

ANA MARÍA PIQUER-PÍRIZ, RAFAEL ALEJO-GONZÁLEZ (eds.), *Metaphor in Foreign Language Instruction*, De Gruyter Mouton, 2020, 289 p.

The collective volume *Metaphor in Foreign Language Instruction* (Volume 42 of De Gruyter Mouton's "Applications of Cognitive Linguistics") was dedicated to Dr. Fiona MacArthur (University of Extremadura) for her notable contributions to the study of metaphor, in particular, and figurative language, in general, in L2 learning and cross-cultural communication. Apart from being entirely dedicated to metaphor research, this volume can be described as a comprehensive handbook and state-of-the-art overview of the study of metaphor-in-use in second language instruction. Thus, influential scholars in the field have gathered to celebrate MacArthur's substantial body of research and to establish the areas that call for further investigation, highlighting the new methods that are utilized in empirical Applied Cognitive Linguistics research.

The entire volume consists of two main parts (pp. 17–286), which are preceded by an *Introduction* (pp. 3–13) and followed by a *Subject Index* (pp. 287–289). The *Introduction* to this volume, belonging to the editors Piquer-Piriz and Alejo-González, establishes the key issues of metaphor in L2 instruction, pointing out the main contributions of cognitive linguistics-inspired studies to teaching figurative vocabulary. Furthermore, the *Introduction* sets the main directions to be dealt with in each part. Thus, Part I *Theoretical Considerations: Reviews and Perspectives* (pp. 17–97) encompasses four review articles that illustrate the relevance of teaching metaphor to L2 learners and identify areas requiring additional examination, whereas Part 2 *New Empirical Studies* (pp. 103–286) is organized in two different sections. Section 1 *Learners' use and knowledge of L2 figurative language* and Section 2 *Fostering knowledge of L2 figurative language* consist of eight new empirical studies that describe various "methodological challenges and promising practices, lighting various paths that can be followed when analyzing the role that metaphorical language plays in L2 instruction in real contexts" (p. 5).

Raymond W. Gibbs' article (*The particularities of metaphorical experience: an appreciation of Fiona MacArthur's metaphor scholarship*, pp. 17–35) touches upon the varying approaches to metaphor within a multidisciplinary world of research (for example, metaphor in broad theoretical terms, metaphor in real discourse, the understanding of verbal metaphor in scientific experiments, metaphorical discourse, and metaphors across cultures). Gibbs addresses some of MacArthur's important empirical findings that have substantially contributed to the study of metaphor and that helped her draw theoretical conclusions around general topics like (i) how speakers understand primary metaphors, (ii) the role of metaphorical reasoning among L2 students from ages 5 to 11, (iii) the relevance of not only linguistic but also social, historical, and cultural factors to metaphorical language, (iv) the reasoning behind mixing metaphors in instructor-second language learner discourse, and (v) the specifics of metaphor identification. According to Gibbs, what makes MacArthur's scholarship outstanding is her constant investigation of metaphor use in different contexts and/or within a situated discourse (e.g., classroom discourse, various socio-cultural contexts, interactions between native and non-native speakers of a language).

The second review article (*Taking stock after three decades: "On teaching metaphor" revisited*, pp. 37–56) is authored by Graham Low who reviews one of his own much cited papers, "On teaching metaphor," published in 1988. By revisiting this publication and also considering the 2008 updated version, "Metaphor and education," Low reviews his position on metaphor and foreign language instruction, attempting to establish the issues that are still pertinent in foreign language teaching and learning of metaphor but also in need of improvement such as: (i) the *treatment* definition of metaphor; (ii) the *core* functions of metaphor; (iii) and the importance of metaphoric competence. Although these main points remain largely valid, Low insists on the necessity of

integrating metaphoric competence into “national foreign language syllabuses, examination profiles, or textbooks” (p. 49), given that the significance of metaphor use in discourse is not yet fully acknowledged in foreign language teaching and testing.

Ana M. Piquer-Piriz’s study (*Figurative language and young L2 learners*, pp. 57–77) continues the discussion of metaphor and its salience in foreign language instruction, revisiting some of the theoretical notions of figurative competence and linguistic motivation, with a focus on how these two concepts are interrelated and the impact they may have on the acquisition of vocabulary in L2. According to the author, the understanding and the production of figurative language depends on children’s exposure to different inputs and experiences which form “the knowledge of the world” (pp. 62–63).

Understudied areas in the field of metaphor and foreign instruction are discussed by Laura Suárez-Campos, Alberto Hijazo-Gascón, and Iraide Ibarretxe-Antuñano in the chapter that concludes Part I of the book (*Metaphor and Spanish as a foreign language*, pp. 79–97). A main goal, among others, is to offer an overview of how the Conceptual Metaphor Theory has been applied to the acquisition and teaching of Spanish. Pertinent findings of the research carried out on metaphor comprehension and production in Spanish as a foreign language (SFL) are presented. For example, for the comprehension of metaphors, L2 learners often employ strategies that are based on linguistic knowledge or on cognitive reasonings (i.e., associative thinking, image formation, analogical reasoning, etc.). The chapter concludes with a review of the studies that dealt with pedagogical proposals in SFL instruction, along with practical activities with metaphor (e.g., identifying conceptual metaphors and metaphorical expressions in a text; work with dictionaries, online corpora, and poetry, etc.), and evident benefits following the implementation of metaphor in the SFL, such as improvement of students’ metaphorical competence as well as their communication skills.

Part II of the book switches from more theoretical accounts, as seen above, to the novel empirical studies, also conducted from the perspective of Applied Cognitive Linguistics. The articles included here are organized in two main sections. The first five chapters in section 1 deal with the *learner’s use and knowledge of L2 figurative language*, whereas the last three chapters in section 2 assess pedagogical approaches for *fostering knowledge of L2 figurative language* in different didactic settings.

Chapter one of the first section, entitled *Is comfort purple or green? Word-color associations in the first and second language*, pp. 103–130, and authored by Jeannette Littlemore, Paula Pérez-Sobrino, Nina Julich, and Danny Leung, delves into the findings of a questionnaire-based project on word-color associations. More specifically, the study consisted of “the administration of two online Qualtrics questionnaires to native speakers of English and Cantonese and to Cantonese speakers answering in English” (pp. 105–106). Given that too little was known about the extent to which the associations between abstract concepts, emotions, and colors were bodily-based or that their perceived embodiment would determine their universality, one of the main goals of this study was to determine whether “physically-based L2 word-color associations are more likely to be adopted by L2 speakers than culturally-based ones” (p. 105).

