

www.ehs-ss.pl

Svitlana Lytvyn-Kindratyuk

Historical and psychological transformations of etiquette behavior of personality

State of the art. In the globalized age the forms of social interaction become more complicated, but regular and routine practices, numerous ritualizations of everyday behavior still dominate, they are focused mainly on the rules of etiquette and good manners in the domestic and business communication. However, nowadays the idea of “discharming the world” by Max Weber [15] is opposed to the idea of a “return to rituals” [13] that allows to deepen understanding of the historical transformations of rationality types. Thus, contemporary sociological and cultural-anthropological studies deal with the ways of connecting ritual and ritualized practices of individual etiquette behavior of personality that indicates its spiritual origins and involvement not only into the aimed rational, but also into the traditional action. However, this treatment of the etiquette behavior is inhibited by the lack of understanding of this problem in social and psychological terms. In our opinion, the developments of the social constructionism can be useful with its commitment to the historical study of discourse practices, that enables to apply hermeneutical methods of psychological and historical reconstruction in this field. It is a psychological

and historical transformation analysis of ritual and household behavior towards its individualization in form of the etiquette behavior, namely in the context of the social construction on the micro-level "discourse-practice".

The article aims at the psychological and historical transformation analysis of etiquette behavior as a form of ritual everyday person's behavior towards its individualization. We defined the following tasks of our study:

1. To consider interdisciplinary approaches to etiquette behavior in the context of modern everyday life.
2. To determine the pragmatic, ritual and everyday aspect of spiritual origins of the etiquette person's behavior.
3. To analyze by means of psychological and historical reconstruction the changes in ritual and everyday behavior of a personality in terms of the traditional and aimed rational action, particularly in the case of knightly behavior practices of a social small talk taking into account the dialogueness and stereotypicalness.

Analysis of recent research and publications. In the traditional way of life, the ritual and household behavior of an individual are represented mainly in situations of regulated everyday life and those of non-commonness and festivity. According to modern lifestyles, the ritual and household behavior become more individualized, non-stereotypical as well as the nature of communication in changing communicative situations.

The interaction of the latter provides the mutual understanding between the parties of a dialogue not only with regard to their age and gender characteristics, but also – to social status, profession, cultural affiliation, etc. The growing repertoire of speaker's freedom in a discourse is constructed on the basis of the dialogue's diversification (M. Bakhtin) [1], as well as of the transition to coordinating dialogues, non-stereotypical character of manners and more advanced self-control by participants of the interaction as the basis of their subjectivity.

But we consider the rules of behavior, i.e. conventional, regular elements as still being the core of the etiquette, polite communication, good manners of a modern personality. It means that good manners, politeness as a part of the regulatory behavioral etiquette complex are the main embodiment of the ritual everyday person's behavior in the age of modern, but in a much modified form. They appear in public and private life and in more diverse contexts such as international, court, salon, business, table etiquette etc. However, the treatment of the etiquette behavior as a more individualized form of ritual and household behavior requires clarification

of the psychosocial mechanisms of this historic transformation.

Currently, the etiquette behavior is most thoroughly studied within the philosophical and ethical concepts. But experts say about the peripheralism of etiquette issues in science of ethics, lack of its study in the historical, structural and functional aspects. The contrast between the moral educational approach and axiological analysis in the field of behavior's culture allows, according to O. Protsenko, to consider etiquette as the unity of following components: 1) the rules of good tone; 2) tact, style, image, 3) behavior (proper, decent). This etiquette behavior is based on complex regulatory stereotypes, patterns, models and acts as a form of fact (manners, methods, techniques) and form of the process (ritual, ceremonial, procedure and other kinds of collective activity) [12].

This indicates the double-vectoriness of etiquette – its moral normativity and at the same time aesthetic embodiment. In this area there are detailed developments of the category “politeness – non-courtesy” not only as imperative norms of etiquette, but also as the expression of linguocultural mentality (A. Wierzbicka) [16], behavioral strategies, conventions, conversational situationality (P. Brown and S. Levinson, H. Leach) [3; 9]. A significant influence on the development of the recognized today concept of courtesy by Brown-Levinson was made by the E. Hoffmann's idea of social drama [7].

