

ROMANIAN IMPERATIVE FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF PRAGMATIC PRINCIPLE OF (IM)POLITENESS

EMILIA KELEMEN¹

ABSTRACT. *Romanian Imperative from the Perspective of Pragmatic Principle of (im)Politeness.* Following a short presentation of the principle of politeness, the article approaches the Romanian imperative identifying negative and positive strategies of (im)politeness, which the imperative is part of. There were identified conventional forms of impoliteness of imperative. The exemplification of (im)polite strategies is based on a corpus elaborated by us. The imperative is present in the most diverse strategies of (im)politeness, however the occurrence of imperative does not mean the interlocutor's threatening act toward the public image (face threatening act). The interpretation depends on several factors, among which the situation of the communication, the relationship between the interlocutors, the presence of intensifiers or attenuators etc.

Keywords: *imperative, politeness, face, strategies of politeness, impoliteness.*

REZUMAT. *Imperativul românesc din perspectiva principiului pragmatic al (im)politeții.* După o scurtă prezentare a principiului politeții, articolul abordează imperativul românesc, identificând strategii ale (im)politeții negative și pozitive din care face parte imperativul. Au fost identificate formule convenționalizate de impolitețe cu imperativul. Exemplificarea strategiilor se face pe baza corpusului întocmit de noi. Imperativul ia parte la strategii ale (im)politeții dintre cele mai diverse, însă apariția imperativului nu înseamnă neapărat un act amenințător la adresa imaginii publice a interlocutorului. Interpretarea sa depinde de mai mulți factori, printre care situația de comunicare, relația dintre interlocutori, prezența intensificatorilor sau a atenuatorilor etc.

Cuvinte cheie: *imperativ, politețe, imagine individuală, strategii de politețe, impolitețe.*

1. Introduction

Approaching the imperative, the directive speech act in general from a pragmatic point of view, analysing the speakers' attitude, the effects which follows

¹ PhD (c), Interdisciplinary Doctoral School of *Transilvania* University, Braşov. E-mail: vasasemilia@yahoo.com

using the imperative, you can easily get to the idea of politeness. As follows, we are going to treat imperative constructions from Romanian language taking into account the reciprocal adjusting mechanisms of the communicative behaviour of those who interact, having a microcorpus starting point elaborated by us. On these premisses, we are going to clarify the following concepts: *face*, *politeness*, *positive politeness*, *negative politeness*, *impoliteness*. In fact, the recognition of the fact that language usage is not only action but also interaction leading to different approaches of pragmatic politeness, Fraser (1990) looks over verbal politeness approach (Lakoff, Leech, Brown and Levinson), but different definitions of the concept are presented in Culpeper (2011b). As follows we are going to make a presentation of the main approaches, based especially on these two above-mentioned works (Fraser 1990, Culpeper 2011a, 2011b), and others from the given bibliography (Culpeper, Haugh and Kadar 2017).

2. Theories of politeness

Classical theories of politeness are based on the theories of language acts (Austin 1962, Searle 1969) and on the idea of conversational implications (Grice 1975). Pragmatically, politeness refers to an important component of the communicative behaviour (see DŞL 2001: 392-393), for different researchers there are different nuances interpreting the concept. Politeness is treated as a conversational maxim (Lakoff, Leech), as part from a conversational contract, being under continuous negotiation (Fraser), or as a result of the participants' concerns in the communication avoiding their public image being prejudiced (Brown and Levinson). The principle of politeness is considered a basic principle in pragmatics, next to the cooperative principle having a complementary relationship. The first has a role in providing social cohesion, and the second provides communicative coherence.

Grice's model with the four maxims: (i) maxim of quantity, (ii) maxim of quality, (iii) maxim of relevance and (iv) maxim of manner constituted the starting point of the Lakoff (1977) and Leech (1983) model. Lakoff proposes two rules of pragmatic competence: 1. be clear 2. be polite. The later concretizes in three rules: 1. Do not impose. 2. Offer some options. and 3. Do it in a way so that the receptor feels good. Leech talks about an interpersonal rhetoric and a contextual one. The principle of cooperation and politeness belongs to interpersonal rhetoric. Leech proposes the following maxims of politeness: the maxim of tact, generosity, approval, modesty, agreement and sympathy.

