

<https://doi.org/10.62837/2026.5.331>

ABBASOVA AYTAMIZ ABBAS
Candidate for a degree,
Azerbaijan University of Languages
Address: Rashid Behbudov str. 134
aytemiz.abbasova@adu.edu.az

ANALYSIS OF INHERENT AND MOCK IMPOLITENESS IN DIFFERENT CONTEXTS

ABSTRACT

Nəzakətsizliyin sözlərin birbaşa və dolayı yolla ifadə olunduğu iki forması var. Mənfi mənada, birbaşa mənada işlədilən sözlərə daxili nəzakətsizlik deyilir. Bu cür sözlər istehzal, zarafatcasına, dolayı yolla işlədildikdə isə saxta nəzakətsizliyi ifadə edirlər.

Impoliteness has two forms in which the words express directly and indirectly. When the words being used in negative meaning, mean direct meaning they are called inherent impoliteness. If such words are used ironically, in a jocular way, indirectly they express mock impoliteness.

Mock impoliteness is classified by researchers as false, artificial impoliteness, and joking expressions. The naming of such cases as false, artificial impoliteness is claimed by J.Culpeper, Huff, D.Bousfield, but G.Leach states that it is synonymous with joking expressions. J.Culpeper broadly classifies this issue in his book under the name of inherent and mock impoliteness. He expresses mock impoliteness as superficial, indirect impoliteness based on close relationships and context, and interprets inherent impoliteness as expressions used directly in a real sense.

Leach believes that mock impoliteness is the perception of impolite words as polite addresses rather than as they are intended for the other party. One of the researchers who was not unambiguous about the classifications of artificial impoliteness by J.Culpeper and Leach was S.Mill does not agree with the close relationship and aimless, thoughtless expression expressed in the classifications of J.Culpeper and Leach. He (S.Mill) refers to Yedes' (1996) analysis of insults and jokes used to complete tasks in difficult situations at work to confirm this opinion. Miriam Webster's online dictionary indicates that the term mock is classified as having the property of imitating something or pretending, or being insincere. When evaluated as mock impoliteness, such expressions said during a conversation are perceived superficially by the addressee. The superficial, superficial perception of impoliteness by the addressee is based on the close relationship between the interlocutors. When, in a joking manner, mock impoliteness is taken as a synonym, the expression uttered during a conversation is perceived as mock impoliteness by one interlocutor, while it is perceived as genuine impoliteness by the other

interlocutor. In order to eliminate this contradiction, it is appropriate to classify both terms separately. In general, when important factors such as close relationship, social status, and context are taken into account, impolite expressions addressed are perceived as mock impoliteness or inherent impoliteness.

Keywords: mock impoliteness, inherent impoliteness, context, social behavior, social evaluation.

Introduction.

The essence of language has been of great importance throughout history. Various theories of language have tried to explain its nature in detail. Let us consider some of them: In anthropological linguistics, language is formed in a social and cultural environment. Language is a biological and mental ability. This means that language has an innate nature [1, p.380]. In anthropological linguistics, diversity and differences are at the forefront. However, there are some overlapping features of functional linguistics and anthropological linguistics in language studies. Both functional linguistics and anthropological linguistics evaluate language as a formal activity and consider the role of context and communication conditions to be important. Within the framework of both language theories, the relationship of language to human life is investigated. However, there are differences in the issues investigated by these two language theories, since functional linguistics emphasizes the communicative function of language [4, p.99], while anthropological linguistics tries to explain its role in normal human life by examining language in its cultural and social context.