The analysis of basic material. We applied the constructionist social approach to the analysis of spiritual origins of transformation in the etiquette behavior in its history-genesis. We presented examples of historical configurations of the ritual everyday person's behavior on the boundary between traditional and modern everyday life. As the main characteristics of ritual and domestic behavior we define its stereotypicalness and dialogueness, thus we observed transforming of good manners in the course of their trends to increasing rarity, originality and non-stereotypicalness, and also to new forms of a dialogue as well. According to N. Elias, the formation of new, more individualized types of the etiquette, ritualized behavior was constructed in the discourse of power elites on the background of regular practices by lower layers of the traditional society. [5] Later, with the changes, that took place in the organization of modern everyday life, a social diffusion of practices of polite behavior into the life of other states (especially the burghers) also took place, according to the elitist models, it was their relative homogenization taking into account the partial leveling of class characteristics (mature modern). However, modern researchers of the phenomenon of chivalry in Western Europe indicate the earlier sources

of a less radical version of Western individualism. These are the less studied (from the social and psychological viewpoint) knightly practices in the early Middle Age in terms of their impact on the development of modern society etiquette, particularly, phenomena of communicative courtesy and a social small talk.

The changes in the lifestyle of knights (from wandering knights to court chevaliers) are closely associated with the development of medieval society in terms of the demographic crisis, the high level of violence and economic risks. The contemporary society of the Middle Age, as D. Barthelemy says, was influenced by power relations and structurally based on partially ordered competition [2]. This was a universal rule of conflict discourse and that of temporary reconciliation. Along with more individualized practices of the military social layer (knights), that were constructed together with their involvement into the heritage of heroic ancestors and the right to defend their own valor and honor, a source of that kind of practices were also urban communes, which arose from neighboring communities on the basis of their members' equality and commitment to mutual dialogue (Le Gough) [10]. To the latter contributed the establishment and development of medieval cities, the growing urbanization, which eventually lead to mutual attraction between the court and burgher society of the urban community.

Thus, the elements of proto-modern in ritual and everyday behavior of the individual are, in our opinion, the knight practices and those of the early modern – the court practices, which have a clearly social state nature. It is difficult to understand the transformation of the more individualized knight etiquette without a thorough analysis of practices of a knightly behavior. Thus, D. Barthelemy believes that the practices of knightly behavior have their origins in the social construction of extreme behavior of Gallic and Germanic warriors of the so-called "Osts" (troops of soldiers from a particular community) and squads (intertribal troops of soldiers) [2]. Taking into account the opinion of the French medievalist, we observe in these practices the elements of an extreme personal life-constructing in risk situations (T. Titarenko) [14], e.g., those of the war or battle. They were based on a special appreciation of individual "valor" and "heartbreaking courage," the ability to take strategic decisions vis-à-vis to the life circumstances, that were preferred in old Germanic and Frankish communities.

Thus, ritualized practices, defined by D. Barthelemy, show the features characteristic for Germanic knights of the early Middle Age as well as for the ancient Germans in general – respect for the individual "valor and

honor” of the warrior-rider, defender and attacker. The heroic actions of them were initially performed in a fully ritual way, since the initiation of a young man by handing him weapons (adoration of a sword) – by war against the neighbors and traditional feasts with his squad, that formed a youth inner-generation group. An axiology of individual valor of a knight was archaic. It was appropriate only for that soldier, who had a genealogic family tree (the legitimized intergenerational dialogue with ancestors) and reaffirmed it by his coat of arms, family legends, an eloquent ancestral title. In the course of time, the courage of the warrior changed to the gallantry, polite behavior, that takes gaming, demonstration and performative forms by leisure (tournaments, protection of weak persons, the cult of the Grate Lady). The latter takes place on the background of weakening conflict discourse and reallocation of resources for the life support (land and castles). After the age of the Crusades European knights became more secular, preferring courtesy and status nobility.

