm/socially prestigious language forms etc.) it might be possible that the same physical space be caught within the domain of two different social occasions. The social situation then may be the scene for a potential or actual conflict between the sets of regulations that ought to govern.

From the point of view of public order, especially in socially heterogeneous communities, situations of social interaction play a very important role since co-presence renders persons uniquely accessible, available and subject to one another. Public order, in its face-to-face aspects has to do with the normative regulation of this accessibility. For instance, when two people are presented to one another they function "not merely as physical instruments but also communicative ones. This possibility, no less than the physical one, is fateful for everyone concerned and in every society appears to come under strict normative regulation, giving rise to a kind of communication traffic order" (Goffman, 1999, p. 19).

The rules determining the particularities of a person's conduct in a given situation are termed as "situational proprieties" in (Goffman 1999). The code of conduct which is derived from these rules must be distinguished from other moral codes regulating other aspects of life, even though they sometimes apply at the same time as the situational code (codes of honour, regulating relationships; codes of law regulating economic and political matters; and codes of ethics regulating professional life).

The communicative behaviour of those immediately present to one another can be considered in two steps. The first deals with unfocused interaction, that is, the kind of communication that occurs when one gleans information about another person present by glancing at him, if only

momentarily as he passes into and then out of one's view. Unfocused interaction has to do largely with the management of co-presence. The second step deals with focused interaction, the kind of interaction that occurs when persons gather close together and openly cooperate to sustain a single focus of attention, typically by taking turns at talking.

Since any communication strategy is a conscious activity on the part of the speaker, from the linguistic point of view the so-called 'focused interaction' between the participants of a communicative situation is much more relevant, as it is directly involved in the choice of speech patterns on the part of the communicants at a given social occasion.

In a multilingual sociolinguistic community it is vital to understand the motives of people's linguistic behaviour and take into account the range of accessible languages/variations urban residents can use in various situations. The parameters of any language production include more than one factor: pragmatic goal, adequate choice of linguistic tools, matters of linguistic norm/socially prestigious language forms etc.

From the point of view of public order, especially in socially heterogeneous communities, situations of social interaction play a very important role. Still, matters of social and economic prestige associated with one or another language tend to have a more long-lasting effect on the urban community at large as they leave more tangible traces in its linguistic landscape. For instance, in the case of emerging global cities that cannot yet be called global linguistically, the shifts from monolingualism to bilingualism or from bilingualism to multilingualism present a very interesting field of research as they represent actual models of introducing the English language and culture into their established and linguistically stable environments.

Thus, in any globalised/globalising multilingual community, sociolinguistic analysis of communicants' linguistic behaviour based upon only conventionally established notions of a monolingual community appears problematic. Conventional rules of distribution should be complemented by a thorough understanding of multilingual/multidialectal toolkit used by the local population for achieving their pragmatic communicative goals.

So, it may be concluded that in the context of globalisation, only a combination of linguistic and extra-linguistic parameters (such as social setting, linguistic variety and socio-economic prestige of languages) within the framework of speech and discourse analysis can provide a truly thorough understanding of the multifaceted nature of verbal interaction.

References

1. Blommaert, J. (2010), *The sociolinguistics of globalisation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
2. Bogin, G.I. (1986), *Typology of understanding text. Trans. from Rus. [Tipologija ponimanija teksta]*, Kalinin State University, Kalinin.
3. Goffman, E. (1999), *Behaviour in public places: notes on the social organisation of gatherings*. New York: The Free Press.
4. *Ozhegov, S.I. On the norms of word usage [*O normah slovoupotreblenija.
5. V Ozhegov, S.I. Leksikologija. Leksikografija. Kul'tura rechy*]. In Ozhegov, S.I. (1974) Lexicology. Lexicography. Speech culture. Moscow. pp.287 - 288.*

WORD-FORMATION AS GENDER REPRESENTATION IN ENGLISH AND RUSSIAN

M. AXYUCHENKO, K. VLASOVA
(RUSSIA, ARZAMAS, LOBACHEVSKY STATE UNIVERSITY OF NIZHNY NOVGOROD, ARZAMAS BRANCH)

Key words: *gender, word-formation pattern, gender identity, feminist linguistics, gender asymmetry.*

Annotation. *The present paper represents the category of gender in the English language in comparison with some elements of the Russian language. Gender marked word-formation patterns are described in terms of politically correct language. The examples of correlated masculine and feminine words are given in English and Russian.*

In modern linguistics gender finds its expression in a large body of research related to various levels of language. Popular understandings of gender and language had existed for centuries before 'gender and language' was considered worthy of study (Sunderland, 2006).

