

FACE

An Interdisciplinary Perspective

To my Mother, my Sister Nika and Tomek



NR 2790

Ewa Bogdanowska-Jakubowska

FACE

An Interdisciplinary Perspective

Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego



Katowice 2010

Editor of the Series: Językoznawstwo Neofilologiczne
Maria Wysocka

Reviewer
Anna Lubecka

After this edition runs out, the book will be available online:

Śląska Biblioteka Cyfrowa
www.sbc.org.pl

Contents

Acknowledgements	11
The list of abbreviations and notational conventions	12
Preface	13
Introduction	15
Justification of the approach	15
Methods of collecting empirical data	17
Outline of the book	20
Chapter 1	
A cognitive study of the concept of FACE in English and Polish	23
1.1. Introduction	23
1.2. <i>Face</i> and <i>twarz</i> – two words for one concept?	25
1.3. A theoretical framework	29
1.4. FACE as a radial category	32
1.5. FACE metaphors in English and Polish	34
Chapter 2	
The face as a part of the body	53
2.1. Introduction	53
2.2. Is the face exclusively human?	54
2.3. The face as a person	57
2.4. The face as a mirror of the soul	59
2.4.1. Reading faces in ancient China	60
2.4.2. Physiognomy in ancient Greece and Rome	61
2.4.3. Physiognomy in Europe	64
2.5. The face and expression of emotions	75

2.6. Face and mask	82
2.7. The face of the other	92
2.8. Face-blindness	95
2.9. The face and beauty	97
2.10. The “troubled” face	104
2.10.1. The face as a display of illness symptoms	104
2.10.2. The face as a symbol of split personality	105
2.10.3. Face and shame, guilt and embarrassment	106
2.10.4. The stigmatized face	110
2.11. The hidden face	113
2.12. The “wrong” face	114
2.12.1. The “mismeasured” face	114
2.12.2. The “racial face” in Germany	117
2.12.3. The criminal face	119

Chapter 3

The concept of self	123
3.1. Introduction	123
3.2. The definition of self	124
3.3. The self and its components	128
3.4. Self-presentation	131
3.5. The self and the body	134
3.5.1. Body–soul/mind dualism	135
3.5.2. The body and the soul/self in modern philosophy	137
3.5.3. The body – the symbol of the self	138

Chapter 4

Face as a folk concept	141
4.1. Introduction	141
4.2. Face, morality and related social concepts	142
4.2.1. Face and morality	143
4.2.2. Face and pride, dignity, tact, respect and (self-)esteem	146
4.2.3. Face and honour	148
4.3. Defining culture	151
4.3.1. Cultural traditions and belief systems	152
4.3.2. Dimensions of cultural variability	153
4.3.3. Culture-specific concepts of self	156
4.3.4. Emic and ethic approaches to cultural concepts	159
4.4. The Chinese concept of face	160
4.4.1. Chinese culture and its Confucian roots	160
4.4.2. Face in Chinese culture	163
4.5. The Anglo-American concept of face	167
4.5.1. Culture of the United States	167
4.5.2. Interpersonal relations and facial expressions in Anglo-American culture	171

4.5.3. Face in Anglo-American culture	174
4.6. The Polish concept of face	178
4.6.1. Polish culture	178
4.6.2. Interpersonal relations and facial expressions in Polish culture	185
4.6.3. Face in Polish culture	189
Chapter 5	
Face as an academic concept	195
5.1. Introduction	195
5.2. Goffman's world of social encounters	196
5.2.1. Social interaction in a dramaturgical perspective	196
5.2.2. Social interaction as a game	199
5.2.3. The ritual organization of interpersonal contacts	201
5.2.4. Frames	205
5.2.5. Goffman's concept of self	207
5.2.6. Face	208
5.2.7. Facework	210
5.3. Face theories – an overview	212
5.3.1. A sociolinguistic approach to face	213
5.3.1.1. Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness	213
5.3.1.2. Criticisms of Brown and Levinson's conceptualization of face	217
5.3.1.3. Face theories inspired by Brown and Levinson's model	228
5.3.2. A relational approach to face	235
5.3.3. A cross-cultural approach to face	244
5.3.4. A socio-psychological approach to face.	250
5.3.5. A communicative approach to face	253
5.4. The Cultural Face Model – an approach to face interpretation and management	259
5.4.1. Face and interaction	260
5.4.2. Face as a property of the individual	261
5.4.3. Face and culture	262
5.4.4. The Cultural Face Model – presentation	263
5.4.5. Types of facework	265
5.4.6. The applicability of the Cultural Face Model	268
Conclusions	291
References	295
Index of names	325
Subject index	333
Streszczenie	339
Résumé	341

Acknowledgements

This book would not have been written without my great fascination with the works of Erving Goffman, which were the main source of my general ideas.

I owe a very important debt to Professor Roman Kalisz, who many years ago turned my attention to the problem of culture-specific face and in this way inspired me to write this book.

My special thanks go to Professor Janusz Arabski for his inspiration, ideas and constant encouragement.

I would also like to express my gratitude to the Kościuszko Foundation, which awarded me a Fellowship for the Academic Year 2006/2007 at the University of California, Berkeley, where a large portion of my book was prepared.

My thanks go to the Department of Linguistics, the University of California, Berkeley, where I was invited as a visiting scholar, and to my faculty sponsor there, Professor Robin Lakoff.

I would like to thank Professor Anna Lubecka, who reviewed the manuscript and helped me with many inspiring comments.

I would not be able to complete this book without the great support from my Mother, Wanda Bogdanowska.

I acknowledge the tremendous contribution of my Sister, Nika Bogdanowska. I am indebted to her for her thoughtful readings and helpful suggestions. Many ideas in this book have emerged from discussions with Nika.

Finally, I would like to mention Tomek, whose presence was very important to me.

Preface

This book is to show the concept of face from many distinct perspectives. Paul Ekman, who studied the face and facial expression for more than fifty years, said in an interview for the *San Francisco Chronicle* (2002) that “Everyone is interested in faces.” My fascination with faces is the main reason why I have taken up the concept. As a linguist whose main research interests focus on sociocultural conditioning of language use, I cannot concentrate exclusively on the physicality of face. Therefore, I decided to create a picture of the concept which would include its most important aspects. Although my intention is to provide a thorough presentation of face, the key issue is to be the role it plays in social interaction. Entering into contact with other people, we have to take into account:

- the face as a part of the body, with its stable features and transient expressions,
- face understood as an image of self which every person creates during social interaction.

The social significance of these two aspects of face is indisputable and deserves a close analysis.

Thus, the topic of the book is face, and the main objective is to carry out an analysis of this complex, multi-dimensional concept in an interdisciplinary perspective (interdisciplinarity is understood here as the diversity of practices and relations among disciplines (Fairclough and Duszak, 2008)). The concept of face has been the subject of many academic papers and monographs in different disciplines, e.g., psychology, sociology, cultural and historical anthropology, philosophy, literary studies, biology, medicine, communication studies, linguistic pragmatics and sociolinguistics. It should be indicated, however, that no monograph on the subject of face has been published, which takes such an interdisciplinary perspective as the present work. The interdisciplinary perspective taken here involves:

- a cognitive study of the concept of FACE,
- an analysis of the role of the face as a part of the body over the centuries and across cultures and disciplines,
- a cross-cultural analysis of face as a folk concept in Anglo-American (further in the book called American; for the explanation see p. 168) and Polish cultures,
- a presentation of the *Cultural Face Model* – a new theoretical approach to face interpretation and management.

It is also worth mentioning that face is not a “popular” topic among Polish scholars. There are only a few publications on face by Polish authors (e.g., Kępiński, 1998; Marcjanik, 1991/2001; Kopytko, 1993, 1993a; Filipowicz, 1998; *Twarz. Punkt po punkcie*, 2000; Kornacki, 2004; see also Kisiel, 1992; Tomiczek, 1992; Duszak, 1998), myself among them (e.g., Jakubowska, 2001, 2003, 2004, 2007, 2007a, 2007b). There are, however, no works on the emic concept of Polish face. The present work is to compensate for this lack.

Introduction

Justification of the approach

Face is a complex concept which over the centuries and across cultures has attracted a lot of attention among both scholars and laymen. Even a superficial observation of any aspect of everyday life results in finding faces. Before greeting a friend, we have first to identify his face. Drawing money from our bank account or crossing the border we have to present our identity card with a photo of our face. In face-to-face interaction, the success of meeting other faces depends on whether they like our face. However, no matter how we communicate with others, e.g., face to face, by phone or through an internet communicator, we have to think about face (the self-image). To lose face is one of the greatest dangers involved in social interaction.

A brief look into a dictionary allows us to see abundance of meanings of the word *face* or of any of its equivalents in other languages. Putting the English word *face* through an internet search engine gave 640,000,000 results, and a search for the Polish word *twarz* (face), 8,650,000. This indicates the omnipresence and complexity of the concept. We are, literally and metaphorically, surrounded by faces. To understand the concept, however, one cannot restrict its analysis to one discipline or one perspective.