By ritualization of the new established practices the knightly culture lost such features as extreme spontaneous rudeness, it was a certain “knightly mutation”, that took place in that time. For the knightly behavior the playfulness, decorativeness, aestheticism became inherent, which were summarized by practice of courtesy as a desire for terrestrial pleasure and gallantry, i.e. exquisite manners. The analysis of the history of chivalry from the social structuralist position by P. Bourdieu, allowed D. Barthelemy to argue that chivalry which devoted itself to traditional feats, games, entertainment and good manners in the communication between knights from different countries can be divided into two types – proto-chivalry and classic knights. The first emerged and was gradually formed in the Osts and the courts of regional princes [2]. The second, actually the classic knights, with their tournaments and celebrations, which was reflected in courtly novels and poetry were largely the socially constructed style of behavior, configuration of ritual and “assumed” ritualized practices in situations of reduced violence in the society [ibid].

Without any idealization of chivalry as the social status, one should clarify its axiological orientations, that were declared in the knightly discourse and concerned the knight community, standards of relationship between knights, culture of the knight, who was constantly traveling and away from home, did not appreciate very much the family joy, i.e. of the warrior-rider (chevalier). According to M. Osovska, the knight ethos were the values of strength, courage, fame, generosity, faithfulness [11], in opinion of F. Duby – it was a pleasure of battles and adventures, consolidation of

his power, triumph over the enemy [4]. Initially, the foundation of the knightly culture was laid by “male and military virtues: strength, courage and loyalty to a freely chosen commander” [Ibid, p. 204], when everybody is united by belonging to the noble and heroic ancestors. In fact, at that time only feudal aristocrats (nobles, knights) had the power to assert by means of intergenerational interaction their right for a dialogue with the ancestors. Although most of them were illiterate, but they were involved into the intercultural communication and generally had the foreign language skills.

Subsequently the axiological profile of a knight changed – especially important becomes for him the beauty of appearance, courtesy, gallantry (polite treatment of persons of the opposite sex), as the knight discourse is complemented by new forms of inter-group gender dialogue (only with women of the same social status). This is a cult of the Great Lady, on the factors, that caused it, numerous discussions are still going on. For example, the medievalist historians speak of the growing economic independence and social status of women from higher strata of the society [4], ethicists (M. Osovska) – of compensation in that way of deformations in marital relationships [11, p. 93].

However, S. Zizek after J. Lacan, who considered courtly love as an anamorphosis, also believes that “a courtly image of a man as the servant of his lady was a mask that hides the reality of male dominance” [17, c. 96], and “courtly love is to the great extent just politeness and etiquette, it has nothing to do with some elementary passion that is free from all social rules” [Ibid, c. 81]. However, citing examples of this anamorphosis of the “courtly love matrix” on the material of modern everyday life, S. Zizek does not account for historical changes of phenomena of politeness and etiquette on the background of differences between the proto-modern (knightly) and early-modern (bourgeois) life.

In our opinion, the cult of the Great Lady should not be seen as the archetypal matrix, but as a product of the social construction of gender, i.e. in the context of the knight discourse, when a sexual impulse of the subjugation of women is regulated by means of behavior ritualization and becomes a part of a new gender behavioral pattern. The latter is constructed as a mystery game that involves fighting, racing and at the same time love, care, confrontation with in some way equal (struggle), but somehow uncomparably different (care) opponents. In terms of a knight, the lady as an enemy certainly deserves respect and vassal serving, following the code of honor in the new quality (courtesy).

The legitimization of the vassal service was carried out in the knight

fight, full of dangers for life, that gradually transformed from the group military actions in the 12th – 13th century into duels of genealogically certified noble opponents, carefully regulated by the rules, the Supreme Court over them could only be done by the lady, bringing gifts and prizes (wreath, sword, ring, etc). And after that it was not the victory that became principal, but the gallant behavior in the tournament, besides in the fifteenth century the prevalent sort became a performance, the tournament-play (*Pas d'arm*). So, in our view, the Great Lady is not a faceless “black hole” in the imagination of men and not some kind of an “abstract object” [17] but an equal member of the courtly discourse.

The latter had the ritualized character, a distinct emotional tone and playing background, indicating rare-illusory, spiritual and secret style of these practices, that compensated the deficit of real inter-generational gender interaction in the society. So, J. Dubi said: “in its nature and form of expression the courtly love is, like a holiday, a total escape from reality, where the festival was a gallant game based on poetization of appearance, clothing and was developed as the dialogue between the two sexes” [4, c. 256].

