

**PRAGMATIC DIFFERENCES BETWEEN COOPERATIVE PRINCIPLE AND
POLITENESS PRINCIPLE IN CHINESE AND ENGLISH COMMENTATORS'
UTTERANCES**

Peng Lulu

School of Foreign Languages and Literatures, Lanzhou University, China

ABSTRACT: *From the perspective of pragmatics, this paper makes a comparative study on utterances from Chinese commentators and English commentators, through four groups of Chinese-English real authentic corpus in the same e-sports competition. Results show that Chinese commentators attach great importance to harmony and indirect euphemism, so they would take priority on Politeness Principle. Whereas English commentators tend to be more straightforward, so they pay more attention to the Cooperative Principle. According to existing researches, due to the differences between Chinese and western cultures, Chinese and western native speakers have different thinking modes, which makes them have different tendency in observing the Cooperative Principle and Politeness Principle in communication.*

KEYWORDS: Cooperative Principle, Politeness Principle, cultural differences, commentators' utterances,

INTRODUCTION

Previous comparative studies of discourses between Chinese commentators and English commentators mainly focus on the context in traditional sports events such as football games and basketball matches of NBA (Zuo Huifen, 2007; Du Fu, 2009). Their research outcomes mainly shed lights on differences between Chinese commentators and English commentators in terms of vocabulary, interjection frequency, and syntactic features, which are all from the layer of discourse analysis (Zhang Shan, 2017; Li Yude, 2017). Also, there is research comparing the differences between Chinese and Western commentary technology from the field of communication technology perspective (Lv Pin, 2014). However, for one thing, there is a lack of research on the analysis of commentators' utterances from the perspective of pragmatics. For another, since most corpora are involved in traditional sports event, the analytical corpus for the commentary discourses of newly online e-sports are little involved. This article is based on the Cooperative Principle and the Politeness Principle to investigate whether there are pragmatical differences between Chinese and Western commentator' utterances. The analytical corpora are from one of the latest international e-sports finals with synchronized broadcast live of Chinese and English commentators. A comparative analysis of the pragmatic features of Chinese and English e-sports commentary is conducted to explore:

Whether the Chinese and English commentator's discourses are pragmatically different in observing Cooperative Principle and Politeness Principle?

If the pragmatic difference does exist, what are the reasons behind the differences?

Theoretical underpinning

The American philosopher Grice believes that in order to achieve some specific goals in all language communication activities, there is a tacit agreement between the speaker and the hearer. A principle means both parties should observe during talking. In order to make the conversation go smoothly, both parties in the conversation need to abide by some basic maxims, so as to avoid conversations becoming irrelevant and nonsense. Grice refers to this principle as the Cooperative Principle. The main idea is to require each conversation participant to talk in accordance with the common goal and direction in the course of communication (Grice, 1975). The Cooperative Principle can be embodied in the following four maxims:

(1) Maxim of Quantity

The words should include the level of required detail for the current communication, and the words should not exceed the level of detail of the information required.

(2) Maxim of quantity

Make your contribution as informative as is required for the current purposes of the exchange.

Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

(3) Maxim of Relation

Be relevant.

Make sure that whatever you say is relevant to the convention at hand.

(4) Maxim of Manner

Be perspicuous.

Do not make your contribution obscure, ambiguous or difficult to understand.

The Cooperative Principle explains the relationship between the literal meaning of the discourse and its intended meaning, and shows how the meaning of the conversation is generated and understood. But it does not explain why people intentionally flout the conversational maxims to express themselves implicitly and indirectly. Although it cannot be said that in all conditions that people flouting the conversational maxims to express themselves implicitly is for the consideration of being polite, in many cases, people do this out of courtesy. Like the Cooperative Principle, the Politeness Principle can also be embodied in some maxims (He Zhaoxiong, 2000:154).

On the basis of Grice's theory, Leech (1983) puts forward the "politeness principles" from the

view of rhetoric and stylistics to make up for the deficiency that the principle of cooperation cannot explain. Leech believes that the Cooperative Principle can only require people to follow the principle of quality association, to restrict what people say in communication and how to understand the reason for the speaker's intentional violation of a certain maxim. However, it cannot explain why people want to talk in a roundabout way. In other word, why there are so many indirect linguistic behaviors. Leech's politeness principle has six maxims (Leech, 1983):

(1) Tact Maxim

Minimize the expression of beliefs which imply cost to other.

