Book Review published on the journal *Internet Pragmatics* http://doi.org/10.1075/ip.00034.wan

Kádár, Dániel Z. *Politeness, Impoliteness and Ritual*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2017.

By Jiayi Wang

Dániel Z. Kádár has been the most vocal scholar of ritual in the field of pragmatics. His recently published monograph epitomises his ground-breaking exploration of the broad interface that exists between politeness, impoliteness and ritual. Its aim is to provide a research framework that captures the interface area. Specifically, it sets up the first (im)politeness-focused interactional model of ritual. Ritual is not a completely new concept for politeness researchers due to the fundamental impact of the works of renowned sociologist Erving Goffman (1955, 1967) on the theorising of politeness. Brown and Levinson (1978/1987) loosely adopted the notion of face from Goffman to build their seminal theory of politeness, which has been widely adopted and criticised, and recently there has been a call to return to the original Goffmanian notion of face (see Wang and Spencer-Oatey 2015 for a detailed discussion). Goffman used ritual to refer to all types of interpersonal interactions that involve face work. Within politeness research, it is Kádár and colleagues who, through a series of published studies (e.g. Kádár 2013; Kádár and de la Cruz 2016; Kádár and Ran 2015; Kádár and Robinson Davies 2016), have brought ritual to the fore of our attention. This volume defines it as a recurrent, emotively invested action that reinforces or transforms interpersonal relationships (p.12). Kádár's definition is somewhat different from Goffman's in that it aims to 'capture the formal and functional interactional characteristics of ritual practices from the politeness researchers' data-driven perspective' (p.54). By focusing on the relational function of ritual action, Kádár approaches this phenomenon through an analysis of its role in maintaining a perceived communal moral order in interactions.

Conceptually, the book positions itself in the post-second-wave politeness research. That is, it avoids the rationalistic means-ends approaches of the first wave (Brown and Levinson 1978/1987), which have a universalistic focus, while acknowledging the important findings of second-wave discursive approaches (Linguistics Politeness Research Group 2011), which have a micro focus. Kádár approaches ritual as an interactionally (co-)constructed phenomenon by which moral order is maintained. (Im)politeness is situated within the ritual action 'both as an interactional behavioural phenomenon (fringing) and as an inference triggered by the interactional action of ritual' (p.221). 'Fringing' is a new analytic concept introduced by Kádár to replace 'strategy', because a ritual performer's 'decorative' form of behaviour attempting to trigger im/politeness inferences in ritual action, which is emotively invested by nature, is a choice that is not always strategic (p.19). Methodologically, this volume looks at stretches of ritual interactions from different periods and genres, including historical and contemporary data in written and spoken forms, including emails; extracts from films, literary pieces and blogs; audio-recorded family conversations; and TV shows. Equally, if not more importantly, this book draws data from various languages and cultures, including Hungarian, English, Chinese and Japanese, extending the scope to cross-linguistic and cross-cultural comparisons and intercultural appropriation of ritual practices, the latter of which is a particularly under-researched area to date. It is worth pointing out here that Kádár has been noted for promoting the study of non-Western languages. This is also evidenced through his work as the founding co-editor of the international journal *East Asian Pragmatics*.

The book itself is structured in an incremental manner. The full complexity of the framework unfolds as Kádár leads the reader through the process of theory building. The first chapter offers an overview. It outlines the technical definition of ritual adopted in this volume, the key elements of the model, the rationale for choosing the aggressive rites of bystander intervention and countering hecklers as case studies and data and methodology in general. Ritual is defined as a formalised and recurrent action that forces relationships and goes beyond demarcated ceremonies. It incorporates

many restorative and transgressive ritual events, such as countering the heckler, which may not be seen as rituals in the popular sense of the word. It is simultaneously 'liminal', meaning that it stands out from the ordinary flow of events and interactions, and 'normative', reflecting the moral order that underlines interpersonal relationships (pp.9-14). In his first step towards a model of the relationship between ritual and (im)politeness, Kádár discusses its key elements. The participatory structure is complex as ritual is a performance that goes beyond the dyadic producer-recipient relationship, and the third party can merge with the second party in cases like bystander intervention. The performer may need to fringe by striking a balance between animating the moral order of the community and attempting to take the recipient's feelings into account (in the case of countering the heckler, the recipient is the heckler; in the case of third party intervention, the recipient is the wrongdoer) (p.21). While impolite fringing such as interruption tends to be sanctioned by broader society, it is acceptable if it is effectively used to maintain or restore a community's moral order.

Consisting of Chapters 2, 3 and 4, Part I presents the model in its basic form, whereas Part II, comprising Chapters 5, 6, and 7, complicates the model by looking into the intricate rites of moral aggression. Mainly drawing on ritual studies from other disciplines, notably anthropology and psychology, Chapter 2 overviews the main characteristics of ritual from an interactional perspective. It describes the framework in its simplest form without the introduction of fringing, revealing that the fundamental relationship between ritual action and (im)politeness inferences may already be ambiguous. Mixed messages are not uncommon in certain types of ritual practices. The relational function of a ritual can be static (maintaining the status quo), constructive or destructive. The basic model depicts that, by default, relationally constructive ritual actions trigger polite evaluations and destructive ones trigger impolite inferences. The more static the function is, the less evident is its relationship with (im)politeness evaluation.

In Chapter 3, the focus of theory building shifts to placing ritual within politeness research. The phenomenon of ritual is examined in light of previous politeness theories, particularly through the notion of discernment, which originally derived from and referred to the appropriate indexical display of social hierarchy in Japanese use of honorifics. Kádár argues that discernment may be reinterpreted as an interactional rather than a politeness principle because it can be used to describe broader ritual practices that appropriately display interpersonal relationships to maintain interactional harmony (p.81). The boundaries of ritual within the field of politeness are described by comparing it with convention. He uses examples of family conversation, the diachronic development of heckling in China and Britain and heckling in Sino-British intercultural contact to illustrate ritualisation, or the way in which rituals come into existence locally, culturally and interculturally.

