We are happy today to publish our new peer-reviewed international journal PRAGMATICS.REVIEWS. We hope the online and open-access publishing format on our platform, which contains several interactive tools to stimulate senior researchers and young scholars alike. We also hope that these publications on pragmatics will spur a lively, even fervent discussion between linguists from all over the world. Linguistic pluralism has always been an essential part of our discipline, and PRAGMATICS.REVIEWS offers the forum to showcase and practice this.

Reviews have always been, and continue to be, one of the means of spreading knowledge in our growing subdiscipline by overcoming linguistic borders. Pragmatics sans frontières could have been another choice for the name of our journal. Gaining an understanding for what is happening on the other side is critical. Curiosity is essential for research. PRAGMATICS.REVIEWS aims to create a platform where researchers can publish and discuss scientific approaches on language use published in any language; where evaluations are interchanged and possibly debated again. This kind of orientation is searched by young scholars and novices in general. Two things have emerged during the successful development of the comparatively young history of our research in Pragmatics: The rapid growth of publications on the one hand, and the historical moment of passing the baton to the next generation on the other. Accepting this challenge, we have developed an interactive and innovative online platform around the review journal PRAGMATICS.REVIEWS.

PRAGMATICS.REVIEWS strives to become one of the major “marketplaces” for research on Pragmatics, allowing researchers and students to browse through books, reviews, and the research profiles of fellow pragmatics; to share evaluations and thoughts both across the platform and across other social media; and finally, to discuss books, reviews and other topics related to pragmatics in the forum. Publishing your review in PRAGMATICS.REVIEWS will ensure its high visibility within the Pragmatics community, rather than having it trail out of sight among myriad publications perhaps unrelated to your field of study. In PRAGMATICS.REVIEWS, your review will find the interested and informed audience necessary for fruitful scientific exchange.

While moving energetically forward, reflection has to be part of the endeavor. In our first volume, we include an article addressing review as a text genre. This article tells us a lot about culture-specific differences between evaluations – an essential part of every review – while at the same time describing the structure and typology of the text genre or discourse tradition Review. It was not written very recently, but is being published for the first time.
today. The delay in publishing makes evident that Reviews may turn into (in-)visible stumbling stones, preparing careers and failures. Embedded in different sociocultural and scientific contexts, evaluations have different outcomes. The way to express evaluation, enthusiasm or critique on thoughts and results of contemporary researchers of different ages and variable backgrounds can vary a lot itself, and it changes over time. We are very much looking forward to receiving comments or even articles on this topic. We encourage you, senior researchers and young scholars alike, to keep practicing this text genre by writing reviews on monographs and edited volumes you find interesting. The larger the community, the larger the need for orientation arises. It is the responsibility of experienced researchers to provide this for novices. This platform offers a comment function, the possibility to evaluate reviews and books, as well as a forum to share your perspective with other users. Our wish for the future is that you, our users, will turn it into a platform for lively discussions, with the outcome of growing reciprocal understanding of different standpoints rooted in the respective scientific and sociocultural background.

PRAGMATICS.REVIEWS, embedded in the faculty of cultural and social sciences of the Europa Universität VIADRINA, is the shared cross-point of the four responsible editors and researchers in Pragmatics anchored at the German-Polish border. Chief-editor Konstanze Jungbluth is supported by her co-editors Cornelia Müller, Nicole Richter and Hartmut Schröder. We are incredibly happy to collaborate with the members of our advisory board connecting – so far – three continents: Guiomar Ciapuscio (Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina), Katarzyna Dziubalska-Kołaczyk (Poznan: Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza: English Faculty, Poland) and Heinz Leonhard Kretzenbacher (University of Melbourne, Australia). We warmly welcome colleagues interested in joining us in this exciting endeavor.

Contribute to PRAGMATICS.REVIEWS: please browse our books waiting for reviews and encourage colleagues to do so, too! We are very much looking forward to getting in touch with you to interchange experiences, thoughts and reciprocally enrich our perspectives!

Konstanze JUNGBLUTH
Reviews embedded in culture: a comparative point of view. Structure – typology – pragmatics

The Theme-Rheme Classification (TRC) lends itself to the cultural and linguistic analysis of scientific texts, possessing the advantage of being a practicable – and therefore intersubjectively verifiable – principle. On the sentential level, the content of a sentence becomes accessible to the audience via the functional sentence perspective, and with the application of TRC at the textual level, the underlying framework of the text can be established. Previous literature has also recognized the fundamental importance of TRC: According to Benes (1981), TRC is "one of the regularities that are part of sentence complexity and organization of text ('textualization')." Here, the rheme plays the decisive role communicatively, while the theme is more relevant for the composition of the text (Benes 1981: 207). The coherence-building capacity of TRC is discussed in Gülich and Raible (1977: 75) and Hellwig (1984: 1). Gerzymisch-Arbogast (1985: 19) addresses the interesting question of whether TRC could also be used as a boundary criterion for particular text types with various functions.

The review text type, being a "self-contained" composition, lends itself particularly well to a TRC analysis. This stands in contrast to longer monographs or essays that would require far greater effort, thus rendering it too large a task for an individual researcher.

The following paper will present the results of two such analyses exemplifying the utility of TRC investigations, while also shedding light on the different functions of the literature review text type. The results of the exemplary studies relate solely to the relevant texts; a further generalization of the conclusions would thus require further research, which could potentially be guided by the results of this study.

For our exemplary studies, we assume that the determination of theme and rheme depends on the communicative situation. In our case, the review is analyzed in the context of its function as a means of scientific communication. The following investigation corresponds with this type of communicative-linguistic approach.

1. On the review as a text type

According to the Duden Fremdwörterbuch, a review is a "critical discussion of an artistic or scientific composition published in a newspaper, magazine or journal." Sager et al. (1980) define the review as a specialized text:
A review is a report: the event is the reading of the book by the reviewer. It should be informative, evaluative and may also be directive: to the writer of the book, potential readers or publishers. General reviews are often criticized for not being informative: special reviews are differentiated from general in the requirement that they be informative of the book reviewed and, in common with many special texts, that they are more self-consciously written, edited and read […] the review limits itself to the scope of the book reviewed, or embarks upon a wider survey, with the organizational structure of the essay, the technical review, or the special leader (ibid.: 151).

The fundamental basis of the review in scientific journals is the schema "Report – Critique – Evaluate." Scientific journals establish a standard form for the review based on this schema; however, variation from journal to journal is also possible.

Seeing as the review is not only a descriptive work, but also includes evaluative and critical elements, we view this text type also as an argumentative text. The explanation of scientific argumentation of controversial topics in Geier et al. (1977) also applies to the argumentation in reviews discussing a newly published book. The schemata proposed by Geier et al. (1977: 74ff.) outline how something is contested, constrained, or supported, and can therefore also be implemented for the analysis of reviews. Here, the "pragmatic inconsistency of argumentative discourse" (Geier et al. 1977: 77) is brought to the fore:

On the one hand, it is all about the resolution of a contested problem, where the interlocutors are in a medium of universality that should facilitate a cooperative establishment of truth. On the other hand, it is a debate between scientists, where each participant acts and competes as an individual for the purpose of gaining personal advantage over another (ibid.: 77).

It is therefore crucial when analyzing argumentative discourse to consider the fundamental importance of a "very broad situational context" (ibid.: 73), thus allowing an evaluation of the intention of a given text. In the case of reviews, such a situational context can be formulated as follows: Who (paradigm, social standing, etc.) reviews whom (paradigm, social standing, etc.), when (historical vs. current review) and where (journal, column, etc.) and to what end (see outline below). Furthermore, one must consider the target audience of the reviewer (the author of the book, colleagues in a department, devotees of an author, etc.). The differentiation of specific types of reviews depends on the answers to the above questions. If we limit ourselves here to current reviews, the following model may be formulated:
This model should certainly only be considered as provisional and only considers ideal forms. It also does not exclude the existence of hybrid forms. In reality, the different categories are only realized to a certain extent: a review can be about the pursuit of truth and about profiling at the same time; in other words, they are not mutually exclusive. Here again, it is useful to consider the pragmatic inconsistency of argumentative discourse proposed by Geier et al. (1977), the source of which being the societal situation of the scientist:

because he as a scientist is by definition working under official appointment toward the advancement of knowledge, his first priority must be the pursuit of truth. This occurs independently of any particular interests and is based on the idea of true universality [...] on the other hand, he also knows that a truly cooperative pursuit of the truth is simultaneously a hindrance to his own career. The less his colleagues achieve, the more his own achievements are brought to the fore. The will toward the truth is formed through social particularities (ibid.: 78; emphasis added).

The aforementioned model could be expanded by including further elements. Regarding the target audience of the viewer, there could be multiple target groups that need to be considered, which the reviewer addresses with different intentions.

Another interesting aspect of the analysis of reviews that should be addressed is its embedment in culture: do the reviewer and the author come from the same cultural community? Clyne (1981) shows in this context – using the example of Schütze’s *Sprache Soziologisch Gesehen* and Dittmar’s *Soziolinguistik* – how different the structure of books is in cultural communities that are not so far apart from each other (such as those of Central Europe and Anglo-America):

The English translation of Norbert Dittmar’s book, *Soziolinguistik*, a landmark in the development of sociolinguistics in West Germany, was described by Bills (1979) as ‘chaotic’ and criticized for its ‘lack of focus and cohesiveness’, ‘haphazardness of presentation’, and ‘desultory organization’. None of the four reviews of the original written by scholars from Central European universities [...] make any criticism of this kind (Clyne 1981: 64).
Furthermore, it can be assumed that the style and structure of reviews themselves are dependent on cultural norms – that, for example, certain ideals of our model are represented differently in contrasting cultures. Drawing on Galtung's (1979) hypotheses on the different intellectual styles and manners of scientific debate, it appears that the "destructive review" most aptly reflects the Teutonic cultures, the "favorable review" Gallic cultures, and the "pursuit of truth" type Anglo-Saxon cultures. However, such hasty generalizations are perhaps a bit out of place and can also be called into question; Galtung's models appear much more problematic when one considers the ever-increasing globalization and internationalization of the paradigms of science.¹

The above-mentioned aspects of the review sufficiently address the complexity and range of expression of this text type. The following discussion cannot possibly expound on all of the mentioned elements; likewise, examples for all of the introduced ideal forms cannot be provided. The purpose of the empirical part of our article is limited to exemplary analyses of a considerably standardized and non-standardized review, with the working hypothesis that they will differ in their TRC.

2. Results of the exemplary study

We take our first review from the Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie (The Cologne Journal of Sociology and Social Psychology).² Here we are presented with a typical review for this journal, with the "pursuit of truth" as its focus: the reader encounters a text that objectively informs without a polemic, yet also offers critique of new published materials in the relevant fields.³ One can therefore hypothesize that the central theme of this type of review is the book itself, whose various features (problem statement, structure, inadequacies, usefulness, etc.) are discussed in the framework of the field. The thematic progression should therefore be continuous.

The TRC of our first example offers exactly such a picture (see figure 2 on the following page): the main topic is "Beckmans Beitrag 'Theorie der sozialen Bewegung'', in which 4 elements are developed:

¹ A critique of Galtung (1979) from a linguistic perspective is still absent.
² The relevant text is a review of Michael Beckmann's "Theorie der sozialen Bewegung" written by Clausjohann Lindner, München 1979.
³ This of course does not exclude the "pragmatic inconsistency", but rather implies it: Under the pretext of the pursuit of truth, and with an objective tone, the reviewer is also naturally profiling himself.
1. a problem element (questions addressed in the work)

2. a structure element (structure of the work, primary content)

3. a critique element (deficiencies, weaknesses, etc.)

