

Ana Lj. Vučićević  
Aleksandra D. Rakić  
University of Kragujevac  
Faculty of Philology and Arts  
The Centre for Scientific Research

УДК 001.81:070.447  
DOI [10.46793/Uzdanica20.2.021V](https://doi.org/10.46793/Uzdanica20.2.021V)  
Оригинални научни рад  
Примљен: 16. јун 2023.  
Прихваћен: 22. децембар 2023.

## FOCUSED EVALUATION IN ACADEMIC BOOK REVIEWS: REALISATIONS AND FUNCTIONS<sup>1</sup>

*Abstract:* Book reviews are highly evaluative academic genre as they essentially convey the assessment of the novel academic content within disciplinary communities. In terms of the (rhetorical) structure of the review, it has been observed that certain sections that contain focused evaluation (i.e. evaluation of the specific aspects of the reviewed book that is generically called *Move 3*) might be central to the evaluative rhetorical purpose of the genre. Having in mind that the evaluation in book reviews in Serbian is scarcely researched, this paper explores the positions and functions of *Move 3* in the academic book reviews published in the prestigious Serbian journal *South Slavic Philologist*. The principal aims are to provide qualitative accounts of *Move 3* and introduce possibilities for the rhetorical implementation of this section as illustrated in expert writing in Serbian. Motta-Roth's (1996) four-move framework as well as Biber et al.'s (2007) steps from *top down* corpus analysis approach were used to determine the general rhetorical patternings of the reviews as well as the specific realisations of *Move 3*. The results show that, aside from being a part of the regular pattern (M1–M2–M3–M4) that is widely recognised in literature, *Move 3* also interacts with Moves 1 and 2. *Move 3* interacts with *Move 1* so that it either merges with it or follows it. When it comes to the interactions with *Move 2*, *Move 3* either precedes it or combines with it in information cycles.

*Keywords:* academic book reviews, *South Slavic Philologist*, rhetorical structure, focused evaluation, *Move 3*.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Previously somewhat neglected in literature (Hyland, 2004: 41; Tse & Hyland, 2006b: 768), in the last decades the genre of book reviews gained an important place in the studies on academic discourse. This comes as no surprise since

---

<sup>1</sup> The research was funded by the Ministry of Science, Technological Development and Innovations of the Republic of Serbia through Grant Agreement on the implementation and funding of scientific research no. 451-03-47/2023-01/200198.

genre analysts, particularly those from the ESP tradition, recognised the significance of the familiarity with the demands of writing professional and informed assessment for disciplinary academic journals in the age of, we could say, hyperproduction of academic content. Precisely due to their evaluative nature, reviews are held as highly interpersonal and interactive (Tse & Hyland, 2006a, 2006b). The reviewer has to openly position him-/herself with respect to the reviewed material and prospective readers, having in mind the criteria valid within an individual discipline (Groom, 2009: 125) as well as the necessary neutrality, objectivity (Giannoni, 2009: 19) and disinterestedness (Shaw, 2009: 217–218) the evaluation has to convey to be accepted.

The majority of the research papers on the evaluative aspects of book reviews that were available to us took a more pragmatic approach either through examination of cross-cultural/linguistic (Itakura & Tsui, 2011; Lorés Sanz, 2009; Moreno & Suárez, 2008b; Salager-Meyer, Alcaraz Ariza & Pabón, 2007b) and diachronic differences (Salager-Meyer, Alacaraz-Ariza & Pabón Berbesí, 2007a) or by using some specific pragmatic concept such as politeness (Gea Valor, 2000–2001; Gea Valor & Del Saz Rubio, 2000–2001) or proposition and metadiscourse (Moreno & Suárez, 2008a; Vučićević & Rakić 2020; Vučićević & Rakić 2023).

However, to our knowledge, not many studies dealt with evaluation as realised by means of the particular patterns of rhetorical structure. Generally speaking, Motta-Roth's (1996) work on the overall discourse organisation of academic book reviews in three disciplines (linguistics, chemistry and economics) was pioneering. The author suggested the four-move structure provided below:

- (a) Move 1: INTRODUCING THE BOOK (introducing the general topic, informing about the readership/author, inserting the book in the field);
- (b) Move 2: OUTLINING THE BOOK (providing overview of the organisation of the book and its individual sections);
- (c) Move 3: HIGHLIGHTING PARTS OF THE BOOK (providing focused evaluation) and
- (d) Move 4: PROVIDING CLOSING EVALUATION OF THE BOOK (recommending or disqualifying the book).