Maximize the expression of beliefs which imply benefit to other.

(2) Generosity Maxim

Minimize the expression of beliefs that express or imply benefit to self.

Maximize the expression of beliefs that express or imply cost to self.

(3) Approbation Maxim

Minimize the expression of beliefs which express dispraise of other.

Maximize the expression of beliefs which express approval of other.

(4) Modesty Maxim

Minimize the expression of praise of self.

Maximize the expression of dispraise of self.

(5) Agreement Maxim

Minimize the expression of disagreement between self and other.

Maximize the expression of agreement between self and other.

(6) Sympathy Maxim

Minimize antipathy between self and other.

Maximize sympathy between the self and other.

In short, Leech's Politeness Principle can be summed up as "to minimize the benefits of others, to maximize the benefits of others; to maximize damage to others and to minimize the damage of others" (He Zhaoxiong, 2000:154). The politeness principle not only perfects the theory of "conversational implicature", but also explains the problem that the Cooperative Principle cannot explain. In addition to this, the Politeness Principle can also "save" the Cooperative Principle, since there is a trade-off relation between them. When considering

more Cooperative Principle, the Politeness Principle will often be considered less, vice versa (Yang Lei, 2005). Similarly, there is a mutually restrictive relationship between the Cooperative Principle and the Politeness Principle. To a certain extent, to abide by the maxims of the Cooperative Principle, it is necessary to derogate from the Politeness Principle to the same degree. Likewise, to what extent to abide by the Politeness Principle, it is also necessary to disregard of the maxims of the Cooperative Principle to the same degree. The complementary and restrictive relationship between them in verbal communication can be expressed by the formula $CP+PP=1$ (He Xuede, 2005), the greater the share of the Cooperative Principle, the smaller the proportion of the Politeness Principle. on the contrary, the smaller the share of the Cooperative Principle, the greater the share of the Politeness Principle.

METHODOLOGY

Due to the popularity of the Internet nowadays, the live broadcast and broadcasting of e-sports related events have become increasingly popular with young people and gradually standardized. Instead of the traditional sports events as the research corpus, the commentator's utterances from online platform broadcast and the video of live e-sports matches are selected as corpus resources. Compared with traditional sports event, e-sports matches are more time-sensitive and popular to the young generations. Because this article is to conduct a comparative study of Chinese commentator's utterances and English commentator's utterances during match interpretation, the selected corpus focus on the same e-sports competition simultaneously synchronized broadcast by Chinese native commentators and English native commentators respectively (2018 League of Legends Professional League spring finals). In this way, other interference factors and contents of Chinese and Western commentary on the same match is basically consistent, so it could ensure that the pragmatic contrast is more reliable and valid.

Ultimately, the author used the method of random sampling and selected four pairs of Chinese-English real authentic corpus. The specific process is as follows:

- (1) Download the final videos (2018 League of Legends Professional League spring finals) of both the Chinese commentary version and English commentary version, ensuring the length and contents are consistent.
- (2) Randomly choose the 4 pairs of similar time span from both in the Chinese commentary version and in English commentary version video and pull the similar length clips that are lasting around 2 minutes.
- (3) Write the transcription based on the video and translate the Chinese discourses into English.

