Karin Aijmer (ed.), *Contrastive Pragmatics.* 2011. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins. ISBN 978 90 272 2260 2. 182 pp.

Reviewed by Lieselotte Brems
University of Liège

Contrastive Pragmatics brings together papers which were originally presented at the 10th International Pragmatics Conference in Gothenburg in 2007. It serves as a representative state of the art of the prolific field of (corpus-based) contrastive pragmatics, both in terms of the variety of topics dealt with and the theoretical approaches used. It incorporates such frameworks as politeness theory, Conversational Analysis and Appraisal Theory, but also reaches out to construction grammar and such diachronic frameworks as grammaticalization and (inter) subjectification. The pragmatic phenomena studied range from modality and evidentiality over false friends, error analysis, politeness expressions to interruption phenomena. The range of topics as well as the (synchronic and diachronic) models of analysis represented in this volume contribute greatly to its strengths and merits. The volume holds obvious appeal for contrastive linguists, but also provides valuable insights for people working within the frameworks of grammaticalization and translation studies or involved in language teaching and learning.

In the introduction, Karin Aijmer first sets out the background and main aims of the volume and then summarizes the articles, linking them up with the larger themes of the volume. The contributions can be said to centre around three themes. Firstly, there is a focus on "what is culture- and language-specific (cf. Wierzbicka 1985) and on regional (especially) variation". Secondly, Aijmer highlights that contrastive studies can help us gain insight into language systems which are still relatively poorly understood, such as modality and evidentiality. Thirdly, contrastive studies are argued to have pedagogical implications for foreign language teaching.

The first contribution, by Annette Becker, looks at the genre-specific use of modality and Engagement resources in British English and German political interviews. In this dialogical genre the speech participants have to position themselves intersubjectively in order to indicate their attitudes regarding the truth or likelihood of a proposition, a speech act that might be face threatening. The types of modal constructions studied include verbs like *believe* and *may* but also modal particles such as *apparently*, and presuppositions. The study is based on comparable election night broadcasts from 1997 and 1998, and is situated within an Appraisal

English Text Construction 6:2 (2013), **301–305**. DOI 10.1075/etc.6.2.05bre
ISSN 1874–8767 / E-ISSN 1874–8775

theory framework (Martin & White 2005). A distinction is made between monoglossic and heteroglossic engagement. The former refers to the exclusion of alternative positions, the latter to their inclusion. An important means of realizing monoglossic engagement is presupposition (e.g. *how deep is the mess you're in at present?*) (Becker 2011: 8). Within heteroglossic engagement a further distinction is made between dialogic expansion ('entertain' and 'attribute') and dialogic contraction ('proclaim' and 'disclaim'). Dialogic expansion can be realized by means of expressions such as *It seems… In my view*, etc., while contraction is realized by *naturally*, *I contend*, etc. The comparison of English and German interviews reveals that heteroglossic engagement is used more frequently than monoglossic engagement in both sets of data. In addition, it turns out that BBC interviewers use more resources from the engagement system than their German colleagues. The author interprets these findings in terms of a set of dimensions proposed by House (1996), such as indirectness (English) versus directness (German); Orientation towards Other (English) versus Orientation towards Self (German). Exceptions to these general tendencies are explained as being genre-specific.

Agnès Celle's contribution also deals with modality and intersubjectivity, but focuses on two pairs of English and French adverbs, i.e. évidemment vs. *obviously/evidently* and *apparemment* versus *apparently*, in journalistic discourse. Her data consist mainly of 15 English and French editions of *Le Monde Diplomatique,* including both original and translated texts. The modal adverbs looked at can all be shown to have intersubjective functions, but they function differently in the two languages. French assertive modal adverbs split up into identificative adverbs (*visiblement*, *apparement*), which can be said to be evidential in nature, and restrictive ones, which restrict the validity of an utterance (*probablement*, *vraisemblablement*). These semantic categories link up with formal reflexes such as position. The two types of adverbs can in theory co-occur in French, as in *Apparement l'avion va certainement atterir à 16 heures* (Rossari et al. 2004: 29), while this double modality seems impossible for English, e.g. ?? "Obviously, Mary will probably come and help us" (ibid.). Celle concludes that identificative modal adverbs do not modify assertions in the same way in French and in English. English *apparently* and *obviously* are said to mark the speaker's identification with the addressee's point of view, whereas French *apparemment* and *évidemment* express the speaker's evaluation regardless of what the speaker and addressee's common knowledge might be.

