

REVIEWS

Language in Society 33 (2004). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404504211058

CYNTHIA LEWIS, *Literacy practices as social acts: Power, status, and cultural norms in the classroom*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2001, Pp. xi, 213, Hb \$59.95, Pb \$24.95 US.

LUDO VERHOEVEN & CATHERINE SNOW (eds.), *Literacy and motivation: Reading engagement in individuals and groups*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2001. Pp. 326, Pb \$39.95 Hb \$79.95 US.

Reviewed by STEVE BIALOSTOK
Education, University of Wyoming
Laramie, WY 82071
smb@uwyo.edu

Literacy practices as social acts and *Literacy and motivation* share an interest in the question of what engages children in reading. Both are relevant to our political times, when the federal government micromanages literacy education in schools. The U.S. federal initiative “No Child Left Behind” gave rise to the Reading First grants, and both are designed to “get kids reading at grade level.” Reading First ended up not including “motivation” as a rationale for funding. The government’s preoccupation with phonics instruction has superseded the more important issue of what makes a child want (or not want) to read in the first place. *Literacy and motivation* is a useful corrective. However, Cynthia Lewis’s *Literacy practices as social acts* really gets at the heart of the matter.

By carefully examining how children do and do not engage in literacy-related social practices in classrooms, Lewis’s ethnography, based on a year-long study in 1993–1994 of a fifth and sixth grade classroom, tells us precisely what our national conversations about literacy should be about. Lewis focuses on five students and their teacher while examining literacy practices that are common to many classrooms and already well documented: read-aloud, peer-led literature discussions, teacher-led literature discussions, and independent reading.

What makes Lewis’s book so important is that she avoids the puffery that surrounds much of this type of research. Lewis systematically explores these practices, providing profound insights into what must be an extraordinary task: treating the all too familiar classroom setting as a “strange” place. Lewis’s work reminded me of Geertz’s description of “exotic cultures,” of his method of interpreting the way people made sense of their lives by paying attention to the ordinary details of everyday life. He located “in the tenor of their setting the sources of their spell” (p. 120).

By embedding her theoretical orientation in the context of performance and gender theories, as well as of ritualized practices – while never forgetting that literacy practices must be understood from a sociopolitical, cultural, and critical stance – Lewis vividly demonstrates how identities are discursively constructed, and how various identity markers “intersect and compete to complicate life in school and create the social drama that shapes the local scene of the classroom” (51).

Lewis’s introduction alone is worth the price of the book. Her summary of performance theory is extremely important and useful, explaining that special attention must be given to the ways in which communicative acts are executed, and that we are constantly being “evaluated” by our listeners (and by ourselves). Applying the work of the anthropologists Bauman & Briggs (1990) to this fifth/sixth grade classroom, Lewis describes how a performance view of literacy sees context as dynamic in relation to performers: “An individual or group performance is created by context that is re-recreated by the performance” (16). Lewis is careful to point out that her study is grounded in the theoretical orientation that accepts the dynamic interplay of context and performance as central to classroom life.

In chap. 2, “A social geography of the classroom and surrounding community,” Lewis examines (i) her five focal students through the lens of social and academic status, augmented by ethnographic data about these students’ social and academic identities within the classroom, the school, and the community; (ii) the larger context of the school and community that helps shape these students; and (iii) how literacy education is discursively constructed by the school district and how these practices play out in the teacher’s classroom. Although all five students are white, Lewis never neglects issues of race and class. Rather, she argues that “literacy practices are enacted by readers who have been constructed through social codes that shape their relationship to peers and texts” (44–45). Instead of resorting to framing her work in terms of convenient discursive binaries (black/white, middle class/working class), Lewis wisely recognizes how the intersection of identity markers such as gender, age, ability, social class, and race within an entire school (for example, in the lunch room) creates the “social drama” that shapes the social life in the individual classroom that she studies.

Chap. 3 critically explores what is perhaps the most mundane, morally freighted, and common literacy practice: reading aloud to children. Virtually all literature on literacy education REQUIRES that adults read aloud to children. It has become the hegemonic norm for what constitutes “good teaching” and “good parenting,” where the preoccupation is to enjoy and love literature. Lewis doesn’t challenge this dictate; rather, she seeks to understand this practice as a means the classroom teacher uses to enact the classroom culture. She investigates both the collective and the disharmonious dimensions of social community that the classroom teacher promotes.

Here, reading aloud serves as a classroom ritual, bound by the “rules” that govern the students’ and teacher’s everyday, unquestioned performances. Issues of gender are particularly revealing. Despite the teacher’s efforts to use the read-

aloud ritual to construct a common classroom community as “a story that made some sense,” several boys removed themselves from that community. These boys sat outside the inner circle, usually not participating, manipulating the available social codes within that particular context to resist the expectation of the classroom teacher and the girls. As this community’s perceived outsiders, they took up positions in relation to their own arenas of power and social relationships. For them, the read-aloud session was a feminized practice, and they rejected it. Further, when one of the boys asked if students could draw at their desks during this time, the teacher told him no, that they couldn’t do two things at once. But she does allow the girls to style each other’s hair during the reading sessions.

Chaps. 4 and 5 contrast two sides of the same coin. Influenced by the midcentury work of linguistic and cognitive researchers and literary theorists, as well by anthropological conceptions of social and cultural forms of literacy, many teachers began orchestrating opportunities for small groups of children to engage in conversations about books. Central to this approach is a reader-based theory of instruction intended to help children “transact” with the text in order to come to understand literature from their own point of view.

These conversations take several forms, including the styles that Lewis’s analysis contrasts: peer-led versus teacher-led literature groups. In chap. 4, Lewis is clear that in this classroom, “the most obvious conflicting norms were those associated with social class” (86). Not surprisingly, middle-class children whose family dispositions matched those of the school were more competent in the book conversations than were children from working-class families. However, social class intersected with ability, age, and gender, shaping events in peer-led literature groups. For example, while the rule of thumb appeared to be that students could “choose” whichever books they wanted to read, book selection was in fact shaped by a “discursive construction of ability.” While the teacher encouraged and orchestrated opportunities for “choice,” the classroom operated under only an illusion of choice. More proficient readers read the more sophisticated books, and less proficient readers (usually from lower socioeconomic strata) were encouraged to read easier books. Ultimately, schooling in the United States operates under a set of available and implicit discourses which students are quick to read and within which they quickly position themselves.

During peer-led groups, talk was used to achieve social and interpretive power, and such power was achieved based on whether one was an insider or outsider. For example, girls, even when not designated leaders of the group, would assume the role of directing the discussion. Allegiances they had formed both in and out of the classroom also provided children with power when discussing books. The contributions of both boys and girls who did not have social status in the classroom were generally disregarded in peer-led groups; or, for fear of intimidation or that they would be put down by their peers, they remained silent.

Teacher-led literature groups were a different matter. Because the teacher held control, children spent less time contesting each others’ opinions, although cer-

tain students still had more interpretive power. The classroom teacher felt strongly about her role as an active member of the literature group. Children, therefore, were encouraged to see the text as a historical and social construction, as with discourses of individuality, and to probe and resist the ways in which certain cultural assumptions and textual ideologies “shaped the readings of texts and experience” (122). The teacher’s continual push toward textual critique allowed her to get children to think about their interpretive processes. Further, the meaning of interpretive competence was refined and expanded beyond that of student-led groups.

Lewis’s clear-eyed portrayal of this teacher gives the book much of its impact. Lewis doesn’t whitewash her; we read about her own biases (she favors the girls), and there is clearly a sense of literary elitism. Yet, as portrayed by Lewis, she is smart and reflective. I’d have given anything for her to be my own son’s fifth grade teacher.

Literacy and motivation demonstrates, in 16 contributions from various scholars, just how wildly complex the term “motivation” is. Over the past several decades – in education, anthropology, psychology, and popular culture – scholars have attempted to demonstrate what motivates children not only to read, but to learn in general. Ludo Verhoeven & Catherine Snow’s new book examines literacy and motivation from three perspectives expressed in the titles of its sections: “The social and affective context of literacy development,” “Prevention and instruction programs that promote literacy engagement,” and “Policy perspectives on promoting literacy engagement.”

The commendable diversity of perspectives in the volume is also one of the book’s weaknesses, however. Some chapters do a good job of connecting directly to the theme of motivation while others don’t even mention the term, leaving the reader to make the connection. In this review, I have space to discuss only a few of the chapters.

The editors’ introduction envisions a “world of engaged readers” (2). They link literacy and motivation in several dimensions, including a summary of experimental research that emphasizes phonological representation of graphic symbols, automaticity, and effortless recoding – all gained as a product of many opportunities to practice reading. Children must have an “active voice in their own development” (5) and access to books “as the vehicle for resolving the literacy crisis” (6). Literacy education should emphasize “parents as sensitive to their children’s literacy attempts” as well as classroom settings that provide “sequentially structured activities that are mediated by a teacher” (7). The authors include a section that attends to “literacy across cultures,” where they acknowledge the cultural specificity of literacy.

Ultimately, however, in spite of efforts to represent a broad perspective of literacy, the chapter seems to reproduce the old-school maxim, “First you learn to learn to read, then you read to learn,” as the authors put forth their hope that the

“later school years can be fostered by planning socially purposeful lessons” that include “time to reflect . . . and to achieve depth of meaning and understanding” (8). The greater road to motivation, I suggest, is to reverse that maxim: First one reads to learn, and in the process one learns to read.

In David Barton’s powerful chapter, where he describes the everyday literacy practices in a British working class community, one gains a clear understanding of motivation. As Barton makes clear, literacy can be understood only as something that occurs locally, historically, and within networks of social relations. Literacy is used in a range of everyday contexts, in and out of the home, in terms of organizing life, personal communication, and private leisure. Most literacy learning occurs outside of school. Barton writes that parents and others in the home can do much to support children’s literacy development, but this does not necessarily mean that “parents should take on the practices of formal education and be expected to act as school teachers” (36). He adds that when one begins by examining everyday literacy practices, it becomes clear that (i) there is not “less reading today” than at some other imagined time, and (ii) everyday literacy practices are highly motivating in and of themselves.

The two chapters that follow Barton’s focus on parent-child book-reading dyads and on the social and interactional nature of reading. Despite their authors’ excellent research, these chapters are troubling in their unspoken ideological bias. Adriana Bus examines parent-child book reading at home through the lens of attachment theory. She begins with the standard trope: Book reading “plays an important role in becoming literate and in preparing preschoolers and kindergartners for success in school” (39). Since she frames the issues strictly in terms of formal schooling, this narrows the impact of Bus’s work. She then summarizes studies that emphasize how the “positive history,” “quality of the relationship,” and the “emotional bond” between mother and child affects the reading routine. We discover that “insecurely attached mother-child pairs . . . are less inclined to develop daily book-reading routines than secure ones” (43); insecure pairs were “less likely to constitute an interactional context that fosters children’s engagement and thus proved less rewarding” (47).

All this shows that simply reading to your child is not enough. Since “emotional relationships between parent and child can embrace or inhibit interactive routines that offer literacy learning opportunities” (51), literacy programs focused on the parent-child dyad can even be counterproductive. Bus doesn’t make any recommendations, although she wants to find programs that support families differently than many present family literacy programs do. I worry, however, that schools pathologize “nontraditional” families enough without looking at parent-child relationships as just one more reason to find fault.

Jeanne De Temple & Catherine Snow’s chapter also examines the quality of conversational patterns between parent and child in relation to future experiences in school. The authors look at the incorporation of “nonimmediate talk” – talk that goes “beyond naming pictures and repeating text” – between parent and child

about books they are reading. Variations of nonimmediate talk have already been studied within the framework of Bernstein's "elaborated and restricted codes" and Shirley Heath's description of "contextualized language" (Snow 1991, among many others who have written about decontextualized use of language). All these scholars, including De Temple & Snow, attempt to identify a regulative principle that determines the selection and combination of elements, and in these cases those elements that enter into a limited range of paradigmatic relations.