FINDINGS

Table 1 the first pair of discourses of Chinese and English commentators

Discourses of Chinese commentators		Discourses of English commentators
<p>A: EDG 和 RNG 也是老对手了。</p> <p>C: 第四次在决赛的舞台上面交手。</p> <p>B: 而且在过去五次的决赛当中都有 RNG 的身影。让我们看一下两队此前的交锋记录, 两队三次交锋中 EDG 是两次捧杯, 而 RNG 是在 2016 年的春天以 3-1 战胜过 EDG, 但是在那一轮的战胜中 Uzi 还未能归队。</p> <p>A: 所以一直说有个魔咒这个东西。</p> <p>B: 但是最近的魔咒好像比较多, 究竟今天能不能打破这个魔咒, 要把我们的选择交到我们的选手手里。</p> <p>A: 然后今天的话其实在我们之前其他的赛区都已经打完了季后赛的决赛。有一些以往的幻神已经失利了。</p> <p>B: G2 和 TSM 已经离开了幻神的队列, 但是 FW 闪电狼依旧进入到了季中赛当中。</p> <p>A: 所以说我们也不能说有什么魔咒, 逆境无论是 EDG 还是 RNG, 这两只队伍都是我们心目中捧得起这座奖杯的队伍。</p>	<p>A: EDG and RNG are also old rivals.</p> <p>C: For the fourth time, they will play against on the stage of the final.</p> <p>B: And in the past five finals, there are RNG's presents. Let's take a look at the previous match record between the two teams. The EDG won twice in the three battles. The RNG defeated EDG 3-1 in the spring of 2016, but Uzi has not yet been a member of RNG at that time.</p> <p>A: So I always said that there is a "spell".</p> <p>B: But the recent spells seem to be more, whether today can break this spell, we have to hand our choices to our players.</p> <p>A: Then today, in fact, in the other divisions before us, they have already finished the finals of the playoffs. Some of the past strong teams have lost unexpected.</p> <p>B: G2 and TSM have left the queue of the strong teams, but the FW Lightning Wolf is still in the mid season finals.</p> <p>A: So we can't say that there are any spells. Whether it's EDG or RNG, these two teams can afford to win this championship.</p>	<p>B: Talking about EDG vs RNG the last 3 times they met in 2016 spring finals, 2016 summer finals, and 2017 summer finals. They gonna against each other time and time against. RNG took them once, but Uzi he was not one of the team at the time, he is still the crownless king.</p> <p>C: Yep. He is still looking for that crown. Again, RNG has been the better interaction team. Uzi is gonna go down in history as the best LPL player ever, but the mad dog domestically speaking has always been the underdog when it comes against EDG. EDG, the last time they met in the finals they reverse and swept RNG. Uzi even admits Clearlove was in his head.</p>

As for Chinese commentators, in the intense pre-match discussing session, they need to analyze the teams that are going to attend in the upcoming finals, including historical battles, media discussion hotspots, and pre-heating for promoting the atmosphere of the upcoming games. First of all, their interpretations made a statement about the history of the two teams. The two teams have met four times in the finals. Between them, EDG defeats RNG for three times. Although RNG has a successful victory, at that time the team does not have Uzi (a star player). At this point, the commentator A says the word “spell”. The reason for using this fuzzy euphemistic expression is that there is a so-called “spell” to make this player just missed the opportunity for final champion every time. To express the fact that the player has not won a championship so far, the commentator B immediately responds: “But the recent spells seem to be more, whether today can break this spell, we have to hand our choices to our players.” The reason why B says this is he did not agree with A’s conclusion about the word “spell”. Since B thinks that A is too absolute when the game is not even in progress, it is also unacceptable to the audience who support RNG. Then, B adds that “there are a lot of other recent spells” to ease and transfer the absoluteness of A’s words, which means that even if there is a so-called “spell”, it is impossible to impose the curse only on a specific player. Afterwards, it is reasonable that A transfers the topic to the finals regarding Europe and Taiwan competitive areas, where the traditional strong teams have a wired tendency to lose. A’s intention is to express that there is no absolute final conclusion before the beginning of the real finals since even strong teams also have backwardness. This situation is not the only and absolute issue that would absolutely happen to Uzi and his team RNG. Later, commentator B immediately says that although some traditional strong teams do lose, other traditional strong teams still have no way to be attacked. In this way, A said “so there is no spell” to express that a fair game’s result would be determined only by the team who wins, for a team’s strength is better than everything. Commentators A and B subtly resolve the “existing spell” that they proposed, and finally come to the conclusion that “there is no spell in a fair game” by citing a series of arguments of other facts that have occurred.

The Chinese commentary of A and B about “spell” shows the observance of the maxims of the tact maxim in the Politeness Principle, which means the more indirect and euphemistic the utterances are, the more polite the language seems. Although the explanation does not directly indicate that the player has not yet won any championship as far, commentator A uses “spell” to indicate “this player has not yet won the championship”. After the audience hearing the word “spell”, they will immediately understand that the underlying meaning is that A is using the word “spell” in an indirect way to state the fact that the play has not yet won a championship. The dialogue between commentator B and commentator A initially embodies the approbation maxim, that is, to minimize denigration to others. Although the word “spell” is already expressed indirectly, the commentary finds that after the word is spoken, it is possibly detrimental to the upcoming performance of the player and the team’s honor. It seems to imply that the spell really exists, which might show bad luck to the team and the players. Therefore, commentator A and commentator B transfer the topic to situations in other divisions and conclude that there is no such thing as a curse to reduce the depreciation of the

team. Although the commentator's explanation here violates the quantitative maxim in the Cooperative Principle since it exceeds the normal length of a statement, it complies with the decent and tact maxims in the Politeness Principle.