In the chapter *Metaphorical reasoning in comprehension and translation: an analysis of metaphor in multiple translations* (pp. 131–148), Gill Philip offers an overview of an “ongoing research and teaching project dealing with metaphor in translation” (p. 146). Philip analyzes the multiple translations of trainee translators in order to reveal those strategies that are actually used in the translation of metaphors. Three extracts were offered in a translation course (English – source language; Italian – target language) at an Italian university. The experiments reiterated the importance of three phases essential to the processing of metaphors: (i) recognize the metaphor; (ii) comprehend the metaphor; and (iii) interpret the metaphor. Furthermore, Philip notices that a successful translation of metaphor highly depends on language proficiency in L2. With this in mind, it appears that lower-proficiency students are likely less successful at translating metaphors and may be inclined to misinterpret metaphorical language as literal.

Another teaching context, office hours’ consultations, is dealt with in the following chapter (*Metaphorical alignment in cross-cultural office hours’ consultations*, pp. 149–171), where Tina Krennmayr investigates alignment of metaphorical use between speakers that use English as a lingua

franca. Twenty-seven conversations during office-hour consultations between Spanish Erasmus students and their lecturers are analyzed. These interactions are a good way to explore the metaphor in use between users with a varying degree of experience in utilizing and understanding metaphors. By focusing on SIGHT metaphors, Krennmayr looks into how conversational partners use metaphors and respond to them, or otherwise, how they “align their use of metaphors” (p. 151). The case study combines a computational semantic annotation tool, WMatrix, and metaphor identification procedures like MIP or MIPVU.

The *Development of L2 metaphorical production* (pp. 173–198), authored by Susan Nacey, looks into the development of metaphorical production of L2 school learners of English across grade level. This pseudo-longitudinal exploratory study is based on data from “Tracking Written Learner Language” (TraWL), a longitudinal corpus that is currently under compilation, and focuses on metaphorical competence in texts written by Norwegian pupils belonging to different age groups (10–19). Linguistic metaphors are identified through the Metaphor Identification Procedure Vrije Universiteit (MIPVU). Nacey, who in a previous study (Nacey 2013) investigated “metaphor frequency in English argumentative texts written by Norwegian college students” (p. 174), shows in this current study how “metaphorical production develops as proficiency increases” (p. 173), the grade and age being used as a proxy for proficiency level. The increase in metaphor density in more advanced school grades is also triggered by the more abstract nature of the topics discussed, “indicating a correlation between grade level and abstraction level” (p. 186). The results of this analysis are interpreted both quantitatively, showing that “metaphor density of texts increased steadily as grade level increases” (p. 195), and qualitatively, indicating that “the role of metaphor in discourse evolves as the grades increase” (p. 196).

Irene Castellano-Risco and Ana M. Piquer-Piriz’s exploratory study (*Measuring secondary-school L2 learners vocabulary knowledge: metaphorical competence as part of general lexical competence*, pp. 199–218) touches upon the importance of considering all four dimensions of metaphorical competence, as identified by Littlemore (2001), when we attempt to show the importance of figurative language in the L2 learning process, given that “learners have to deal with aspects of metaphor at all stages of proficiency and in all the different dimensions of communicative competence in the L2” (p. 201). Considering that most research studies in this area have focused on measuring learners’ production of metaphor, Castellano-Risco and Piquer-Piriz proposed the analysis of another dimension of metaphorical competence: “the understanding/recognition of metaphor” (p. 202). Thus, relying on well-known standardized vocabulary tests and metaphor identification tools, and bringing together two significant fields, metaphor research and vocabulary studies, the authors measure “secondary-school learners’ general lexicon competence as well as their understanding/recognition of figurative meanings” (p. 205), with the results indicating that the learners’ ability to comprehend figuratively-used lexical items is linked with their larger vocabulary size.

In section two of part II, Xinqing Wang, Frank Boers, and Paul Warren’s study (*Using literal underpinnings to help learners remember figurative idioms: Does the connection need to be crystal clear?*, pp. 221–239) begins with addressing important challenges that L2 learners may face in the process of comprehension and retention of figurative idioms. According to well-known theories (e.g., Levels of processing, Dual coding theory, etc.), it is thought that providing information about the literal meaning or the origins of the idiomatic expressions may contribute to learners’ retention of the idioms. The question following from this is the extent to which students may really benefit from this approach to idiom learning, given obstacles such as misinterpretations due to homonymy or polysemy, lack of culture knowledge, etc. (pp. 222–223), which may render the literal-figurative links too obscure for an accurate interpretation. The results highlighted, on one hand, that *transparent literal-figurative connections* do count for the recall of the idiomatic expressions’ meaning. On the other hand, it showed that learners’ level of proficiency seems to play a role in L2 idiom instruction. However, as the authors suggest, future research on L2 idiom learning and teaching should take account of other learning procedures and “the potential influence of other learner traits than proficiency” (p. 237).

In “*The manage of two kingdoms must*”: *An analysis of metaphor in two CLIL textbooks* (pp. 241–262), Rafael Alejo-González and Verónica García-Bermejo call attention to CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning), an educational approach to bilingualism “widely implemented in European Primary and Secondary schools” (p. 241). Thus, the main objective of this study is to “provide a first approach to the importance of metaphor in CLIL” (p. 242). To analyze metaphor density from this perspective, the authors select six lessons from two textbooks (Natural Science and Social Science) that are generally used to teach students in 5th grade of Primary Education in Spain (p. 247). The results indicate high open-class metaphor density, although smaller if compared with academic texts in general. Furthermore, the metaphor density is not evenly distributed throughout the proposed data. On one hand, the Natural Science textbook displays higher use of metaphor than the Social Science one. On the other, metaphor frequency was higher in different parts of each lesson unit. The latter could be a result of the pedagogic function they perform.

The final chapter by Rawan A. Saaty, *An enactment-based approach to the teaching of metaphoric expressions* (pp. 263–285), investigates how figurative language teaching may be enhanced through awareness-raising activities. The author carries out an experimental study that involves 60 female Saudi EFL students, and it compares three different activities generally used in the teaching of vocabulary and their impact on “learners’ comprehension, retention, and production of taught metaphoric expressions” (p. 278). The activities focused on: (a) enactment-based metaphor awareness, connecting literal and figurative meanings of the expressions through enactment and mime, given that “embodied metaphors are viewed as grounded in sensorimotor experience” (p. 263); (b) conceptual metaphor awareness, including verbal explanations of the conceptual metaphor behind the figurative expressions; and (c) semantic clustering, with no reference to the conceptual motivations behind the metaphoric expressions. For one, the results supported the notion that the first activity increased the understanding and retention of metaphors. For another, the findings suggested that the three proposed activities “may be unsuitable teaching methods for the production of metaphoric expressions” (p. 281).

