REVIEWS

Jan Blommaert (ed.), *Language ideological debates*. (Language, Power and Social Process, 2.) Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1999. Pp. xiii, 447. Hb $74.00, pb $25.00.

Reviewed by Eric Hoenes Del Pinal
Anthropology, University of California, San Diego
San Diego, CA 92093
ehoenes@weber.ucsd.edu

This volume contributes to the study of language ideology by focusing on the historical processes through which ideological positions about the relationship of language and society are produced and reproduced. Specifically, the contributors seek to contextualize the ways that language ideologies are contested in particular, often well publicized debates about language and its relationships to society. While ostensibly about linguistic issues, these debates, at one level or another, also address questions of power and national identity.

In the introduction to this volume, Jan Blommaert argues that much of the study of language ideology (and of language in general) has tended at worst to ignore the historical dimension of language, or at best to treat it as epiphenomenal. Given that the study of language ideology is explicitly concerned with the real, material ways in which language and ideas about language affect social life, there is a great and, Blommaert suggests, unfulfilled need to contextualize historically the processes by which these ideologies are produced and modified, and, if they are successful, implemented as policies. To these ends, this volume presents eleven case studies to show us how language ideologies are discursively formed and re-formed in the public arena by real social actors.

The studies are loosely grouped according to geographical region. The first section comprises three essays dealing with modern European states and the case of Quebec. Next are two essays about bilingual education policy in the United States. The third section tackles two cases of emerging but socioeconomically and geopolitically strong states, Israel and Singapore. The fourth and final section is made up of three studies of developing states in Africa. I am a bit perplexed by the decision to group the cases in this manner, because it is clear that important ideas and themes emerge across cases and extend beyond geographical or geopolitical boundaries. Given this, I will discuss the essays according to some common themes that emerge across sections.

Blommaert suggests in his concluding remarks that, at some level, all of the debates present in this volume concern nation-building projects (p. 427). Most

states accept the Herderian idea that monolingualism and monoculturalism are the essential and constitutive characteristics of the modern nation. Thus, when emerging states (such as Mozambique) endeavor to become nations, a project of linguistic homogenization is often undertaken. However, in the process of planning, drafting, and implementing language policies, existing linguistic ideologies may be transformed and new ones may be produced. Christopher Stroud shows us how the vanguard and opposition parties in Mozambique have variously dealt with the strategic appropriation of the old colonial language, Portuguese, to further claims about national identity after independence. Monica Heller's analysis of the Québecois situation shows how two groups that ostensibly began with similar ideologies of monoculturalism have come to take different stances on the issue of language and nation through a lingering debate. Heller argues that francophone Québecois have clung to an ideology that posits a correlation between the French language and an essential national identity that stands in opposition to the Canadian state, while anglophones have come to ideologize bilingualism as one of the essential markers of Canadian national identity. Language ideologies, then, are often mobilized in the rhetoric of nation-building projects.

I want to turn now to some of the narrower thematic concerns that we can use to bring the diverse case studies in this volume into dialogue with each other. The chapters by James Collins, Sheila Shannon, and Richard Watts bring up the issue of how language ideologies affect educational institutions. Collins offers a nuanced analysis of the national controversy that arose in the late 1990s when the Oakland (California) School Board proposed that "Ebonics" (African-American Vernacular English) should be recognized as a legitimate language variety and used to facilitate teaching in primary schools. Collins frames the debate in the context of Michael Silverstein's arguments about the "culture of standard" in the United States to show that the OSB's proposal was a strong challenge to deeply entrenched ideologies about race, class, and how these are indexed by "legitimate" forms of speech. Shannon takes on a related topic, the protracted debates about Spanish/English bilingual education in California's public schools. She argues that educators, in the absence of clearcut policy directives, are often left to their own devices in approaching bilingual education. This, she says, results in the situational deployment of latently held ideologies about the relative value (or lack thereof) of different languages. Watts proposes a counterexample to the United States' valuation of the standard with his analysis of Switzerland's "ideology of dialect." Of particular interest in this context is the way that standard German is consistently devalued vis-à-vis local dialects as unnatural and inauthentic, even within the confines of the schoolhouse (quite the opposite of the U.S. case). This ideology of dialect does not originate in educational settings, but it seems to be cemented there. These three cases suggest that, insofar as schools act as places where ideas about the authority of different language varieties are developed and institutionalized, educational settings may be privileged sites in

which to observe the complex ways that language ideologies are produced and transmitted.

The chapters on Catalan nationalists' efforts to be represented as a part of the 1992 Olympics in Barcelona and on Singapore's "Speak Mandarin" campaign begin to touch on questions of how the public presentation of ideological positions might be affected by the media they adopt. Catalan nationalists recognized the 1992 Barcelona Olympics as a unique opportunity to further their cause by presenting it to the world at large. Susan DiGiacomo argues that, because the press acts as an important site of "authoritative entextualization … [t]he process of journalistic reproduction itself can officially become an object of debate and contestation" (105). Because the stake was so large, both Catalan nationalists and the Spanish government tried to deploy their messages strategically in a "media-friendly" fashion. This case shows that the media through which language-ideological conflicts get played out may be seen as constitutive of the nature of those ideologies, the debates, and their outcomes. Wendy Bokhorst-Heng's analysis of a state effort to encourage "ethnic Chinese" in Singapore to adopt Mandarin as a "home" language brings up the question of how the public for such directed efforts at language planning is imagined. These cases raise the issue of how ideologies are transmitted, and how that transmission affects them.

This basic question of representation is also taken up by the two studies that look at the relationship between literature and nationhood. Alexandra Jaffe's chapter explores some of the public discourse that was generated after a French novel was translated into Corsican. This unorthodox literary practice raised questions among Corsican activists and literati about the macropolitics of literacy and the real purpose of writing in Corsican. Is the production of literature in a minority language with a small number of literate speakers a necessary step to the development of the language? Or is it primarily a symbolic act used to assert ethnolinguistic autonomy? The positions taken on either side of this debate help to illustrate how writing practices may attempt to subvert or justify the hierarchical relationships between languages. In a similar vein, Joshua Madumulla, Elena Bertoncini, and Jan Blommaert give us an excellent, multilayered analysis of how a debate about what counts as the appropriate form of poetry has served as the surrogate ground for a battle over the political and ideological orientation of the Tanzanian nation. The authors argue that this seemingly inconsequential debate metapragmatically indexes an ideological struggle that cuts to the core of the relationship among ethnic, linguistic, and political identities and the way that Tanzanian nationhood is imagined.

Implicit in these cases is also a concern with the role that "ideology brokers" (9) play in the production and reproduction of language ideologies. Investigating the ideological commitments of brokers, be they teachers, politicians, journalists, or poets, should help us to see how ideologies become policies and practices. Ron

Kuzar's dense but ultimately rewarding chapter on the development of Israeli Hebrew shows us how the linguists who have helped to "revive" the language have also shaped the way that its speakers understand it. Two issues are at the heart of this debate between professional linguists: One is the question of whether Hebrew's "revival" has been completed or not; the other is how closely and continuously Israeli Hebrew can properly be understood to be related to ancient Hebrew. Michael Meeuwis's discussion of how Flemish missionaries imported their understandings of the link between language and ethnicity into their work in the Belgian Congo also foregrounds the way that ideology brokers shape their field of discourse. The subject of how professional linguists affect their field of inquiry gives us pause to reflect on the work of this volume. Fortunately, Blommaert is also sensitive to this problem, and in his concluding remarks he reflexively turns our attention to the fact that the authors represented here are implicated in the debates they write about by virtue of their positions as researchers and the authority that their academic credentials carry. Thus, we must be sensitive to our own social and historical positions vis-à-vis our subjects of study, and to the consequences that our involvement entails.

Above all, Blommaert and the other contributors to this volume present us with a strong methodological statement on how we might carry out further research on language ideologies by focusing on the processes by which they are shaped and reshaped in socially and historically situated debates. By specifically choosing to concentrate on those instances in which language ideologies become mobilized in public discourses, they offer us a collection of cases ripe for comparative analysis. There are, of course, myriad ways that one might slice up this volume, and I have suggested only some of the broad themes that may be of interest to potential readers. Not every chapter is an unqualified success, but they are all interesting in and of themselves, and some (notably Collins and Madumulla et al.) provide excellent models of how to proceed with the study of language ideologies in action. When read in conjunction with the other two major volumes on language ideology (Schieffelin et al. 1998, Kroskrity 2000), this collection offers some new and interesting ways in which we might further theorize the way that language operates in a social and historical context.

REFERENCES

Kroskrity, Paul V. (ed.) (2000). *Regimes of language: Ideologies, polities and identities*. (School of American Research Advanced Seminar Series.) Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.
Schieffelin, Bambi B.; Woolard, Kathryn A.; & Kroskrity, Paul V. (1998). *Language ideologies: Practice and theory*. (Oxford studies in anthropological linguistics, 16.) Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.

(Received 15 November, 2003)

JOSHUA A. FISHMAN (ed.), *Handbook of language and ethnic identity*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999. Pp. xii, 468. Hb £50.00.

Reviewed by JOAN PUJOLAR
Sociolinguistics, Universitat Oberta de Catalunya
Av. Tibidabo, 39-43
E-08035 Barcelona
jpujolar@uoc.edu

This book's manifest aim is "to bring to the non-specialized reader a substantial selection that reflects the . . . regional and disciplinary variations in views toward and experiences with ethnicity" (3). To be more precise, the book is about issues of ethnicity AND language, as the title correctly suggests. It will certainly be of interest to nonspecialists and less advanced students, and useful as a resource for teaching and seminar work. I will comment on it on the basis of this declared intention, globally – that is, I will not go into the details of individual contributions.

The book is divided into two main parts. In the first part, each chapter is devoted to the way in which the language/ethnicity issue has been studied and conceptualized in various broad disciplines (economics, linguistic ethnography, sociology, history, political science, psychology, social psychology, sociolinguistics) or from the perspective of a number of fields where linguistic issues are important (education of minorities, nationalism, sign language, and second language learning). Most of the authors are well-known sociolinguists working in the relevant areas.

The second part comprises regional descriptions of sociolinguistic situations. The "regions" have been defined, it seems, on the basis of sociolinguistic criteria – generalizable patterns of cultural and political organization of linguistic usages, often based on common historical developments. These are the Amerindian and the African American communities, Latin America, North America, the Celtic and Slavic areas, Germany, Scandinavia, western Europe, sub-Saharan Africa, the Arab world, the Far East, the Pacific, and South and Southeast Asia, plus a chapter on rural border communities, specially the Afro-Asian ones. The most awkward region is "western Europe" (chap. 22), which here includes the heterogeneous European area that was not covered in the chapters on Germany, Scandinavia, and the Celtic communities. It would probably have been more appropriate to create a "Romance languages" area.