Following this framework, Suárez and Moreno (2008) reached important conclusions along the dimension of descriptive-evaluative in the overall discourse organisation of book reviews. Junqueira (2013) noticed the importance of repeated (cyclical) evaluation, whereas Lorés Sanz (2009) and Moreno and Suárez (2009) determined distribution of acts of evaluation in correlation with discourse structure. Even though he did not apply Motta-Roth's classification when examining praise and criticism in book reviews, Hyland (2004) also observed structurally-related patterns of evaluation.

While all the moves are evaluative to a degree, it might be argued that Move 3 most saliently fulfills the evaluative function of the genre. According to Motta-Roth (1996), Move 3 differs from other parts of the review as it is primarily evaluative in its function: it is not as descriptive as Move 2 or evaluative only at some points; here, the reviewers specifically focus on particular aspects of the book under review and may assess them at greater length. Some results of the studies of the rhetorical structure mentioned above corroborate this idea: most prominent differences were observed in relation to Move 3. We will return to these in the discussion section of our paper.

The present paper attempts at presenting different realisations (positions) and rhetorical functions of Move 3 in book reviews written in a reputable discipline-specific academic journal *Južnoslovenski filolog* [*South Slavic Philologist*] (or *JF/SSP* thereon). The aim is to point out the relevance of this evaluative unit of discourse organisation for the genre and introduce some possibilities for its rhetorical implementation as illustrated in the expert writing.

## 2. METHODOLOGY<sup>2</sup>

### 2.1. THE COMPILATION OF THE CORPUS

The corpus consists of fifty-two linguistics reviews of monographs published in SSP from 2000 to 2020.<sup>3</sup> In order to achieve the numerical balance, three reviews per volume in order of their appearance in the journal were picked.<sup>4</sup> To ensure comparability, we opted for the reviews of one genre solely. This implied the exclusion of the reviews of collections of papers / conference proceedings, journal volumes, individual articles, reference literature (such as grammar books, dictionaries), even the reviews of monographs written by the same author for the same SSP volume. When determining the type and size of the corpus, the following factors were taken into account:

- (1) real-time requirements of the study: data interpretation was based on the context-dependent and (admittedly) time-consuming rhetorical mapping of the texts (see Hunston, 2022 on corpus size and annotation) and

---

<sup>2</sup> Detailed Excel corpus lists with respective data and corpus analysis are available at [https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1UyAVvdGRcgz4dl9fNe\\_SdG2wvaRyUajq?usp=share\\_link](https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1UyAVvdGRcgz4dl9fNe_SdG2wvaRyUajq?usp=share_link).

<sup>3</sup> As the journal accepts submissions in all South Slavic languages, we consulted an expert in Contemporary Serbian language and Diachrony of the Serbian language, Tamara Lutovac Kaznovac, Assistant Professor at the Faculty of Philology and Arts, University of Kragujevac. We use this opportunity to thank her for her contribution in corpus selection.

<sup>4</sup> However, there were no reviews in the volumes issued in 2000, 2008 and 2010; additionally, only two monograph reviews per 2004 and 2009 were observed.

- (2) relative acquaintedness with the corpus: in this particular case, the corpus compilers are the corpus analysers (see Koester, 2010) and professionally speaking, they belong to the same discipline (linguistics) the reviews contribute to (see Flowerdew, 2005 on the role of the specialist informant in a corpus analysis).

## 2.2 ANALYTICAL PROCEDURES

Subsequently to the compilation of the corpus, the reviews were coded. The code implied the abbreviation for the journal (SSP), the year of publication (variable) and the number of the selected review for that particular year (variable).

The general analytical approach we took was top-down corpus analysis (Biber, Connor, & Upton, 2007). The model for the analysis of rhetorical organisation was Motta-Roth's (1996) move-step classification which was the basis for developing an initial framework of the moves we should take account of in the analysis. This particular classification was selected due to its attestedness in literature (see the introductory section). The corpus was examined independently, with individual instances of all four moves located manually in the texts and interpreted across different hierarchical units (sentence, paragraphs or sequences of paragraphs). The positions and functions of move of focused evaluation (Move 3) presented herein are the result of the mutual (inter-rater) adjustments.