Brown and Levinson's (1978, 1987) model was considered the most coherent by the majority of researchers, till now. They consider politeness a universal strategy in different social interactions and one of the subsequent critics brought to this theory is in connection to this idea of universality. In their

concepts the principle of politeness regulates the realization of verbal changes keeping an amiable relation between the participants and a social balance. Brown and Levinson's theory emphasises the rationality of the human behaviour and represents the social image, focusing on the concept of *face*, the public image of the individual, taken from Goffman (1967) with a certain reductionist modification of the meaning (remarked by Culpeper among others, 2011b). Brown and Levinson (1987) see the concept of politeness as collaboration between interlocutors for maintaining reciprocally the image (Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu, 2003: 74). The individual public image has got two hypostasis: on one hand, a tendency to keep your own territory, namely the desire of everyone's independency (*negative face*), on the other hand, the tendency of imposing a favourable image of self, the desire of being appreciated by others (*positive face*). Most verbal acts contain a threatening potential. This threatening potential is calculated based on three variables: social distance (D), relative power (P), interference grade (I) of the act, in relation to the desire of independence or the appreciation of the individual. Hence, a rational attitude from the individual presumes adapting strategies which diminishes the threatening potential of the acts. This strategic behaviour means an unambiguous language (*on record*) of communicative intentions, together with the redress explicit or implicit actions intended for counter-balancing the possible threat or an ambiguous language (*off record*) of intentions for leaving open to possibly negotiate the meanings. We can see that even the unambiguous language can form a strategy, especially in cases where efficiency is prioritized (for example emergency situations). These strategies are organised hierarchically. We illustrate these hierarchical organizations for the directive acts:

- (i) Direct language without redressive actions: Închide telefonul! (SDM113) - 'Hang up the phone!'
- (ii) Direct language with redressive explicit actions: Ține-le puțin, te rog frumos! (SDM44) - 'Hold it a bit, please!'
- (iii) Direct language with redressive implicit actions: Nu pune mânuțele pe la urechi! (SDM695) - 'Don't put your hands in your ears!'
- (iv) Indirect language: Asta e stricată! (Arunc-o!) - 'This is spoiled. (Throw it away)!'

Positive politeness intends to protect the participants' positive self, and negative politeness the negative self of these. Positive politeness considers the speed up of social relations, emphasises common points, whereas negative politeness emphasises the distance from the other, the affirmation of independence. Each of them subsumes a series of strategies.

Starting from the theory of politeness, Culpeper (1996, 2011b: 391-436) proposes a model for impoliteness. Impoliteness means deviation from the requirements of polite behaviour using aggressive procedures, with potentially creating dissension between interlocutors. Determining the grade of impoliteness the same factors are in view as Brown and Levinson proposed for politeness: social distance, power and the level of interference. Ionescu Ruxăndoiu (2003: 102) points out the graduality of transition from politeness to impoliteness, a fact, which we cannot lack the situational context in interpretation. Generally, impolite constructions have a provocative character (Culpeper 2011b), offensive. Therefore, we presume that imperative structures make a practical usable tool when it is about impoliteness mainly the directive acts, specially the order, are considered *threatening* (Haverkate 1994, 2004 in Mihăilescu 2009) having a *taxemic* and *offensive* value (Bigot 2005:46 in Mihăilescu 2009). But at the same time there is a need of precaution, as long as a linguistic structure is not polite or impolite in an inherent way (Watts 2003 in Hoop et al. 2016:42). Culpeper (1996) defines positive impolite strategies and negative impolite strategies.

