

В. В. Михайленко,

Буковинський державний фінансово-економічний університет, м. Чернівці

'PLEASE' AS AN ATTITUDINAL MARKER IN DISCOURSE

*У фокусі дослідження знаходиться одиниця *please*, яка в мовленнєвому акті прохання виконує прототипічну функцію маркера ввічливості, при цьому вона одночасно реалізує функцію міжособистісного відношення. Доведено, що *please*, представляє функцію «десемантизовану» ввічливості, проте у дискурсі його функція міжособистісних відношень між співрозмовниками стає домінуючою.*

Ключові слова: *ввічливість, реєстр дискурсу, прохання, корпусна лінгвістика, значення міжособистісного відношення, маркер дискурсу.*

*Статья сфокусирована на единицу *please*, которая в речевом акте 'просьбы', выполняет прототипическую функцию маркера вежливости, при этом она одновременно реализует функцию маркера межличностного отношения. Доказано, что *please* выражает функцию вежливости «десемантизированной», напротив, в дискурсе его функция маркера межличностного отношения между собеседниками становится доминантной.*

Ключевые слова: *вежливость, реестр дискурса, просьба, корпусная лингвистика, значение межличностного отношения, маркер дискурса.*

*The present paper is focused on the unit *please* which in the speech act of request is used in the prototypical function of the 'politeness' marker, besides it realizes the attitudinal function between interlocutors in textual fragments of various discourse registers. It is proved, that *please* expresses 'desemantized' politeness in English. On the contrary, its attitudinal function becomes dominant in discourse.*

Key words: *politeness; discourse register, request; corpus linguistics; attitudinal meaning, discourse marker,*

Points for discussion. Since 1950s some theories of attitudinal functions have been suggested to reveal the purposes they serve for the speaker (Katz, 1960; Katz & Stotland, 1959; Kelman, 1958, 1961; Smith, Bruner, & White, 1956). Sharon Shavitt and Michelle R. Nelson consider that functional theories were the first to recognize attitudes as instrumental constructs designed to serve speakers' physical, social, and emotional needs [8, p.137]. One of the most basic functions of language is to create interpersonal relationships between the Speaker and the Addressee through the way in which text/discourse is worded. Speech act functions establish whether we are offering or demanding, aiding or attacking, creating solidarity or emphasizing social distance [5, pp.33-56]. In these and other ways we use language to express our attitude towards the interlocutor / community and socially orient ourselves and our text/discourse to others. Evidently, the attitudinals are derivative— they are generated in the process of discourse like *please* reveals, for example, the component of beseeching or persuasion. The pragmatic meanings represent prototypical semantics [13, p.731-769] of *please* – politeness.

Linguistic politeness covers all areas of historical pragmatics from grammaticalization theory to pragmatic entities, such as discourse markers, speech acts and politeness to individual discourse domains from scientific writing to literary discourse. Being polite may differ from culture to culture – there are linguistic and paralinguistic means of conveying politeness, distance and respect which do not hold true in every language [10, p.47]. Our object of research is the highly frequent use of *please* in English and many other languages. The close association of *please* with requests has led some to define it as an illocutionary marker rather than as a politeness marker. Politeness is «a system of interpersonal relations designed to facilitate interaction by minimizing the potential for conflict and confrontation inherent in all human interchange (Lakoff, 1990).

Current publications on the topic. Semantics, as the theory of the relation between language and the world, is reformulated as cognitive semantics referring to the theory of the relation between the language and the mind's understanding of the world. It combines analysis of cognitive structure, conceptual structure and semantic structure. During the last fifteen years, existing models of linguistic politeness have generated a huge amount of empirical research. Using a wide range of data from real-life speech situations, this new introduction to politeness breaks away from the limitations of current models and argues that the proper object of study in politeness theory must be commonsense notions of what politeness and impoliteness are. From this, Watts argues, a more appropriate model, one based on Bourdieu's concept of social practice, is developed. The paper aims to show that the term 'polite' can only be properly examined discursively. In doing so, 'polite' and 'impolite' utterances inevitably involve their users in a struggle for power. Until very recently, pragmatics has been restricted to the analysis of contemporary spoken language while historical linguistics has studied historical texts and language change in a decontextualized way (Малая, 2006; Сапрун, 2006; Стернин, 1996; Шамянова, 2007; Traugott, 1972; Schlieben-Lange, 1979; von Polenz, 1981; Sitta, 1980; Вак, 1983; Historical Pragmatics, 1996). It has radically changed and scholars from various countries try to work out a new theoretical framework that can integrate recent advances both in pragmatics and in historical linguistics [1].