4. an evaluative element (appraisal and evaluation)

The TRC shows that we are dealing with a coherent text, despite being only minimally pronominalized and paraphrased, but rather more repeated (e.g. central termini). Thematic breaks or jumps are not apparent: When viewing the text as a whole, each individual sentence logically follows its predecessor; likewise, the reviewer has arranged the paragraph structure into three parts to express the following intersentential modes of communication: reporting – critique – evaluation.
Figure 2: Theme-Rheme structure of a review in *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie.*
In our second example, Jürgen Habermas reviews the book written by Sloterdijk *Kritik der zynischen Vernunft* (‘Critique of Cynical Reason’). A very brief glance at this review reveals that this text is not at all standardized, and can only with great difficulty be organized within a model. An analysis of the extra-linguistic and pragmatic background suggests that the primary purpose of the text is the profiling of the reviewer. The following facts support this suggestion: Sloterdijk's book is one of only a few philosophy best sellers of the last century. Sloterdijk is difficult to categorize within a paradigm, but can loosely be connected to Nietzsche, Heidegger and "Spontis" (member of a political activist movement in the 1970s and 80s in West Germany propagating „being spontaneous”). The latter, influenced by the *Frankfurter Schule* – whose leading representative is Jürgen Habermas – attempts to address the reviewer and argumentatively introduce his own positions. This is supported by the fact that this review was first published in the journal "*Pflasterstrand*", one of the most well-known organs of the "Spontis". The text also contains numerous presuppositions that can only be grasped by participants or experts within this particular milieu. Through this review of Sloterdijk's book, Habermas attempts to claim the "Spontis" for himself; he offers thus less of a discussion of the book (a certain amount of knowledge from the reader about the content of the book is assumed), and more of an addendum. The reviewer praises, criticizes and appropriates the book, but also shows how the set of problems can be solved.

Using a TRC of Habermas' review (see figure 3 on the following page), we can reconstruct the thematic structure of the text containing the above-mentioned intentions of the writer. The central theme of this review is not Sloterdijk's book, but rather "cynicism" as a philosophical topic. Thus, “cynicism” represents a hypertheme, under which Sloterdijk’s book is just one

---

4 First published in: "*Pflasterstrand*", Frankfurt am Main, June 4-17, 1983.  
5 The specific details behind the concept "Spontis" will not be further discussed as it is far beyond the scope of this article.  
6 In determining the theme and rheme in this case, we did not limit ourselves to sentence boundaries: on the one hand, not all sentences could readily be attributed to a given theme because they were purely rhematic; on the other hand, some complex sentences occasionally contained multiple themes and rhemes. We interpret the title of Habermas' review *Zwischen Heine und Heidegger. Ein Renegat der Subjektphilosophie?* as rhematic, though the interrogative suggests a certain thematization of the whole text: the review shall determine whether Sloterdijk is a renegade of subjective philosophy. However, if one views the text not only as a means of communication, but also as a result of communication, it is apparent that – from the perspective of Habermas' intentions – one could replace the question with an exclamation mark.
strand. Altogether, we can identify the following elements or subtopics that are rhematized to a greater or lesser extent:

1. an element of the relevant book;
2. a Sloterdijk element (background information about Sloterdijk, both positive and critical);
3. a cynicism element (explanation, consciousness, truth etc.);
4. a kynicism element (concept, kynical methods, etc.);
5. an element about the idea of scoffing critique (Diogenes); and finally
6. a Habermas element (critique, statement of the problem, Habermas' position, etc.).

In addition to these elements, a rhematic prelude and epilogue can be identified, which in this case are unconnected to a theme. The text's coherence is based on the communicative situation. In general, the coherence of this text stems primarily from the content, previous knowledge of the reader, the resolution of presuppositions, etc. The logical structure of the text can thus only be ascertained in the context of a mutual discussion (reader and writer). Hence, a TRC cannot be constructed using linguistic tools alone: a communicative-linguistic analysis of the text is a prerequisite for TRC.

However, the incorporation of communicative-linguistic analyses in identifying the theme can occasionally prove problematic. These problems, in connection with our exemplary studies, are supported by von Polenz (1985):

Sentence semantically multilayered texts are not to be structured one-dimensionally following the KNOWN-NEW sequence. This is also true for scientific texts in case the ongoing argumentation is consistently overburdened with secondary information, cross references, relativizations, preventive safeguarding, exemplifications, explanations etc. (ibid.: 296).

A cursory look at Habermas' text leaves little doubt that this is the case with his review. We therefore decline to make further interpretations here about the TRC of Habermas' texts, and conclude that the paragraph structure in this text is not always compatible with TRC.
Figure 3: Theme-Rheme structure for Habermas' review.
3. Conclusion

The completed investigations show how the thematic structure of texts can be reconstructed using TRC. Furthermore, these examples demonstrate that the TRC is not just dependent upon the text type, but that it also stems from the function of the text: heavily standardized reviews appear to favor a continuous progression, while "profiling reviews" appear to be implemented using a thematic progression with a hypertheme.

The persisting uncertainty in determining the theme and rheme in a TRC analysis – and the substantial effort in carrying one out – call to question the ultimate utility of this principle for interpreting texts. Investigations focusing on longer cohesive texts could eschew the evaluation of theme and rheme at the sentential level, thus focusing on larger units, for example the paragraph or chapter. In this case especially, the goal is to go beyond the realm of content so that the text can be understood as a whole, and within its function as a product of communication.

Notes

** The present study is a revised and shortened version of an as yet unpublished article written in 1986/87 as part of a project on the cultural comparison of scientific texts. For further results and a background on the project, see the following edited volumes:
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Pragmatic approaches to languages in contrast: Expansion or recycling?


1. General overview
In their series *Benjamins Current Topics*, John Benjamins publishers re-edit special issues of John Benjamins published journals. *Contrastive Pragmatics* is such a re-edition of the *Languages in Contrast* special issue 9.1 (2009) and contains contributions originally presented as a panel at the 10th IPrA conference in Gothenburg, Sweden, in 2007. The individual contributions are all quite valuable, although a number of objections can be made regarding the scope of research and the lack of updated information for the book publication that remain problematic (see point 3 below).

2. Individual contributions
The introduction explains the origin of the special issue from a conference panel of 2007, gives an overview over the volume and introduces the individual chapters. The description of the scope of the volume appears a tad overgenerous, the “strong focus […] on regional (especially dialectal) variation (‘variational pragmatics’ […]” promised in the introduction (1), for example is really nowhere to be seen in the volume, and it turns out that the index entry ‘variational pragmatics’ only refers to the introduction and that the most important recent book on variational pragmatics (Schneider and Barron 2008) is only referred to once in the volume, again in the list of references to its introduction.

2.1. Modality and ENGAGEMENT in British and German political interviews
Based on Martin and White’s systemic linguistics-oriented appraisal framework (Martin and White 2005), Annette Becker studies intersubjective positioning of British and German political journalists in election-night interviews with politicians. The results of her detailed analysis show that in spite of the large diversity of linguistic resources the interviewers use, at least in this specific genre the dimensions of pragmatic differences between British English and German as observed by House (1996), can be detected.

2.2. The intersubjective function of modal adverbs
In her short chapter, Agnès Celle compares French and English evidential or identificative modal adverbs such as *évidemment / obviously* and *apparemment / apparently* in the French and English editions of *Le Monde Diplomatique*. She concludes convincingly that while those adverbs establish a pragmatic relation in both languages, they modify assertion in different
ways in each language. French identificatives imply an (unspecified) viewpoint other than the speaker’s and at the same time signal that the speaker distances themselves somewhat from that viewpoint. This latter characteristic is not shared by English identificatives; apart from that, in contrast to French identificatives, they suggest the addressee’s viewpoint as a basis. Modal adverbs also function within a language specific macro-organisation of discourse, with tense cooperating in the pragmatic function of modal adverbs in very different ways in both languages.

2.3. Intersubjective positioning in French and English
Bart Defrancq and Bernard De Clerck show in their chapter that English to depend as well as French dépendre, and in particular the forms it depends, respectively ça dépend, are undergoing a grammaticalisation toward pragmatic markers of intersubjective positioning. The corpus-based analysis is sound and the arguments are stringent. Unfortunately, the diachronic statement “French ‘dépendre’ seems to be slightly more advanced on the path to discourse marker status” (p. 68) is not convincingly supported by any diachronic data. Also, though the French corpus the authors use is the specifically Belgian French one collected in the “Valibel” research centre at the University of Louvain, no attempt at discussing possible diatopic variation within French is made. The chapter closes with a bit of a cliffhanger, the authors stating that further research would be needed, amongst others into equivalent verbs in other languages such as Dutch. It would have been nice if there were a reference to a publication co-authored by one of the chapter authors that does just that (Defrancq and De Sutter 2010). But there isn’t one.

2.4. Challenges in contrast
Using a function-to-form approach, Anita Fetzer analyses discursive challenges in British and German political interviews after a discussion of the pragmatic function of challenge and its linguistic forms in British English and German. In both languages, interlocutors within the genre prefer challenging the context of another interlocutor’s contribution rather than challenging its force or presuppositions, although the British corpus shows more variation in this respect. The face threatening potential of challenges is mitigated by a high frequency of cognitive verbs and more formulaic language in the British corpus, while the German data show higher frequencies of both indirectly formulated challenges and elliptical structures.

2.5. Interruption in advanced learner French
In what the author herself refers to as an “exploratory study” in the abstract (p. 97), Marie-Noëlle Guillot attempts a quantitative study of interruptions in English and French by L1 and
advanced L2 speakers of both languages. Guillot bases her qualitative categories of interruptions on Julia Goldberg’s (1990) type of schemes for interruptions. Of course, Goldberg, as well as most of the theoretical literature the author builds her study on, developed her model with Anglo-Saxon culture and English language as the default. Guillot’s references to English-French contrastive studies are restricted to two authors, neither of whom is Bert Peeters, whose seminal study of 2000 would have been an important point of reference for theory, and one of whom is only referred to with a 1993 article instead of her recent book (Béal 2010) which would have been very close to the topic. Consequently, the study lacks a convincing theoretical foundation and while the conclusions are interesting, the data, particularly in conjunction with the somewhat Anglocentric scheme used to categorise interruptions do not, in my opinion, fully support the interpretation given in the conclusions, that there is a
tendency for L2 French subjects to orient to non-affiliative interruptive acts as acts of competition and conflict, as is stereotypically associated with native French, whereas L1 French subjects tend to orient to them as acts of cooperation in the build-up of argument (p. 117).

2.6. Closeness and distance
The first of two diachronic studies concluding the volume is Martin Luginbühl’s chapter on the development of the TV news genre on Swiss German public TV as compared with the US news program CBS Evening News from 1968 to 2005. It sits a bit uneasily within the scope of the other chapters, its methodology and background being closer to media studies than to linguistic pragmatics. The study is interesting in its demonstration of how the Swiss program changed its format over time to become more similar to the American news program format, without ever entirely giving up its “Swiss” character. The chapter could have been quite relevant for contrastive pragmatics (even for cross-varietal pragmatics across the German speaking area, if German and Austrian TV news programs had been included).
Unfortunately, the basic concepts of closeness and distance taken from media theory (p. 126) do not become linguistic concepts just by referring to linguistic texts that use the same terms (p. 137), since of course there is a whole different terminological history of those terms in linguistics. Another unfortunate use of terminology is the insistence on using the rather literal translation “text type” for what has become known as Textsorte/Texttyp in the German tradition of text linguistics, but what in the English tradition is much better known under the term of ‘genre’. Thus, the index points to genre and text type under two separate entries, which somewhat defeats its purpose of linking similar topics in different chapters.
2.7. The nominative and infinitive in English and Dutch

The last chapter is a thorough and convincing diachronic study of a structure that many European languages took over from Latin, the “nominative and infinitive” (NCI, nominativus cum infinitivo). Thinking outside the box of the traditional discussion of the NCI as a mere passive alternative, Dirk Noël and Timothy Colleman distinguish three types of the NCI (a passive, a descriptive and an evidential NCI) and discuss the development of those types in both English and Dutch from the 17th to the 20th century. In both languages, NCI patterns appear to have reached the peak of their relative frequency in the 18th century. However, while Dutch NCI constructions show a sharp decline after that peak period, a similar decline of English NCI constructions after the 18th century only occurred in fictional literature, while such structures properly came into their own as evidential NCIs in English academic and journalistic texts from then on. I probably enjoyed reading this very well researched and argued chapter with its comparative as well as diachronic dimensions most of all chapters in the book. The enjoyment could only have been any greater if the authors had not apparently neglected to update the reference list from their 2007 conference paper, as shown by a journal article published in 2007 which is still marked “to appear” in their list of references (p. 177).