Most specialists reading this book will come across contributions on issues or regions about which they have only superficial knowledge. For instance, the history of the German intellectual tradition regarding the cultural value and role of language (chap. 19, by James R. Dow) contains information that was totally new to me: I had wrongly assumed that German linguists, including those who sympathized with the Nazi regime, had generally followed the ideas of Herder

and Humboldt. I also found significant new information and ideas in the chapters devoted to the Far East, the Pacific, and South Asia (chaps. 26, 27, and 28, by Florian Coulmas, Heather Lotherington, and Harold Schiffman, respectively). *Mutatis mutandis*, other researchers on language and ethnicity may also find interesting new information in other parts of the book that refer to regions distant from theirs. With regard to the theoretical contributions, Glyn Williams's discussion of sociology's historical construction of ethnicity (chap.12) summarizes quite successfully ideas that have already been voiced in his previous publications (Williams 1992), which makes it an interesting piece of writing for the purposes of seminar work and discussion.

Moreover, the book will be valuable for people in other fields or professions who wish to go beyond the superficial views about ethnicity that are disseminated by the media as a result of regional conflicts. It is very clearly written and has a remarkable unity of style, considering that it contains 29 contributions. Many of the authors are well-known specialists, such as Nancy Dorian, Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, Fishman himself, Bernard Spolsky, Baker, and others I mention below. It will also be useful to provide selected readings for undergraduate and, in some cases, postgraduate students. The structure, the style, and the content are clearly geared in this direction. Generally, chapters begin with definitions of the important concepts, such as "ethnicity" or the social/cultural meaning of language. There is always a summary at the end (which in most cases is REALLY a summary), "questions for further thought and discussion" (useful for seminar text), and a reasonably short "selected bibliography." Unfortunately, there is almost no formal presentation and discussion of data or findings of any kind (virtually no graphs, tables, transcripts, telling examples, etc.). From the teaching perspective, I feel this is the book's weakest point; I believe that small doses of highly simplified presentations of data would have helped greatly to make some points and opinions clearer. Nevertheless, it has to be conceded that it would probably have made the task of the editor much more complex, since data invariably involve complexity and authors would have felt the need to justify their arguments in more detail.

An important strength of this book is certainly the wide range of perspectives it contains, covering the work of many researchers – many of them language activists as well as academics – who are by no means in agreement as to how the relationship between language and ethnicity should be conceptualized. However, contributors are at one in radiating a firm faith in the value of ethnicity, in the strength of ethnic identification in many contexts, and also in the value of language as the expression of culture, social values, heritage, and so on. This is reflected in one of Fishman's concluding remarks: "There should be no doubt whatsoever that changing the associated language means a drastic change in the content of ethnic identity and behavior, no matter how continuous the label that is attached thereto" (451). This phrase summarizes, in my view, the agenda behind the whole book and, in a way, that of Fishman's own career.

Another matter is whether this "doubt" gets really dispelled by the contributions. From this perspective, what the book as a whole suggests is that "ethnicity" is quite an elusive concept, that ethnic boundaries are highly relative to context, and that the language-ethnicity link is hard to pin down with the present conceptual apparatus of the social sciences. This means that we do not really know exactly what it is that changes when a language is lost, nor how important these changes are.

Thus, the book shows that the field of sociolinguistics has not yet reached a working consensus about the connection between language and ethnicity. Certainly, it does show that this link is almost universal in the sense that it is perceived by virtually all communities, both in the industrialized world and elsewhere. However, I do not yet see how this "perception" can be turned into clear formulations of individual and community rights, or of gains and losses of resources, in a way that can be practically applied where we FEEL that languages or communities should be protected or developed (whoever this "we" should be). In the meantime, English is becoming a powerful lingua franca that is displacing its competitors in international fields (French quite rapidly, and Spanish more slowly), thus creating a linguistic monopoly that will eventually swallow up hundreds of communities in sub-Saharan Africa, the Pacific, and part of Southeast Asia – and who knows where else in the long term, since it is being appropriated in many spheres of life in Scandinavian countries, the Netherlands, and elsewhere (see chap. 7, by Robert Phillipson).

The only way out of this bleak future scenario involves challenging the basic liberal principles that underpin the politics (and hence the economics) of contemporary globalization. For sociolinguists, this also means that an intellectual break, a critique of traditional sociological paradigms, is needed, as Glyn Williams (chap. 12) argues. In this sense, it is worth quoting Fishman's pointed comment in the concluding chapter:

> Ethnicity was a peripheral phenomenon within the grand social theories constructed by Karl Marx (1818–1883), Émile Durkheim (1858–1917), Max Weber (1864–1920) and Talcott Parsons (1902–1979), probably because of their Western Eurocentric philosophical certainty (born of uniformistic developments in commerce, industry, urban society and mass communications). (445)

This critique should involve a deconstruction of notions such as "progress," as Williams argues, which have played a key role in the social struggles for the maintenance of minority languages. For instance, there is the old dichotomy between a dominant language associated with modernization and a vernacular associated with traditional cultures, values, and (last but not least) economic means. Additionally, Western liberal democracies and political discourses are based on an abstract idea of "the citizen" that fosters cultural uniformity in the name of equality. These discourses have also been disseminated by sociolinguists because they have been located within the predominant sociological paradigm. They are

implicit in most of the contributions to the book, particularly the "regional" ones where the "overview" register fosters a simplified view of ethnic communities, as if they had clear, uncontested boundaries and social locations. True enough, there is a general trend to avoid the "primordialist" view of language and ethnicity, and a few contributors acknowledge that political processes associated with ethnicity and language often involve struggles for access to symbolic and economic resources (see chap. 8, by Amado M. Padilla). In any case, feminist social critique is far ahead in those matters, as well as other poststructuralist approaches that clearly show that social participation in the real world is constituted or intrinsically mediated by gender, ethnicity, class, religion, age, and the complex interrelations among these forms of identity. It remains to be seen whether the more sociologically oriented sociolinguists, which this book in a way represents, will finally take that road.

To summarize, this handbook constitutes an important contribution to the dissemination of academic thinking and research on issues of language and ethnicity. From this perspective, I should wish for it to be widely read by politicians, journalists, teachers, and those in other sectors who influence public opinion. Public opinion certainly needs to receive a richer picture of these matters, particularly after the wars in the Balkans and the "ethnic" conflicts in Africa and elsewhere. Because it covers a wide range of issues and fields and virtually all regions of the planet, this is also a useful resource for teaching, and, indirectly, it provides an interesting overview of the state of thinking among sociologists of language.

REFERENCE

Williams, Glyn (1992). *Sociolinguistics: A sociological critique*. London: Routledge.

(Received 27 January, 2003)

DAVID HERMAN, *Story logic*. Lincoln & London : University of Nebraska Press, 2002, Pp. xvi, 477. Hb $60.00

Reviewed by ANNA DE FINA
Italian Department, Georgetown University
Washington DC 20058
definaa@georgetown.edu

One of the virtues of David Herman's *Story logic* lies in its attempt to bring together literary and linguistic approaches to the study of narrative. The attempt results in a synthesis that promotes a better understanding of discourse for literary scholars and a deeper grasp of basic narratology tools for discourse analysts. The title of the volume reflects one of the main points of the book: that "stories both

have a logic and are logic in their own right" (p. 22) because they constitute a powerful instrument for understanding the world. The more general objective of the analyses presented in the volume is to work toward a cognitive approach to narrative in which narrative understanding is explained as a process of creating and updating mental models of particular storyworlds. Thus, Herman looks at language theory and narrative theory as theoretical frames that not only can enrich each other, but that also constitute a resource for cognitive science in general.

The book is divided into two main sections. In part 1 (chaps. 1–5), Herman studies what he calls narrative "microdesigns," or principles that define narrative organization at the micro level, such as the encoding and separation of events, states, and actions, the regrouping of action structures into larger sequences, or the role of scripts and schemata in story interpretation. In part 2 (chaps. 6–8), he analyzes "macro-designs," more general principles that define the overall contour of the storyworld being modeled, such as the organization of space and time and the contextual anchoring of narratives.

In chap. 1, "States, events, and actions," Herman critically discusses the equation between events and actions, which derives in models of narrative as a series of sequentially ordered events. Herman views the category of "action," as used in narratology, as both underspecified and too exclusive. To build an alternative, he uses a number of semantic studies on the meanings of action, such as Vendler's taxonomy of verbs, William Frawley's classification of events, and Talmy Givón's taxonomy of states, to work toward more subtle distinctions within the category, and also to start building a continuum of preference for types of action, along which narrative genres can be placed. Herman shows that, although many narratives focus on actions, all narratives present stative events, and narrative genres differ widely in the degree of their reliance on actions as opposed to states.

In chap. 2, "Action representations," Herman further develops his reflections on action as a basic narrative category. He makes the point that theories of action are important for narratives because stories configure a variety of modes of action, but that narrative analysis also needs to consider the role of "possibilities for action" – events that did not happen – since these are the basis of stories' "tellability." Again, analysts can build a taxonomy in which different narrative genres attribute differential weight to opportunities for action and results. Another point underlined in this chapter is that actions can be represented in elaborate ways, and that different narratives may be more or less open in giving cues that trigger interpreters' inferences about action representations. The author points to the existence of allusive narratives in which the nature of actions and their interpretation is not clear.

Chap. 3, "Scripts, sequences, and stories," focuses on narrative sequences and how our understanding of them can be enriched through the use of notions derived from cognitive linguistics such as schema, script, and frame: Narratives can be construed as sequences of actions, states, and events that situate remarkable or "tellable" occurrences against a background of stereotypical expectations. In fact,

the author argues that understanding the essential quality of narratives, or "narrativehood," depends on grasping ways in which narrative events differ from stereotyped sequences, and also on being able to capture the balance between stereotypicality and "breach." However, the degree of narrativity in a sequence depends not only on a script but also on a constellation of formal and contextual cognitive factors. The relationship is not unilateral; rather, it needs to be seen as dynamic and constitutive. Scripts change through time, and stories build new frames while putting received ones under scrutiny.

Chap. 5, "Dialogues and styles," is devoted to the study of "narratives of words," or represented discourse. It is conceived as an investigation of ways in which participants mentally model varieties of communicative behaviors. Herman analyzes fictional dialogue in James Joyce's *Finnegan's Wake* and style shifting in Edith Wharton's *The House of Mirth*, applying to these texts some important notions derived from Pragmatic Theory and Conversation Analysis. The texts under analysis are seen as meta-communicative insofar as they push interpreters to scrutinize their own assumptions about communication. Thus, fictional dialogue in *Finnegan's Wake* is seen as a meditation on conversation and coherence in which Joyce both draws on the reader's knowledge of the mechanisms of conversation and points to the limitations of a vision of communication based on informativeness. Likewise, style in *The House of Mirth* is conceived as embodying different gendered identities, in that discordant communicative norms constitute and foster gender clash and antagonism.