I admire De Temple & Snow's emphasis on the inextricable link between conversations and literacy, as well as their careful linguistic analysis of parent-child conversations. However, instead of using conversation as a means by which one can "assess" one's literacy skills, I wish they had made concrete connections to motivation. One is left to conclude (as I did) that a certain kind of conversational style improves reading outcomes (as measured by school) and is therefore motivating.

As with Bus's chapter, I wondered how De Temple & Snow hoped this information might be used. Are we to teach parents how to use nonimmediate language to prepare children better for school? What, if any, is the role of "nonimmediate language" in the types of literacy practices that Barton describes? It is easier to stress how to prepare low-income students for formal education than to critique the systems that turn them into low-income people in the first place. If suddenly all low-income mothers spoke "nonimmediate" language with their children while reading books, would their status change? As Brian Street writes later in this book, reading engagement "does not automatically give rise to empowerment" (298). Finally, while the usefulness of "nonimmediate" use of language may sound compelling, if it is indeed important then why can't it be taught in school, like any other secondary discourse? A large part of the reason that middle-class parents use nonimmediate (or decontextualized) language in the first place is that they acquired it as a result of their success in school.

Standout chapters that cannot be detailed here include those by Robert Serpell, Rose-Marie Weber, David Reinking, and Brian Street. All demonstrate that literacy must be understood in terms of concrete social practices; its meanings vary from situation to situation; and people's understandings of those practices must be understood within the ideologies in which those practices are embedded.

In sum, both these books have much to offer in the area of literacy and "motivation." However, as Jim Gee says in the introduction to Lewis's book, there is not a reading crisis in schools; there is an "affiliation crisis." Participation in any social practice requires that the person be willing and able to take on the identity that this practice demands, and thus to participate fully in the norms, values, and attitudes required of the practice. Nothing that has emerged from the U.S. federal government lately comes close to addressing this point. Lewis tackles these difficult issues better than anyone in a long time. She has set the stage for further research in this crucial area.

REVIEWS

REFERENCES

- Geertz, Clifford (1983). *Local knowledge: Further essays in interpretive anthropology*. New York: Basic Books.
- Snow, Catherine (1991). The theoretical basis for relationships between language and literacy in development, *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, 6:5–10.

(Received 30 June, 2003)

Language in Society 33 (2004). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404504221054

GUNTHER KRESS & THEO VAN LEEUWEN, *Multimodal discourse: The modes and media of contemporary communication*. London: Arnold, 2001. Pp. vii, 142. Hb \$72.00, Pb \$24.95.

Reviewed by SILKE BRANDT
*American Studies, University of Leipzig and
Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology
Leipzig 04103, Germany
brandt@eva.mpg.de*

Multimodal Discourse offers a theoretical framework for the study of communication in the modern world of multimedia. The book helps students of linguistics, cultural studies, and communication as well as journalists, photographers, designers, and others who work practically in the field of communication and design, to understand and differentiate the distinct levels of mass communication and their interaction. The authors also give an overview of the development of communication and discourse and show how this development is influenced by overall changes in society and social life. All the definitions of theoretical concepts and notions are further explained and illustrated by a great variety of examples. Linguists have shown that discourse is not only used and expressed in and/or by language; Kress & van Leeuwen also apply the term to music, architecture, and many other domains of culture. The notion of modes, however, is explained only in a very abstract way as “semiotic resources which allow the simultaneous realization of discourses and types of (inter)action” (p. 21). Media, on the other hand, are described as the material resources being used for the production. Examples of modes mentioned by the authors are music, language, and images. The medium is supposed to be the material, such as a book (6).

In the first chapter, four different levels of communication that contribute meaning are introduced and defined: discourse, design, production, and distribution. The authors explain their concepts of multimodality (language, images, and sound can be used for the same discourse), stratal configurations (the division of labor and the different levels), and experiential meaning potential (“the idea that material signifiers have a meaning potential that derives from what we do when we articulate them” [22]; a singer may use a special sound quality, for example). The last term defined is “provenance”: “Signs may be ‘imported’ from one con-

text . . . into another, in order to signify the ideas and values associated with that other context by those who do the importing” (23); an example of provenance is to name a perfume “Paris” (23). The authors argue against the traditional linguistic assumption that meaning is made only once by stating that multimodal texts make meaning in multiple articulations within a single instance. Discourses are defined as “socially constructed knowledges of (some aspect of) reality” (4) that do not apply to linguistic expressions alone. They depend on specific social contexts and the interests of social actors in these contexts.

Design is supposed to stand between content and expression. It is a sketch or a blueprint of the expression of a discourse. However, they do not predetermine the materialities in which the discourse will be produced. The “actual material articulation” (6) takes place at the level of production. At this level, a medium – such as oil paint, speech, or music – has to be chosen. What might follow is the distribution, the “technical ‘re-coding’ of semiotic products and events” (21). As examples of distribution, the authors mention recordings of concerts. They make the important point that, nowadays, discourse, design, production, and distribution are often separated. Later on they refer to the work of Erving Goffman, saying that their concept of discourse is equal to his idea of the “principal”; the design is made by the “author,” and the “animator” produces it. However, specialists who work on one of those levels are expected to know the other levels, too. An architect has to know whether it is possible to produce the house that she has designed. Moreover, digital media can reunite distinct levels. In radio stations, for examples, sound programs are used to record, edit (design), and distribute speech and music. The first chapter is summarized in definitions of all the important terms and concepts introduced by the authors.

The second chapter explains the authors’ notion of discourse in greater detail. English and French home-and-lifestyle magazines serve as examples. Unfortunately, all illustrations are in black and white, although the authors stress the importance of color, which can function as a mode “and is used to articulate aspects of a course of living” (25). Colors, gestures, textures, objects, and so on add to the modes of speech and writing and can, according to the authors, often be more powerful than language. In the second part of this chapter, Kress & van Leeuwen show how changes in discursive practices are caused by changes in economic and social practices. They point out the “shift from a social organization around class to a social organization around lifestyle” (35) in Western society. This change causes the emergence of new modes for the articulation of discourse. It is very hard, incidentally, to follow the authors’ distinction between mode and media throughout this chapter and the whole book. First, “media” is defined as material and instruments, then color and texture are mentioned as examples of “modes.”

The third chapter is concerned with the concept of design. The general interest in design is an effect of multimodality. The question is “What mode for what purpose?” (46) This question can be asked because, today, more and more pro-

professionals are expected to be able to use more than one mode with the help of digital technology. Thus, they have a choice and are not bound to one mode. Moreover, a single person – in the field of journalism, for example – can report, write, edit, do the layout, and publish, no longer dependent on other specialists. What the authors do not mention is that nonprofessionals also have access through professional modes like digital technology. It is necessary to examine how these “hobby journalists” influence professional standards. This phenomenon can be recognized in many other kinds of communication as well. On the other hand, the question has to be raised whether it is desirable to have multi-skilled professionals. One cannot expect somebody to be an expert in an unlimited number of modes. How does open access affect the quality of products? In other words, how do professional and amateur communication influence each other?

In the fourth chapter, the authors describe production as “the communicative use of media, of material resources” (66). A medium can be the body, the voice, tools, or materials. Musical instruments, pens, and wood serve as examples. Kress & van Leeuwen show that production does not just realize design but also adds meaning. The same design can be realized with different materials. Thus, the choice of the medium plays a role. A piece of music can be either sung or played by an instrument, or both.

The fifth chapter focuses on distribution, which is generally explained as “reproduction” of an original and is often accompanied by a “sense of loss” (89) when familiar contents are re-produced in new media. The authors describe the transformation of distribution instruments into production instruments. This is most prominent in the production of mixes and sampling in modern dance music. Again, Kress & van Leeuwen do not mention that this also gives, in this case, “non-musicians” access to the field.

In the last chapter, the authors recapitulate and suggest further research topics. Discourse, design, production, and distribution are once again described and explained in relation to another example. Kress & van Leeuwen compare an advertisement for a product for babies with a text from a magazine for parents. The authors make the distinction between grammaticalization and lexicalization and draw a connection between these two and producer and consumer. Generally, it can be said that producers more often know the grammar (the rules) of a mode, whereas consumers cannot recognize those regularities and thus have only lexical knowledge. The authors seem to assume that grammar is easier to work with than the lexicon. Professionals are supposed to be able to use grammaticalized entities only because they have rules for those. The authors do not consider the opposite view that rules might also apply to single lexical items, and that grammar and the lexicon influence each other. What they try to say is, perhaps, that producers are more aware of the rules.

Multimodal discourse helps readers to understand the different levels of mass communication and their development over time. It is very useful that Kress & van Leeuwen explain all their concepts and terms with so many examples. However,

it might have been better if they had applied all terms to a limited set of examples, so that it would be easier to recognize the interplay of the different levels of communication. Moreover, the authors should have gone beyond defining the concepts. How can we make use of these terms and our knowledge about them?

Another thing that the book leaves out are the consequences of multimedia and multi-skilling. Although the authors write about the relation between social changes and multimodal discourse, they do not write much about the effects of multimodal discourse on society and the professions. *Multimodal discourse* makes students of communication and sociolinguists aware of the different levels of communication, but it does not deal with the questions that build around those concepts and their change and development over time.

(Received 1 March, 2003)

Language in Society 33 (2004). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404504231050

SHOSHANA BLUM-KULKA & CATHERINE E. SNOW (eds.), *Talking to adults: The contribution of multiparty discourse to language acquisition*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2002. Pp. 355.

Reviewed by TIIA TULVISTE
Department of Psychology, University of Tartu
Tiigi 78
50410 Tartu, Estonia
tiiat@psych.ut.ee

This volume of 12 individual essays is an important step forward in the literature on child language development. As the title hints, the book follows *Talking to children* (Snow & Ferguson 1977). Both volumes focus on input and language acquisition. *Talking to children* demonstrated the importance of phenomenon of baby talk and dealt with the nature of speech addressed to young children and different parental conversational styles. The title *Talking to adults* gives an impression that this time, more attention will be paid to speech used by children to adults, but that is not what it seems to be. Rather, the contributors here focus on how children participate in discourse with participating structures more complex than dyads – that is, when the audience is “larger” than just the child’s own mother, and when simplified registers are not necessarily used. The pioneering *Talking to children*, in contrast, was concerned mainly with dyadic interaction with a primary caretaker. The papers in *Talking to adults* aim to show that child’s participation in such multiparty talk seems to contribute greatly to the pragmatic development of children. The 12 chapters give an overview of empirical research concerning the acquisition of various discursive skills: explanations and narratives, control talk, affect, humor, telling a joke, telling lies, and bilingualism.

One common characteristic of the articles collected in this volume is that all pay much attention to the contexts, both cultural and interactional, in which lan-

guage acquisition occurs. The title of the volume might as well read “talking at meals,” since the lion’s share of chapters deal with mealtime discourse (chaps. 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, and 11). This is not surprising, because meals have been one of the most frequently used interaction contexts in this field of studies (see Pan et al. 2000 for a review). Moreover, most of the articles are about family discourse. Only a few chapters (e.g., chaps. 5 and 10) focus on how children participate in peer-group interactions at kindergarten, or in classroom discourse at school (chap. 11).

One of the advantages of the book is that it brings together the work of authors with rather different sociocultural backgrounds. As a result, it includes an overview of studies made in a variety of ethnic and minority cultures with speakers of a number of languages. This offers a picture of similarities and differences of children’s participation in multiparty discourse in American, Greek, Japanese, Mayan, Norwegian, and Swedish families, peer groups, or classrooms. Furthermore, some authors compare multiparty talk across several cultures (e.g., chaps. 3, 11, and 12).

