different language groups and points out future challenges linked to the categorization of those minorities. Williams closes with a positive remark on recent movements within minority language groups that shall encourage further negotiation and strengthen their position in an enlarged Europe.

   This book represents an excellent overview on fundamental aspects of multilingualism in present Europe. The articles offer a great amount of information on different minority groups and their respective languages, starting from the legal context over theoretical aspects up to a variety of highly interesting case studies thus connecting theory and practice. The structure gives the reader the possibility of gaining a wide, yet in-depth insight into the subject. Finally, it presents minority groups that are usually not in the spotlight of public interest, a factor that might, and hopefully will, contribute to a positive attitude toward multilingualism.

Hamburg University   JULIA LANGE

Correspondence address: julichuan@yahoo.co.jp

Richard J. Watts: *Politeness* (Key Topics in Sociolinguistics). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Building on Eelen's (2001) critique of Brown and Levinson's universal model of politeness, Watts attempts to develop in this book a new framework for politeness research — one that is discursive in nature and claimed to be "a serious, radical alternative to current theories on the market" (p. 250).

   Chapter 1 (titled "Introducing linguistic politeness") begins with a distinction between politeness as a lay concept signifying a range of disputed notions of polite and impolite behavior, referred to as first-order politeness, or *politeness1*, and politeness as a technical term for discussion of particular features of language use in social interaction, referred to as *politeness2*. Watts argues that investigating politeness1 "is the only valid means of developing a social theory of politeness" (p. 9). Therefore, "[i]f the researcher wishes to locate polite behaviour, s/he must begin by examining very closely what happens in the flow of social interaction in order to identify the kinds of behaviour that seem to warrant the attribution of the term 'polite'" (p. 8). He then introduces the distinction between behavior that is "politic" and behavior that is "polite." The former

is defined as behavior which is "perceived to be appropriate to the social constraints of the ongoing interaction," the latter as behavior which is "perceived to be beyond what is expectable" (p. 19).

Chapter 2 ("Politeness through time and across cultures") provides an overview of historical changes and the cultural relativity of notions of politeness within western Europe, while Chapter 3 ("Modelling linguistic politeness [I]") reviews a number of previous approaches in politeness research. Watts rejects them all for their "unwarranted" focus either on politeness2 or on politic, not polite, behavior in his terminology.

Chapter 4 ("Modelling linguistic politeness [II]: Brown and Levinson and their critics") and Chapter 5 ("Facework and linguistic politeness") are devoted to a review and critique of Brown and Levinson's (1987 [1978]) politeness model. Watts argues that their model is not a theory of politeness, but, rather, a theory of facework (p. 97); that is, tact or a set of face-related strategies. Because facework is not always associated by interactants with politeness, Watts continues, they must be differentiated.

Chapter 6 ("A social model of politeness") presents Watts's original discursive model of politeness, which attempts to embed politeness into Pierre Bourdieu's theory of practice. He aims to provide "the means of assessing how lay participants [...] assess social behaviour that they have classified as (im)polite utterances [...] It does not [...] try to define politeness as a term in a model of society, but it allows us to see how social members themselves define the term [i.e., the term politeness1]" (p. 143). Much of what has been regarded as politeness is now classified as politic; that is, conventional, ritualized behavior that is situationally expected and therefore not necessarily considered by interactants as polite.

In Chapter 7 ("Structures of linguistic politeness") Watts examines linguistic forms typically viewed as markers of polite intent, such as formulaic expressions and semi-formulaic indirect speech acts. He argues that they are not inherently more polite, although certain forms may be more open to interpretation as polite than others. Chapter 8 ("Relevance Theory and concepts of power") is Watts's critique of the Gricean model of implicature, an underpinning of Brown and Levinson's politeness theory. Instead, he suggests a modified version of relevance theory as a means of explaining how certain utterances might be judged as polite or impolite.

Chapter 9 ("Politic behaviour and politeness in discourse") is an application of the ideas developed in earlier chapters to two examples of English discourse, and Chapter 10 ("Politic behaviour and politeness within a theory of social practice") is a summary of the work.

This book offers illuminating ideas and profound insights. Watts's criticism of Brown and Levinson for their static view of politeness phenom-

ena seems indisputable, and his major tenet that politeness is an emergent property from interactants' interpretations and evaluations of particular behavior is convincing as well. Nevertheless, it may be premature to present these ideas as a model that can stand as an alternative to Brown and Levinson's research paradigm. In order to interpret Watts's confusing terminology, the reader will likely find it necessary to refer to Brown and Levinson's conceptualization of politeness.

