

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
0. Introduction	19
1. The Notion of Politeness	23
1.1 Politeness as a folk-notion	23
1.2 Politeness in linguistic theory	28
1.2.1 Politeness: Folk notion vs. scientific concept	29
1.2.2 Different forms of politeness	33
1.2.2.1 Haverkate (1988)	34
1.2.2.2 Lakoff (1989)	37
1.2.2.3 Watts (1989, 1992, 2003)	38
1.2.3 Discernment vs. Volition (Hill et al. 1986)	42
1.2.4 Strategic Politeness vs. Politeness as Social Indexing (Kasper 1990)	44
1.2.5 Social politeness vs. Tact (Janney and Arndt 1992)	47
2. Pragmatic Approaches to Politeness	51
2.1 Grice (1967)	51
2.2 Lakoff (1973, 1975, 1989)	52
2.3 Leech (1983)	58
2.4 Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987)	67
2.4.1 The notion of face	67
2.4.2 The notion of FTA	68

	Page
2.4.3 Politeness Strategies	71
2.4.3.1. Bald-on-record	74
2.4.3.2+3. On-record with redressive action	75
2.4.3.2. Positive politeness	76
2.4.3.2.1. Notice, attend to H (his interests, wants, needs, goods)	76
2.4.3.2.2. Exaggerate (interest, approval, sympathy with H)	77
2.4.3.2.3. Intensify interest to H	78
2.4.3.2.4. Use in-group identity markers (address forms, dialect, slang)	78
2.4.3.2.5. Seek agreement	79
2.4.3.2.6. Avoid disagreement (token agreement, hedging)	80
2.4.3.2.7. Presuppose/ raise/ assert common ground	80
2.4.3.2.8. Joke	82
2.4.3.2.9. Assert or presuppose S's knowledge of and concern for H's wants	82
2.4.3.2.10. Offer, promise	84
2.4.3.2.11. Be optimistic	84
2.4.3.2.12. Include both S and H in the activity	85
2.4.3.2.13. Give (or ask) for reasons	85
2.4.3.2.14. Assume or assert reciprocity	85
2.4.3.2.15. Give gifts to H (goods, sympathy, understanding, cooperation)	86
2.4.3.3. Negative politeness	86
2.4.3.3.1. Be conventionally indirect	87

	Page
2.4.3.3.2. Question, hedge. Give option not to do act	89
2.4.3.3.3. Be pessimistic	91
2.4.3.3.4. Minimize the imposition R_x	91
2.4.3.3.5. Give deference	92
2.4.3.3.6. Apologize	94
2.4.3.3.7. Impersonalize S and H	95
2.4.3.3.8. State the FTA as a general rule	96
2.4.3.3.9. Nominalize	96
2.4.3.3.10. Go on record as incurring a debt, or as not indebting H	96
2.4.3.4. Comparison of positive and negative politeness strategies	97
2.4.3.5. Off-record	102
2.4.3.6. Don't do the FTA	106
2.4.4. Critique of B+L's classification of politeness strategies	107
2.4.4.1. B+L's model is hearer oriented	107
2.4.4.2. Politeness strategies are not always related to the realization of FTAs	110
2.4.4.3. Strategies can be mixed	112
2.4.4.4. Correlation between type of face threatened and strategy chosen	115
2.4.4.5. The hierarchy of the strategies does not reflect their degree of politeness	116
2.4.5. Weightiness of the act	117
2.4.5.1. The social distance (D (S, H)) between the participants	117
2.4.5.2. The power (P (H, S)) the hearer has over the speaker	118
2.4.5.3. The ranking of the imposition (R_x) of the act	118

	Page
2.4.6. Correlation of Weightiness and Strategy Chosen	120
2.4.7. Criticism of B+L's formula	121
2.4.7.1. The adequacy of P, D, and R	121
2.4.7.2. The interdependency of P, D and R	122
2.4.7.3. The symmetry of the formula	124
2.4.7.4. Addition may not be the proper function between the parameters	124
2.4.7.5. The presence of third parties at the realization of the act	124
2.4.8. The Universality of the Notion of Face	125
 3. Politeness Dichotomies	 133
3.0 Outline	133
3.1. The social and individual aspects of politeness	134
3.1.1 Politeness as the rule	136
3.1.1.1 Fraser (1990)	136
3.1.1.2 Meier (1995)	139
3.1.1.3 Escandell-Vidal (1996)	140
3.1.2 Politeness as a voluntary expression of feelings	141
3.2. Phatic/Emotive	143
3.3. Watts' politic/polite distinction	152
3.3.1 Polite and politic form and content	156
3.3.1.1. Politeness and sociolinguistic competence	156
3.3.1.2. Polite form	159
3.3.1.3. Polite content	161
3.4 Messages of Politeness: Approaches so far	169

	Page
4. Politeness Implicatures and the Maxim of Politeness	185
4.0 Outline	185
4.1 Implicatures vs. Inferences	186
4.2 Politeness in the Gricean Model	194
4.2.1 Politeness: Maxim or Principle?	194
4.2.2 The Maxim of Politeness	202
4.2.3 Politeness Implicatures	204
4.2.4 Types of non-observance of the Maxim of Politeness	211
4.2.5 Do we need a maxim of politeness?	214
4.3 Politeness and Relevance Theory	218
4.4 Advantages of the maxim analysis of politeness	223
4.5 Conclusion	226
5. Conclusion	227
6. References	235