

ends “Negation in linguistics papers”, Pauline Webber’s study of evaluative negative constructions in 8 articles from *Applied Linguistics* and *Text*.

An evaluation of the whole conference is offered by Anna Mauranen in “Where next? A summary of the round table discussion”, which is particularly useful for making the right connections between the different strands of research, while accepting that the picture is still far from complete. Some of the aspects awaiting further investigation are whether evaluation is inescapable or an option; the role of situational, cultural and disciplinary contexts; and how far speech diverges from writing. It is also unclear what kind of language units (e.g. morphemes, words, utterances, propositions, exchanges) are relevant in the analysis of evaluation. Readers are forewarned that “since we are linguists, we ought to take our task seriously and primarily describe that which is there in the language. It is important to continue linguistic description as far as we can before calling outside forces (such as vague notions of ‘situation’ or ‘world knowledge’) to help” (p. 214). Paul Drew offers his view of the debate in “Integrating qualitative analysis of evaluative discourse with the quantitative approach of corpus linguistics”, which recommends a combination of interactional analysis and corpus data in response to some of the difficulties and inconsistencies identified during the conference.

The overall impression of this excellent volume is that the editors have succeeded in offering a very readable, well-balanced selection of papers spanning texts from several genres and international disciplinary settings. Albeit limited to contributions dealing with English, and largely with Anglo-American discourse, its insights may be usefully extended to other languages for a cross-cultural understanding of how modern scholars communicate and negotiate academically-relevant value judgements within their respective communities.

[Davide Simone Giannoni]

ANDERSON, Laurie / BAMFORD, Julia (eds.), *Evaluation in Oral and Written Academic Discourse*, Officina Edizioni, Rome 2004 [Varietà di testi - Varietà di lingue, 2], pp. 162, ISBN 88-87570-76-0, € 15,00.

There is a growing body of research dealing with evaluation and its linguistic realisations in specialised texts, as illustrated by the review of Del Lungo Camiciotti and Tognini Bonelli’s book in the previous issue of *Linguistica e Filologia*. The editors of this new volume explain that “nowhere is evaluation more prevalent than in academic discourse, where it forms the very backbone of the argumentative structure of many of its texts” (p. 7). Its contents offer various perspectives on academic evaluation, originating from a research project on “Small Corpora and the Analysis of Academic Discourse: Metadiscursive and Evaluative Features” conducted by the Universities of Florence, Modena and Reggio Emilia,

Rome, and Siena. They are divided into two sections, dealing respectively with spoken and written English texts.

Julia Bamford's opening contribution, "Evaluating retrospectively and prospectively in academic lectures", discusses evaluative/interactional uses of the noun *problem* in a corpus of economics lectures by both native and non-native speakers. This is followed by "A complex interplay of voices: first and second person pronouns in university lectures", where Polly Walsh investigates the role of personal pronouns (e.g. repetitions, false starts, exclusive/inclusive, impersonal, metadiscursive) in videorecorded lectures by one Spanish and two British economists. Belinda Crawford Camiciottoli's "Metaphors as evaluation in business studies lectures" analyses the disciplinary and pedagogic functions of root metaphor categories (organic, mechanical, warfare, liquid, sports) in twelve business studies lectures. In "Evaluating task assignment contributions: a description of participant practices", Laura Gavioli and Nick Maxwell describe the use of 'candidate solutions' and 'report formatted contributions' within evaluative sequences produced by EFL learners during spoken interaction. Laurie Anderson's paper "The collaborative construction of an appraisal in a graduate seminar: an analysis from different research perspectives" highlights instead the linguistic resources and sequences found in evaluative acts by non-native English speakers attending a doctoral seminar-discussion at the European University Institute in Florence.

Turning to written discourse, Marina Bondi and Marc Silver ("Textual voices: a cross-disciplinary study of attribution in academic discourse") examine 'textual voices', that is the interplay between evaluation and reporting, in history and economics article introductions. Franca Poppi's "Boosters and hedges: two sides of the same coin? A case study of a small corpus of economics textbooks" looks instead at the use of interpersonal metadiscourse markers for expressing epistemic stance in economics textbooks. Finally, in "Taking a stance: evaluative adjectives in a corpus of written economics lectures", Christina Samson describes how written discourse exploits evaluative adjectives for pedagogic, academic and self-promotional purposes.

The different insights reflected by this very welcome volume are not only complementary but also point to new avenues of research. One area that clearly deserves further attention is variation across languages and disciplines; another, more neglected aspect is the degree of interpersonal (and intrapersonal) variation, as indicated by Polly Walsh's conclusion that "each lecturer meets the challenge of relating to the audience in his/her own way" (p. 49). Throughout the academic genre system there is a clear tension between standardising disciplinary and language-specific norms, on the one side, and the individual crafting of discourse on the other side - a picture further complicated by the need to reconcile global and local concerns, especially wherever English has become the lingua franca of international research communities.

[Davide Simone Giannoni]