No one can deny the social character of face. Changing Erving Goffman's (1967: 12) words slightly, we can say that it is a condition of interaction. Any form of social contact between individuals (*social interaction*) is conditioned by face; its existence, recognition and maintenance. *Communication*, the transfer of messages from one interactant to another, is necessary for social interaction (Giddens, 2006). The face (the part of the body) is indispensable for an individual to participate in social interaction and communicate with others. First of all, because its elements contribute to the transfer of information from

one interactant to another: the lips, one of the organs of speech, participate both in verbal and nonverbal communication, the eyes “tell” us things that are left out by the lips. The face as a whole is an invaluable source of information about its owner. Possession of the face makes it possible for the individual to be recognized by other interactants and identified as a particular person. Mutual maintenance of face (the image of self) involves treating the other with due respect. Deprived of the face, either through an unfortunate accident or injury or through improper behaviour, the individual is incapable of interaction with others.

The face is not only social but also cultural in nature. The face we present to others during social interaction, although said to be the mirror of our soul, to some extent can be controlled by its owner. Facial expressions of emotions have been proved to be universal, but there are significant differences across cultures in the extent to which they are free or controlled. All cultures have special display rules regarding the expected management of facial appearance and emotional expressions (Ekman, 1999). Face (the image of self) is also culture-determined. In different cultures, different aspects of self may be foregrounded during social interaction, as members of these cultures are “face sensitive” to various attributes related to different hierarchies of values (Ruhi and Işık-Güler, 2007; Spencer-Oatey, 2007). The concept of culture helps greatly to understand the diversity of human behaviour (Fitzgerald, 1993), both verbal and nonverbal; it helps one also to understand interpersonal relations which shape the culture-specific content of face (Duszak, 1998).

As can be seen, the face (the part of the body) as well as face (the self-image), due to their social relevance, are closely interrelated. As such they are a focus of interest and subject to research in many academic disciplines, social sciences in particular, e.g., cultural anthropology, communication studies, psychology (social psychology in particular), and sociology. The face is subject to philosophical investigations. For medicine, it is both a location of illness symptoms (e.g., in psychiatry) and a part of the body to be cured (e.g., plastic and aesthetic surgery). In criminology, facial features have been investigated for signs of a criminal nature. The face had even its own “science” – physiognomy. Finally, face (the self-image) has become one of the central notions of sociolinguistics-based politeness research. Such a diversity of approaches to one concept suggests that it constitutes a good construct for interdisciplinary use.

Because face is culture-determined, it is reasonable to investigate how it (both facial expression and image of self) is managed cross-culturally. There is a distinction between the cross-cultural and intercultural aspects of communication. As William Gudykunst (2001: 19) states, *cross-cultural* “involves comparisons of communication across cultures,” while *intercultural* communication “involves communication between people from different cultures.” In the present book, face will be analysed across cultures.

Taking into consideration everything mentioned above, I think that face as a multi-faceted concept, involving psychological and social motivation, cultural knowledge, and the ability to perform appropriate roles, deserves to be presented in an interdisciplinary perspective. The main aim of the book is to present a comprehensive picture of face.

Methods of collecting data

Methods of collecting data should be adjusted to the aims of the study. As this book involves different approaches to the concept of face and investigates its different aspects, the data used in the respective parts of the book are of different character. In this study two kinds of data have been used:

- ethnographic data,
- linguistic data.

The *linguistic data* are collated from:

- English and Polish dictionaries,
- word searches conducted in newspapers and literary works,
- various corpora,
- word searches conducted on the Internet, on web pages both in English and in Polish,
- American and Polish library catalogues,
- electronic resources,
- general observation.

The *ethnographic data* used in this study come from different sources as well. Ideally, to study behaviour across cultures, which is what a cross-cultural study of face involves, the researcher should use multiple methods of collecting data. In my selection of ethnographic data collecting methods, I was inspired by Erving Goffman's "eclectic array of sources," including newspapers, memoirs, novels and observations. Goffman (1959) used both casual observation and participant observation. In the former case, he himself admitted that he was following Georg Simmel, the German sociologist, who justified his opinions by his own observations. The ethnographic data used in this study come from:

- introspection,
- participant observation,
- interviews,
- questionnaire,
- searches of newspapers and literary works.

Introspection is “a means for data collection only about one’s speech community” (Saville-Troike, 2003: 96). The method can give valuable information and important insights about the researcher’s own culture, his beliefs, values and behaviour, which on the one hand constitute useful data, and on the other stimulate the formation of working hypotheses. Introspection can be a starting point for fieldwork; the researcher can use the data obtained by introspection to select problems to be investigated by other methods. It can also give him some clues as to the questions to be asked in interviews.

In this study, I resorted to introspection at the beginning of my fieldwork when I tried to formulate working hypotheses on which my analysis of the concept of face was to be based.

Participant observation is useful for researchers investigating different domains of culture. It is the most common method of collecting ethnographic data, in which the researcher participates in the situation he observes. In a talk about his fieldwork methods given in 1974, Goffman defines participant observation in the following way:

a technique that wouldn’t be the only technique a study would employ, [...] It’s a matter of getting data, it seems to me, by subjecting yourself, your body and your own personality, and your own social situation, to the set of contingencies that play upon a set of individuals, so that you can physically and ecologically penetrate their circle of response to their social situation, or their ethnic situation, or whatever (1989: 125).

Such an understanding of participant observation requires that the researcher immerse himself in the culture he is to investigate, become a part of it, and allow its routines to become his own. This makes the method appear very time-consuming. Another weakness of this method is that conclusions drawn from the analysis of the data obtained by means of it are not open to verification and replication by others (Rosenfeld *et al.*, 1995: 186–187). However, it has also some benefits. As Muriel Saville-Troike (2003: 97) claims:

One of the most important benefits of participation is being able to test hypotheses about rules for communication, sometimes by breaking them and observing or eliciting reactions. Participation in group activities over a period of time is often necessary for much important information to emerge, and for necessary trusting relationships to develop.

Participant observation allows the researcher to collect information about spontaneous, natural behaviour, not monitored in any way by the participants, during everyday social interaction.

As maintenance of face is a condition of interaction, I used participant observation by taking part in various types of social gatherings, both formal

(e.g., faculty meetings, seminars, conferences) and informal (e.g., parties, restaurants or cafés, street encounters) to see how participants manage their face, express concern for the other's face or react to a face threat.

Both the *interview* and the questionnaire constitute a good supplement to participant observation. Interviewing may provide a lot of valuable cultural information and explanation for the data collected by observation. Unlike participant observation, which presents the researcher with the "real" specific behaviours (what actually occurs), interviews provide "ideal" answers (the respondents give answers which reflect a cultural ideal or norm) (Saville-Troike, 2003). An interview usually has the form of a guided conversation during which the researcher asks questions with no predetermined response alternatives (Saville-Troike, 2003).

I decided to choose this method of collecting data, because:

To achieve conceptual equivalence so that meaningful cross-cultural comparisons can be made, it is important first to determine the meaning of face in various cultures. Open-ended interviews or surveys in which people within the culture respond to questions designed to elicit the meaning of face are needed. Such studies would help identify commonalities with which to establish a conceptualization of face that is shared by various cultures [...]. To determine which situations involve face, determination of common emotions associated with face is necessary (Cocroft and Ting-Toomey, 1994: 500).

The interviews prepared for the present research were carried out in informal settings. They were composed of open-ended questions intended to elicit the information concerning the informants' culture, the values they cherish and the meaning of the concept of face as well as face management during social interaction. Sometimes I asked some supplementary questions in order to get a more clear and full answer.

The *questionnaire* is a data collecting method which, like the interview, involves asking questions that can be either close-ended or open-ended. As in the case of interviewing, the informants give answers which reflect cultural ideals or norms rather than admit what they actually mean or do. A questionnaire can be an alternative for interviewing, because it is much less time-consuming. However, its weakness is that the researcher does not have the chance to ask additional questions to clarify the respondents' answers.

The questionnaire used in the present research consisted of open-ended questions which were designed, as in the case of the interviews, to elicit data concerning culture, face interpretation and management.

As face is to be analysed cross-culturally, i.e. as it is interpreted and managed in two cultures, American and Polish, American and Polish respondents participated in the research. All of them were native speakers of their respective languages. Both groups came from a similar sociocultural

background and were rather homogenous. All of the participants were educated (university or high school graduates), often related in some way or another to university circles. There were 110 respondents, 50 Americans and 60 Poles, aged 22 to 74.

The application of this multiple-method approach allowed me to collect objective data which adequately illustrate the picture of face and represent patterns of face-related behaviours in the two cultures.

Outline of the book

The book consists of five chapters and conclusions. It shows interrelations between different aspects of the concept of face as well as between face and other concepts or phenomena relevant to its description. Chapter 1, "A cognitive study of the concept of FACE in English and Polish," is devoted to a general presentation of the concept of face. First, a semantic analysis of the English word *face* and the Polish word *twarz* is carried out; lexicographic definitions of these two words which are found in modern English and Polish dictionaries, respectively, are compared. Second, I employ the cognitive linguistics approach to present the concept of FACE as a radial category and FACE/TWARZ metaphors existing in English-speaking and Polish cultures, respectively. I use the English word *face* to refer to the universal concept of face; when referring to a culture-specific concept I use the word modified by an adjective denoting a given nationality (e.g., *the Polish face*) or a word denoting an emic concept (e.g., *twarz*).