## 3. POSITIONS AND FUNCTIONS OF MOVE THREE

In our corpus, the rhetorical functions of Move 3 depend on the positions it occupies in the text in comparison to other moves. In eight reviews, Move 3 was in its expected place in a linear sequence (M1 + M2 + M3 + M4). Compare the following sections going from Move 2 to Move 4, with Move 3 being in the middle:

Izlaganju onoga čemu je knjiga posvećena prethodi kraći tekst [...]. [...] Na kraju izlaganja, posle spiska konsultovane literature [...] i spiska korišćenih skraćenica (361), priložen je i rezime na engleskom jeziku [...].<sup>5</sup> (SSP2004/1, p. 218)

Knjiga je, kao što joj naslov kazuje, posvećena proučavanju [...]. Svojim prikupljanjem tog istraživačkog temi S. M.<sup>6</sup> je učinila retko srećan izbor s tačke gledišta naučne dobrobiti. Zasluguje da bude pozdravljena, pre svega, već sama ta činjenica da se autorka prihvatila zadatka da dopuni dosadašnja saznanja [...]. Treba joj još više odati priznanje zbog toga što je u taj obuhvat istraživačke optike postavila baš

---

<sup>5</sup> Due to the language of the paper, all excerpts are transliterated from the Cyrillic script.

<sup>6</sup> In order to preserve anonymity, we provide only initials of the authors mentioned in the review.

[...], čime su znatno povišeni izgledi da se, u rezultatu obavljenih analiza, osvoje neke nove naučne spoznaje; [...]. (SSP2004/1, pp. 218–219)

Pažnja stručne javnosti nikako ne bi smela da zaobiđe ovu sadržajima toliko bogatu knjigu. (SSP2004/1, p. 220)

In addition to these transparent cases, Move 3 has shown greater positional and, consequently, functional variation when interacting with other moves.

### 3.1. INTERACTIONS WITH MOVE 1 (SIX REVIEWS)

Move 1 usually introduces the book in terms of the publication details and its authorial and disciplinary affiliation. This information may vary from purely technical to more rhetorically complex assessment-like description of the publication that conveys reviewer's acquaintedness with the author's work, previous and recent findings and authorities in the discipline. Depending on the prominence of the assessment, we may consider this to be an integration of Moves 1 and 3. Observe how the technical information in the very first paragraphs of the review is skillfully developed into a proper evaluation of virtually all elements that might be relevant to an expert reader of the review and the book: publisher, author, scope of the research, principal approach, methods, topics, implications and the like.

Najnovija monografija dr S. R. pod naslovom [...], koja je objavljena kao dva-deset druga po redu knjiga u uglednoj ediciji [...], predstavlja rezultat autorkinih dugogodišnjih istraživanja u oblasti opisa leksike srpskog jezika [...], kao i rada u okviru leksikografskog projekta [...]. O naučnoj aktuelnosti tema zastupljenih u monografiji svedoči činjenica da su u njoj primenjeni metodološki postupci koji su razrađivani poslednjih decenija u okviru vodećih lingvističkih škola [...]. [...] Na bogatoj gradi ekscerpiranoj iz [...], analiziraju se [...], izdvajaju se [...]. [...] Istovremeno autorka nastoji da pokaže utemeljenost moderne tezaursne leksikografije [...]. Time recenzirana monografija zalazi i u teorijska promišljanja tradicije [...], a ujedno skicira i buduće pravce [...]. (SSP2015/3, pp. 336–337)

Knjiga R. D. [...] može se čitati u kontinuitetu ili po delovima, no, bez obzira na to kako ćemo je čitati, sud o njenim opštim odlikama neće se u biti razlikovati. Svako poglavlje odražava isti metodološki princip kao i knjiga u celini – iscrpno obraditi [...], a sve potkrepiti brojnim primerima, i sagledati sa stanovišta relevantne literature [...].

Knjiga [...] pokazuje da su faze autorkinih istraživanja strukture leksičkog sistema tekle ovim redosledom [...]. [...] Određenje odnosa [...] sprovedeno je na jedino ispravan način [...]. Određenje tih nejezičkih, društveno-istorijskih faktora čini ovu knjigu vrednim i pouzdanim prilogom poznavanju nacionalne kulture. [...]