Topicality of the investigation. Linguistic politeness is a matter of strategic interaction aimed at achieving goals such as avoiding conflict and maintaining harmonious relations with others (Kasper, 1990). According to Brown and Levinson, politeness strategies are developed in order to save the hearer's «face». Face refers to the respect that an individual has for him or herself, and maintaining that «self-esteem» in public or in private situations [4]. The current explorations touch upon the most important problems in developing a theory of linguistic politeness, which must deal with the crucial differences between lay notions of politeness in different cultures and the term 'politeness' as a concept within a theory of linguistic politeness. The universal validity of the term itself is called into question, as are

models such as those developed by Brown and Levinson, 1987; Lakoff, 1990, and new approaches are suggested [3, p18]. However, *please* remains an important feature of politeness in English: its omission in some contexts makes a request less courteous rather than less like a request, so its function must be, at least to some extent, to convey interpersonal, 'attitudinal' meaning.

Scientific and methodological significance. We try to present a radically new way of looking at linguistic category of politeness which will also open up the field of politeness research to students of sociology, anthropology and cultural studies. The politeness theory originally developed employing the two pillars of speech act theory (Searle, 1969) and conversational implicature theory (Grice, 1975) which were increasingly criticized for their single-utterance orientation and speaker focus [9, pp. 617-637]. Therefore, due to the development of the discourse analysis correspondingly shifted toward a discourse as a speech continuum in the social context, wherein the relationships between the interlocutors and their attitude [2, p.3-14] to reality are expressed through language [1, p.12]

Problems under consideration. Im/politeness studies are pursued within discourse studies – and have borrowed notions from – several neighbouring disciplines, including social psychology, sociology, linguistic anthropology, human communication research, cross-cultural linguistics, and linguistic typology.

If we adopt this approach, then politeness is a matter of specific linguistic choices from a range of available ways of saying something. Definitions of politeness abound (see, for example, Sifianou, 1992; Eelen, 2000), but the core of most definitions refers to linguistic politeness as a means of expressing consideration for others (e.g., Holmes, 1995; Thomas, 1995; Watts, 2003). Therefore, we shall concentrate on the prototypical meaning of *please* and its attitudinal functions.

Data investigation. The words '*polite*' and '*politeness*' can be traced back to general notions related to cleanliness or to smooth, polished, refined, planned, civilized, or courtly activity. The notion of *politeness* has been approached from two angles: first-order politeness (or politeness 1 as perceived by members of different socio-cultural groups) and second-order politeness (or politeness 2) as a theoretical construct or the scientific conceptualization of politeness (Eelen 2001; Watts 2003, 2005; Watts, Ide, & Ehlich 1992).

