International Journal of Engineering & Technology, 7 (4.8) (2018) 759-764

SPC

International Journal of Engineering & Technology

Website:www.sciencepubco.com/index.php/IJET

Research paper



Vocative as a Marker of Politeness Category Expression

Alla Bolotnikova[1*], Nadiya Balandina[2]

[1]Poltava National Technical Yuri Kondratyuk University
[2]Poltava V.G.Korolenko National Pedagogical University
[*]Corresponding author E-mail: a.p.bolotnikova@gmail.com

Abstract

The article focuses on the analysis of grammatical markers of politeness category expression. The object of the study is fragments of texts, which include expression of politeness; the subject is politeness category grammatical markers, their communicative-pragmatic features and varieties. The role of grammar in the expression of politeness has been substantiated in linguistics; vocative as a marker of politeness has been determined and inventoried; communicative-pragmatic potential of vocative as the politeness category expression and the verbalization mechanism of positive and negative politeness strategies have been described.
It has been found out that politeness is a communicative-pragmatic category intended to regulate the communication process and to promote formation of harmonious, benevolent and parity relationships with the help of specific linguistic means, in particular grammatical ones. The focus is on the theoretical aspects of the study. The role of politeness category in the communication process and its linguistic and pragmatic features is revealed. It has been found out that politeness is realized through a complex system of strategies and tactics aimed at achieving effective communication.
Vocative case expresses the importance of drawing and keeping attention. The speaker's ability to control the communicative process by means of the vocative case through the mediation of the speaker is determined, implementing a pragmatic strategy of influence on the intellectual, volitional and emotional spheres of the addressee. Distant and contact vocatives are highlighted in a number of word forms. Their use in accordance with the implementation of positive and negative politeness strategies and communicative-pragmatic presupposition is grounded.

Keywords: *category of politeness, communicative intention, negative politeness, positive politeness, pragmema, presupposition, strategy, tactics, vocative as a marker of politeness.*

1. Introduction

Verbal means of language, which "express high pragmatic orientation on the addressees, creating the effect of their presence" [3, p. 80], play an extremely important role in explication of the speaker's intentions. Nouns in the vocative case represent an example of such means. Semantic-syntactic, formal-syntactic and morphological characteristics of vocative as a grammeme in the case paradigm of the Ukrainian language were investigated by I. Vykhovanets [5], L. Kornovenko [10], N. Kostusiak [11], I. Kucherenko [13], V. Rusanivskyi [18], M. Skab [19], Y. Tymchenko [21] and others. Vocative is mainly considered as means of drawing and keeping attention, and no subtypes are identified, since one expression is the representation of the whole grammeme [13, p. 142–156]. It is sometimes difficult to determine the dominant in the meaning of vocative (drawing attention, identifying or leading into action) due to the "combination of inducing and attention drawing functions with the qualification function of the listeners themselves" [16, p. 407], which is confirmed by such examples: ***Пане добродію****, почекайте-но, я хочу Вам ще щось сказати!* (Domontovych V., "Bez gruntu"). Many researchers have identified the induction function (expression of a will, imperative, imperative mood). Thus, O. Espersen states that the vocative case "has a special form...; we can say that it expresses inducement" [9, p. 211]. Such domestic researchers as I. Vykhovanets and M. Skab share this opinion, paying attention to the communicative multi-functionality of vocative, which, depending on the context, implements either one function or another, or several at the same time. I. Shkitska convincingly claims: "With the help of vocatives, a speaker can establish, maintain and end the contact with the interlocutor, draw and shift their attention, as well as give an evaluative characteristic, make communication easier in the future" [24, p. 59]. According to I. Vykhovanets, the main function of vocative is that it combines the addressee of the speaker's volitative actions and the subject of interlocutor's potential influence [5, p. 138-145]. M. Skab extends the functional potential of the vocative, suggesting the idea of two most important examples of its use: "the fullest implementation of semantic and syntactic features of grammemes"; these are the intention of inducement and holding the interlocutor's attention [19, p. 62]. The first type is introduced by the combination of the vocative case and the imperative mood of the verb: *"Скажіть мені,* ***добродію****, хто це придумав границі для людей?"* (Makovii O., "Hranytsia"); the second type is based on appellation: "… ***шановний пане****..., будь ласка, Ваше прізвище. – Кириленко. –* ***Шановний пане Кириленко****"*(Khvylovyi M., "Syni etiudy"). O. Myroniuk considers vocative as a part of emotional-volitional speech and draws it together with the imperative, allocating therefore two functions of the pragmema: "vocative (appellate) and evaluative-characterizing (expressive)" [15, p. 69]. Other researchers, in particular N. Arutiunova [1], N. Balandina [3], I. Vykhovanets [5], M. Skab [19] and others support this opinion. N. Arutiunova points out: "The vocative in the functional sense has a double meaning: on the one hand, it allows the addressees to identify themselves, on the other hand,