The formation and burst of gender studies in linguistics refers to the last decades of the 20th century. This is connected with the humanities' scientific paradigm change, influenced by the philosophy of postmodernism. The new understanding of categorisation processes, the interest in a human's personal life, the development of new personality theories resulted in the revision of scientific principles of study the categories, connected with a man, such as ethnicity, age and gender, which were earlier interpreted as biologically determined categories.

A new approach required a new terminology, which could correspond to new research more appropriately.All this was the reason for the introduction of the term "gender", the aim of which was to emphasise the "socially constructed gender character, its conventionality, institutionalisation and ritualisation" (Kirilina, Tomskaya, 2005).

Cultural and social factors, which determine the society's attitude

towards men and women, stereotypic ideas of male and female qualities or human behaviour caused by gender differences are studied by linguists. Gender representations are in constant dynamics, being transformed during people's life, "People are 'gendered' and are actively involved in the process of their own gendering…" (Talbot, 1998, pp. 7).

Gender special nature originated in ancient Chinese philosophy, based on the two forces called "*yin* and *yang*" (Khaleeva, 2000). It is a complex social and cultural construct, which represents differences in roles, behaviour, as well as in mental and emotional characteristics between a man and a woman. Gender matter can be disclosed using the analysis of linguistic phenomena, "femininity and masculinity (womanhood and manhood) are recognised in the context of gender. Both get the status of a concept" (Klimkova 2007, pp. 287). Being a culture product, gender represents a folk's concept of manhood and womanhood, fixed in its language and traditions. The collective consciousness includes gender stereotypes – oversimplified and pointed concepts of male/female gender characteristics and qualities.

The researchers' attention was primarily paid to the differences between male and female language, verbal behaviour, use of lexical units and syntactic constructions on one side and the representation of male and female realities in the nominative system of the language on the other side. (Grytsenko, 2011).

Gender analysis of the language was preceded by the research works of linguists-feminists, who influenced the language politics (Grytsenko, 2011). Accordingly, works dedicated to male gender identity and its reflection in the language appear in contrast to those feminist works.

According to A.V. Kirilina, the research works connected with gender studies in linguistics, are developing in the context of two approaches: the first analyses the language and the representation of gender in it and the second one is connected with verbal and communicative behaviour of men and women.

The category of gender is a feature of the grammatical structure of Indo-European languages despite the fact that they reflect different degree of gender manifestation. Analytism development in English led to the destruction and loss of inflections. Thus, gender became a covert category detectable only through the pronouns *he*, *she*, *it*.

Consequently, in English, as in many other Indo-European languages neutral words denoting people of both sexes, are usually masculine words.

This basic situation created during the development of some modern societies causes a negative attitude on the part of a certain group of linguists who are fighting for the revision of gender in modern English.

They believe that the practice of fixing the masculine for neutral concepts is associated with the presence of prejudice in English society in the course of its historical development when it was a 'society for men' with a dominant patriarchy, which could not affect the evolution of the English language. For example, they propose to replace words containing the generic feature *man* with words having a general meaning. Instead of *chairman*, *chairperson*, *mediator*, *coordinator*; *manpower* it is recommended to use *workforce*, *personnel*, *the staff*, *the workers*.

Studies of gender in the aspect of word-formation belong to a number of unsolved problems both in Russian and foreign linguistics. Word-formation, meanwhile, is one of the most important resources of gender representation. It is well known that means of word-building are often used to denote the vital realities essential for man and his perception of the world. Word-formation can be looked upon as a piece of the language picture of the world as it helps to understand the values essential for the native speakers as well as their attitude to the reality.