In Chapter 2, "The face as a part of the body," the face is described in terms of the functions it performs in human life, the impact of its appearance on interaction with other people and the quality of life, and the meanings it conveys. Here I ponder the role of the face in our lives and discuss various approaches to this specific part of the body taken over the centuries and across cultures by different scientific or pseudo-scientific disciplines, such as anthropology, criminology, medicine, psychology, philosophy, physiognomy, and sociology.

The rest of the book deals with face as an image of the self which is socially constructed. However, in order to carry out an adequate analysis of the concept of face, one cannot avoid the study of the self (the self is said to be externalized through the face). In Chapter 3, the self is defined from psychological, sociological and philosophical perspectives. It is a concept which is central to various social theories describing the complexity of individual experience. As such it is contrasted with other related concepts, such as soul, identity and person. Finally, the self is described in terms of its relationship with the body,

starting with body–soul dualism, and leading to the body as a symbol of the self.

Face as a social construct is the topic of the next two chapters. Chapter 4 depicts the commonsense concept of face, a folk or emic notion. First, it is presented together with some related concepts, such as morality, dignity and honour. Second, the concept of culture and the models of cultural variability (Hofstede, 1980, 1991, 2001; Triandis, 1995; Hall, 1976) are introduced, as emic concepts of face need to be analysed against the cultural background. Culture and cultural experience have a strong impact on our hierarchies of values, ways of thinking and social relations, and they also shape the self (Marsella, 1985; Holland, 1997; Thoits and Virshup, 1997; Hofstede, 1998; Owens and Aronson, 2000; Barker, 2005) and face (the self-image). In the following sections, three emic concepts of face are described and analysed against the detailed background of three cultures: Chinese (as Chinese culture is said to be the original source of the concept of face), American and Polish. The analysis of the Chinese concept of face is based, for obvious reasons, on sociological and linguistic literature. My analyses of the American and Polish concepts of face are based on the data I collected in the United States and in Poland, and supported by a discussion of the character of interpersonal relations and the role of facial expressions in the two respective cultures.

The presentation of the academic concept of face, in Chapter 5, begins with an analysis of the works of Erving Goffman, the American sociologist who was the first to employ it in his research. In his works on “the world of social encounters,” he presents social interaction in a theatrical perspective: treating its participants as actors, he sees the ritual organization of everyday social contacts, and perceives maintenance of face as a condition of interaction. Goffman’s original ideas have become an inspiration for scholars in many academic disciplines, e.g., social psychology, sociology, (intercultural/cross-cultural) communication studies, linguistic pragmatics and sociolinguistics. Next, there follows an overview of the theories whose central concept is face. The first and most thorough treatment of the concept is Brown and Levinson’s (1978, 1987) theory of politeness. Their theory and conceptualization of face were met with many voices of criticism, the most important of which are discussed. This discussion is followed by the presentation of other relevant theories or conceptualizations of face. Finally, in the section “The Cultural Face Model – an approach to face interpretation and management,” I present my own contribution to the interpretation of the social construct of face, formulating an alternative theory of face and facework, the *Cultural Face Model*. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the applicability of the model to Anglo-American and Polish cultures.

Conclusions include general remarks on the character of the concept in question.

Index of names

- Abé, Kobo 43, 47
Abercrombie, Nicholas 123, 125
Althen, G. 167, 169, 173, 174
Antas, Jolanta 184, 186, 188
Antonopoulou, Eleni 225, 226, 257
Arabski, Janusz 184
Aristotle 54, 55, 61–63, 67, 68, 98, 108, 135, 136, 143
Arndt, Horst 250, 251
Aronson, Pamela J. 21, 156, 262
Arundale, Robert B. 217, 220, 235, 240–242, 260, 264–266
Ashmore, Richard D. 125, 129
Astell, Anne W. 92
- Bachelard**, Gaston 82
Baldwin, James Mark 125, 129
Bangerter, Adrian 132
Barcelona, Antonio 31
Bardi, Anat 179
Bargiela-Chiappini, Francesca 168, 204, 206, 219, 224, 226, 235, 242, 259, 260, 262
Barker, Christopher 21, 129, 130, 156
Barnlund, Dean C. 173
Baryła, Wiesław 170, 186
Batchelor, Jennifer A. 266
Bauman, Zygmunt 90, 91, 94
Baumeister, Roy F. 124, 132, 133, 193, 261
Baxter, Leslie A. 217, 241
- Beckam, David 35
Befu, Harumi 159
Bell, Charles 76, 99
Bergengruen, Maximilian 66
Berland, Kevin 63, 67, 76
Bernard, Saint 65
Bernasconi, Robert 92
Berrios, German E. 53, 57
Berry, John W. 159
Bertillon, Alphonse 58
Bierwaczonek, Bogusław 29
Blumenbach, Johann Friedrich 73
Bogdanowska, Monika 93
Bogdanowska-Jakubowska, Ewa 184
Bond, Michael Harris 154, 160, 161
Borowski, Marek 194
Boryś, Wiesław 25, 27
Bourne, E.J. 156
Bowers, John Waite 217, 253, 255, 256, 260
Brain, L. 116, 117
Brener, Milton E. 80
Brewer, Gene 106
Brewer, Marilyn B. 130, 239
Broca, Paul 115
Brown, J.D. 129, 132, 261
Brown, Penelope 21, 45, 90, 148, 149, 157, 195, 202, 212, 213–229, 231, 233–235, 238–241, 244, 251, 252, 255–259, 265
Brown, Roger 216, 217,

- Brown, William J. 262, 267
 Bull, R.H. 120
 Burke, Peter J. 125, 126, 128
 Burns, Tom 197, 205
 Byron, George Gordon 86
- Calkins, Mary Whiton 125
 Camper, Petrus 72, 73, 114
 Cardan, Jérôme (Cardano Gerolamo) 67
 Carus, Carl Gustav 114, 115, 117
 Cavaye, Ronald 85, 86
 Chang, Hui-Ching 148, 208
 Charmides 96
 Chauchadis, Claude 149
 Chaudhry, Mohammad Sharif 113
 Chen, Rong 227
 Cheng, Chung-Ying 161–163, 165–167
 Chojecki, Andrzej 59
 Chu, Godwin C. 174, 259, 262
 Chung, S. 151
 Cicero, Marcus Tullius 38, 63
 Ciechowicz, Jan 58, 91
 Ciesielski, Remigiusz T. 82, 87
 Cleopatra 101
 Clinton, William (Bill) 283
 Cocroft, Beth-Ann K. 19, 146, 154, 220
 Cohen Jr., Meyer Michael 54, 56, 59, 60, 61, 63, 64, 66, 102, 114, 115, 119
 Cole, Jonathan 77, 112
 Cole, Michael 176, 178
 Collins, Randall 195, 201, 202, 205, 208, 210
 Colman, Andrew M. 106, 131
 Confucius 45, 161–163
 Cooley, Charles Horton 125, 131, 132, 133, 261
 Corson, David 152
 Courtine, Jean-Jacques 53, 64, 65, 75, 87, 88, 111
 Critias 96
 Croft, W. 31
 Cross, Susan E. 147, 148, 152, 153, 157, 158, 174, 176, 189
 Crozier, W. Ray 108
 Cruz, Penelope 36
- Cudak, Romuald 181
 Culpeper, Jonathan 228, 234, 235
 Cunningham, M.R. 100
 Cupach, William R. 45, 250, 252, 253
- D**
 Dante Alighieri 37, 55, 65, 70
 Darwin, Charles 78, 79, 99, 108, 109, 120
 Deleuze, Gilles 56, 114
 Denzin, Norman K. 126, 127, 129
 Derrida, Jacques 97
 Descartes, René 76, 134, 136
 DeVos, George 174, 190
 Dewey, John 137, 257
 Diderot, Denis 75
 Dijk, Teun A. van 280
 Dionysus 85
 Dirven, René 30
 Długosz-Kurczabowa, Krystyna 25
 Doğan, Gürkan 148
 Dolby, William 85
 Doliński, Dariusz 186, 187, 193
 Domenici, Kathy 255
 Down, John Langdon Haydon 116
 Drong, Leszek 96
 Dubisz, Stanisław 152, 182
 Duchenne de Boulogne, Guillaume Benjamin Armand 76–79
 Dunaj, Bogusław 43
 Dunning, David 126
 Durczok, Kamil 272–273
 Durkheim, Emile 145, 195, 201–202, 204, 207, 213, 216, 220, 226, 265
 Duszak, Anna 13, 14, 16, 173
 Dyczewski, Leon 179
- Earley, P. Christopher 157, 162, 166, 244, 247–250, 257, 262, 264
 Eco, Umberto 64, 65
 Edgley, Charles 197
 Edson, Gary 55, 83–86
 Eelen, Gino 141, 219, 236
 Ehlich, Konrad 224
 Ekman, Paul 13, 16, 75–82, 160
 Eliade, Mircea 84
 Elliot, Anthony 124, 127