Chap. 6, "Temporalities," opens the second section of the book, and, in my view, this together with chap. 7 provides the volume's most original suggestions for narrative analysis. Herman questions the fundamental isomorphism established by many narrative models (including William Labov's) between extralinguistic world and storyworld temporality, and the consequent reduction of temporality itself to sequentiality. Using two works of literary fiction and one movie, the author shows that the manipulation of temporality can become a tool for the expression of a variety of meanings. Taking inspiration from fuzzy logic in semantics, he introduces the notion of "fuzzy temporality," or temporality that is indeterminate. The latter characterizes "polychronic narration," in which time reference may be nonsequential and ambiguous. The chapter investigates the different techniques that allow authors to create a vague temporality in which events cannot be placed in order on a line from earlier to later, or in which possible worlds include events that have not occurred and yet affect the present in multiple ways.

In chap. 7, "Spatialization," Herman proposes to rethink the role of space and its construction in narrative, taking as a starting point Greimas's original ideas about spatialization as a focal point in narrative. Herman argues throughout the chapter that construction in space is not a secondary aspect of narrative, as the focus on time as a basic principle of narrative organization has led many to believe, but that in fact spatial reference plays a crucial role in stories. Herman lists

and applies to narrative analysis a number of concepts and oppositions derived from recent research on language, narrative, and space – such as the idea of deictic shift, and the distinctions between figure and ground, or typological and prospective location – to show how the configuration of these elements in narrative reveals particular constructions of experience and of characters. This application supports his main point that "far from merely providing descriptive background or ornamentation for the primary action in a story, spatial reference helps CONSTITUTE narrative domains" (285).

Chap. 8, "Perspectives," looks at point of view in narrative. Perspective is studied through Genette's concept of focalization as a "way of talking about perceptual and conceptual frames, more or less inclusive or restricted, through which participants, situations, and events are presented in narrative" (302). Focalization is conceived as related to the expression of propositional attitudes. Herman draws on possible-worlds semantics to explain "hypothetical focalization" as a narrative mode in which mismatches exist between the reference world of the story and other possible worlds. He proposes a taxonomy of types of hypothetical focalization to explain how "uncertainty can enter narrative discourse." Such classification can provide another basic dimension for distinguishing narrative genres.

The last chapter, "Contextual anchoring," deals with second-person narration as a window into the relationship among narrators, narratives, and recipients. Looking at narrative interpretation as a process of anchoring the story context to the interpreter's context, the author attempts to show how stories not only assume a relationship between text and context but also create it. Second-person narratives have posed difficulties for narratologists because they subvert the traditional division between audiences as storyworld characters and audiences as story interpreters by blurring the distinction between storyworlds and storytelling worlds, and by proposing profoundly ambiguous uses of the pronoun *you*. Drawing on linguistic theories of deixis, Herman demonstrates the richness and polysemy of second-person narratives and proposes that contextual anchoring in narratives of this type requires situating instances of *you* on a scalar functional continuum. The chapter significantly ends with a call to develop new narrative tools based on linguistic and discourse analytic insights.

As is evident from this brief review, Herman has originally and successfully applied basic concepts and tools of linguistic analysis to the study of literary narrative. The question is whether an approach that is essentially cognitive and rather formalized can account for the interactional complexities of naturally occurring narratives. I leave this question open to further scrutiny; however, I believe that many aspects of the narrative analyses proposed in the volume, such as Herman's ideas about space, time, and action, can help linguists develop new insights about the ways in which different kinds of narratives construct meaning.

(Received 10 December, 2002)

ANNA LIVIA, *Pronoun envy: Literary uses of linguistic gender.* Oxford & New
York: Oxford University Press, 2001. Pp. x, 237 (including index). Hb $49.95,
pb $29.95.

Reviewed by SALLY MCCONNELL-GINET
Linguistics, Cornell University
Ithaca, NY 14853
smg9@cornell.edu

In 1971, women students at the Harvard Divinity School began protesting the use
in their classes of BOMFOG ("brotherhood of man, fatherhood of god") talk, the
equation of the universal with the masculine exemplified by apparently generic
uses of forms like *he* and *man*. Responding to reports of these protests in the
Harvard *Crimson*, Harvard's linguistics faculty wrote a letter to the editor ex-
plaining that English masculine forms were linguistically "unmarked" for gender
and patronizingly assuring the protestors that "there is no need for anxiety or
pronoun envy" (quoted in Livia, p. 3). Once launched, that phrase begged to be a
title, and Anna Livia's enlightening book is a most suitable bearer. This is a vol-
ume from which linguists and others interested in the linguistic encoding of gen-
der can learn much.

The 1971 Harvard linguists were enunciating the view then standard among
linguists. Even then, however, it was clear that matters were more complicated
than standard linguistic accounts assumed. For example, to say *someone called
but he didn't leave his name* was to imply a male caller, not simply to leave sex
unspecified. And no woman counted among the "ten men" needed for a Jewish
minyan. The quotation heading Livia's first chapter, "*un homme sur deux est une
femme*" 'one man in two is a woman', sounded as odd when shouted by French
feminists in the summer of 1970 as its gloss still does in English. In spite of such
indications that masculine forms could not always be used in sex-indefinite or
generic contexts, even feminist linguists like Robin Tolmach Lakoff focused on
different issues: for example, using *girl* to speak of grown women, using *broad*
(or more vulgar forms) to speak about women generally, or lack of semantic
equivalence between paired terms like *master/mistress* or *governor/governess*
(see Lakoff 1975).

Livia is concerned less with everyday linguistic practices than with some of
the ways gender gets encoded in literature. Her book is not, however, of interest
only or even chiefly to literary scholars. Its many detailed analyses give concrete
illustrations of the interplay between what she calls the "micro (linguistic)" and
"macro (ideological)" levels of discourse, an interplay of crucial importance in
understanding just how language works in society and culture. These analyses
also show the systematicity of language – the connections among different lin-
guistic resources.

The book opens by situating the Harvard pronoun wars and related debates in a much longer history. Chap. 1 discusses pronominal systems and grammatical gender in languages like French, as well as offering an intelligent account of different views of causal connections between language and thought, from versions of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis to recent experimental studies. This sets the stage for the meat of the book: detailed analyses of particular literary works.

Chap. 2 features the French writer Anne Garréta's novel *Sphinx*, seen as a tour de force when it appeared in 1986. Garréta presented two central characters, the first-person narrator and the narrator's beloved ("A***"), without ever assigning either a gender. She obviously succeeded in this task: "Each of the four possible combinations [has been] cited [by some reviewer] as the correct one: male narrator, female beloved; female narrator, male beloved; male narrator, male beloved; female narrator, female beloved" (52). In trying to escape what Livia (57) dubs the "tentacles" of the French gender system, Garréta uses many stylistic devices that have other effects on the text. The first person *je* is indeed an epicene pronoun (i.e., it attributes no gender to its referent), but French requires gender agreement of many participles and adjectives predicated of *je*, forcing Garréta to take steps to avoid such forms. Sometimes she uses deverbal nouns where verbal participles might have been expected, and sometimes she uses the *passé simple* where the *passé composé* is the norm. The overall effect is of a somewhat archaic style, Livia argues, with a static quality. As Livia makes clear, however, the most dramatic impact of eliminating gender marking is in third-person narration: "A***"cannot be referred to by any pronoun and emerges as depersonalized, more a collection of body parts than a coherent persisting self with whose perspective a reader might identify. Livia argues cogently that *Sphinx* shows that "[w]ithout gender, the very concept of selfhood is tenuous outside of the first and second persons" (56). She makes clear that pronouns matter enormously: They reliably link references to an individual across a range of different situations. Other modes of linkage (e.g., repetition of a proper name) often suggest that another individual has now appeared.

In chap. 3, Livia examines five English-language novels with genderless characters, at least one of whom in each novel is a first-person narrator. Many of her observations about these novels build on what we have learned from the preceding chapter. Characters presented mainly in the third person will tend to seem "distant," hard to empathize with. But ungendered first-person narration does not raise the same strategic questions for English authors as for French: In English, a first-person narrator can remain genderless with no need for a marked style. Sarah Caudwell's *Thus was Adonis murdered* (1981), a hilarious British mystery, is the only one of these books that I have read; I still remember the sense of shock I felt when I realized at the end of the book that I still had no idea whether Professor Hilary Tamar, the first-person narrator, was a man or a woman. Many readers have simply assumed a sex, usually male, without noticing that Caudwell offers reasons for doubting such principles as presumptive heterosexuality (Hi-

lary speaks admiringly of the bodies of both male and female characters, for example). Because most of the narration is first-person (and English makes it so easy to avoid gender attributions to a first-person referent), Hilary's sex is just another of the "mysteries" the reader must try to solve. Some of the other novels discussed here are far less conventional and challenge more directly standard gender assumptions.

Chaps. 4 and 5 are devoted to Monique Wittig's work. Chap. 4 shows how Wittig uses grammatically feminine neologisms to expose the cultural baggage packed into the supposedly "purely linguistic" gendering of the traditional French lexicon. Chap. 5 explores the use of the French epicene pronoun *on* in Wittig's *L'opponax*. Livia draws on recent investigations of *on* in everyday usage, showing how very different it is from English *one*. Wittig draws on its "monomorphous diversity" (113) to "force the reader to invest a significant amount of processing time in identifying the referent [and in moving between different] centers of consciousness" (102). This chapter also looks at Wittig's innovative pronominal usages, the generic *elles* of *Les guérillères* and the split *j/e* of *Le corps lesbien*.

Chap. 6 considers an array of epicene pronouns, or new uses of existing pronouns, with which authors of English novels have experimented in writing about alternatives to familiar gender arrangements. The best-known of these works are two science fiction novels, Ursula K. Le Guin's *The left hand of darkness* (1969) and Marge Piercy's *Woman on the edge of time* (1976). Le Guin initially used the so-called masculine generic *he* and nouns like *king* to designate her Gethenians, extraterrestrials who are sexless for a large part of each month and assume either female or male sex during their sexually active period. The same individual might be female one month, male another. But Le Guin came to see that use of *he* as problematic and experimented later with feminine forms and with singular *they*. In contrast, Piercy invented new forms: *person* as subject, and *per* as object and possessive (though juxtaposing these with the standard *he/she* set). Piercy is not the only widely read author to have introduced new epicene pronouns. In her 1971 novel *The kin of Atta are waiting for you*, Dorothy Bryant introduced the single pronoun *kin*, and the novelist June Arnold used *na*, *nan*, and *naself* in *The cook and the carpenter* (1973). Dennis Baron (1986) characterizes English epicene pronominal neologisms as "the word[s] that failed," but I agree with Livia that these literary experiments cannot be just dismissed as failures. Nonetheless, as Le Guin and many linguists have observed, singular *they* is a far likelier candidate for a general-use epicene pronoun in English than any neologism.

Returning to French in chap. 7, Livia looks at the use of linguistic gender in self-reference by sexual minorities, especially but not only transsexual or transgendered people. This chapter, a revised version of Livia 1997, shows nicely that grammatical gender, rather than always being a straitjacket, can be a resource for those who want to signal shifting gender identities and allegiances. The book

concludes with a chapter that makes clear that language users can draw on a range of resources to challenge standard gender assumptions in various ways.