The children studied are somewhat older than the children discussed in Snow & Ferguson 1977, ranging in the present instance from two years to school age. The composition of multiparties varies in the different chapters. Most frequently, it consists of the target child and his or her mother and father, and occasionally involving also the experimenter, siblings, and/or peers.

The first part of the volume deals with production of extended discourse. Diane Beals & Catherine Snow compare stories initiated and told by children in everyday natural family conversation at the dinner table with those produced when asked by the researcher. The finding that the performance of children differs between the two contexts shows that the assessment of children’s storytelling abilities in a single context may be limited, and it highlights the need to study children’s speech in several contexts. Vibeke Aukrust’s essay compares Norwegian and American familial discourse at meals, revealing more explanatory talk in Cambridge, Massachusetts, but more narratives in the Oslo sample. Furthermore, the narrative genre appears to be more symmetrical than the explanatory genre, taking into account that narratives were provided spontaneously by both adults and children; at the same time, only two adults but no target child participated in explanatory talk. Cultural differences were also found in what was deemed worth talking about, as only the Oslo children provided narratives about school.

The second part of the book analyzes affect, humor, and poetics in multiparty talk, and the third part focuses on cultural similarities and differences in pragmatic socialization. Karin Aronsson & Mia Thorell’s chapter, for instance, describes a study in which preschool-age children were asked to play the roles of adults (mother and doctor), while the adult experimenter, in turn, played the role of the child’s patient. The authors are interested in how well preschoolers and young schoolchildren understand multivoicedness and a multiplicity of roles.

Hiroko Kasuya’s chapter deals with language socialization in bilingual mixed-language family environments, in two English/Japanese-speaking families liv-

ing in the United States. In both cases, minority language input comes mainly from mothers because the fathers' fluency in Japanese is limited. As is known from previous research, it is hard to promote active bilingualism in children in such conditions, especially when children get older and their topics of conversation become more complex. In Kasuya's chapter, the quantity of input of mother, father and child in each of two languages, and their code-switching and code-mixing, are analyzed.

Finally, chap. 12, by the editors, seeks to answer the question: What do children have to learn to function well as participants in bilingual classroom discourse? At the same time, Snow and Blum-Kulka sum up the other chapters of the volume.

To date, most research on child language socialization has been done on adult-child, usually dyadic interactions, where the more competent person (usually mother, sometimes father or some older child) instructs, guides, and corrects the child. The message of this volume is that the study of language socialization should not remain at the level of dyadic interactions but should go further into research on multiparty, multigenerational talk. The first big step on this path has been taken by the authors of this volume. Because there is still little research done from a multiadic perspective, all these articles are descriptive in nature. They demonstrate that multiparty talk seems to provide good opportunities for acquisition of various pragmatic skills.

As one reads the volume, many unsolved problems and interesting issues arise that need to be addressed in future research. How does multiparty talk contribute to the pragmatic development of children of different ages, who differ in their cognitive, interactive and linguistic skills? Do infants benefit from it, and how? What is the optimal balance between participating in multiparty talk while adults talk to each other as well as to the children present, and in dyadic interactions when child-adjusted talk is used? How, if at all, does the child who seldom has an opportunity to take part in multiparty intergenerational discourses (e.g., only child of a single mother) differ from the child who spends a lot of time in the company of more than one adult? How does socially and culturally specific multiparty talk influence pragmatic development in the child?

In sum, this volume achieves its aim to increase awareness among readers of the importance of rethinking and broadening the "social context" employed until now by most empirical research in the field of language socialization. It is thought-provoking and interesting reading for all people working in the area of language and social development in the child, but also for novices in the field.

REFERENCES

- Pan, Barbara Alexander; Perlmann, Rivka Y.; & Snow, Catherine E. (2000). Food for thought: Dinner table as a context for observing parent-child discourse. In Lise Menn & Nan Bernstein Ratner (eds.), *Methods for studying language production*, 181–205. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

REVIEWS

Snow, Catherine E., & Ferguson, Charles A. (1977) (eds.). *Talking to children: Language input and acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

(Received 10 March, 2003)

Language in Society 33 (2004). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404504241057

JAMES E. ALATIS, HEIDI E. HAMILTON, AND AI-HUI TAN (eds.), *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 2000: Linguistics, language and the professions: Education, journalism, law, medicine, and technology*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2002. Pp. i, 279. Pb \$39.95.

Reviewed by CHRISTINA WASSON
Anthropology, University of North Texas
Denton, TX 76203
cwasson@unt.edu

The 2000 Georgetown University Round Table focused on “the application of linguistics to . . . a full range of . . . professions” (p. 3). It offered tracks on education, journalism, law, medicine, technology, and other professions. The book reviewed here presents highlights from that conference: six plenary speeches, eight selected conference papers, and a closing discussion among plenary speakers, conference organizers, and audience members. The chapters are distributed fairly evenly across the range of professions identified for the conference. The plenary speakers were Shirley Brice Heath, John R. Rickford, Allan Bell, Roger W. Shuy, Richard M. Frankel, and Lee Lubbers. James E. Alatis and Heidi Hamilton were the conference chairs. In this review, I will not comment on each chapter of the book; rather, I will highlight some themes and focus on articles I found particularly relevant to them.

An overarching theme of this volume is the complex and historically shifting relationship between theory and application. As Shuy points out in the concluding section, the field of linguistics has moved between phases in which theoretical and applied work were closely integrated and phases in which the two were sharply differentiated. Currently the discipline seems to be moving toward integration again, with academics showing a renewed interest in how they might apply their expertise to various institutional settings. This book includes some chapters that focus on practical applications and others that investigate the professions more from a “knowledge for the sake of knowledge” point of view. It therefore has several target audiences. One potential readership, however, is students or established academics who wish to learn more about the opportunities they have to engage in practical work.

The conference’s closing discussion is especially interesting in this regard. Participants raised a number of profound questions about what it means to be an academic who engages in applied work, going beyond the particularities of their

areas to explore issues they all had in common. Several point out the importance and difficulty of learning to communicate effectively with their nonacademic audiences, the need to develop a “remarkable code-switching ability” (Rickford, 253). As someone who moves between academic and applied work myself, I have found that the cultural logics of these two realms are indeed more divergent than many academics realize. It is useful to remember Bourdieu’s insights about how unusual the scholastic point of view is (Bourdieu 1990).

Shirley Brice Heath and John Rickford discuss the need for linguists to document the value of their contributions to the institutions where they apply their expertise. I agree that developing forms of assessment for our applications is a productive avenue for future work. Through the example of his own role in a school of medicine, Richard Frankel demonstrates that building close working relationships with professionals is also a means to gain influence. Roger Shuy further points out that linguists can advertise the value of their work and stimulate job opportunities by giving talks to audiences of potential clients.

Researchers who inhabit both academic and applied worlds not only need to become fluent in the codes of each context; they also need to develop the ability to translate each world’s logic to the other one. When linguists present their insights to nonacademics, they face the task of making their specialized theoretical notions easily understandable to a lay audience. A volume like this offers the reverse challenge: The authors are faced with the task of explaining the needs and priorities of the professions they work with to an audience of linguists.

Shuy’s chapter on “Breaking into language and law: The trials of the insider-linguist” is a model of how to explain differences between the practice of linguistics in a university setting and its use in an arena of application. The body of this paper is organized around a description of eight problems linguists encounter when they work with lawyers. For instance, linguists need to shift their sense of time and deadlines, since legal cases often require a quick turnaround and the deadlines, set by the court, are inflexible. Another problem Shuy explores is the way courtroom procedure restricts what linguists can say during a trial. He describes the rules concerning turn-taking and topic control that shape direct examination and cross-examination, and explains the implications of these rules for what linguists on the stand can or cannot say.

Rickford’s chapter on “Linguistics, education, and the Ebonics firestorm” presents a thoughtful account of the linguistic issues surrounding the 1996 Oakland School Board resolution. In particular, he explores the problems that led the Oakland School Board to seek a series of remedies, and the “Contrastive Analysis” approach to teaching Standard English that teachers were to adopt. Rickford’s detailed description of this approach is a welcome addition to the many commentaries linguists have offered on the Ebonics controversy. He presents three examples in which Contrastive Analysis has been used successfully in other schools, and he narrates its history of use in Oakland since 1981 as part of a “Standard English Proficiency” program. Rickford’s chapter is a

model for the way linguists can contribute to public debates on government policy.

A third chapter that illuminates the history and cultural logic of an institution in which linguists can make a difference is “The (socio)linguistic turn in physician-patient communication research,” by Richard M. Frankel. The author considers the three main tasks doctors accomplish during medical encounters: data gathering, relationship building, and educating patients. In each area, he identifies common mismatches between the assumptions and needs of physicians and of patients, and communication problems that result. I found Frankel’s arguments compelling and would have liked to see an additional section on how he has applied these insights to medical training programs. Frankel also points out two further opportunities for applied research: changes in doctor-patient relationships over time, and the effects of computer technologies.

The chapter by Anne-Marie Currie, Jocelyn Cohan, & Larisa Zlatic, “Linguistic approaches in information retrieval of medical texts,” is interesting because it represents the extreme of an applied focus. This is the only chapter whose authors do not work for an educational organization. This paper provides a window into an arena of applied work – technology – that is an increasingly common career option for linguists.

The chapters described so far all draw clear connections between linguistic research and its practical application. However, not all of the contributions to the book follow this approach. Other chapters present fascinating insights about particular professions without seeking to identify practical uses for these discoveries. The two papers that examine the media both fall into this category. In “Dateline, deadline: journalism, language, and the reshaping of time and place in the millennial world,” Allan Bell offers an elegant analysis of changes in news reporting over the past hundred years, using New Zealand media accounts of three journeys to the South Pole as illustrations. He shows how the time between an event and its reporting became increasingly compressed as the medium for “scoops” shifted from newspapers to radio to television. Likewise, the distance between news consumers and the subjects of stories shrank to the point where an intimate conversation between the explorer just arrived at the South Pole and his wife was broadcast live on television. In “Involvement strategies in news analysis roundtable discussions,” Stacy Krainz shows how journalists use the involvement strategies of repetition, constructed dialogue, and figurative language to enhance their persuasiveness during unscripted discussions between reporters.

Finally, some chapters fall halfway between an academic and an applied focus. Shirley Brice Heath presents a rich analysis of parallel changes in philosophy that have occurred in the fields of business and community-based youth organizations, in her chapter “The talk of learning professional work.” She argues that both domains increasingly seek to develop creative and entrepreneurial qualities in their members. Her paper summarizes deep and extensive ethnographic work among youth-based organizations. She does not examine business organizations

in the same way, so this suggests productive areas for future research. A study that tracked graduates of youth-based organizations as they developed careers in corporations would be fascinating. Would the subjects' earlier experiences give them an advantage in the workplace? If so, such a study could have powerful effects; for instance, large companies might be motivated to donate money to youth organizations.

Another chapter that occupies this midway point is Nkonko M. Kamwangamalu's "Language policy and mother-tongue education in South Africa: The case for a market-oriented approach." Kamwangamalu shows how the history of language planning in South Africa has led to a devaluation of education in African languages. The present government formally treats nine African languages as equal to English and Afrikaans. In practice, however, English carries the greatest value because it is used in most workplace contexts. Kamwangamalu argues that the government must go further in raising the market value of African languages. This could be done, for instance, by making "certified knowledge of these languages . . . one of the criteria for access to employment" (132). The chapter thus suggests a powerful arena of application for linguists who could develop collaborative relationships with the South African government.

