Філологія / Philology

Olga Beskletna
Senior tutor
National Technical University of Ukraine
"Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute"
Kyiv, Ukraine
ORCID ID 0000-0002-5522-2909
beskletnaya@gmail.com

Olena Shepelieva
Senior lecturer
National Technical University of Ukraine
"Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute"
Kyiv, Ukraine
ORCID ID 0000-0003-4260-0840
shepelevaolena@ukr.net

Olena Mukhanova
Senior lecturer
National Technical University of Ukraine
"Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute"
Kyiv, Ukraine
ORCID ID 0000-0001-9914-5258
e.gouseva@ukr.net

LINGUISTIC ASPECT OF THE CATEGORY OF POLITENESS IN ADVERTISING DISCOURSE

The paper highlights the correlation between the concepts of etiquette and politeness in terms of advertising discourse. It is stated modern research on language and speech is becoming more and more interdisciplinary, focusing on functioning the language in various social and cultural contexts. Differentiation of the concepts of etiquette, politeness and etiquetization is considered. Etiquette is the broadest concept that can be defined as the objictification of existing norms of social relations in society. Politeness as a complex sociocultural phenomenon, contributing to the success of communication, is one of the means of expression of etiquette. Etiquetization is a principle of speech politeness, which is designed to facilitate the flow of communication and achieve the goals of the addressee. The category of etiquette in advertising discourse is realized through the category of etiquetization on the basis of the main features of speech politeness: care for the recipient (facilitating the perception of information by the recipient) and modulation of categorical and non-categorical nomination with predominance of non-categorical (based on objectivity, impartiality and persuasiveness). The main means of politeness include caring for the addressee (facilitating the recipient's perception of information) and modulating the categorical and non-categorical nomination with a predominance of non-categorical (based on objectivity, impartiality and motivation) to convince the addressee of that or another statement. Politeness as a manifestation of the purposefulness of language behavior is mostly considered on the basis of rhetorical pragmatics, determining the speaker's illocutionary goals (which speech acts are conveyed through utterances) and their social goals (speaker status depending on his courtesy, truthfulness, and irony) as well as distinguishing between interpersonal rhetoric and textual rhetoric, each consisting of a set of maxims.

Keywords: advertising discourse; etiquette; etiquetization; politeness; rhetorical pragmatics.

1. INTRODUCTION

Nowadays, the study of the etiquetization of the advertising discourse is an extremely diverse sphere of language use. Its relevance is also determined by the fact that the very concept of etiquetization of modern advertising is becoming increasingly popular in academic circles. Currently, the active development of mass media in today's fleeting world also explains the significant interest of linguistics to this area. And rather high economic significance of advertising accelerates further the growing popularity of the field under scrutiny.

Well-known sholars, such as Kovalenko, Stern, Silvestrov, Malyshenko, and many others have studied different aspects of advertising discourse. The concept of etiquetization, in turn, was under scrutiny by Pocheptsov, Starikova, Bohdan and others. The study of the notion "politeness" in terms of linguistics has been started since 1960s with the Speech Act Theory (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969; 1976), the Theory of Positive and Negative Face by Brown and Levinson (1987), according to which a positive face presuposes being appreciated by others and having the wants which are considered desirable (p. 62). Negative face refers to a person's desire to be unimpeded in their actions, i.e., the desire for freedom of action and freedom from imposition (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p. 62). Face "is something that is emotionally invested, and that can be lost, maintained, or enhanced, and must be constantly attended to in interaction" (Brown & Levinson 1987, p. 61). Therefore, based on their theory, politeness is a linguistic phenomenon of human interaction in terms of the fact that desire is a basic human nature (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

Modern research on language and speech is becoming interdisciplinary and focuses on the functioning of language in various social spheres. Linguists are researching into interdisciplinary concepts, theories and categories, one of which is the category of politeness – a complex sociocultural phenomenon, contributing to the success of communication (Bolotnikova, 2017; Bacak, 2021). The degree of polite communication influences the very behavior of interlocutors more than the content of their speech. The task of polite behavior is to convince the interlocutor of a positive attitude towards them and provoke the same reaction. At the personal level, the feedback should be personal, at the social level – formal (Blankenship & Holtgraves, 2005; Bonnefon, 2014; Haugh, 2007; Holtgraves & Perdew, 2016).