Ovakav metodološki pristup proizlazi i iz dosadašnjih istraživanja R. D., odnosno odražava njenu dosadašnju bibliografiju. Da navedemo samo monografije: [...]. (SSP2018/2, pp. 217–219)

In our corpus Move 3 also followed Move 1 in the introductory segments of the review. In that way, the reviewers concisely separated the general context and more or less technical information from the essential evaluation the reviewer provides. What is evaluated are particularly valuable facts from the monograph or its main contribution to the discipline. Compare this transition from the paragraph on the author and her main research orientation (Move 1) to the paragraph on the value of the particular segments of the book (Move 3):

Autorki ove knjige je „idejni otac” bio njen profesor sa univerzitetskih studija istaknuti američki lingvista [...]. Taj kognitivistički opredeljeni istraživač [...] uputio je svoju učenicu na dalja razmišljanja o principima [...]. [...] Odmah je stekla istomišljenike. Od tih se najkonstruktivnijim pokazao W. C. On je, naime, 2001. godine objavio [...]. (SSP2006/1, p. 367)

*Konstruktionalizam* se, kao teorijsko-metodološki pristup, najkompletnije „iščitava” upravo iz ove knjige [...]. Iz nje saznajemo, između ostalog, kako se ustrojavaju [...], zatim šta uslovljava izvesna generalizovanja koja su dvostruko značajna [...]. Posebno vredi spomenuti da ova knjiga ne mimoilazi ni ono što je ne samo za lingvistiku, već i za nauku uopšte, bitno – stavlja na uvid određene podatke o [...]. (SSP2006/1, p. 367)

The paragraph that ensues immediately shows that this is Move 3 and not Move 2. It is different in tone and purpose as it is an overview of the organisation of the book:

Autorkino izlaganje započinje kratkim uvodnim rečima [...], pa se zatim raslojava u tri posebna odeljka. Kao što im naslovi kazuju, ti su odeljci posvećeni [...]. Izlaganje se završava odeljkom *Zaključak* [...]. Potom sledi spisak korišćene stručne literature [...]. (SSP2006/1, p. 368)

In another review, Move 1 inserts the book into the field by bringing up the existing contributions on the topic. In Move 3, that again immediately ensues, the more detailed assesment of the different aspects of the monograph (the content, language, style, appeal to the readership, general contribution) is provided. Move 3 here is a logical continuation of Move 1: as the book is first described as a unique contribution, Move 3 further specifies other unique components.

Knjiga S. M. [...] predstavlja jednu od malobrojnih studija o žargonu napisanih na srpskom jeziku. Jedini koji je monografski obuhvatio problematiku žargona je [...], baveći se pritom [...], dok je [...] vršila semantičko-derivacionu analizu [...]. U Srbiji ima i drugih lingvista koji su se bavili žargonom [...], ali njihov broj nije veliki. Rečnici žargona su takode relativno slabije razvijeni [...]. (SSP2012/1, p. 181)

Sadržaj monografije [...] vrlo je zanimljiv, knjiga je pisana jednostavnim i razumljivim jezikom, te se njome može koristiti širok krug čitalaca [...]. Jasnost i jednostavnost, aktuelnost teme i zanimljivi primeri [...]. Štaviše, ova studija predstavlja

veliki doprinos srpskoj lingvistici [...]. Nesumnjivo, ova knjiga važna je i za druge društvene discipline [...]. (SSP2012/1, p. 182)

### 3.2. INTERACTIONS WITH MOVE 2 (TEN REVIEWS)

Move 3 could also be placed at the very beginning of the review so that it precedes the general overview of the organisation and content of the book. In the following Move 3, the reviewer assesses the whole publication while leaving out any other detailed comment in Move 2.

[...]

Napisati prikaz ove knjige nije lak zadatak, i to iz više razloga. Prvo [...], knjiga je prepuna zanimljivih ideja, napomena, upućivanja, koja su bukvalno sva vredna da im se posveti pažnja. To i nije čudno za jedan rad koji predstavlja vrstu sinteze višedecenijskih autorkinih istraživanja [...]. Vredi pomenuti da se na više mesta u knjizi postavljaju važna pitanja [...] ali se ne daju odgovori [...]. Kao što je poznato, u nauci je postavljanje pitanja bitnije od odgovora [...]. (SSP2020/2, p. 186)

Move 2 focuses only on the facts and notions from the reviewed monograph.