One of the most, if not *the* most, consequential contributions of Brown and Levinson's model to politeness research is its provision of a model that can be used to compare and contrast politeness crosslinguistically and crossculturally — that is, what Watts refers to as "politeness2". True, the crosslinguistic and crosscultural validity of politeness2 has been discussed intensely; without it, however, we cannot meaningfully compare concepts derived from different languages and cultures. Across linguistic and cultural boundaries, politeness2 delimits the range of concepts that are sufficiently similar and thus worthy of comparison. Nonetheless, Watts rejects politeness2 *in toto*, arguing that it "has been lifted out of the realm of lay conceptualizations of what constitutes polite and impolite behaviour and how that behaviour should be evaluated" (p. 11). He proclaims that Brown and Levinson's use of the term *politeness* to refer to a universal scientific concept is particularly inappropriate and has caused a great deal of confusion: for example, if a Japanese linguist discusses politeness2 with a German colleague in English, we have no way to verify whether or not they refer to the same set of ideas (p. 13).

However, Watts's notion of politeness1 is even more problematic. He argues that Brown and Levinson's defense of the universality of politeness "is made in relation to their conceptualisation of an idealized concept of politeness2, not in relation to the ways in which groups of participants struggle over politeness1 (*or whatever terms are available to them in their own languages* [emphasis mine]) in social interaction" (p. 12).

Watts then considers that "[a] rough translation equivalent of 'polite' in Japanese is *teineina*" (p. 16). He reports the results of Ide et al.'s (1992) work in which Japanese subjects were seen to evaluate *teineina* ('polite') and *shitashigena* ('friendly') along a completely different axis from that involved in the American subjects' evaluations of *polite* and *friendly*. While politeness and friendliness are reasonably well correlated in American culture, the Japanese concepts *teineina* and *shitashigena* are not. Watts concludes: "This is strong evidence that the Japanese notion of politeness1 as expressed in the adjective *teineina* is very different from the American notion" (p. 17). Japanese does have politeness2, *poraitonesu*, but what, one wonders, is the Japanese notion of politeness1 that can be expressed by *teineina*?

In some places, Watts defines politeness1 as a lay person's perception of an utterance as polite or impolite; politeness1 must then be language-specific and cannot exist in non-English speaking societies. However, Watts also claims that politeness1 is universal. "Cooperative social interaction and displaying consideration for others seem to be universal characteristics of every socio-cultural group," he says, adding that "[n]ative speakers of any language will have individual ideas about what sort of behaviour is denoted by the lexical terms available to them, and very often they will disagree. In general, however, we must assume that there is likely to be a core of agreement about the rough outlines of what is meant" (p. 14). According to this conceptualization, then, politeness1 must be defined in such abstract and objectified terms as "cooperative social interaction" and "displaying consideration for others."

Either of the above definitions of politeness1 seems necessarily to include not only polite behavior, but also politic behavior, and is thus contradictory to Watts's contention that "[c]onceptualising (im)politeness1 as behaviour in excess of (or deliberately not fulfilling) the politic behaviour conventionally required of participants in verbal interaction allows for differential interpretations of the term" (pp. 261–262).

Watts advocates turning "our attention away from setting up a notion of politeness2 to investigating the discursive nature of the social struggle over the terms available to native speakers of other languages that refer to 'polished' behaviour, socially (in)appropriate behaviour, etc," and continues by saying that "[i]f we do not want to give up the claim for universality, we will need to define politeness1 in such a way that we can recognize it in verbal interaction in any language" (p. 14). This essential definition is never provided, and instead Watts states that "there are no objective criteria for determining politic behaviour [which, in Watts's model, in turn, defines politeness1] even though we could say what is and what is not appropriate behaviour. There are also no purely subjective criteria, since social practice is always and only interactive" (p. 166). Nevertheless, "[w]e recognize politic behaviour when engaging in social practice because it conforms to the objectified structures of the social field of the interaction and the forms of habitus we have developed to cope with the exigencies of social practice" (p. 166). *Habitus* is defined by Watts later in the book as "the set of dispositions to behave in a manner which is appropriate to the social structures objectified by an individual through her/his experience of social interaction" (p. 274). People from different cultures necessarily have different habitus; therefore, it seems impossible to define politeness1 in a way which can be recognized cross-linguistically and/or crossculturally.