Therefore, **the study aims** to highlight the correlation between the concepts of etiquette and politeness in terms of advertising discourse.

2. METHODS

A complex of methods is exploited in the work: descriptive method (used to substantiate the selected theoretical material), method of analysis (for interpretation and systematization of selected theoretical material), deductive method (used in the transition from general description to direct analysis).

3. RESULTS

In a broad sense, etiquette is closely linked to ethnocultural factors: traditions, rituals, customs. It is well-known fact that anthropological factors play an important role in the formation of etiquette. Other factors, influenceing its formation, include the level of socio-economic development of the society, morality, and foreign policy aspects that ensure the unification of any nation. Etiquette as a regulation of the process of communication of representatives of different strata of society objectifies social relations (Shelomentsev, 1995, p. 5–7). The typology of etiquette can be as follows: domestic, scientific, diplomatic, official, etc. As a social phenomenon, etiquette dates back to the Ancient World. It is believed that etiquette in Europe was originated in Italy during the Renaissance, but in its narrow sense, etiquette appeared in France in the XVII century during the reign of Louis XIV, and meant the rules of conduct at the royal court.

Traditionally, the material for the study of language issues of etiquette were vernacular languages and fiction. But today, speech etiquette is presented by a microsystem of national-specific verbal units that are tinted by the rules of behavior of a particular society. Словник *Longman Dictionary of English Language and Culture* (1992) establishes a connection between two concepts:

etiquette (*the formal rules of proper (social) behaviour; cultural note: in Britain the rules of social behaviour are not as severe as they were in the past, but there are still many rules about formal behaviour in upper class society. People who move up in society sometimes look at etiquette books to learn how they are expected to behave* (p. 436)) and politeness (*having or showing good manner, sensitivity to other people's feelings, and/or correct social behaviour).* The concept of politeness, directly related to the concept of etiquette, is correlated with the concept of preserving the face, or image (Pocheptsov, 1980). Brown and Levinson (1987) introduced the terms "positive face" (i. e., public image), and "negative face" (denoting freedom of action). With the relevance to the advertising discourse, politeness also refers to the lack of categorical statements, the lack of pressure on the recipient of the message.

From the above, we can conclude that the concept of etiquette encompasses the concept of politeness, which is also a means of its expression. At the same time, etiquette is a much broader concept: it covers not only ethnocultural features, but also affects social and professional factors (Shelomentsev, 1995). The concept "*etiquetization*", referring to the culture of behaving, is introduced by Pocheptsov (1980). The scholar argues that labeling is attention to the other person, so one can draw parallels between the concepts of *etiquetization* and *tact* (care for the feelings of the addressee) (Pocheptsov, 1980). Therefore, the concept of etiquetization in relation to the advertising discourse should be considered through the principle of politeness. And the category of etiquette in advertising discourse is realized through the category of etiquetization on the basis of the main features of speech politeness: care for the recipient (facilitating the perception of information by the recipient) and modulation of categorical and non-categorical nomination with predominance of non-categorical (based on objectivity, impartiality and persuasiveness). Although etiquette is a global cultural phenomenon, its cultural specifics should be taken into account, for example, the peculiarities of the implementation of verbal and nonverbal etiquette situations, the peculiarities of behavior that are influenced by the mentality of the people.

The national specificity of etiquette forms of communication can be explained through the correlation of the paradigms of language and culture, language and mentality. Ukrainian scholar Chepiga (1909) theoretically substantiated the mental differences of native speakers of different languages, introducing his work in pedagogical practice and establishing a new direction – language pedagogy. Mentality – a set of readiness, attitudes and tendencies of an individual or social group to act, think, feel and perceive the world in a certain way. It is formed on the basis of culture, traditions, social structures and everything that surrounds a person.