Readers unfamiliar with the works discussed may occasionally find their interest flagging. Those who are not linguistic junkies may have trouble with some of the descriptions of linguistic details that are only indirectly linked to gender matters. But many readers of this journal will, I am sure, share my appreciation for Livia's inquiry.

REFERENCES

Baron, Dennis (1986). *Grammar and gender*, New Haven: Yale University Press.
Lakoff, Robin Tolmach (1975). *Language and woman's place*, New York: Harper & Row.
Livia, Anna (1997). Disloyal to masculinity: Linguistic gender and liminal identity in French. In Anna Livia and Kira Hall (eds.), *Queerly phrased: Language, gender, and sexuality*, 349–68. New York: Oxford University Press.

(Received 21 February, 2003)

RON SCOLLON, *Mediated discourse: The nexus of practice*. London & New York: Routledge, 2001. Pp. ix, 182. Pb $29.80

YULING PAN, SUZANNE WONG SCOLLON, & RON SCOLLON. *Professional communication in international settings*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2002. Pp. x, 240. Hb $73.95

Reviewed by HAO SUN
English & Linguistics
Indiana-Purdue University Fort Wayne
Fort Wayne, IN 46805
sunh@ipfw.edu

Mediated Discourse (*MD*) reports a longitudinal study of the development of a one-year-old child, focusing on a single, narrowly defined social practice – handing, or "the simple practice of giving an object to another person" (p. 12). In this book, R. Scollon proposes a framework of mediated discourse to address social (practice) theory, which was "badly in need of an ontogenetic view of social practice" (vii). Discussing the importance of the analysis of focused and specific practices ("practice" used in the plural as a count noun, not a mass noun), Scollon stresses that "a theorization of the origins of any particular practice (an 'ontogenesis') within the life of the developing infant" (12) constitutes an indispensable part of a well-formulated practice theory.

Data for the study were collected from the author's weekly visits to the child's family throughout a year, and include weekly videotaping, detailed notes, and photographs of the house and of objects in the child's environment. With a focus on social actors, the unit of analysis of a mediated discourse analysis, as the

author explains, is mediated action rather than other components such as discourse or text.

The book is divided into six chapters. In chap. 1, "Mediated discourse: A discursive theory of human action," the author lays out the framework of *MD*, explaining central concepts and theoretical principles; this serves the readers well. In spite of the definitions provided, readers are assumed to be acquainted with theories from diverse disciplines, including anthropological linguistics, critical discourse analysis, interactional sociolinguistics, and sociocultural psychology. Lacking this, much of the book may not be easy to follow. In a few places in chap. 1, additional explication would have helped. For example, we read that *MD* "is a theory about social action with a specific focus on discourse as a kind of social action as well as upon discourse as a component of social action" (6). This is a complex statement about a complex issue, so elaboration would have conveyed the author's meaning more clearly.

The bulk of the very interesting chap. 2 is constituted by transcripts, analyses, and interpretations. It is enjoyable to read through the transcriptions along with the contextual descriptions; one can almost visualize and hear the "actor," Brenda, learning to speak and to interact with those around her. The centerpiece of the book, chap. 2 contains 41 examples. Each is presented in a table form that is fairly easy to understand, with columns indicating different speakers as well as a column called "Context," a useful feature that provides critical information about the background, including nonverbal behavior. The discussion emphasizes the point that no social practice (as a count noun) in real time is an act of its own; its intersection with other practices is inevitable.

In chap. 3, Scollon centers the discussion on the nature of talk as evidenced in the data and argues that much of discursive practice is focused not on the handing itself but rather on the production of identities – those of the social actor. He suggests that we might consider handing as a mere means through which the more essential issue of enabling a social actor to engage in this and other practices is addressed and resolved.

One of the major contentions the author presents is an argument against the assertion by Chouliaraki & Fairclough that there is a reflexive, discursive practice for every social practice. Elaborating on the five different discursive accompaniments for handing – silence, nomination, functional directive, interpersonal directive, and behavioral directive – Scollon proposes that linkages between talk and the practice of handing are "not invariant" (47). His categorization of the different discursive functions is useful, and his arguments seem convincing.

The focus of chap. 4 is on mediational means, following a neo-Vygotskian sociocultural framework. The author defines mediational means as "a class of objects positioned within a social practice" (137); they "predate the social actor" and exist as "objective and external givens which are, over time, appropriated into the habits of the social actor" (15). Although Scollon has attempted to address the interaction between discourse and mediated actions, his explication

remains mostly at a theoretical level, which, in my view, makes it difficult for readers to conceptualize fully the relationship between the two in the context of the practice of handing.

Chap. 5 is devoted to the question of how the social actor comes to be a member of social groups, and what those groups are. Unlike some theorists of socialization, Scollon makes no assumption about a natural link between the child's caregiver's group and that of the child, because, as a unique individual, the child develops her own identity through social interactions with membership in multiple groups, including being a daughter in her family, a child of the middle class, a Japanese-Chinese Hawaiian, and a girl, a point that is also addressed in a previous publication (Scollon & Scollon 2001). In this chapter, the author also discusses the notion of "nexus of practice," a term intended to capture the essence of the multiple and various linkages among practices. The last chapter addresses some issues that need to be explored further. In conclusion, Scollon presents *MD* as a nexus of practice rather than an encompassing enterprise, "a program of linkage among other research frameworks" (17).

Although mediated discourse analysis is not entirely new, being "a program of linkage among other well-established theoretical and methodological approaches" (1), it is distinctive in that it attempts to examine and analyze human action and discourse as inseparable within a broader framework, within their situated social, cultural, historical, and materialistic milieu. Scollon's integrative approach, examining the ontogenesis of a single social practice, breaks new ground, suggesting a new way to build theories of social practice that can bring together research in different areas so that we can achieve a dynamic, holistic, deeper, and more objective understanding of the phenomena of social life and social change.

Although Ron Scollon is an author of both books under review, the second differs from the first, theoretical, work in focusing on practical application. *Professional communication in international settings* (*PCIIS*) is an excellent book that is much needed by professionals, researchers, trainers, or anyone else involved in business or professional communication across cultural boundaries. Different from many other books on the same subject, its goal is to offer a method for effective communication, and it can be used as either a textbook or a reference. Based on the authors' research in three sites – Hong Kong, Beijing, and Jyväskylä, Finland – the book focuses specifically on how professionals should present themselves in international settings, introducing a practical method called "Communication Display Portfolios" (CDPs).

The use of CDP requires participating companies (or individuals) to exchange their best-case examples of professional practices, which include product brochures, resumes, and videotapes of sales presentations or business meetings. Focus group discussions are then held to discuss the materials provided by the collaborating team and their communicative effectiveness in order to reveal what seems to be confusing or ineffective from the other team's perspective. This feedback helps partners in the exchange to reflect, digest, or adjust, and it constitutes

a cross-cultural educational process through which one learns about the different interpretations other cultures make of one's own self-presentation, and thus learns to become a better communicator.

One excellent methodological feature that makes the analysis especially deep is that four perspectives are examined for each of the practices: (i) members' interpretations and generalizations about what they do (conventional wisdom); (ii) the objective or neutral view obtained through recording both verbal and written actual behavior; (iii) individual case histories; and (iv) contrastive studies.

The book consists of six chapters. The first, "Analyzing communication," offers an overview of the theoretical framework. Chap. 2, "The telephone call," starts with a discussion of conventional wisdom informed by historical insights, and includes an analysis based on focus group discussions. The authors compare three calls by one individual, observing that there is "no universally accepted way of speaking on the phone either as a caller or as a respondent" (21).

In chap. 3, "The résumé," the authors rightly point out that this practice is relatively new and that there are really "no agreed-upon standards" (21) regarding how information should be presented. They discuss various views and practices around the world about the forms and functions of résumés, one of the major points of contention being the inclusion of personal information. However, what is not mentioned in the analysis is that in many cities in China, some of the job advertisements specify the gender and desired age range for applicants (although professional positions may be less likely to be so constrained). Therefore, if the résumé is sent to a particular employer, applicants may have no choice as to whether to make such information explicit.

Chap. 4, "The presentation," discusses, among other issues, how technology poses new challenges to presenters and also homogenizes practices. Specifically, the authors make the keen observation that the use of visual aids tends to take the audience's attention away from the presenter. Chap. 5, "The meeting," approaches the topic from a functional perspective. The authors examine the different emphases three cultures place on meetings, providing a broader and deeper understanding of the different assumptions about the functions of meetings as well as conflicts in perceptions of appropriate conduct at them. Chap. 6, "The reflective view," addresses practical issues of how CDPs can be developed and implemented.

The last section of the book contains three useful appendices and a section of "Further reading." The first appendix guides readers through the planning process with a step-by-step checklist for each phase. The second appendix, "Presenting across cultures," is a handbook that can be used to prepare for a one-day training program in CDP exchange; it includes examples of résumés and telephone call transcripts discussed in the book. Appendix 3 offers specific suggestions for users.

Although many books have been written on intercultural communication, the CDP approach presented in *PCIIS* is unique in that organizations can learn to obtain the necessary information directly from their counterparts instead of hav-

ing to rely on training programs, agencies, or other typical means. In view of the complexity of intercultural communication, which often involves interaction among several cultures, such a method is a more viable solution. As the authors state, the best source of knowledge in a complex international setting is the participants themselves.

Discussing current practices, the authors challenge and criticize the standardization attempt advocated in many books, which advance only the practices of North American business people instead of developing a truly international standard acceptable to all. Such an approach will be "doing violence to very important cultural practices within other groups" (4). In addition, the authors state that, even within English-speaking regions, no one form or practice will suffice in the world today because "there isn't just one English" (4). People unavoidably interpret practices that are different from their own, the authors stress, and this often leads to negative evaluation. This point was established by interactional sociolinguistics decades ago, and it is well illustrated through the telling examples here. Since comparison helps us to see that even "natural" behavior is only relative (Saville-Troike 1989), a reflective, comparative method works well to increase our awareness.

Grounded in cultural anthropology and interactional sociolinguistics, this book makes several important contributions. Its three-culture reflective model, unlike the traditional binary comparison between two cultures, adds to its validity and enriches the perspective of the analysis. Methodologically, the use of multiple views, along with the four-way data collection and analysis, manifests the rigor of the approach. The prescribed norms of behavior are analyzed against the actual practices observed along with participants' reflections. In addition, the incorporation of a historical perspective provides not only background information but also depth and a broader context for the analysis.

The book also raises important theoretical questions. For example, the authors argue that in light of current technology, the commonsense view of telephone etiquette of the CBS style (clarity, brevity, sincerity) is out of date and inappropriate owing to its derivation from the limitations of the primitive technology at the time of invention.