Intimacy and equality relations lead to a decrease in using polite manifestations, and the personality or sympathy/dislike between interlocutors plays an important role in polite manifestations. We observed that a bare imperative in a certain situation can be an impolite strategy, in other cases it can be considered unmarked from politeness point of view, like in emergency situations (as it was seen by other researchers), when the efficiency comes first or in intimate conditions, in peaceful collaborative moments. For instance, carrying out housework together, the utterance *Pune-l acolo!* 'Put it there!' is neutral from politeness perspective.

3. (Im)politeness strategies

Further on, we identified strategies of politeness/impoliteness, in utterances which have an imperative verb in their structure, and as for the terms of strategies we used Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu (2003). The examples come from a microcorpus prepared by us, which contain samples of spoken language and also samples of written texts. The samples from our corpus were entirely extracted from two well-known collections of transcriptions of real conversations in standard Romanian language (IVLR, CORV), respectively recorded spoken language samples from dialectal folk collections, samples from a reality show Wife Swap (Schimb de mame) (12 episodes, generally 1 hour 20 minutes each) and samples collected occasionally.

The written text samples come from fictions and other sources like flyers, online texts (blogs, forums, comments, advertisements, notices) etc. First of all, the

superimposed styles are colloquial and belletristic. There were used contemporary, epical and dramatic literary texts. The number of imperative structures which form the inventory is 3986, out of which we manually selected relevant examples for illustrating the approach of the problem in this present article.

3.1. Positive impoliteness strategies

Further, we follow the positive impoliteness strategies, which we identified.

a. dissociation from the other

On one hand, noticing the I – you opposition (1), (2), (3) marked linguistically, using the appropriate personal pronoun, and verb forms for 1st and 2nd person, expressing the delimitations from each other, the difference between the two or the action of the two. In example (4), the delimitation attitude is expressed through the *leave* verb in imperative form. We can see an accumulation of the strategies in example (5), where dissociation is marked on one hand by using the 2nd personal pronoun in singular form, on the other hand there is the *we*, where the speaker is self-included and this plural form is meant to suggest the difference in power in favour of more and, which from the speakers point of view, represents the correct position in the discussion. And to all these it is added the ironic address form *luminatule*, 'enlightened one'.

- (1) Pune-ți, mă și mănâncă singur că eu n-am chef să îți pun nici masa, nici să strâng masa! (SDM502) – 'Set the table and eat alone 'cos I'm not in the mood to set or clear the table!'
- (2) Ia du-te tu la tine la Teleorman, și fă ce vrei tu acolo și nu da la mine ordine! (SDM671) – 'Why don't you go back home to Teleorman and do what you want there and don't give me orders!'
- (3) Fă tu treaba ta, eu treaba mea! (SDM769) – 'Do your job and I do mine!'
- (4) Hai lasă-mă că mă freci atâta, hai lasă-mă! (SDM365) – 'Leave me alone, don't bust my balls, leave me alone!'
- (5) Ia zi-ne tu, luminatule, cum funcționează democrația? (Net09) – 'Tell us, you, enlightened one, how democracy works?'

b. disinterest

The imperative verb *to leave* followed by the direct object, 1st person pronoun is part of an imprecation structure combined with the noun *dracu* – 'the devil/hell', a colloquial form, showing not only the disinterest toward the topic, but also a surplus of resentments (6).

- (6) Lasă-mă dracu' cu camera ta, că asta îți trebuie ție. (SDM640) – 'Leave me the hell alone with your room, 'cos it's all you're about.'

c. using inappropriate identity marks, improper forms of address

In the following examples the imperative forms of the verbs are associated with inappropriate forms of address of the situation or the relation between interlocutors. In each given situation, social distance is unimportant; the speaker is the one who self-positions himself above the interlocutor, imposing a subordinate position. The appellation *măi femeie* – ‘you, woman’ from (7), (8) is disparaging. The name of kin in these cases (9), (12) have nothing to do with the comforter or with the common territory, but inadequate familiarity induces a patronizing treatment, what is more a despise. We can notice the use of an interlocutor’s pronoun (10), who is not known, in fact, associated with the imperative followed by an ironical completion. The figurative language *boule* – ‘you jackass’ – it is a direct insult toward the interlocutor (14), and the example (13) constitutes a conflictual challenge through its disregarding and hostile formula containing *tu* – ‘you’ retaken, and the demonstrative popular form referring to the person of the interlocutor followed by the imperative and the observation of dislike.