Gender division of the objective world is inevitably reflected in language differentiation of the reality. Such notions in the semantic sphere "People" as man/woman, father/mother, husband/wife, brother/sister, uncle/aunt, boy/girl are lexically differentiated in most modern languages, including English and Russian. Gender division can be also observed in names of jobs and occupations. In many languages gender differentiation of names is characteristic of the semantic sphere "Animals".

Studies of gender aspect are especially important for languages which do not have a grammatical category of gender. In English common names of people and animals do not only have formal grammatical indications of gender, but are often not gender marked at the lexico-grammatical level either. This is a considerably numerous group of lexical units: kinship terms *parent, sibling, cousin, infant, baby, child, kid*; names of professions *doctor, driver, teacher, pilot, shop-assistant, journalist*; names of birds and animals *duck, goose, fox, rabbit, goat, cat, dog* etc.

Such lexical units are called *unmarked*, *neutral*, *names of dual gender* and even *neuter names* in the literal sense of the grammatical term. This layer of vocabulary developed, on the one hand, as a result of the loss of the grammatical category of gender, and on the other hand – as a consequence of a huge amount of borrowings in the Middle-English period. However, in place of synthetical, mostly grammatical indications of gender there appeared new ways and means of gender representation, now at the lexico- grammatical level, i.e. in the word-formation system. A derivational type of forming feminine names from masculine nouns was borrowed from French: *count – countess, duke – duchess* etc. The suffix -ess originated from the French -esse,

which in its turn goes back to the Latin -issa and further on to the Greek -issa (Online Etymology Dictionary), which is indicative of its Indo-European origin. This fact of borrowing a word-formation pattern deserves special attention: perhaps it was quite easily and naturally taken on by the English language because as back as in Old English there existed a feminine agent suffix -icge of common Indo-European origin.

In Russian animate nouns grammatical category of gender is associated with sex. It is impossible to identify a single suffix gender in fusional language as the category of gender is a general category for nouns which distributes them to the three classes of words – masculine, feminine and neuter. This category is a universal one. Every noun retains its gender in all its forms. Old Russian texts indicate that the generic characteristics of nouns are often marked with fluctuations. The category of gender (masculine, feminine, neuter) established since ancient times in the Russian language has observed transitions of certain nouns from one kind of gender to another. These transitions and fluctuations are explained on the syntactic and semantic levels.

Feminine names are usually formed from the masculine nouns. The following are the most productive ways of producing words with a feminine suffix: 1) feminine suffix is added to the masculine noun with no suffix or zero suffix (*вампир – вампирша, мэр – мэрша, игумен – игуменья, клиент – клиентка*); 2) feminine suffix is attached to a stemmed word instead of a masculine suffix (*вымогатель – вымогательница, заложник – заложница*); 3) feminine noun is formed by adding a feminine suffix to the derived masculine noun (*галерист – галеристка, блокадник – блокадница, активист –активистка*). As a result, they form correlative pairs of words: a masculine noun and its derivative feminine noun. However, in the modern Russian language there are a lot of masculine words that are gender-neutral and represent both sexes, for example: *акционер, арендатор, биоэнергетик, волонтер, декларант, менеджер, маркетолог, маркетинг-директор* and etc.

In traditional Lexicology and Grammar lexical correlations of the *heir – heiress* type are considered as an isolated case which is not typical of the English language. This opinion is supported by the fact that the suffix -ess and the stems of such words are usually borrowed elements. Anyway, such way of gender differentiation in Modern English turned out to be quite common and popular. The morpheme -ess in most modern dictionaries was defined as a feminine suffix, cf. *host – hostess, steward – stewardess, actor – actress, waiter – waitress, god – goddess, instructor – instructress, master – mistress, poet – poetess, duke – duches, count – countess, author – authoress, priest – priestess, hunter – huntress, singer – songstress,*

mayor – mayoress etc. Many feminine words of the type were built in English.