We know, that about the twelfth and thirteenth century in more populated and urbanized South-West France the educated female aristocrats founded their salons. The discourse in the salons was led by some noble ladies, that is why the courtly behavior was constructed at the heart of the medieval way of life – in castles, often far from cities, first of all, in the courts of Mary of Champagne, Eleanor of Aquitaine, where small talks and real “courts of love” were prevalent. At that time, in opinion of J. Dubi, a new form of relations between the sexes, called Western love, was developed. The values significant for the knights – to fight for freedom and to have fun of a free natural life were enriched by a happy courtship [4, p. 251], because the gallant love is not just a sexual chatting, but, above all, personal choice that was disabled by the ritual of marriage.

From that time the knight devoted himself to the loving pursuit of the lady of his social status, because to be in love was his duty, and the long parting – was a test of loyalty. The knight sought not to force a lady, but to win her heart, to serve her. So the whole lexicon of this strategy, this secret game and entertainment was borrowed from the vocabulary of vassalage dependence and enriched by lexicon of loving, giving it a fancy emotionality. It had to denote contrasting emotional states – happiness, sadness, tears, frustration, namely: «*amitie*» – friendship, «*ardeur*» – enthusiasm, «*attachement*» – attachment, «*embarras*» – confusion, «*passion*» – passion,

«tendresse» – tenderness, «trouble» – excitement and more.

We believe that the courtly behavior is a variant of social construction of gender practices on the basis of decorative polarization, allowing to aesthetize the stereotypical discourse of authoritativeness and subordination in this area, thereby to outline the space of innovational playfulness, delayed motivation (illocutivity) for its members. The gradual transformation of the knightly life, which became more settled, contributed to this process and their increased resources toward welfare standards, the highest at that time, did not correspond with the knight mythology, which resulted, according to J. Heisinga, in its artificial preservation [6]. Narrative means of regulating sexual instincts of courtly discourse participants were the court love poetry and epic works ("Parcival," "Tristan", etc.) Not less important were the courtly novels ("Lancelot" by Chretien de Troyes, "The Art of courtly love" by Andreas Capellanus etc.) [8, p. 157]. They convincingly asserted a new style and game strategy of interactions, that involved compliance with the code of honor and gallantry.

In summary, we come to the conclusion that the emergence of court etiquette, which, according to N. Elias, stands for becoming a self-regulated modern personal identity, was introduced by the practice of courtesy, knight serving to the Great Lady, that asserted the new aspects of dialogueness and non-stereotypicalness in ritual and household behavior towards its individualization.

The construction of the new style was completed in the second half of the twelfth century, and its wide spread took part in the fourteenth century. The consensusness and regularity was combined in this style with a focus on individuality, exoticism, that was achieved by the knight due to his knightly perfection (courage), observation and experience of the traveler in lands far and near. Subsequently the rules of a knight and gallant game became the ideal for all those who wanted to belong to the elite.

Transliteration of references:

1. Bakhtin M. M. Estetika slovesnogo tvorchestva / M.M. Bakhtin; sost. S.G. Bocharova. – M.: Iskuststvo, 1986. – 446 s.
2. Barthelemy D. Rytsarstvo : Ot drevney Germanii do Frantsii XII veka /D. Barthelemy; [per. s frants. M.Yu. Nekrasova] – SPb.: EVRAZIYa, 2012. – 584 s.
3. Brown P. Politeness Some Universals in Language Usage / P. Brown S. Levinson. – Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1987 – 345 p.
4. Dubi J. Doba soboriv: Mystetstvo ta suspil'stvo 980 – 1420 rokiv; [per. z fr.] – K.: Yunivers, 2003. – 320 s.
5. Elias N. O protsesse tsivilizatsyi. Sotsiogeneticheskie i psikhogeneticheskie