- Ervin-Tripp, Susan 45, 175, 177, 191, 220
 Euripides 85
- Fairclough, Norman 13
 Fajans, Jane 124
 Fant, Lars 255
 Ferrara, Alessandro 173, 187
 Feyaerts, Kurt 30
 Filipowicz, Stanisław 14, 89, 90
 Fitzgerald, Thomas K. 16, 123, 124, 128, 151, 168, 174, 176
 Flew, Antony 143, 161
 Fontana, Andrea 135
 Franklin, John Hope 283
 Fraser, Bruce 90, 217, 225, 237
 Frederic II, Emperor 62
 Freud, Sigmund 97, 135
 Fridlund, Alan J. 56, 61, 64, 66, 73, 78–81, 83, 87, 114, 116
 Friesen, Wallace V. 79, 80–82
 Fukushima, Saeko 222, 223
- Gabryś-Barker, Danuta 56
 Gajda, Stanisław 127
 Galen (Claudius Galenus) 61, 63, 64
 Gall, Franz Joseph 73, 74, 117
 Galton, Francis 100
 Gao, Ge 157, 162–164
 Garcia, Wintilo 224
 Gardner, Wendi 130, 239
 Garfinkel, Harold 144
 Gert, Bernard 144
 Giddens, Athony 15, 56, 127, 130, 138, 139, 147, 152, 199
 Gilbert of Hoyt 64
 Gilbert, Paul 75, 99, 100, 108, 109
 Gilman, Albert 216
 Głowiński, Michał 86
 Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von 72, 117
 Goffman, Erving 15, 17, 18, 21, 31, 45, 46, 107, 110, 111, 113, 127, 130, 132, 134, 138, 139, 142, 145, 147, 152, 170, 175, 177, 193, 195, 196, 212–214, 218–220, 228, 236–238, 340–242, 246, 248–250, 252, 255–257, 259, 260, 262, 264, 265
- Gombrich, Ernst Hans 87
 Gombrowicz, Witold 91
 Gomułka, Władysław 268
 Goossens, Louis 31
 Gore, Jonathan S. 147, 148, 152, 153, 157, 158, 174, 176, 189
 Gould, Stephen Jay 115, 116
 Gray, Richard T. 72, 73, 115, 117–119
 Green, J. 120
 Grice, Herbert Paul 213, 215, 218, 242
 Gryboskowa, Antonina 183, 187, 188
 Gu, Yueguo 220, 221, 225, 226
 Guattari, Félix 56, 114
 Gudykunst, William B. 16, 130, 148, 151, 155, 156, 158, 159, 176, 177, 192, 262
 Gumperz, John J. 152
 Günther, Hans F.K. 118, 119
- H**
 Habermas, Jürgen 144, 257
 Hagège, Jean-Claude 103
 Hall, Edward T. 21, 155
 Hand, Seán 92
 Haroche, Claudine 53, 64, 65, 75, 87, 88, 111
 Hart, Robert 45
 Harter, Susan 128, 130, 131
 Haugh, Michael 83, 141, 166, 167, 222, 236, 260
 Hawthorne, Nathaniel 111
 Heath, Christian 109
 Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich 69–72, 74, 98, 99, 117
 Heidegger, Martin 90
 Henneberg, Maciej 54–56, 73
 Herder, Johann Gottfried 117
 Herrnstein, Richard J. 120, 121
 Hill, Beverly 222, 226
 Hinze, Carl 141, 159, 160, 164, 166, 167, 221
 Hippocrates 61, 64, 105
 Hirschon, Renée 148–150, 224
 Ho, David Yau-Fai 43, 45, 85, 106–110, 142, 162, 163, 165, 208, 238, 248, 260, 263, 264
 Hobbes, Thomas 57, 58, 87, 136, 196

- Hofstede, Geert 21, 151–154, 156, 168, 178, 179, 262
 Hogarth, William 68, 69
 Hogg, Michael A. 130
 Holland, Dorothy 21, 129, 156, 262
 Holt, G. Richard 142, 208
 Holtgraves, Thomas 134, 216, 228, 229, 260, 261
 Hooton, Earnest Albert 40, 120
 Hsu, Chuang Hu S. 221
 Hu, Hsien Chin 60, 142, 162, 164, 165, 166, 167, 195, 208, 212, 214, 248
 Hugo, Victor 112
 Hume, David 143
 Huszcza, Romuald 187
- Ide, Sachiko 222, 224, 226
 Inglehart, Ronald 179
 Iseman, Vicki 269, 270
 İşik-Güler, Hale 16, 141, 162
- Jackson, Linda A. 100, 101
 Jakubowska, Ewa (Ewa Bogdanowska-Jakubowska) 14, 172, 173, 182–188, 243, 275, 277, 289,
 James, William 124–126, 128, 129, 131, 163
 Janney, Richard W. 250, 251
 Jaworski, Adam 193
 Jędrzejko, Ewa 107, 108
 Jerome, Saint 63
 Ji, Shaojun 165
 John Paul II (Karol Wojtyła) 44
 Johnson, Frank 168
 Johnson, Mark 23, 24, 29, 31, 34–36, 50, 143
 Josephs, Lawrence 148
 Jussim, Lee 125, 129
- Kaczyński, Jarosław 46, 268, 269
 Kadt, Elizabeth de 224
 Kakietek, Piotr 46, 104
 Kalaga, Wojciech 25, 54, 90
 Kalisz, Roman 29, 30
 Kant, Immanuel 69, 70, 98, 124, 126, 143, 144
- Kasper, Gabriele 220
 Kassner, Rudolf 117, 118
 Keating, Caroline F. 101
 Keller, Bill 270
 Kemp, Sandra 35, 47, 53, 58, 103, 112
 Kenagy, Suzanne 83
 Kennedy, Caroline 274
 Kerbat-Orecchoni, Catherine 225, 226
 Kępiński, Antoni 14, 36, 39–42, 47, 58, 76, 91, 139
 Kielkiewicz-Janowiak, Agnieszka 187
 Kietlińska, Anna 91
 Kisiel, Przemysław 14
 Kita, Małgorzata 179
 Kitayama, Shinobu 157, 162, 174, 176, 225, 262, 265
 Kitowska-Lysiak, Małgorzata 145
 Klages, Ludwig 117, 118
 Klein, Ernest 25
 Klos Sokol, Laura 172, 177, 186, 192
 Kołakowski, Leszek 89, 90
 Kopaliński, Władysław 38, 39, 42, 47, 149, 179
 Kopytko, Roman 14, 218, 261
 Kornacki, Paweł 14, 161, 165
 Kosowska, Ewa 182, 183, 189
 Kövecses, Zoltán 30, 31, 34, 170
 Kowalski, Robin M. 132, 134
 Kozeny, E. 120
 Kretschner, Ernst 117, 118
 Kroger, Rolf O. 266
 Kryk-Kastovsky, Barbara 56, 185, 235
 Kubiński, Wojciech 29
 Kuczynski, Alex 54, 103
 Kulawik, Adam 87
 Kundera, Milan 36, 37
 Kurogi, Atsuko 158, 161, 244–247, 264
 Kuryło, Elżbieta 132
- La Rochefoucault, François de 89
 Lado, Robert 151
 Lakoff, George 23, 24, 29, 31, 32, 34–36, 48, 50, 143, 169, 171
 Lakoff, Robin Tolmach 90, 195, 230
 Lankosz, Borys 284
 Lavater, Johann Gaspar 68–74, 117

- Le Brun, Charles 76
 Leary, Mark R. 124, 132–134, 193
 Lebra, Takie Sugiyama 147
 Leech, Geoffrey 90, 147, 195, 237, 251
 Lee-Wong, Song-Mei 160–162, 165, 220
 Leonardo da Vinci 99
 Lerner, Gene H. 236
 Lessa, William Armand 59, 60
 Leśmian, Bolesław 87
 Levinas, Emmanuel 92–95
 Levinson, Stephen C. 21, 45, 90, 148, 149, 157, 195, 202, 212, 213–227, 228, 229, 231, 233–235, 237–241, 244, 251, 252, 255–259, 265
 Levi-Strauss, Claude 84
 Lewicka, Maria 178, 181
 Ley, Graham 85
 Lichtenberg, Georg Christoph 117
 Lim, Tae-Seop 217, 253, 255, 256, 259, 260, 262
 Limon, Jerzy 39
 Little, Anthony C. 100
 Littlejohn, Stephen W. 255
 Locher, Miriam A. 235–237, 258, 266
 Locke, John 124
 Lombroso, Cesare 119, 120
 Lombroso Ferrero, G. 120
 Lommel, Andreas 87
 Lorentz, Hendrik 124
 Lubecka, Anna 128, 152, 168, 170, 178, 179, 182, 184, 185
 Lutz, Catherine A. 172
 Lynch, David 112