Moreover, the process of such derivation affected not only borrowed stems, but also English roots proper. These facts prove the importance of the word- building pattern for gender representation in the English language.

At the same time, it is worth noting that in Modern English the feminine term marked by the suffix -ess often denotes "a lesser social role or something with a negative overtone compared with the masculine term" (Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English). For example, the word *mayoress* has two meanings *(woman mayor* and *wife of a mayor)*, and they both show negative connotations. This is proved by illustrative contexts from modern dictionaries and e-corpora: *And the town is run by a mayoress and her crooks. The mayoress, Madame Bruno, has the shape and disposition of a cannonball* (Corpus of Contemporary American English). Cf. the Russian word *мэрша*, possessing a derogatory meaning.

Negative semantic prosody of the word *mayoress*, as well as other lexical units of the type, manifests itself in numerous illustrative contexts. The term *semantic prosody* is defined as evaluative attitude of the speaker to the utterance, conveying the information as positively or negatively coloured (Partington, 2004).

In Russian, we can find suffixes such as -ка и -ша, which may convey both positive and negative information. For example: *бизнесмен – бизнесмен**ка**, визажист – визажист**ка**, знахарь – знахар**ка**, баптист – баптист**ка**, бизнесмен – бизнесмен**ша**, директор – директор**ша**, губернатор – губернатор**ша**, кооператор – кооператор**ша**, генерал – генераль**ша*** and others.

Suffix -ка shows diminutive and derogative attitude to feminine nouns, and suffix -ша 'sounds' quite rude. Words with both suffixes can be classified as colloquial words. The fate of the suffix -ша is rather interesting in the Russian language. In prerevolutionary Russia, it was very productive and was used in the names of the wives of male members of certain professions. It is certainly evidence of social inequality. The change of socio-political conditions in the country has led to the fact that a woman has become equal both in the family and in all spheres of life. Now it is not even polite to call a woman by the name of the man's profession. Still modern dictionaries fix units with suffixes *кА* and *ша*. (See, for example, for example, the *Contemporary Russian Definition Dictionary. Language changes of the end of the XX century*.

It is also worth noting that words marked by the suffix -ess are less frequent than the corresponding masculine terms. According to The

Corpus of Historical American English, the word *mayoress* occurred in 19 contexts only. Similar facts are found out in relation to the correlations *author – authoress, clerk – clerkess, doctor – doctress, host – hostess* etc.

Modern dictionaries often provide corresponding entries with the so-called non-sexist language guidelines. Thus, in the latest edition of OALD (Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary) most entries for feminine words with the -ess suffix contain a note **at GENDER**. The corresponding recommendation begins with a general comment on speaking about men and women in English: "When you are writing or speaking English it is important to use language that includes both men women equally. Some people may be very offended if you do not." As for the -ess suffix, the note says: "The suffix -*ess* in names of occupations such as **actress, hostess** and **waitress** shows that the person doing the job is a woman. Many people now avoid these. Instead you can use **actor** or **host** (although **actress** and **hostess** are still very common) or a neutral word, such as **server** for *waiter* and *waitress* (OALD). The recommendations and entries, however, do not always say which word should be used instead of a particular term with the -ess suffix. In other cases there is no usage note at all: the entries for *baroness, countess, duchess, goddess, governess, heiress, huntress, mistress, princess, and songstress* do not have a **note at GENDER**. These words apparently are not offensive as they name women of higher social and moral status.

Another gender marked word-building type, *spokesman – spokeswoman, policeman – policewoman*, also originated in the Middle-English period: *kinsman – kinswoman* (Marchand, 25). It has been one of the most highly productive and frequent patterns ever since. Nevertheless it was also affected by political correction of vocabulary. About thirty years ago the feminist movement introduced the word *chairperson*, instead of *chairman* and *chairwoman*. The initiative was enthusiastically supported, and soon there appeared numerous terms like *spokesperson* (instead of *spokesman – spokeswoman*), *police officer* (instead of *policeman – policewoman*), etc. Such *neutral words*, as the non-sexist language guideline in OALD says, "are very common in newspapers, on television and radio and in official writing, in both *British English* and *North American English* (OALD).