Given the varying perspectives offered by different chapters, this book holds interest for several audiences. On the one hand, it is a valuable resource for students as well as established faculty members who want to learn about opportunities to do applied work. On the other hand, it is of equal relevance for those who have a strictly academic interest in the linguistic aspects of the professions and institutions addressed. In addition, the articles are accessible to students, so teachers can use them in courses that include a consideration of language and the professions.

REFERENCE

Bourdieu, Pierre (1990). The scholastic point of view. *Cultural Anthropology* 5:380–91.

(Received 17 March, 2003)

Language in Society 33 (2004). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404504251053

JANET L. NICOL (ed.), *One mind, two languages: Bilingual language processing*.
Oxford: Blackwell, 2000. Pp. 264. Hb \$77.95, Pb \$35.95.

Reviewed by ELLEN BIALYSTOK
Department of Psychology, York University
4700 Keele Street, Toronto, Ontario M3J 1P3
ellenb@yorku.ca

When I have a dinner party, it's a matter of great importance to me that all the places are set with the same tableware. It's the same at a restaurant – a group of

people sitting down for dinner should be served on the same dishes. It's neurotic, I know. But aside from some primitive sense of symmetrical comfort, the plates tell you much about the meal that is to follow: Fine porcelain sets expectations of grace and elegance; brightly colored stoneware establishes a casual ambience; and simple plates communicate a utilitarian attitude to the ensuing meal. The form serves as a gatekeeper, announcing at the outset the intended clientele. If a family with small children in search of cheeseburgers and fries wanders by chance into an establishment that places Royal Doulton in front them, they will know instantly that the content will not meet their expectations. Form matters, and content is partly conveyed by the form.

Form matters in academic writing as well. There are different styles for presenting scholarship, and just as the form announces some aspect of the food we can expect, the form of academic writing anticipates the material we are about to read.

This collection edited by Nicol is a table set with different plates. The articles cross boundaries of style and content, offering a compendium of general reviews, detailed experimental reports, and hints of grand reflections. Some chapters appeal to a general audience that seeks a handbook-type overview of broad issues; others target specialists and report details of research that extends the edges of a specific issue in a very particular way. The variety of the chapters is in many ways a commendable asset. The problem is that we are never sure who was invited to the table.

One of the two dedications at the front of the book hints at an explanation for the nature of this collection. We infer from this dedication that the papers were originally presented as contributions to a colloquium series held in 1998. That information is useful and would have been helpful as an explicit frame around the collection: It explains both why the papers are so diverse (colloquium series) and why many of the contributions seems somewhat dated (1998).

The book contains nine essays covering a variety of issues in second language acquisition and use (and, to a lesser extent, bilingualism). The first chapter, by François Grosjean, outlines his important idea that bilingual research must consider his notion of "mode" and attend to the context in which the bilingual is functioning. Bilinguals, he correctly points out, do not become monolinguals when they use only one of their languages, and we must be more aware of the mental complexity of bilinguals when we attempt to assess their performance in one of their languages. The next chapter, by Mary Zampini & Kerry Green, presents a detailed account of the psychophysical differences between voicing contrasts in Spanish and English and uses that account to explain differences in the production of stop consonants by English monolinguals and English learners of Spanish at various levels of proficiency. Judith Kroll & Natasha Tokowicz summarize work from Kroll's lab that lays the foundation for their model describing the evolving relationship between L1 lexicon, L2 lexicon, and the conceptual system. Kenneth Forster & Nan Jiang report a series of studies demonstrating cross-language priming. The implications of the discussion from this and the previous

chapter are important for constraining models of how two languages might plausibly be represented in a bilingual brain. Carol Myers-Scotton & Janice Lake offer an extensive survey of their research on code-switching, a topic important partly because it is unique to bilingual language use. The chapter, however, challenges the reader's ability to learn a new language of technical acronyms, containing myriad sentences like this: "First, it enables us to discuss how congruence between the ML and the EL influences the CS patterns found in classical CS" (116). The sixth chapter, by Nicol, Matthew Teller, & Delia Greth, tackles the difficult topic of language production, and in particular, syntactic production. They report two studies that point to limitations in the syntactic competence of second language learners. In the next chapter, Montserrat Sanz & Thomas Bever apply Minimalist theory to a set of data obtained from Spanish second language learners to elucidate both the competence of those learners and the organizing principles of the Minimalist Program. Paola Dussias reports studies that compare the parsing strategies used by native English speakers and Spanish-speaking English learners to determine reference in complex sentences. In the final chapter, Samuel Supalla, Tina Wix, & Cecile McKee describe an instructional program used to help deaf learners with the transition to English literacy by introducing a written system of sign that bridges sign language and written English.

The articles contribute to three major pursuits: methodological precision, theoretical advancement, and empirical grounding. The methodological contribution is implicit in all the chapters, although there is some ambivalence over whether the collection addresses bilingualism, as promised in the title, or second language acquisition, the topic of the majority of the papers. Bilingualism and second-language acquisition are obviously closely related, but they are not the same thing. Both the chapter by Grosjean and that by Kroll & Tokowicz explain how bilingual processing must be considered in terms of a more nuanced gradient that incorporates estimates of proficiency. Neither of these accounts, however, addresses second language acquisition. Other chapters are more concerned with the processes and strategies involved in building up competence in the second language, such as the chapters by Nicol et al. and Dussias. These issues seem less relevant to bilingual language processing than they do to second language acquisition. The difference between these subfields is most evident in their methodological approaches, which base their research on different types of populations and set different types of dependent variables as the goal of study. To be glib, second language acquisition is the study of how a nonnative language is acquired, while bilingualism is the study of how two languages are used (and the implications of using two languages instead of one). The book's title promises an examination of bilingualism in language processing, priming the reader for a discussion of the latter, but few of the chapters address that set of issues. These distinctions should be made clearer, at least to the extent that the relation between the two is explicated.

The greatest variation among the chapters is in their theoretical assumptions and contributions. This is an example of a place where matching dinnerware

would have been helpful. In some cases, a particular theory is presented with insufficient context and alternatives for non-experts to evaluate the viability of the explanation; in others, we become distracted by the alternatives. The general state-of-the-art review that is best suited for a handbook and the closely argued description of evidence for a single framework that is best suited for a monograph do not combine well.

Finally, the collection includes a large number of empirical studies, some presenting new data and others usefully assembling existing data in one place. When new data are reported in refereed journal articles, one can assume a level of adjudication and reliability. Many of the new data reported in this collection, however, are cited from unpublished work, and insufficient methodological detail is provided for the reader to make a judgment about their interpretation.

The collection offers a wide-ranging review of many important topics in second language acquisition and bilingual language processing. All the chapters are interesting, and all the topics are important. The main problem is that there is no center, no glue that holds the pieces together. We are never sure what kind of meal we are being invited to share. A reader in search of an overview of the state of the field of bilingualism processing will be disappointed by the narrow perspective; a researcher concerned with the latest empirical advances will be frustrated by the lack of detail. The collection would have profited from a road map that contextualized the individual contributions and assembled them into a description of where we have come from and where we are going. The lack of such a map is the most conspicuous absence in this collection.

(Received 8 May, 2003)

Language in Society 33 (2004). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S004740450426105X

ANETA PAVLENKO, ADRIAN BLACKLEDGE, INGRID PILLER, AND MARYA TEUTSCH-DWYER (eds.). *Multilingualism, second language learning, and gender*. Boston & New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2001. Pp. 350. Hb \$79.95, Pb \$29.95.

Reviewed by BEGOÑA ECHEVERRIA
Graduate School of Education
University of California, Riverside
b.echeverria@ucr.edu

This book uses a feminist, poststructuralist perspective to examine the relationships among gender, second language acquisition and multilingualism. It is a welcome addition to the study of these topics, which are usually examined separately. Gender is rarely considered in research on second language acquisition, and most studies of language and gender are conducted in monolingual contexts. This volume proposes a new interdisciplinary approach to these issues which “strives to theorize and to investigate the role of language in the production of

gender relations, and role of gender dynamics in language learning and use” (p. 22).

The first section, “Gender, society and ideology in multilingual settings,” focuses on the “gatekeeping and discrimination which take place in various communities of practice” (4). In their introductory chapter, Aneta Pavlenko & Ingrid Piller argue that, although traditional theories of second language acquisition present learners as passive receptacles of input and output, learners are in fact active agents in their learning. Gender ideologies are one of the factors affecting learners’ language choices. Gender is indexed covertly in most bilingual and multilingual communities; it is “mediated by ideologies of language, gender, and power, so that particular languages or ways of using them are positioned as predominantly feminine or masculine” (34). But, since languages acquire different meanings across contexts and cultures, the indexicality between languages and gender is continually renegotiated, and this is manifested in different ways through language practices.

These ideas are nicely illustrated in the three empirical chapters that follow. Adrian Blackledge, focusing on literacy events in British society, argues that teachers’ perceptions of Bangladeshi women deny them access to “the rules and values of the dominant group” (72). Teachers dismissed the efforts Bangladeshi women made to foster their children’s literacy because those efforts took place in a language other than English. In so doing, the teachers exacerbated the unequal power relationships of British society more generally.

In her study of Portuguese women immigrants in Canada, Tara Goldstein shows how gender ideologies can limit the access minority women have to a dominant language. Because of the cultural proscription against taking classes with men, most of the women did not avail themselves of the English classes offered them. Those who did learn English rarely used it at work; workers with friends on the factory line could expect help in times of trouble, and the language of friendship was Portuguese.

Similarly, in her examination of students in overseas language programs, Susan Ehrlich finds that gender ideologies often restricted women’s access to a second language, while they enhanced that of men. Women were often discouraged from speaking the second language, for example, because they were ridiculed or harassed by local men when they did so. Men, in contrast, had greater access to the informal networks conducive to second language acquisition – and often found local women eager to engage them in conversation, which further increased their opportunities for second language learning.

The second section, “Negotiation and performance of gender in multilingual contexts,” looks at how language is used to perform gender identities in private settings. In her examination of autobiographies and oral narratives, Pavlenko contends that women are often eager to learn a second language when they perceive it to be more gender-neutral than their first language. Many men, however, are less enthusiastic when they find that speech acts key to performing mascu-

linity in their first language – bawdy jokes, flowery compliments – are inappropriate in the second language. But women, too, can find it difficult to negotiate their gender identity in a second language. Yumiko Ohara found that English/Japanese bilingual women, aware of the association between femininity and high pitch, purposely manipulated Japanese to perform the kind of identity they wanted to project. Some changed their pitch to hasten their acceptance as “feminine” Japanese women; others maintained the lower pitch they used in English to project a more assertive, independent persona.

The two remaining chapters in this section point out how gender and second language acquisition can play out in romantic relationships. Marya Teutsch-Dwyer focuses on a Polish man’s attempts to learn English in America. She contends that the positive response he receives from his female – in contrast to his male – interlocutors actually impedes his acquisition of English: “He did not have to use ‘correct’ English because his stories were well received [by women] and his jokes laughed at” (185). Piller, in her examination of German-American couples, argues that bilingualism can disadvantage women in ways it does not men. Wives were more likely than husbands to find themselves in a “doubly weak” position – living in a foreign country, and using a second language as the main language within the marriage. Women were also more likely to feel a loss of national identity; all of the women, but none of the men, reported that they no longer considered themselves natives of their country of origin.

The final section, “Gender in multilingual educational settings,” while focusing on bilingual case studies, has implications for multilingual settings as well. Monica Heller, in her investigation of a French-English school in Ontario, shows how boys benefited from the school culture more than did girls. It was mainstream boys who constructed the school’s discursive space, while girls were relegated to secondary roles. And it was boys from the margins who were more successful in challenging prevailing norms. Somali boys were able to use hip-hop music as a bridge between them and white boys; Quebecois boys were able to use the audiovisual club as a site for constructing a masculine persona. While one group of academically oriented girls, the “Nerds,” also challenged hegemonic gender roles, they remained on the margins of school life, their perspectives and achievements largely ignored.