The etymological analysis of *please* proves that it was registered in early 14c., «to be agreeable». It was borrowed from Old French *plaisir* «to please, give pleasure to, satisfy» (11c., Modern French *plaire*, the form of which is perhaps due to analogy of *faire*). This form came from from Latin *placere* «to be acceptable, be liked, be approved, it may be related «to placare «to soothe, quiet» (cf.: source of Spanish *placer*, Italian *piacere*). They all possibly developed from from Proto-Indo-European **plak-e-* «to be calm,» via notion of *still water*, etc., from root **plak-* (1) «to be flat» (see placenta). The meaning of *please* «to delight» in English is from late 14c. The inverted use of *please* for «to be pleased» is from c.1500, first in Scottish, and paralleling the evolution of synonymous like (v.). The intransitive sense of *please* (e.g.: do as you please) first recorded c.1500. The imperative use of *please* (e.g.: please do this) was first recorded 1620s, it was probably a shortening of 'if it please (you)' (late 14c.). Verbs for «please» supply the stereotype polite word (e.g. «Please come in,» short for may it please you to...) in many languages (French, Italian), «But more widespread is the use of the first singular of a verb for 'ask, request' «. Spanish *favor* is short for *hace el favor* «do the favor». Danish has in this sense *vær saa god*, literally «be so good». *Pleased* (adj.) «satisfied, contented» comes in late 14c., past participle adjective from *please* (v.).

Polite came into English in late 14c., «polished, burnished» (mid-13c. as a surname), from Latin *politus* «refined, elegant, accomplished,» literally «polished,» past participle of *polire* «to polish, to make smooth» (see: *polish* (v.)), used literally at first in English; In the sense of «*elegant, cultured*» it was first recorded c.1500; that of «behaving courteously» was 1748 (implied in politely, cf.: etiquette n.). It came to England in 1750, from French *étiquette* «prescribed behavior,» from Old French *estiquette* «label, ticket» (see: ticket).

Politesse (n.) «civility,» in 1717 comes from French *politesse* (17c.), from Italian *politezza*, properly «the quality of being polite,» from *polito* «polite,» from Latin *politus* (see: *polite*). Etymologically the English word '*polite*' is derived from the Latin past-participle of the verb '*polire*' which is '*politus*', meaning 'polished' or 'smoothed' [see: 11].

Linguistic *politeness* has generally been considered the proper concern of pragmatics, the area of linguistics that accounts for how we attribute meaning to utterances in context, or meaning in interaction. Semantics, as the theory of the relation between language and the world, is reformulated as cognitive semantics referring to the theory of the relation between the language and the mind's understanding of the world. It combines analysis of cognitive structure, conceptual structure and semantic structure. We shall start with the analysis of definitions of *please* in the English language system recorded in various dictionaries:

A. Oxford English Dictionary gives the definition of *please* as an adverb:

1. In polite requests or questions: please address letters to the Editor what type of fish is this, please?
2. To add urgency and emotion to a request: please, please come home!
3. To agree politely to a request: 'May I ring you at home?' 'Please do.'
4. In polite or emphatic acceptance of an offer: 'Would you like a drink?' 'Yes, please.'
5. To ask someone to stop doing something of which the speaker disapproves: Rita, please—people are looking
6. To express incredulity or irritation: Oh please, is that meant to be a serious argument?

B. McMillan Dictionary gives the definition of polite as an interjection:

1. As a polite way of asking for something or of asking someone to do something: Would you help me with these bags, please?

Could I have change for a pound, please?

Can you tell me how much this costs, please?

2. For emphasizing a request, an order, or a statement: Please stop making all that noise! 'Do you mind if we come in?' 'Please do.' Please note that there will be no class next Thursday.

3. For asking someone to stop doing something annoying: Billy, please! I'm warning you!
4. As a polite way of accepting something that someone has offered you.
Yes, please. 'Would you like some more coffee?' 'Yes, please.'
5. For saying that you think someone has said something silly: 'Why don't you join a gym?' 'At my age? Oh, please!'

C. The Longman Dictionary gives the definition of *please*, as an interjection, in the formal style:

1. To be polite when asking someone to do something:

Could you please clean up the living room? Sit down, please. Please be quiet!

2. To be polite when asking for something:

I'd like a cup of coffee, please. Please can I go to Rebecca's house?

3. In order to politely accept something that someone offers you:

'More wine?' 'Yes, please.' Please, interjection, informal

4. When you think what someone has just said or asked is not possible or reasonable: Oh, please, he'd never do that.

5. Ask someone to stop behaving badly: Alison! Please!

6. British English spoken used by children to get an adult's attention please Sir/Mrs Towers, etc.

D. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* gives the definition of *please*:

1. As a polite way of asking for something or telling somebody to do something: Please sit down. Two coffees, please. Quiet please! Please could I leave early today?