The authors have laudably bypassed "the narrow loop of external analysis by researchers" (12); participants themselves can obtain a deeper understanding of how their own practices are perceived and interpreted by others. The authors have also rightly moved beyond linguistic analysis in stressing the need to examine other semiotic systems, such as the study of use of space, time, and colors, or formal agendas vs. open discussions. Furthermore, they have "[o]vercome the ethnocentric approach in most textbooks" (ix) by referring to books written in languages such as Chinese and Japanese, thus examining communication across cultures from different perspectives.

I am left wondering, however, about one methodological question. In the discussion of telephone calls in *PCIIS*, there is no mention of why the telephone calls

recorded are only one-way conversations, with no recorded speech from the recipients of the calls. It isn't explained whether this was intentional (and if so, why) or the result of other considerations. Since the recipient's remarks certainly constitute one of the variables of the content as well as the structure of the conversation, it is unfortunate that we don't have the interaction completely captured on record and analyzed.

In summary, *PCIIS* is scholarly and extremely informative, yet it is also enjoyable to read with its illuminating examples. In spite of the authors' comment, "If we are successful, most readers should not have to read every page in order to accomplish this purpose" (26), I found it hard to stop reading once I started, simply because I was eager to find out how these practices are constructed and interpreted in different groups. This book is a must for business people or professionals who strive to achieve a better understanding and more effective communication in cross-cultural interactions.

REFERENCES

Saville-Troike, Muriel. (1989). *The ethnography of communication*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell.
Scollon, Ron, & Scollon, Suzanne W. (2001). *Intercultural communication: A discourse approach*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell.

(Received 8 January, 2003)

SIMON FRANKLIN, *Writing, society and culture in early Rus, c. 950–1300*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. Pp. xv, 325. Hb $65.00 US.

SEAN HAWKINS, *Writing and colonialism in Northern Ghana: The encounter between the LoDagaa and 'the world on paper'*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002. Pp. xv, 468. Hb $80.00 Can.

Reviewed by DAVID R. OLSON
OISE/UT, University of Toronto
Toronto, CANADA M5S 1V6
Dolson@oise.utoronto.ca

Two remarkable books arrived on my desk from quite different sources early in 2003. My purpose in reviewing them is twofold: first, to convince the general reader that the study of culture can no longer ignore the transformative role of written documents in social and mental life in either antique cultures or in contemporary modernizing ones; and second, to introduce the authors of these fine books to each other.

One of them, the historian Simon Franklin, shows how documentary practices and bureaucratic social organization spread through the land of the Rus beginning in the 10th century. These practices had been imported from Byzantium with the

adoption of the Christian religion and then spread over a period of three centuries into many aspects of government, economic, and social life. The other author, the anthropologist Sean Hawkins, shows how the documentary practices of colonial Britain were imposed on the traditional practices of the LoDagaa of Ghana. Both show in exquisite detail how "power came to reside in writing" (Hawkins, p. 328) and how "writing was a necessary condition and component part of, a crucial enabling device [for] ... the changes in social and cultural life" including the economy, the structures of authority, international politics, and political ideology, as well as "for the urban environment, for aesthetic standards, for public and private behavior" (Franklin, p. 279).

Both books take as indicative of written culture the enterprise of turning social practices into explicit categories, rules, and laws. Hawkins examines a century's worth of documents, including legal texts, court judgments, anthropological reports, and colonial reports, as well as maps and charts bearing on the British attempt, largely unsuccessful, to impose their social order on a farming people living along the Black Volta River in present-day Ghana and Burkina Faso. He shows how the British colonial power systematically misread traditional LoDagaa cultural practices in trying to impose their well-defined bureaucratic categories on them. For example, in regard to marriage, the British were first baffled by social practices that allowed a woman to change partners and children to be unconcerned about biological paternity. The British formal categories of "married" and "father" rendered a large part of local practice deviant. The law courts attempted to

> shape the identities of LoDagaa women as wives, to define their relationships with men as marriage, and to use the concept of adultery to punish younger and less powerful men and so prevent them from eloping with the wives of older men and chiefs. However, the courts' use of concepts such as wife, marriage, and adultery was highly problematic because of the lack of commensurability between indigenous practices and these categories of colonial control. (229)

Similarly, in imposing the rule of law the British were appalled to find, as one colonial officer claimed, that "there are no criminal laws among these pagans" (161). Conflicts were resolved not by appealing to a rule or law but by dispute: "The ensuing discussion is confusing, it is laborious, and [yet] it generally ends in agreement" (240). Hawkins argues that the problems arose from the descriptive dilemma facing observers. They imposed their own formal, written categories on local practices, and the lack of fit led them to see those practices as deficiencies to be remedied. After a century of colonization, the LoDagaa now live under the jurisdiction of writing, of formal categories, rules, norms and laws: "Culture became ethnicity, paths became roads, memory became history, scarification patterns became clothes, Earth priests became chiefs, god became God ... actions became words, [and] practices became rules" (324). Yet, as Hawkins

points out, this document culture penetrates only peripherally into the daily lives of the people.

Franklin analyzes the form, content, and function of every piece of writing surviving in the "land of the Rus" from the earliest times up to the Mongol invasions of the 13th century. He shows how writing came to serve not only as a communicative convenience but also as a formal record or document and as a part of official procedure. In the 10th century, the Rus adopted the Cyrillic writing system, an alphabetic system developed by St. Cyril, along with the bureaucratic structures of the Eastern Catholic Church. While monastic life was ordered by written rules and the acceptance of written codes was essential to the Christian identity, the rest of social and economic life was not. How the formation of rules, laws, norms, and standards spread to become part of social life more generally is examined in detail. Franklin points out that the Primary Chronicle for 1051 set out the rules for "how to sing the monastic offices, how to make prostrations, how to read the lessons, and standing in church, and all the church rites, and sitting at table, and what to eat on which days, all according to regulation" (144). This attitude to rules diffused through the society so that written rules came to have authority. Over the 11th and 12th centuries, rule-lists expanded to cover a range of social activities, beginning with rules "on homicide, injury, theft, penalties for killing the prince's stablemaster, for the theft of a boat, a dove, a dog, a goat, or hay" (156–7). In the period examined, this rule-list "mentality" spread widely but never became a part of a pervasive cultural pattern. Local activities continued relatively unfazed by this writing revolution.

Both writers insist that this kind of social change is not merely the transcription of custom into written form. In the case of the LoDagaa, the written was borrowed and superimposed on local practice. For the Rus, where this development was more indigenous, writing turned a precedent into a norm or rule. At first, it is unclear whether procedures were adopted because they follow the rule, or the rule was derived from the procedure; but by the late 13th century, the written "did acquire a kind of 'constitutional' aura as a unitary written rule-code which was formed and maintained in a land without a unitary structure of authority" (Franklin, 158).

Both books emphasize the importance of documentary practices in the "scripting" of social relations, in the formalization of concepts and categories, and in the realignment of authority between oral practices and the written record. Both criticize the social sciences for not recognizing the effects of writing on mind and society, and both acknowledge the influence of Jack Goody.[1] These two books show in exquisite detail just how diverse informal social practices get organized, categorized, and formalized in the enterprise of describing and formulating them in writing. Consequently, those descriptions often came to have normative qualities as rules, laws, or precedents.

One important difference between the written cultures of the LoDagaa and the Rus should be emphasized. Hawkins points out that the British colonial written

tradition denied the LoDagaa the right to describe their culture and society in their own terms, resulting in an essentially unbridgeable gap between social practices and formal law. Franklin, on the other hand, shows that although the authority of the written was more or less imposed through the church, its diffusion throughout the culture was the product of the indigenous attempt to formulate local practice as general norms and laws. The result was that the normative structures of the law could find a place in the consciousness of the citizenry (even if this did require some three centuries and was never complete); for the LoDagaa, in contrast, these normative structures remain largely alien. Although literate practices are almost universally borrowed rather than invented, socialization is never a matter of merely imposing the norms, rules, and standards on others. Grounding rules and laws in local social practice is what makes them comprehensible to those so governed.

But how, then, is one to avoid the misrepresentation of culture? The very act of describing is an imposition of categories and rules in a domain where there have been only social practices. Social practices may be characterized in terms of rules and laws, but they do not consist of following such rules and laws, to revert to a distinction made famous by Wittgenstein 1958. It is possible that the rule-list mentality evolved by the Rus became pervasive because the rule-lists were indigenous and reflected custom to a far greater degree than did the British-imposed rule-lists encountered by the LoDagaa.[2]

These books also help to steer us between two common but flawed assumptions regarding the relation between documentary literate practices and social and cognitive structures. The imperialist mode (with us to this day in the form of directives from agencies such as governments and schools) is simply to impose formal rule systems and expect subjects to comply with them. The indigenous mode insists that literate practices be assimilated into existing social practices. Neither is adequate. There is a delicate balance between custom and law. If the law is not rooted in custom, it seems to have limited effect, as among the LoDagaa. But law is not just custom either; it is a mode of formalization, of definition, and of documentation that societies invent or adopt for some activities but not for others, as among the Rus.

However such issues are adjudicated, these wonderful books show with remarkable precision how the very shape of modern thought and modern bureaucratic social systems is rooted in the creation of an archival written tradition, a "world on paper."

NOTES

[1]To be discussed in D. Olson and M. Cole (in preparation), *Writing, culture and history: The intellectual legacies of Jack Goody.*

[2] That the transformation from custom to law is never straightforward is convincingly shown by Walker 1998, who shows how the somewhat informal social practices of 19th-century German towns conflicted with and were progressively overwritten by the more formal and rationalized procedural orders, rules, and laws imposed by state bureaucracies.

REFERENCES

Walker, Mack (1998). *German home towns: Community, state and general estate, 1648–1817*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
Wittgenstein, Ludwig (1958). *Philosophical investigations*. G.E.M. Anscombe (trans.). Oxford: Blackwell

(Received 21 February, 2003)

BIONOTE

David R. Olson is author of *The world on paper: The conceptual and cognitive implications of writing and reading*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press and of the forthcoming *Psychological theory and educational reform*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nanette Gottlieb & Ping Chen (eds.), *Language planning and language policy: East Asian perspectives*. Richmond, UK: Curzon, 2001. Pp. x, 210. ISBN 0-7007-1468-5.

Reviewed by Paul Bruthiaux
Department of English
Texas A&M University
bruthiaux@english.tamu.edu

In this well-focused collection of papers, editors Gottlieb & Chen present an overview of language planning and policy issues in East Asia. Given the time-honored emphasis on scholarship and especially on writing that is characteristic of the region, it is not surprising to find that the book is rich in historical information. However, it also provides a wealth of insights regarding recent developments across related yet unique settings. In this sense, the volume fulfills its publicized aim of meeting the needs of students, researchers, and educated readers with an interest in the complex language practices of the region.