[...]

U knjizi se obrađuju različiti aspekti jezičke egocentrije u okviru polja *jezičke subjektivnosti* [...]. [...] Temelj koncepcije je globalni sistem orijentacije čoveka u vremenu i prostoru, njegove misaone delatnosti i recepcije sveta.

[...]

U knjizi se, na bazi više primera, prikazuje repertoar egocentričnih jezičkih elemenata ruskog jezika (koji su ponegde i neočekivano široki). U ove *egocentrike*, pored ostalog, spadaju markeri subjektivne modalnosti [...]. (SSP2020/2, pp. 186–188)

In some reviews Move 3 is not a single separate section, but is rather inserted multiple times within Move 2, so that it immediately provides the evaluation of the specific segment of the monograph presented beforehand. The structure is usually a combination of the cycling moves: M2 + M3 + M2 + M3 (the number of the cycles varies). In that way, the reviewers assess the content systematically and in greater detail, thus providing more precise insight into every single aspect of the individual sections of the book.

[...]

Podnaslov: *Tekst – Komentari – Snimci* precizira sadržaj i kompoziciju knjige, a naravno i zamisao odnosno ambicije autora. Prof. M. zapravo daje kolekciju petnaest malih monografija, koje se uzajamno podržavaju. Svaka od njih započinje opisom i istorijatom dokumenta. [...] Zatim slede tri vrste izdanja.

[...]

U svakom od ovih triju postupaka s tekstem u ponekom detalju možda bi se moglo postupiti drukčije (u transkripciji pre svega), ali – što je najvažnije – prof. M. korisniku nikad ne ostaje dužan informaciju o tome kako je to u originalu i kako je on postupio. [...] Ponekad mi se činilo da je prof. M. mogao eliminisati pokoje sumnjivo čitanje [...]. Zna on, međutim, da je manji greh ostaviti problem otvoren, nego žuriti ispred pouzdanih [...]. (SSP2003/2, pp. 178–179)

Prvi deo knjige je posvećen sinonimiji u filozofskim teorijama, u logici, retorici, stilistici i leksikografskom opisu. U ovom delu daje se istorijsko-teorijski pregled shvatanja o sinonimiji od Antičke Grčke do danas. Saznajemo da [...].

B. P. naglašava da se sinonimija drugačije tretira u logici nego u lingvistici. Logičari sinonimiji pristupaju [...]. [...] Retoričari pristupaju sinonimiji kao važnom jezičkom sredstvu za postizanje ubedljivosti. [...]

U poglavlju o sinonimiji u stilistici naglašava se da je sinonimija pojava na svim jezičkim nivoima i u svim funkcionalnim varijetetima. [...]

Značaj prvog dela knjige ogleda se u tome što se sinonimiji pristupa široko, iz različitih uglova, a time istraživanje dobija na interdisciplinarnosti, objektivnosti i celovitosti. Eventualna zamerka mogla bi se uputiti opsežnim uvodnim napomenama u vezi sa [...]. Opravdanje za ovakav autorkin postupak vidimo u tome što se čitalac postepeno uvodi u [...]. (SSP2006/2, pp. 369–370)

### 3.2. MOVE 3 OR...? (THREE REVIEWS)

In several reviews we could not precisely determine whether the segment of assessment should be classified as Move 2, 3 or 4. In the review from which we present the excerpts below, there is a multiple-paragraph-long section that is clearly Move 2 as it presents the organisation of the book and main contribution of the principal chapters.

Sadržaj monografije, pored glavne teme, pregledno organizovane u više poglavlja, sadrži još i *Uvod* [...], *Zaključak* [...], *Rezime* [...], *Literaturu* i *Izvore* [...] i *Registre* [...]. Glavni deo monografije podeljen je u dve veće celine [...]. [...]

U *Uvodu*, uz predstavljene metode i cilj rada, opisana je građa na kojoj je radeno istraživanje i kritički je predstavljen istorijat teme [...].