2. To add force to a request or statement: Please don't leave me here alone.

Please, please don't forget. Please, I don't understand what I have to do.

3. As a polite way of accepting something: 'Would you like some help?' 'Yes, please.' 'Coffee?' 'Please.'

4. Please! (informal, often humorous) used to ask somebody to stop behaving badly: Children, please! I'm trying to work. John! Please!

5. When you are replying to somebody who has said something that you think is stupid: Oh, please! You cannot be serious.

The definitional analysis has revealed the dominant component *politeness* and a number of components in the lexical meaning of *please*: opener [10, pp.205–221], softener, intensifier, emphasiser, and downtoner, which in the discourse can express the speaker's attitudinal meanings.

The discourse analysis of *please* (its frequency is 13 777) represented by text fragments selected from the British National Corpus (100 ml word forms).

1. If there is confusion, please don't hesitate to call me! Please + Vdo + Not + V (no punctuation mark after).
2. Ten shillings, please. If you are in straightened circumstances please contact your social security office, you cannot know whether you are eligible for financial help unless you ask. NP + Please (punctuation mark).
3. Jean-Paul – please. NP + Please (punctuation mark).
4. For further information please contact. NP + Please + V (no punctuation mark).
5. Please help as I feel I'm going to look old before my time! Please + V (no punctuation mark).
6. He wanted an answer quickly, he wasn't used to delay of any kind and kept up the pressure, 'Please give me your answer,' he implored. Please + V (no punctuation mark).
7. Oh, and could I please have the hot-water ration today, Mama? Vmod + I + Please + V (no punctuation mark).
8. Now please look at these two young people here in this court,' he said to the jury. Now + Please + V (no punctuation mark).
9. Please, will you tell me who it is. Please + V will + Q (punctuation mark)
10. Is it possible to speak to Pete please? Q + Please (no punctuation mark).

However, 'please' is originally included into the group modifiers (internal and external) [3]. The typology of internal modifiers differentiates four major types of speech act modification: openers (to seek the addressee's cooperation) [10, pp.205–221]; softeners (to soften the (im-) positive force of the request); intensifiers ((to aggravate the impact of the request); fillers (to fill in the gaps in the interaction). Among the external modification devices of the request there are six major types can be identified: preparators, grounders, disarmers, expanders, promise of rewards, and politeness signal [9, p.37; cf.: 3, p.18].

But the semantic and pragmatic analyses negate the definition of *please* as the commonest and most significant modifier of the request [cf.: 12, p.273]. The syntactic, pragmatic, prosodic, and [12, pp.1521-1549] contextual features [7, pp.5-19] co-occur in a systematic way, and on this basis the view can be supported that there is a unifying deontic meaning of *please*, referring to an agreed set of rights and obligations, but that the focus of a *please*-request can be both speaker- and hearer-oriented.

Main conclusions. Grammatical categories (e.g. complementizer, negation, auxiliary, case) are some of the most important building blocks of syntax and morphology. You might analyze *please* as, say, a verb-phrase placeholder. The reality is that lots of words/phrases don't really fit into those traditional grammar categories. The classification of *please* as an adverb is not watertight. It can appear in similar positions in sentences (Will you please / kindly / quickly fasten your seat belts). English words are divided into eight different parts of speech according to their function in a sentence. The parts of speech are adjectives, adverbs, conjunctions, interjections, nouns, pronouns, prepositions, verbs, and articles. This categorization therefore poses fundamental questions about grammatical structures and about the lexicon from which they are built [6, pp.1-13].