In their introduction to language planning and policy in East Asia, Gottlieb & Chen review what (mostly) unites the nations and other entities represented in the collection – Japan, mainland China, Hong Kong, Taiwan, the Koreas, and Vietnam. They point out that all were influenced by Confucian values and the Chinese script, have a long tradition of and deep reverence for writing, and are familiar with highly politicized perceptions of language. With the significant exception of North Korea, all have factored in a growing role for English. Most have deliberately based the dominant spoken standard on the speech of their capital city and have entrusted the thrust of language policy to formal, quasi-governmental bodies. Though a promising discussion of the connection between language planning and economic development fails to convince, the authors formulate tantalizing questions regarding the likely evolution of East Asian scripts under the influence of information technology. Overall, the chapter is informative and cogently argued, and it succeeds in tying the themes of the book into a coherent whole.

A discussion of language planning and policy in Japan, by Gottlieb, offers valuable historical insights into the evolution of language planning in the country, such as the early promotion of the Tokyo standard. Gottlieb details various language planning bodies and their activities, which include carrying out language surveys, overseeing Japanese language teaching outside the country and foreign language teaching inside it, and promoting the endangered Ainu language. Aspects of corpus planning discussed include regulating the incorporation of loanwords into Japanese, the use (or disuse) of honorifics, and script norms and writing conventions. Two specific strengths stand out. One is Gottlieb's exploration of the connection between nationalist politics and language planning. The other, despite the fact that no book can ever do justice to fast-changing technology, is Gottlieb's insightful analysis of the challenges posed to language planners by technological change and its influence on writing.

Contributing the lion's share of the pieces in the volume, co-editor Chen first discusses the development and standardization of the modern Chinese lexicon. He stresses the large gap that opened over the centuries between written and spoken norms until 19th-century reforms began to tackle illiteracy. This was achieved by promoting a spoken standard among competing dialects and by reforming the standard script. Chen notes that standardization was essentially based on northern Mandarin, with (surprisingly, perhaps) substantial contributions from regional dialects and foreign languages. Chen shows that language planners were aware of the urgency of promoting a written standard as a safeguard against the risk that Chinese might split into distinct languages, and that they regarded national and linguistic unity as inseparable, and access to literacy by the masses as a key policy goal.

In his review of phonetic writing in Chinese, Chen successfully analyzes the dual nature of Chinese writing, a logographic and phonetic script all at once. Noting that proposals for entirely phonetic alternatives go back to the 16th century, he reviews competing proposals for the provision of scripts that would facilitate learning and fill gaps in the existing system, or even supersede it altogether. Surveying the options open to language planners, Chen notes the key role played by the current writing system in unifying mutually unintelligible dialects within China and across the Chinese diaspora. He also concurs with Gottlieb regarding Japanese in noting that, far from bringing about the demise of logographic writing, computer technology makes it more likely that the script will adapt and flourish.

Turning to a local context for language planning in relation to Chinese, Chen takes up the theme of language standardization and conflict in Taiwan. He surveys the historical background, including that of the aboriginal peoples of the island and their languages, a dimension of the country that is often overlooked. He chronicles the political and military background behind the major inroads made into the country by Japanese, a language whose influence continues to be felt today. Chen describes the political motivations behind the elevation of Guoyu (Modern Standard Chinese) to national-language status, reflecting a view of Taiwan as a province of mainland China. He also emphasizes the growing tolerance

of local languages and dialects in the country, as well as the recent popularity of Taiwanese in public debate and administration, as a statement of political differentiation from the mainland.

In his essay on language policy in Hong Kong up to the 1997 handover, Chen describes the roles of English and now increasingly of Putonghua in an overwhelming Cantonese-speaking city. He notes the long history of dominance of English as a route to power and social mobility through education, and he reports on the longstanding criticism that a language policy favoring English had an adverse effect on teaching in general and on the teaching of Chinese and Chinese values in particular. Chen discusses the steady erosion in the popularity of Chinese schools and the recent rise in the popularity of Putonghua as a school subject, and he notes that post-handover language policy provides for the promotion of Chinese as a medium of instruction. However, as often happens in discussions of education policy in Hong Kong, it is not always clear whether "Chinese" is meant to be interpreted as Cantonese or Mandarin.

In an intriguing discussion of divergence and convergence in language policy and practices in North and South Korea, Song stresses the historical roots and ideological motivations of language policy in the Koreas, including the profound influence of Chinese on Korean culture, the creation of the Korean script, the traumatic Japanese occupation, and the recent spread of English in the South as part of a preoccupation with internationalization. Song notes the work of South Korean language planners, but he berates them for lack of leadership and for rarely bothering to bring the public on board. Song provides a rare insight into North Korean language planning practices, the preservation of Korean flavor in borrowings, and the ban on the use of Chinese in print. Half a century of rigid separation, Song argues, has not succeeded in seriously impeding communication between the two Koreas. Although North Korean conditions undoubtedly make it difficult to access recent information, curious readers may wonder why a review published in 2001 has nothing to say concerning any shift in language policy in North Korea following the death of Kim Il Sung in 1994.

A fitting conclusion to the volume is Lo Bianco's discussion of the interplay of colonialism and language policy in Vietnam, which paints a broad picture of Vietnamese language history from linguistics to literary production, and usefully situates Vietnamese language practices within language planning theory. Noting the absence of formal language planning institutions in Vietnam and a preference for ad hoc measures, Lo Bianco is highly informative regarding the emergence and spread of Quoc Ngu (the alphabetic script originally adapted by European missionaries to represent the tones of Vietnamese phonology), the rise of a French-speaking elite and administrative cadre under French colonial rule, the success of a post-liberation literacy campaign, and recent efforts to preserve and promote indigenous languages. This is an encyclopedic yet highly readable piece that serves as an excellent introduction to a country not often discussed in sources on language planning and policy.

Unusually for an edited collection, the volume benefits from a useful index. The standards of editing are high, and the book is very informative and reads fluently, with the authors wearing their considerable scholarship lightly. One weakness of the volume is the fact that some of the pieces are reprinted, leaving the reader with a sense that updates on some of the more topical issues it covers will have to be sought elsewhere. It is also somewhat regrettable that so few authors are represented in the collection, and that other experts on language planning in East Asia were not recruited with a view to making the volume representative of wider scholarship. Overall, however, this is a welcome addition to the specialized literature on language planning and policy, and one that will largely meet the needs of students, scholars, and educated readers, as intended by the editors.

(Received 13 January, 2003)

JOHN ALGEO (ed.), *The Cambridge history of the English language, vol. 6: English in North America*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001. Pp. xxxii, 625. Hb. $120.00.

Reviewed by MATTHEW J. GORDON
English, University of Missouri
Columbia, MO 65211
gordonmj@missouri.edu

This is the sixth and presumably final volume in an ambitious series. The first four volumes were distinguished chronologically according to the traditional paradigm for the history of English: Old English, Middle English, Early Modern English, and Present Day English. The other two volumes are organized geographically. Volume 5 examined English outside England in most of the expected places (e.g., Scotland, Ireland, Australia), with the exception of North America, to which the present volume is devoted. As the general editor, Richard Hogg, writes (p. xi), the series is designed to offer "a solid discussion of the full range of the history of English" to anglicists and general linguists alike. Readers of the latter category will certainly find this volume accessible. In fact, the inclusion of a glossary of terms extends that accessibility to readers outside linguistics as well. Specialists, however, are likely to be disappointed by the unevenness of the collection.

The book comprises 14 chapters, including one written by the editor, John Algeo, who also contributed the Preface, in which he sketches the standard account of dialect differentiation as the product of physical or social separation and language change. He stresses that differences between American English (AE) and British English have resulted from changes on both sides of the Atlantic. Endorsing a traditional dichotomy, Algeo notes that linguistic changes arise from factors that are either external or internal to the language system. In his chapter,

therefore, Algeo seeks to lay the groundwork for studying the development of AE by presenting an "External History." This history is divided into three phases: the Colonial period (1607–1776), the National period (1776–1898), and the International period (1898–present). Algeo presents Fischer's (1989) conception of colonial settlement as proceeding in four waves, each representing a different British folkway (e.g., eastern British Puritans to Massachusetts, northern Quakers to Pennsylvania). These original emigration waves certainly played a role in establishing dialect differences (and other cultural patterns), but as Algeo notes, "The result was not a homogenous blend, but a mixture ensuring that American local differences cannot be traced back to the motherland by any simple direct line" (15). Much of Algeo's discussion, especially of the National and International periods, reflects his lexicographical interests. He focuses on major events, social and political movements, and technological developments, the main linguistic consequences of which are new vocabulary. In fact, very little mention of linguistic developments is made throughout this discussion, except for noting the introduction of terms like *jazz*, *skyscraper*, or *McCarthyism*.

Algeo's contribution seems most directly a prelude to the chapter by Frederic G. Cassidy & Joan Houston Hall, which treats "Americanisms," a term coined in 1781 by Scottish-born John Witherspoon. Cassidy & Hall present a chronological survey of the lexical effects of American history. Among the hundreds of forms discussed is *OK*, "the most successful of all Americanisms" (196) and a word with a curious history, which the authors describe.

Also lexical in focus is Jonathan E. Lighter's chapter on "Slang." In addition to reviewing the development of various slang forms throughout U.S. history, Lighter offers an interesting account of the differing senses that the word *slang* has conveyed over time. The chapter concludes by considering the role that slang plays in American life. Here Lighter offers some intriguing speculations about the connections between slang and the American character.

The historical relationship between British and American English is addressed in the chapters by John Hurt Fisher and Michael Montgomery. Fisher explores "continuity and divergence" between the national varieties along various dimensions, including vocabulary, style, and pronunciation. Sociolinguists are likely to find this treatment out of step with current thinking. The discussion of pronunciation focuses on Received Pronunciation (RP) as the point of comparison. Moreover, there are at least two factual errors – one related to William Labov's New York City study (76), and one in the description of RP vowels (77). Interestingly, some of the deficiencies in Fisher's approach are addressed (without explicit criticism) by Montgomery, in one of the strongest chapters in the collection. Montgomery stresses the need for scholars investigating antecedents of AE to remember that migrants came from all over the British Isles, so that one needs to consider a range of dialects as potential input. He also argues for the value of nonliterary texts as a source of information on early AE. These include town records such as those examined by Krapp 1925 and the business and personal

letters that Montgomery has investigated in his research. Such sources offer a less subjective perspective than the comments of grammarians and orthoepists from which many scholars, including Fisher, have drawn. In the second half of his chapter, Montgomery details a range of trans-Atlantic linguistic connections, some limited to particular colonial regions and others having more widespread currency. Significantly, Montgomery does not treat the identification of British antecedents as the end of the story; instead, he notes that many features show continuing developments in AE. In this sense, then, "items that migrated represent both antecedents and Americanisms, and their ancestry may be of secondary significance to their subsequent evolution" (150).

Another strong contribution to the collection is Salikoko Mufwene's chapter on African American English. Mufwene makes the unusual decision to consider Gullah alongside African American Vernacular English (AAVE), despite the fact that the former is usually considered a separate creole language rather than a dialect of English. Mufwene's decision is in keeping with his challenge to conventional thinking on the nature of creoles in general and the development of AE in particular. Regardless of one's position on these larger issues, the inclusion of Gullah material is valuable as a point of comparison for AAVE. Mufwene details a number of significant linguistic features. His treatment offers more than a simple list of forms, especially in discussing grammatical features, for which he comments on semantic distinctions and linguistic conditioning of variable forms. Mufwene also reviews the scholarly debate on the origins and continuing development of AAVE. His balanced account makes clear that many open questions remain in this active area of research.