When it comes to English commentators, it should be emphasized that the English commentators are English native speakers. Their content of commentary is consistent with that of Chinese commentary, and also talks about the previous matches between EDG and RNG in finals. The commentary shows that the player Uzi is still not a member of the team when the last RNG victory over EDG. Then the English commentary B says bluntly: "He is still a crownless king." The English commentary is very straightforward to state that the player currently has no championship. This is different from the Chinese commentary that would treat the words "spell" as inappropriate evaluations of the player and use strategies to avoid the possible negative effects. The English commentator C agrees with the expression "crownless king" mentioned by the commentator B, adding that the player is still fighting for the championship and inserting a complementary statement: "Although Uzi is definitely the best player in LPL's history, he has changed from a bad dog to a defeated player when he encounters EDG. In the last final, EDG defeat RNG by reversing the game." Discourses of the English commentary are in full compliance with the Cooperative Principle and its maxims. And the English commentators use direct explanations to illustrate current facts, which is different from Chinese commentators. However, while the English commentary adheres to the Cooperative Principle to the greatest extent, there are few considerations for the Politeness Principle. The expressions "the crownless king" and "underdog" violate the maxims of tact, approbation in the Politeness Principle.

Table 2 the second pair of discourses of Chinese and English commentators

Discourses of Chinese commentators		Discourses of English commentators
<p>B: Rng 今天跟之前的区别就是, 打野位上的是Karsa, 所以对于RNG来讲, 今天这个葫芦里卖的什么药, 大家还是期待一下。</p> <p>C: 是的, 看一下今天上野会不会有新的打法。</p> <p>B: 这个比赛啊我觉得第一局定调的是很重要的, 因为今天两个队有一个共同的特点,</p>	<p>B: The difference in RNG today is that Karsa is playing as the jungler. So for RNG, what kind of medicine is sold in this gourd today, we still look forward to it.</p> <p>C: Yes, let's see if there is a new style of play in top-lane and jungle today.</p> <p>B: This final, I think the first game is very important, because today the two teams have a common feature, that is, if you let them play fast, they will speed up. But if you let them play in slow</p>	<p>A: Well now, we've heard all about the teams the players on stage getting ready. I cannot wait to get into this. But first I gonna to know gentlemen, who are you gonna take in this match-up? It gonna be the mad dog or the pig farmer?</p> <p>B: I think it gonna be the pig farmer. I feel like EDG ran counter to RNG strategy. EDG should be able to hit them and hit them quickly.</p> <p>C: I'm in the favor of RNG</p>

<p>就是你要是让他们打快，他们也快得起来，但是你要是让他们打慢，也可以，两队也慢得起来。唯一可能比较大的区别是就是EDG在快节奏结束比赛的能力我觉得比RNG是要强一些的。但是RNG在比赛的中后期，在有效地调整BP策略，让自己中后期更紧凑的情况下，他们来到后期的胜率也比较高，所以我觉得今天第一场我觉得也能说明很多东西。</p>	<p>pace, the two teams can also slow down. The only big difference is that EDG's ability to end the game at a fast pace is better than RNG. However, in the middle and late stages of the game, RNG effectively adjusting ability and the BP strategy make it more compact. They also had higher winning percentages in the later stage, so I think their performance could illustrate many things in the first game today.</p>	
--	---	--

The discourses of Chinese commentary usually show a high degree of ambiguity, focusing on the balanced evaluation of the two teams, rather than directly expressing the bias to certain one side. For example, the explanation B first summarizes the common characteristics of the two teams, and then separately evaluates the advantages of the two teams. First of all, they mention that “EDG is better in ending the game quickly.” Then the other side’s advantage is described as “RNG’s possibility of winning will be higher in the middle and late stages.” B’s utterances aim to balance the strengths of the two teams that are going to participate in the competition and to summarize their respective advantages. The purpose is that he does not want to show an unfair tendency or bias before the game. Therefore, after saying the advantages of one team, he immediately supplements the advantage of another team. As far as the Politeness Principle is concerned, the discourses of B are in full compliance with the tact maxim, the approbation maxim, and the agreement maxim. However, B’s words actually violate the quantitative maxim of the Cooperative Principle. Because compared to other commentator, the words of B are not concise, and even somewhat lengthy and tedious. The reason is that the long supplementary explanation given by B aims to indirectly observe the politeness maxims. He wants to use more complementary words to increase the balance between the two sides, so that his assessments of the two teams seem easier to be accepted by listeners and teams’ fans.