In linguistic as well as in pedagogical terms, it is important to pay attention to the differences in the national and cultural component of languages. The phenomenon of politeness can be attributed to general sociocultural concepts, but it should be born in mind that in different cultures, the requirements for polite speech depend on national and ideological factors. A good example here can be non-verbal elements of communication – gestures that in one culture can serve as a means of courtesy, in another may be unacceptable (Ilchenko, 2001).

Politeness has its own peculiarities of expression in different social as well as academic circles. For example, hedging is often used in advertising to reduce categoricalness. Professional advertising seeks to avoid the absolutization of claims to reduce pressure on the recipient. This can be explained by the social environment and the conditions in which advertising operates: the manufacturer is responsible for the quality of its products and builds its reputation. In the case of certain discrepancies, the recipients of advertising messages seek to protect themselves from possible criticism, so it can be argued that hedging tools have a social burden (Ilchenko, 2001; 2002).

From a linguistic point of view, politeness is analyzed in terms of exploiting certain language tools for implementing strategies of communicative behavior, specifics and pragmatics of speech acts of politeness of certain languages, social status patterns of its expression and historical formation. For example, the problem of the pervasiveness of speech communication is studied through letters, with a request to reconsider previous decisions, or politeness and compliments between communicators who have the same social status.

However, despite the fact that the issue of politeness has received considerable coverage in the scientific literature, an accurate and explicit definition of speech politeness has not yet been proposed. This function can to some extent be fulfilled by the understanding of politeness as a result of the agreement of communicators in order to avoid conflict in socio-communicative verbal interaction. This situation can be explained by the fact that a specific definition can lead to too narrow or too broad an understanding of the concept. It may be more appropriate to use a free definition of politeness depending on the specific language or area of operation (Ilchenko, 2001).

Some scholars (Ilchenko, 2001; 2002; Kyrychuk, 1999; Pocheptsov, 1980) argue that politeness is an integral part of speech acts and may depend on certain scales of values of communicators. There is also a link between politeness and the nature of interpersonal relationships within the team or society as a whole. The scientific literature does not rule out the possibility of differentiating the concepts of politeness and tact, for example, politeness applies to a group of people, because it is based on established social relations and is explained by the need for effective communication. Tact is rather an individual concept designed to preserve the "face" of a particular person and is determined by intra- and intercultural features, traditions, values of a particular culture. Certain difficulties in this regard arise during intercultural communication. Of particular note is the development of politeness in terms of maxims of communication and the principles of cooperation Grice (1975), according to there have been singled out:

- quantities: make your message as informative as the purpose of the communication; do not make the message more informative than necessary;
- qualities: do not lie; do not say something if you lack enough facts and evidence;
- relevance (do not be distracted from the topic);
- mode of action: avoid ambiguity of expression; avoid ambiguities; speak concisely; speak properly (maxims of politeness).

From this follows the possibility of differentiating politeness into three different types: formal, informal and personal. This classification is subjective, as the language situation of politeness is determined by the speaker. There is another classification (Ilchenko, 2001), which is as follows: polite behavior – compliance with the rules of conduct regardless of the circumstances or certain expectations of the addressee; impolite behavior – non-compliance with the rules of conduct, when politeness is not expected; rude behavior – rude behavior when it is expected to be polite.

Politeness is one of the goals of communication, the degree of achievement, which is determined by one of four strategies of politeness, which are as follows: bald on-record, negative politeness, positive politeness, and off-record strategy (Brown & Levinson, 1987). In addition, tact is a type of politeness that has its own scales that express the level of social distance, authoritarian, scales of illocution, due to the choice that the speaker gives to the addressee and the degree of understanding of the speaker's intentions, and the scale of preferences for listener and speaker. Politeness as a manifestation of the purposefulness of language behavior is considered on the basis of rhetorical prangmatics. Therefore, it is important to determine the speaker's illocutionary goals (which speech acts are conveyed through utterances) and their social goals (speaker status depending on his courtesy, truthfulness, and irony) to distinguish between interpersonal rhetoric and textual rhetoric, each consisting of a set of maxims. Politeness refers to interpersonal rhetoric, including the principle of Grice's cooperation, the principle of politeness, and the principle of irony, which are closely related (Grice, 1975). According to this scholar, the communicative intentions of the speaker do not have to be expressed explicitly in order for the addressee to understand them correctly. In order to adequately understand these intentions of the addressee is not enough to have only linguistic knowledge that provides a literal interpretation of statements, one needs knowledge of the contextual conditions of the statement, including socio-cultural, which are involved in "reading" communicative meaning (Fedorenko, 2016). Thus, interpersonal maxims are as follows (Grice, 1975):