Copyright © 2018 Authors. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

it often represents the speaker's attitude towards the addressee. As a result, vocative combines the identification component with the subjective evaluation element" [1, p. 356]. In some cases, vocative as a pragmema adds some intimacy, warmth, heartfullness, brings interactants together, focuses their attention: *Сердечне спасибі Вам,* ***брате-товаришу****, за Ваш прихильний лист!* (Hrabovskyi P., From the collection of letters). The vocative indicates the establishment of the atmosphere of mutual understanding, affection and trust: *Я не заважаю Вам,* ***шановний добродію*** (Khvylovyi M., "Syni etiudy"). That is, the role of the vocative case is the creation of polite atmosphere based on a neutral one, so that the addressee's reaction is positive: "***Ласкавий Фрідріху Варфоломійовичу****, – не розгубився молодий чоловік, – я оце цілий вечір дивлюся на Ваші нагороди і захоплююсь"* (Hrymych M., " Varfolomiieva nich"). The vocative case as an indicator of politeness category expression has a pragmatic orientation, that is, influence on the addressee's emotional-volitional sphere and communicative behavior.

So far, the issue of the vocative functions in scientific literature has been argumentative, since their differentiation is not always reasonable. As V. Goldin rightly points out, "the criterion for the analysis results objectivity and the indicator of the allocated functions independence is the possibility of identifying specialized means that serve one or another function in the composition of communicative units" [7, p. 18]. The use of vocative has a pragmatic nature, since the speaker uses it in order to draw attention of the communicative partner; it means that the speaker with the help of vocative induces the addressee to listen, respond or act, "causes a change in the addressee's mental and emotional state, behavior" [25, p. 105]. Functions of vocative in the context of linguistic pragmatics are relevant for the research: 1) drawing and holding attention; 2) identifying the addressee; 3) initiating and maintaining interpersonal relations. These functions are illustrative of the regulative potential of the word forms under analysis. At the same time, it is just a potency, which requires observing a number of important conditions, which ensure successful use. It is necessary that during interaction, the speaker is ready to pass specific information and the addressee is ready to get it. If the speaker is unsure that the communicative partner is ready for that, they need to induce them to listen and that is indicated by vocatives. Thus, the vocative case *Андрію! – Чую, Ольго, уже йду!* has the following meanings: *Андрій* is the addressee, *Андрію* is the subject of potential actions, the implicit component *іти* is the potential, expected action by the speaker, *Ольга* is the speaker. The speaker's intention (inducement to act), marked by the vocative case, is achieved only when the interlocutor adopts the strategy of intention furtherance. In general, it is considered that "using the vocative case is more polite than using the nominative case" [29, p. 23]. Vocative and nominative have a different illocutionary force; therefore, researchers mention "magical influence" of the vocative [17].

Polish researcher K. Ożóg emphasizes that every dialogue as the main form of communication involves partners addressing each other [34, p. 62]. Vocative establishes WHO–TO WHOM relation, which is realized in almost every communicative act, represents the relation between the producer of a speech act and the addressee, indicates the will of the speaker concerning the addressee in the field of communicative distribution. Vocative represents the addressees, active participants in communication, who understand that they influence the communication effectiveness and react accordingly. This confirms the manipulative and persuasive potential of the pragmema.

The vocative case is a linguistic indicator of interpersonal relationship realization, a communicative device that helps to see a respected or not very respected, close or not very close person in "you".

French philosopher E. Lévinas points out: cognizing and establishing contact with another person is implemented in the interrelationship of the communicants, the addressee always self-identifies when the speaker addresses them, even when the speaker dominates, disagrees or informs, that he or she has no desire or opportunity to communicate, the speaker shows interest in the communicative partner [31, p. 66].

By using vocatives, the speaker is willing to focus the interlocutor's attention: *I am addressing you: pay attention* (the main meaning).

Vocative represents not only the addressee, but also the speaker's specific intention, which can be formulated in the language of semantic primitives in this way: I – you – here – now – have motive and aim – politely address – to make contact – in a polite tone (according to the communicative situation, social roles and status, relationship).

Vocative is an important communicative signal, which promotes complex diagnosing of interactants linguistic behavior and depends on social and biological characteristics, which guide the speaker in the communication process: a) social status ("higher" – "lower", "lower" – "higher", "equal" – "equal"); b) communicative situation (formal – informal); c) level of acquaintance (acquainted – slightly acquainted – unacquainted); d) age; e) gender; f) tone of communication (high – neutral – familiar). We find N. Balandina's view reasonable, that "the speaker in order to create favorable background for communication intentionally or otherwise takes these factors into account and selects relevant for communication aspect, and by choosing a particular vocative establishes social and psychological distance [3, с. 85].

2. Problem search

Vocative correlates with the ability to "lead" the communication process, which characterizes it as a pragmatic strategy of influence on the addressee's intellectual, volitional and emotional spheres, the purpose of which is to shorten the distance.