The English commentary and the Chinese commentary appear almost at the same time, during the section of prediction and analysis of the upcoming game before the first game is about to begin. Different from the euphemism and supplement words used by Chinese

commentators to balance the atmosphere of the game, the English commentators directly express which team is more prevailing with reasons. They don't care whether it has a relatively balanced evaluation of the team's advantages, nor do they consider whether supporting only one party will be uncomfortable to the other's supporters. The English commentators directly show the audience which side they support, indicating on record that which team will be more advantageous in the next game in their own opinions. As for A's utterance: "Which side do you support for the next upcoming game?" Commentator B says bluntly: "I think EDG will quickly defeat RNG." Then C says: "I support RNG." It can be seen that the explanation of the three-person conversation is completely in accordance with the Cooperative Principle with quantitative and relation maxims, because the explanation is informative and on record. Unlike Chinese commentary, the expression of English commentary does not take into account the Politeness Principle and its maxims.

Table 3 the third pair of discourses of Chinese and English commentators

Discourses of Chinese commentators		Discourses of English commentators
<p>A: 其实在第一场比赛中, 两队的打野都是选择 Haro 和 Karsa, 没有选择 MLXG 和 Clearlove, 但是我觉得两边的打野, 在第一场比赛里面表现都非常好。</p> <p>B: 对, 表现确实很好。RNG 可能唯一一个失算点就是没有想到 Ray 会拿剑姬。明显这个剑姬出场以后, RNG 玩不动线, 而且下路对线实在太难打了</p> <p>A: 但在这种情况下 RNG 尽可能止损但依然没有办法挽回败局。再次恭喜 EDG 赢得这一场比赛的胜利。</p> <p>C: 其实第一把两边打野真的已经很强了。</p> <p>A: 是啊。</p>	<p>A: Actually, in the first game, the two junglers are Haro and Karsa. They didn't choose MLXG and Clearlove, but I think the two sides' junglers performed very well in the first game.</p> <p>B: Yes, the performance is really good. RNG maybe have the only point of miscalculation. They did not expect Ray to take the sword goddess. Obviously after the appearance of this hero, RNG played hard, and it was too difficult to hit the opposite.</p> <p>A: But in this case, RNG has already make efforts to stop loss. Congratulations again to EDG for winning this game.</p> <p>C: Actually, the first game on both sides is really wonderful.</p> <p>A: Yes.</p>	<p>A: We knew that EDG are good at planning, we knew that they have strategies of this, and they did not even need Clearlove to do in the first game. They've got Haro, they've got Iboy showing up to play, as well very good form for this first game. They do get themselves this super clean victory in the end.</p> <p>B: Haro did well in early game, to trap down Karsa.</p>

After one game is over, there will definitely be one side to fight against the other. The Chinese commentator needs to first state the outcome of the game, and then evaluate the performance of the players in the course of the game. The Chinese commentators also add the evaluation of the losing party after congratulating the winner, and the evaluation of the losing party would be as euphemistic as possible. They rarely directly say when and where the defeated team performed badly, but use euphemism and even encouragement. The statements of the deficiency of the loser are always in indirect way. For example: A says “RNG has already make efforts to stop loss” to show that RNG has tried to resist, but still fails to win. The implication is that RNG’s defeat is not for weak fight but after the intense struggling. On the one hand, this kind of explanation to failure of RNG is acceptable for listeners, especially for RNG’s supporters. On the other hand, it shows that the victory side is strong and it seems that the game has evenly matched. Afterwards, C says that “the two sides are actually very strong.” What he wants to express is that the performances of both junglers are very good. It is not only the affirmation of the strengths of the players, but also the recognition and encouragement of the players on the losing side, hoping that they will not feel frustrated. To sum up, China’s commentator will still try to maintain the tact and approbation maxims in the Politeness Principle. Even if the evaluation of the losing side has to be mentioned, it should be comforted by positive euphemism and encouragement, rather than criticism on the deficiency or error.