In Chapter 9, Watts demonstrates his analysis of locating "those possible points in stretches of naturally occurring verbal interaction that might be open to interpretation as 'polite' or 'impolite'" (p. 262). In that chapter Watts used two examples of English discourse. Suppose that a similar analysis is performed on Japanese conversation with respect to *teineina*, which Watts contends expresses "the Japanese notion of politeness1" (p. 17). One bilingual dictionary lists the following terms as translation equivalents of *teineina* in this order: *polite, civil, courteous, careful, scrupulous, thorough, meticulous, conscientious, minute, close, precise, painstaking, punctilious, attentive, rigorous*. Lay persons familiar with neither politeness1 nor politeness2 might mark clearly articulated speech as *teineina* and mumbled speech as not *teineina*, and they might also mark careful rephrasing of a complex sentence as *teineina*. The same dictionary translates "polite" as: (1) *reigi tadashii*; (2) *jōhinna, kyōyō no aru, jōryūno*; (3) *senren sareta, yūgana*. If we asked a lay person to mark behaviors that are open to interpretation as *reigi tadashii*, he/she would mark honorific language as well as the upright kneeling posture. And if we added *yūgana*, they might associate it with *waka* poetry and ballet dancers. Thus the worthiness of such unfocused crosslinguistic and crosscultural research can easily be called into question.

Despite these problems, however, Watts's book demonstrates the possibility for a new discursive approach to politeness research. Watts himself acknowledges that some work "still has to be done to find the ways to give an adequate theoretical description of the crucial terms in the theory such as 'face', 'politic behaviour', 'habitus', 'social field', 'symbolic capital' — and of course '(im)politeness' itself" (pp. 262–263). Nevertheless, he maintains that "the only valid object of a theory of linguistic politeness is not a hypostasised, objectified abstract term 'politeness' but rather the ways in which interactants classify social, verbal acts as realizing their own personal conceptualization of what is 'polite' and what is 'impolite'. (Im)politeness1 is an area of discursive struggle in social practice in every society and in every language" (p. 263). Application of his model to non-English data can be expected in the near future.

University of California, Berkeley   Yoko Hasegawa

Correspondence address: hasegawa@berkeley.edu

References

Brown, Penelope & Stephen Levinson. 1987 [1978]. *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Eelen, Gino. 2001. *A critique of politeness theories*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
Ide, Sachiko, Beverly Hill, Yukiko Carnes, Tsunao Ogino & Akiko Kawasaki. 1992. The concept of politeness: an empirical study of American English and Japanese. In Richard Watts, Sachiko Ide & Konrad Ehlich (eds.), *Politeness in language: Studies in its history, theory and practice* (Trends in Linguistics, Studies and Monographs 59), 281–297. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Naomi Geyer: *Discourse and Politeness: Ambivalent Face in Japanese*. London and New York: Continuum, 2008. £75.00.

Writing a book on politeness is not an easy task these days given the current state of disorder of the field. The emergence of a novel, so-called discursive, approach to politeness has severely questioned most of the things that were taken for granted in Brown and Levinson's (1987) most widely known theory of politeness. However, the discursive approach so far has not quite succeeded in establishing a workable counter-model to the one proposed by Brown and Levinson. As a result, researchers must work their way between these two major (and a couple of minor) strands. Naomi Geyer's *Discourse and Politeness* is one example of this and, to start with the conclusion, a quite successful one at that.

The opening chapter of the book provides a brief introduction to the field of politeness and the premises of the present study. In line with recent approaches to the topic, Geyer argues for a shift from analyzing politeness on the basis of isolated sentences to conceptualizing it as a discursive phenomenon. Politeness, in her view, is part of a larger phenomenon called facework, which is defined as "behavior that displays and acknowledges others and the speaker's interactional self-image" (p. 6). The main aim of Geyer's study is to "provide a discourse-based analysis of facework realized in several interactionally delicate social actions" (p. 7). The empirical data she uses to do so are audio recordings of multiparty interactions by teachers in small faculty meetings in Japanese elementary schools.

The second chapter, "Politeness, face, and identity" is about previous approaches to politeness and related fields. It reviews the most common perspectives on politeness, including the most widely applied face-saving view by Brown and Levinson (1987). With regard to the latter, Geyer also discusses the major points of criticism that have recently been made by adherents of the discursive approach to politeness (e.g., Eelen 2001; Watts 2003). In doing so, she points out some limitations to this latter approach, particularly with regard to its negative view of politeness evaluations on the part of the analyst (see also Hasegawa, this issue).