Until recently, the word-formation pattern under consideration has been one of the major ways of gender differentiation in English. There are about forty words ending in -*woman* in Modern English. Most of these words have parallel terms ending in -*man*, which are many times more common. There are only seven feminine words having no masculine counterparts: *beggarwoman, catwoman, charwoman, ghostwoman, needlewoman, slavewoman, sweeperwoman*. Lexicographic analysis shows

that such words are coming out of use: in modern dictionaries they are either not registered at all or marked as *old-fashioned*. Most of them are being replaced by *neutral, politically correct lexical units*, made in accordance with generalised word-formation patterns.

These changes in gender representation are caused by both extralinguistic and linguistic proper factors. Social gender images are considerably changing under the influence of feminist criticisms of language. Feminist linguistics as well as gender linguistics point out gender asymmetry in language and insist that some language norms should be rethought and changed to present men and women more symmetrically. Lexicographic analysis of a particular word-formation pattern and corresponding gender marked words shows a certain dependence of gender representation on cultural and ideological propositions.

References

1. Axyutchenko, M.A., Vlasova, K.A. (2008) "Gender Information in Semantical and Derivational Structure of a Word". In: *Actual Problems of Communication and Culture*. Issue 8. International Collector of Scientific Papers ["Gendernaya informatsyya v semanticheskoj I derevatsyonnoj strukrure slova". V *Actual`nye Problemy Communicatsyi I Cul`tury*]. Moscow – Pyatigorsk: Pyatigorsky State Language University.

2. Gritsenko, E.S, Sergeeva, M.V., Laletina, A.O., Bodrova, A.A., Dunyasheva, L.G. (2011) *Gender in British and American Linguaculture.* [Gritsenko E.S., Sergeeva M.V., Laletina A.O., Bodrova A.A., Dunyasheva L.G. *Gendarnye razlichiya v Britanskoj I Americanskoj Lingvocul`ture*]. Moscow: FLINTA- NAUKA.

3. Kirilina, A.V., Tomskaya, M.V. "Linguistic Gender Researches*"*. In: *Notes of the Fatherland* [Kirilina A.V., Tomskaya M.V. "Lingvistica Gendernyh Issledovanij". V *Otechestvennye zapiski*]. Available at: http://www.strana-oz.ru/2005/2/lingvisticheskie-gendernye-issledovaniya. [Accessed 12 January, 2014].

4. Klimkova, L.A. (2007) *Microtoponymy in a Linguistic View of the World.* [Klimkova, L.A., *Microtoponimika v lingvisticheskom vzglyade na mir*]. Moscow: Moscow State Pedagogical University. Arzamas: Arzamas State Pedagogical Institute.

5. *Language changes of the end of the XX century.* (2005). In: Sklyarevskaya, G.N. Contemporary Russian Definition Dictionary. [Sklyarevskaya G.N.,*Yazykovye izmeneniya v kontse 20 veka*]. Moscow: Astrel: AST: Transitbook.

6. Khaleeva, I.I. (2000) *Gender as Intrigue of Perception* [Khaleeva I.I., *Pol kak intriga vospriyatiya*]. Moscow: "Rudomino" publishing house.
7. *The Corpus of Contemporary American English.* Available at: http://corpus. bya.edu/coca/.
8. *The Corpus of Historical American English*. Available at: http://corpus.bya. edu/coha/.
9. Biber, D., Johanson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., Finegan, E. (2000) *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English. London:* Pearson Education Limited.
10. Marchand, H. (1969) *The Categories and Types of Present-Day English Word- Formation. A Synchronic-Diachronic Approach.* Munchen.
11. *Online Etymology Dictionary.* Available at: http://www.etymonline.com.
12. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary (*2010). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
13. Partington, A. (2004) "Utterly content in each other's company: Semantic prosody and semantic preference" *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics,*9(1), pp. 131-156.
14. Sunderland, J. (2006) "Language and Gender*" An advanced resource book*. London: Routledge.
15. Talbot, M.M. (1998) *Language and gender*. New York: Polity Press.