The pragmatic strategy of the vocative case use is implemented in the speaker's cognitive behavior planning, intended for the addressee through marking their social role and representing the relation between the interactants: ***Товариство****, у мене народився міст* (Andrukhovych Y., "Rekreatsii"). The speaker's intention realization depends on the addressee and is desirable/undesirable, expected/unexpected for them.

A number of polite vocatives in the Ukrainian communicative culture caused formation of a branched system of language units, diverse in structure and meaning, which tend to unify. Relevant for the research are two illocutionary types of stereotypical appellatives suggested by N. Balandina, based on predominance of functional features: "identifications (directed at addressee's referential identity) and characterizations (related to emotional attitude towards the addressee and formation of connotative meaning)" [3, с. 86].

Relation between the interlocutors is often described using such opposition: *distant* relationship and *close* relationship [28, p. 253–276], which enables us conditionally distinguish distant and contact vocatives, which accordingly promote achievement of positive and negative politeness strategies in the Ukrainian communicative culture. The criterion for differentiating is based not only on special-temporal factor, but also on the notion of social distance, interpersonal relations and saving "face" (according to P. Brown and S. Levinson) [27].

Distant relations are mainly typical for formal communication and correlate with the form of *"Ви"* (polite form), while close relations are peculiar to informal communication, and are associated with *"ти"* form. Use of distant vocatives "takes the speakers to a level regulated by conventions, emphasizes social and age distance", use of contact vocatives "takes to a convention-free level of communication" [3, p.89].

Distant politeness vocatives

The vocative case marks the shortening of psychological and social distance; therefore, analysis of language means that contribute to preserving positive and negative "face" of communicants seems important. Distant vocatives are determined by semantics of authority: in order to politely address a person, the speaker has to

determine their position in the social hierarchy. The main intention of the speaker is as follows: *I am addressing you politely, as by showing you my respect I want to establish appropriate communicative contact and set an appropriate tone of communication*. Distant vocatives are subdivided into honorifics *пане / пані, добродію / добродійко*, which evidence the fact of relative equality of the communicants: ***Шановна пані!*** *У відповідь на Ваше клопотання раді повідомити про перше розширення Ваших повноважень* (Sniadanko N., "Komashyna tarzanka").

Honorifics (lat. *honorificus* – respectful, honorable, that does honor) include set codified means, fixed inseparable units used in the appropriate context, containing connotations of dignity and respect when addressing the interlocutor. By using honorifics in speech, the speaker informs the addressee: *I inform you that you are not a friend or a relative of mine, we are separated by our social status, age etc.*, this is relevant for Ukrainian analogues as well. Honorifics are more stereotyped and clichéd, therefore they make the process of establishing and maintaining communicative contact in formal communication easier, when social distance between the interlocutors is more significant than the distance in informal communication. While the vocative pragmema marks interference in the addressee's personal sphere, the speaker in order to save their negative "face", uses honorifics, the main task of which is ensuring the balance of positive and negative politeness.

For initiating a communicative act, it is important for interactants to understand their social roles, which makes possible the choice of appropriate behavior strategy. In this respect, communication can be compared to a game, in the process of which the participants with different communicative roles try to keep balance (save "face") or intentionally upset it ("face" threat). Taking into account the addressee's "type" gives the speaker the right to establish contact and cooperation, or keep them in the right tone. Drawing the addressee's attention occurs with these two factors: a particular communicative situation and a relevant communicative interaction of the participants. Honorifics in the process of communication mark social and interpersonal relations of the interlocutors. Therefore, using the vocative is conditioned by pragmatic presuppositions, including the following: a) the speaker is aware of the need to draw the addressee's attention by selecting from one or another object situations for the role of the referent; b) if it is not accomplished, the attention won't be drawn; c) it is necessary to consider the social status when doing this: ***Пане директоре****, Вас до телефону* (Yeshkiliev V., "Pobachyty Alkor").

Using such honorifics such as *пане / пані*; *добродію / добродійко* is the best option when the interlocutors are not acquainted or there is no need in addressing the addressee with a contact vocative: ***Добродію****, як пройти на вулицю Остроградського?*; when the interlocutors are acquainted, but cannot/are not willing to use another verbal means (e.g. neighbors): ***Пане****, завтра у нашому будинку розпочнеться ремонт!*; when addressing an unacquainted addressee in letters and emails: ***Шановні пані та панове****! Goethe-Institut в Україні запрошує на вечір із Сергієм Жаданом* (From an Internet source).

N. Balandina [3], V. Goldin [6], M. Marcjanik [32] and others point out at the problem of a universal vocative absence in many languages, especially Slavic, emphasizing that a universal vocative is not necessary for the successful course of communication.