In Chapter 4, the basic model is broadened to include (im)polite fringing. Taking workplace rites of promotion, hiring and dismissal as a case study, it examines the default relationship between (im)polite fringing, ritual actions and evaluative tendencies. Im/politely fringed ritual tends to trigger perceptions of im/morality. However, an impolitely fringed ritual action, such as rudely dismissing an employee, that is sanctioned by larger society by default can become morally justifiable and acceptable within a given community, (e.g. the employee has done something morally wrong in the first place) because it restores the moral order of the narrower community (p.115).

After overviewing the fundamental relationship between ritual and (im)politeness in the first part of the book, the second part brings the ritual model to its full complexity by considering moral aggression. Chapter 5 examines the ritual practices of bystander intervention and countering hecklers without looking into their (im)politeness aspects. Social pressure to restore the perceived moral order is a key motivation behind performing these rites of moral aggression.

Chapter 6 further extends the model to capture the role of (im)politeness in moral aggression where there is a potential discrepancy between recipient and third-party evaluations of an impolitely fringed or unfringed ritual action. It focuses on bystander intervention, which, unlike heckling, affords longer metapragmatic debates between participants that voice their awareness of moral order(s). For example, a third party interrupts a wrongdoer's interaction with a victim. The recipient of the intervention, the wrongdoer, may challenge the interruption by appealing to the politeness principle,

whereas the intervener, the observer, may legitimise the ritual action by referring to the moral principle of altruism.

Chapter 7, the final chapter of Part II, widens the model even further by looking into the role of third-party (de)ratification in rites of moral aggression. Using the countering of hecklers in performing arts as a case study, it examines the ritual performer's moral responsibility via individual agency. Four choices of international style are outlined: constructing identities by fulfilling ritual roles, building up a personalised identity within a ritual role, making unexpected interactional moves (like a performer defying the norms of the ritual role without clearly violating what the performer is ratified to do) and failing to appropriately perform one's ratified ritual role. These choices rank in an ascending order in terms of individual moral responsibility and situational ambiguity (p.200). Unlike ordinary rituals, as far as impolite fringing in rites of moral aggression visibly helps the performer restore the moral order of the event and resolve the situation, it tends to be evaluated as appropriate. However, if impolite fringing does not help, if it goes out of control and becomes a performer's personal attack on the recipient (the heckler), it fails to restore the moral order and tends to be treated as inappropriate.

Finally, in Chapter 8, a brief overview of book is provided along with its implications and future directions. The ritual model proposed in this volume is an interaction-based theoretical framework. It is the first one to capture the relationship between ritual and (im)politeness by integrating ritual into politeness research, and can be applicable to a wide range of interpersonal phenomena. There is a clear need to undertake more empirical research, especially research on the ritual practices of less-studied languages and the intercultural spread of ritual practices, to develop our emic and etic understandings.

Although the important phenomenon of ritual has a multidisciplinary history outside linguistics, it has been overlooked in the field of politeness research until more recently. Kádár breaks disciplinary silos to offer a much-needed macro-level account of ritual and (im)politeness that rationalises operational tendencies. Its innovative focus on the interface area between the two important interpersonal phenomena contributes to the emerging sub-discipline of interpersonal pragmatics (Haugh, Kádár, and Mills 2013). The ritual framework places dual emphasis both on (im)politeness behaviour and evaluation, and the analysis covers both macro- and micro-levels. This means that the book serves as a rich source of thought-provoking and valuable insights to a large readership with research interests that span production and evaluation, as well as languages and cultures. This volume also offers an excellent example of theoretical scaffolding. Indeed, by promoting interdisciplinarity, Kádár's *Politeness, Impoliteness and Ritual* is a welcome contribution to the field of politeness research.

References

Brown, Penelope, and Stephen C. Levinson. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 56-311, 1987 (Originally published as 'Universals in language usage: Politeness phenomena'. In: Goody, Esther N, 1978. Questions and Politeness: Strategies in Social Interaction).

Goffman, Erving. "On face-work: An analysis of ritual elements in social interaction." *Psychiatry* 18, no. 3 (1955): 213-231.

Goffman, Erving. Interactional Ritual. Essays on Face-to-Face Behavior. Doubleday, Garden City, NY, 1967.

Haugh, Michael, Dániel Z. Kádár, and Sara Mills. "Interpersonal pragmatics: Issues and debates." *Journal of Pragmatics* 58 (2013): 1-11.

Kádár, Dániel Z. *Relational Rituals and Communication: Ritual Interaction in Groups*. Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke, 2013.

Kádár, Dániel Z., and Melvin De La Cruz. "Rituals of outspokenness and verbal conflict." *Pragmatics and Society* 7, no. 2 (2016): 265-290.

Kádár, Dániel Z., and Siân Robinson Davies. "Ritual, aggression, and participatory ambiguity." *Journal of Language Aggression and Conflict* 4, no. 2 (2016): 202-233.

Kádár, Dániel Z., and Yongping Ran. "Ritual in intercultural contact: A metapragmatic case study of heckling." *Journal of Pragmatics* 77 (2015): 41-55.

Linguistic Politeness Research Group (Ed.). *Discursive Approaches to Politeness*. Berlin, Walter de Gruyter, 2011.

Wang, Jiayi, and Helen Spencer-Oatey. "The gains and losses of face in ongoing intercultural interaction: A case study of Chinese participant perspectives." *Journal of Pragmatics* 89 (2015): 50-65.