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In recent years there has been a growing interest in linguistics to the study of its anthropocentric perspective in general, and the category of politeness, in particular. It is being studied on the material of one language within the limits of a single linguistic and cultural community, as well as on the material of several languages in various linguistic and cultural communities in the works of a great number of scholars [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6].

The classifications of politeness offered show the dependence of the verbal representation of politeness on a wide range of factors. Each classification, developing different aspects of this phenomenon, aims to determine what the interlocutors should be guided by to successfully realize their communicative intentions. These classifications focus on the fact that different types of politeness have different ways of verbal realization depending on a situation, the interpersonal relationship between the speaker and the addressee, cross-cultural factors.

The topicality of the problem under investigation lies in the fact that due to the expansion of the boundaries of international cooperation and the increasing role of intercultural communication, there is a great need to know and follow speech strategies leading to successful communication process.

Proceeding from the definition of politeness as a phenomenon implying socially acceptable behaviour based on the attention to the feelings of others, aimed at ensuring a successful, non-conflict interaction associated with the assessment of the behaviour of the speaker by the listener being realized in speech through a certain strategy, we can suggest that language means expressing communicative strategy of politeness is a complex phenomenon having its own reasons, strategies, and is being realized through the whole set of linguistic devices, called downtoners. Among them can be singled out three main groups: lexical, grammatical and discoursal downtoners.

The lexical level of contemporary English provides a large number of units, the use of which contributes to the expression of polite intentions in the process of communication.The ability to operate them represents an important communicative skill, mastering of which involves studying the peculiarities of their functioning. These include the following:

1. addressing words, indicating the status, profession, the age of the interlocutor which can be expressed by nouns, substantivized adjectives, proper names, or a combination of an adjective and a noun like Mr., Mrs., Ms., Your Honor / Majesty / Highness and so on. *Dr. Petrescu, how nice to hear from you again. I hope you are well? − I am thank you, Nakamura-san* [7, p. 267];
2. absolute markers of politeness as *please, sorry, apologize, excuse, thank, welcome, congratulate*, the nature of which may be explained by means of the theory of G. Leech, differentiating politeness into relative (depending on contextual parameters of a situation of communication) and absolute (initially inherent in a particular type of a speech act) [5, p.10]. *Rosmerta, please, send a message to the Ministry* [13, p. 582];
3. complimentary adjectives *amazing, loyal, magnificent, marvelous*, *brilliant, divine, gorgeous*, which we define as adjectives that convey the meaning of acceptance and appreciation of the interlocutor (or other objects that are directly related to him according to the context) by the speaker. *"No, you are easily the most beautiful... desirable woman I've ever... there couldn't be ..."* [12, p. 21];
4. lexical language segments focusing attention on the feelings of the sender of the message (*hope, anticipate, aspire, await, believe, contemplate, count on, cross one's fingers, desire, expect, foresee, long, look forward to, rely, trust)* which allow the speaker to express the subjective anxiety about addressee. *“I’m sorry, Helen,” drawled Sally. He checked Paul’s face then turned back to me. “I took advantage of you when you were vulnerable. I have no excuse. My behaviour was indefensible. I hope you can find it in your heart to forgive me”* [9, p. 60];
5. the use of the adjective ‘*no*’ in various fixed expressions aimed at avoiding conflict. *“I’ve come out without any money,” Tina blurted, and then waited for a string of expletives to follow. - “No problem,” muttered the driver, who jumped out of his cab to open the door for her* [7, p. 106];
6. lexical downtoners which include modal words (perhaps, maybe, possibly), minimizers (a little/a little bit, quite, just, hardly, rather, slight/slightly, only, enough), words and phrases that denote uncertainty (somewhat, somehow, in a sense, not at all). For example: *You don't believe in impressions?'—'Oh, yes, I do, in a sense'* [8, p. 45].

The implementation of the communicative strategy of politeness on the morphological level implies the analysis of the categories of grammatical structure of the English language. We consider that relevant grammatical categories here are the category of voice, the category of mood and the category of modality. These include the following:

1. modal verbs as the grammaticalization of speakers attitudes and opinions are the most common way to attenuate the illocutionary force of the utterance. *I* *thought we might take him back with us and give him a spot of lunch* [11, p. 11];
2. oblique mood forms which express the relation of the nominative content of the utterance towards the reality implemented within the framework of politeness strategies. *Otherwise I’d have gone into the army like my father* [11, p. 22];
3. the form "to be going to" which serves to denote a future action. *'What are you going to do now?' she asked quietly*[11, p. 31];
4. passive constructions, as specific grammatical constructions, which are used to achieve the effect of indirectness which in turn is an indication of politeness, achieved through evasiveness. I *suppose you've* *been told you're good-looking?'*[11, p. 22]

To syntactical downtoners can belong: rhetorical questions, disjunctive questions, devices denoting impersonalization (the use of impersonal pronouns) which serves to show social distance, double negative, the negation of predicate, pseudo-conditionals, and expressions ending with "but". The basic message that follows these downtoners is typically disadvantageous to the addressee and thus is susceptible to mitigation. *'Why don't you put the money back in the bank tomorrow, and forget about her?'*[10, p. 33]

Discoursal devices can be represented by the following groups: syntactic devices (stop-short utterances)and lexical devices as

1. mode units (*I think*,*I suppose,**I'm afraid,**I guess, I believe, I suspect*, *I imagine*);
2. introductory words (*I wonder, Do you mind, You know*)*;*
3. phrases (*by* *the way*).

To sum up, language means expressing politeness, lexical, grammatical, syntactical and discoursal in varying degrees closely interact with each other to form communicative units which are sustainable stereotypical complexes that ensure the success of the communication and do not exist outside discourse. In addition they make a structured system, disclosing the specifics of its basic components. Therefore, we can conclude that the category of politeness depends on the structure of the language and the culture it belongs to. The speaker cannot reach the desired goal if the means of its expression are being used incorrectly.
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