In the process of contacting interactants use honorifics with extensions (titulary, surnames, names). Use of the cliché *пане / пані* + *titulary* marks social distance, typical for showing strictly limited relations mostly in formal communication: military, scientific, academic, medical, legal, administrative spheres. The main meaning of titulary is demonstration of respect to the interlocutor, keeping distance, saving negative "face" of the communicative partner. Use of *пане / пані* + *titulary* combination seems effective when, first of all, the addressee has a high status and according to polite manners the speaker is obliged to show honor and respect: *Дозвольте,* ***пане міністре****, ще одне запитання: яке економічне становище наше й наших сусідів?* (Ostap Vyshnia, "Vyshnevi usmishky"); secondly, such clichés are peculiar only to formal communication: *Будь ласка,* ***пані вчителько****, підкажіть це слово – канючить Надійка, найменша дівчинка в класі* (Hulko L., "Artem Stetsenko rozpovidaie").

Based on observations of various talk-shows and political programs, when addressing former leaders with the first component *ex- (ex-president, ex-director, ex-champion etc.)* and *vice- (vice-president, vice-premier, vice-admiral, vice-consul, vice-director etc.)* vocative is used with increasing frequency without these first particles: *Пане Президенте! Пане консуле! Пані прем'єр!* This way an additional level of politeness, respect, and honor is shown, while implementing the strategy of negative politeness. Moreover, in certain cases Ukrainian communicative culture accepts intentional use of higher titles, which indicates possible career advancement of the addressee, or implicates self-interested intentions of the speaker (manipulative strategy). Addressing a person by a higher title happens when the speaker is not sure about their position: *…полковник Юрій Капкан. – Він лише підполковник. –* ***Буде полковником, буде і генералом*** (Folvarochnyi V., "Symon Petliura: na probudzhenomu vulkani").

Cliché *пане / пані* + *last name* explicates formal relations between the speakers, indicates distance between the interactants. This is determined by some additional factors: social factors, the place of residence, the level of education etc.: ***Пане Петренко****, електронне декларування – уже реальність?* (From an interview with Illia Lukash). The conclusion to that is N. Balandina's opinion, that broadly *пане / пані* + *last name* cliché has the same meaning: it names the addressee and draws their attention [3, p.187].

Lately, in institutions where there are documents containing first and last names, employees mostly address customers either by their first names or by the *пане / пані* + *last name* combinations. We share T. Larina's view, that first name vocatives can be considered by the addressee as a familiar sign of inappropriate intimacy (the communicants are not acquainted and the addressee did not give permit for such addressing) [14, p. 368]; therefore *пане / пані* + *last name* cliché in such situations is the best option, while it shows that the distance is kept and contributes to saving the interlocutor's negative "face".

During formal communication its use is predetermined by pragmatic meaning, that is, the speaker's intent to identify the addressee exactly: ***Пане Стасенко****, Ваші документи в порядку!* (travel agency). In other situations in the Ukrainian communicative culture such vocatives are considered inappropriate [4; 15 and other], since they acquire indications of familiarity, and in certain circumstances irony or at times rudeness.

It seems that *пане / пані* + *first name* cliché rather shortens the distance between interlocutors, since it can indicate some level of friendliness. Under the influence of the English culture, an expansion of use range of this model in order to democratize the discourse has been observed [6; 20 and other].

The *пане / пані* + *first name* model is common in neutral, friendly, sometimes professional spheres, when it involves people holding equal positions, yet who do not address each other by «*ти*»: *Ви чомусь не приходите до театру,* ***пане Олександре****, а Ваші «Дами і гусари» йдуть вельми успішно* (Ivanychuk R.., "Voda z kameniu"). Such vocative can indicate violation of personal boundaries, caused by the influence of western cultures on Ukrainian. The speakers, in pursuit of effective communication even do not realize shortening of the distance, as they do not feel any threat to negative "face": *О, маємо гостей! – і до міліціонерів: –* ***Пане Вікторе! Пане Володимире!*** *Може, приготувати чай? Я маю тістечка й пиріг з яблуками* (Sheiko-Medvedieva N., "Alfons").

Cliché *first name* + *patronymic* is generally used in formal speech when addressing an acquainted person who is older and has a higher social class: *Спасибі,* ***Маргарито Зенонівно****, все нормально* (Nestaiko V., "Neimovirni detektyvy"), which shows respect to the addressee and is proven by the principle of politeness: *І я Вас рада бачити,* ***Петре Івановичу****!* (Dermanskyi C., "Chudove chudovysko i pohane pohanysko"). Use of *пане / пані*

honorific in the contemporary Ukrainian language tends to expand, although in some communicative situations, for example, when addressing teachers or lecturers the vocative *first name + patronymic (ім'я* та *по батькові)* is predominant: *Дорога наша* ***Ганно Іванівно****!... Ми Вас любимо,* ***Ганно Іванівно****!* (Nestaiko V., "Teodory z Vasiukivky"). Combining a honorific with a first name and a patronymic is incorrect: **Пані Таміло Володимирівно! Пане Миколо Онуфрійовичу*!

Thus, by using distant vocatives in the vocative case, which marks keeping social and psychological distance, the speaker implements the pragmatic intention of showing respect to the addressee in order to save negative "face".