However, Cheiron McMahill, in her investigation of Japanese women learning English, points out that women can successfully use a second language to challenge reigning gender ideologies. Even though English is associated with hegemonic Western culture, these women were able to transform the language into a tool for personal empowerment. Feeling constrained by language-specific Japanese notions of femininity, they used English to construct more assertive, independent identities. Ultimately, McMahill’s work demonstrates how learners can imbue a second language with new meanings that liberate them. This suggests that they can also transcend the andro- and ethnocentrism of the textbooks used to teach them, a topic discussed by Claire Kramsch & Linda von Hoene, who

examine three college-level German textbooks used in American classrooms. The explicit curriculum of all three texts seems closely aligned with feminist theories of difference that would advocate that students “accept the impossibility and, indeed, the undesirability of identifying seamlessly with the other and . . . understand the value of identities constructed by inhabiting multiple cultures” (288). However, none of these books fulfills this promise in that they proffer an understanding of culture as “univocal” and homogenous, and of the prototypical German speaker as male.

Taken together, this research clearly demonstrates that, unlike the idealized, abstract learner posited in much research on second language acquisition, learners’ social identities have real consequences for second language experiences and outcomes. Indeed, this research shows that learning a second language is “not always a boon,” to the extent that it can threaten a person’s gender or ethnic identity. To scholars interested in second language acquisition, this research suggests that much theoretical insight can be gained by paying more attention to the experiences of adults, especially as they negotiate the workplace. To scholars of language and gender, it offers second language learners as a rich source for inquiry. In its attention to these issues, this volume makes a valuable contribution to linguistic anthropology, education, and linguistics.

(Received 15 May, 2003)

Language in Society 33 (2004). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404504271056

HELENA RAUMOLIN-BRUNBERG, MINNA NEVALA, ARJA NURMI, AND MATTI RISSANEN (eds.), *Variation past and present: VARIENG studies on English for Terttu Nevalainen*. Mémoires de la Société Néophilologique de Helsinki, 61. Helsinki: Société Néophilologique, 2002. Pp. xviii, 378. Pb. \$45.

Reviewed by RICHARD W. BAILEY
English, The University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, MI 49109-1003
rwbailey@umich.edu

It is an astonishing fact that the dynamo producing some of the most powerful scholarship on the history of the English language is not even in Indo-European territory. Under the inspired leadership of Professor Matti Rissanen, Helsinki has reached an unprecedented level of effort in this field, and, when Rissanen retired in 2001, Terttu Nevalainen became his successor as director of the Research Unit for Variation and Change in English. This volume celebrates her elevation to her new role and, at the same time, her fiftieth birthday.

VARIENG (as the unit is known) became “one of the National Centres of Excellence in Finland co-funded by the Academy of Finland and the University of Helsinki.” In April 2002, when this volume was ready for publication, “The current personnel consist[ed] of 18 scholars, 16 postgraduate students and 15

part-time research assistants. The Unit also has 15 collaborating scholars from other universities” (p. xvix). Funds have been promised through 2005, and we may hope the benefactors will continue supporting the astonishing productivity, sound planning, and fine scholarship of the group.

Interest in the history of English is not new in Finland, and the same series in which this volume appears was also the publisher of Mustanoja’s *Middle English syntax* in 1960. While various corpora were produced in the United States and Britain for the analysis of variation by genre beginning in the 1960s, these were for recent or contemporary English, and they were seen as showing variability within a genre (e.g., scientific writing) or mode (e.g., spoken English). Lexicography and EFL/ESL materials were seen as the main beneficiaries, and, coming as they did when mere performance was scorned in favor of the ever-elusive competence, they were not seen as having much to offer general linguistics or even English studies. With very few exceptions (one in Scotland, one in the U. S.), there were no corpora designed for historical study, except insofar as a concordance to a major English author (e.g., Shakespeare) might be used to inquire more deeply into, say, the pronoun or auxiliary verb systems at the end of the 16th century.

All this changed when Rissanen and his team designed and produced the *Helsinki Corpus of English Texts* and the *Helsinki Corpus of Older Scots*. American scholars soon followed in building historical corpora, and a series of articles and monographs beginning with Biber & Finegan 1989 made this work better known in the United States. In Britain those affiliated with the Survey of English Usage at University College, London, watched these developments closely. The late Professor Sidney Greenbaum, successor to Randolph Quirk as director of the Survey, organized the ambitious International Corpus of English (ICE) with branches around the anglophone world (e.g., Australia, South Africa, Ireland), and, though these corpora were contemporary rather than historical, they were designed with an eye to the work going on in Helsinki. Now systematic plans are in place to select, enlarge, and provide linguistic tagging for these corpora (see Meurman-Solin 2001). Access to many of them is sometimes limited (though not to the two pioneering Helsinki corpora) because copyright restrictions may apply and prevent distribution even of short specimen texts, but several are available to all at low cost or for a modest subscription price.¹

Contributors to this volume present their work under the five headings that make up the subdivisions of the VARIENG group. It is not possible to mention all contributors here, and the editors give a thumbnail sketch of each cluster in their introductory material (3–8), to which readers of this review are referred.

Rissanen remains associated with the first group, “Internal Processes of Language Change,” and it is the subunit with the longest history of publication. In the four papers published here, grammaticalization (of *wit* and *anent*) reveals how once flourishing oppositions (e.g., Old English *witan* and *cnawan*) wither to stumps like *to wit* or *unwittingly*. Both papers raise larger questions about language change within the context of these particular examples. A similar process is displayed in

the shifting meanings of *bliss* and *happiness*, with OE *bliss* being displaced by *happy*, and *happy*, formerly a word applied to the corporate joys of eternity, shifting to feelings of individuals in the here and now. The final paper, somewhat inconclusively, treats the issue of the extent to which borrowed words “fill gaps” in the existing lexicon.

Nevalainen still has charge of the second subunit, “Historical Sociolinguistics,” a position she has occupied since 1993, and most new corpora under development within it are organized to produce the most revealing results for questions of gender, status, community, time, style, and mode. Helena Raumolin-Brunberg begins this section of five papers with this question: “Could there be anything more exciting than to trace the path of a linguistic innovation while it diffuses into varying linguistic and non-linguistic contexts?” (101). The implicit answer is “No, nothing could.” Drawing on prior scholarship, she examines the idea of “stable variation” and asks whether or not the conditioning factors for such variation remain the same over time. While very guarded in her conclusion, she states that “linguistic variation does not remain entirely stable for very many generations of speakers” (113).

Data-reporting essays in this section look at the “personal letters” data sets and related materials: verb types (by semantic function), *thou/you* pronoun alternation, and relation of practice to precept in Robert Lowth’s unpublished letters (particularly the choice between auxiliary *be/have* with verbs like *come*, *got*, *gone*, *arrive*). The final essay argues that, for modal verbs at least, the “sampler” corpus (0.45 million words) is as good as the comprehensive one (2.7 million words), thus suggesting that the burdens of copyright may not weigh so heavily on results as might be feared, at least for very frequent events.

The subunit “Dialectology and Regional Variation” has two parts, and two of the three papers in the corresponding section are by the heads of each part: one on temporal subordinators (e.g., *while*, *until*) in Scots, and one on the verbal inflection *-s* in Devonshire. The third reports gender differences in the use of relativizer *what* in the interviews conducted in the 1950s by the late W. Nelson Francis in northern Norfolk for the Survey of English Dialects, supplemented by further recordings made in 1988–1991.

The four essays in “Text Conventions and Genre Evolution” begin with one describing the “Corpus of early English medical writing” (from 1375 to 1750), a collection that is already influencing our understanding of the role of scientific writing in the evolution of Middle English, the prior view having been shaped by an overemphasis on literary-theological texts. Irma Taavitsainen, the head of this independent unit within VARIENG, and her colleagues describe a broad array of investigations involving “thought-styles” in scientific writing. The remaining papers in the section are not corpus-based; they illuminate “conventions” in two medieval texts (a herbal and a romance) and one modern short story.

“Pragmatic Variability” is a subunit concerned with “social, cognitive, and cultural variation and variability in present-day discourse” (7, 321). Databases of

1994 news coverage of the sinking of the ferry M/S *Estonia* and of journalism devoted to national holidays (especially the U.S. Fourth of July) illustrate the ways in which language choice, broadly conceived, gives insight into ideology. The volume concludes with an illustration of uncritical “recycling” of news from secondary sources (e.g., prior news reports, releases from interest groups); the transmogrification of speculations and estimates into “facts” is especially troubling and pervasive.

This excellent volume concludes with a brief index.

NOTE

¹ This issue of access is one that needs to be addressed. European copyright law is far more restrictive than U.S. law, and in the United States the principle of “fair use” allows brief extracts of almost anything that is not poetry to be used freely for scholarly purposes. Indeed, there is a provision in the U.S. constitution guaranteeing that the public has, eventually, the right to all products of science and creativity, though the Supreme Court has said recently that the Congress may delay giving the public its right for as long as it likes. But brief extracts of linguistic data do not reduce the demand for the whole work; in fact, they probably increase it by drawing attention to, for instance, the early letters of an English noblewoman available only in a copyrighted edition (see St. Clare Byrne 1981). Limiting access to these corpora to those actually present at the site where they are produced is not designed to extend access beyond the members of the club, and the practice of keeping others away on the grounds of “copyright” is to me wrong, especially when the data have been gathered with support of a U. S. government agency. The analogy to the maps of the human genome seems to me compelling, and we should seek more collaboration rather than less.

REFERENCES

- Biber, Douglas, & Finegan, Edward (1989). Drift and evolution of English style: A history of three genres. *Language* 65:487–517.
- Meurman-Solin, Anneli (2001). Structured text corpora in the study of language variation and change. *Linguistic and Literary Computing* 16:5–27.
- Mustanoja, Tauno F. (1960). *A Middle English syntax*. (Mémoires de la Société Néophilologique de Helsinki, 23). Helsinki: Société Néophilologique.
- St. Clare Byrne, Muriel (1981) (ed.). *The Lisle letters*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

(Received 15 May, 2003)

Language in Society 33 (2004). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404504281052

COLIN H. WILLIAMS (ed.). *Language revitalization: Policy and planning in Wales*.
Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2000. 388 pp. £35 (\$69.95)

Reviewed by KEVIN J. ROTTET
French and Italian, Indiana University
Bloomington, IN 47405
krottet@indiana.edu

By the end of the twentieth century, Wales had become a hotbed of language planning. The sharp decline experienced by the Welsh language in the first half of the century had given way to a state of “level maintenance.” The Welsh Language

Act of 1993 has brought about marked improvements in the language's profile and in people's attitudes toward bilingualism. Language planning in Wales has created significant interest in other parts of Europe and around the world in other minority language communities hoping to achieve something of the Welsh successes of recent years. Nevertheless, if there have been important accomplishments, much still remains to be done to turn Wales into a truly bilingual society. The edited collection *Language revitalization* is an excellent, state-of-the-art volume by top specialists who analyze in detail what has been accomplished and identify remaining challenges.

Colin H. Williams, the volume editor, penned three chapters himself and co-authored three others. In chap. 1, he provides a historical introduction to language issues and problems in Wales, and gives an overview of Welsh language planning. Chap. 2, a collaborative effort between Williams and Hywel Jones, provides various numerical analyses of Welsh language maintenance and transmission, from the basic facts regarding numbers of speakers in various decennial census years to figures regarding schools in which Welsh is taught as a first or second language. One of the most striking trends is that the percentage of primary pupils who can speak Welsh fluently is rising, but the percentage of those who speak Welsh as a home language is decreasing. The reader is thus introduced to one of the constant concerns of Welsh language planners: the breakdown in language transmission in the home versus the comparative success of the Welsh-medium schools. This is a theme that runs throughout the volume. A second interesting finding of the chapter is that long-term exposure to Welsh-medium formal education has promoted positive attitudes toward bilingualism and has reduced the suspicion which characterized previous generations (67).