- issledovaniya. – Tom 1. Izmeneniya v povedenii vysshego sloya miryan v stranakh Zapada. – M.: SPb.: Universitetskaya kniga, 2001. – 332 s.
6. Heisinga J. Homo Ludens / Johann Heisinga; [per. z angl. O. Mokrovól's'koho]. – K.: Osnovy, 1994. – 250 s.
 7. Hofmann E. Ritual vzaimodeystviya. Ocherki povedeniya litsom k litsu / E. Hofmann; [per. s angl., pod red. N.N. Bogomolovoy, D.A. Leont'eva]. – M.: Smysl, 2009. – 319 s.
 8. Kinder H. Vsesvitnya istoriya: dtv-Atlas / H. Kinder, V. Khil'heman : [per. z nim / Khudozh. Haral'd i Rut Bukor; nauk. red. per. A. H. Slyusarenko, O.F. Ivanov]. – K.: Znannya-Pres, 2001. – 631 s.
 9. Leech G. N. Principles of Pragmatics. – London Longman Publishing Group, 1983. – 250 p.
 10. Le Hoff J. Tsivilizatsiya Srednevekovogo Zapada / J. Le Hoff; [per. s fr. pod obshch. red. V.A. Babintseva; Posleslov. A.Ya. Gurevicha]. – Ekaterinburg: U-Faktoriya, 2003. – 568 s.
 11. Ossovskaya M. Rytsar' i burzhua / Mariya Ossovskaya; Issled. po istorii morali; [per. s pol'sk. A.A. Guseynova]. – M.: Progress, 1987. – 528 s.
 12. Protsenko O. P. Etyket yak aksiolohichnyy vymir kul'tury povedinky i spilkuвання / O. P. Protsenko. – Avtoref. dys. ... doktora filos. nauk. Spetsial'nist' 09.00.07 – Etyka. – K., 2004. – 21 s.
 13. Selikhman A. B. Da zdravstvuet ritual (Ritualy i ikh gospodstvo tam, gde ne nuzhna iskrennost'): vvedenie k knige / A. Selikhman, R. Weller, M. Piet, B. Saymon // Inostrannaya psikhologiya i sotsial'naya istoriya. – 2004. – № 2. – S. 171 – 183.
 14. Tytarenko T. M. Osobystisne samokonstruyuvannya: pul'satsiyi khaosu i poryadku / Tetyana Mykhaylivna Tytarenko // Naukovi studiyi iz sotsial'noyi ta politychnoyi psykholohiyi. Zbirnyk statey. – Vypusk 31 (34). – Kyiv, 2012. – S. 3 – 11.
 15. Weber M. Sotsiolohiya. Zahal'noistorychni analizy. Polityka / M. Weber; per. z nim. O. Pohorilyy. – K.: Osnovy, 1988. – 542 s.
 16. Wierzbicka A. Yazyk. Kul'tura. Poznanie / A. Wierzbicka; per. s angl., otv. red. M.A. Kronhauz, vstup. st. E.V. Paduchevoy. – M.: Russkie slovari, 1996. – 416 s.
 17. Zhyzhhek S. Metastazy nasolody: Shist' narysiv pro zhinku y prychynnist' / Slavoy Zhyzhhek; [per. O. Mokrovól's'kyy]. – K.: Vydavnychy dim «Al'ternatyvy», 2000. – 188 s.

The Author

Svitlana Lytvyn-Kindratyuk
*PhD, associate professor, department of pedagogical
and age psychology,
Wassyl Stefanyk National Precarpathian University,
Ivano-Frankivsk
e-mail: lytvynkindr@ukr.net*

Abstracts

СВІТЛАНА ЛИТВИН-КІНДРАТЮК. Психолого-історичні трансформації етикетної поведінки особистості. Етикетна поведінка вивчається у контексті історіогенезу ритуально-побутової поведінки особистості в аспекті індивідуалізації останньої. Опираючись на існуючі у прагматиці та соціальній психології підходи до вивчення ввічливості та гарних манер етикетна поведінка конструюється у просторі регулярних практик як така, що має переважно комунікативну спрямованість. Психолого-історичні трансформації етикетної поведінки особистості аналізуються у річищі соціального конструкціонізму та соціального конструктивізму, методологія яких й дозволяє простежити конвергенцію типів раціональності та регулярних соціальних практик щодо вивчення ввічливості та гарних манер. В умовах модерного побуту у порівнянні з традиційним укладом життя етикетна поведінка набуває характеру соціально-ілокутивного конструювання з властивими йому діалогічністю та нестереотипністю висловлювань у форматі світської бесіди. Зазначені зміни простежені на прикладі зародження рицарського етикету, куртуазного дискурсу та культу Прекрасної дами.
Ключові слова: етикетна поведінка особистості, ритуально-побутова поведінка, куртуазність, дискурс, ввічливість, соціальне конструювання, історіогенез.