The book summarized here, edited by Piquer-Píriz and Alejo-González, is one of the latest notable contributions to the study of metaphor in foreign/second language (L2) instruction, comprising both theoretical perspectives and new empirical studies, all based on three decades that have been devoted to giving metaphor, in the editors’ own words, “its well-deserved place in foreign language instruction” (p. 9). The book sheds light on various issues and concepts of great relevance among metaphor scholars, although many gaps are yet to be filled.

To begin with, the studies included in this volume brought forward a large amount of information related to the concepts of “metaphorical competence” (for a thorough review, see Castellano-Risco and Piquer-Píriz in this volume, pp. 200–205) and “linguistic motivation”, along with their impact on the acquisition of vocabulary in L2, in general, and understanding and production of figurative language, in particular, by means of various techniques (for example, raising metaphor awareness in the L1, identifying conceptual metaphors, using etymological elaboration, promoting awareness of embodied metaphors through actions that help link figurative senses to their literal underpinnings, etc.). Metaphorical competence, however, needs to be further developed, taking into consideration all four components that, according to Littlemore (2001: 461), “make up learners’ metaphorical competence: originality of metaphor production; fluency of metaphor interpretation; ability to find meaning in metaphor; speed in finding meaning in metaphor” (*apud* Castellano-Risco and Piquer-Píriz, this volume, p. 201).

Other important areas in need of further investigation are as follows: (i) developing reliable cognitive linguistics-oriented teaching materials and strategies that would enhance metaphor awareness among L2 learners of English and/or integrating metaphoric competence into national foreign language syllabi and examination profiles – the last chapter reviewed dealt with different metaphor awareness-raising activities; (ii) further cognitive linguistics-inspired studies to teaching figurative vocabulary in languages other than English – one chapter looked into the case of Spanish as L2; (iii) taking into account relevant aspects of the different language learners like their age and grade level, and their different proficiency levels of the target language – four of the chapters explored these issues.

In a little over 40 years since the publication of Lakoff and Johnson's ground-breaking work, *Metaphors We Live By* (1980), and over 30 years since Low's article on how to approach metaphor in foreign language instruction (1988), both strongly influencing later developments across various disciplines, we can observe how pervasive metaphor is in all the registers of language, in both spoken and written discourse. The numerous studies and ample contributions to the field of figurative language and the various perspectives and approaches (such as integrating tenets of cognitive linguistics to teaching vocabulary in foreign language instruction) demonstrated the important role of figurative language in L2 instruction and cross-cultural communication.

Gina Scarpete Walters
School of International Letters and Cultures
Arizona State University, Tempe

ANDRÉ ZAMPAULO, *Palatal Sound Change in the Romance Languages. Synchronic and Diachronic Perspectives*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2019, 256 p.

André Zampaulo's "Palatal sound change in the Romance languages. Diachronic and synchronic perspectives" investigates the evolution of palatal changes in Romance diachronically, while also providing useful data in the synchronic variation of this phenomenon. As suggested from the title, this monograph focuses mainly on phonetics, namely the particular case of palatals, while also bringing various phonological explanations and data. After Acknowledgements, the author provides an extensive and useful List of abbreviations, also including geographical information in the case of languages and dialects, e.g., "Lecc. Leccese (southern Salentino dialect of Lecce, extreme southeast Italy)" (p. xii). Seven chapters of unequal size are followed by Appendices, References and Index.

Chapter 1, "Introduction", starts with the description of the six major groups of Romance languages that will form the focus of Zampaulo's research: Eastern Romance (Romanian, Dalmatian – now extinct), Rhaeto-Romance (Friulian, Ladin, Romansh), Italo-Romance (Italian, Tuscan, Corsican, alongside northern, central and southern Italian dialects), Sardinian, Gallo-Romance (French, Occitan, Francoprovençal), and Ibero-Romance (Catalan, Navarro-Aragonese, Astur-Leonese, Galician, Portuguese, Spanish) (p. 1). It is worth mentioning at this point that the author does not exclude the existence of other Romance languages and varieties (while also mentioning a few), but his synchronic and diachronic data analyses will go in the direction of the six major groups identified. The Romance "palatals" are introduced in subsection 1.2 using the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA) system, alongside a series of conventions and adaptations to best serve the purposes of the monograph. Of the 20 palatals identified in Table 1.1 (p. 2), only the yod (the palatal approximant [j]) had already appeared in Latin. On p. 5, André Zampaulo puts forth four research questions to guide the reader through the book, focusing on: the Latin sources and diachronic evolution of Romance palatals, different diachronic evolution leading to similar synchronic outcomes, the effect of phonetic and phonological information on the evolution of Romance palatals, and the integration of phonetic motivation in phonological analysis. The last subsection of the Introduction presents the book outline.

Chapter 2, "Theoretical considerations", is self-explanatory. After a brief history of the attention given by scholars to phonetic change (going as back as 4th century BC), the author provides a list of canonical authors in the field of phonetics and phonology, in general, as well as in the specific field of Romance languages. Judging from the list of names and works, at this stage it appears that Zampaulo based most of his research on available literature published primarily in English. However, the theoretical background would have been significantly improved if additional references for Romanian had been in place, other than Maiden (2016), albeit highly valuable and up to date, as prior research is at this introductory point ignored (e.g., Chitoran (2002) or Steriade (2008),

among others). Expanding on the concept of sound change, the author sets the framework of his research to Optimality Theory (OT), à la Prince and Smolensky (2004 [1993]) and talks about the role in sound change of the speaker and the listener that becomes the speaker, following Ohala (2003). The speaker and the listener-turned-speaker distinction is formally the representation of the approach to sound change in this monograph: “a sound change may spread through the lexicon and the speech community until it is incorporated into the sound inventory of all language users” (p. 29).

Chapter 3, “The phonetics of palatals”, introduces the articulatory and acoustic characteristics of palatals. Based on all experimental work carried out, the articulation of these sounds is intrinsically complex. In this chapter, Zampaulo describes the palatal vowels [i e ε] and the glide [j], alongside the palatal sonorants and palatal obstruents. These phonetic characteristics are used to support the goals of the study, accounting for their realizations in Romance from both synchronic, and diachronic perspectives. The author reiterates in this chapter that it is not phonetics itself that triggers change, as sound production is intrinsically related to phonetic variation. Rather, it is the interplay between the speaker and the listener-turned-speaker that best explains the initiation of sound change (p. 45).