Chap. 3 was collectively written by the Welsh Language Board, a statutory body established by the Welsh Language Act of 1993. The Board serves as a facilitator and adviser working in conjunction with other organizations involved in any and all issues related to the Welsh language. In the view of the Board, "No minority language in the world will survive unless there is deliberate language planning" (94). The Board sees the two major causes of decline as the cessation of intergenerational transmission in the home, and the failure to educate children through the minority language.

Chaps. 4 and 5 both deal in depth with Welsh-medium education. Chap. 4, penned by Colin Baker and Meirion Prys Jones, explores the "disconcerting discontinuity" (p. 116) between primary and secondary Welsh-medium education (there are 449 bilingual primary schools and only 49 bilingual secondary schools). Baker and Jones argue that ultimately the solution will require greater clarity as to the purposes of bilingual education. Chap. 5, by Glyn E. Jones and Colin H. Williams, traces the history of Welsh-medium education in Cardiff as a case study from which important lessons can be drawn for other school districts.

In his discussion of the use of Welsh by young people, Heini Gruffudd (chap. 6) identifies the need to strengthen social networks and domains in which Welsh is

the natural language choice. He acknowledges some of the major accomplishments of language planning in Wales to date, such as the new perception that Welsh is a qualification for getting a good job, but he argues that further success will be achieved only through local and national language planning that takes adequate account of economic and social issues. In his view, the existing Welsh Language Board is not able to meet these challenges and should be replaced by a Welsh Language Authority at the national level with much broader powers.

Steve Morris (chap. 7) addresses the role of adult L2 learners of Welsh in the revitalization of the language. In particular, he examines the pool of adult learners of Welsh at the University of Wales, Swansea, in terms of their demographic profile and their motivations for learning Welsh. Getting adult learners to transmit Welsh to their children is perceived as one of the central problems facing language planners in Wales today.

Colin H. Williams (chap. 8) reports on the results of the Community Research Project carried out in 1996 in four different locations. Williams notes that the use of Welsh has undergone a notable increase in certain domains over the past 30 years, particularly in education, the media, leisure, and selected public services. At the same time, community use of the language in the form of social networks has declined sharply, leaving the task of creating new Welsh speakers to the home and schools. He points to the great need to increase opportunities to use Welsh in public settings, particularly in business; survey results suggest that many people would use the language more if there were greater provision of Welsh-medium services. On the other hand, linguistic insecurity prevents some speakers from using the language more; local vernaculars and idiolects suffer by comparison with the media standard. Increasing speakers' confidence in using the language is thus an important issue for Welsh language planning.

Chap. 9 was penned by Cefin Campbell, the director of the first *menter iaith* or language enterprise agency, Menter Cwm Gwendraeth, which was founded in 1991. By the year 2000 there were 18 *mentrau iaith* across Wales. Their purpose is to promote the use of Welsh at the community level, not by doing all of the work themselves but by persuading others to act – that is, to encourage community ownership of the language. Campbell's article is an overview and critique of the different kinds of activities that Menter Cwm Gwendraeth has undertaken. The chapter is thus a comprehensive and authoritative account, and the range of programs and ideas explored by this *menter iaith* is nothing short of amazing.

Jeremy Evas (chap. 10) addresses one of the major concerns for the future of the Welsh language: the "heartland" areas, which over the past two decades have seen a large influx of non-Welsh-speaking people, as well as the departure of many Welsh-speaking natives. Evas focuses on one of these areas, the Teifi Valley. According to the 1991 census, 43.7% of the population of the county of Dyfed, which includes the Teifi Valley, were Welsh-speaking, a figure which is considerably higher than for Wales as a whole. Evas found that the lack of opportunity to use Welsh produced a lack of confidence in its use even in those

situations where Welsh-language provision is actually available. This creates a vicious circle and leads to yet further decrease in its use (Evas 299). Many speakers in the Teifi Valley felt that the lack of provision in Welsh in the area affected their rights as citizens. An area of concern was that Welsh L2 speakers showed significantly less ownership of the language than L1 speakers and were much less eager to see its uses expanded. This suggests that one important consideration for language planners is the need to market the language proactively to L2 speakers.

The central message of chap. 11, co-authored by Nicholas Gardner, Maite Puigdevall i Serralvo, and Colin H. Williams, is that those involved in Welsh language planning should look beyond the other Celtic lands such as Ireland and Brittany (they refer to the “tired cliché of Celtic solidarity,” p. 311) to other, more successful models of language planning, including the Basque Country and Catalonia in Spain, and Quebec, New Zealand, and South Africa outside of Europe. The chapter reviews Basque and Catalan language planning and suggests avenues of cooperation among different minority communities.

Finally, in chap. 12, Colin H. Williams discusses how language policy in Wales has failed to take account of regional economic development. Williams argues for increased interaction between language planners and the private sector, thereby reinforcing one of the volume’s themes: Language planning should not be carried out in a piecemeal fashion but needs to be part of a larger agenda of economic and social development.

In addition to being an excellent presentation of the current language issues in Wales, this collection of articles is useful reading for anyone interested in language planning issues in general, and it offers abundant fodder for revitalization programs in search of inspiration and practical ideas.

(Received 15 May, 2003)

Language in Society 33 (2004). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404504291059

GABRIELLE VARRO, *Sociologie de la mixité: De la mixité amoureuse aux mixités sociales et culturelles*. Paris: Editions Belin, 2003. Pp. 256. Pb, €18.95.

Reviewed by JACQUELINE LINDENFELD
Department of Anthropology, Sonoma State University
Rohnert Park, CA 94928-3609
jlind@sonic.net

This book should be of particular interest to sociolinguists who believe in the value of discourse analysis for a better understanding of society. As indicated in the title, Varro’s overall objective is to contribute to a nascent *sociologie de la mixité* by examining the concept of “mixed” as used at various levels of life in society. Her insightful analysis results in an enlightening description of some fundamental aspects of contemporary French society regarding the condition of immigrants and foreigners in the nation. She accomplishes this task through a

constructionist approach to language inspired by J. L. Austin and Pierre Bourdieu, among others. The focus is on behavioral consequences of the categorizations and discourse engendered by a deceptively simple term, *mixte*, as applied to individuals or other social units. For instance, so-called mixed families are often automatically considered as dysfunctional and may become scapegoats at the societal level.

Varro's valuable contribution appears at a time when the French are finally coming to grips with the fact that their country, despite its long-held self-image, is not homogeneous, and that the famous motto *Liberté, égalité, fraternité* does not necessarily apply to all individuals within the nation. Varro remarks that even the public school fosters the existence of differential treatment: once a child is branded as having foreign or mixed parentage, a whole chain of associations sets in, shaped by the Jacobin model (inherited from the 1789 Revolution) according to which heterogeneity is essentially negative, and a mixed marriage a potential threat to the unity of the nation. Such attitudes, which are engendered by language-based social categorizations, are examined here in a "language as action" perspective. Unlike other social scientists who often focus on external (legal, political, economic) aspects of immigration, Varro resolutely starts from the internal reality of being a foreigner – an experience she underwent herself when she arrived in France as a young woman from the United States. Her primary tool is discourse analysis, and her data consist mainly of the abundant material she has collected over the years through interviews with members of mixed families in France, in Germany, and to a lesser extent in Bosnia.

The Introduction clearly outlines the author's specific objectives: contextual analysis of linguistic expressions centered around the notion of *mixte* at various levels of life in society; critical examination of social behaviors engendered by related categorizations, and discourse. She will ultimately propose that the notion of *mixité* (an abstract noun she derives from the adjective *mixte*) be used as a positive concept representing the will of different individuals and groups to live together in a society, in contrast to segregation or ethnicization. To this end, she will patiently demolish the idea that the term *mixte* should be used to single out people, a categorization which may lead to harmful finger-pointing in society.

In chap. 1, we find a detailed analysis of the uses and meanings of the term *mixte* through the centuries in French society, as applied in particular to mixed marriages. As Varro points out, there is often interplay between dictionary definitions and speakers' actual uses of the term. She also demonstrates that the meaning of "mixed marriage" varies with time and place: It can refer to religion, race, or nationality.

Chaps. 2–4 deal with the notion of *mixte* at the micro level, focusing in turn on the couple, the family, and the individual. In chap. 2, the author suggests that, unless mixed couples can be shown to have particular features unique to them, they should not really be considered as a separate category. Using the theory of homogamy as a point of departure, she convincingly demonstrates that mixed

couples in France (which, by the present definition, are couples that include a member born outside of France, regardless of race or religion) are no more heterogamous than others in terms of such social markers as level of education or socio-economic status. She concludes that the categorization of a couple as mixed derives essentially from its members' self-image and the image others may have of them, as fashioned in part by the degree of social markedness of the foreign identity.

In chap. 3, Varro turns her attention to the mixed family in order to test the existence of structures specific to it. This discussion is based mainly on her own studies of American-French families in France and German-French families in France or Germany. She stresses the high degree of variability characterizing such cross-national families, but still proceeds to look for recurring patterns. Regularities do appear in two areas: ways of life, for example food practices and extended visits to the country of the foreign parent; and marking and negotiating the children's identities in three specific domains – choice of first names, language practices, and religion. However, it turns out that the children's identities are mainly grounded in the country in which they get socialized and formally educated, and whose language is their first. Apart from the few who live in ethnic neighborhoods, the children of mixed couples do not really differ from other local children; even when exposed to two different cultures and languages, they live in a unified universe – unlike first-generation individuals, who typically live in a dichotomized universe. Varro proposes not to erase the concept of mixed family, but rather to give it a positive connotation by emphasizing the fact that, given the presence of an “outsider” in its midst, such a family is likely to be more open to and accepting of diversity.

Chap. 4 deals with self-identification as constructed through language. Individuals constantly have to define themselves according to imposed official categories that are constitutive of their identities, whether in a census questionnaire or in an application for a passport. In this discussion Varro makes use of interview data she collected among young people of American-French or German-French parentage. She notes that some of those adolescents are actually constructing new, European or international identities that transcend the family and the nation.

In chap. 5, we get to the macro level, with a focus on the French public school system, which until the 1970s was modeled on the Jacobin principle of uniformity. Once the concept of assimilation was discredited in France and replaced by the concept of integration, special programs were put in place for children of mixed or foreign parentage. However, the notion of “handicap” is still widely used to refer to a lack of skills in the French language, which leads to negative attitudes toward the children concerned. Such stigmatization actually goes counter to integration and may foster balkanization along ethnic lines, which is contrary to the French model of national unity. Varro warns against automatically equating “mixed origins” with “problems” and isolating children of mixed/foreign families within the school system. Rather, the children's foreign background and knowl-

edge of another culture or language should be regarded as positive features to be exploited.

Chap. 6 is an attempt to characterize both the actual and perceived conditions of immigrants and foreigners in French society at large, as shaped by the lingering Jacobin model of a homogeneous society – which is totally contrary to a multicultural perspective grounded in cultural relativism. Varro notes that there is more and more mixing at the individual level in French society, particularly in urban areas, where people live fragmented lives and frequently come in contact with strangers. Most foreign-born individuals live and work among French people, and they often belong to voluntary associations that are open to all. Hence, Varro suggests a model of a “mixed culture” grounded in the recognition and appreciation of “the Other” and his or her role in social change at various levels of society (family, school, neighborhood, etc). This means getting away from any kind of discourse that reinforces images based on a monolingual and monocultural model of society; it also means recognizing the existence of multiple (or mixed) identities. To those who might regard this approach as a threat to the unity of France as a nation, Varro retorts that French people can be trusted to manage this mixed identity without falling into the trap of ethnicization. And, as she sees it, the recognition of differences within the French nation actually does conform to the Jacobin model of *égalité* for all: in fact, it is precisely the lack of recognition of differences that deviates from this principle, creating inequalities in the way people are treated.