Behavior in the communication process serves certain purposes and like all social behavior, is regulated by rules. To achieve a communicative goal, participants in the act of communication use certain methods and rules known as communicative strategies, communicative tactics, and communicative habits. The main task of pragmatics is to identify and refine these rules and methods. For this reason, various scholars have developed a number of principles that contribute to successful communication, such as H. P. Grice's Cooperative Principle, R. Lakoff's Politeness Principle, and D. Sperber and D. Wilson's Relevance Principle. Violation of communicative postulates, for example, failure to provide an appropriate amount of information, disregard for the rules of speech etiquette, insufficient motivation in performing a speech act, lack of communicative purpose, and similar factors may lead to a breakdown of cooperation between communicators and result in conflict. Thus, two opposite types of communication function in relation to one another: cooperation (the sphere of agreement) and conflict (the sphere of disagreement). Such communicative breakdown can give rise to impoliteness [2, p. 265-266]

For more than twenty years, the theory of politeness and how it is used during communication have been studied. The category of impoliteness, which is considered the opposite of this category, has been studied in recent years. In this article, we will

focus on the types of impoliteness, especially the situations in which mock impoliteness occurs, and the moments of its manifestation.

Mock impoliteness is expressed by different terms by different researchers. J. Culpeper, G. Leach, D. Bousfield, M. Haugh have studied this category in different ways and interpreted the term they named in their classifications in different ways. The article will comment on this issue in more detail, as well as touch on the issue of whether or not mock impoliteness is perceived superficially, indirectly by the interlocutors.

Depending on the context, impolite expressions can indicate impoliteness. Sometimes, not the context, but the number of interlocutors is important. If such impolite expressions are perceived superficially by one interlocutor, they are understood as impolite by the other interlocutor. All of these points find their explanation in the article with the classification.

Analyzing inherent impoliteness depending on the context

The concept of acts (means) expressing politeness and impoliteness is also relative. Depending on the context, impolite acts can also express politeness. B. Frase and V. Nolan argue that “no sentence is truly polite or impolite. We often understand certain expressions as impolite, but they are not impolite words and expressions, but are simply used to determine the rule of politeness in some situations” [8, p. 96]. It is possible to agree with this opinion, because expressions expressing true politeness or impoliteness can also be understood in the opposite way depending on the context. For example, when offering a guest dinner, such a sentence is used.

“Eat, eat, and drink.” (Go on, eat up.)

In our opinion, this expression can be addressed to a person with whom we have a close relationship (for example, a brother, a sister, a friend, etc.) and can be received well. As can be seen, although the above expression indicates impoliteness, it is not perceived as impolite depending on the context. However, the opposite can also be the case, that is, there are cases where expressions indicating politeness also indicate impoliteness depending on the situation. To substantiate this idea, let's look at an example from the article of the English linguist J. Culpeper: a driver is carrying three passengers, but he keeps the windshield wipers on even when it is not raining while driving. Although two of the passengers ask the driver to turn them off, he does not answer them and continues to drive the car in an angry state. However, the third passenger intervenes and says:

“It is raining.” Hearing this, the driver turns off the windshield wipers [6, p. 351].

It can be noted that although this expression indicates politeness and is a polite address, the sentence indicates that there is some deficiency in the person's driving skills, which is embarrassing for the driver.

Analyzing inherent impoliteness out of context

Above, we analyzed the cases of inherent impoliteness that depend on the context. Now let's consider a set of acts that indicate inherent impoliteness that arise regardless of the context. For example, there are a number of behavioral rules that contradict social rules. For example, (belching, cleaning one's nose or ears, using taboo words). However, such behavioral rules are perceived differently in different cultures, that is, while for one culture (Azerbaijani culture, English culture) the same behavior (belching - indicating that one eats food with appetite and likes it) is considered acceptable for another culture (Indian culture). It is difficult to determine whether the act of politeness or the change in context creates impoliteness, depending on the way the word is said. J. Culpeper clarifies this issue as follows: "both forms of inherent impoliteness (context-dependent and context-independent) indicate acts that are contrary to social behavior, and this is more of a blow to the face of the addressee with unsocial behavior than an insult. Based on this argument, it can be noted that although there is a close connection between the act of threatening the face, which is related to the act of politeness, and the acts that express inherent impoliteness, the distinguishing feature is that while threatening acts express only hurt, heartbreak, acts that express inherent impoliteness express more of a person's antisocial behavior than an insult" [7, p. 178; 62, p. 49].