The effects of the palatal glide [j] (yod) and the influence of palatal vowels over Latin sonorant and obstruent consonants are key in understanding the emergence of palatals across Romance and are the subject of Chapter 4, “Palatals in the history of the Romance languages”, with thorough theoretical assumptions and careful analyses of: the emergence of Latin yod, the emergence of the palatal lateral [ʎ], the emergence of the palatal nasal [ɲ], and the emergence of palatal obstruents. Data are brought from an abundance of Romance languages and varieties. On p. 63, Zampaulo provides the different evolutionary results of Latin [pl- kl- fl-] in the Romance-speaking world. Although the author does mention that the list is not exhaustive, the data from Eastern Romance is again scarce, providing only the situation from (standard) Daco-Romanian (the author uses “Romanian”, but I chose to write Daco-Romanian, to oppose it to Aromanian, Megleno-Romanian and Istro-Romanian). Nevertheless, the whole analysis would benefit if the other Eastern Romance varieties, such as Aromanian or Istro-Romanian, had been further researched, where the evolution of Latin [kl-] resulted in an intermediate stage [klj-], for example Lat. “clamare” > Arom. [klje'ma]; in Istro-Rom. [klje'mã] alternates with [kle'mã] and also [ce'ma] (see more examples and discussion in Saramandu (1984: 428–33) for Aromanian, and Kovačec (1984: 554–8) for Istro-Romanian, both in Rusu (ed.) 1984). In the concluding remarks to this chapter, on p. 97–8 the author reconstructs the main evolutionary patterns of palatals from Latin to Romance.

Zampaulo switches from diachrony to synchrony in Chapter 5, “Palatals in the Romance languages today”, with the goal of setting an inventory of palatals in the family of Romance languages. While being aware of this tremendous undertaking, the author looks at synchronic dialectal data (both readily available, as well as unpublished material) from Ibero-Romance, Gallo-Romance, Italo-Romance and Sardinian, as well as Rhaeto-Romance and Eastern Romance, with the largest portion of this chapter dedicated to Ibero-Romance (roughly forty-five pages, against two-three pages for the each of the other varieties), with relevant graphs, spectrograms, tables, maps, and charts. Eastern Romance (Dalmatian and Daco-Romanian) data is unfortunately given a seven-line treatment. Although an equal treatment of all sub-Romance varieties (added by compare and contrast analyses) would have added significant value to this monograph, this may provide the grounds of new topics for further research (either by the author, or by other linguists) and does not diminish the tremendous effort into researching Ibero-Romance. The author rightfully stresses in the conclusions to this chapter that synchronic data can explain diachronic data and vice versa.

The goal of Chapter 6, “Palatal sound change in the Romance languages: a unified account”, is to propose an evolutionary formal portrait, by formalizing changes as resulting from both documented, and reconstructed pathways. Adopting the speaker-listener interaction and the constraint-based model, Zampaulo proposes an integrated account of how and why these sound changes could emerge, also revealing the mechanisms that may lead to the possible reoccurrence of similar change events: [ʎ]-delateralization, [j]-fortition, [t d]-palatalization, [tʃ dʒ]-deaffrication, [dʒ ʒ]-devoicing, etc. (p. 150). The author dedicates subchapters to sound change as constraint reranking, pathways for the emergence and evolution of palatal sonorants and obstruents, showing how similar palatal change events have taken place in different Romance varieties in the passage from Latin to

Romance and/or in the evolution of the same variety. The unified account in the study of palatal variation is achieved by bringing diachrony and synchrony together.

Chapter 7, “Final remarks”, Zampaulo restates the theoretical background that shapes his analysis of Romance palatals, summarizing the chapters of his monograph, while also providing invitations to further research (open questions) on the nature of the constraints used throughout his analysis, among others. The Appendices section includes demographic questions (Appendix 1), sentence-reading task (Appendix 2), and knowledge of potential minimal pairs (Appendix 3), followed by References and Index.

André Zampaulo’s “Palatal sound change in the Romance languages. Diachronic and synchronic perspectives” (part of the series Oxford studies in diachronic and historical linguistics, general editors: Adam Ledgeway and Ian Roberts) is a state-of-the-art, theoretically sound well-written monograph. It treats a topic that has set the grounds for hot debates among linguists of various theoretical orientations. The historical and contemporary treatment of palatals in Romance is an endeavor that André Zampaulo successfully accomplishes, using mostly phonetics and phonology tools. The amount of data that the author uses to build his analysis upon is phenomenal, which is understandable given the number of Romance varieties (languages, dialects, subdialects, idiolects, etc.), all well-represented in the literature. Considering its high degree of detailing and formalization, this monograph is useful for linguists and graduate students with a solid background in generative linguistics, alongside descriptive Romance linguistics, in particular Romance phonetics and phonology.

The graphics used in this monograph are exceptional, being easy to read and follow, as well as move through chapters (despite some minor typos, for example on p. 98, “relying on .the results”, where the full stop is superfluous). The chapter dedicated to Conclusions could have been extended to include, beside the topics and questions for further research, the shortcomings and difficulties of the analysis put forth by the author. For example, as stated in my brief description of each chapter above, the data from Eastern/Balkan/Daco-Romance is heavily underrepresented, and the author does not provide the reader with explanations as to why this is the case; indeed, this drawback could be easily overcome by looking at data available since the end of the 19th century, see, for instance, Weigand (1888/2010), as well as more recent work, as Rusu (ed.) (1984) or Chițoran (2002). Other than this, the bibliography is consistent and up to date, and properly cited throughout the book.

To sum up, André Zampaulo’s “Palatal sound change in the Romance languages. Diachronic and synchronic perspectives” is a state-of-the-art monograph on the treatment of the palatals in Romance. Based on all of the above, this book is highly useful to phoneticians and phonologists, in general, and to linguists trained and/or specializing in Romance phonetics and phonology, in particular.

REFERENCES

- Chițoran, I., 2002, “The phonology and morphology of Romanian diphthongization”, *Probus*, 14, 205–246.
- Kovačec, A., 1984, “Istroromâna”, in V. Rusu (ed.), *Tratat de dialectologie românească*, Craiova, Scrisul Românesc. 550–591.
- Rusu, V. (ed.), 1984. *Tratat de dialectologie românească*. Craiova, Scrisul Românesc.
- Saramandu, N., 1984, “Aromâna”, in V. Rusu (ed.), *Tratat de dialectologie românească*, Craiova, Scrisul Românesc. 423–550.
- Steriade, D., 2008, “A pseudo-cyclic effect in Romanian morphophonology”, in A. Bachrach, A. Nevins (eds), *Inflectional Identity*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 313–359.
- Weigand, G., 1888/2010, *Die Sprache Der Olympto-Walachen: Nebst Einer Einleitung Uber Land Und Leute*. Kessinger Publishing, LLC.