- maxim and metamaxim of the tact (goal – maximum care for the recipient, the essence – do not create conditions under which the recipient may violate the maxim of the tact);
- maxim of generosity (minimize your own privileges, maximize the benefits of the recipient);

- maxim of approval (minimize criticism of the addressee, maximize his approval);

- maxim of modesty (praise yourself less and the addressee more);

- maxim of agreement (minimize disagreement between yourself and others, maximize agreement between yourself and others);

- maxim of sympathy (minimize antipathy between yourself and others, maximize sympathy between yourself and others).

Each of the mentioned above maxims can vary according to the scale of social distance, authoritarianism, indirect expression, the degree of freedom of choice of the listener and the preferences of the speaker / listener. For example, in the implementation of the maxim of tact, increasing social distance necessitates greater freedom of choice, which leads to the use of more means of indirect transmission of thought. If we distinguish between relative politeness as politeness of a specific situation and politeness absolute as a universal trait inherent in certain actions, some speech acts are inherently impolite from the beginning, while others are inherently polite (order-proposal). Based on this assumption, negative politeness refers to reducing the rudeness of "rude" speech acts, and positive – increasing the positive potential of "polite speech acts" (Grice, 1975).

Brown and Levinson (1987) offer somewhat different view on the concept of negative and positive politeness. According to their theory, politeness is based on the concept of public "face" as self-esteem of individuals, which is affected by two points: the desire to avoid obstacles in their actions and the desire to gain approval for their actions. There are two types of politeness: positive, associated with solidarity, and negative, which refers to the provision of maximum freedom of action (a feature particularly characteristic of English-speaking society), as a result, there is a concept of positive and negative personality. The first concerns the belief in the desirability of action, and the second is the attempt to avoid obstacles in action. An important element of this theory is the concept of threat to the "face" of the person, on the basis of which these strategies are classified as unveiled and veiled. Brown and Levinson (1987) argue that certain speech acts can potentially threaten the "face" of the individual. Among such speech acts are the following:

- those that threaten the positive face of the speaker (apology, reaction to a compliment, confession); positive face of the listener (criticism, disagreement, touching taboo topics);

- those that threaten the negative face of the speaker (acceptance of the proposal, response to gratitude) and the negative face of the listener (order, advice, threat).

Traditionally, language issues of etiquette and courtesy have been studied on the basis of fiction and vernacular. However, advertising discourse has not yet gained popularity among researchers. Politeness is an important means of *etiquetization* of advertising. And although there is a scholarly opinion that politeness plays a minor supporting role for any discourse, but in the advertising discourse, the category of politeness is extremely important, because it is realized through a number of specific tools. In addition, it is basic for any discourse in terms of functional-semantic categories, such as personality, modality, etc. In advertising discourse, politeness acquires a specific expression, structurally complex one, often going beyond just one statement and relating to the sequence of speech acts. Therefore, a differentiated approach to the analysis of sociocultural and genre specifics of advertising texts in discursive-rhetorical and pragmatic aspects acquires special significance.

Politeness, according to van Dijk (2014), refers to social conditions that form pragmatic rules and are cognitively determined, relevant only to the extent that communication participants know these rules, able to use them and correlate their own interpretations of events with social characteristics of the context. English-language advertising communication is usually guided by such prammatic rules, and their detection is mandatory for learning English as a foreign language. The use of various means of courtesy as a manifestation of *etiquetization*, among which the modulations of non-categorical and categorical nominations deserve special attention, is an integral part of civilized dialogue, which is advertising communication.