Mock impoliteness

As for the question of mock impoliteness, let us note that this form of impoliteness is understood superficially and is not used with the aim of causing offense. J. Leach associates this term with the principle he calls "banter principle". The author shows that "two methods are used to show solidarity with the listener. First, what the speaker says is superficial and this seems clearly impolite to the listener. Second, although what the speaker says shows impoliteness to the listener, it is perceived superficially because of what is said" [11, p. 144].

J. Culpeper in his article commented on J. Leach's idea that the banter principle reflects social proximity: "Here, social proximity means proximity in terms of social distance and equality in terms of legality. That is, the more proximity there is, the less politeness there is" [6, p. 352]. Commenting on J. Leach's approach to this idea, it can be noted that J. Culpeper's different attitude can be noted that, in his opinion, this happens only within the context, that is, depending on the context, this impoliteness is understood superficially.

P. Brown and S. Levinson touch on the issue of mock impoliteness in their work "Politeness: Some universals in language usage". Although they also associate the lack of politeness with a close, intimate relationship, they emphasize that such impolite expressions do not cause offense between the interlocutors. J. Culpeper notes that "such situations cannot be associated only with a close relationship. They can also occur between people who are not in this close relationship and are not

perceived as impolite. Such situations can be shown in advertising slogans”. The researcher cites the following example to substantiate this idea.

“Eat beef, you bastard”.

This sentence was used by an Australian meat seller. However, buyers do not perceive this as impolite, and it seems that the seller did not intend to use this expression in the sense of a derogatory address, but simply used it as an idiom, a joke. Here it is possible to see that there is no close relationship between the buyer and the seller [6, p. 352].

Let's look at an example in Azerbaijani.

Almaz: Comrades, peasants, we are working for you [3, p. 155].

In this example, the form of address (Comrades - in Azerbaijani translation- *Ay gədə*) shows a derogatory case. However, such impoliteness does not create resentment between the interlocutors, and as a result, mock impoliteness occurs. When this sentence occurs in a different context, when it is said in the form of an order, when it is used between the participants in the conversation, and when there is a close relationship between the interlocutors, a case of inherent impoliteness occurs.

So, what J. Leach calls banter, what P. Brown and S. Levinson call lack of politeness, and what J. Culpeper calls mock impoliteness occur between both close and unrelated interlocutors. In general, people who like each other a lot try to maintain their respect, so even impolite expressions used between them are accidentally used in a joking manner.

Mock impoliteness in the approaches of various linguists

The term mock impoliteness was first used by J. Leach, who put it forward by referring to the situations he encountered. In these situations, the speaker perceives impolite words as polite addresses, not as they are for the other party. For example,

i) You are a fine friend. (face value, i.e what is said)

ii) By which I mean, you aren't a fine friend. (Irony principle).

iii). But actually, you are my friend, and to show it, I am being impolite to you.

Banter principle) [11, p. 145].

According to J. Leach, the principle of irony refers to the first part of the hidden meaning in the sentence, that is, what the speaker says is impolite to the listener. However, in the banter principle, the hidden meaning is in the second part. Here, what the speaker says to the listener is polite and honest [11, p. 144]. Therefore, mock impoliteness is interpreted as a hidden form of politeness in J. Leach's classification.

Mock impoliteness is given in detail in J. Culpeper's classification. He calls this form of impoliteness superficial, indirect impoliteness, since it is used in order not to cause offense [6, p. 349-367]. One of the interesting points in this classification of the researcher is the analysis of J. Leach's ideas on this issue and the additions made to that analysis by J. Culpeper. J. Culpeper, expressing his opinion on J. Leach's

association of artificial impoliteness with close, intimate relationships, notes that "this form of impoliteness occurs not only in close relationships, but also between people with a sufficient social distance". He claims that the context is important here, and J. Leach did not take this issue into account. This is mainly reflected in advertising slogans [6, pp. 349-353]. So, if in the classifications of J. Leach, P. Brown and S. Levinson, artificial impoliteness is based on intimate relationships, then in the classification of J. Culpepper, in addition to not taking into account intimate relationships, context plays a key role.