The suggested analysis shows that discourse marker *please* not only create cohesion by playing an active role in the structuring of discourse and also underlines its role which is not reducible to the syntactic role of a coordinate

clause conjunction». The analysis demonstrates that *please* is polysemous, and the variety as originating in different areas of meaning (discourse, semantic, pragmatic);

examines its discourse function (whether a pronominal expression or a discourse marker), the semantic domains it contributes to (temporal relations and logical links, with extended discussion of the variety of logical links that can be signaled) and its attitudinal functions in regard to the addressee. The text fragments are selected from literary texts of various discourse registers. Politeness is broadly defined to include both polite friendliness and polite formality – and a universal model is constructed outlining the abstract principles underlying polite usage [see: 11].

Perspectives of a further investigation. The results can be considered to be of special interest to students in linguistic pragmatics, sociolinguistics, applied linguistics, anthropology, and sociology and social psychology of interaction. Further on the investigation must offer surveys of historical pragmatic research in individual discourse domains from scientific writing to literary discourse. It can be also the basis for developing a cross-cultural aspect, for example, in English and Ukrainian space. Underneath the apparent diversity of polite behaviour in different societies lie some general pan-human principles of social interaction, and the model of politeness provides a tool for analysing the quality of social relations in any society.

References:

1. Кубрякова Е. С. Язык и знание. На пути получения знаний о языке: части речи с когнитивной точки зрения. Роль языка в познании мира / О. С. Кубрякова. – М.: Языки славянской культуры, 2004. – 506 с.
2. Andersen Gisle and Fretheim Thorstein (Eds). Introduction / Gisle Andersen and Thorstein Fretheim // Pragmatic Markers and Propositional Attitude. / Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2000. – Pp. 3-14.
3. Brown P., Levinson S. C. Politeness: Some Universals of Language Use / P. Brown, S. C. Levinson. – Cambridge: CUP, 1987. – 358 p.
4. Lai Junming. Interpersonal Functions of EFL Teachers' Evaluative Discourse / Junming Lai // International Education Studies. – 2010. – Vol. 3. – No 2. (on-line).
5. Lemke J. L. Resources for Attitudinal Meaning: Evaluative Orientations in Text Semantics / J. L. Lemke // Functions of Language. – 1998. – 5(1). – Pp. 33-56.
6. Manzini M. Rita, Savoia Leonardo M. Grammatical Categories: Variation in Romance Languages / M. Rita Manzini, Leonardo M. Savoia // Cambridge Studies in Linguistics. – No. 128. – Cambridge : CUP, 2011. – 364 p.
7. Martinez-Flor A. The Use and Function of 'Please' in Learners' Oral Requestive Behaviour: A Pragmatic Analysis/ Alicia Martinez-Flor // Journal of English Studies. – 2009. – 9. – Pp. 35-54.
8. Shavitt Sharon, Nelson Michelle R. The Role of Attitude Functions in Persuasion and Social Judgement / Sharon Shavitt, Michelle R. Nelson // The Persuasion Handbook: Developments in Theory and Practice. – Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, Inc., 2002. – Pp. 137-153.
9. Terkourafi Marina. Politeness and pragmatics / Marina Terkourafi // The Cambridge Handbook of Pragmatics. – Cambridge: CUP, 2012. – Pp. 617-637.
10. Trillo Jesús Romero. Your Attention, Please: Pragmatic Mechanisms to Obtain the Addressee's Attention in English and Spanish conversations / Jesús Romero Trillo // Journal of Pragmatics. – 1997. – Vol. 28. – Issue 2. – Pp. 205-221.
11. Watts Richard James, Ide Sachiko, Ehlich Konrad. Politeness in Language: Studies in Its History, Theory and Practice / Richard James Watts, Sachiko Ide, Konrad Ehlich. – Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2005 – 404 p.
12. Wichmann Anne. The Intonation of Please-requests: a corpus-based study / Anne Wichmann // Journal of Pragmatics. – 2004. – 36. – 9. – Pp. 1521-1549.
13. Wierzbicka Anna. Prototypes in Semantics and Pragmatics: Explicating Attitudinal Meanings in Terms of Prototypes / Anne Wierzbicka // Linguistics: An Interdisciplinary Journal of the Language sciences. – 1989. – 27. – № 4. – Pp. 731-769.