[...]

U drugom poglavlju [...] data je kritička analiza leksikografskih postupaka u obradi ovih glagola u referentnim deskriptivnim rečnicima srpskog jezika. (SSP2014/3, pp. 360–362)

However, the following couple of paragraphs present the reader with the contribution of the selected segments of the book, but perhaps more in the form of detailed recounting as if Move 2 extends all over the rest of the review. While



there is a focus on the specificities from the book characteristic of Move 3, there is also a more prominent narrative tone which is usually predominant in Move 2.

Monografija M. S. [...] predstavlja važan doprinos u razrešavanju otvorenih pitanja u vezi sa naslovljenom temom u više jezičkih aspekata [...]. Tako je na sintaksičko-semantičkom planu ustanovljeno da su glagoli od pridevske osnove izvedeni [...]. [...]

Zapaženo je i to da su kod glagola motivisanih pridevom sa značenjem boje prelazni aktivni glagoli u iščezavanju. [...]

Na hronološkoj i dijalekatskoj ravni važno je zapažanje da se nestandardne varijante [...] javljaju u tekstovima iz XIX veka, a u tekstovima iz XX veka ovo odstupanje se javlja kod pisaca [...]. (SSP2014/3, pp. 362–363)

This detailed depiction continues even in the ultimate section, that usually serves to summarise the impressions and provide the final recommendation as Move 4.

Doprinos istraživanja u monografiji vidim i u tome što je M. S. znatno proširila polje istraživanja naslovljene teme i razrešila mnoga otvorena pitanja [...]. Na osnovu analize stanja u jezičkoj praksi, uočena je stabilizacija norme u vezi sa distribucijom sufiksa [...] kod određenih glagolskih grupa [...]. Tako, u savremenom srpskom jeziku najnovijeg perioda sufiks [...] preuzima na sebe i medijalno značenje. (SSP2014/3, p. 363)

#### 4. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUDING REMARKS

The qualitative findings reported above point to the important patterns of the move of focused evaluation in academic book reviews. Apart from the place in the linear sequence that is widely recognised in literature and also somewhat transparent to observe, Move 3 occupies positions in other segments as well.

In initial parts, it interacts with Move 1 so that it either merges with it or follows it. In both cases, it builds on the technical details and puts emphasis on the expert evaluation from the very beginning of the review. While publication information matters, the focus is placed on the introductory and frequently comprehensive assessment of the various aspects of the monograph. In that way, professional readers may gain a relatively quick access to the overall evaluation on the basis of which they might decide to get themselves acquainted with the further discussion developed by the reviewer. This is in line with Hyland's (2004: 52–53) observations that when evaluation is placed at the beginning it seems to set the tone for the readership. We would like to add here that even though the content of the book may be by far more important than the formal labels of the author, school of thought or affiliation provided in Move 1, it appears that the evaluation attached to such labels

establishes the particular disciplinary context for the reader and paves the way for the interpretation of the principal points that will ensue later on in the text.

When it comes to the interactions with Move 2, Move 3 either precedes it or combines with it in the information cycles also acknowledged in Junqueira (2013) and Moreno and Suárez (2009). When in the preceding position, it functions as a substitute: the evaluation is summarised at the beginning and it does not appear again in Move 2 that follows. Instead, Move 2 is predominantly descriptive. However, when Moves 2 and 3 are fused (to use the term by Suárez & Moreno, 2008), the short accounts of the book content are immediately accompanied by the assessment of that content. In comparison with longer Move 3 that appears in separate sections, this kind of cyclic evaluation seems more informative regarding specific book segments as its scope is inherently narrower. It could also be argued that the integration of Moves 2 and 3 at this local level also symbolises the synthesis of the widely-acknowledged informative and evaluative rhetorical functions of reviews as a genre.

In our corpus we also recorded the ambiguous instances we mentioned in the last section of our analysis; though the form may be that of other moves, the function of the focus on specific elements, though in more description-like manner, could be said to be partly preserved.

To conclude, focusing on a relatively small-sized corpus of the reviews from a single journal makes this study limited in scope. However, we believe that this paper provides at least some important indications of the features of rhetorical structure of both academic reviews in general and focused evaluation in particular. As it is one of the rare studies that examined the genre of book reviews in Serbian, we hope prospective readers will find it encouraging for further studies. Further research is needed to trace the functions of other moves in the reviews of this and earlier periods and perhaps establish potential similarities in the organisation of the discourse of reviews in other discipline-specific Serbian journals.