There are also a number of critical opinions in the classifications we have mentioned about artificial impoliteness. One of these criticisms concerns the fact that artificial impoliteness indicates that the speaker says something falsely, incorrectly, that is, in the classifications of J. Leach and J. Culpepper. In this regard, S. Mills disagrees with the fact that "mock impoliteness allows the speaker to express something closer to his true, real feelings and thoughts in an exaggerated, exaggerated form and at the same time convey it in a way that can be interpreted superficially" [12, p. 124].

In our opinion, S. Mills disagrees with this idea with the issue of close relationship and aimless, thoughtless expression expressed in previous classifications (C. Culpepper, C. Leach). He even refers to Janet Yedes's (J. Yedes, 1996) analysis of insults and jokes used to complete tasks in difficult situations at work to confirm this idea. It is difficult to fully agree with this idea. The point we disagree with here is that insults used or rude expressions used as a joke can create mock impoliteness, but this can happen only when there is a close relationship between the addresser and the addressee and the expressions are not perceived in their real meaning. Another point of disagreement is that sometimes such expressions are perceived in their real, true meaning by the addressees, which also causes controversy. So, the first situation is an indicator of artificial impoliteness, and the second situation is an indicator of impoliteness. At the same time, Gringer's research also shows that nurses generally use mockery or humor to control patients, and the purpose of doing this is to show that they are in a close relationship with them in order to alleviate their anxiety (Gringer2004). In addition, P. Brown and S. Levinson note that "insulting someone in front of an audience in a joking manner is evaluated by the audience as a close, intimate relationship between these individuals (the addresser and the addressee)" [5, p. 134]. Summarizing the critical opinions, it can be noted that mock impoliteness is not only a form that is used accidentally and purposefully between friends and family members, but also occurs between people who have a sufficient social distance, provided that it does not cause offense. Here, by purposeful, as seen in the analyses of both J. Yedes and Gringer, it is meant to perform some task.

After mentioning the classifications related to mock impoliteness, let's pay attention to this term and what relationships it reflects and the points of its use in

conversations. The Miriam Webster online dictionary states that the term “mock” is classified as “having the quality of imitating something”, or “to pretend”, or “to be insincere”. In this regard, the meaning of “fake, applied to thoughts or actions” is that although it seems to reflect reality, it does not show the true feeling and object. J. Culpeper classifies this issue in his work and distinguishes between real and fake impoliteness. Fake impoliteness is classified as the absence of contextual situations that provide real, inherent impoliteness. He claims that “fake impoliteness is associated with both the relationship between the participants and the identity work in the social group. Here, identity work refers to the intra-group status of group members. That is, it is fake impoliteness used between the group leader and the group members, between employees and the boss. For example, a boss uses such expressions on the condition that it does not cause offense to his employees regarding the performance of their work”. According to J. Culpeper, “fake impoliteness affects both interpersonal relationships and status, and this fake impoliteness is reflected in its multifaceted functions. The first function strengthens solidarity, and this occurs between friends and close relatives with equal rights, and at the same time provides mutual understanding between these individuals. The second function can also be called covert oppression, where humor is used to hide cruel and oppressive intentions while having high rights and status. The last, third function of fake impoliteness is used to amuse some participants, especially for this target, causing pain, but entertainment for others” [7, p. 208].

Regarding these functions, we can note that such situations are often encountered in society. The first function occurs between family members, friends, close relatives of equal age and rights. It happens by chance and does not cause any offense. This function occurs in family and household discussions. The second function reflects inequality and is a status used by some executives. The third function is more often reflected in family discussions. In our opinion, the essence of the latter function is to ridicule, which can be unpleasant for the target and amusing for others. Let's look at a situation we encounter: One of the conversation participants speaks sarcastically to his interlocutor, who has undergone cosmetic surgery, about this operation. Although this conversation is a heartbreaking blow for the person addressed, it is funny for some interlocutors.