The third contribution, by Bart Defrancq and Bernard De Clerk, discusses the potential false friends ça *depend* and *it depends* as emerging discourse markers expressing intersubjective positioning (Traugott & Dasher 2002; Aijmer & Simon-Vandenbergen 2003; Moissinac & Bamberg 2004). As intersubjective markers they modify or challenge the truthfulness of an assertion by referring to other factors. In addition, they may help spare the listener's feelings. They compare data from

the spoken component of the British National Corpus (BNC) (ten million words) and French interviews compiled in the Valibel corpus at the University of Louvain (3.5 million words). They set out to see how frequent this intersubjective marker use is in English and French and whether there are differences in the speed of grammaticalization in both languages. The authors track the movement from lexical meaning to intersubjective marker in answers to questions as well as in other dialogic contexts, and assertions. They back up their grammaticalization claim by referring to a number of important principles of the latter process, such as decategorialization, phonetic erosion and scope expansion. They conclude that ça *depend* has grammaticalized further than its English counterpart.

The contribution by Anita Fetzer picks up on the topic of potentially face-threatening expressions by comparing challenges in a corpus of English and German political interviews. Challenges are described as expressing "the speaker's intentions not to comply with a proposition, force or presupposition communicated in and through a prior conversational contribution" (p. 73), and are characterized as responses that (explicitly or implicitly) link up with a prior contribution and express some kind of contrast. Examples are *I **don't** think it's a question of that at all* in English and ***Nein** ganz gewiss nicht sondern **jetzt** mit ganzer Kraft die Union zusammenzuhalten* 'No not at all but rather now with all our strength to keep the CDU together' in German (p. 75, original emphasis). These examples show that challenges rely on all kinds of negative linguistic devices, which both languages are argued to use differently. The German negative operator is quite mobile and its scope does not necessarily correlate with its position in the way that it does in English. In addition, transferred negation, which mitigates the pragmatic force of a challenge, is very common in standard English political interviews as opposed to German. English challenges contain more verbs of cognition (*I/we think*) and have more anaphorically cohesive links (*so, you're saying*). She concludes that challenges are mostly realized indirectly and that it is typically the content of a contribution that is challenged, rather than its illocutionary force or presuppositions.

Marie-Noëlle Guillot's contribution deals with interruption in advanced learner French. It is based on elicited multi-participant discussions by L2 learners on the pros and cons of anti-smoking campaigns, which are compared to L1 English data and parallel L1 French data. Previous studies have shown that the French have fewer problems with interruptions than Anglo-Saxon speakers. The former often experience them as signs of involvement and closeness, whereas the latter see them as aggressive. The results of the quantitative analysis show that the highest number of interruptions in French is found in the L2 group. This may suggest that French learners exaggerate the use of interruptions to sound French. Other factors that may motivate the use of interruptions in L2 French have to

do with competing processing and communicative pressures, which explain why many of the interruptions do not display much cohesion with prior turns.

The paper by Martin Luginbühl compares TV news reporting in the American CBS Evening News and the Swiss Tagesschau, focusing on how they stage closeness and how cultural practices and text repertoire have changed from the 1940s (CBS Evening News) and 1950s (Tagesschau) until now. News texts are interpreted as cultural artefacts, "manifestations of a group's norms, values and agendas" (p. 125). The study investigates to what extent the news reporting on the public Swiss TV channel has americanized as a consequence of commercialization. The author concludes that americanization alone does not explain the observed changes, although partial homogenization can be observed. The CBS news shows a constant expression of closeness, whereas the Swiss news seems to have moved from a 'communication of distance' to a 'communication of closeness' (Linke 2000).