SWIETŁANA LITWIN-KINDRATIUK. Psychologiczno-historyczne zmiany zachowań kurtuazyjnych jednostki. Zachowania kurtuazyjne rozpatrywane są w kontekście historiogenezy zachowań rytualno-obyczajowych jednostki w aspekcie jej indywidualizacji. Wykorzystując istniejące w pragmatyce i psychologii społecznej podejścia do badania zagadnień grzeczności i *savoir-vivre*'u zachowania kurtuazyjne kształtują się w przestrzeni regularnych praktyk jako coś, co jest ukierunkowane komunikacyjnie. Psychologiczno-historyczne zmiany zachowań kurtuazyjnych jednostki analizowane są w kontekście społecznego konstrukcjonizmu i społecznego konstruktywizmu, których metodologia umożliwia obserwowanie konwergencji typów racjonalności oraz regularnych praktyk stosowanych w badaniu zagadnień grzeczności *savoir-vivre*'u. W porównaniu z tradycyjnym stylem życia, w nowoczesnych warunkach zachowania kurtuazyjne nabierają charakteru społeczno-illokucyjnego konstruowania z charakterystyczną dla niego dialogicznością i niestereotypowością wypowiedzi w formie rozmowy towarzyskiej. Wymienione zmiany zostały w niniejszym artykule omówione na przykładzie etykiety rycerskiej, dyskursu kurtuazyjnego i kultu pięknej damy.

Słowa kluczowe: zachowanie kurtuazyjne jednostki, zachowania rytualno-obyczajowe, kurtuazja, dyskurs, grzeczność, konstruowanie społeczne, historiogeneza.

СВЕТЛАНА ЛИТВИН-КИНДРАТЮК. Психолого-исторические трансформации этикетного поведения личности. *Этикетное поведение изучается в контексте историогенеза ритуально-бытового поведения личности в аспекты ее индивидуализации. Исходя из существующих в прагматике и социальной психологии подходов к изучению феномена вежливости этикетное поведение конструируется в пространстве регулярных практик в качестве коммуникативно направленного. Психолого-исторические трансформации этикетного поведения личности анализируются в русле социального конструкционизма и социального конструктивизма, методология которых и позволяет проследить конвергенцию типов рациональности и регулярных практик относительно изучения вежливости и хороших манер. В условиях современного быта в сравнении с традиционным укладом, этикетное поведение приобретает характер социально-иллокутивного конструирования со свойственной ему диалогичностью и нестереотипностью высказываний в формате светской беседы. Указанные изменения прослеживаются на примере рыцарского этикета, куртуазного дискурса и культа Прекрасной дамы.*

Ключевые слова: *этикетное поведение личности, ритуально-бытовое поведение, куртуазность, дискурс, вежливость, социальное конструирование, историогенез.*

SVITLANA LYTVYN-KINDRATYUK. Historical and psychological transformations of etiquette behavior of personality. *The etiquette behavior is analyzed in a context of history-genesis of the ritual-domestic behavior of the personality in the aspect of its individualization. Based on approaches developed in pragmatics and social psychologists - to studying of politeness and good manners, the etiquette behavior is constructed in the practical regular space and has mainly communicative focus. The psychological and historical transformations of the etiquette behavior of the personality are analyzed in terms of the social constructionism and social constructivism, their methodology enables to study the convergence of the rationality types and regular social practice in order to research politeness and good manners. Considering specifics of the modern life in comparison to the traditional tenor of life, polite conversation gains the character of social illocutionary constructing with its characteristic dialogueness and non-stereotypicalness of expression in the form of a social small talk. The specified transformations are traced on the example of the origin of knightly etiquette and to a cult of the Great Lady.*

Key words: *etiquette behavior of the personality, ritual-domestic behavior, courtesy, discourse, politeness, social constructing, history-genesis.*