Mock impoliteness or inherent impoliteness

The multifunctionality, that is, the multifaceted nature of mock impoliteness creates a problem in understanding it as false or inherent impoliteness during a conversation. In this regard, J. Culpeper notes that “interviewees may not perceive an event in the same way: while one understands the event as mock impoliteness, the other understands it as inherent impoliteness” [7, pp. 213-215]. In solving this problem, it is necessary to pay attention to the differences in the analysis of mock impoliteness. In this regard, D. Bousfield proposed a conceptualization of mock

impoliteness. In his opinion, “mock impoliteness constitutes an assessment in both the addressee and the addressee, and this is theorized separately from the social activity and habit corresponding to this assessment”. This means that mock impoliteness or banter are expressed as separate concepts. Here, mock impoliteness constitutes the evaluation, and the joke constitutes the activity. Such evaluation (social evaluation) consists of judging a person and an attitude, or evaluating that person and an attitude. Let us note that social evaluation is understood as the idea and judgment formed on the basis of the behavior and speech of a person. Social behavior is the verbal and nonverbal behavior of individuals that takes into account the reactions and actions of others. What is analytically important here is that the evidence we pay attention to for the joint construction and mutual acquisition of this social behavior is not synonymous with the evidence required for the specific evaluation of that behavior [9, pp. 251-274]. Regarding such social behavior, it should be noted that since the reaction of the addressee is taken into account in this form of behavior, it is called a banter, otherwise the real evaluation of this behavior would mean the presence of impoliteness. As we have seen, the concepts of mock impoliteness and banter are very close to each other. Considering this proximity, although J. Leach uses these terms as synonyms, D. Bousfield considers that there is a barrier between them, that is, he considered the problem of analyzing mock impoliteness separately or in conjunction with the second form (jokingly - banter). In their article on mock impoliteness, written together by D. Bousfield and M. Haugh, they explain mock impoliteness as a term that evaluates “impolite behavior”, “unpolite behavior” [10, p. 1119]. Here they take the number of participants in the conversation as a basis. If the conversation is between two people, then mock impoliteness should be perceived as mock impoliteness. Moreover, if the conversation is between three or more people, then mock impoliteness may be perceived by one of the participants not as impolite behavior, but as impolite behavior. In such situations, noticeable tension arises. The presence of homonyms between these terms (impoliteness and impoliteness) is associated with mock impoliteness. Therefore, mock impoliteness is understood neither as politeness nor impoliteness, but rather as impoliteness from a conceptual point of view. The concept of “non-impolite” is based here on an allowable offense, that is, it is not evaluated as polite or impolite. The threat that causes offense is associated with the characteristics of the person addressed among individuals, and the fact that these characteristics are known to the addresser creates the conditions for the addressee to speak in this way.

Conclusion.

From all the above, it can be concluded that mock impoliteness is a type of impoliteness used with the aim of not causing offense. According to J. Culpeper, Bousfield, and Huff, mock impoliteness is impolite expressions that are superficially,

superficially accepted by the other party. The superficial, superficial acceptance of these expressions is based on a close relationship. Leach, on the other hand, equates mock impoliteness with a joking expression. J. Culpeper disagrees with his opinion and claims that although a joke expresses impoliteness, it is sometimes not superficially accepted. Whether impolite expressions are perceived superficially or indirectly depends on the context. It is also based on close relationships. Such expressions are not perceived indirectly between people who are not in a close relationship. Whether impolite expressions are perceived as superficially impolite also depends on the number of participants in the communication. If there are two people (the speaker and the addressee) during the communication, then impolite expressions express mock impoliteness. If there are two listeners, one may perceive the said expression superficially, while the other may understand it as direct impoliteness. In general, mock impoliteness occurs when the above-mentioned points are present.