In contrast, the English commentary, they will directly evaluate the performance of the players: “Haro performed well in the early game and successfully suppressed Karsa.” It is directly indicated that the victory is due to the better performance of the jungler. The winner’s performance is better than the loser’s, which is positively given to the winners a positive evaluation. The English, in contrast with the Chinese commentary in seeking truth from fact, explains the key factor that lays the result of the game, as well as respecting the victory side, maintaining the face of the losing side, and expressing a clear fact to the performance of both players. Although both Chinese and British commentators refer to the performance for mentioning the essential players, the perspectives and angles of the comments are completely different. China’s commentary chooses to adhere to the Politeness Principle to the greatest extent, congratulating the winner as well as comforting the loser, whereas the foreign commentary chooses to be concise and succinct, and evaluates the situation on the spot to abide by the quantity and quality maxims under the Cooperative Principle.

Table 4 the forth pair of discourses of Chinese and English commentators

Discourses of Chinese commentators		Discourses of English commentators
<p>A: 我们中路看完了就要看两边非常非常重要的下路组合。</p> <p>B: EDG 的下路组合在个人的一些数据上都高一些,但是再跟团队的协作上, RNG 下路显得更加老辣,占比更多一点。因为整体的风格来讲, EDG 的前期节奏我觉得会比 RNG 稍微快一点。</p> <p>A: 是的。</p> <p>C: 是的。</p> <p>A: RNG 辅助 MING 在游走排眼上做的比较多, EDG 的辅助 Meiko 在对线上做的比较多。</p> <p>C: 就看一下双方今天谁能够先拿一塔吧,因为这两个队伍有一个数据就是谁拿到一塔那么对的胜率就会很高。RNG 的拿到一塔胜率在 83%左右,而 EDG 也在 80%左右,两个战队可以说非常的接近。因此,如果说下路能够打开局面,我觉得双方胜率都会高一些。</p>	<p>A: After we have finished watching the middle lane, we have to look at the very very important group of bottom lane.</p> <p>B: EDG's bottom lane is stronger in some personal data, but referring to the team's collaboration, RNG is more experienced, accounting for more in data board. Because the early rhythm of EDG, I think, will be slightly faster than RNG.</p> <p>A: Yes.</p> <p>C: Yes.</p> <p>A: RNG's player MING does more in assisting the other players, EDG's player Meiko is doing more on the lane.</p> <p>C: Just look at the two sides who can get the first tower today, because the two teams have a data that is who gets the first tower whose winning percentage will be higher. RNG has this win rate of around 83%, and EDG is also about 80%. The two teams can be said to be very close. Therefore, if the bottom lane has advantage, I think the winning percentage will be higher.</p>	<p>A: This is a long history between Uzi and Clearlove, these two players competing 4 years now at this point. But it is not just two players on the stage going on for a one vs one. This is not ALL-STAR. This is the LPL we gonna 5 players in each team. How is this match-up going to be decided? Is it just going to be Uzi and Clearlove for us?</p> <p>B: Emm..... we team talk about the mad dog vs the pig farmer.</p>

Chinese commentators are accustomed to use the agreement maxim in the Politeness Principle to convert the commentary floor between each other. Even if there are inconsistencies between the explanations, it will still be euphemistically expressed by supplementary explanations. In addition, they might not directly convey disagreement or opposition to other's point of view. For example, the commentary A says: "When it comes to

the overall style, I think the EDG's early rhythm will be slightly faster than RNG." After this, A and C immediately express agreement and answer "yes". However, the characteristics of the two teams are immediately added to balance the performance of the two teams. Finally, it is concluded that which team "takes a tower first" and "take advantage on the bottom lane", that team would have a higher winning percentage. The Chinese commentators not only adopt the maxim of agreement in the Politeness Principle when interpreting during the turn-shifting, but also balance the merits of the two teams, and maintain the tact, approbation, and agreement maxims in the Politeness Principle.

In contrast, the English commentators will not put the Politeness Principle in the first place. They go straight to express different opinions and facts. For example: Commentary A expresses dissatisfaction with the fact that the other two commentators only discuss the star players of the two teams and says directly: "But this is not just a one-on-one match between two players. This is not an All-Star game. The team has a competition between five players. Who is going to participate in the whole competition? Is the whole game only for Uzi and Clearlove to present to us?" to show his disagreement with the other two's commentary. In addition, combined with this we can see that A is more serious when he feels B and C's words are inappropriate. It can be concluded that A does not prioritize the Politeness Principle, nor does he consider the other two commentator's positive face. Instead, he directly expresses the opposition and dissatisfaction for merely regarding the star players, which also uses the form of the rhetorical question to counter other commentators. The implication is that this is a team game that needs to be more focused on the overall strength of the whole team spirit, instead of over-exploring of individual performance. At this time, commentator A does not follow the Politeness Principle, but mainly obeys the quality maxim in Cooperative Principle.