3. Conclusion and points of criticism

The individual contributions in this volume are intellectually stimulating and interesting. However, in spite of the rather general volume title Contrastive Pragmatics, they represent a quite narrow choice of only four Western European languages, contrasted in pairs in each chapter (and of whom furthermore Dutch is only studied in one of the chapters), a restricted field of pragmatics (e.g., ignoring important and cross-linguistically varied micro-pragmatic phenomena such as address), and, what is most disturbing for a 2011 publication, the state of research in contrastive pragmatics of ca. 2007, only here and there updated for the 2009 publication of the Languages in Contrast special issue. For the 2011 volume, all that appears to have been further updated are the individual authors’ post-2009 publications in the references sections of their respective chapters. Even references to such publications in the text or in endnotes have been left without a matching update (e.g. on pp. 35, 60 and 135). The authors also neglected to correct obvious errors such as mistyped titles in reference lists (e.g. p. 95), mix-ups in references to examples (e.g. p. 42) and some idiosyncratic non-native English (such as the often rather German commas and hyphenation in Fetzer’s chapter and the similarly quite German syntax in Luginbühl’s).

While it is easy to see the benefit of recycling a hardly updated version of the 2009 special issue of Languages in Contrast for the publisher, the editor and the contributors, I am not
entirely sure that the benefit of this particular form of recycling for the reading public is immediately apparent. After all, the special issue mentioned continues to be available both in print and electronic forms.
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Advances in interaction-based prosody research


*Prosody in Interaction* stems from the 2008 conference *Prosody and Interaction* in Potsdam and is a festschrift to Elisabeth Couper-Kuhlen, who spearheaded the study of prosody in naturally occurring interaction. The volume is presented in three parts plus an extensive introduction. It has a refreshing format of main paper + response for most chapters. Many chapters include supplementary audio and/or video, which further aids readers in forming their own opinions of the analyses. As a conversation analyst who is interested in prosody, I found it quite useful and accessible.

Whilst Elisabeth Couper-Kuhlen has undoubtedly made significant contributions to the study of prosody, the preface and foreword frame her work as foundational to prosody research in general. Margret Selting’s introduction offers a more well-rounded view of prosody research (whilst remaining focused largely on post-Couper-Kuhlen research) and is extremely interesting. Although the focus is understandably on prosody *in interaction*, a stronger historical account of previous work that involved prosody in various ways that have informed the field would be useful to non-prosodic researchers (e.g., from psychology and linguistics: Bing 1980 and Duncan 1972; work on aphasia: Danly and Shapiro 1972 and Weintraub, Mesulam, and Kramer 1981; in particular languages: Vaissière 1975 and Halle and Keyser 1966; and in poetry: Shapiro and Beum 1965). These criticisms aside, Selting clearly defines how prosody is conceived in the volume through a “West European research tradition” (p. 4). She describes prosody as *always* co-occurring with grammar and lexis, ignoring non-lexical vocalisations (e.g., Wiggins 2002) but later addressing them as a research area (p. 23).

Selting raises the relationship between prosody and syntax of a *turn constructional unit* (TCU) with respect to transition between speakers (p. 9). This is a very important and interesting issue where input from researchers with prosodic expertise is very valuable. Unfortunately for readers unfamiliar with Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974), the inevitably brief treatment of how transitions are organised (Section 2.3) could be misleading, especially because of references to “turn yielding” and “turn holding” which are central to Duncan’s account of turn-taking (Duncan 1972) rather than Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson’s (1974) model. German speakers may also find the extracts confusing in relation to the text. For example, extracts that are given as multi-unit turns (and would be in English) are not multi-unit in German due to final position verbs (p. 8). These criticisms aside, section 2.4
contains a particularly compelling account of action formation grounded in the practical concerns of participants. Section 3.1 contains a concise and informative history of technological advancements in prosody research, and Selting gives a fair assessment of her own transcription systems.

Selting provides convincing arguments why other research traditions ought to be concerned with prosody in natural conversation and how different approaches have accomplished different goals. Arnulf Deppermann responds with an argument for large public corpora and technology as important moves forward.

Part I deals with linguistic organisation (including prosody) in social interaction. Gareth Walker (pp. 51-72) provides a thorough account of prosodic and phonetic features of rush-throughs. His analysis is accessible to a wide audience and includes clear figures and explanations whilst also addressing potential criticism. Whilst Susanne Günthner’s critique (pp. 73-79) appears unnecessarily harsh, she adds greater depth to some of the issues that Walker mentions.

Whilst Walker explores the prosodic features that occur in a particular structural position, Richard Ogden (pp. 81-102) goes on to demonstrate the potential of comparing prosodic features across positions and categories and describes how initial complaints and summing up differ. It is an ambitious paper, and future research in this area could include summing up of complaints versus summing up other topics. Auli Hakulinen (pp. 105-108) provides a substantive and thought-provoking critique, citing the need to clearly define phenomena using recurrent features that are available to interactants. She discusses how this approach applies to how complaints are oriented to as such by participants and expands on the construction of complaints as actions, alluded to by Ogden, working from a largely conversation analytic (CA) framework.

Continuing from a CA framework, Geoffrey Raymond (pp. 109-130) offers a beautifully woven analysis incorporating classical and current CA research that would be intelligible to people who are new to CA or yes/no interrogative (YNI) research yet has analytic depth relevant to specialists. The breadth of related phenomena and availability of supplementary data contribute substantially to his explication of prosody’s role in responses to YNIs.

John Local et al. (pp. 131-159) describe the position and prosody of reissued turns with a focus on structural considerations. Although their reasons for classifying such turns as retrieving, redoing, and resuscitating are unclear, they make a strong case that there are
prosodic differences between reissues in these positions. Greater depth of analysis of what these prosodic differences accomplish would be welcome.

Harrie Mazeland and Leendert Plug (pp. 161-188) return to the approach of examining the prosodic features of a very particular practice. They discuss sequential and prosodic characteristics of the Dutch particle *hoor*. Although their analysis could be improved by clearly justifying their terminology (e.g., *marked* and *un-marked* with seemingly conflicting data) and comparing a wider range of responses and actions, this chapter offers an engaging account of *hoor* that is very accessible to non-Dutch speakers.

Part II moves from the prosodic properties of organisational structures to prosody as a structuring device itself. Beatrice Szczepok Reed (pp. 191-212) begins Part II by questioning whether intonation phrases exist in natural conversation. Most research on intonation phrases has used elicited speech, so this is a very relevant external validity issue. Engagement with Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974) would have enhanced the chapter greatly, as many of the points and criticisms she makes are addressed in this and related papers. For example, it is thus not surprising that people design their turns so that pauses fall mid-TCU, as silence at the end of a TCU would create a gap between speakers. It is unclear how the new terminology she suggests is an advance in our understanding of turn design. Rather, I think the important message is that whilst pauses separate smaller *chunks* of speech within TCUs, the prosodies of these chunks do not follow intonation phrase patterns as described in classical elicited-speech and oratory research. Jan Anward (pp. 213-216) challenges Reed’s analysis that a participant’s chunks within her turn are a trouble source. He analyses the trouble source as the peculiarity of the participant’s desire and notes that the chunks are syntactically impeccable immediately before one repair initiation. He goes on to suggest further research areas around *chunking*.

Prosody in stylistic delivery is then explored by Friederike Kern (pp. 217-238). She draws on a large body of research on sport commentaries and provides a thorough prosodic analysis of German radio football commentary. Johannes Wagner (pp. 239-242) engages well with Kern’s analysis, drawing on differences between football and other commentaries. He proposes that although commentators have similar resources available, they are used to accomplish different styles.

Looking at a very different setting, Bill Wells (pp. 243-262) delivers an important and thought-provoking analysis of child-parent interactions and the role of prosody in interpreting very young children’s speech. He aims to explore tonal repetition/contrast but focuses on lexical
repeats of the adult’s turns. Greater attention to the sequential environment could improve what currently appears a rather superficial assignment of turns as tonal repetition and contrast based on phonetics rather than tone. Wells shows that although very young children do not use adult prosodies, their prosodies are neither random nor meaningless. Picking up on the issue of lexical repeats, Traci Walker (pp. 263-266) expands on the adequacy of the child’s phonoetically imperfect turns based on tonal repetition.

Although not escaping entirely from structural considerations, Part III aims to address prosody as a semiotic resource. Elisabeth Gülich and Katrin Lindemann (pp. 269-294) begin this part by offering a single case analysis involving a woman with epilepsy in the context of a research interview. Their work adds to a growing literature on how fear and panic are expressed in German without naming emotions. Elisabeth Reber (pp. 295-302) addresses how the constructions of fear are interactionally managed rather than unilateral phenomena.

Hiroko Tanaka (pp. 303-332), looking at a particular recurrent practice, focuses on one Japanese non-lexical response token, *huun* (pronounced approximately ‘hmm’). She shows how *huun* in Japanese conversation is used to do a variety of tasks. Perhaps most interesting to an English speaker is how *huun*, even with “affective loading”, promotes topic closure rather than expansion. It would be very interesting to see a cross-cultural study on similar vocalisations. Dagmar Barth-Weingarten (pp. 333-338) follows with a discussion of the technical aspects of visual and prosodic resources that Tanaka mentions and how these can aid in research on lexical and non-lexical items.

Also exploring a non-lexical resource, Cecilia E. Ford and Barbara A. Fox (pp. 339-368) take a multimodal approach to the construction and recognition of *laughables*, which they show is necessary for understanding co-present laughables. Whilst I take issue with the term *laughable* (its denotation is that something merits derision), I can appreciate that it is a widely used term. On the other hand, they define laughter colloquially, thus avoiding elitism and distance from participant orientations. They also provide a detailed account of non-vocal practices involved in (some) constructions of humorous utterances and their responses.

One briefly mentioned issue is that of (h) being used in transcripts when an utterance is not in fact plosive. This may necessitate a return to Gail Jefferson’s transcription of breath quality during utterances (e.g., Jefferson, 2004), as she distinguishes between breathy (as in h) and plosive (as in (h)) speech among others. New transcription symbols may become necessary to capture the nuances of laughter. Karin Birkner (pp. 369-372) critiques the attempt to address such broad phenomena as speech-laugh or “possibly laugh relevant sounds”
(Jefferson 2010). She clarifies that what is being studied is the sharing of amusement. However, some aspects of her critique seem unwarranted, such as “a laughable is a holistic phenomenon which is difficult to reconstruct by reading the transcripts without listening to the excerpt.” Precisely because transcription of laughter is imprecise, one would expect the supplementary videos that have been provided.