References

1. Abdurahmanova R., Noam Xomski ilə bərabər dilçiliyə yeni düşüncə tərzinin gətirilməsi “Dil, şəxsiyyət, cəmiyyət və Nizami Gəncəvi yaradıcılığı” Konfrans Materialları, Sumqayıt: SDU s.376-379-382, <https://www.ssu-conferenceproceedings.edu.az/pdf/xarici2021.pdf>
2. Babayev C., Praqmalingvistikanın əsasları, Bakı. Mütərcim, 2024, 334 s.
3. Cabbarlı C.Q. Seçilmiş əsərləri: 4 cildə, II c., Bakı: yazıçı, 1983, 400s.
4. Abdurahmanova, R. Functional Approach in Linguistics: Theoretical Foundations, AMEA, M.Füzuli adına Əlyazmalar İnstitutu, Filologiya məsələləri 2025 №1 (14168) s.99-107 <https://filologiyameseleleri.com/pdf/2025/n1/99-107%20Roya%20%20Abdurahmanova.pdf>
5. Brown, P., Lewinson, S.C., Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage, Cambridge University Press. - 1987. – 345 p.
6. Culpeper, J., Towards an anatomy of impoliteness. Journal of Pragmatics, 25, 1996. pp.349-367.
7. Culpeper, J. 2011. Impoliteness: Using Language to cause Offence, Cambridge University Press.
8. Fraser, B., Nolan, W. “The association of deference with linguistic form”, International Journal of the Sociology of Language 27, 1981 s. 96.
9. Haugh, M. Conversational interaction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, Cambridge Handbook of Pragmatics, - 2012. - pp. 251-274
10. Haugh, M. and D.Bousfield, Mock impoliteness, jocular mockery and jocular abuse in Australian and British English Michael, 2012, Journal of Pragmatics 44(9): Elsevier publishing house Amsterdam s.1119).
11. Leech, G.N. Principles of Pragmatics, Longman. pragmatics, London: longman 1983, s. 144.

12. Mills, S. Gender and politeness, United Kingdom, Cambridge University press. - 2003. - p. 270.

Xülasə

MÜXTƏLİF KONTEKSTLƏRDƏ HƏQİQİ VƏ SAXTA NƏZAKƏTSİZLİK

Abbasova Aytəmiz Abbas

Saxta nəzakətsizlik tədqiqatçıları tərəfindən saxta, süni nəzakətsizlik, zarafatyana deyimlər kimi təsnif edilir. Belə halların saxta, süni nəzakətsizlik adlandırılması C. Kalpeper, M.Haf, D.Bousfield tərəfindən iddia olunur, ancaq zarafatyana deyimləsinin sinonim olmasını C.Liç bildirir. C. Kalpeper öz kitabında bu məsələni həqiqi və saxta nəzakətsizlik adı altında geniş şəkildə təsnif edir. O saxta nəzakətsizliyi sıx münasibətə və kontekstə əsaslanan səthi ötəri nəzakətsizlik kimi ifadə edir və həqiqi nəzakətsizliyi birbaşa real mənada işlənən ifadələr kimi şərh edir. C.Liç hesab edir ki, saxta nəzakətsizlik nəzakətsiz sözləri qarşı tərəf üçün olduğu kimi deyil, nəzakətli müraciət kimi qəbul edilməsi məqamlarıdır. C. Kalpeper və C.Liçin süni nəzakətsizlik təsnifatlarına birmənalı yanaşmayan tədqiqatçılardan biri də Mill olmuşdur. Mill C.Kalpeperin, C.Liçin təsnifatlarında ifadə olunan yaxın münasibət və məqsədsiz, düşünülməmiş ifadə olunması məsələsi ilə razılaşmır. O, (Mill) bu fikrinin təsdiqlənməsi üçün Yedesin (Yedes, 1996) işdə çətin situasiyalarda tapşırıqların yerinə yetirilməsi üçün istifadə olunan təhqir və zarafatların təhlilinə istinad edir. Miriam Vebsterin onlayn lüğətində göstərilir ki, süni, saxta termini (mock) nəyisə yamsılamaq xüsusiyyətinə malik olmaq yaxud biclik etmək, və ya qeyri-səmimi olmaq, kimi təsnif edilir. Saxta, süni nəzakətsizlik kimi dəyərləndirildikdə söhbət zamanı deyilən belə ifadələr ünvanlanan tərəfindən ötəri, səthi qəbul edilir. Nəzakətsizliyin ünvanlanan tərəfindən ötəri, səthi qəbul edilməsi həmsöhbətlər arasında sıx münasibətə əsaslanır. Zarafatyana deyimlə saxta nəzakətsizlik sinonim götürüldükdə söhbət zamanı deyilən ifadə bir həmsöhbət tərəfindən saxta nəzakətsizlik kimi qəbul edildiyi halda, digər həmsöhbət tərəfindən həqiqi nəzakətsizlik kimi qəbul edilir. Bu ziddiyyətin qaldırılması üçün hər iki terminin ayrı-ayrılıqda təsnif edilməsi məqsədəuyğundur.