The advertising discourse is characterized by adherence to maxims, the manifestation of the principle of politeness as a characteristic feature of discourse through a number of special linguistic

means of reducing the categorical expression. However, these maxims are not absolute, for example, they can be omitted in the case of harsh criticism, contradictory or too original statements. Under such conditions, the speech communication can change as follows:

- negative courtesy on the part of the author ("I do what I consider necessary, despite the opinion of others") and negative courtesy from the addressee (giving the author the right to express his opinion);

- negative and positive courtesy on the part of the author ("I must constantly consider new ileas and keep up with others") – positive courtesy on the part of the addressee (general approval, approval).

From the above it can be concluded that the addressee has the ability to criticize only if it remains anonymous. However, this statement is too general.

In general, for our study it is appropriate to note some universal features of politeness inherent in intercultural communication, despite their significant national specificity. For example, the Anglo-American emotional expression of solidarity, which is adequately perceived by Italians, surprises and sometimes irritates the Japanese, and the overwhelming non-categorical nature of English-language speech acts seems excessive to Ukrainian-speakers. According to Bogdan (1998), "knowledge of categoricalness" is perceived as "knowledge of objectivity" (p. 434). Conversely, Ukrainian statements are perceived by English-speaking recipients as too categorical. Still, it is possible to outline the basic universal principles of civilized international dialogue, including touching on topics of mutual interest to communicators and, in the event of a potential conflict, trying to change the subject and turn the conversation into a positive one for common communicators. that his views and point of view are clear and worthy of respect), as well as attempts to avoid excessive categorical statements, excessive emotionality of communication, the use of means of expression of empathy, the desire for constructive cooperation.

4. CONCLUSIONS AND SCOPE FOR THE FURTHER RESEARCH

To conclude, we are supposed to stress that anthropological factors play a significant role in the formation of etiquette, as it is based on traditions and customs. Other extralinguistic factors influencing the formation of etiquette include the level of socio-economic development of society, morality, foreign policy factors that ensure the unification of a nation. One of the main functions of etiquette is to objectify existing social relations. Etiquette is a broad concept that covers not only ethnocultural but also socio-professional aspects of society. Etiquetization can be defined as the principle of politeness. Etiquette has its own national specifics, which can be analyzed by correlating such concepts as language and culture, language and mentality. Features of polite speech varies, depending on the national mentality. Etiquette also has its gradation at the social level, as they affect the situational conditions of language functioning. Despite considerable attention from linguists, there is no precise linguistic definition of politeness yet. The main means of politeness include caring for the addressee (facilitating the recipientєs perception of information) and modulating the categorical and non-categorical nomination with a predominance of non-categorical (based on objectivity, impartiality and motivation) to convince the addressee of the statement.

Etiquetization is an essential discourse-creating feature of advertising discourse. In this type of discourse, etiquetization acquires a specific expression, which is structurally complex, often it goes beyond just one statement and can relate to the sequence of speech acts. Etiquetization of the advertising discourse is implemented through a number of strategies and tactics, which present the background for further research on the basis of the U. S. advertising discourse.

СПИСОК ЛІТЕРАТУРИ
Богдан С. К. Мовний етикет українців. К.: Рідна мова, 1998. 475 с.
Болотнікова А. П. Увічливість як національно-культурна категорія. *Вісник Харківського національного університету імені В. Н. Каразіна.* 2017. № 77. С. 63–68.
Ільченко О. М. Порівняльно-кількісний аналіз вербальних засобів етикетизації англомовного наукового дискурсу. *Проблеми семантики слова, речення та тексту.* 2001. Вип. 7. С. 91–94.
Ільченко О. М. Етикет англомовного наукового дискурсу. К.: Політехника, 2002. 288 с.

Киричук Л. М. Прагмасемантичні особливості категорії оцінки в рекламному тексті (на матеріалі реклами журналу *Time*). Автореф. дис. ... д-ра. філол. наук: 10.02.04 «Германські мови». К., 1999. 19 с.