This review appeared originally in the LINGUIST List at <https://linguistlist.org/issues/32.1774/>

Ionuț Geană

*“Iorgu Iordan – Alexandru Rosetti” Institute of Linguistics/
University of Bucharest, Faculty of Letters*

LILIANA IONESCU-RUXĂNDOIU, *De la sociolingvistică la pragmatică și analiza discursului* [From Sociolinguistics to Pragmatics and Discourse Analysis], București, Editura Universității din București, 2020, 570 p.

Starting with the second half of the 20th century, linguistic research has known a continuous diversification and refinement. Two directions, structuralism and functionalism, continue to dispute their preeminence in discussing the linguistic issues. Although mutually exclusive as a theoretical approach and method of analysis, they are, in reality, complementary, providing two ways of understanding, analysing, and interpreting the still mysterious and fascinating mechanisms of language. Romanian linguistics has been remarkably synchronous with these directions, since the totalitarian period, thanks to the individual effort and intellectual curiosity of outstanding scientific personalities, who have not only made them known, but have also succeeded in creating local research schools. As far as the functionalist direction, which includes sociolinguistics, pragmatics, and discourse analysis, is concerned, its acknowledgement and founding in our country is strongly related to the activity of the distinguished professor Liliana Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu.

The volume *De la sociolingvistică la pragmatică și analiza discursului* [From Sociolinguistics to Pragmatics and Discourse Analysis] includes a selection of studies and articles published by the author in various periodicals and volumes, from 1975 until nowadays. It is a retrospective, „balance sheet” volume, which gives the readers the privilege to capture ideas, issues, and interpretations in their historical context, when the directions had not been firmly decanted yet. Such a diachronic presentation not only describes an intellectual and professional itinerary, but captures the effervescence of ideas, the scholarly climate in which they have crystallized and gained coherence. Beyond the accuracy of data analysis and interpretation, the volume thus has a historical and documentary shade and we can only be grateful to the author for allowing us such a foray into an experience both personal and institutional, in which we can polyphonically glimpse the diversity of views and trends of a significant and impressive epoch.

Choices are defining for someone’s personality, no matter in which field s/he acts/performs; in this case, they reflect an extraordinary receptivity and intuition of the validity of new trends, on the background of the full assimilation and understanding of currently accepted theoretical models.

From the *Preface* (p. 99–11), the author describes the motivation of these scholarly choices, which have marked a profound and prolific scientific activity. A close disciple of professor Alexandru Rosetti, since graduating from University of Bucharest (a very relevant fact for the intellectual quality of the young university assistant and researcher), Liliana Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu started with studies in the field of phonetics, from a diastatic and diatopic point of view (historical and synchronous). Phonetics and phonology were integrated into the structuralist framework that was dominant at the time, this perspective being preferred due to its “abstract” character, «by allowing a game of the mind in which no semantic “complications” intervened» (p. 9). The grafting of phonology on the very recent methodology of transformationalism was materialized in a doctoral thesis, defended in 1970: *Sketch of typology of Moldavian dialects (based on the rules of word level phonology)*.

The transition from the study of dialects to sociolinguistics, facilitated by the participation in a circle of studies led by professor Boris Cazacu, was natural, so that the latter discipline aroused the author’s interest in the second major orientation in linguistic research, namely functionalism. A complex field of actualizing the functional direction in linguistic research is represented by pragmatics and discourse analysis, which allowed the author a more comprehensive and deeper observation of linguistic phenomena, as well as the overcoming of a certain stylistic formalization and aridity of expression, typical of structuralism. In the words of the author: “Relating the variety of regional and social uses – but also the language choices that speakers make in different situations – with the diversity of functions updated in real communication processes involves the researcher’s opening to a wider horizon of knowledge, and, at the same time, may have a wider practical applicability than operating with a formalized system.” [...] In addition, “As a domain with a wide

interdisciplinary openness, pragmatics offers a practically unlimited field to the stylistic exercise” (p. 10). During her six decades of research, Liliana Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu has published articles in various fields, including phonetics, grammar, historical linguistics, stylistics, and poetics. However, the author confesses that sociolinguistics, pragmatics and discourse analysis fit better to her profile.

The interest in these fields was actively manifested through practical initiatives, meant to promote them at the Faculty of Letters of the University of Bucharest: elaborating academic volumes, both theoretical and analytical; initiating courses (in the early 1990s, an optional course was introduced, which later became optional pragmatics, so that, starting with the 2000s, compulsory courses were introduced); inviting foreign researchers to lecture in Bucharest; organizing international congresses, such as *The 10th Biennial Congress of the International Association for the Study of Dialogue* (IADA), in 2005, and the *International Conference on Parliamentary Discourse*, in 2011; publishing thematic volumes in the country and abroad. We owe the creation of the Romanian school of pragmatics and the training of countless current teachers and researchers to Professor Liliana Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu.

The astonishing versatility of pragmatics, seen in a broad sense, as a communicative, rhetorical approach to language, has made certain distinct research fields to be reunited and capitalized in the melting pot of this discipline: the theory of speech acts, cognitivism (a modern variant of psycholinguistics), theories of politeness (considered a variety of sociolinguistics), Bakhtinian discourse analysis (polyphony, dialogism), analysis of conversation, analysis of dialogue, rhetoric and argumentation (pragma-dialectics), more recently – historical linguistics (diachronic pragmatics). The importance of the functionalist orientation in linguistic research is not denied by anyone today, and the synchronization with Western research, that is promoted, in a much more restrictive and ideological climate, by different scholars, Liliana Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu included, remains a duty not only of those who were formed as specialists in this domain and benefited from the enthusiasm, intellectual openness and vision of this great teacher, but also of the academic community in general.

The studies and articles selected in the volume under review are grouped into three sections. The year of republishing is indicated at the end of each article. The texts, written in Romanian, English, and French, were published in their original form. The interventions operated in the text are only editorial (related mainly to the indication of the sources). The final bibliography includes all the references, in order to emphasize also, from a formal point of view, the unitary character of the volume. The volume also includes some unpublished texts, papers presented at various conferences and symposia.

As the author points out, the grouping of articles is mainly thematic and only secondarily chronological. Theoretical articles are placed before the applied ones, the order of the latter being chronological.