POLITENESS IN INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION: MEANS OF EXPRESSING REQUESTS IN TAJIK

D. ISKANDAROVA
(TAJIKISTAN, DUSHANBE, RUSSIA-TAJIKISTAN (SLAVONIC) UNIVERSITY)

Key words: *politeness, communication, means of expressing request, the Tajik language.*

Annotation. *The article deals with the specificity of understanding of politeness in different cultures. The paper analyses means of polite expression of requests in Tajik in contrast with English and Russian.*

With the rapid development of intercultural communication people pay more and more attention to the different cultural connotation and the concept of politeness in cross-cultural communication.

Are we polite? What is politeness in different cultures? I first thought about this question about ten years ago. A student from Scotland who was studying the Russian and Tajik languages said that, in his opinion, the word *please* in English was used far more often than the equivalent words in Russian or Tajik. At that time I did not agree with him and argued that the use of these words, or the frequency of their use, depends more than anything on the level of culture of the individual. Five years later I heard a more severe and categorical assertion from an American student who said that Tajiks do not use, or rarely use, the word *пожалуйста* ("pozhalujsta" - Russian for *please*) in speech, and that even when they were speaking English, they used the word *please* less frequently than did English speakers. All my arguments were of no use since she had already made up her mind.

And then I thought about why it is that some foreigners form the opinion that we are impolite. Are we, in actual fact, polite? My answer is that we are (Iskandarova, 2007). While in every society there are people

who exhibit different level of politeness, it is not possible to speak of the impoliteness of an entire society. It might seem so, however, because we accord great significance to specific words, while there may be single item in a given language that is equivalent to the English *please* or the Russian *пожалуйста* ("pozhalujsta"). My argument is that the impression of impoliteness is due to the fact that we generally take note of specific words rather than the whole spectrum of means that make a language rich.

My research focuses on various means of expressing request and invitations to action, that in English is expressed by means of the lexical item *please* (as well as some grammatical phrases), and in Russian by means of the word *пожалуйста* ("pozhalujsta").

In many languages a special lexical item is used for the expression of requests, such as *please* in English or *пожалуйста* ("pozhalujsta") for *please* in Russian. The same words are used for the expression of polite invitations to action: *come in, please; входите* ("vhodite"- Russian for *come in*), *пожалуйста* ("pozhalujsta" - Russian for *please*).

In the Tajik language no one lexical item exists to translate these words. Alongside the use of such words as the exclusively literary form *лутфан* ("lutfan") for the expression of requests and *марҳамат* ("marhamat") for invitation to action, there is a large number of grammatical and syntactical means for the expression of these meanings. The words *please* in English or *пожалуйста* ("pozhalujsta") in Russian are used for at least three purposes:

1. the polite expression of requests,
2. invitation to action (overlapping with the meaning of inducement), and
3. permission (that is, a request to allow something, overlapping with the polite expression of requests).

In the remaining part of the research article I will examine the polite expression of requests and invitation to action.

As has been noted, in English and Russian there are general lexical items of the type *please* and *пожалуйста* ("pozhalujsta") which are used for the expression of requests. More careful scrutiny, however, reveals that the Russian word *пожалуйста* ("pozhalujsta") is used less often than *please* in English. An explanation of the reason for this is possible only by looking at syntactical constructions.

In English polite expression of requests are expressed by an interrogative clause with the modal verb *can* or *could*. It is also possible to use the verb *would*. In the Russian version of such clauses the negative

interrogative form is used, with the modal verb *мочь* ("moch") in the past tense and the particle *бы ("bi")*. An example is given in (1e) and (1r) (where 'e', 'r' and 't' are used to indicate English, Russian and Tajik variants).