Почепцов Г. Г. Семантический анализ этикетизации общения. *Семантика и представление знаний: труды по искусственному интеллекту*. 1980. № 2. С. 98–108.

Федоренко С. В. Методологічне значення педагогічного дискурсу в формуванні гуманітарної культури студентів бакалавріату в США. *Педагогіка і психологія*. 2016. № 3(92). С. 56–61.

Чепига Я. Соединение словесного метода со звуковым при обучении чтению и письму. *Народный учитель*. 1909. № 3. С. 9–12.

Шеломенцев В. Н. Этикет и культура общения. К.: Оберіг, 1995. 344 с.

Austin J. L. How to Do Things with Words. Oxford: University Press, 1962. 174 p.

Bacak B. The impact of prep clas education on effective English requestive e-mails written by students in Turkey. *Advanced Linguistics*. 2021. № 7. P. 12–25.

Blankenship K. L., Holtgraves T. The role of different markers of linguistic powerlessness in persuasion. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*. 2005. № 24(1). С. 3–24.

Bonnefon J. F. Politeness and reasoning: Face, connectives, and quantifiers. *Oxford Handbook of Language and Social Psychology* / T. M. Holtgraves (Ed.). New York: Oxford University Press, 2014. P. 387–406.

Brown P., Levinson S. C. Politeness: Some universals in language usage. Cambridge University Press, 1987. 345 p.

Grice H. P. Logic and conversation. Syntax and Semantics. NY: Academic Press, 1975. P. 41–58.

Haugh M. The discursive challenge to politeness research: An interactional alternative. *Journal of Politeness Research*. 2007. № 3(2). P. 295–317.

Holtgraves T., Perdew A. Politeness and the communication of uncertainty. *Cognition*. 2016. № 154. P. 1–10.

Longman Dictionary of English Language and Culture. Harlow: Addison Wesley Longmans Limited, 1992. 1528 p.

Searle J. R. Speech acts. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969. 203 p.

Searle J. R. A Classification of Illocutionary Acts. *Language in Society*. 1976. № 5(1). P. 1–23.

van Dijk T. A. Discourse and knowledge. A sociocognitive approach. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014. 407 p. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107775404

REFERENCES

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: University Press.

Bacak, B. (2021). The impact of prep class education on effective English requestive e-mails written by students in Turkey. *Advanced Linguistics, 7*, 12–25.

Blankenship, K. L., & Holtgraves, T. (2005). The role of different markers of linguistic powerlessness in persuasion. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 24*(1), 3–24.

Bohdan, S. K. (1998). *Movnyy etyket ukrayintsiv* [Language etiquette of Ukrainians]. K.: Ridna mova. [in Ukrainian]

Bolotnikova, A. P. (2017). Uvichlyvistiak natsionalno-kulurna katehoriia [Politeness as a national and cultural category]. *Bulletin of V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University, 77*, 63–68. [in Ukrainian]

Bonnefon, J. F. (2014). Politeness and reasoning: Face, connectives, and quantifiers. In T. M. Holtgraves (Ed.), *Oxford Handbook of Language and Social Psychology* (pp. 387–406). New York: Oxford University Press.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage.* Cambridge University Press.

Chepiga, Ya. (1909). Soedinenie slovesnogo metoda so zvukovym pri obuchenii chteniyu i pismu [Combining the verbal method with the sound method in teaching reading and writing]. *People's teacher, 3*, 9–12. [in Russian]

Fedorenko, S. V. (2016). Metodolohichne znachennya pedahohichnoho dyskursu v formuvanni humanitarnoyi kultury studentiv bakalavriatu v SSHA [Methodological significance of pedagogical discourse in the formation of liberal humanistic culture of undergraduate students in the United States]. *Pedagogy and psychology, 3*(92), 56–61. [in Ukrainian]

Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and Conversation. In P. Cole, & J. L. Morgan. (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics* (vol. 3, Speech Acts, pp. 41–58). New York: Academic Press.