 Łotocka, Ida 101, 138

 MacLaine, Shirley 284
 Maćkiewicz, Jolanta 23, 35, 41, 50
 Magli, Patrizia 66, 67, 138
 Manning, Philip 197, 199–201, 206, 209
 Manno, Guiseppe 226, 227
 Mao, LuMing Robert 45, 142, 160, 165, 217, 220, 221, 223, 226, 259, 260, 265
 Marcjanik, Małgorzata 14, 179, 184, 188
 Mariański, Janusz 145
 Markiewicz, Henryk 194
 Markus, Hazel Rose 157, 162, 168, 169, 174, 176, 225, 262, 265
 Marsella, Anthony J. 21, 156, 262
 Matsumoto, Yoshiko 160, 217, 220–222, 225, 226, 229, 259
 Mayumi, Usami 222
 MacGowan, John 163, 164
 McCain, John 35, 171, 269, 270
 McGlone, Matthew S. 266
 McMordie, W. 60
 McNeill, Daniel 37, 49, 54, 56, 57, 73–76, 78, 80, 84, 95, 101, 102, 108, 113, 119
 Mead, George Herbert 125, 126, 128, 131–133, 144, 208, 261, 263
 Merkin, Rebecca S. 110, 153, 154, 246, 267
 Merleau-Ponty, Maurice 138
 Metts, Sandra 45, 250, 252, 253
 Mill, John Stuart 143, 144
 Miller, David L. 144
 Mirabeau, Victor Riquetti de 88, 89
 Mong, Lee Siow 61
 Montaigne, Michel de 66, 67
 Montgomery, B.M. 241
 Morisaki, Seiichi 148, 158, 176, 177, 192, 262
 Morton, Samuel George 115, 116
 Mourad, Youssef 64, 111

 Naylor, Larry L. 167–170, 174
 Nesi, Frank A. 102
 Niemeier, Susanne 34
 Niesiołowski, Stefan 46, 268, 269
 Nolen, William 90
 Norden, Bryan W. van 161, 162
 Nwoye, Onuigbo G. 220, 223–226

 O'Driscoll, Jim 160, 218, 225, 226, 228, 231–233, 241, 243, 259, 265, 276
 Obama, Barack 35
 Oettinger Jr., Marion 83
 Oetzel, John G. 142, 146, 152, 157, 158, 244, 245, 247, 267
 Olejnik, Monika 272, 273
 Onions, Charles Talbut 25
 Orzechowski, Sylwester Wojciech 58

- Oster, Harriet 77, 78, 160
 Owens, Timothy J. 21, 156, 262
 Ożóg, Kazimierz 179, 181, 184, 187, 188, 192, 267
- P**
 Pacewicz, Piotr 271–273
 Palikot, Janusz 35
 Palin, Sarah 171
 Paracelsus 66
 Paterson, D.A. 273, 274
 Pattison, Stephen 107, 109
 Patton, Kimberley Christine 84
 Paul IV, the Pope 67
 Pawełczyk, Joanna 187
 Peck, Stephen Rogers 77
 Penman, Robyn 147, 253, 257, 258, 262
 Percival, Melissa 69, 73
 Pernet, Henry 83
 Piderit, Theodor 73, 74
 Pieczyński, Adam 272, 273
 Pietrzak-Porwisz, Grażyna 35, 44
 Pike, Kenneth L. 159
 Pizziconi, Barbara 222
 Plato 95, 96, 98
 Pochanke, Justyna 272, 273
 Pontari, Beth A. 131, 132, 134, 193
 Pope, Alexander 97
 Porta, Giovanni Battista della 65, 66, 70
 Pythagoras 61
- R**
 Radden, Günter 31, 34
 Rawls, Anne Warfield 202
 Rembrandt Harmensz van Rijn 95
 Retzius, Anders 115
 Reynolds, Joshua 96, 98, 220
 Rhodes, Gillian 100, 101
 Rockridge Institute 169
 Romanowski, A. 194
 Rosenfelt, Paul 18
 Rousseau, Jean-Jacques 87–89
 Rubenstein, A.J. 99–101, 104
 Ruhi, Şükriye 16, 141, 148, 240, 262
 Rymanowski, Bogdan 271–273
- S**
 Sartre, Jean-Paul 137, 138
 Saville-Troiike, Muriel 18, 19
- Scheff, Thomas J. 146
 Schegloff, Emanuel A. 209
 Schlenker, Barry R. 131–134, 193, 261
 Schopenhauer, Arthur 39, 71, 72, 117
 Schoug, Fredrik 56
 Schwartz, Shalom H. 179, 239
 Scollon, Susanne (see Wong Scollon,)
 Scollon, Ron 123, 151, 160, 174, 190, 213, 228–231
 Scott, Michael 64
 Seidl, Jennifer 60
 Sell, Roger D. 88
 Shakespeare, William 38, 39, 42, 70, 198, 271
 Showers, Carolin J. 128, 263
 Shweder, Richard A. 156
 Sifianou, Maria 225, 226, 257
 Simmel, Georg 40, 74
 Simon, Bernd 238, 239
 Singelis, Theodore M. 262, 267
 Sixtus V, the Pope 67
 Skudrzykowa, Aldona 179, 183
 Sławek, Tadeusz 24, 53
 Słowacki, Juliusz 86
 Smith, Susan Valeria Harris 85
 Sochoń, Jan 53
 Socrates 63, 85, 96, 97, 143
 Spencer-Oatey, Helen 16, 148, 151, 217, 225, 235, 237–240, 246, 254, 260–262, 264
 Spicker, Stuart F. 136, 137
 Spiers, Judith Ann 228
 Spindler, George 167, 174
 Spindler, Louise 167, 174
 Spiro, Melford Elliot 125
 Stanisławski, Jan 28
 Stadius 96
 Stets, Jan E. 125, 126, 128
 Stevenson, Robert Louis 106
 Stewart, Potter 271
 Stimilli, Davide 37, 55, 59, 66, 95–97
 Stoddard, J.Theodore 100
 Strauss, Anselm L. 91
 Strecker, Ivo 31, 159, 160, 220, 224, 291
 Strong, P.M. 145, 203
 Stryker, Sheldon 126, 128

- Synnott, Anthony 55, 63, 67, 68, 98,
134, 137–139
Szarota, Piotr 102, 172, 188
Szczepkowska, Joanna 36
- Środa, Magdalena 147
- Tacitus 118
Tagore, Rabindranath 41
Tajfel, Henri 129, 130
Tangney, June Price 124
Tatarkiewicz, Władysław 143
Taylor, Charles 144
Terkourafi, Marina 141, 220, 225, 235,
242, 243
Terminińska, Kamilla 109
Thoits, Peggy A. 21, 129, 156, 262
Thornton, M. 120
Tice, Dianne M. 132
Tillett, S. 135
Ting-Toomey, Stella 19, 142, 146, 151,
152, 154–159, 161, 168, 177, 220,
244–248, 264, 267
Tischner, Józef 90–92
Tjosvold, Dean 45
Tomiczek, Eugeniusz 14
Tracy, Karen 123, 233, 253, 254, 257,
266
Triandis, Harry Charalambos 21, 154–
156, 158, 170, 174, 179, 185, 261, 271
Tuan, Yi-Fu 24
Turner, John C. 129, 130
Turner, Mark 171
Turner, Ronny E. 197
Tytler, Graeme 61, 64, 67, 68, 73
- Ukosakul, Margaret 223
Urban, Krystyna 132
- Virshup, Lauren K. 21, 129, 156, 262
- Wajda, Andrzej 284
Wallace, Harry M. 132
Warchala, Jacek 179
Watts, Richard J. 88, 90, 141, 217, 219,
224, 227, 235–237, 246, 258, 266,
267
Weinrich, Harald 149, 150
Werkhofer, Konrad T. 218–221
Wierzbicka, Anna 80–82, 152, 168, 171–
174, 179, 185, 186, 220, 275
Williams, Robin 203
Wilson, James Q. 120, 121
Winslet, Kate 284
Wittgenstein, Ludwig 38, 79, 258
Wnuk-Lipiński, Edmund 179
Wojciszke, Bogdan 170, 186
Wolfson, Nessa 172
Wong Scollon, Susanne 123, 151, 160,
174, 190, 213, 228–231
Wood, Linda A. 266
Wyschogrod, Edith 93, 94
- Xing, Jianyu 217
- Yang, Joong-Nam 216
Young, L. 61
Yu, Ming-Chung 226
- Zebrowitz, Leslie A. 38, 55, 101, 105
Zeigler-Hill, Virgil 128, 263

Subject index

- Adaptors 81
Alter 129
Aprosōpos 95, 96
Association rights 238
Avoidance process 211
- Bare-faced* 48, 49
Beautyism 98
Bezczelność, bezzelny 27, 49, 51
Blushing 108
Body as the symbol of the self 138–140
Body–soul dualism 135, 136
Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness 212, 213–217, 222, 227, 229, 234, 235, 238, 241, 242, 244, 252, 257, 265, 266
- Cheek* 46, 48, 49
Chin 42
Civility 88, 90
Cognitive linguistics 29
Communication
 Cross-cultural c. 16, 151, 232, 244
 Emotive c. 251
 Emotional c. 251
 Intercultural c. 16, 151, 232, 233, 244, 251
Communication model of facework 253, 255, 256
Complexio 64
- Conversational signals 81
Cooperative Principle 213, 242, 243
Corrective process 211
Cranial index 115
Cranimetry 70, 73, 114, 115
Cranioscopy 114
Cultural Face Model 14, 21, 195, 259, 263–265, 268–290
 The applicability of model 268–290
Culture 16, 21, 55, 87, 101, 106, 107, 111–114, 125, 128, 132, 138, 141, 146–149, 151–160, 197, 210, 212, 214, 244, 245, 249, 259, 262–264, 267, 268, 290
 American c. 50, 167–175, 178, 186, 187, 192, 268, 269, 271–274, 277, 278, 281, 282, 285, 286, 288–290
 Chinese c. 40, 45, 142, 160–164, 220
 Collectivistic c. 146–148, 160
 Commercial c. 103
 Individualistic c. 146, 148, 168
 Polish c. 50, 178–188, 191, 192, 194, 268, 271, 274, 277, 278, 281, 285, 288–290
 Relational c. 252
Czelność 27, 34, 49–51
Czoło 27, 34, 40, 51