- (7) Stai, mă, femeie, că nu se poate chiar așa! (SDM72) – ‘Hold on You, woman, that can’t go like this!’
- (8) Du-te, măi femeie, că mă enervezi! (SDM74) – ‘Go now, you, woman, you get on my nerves!’
- (9) Lasă-l, frate, că-i sănătos! (SDM895) – ‘Leave him, bro’ ’cos he’s well!’
- (10) Ioane, păi fă tu mai mulți, dacă tot îți pasă de rasa pur românească. Fii un exemplu! (Net15) – ‘John, you make some more, if you care about the pure Romanian rase. Be an example!’
- (11) Moșule, ține-ți simpatia! (Net62) – ‘Old man, keep your sympathy!’
- (12) Oprește-te, mămică! (Net70) – ‘Stop, ma!’
- (13) Tu, tu ăla de-acolo, nu te mai uita la mine! Nu-mi placi. (FCGP36) – ‘You, you over there, don’t stare at me! I don’t like you!’
- (14) Nu pune mâna! Lasă-l așa, că e ars, boule, și-i smulgi pielea! (FCGP68) – ‘Take your hands away! Leave it ’cos it’s burnt, you jackass, you’ll rip off your skin!’

d. using taboo words, swearing, abusive or defiler language

Example (15) is a direct attack to the interlocutor’s positive face through the insulting assertion, followed by the ironical imperative. In (16) swearing is accompanied by imperative negative form which limits the other’s free expression, the despised attitude is expressed by the demonstratives popular form and highlights the lack of interest. In example (17) the register is chosen inadequately because it is about an adolescence and an older lady, quasi guests in his house, more educated, who tries to give advice with good intentions but unasked.

- (15) Tu esti bolnavă mintal, tratează-te! (SDM227) – ‘You are mentally ill, go and treat yourself!’
- (16) Lasă-le dracu, nu mai spune mie de alea că n-o să le caut! (sensul cuvintelor) (SDM363) – ‘Fuck off, don’t tell me such things,’cos I won’t look up for it!’ (word meaning)
- (17) Aicia iar ai luat-o pe ulei și nu-mi place! N-o mai lua pe ulei degeaba! (SDM968) – ‘Here, you hit the bottle again, and I don’t like it! Don’t do it for nothing!’

e. interest in making the other to feel uncomfortable – through aggressive acts which threatens the interlocutor’s face, through the interlocutor’s contradiction, through complaint about the right to talk

Example (18) contains a threat in case the interlocutor does not fulfill his action named by the imperative.

- (18) Toacă-o și tu mai mărunț, că dacă nu, mă duc și te iau cu o bardă! (SDM127) – ‘Chop it more finely, if you don’t, I go and cut you with a cleaver!’

Example (19) argues the mode of belonging to the other, thus turning it into an insult.

- (19) Învață măcar să ascuți! (SDM 108) – ‘At least, learn to listen!’
- (20) the interlocutor is intimidated by the imperative appeal, in fact an accumulation of imperatives, and in (21) the imperatives are framed at the beginning and at the end of the sentence with interjectional appellation from the familiar language of *hai* – ‘come on’.
- (20) Hai, scoate caietul te rog și arată-mi și mie ce ați scris! (SDM201) – ‘Come on, take your notebook out and show me what you’ve written!’
- (21) Hai, lasă telefonul ăla jos, și pune mâna și ajută-mă, hai! (SDM94) – ‘Come on, put that phone down, and get your hands and help me, come on!’

Complaining about the right to talk is another aggressive strategy, expressed almost routinely with the imperative verb form *taci din gură* – ‘shut up/hold your tongue/zip it/be quiet’ etc.