In the first section, *Preliminarii* [Preliminaries] (pp. 15–25), two general articles were selected to give the reader a perspective on the volume. The first article, *Sincronizarea cu Occidentul – tradiție în lingvistica românească* [Synchronization with the West – a tradition in Romanian linguistics], originally published in 2003, describes the historical context in which the main linguistic theoretical and methodological orientations that developed in the West, especially structuralism, were introduced in the Romanian academic environment, starting with the 50s of the last century, and the relationship, often unilateral, between Romanian and Western research. The second contribution, *Teorie și practică în pragmatica actuală. Câteva reflecții* [Theory and practice in current pragmatics. Some reflections] is a paper presented in 2017 at the *Conference of the Department of Linguistics of the Faculty of Letters*, University of Bucharest. Starting from the concept of paradigm in science, introduced and defined by Thomas S. Kuhn, current directions and trends of pragmatics are described; initially configured polemically in relation to Chomskyan linguistics and logical positivism, pragmatics quickly gained ground, the emergence of various directions in pragmatics attesting the tendency to change the formal paradigm with the functional one.

The second section, *Sociolingvistică* [Sociolinguistics] (27–106), which include papers written in English and Romanian, is divided into three subsections, (a) *Aspecte generale* [General aspects], with theoretical contributions; (b) *Textul literar din perspectivă sociolingvistică* [Literary texts from a

sociolinguistic perspective], and (c) *Adresarea și referirea din perspectivă sociolingvistică* [Addressing and referring from a sociolinguistic perspective]. The articles from the theoretical section, namely *Sociolingvistica: Orientări, principii, metode, aplicații* [Sociolinguistics: Tendencies, principles, methods, and applications] (1975); *Sociolingvistica – domeniu interdisciplinar* [Sociolinguistics – an interdisciplinary field] (1981), introduce the new discipline, “*par excellence*, a study of linguistic variation” (p. 35). The first article represents the *Introduction* chapter of the volume *Sociolingvistica. Orientări actuale* [Sociolinguistics. Current trends], edited in 1975 by Liliana Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu and Dumitru Chițoran. Concise and very well documented, these synthesis articles capture the aspects of a new and dynamic discipline, which links the study of the language and society, linguistics and sociology. Sociolinguistics will replace “language research *in abstracto*, characteristic of formalizing orientations, with language research in the community that uses it” (38). The diverse and updated bibliographic information impresses today, considering the year of publication and the informational blockade of the respective period. The direction oriented towards the analysis of concrete aspects of language functioning will become more and more prominent and diversified in the epoch, and will be reunited quite soon under the “umbrella” of pragmatics.

Two other articles were written a decade and a half later. *Structuri sociale și forme de expresie lingvistică* [Social structures and forms of linguistic expression] (1996) analyzes the relationship between linguistic and social structures from a diachronic point of view, and *Codeswitching and borrowing. Remarks on an Aromanian dialect spoken in Greece* (1997) considers the issue of linguistic contact, more precisely the influence of the Greek language on the Aromanian dialect, conditioned by bilingualism and other cultural factors.

The applicative articles, written between 1978 and 1982, have in view literary texts, except for one, *Some linguistic problems of the address forms in Romanian* (1982), which presents a taxonomy of the main means of addressing in Romanian, based on grammatical, semantic, and sociological criteria. Literary texts reflect the historical contextualization of sociolinguistic norms and the communicative competence of the characters, as highlighted in the article *Normele sociolingvistice și unele aspecte ale analizei stilistice a textului literar* [Sociolinguistic norms and some aspects of the stylistic analysis of the literary text] (1978). The subject matter under scrutiny concerns the relationship between the textual norm and the sociolinguistic norm in the novels *Frații Jderi* and *Hanu-Ancuței* by M. Sadoveanu, the means of addressing in the short stories of I.L. Caragiale, the functions of addressing and referring in the comedies of I.L. Caragiale. The analysis of fictional texts from a sociolinguistic perspective is quite new and rather singular in that period (1978; 1980; 1981; 1982): artistic language is no longer studied as an element of expressivity, but as a means of evoking a sociolinguistic code and interpersonal, historically conditioned rhetoric. It is the reconstruction of the sociolinguistic norm that helps to realistically construct a coherent fictional universe, and not (only) the lexical choices and other stylistic devices.

Section III, *Pragmatică – Analiza conversației – Analiza discursului* [Pragmatics – Conversation analysis – Discourse analysis] (pp. 107–550), is the largest in the book, in accordance with the continuous development of these directions, which closely intersect each other. The chapter *Pragmatică* [Pragmatics] (109–206) groups, under the title (a) *Aspecte generale* [General aspects], five articles written between 2010 and 2018. *De la filosofia limbajului la pragma-lingvistica interacțională* [From the philosophy of language to the interactional pragma-linguistics] (2010) is an article dedicated to the memory of Professor Sorin Stati, emphasizing his vision on pragmatics: the interpretation of speech acts as statements with a conventional, literal and pragmatic content; the research on transphrastic structures and dialogue, as well as the transition toward interactional pragmatics, which focuses on the actual language used in social interaction. For 15 years, Sorin Stati was the founder and president, of the IADA (*International Association for Dialogue Analysis*). *Universal vs. Specific. Reflecții asupra politeții pragmatice* [Universal vs. Specific. Reflections on pragmatic politeness] (2005) and *Versiuni actuale ale unei teme tradiționale: politețea* [Current versions of a traditional theme: politeness] (2006) present the pragmatic interpretation of the current concept of politeness and the main descriptive models of politeness. Two other articles in English: *Keep silent or keep talking! Remarks on silence in the Romanian culture* (2016); *Questions and*

rhetorical questions. A theoretical synthesis (2018), reinterpret the linguistic phenomena of silence and interrogation from a communicative-functional perspective.

Subchapter (b), entitled *Comunicarea curentă în româna non-standard* [Current communication in non-standard Romanian], contains articles from the period 1988–2003. Studies focused on particular issues precede those devoted to theoretical synthesis, illustrating the development and expansion of pragmatics itself, which progressively reconfigured and re-evaluated its limits insofar as studies on communication have multiplied and become more consistent. In the absence of corpora of spoken language, research on current, authentic language was done on dialectal recordings. As the author points out in the article *Working with dialectal texts for dialogue analysis* (1999), «dialectal texts, especially the so-called free texts, could provide the dialogue analyst a reliable material. Being elicited for completely different purposes, they have the advantage of the “objectivity” of the data: dialogues included by the storyteller in his/her account are not elicited by the researcher; they escape his/her control. Although in a way they resemble the dialogues in fiction, dialogues in the dialectal texts have the advantage of being genuine and not carefully elaborated, according to certain aesthetic principles and norms. They illustrate the *spontaneous* metaphorical type of literature (cf. Toolan 1992: 31)» (p. 198).