Contact politeness vocatives represent relations between the communicants, who share common interests, friendship, family relations, etc. Metalinguistic description of the speaker's intention is as follows: *I want you to know, that I appeal to you and my act is meant for you.* Implementation depends on the speaker's intention and familiarity with the addressee and "on the relations between the interlocutors, which can be neutrally polite or subjectively motivated" [6, p.92]. This refers to affective-evaluative nature of the vocative and its function of characterizing. In this case, the focus is on the connotative aspect of the meaning, psychological correlate of which is: a) establishing proper interpersonal relationship, b) neutralizing psychological tension, c) indicating personal attitude toward the interlocutor, d) strengthening the addressee's communicative position [3, p.85].

We share the view of researchers, that contact vocatives cannot be given the function of emotive attitude toward the addressee without considering specific pragmatic vector [3, c. 90]. This pragmema explicates the most complicated pragmatic meaning: intensification of the addressee's communicative position, minimization of emotional distress caused, decrease in social and psychological distance, saving positive "face", setting positive attitude for the interlocutor, showing friendly and sincere relations. Contact vocatives of politeness include: a) first names: *Бачу,* ***Ольго****, Ви добра господиня – визнає Антон Никандрович – якби я мав дочку, завжди казав би: подивіться на Ольгу, вона швидко порядкує, і всі мої папірці на місці* (Barka V., "Rai"); b) nominations referring to family relations in indirect meaning (*брате, сестро, сину, дочко, дядьку, тітко* etc.): *Прошу до снідання, бо вже сонце височенько підбилось вгору, а ми з тіткою, вибачай нам,* ***дорогий дядьку****, трохи заспали. Певно, пане Йване, ти вже голодний?* (Nechui-Levytskyi I., "Zaporozhtsi"); в) nominations referring to acquired family members (*куме, кумо, свате, свахо* etc.): *Як Вас,* ***свахо****, Бог милує? Чи живі чи здорові?* (Nechui-Levytskyi I., "Kaidasheva simiia"); d) friendly relations (*друже, подруго, приятелю, приятелько, товаришу, товаришко* etc.): ***Дорогий мій друже****, – підвівся воєвода, – дозволь познайомити тебе з моєю дружиною Анкою* (Malyk V., "Posol Urus-shaitana"); e) occasional addresses (*ювіляре, переможцю, надіє, земляче* etc.): ***Земляче****! А,* ***земляче****! Дай,* ***друже****, водички!* (Khvylovyi M., "Syni etiudy").

Using *first names* as vocatives is mostly typical for informal communication: *Цю пісню я дарую тобі,* ***Світлано*** (Zarudnyi M., "Uran"), whereas in formal communication its use without *пан / пані* honorific is debatable. This pragmema has a dual nature: on the one hand, it represents the shade of formal polite attitude towards the addressee, and from the other hand, it shows close, friendly, sincere relationship between the communicants. Contact vocatives, apart from the meaning of friendliness, form expressive background, place emphasis on trust, intimacy and inducement to act, implement the strategy of positive politeness and "indicate unsubordinated relationship between the speakers" [20, p.122]. The vocative case of *first names* is a marker of short sociopsycological distance. This way the speaker explicates the strategies of positive politeness: *Пішли,* ***Андрію****, до музик, послухаємо, як козаки грають, – запропонував Іван, і Андрій на знак згоди кивнув головою, швидко підхопився з трави* (Kilchenskyi V., "Prysmak voli"). As T. Larina reasonably states, by using first names communicants "emphasize that they belong to the same group, negating the presence of any distance between them, either social or concerning their status" [14, p. 371].

Sometimes vocatives denoting family names (*брате, сестро, дядьку, тітко* etc.) are used for addressing interlocutors, who do not have real kinship: *Ми не називаємо імен,* ***дорогий брате.*** *Це давня історія. Так само радимо чинити і вам* (Yeshkiliev V., "Pobachyty Alkor"). Matalinguistic description of this intention looks this way: *You are very important to me and I trust you, thus I include you to the circle of my family members*.

Plural forms *brothers / sisters* used for addressing the faithful are deliberately solemn: *Брати та сестри! Вітаю Вас із Великоднем! Будьте здорові!* Using this pragmema the speaker shows solidarity and partnership, implements the positive politeness strategies: ***Брате****!* ***Друже****!* ***Борисе****! Тримайся! Вірно прийде визволення час! Над степами і Дніпром, вір, замає прапор тризуба і меча!* (Debrush M., "Karahanda").