DISCUSSION

Due to the differences between Chinese and Western cultures, Chinese and English native speakers have different modes of thinking, which can be reflected in the preference of Cooperative Principles and Politeness Principles from daily communications from Chinese and Western native speakers. Specifically, Western culture is characterized as the linear thinking mode. When it comes to linguistic expression, it is featured by its direct, frank and practical linguistic content. In the choice of Cooperation Principle and Politeness Principle, Westerners always consider the Politeness Principle at the top of their agenda, which means they are inclined to use the directive way and channel to convey enough information to the listener. For social considerations, they will abandon politeness and lengthiness for authenticity and clearness. Compared with the Western way of thinking, the Chinese culture tends to be circular thinking mode with obvious generality and ambiguity. Chinese expression is characterized as making the language indirect, implicit and euphemistic. When Cooperation Principle and Politeness Principle have conflicts, the communicators might first consider the Politeness Principle, and weigh how to avoid damaging the face of the other party (Meng Qingtao, 2009). In addition, the Chinese have a collectivist ideology, where

people attach great importance to maintaining harmony and retaining others' faces. Therefore, in the interpersonal communication, they will naturally consider to observe Politeness Principle. The United Kingdom and the United States are regarded as individualistic societies, respecting individuals and individuality, and talking bluntly is regarded as a feature of honesty. Therefore, under the premise of maintaining politeness, more emphasis is placed on the Cooperative Principle (Yang Lei, 2001).

CONCLUSION

From the Chinese commentary and English commentary, the comparative analysis of discourse in the same context gains the following results. The pragmatic principles adopted by Chinese and English commentators and the priority of each maxim are different. The Chinese commentators mainly use euphemistic and indirect way to balance the atmosphere with even description and evaluation of both teams, to ensure fairness. Therefore, they observe the Politeness Principle and its maxims firstly. On the contrary, The English commentators mainly follow the Cooperative Principle and its various maxims, and they tend to be straightforward to comment on the players and their performance. This finding can be explained through different thinking modes between Chinese and Western cultures. Westerners always consider the Cooperative Principle to relevant and informative. Namely, how to convey sufficient information to the hearers in the most direct way, while Chinese priority is given to the Politeness Principle to keep balance in commenting, and thus the discourse has obvious indirectness and ambiguity to show euphemism.

REFERENCES

- Du, F. (2009) A Comparative Study of Chinese and American TV NBA Interpretations——A Case Study of the Houston Rockets NBA Regular Season CCTV5 and TNT [D]. Wuhan Institute of Physical Education.
- Grice, P. (1975). "Logic and conversation". In Cole, P.; Morgan, J. Syntax and semantics. 3: Speech acts. New York: Academic Press. pp. 41–58.
- He, X. (2005) Conversational Quality: Research on the Application of Cooperative Principles and Politeness Principles[J]. Journal of Southwest University for Nationalities, Humanities and Social Sciences, 26(11): 344-346.
- He, Z. (2000) Summary of New Pragmatics[M]. Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Leech, G. N. (1983) Principles of Pragmatics [M]. London: Longman.
- Li, Y. (2017) Text analysis of NBA Chinese and English live commentary [D]. Beijing Sport University.
- Lv, P. (2014) A comparative study of TV broadcasts in Chinese and American professional basketball leagues [D]. Shanxi University.
- Meng, Q. (2009) An Analysis of the Application of Politeness Principles in English and

Chinese Intercultural Communication[J]. Modern Language (2): 109- 110.

Yang, L. (2001) On the Principles of Cooperation and Politeness from the Perspective of Cultural Differences[J]. Journal of Southwest University for Nationalities, Humanities and Social Sciences, 22(7): 182-184.

Zhang, S. (2006) Comparative analysis of Chinese and English football commentary texts [D]. Shandong Normal University.

Zuo, H. (2007) Cross-cultural study of impromptu comments on sports events in China and the United States [D]. Guangxi Normal University.