Thus, the studies capture the transition from actual sociolinguistics – the differences regarding the standard use, in the introductory article: *Normă și abatere de la normă în graiuri* [Norm and deviation from the norm in dialects] (1988) – to pragmatics, with articles focused on politeness strategies: *Remarks on politeness strategies in the dialects spoken in Muntenia* (1989); *Politeness strategies in oral dialogues* (2003), and deixis: *Sugestii pentru interpretarea pragmatică a unor deictice în dacoromâna vorbită* [Suggestions for the pragmatic interpretation of some deictics in spoken Daco-Romanian] (I) – (II) (1992); (1993). Oral communication phenomena, such as corrections, hesitations, gaps, lapses, silence, fumbings, are defined and discussed in the article: *Mărci ale discontinuității în textele dialectale muntenesti* [Marks of discontinuity in dialectal texts from Muntenia] (1994). The research introduces a new perspective on language, the communicative one, in which certain aspects eluded by traditional analysis acquire a functional/strategic importance.

The second chapter of Section III, *Analiza conversației. Aspecte generale* [Conversational Analysis. General aspects], includes articles that present the main concepts and definitions of Edmondson’s ethnomethodological model of conversation analysis: pre-exchanges, post-exchanges, macro- and micro-structural levels, intensifiers: *Funcții strategice ale schimburilor preliminare* [Strategic function of pre-exchanges] (1993); *Pre-exchanges as a conversational strategy* (1997). Argumentation is analysed within the above mentioned theoretical model as a (macro-)speech act, which encompasses several conversational moves (Proffer – Satisfy – Contra – Counter – Re-proffer) (*Argumentation as a strategy in face-to-face interaction*) (1999). The introductory part of the Corpus of spoken Romanian *Interacțiunea verbală în limba română actuală* [Verbal interaction in present-day spoken Romanian] is included too, as an important article which indicates the growing interest in dialogue analysis in Romania, in 2002, and the synchronicity with similar international interactionist researches. Practically, the *Corpus of Spoken Romanian*, coordinated by Liliana Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu, along with other individual researches, inscribes Romanian linguistics in the emerging interactional orientation named *Corpus Linguistics*. Today, linguistic research would be unconceivable without these corpora, which attest to the current, authentic, and spontaneous use of language. Another two articles specifically refer to metacommunication: *Funcții discursive ale secvențelor metacomunicative* [Discursive functions of metacommunicative sequences] (2003), and the concept of conversational history (*Some comments on the concept of conversational history*) (2018).

The third chapter of Section III, *Analiza discursului. Forme discursive* [Discourse Analysis. Discursive Forms] (pp. 249–474), is the largest one, given the amplitude of the subject. It encompasses two subchapters, **3.1. Discursul politic** [Political discourse], and **3.2. Discursul literar** [Literary discourse], which reflect the constant preoccupation of the author for different instances and ways of contextual actualisation of these specific discursive genres. Various forms of political discourse have been analyzed, considering both some theoretical and empirical aspects: (a) *Dezbaterea televizată* [TV Debates]; (b) *Dezbaterea electorală* [Electoral Debate]; (c) *Discursul*

parlamentar [Parliamentary Discourse]; (d) *Discursul de presă* [Political Media Discourse]. Under the first category are included articles such as: *Réfutation et correction dans un débat politique télévisé* [Refutation and correction in a TV Debate] (2001); *Cooperare și conflict în dezbaterile televizate* [Cooperation and conflict in the TV Debate] (2003); *Politețe și impolitețe în dezbaterile televizate* [Politeness and impoliteness in TV debates] (2004). While the first contribution refers to a French debate (an electoral debate presented on France 2, on May 11th, 1997), the last two concern Romanian political actors, who compete in a particular form of political talk show, illustrated by two recordings of *Marius Tucă Show*, on Antena 3.

The subchapter dedicated to electoral debate brings together the contributions: *Dezbaterile electorale televizate ca formă discursivă* [Electoral debate as a discursive form] (2007); *Sugestii pentru interpretarea pragma-retorică a discursului electoral* [Suggestions for the pragma-rhetorical interpretation of electoral discourse] (2007); *Prezentarea și negocierea identității în dezbaterile electorale* [Presentation and negotiation of identity in the electoral debate] (2006); *O dezbateri electorale atipică. Alegerile prezidențiale din 2000* [An atypical electoral debate. The presidential elections in 2000] (2007); *Identitate și imagine în dezbaterile electorale* [Identity and image in electoral debate] (2011); *Strategic uses of certainty and uncertainty in a political debate* (2014). These studies overcome their strict pragmatic value, contributing to an interdisciplinary analysis and interpretation of political behaviour in a specific socio-political context, which is retrospectively highly valuable.

Parliamentary discourse has also been approached as a specific form of institutional interaction. Some particular aspects which define it: stance and argumentation; modality; im/politeness; rhetorical forms (preterition) are also analysed. The titles of the contributions are relevant, since together they succeed to illustrate the specificity of the most formal and ritualized instance of political discourse: *Discursul parlamentar ca formă specifică de interacțiune instituțională* [Parliamentary discourse as a specific form of institutional interaction] (2014); *Discursive perspective and argumentation in the Romanian parliamentary discourse* (2008); *Perspectivă și modalizare în discursul politic. Studiu de caz* [Perspective and modality in political discourse. A Case study] (2009); *Impolitețea în absența în discursul parlamentar românesc* [In absence impoliteness in the Romanian parliamentary discourse] (2010); *Straightforward vs. mitigated impoliteness in the Romanian parliamentary discourse* (2010); *Sintaxă și funcționare discursivă: preteritia în discursul politic* [Syntax and discursive functioning: preterition in political discourse] (2009); *The argumentum ad hominem in a Romanian parliamentary debate* (2011); *Perspectivization in the Romanian parliamentary discourse* (2012).

The study of this specific form of institutional interaction is quite recent in Discourse Analysis and contributes to a better understanding of national parliamentary discourse from a transcultural perspective. It is also important to remind here that Liliana Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu edited and coordinated two collective volume, *Parliamentary discourse across cultures* (2012), which gathers a selection of the papers presented at *International Conference on Parliamentary Discourse*, which took place in Bucharest, on September 23-24, 2011, and *Discursul parlamentar românesc (1866–1938). O perspectivă pragma-retorică* [Romanian Parliamentary Discourse (1866–1938): A Pragma-rhetorical Perspective] (2018), an ample historical research on Romanian parliamentary discourse.