1e) Salesman: …Well, we have some Orly deluxe watches… probably the best watches in the world. But I'm afraid they're gar more expensive than this one. They cost…
Man: Would you show us one, please?
Woman: Yes, could we see one of them, please?
Salesman: They're in the manager's office. You see, we do not… Man: Could you possibly get one or two of them now?
Salesman: Er, yes, of course. Would you wait here for a moment, please? (O'Neill, 1982; Muhammadiev, 1966).
1r) Продавец: Ну, у нас есть часы … вероятно лучшие часы в мире, но я боюсь, они намного дороже, чем эти. Они стоят… Мужчина: Вы бы нам не показали одни из них, пожалуйста? Женщина: Да, не могли бы мы посмотреть одни из них, пожалуйста? Продавец: Они в кабинете управляющего. Видите ли, мы не… Мужчина: Не могли бы Вы по возможности принести одни или
двое из них сейчас?
Продавец: Ээ… да, конечно. Не могли бы вы подождать здесь минутку, пожалуйста?

It is possible to omit the word *пожалуйста* ("pozhalujsta") in all the clauses that contain requests in the Russian translation, since the very form of question is itself a polite expression of a request. The addition of the word *пожалуйста* ("pozhalujsta") in these constructions is semantically redundant. That is to say, in Russian, the following would be sufficiently polite, and far more common.

1r1) Мужчина: Вы бы нам не показали одни из них? Женщина: Да, не могли бы мы посмотреть одни из них? Продавец: Они в кабинете управляющего. Видите ли, мы не…
Мужчина: Не могли бы Вы по возможности принести одни или двое из них сейчас?
Продавец: Ээ… да, конечно. Не могли бы вы подождать здесь минутку?

In both the preceding dialogue and its translation it is evident that the customers, wishing to see some expensive watches, are highly polite and use polite request formulas, but at the same time display impatience, interrupting and not allowing him to finish speaking. In actual fact, their politeness is feigned, since it becomes clear in the following dialogue that

they want to rob the shop, and that the only reason they need to see very expensive watches is so they can gain entry into the manager's office and open the safe. As soon as they succeed, all their politeness evaporates and demands are heard (for which the imperative form is used):

> 2e) Salesman: Mr. Crawford. I have two customers who... Woman: All right! Hands up! Stand over there! Manager/Salesman: What in the world... Man: Shut up! And open that safe! Come on! Open it!
> 2r) Продавец: Мистер Кроуфорд, У меня два клиента, которые …
> Женщина: Ладно! Руки вверх! Стойте там!
> Управляющий/ Продавец: Какого черта…
> Мужчина: Заткнитесь! И откройте тот сейф! Давайте! Открывайте!

Translating the dialogue (Iskandarova, 2007) into Tajik, it is not possible to use either a single lexical item or analogous constructions to communicate requests. It would be more natural to use a construction with the verb in the past continuous tense (Tajik *замони гузаштаи ҳикоягӣ*) ("zamoni guzashtai hikoyagi") in the second person plural (such as *мекарде, мегуфтед*) ("mekarded", "megufted").

> 1t) Мард: Ба мо яктоашро нишон медодед. Зан: Бале, яктоашро диданамон мумкин аст? Фурушанда: Онҳо дар офиси мудир. Медонед, мо…
> Мард: Мумкин бошад, ба мо як ё дутоашро ҳозир меовардед.
> Фурушанда: Хм… ҳа, албатта. Дар ин чо як дам меистодед.

Such constructions are often and widely used both in literature as well as in conversational speech.

> 3t) Якта соат харидам, хаминро як медидед? (Muhammadiev, 1966, pp.193).
> r) Я купил часы, не могли бы Вы на них взглянуть?
> e) I bought a watch, could you look at them, please?

When translating the preceding dialogue variations are, of course, possible. For example, it is possible to use the imperative form with the addition of the literary *лутфан* ("lutfan") as shown in (4).

> 4t) Лутфан, ба мо яктоашро нишон дихед. r) Пожалуйста, покажите нам одни.
> e) Show us one, please.

The word *лутфан ("lutfan")*, however, is practically never used in conversational speech. Even in literature, the word *лутфан ("lutfan")* is used very rarely, although it is sometimes used to communicate irony as in (5):

5t) -Лутфан, бигӯед, ки дар ин торикӣ чаро бо бинии мубораки худ ба замин хат мекашед? (Muhammadiev, 1966, pp.176).