Nominations of acquired family members perform a similar function (*куме / кумо, свату / свахо* etc.): *Здорові були,* ***свате****! – Здорові будьте й Ви* (Kotsiubynskyi M., "Tini zabutykh predkiv"). Using the second person pronoun in the plural form (polite form) *Ви* is a peculiar kind of intensification of *куме / кумо* pragmema: *Добре сказали* ***Ви****,* ***кумо****!* (Kobylianska O., "Zemlia"). It seems that the speakers simultaneously implement the strategies of positive and negative politeness, caring about saving the communicative partner's "face: *I want to inform you that I respect you and at the same time you are a very close person to me.*

Using vocatives denoting friendly relations (*друже / подруго, приятелю / приятелько, товаришу / товаришко* etc.) is possible when people are partners, psychologically or spiritually close: *Розумієте,* ***друзі****, кожен наш крок – це прямування шляхом* (Andrukhovych Y., "Rekreatsii"). N. Formanovska quite rightly states that these vocatives enable the speaker to draw attention of any addressee, do not contain any information about the interlocutor's sociobiological portrait, but show the attitude, establish appropriate tone of the communication, which is mostly natural, friendly, sometimes familiar [23, p.201].

Therefore, they are considered as regulative means, as they influence the communication process, set stylistic features, outline roles: *Скажу лише одне,* ***друже мій****: якщо навіть так і станеться, ти достойний подібної перемоги. Інакше не був би моїм товаришем* (Lytovchenko T., "Orli, syn Orlyka").

Occasional vocatives, apart from expressing politeness, mark additional level of emotivity: *Давай,* ***земляче****, потиснемо один одному руки – і на тому об'єднаємося!* O. Myroniuk's remarks on the special status of the vocative "*земляче"* convincingly prove that "not only it emphasizes that the interlocutors have something in common and come from the same background, but also based on this indication they accept the interlocutor to the circle of trusted people [15, p. 120]. In the vocatives *Надіє філологічної науки! Душе й серце нашого колективу!* neutral semantics of words shift to the complimentary sphere, obtain metaphorical-poetic meaning, emphasize the addressee's achievements, show positive attitude.

It is not enough for people as creative individuals to use set vocative forms, they always try to increase the influence on the interlocutor by using various intensifiers (derivational, lexical, syntactic, stylistic and graphical in written texts).

Derivational means, diminutive suffixes in particular, intensify friendly attitude, shorten the distance, emphasize that the communicative situation is informal: *Допоможіть мені,* ***панночко****!* (Kachurovskyi I., "Shliakh nevidomoho"). We share L. Fedorova's view, that "diminutive-hypocoristic suffixes denoting a person… do not indicate a small value, but shorten the social distance, which makes someone "small and close", and accordingly tender, kind or familiar, indulgent attitude" [22, p. 39]. Use of diminutives is generally considered peculiar to everyday language and expressing particular representations of politeness forms. Metalinguistic description of the speaker's intention is: *I have warm feelings for you, so I want to do something food for you*. The

vocative form of diminutives modifies the communicative relations between the interlocutors and makes them effective due to the demonstration of positive and friendly attitude toward the addressee. Speakers are concerned about being psychologically close to recipients, and the recipients, feeling that the speakers respect them, are open to dialogue, willing to cooperate and achieve mutual understanding.

In order to stress the politeness vocatives, interactants typically use distributers that include adjectives, possessive pronouns and nouns. Adjectival forms can be divided into honorific (*шановний, поважний, високошановний, вельмишановний, високоповажний* etc.) and emotional-evaluating (*милий, ласкавий, дорогий, рідний, любий* etc.). Honorific adjectives sound more solemn and noble, they are typically used in combination with distant vocatives, which changes the communication tone: ***Вельмишановний Володимире Юхимовичу***! *Колектив державного видавництва «Либідь» щиросердно вітає Вас зі славним ювілеєм!* Emotional-evaluative adjectives "recreate stylistic decrease or increase in the level of emotiveness of communication and have a peculiar shade, which allow determining the nature of relationship and interpersonal distance" [20, p. 123], mark friendliness, sincerity: ***Дорогий хлопче****, як тебе звати-величати?* (Sokolian M., "Khymerne misto Drobodan"); friendly goodwill: *Але Ви,* ***срібний Михайлику****, без пояса дрова кололи, а вітер був великий, можете поперек застудити* (Matios M., "Solodka Darusia").

Intimacy, affection, sincerety of contact politeness vocatives are intensified by possessive pronouns (*мій, моя, моє, мої, наш, наша, наше, наші*), which almost lose the meaning of possessiveness: ***Дорога моя Євочко****! Якби ти могла зазирнути в той мій сон…* (Humeniuk N., "Enna. Doroha do sebe"). As known, such vocatives provide the effect of individuality, uniqueness, kindness, shifting the conversation to the sphere of intimate-friendly communication: *Цілую Вас,* ***мій дорогий друже!*** (Stefanyk V., "Kaminnyi khrest").