- Desirable identity images 134
- Dimensions of cultural variability 153–156
- Discernment 222
- Display rules 78
- Double-faced* 47, 50
- Dramaturgical approach to social interaction 196–199
- Dwulicowość* 47
- Ego 129
- Emblems 81
- Emic 21, 141, 159, 241, 248, 265, 268, 289
- Equity rights 238
- Ethic 159
- Eudaimonia* 143
- Eyes* 40, 41
- Eyprosōpos* 95
- Façade 93
- Façade* 28, 29
- Face (concept)
- American f. 142, 174–178, 192, 223, 268
 - and beauty 97–104
 - and culture 262, 263
 - and dignity 142, 147
 - and esteem 142, 232
 - and mask 47, 48, 82–91
 - and honour 142, 148–150, 181
 - and morality 142–146, 262
 - and pride 142, 146, 147, 244
 - and race 37, 114–119
 - and racism 114
 - and respect 142, 147
 - and self-esteem 147, 148
 - and shame, guilt and embarrassment 43, 106–110, 146, 232, 244
 - and tact 142, 147
 - Approval f. 244
 - as a display of illness symptoms 104, 105
 - as a folk concept 141–194
 - as a mirror of the soul 38–43, 59–75
 - as an academic concept 195–290
 - as a part of the body 15–17, 20, 53–121
 - as a person 34–36, 57–59
 - as a self-image 13, 16, 17, 21, 45–56, 134, 145, 213, 259, 260
 - as a sociocultural construct 259
 - as a symbol of split personality 105, 106
 - Autonomy f. 244, 247, 255, 265–267, 276–278, 290
 - Brown and Levinson's concept of f. 214, 217–228, 231, 240, 241, 258
 - Chinese f. 142, 163–167, 195, 220, 248, 250
 - Connection f. 241, 265
 - Competence f. 247, 255
 - Cosmopolitan f. 233
 - Criminal f. 119–121
 - Culture-general f. 264, 265
 - Culture-specific f. 232, 233, 264
 - Ethnolinguistic f. 233
 - Fellowship f. 255
 - First-order f. (face1) 141, 243
 - Goffman's concept of f. 45, 47, 208–210, 217, 220, 221, 236, 240, 252
 - Group f. 166
 - Hidden f. 113, 114
 - Identity f. 238
 - Independent f. 177
 - Individual f. 166
 - "in transition" f. 191, 192, 194
 - Interpersonal f. 251
 - Levinas' concept of f. 92–95
 - Moral f. 247, 264, 266, 268–271, 278–280
 - Mutual f. 192, 233, 234, 245
 - Negative f. 156, 214, 220, 221, 223, 225, 226, 229, 231, 234, 238, 240, 241, 244, 252, 265

- Other-f. 177, 192, 245, 258, 266
 Pan-situational f. 238, 264
 Personal f. 251
 Polish f. (*twarz*) 142, 188, 189–194, 268
 Positive f. 214, 156, 222, 225, 229, 231, 234, 238, 240, 241, 244, 252, 265
 Prestige f. 264, 266, 269, 271–274, 276, 279–284
 Relational f. 264, 266, 274–276, 284–289
 Relationship-specific f. 253
 Reliability f. 247
 Respectability f. 238
 Second-order f. (*face2*) 141, 195, 243
 Self-f. 177, 227, 245, 258, 266
 Separation f. 241, 265
 Situation-specific f. 232, 238, 264
 Social f. 45, 252
 Solidarity f. 265–267, 275–278, 285, 290
 Status f. 247
 Stigmatized f. 110–112
Face (word) 15, 20, 23, 25–29, 31, 34–51
 as a noun 25–26
 as a verb 26
 etymology of the word 25
 FACE (concept in cognitive linguistics) 23, 24, 29, 31–33, 50
 as a radial category 32, 33
 FACE/TWARZ metaphors 20, 34–51
 Face-blindness 95–97
 Face Constituting Theory 241
 Face dualism 232
 Face-flattering acts 226
 Face game 258
Faceless 113
 Face management 158, 228–229, 237, 240, 244, 253, 260
 Face management theory of language use 228, 229
 Face model of language choice in intercultural communication 228, 233
 Face-Negotiation Theory 244–247
 Face of the Other 92–95
 Face opposition 228, 232
 Face-reading 60, 61, 64, 67
 in China 60–61
 face theories, an overview 212–258
 Face-threatening act 213, 215, 225, 227, 232
 Face-threatening situations 177, 178, 194
 Facework 190, 195, 212, 225, 245, 246, 253–256, 265–267
 Approbation f. 255, 256
 Goffman's f. 210, 211, 265
 Negatively-marked f. 266, 267
 Other-directed f. 265, 266
 Positively-marked f. 266
 Self-directed f. 265, 266
 Solidarity f. 255
 Tact f. 255
 Unmarked f. 266
 Facework competence 264
 Facework-orientation 266, 267
 Facework strategies 266, 267, 278–289
 Moral Face-oriented s. 278–280
 Negatively-marked s. 266, 267, 278–282, 284, 285
 Positively-marked s. 266, 279, 280, 283, 284, 288, 289
 Prestige Face-oriented s. 280–284
 Relational Face-oriented s. 284–289
 Unmarked s. 266, 267, 279, 283, 286–288
 Facial adornment 101, 102
 Facial attractiveness 97, 99–101
 Facial beauty
 in commercial culture 103
 in folk sayings 103, 104
 Facial expression 16, 21, 39, 40, 42, 43, 47, 53, 56, 57, 62, 74–82, 87, 89, 99, 101, 102, 106, 197, 267
 in American culture 172–174
 in Polish culture 188, 189

- Facial prognathism 73
 Facial shame 109
Facies hippocratica 39, 105
 Facism 98
Facjata 25
 Fact game 258
Fasada 28, 29, 50, 51
Firāsa 64
Forehead 40
 Frames 205, 206
Front 28, 29, 50, 51
Frontowy 50
- Gęba** 91
 Golden proportion 99
- Honor* (Polish word) 149
 Honour 148, 149
- Identity** 91, 92, 105, 123, 124, 127, 128, 137, 138, 151, 155, 156, 158, 167, 203, 232, 233, 234, 238–240, 244, 245, 249
 - Ego i. 127
 - Human i. 129
 - Individual i. 89
 - Personal i. 130, 158, 176, 206
 - Polish i. 189
 - Self-i. 127, 139, 257
 - Social i. 111, 129, 158, 176, 186, 217, 223, 260, 249, 257
 - Spoiled i., see stigma 110, 111
- Illustrators 81
 (Im)politeness 212, 258, 267
 Impoliteness 234–235, 239
 Impression management 131, 132, 199, 264
 Individualism-collectivism 146–148, 154–156, 168, 178, 189, 244, 245, 249
 Interdisciplinary perspective 13
- Kalokagathia* 59
- Lian* 45, 160, 163–167, 221, 238, 248, 250
Lico 50, 51
- Licowy* 50
Linea facialis, or facial angle 73, 114
Lips 42
- Masculinity–femininity** 154, 181
- Mask** 47, 82–91, 197
 - and its utilitarian functions 86
 - as an element of culture 83–85
 - as an element of worship 84, 85
 - as a sociocultural construct 87–91
 - in poetry 86, 87
 - in theatre 85, 86
- Mask* 47, 83
Maska 47
Menboku 83, 160
Mentsu 160
 Metaphor 29–31
 Metonymy 30, 31
 Metoposcopy 67
Mianzi 45, 160, 164, 165, 167, 221, 238, 248, 250
Mina 28, 43
Morda 27
Mouth 42
 Multiple faces 263
 Multiple selves 128, 205, 263
- Nos* 34, 42, 49, 51
Nose 41–42
- Oblicze* 28, 34, 44, 49, 51
Oczy 34, 41, 49, 51
- Patognomy** 68
 Person 57, 83, 124, 196
Persōna 57, 83, 124
 Phrenology 70, 73, 114
 Physiognomy 16, 59, 75, 76, 114, 117, 118
 - in ancient Greece and Rome 61–63
 - in Europe 64–75
 - in Germany 117–119
 - Racial 114, 117–119
- Podbródek* 42, 51