Using a detailed single case analysis approach, Charles Goodwin (pp. 373-394) demonstrates the prosodic resources used by a man with aphasia, Chil, during an interaction with his family. Chil has a three word vocabulary and uses a range of gestures and prosodies to convey rich meaning using these three words and non-lexical vocalisations. Video extracts and drawings within transcripts bring the interaction to life along with a clear and engaging writing style. Helga Kotthoff (pp. 395-400) takes implications of Goodwin’s analysis to children and second language learners. Whilst she makes some valid points, it is a leap from a man who has lost his ability to communicate with people who had previously been able to understand him to these populations. Any pedagogy relevant to Goodwin's data is Chil’s family learning to understand, not teaching Chil to speak competently. Nevertheless, issues of understanding and finding ways to communicate unknown words exist across these populations.

Overall, Prosody in Interaction is a collection of work falling broadly under the heading of prosody research. Some are very high-level prosodic analyses and others are more traditionally conversation analytic. Despite the precipitating conference being “international” (xv), all authors list their affiliations in Western Europe or the US. No work on tonal languages is included, and most are Germanic with much of the transcription in GAT or GAT2 and no transcription key provided. A more global orientation would be appreciated and useful. As a festschrift, however, the volume represents a lively and constructive debate amongst friends. The variety of topics and styles makes it accessible to a wide range of people of different interests and career stages, but it is not necessarily comprehensive. The inclusion of responses to most of the papers lends a nice touch for both the student and the experienced researcher.
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Focal or subsidiary? Managing gender categories in analysis


For readers who are interested in a conversation analysis (CA) approach to gender, this edited volume is something of a must-read, as it brings together a group of scholars from across disciplinary backgrounds who work at the intersection of gender and interaction, and whose contributions to the volume encapsulate the latest development in the understanding of gender as a situated, ongoing, and routine accomplishment. While the topics and the data sources of the chapters vary, all contributors share a broadly social constructionist perspective that treats gender as members’ local practices ascribed, negotiated, constructed, resisted, and enacted in interaction (see Speer 2005 for an argument on how ethnomethodology and CA are compatible with a social constructionist agenda). Both editors are noted for their prolific, cutting-edge research on gender and conversation. Their introduction to the volume offers a useful critical overview of the field and raises issues and concerns for future research. Thirteen empirically grounded chapters that follow exemplify the deployment of CA to illustrate how gender is invoked by participants as a resource to perform various actions in conversation.

Within a CA approach to gender, an important locus of investigation in recent years has been person reference and gender category. Such a trend is well reflected in the collection. Jackson, for example, examines in her chapter the pronoun *I*, which, due to the paucity of categorical information it can convey about the referent, is referred to by Schegloff (1996: 440) as “reference simpliciter” – that is, *I* does not reveal any information about the race, gender, age, and occupation of the speaker; it is simply a term of self-reference. Jackson’s analysis, however, shows just the contrary: she demonstrates that in interactional contexts where gender has already constituted the backdrop of talk, the pronoun *I* can be read as gendered.

Other contributors also give analytic attention to person reference or gender category or both, albeit from different angles and with a varying degree of emphasis: Klein on non-recognitional person reference; Land and Kitzinger on first person self-categorization; Stokoe on the repairs of gender categories; Cromdal on gender categorization as a site of stereotype (re)production; Goodwin on children’s mobilization of person reference and gender categories in conflict; and Garcia and Fisher on the construction of gender inequality in divorce mediation sessions. Space constraint does not permit a thorough overview of each
study. What I would like to highlight here is the chapter by Garcia and Fisher because of the methodological stance that it adopts.

When discussing their analytic approach, Garcia and Fisher state that their analysis is “a combination of a conversation analytic perspective with an interpretive analysis of the interaction based on shared cultural knowledge” (p. 275), thus acknowledging that it is legitimate for CA analysts to bring their interpretive resources to bear on the analytic process. Their explicit methodological statement turns on the longstanding question of what counts as an orientation to gender, a question that has been at the center of the debates between sequential CA and membership categorization analysis (MCA) (see, for example, Stokoe and Smithson 2001, for a discussion of what counts as an orientation to gender from a feminist CA and MCA perspective).

For MCA researchers, an important analytic task is to unpack the “inference-rich” (Sacks 1992: 40) properties of categories in interaction. To do so, analysts would have to mobilize the known-in-common cultural knowledge, or knowledge that they share with participants by virtue of being co-members of a culture, to make sense of the meanings and actions of categories in interaction. In other words, to render a meaningful and subtle analysis of categories in action, analysts would have to draw on a stock of cultural knowledge that is unspoken and unspecified by participants but is nevertheless stored in categories (Stokoe 2012). In one way or another, most of the aforementioned chapters on person reference and gender category rely on the analytic procedures of both sequential CA and MCA. However, if researchers bring cultural knowledge that is unspoken and unspecified by participants to bear on the analysis, they will run the risk of not grounding the analysis on participants’ orientation (see Schegloff 2009: 362-73 for a critique on an etic or data-external perspective on data analysis).

It is exactly on this ground that Schegloff (2007) criticizes MCA for being “promiscuous” in its analytic orientation. The debates are likely to continue. While it is important to heed the criticisms and injunctions of sequential CA and to strive for grounded analysis, it is unproductive to get mired in the debates and let the terms of the debates define MCA’s research methodology and agenda. To forge ahead, MCA researchers need to systematically formulate and continually refine their own research program (for an important move in this direction, see Stokoe 2012).

As all contributors to the volume adopt CA as their analytic framework, they share a common ground in treating gender as a social action. For analysts, therefore, an important question to
ask is “if gender is relevant here, then what does it do in relation to what the participants wish to accomplish in the interaction?” This means that analysts should not be driven by an unwarranted priority on gender at the expense of the interaction as a whole. Analysis of gender, or any other category for that matter, should take into consideration the overall interactional goals of participants (Schegloff 2007). When such an analytic stance is taken, analysts may find that even when gender is made relevant, it may not be always pushed to the forefront, but may remain a peripheral concern, subservient to certain focal interactional goals (see Kitzinger 2007 for how the category “woman” is not always gender relevant and can be used to achieve gender or non-gender relevant social actions within a single episode of interaction). Indeed, a few chapters in the volume illustrate just this point. In Speer’s chapter, for example, participants embed their (gendered) reported third party compliments within some other more focal actions; in Wilkinson, although gender is evident in the helpline call taker’s turn designs, the designs are first and foremost motivated to provide relevant information to callers; and in Beach and Glenn, sexualized and gendered talk is deployed to pursue intimacy and affiliation. The challenge for future researchers, as the editors note in their introduction, is to demonstrate “that and how gender is a focal or subsidiary aspect of these broader social actions” (p. 26).

Another important theme that emerges from the collection is an empirical reengagement with, and a respecification of, some gender and language models from a CA perspective. Sidnell, for example, revisits the model of gender difference proposed by Maltz and Borker (1982). He focuses his analysis on a single turn-at-talk – *D’you understand that honey?* – directed to a wife by her husband in the course of dirty joke sharing among a group of adults at a backyard barbecue. Based on a meticulous and insightful analysis of the embodied conduct of the participants and their participation framework, Sidnell argues that gender is made relevant by the utterance, and that the participants are divided into two membership groups along the gender lines on the grounds of whether or not they display an understanding of the joke. He suggests that gender difference is something invoked by the participants and is of their local concern. In this sense, what Sidnell does is not so much endorse the model of gender difference, but respecify it from a CA perspective. While gender difference researchers typically assume the a priori existence of “men” and “women” and use separate gender subcultures to explain the differences in their speech styles, Sidnell uses CA to demonstrate that participants constitute themselves as men and women, and as different subcultural species in talk.

To some extent, the data from Cromdal’s chapter also speak to the theme of gender difference. Cromdal shows that boys and girls participating in play attribute gender
stereotypes to members of the opposite sex. In so doing, they draw a gender line and submit themselves to a view of gender bifurcation. Like Sidnell, Cromdal illustrates with CA’s bottom-up approach that gender difference is members’ local management and accomplishment, and therefore it is a research topic rather than an explanatory resource.

In a similar vein, Hepburn and Potter rectify the “deficit” model of language and gender through an investigation of the function of tag questions used by women in interaction. Their analytic focus is on “the operation of one practice through which tag questions are systematically exploited to press subtly and rather indirectly for a course of action that has already been resisted” (p. 135). In contradistinction to the “deficit” model’s claim that the use of tag questions is an indication of women’s being powerless and ineffective, Hepburn and Potter show that tag questions can be used to do “coercive” and “invasive” interactional work.

If the chapters by Sidnell and Hepburn and Potter put a new theoretical and empirical spin on the “difference” and “deficit” views of language and gender, then the contribution by Butler and Weatherall adds an interactional dimension to Garfinkel’s (1967) ethnomethodological account of gender as a mundane, collaborative accomplishment. Their study examines how a six-year-old boy, William, is ascribed a fictional female identity called Charlotte in the course of school group work, and how this cross-gender identity becomes a site of negotiation and contestation.

It has been more than a decade since the well-known debate between the adherents of CA and those of what can be broadly termed as discourse analysis (e.g., Billig 1998; Schegloff 1997; Wetherell 1998). Although the debate was not about gender per se, it is partially responsible for initiating a flurry of CA research studies on language and gender. What this body of research has in common is to heed Schegloff’s criticisms and injunctions by engaging seriously with data and by privileging “technical” analysis over “ideological” bias. This volume represents an important continuation of the undertaking. However, Schegloff (1997) also points out that a technical analysis does not preclude political considerations, and that there is nothing inherent in CA that prevents researchers’ political engagements. CA researchers can explore what their technical analysis allows them to say about politics. Readers will find that with perhaps only one or two exceptions, contributors to the volume seem to choose to stay within the “safety zone” of technical analysis. Even Land and Kitzinger, two contributors who have published politically informed CA work elsewhere (e.g., Land and Kitzinger 2005), acknowledge that their chapter is not “inherently ‘political’” (p. 63). For CA researchers who are politically engaged, the challenge then is how to combine CA analysis with warranted political considerations.
Overall, the volume greatly enriches our understanding of gender and conversation at both theoretical and methodological levels. Most importantly, it illustrates how CA can be fruitfully exploited to address gender in and for interaction. The editors should be commended for assembling a remarkable collection that represents a comprehensive and up-to-date treatment of the subject.

References


**Houxiang Li**

Houxiang Li is interested in conversation analysis and language ideology. He is working toward completing his dissertation on how ESL students co-construct syntax and lexis in small group discussion.

Houxiang Li: Review on *Conversation and Gender*. 2011. In PRAGMATICS.REVIEWS 2013.1.1
Language and the world: Some perspectives on impact linguistics


1. *Introduction*

Alwin Frank Fill is the author of both standard reference works, such as *Ökolinguistik. Eine Einführung* (1993), and a number of studies, e.g. *Language, Signs and Nature* (2008). He also coedited volumes such as *Colourful Green Ideas* (2002) and *Sustaining Language* (2007).

In the monograph under review, Fill shifts his focus to what he calls *Impact Linguistics* (1). He uses this term to cover various branches of linguistics, dealing with the manifold effects of language upon the world. With regard to the target audience of undergraduate students of English linguistics, this monograph stands in line with Fill’s introductory works, but offers a variety of topics related to a much wider spectrum of linguistic disciplines.

One of Fill’s aims is to show “in what way and to what extent language [...] has left its imprint on this earth” (p. 2). As vague as this objective may appear, so is his understanding of *impact* “as the force exerted by a new idea, concept, technology, or ideology” (p. 1; the same wording recurs in App. I, 227 and is quoted from *Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary* 1996). Following further elaborations, one gains a better understanding of Fill’s application of this term’s concept and learns that *impact* is closely related to the uses, functions and effects of language.

Fill’s second aim is to present an overview of the most prominent and relevant philosophic and (socio)linguistic thinkers on the topic of language impact (p. 2). Finally, it is his highly personal and idealistic endeavour to make “students of language avoid the fallacy of blaming on language all the problems of the world (conflicts of various kinds, war, racism, unequal treatment of the genders, environmental problems, etc.)” (p. 201) that Fill is seeking to pursue with his work.