Repetition of vocatives in form of reduplication such as *мамцю-мамочко, доню-донечко, сину-синочку* and at the discourse level increases the influence on the interlocutor: *… –* ***Іване Петровичу****, то замовте за мене добре слівце. Ви ж маєте великий вплив в облдержадміністрації. – Слівце я неодмінно замовлю, але чи допоможе, це? –* ***Іване Петровичу****, дорогесенький! Ви ж маєте вплив на самого. Постарайтесь вже, будь ласка, а я Вам обов'язково віддячу добром! Ви ж мене знаєте! – Звичайно, знаю! Скільки ж ми знайомі з Вами! – Я,* ***Іване Петровичу****, буду Вашим боржником до кінця життя! Допоможіть, будь ласка,* ***Іване Петровичу****!..* (Honcharuk M., "Krai neliakanykh ptakhiv"). This method activates and keeps the interlocutor's interest. Gradation method intensifies influence in the communication process. The speaker, aiming to save the addressee's negative "face", uses several vocatives, which causes an increase in social distance: ***Шановний Михайле Івановичу****, – починав після довгої незручної мовчанки заступник декана з питань студентської успішності, –* ***Шановний пане Підобідку, Підобідко****, – плутався він, від розгублення вагаючись, чи варто вживати форму кличного відмінка, коли йдеться про таку пікантну справу. …* ***шановний пане Підобідку, Підобідко****,* ***шановний батьку однієї зі студенток нашого вузу****, хіба ж можна наважитися на таке? Продавати в найми власну дитину…* (Sniadanko N., "Amarkord"). On the contrary, a shift from a distant vocative to a contact one causes distance shortening: ***Мартофляк! Ростику! Старий!*** (Andrukhovych Y., "Rekreatsii").

Graphically marked vocative represents expressiveness and pragmatic predetermination. Among graphic means there are: a) capitalization method, which shows special respect and friendly attitude towards the addressee: *Щирий* ***Добродію****! Високоповажний* ***Земляче!***; b) capital letters: *ПЕТРЕ*; c) intentional repetition of a letter in order to draw attention and emotionally influence the addressee: *Анюююююююююю*; d) punctuation marks for holding attention and mutual understanding: *Ох,* ***серце Дмитре!*** *читав я твого листа до Солодила* (K. Bilykovskyi to D. Yavornytskyi).

As for syntactic position of vocatives of politeness, preposition is of course prevalent: to tell something it is necessary to draw attention: ***Шановний добродію****, дозвольте й мені слово сказати!* The pragmema shows communicative focus on the interlocutor, sets the appropriate tone and indicates the attitude toward the addressee. Interposition and postposition rather balance those functions; they serve solely as a means of keeping attention. Sometimes vocative is in interposition between an etiquette cliché and the informative act itself: *Просимо,* ***шановний Іване Леонтійовичу****, з Вашим багатолітнім досвідом є що сказати всім нам* (Horlach L., "Neperebutnie"). The cliché draws attention, and the vocative just specifies it: *Добрий день Вам,* ***панно Маню!*** (Kobylianska O., "Cherez kladku"). The function of making contact is mostly fulfilled by greetings, apologies, gratitude etc.

3. Conclusions

The vocative case is special among other pragmemas denoting politeness, as it expresses the meaning of drawing and keeping attention, which are its primary features. Among these word forms, it is possible to distinguish distant and contact vocatives based on the social distance criteria. Implementation of positive and negative politeness strategies and communicative-pragmatic presuppositions determine the use of these vocatives. The meaning of vocative pragmemas can be intensified by attributive distributers, possessive pronouns, suffixes, particles, repetitions, inversions and gradations.

References

[1] Arutiunova ND, *Predlozheniye i ego smysl: leksiko-semanticheskiye problemy*, Moskva, Nauka, (1976), 383 p.

[2] Arutiunova ND, *Yazyk i mir cheloveka*, Moskva, Shkola Yazyki russkoi kultury, (1998), 896 p.

[3] Balandina NF *Funktsii i znachennya cheskih pragmatychnyh klishe v komunikatyvnomu konteksti*, Kyiv, ASMI, (2002), 332 p.

[4] Bogdan S, *Movnyi etyket ukraintsiv: tradytsii i suchasnist*. Kyiv, Ridna mova, (1998), 475 p.

[5] Vykhovanets IR, *Systema vidminkiv ukrainskoi movy*, Kyiv, Naukova dumka, (1987), 231 p.

[6] Goldin VE, *Obrashcheniya: teoreticheskie problemy*, Moskva, Knizhnyi dom LIBROKOM, (2009), 136 p.

[7] Goldin VE, *Etiket i rech*, Saratov, Izd-vo Saratovskogo un-ta, (1978), 112 p.

[8] Epishkin NI, *Istoricheskiy slovar gallitsizmov russkogo yazyka*, Moskva, (2010). URL: http://gallicismes.fcademic.ru/16471. (last visit: 15.08.2018).

[9] Espersen O, *Filosofiya grammatiki*, Moskva : Izd-vo inostr. lit., (1958), 404 p.

[10] Kornovenko LV, *Zvertannia u pragmalingvistychnomu aspekti (na materiali suchasnoi rosiiskoi movy)*, Kyiv, (2001), 21 p.