- Poker face* 47, 76
Pokerowa twarz 47
Policzek 34, 46
 Politeness 48, 88–90, 141, 149, 150, 168, 182, 184, 187, 188, 190, 192, 208, 213, 217, 225, 227, 229, 235–237, 250, 251, 265, 266, 277
 Deference p. 229
 Hierarchical p. 230
 Interpersonal p., or Tact 250
 Negative p. 216, 226
 Polish p. 192
 Positive p. 216
 Social p. 250
 Solidarity p. 229
 Politeness (face) systems 229, 230
 Politic behaviour 227, 236, 237, 266
Potwarz 34, 46, 51
 Power distance 153, 154
Prosopagnosia, or face-blindness
Prosonon 57, 83, 95
Przodek 50, 51
 Public order 196
Purdah 113
Pysk 27
- Radial category** 29, 32, 33
 Rapport management 237–240
 Reflexivity 127
 Regime
 of face 90
 of mask 89
 Regulators 81
 Relational work 235–237, 258, 262, 266
 Relative face orientation 223, 265
 Rites
 Negative 202, 265
 Positive 202, 265
 Ritual constraints 203
 Ritual cooperation 207
 Ritual equilibrium 203, 250
 Ritual order 203, 211
 Ritual organization of interpersonal contacts 201–205
 Rituals 151, 161, 201–205, 207, 250, 274–277, 288
- Access r. 204
 Avoidance r. 204, 216, 265
 Interaction r. 202, 240, 246
 Presentational r. 204, 216, 265
 Remedial r. 204
 Supportive r. 204
- Rysy (twarzy)* 37, 38
- Self** 20, 21, 107, 124–140, 148, 149, 156–158, 161, 162, 168, 174, 175, 177, 189, 196, 200, 202, 205, 206, 209, 210, 220, 221, 235, 237, 248, 260–263
 American concept of s. 174, 175 and the body 134–140
 as desire 129
 Bodily s. 128
 Chinese s. 162, 164
 Collective s. 130
 Complete unitary s. 128
 Culture-specific concept of s. 156–158, 262
 Empirical s. 128
 Extracorporeal s. 128
 Goffman's concept of s. 207, 208
 Ideological s. 129
 Independent s. 176
 Individual s. 130, 189
 Interactional s. 129
 Linguistic s. 129
 Material s. 128
 Phenomenological s. 129
 Polish concept of s. 189
 Private s. 133, 157
 Public s. 133, 157
 Reflected s. 131
 Relational s. 130
 Social s. 108, 109, 127, 129, 158, 197, 240, 242, 268
 Spiritual s. 129
 Complete unitary s. 128
- Self-construal** 156–158, 253
 Anglo-American s.-c. 174
 Independent s.-c. 157, 158, 174, 189, 191, 192, 194, 223, 239, 246, 265

- Interdependent s.c. 157, 158,
 162, 189, 191, 223, 239, 246,
 265
 Polish s.c. 189
 (Self-)esteem 103, 107, 125, 145, 147,
 148, 163, 231, 267
 Self-presentation 82, 94, 127, 131–134,
 139, 156, 167, 172, 177, 192–194, 205,
 240, 250, 260, 261, 264–266
 Self-politeness 227
Sight 37
 Smile 78–80, 82, 172–174, 178, 188
 American s. 172, 173
 Duchenne's s. 79
 Enjoyment s. 79
 False s. 80
 Self-presentational s. 172
 Smile restoration 102
 Social interaction as a game 199–201
 Sociality rights 237, 238, 240
 Social order 87, 107, 163, 196, 259
 Society of the mask 88
 Somatomancy 59
 Soul 124, 207
 Spojrzenie 41, 44
 Stigma, or spoiled identity 66, 110, 111
 Symbolic interactionism 125–127
 Symptomatology of emotion 76
Taimen 83, 160
 Theory of Face Management in Close
 Relationships 250, 252, 253
Twarz 15, 20, 27–29, 34–51, 160
Twarzowy 28
 Uncertainty of avoidance 154
 Universality of face 159, 219, 220, 223,
 242, 243, 248, 255
 Usta 42, 51
Vision 37
 Volition 222
Wakimae, see discernment
Wargi 38
Widzenie 34, 37
Wyraz twarzy 44
Wzrok 41

Ewa Bogdanowska-Jakubowska

TWARZ Perspektywa interdyscyplinarna

Streszczenie

Celem książki jest możliwie najszerze przedstawienie pojęcia twarzy. Omawiane zagadnienie obejmuje zarówno elementy wynikające z fizycznego aspektu twarzy, jak i te związane z jej socjokulturowymi uwarunkowaniami. Mimo że moim zamiarem jest szeroka i gruntowna prezentacja pojęcia, za kwestię kluczową uznałam rolę, jaką odgrywa twarz w interakcjach społecznych. Stykając się z ludźmi, musimy zawsze brać pod uwagę:

- twarz jako część ciała, z jej cechami stałymi i mimiką;
- twarz rozumianą jako wizerunek własny, jaki każdy człowiek tworzy na potrzeby danej interakcji społecznej.

Kulturowy wymiar pojęcia twarzy umożliwia interpretację różnorodnych zachowań ludzkich – zarówno językowych, jak i pozajęzykowych. Tłumaczy również relacje międzyludzkie, które kształtują treść pojęcia twarzy specyficzną dla danej kultury.

Kategoria twarzy znajduje się w centrum zainteresowania wielu dyscyplin naukowych, a w szczególności nauk społecznych: antropologii kulturowej, studiów nad komunikacją (międzykulturową), psychologii (w szczególności psychologii społecznej) oraz socjologii. Twarz jest przedmiotem dociekań filozoficznych. W medycynie traktowana jest jako część ciała ludzkiego, poprzez którą ujawnia się choroba. Rysy twarzy – jako oznaki natury przestępczej – interesują również kryminologów. Powstała nawet „nauka” poświęcona twarzy – fizjonomia. Twarz jako wizerunek własny stała się jednym z głównych przedmiotów socjolingwistycznych badań nad uprzejmością. Obecność omawianego pojęcia w tak wielu dziedzinach badań jest wystarczającym uzasadnieniem przyjęcia perspektywy interdyscyplinarnej.

Twarz nie była dotąd tematem „popularnym” wśród polskich uczonych. Istnieje zaledwie kilka publikacji omawiających to zagadnienie. Zupełnie natomiast brak opracowań dotyczących polskiego rozumienia pojęcia twarzy. Niniejsza rozprawa ma tę lukę wypełnić.

Książka składa się z pięciu rozdziałów oraz wniosków końcowych. Rozdział pierwszy, zatytułowany „Kognitywne studium pojęcia TWARZY w języku angielskim i polskim”, poświęcony jest ogólnej prezentacji pojęcia, poprzedzonej semantyczną analizą angielskiego słowa *face* i polskiego słowa *twarz*. W oparciu o założenia językoznawstwa kognitywnego, TWARZ przedstawiona została jako kategoria radialna. W drugiej części rozdziału podjęto próbę kognitywnej analizy metafor i metonimii TWARZY występujących w kulturze anglojęzycznej oraz polskiej.

Rozdział drugi, „Twarz jako część ciała”, prezentuje twarz w kategoriach funkcji, jakie pełni ona w życiu człowieka. Rozważany jest wpływ jej wyglądu na relacje z innymi ludźmi i na ogólnie pojętą jakość życia. Ta specyficzna część ciała przez wieki wzbudzała wielkie zainteresowanie, stając się przedmiotem analizy różnych dziedzin naukowych i pseudonaukowych. Różnie też postrzegano i interpretowano twarz w poszczególnych kulturach. Rozdział ten stanowi anali-

zę najczęściej występujących sposobów pojmowania twarzy w wielu dziedzinach wiedzy i w różnych kulturach.

Pozostałe rozdziały traktują o twarzy jako o wizerunku własnym, który jest kreowany w trakcie interakcji społecznej. Analiza społecznego aspektu kategorii twarzy wymagała przede wszystkim rozpatrzenia pojęcia jaźni (self). Nie bez przyczyny bowiem mówi się, że „ja” uzewnętrznia się poprzez twarz. Rozdział trzeci przedstawia jaźń w różnych perspektywach: psychologicznej, socjologicznej i filozoficznej. Pojęcie jaźni stanowi centralny punkt wielu teorii społecznych tłumaczących złożoność doświadczenia ludzkiego oraz zachowań w trakcie interakcji społecznej. Dla pełnego zrozumienia pojęcia jaźni istotne jest również zrozumienie relacji między jaźnią a ciałem.