Edward Finegan's chapter, which bears the vague title "Usage," offers a historical review of prescriptivist approaches to AE. Finegan's detailed discussion goes well beyond the usual caricatures of prescriptivists and highlights issues on which they have differed, such as the question of whose usage should be taken as acceptable. Finegan notes the circularity of most reasoning on this point: Prescriptivists accept the usage of the best writers, but they define the best writers as those with the best usage. The practice of error-hunting that has dominated grammatical instruction has often led grammarians to criticize the usage of literary giants (Shakespeare, Milton, Chaucer) as well as that of other grammarians. The linguistics party line is also represented, with quotes from Whitney to Fries to Pinker, and Finegan offers useful critical commentary. His citation of the Linguistic Society of America's "Guidelines for Nonsexist Usage" reminds us that linguists too practice prescriptivism.

Just two chapters deal with English in Canada. William J. Kirwin discusses Newfoundland, and Laurel J. Brinton & Margery Fee treat the rest of the country. Kirwin's chapter points out the connection of Newfoundland English to dialects of southwestern England and southeastern Ireland. He offers a helpful overview of the province's peculiar settlement history and describes traditional features of Newfoundland speech. Brinton & Fee discuss the putative uniformity of Canadian En-

glish from Ontario westward as a product of rapid settlement in the late 19th century. They review linguistic features, devoting much of the discussion to vocabulary.

The collection contains other contributions that cannot be fully described here owing to limited space. These include chapters on language contact by Suzanne Romaine, dialects by Lee Pederson, grammatical structure by Ronald R. Butters, and spelling by Richard L. Venezky. The final chapter is Richard W. Bailey's essay "American English abroad," which offers a fitting conclusion to the collection. It provides both a historical review and a look forward at the influence of AE in Britain and elsewhere.

A general criticism might be leveled against the editor(s) for the volume's lack of cohesion. Contributors rarely reference other chapters in the collection, which suggests that the authors did not have access to their colleagues' work, contrary to Hogg's statement in his preface (xiii). Further supporting this suspicion is the redundancy of much of the discussion. Three different authors tell the story of Witherspoon's coinage of the term "Americanism," and four summarize Fischer's account of colonial settlement.

The volume presents a largely traditional view of the history of AE and of language change in general. Except in Mufwene's discussion, current sociolinguistic research is rarely cited. A good example is Pederson's treatment of AE dialects, which does not mention ongoing sound changes such as the Northern Cities Shift or the Southern Shift, studied extensively by Labov and others. The conservatism of the volume is no doubt a reflection of editorial preferences. Nevertheless, it includes some valuable contributions, as I have noted.

REFERENCES

Fischer, David Hackett (1989). *Albion's seed: Four British folkways in America*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Krapp, George Philip (1925). *The English language in America*. 2 vols. New York: Century.

(Received 18 January, 2003)

JULIE LINDQUIST, *A place to stand: Politics and persuasion in a working-class bar*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press, 2002. Pp. viii, 199. Pb $29.95.

Reviewed by JOLI JENSEN
Communication, University of Tulsa
Tulsa OK 74112
joli-jensen@utulsa.edu

In her preface to *A place to stand*, Julie Lindquist writes, "The experience of class in America is impossible to explain, difficult to render, and dangerous to address." In spite of these caveats, she has combined her experience as a bartender

with her graduate training in theoretical linguistics to render and address, if not to explain, rhetorical performance among the regulars in a working class-bar she calls the Smokehouse.

The Smokehouse bar is connected to the Smokehouse Inn, a barbecue restaurant in a Chicago suburb, housed in a 150-year-old building that was once part of the Underground Railroad. Smokehousers gather in the dark, horseshoe-shaped bar in two shifts: the early regulars rise before dawn, settle in for drinks after work, and head home around 7:30; and the night regulars come in around 9:30 p.m. and stay until closing. On her 11-hour shifts, Lindquist played – or was cast into – the role of liberal antagonist in the ever-present talk of the bar. In this way, she constantly participated in the expressive behaviors she sought to document, analyze, and understand.

In the first chapter, Lindquist describes the complexity of her own social position (raised by a single mother, in working-class circumstances, adept at dissent, a graduate student ambivalent about academic life), and she invokes some of the theoretical framework she deploys throughout her account. Chap. 2 evocatively describes a night's work, starting with the dilemma of what to wear. The owner hires only attractive female bartenders, forbids them to wear pants, and tells the "girls" that their job is to keep the guys at the bar interested. She settles on a denim skirt and marginally comfortable shoes and drives to work. A description follows of a typical composite night of hauling ice, mixing sticky drinks for rude women, greeting and bantering with coworkers and regulars, and ending with clean-up and the drive home.

Lindquist is a gifted storyteller, and it is here that her creative writing gifts shine. The most memorable elements of the book are the descriptive ones – she evokes with extraordinary effectiveness the experience of tending bar, including its sounds, smells, and frustrations, the role and demeanor of regulars, and the rhythms of joking, arguing, and posturing. She is also adept at including herself within the events, an ethnographic conundrum that she finesses well. I worked in a similar bar as a graduate student and well remember the difficulty of finding a "place to stand" when interpreting interpretations.

Lindquist recorded debates and took fieldnotes, but she also conducted interviews with five Smokehousers. Chap. 4 analyzes the responses of a bartender-waitress, two regulars, a cook/bar manager, and the owner to a series of somewhat forced questions about class, race, work, and politics. These interviews offer a compelling contrast to the public performances Lindquist analyzes in later chapters. In these interviews, Maggie, Walter, Joe, Arlen, and Perry all struggle to "do the interview right" for their friend Julie, and Lindquist rightly notes this impulse, as well as her own surprise at the range, subtlety, and diversity of opinion she found in these personal encounters.

What goes on in the interviews is different (and, I think, much richer) from what happens in the interactive group performance around the bar, yet the group theatrical "game of oratory" remains the focus of her analysis. The book treats the

Smokehousers' frequent, dramatic barroom debates (which often cast Lindquist as the "liberal academic") as a form of public political talk. "What first appeared to be a dense and formless thicket of discourse is really a well-traveled and elaborately mapped rhetorical landscape" (p. 73), Lindquist argues. It is through this landscape that she seeks to illuminate her larger concern about the construction of a political "place to stand" for members of the working class.

In chap. 6, "A place to stand: Argument as a class act," Lindquist draws out personal, social, cultural, and political elements in particular barroom discussions. Several of these rhetorical vignettes address aspects of the presidential candidacies of Bill Clinton and Ross Perot; another includes race elements in a mutual friend's reported dispute with a neighbor. She summarizes this portion of her account by listing a "matrix of tensions" that she believes surrounds all the arguments: tensions between public and private, assent and dissent, solidarity and difference, working class and middle class, theory and practice, or stasis and change. She argues that this matrix "suggests that as a group on the margins of marginality, the Smokehouse cohort is fraught with ambivalence about the sociopolitical status of working-class whites in general." But can her rhetorical evidence support this claim?

In the Preface, Lindquist describes her original hopes to document hegemony at work and to attend to what elitist critics ignore. In a disarming aside, she says, "I have long since modulated my arrogance on both counts: my more modest goal, now, is to narrate a small part of a cultural process." My sense is that she hasn't fully let go of her originating desire to document hegemonic mechanisms that victimize the working class, even as the personal, social, and cultural richness (and contradictions) in her material captivated her. But such is always the challenge of ethnographic work.

In spite of the compelling richness of her descriptions, there are times in her analysis when Lindquist's own academic rhetorical performance – arguments about the marginalized rhetorical and political position of the working class – outruns her evidence and cries out for comparisons across locations and social classes. She wants to make claims about the politics of class based on the self-conscious barroom performances of the Smokehouse regulars. This means that she frequently slides from narrating a rhetorical event to assuming a cultural process to attempting to describe the experience of class. As she says in the beginning, this is difficult, and dangerous.

In her final chapter, Lindquist argues that "Smokehousers are . . . unable to name themselves as a political entity [because they] have no conventional language in which to articulate a shared political predicament" (176). But couldn't this also be true for others in contemporary American life? Do any of us – working class, "power elite," middle class, or even academic intellectuals – really have a "conventional language in which to articulate a shared political predicament"? And can and should arguments in bars be expected to offer us political identity or efficacy?

Too much has been made, in recent thought, of the vanishing public sphere. Too little has been made of the role of the tavern in creating and sustaining the public, especially in early American life. Lindquist's valuable work can add to both these areas of inquiry. It can also inform larger questions about what it is we yearn for when we imagine effective public language and viable political identity.

Is contemporary public speech – in newspapers, in Congress, on talk shows, in classrooms, in barrooms – best understood as rhetorical (attempts to persuade), as social (attempts to establish identity), as cultural (attempts to articulate meanings), or as political (attempts to define citizenship)? Evidence of the depth and richness of Lindquist's book is that she implicitly answers "all of the above" to the question of how to understand public speech. *A place to stand* offers access to an undervalued site (the tavern), an understudied group (working-class regulars), and thoughtful consideration of the implications of rhetorical performance.

(Received 22 August, 2002)

ROBERT BRINGHURST, *A story as sharp as a knife: The classic Haida mythtellers and their world*. Vancouver & Toronto: Douglas & McIntyre, 1999. Pp. 527. Hb $45.00.

ROBERT BRINGHURST, *Nine visits to the mythworld: Ghandl of the Qayahl Llaanas*. (Masterworks of the Classical Haida Mythtellers, vol. 2.) Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2000. Pp. 222. Hb $37.95.

ROBERT BRINGHURST, *Being in being: The collected works of Skaay of the Qquuna Qiighawaay*. (Masterworks of the Classical Haida Mythtellers, vol. 3.) Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2001. Pp. 397. Hb. $35.00.

Reviewed by DELL HYMES
Anthropology, University of Virginia
Charlottesville, VA 22903
dhymes@adelphia.net

These three volumes invite a volume in return. They bring Haida to the fore of what is known of oral narrative in Native North America. One finds a dedicated philological sleuth, tracking down original texts and unpublished manuscripts (see *A story as sharp as a knife*, pp. 221–2; *Nine visits to the mythworld*, p. 17); a historian of anthropology, reconstructing and relating the story of a young fieldworker who is now largely forgotten (John R. Swanton); a pursuit of detail that enters into a past world, identifying in footnotes and photographs the places and foods and material culture of that world; and a creative writer reimagining Haida men, on islands crumbled by disease and occupation, re-creating in narratives a world their minds could still imagine. Not least, one finds someone for whom the

arts are a normal part of life, and for whom the conception and misfortunes of a painting by Velasquez (44–49) can illuminate the relationship between myth time and historical time in Haida. Finally, the writing displays an ease, indeed a gift for words, that befits an established poet, and the books themselves are attractive, as befits a typographer versed in visual arts. (Bringhurst was invited to bring out a new edition, Chappell & Bringhurst 1999, of a standard book. The new edition indeed displays two pages [298–99] in line and verse of Victoria Howard's "Gitskux and his older brother" [Clackamas Chinook]; see Hymes 1983. His book of 1992 has been a bestseller.)