[11] Kostusiak NM, Mezhov OG, "Semantyko-syntaksychni oznaky klychnoho vidminka", *XII Mezhdunarodnaya konferentsiya po funktsionalnoy lingvistike «Funktsionalizm kak osnova lingvisticheskih issledovaniy»*, Simferopol, (2005), pp. 159–161.

[12] Krongauz MA, "Obrashchenie kak sposob modelirovaniya kommunikativnogo prostranstva", *Logicheskiy analiz yazyka. Obraz cheloveka v kulture i yazyke*, Moskva, (1999), pp. 124–134.

[13] Kucherenko IK, "Vokatyv yak vyraznyk funktsionalnoho chlena rechennia i tak zvane zvertannia", *Aktualni problemy* gramatyki, Lviv, Svit, (2003), pp. 114–127.

[14] Larina TV, *Kategoriya vezhlivosti i stil kommunikatsii. Sopostavlenie angliyskih i russkih lingvokulturnyh traditsiy*, Moskva, Rukopisnyie pamyatniki Drev. Rusi, (2009), 512 p.

[15] Mironyuk OM, *Istoriia ukrainskoho movnoho etyketu. Zvertannia*, Kyiv, Logos, (2006), 167 p.

[16] Peshkovskiy AM, *Russkiy sintaksis v nauchnom osveshchenii*, Moskva, Uchpedgiz, (1956), 451 p.

[17] Pigalev AI, *Kulturologiya. Volgograd.* URL: http://teligor.narod.ru/books/pigalev/culture2 (last visit: 17.08.2018).

[18] Rusanivskyi VM, *Struktura ukrainskoho diieslova*, Kyiv, Naukova dumka, (1971), 315 p.
[19] Skab MS, *Gramatyka apelyatsii v ukrainskii movi*, Chernivsi, Misto, (2002), 272 p.
[20] Teleki MM, Shinkaruk VD, *Sotsialni katehorii modusu v tekstah epistoliarnogo zhanru*, Kyiv, Vydavnytstvo MDGU Imeni Petra Mohyly, (2007), 176 p.
[21] Tymchenko EK, *Vokatyv i Instrumental v ukrainskii movi*, Kyiv, Z drukarni UAN, (1926), 118 p.
[22] Fedorova LL, "Mehanizmy izmeneniya distantsii v rechevom vzaimodeystvii", *Moskovskiy lingvisticheskiy zhurnal*, Vol.7, No.2, (2003), pp. 21–40.
[23] Formanovskaya NI, *Rechevoe vzaimodeystvie: kommunikatsiya i pragmatika*, Moskva, IKAR, (2007), 480 p.
[24] Shkitska I, "Manipuliatyvnyi potentsial zvertan – zahalnyh nazv", *Naukovi zapysky Ternopilskoho nats. ped. un-tu*, Ternopil, TNPU, (2011), pp. 58–68.
[25] Shkitska IY, "Pryiomy posylennia vplyvovoi funktsii zvertan", *Lingvistychni doslidzhennia*, Kharkiv, HNPU im. G. S. Skovorody, Vol.31, (2011), pp. 104–110.
[26] Yahnich MA, Ionova SV, "Obrashchenie kak proyavlenie rechevoy kultury v internet-kommunikatsii", *Ekologiya yazyka i kommunikativnaya praktika*, No.1, (2013), pp. 246–256.
[27] Brown P, Levinson S, *Politeness: Some Universals in Language*, Cambridge, Cambridge Univ. Press, (1987), 345 p. https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244012470116
[28] Brown R, Gilman A, *The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity*, London, New York, Pinter Publishers, (1960), 137 p.
[29] Gonda J, *Selected Studies: Indo-European linguistics*, Leiden, Vol.1, (1975), 545 p.
[30] Grybosiowa A, "Formy "ty" i "pan (-i)" w kontaktah spolechnyh", *Poradnik jezykovy*, Vol.2, (1990), pp. 88–92.
[31] Levinas E, *Caloshch i nieskonchonnoshch. Esej o zewnetzhnoshchi*, Warszawa, Vydavnictvo Naukove PVN, (2002), 227 p.
[32] Marcjanik M, *Gzhechnoshch w komunikacji jezykovej*, Warszawa, Vydavnictvo Naukove PVN, (2007), 166 p.
[33] Marcjanik M, *Mowimy upzhejmie. Poradnik jezykovego savoir-vivre'u*, Warszawa, Vydavnictvo Naukove PVN, (2009), 235 p.
[34] Ozhug K, "Zvroty gzhechnoshciove współczesnej Polshchyzny muvionej (na materiale jezyka muvionego mieshkancuv Krakova)", *Zeshyty Naukove Universytetu Jagiellonskiego CM XIII, Prace Jezykoznavche*, No.98, Krakuv, (1990), 92 p. https://doi.org/10.3986/jz.v20i1.3008