- (22) Mai taci din gură! Lasă-mă să citesc aicia! (SDM84) – ‘Shut up! Let me read here!’
- (23) Vai Simona, taci din gură, că prea te bagi unde nu-ți fierbe oala! (SDM226) – ‘Oh, Simona, hold your tongue ‘cos you poke your nose where doesn’t belong!’
- (24) Ia mai taci din gură, da? (SDM372) – ‘Zip it, yeah?’

3.2. *Negative impoliteness strategies*

a. **inoculation of fear from the other**

- (25) Domnu' Terezianu, ia seama, acum mecanismul s-a pornit, o să te fărâămăm încetul cu încetul. (FGC55) – 'Mr. Terezianu, beware, cos' the mechanism's started and we gonna crush you little by little.'

b. **highlighting the transmitter's power regarding the receptor**

(despise, being ridiculed, looked down) – irony, sarcasm

In (26), the despise is facilitated by the hierarchical difference of the interlocutors: representative of an authority, namely a curious citizen, in (27) the same attitude comes from the expert consciousness of the speaker toward the interlocutor.

- (26) Dă-te înapoi, madam, unde te-mpingi? Organele au de lucru aici! (FCGP57) – 'Get back, madam, where are you pushing? The bodies have work here!'
- (27) Fă usturoiul ăla cu zahăr, și răspund eu pentru el! (SDM38) – 'Make this garlic with sugar, and I'll be responsible for it!'

Examples (28), (29) show despise, especially in (28) onomatopoeia:

- (28) Nu mai mă tăcăni toată ziua, taca-taca-taca-taca! (SDM133) – 'Don't crack my brain all day, tock-tock-tock!'
- (29) Continuă așa că în două minute revin! (SDM 245) – 'Go on this way 'cos I'll be back in two!'

Irony and mocking are used in (30), (31), (32)

- (30) Ia zi că nu ești perfectă! Ia zi! (SDM101) – 'Say you're not perfect! Say it!'
- (31) Dar mai arată un pic! (cum se șterge praful) (SDM243) – 'Show me a little bit more!' (dusting) - mocking
- (32) Vorbește și cu mine românește, ce dracu e aia matrice, că eu nu știu. (SDM361) – 'Talk to me in Romanian, what matrix is, I don't know.'

c. invading the other's territory (intimate subjects, inadequate relation between speakers)

Example (33) approaches a delicate subject, a personal problem, without, according to conventions, their relation would permit such thing.

- (33) Ia zi-mi și mie, care-i treaba cu pariurile alea sportive! (SDM234) – 'Tell me, what's the deal with those sport bets!'

The first name terms from the (34) reply is intimidating, inadequate relations, it is about an older patient and a younger nurse who see each other for the first time, and the situation of the patient is a delicate one.

(34) Gata! Îmbracă-te! (asistent-pacientă) (FON227) – ‘All right! Get dressed!’ (nurse - patient)

The fact that using the first name term in a situation like this is felt verbally aggressive comes out from the comment of the character in the following part:

(35) „Ajut-o pe bătrână să se dezbrace! (cel care face razele către fiul adult al pacientei) – ‘Help the old hag to get undressed!’ (nurse to the patient’s adult son)

Eu mă adresez cu dumneavoastră, ăsta mă ia la per tu!” (FON 222) – ‘I address him politely, and he talks to me in first name terms!’

d. explicite association of the other with negative aspect (underlining the opposition me and you)

(36) Nu fi hoț! (SDM 248) – ‘Don’t be a thief!’

(37) Uită-te la mine când vorbești! (SDM816) – ‘Look at me when you talk!’

e. explicite expression of the fact that the receiver is in debted to the sender, minimalization of the other

Nu da praful la mine că mă énervezi, pfu! (SDM129) – ‘Don’t throw the dust at me, you’re making me nervous, phew!’

Culpeper (2011a: 135-6) makes an inventory of the conventionalised forms of impoliteness in the English language, syntethises in a table. I used the same idea, only we proposed to identify conventionalised forms of impoliteness which implies the imperative based on the corpus. We got to a short list, probably because of the limited corpus and its specification.