2. *A brief summary of contents*

As the title of his book reveals, Fill divides 21 chapters into three major sections in which he presents the impact of language upon the world by putting language as a “construing force” (p. 110) into different frames. The main arguments and Fill’s technique of approach shall be presented selectively and discussed in the following.
2.1 “The Impact of Speech on a Planet” (pp. 5-36)
In part I, bearing the striking subtitle A ‘Meteorite’ Hits the Earth, Fill covers the diachronic
evolvement of language as well as of linguistics from 2.5 million years ago to the onset of the Linguistic Turn, thereby providing a brief overview on the phylogenetic factors, starting
with the causes and effects of potential origins of the human language (e.g. gossip hypothesis by Power 1998). Then he goes on to present the most prominent functional
models of language (Bühler 1934; Jakobson 1960; Halliday 1973) from „the impact point of
view“, i.e. the effect of language on the world in terms of how the use of it changes people’s
views and influences or even directs their actions.

Lastly for part I, Fill provides his readers with a recapitulation of 2500 years of linguistic
historiography condensed into three pages (pp. 30-32), with examples substantiating his
central idea of language impact and special focus upon the notions of language use as
understood by (language) philosophers from Heraclitus to Wittgenstein (use with regard to
the effects of language) and Chomsky (use related to the “right use” of language) (pp. 33ff.).

2.2 “The Impact of Language as a System” (pp. 37-110)
Part II discusses language impact in terms of language as a system – i.e. as consisting of
phonemic, morphemic and lexical items combined to form grammatical structures – shaping
human thought, human actions and, consequently, human relations (p. 37). Again, Fill
provides a historical panoply of distinguished names and ideas, ranging from Neo-
Humboldtians, Phenomenologists, Structuralists and Anthropologists to Linguistic
Determinism, and describes the practical aspects of each of the approaches presented. This
is followed by a compact diachronic review of scepticism of language and linguistic criticism
in Chapter 6, again starting from Ancient Greece and leading to the 20th century.

Chapters 7 and 8 deal with language impact in General Semantics and Linguistic
Constructivism. Fill provides a few basic insights into the views of Halliday and Fairclough
(representing vs. construing vs. constructing, p. 94) and then proceeds by sketching the
sexuality debate as well as the ways in which gender-specific language and language on
gender affect human thinking, society and how they define the traditional social roles for
(men and) women (99). He correctly observes that “we have to imagine a bidirectional
interaction between language and society, in which it is impossible to say whether language
mirrors social changes or triggers them” (p. 110). A brief, apposite section is appended on
the term and concept of political correctness, pointing out its ambiguity as it “has increasingly
been used to mean free from sexism, although its general usage has come to imply ‘paying
excessive attention to the sensibilities of those who are seen as different from the norm” (p. 101).

Finally, Fill includes some general aspects of the field of Cognitive Linguistics, focusing on the impact of metaphor and framing, referring to leading figures such as Goatly (2007) as well as Lakoff and Johnson (1980).

2.3 “The Impact of Discourse on the World" (pp. 111-199)
Part III of Fill’s monograph deals with the impact of language as discourse, which, as a term, is used quite comprehensively, namely “in all the senses mentioned by Fairclough, viz. written and spoken manifestations of ‘language’ which may, but need not be restricted to an individual text” (p. 113 [original emphasis]). Fill goes on: “In this volume, there will be no separation of verbal from non-verbal effects. Let it suffice to say that by ‘Discourse’ we mean written as well as spoken discourse and that with spoken discourse the combination between verbal and non-verbal elements (supportive or contradictory) must always be taken into consideration” (p. 114 [original emphasis]).

This rather broad definition of discourse is followed by three detailed chapters on the key figures, topics and approaches in Pragmatics, which are supplemented by numerous references to both introductory and foundational works, such as by Bühler (1934), Wittgenstein (1953), Austin (1962), Searle (1969, 1979) and Grice (1975). Moreover, he provides an interesting selection of insights into language impact from a therapeutical, humorous and forensic point of view as subtopics.

In Chapter 15, Fill attends to the impact of texts, using ‘text' to mean a specific unit of discourse or, in accordance with the definition of De Beaugrande [sic!] and Dressler (1981: 3) ‘a communicative occurrence which meets seven standards of textuality’, or […] in David Crystal’s definition (1997: 438): ‘a stretch of spoken or written language with a definable communicative function (news report, poem, road sign, etc.)’ (p. 129).

In the absence of both definitional precision and the usual works of reference cited, it is the section on The Impact of the Internet (15.1) which discusses specific “text-types and text uses” (p. 130) that deserves a closer look: When it comes to the rather new text types generated by “the invention of the internet” (p. 130), we will find that Fill’s remarks as well as the literary references, which do not date later than 2006, are rather scarce. Furthermore, recently much-disputed terms like internet or domain are left undefined (and
Fill’s suggestion that “through the internet, the impact of language […] has reached a stage where language fulfills a new function: [namely that of] the unification of the human species and the globalization of cultural developments” (p. 133), speaks well for the relevance of the internet for the subject of language impact.

Chapter 16 is concerned with discourse ethics, on the one hand, and approaches to the extensions of dialogue, on the other hand. In section 16.1 (which is followed by Chapter 17 and, hence, is missing section 16.2), Fill delineates the terms dialogue and discussion (following Bohm 1996: chapter 2), and arrives at a truism by explaining that a dialogue “welds people together and makes the free flowing of opinions and a new understanding possible”, whereas the term discussion is used when “different views are analysed critically, frequently with a winner and a loser emerging” (p. 138). “In dialogue”, on the contrary, “all participants are winners” (p. 138). On top of this rather trivial definition, the reader is given an incorrect etymology of the Latin discutere (138).

Chapter 17, which explains various types and categories of discourse strategies (cf. Reisigl and Wodak 2001: 44ff.), continues in this vein, also containing a few terminological inaccuracies. For instance, Fill refers to quotations as „purely formal elements“ of linguistic strategies (p. 139), which is a crude over-simplification given the recent pragmatic approaches to the study of quoting (e.g. Bublitz and Hübler 2007 and Cappelen and Lepore 2007). Fill even seems to be contradicting himself, when he suggests that „certain strategic elements tend to be linked ‘forever’ with certain personages, like Martin Luther King’s ‘I have a dream’ and Lincoln’s ‘of the people, by the people, for the people’“ (p. 139), thus recognizing the quotation as a strategy, rather than merely a formal element.

Under Critical Discourse Analysis (henceforth CDA, Chapter 18), Fill compiles various opinions, with numerous illustrative examples by language philosophers on the influences of effective language usage on ideologies and powers, though he is careful to give them a balanced treatment by adding a few points of critique against CDA. A short subchapter on the consequences of misunderstanding and mistranslation (18.4) is then inserted, with Fill explaining in rather general terms that “misunderstanding can occur on all levels of

---


2 Both terms are not listed in Appendix I.

3 Lat. discutere v. is composed of the prefix dis- and the verb quaterē (pp. dis-cussum), not “cutere”, as Fill states (138), which did not exist as a free lexical morpheme (cf. Georges 1998).
language”, i.e. intralinguistically as well as cross-linguistically (p. 163). He cites Chernobyl as an example for how a simple misunderstanding between two operators could lead to a nuclear disaster (p. 163f.).

The many subdivisions of Chapter 20, bearing the rather broad heading *Interaction between Language and World*, first discuss the distinction between the face models of Goffman (1967: 5) and Brown and Levinson (1987: 13). Then – for no apparent reason – follow observations on “ecological” and “unecological” elements in the language system as well as the phenomenon of anthropocentric language and its consequences.

3. Résumé

It should be quite evident that in discussing and exploring language impact, Fill’s references to so many (linguistic) ramifications necessarily allow only for an elementary outline of the varied related linguistic disciplines. On the upside, this work may well serve as a very useful springboard for further research into the areas of discourse and pragmatics – at least for those who will not have themselves distracted by the unconventional structuring of Fill’s work. The reader is provided with numerous and valuable references for further reading and will certainly find the author’s mnemonic devices a useful means for processing the many pieces of information compiled in *The Language Impact*. Fill even offers enhanced readability and facilitates orientation by closing each of the three parts with a concise summary. In addition, he highlights numerous cue words throughout his work, though this is done rather unsystematically. His way of sectioning chapters and subchapters tends to be, at times, equally inconsistent.

The attached glossaries – one listing key terms (App. I, 224-228), the second one containing key names of linguists mentioned in this book (App. II, 229-248) and the third one displaying further examples (App. III, 249-252) – provide the reader with additional portions of essential information in a format reminiscent of a dictionary. Whereas Appendix II features the most prominent creators of the models and theories mentioned by Fill, Appendix I seems unbalanced, consisting of very sketchy explanations of both foundational terms like *discourse, metaphor* and *pragmatics* (which were already defined and well explained in

---

4 What is to be gained for the reader by putting in bold face both the central terms and names of key figures, on the one hand, and rather common phrases, such as “*one’s own language* […] *norm*” und “*English linguistics*” (79) remains obscure.

5 See e.g. the intermediate, unnumbered titles “Inferential Pragmatics”, “Conversation Analysis” and “Deixis” in Chapter 14, before even launching subchapters 14.1 ff. Another sequence of intransparent titles and sections is found on pp. 144ff.
the respective sections) and other more specific technical terms such as biodiversity; yet sorely missing in this list is the one most frequently (and diversely) used term in this book, namely that of language. One is left wondering what purpose this certainly well-intended composite glossary is meant to serve.

These shortcomings notwithstanding, readers of Fill’s work will doubtlessly benefit from the highly descriptive presentation of facts and extensive examples. The rich panorama of the various fields of linguistics will provide a sound understanding of the basic principles of each discipline, serving readers as valuable points of departure for further exploring their particular fields of interest.
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Multi-dimensional frameworks for new media narratives


This volume sets out to discuss the role of narratives in old and new media. The collection centers on two themes, one devoted to the description of narratives in new media environments which can be understood as a variety of forms and functions narratives assume in computer-mediated environments, e.g. weblogs, message boards, etc., and the other to the multimodal composition of new media narratives which typically feature multiple co-occurring semiotic modes such as speech, sound, text, static or moving images. As a matter of fact, this volume works with a broader scope of narratives and so even scholars and students in scientific disciplines other than those interested in the discursive and pragmatic dimensions of narratives will not be disappointed by this volume.

The volume contains revised papers from the international conference on *Narrative Revisited: Telling a Story in the Age of New Media* to honour Professor Dr. Wolfram Bublitz on the occasion of his 60th birthday at the University of Augsburg in 2007. This interesting and worthy collection contains ten papers, which are refreshing, not least because they are the first concise linguistic investigation of narrative texts produced and interpreted via the computer. The focus is on a wide array of authentic examples from text genres as diverse as political speeches, real-time narratives and contemporary feature films. The essays approach narratives from formal (linguistic), functional (pragmatic), social (sociolinguistic) and media (forms of communication) perspectives. This multi-dimensional perspective provides “theoretical access to a variety of narrative genres, spanning from non-verbal means which contribute to storytelling and spoken narratives in political speeches to new media storytelling on websites and weblogs and film narratives” (p. 2). The select authors in this collection aim to show “the way stories are told today, emphasizing the parallels and differences between narratives in changing contexts as well as within different medial configurations” (p. 2).

