

DEL LUNGO CAMICIOTTI, Gabriella / TOGNINI BONELLI, Elena (eds.), *Academic Discourse – New Insights into Evaluation*, Peter Lang, Bern 2004 [Linguistic Insights, 15], pp. 234, ISBN 3-03910-353-9, € 42,80.

The papers in this new volume from Peter Lang are among those presented at an international conference held at Pontignano (Siena) from 14-16 June 2003. They bring together recent research from linguists based in England, Finland, Spain, Sweden, the US and Italy, with each contribution representing a slightly different perspective on the phenomenon. As explained in the Introduction, their plurality is encouraging because “though divergent opinions remain regarding the terminology and ways of analysing evaluation, a general consensus has emerged among scholars as to the centrality of this topic” (p. 12). The volume’s eleven contributions can be roughly divided into three parts, dealing respectively with written/spoken and diachronic corpora; case studies of smaller corpora; and the round table discussion that rounded off the conference.

Ken Hyland’s paper “Engagement and disciplinarity: the other side of evaluation” makes a fundamental distinction between the attitudinal dimension of *stance* and the reader-oriented concept of *engagement*, drawing on linguistic evidence from a corpus of 240 articles in eight disciplines. This is followed by John Swales’s “Evaluation in academic speech: first forays”, which describes some of the insights gained in recent years from the Michigan Corpus of Academic Spoken English (MICASE) and calls for ‘a fresh open-minded stance’ capable of accounting for such dissimilar devices as metaphor, hyperbole, idiom, evaluative adjectives and intensifiers. Ellen Valle offers a diachronic view in “A nice and accurate philosopher: interactivity and evaluation in a historical context”, which illustrates the evaluative practices found in 17th-19th century natural history writings.

Belinda Crawford Camiciottoli begins the second group of contributions with “Audience-oriented relevance markers in business studies lectures”, an investigation of distinctive lexico-grammatical features and audience-related relevance markers based on the transcripts of 12 lectures held in Italy and the US. University lectures (from MICASE) are also dealt with in Inmaculada Fortanet-Gómez’s “Verbal stance in spoken academic discourse”, which describes evaluation in terms of lexical/grammatical and epistemic/attitudinal stance, affective/evaluative first-person verbs and modal auxiliaries. Philip Shaw draws attention to the importance of co-textual and extratextual evidence in “How do we recognise implicit evaluation in academic book reviews?”, a study of *Economic Journal* reviews published in 1913 and 1993. The discourse of historiography is targeted by Marc Silver and Marina Bondi in “Weaving voices: a study of article openings in historical discourse”, which draws on a corpus of 320 RAs from six American journals; this is followed by Paul Tucker’s paper on explicit affective markers, “Evaluation and interpretation in art-historical discourse”. The section

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,