Haugh, M. (2007). The discursive challenge to politeness research: An interactional alternative. *Journal of Politeness Research, 3*(2), 295–317.

Holtgraves, T., & Perdew, A. (2016). Politeness and the communication of uncertainty. *Cognition, 154*, 1–10.

Ilchenko, O. M. (2001). Porivnyalno-kilkisnyy analiz verbalnykh zasobiv etyketyzatsiï anhlomovnoho naukovoho dyskursu [Comparative-quantitative analysis of verbal means of labeling English-language scientific discourse]. *Problems of word, sentence and text semantics, 7*, 91–94. [in Ukrainian]

Ilchenko, O. M. (2002). *Etyket anhlomovnoho naukovoho dyskursu* [Etiquette of English-language scientific discourse]. K.: Politekhnyka. [in Ukrainian]

Kyrychuk, L. M. (1999). *Prahmasemantychni osoblyvosti katehoriï otsinky v reklamnomu teksti (na materiali reklamy zhurnalu "Time")* [Pragmasemantic features of the category of evaluation in the advertising text (on the material of advertising of the magazine "Time"). Dissertation abstract. [in Ukrainian]

Longman Dictionary of English Language and Culture. (1992). Harlow: Addison Wesley Longmans Limited.

Pocheptsov, G. G. (1980). Semanticheskiy analiz etiketizatsii obshcheniya [Semantic analysis of communication etiquette]. *Semantics and knowledge representation: writings on artificial intelligence, 2*, 98–108. [in Ukrainian]

Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts.* Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J. R. (1976). A Classification of Illocutionary Acts. *Language in Society, 5*(1), 1–23.

Shelomentsev, V. N. (1995). *Etiket i kultura obshcheniia* [Etiquette and culture of communication]. Kyiv: Oberih. [in Russian]

Van Dijk, T. A. (2014). *Discourse and Knowledge. A sociocognitive approach.* Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107775404

Ольга Бесклетна, Олена Шепелєва, Олена Муханова. Лінгвістичний аспект категорії ввічливості в рекламному дискурсі. У роботі висвітлено співвідношення понять етикету та ввічливості з точки зору рекламного дискурсу. Наголошено, що сучасні дослідження мови та мовлення стають все більш міждисциплінарними, зосередженими на функціонуванні мови в різних соціокультурних контекстах. Розглянуто диференціацію понять «етикет», «ввічливість» та «етикетизація». Зазначено, що етикет як широке за змістом поняття є об'єктивацією існуючих норм відносин у суспільстві. Окреслено, що ввічливість як складне соціокультурне явище, що сприяє успішності спілкування, є одним із засобів вираження етикету. Етикетизація, базуючись на принципах мовленнєвої ввічливості, покликана полегшити процес спілкування та забезпечити досягнення цілей адресатом. Категорія етикету в рекламному дискурсі реалізується через категорію етикетизації на основі основних ознак мовленнєвої ввічливості: турботи про реципієнта (сприяння процесу сприйняття інформації реципієнтом) і модуляції категоричної та некатегоричної номінації з переважанням останньої (базується на об'єктивності, неупередженості та переконливості). Крім того, що ввічливість як прояв цілеспрямованості мовної поведінки розглянуто здебільшого на основі риторичної прагматики з визначенням ілокутивниих цілей мовця, окреслено також і вплив міжособистісної риторики та текстової риторики, кожна з яких складається з низки максим. З'ясовано, що термін «етикетизація» зустрічається у дослідженні рекламного дискурсу при розгляді аргументації як відсилання до адресата у позитивному сенсі. Наголошено, що етикетизація є важливою дискурсоутворюючою ознакою рекламного дискурсу. У цьому типі дискурсу етикетизація набуває специфічного, структурно складного вираження, часто виходить за межі лише одного висловлювання і може стосуватися послідовності мовленнєвих актів. Етикетизація рекламного дискурсу реалізується за допомогою ряду стратегій, реалізується за допомогою ряду тактик.

Ключові слова: рекламний дискурс; етикет; етикетизація; ввічливість; риторична прагматика.