In conclusion, Varro sees *mixité* as a dynamic and unifying concept that, through language, could modify the images French people have of their nation, setting the stage for more tolerance and also a higher level of recognition of one another. The author of this timely book is to be congratulated for her message of hope, as well as her painstaking analysis of verbal material related to a very complex social issue – the condition of immigrants and foreigners in a western European democracy at the turn of the millennium.

(Received 11 March, 2003)

Language in Society 33 (2004). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404504301053

PAUL GUBBINS AND MIKE HOLT (eds.), *Beyond boundaries: Language and identity in contemporary Europe*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters, 2002. Pp. vi, 162. Pb £ 19.95, US\$ 29.95.

Reviewed by RUDOLF DE CILLIA
Department of Linguistics
University of Vienna, Austria
rudolf.de-cillia@univie.ac.at

This collection of eleven articles addresses in diverse ways the role of language in the construction of social, regional, national, and supranational identities. The

contributions are not based on a common theoretical concept and common methodology. The approaches to the subject vary greatly, ranging from a subtle empirical sociolinguistic study embedded in the theoretical framework of variational linguistics and the theory of language maintenance and language loss, to articles exploring aspects of language policies and political science, to an anthropological contribution.

The common denominator, the bracket that encloses the contributions and justifies their being published in a volume, is the focus on linguistic identity and trans-boundary dimensions. "Beyond boundaries" refers to territorial boundaries in contemporary Europe, but also to boundaries between identities and to the construction of hybrid identities in the context of postcolonial immigration. As the editors state in their introduction, identity is interpreted as a socially constructed phenomenon, and language identities are not unidimensional, but complex and multifaceted.

Some contributions deal with the European level of linguistic identities and refer more or less implicitly to the significance of the English language for European identity construction, now and in the future. Stephen Barbour examines nationalist and internationalist discourses and language policies at the national and international level. Jenny Cheshire starts by presenting an empirical study on the spoken language of young people in three English towns who construct their regional and class identities by using specific nonstandard grammatical features, and then discusses the role of English in European youth culture. Richard Trim raises the question of whether the meaning of words in European languages is coming closer together. Paul Gubbins takes a look at language policy and linguistic identity in the European Union.

Gubbins's article is especially interesting because he examines European language policies in the context of the future EU enlargement, and the generally taboo topic of Esperanto as an international lingua franca. The author focuses on the contrast or contradiction between political declarations in favor of linguistic diversity and an egalitarian concept of language policies on the one hand, and linguistic practice on the other hand. He points out that *de facto* simultaneous interpretation is not provided in all languages in an increasing number of sessions of the European Parliament, and that many languages are excluded from specific areas of EU activity. Gubbins then outlines the "Radical Approach," a working document by a member of the Italian Radical Party, Gianfranco Dell'Alba, that examines various methods of international communication and proposes two possible solutions based on the idea of a common language: selection of a single working language from the official languages of the EU (Spanish is suggested); or adoption of a "neutral" language such as Esperanto. The author presents the arguments put forward in the debates on Dell'Alba's working paper in the European Parliament's Committee for Institutional Affairs (1998), which show that the Esperanto option was not taken seriously, although, according to statistics cited by Gibson, 20% of the MEPs favor Esperanto. He demands further research

to identify the reasons why MEPs support Esperanto. In his view, the players responsible for shaping and formulating the new Europe of the next century “prefer to adopt an attitude of wait-and-see” (p. 57).

Other contributions have a more specific approach to “language-politics-identity,” for example those by Brendan Murphy, Cristina Diaz-Varela, and Salvatore Coluccello about regionalism in Catalonia and northern Italy or “Padania.” In “Cultural memory, language and symbolic Russianness,” Harald Haarmann analyzes the historical development of traditional stereotypes and concepts like “Mother Russia” and “the Russian soul.” Although these concepts were repressed for decades under the Soviet regime, they are still important. In the process of establishing a cultural identity for the post-Soviet era, Haarmann even observes a renaissance of these concepts in all spheres of public and private life. The revival of traditional “Russianness” is interpreted as a reaction to the present chaos and crisis, and to the lack of solidarity, social stability, cultural orientation, and political orientation. The author also analyzes the far-reaching effects on the status and structures of the Russian language produced by radical socio-political changes in the 1990s, when its role as a “pan-union language” changed into that of a state language, and more than 20 million people of Russian descent found themselves living outside Russia as minorities. However, in earlier times the concept of “Mother Russia” was manipulated as a vehicle for assimilating non-Russians. As far as the construction of a future identity of modern Russia is concerned, Haarmann believes that the country must find “reliable strategies of multicultural cooperation to render Mother Russia attractive for non-Russians on her soil” (p. 71).

Su Wright’s very interesting contribution addresses the topic from a historical perspective and highlights linguistic identity changes by describing the language shift from Italian to French in Nice after the city became part of France in 1860. She discusses the different factors that caused French to replace Italian as the official language and that led to the disappearance of the local Italian dialect, Nissart, from the private domain. The factors she mentions are economic ones, such as the attractiveness of French traditions to the intelligentsia of Nice, the fact that French was the lingua franca of tourists, and the fact that the Italian-speaking administrative class left Nice and was replaced by French-speaking newcomers. Last but not least was the impact of the vigorous French nation-building in the Third Republic, in which linguistic unification promoted by compulsory education and compulsory military service played a crucial role. Nice became a French town within a few decades because of the linguistic dilution caused by the French-speaking newcomers and the decision of individuals to adopt French as the language of the nation-state and as a language that guaranteed social mobility, commercial advantages, and prestige.

Mike Holt’s contribution goes beyond the boundaries of Europe to deal with linguistics and colonialism, focusing on the current and past role of the French language in Algeria and the conflict over the relations among French, Arabic, and

other indigenous languages. He examines the roots of the conflict and the shifts in the balance of power among the languages involved. Because neither French nor standard Arabic is, strictly speaking, indigenous to Algeria, they draw on universalism to justify their role and their right to represent Algerian identity. Although education has been arabized under the influence of Arabic nationalism, French is still the language of personal advancement. But in Algeria, as in other non-European countries, European concepts of linguistic and political universality are no longer accepted as the uncontested model of human progress. Holt assumes that standard Arabic will “carry the banner of Algerian identity for the foreseeable future” (p. 109) despite the fact that it has no specifically Algerian pedigree.

Michael Anderson brings the identity debate from the international to the domestic level and offers insight from a social-anthropological perspective into cultural boundaries of bilingual Greek/British households. Finally, the last two contributions offer two different perspectives on minority language use in Britain. Lerleen Willis summarizes the findings of an empirical study on Creole/English bilingualism in the African-Caribbean community, and Mike Reynolds describes an empirical study about bilingualism in the Punjabi/Urdu community in Sheffield, hypothesizing linkages among social network membership, code-switching behaviors, and language maintenance/shift. In this subtle study, a list of the abbreviations used in the text would have been very useful, especially since the confusion of two tables renders understanding more difficult (Figure 11.2, p. 152, and Figure 11.3, p. 153).

This publication contains contributions based on very different theoretical and conceptual frameworks, which sometimes allow surprising and unusual approaches to the topics, such as Michael Anderson’s view of the child in bilingual families as a “boundary,” “a field for competing adult identities” (114), and a “battlefield” (p. 116). In my opinion, this diversity is an advantage rather than a disadvantage of the book, although the theoretical and methodical foundation could have been developed more explicitly in some articles. Furthermore, some readers might expect the book to focus more on the role of language(s) in the discursive construction of a future European identity, and to discuss more explicitly topics such as the lingua franca model of European communication, the principles and contradictions of EU language policies, and the frequently discussed “cost of multilingualism” in the EU, as the subtitle suggests. Nevertheless, this volume covers a wide range of aspects and of attitudes to the field of tension between “language and identity” referred to in the subtitle, and thus it presents a mosaic of contributions that are, on the whole, worth reading and of interest to sociolinguists, discourse researchers, and political scientists.

(Received 28 June, 2003)

Language in Society 33 (2004). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S004740450431105X

YASIR SULEIMAN, *The Arabic language and national identity*. Washington, D.C.:
Georgetown University Press, 2003. Pp. viii + 280. Pb \$25.

Reviewed by MUHAMMAD AMARA
Bar-Ilan University
Ramat-Gan
Israel
E-mail: khitam@zahav.net.il

It is frequently remarked that, for instance, the French language is the French nation, or the Arabic language is the Arab nation. Whatever the nature of the link between language and nation is, language is perceived as an important component in defining social groups. As Dorian writes:

[People] have a name for themselves and their language, and no other people goes by that name or claims to speak that language as a mother tongue. If you seek them out, they will tell you who they are and what language they speak; and if they see that you are really interested in them, they will teach you about themselves and their language, perhaps even help you learn to speak their language if you desire. (1999:25)

According to Dorian's description, the link between language and people is straightforward. However, the majority of studies (e.g., the 1999 collection *Handbook of language and ethnic identity*, edited by Joshua A. Fishman, 1999) show that the relationship between language and social identity is far from being direct and straightforward. The essence of the link between language and identity depends on the social context pertinent to the language groups in question. Language is not the only significant criterion, nor is it necessarily the most significant one for all social groups (Liebkind 1999).

As Edwards explains, "questions of language and identity are extremely complex. The essence of the terms themselves is open to discussion and, consequently, consideration of the relationship is fraught with difficulties" (1988: 1). Yasir Suleiman, in the work under review here, undertakes a challenging task, shedding light on his subject from different perspectives in a context where language is an essential component in identity formation. The role of Arabic as a symbol of group identity is reflected in various domains and intellectual statements of Arabs in both premodern and modern times.

The major aim of the book is to reveal the dominance of Arabic in the ideological articulations of national identity in the Arab Middle East. More specifically, Suleiman aims at studying nationalism in relation to language in the Middle East from a cross-disciplinary perspective. He declares that the main approach in his work is sociolinguistics, encouraging Arab sociolinguists to study language

and national identity qualitatively, and drawing attention to the significance of the symbolic meaning of Arabic in the study of nationalism.

The book comprises seven chapters. The first deals with the aims and theoretical and empirical scope of the study, and gives a brief definition of nationalism. Chap. 2 elaborates on some of the main concepts raised in chap. 1. Chap. 3 deals with aspects of the past relevant to Arabic and nationalism in the modern world. Chap. 4 looks at the Arabic language in the Ottoman Empire and its relation to Arab identity. Chap. 5 deals with major statements of prominent Arab thinkers and intellectuals, such as Sati' al-Husari and Zaki al-Arsuzi, regarding Arab nationalism in its cultural mode. Arabic here is perceived as a paradigmatic factor in defining Arab national identity. Chap. 6 moves to the discussion of territorial nationalism in the Arab Middle East. As Suleiman explains, "In some cases, it [Arabic] is only one marker among other equally important markers. In other cases, the language is subjugated to more important markers, for example the environment" (13). Chap. 7 is the conclusion, and important issues for future study are suggested.