In the last contribution, Dirk Noël and Timothy Colleman deal with the nominative and infinitive pattern (NCI) in English and Dutch, as in *40 million are expected to be infected* and *Een abt wordt verondersteld in zijn abdij te vertoeven* 'An abbot is supposed to reside in his abbey' (p. 144; original emphasis). Within a diachronic constructionist framework they argue that most NCI patterns have come to instantiate three distinct constructions, viz. a (rare) 'propositional' passive NCI (*In this book authorities are said to be limited* […]), a 'non-propositional' descriptive NCI (*striking effects of word order which, on the one hand, may be said to have been contrived*) and a 'non-propositional' evidential NCI *(It is said to offer independent hotels* […]). The authors indicate some differences between English and Dutch, such as the types of verbs in NCI patterns (e.g. in Dutch perception verbs are not possible). Whereas in English the evidential NCI became a very productive pattern, especially in journalistic and academic discourse, its use decreased sharply in Dutch after a peak in the 18th century. On the other hand, both in English and Dutch a deontic pattern emerged, which has become the most frequent NCI pattern in present-day Dutch, e.g. *Chefs van afdelingen worden geacht excessief of nutteloos surfen te voorkomen* 'Heads of departments are supposed to prevent excessive and useless surfing' (p. 166). In English 'be expected/supposed to' can instantiate deontic meaning (*you are expected to leave rooms tidy*) and 'be supposed to' can express epistemic meaning (*the race was supposed to be taking place in a blazing sunshine*). While the authors argue that the emergence of the deontic and epistemic NCI in English is due to grammaticalization, the evidential NCI is argued to be a case of incipient grammaticalization only (Hopper & Traugott 2003 [1993]: 34) and more probably a borrowing from Latin.

While the present volume certainly delivers on its promises, it does have a few minor drawbacks, which by no means detract from its merits. Firstly, the range of languages studied in the various contributions is rather restricted. Comparisons are made between pairs of well-known and well-documented Germanic and

Romance languages such as English, Dutch, German and French. In addition, even though most papers are well-argumented and rely on extensive and sound corpus analysis, some papers are a bit weaker when it comes to methodology. Some claims are based on the analysis of rather small corpora or on elicitation tests from a small number of people. Sometimes not enough information is provided on the source and the nature of sets of data. One might also regret that the significance of the quantitative analysis is hardly ever backed up by commonly used statistical tests.

In sum, the present volume adds an interesting set of contributions to the increasingly popular field of contrastive pragmatics. It provides new insights into old issues, but also discusses hitherto under-researched topics, and the questions raised in it will certainly encourage further research in contrastive pragmatics.

References

Aijmer, Karin and Anne-Marie Simon-Vandenbergen. 2003. The discourse particle *well* and its equivalents in Swedish and Dutch". *Linguistics* 41 (6): 1123–1161.

Hopper, Paul J. and Elizabeth Closs Traugott. 2003. *Grammaticalization*, 2nd edition [1st edition 1993]. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

House, Juliane. 1996. Contrastive discourse analysis and misunderstanding: The case of German and English. In *Contrastive Sociolinguistics*, Marlis Hellinger and Ulrich Ammon (eds.). Berlin: de Gruyter, 345–361.

Linke, Angelika. 2000. Informalisierung? Ent-Distanzierung? Familiarisierung? Sprach(gebrauchs)wandel als Indikator soziokultureller Entwicklungen. *Der Deutschunterricht* 3: 66–77.

Martin, James R. and Peter R.R. White. 2005. *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

Moissinac, Luke and Michael Bamberg. 2004. 'It's weird, I was so mad': Developing discursive identity defenses in conversational 'small' stories of adolescent boys. *Texas Speech Communication Journal*. Special Issue "Narratives we live by". Available online at http://www.clarku.edu/~mbamberg/Material_files/Discursive_Adolescent_Identities.doc

Rossari, Corinne, Anne Beaulieu-Masson, Corina Cojocariu and Anna Razgouliaeva (eds.) 2004. *Autour des connecteurs: Réflexions sur l'*énonciation et la portée. Bern: Peter Lang.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs and Richard B. Dasher. 2002. *Regularity in Semantic Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wierzbicka, Anna. 1985. Different languages, different cultures, different speech acts: English vs. Polish. *Journal of Pragmatics* 9 (2–3): 145–178.