Table 1

Impoliteness formula	Example
insult, vocative negative	<i>Ia zi, pulică!</i> – ‘Say it, you little prick!’ <i>Spune, dobitocule!</i> – ‘Say it, you, asshole!’
imprecation/curse/swearing	<i>Lasă-mă dracului în pace!</i> – ‘Leave me, the hell, alone!’ <i>Du-te, băi, în mă-ta cu ața ta!</i> – ‘Screw you with your thread!’
intensifiers	<i>pune mâna și</i> – ‘get your hands on it and’

Conventionalised impolite forms which imply the imperative (adapted after Culpeper 2011a: 135-6)

4. Politeness strategies

The imperative takes part in realizing the strategies of politeness.

4.1. Positive politeness strategies

a. forming sentences, which reflect the attention given to the interlocutor

- (1) Povestește-ne cum ți-a fost și ție ziua! (SDM971) – ‘Tell us how your day was!’

b. including both partners in the considered activity

In example (2) the idea is achieved by using the inclusive plural:

- (2) Ia un castron să punem roșiile astea să le spălăm puțin. (SDM151) – ‘Take a bowl, we put these tomatoes in to wash them a bit.’

Using confirmative question can have the same effect, of inclusion of partners, as shown in the example (3).

- (3) Nu mai plânge, da? (SDM555) – ‘Don’t cry anymore, all right?’

c. using specific forms of expression for showing relations between members of the same group, forms of address and specific reference; regional or slang forms; elliptical structures (the idea of common informative background)

- (4) Letucuta, te rog frumos du-te și scutură asta! (SDM686) – ‘Letucuta, I kindly ask you to go and shake this!’
(5) Stai, ștrengărițo! (SDM591) – ‘Wait, you little scamp!’
(6) Ia fata mea, du și tu asta afară! (SDM681) – ‘Take this out, my dear daughter!’ The word does not mean any relationship between the communicators, the sender is older than the receiver.
(7) Tată, ia atitudine, și nu te lăsa înjosită! (SDM655) – ‘Dad, take attitude, and don’t let yourself to be humiliated!’

Example (7) is a typical case of inverse addressing, (address forms used by children are used in adults’ language - Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu 2003: 81)

d. assumption or affirmation of the existence of a common territory through diverse procedures

In (8) the meaning of the expression in imperative is doubled for making a gesture underlines the idea of cooperation. In (9) we find a very careful expression:

turns to the information, which communicators share in order to introduce the imperative by the opponent for potentially generating a complaint, and the imperative is attenuated on through a minimalizer *a bit* to close with a justification.

- (8) Mă ajuți? Bate cupa! (bat palma) (SDM22) – ‘Can you help me? Give me five!’
 (9) Păi, știu că vă place (pescuitul), dar lăsați un pic mai departe că, până la urmă mai importantă este casa. (SDM110) – ‘Well, I know you like (fishing), but leave it a bit because after all, the house is more important.’

e. assumption or affirmation of reciprocity as a justification for certain acts, of which the aggressive potential is attenuated

- (10) Am respectat ce am stabilit, acum, strânge masa, spală vasele! (SDM168) – ‘I kept my end of the deal, now clear the table and wash the dishes!’
 (11) Uite, ia lădița asta că mut eu saciiăștia! (SDM138) – ‘Look, take this casket, I’m gonna move these sacks!’

f. joke

- (12) Sebi, mai respiră! (în timp ce mănâncă) (SDM 233) – ‘Sebi, take a breath!’ (while eating)
 (13) Dacă tu crezi că te-am chinuit eu psihic, gândește-te la mine cu voi doi pe cap! (SDM688) – ‘If you think that I tortured you psychic, think about me with you two on my head!’