In this case a more reliable translation into Russian would use *будьте добры ("bud'te dobry")* or *будьте любезны ("bud'te l'ubezny")*.

5r) -Будьте любезны, скажите, зачем вы в такой темноте роете землю своим благословенным носом?

In English sentence (5t) might be translated using 'Could you tell me, please…?' as shown in (5e).

5e) Could you tell me, please, why you are digging up the ground in pitch darkness with your blessed nose?

The use of *мумкин ("mumkin")* in the Tajik clause *яктоашро дидан мумкин аст ("yaktoashro didan mumkin ast")* results in an interrogative construction analogous to the English *can*. This question signifies not only a request, but also a request for permission to do something.

6t) Духтурчон, мумкин-мӯ дар пешатон як дам шинам? (Muhammadiev, 1966, pp.189).
r) Доктор, можно мне посидеть немного с Вами?
e) Doctor, can I sit for a while with you?

This can also be communicated by such expressions as in English *let me*, in Russian *разрешите ("razreshite")* and in Tajik *ичозат диҳед ("ichozat dihed")*.

7t) Духтурчон, ичозат диҳед дар пешатон як дам шинам. r) Доктор, разрешите мне посидеть немного с Вами.
e) Doctor, let me sit for a while with you.

In Tajik, in addition to syntactical means of expressing polite requests, as shown above, and intonation, which has an enormous significance in Tajik, there are also such expressions as *илтимос ("iltimos")*, *хоҳиш мекунам ("hohish mekunam")*, *бемалол бошад ("bemalol boshad")*, *малол наояд ("malol naoyad")* as well as the so called *дуо ("duo")*

ʻblessingʼ: *барака ёбед* ("baraka yebed"), *дастатон дард набинад* ("dastaton dard nabinad"), *монда/хаста нашавед* ("monda/hasta nashaved"):

8t) Илтимос, боз ягон чиз нақл кун (Muhammadiev, 1966, pp. 216). r) Пожалуйста (прошу тебя), расскажи ещё что-нибудь.
e) Please/ I beg you, tell us something else.

9t) Хоҳиш мекунам, хабар деҳ (Muhammadiev, 1966, pp.190). r) Прошу тебя, сообщи.
e) Please stay in touch.

10t) Бемалол бошад, ба салони буфет як сари қадам биёед (Muhammadiev, 1966, pp.305).
r) Пожалуйста (если это Вас не затруднит), зайдите на минутку в буфет салона.
e) If it's no trouble, come into the buffet lounge for a moment.

11t) Барака ёбед, гӯед, ки аз сари коммунист тилло резед, ки ба чои нохонда қадам намемонад (Muhammadiev, 1966, pp.101).
r) Пожалуйста (будьте благословенны), скажите, что если даже осыпать коммуниста золотом, он не пойдет туда, куда его не звали.
e) Please (May you find blessing), tell (him), that even if you pour gold over a communist he will not take one step where he has not be called.

12t) Илоҳо барака ёбед, калиди ҳучраи маро оварда диҳед (Muhammadiev, 1966, pp.81).
r) Пожалуйста (да благословит Вас бог), принесите ключи моей комнаты!
e) Please (May God bless you) bring me the key to my room.

The clause - *Маро ҳамроҳатон мебаред* ("Maro hamrohaton mebared") can, depending on intonation, be understood either as the request *please take me with you*, or as the demand *you will take me with you!*

A writer will make use of commentary in order to specify the correct interpretation.

13t) Маро ҳамроҳатон мебаред.
«Маро ҳамроҳатон мебаред.» Ҳукми қатъӣ ва эроднопазир. Аз оҳанги илтимос ному нишоне нест (Muhammadiev, 1966, pp.200).
r) Возьмете меня с собой!
«Возьмете меня с собой!» Приговор окончательный и не подлежит возражению. Нет и намека на просьбу.
e) Take me with you.
"Take me with you." A decisive and uncompromising command with not even a hint of a request.