In the introduction, the editor defines the scope of narrative on the basis of Prince’s classic view of narratives and tells us that these essays are linked up by a certain view on narrative, namely, a view in which “narrative sequence (chronology and causality) and evaluation are considered essential to narratives albeit to differing degrees” (p. 4).
The first essay, by Carla Bazzanella, draws a blueprint for all the following papers as it not only provides a general view of the contemporary research in computer-mediated communication, but also explains the contextual constraints on new media narration. This paper explores the five features of computer-mediated communication: interactional goals; spatial and temporal contexts; number, identity and common ground of interactants; socio-emotional features; and textual dimensions. Interestingly, while Bazzanella maintains that new technology plays an important role, she also believes that “the narrative impulse, always value-laden, multipurpose and sensitive to context has found other ways of expressing itself, and has upset the usual relationship between being together and talking about events — one talks about events to be together” (p. 19).

Hübler’s essay on the role of electronics in the perception of everyday narratives suggests that computer-assisted forms of viewing and techniques of analysis and notation are the only detailed and accurate way to study the problem of perceiving and describing/analyzing the verbal and the non-verbal, i.e. the prosodic and kinesic/gestural features in conversational narratives. The author uses examples from one TV-narrative to show how a computer-assisted form of analysis can help to study a narrative performance in the most insightful way by comparing different methods of analyzing such data.

Jucker’s essay concerning live text commentaries on the internet follows the pattern of finding similarities and differences which live text commentaries share with unscripted radio commentaries and personal narratives. He first compares the narrative elements of the online sport coverage to Labov’s (2006) classical elements of an oral narrative. Afterwards, he points out that the live text commentaries are not ephemeral in contrast to personal narratives and to unscripted radio commentaries.

Eisenlauer and Hoffmann’s essay on weblog identifies the four most widely used weblog genres as internet diaries, friendship blogs, career blogs, and corporate blogs. Within the theoretical framework of Labov and Waletzky’s (1967) structural model of narrative analysis, two examples of weblog entries are analyzed. By comparing the results of this analysis to Ochs and Capps’ (2001) multi-dimensional model of narration, the authors adapt the four weblog-specific narrative features of interactivity, fragmentation, multi-linearity and multi-modality into Ochs and Capps’ model to demonstrate the functions of weblog discourse.

Arendholz’s analysis of narratives in message boards, which is illustrated by authentic message board entries, is also based on the narration theories of Labov and Waletzky (1967) and Ochs and Capps (2001) with a special focus on the changed communicative
prerequisites of computer-mediated communication in general and of message boards in particular (p. 110). Arendholz differentiates forums and message boards by a careful description of forum in its widest sense. A special emphasis is put on the aspect of storytelling of message boards.

Schubert discusses narrative sequence in political discourse on the internet. He points out four central functions of political narrative (personalizing, integrating, exemplifying, and polarizing). With the advent of the hypertext framework, they can be accentuated by placing online political speech in the form of politicians' biographies, historical surveys and photo essays. The data for analysis consist of speeches by American presidents and British prime ministers.

Political discourse is also the topic of Fetzer's essay. She defines form and function of the small story in political discourse. Besides, she analyzes how the small story works as a tool to integrate the private sphere and a public domain of life. The interpersonal aspect of small story is emphasized and its contextualization is explained within the Gricean framework.

Stenglin and Djonov's essay Unpacking narrative in a hypermedia ‘ortedventure’ for children is a case study of an online game Leonardo’s Workshop to explicate the role of narrative in educational hypermedia for children. In order to evaluate the effectiveness of narrative as a stimulus for children’s engagement with educational hypermedia games, the authors apply Systemic Functional Theory as analytical framework for the study of how the features that define narratives as “a type of western-culture story genre are distributed multimodally and hypertextually in this hypermedia game” (p. 185). In order to provide a sufficient explanation, this theoretical framework integrates the notions of “genre” and “macro-genre” (Martin and Rose 2008), Djonov’s (2008) framework for analyzing logico-semantic relations in hypermedia, Appraisal Theory (Martin and White 2005), and Stenglin’s (2009) concepts of Binding and Bonding.

The last two essays focus on film discourse. Both essays draw an analogy between linguistic and filmic discourse. In Tseng and Bateman’s Chain and choice in filmic narrative, an analytical framework adapted from discourse semantic treatments of verbal text is used as a tool to study the narrative construction of film effectively. They propose that Darren Aronofsky’s The Fountain (2006) provides a good example to illustrate their point and to demonstrate the cohesive ties which are used to help the public to understand the complex narrative structure of this film. Janney’s Film discourse cohesion approaches the topic from
the perspective of discourse in linguistics. Although there might be some differences between conceptual representation in language and perceptual representation in film, film and discourse are similar in terms of cohesive relations.

This collection may serve as a good introduction to linguistic and compositional structure and communicative functions of new media narratives as well as analytical changes and modifications to linguistic narrative theory. Taken collectively, two main themes are discussed: narratives in new media and multi-modal narratives. The book also offers a rich set of comparisons and contrasts between the narrative in old and new media so that what is new can be found by assessing the old. This collection will satisfy those looking for an understanding of contemporary trends in narratives, that is, understanding how exactly stories enter the digital realm and how the classic approaches to the analysis of narratives can be adapted to meet the socio-technological needs of digital narration. Some papers revisit the structural and contextual aspects of stories in old to new media and others emphasize their pragmatic functions in discourse. In my opinion, all the papers help to achieve the editor’s two objectives related to the description of narratives in new media environments and the theoretical and empirical analysis of multimodal narratives. I would like to add that this fascinating and intelligent book should appeal to a wider audience than just those interested in narratives, and although it would not be suitable as a textbook, its many insights into different approaches and viewpoints on storytelling would be of interest and use to any teacher of narrative.
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In PRAGMATICS.REVIEWS 2013.1.1
A gestalt-based solution to problematic sentence-final particles in Japanese


In recent years, Japanese sentence-final particles have attracted increasing attention of researchers from various theoretical backgrounds. However, these previous studies failed to account for the use of particles in interaction. Due to their functional complexity on the one hand and the insufficient description on the other, sentence-final particles are difficult to acquire and pose problems in cross-cultural communication. Saigo tries to overcome these shortcomings by proposing an original hypothesis based on the concepts of gestalt psychology. The study focuses on the most frequent particles *ne, yo* and the combination of both *yone* in contrast to sentences without any particle.

After a brief description of the research question in Chapter 1, Saigo reviews previous approaches to Japanese sentence-final particles in Chapter 2. The studies are divided into two groups:

- studies based on the notion of the speaker's proprietary interest in the information contained in the utterance and
- studies focusing on the communicative function of the particles.

According to the approaches based on the notion of information propriety, *ne* is used when the information is in the territory of the addressee (and the speaker), whereas *yo* is added when the speaker believes that the information is solely in his territory (Kamio 1994). These theories, however, cannot explain why both particles can be used in utterances like (p. 1) that describe a situation obvious to both speaker and addressee.

1. *Ame ga futteimasu yo/ne*
   Rain SUBJ is raining yo/ne
   'It is raining yo/ne'

Communicative approaches to Japanese sentence-final particles claim that they invite the addressee's involvement or show the speaker's epistemic stance towards the conveyed information (Cook 1992; Lee 2007). These studies, however, "do not provide clear explanations as to why the speaker uses the particles in interaction" (p. 16). Saigo therefore proposes what he calls the *particle function hypothesis* (PFH) that he develops within the
general framework of gestalt psychology. According to the PFH, the particles indicate to the addressee how to interpret the preceding information in terms of figure and ground:

- each distinct utterance in a turn constructional unit and the turn constructional unit itself is a figure when it is presented by the speaker to the addressee in the sense that it is foregrounded in the relation to the conversational background. Subsequently, the figure is grounded, by either the speaker or the addressee in one of a limited number of ways. That is to say, each figure becomes the ground for the next utterance, which replaces it as figure (p. 18).

A speaker uses *ne* when he wants the figure emerging in the talk to be treated as ground in the next proposition, and thus directs the addressee's acceptance. By contrast no particle is used, when he does not want to indicate how the figure emerging is to be grounded which leads the listener to the assumption that the topic is closed. Saigo illustrates the PFH with various made-up examples and explains the situations in which the utterances could be made in great detail. After a methodological discussion in chapter 3, chapters 4 to 6 are dedicated to an extensive qualitative analysis of a larger body of natural talk-in-interaction data. As the data comprise an extract from an everyday talk between two Japanese female friends and a goal-directed talk between two male native speakers (each with a duration of 6 minutes), Saigo is able to prove his hypothesis across gender and interaction types. Chapter 6 is of special interest for learners of Japanese as it analyses an extract from an everyday talk between a native speaker and a non-native speaker and illustrates the awkwardness the wrong use of a particle or a wrong reaction may evoke. The final Chapter 7 summarizes the findings and relates them to broader issues of pragmatics including teaching Japanese as a foreign language.

In sum, this book makes an important contribution to advancing our understanding of Japanese sentence-final particles. It is of special interest to all scholars concerned with pragmatic issues and discourse organization in Japanese. It is to hope that the results are taken into account in teaching Japanese as a foreign language.
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In PRAGMATICS.REVIEWS 2013.1.1
Context- and formula based approaches in the investigation of request strategies of Chinese EFL learners


This book investigates how Chinese English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners make English requests, e.g., *Can you open the door*, by means of context-based and formulae-based approaches in an experiment. Two groups of Chinese EFL learners are tested in the foreign language environment. Their pragmatic behaviours like strategy use, formulaic expressions, internal modifications, external modifications and utterance length are examined. The usefulness of these approaches as well as different request models of the learners are introduced.

Aijmer’s (1996) examination of spoken English finds that native speakers of English make requests that are predominantly formulaic. However, in Chinese, request imperatives are used to make bald on-record requests (Lee-Wong 1994: 509), such as in 帶一點兒糖回来 *Dai yidianr tang hui lai* ‘bring a little sugar back’. Studies of cross-linguistic variation in speech acts show that when adult L2 learners have not mastered certain L2 pragmatic norms, they tend to rely on their L1 pragmatic practice. This should then show improvement in their L2 pragmatic behaviours as their L2 learning progresses, and a gradually reduced reliance on L1 pragmatic norms. This discussion on the research of interlanguage pragmatics is then expanded and explained as the author reports his present study.

The author meticulously designed an experiment to obtain samples from two groups of Chinese EFL learners (a group of language students and a group of business students) and a native speaker group. The language group consists of advanced learners, who are third-year students in a Chinese-English translation and interpretation programme at a tertiary institution in Macao. The language and business learners have studied English for an average of 16.8 and 12.6 years, respectively. The mother tongue of the learners is either Cantonese or Mandarin. The native speaker group comprises native speakers of Australian English.

The research goals of Wang’s book concern four areas. First, to what extent the two groups of Chinese EFL learners achieve native-like pragmatic behaviours in the foreign language environment. Secondly, whether the language group outperforms the business group in approximating native norms. Thirdly, to find out which of the elements of request behaviours
are developed in the learner groups. Finally, Wang investigates whether the scenario-based or the formulae-based approach has any advantage for interlanguage pragmatics. Enhanced discourse completion tasks are applied for eliciting request utterances from the different groups. The discourse completion task instruments contain ten scenarios, such as in the post office, in a restaurant, in a shop, to a technician, a retired actress, a police officer, and a professor. For example, request an extra bag in the supermarket, request an account statement in the bank, request to borrow money, or a reference letter from a professor. Each of the scenarios (see Appendix 1 of the book) consists of a written prompt that describes the situational context, an image and blank lines for respondents to write down their utterances. The instructions explain to the respondents that they are supposed to produce request utterances for scenarios that would occur in an English-speaking country, just as they would in real-life situations.

The discourse completion tasks elicited 1016 valid instances of request utterances — 401 for the business group, 306 for the language group, and 309 for the native speaker group. The results are analyzed in detail based on their pragmatic features including utterance length, strategy types, formulaic expressions, syntactic downgraders (conditionals and hi-clausal structures), lexical modifiers, and external modifiers (supportive moves and information sequencing). Previous research is reviewed wherever necessary to enhance the background of the research and the reliability of the data analysis.