4.2. Negative politeness strategies

a. reducing the level of interference through restrictive or litote elements or constructions

- (14) Dă-mi un pic grebla! (SDM479) – ‘Give me the rake a bit!’
 (15) Ia trage un pic de aer în piept! (SDM901) – ‘Take a deep breath!’

b. forming excuses: asking for forgiveness

One of the means of linguistic expressions of excuse is the imperative. Excuse is an act of speech with double nature, carrying not only the characteristic of expressive acts but also directives (v. Cebotaroș 2017). Some of the excuse forms contain in their structure verbs/phrasal verbs in imperative: *iartă-mă/iertați-mă* – ‘Forgive me’, *scuză-mă/scuzați-mă* – ‘Excuse me’, *dă-(mi) voie/dați-(mi) voie* – ‘Let me’, or the negative forms *nu te supăra/ nu vă supărați* – ‘Don’t mind/No

offence/Don't get mad/angry'. In most frequent cases their usage is connected to typical situations, clichés. Researchers' opinion is not univocal. Some treat the excuse as a valuable act for the recipient, but threatening for the speaker, others think that it is beneficial for both parties taking part in the act of communication. Excuses are anticipated in (16), (17), (18), (19) situations, referring to a future or possible offence, thus the excuse itself gains a mitigating character. In (16) the excuse it is preceded by an act of speech, which can be upsetting for the recipient and in (17) a provocative act, in (18) an act which prejudices the communicator's image. The disturbance is felt as an offence, at the same time covers a benefit on the image of the speaker, who shows knowledge of good manners (19). In example (20) the excuse presents the diminution of the insulting tone of the act which follows.

- (16) Iartă-mă că spun, dar mie nu mi se pare... nu-mi place nici cum arată... (SDM 648) – 'I'm sorry to tell you, but it doesn't seem to me that...I don't even like how it looks...'
- (17) Dar nu te supăra, tu practici sport? (SDM919) – 'No offence but, you practice any sports?'
- (18) Dă-mi voie să nu te cred că aceste lucruri se întâmplă, având în vedere situația ei școlară. (SDM928) – 'Let me not believe you, that these things happen, considering her school results.'
- (19) Nu vă supărați, pe unde se ajunge în spate? (FON241) – 'Excuse me, how can we get to the back?'
- (20) DOMnu președinte↓ dați-mi voie să încep să am îndoieli din moment ce nimeni nu spune că noi am făcut-o GRATIS# de la constanța înseamnă că cineva o fi luat bani pe ea. (Rux100) – 'Mister President, let me start having strong doubts as long as no one says we did it for free, from Constanta, it seems someone took money for it.'

c. impersonalization

The transition from using plural imperative verbs to singular ones with generic value tempers the powerful directive force from the beginning.

- (21) ÎnvăȚĂȚi i mă și voi↓ coboRÎȚi la amărîȚȚ↓ DAȚi-le mă ceva↓ nu le lua de fiecare dată↓ i-a murit ăla și-l lași în casă dacă nu-ți dă: (Rux153) – 'You, teach me something, get down to the needy, give them something, don't always take from them, that one died and you leave him in the house if he doesn't give anything'.

d. using justifications

The explanations attenuate the produced imposed effect.

- (22) Am pierdut și cuiul! Păi lasă cuiul, termină mai repede că îngheț aicia! (SDM 285) – ‘I lost the nail, too! Leave that nail and finish it quickly because I froze here!’
- (23) Schimbă subiectul că nu vreau să mă apuc de plâns. (SDM 323) – ‘Change the subject ‘cos I don’t wanna start crying.’
- (24) Nu mă înțelege greșit, dar abia aștept să scap de tine! (SDM906) – ‘Don’t get me wrong, but I can’t wait to get rid of you!’

e. using terms of endearment

One of the complementary redress strategies (Kerbrat-Orecchioni în Constantinovici 2017) is using terms of endearment (25). The form, which contains an imperative *fiți amabilă/fii amabilă* – ‘be so kind/be nice’ it is a cliché meant to diminish the effect of the act, which follows (26).