Each of the present volumes includes a clear guide to Haida spelling and pronunciation. The first volume has appendices that show several ways of writing Haida; the spelling of some other Native American languages; the thematic structure of Skaay's "Raven Travelling"; Haida village names; and a short pronouncing glossary of Haida people and places. Its table of contents lists the many illustrations and photographs. In the second and third volumes, there are notes to the illustrations. The first volume does not have such notes but does have fine maps locating the Haida in the world and their communities in Haida Gwaii (the recently standardized name) (20–25). All three volumes have notes to the text, some specific explanations, and some comparative perspective. Only the first, unfortunately, has an index.

Work with Native American materials can involve tension and controversy. Bringhurst has been the object of intense objections, particularly from linguists working in the Haida area – in part, apparently, because he is not seen as much involved with present-day communities. That seems unfair, since he came to study these narratives of a century ago through collaboration with the renowned Haida sculptor Bill Reid (see Reid & Bringhurst 1996), and has edited Reid's writings (Reid 2000).

Bringhurst's work with Swanton's texts was for a time the object of a derogatory website set up by John Enrico, himself long immersed in the language and its texts. At least in part, Enrico's critique had to do with Bringhurst's concern to remain close to the century-old originals. One list on the website of hundreds of errors reflected almost entirely the use of a different symbol for a velar consonant. In his first volume (1999: 418–22), Bringhurst discusses issues of orthography with balanced recognition of the different concerns involved. In notes to this volume, he acknowledges Enrico's work objectively, and in the acknowledgments to the second volume, quite graciously (11). (In chap. 17 of the first volume, Bringhurst joins others in being unfair to Alfred Kroeber's work with the Mohave at the beginning of the century. He, like they, could not have known that the original manuscript makes it possible to detect an unusual, but consistent, patterning in five pairs; cf. Hymes 2000.)

With regard to his use of Haida names, rather than, say, the English names the narrators had been given, Bringhurst remarks:

> I know most readers of this book will find the Haida and other native names harder to spell, remember and pronounce. Acknowledging these names seems to me nonetheless an essential gesture of respect and recognition – one I hope most readers of this book will also want to make. (1:17)

The second and third volumes, as their subtitles indicate, are each devoted to the extant work of a single narrator, Ghandl in vol. 2 and Skaay in vol. 3. In the introduction to vol. 2, Bringhurst takes up again the narrator as individual, having previously indicated examples of anthropologists' failing to do so (1:135–39), and indeed quoting Edward Sapir there to the contrary (66): "The true locus of culture is in the interactions of specific individuals and, on the subjective side, in the world of meanings which each one of these individuals may unconsciously abstract" (cf. 1:407–8, 410).

The narratives are carefully spaced and attractive to read. The first volume contains valuable discussion of several narrators. In n. 6 to vol. 3, Bringhurst is generous to me, while noting that he prefers different terms. Let me respond in two ways.

First, Bringhurst is concerned not to use terms that connote meter. Of course he is right. So far as we know, Native American oral narratives in North America are not metrical. But it does not follow that the only alternative is "noetic." My use of "verse," at least initially, implied meter, but that has not been my intention. I use "verse" because it does imply poetry, but there is abundant precedent in 20th-century poetry for verse that is not metrical. William Carlos Williams is frequently given as an example. Lines, yes; meter, usually no. Then why not just "lines"?

The answer is that there are often units of more than one line that constitute parts of what can be called a "stanza." Bringhurst himself marks each tenth line to the right, and in two cases in the first volume, he marks sections with small roman numerals in brackets (1:227ff., 375ff.); and for another case he provides an outline (1:218–19). The second and third volumes regularly indicate sections in brackets.

The question of meter, then, is not basic. The basic question is to discover the ways in which such lines are grouped. A concept that should bridge the gap is that of "equivalence," put forward by Roman Jakobson. There are a variety of ways in which lines, or groups of lines, may be equivalent – that is, units within an on-going structure (cf. vol. 1, Index, under "verse"; and Hymes 2000:192).

What about the organization of Haida oral poetry, then? Bringhurst makes clear that there are lines and groups of lines, which indeed sit beautifully on the pages of his books. There seems to me (and to him) more to be discovered. I say that not in criticism. It took me years to discover that Louis Simpson, whose texts I had known for a long time, might group not only three or five lines, but PAIRS of lines – i. e., couplets – that would count as a single unit (see Hymes 1994:345–49, reprinted in Hymes 2003).

Quotative markers seem almost always to matter in these things, but not necessarily in the same way. Bringhurst reports that one narrator never used the standard quotative word.

The texts he presents show that a small set of lines may have three quotative markers. Sometimes a set of lines appears with a quotative marker at the end of the first line and again at the end of the last.

One guess I entertain is that sometimes the initial line of a group is other than that shown in these books. But that possibility can be checked only by access to the Haida texts themselves. Bringhurst does present several series of lines from some texts, and that is very helpful, but one would need to trace the Haida through all of a text. For the texts to be available, further resources would be needed. And here we touch on a general problem: a lack of resources for sustained research and publication, including in many linguistics departments a lack of support academically for promotion and tenure for such work.

That Haida narratives do have this kind of organization seems without doubt. Some years ago, John Enrico sent me and my wife a recording of himself speaking one myth in Haida. Sure enough, the intonation contours indicate lines and groups of lines. The analysis can be found in Hymes 1995 and is noted by Bringhurst (1: 461, n. 8).

But to close, there is much more than Haida in this set of books, especially in the first volume. Bringhurst has sought examples of quotatives, for example, in a number of other Native American languages.[1] As noted, his conception of Haida poetry is informed by a wide-ranging understanding of literature and visual art. This trilogy should become a classic reference point.

NOTES

[1] By all means read chap. 19 in vol. 1, "The prosody of meaning," and notice the presentation there (368ff.) of a reflection in Sahaptin on the nature and situation of myths by Joe Hunt to Melville Jacobs. A less elegant translation can be found in Hymes & Hymes 1989 (but in line 28 Bringhurst's *now* should be initial, not final).

REFERENCES

Bringhurst, Robert. (1982) *The beauty of the weapons: Selected poems 1972–82*. Port Townsend, WA: Copper Canyon Press.
———— (1992). *Elements of typographic style*. Point Roberts, WA: Hartley & Marks.
———— (1995). *The calling: Selected poems 1970–1995*. (Modern Canadian Poets Series.) Toronto: McClelland & Stewart.
———— (1998). *Native American oral literatures and the unity of the humanities*. (1998 Garnett Sedgwick Memorial Lecture.) Vancouver: University of British Columbia.
Chappell, Warren, & Bringhurst, Robert. (1999). *A short history of the printed word*. 2nd ed. Vancouver, B.C. & Point Roberts, WA.
Dreher, Gudrun (2002). *Stories are maps, songs are caches and trails: The verbal art of Haayas, Kingagwaaw, Gumsiiwa, Ghandl and Skaay-Five master mythtellers of the Qquuna Qiighawaay*. Ms.
Hymes, Dell (1983). Victoria Howard's 'Gitskux and his older brother'. Typography by Charles Bigelow. In Swann 1983, 129–70.

          (1994). Ethnopoetics, oral-formulaic theory, and editing texts. *Oral Tradition* 9:330–70.

          (1995). Na-Dene ethnopoetics, a preliminary report: Haida and Tlingit. In Michael Dürr et al. (eds.), *Language and culture in native North America: Studies in honor of Heinz-Jürgen Pinnow*, 263–311. (Lincom Studies in Native American Linguistics 2). Munich & Newcastle: Lincom.

          (2000a). Poetry. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 9:191–93.

          (2000b). Review of *The Mohave Epic....*, by A. T. Hatto. (Folklore Fellows Communications no. 269). Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatema. In *FF Network No. 20*, 16–21.

          (2003). *'Now I know only so far'*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

          , & Hymes, Virginia (1989). *'I leave you the myths'*. *Calapooya Collage* 13:6–7. Reprinted in Ingrid Wendt & Primus St. John (eds.), *From here we speak: Oregon poetry*. Corvallis: Oregon State University Press.

Reid, Bill (2000). *Solitary Raven: Selected writings*. Robert Bringhurst (ed.). Vancouver & Toronto: Douglas & McIntyre.

Reid, Bill, and Bringhurst, Robert (1996). *The Raven steals the light*. 2nd ed. with preface by Claude Lévi-Strauss. Vancouver & Toronto: Douglas & McIntyre.

Rigaud, Thérèse (2002). *Translating Haida poetry: An interview with Robert Bringhurst*. Vancouver & Toronto: Douglas & McIntyre. [supplement to boxed set of three volumes]

Swann, Brian (1983) (ed.). *Smoothing the ground: Essays on Native American oral literature*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

(Received 9 March, 2003)

Paul V. Kroskrity, Rosalie Bethel, & Jennifer F. Reynolds, *Taitaduhaan: Western Mono ways of speaking*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2002. (CD-ROM)

Reviewed by William Bright
University of Colorado
william.bright@colorado.edu

We have become accustomed to seeing reference works in CD-ROM format, such as the *Oxford English dictionary,* often alongside equivalent hardcopy publications. By contrast, *Taitaduhaan* ('Our language') is not a reference work, and it is published not merely in that familiar electronic format but rather as an INTER-ACTIVE CD-ROM, in which the user can move with a finger-click from written text, to video images, to audio recordings. Is this a "book," or an entirely new form of publishing? In any case, "reading" it is definitely a new experience for us in these first years of the 21st century.

Western Mono is an endangered language of the Numic family (Uto-Aztecan stock), used by about 40 fluent speakers in a population of around 1,500, living around the community of North Fork in the central Sierra Nevada foothills of California. The production of this CD was initiated by Paul Kroskrity, a linguistic anthropologist at UCLA, and Rosalie Bethel, the Mono elder who demonstrates her language here. The contents include multiple types of information: cultural and linguistic overviews; pronunciation and spelling of the language; a sampling of stories and songs – shown in performance as well as in written form, with translations and annotations – and bibliographies for both language and culture.

The stories, in particular, serve as an audiovisual supplement to the book *Walking where we lived: Memoirs of a Mono Indian family*, by Gaylen D. Lee (University of Oklahoma Press, 1998).

All this will whet scholarly appetites for the conventional grammar, dictionary, and text collection that we hope will be published in due course. In the meantime, the CD should provide a stimulus and an aid to learning for members of the larger Western Mono community, as well as for other interested Indians and Whites. Indeed, it can serve as a model for many Native American tribes who may wish to use this new electronic medium for audiovisual education in their own languages.

(Received 7 November, 2002)