## CORPUS

Srpska akademija nauka i umetnosti i Institut za srpski jezik SANU (2000–2020). *Južnoslovenski filolog* [South Slavic Philologist]. Retrieved from <http://www.isj.sanu.ac.rs/izdanja/casopisi/juznoslovenski-filolog/>

## REFERENCES

Biber, D., Connor, U., & Upton, T. A. (2007). Discourse analysis and corpus linguistics. In D. Biber, U. Connor, & T. A. Upton (Eds.), *Discourse on the move: Using corpus analysis to describe discourse structure* (pp. 1–20). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Flowerdew, L. (2005). An integration of corpus-based and genre-based approaches to text analysis in EAP/ESP: Countering criticisms against corpus-based methodologies. *English for Specific Purposes*, 24(3), 321–332. doi: [10.1016/j.esp.2004.09.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2004.09.002)

Gea Valor, M. L. (2000–2001). The pragmatics of positive politeness in the book review. *RESLA*, 14, 145–159.

Gea Valor, M. L., & Del Saz Rubio, M. M. (2000–2001). The coding of linguistic politeness in the academic book review. *Pragmalingüística*, 8–9, 165–178. doi: [10.25267/Pragmalinguistica.2000.i8.08](https://doi.org/10.25267/Pragmalinguistica.2000.i8.08)

Giannoni, D. S. (2009). Negotiating research values across review genres: A case study in Applied Linguistics. In K. Hyland & G. Diani (Eds.), *Academic evaluation: Review genres in university settings* (pp. 17–33). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Groom, N. (2009). Phraseology and epistemology in academic book reviews: A corpus-driven analysis of two humanities disciplines. In K. Hyland & G. Diani (Eds.), *Academic Evaluation: Review Genres in University Settings* (pp. 122–139). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hunston, S. (2022). *Corpora in Applied Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hyland, K. (2004). *Disciplinary discourses: Social interactions in academic writing*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Itakura, H., & Tsui, A. B. M. (2011). Evaluation in academic discourse: Managing criticism in Japanese and English book reviews. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(5), 1366–1379. doi: [10.1016/j.pragma.2010.10.023](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.10.023)

Junqueira, L. (2013). A genre-based investigation of applied linguistics book reviews in English and Brazilian Portuguese. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 12(3), 203–213. doi: [10.1016/j.jeap.2013.05.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2013.05.001)

Koester, A. (2010). Building small specialised corpora. In A. O’Keeffe & M. McCarthy (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Corpus Linguistics* (pp. 66–79). London: Routledge.

Lorés Sanz, R. (2009). (Non-)Critical voices in the reviewing of history discourse: A cross-cultural study of evaluation. In K. Hyland & G. Diani (Eds.), *Academic evaluation: Review genres in university settings* (pp. 143–160). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Moreno, A. I., & Suárez, L. (2008a). A framework for comparing evaluation resources across academic texts. *Text & Talk: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Language, Discourse & Communication Studies*, 28(6), 749–769. doi: [10.1515/TEXT.2008.038](https://doi.org/10.1515/TEXT.2008.038)

Moreno, A. I., & Suárez, L. (2008b). A study of critical attitude across English and Spanish academic book reviews. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 7(1), 15–26. doi: [10.1016/j.jeap.2008.02.009](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2008.02.009)

Moreno, A. I., & Suárez, L. (2009). Academic book reviews in English and Spanish: Critical comments and rhetorical structure. In K. Hyland & G. Diani (Eds.), *Academic evaluation: Review genres in university settings* (pp. 161–178). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Motta-Roth, D. (1996). Same genre, different discipline: A genre-based study of book reviews in academe. *The ESPecialist*, 17(2), 99–131.