- (25) Mămico, mai fă și altceva că mie-mi trebuie carne! (SDM946) – ‘Mummy, do something else, because I need some meat too!’
- (26) bună ziua. fiți amabilă↓ aveți cumva> loțiune gerovital↑ pentru regenerarea părului. (Rux92) – ‘Good afternoon. Be kind and tell me if you have any gerovital hair reconditioner lotion.’

f. using *please* formula

Usually, adding *please* to an imperative is a negative politeness strategy (27). However we must mention that sometimes the apparition of this form has an impolite effect (28).

- (27) Dați-mi și mie vă rog trei cepi! (SDM921) – ‘Please, give me three onions!’
- (28) Bă, lasă-mă în pace, te rog frumos! (SDM299) – ‘Hey you, leave me alone, please!’

5. Conclusion

Often the imperative is involved in realizing polite and impolite strategies in Romanian language. We captured various imperative combinations with various means (morphologic, semantic, pragmatic) having (im)politeness effect. Furthermore, it can be identified even conventional impolite imperative forms. At the same time, we observed that using the imperative in itself does not imply impoliteness too; its interpretation depends on the situation, relation between communicators but also joining elements, verbal, nonverbal and/or paraverbal.

SOURCES AND ABBREVIATIONS

- Dascălu Jinga, Laurenția (coord.), Corpus de română vorbită. Eșantioane Academia Română [Corpus of spoken Romanian. Romanian Academic Samples]. (38.350 de cuv.) CORV
- Ruxăndoiu, Liliana (coord.), 2002. *Interacțiunea verbală în limba română actuală. Corpus selectiv. Schiță de tipologie* [Verbal interaction in modern Romanian language. Selective Corpus. Typology draft], Ed. Universității București. (62.900 de cuv.) IVLR – Rux
- Schimb de mame. [Wife Swap] Reality show SDM
- Blogs, internet comments Net
- Fiction F:
- Chifu, Gabriel, 2014, *Punct și de la capăt* [End and over again], Polirom, FGC
- Nimigean, O., 2015 (2010), *Rădăcina de bucsau* [Thimble root], ed. a II-a, Iași, Polirom FON –
- Popa, Cornel George, 2014, *Ura* [Hatred], Cartea Românească FCGP

REFERENCES

- Cebotaroș, Viorica, 2017. *Aspecte pragmatice ale actului scuzei în limba română* [Pragmatic aspects of apology act in Romanian language, doctoral thesis], teză de doctorat, Bălți.
- Constantinovici, Elena, 2017. „Politețea și rolul ei în procesul comunicării cu celălalt” [Politeness and its role in the communication] In *Filologia modernă: Realizări și perspective în context european*, Chișinău, 116-121.
- Culpeper, J., 1996. "Towards an Anatomy of Impoliteness", *Journal of pragmatics*, Volume 25, Issue 3, 349-367.
- Culpeper, J., 2011a. *Impoliteness: Using Language to Cause Offence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Culpeper, J., 2011b. "Politeness and Impoliteness". In *Sociopragmatics*, ed. K. Aijmer and G. Andersen, vol. 5. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Culpeper, J., Haugh, Kadar (eds.), 2017, *The Palgrave Handbook of Linguistic (Im)politeness*, Palgrave Macmillan.
- DȘL – *Dicționar de științe ale limbii* [Dictionary of linguistic science], 2001, București, Editura Nemira.
- Fraser, Bruce, 1996. "Pragmatic Markers", *Pragmatics*, 6.2: 167-190.
- Goffman, E., 1967. *Interactional Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behavior*. Allen Lane: The Penguin Press.
- Hoop, Klatta, Mulder, Schmitz, 2016. "Imperatives and politeness in Dutch", In: *Linguistics in the Netherlands*, 41-53.
- Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu, Liliana, 2003. *Limba și comunicare. Elemente de pragmatică lingvistică* [Language and communication. Pragmatic linguistic elements], București: All Educational.
- Mihăilescu, Angelica, 2009. „Comunicare și abilități sociale: politețea verbală” [Communication and social abilities: verbal politeness], In *Revista de Pedagogie* nr. 4-6/2009.