Concerning the request strategies, the two learner groups are quite native-like. The author reveals the distribution patterns of ten strategy types and three strategy categories (direct, conventionally indirect, non-conventionally indirect) in the learner and the native speaker group, and examines inter-group differences using Chi-square tests. Request utterances, for example, *I want to trouble you to give me the letter*, *Could I possibly borrow $50?*, are used to illustrate the qualitative features of the respondent groups’ use, as well as analyse the lexical realizations of the major strategy types. It is found that the two learner groups strategy uses are similar to those of native speakers. The two groups do, however, differ from the native speakers in their use of strategies in several individual scenarios. The group in the EFL learning environment does not show a native-like use of request strategies even though they are advanced learners who had spent an average of 17 years studying English and training in translation and interpreting. There are two likely factors that can account for this: L1 transfer and L2 instruction. The EFL learners exhibit L1 pragmatic interference on at least the strategic, lexical and sociopragmatic levels. The language learners come slightly closer to a native pattern strategy use than the business learners, both in the scenarios as a whole and in individual scenarios.
Both learner groups use request formulae in a distinctively non-native-like manner. The learner groups could not use some of the longer and more syntactically complex formulae, such as I was wondering if, Would it be Adj if and Would you be Adj to VP, that native speakers commonly use for elaboration and deferential requests. The learners were also unable to utilize some scenario-specific formulae. As for the internal modifications, the two learner groups also differ in several ways from native speakers in their use of downgraders, such as possibly, maybe, just, at all, look, and you know.

In addition, supportive moves and information sequencing are employed for the analysis of external modifications. Both learner groups employ supportive moves more frequently and in more elaborate configurations than the native group. Disarming strategies such as I know this is a big ask, and I completely understand if you say no are used by the native speakers only. On the other hand, for the information sequencing, the two learner groups favoured supportive moves when making requests, while the native speaker group would often choose to omit them. However, when the native speakers do use supportive moves, the positions in which they use them are similar to those of the learner groups — the post-posed position is favoured in the service scenarios, while the pre-posed and hi-positions predominate in the favour-asking scenarios.

Furthermore, the author revisits basic questions put forth by Kasper and Schmidt (1996) that pertain to interlanguage pragmatics studies. Among them, for the question “Does the L1 influence L2 learning?” the author compares the result of the present study with those of Lee-Wong (1994), Zhang (1995), and Yu (1999). In general, Yu (1999) and the present study both uncover similar results, i.e., that Chinese EFL learners noticeably increase their use of conventionally-indirect strategies and reduce their use of direct strategies in English in comparison to what Chinese speakers generally do in their L1 (cf. Lee-Wong 1994; Zhang 1995). In terms of lexical interference, Wang explains that L1 to L2 transfer can also occur in terms of lexical choices that reflect learners’ L1 origin. The same is observed in the present study, e.g., the Chinese EFL learners use requests like I want and I would VP much more frequently than the native English speakers. These two formulae mirror two common Chinese expressions: 我要 wo yao ‘I want’ and 我想要 wo xiang yao ‘I think [that I] want’ in terms of semantic meaning and situational usage. The EFL learners also use certain words that suggest L1 interference, for example, the expression 給我一個機會 gei wo yige jihui ‘give me a chance’ is commonly used in situations where the speaker acknowledges guilt, will stop making the mistake, and requests the hearer not to impose punishment. L1 interference in L2 also occurs at the sociopragmatic level where the learners’ knowledge influences the way they perceive social and contextual factors in L2 situations. The samples centering on
“police” and “bank” given by the learners and the native speakers differ markedly in their levels of politeness and directness. Differing from Yu’s (1999) study, however, Wang found more direct strategies and fewer conventionally-indirect strategies than Yu’s (1999) study in both EFL learners and native English speakers. Such differences depend on the scenario types used for data elicitation in the two studies.

At last, the author evaluates the two major approaches — the context-based approach and the formulae-based approach. The former provides evidence that learners do not vary their linguistic behaviour to the same extent that native speakers do, and that they do not perceive contextual factors in a native-like manner. In this sample, linguistic behaviour occurs in patterns, suggesting that learners need to adjust these patterns more towards native norms. As for the formulae-based approach, the results of the study show in different contexts that formulaic language provides an important means for learners to achieve native-like request behaviours for their responses.

It is a virtue of Wang’s book that he builds his research on the basis of a solid grasp of previous research on interlanguage pragmatics. This allows him to provide a concise review of and critical view on the research background. The clear and step-by-step analysis of the request samples provides the reader with a deep understanding of request strategies in Chinese EFL learners. At the same time, the author does not lose sight of the L1 and L2 comparison. Wang has genuine empirical evidence for the usefulness of the context-based and formulae-based approaches and contributes a study for cross-cultural pragmatics, politeness and language pedagogy.
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Novel applications of cognitive approaches in second language acquisition


For the past three or four decades, *Cognitive Linguistics* (CL) as a research paradigm has been employed in fields such as phonology, syntax, semantics, and discourse analysis. This volume is a novel and significant endeavor that extends cognitive linguistics theories into the area of *Second Language Acquisition* (SLA). The CL processes or areas being examined in this volume include construal, radial categories, prototypes and “fuzzy boundaries”, explicit and implicit knowledge, cognitive grammar, construction grammars, metonymy, and metaphor. The research focuses in terms of language learning and teaching encompass speaking (accuracy and fluency), grammar (the English modals, Spanish mood selection), phrasal verbs, lexis, writing and second language acquisition in general.

This collection includes an introduction and eight papers, most of which are empirical studies that address the significance and pedagogical effectiveness of cognitive linguistics in language learning and teaching. The first paper by Karen Roehr focuses on language representation and processing in the mind. She presents a case study of an adult L2 learner whose development of oral proficiency was tracked for a period of 17 months. Her findings indicate that explicit knowledge and learning have both benefits and limitations. The use of metalinguistic tools contributed to accuracy, and there was no obvious trade-off between accuracy and fluency. But the excessive cognitive load imposed by explicit processing may result in implicit processes taking over.

The next five papers all focus on motivated language in SLA. The paper *Applying cognitive linguistics to instructed L2 learning: The English modals* by Andrea Tyler, Charles M. and Vu Ho reports the results of a quasi-experimental study. The English modal verbs present great difficulty to L2 learners due to the fact that they usually have two divergent senses: a root and an epistemic sense. The authors argue that the speech act approach that traditional English language teaching textbooks adopt is defective because it does not address the systematic patterning in the modal system as a whole. By comparing the groups of learners taught through a cognitive linguistic approach and those by a speech act approach, the authors conclude that the former group demonstrated significantly more improvement than
the latter. It is therefore argued that CL is not only a more complete and accurate theoretical approach to language in general, but also one that is of particular benefit to L2 learners.

Rafael Alejo Gonzalez, inspired by the “thinking for speaking hypothesis” (Slobin 1987) for motion events, provides a comprehensive and critical summary of the CL literature on phrasal verbs (PVs), which is intended to explain the acquisition of PVs by L2 learners. Gonzalez examines the out-PVs using corpus linguistic methodology and finds that both Germanic and Non-Germanic satellite-framed language learners use a greater number of out-PVs tokens and types than verb-framed language learners and that satellite-framed language learners also use a greater elaboration of path when non-motional out-PV meanings are involved. Gonzalez argues that the “thinking for speaking hypothesis,” which has been found to be predictive in the acquisition of motion events by L2 learners, is also useful when applied to the acquisition of PVs.

Reyes Llopis-Garcia presents a series of experiments studying mood selection, the last feature acquired in learning Spanish as a foreign language as it is one of the most difficult aspects, in Spanish using Operational Grammar. After eight 90-minute sessions of instruction using a combination of cognitive-based approach to teaching grammar with Processing Instruction for the practicing part, the author found that the combination of these two approaches had yielded very positive effects on how the students identified mood selection to construe meaning in both input and output learning situations. The study suggests that the cognitive approach to teaching grammar is highly beneficial. Operational grammar, a pedagogical grammar approach, based on teaching form and meaning as one unit, helps to bridge the gap between the two and enables learners to perceive the interplay between language form and its communicative outcome.

Julie Deconinck, Frank Boers and June Eyckmans describe an experiment in which 56 university students are involved in three different learning treatments. The chances of an L2 word becoming entrenched in long-term memory are influenced by the degree of cognitive (and affective) involvement on the part of the learner (e.g. Laufer and Hulstijn 2001). Others have adopted terms such as engagement or elaboration to describe the various mental operations learners can perform with regard to lexical items. Equipped with the notions that language is far less arbitrary than has often been assumed and that learners might resort to a certain type of engagement spontaneously when presented with new words, the authors of this study designed an experiment to stimulate a type of engagement for their students who were prompted to consider the degree to which the form of a word might fit the word’s meaning. Their study suggests that an evaluation of the linguistic motivation of a word’s
form-meaning link can be an effective form of elaboration. It could be turned into a conscious, simple and time-saving vocabulary teaching method, especially lexical items whose form-meaning link is perceived as being motivated.

Randal Holme discusses constructions, as they are the central units of grammatical analysis in CL. They comprise any grouping of words or morphemes that in combination possess meanings that cannot be predicted from their isolated parts. Language learning is more than just learning lexis but also constructions and the text types in which they are used. Constructions can be regarded as either compositional or non-compositional. The former means treating a form of words as an example of a productive grammatical pattern, and some or all of the words in the pattern may be substituted with others that fit its or their meaning(s). The latter means the construction is regarded as a fixed expression, such as idioms. Compositionality as a pedagogical choice is determined by the nature of the form in question and what the teacher wants the learners to do with it. CL positions constructions on a lexico-grammatical continuum. Those constructions with little or no schematicity and not much prospect of formal variation can be placed towards the continuum’s lexical end. Constructions such as the transitive, agent+process+patient, are very schematic and productive and thus can be placed on the continuum’s grammatical end. Teachers can use image schema to develop students’ grasp of abstract concepts, such as from the more concrete use of heavy rain to the more abstract use of heavy demand. Also, the use of heavy smoker shows how metonymy extends meaning. Teachers can help students come to grips with constructions as productive meanings that are built around one or more fixed terms. Through pattern-finding, especially advanced students are encouraged to generalize constructions and gain a more secure compositional control of L2.

The last two papers focus on metonymy and metaphor, respectively. Antonio Barcelona reflects on the various areas of CL research on metonymy. Metonymy is a cognitive process whereby one concept is used to mentally activate another one with which it is closely related in experience. It is ubiquitous in cognition and language, and metonymic inferencing is highly relevant for SLA. The author discusses three areas of CL-inspired metonymy research that are of particular relevance to SLA:

1) research on metonymy-guided inferencing;

2) research on metonymy-motivated lexical polysemy; and

3) research on metonymy-based grammatical constructions and processes.
The first area is closely related to second language comprehension, especially when the second language learner is confronted with discourse types relying heavily on the comprehender's quick inferential work. Metonymy also plays a role in pragmatic inferencing, and in discourse modes. The second area is related to the learner's vocabulary building or comprehension activities, and the last to the acquisition of grammatical constructions. A number of suggestions of metonymy research for second language learning and teaching are put forward at the end of the article. These include raising learners' awareness of the ubiquity of metonymy-guided inferencing, using adequate contexts with metonymy triggers, stimulating metonymy-guided reasoning and exploiting the metonymic motivation of certain basic metaphors.