Salager-Meyer, F., Alcaraz Ariza, M. Á., & Pabón Berbesí, M. (2007a). Collegiality, critique and the construction of scientific argumentation in medical book reviews:

A diachronic approach. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39(10), 1758–1774. doi: [10.1016/j.pragma.2006.06.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2006.06.003)

Salager-Meyer, F., Alcaraz Ariza, M. Á., & Pabón, M. (2007b). The prosecutor and the defendant: Contrasting critical voices in French- and English-written academic book reviews. In K. Fløttum (Ed.), *Language and Discipline Perspectives on Academic Discourse* (pp. 109–128). Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Shaw, P. (2009). The lexis and grammar of explicit evaluation in academic book reviews, 1913 and 1993. In K. Hyland & G. Diani (Eds.), *Academic Evaluation: Review Genres in University Settings* (pp. 217–235). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Suárez, L., & Moreno, A. I. (2008). The rhetorical structure of academic book reviews of literature: An English-Spanish cross-linguistic approach. In U. Connor, E. Nagelhout, & W. V. Rozycki (Eds.), *Contrastive rhetoric: Reaching to intercultural rhetoric* (pp. 147–168). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Tse, P., & Hyland, K. (2006a). Gender and discipline: Exploring metadiscourse variation in academic book reviews. In K. Hyland & M. Bondi (Eds.), *Academic Discourse Across Disciplines* (pp. 177–202). Bern: Peter Lang.

Tse, P., & Hyland, K. (2006b). ‘So what is the problem this book addresses?’: Interactions in academic book reviews. *Text & Talk: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Language, Discourse & Communication Studies*, 26(6), 767–790. doi: [10.1515/TEXT.2006.031](https://doi.org/10.1515/TEXT.2006.031)

Vučičević, A., & Rakić, A. (2020). Textual Metadiscourse in Academic Book Reviews in Serbian and English. *Zbornik radova Filozofskog fakulteta u Prištini*, 50/3, 269–292. doi: [10.5937/ZRFFP50-23692](https://doi.org/10.5937/ZRFFP50-23692)

Vučičević, A., & Rakić, A. (2023). Building (academic) voices of power: A case study of academic book reviews. In B. Mišić Ilić, V. Lopičić, I. Mitić, S. Ignjatović (Eds.), *Jezik, književnost, moć. Language, Literature, Power: Tematski zbornik radova* (pp. 299–312). Niš: Filozofski fakultet. doi: [10.46630/jkm.2023.18](https://doi.org/10.46630/jkm.2023.18)

Ана Љ. Вучићевић

Александра Д. Ракић

Универзитет у Крагујевцу

Филолошко-уметнички факултет

Центар за научноистраживачки рад

## ФОКУСИРАНА ЕВАЛУАЦИЈА У АКАДЕМСКИМ ПРИКАЗИМА КЊИГА: ФОРМЕ И ФУНКЦИЈЕ

*Резиме:* Прикази књига су високо евалуативан академски жанр јер суштински служе томе да пренесу процену нових академских садржаја у оквиру дисциплинарних научних заједница. У погледу (реторичке) структуре приказа примећено је да одређени сегменти који садрже фокусирану евалуацију (односно, евалуацију посебних аспеката приказаног материјала која се генерички назива *Поџез 3*) могу бити кључни при остваривању евалуативне реторичке функције овог жанра. Имајући у виду да је евалуација у академским приказима на српском језику слабије истражи-

вана, овај рад се бави позицијама и функцијама Потеза 3 у академским приказима књига објављеним у престижном српском академском часопису *Јужнословенски филолоџ*. Главни циљеви рада су пружање описа употребе Потеза 3 и представљање могућности за реторичку имплементацију овог сегмента кроз анализу приказа као жанра чији су аутори стручњаци препознати у својој области. Помоћу шеме од четири (реторичка) потеза коју је развила Мота-Рот (1996), као и приступа *са врха на доле* чије су кораке осмислили Бајбер и др. (2007), установиле смо опште реторичке обрасце у приказима а затим и специфичне реализације Потеза 3. Поред уобичајеног места у линеарном низу које је препознато у литератури, Потез 3 такође ступа у реторичку интеракцију са Потезима 1 и 2 и тиме остварује нове позиције и функције. У уводним деловима се обично или стапа са Потезом 1 или га следи. Када је у питању интеракција са Потезом 2, Потез 3 му или претходи или се комбинује са њим у цикличну структуру.

*Кључне речи:* академски прикази књига, *Јужнословенски филолоџ*, реторичка структура, фокусирана евалуација, Потез 3.