Ümumiyyətlə, sıx münasibət, sosial status, kontekst kimi mühüm amillər nəzərə alındıqda ünvanlanan nəzakətsiz ifadələr saxta nəzakətsizlik və ya qeyri-nəzakətsizlik kimi qəbul edilir.

Açar sözlər: saxta nəzakətsizlik, qeyri-nəzakətsizlik, kontekst, sosial davranış, sosial dəyərləndirmə, birbaşa nəzakətsizlik.

Резюме

АНАЛИЗ ВНУТРЕННЕЙ И ПРИТВОРНОЙ НЕВЕЖЛИВОСТИ В РАЗЛИЧНЫХ КОНТЕКСТАХ

Аббасова Айтемиз Аббас

Невежливость имеет две формы, в которых слова выражают ее прямо и косвенно. Когда слова используются в отрицательном значении, то есть имеют

прямое значение, они называются внутренней невежливостью. Если же такие слова используются иронически, в шутливой форме, то косвенно они выражают притворную невежливость.

В статье рассматривается анализ семейных разговоров, возникновение невежливости как следствие недовольства между членами семьи во время разговора, причины невежливости среди собеседников, а также причины, по которым члены семьи склонны вести себя невежливо во время разговора. Иногда слова, которые употребляют собеседники, выражают невежливость, но не вызывают обид между участниками разговора. Это называется ложной невежливостью и в ее основе лежат близкие (дружеские) отношения между людьми. Эта форма невежливости часто используется в семейных разговорах, и ее использование членами семьи не ухудшает отношения. Подлинная невежливость – это форма невежливости, усугубляющая ситуацию во время разговора. Здесь неприятные выражения воспринимаются как оскорбления, вызывают обиду между собеседниками и создают почву для того, чтобы разговор стал еще более напряженным. Чаще всего это происходит, когда у участников разговора есть ожидания. Эта форма невежливости приводит к использованию неуместных вербальных и невербальных выражений, обостряя отношения между участниками разговора, что обеспечивает переход от невежливости к грубости. Причина, по которой в семейных разговорах чаще всего возникают невежливые ситуации, заключается в том, что собеседники проживают вместе (в одном доме) и в результате им приходится проводить вместе определенную часть дня, члены семьи в ходе разговора по-разному относятся к проблеме и они не соглашаются друг с другом.

Далее в статье рассматривается использование членами семьи в разговоре действий, угрожающих лицу, и действий по спасению лица. Акт угрозы лицу вызывает напряжение, тогда как сохранение лица приводит к уменьшению недовольства. Угроза лицу и использование средств сохранения лица являются показателем статуса человека в семье. В завершении, в статье изучается невежливость властных людей, считающих себя выше всех остальных в семье, а также классифицируются методы устранения невежливости в семейных беседах.

Ключевые слова: невежливость, ложная невежливость, подлинная невежливость, угроза репутации, акт сохранения лица, семейный дискурс, анализ разговора.

Rəyçi: Ph.D., prof. M.Y. Gaziyeva