Rozdział czwarty przedstawia twarz jako pojęcie w potocznym jego rozumieniu. Twarz jako konstrukt społeczny skorelowana tu jest z innymi pojęciami pokrewnymi, istotnymi dla relacji międzyludzkich, takimi jak godność, honor i moralność. Rozumienie pojęcia twarzy oraz zachowania społeczne z niego wynikające podlegają różnicowaniu kulturowemu. Dlatego też rozdział ten omawia pojęcie kultury oraz wybrane jego modele, które dostarczają kryteriów niezbędnych do interpretacji tych zachowań. Kultura i doświadczenie kulturowe mają silny wpływ na hierarchię wartości, sposób myślenia oraz relacje społeczne, kształtują one społeczne i indywidualne „ja”, jak również twarz (wizerunek własny). Następnie przedstawiono analizy rozumienia pojęcia twarzy w trzech różnych kulturach oraz związanych z tym rozumieniem zachowań społecznych. Jako pierwsze przedstawiono chińskie rozumienie twarzy, gdyż Chiny uważane są za pierwotne źródło tego pojęcia. Twarz chińską zaprezentowano na podstawie literatury socjologicznej i językoznawczej. Pozostałe dwie analizy – wykorzystujące materiał empiryczny zgromadzony przez introspekcję, obserwację uczestniczącą, wywiad oraz ankiety przeprowadzone w Stanach Zjednoczonych i w Polsce – dotyczą twarzy angloamerykańskiej i twarzy polskiej. Każda z analiz poprzedzona jest opisem charakteru danej kultury, specyfiki relacji międzyludzkich w niej panujących oraz roli w tym czasie twarzy (w szczególności uśmiechu).

Rozdział piąty poświęcony jest teoriom dotyczącym pojęcia twarzy. Na wstępie omówione zostały podstawowe pojęcia teorii interakcji społecznej Ervinga Goffmana (np. 1955, 1959, 1967) wybitnego socjologa amerykańskiego, który jako pierwszy potraktował pojęcie twarzy jako przedmiot badań naukowych. Oryginalne idee Goffmana, a w szczególności jego ujęcie twarzy, stały się inspiracją badań w różnych dziedzinach, takich jak psychologia społeczna, socjologia, studia nad komunikacją międzykulturową czy socjolingwistyka. Przegląd głównych teorii twarzy oraz teorii uprzejmości i komunikacji, w których twarz odgrywa centralną rolę, począwszy od teorii uprzejmości Brown i Levinsona (1987), stanowi kolejny element tego rozdziału. Podrozdział „Model Twarzy Kulturowej – podejście do interpretacji i zarządzania twarzą” stanowi wkład własny autorki w dyskusję na temat teoretycznego pojęcia twarzy. Rozdział kończą rozważania nad możliwościami zastosowania Modelu do analizy interakcji społecznych w kulturze angloamerykańskiej i polskiej.

Uwagi końcowe zawierają wnioski dotyczące charakteru pojęcia twarzy.

Ewa Bogdanowska-Jakubowska

Le visage Une perspective interdisciplinaire

R é s u m é

Le but de livre est de présenter de manière la plus large possible la notion de visage. La question abordée englobe de même des éléments résultant de l'aspect physique du visage que ceux qui découlent de leur conditionnement socioculturel. Bien que mon objectif soit une présentation profonde de cette notion, j'ai trouvé cruciale le rôle du visage dans les interactions sociales. En regardant les autres nous devons prendre toujours en considération :

- le visage comme une partie du corps, avec ses traits permanents et la mimique ;
- le visage compris comme une image personnelle que chaque homme crée pour une interaction sociale concrète.

La dimension culturelle du visage rend possible une interprétation de divers comportements humains, linguistiques et non-linguistiques. Elle explique également des relations interpersonnelles, qui modèlent l'essentiel de cette notion, spécifique pour une culture donnée.

La catégorie de visage se place au centre d'intérêt de nombreuses disciplines scientifiques, et en particulier des sciences humaines : anthropologie culturelle, études de communication (interculturelles), psychologie (surtout la psychologie sociale) et sociologie. Le visage est l'objet des recherches philosophiques, et dans la médecine il est traité soit comme une partie du corps humain qui extériorise la maladie, soit est soumis aux opérations de chirurgie esthétique. Les traits du visage – comme signes d'instinct criminel – fascinent également les criminologues ; même une pseudo-science, la physiognomonie, consacrée à l'étude du visage, est née. Le visage en tant que l'image personnelle est devenue une des matières sociolinguistiques les plus importantes dans les recherches sur la politesse. La présence du phénomène en question dans des domaines de recherche si nombreux est une justification suffisante d'admettre une perspective pluridisciplinaire.

Le visage n'était pas, jusqu'au présent, un sujet « populaire » des chercheurs polonais. Il existe à peine quelques publications concernant ce problème, néanmoins il n'y a absolument pas d'études sur la perception polonaise de la notion de visage. La dissertation présente cherche à combler ce vide.

Le livre se compose de cinq chapitres et d'une conclusion. Le premier chapitre est consacré à une présentation générale de la notion, précédée par une analyse sémantique du mot anglais *face* et du mot polonais *twarz*. En accord avec les suppositions de la linguistique cognitive, le visage est présentée comme une catégorie radiale. Dans la seconde partie du chapitre l'auteur a entrepris une tentative d'analyser dans la perspective cognitive des métaphores et des métonymies FACE / TWARZ qui apparaissent dans les cultures américaine et polonaise.

Le deuxième chapitre analyse le visage dans le contexte des fonctions qu'il joue dans la vie de l'homme. L'auteur examine l'influence de son aspect physique sur des relations avec d'autres gens et sur la qualité de vie. Cette partie du corps particulière pendant des siècles éveillait un grand in-

térêt en devenant l'objet de recherches de nombreux domaines scientifiques et pseudo-scientifiques. L'auteur analyse des façons de conceptualiser le visage, présentes le plus souvent dans des cultures et des domaines de science différents.

Les chapitres suivants traitent du visage comme de l'image propre qui est créée au cours de l'interaction sociale. L'analyse de l'aspect social de la catégorie du visage exige avant tout de prendre en considération la notion du moi (*self*) ; on dit souvent, et non sans cause, que le « je » se manifeste à travers le visage. Le troisième chapitre présente le moi dans des perspectives différentes : psychologique, sociologique et philosophique. La notion du moi constitue le point central de nombreuses théories sociales expliquant la complexité de l'expérience humaine et des comportements au cours des interactions sociales. Pour une pleine compréhension de la notion de moi il est important de comprendre la relation entre le moi et le corps.

Le quatrième chapitre présente le visage dans sa conception populaire. Le visage, en tant qu'une construction sociale, est corrélé avec d'autres notions proches, importantes pour des relations interpersonnelles, comme dignité, honneur et moralité. La compréhension de la notion de visage et des comportements sociaux qui en résultent dépendent de la différenciation culturelle ; c'est pourquoi dans ce chapitre l'auteur explique la notion de culture et ses modèles choisis qui fournissent des critères indispensables pour interpréter ces comportements. La culture et l'expérience culturelle influencent profondément la hiérarchie de valeurs, la façon de penser et les relations sociales, elles forment le « je » collectif et individuel aussi que le visage (image propre).

Ensuite l'auteur a présenté des analyses de la conception de visage dans trois cultures différentes ainsi que des comportements sociaux liés avec elles. Dans le premier lieu l'auteur décrit la conception chinoise, car la Chine est considérée comme la source première de cette notion. Le visage chinois est formulé à partir de la littérature sociologique et linguistique. Les autres deux analyses, basées sur le matériel empirique recueilli par l'inspection, grâce à un observateur participant, par l'entretien et des enquêtes menées aux Etats-Unis et en Pologne, concernent le visage anglo-américain et polonais. Chaque analyse est précédée de la description du caractère de la culture donnée, de la spécificité des rapports interpersonnels au sein d'elle, et du rôle de l'expression de visage (en particulier du sourire).

Le cinquième chapitre est consacré aux théories concernant la notion de visage. En premier lieu l'auteur explique des notions de base de la théorie de l'interaction sociale d'Erving Goffman (p. ex. 1955, 1959, 1967), un éminent sociologue américain, qui a placé comme premier le visage dans le cadre de recherches scientifiques. Les idées originales de Goffman, et en particulier sa conception du visage, sont devenues une inspiration pour les recherches dans des domaines comme psychologie sociale, sociologie, études sur communication intra-culturelle ou sociolinguistique. La partie suivante de ce chapitre s'appuie sur une étude des théories où le visage joue le rôle principal, en commençant par la théorie de politesse de Brown et Levinson (1987). Le sous-chapitre « Le Modèle du Visage dans la Culture – approche d'interprétation et de gestion du visage » constitue la proposition de l'auteur dans le débat sur la notion théorique du visage. Le chapitre finit par des réflexions sur l'application possible du Modèle dans une analyse des interactions sociales dans les cultures anglo-américaine et polonaise.

La partie finale comprend une conclusion sur le caractère de la notion de visage.

Executive Editor
Krystian Wojcieszuk

Cover Designer
Ewa Bogdanowska-Jakubowska

Technical Editor
Małgorzata Pleśniar

Proof-reader
Sabina Stencel

Copyright © 2010 by
Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego
Wszelkie prawa zastrzeżone

ISSN 0208-6336
ISBN 978-83-226-1947-6

Published by
Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego
ul. Bankowa 12B, 40-007 Katowice
www.wydawnictwo.us.edu.pl
e-mail: wydawus@us.edu.pl

First impression. Printed sheets: 21.5. Publishing sheets: 27.5
Paper offset. grade III, 90 g Price 42 zł

Computer generated forms: Pracownia Składu Komputerowego
Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Śląskiego
Printing and binding: PPHU TOTEM s.c.
M. Rejnowski, J. Zamiara
ul. Jacewska 89, 88-100 Inowrocław