Unlike the previous paper which is discussed from a more theoretical perspective, the last paper, by Fiona MacArthur, addresses metaphor from a more practical point of view. Considerable research has focused on how to help learners come to grips with metaphors of the target language, and how to understand and retain the conventional figurative language. However, little has been said about how learners actually produce metaphors in their second language. So MacArthur's work helps fill this gap. She uses the data she gathered in the EFL classroom to describe and explore the metaphorical language used by Spanish undergraduates in their writing over a period of about 5 months. The data show that learners use metaphors to express their ideas on complex and abstract topics, but their metaphorical usage is neither conventional nor felicitous. The possible reasons may lie in the learners’ lack of vocabulary, resources or negative transfer from L1. The author suggests that the adoption of a complex scientific metalanguage to account for metaphor may impede learners’ comprehension and creation of metaphors. Instead, metaphor can be talked about as a way of “seeing” particular entities or processes in terms of other entities or processes, which is easy to comprehend and more “user-friendly.” How to give feedback to learners’ metaphoric production also presents considerable challenges and deserves the teacher's careful consideration.

All papers in this volume examine the potential benefits and effectiveness of a CL approach in language teaching and learning. They represent a trend to utilize CL for the benefit of pedagogical situations and raise complex issues that may emerge in this process. By and large, CL-inspired approaches to language teaching have yielded positive results and often significant impacts on the language learning process. This volume has opened up new areas of research and may be of great value to those who are interested in CL, SLA or both.
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Breaking new ground in the research on L2 speakers’ use of Korean honorifics


*Korean Honorifics and Politeness in Second Language Learning* by Lucien Brown is part of John Benjamins’ *Pragmatics & Beyond New Series.* Undeniably, the Korean honorifics system plays a pivotal role in Korean language acquisition, but previous research has largely been confined to approaching honorifics as a grammatical feature from a static angle with very limited focus on the acquisition, development or usage of honorifics. Lucien Brown, however, exhibits a strong dual commitment throughout the book: on one hand, it fills a considerable gap in the literature on Korean honorifics acquisition; on the other hand, it offers an in-depth exploration of re-framing and re-facing – the constant dynamic process of enriching, re-analyzing or re-negotiating existing frames of knowledge and that of constructing a new presentation of the self in interaction from the perspective of interlanguage pragmatics. To this end, he examines a large body of data collected through a blend of methods, which provides a rich and fertile site for exploring the complexities and intricacies of L2 speakers using Korean honorifics.

The book is comprised of 9 chapters and appendices. Chapter 1 provides the contextual and methodological background to the study. At the outset, the author presents the goals and research questions of the study: the competence that advanced speakers of Korean as a Second Language have of the Korean honorifics system and the effects of social identities and ideologies on honorifics development. After briefly outlining previous approaches to the acquisition of Korean honorifics, the author focuses on the interlanguage pragmatics approach adopted in his study. Then, detailed information about participants, data collection techniques and the methodology are provided.

With a view to providing a point of reference for observations in the study, Brown presents a highly detailed description of the contemporary Korean honorifics system in Chapter 2. *Honorifics* are defined as “resources for indexing the relative position of interlocutors, referents and bystanders either in the lexicon or the morpho-syntax of a language” (p. 13) by recourse to cross-linguistic examples. To facilitate readers’ understanding, not only does the author give an isolated account of the component parts of the Korean honorifics system, but he also highlights the interplay between the different parts of the honorifics system and the major factors influencing usage of honorifics (including power and distance between
interlocutors, level of formality, and such strategic uses as the softening of assertion, sarcasm, anger, insults and jokes). It is noteworthy that honorific forms are viewed as indexing degrees of “separation” and “connection” from a dynamic perspective rather than from a static semantic angle. The author concludes this chapter by briefly commenting on major differences between Korean and Japanese honorifics since the latter has captured more attention in previous literature. For example, the use of honorifics in Japanese is related to femininity and beauty whereas the use of high honorific forms in Korean are perceived as still, authoritarian and masculine.

The theoretical background of the study on Korean honorifics is presented from socio-pragmatic and interlanguage pragmatic perspectives in Chapters 3 and 4. First, Brown reviews the position of honorifics in previous politeness research by examining four approaches: Brown and Levinson’s “honorifics as FTA (face threatening act) mitigators” (p. 60), Hwang and Ide’s “honorifics as deference or discernment” which are socio-pragmatically or grammatically obligatory (p. 61), Watts’ “relational work” model viewing honorifics as “politic” instead of “polite” (p. 63) and Lee and Yoo’s normative/strategic framework, stating that the “normative usage” of honorifics is intended to meet social expectations, and the marked and intentionally controlled “strategic usage” is employed to pursue specific motives (p. 65). It is revealed that these dominating theoretical camps on “politeness” and “honorifics” are not adequate to account for Korean honorifics use. Accordingly, the author argues that a “frame-based” view of politeness (Terkourafi 2003, 2005) and a remodeled version of “face” (Arundale 2006) can be employed to address those deficiencies. Within the “frame-based” politeness model, frames are viewed as “structures of expectation” (p. 67) and “politeness consists in the regularity of the co-occurrence between linguistic expressions and a given context” (p. 67). The author then expands the model by positing that politeness does not necessarily apply to all types of communication and that politeness ideologies have a significant bearing on the use of honorifics. Thereafter, the author presents his Korean-specific concept of face as relational and interactional in the study of interlanguage pragmatics. Finally, the author discusses the four defining features of Korean politeness ideologies (i.e. indexical politeness, hierarchical patterns, obligation and conformity, and intimacy and closeness) and interprets how they differ from their “Western” counterparts.

Chapter 4 is focused on a framework that the author adopts to analyze interlanguage pragmatic development in Korean honorifics. After briefly presenting the definition of pragram-linguistic knowledge as “pragmatic phenomena oriented towards the grammatical or organizational end of the scale” (p. 86), the author models the development of L2
sociopragmatic knowledge as *re-framing* by which L2 speakers re-analyze, re-negotiate, and enrich existing frames. These processes are influenced by such factors as the speakers’ pre-existing language(s) and culture(s), pragmatic over- and under-generalization, and teacher-fronted metapragmatic instruction and teaching materials. The construction of a new presentation of the self is dubbed as *re-facing* which is influenced by attitudes of the Korean community (language inheritance) and attitudes of L2 speakers (language affiliation).

Chapters 5, 6, 7 and 8 are devoted to fine-grained analyses of four types of data collected by means of discourse completion test (DCT), role-play, natural conversation and “learner stories” through a mixture of quantitative and qualitative research methods. In Chapter 5, data collected by DCTs, taken by 20 advanced second-language (L2) speakers from “Western” backgrounds and 40 native Korean speakers, are put under analysis in three aspects: hearer honorifics, referent honorifics and forms of address. The findings reveal that

1. L2 speakers use honorifics with less variation than L1 speakers;
2. L2 speakers are less sensitive to power than distance or formality in terms of honorifics usage and tend to avoid saliently subservient or condescending language; and
3. notable differences exist among L2 speakers in that exchange students and heritage speakers are inclined to overgeneralize non-honorific language whereas professionals and non-heritage speakers tend to overuse honorific language.

In Chapter 6, Brown elicits data from recordings of staged role-plays between the 20 L2 participants and L1 speaker partners in two contrasting power-distance relationships: the “professor” role-play and the “friend” role-play. Likewise, he takes a close look at the three aspects mentioned in Chapter 5. Data analysis reveals that L2 speakers show inadequate pragma-linguistic competence concerning referent honorifics. It also manifests a connection between honorifics use by L2 speakers and their perceptions and beliefs regarding politeness in two ways. First, L2 speakers avoid “too high” or “too low” honorifics because it is incompatible with their egalitarian and reciprocal social values. Second, L2 speakers tend to adapt the modulation politeness strategy when upgrading to honorific styles as a sign of “respect” due to their pre-existing ideologies in the Western context.

The study is labeled as “incomplete” due to the fact that data were collected by artificial means. Thus, to lend more force and validity to his study, the author provides an empirical analysis of honorifics use in real-world interactions in the following two chapters. In Chapter 7, the author utilizes recorded naturally occurring conversational data. He breaks down these
data into two separate sections: interactions with status superiors and new acquaintances and interactions with intimate status equals and inferiors. Data analysis not only confirms the two patterns found in the elicited data from DCTs and role-plays in real-world interactions but also uncovers a new pattern of *panmal* 'non-honorific language' use towards strangers/elders. The author accounts for these three patterns in relation to the identities and politeness ideologies of the participants. On one hand, he concludes that L2 speakers’ honorifics use is affected by both their own identity as “foreigners” and the attitudes of the Korean community, which provides a possible explanation of cases where exchange students mistakenly used non-honorifics when *contaymal* ‘honorable language’ was desirable or even obligatory. On the other hand, he reiterates that L2 speakers’ misuse of honorifics/non-honorifics is attributable to their pragma-linguistic deficiencies, lack of opportunities to establish appropriate social relationships and more egalitarian politeness ideologies of “Westerners”.

Finally, Chapter 8 focuses on “honorific sensitive incidents” by means of participants’ retrospective narratives of actual incidents during their interactions with Korean native speakers. The author analyzes collected data from three angles: the lack of pragma-linguistic competence of L2 speakers, the attitudes of the local Korean community and L2 speakers’ negotiation of their own identity. The findings reveal that

1. native speakers tend to provide little or inexplicit, if any, feedback for L2 speakers when pragma-linguistic deficiencies arise;
2. L1 speakers initiate the application of “different” honorifics either due to their perception that interactions with non-Koreans do not necessarily follow the same norms as Korean-Korean conversations or their utilization of L2 speakers’ lack of honorific knowledge for their own strategic ends; and
3. L2 speakers attempt to actively diverge from hierarchical or non-reciprocal use of honorifics and negotiate egalitarian modes of interaction.

In the concluding chapter, the author first recapitulates the major findings with regard to the Korean honorifics competence of L2 speakers and analyzes their pragma-linguistic deficiencies within the framework of social identities and politeness ideologies. He then discusses the implications of the study at length in three different areas: politeness research, interlanguage pragmatics and language pedagogy. Lastly, recommendations are made for future research on Korean honorifics by placing emphasis on (diverse) speech groups’ diversity and different settings for data collection.
Overall, the strengths of Brown's well-implemented work can be summarized at two levels: at the first level, this book presents theoretical contributions to politeness theory, interlanguage pragmatics and Korean honorifics acquisition as well as intriguing findings about its rich data in a concise, lucid and accessible manner. Building upon the author's observations and other researchers' theoretical models, Brown demonstrates and promotes a remodeled version of re-framing and re-facing from a dynamic and context-sensitive perspective by delineating the pragmatic development of L2 speakers in Korean honorifics through negotiation of politeness between their socially constructed identities in communication with Korean native speakers. In addition, the study has pedagogical implications for developing L2 speakers' competence in Korean honorifics. The second level is that the analyses of data from authentic natural interactions are literally the beginning of a new subfield of Korean honorifics research from an emic perspective. Even though DCTs and staged role plays are deemed as mirroring natural interactions, these elicited data remain “non-natural” or “contrived” in contrast to naturally occurring data. By analyzing recordings of non-manipulated interactions, researchers can penetrate the actual language use by L2 speakers.

Nevertheless, I have a certain degree of skepticism towards one minor point of the study. The author labels the participants as having “Western” backgrounds due to the fact that “the socialization that all of these speakers had undergone in Western society had shaped (or at least played a major role in shaping) the assumptions they held regarding human interaction” (p. 9). This kind of classification is arbitrary, thus lacking sufficient validity. Moreover, it is an oversimplification to attribute L2 speakers' failures in using Korean honorifics appropriately to their egalitarian politeness ideology. Before arriving at this conclusion, it would be preferable and more convincing had the author conducted a contrastive analysis of Korean honorifics use of L2 speakers from different cultural backgrounds and explored whether errors in their application of honorifics are determined by language-specific or by culture-specific factors.

In conclusion, this book belongs on the shelves of scholars involved in research on interlanguage pragmatics and politeness as well as textbook writers, syllabus designers and KSL (Korean as a second language) teachers.
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