

**EARLY PRACTICAL FOUNDATIONS OF THE THEME**

**Yokubov Anvar**

anvaryoqubov26@gmail.com

Teacher, Samarkand Institute of Economy and Service

**Amonov Humoyun**

Student, Samarkand Institute of Economy and Service

**Annotation:** The study looks at politeness theories from various language perspectives. It covers a wide range of viewpoints and theories regarding civility. It examines a variety of models, guidelines, and tactics. It is mostly based on the face-saving techniques of Brown and Levinsons and the differences between positive and negative faces. Furthermore, they believe that politeness should be reciprocated and that the absence of reciprocated politeness might be interpreted as the absence of a polite approach.

**Key words:** Linguistic, research, theory, nonexistence, communication, practical, perspective, companionship, scientific.

---

Politeness is regarded a typical basis of divergence from this balanced effectiveness, and is exactly communicated by this divergence. The research aims at explaining politeness and its theories due to their importance in daily communication; therefore, this topic is selected by the researcher.

It is likely for us to deal with politeness as a constant notion, as in the notion of polite societal conduct, inside a society. It is additionally viable to identify a group of one-of-a-kind typical standards due to behaving politely in social interplay inside a certain society. Several of these may encompass behaving tactfully, generously, modestly, and sympathetically towards the others. Nevertheless, inside a communication, there will be an extra scarcely special kind of politeness at function. If we want to illustrate it, we require the face notion.

As a scientific expression, face signifies the communal individual's self-image. It points to that self moving and communal sense that everybody owns and anticipates others to be familiar with. Politeness in a communication is defined as the way utilized to confirm consciousness of the face of another individual. By this, politeness is likely to be achieved in conditions of social remoteness or nearness. Showing consciousness for the face of other individual whilst that individual looks socially remote is frequently illustrated in terms of high opinion or esteem. Showing the corresponding consciousness while the other individual is socially near is frequently illustrated with respect to openness, companionship, or harmony. Type one is seen in a question posed by a student to the teacher, as shown in [a], and type two in the question posed by a friend to the similar person.

a. Excuse me, Mr. Ali, but can I talk to you for a minute?

b. Hey, Ahmed, got a minute?

It is understood from this kind of attitude that there are various sorts of politeness related to and linguistically manifested the supposition of comparative social remoteness or nearness. In nearly all contexts of English dialogues, the contributors in a communication frequently must

decide, when they converse, the comparative social remoteness between them, & thus their face needs.

Subsequently, the action of face saving directed to the negative face of a person shall have a tendency to exhibit respect, stress the significance of the time of the other person or his/her concerns, and encompass as well an apology for the annoyance or break, which is additionally named negative politeness. The action of face saving worried with the individual's high quality face shall have a tendency toward showing harmony, emphasizing that all speakers wish for the identical thing, & they have a frequent aim, which is additionally named positive politeness.

The strategy of positive politeness results in the asker to attract to a joint aim, and companionship as well, by words similar to those in the following question [a].

- a. How about letting him see her gift?
- b. Hello, friend, he'd be glad if she'd let him see her gift.

These on register expressions do signify an increased hazard to the speaker who suffers from a rejection and can be headed by several who wants and gets to understand you when you talk, the same as the sort shown in the following, intended to institute the required common on the base of this strategy.

- Hello. How's it going? Ok, if I sit there? We should be interested in the same crazy things. You take a lot of remarks as well, huh? Say, do me a big favor and let me take one of your pencils.

Nevertheless, mainly in nearly all the contexts of English speaking, the action of face saving is usually done by means of a strategy of negative politeness. The usual shape utilized is a question that includes a modal verb like the following [a]:

- a. Could you lend me a pencil?
- b. I m sorry to bother you, but can I ask you for a pencil or something?
- c. I know you're busy, but might I ask you if-mmm-if you happen to have an additional pencil that I can, you know -eh- borrow?

Utilizing this strategy leads to structures including apology expressions for imposing. Further complex negative politeness action may from time to time be listened to in extensive chat, frequently with uncertainties.

Negative politeness is usually articulated by questions which even request agreement to pose, for instance, Might we ask---? Superficially, questions like these provide a chance for another to reply in negative manner to the question without embracing the same effect of refusal of replying with negativity to a bald straight on record imperative.

The inclination to utilize positive politeness forms, highlighting nearness between the one who speaks and the one who hears, may be viewed as a solidarity strategy. This can be the main operating strategy amongst an entire group or it can be a choice utilized by an individual speaker on a certain occasion. Linguistically, a strategy like that will contain personal information, utility of nicknames, sometimes abusive terms as well (principally amongst males) and shared dialect or slang expressions. Often, a solidarity strategy will be distinguished by inclusive terms like 'we' and 'let's', as in the party invitation.

**LIST OF USED LITERATURE**

1. Domaneschi, F., Carrea, E., Penco, C., & Greco, A. (2013). The cognitive load of presupposition triggers: Mandatory and optional repairs in presupposition failure. *Language and Cognitive Processes*, 29(1), 136–146.
2. Grant, L. & Starks, D. (2001). Screening appropriate teaching materials: Closing from textbooks and television soap operas. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 39, 39-50.
3. Glanzberg, M. (2005). Presuppositions, truth values and expressing propositions. In M. Glanzberg, G. Preyer & G. Peter (eds.), *Contextualism in philosophy: Knowledge, meaning, and truth*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
4. Bonyadi, A. & Samuel, M. (2011). Linguistic nature of presupposition in American and Persian newspaper editorials. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 3, 1-16.
5. Davoudi, M. (2005). Inference generation skill and text comprehension. *The Reading Matrix*, 5(1), 106-123.