The second subchapter of Section III, 3.2., *Discursul literar* [Literary discourse] (p. 404–474), includes contributions that carry on and refine the literary analyzes regarding sociolinguistic norms, since pragmatics incorporated this research direction quite soon: “Sociolinguistics should be applied pragmatics” (Brown/Levinson 1978: 286).

Literary pragmatics was the subject of a reference volume by Liliana Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu, published in 1991, *Narațiune și dialog în proza românească. Elemente de pragmatică a textului literar* [Narrative and dialogue in Romanian fiction. Elements of a pragmatic approach to the literary text], which presented and analysed the main concepts of this new discipline. Some of the articles republished under this section were later developed in the above mentioned volume, in its theoretical or applied part: *Reflecții asupra interpretării pragmatice a textului literar* [Reflections on the pragmatic interpretation of the literary text] (1984), *Storytelling as a component of the literary prose*

text (1985); *Scrisoarea literară ca act de comunicare* [The literary letter as a communicative act] (1985); *Aspecte ale relației autor – cititor în textul literar* [Aspects of the author–reader relationship in the literary text] (1987). The presentation of pragmatics through literary texts facilitated the access of specialists and students to the new discipline, which displayed a completely new conceptual apparatus and method of analysis; the author’s intuition was to choose certain classical texts, well known by the readers, in order to illustrate the abstract theoretical framework: Caragiale’s short stories and comedies, Sadoveanu’s novels or (in volume) G. Călinescu’s novels. Other articles, written after 1991, extend the analysis to both Romanian historiographical texts: *Structuri dialogale la cronicarii moldoveni* [Dialogue Structures in Moldavian Chronicles] (1997), or fictional texts from foreign literature, through which some discursive forms and phenomena, such as confession or intertextuality, are analyzed: *Les parents terribles de Jean Cocteau (acte I) ou le carrousel des confidences* [*Les parents terribles* by Jean Cocteau (acts I) or the carousel of disclosures] (2007); *Voix et intertextualité dans le théâtre de l’absurde. Étude de cas: E. Ionesco, La cantatrice chauve* [Voice and intertextuality in the theatre of the absurd. A case study: E. Ionesco, *The Bald Soprano*] (2014). The relationship between quotation/dialogism/plurilingualism, social performance (*staging*, cf. Goffman 1959), and stance/stancetaking is analyzed in the article: *Forme de citare în comediiile lui I.L. Caragiale* [Forms of quotation in I.L. Caragiale’s comedies] (2018).

The final chapter, IV, *Variabilitatea spațio-temporală a modelelor pragmatice* [Spatio-temporal variability of pragmatic models] (p. 475–550), includes articles on diachronic and intercultural pragmatics, in accordance with the latest trends in the discipline. The analyses of different fictional or non-fictional texts from various perspectives capture the process of transition and modernization of cultural models in the Romanian space. It is noteworthy that pragmatic analyses of this type are essentially interdisciplinary, integrating elements of history and sociolinguistics, as well as cognitive anthropology (according to which cultural models are collective or shared cognitive structures and patterns of behaviour that distinguish one culture from another) (see Kronenfeld 2008). Interpretations are meaningful, contributing to the understanding of the historical framework from inside, since mental structures as well as behavioural patterns are revealed through the fictional or authentic language of the time. Some titles are suggestive: *From irony to insults. Past and present in the Romanian parliamentary discourse* (2011); *Exploatarea variației intraculturale ca strategie a (im)politeții* [Exploiting intracultural variation as a strategy of (im)politeness] (2017); *Bonjuriști și Tombatere. Aspecte ale tranziției spre modernitate în Principatele Române (1800–1859)* [*Bonjuriști și Tombatere*. Aspects of the transition to modernity in the Romanian Principalities] (1800–1859) (2018); *Forme de adresare și de referire în a doua jumătate a secolului al XIX-lea (pe baza datelor din comedia O noapte furtunoasă)* [Forms of addressing and referring in the second half of the 19th century (based on data from the I.L. Caragiale’s comedy *A Stormy Night*)] (2019). The evolution of the addressing forms in Romanian, from feudalism to the modern era is presented in the article *Politeness variability: between theory and communicative practices* (2019). An interesting contribution: *Living in a different language. Speakers’ meta-linguistic comments on cultural differences* (2018), which takes as its starting point two autobiographical books, refers to intercultural communication, namely how outsiders/foreigners evaluate and comment on the cultural model they want to adopt. As the author emphasizes, integration into another ethnic community involves the assimilation of cultural-communicative norms, understanding the type of ethos (egalitarian or hierarchical), which is reflected in the choice of politeness strategies and, most importantly, an open attitude towards negotiating differences.

In the end of this presentation, some general consideration can be added. The volume is very well structured, facilitating a rapid orientation of the reader and the selection of a certain topic. The contributions, yet complete together, can be regarded separately, from different angles, and they offer a coherent vision on the functional aspects of language, in various communicative contexts. The theoretical part is constantly sustained by applications and textual analyses; this specific approach facilitates the understanding of concepts and puts them in a balanced relation with communicative reality. The clear and logical presentation, doubled by the analytical insights, explains the interest and emulation that these contributions aroused at the time of their appearance; together they

retrospectively outline a deep vision and an original method of analysis, thorough and compelling from the beginning.

On the other side, the volume summarizes, through distinct articles, the evolution of pragmatics, and its effective actualization in a specific cultural framework, namely the Romanian one. It offers a dynamic as well as a synchronous perspective on functionalist orientations, capturing the emerging tendencies and directions and ultimately their crystallisation. The thorough analyses and accurate observations applied to a diverse linguistic material (from dialectal recordings, spoken Romanian corpora to non/fictional literary texts), the intrinsic interdisciplinary suggestions recommend the volume to a wide spectrum of scholars. Scientifically rigorous, but at the same time interesting and captivating, through the constant reflection on the language-society-culture triad, the volume under review is an exceptional monograph, whose reading is compulsory for understanding the development of the Romanian pragmatic research.

REFERENCES

- Brown, P., St. C. Levinson, 1978, "Universals in language usage. Politeness phenomena", in E. N. Goody (ed.), *Questions and politeness. Strategies in social interaction*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 56–289.
- Goffman, E., 1959, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Garden City/New York: Doubleday & Co., Anchor Books.
- Kronenfeld, D. B., 2008, "Cultural models", *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 5, 1, 67–74.
- Toolan, M., 1992, "The signification of representing dialect in writing", *Language and Literature* 1, 1, 29–46.

Liliana Hoinărescu

"Iorgu Iordan – Alexandru Rosetti" Institute of Linguistics