Suleiman admits from the beginning the limitations of his study. First, he deals mainly with Standard Arabic. Second, the study is restricted to the Levant and Egypt. Another limitation, mentioned only at the end of the book, is that Islam and Arabism are two main components of Arab national identity, and he has not dealt with these as part Arab nationalism. Though this is a demanding task and possibly requires a separate work, some space devoted to Islam would enrich the book, since it is almost impossible to separate Arabism from Islam. As Litvak explains, "Collective identities in the Arab world contain multiple components. Religion, Arab nationalism and territory are the most prominent. These elements are not mutually exclusive and often complement each other" (1996:4).

The importance of the book is its scope, description, theory, and rich examples. To the best of my knowledge, this is the most comprehensive study of the Arabic language and national identity. Relatively few studies have touched on some aspects of this subject (including the author's significant contributions in earlier works, e.g. Suleiman 1994, 1996, 1999).

Suleiman states that "the closest approach to a linguistics-related field of study which can investigate the question of language and national identity is sociolinguistics" (p. 4), though he believes the field is handicapped in its treatment of Arabic. (On the current status of Arabic sociolinguistics, see the finely detailed and critical study by Owens 2001.) His major criticisms are that Arabic sociolinguistics is mainly interested in the communicative dimensions of the language (the pragmatic) rather than in its symbolic power, and the analysis is mainly quantitative. Another limitation is that "Arabic sociolinguistics in its quantitative mode is handicapped by the invisibility of national identity as a prominent factor in the theoretical impulses which historically informed this field" (4).

Though there is some truth in Suleiman's claims, it is obvious that he adopts mainly a sociolinguistic framework in his study. He is aware of the many studies

and theories in the field of sociolinguistics dealing with language and identity, but many seminal concepts, frameworks, and theories are missing from his work. For instance, he does not mention, either in the theoretical section on language and national identity (27–33) or in the rest of the book, some of the basic models and theories in sociolinguistics. Among these are the acculturation model (e.g. Berry 1990), social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner 1979), ethnolinguistic identity theory (Giles & Johnson 1987), perceived ethnolinguistic vitality (e.g. Bourhis et al. 1981, Allard & Landry 1994). These works have contributed greatly to the study of language and social identity, and Suleiman's work could have benefited considerably from some of their ideas.

This interesting book is a contribution not only to Arabic sociolinguistics but also to other disciplines. The background of the author, with the perspective and tools to undertake the challenging task of the topic, enables him to combine masterfully various fields of study – sociolinguistics, Arabic literature, and nationalist ideology – making the book valuable to all who are interested in the Arab world, nationalism, sociolinguistics in general, and Arabic sociolinguistics in particular. The book also sheds interesting light on issues of language education policy in the Arab world, though this does not receive as much attention from the author as do his other themes.

REFERENCES

- Allard, R., & Landry, R. (1994). Diglossia, ethnolinguistic vitality and language behavior. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 108:15–42.
- Berry, J. (1990). Psychology and acculturation. In J. J. Bremen (ed.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, 1989: Cross-cultural perspectives*, 201–35. Lincoln: University of Nebraska.
- Bourhis, R.; Giles, H.; & Rosenthal, D. (1981). Notes on the construction of a “subjective vitality questionnaire” for ethnolinguistic groups. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 2:145–55.
- Dorian, N. C. (1999). Linguistic and ethnographic fieldwork. In Fishman, 25–41.
- Edwards, J. (1988). *Language, society and identity*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Fishman, J. A. (1999) (ed.). *Handbook of language and ethnic identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Giles, H., & Johnson, P. (1987). Ethnolinguistic vitality theory: A social psychological approach to language maintenance. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 68:69–99.
- Liebkind, Karmela (1999). Social psychology. In Fishman, 141–51.
- Litvak, Meir (1996). *The islamization of Palestinian identity: The case of Hamas*. Tel Aviv University, Moshe Dayan Center for Middle Eastern and African Studies.
- Owens, Jonathan (2001). Arabic sociolinguistics. *Arabica* 48:419–69.
- Suleiman, Y. (1994). Nationalism and the Arabic language: An historical overview. In Yasir Suleiman (ed.), *Arabic sociolinguistics: Issues and perspectives*, 3–24. Richmond, Surrey: Curzon.
- _____. (1996). Language and identity in Egyptian nationalism. In Yasir Suleiman (ed.), *Language and identity and North Africa*, 25–37. Richmond, Surrey: Curzon.
- _____. (1999). Language and political conflict in the Middle East: A study in symbolic sociolinguistics. In Yasir Suleiman (ed.), *Language and society in the Middle East and North Africa: Studies in identity and variation*, 30–49. Richmond, Surrey: Curzon.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. C. Austin & S. Worchel (eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations*. Monterey: Brooks/Cole.

(Received 20 June, 2003)

Language in Society 33 (2004). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404504321056

KINGSLEY BOLTON (ed.), *Hong Kong English: Autonomy and creativity*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2002. Pp. viii, 324. Pb US\$27.95.

Reviewed by JAMES STANLAW
Anthropology, Illinois State University
Normal, IL 61790
stanlaw@ilstu.edu

Many casual observers outside Asia believe that everyone in Hong Kong, owing to its British colonial past, speaks English as fluently as the queen (or, at least, George Bush). Others, hearing the grunts of martial artists like Jackie Chan, might think that English is truly a foreign entity to the people of Hong Kong, as unknown to them as, say, pizza or hamburgers. Both assumptions, as Kingsley Bolton shows in this fascinating new collection of essays, are quite wrong. Instead, the place of English in Hong Kong is probably unique in the world: It is neither simply a variety poorly mimicking the language of the UK, nor an imperial tongue imposed on a subservient populace. It is these dynamics of culture, identity, economics, globalization, education – and, indeed, politics – that are addressed in this stimulating book.

Bolton, an associate professor at the University of Hong Kong, is a widely known authority on the history and sociolinguistics of English in China and Hong Kong (e.g., Bolton 2003). Most of the articles in this volume first appeared in a special issue, which he also edited, on Hong Kong English in the journal *World Englishes* at the end of 2000. For this book, Bolton has written a new 25-page introduction describing how the autonomy and creativity of Hong Kong English has remained intact even since reunification with the mainland in 1997, and setting the stage for the arguments presented in the subsequent chapters.

Bolton divides the 16 remaining chapters into five thematic sections. Part I, “Language in context,” discusses the English-language media in Hong Kong (Chan Yuen-ying), Cantonese-English code-switching (David C. S. Li), English-language teachers’ attitudes (Amy B. M. Tsui & David Bunton), and the historical sociolinguistics of English in the region (Bolton).

Part II focuses on the formal aspects of Hong Kong English. Tony T. N. Hung describes its phonology, Nikolas Gisborne examines relative clauses, and Phil Benson discusses the lexicon. In Part III, “Dimensions of creativity,” we find three poets (Louise Ho, Agnes Lam, and Leung Ping-kwan), a novelist (Xu Xi), and a newspaper satirist (Nury Vittachi) focusing on literary production and the use of Hong Kong English.

“Resources” for further research on Hong Kong English are presented in Part IV. Bolton gives an extensive annotated bibliography of about 150 academic sources in one of his contributions in this section. Shirley Geok-lin Lim shows how the use of Hong Kong English can be a tool for educators to foster the “cultural imagination” of Hong Kong students. And Bolton and Gerald Nelson

show the potential research applications of corpus linguistics in analyzing Hong Kong English. (These last two chapters were not included in the original *World Englishes* special issue, and they make a nice addition, complementing the other articles in the book.)

Finally, in Part V, “Future directions,” Bolton and Lim review the various linguistic and literary issues that have been brought up in the previous chapters, and offer suggestions as to how a careful reexamination of Hong Kong English could not only contribute to improved English-language instruction but could also help to solidify the region’s identity vis-à-vis mainland China and the international community.

I believe that this book would be of scholarly interest to many linguists, sociologists, and anthropologists. The articles are also lively enough – containing the right mixture of theory, data, and colorful anecdotes – to hold the attention of even casual undergraduate students. Where else would one learn, for example, that when Wong Wing-fai was “chopped to death” (p. 209) – as described in Hong Kong English – he was really just stabbed? But, more importantly, these articles tackle crucial theoretical issues of concern to all who study the use of language in daily practice, regardless of geographical area. For example, we see that code-mixing or code-switching between English and Cantonese occurs in parallel to the localized usages of Hong Kong English, giving new resources to everyday users and creative writers.

One of the most important reasons why this book is significant, however – and a reason why it will appeal to sociolinguists of many different persuasions – is that it is an illustrative Asian case study of the claims that many in the “world Englishes” movement have been making over the past decade. In particular, these theorists have been arguing that international varieties of English now have autonomy and are no longer linguistically or culturally dependent on the norms or authority of British or American native speakers (Kachru 1997b). Braj Kachru, probably the foremost scholar in this field, makes a strong argument that English is now an Asian language as much as a North American or European one. For example, consider these facts (Kachru 1996, 1997a). At least one in every ten Asians uses English every day in some form for either work or recreation. The third largest English-using country is India, second only to the United States and the United Kingdom. In close to half of the countries in Asia, English is a *de jure* official, auxiliary, or second language. In some parts of Asia, such as Singapore, English is acquiring *de facto* status as the dominant or first language.

In many places in Asia – India, the Philippines, and Singapore, for example – there has developed a consciousness of the local varieties of English, and indeed pride in them. At the same time, these places have also become sites of creative vitality, often with extensive literatures in the local English variety. Until recently, however, Hong Kong residents were unaware of a Hong Kong variety of English, or else they dismissed it as merely a bad or inadequate version of “real” English. Sometimes these attitudes were fostered by well-meaning but linguisti-

cally naïve English teachers of native origin who, throughout the 1970s and 1980s, tried to improve perceived falling academic standards.

However, there is now no doubt of the growing importance of English in all aspects of life in Hong Kong. In 1961 less than 10% of the population had good knowledge of English. This grew to a quarter of the population in 1971, and to almost a third by 1991. This number climbed to 43% in 2001 (34). No doubt the eight universities in Hong Kong that use English as the primary medium of instruction are also a contributing factor.

Oddly, the prominence of English increased as steps toward reunification with the mainland took place. This is one of the more intriguing developments in the story of Hong Kong English. Before the People's Republic of China established the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region under its "one country, two systems" policy in 1997, the Hong Kong government announced that it would develop a civil service that was "biliterate in English and Chinese, and trilingual in English, Cantonese, and Putonghua" (35). The interplay among three languages and two orthographies has made Hong Kong a fascinating linguistics laboratory. The handover, of course, has seen a marked increase in the use of Putonghua 'common speech', the official prescribed language of China. This language is often referred to as Mandarin, or simply "Chinese," in the West, and is called Guoyu 'national language' in Taiwan. Regardless of nomenclature, Putonghua is not mutually intelligible with Cantonese, the local language of most Hong Kong residents. As a noted Sinologist has pointed out, "As far as the magnitude or difficulty of the learning problem is concerned, there is not much difference between a Cantonese learning Putonghua and a Hispanic learning English" (DeFrancis 1984:230). The tension between these languages can be seen in various institutional and informal arenas; for example, a Chinese saying claims, "We do not fear the sky or the earth. What we fear is hearing a Cantonese speaking Mandarin" (Chang & Chang 1978:10).

Ironically, it was the presence of English in the territory that allowed Cantonese to elaborate its functions in ways that were denied other "dialects" (2). Official policy in China since 1949 was to promote the Putonghua national language at the expense of local languages in schools and the media. (And since the mid-1950s, this language was written exclusively in simplified Chinese characters.) But because Putonghua is competing in Hong Kong with another official language, English, Cantonese can take on numerous other roles, such as that of a lingua franca among new immigrants (79). As a result, however, among academics, intellectuals, and the media there has developed a belief in a monocultural Hong Kong Cantonese ethnic identity. It appears irrelevant that this ideology is at odds with both historical fact and contemporary demographics. What this means for the future of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region remains to be seen; what is certain, however, is that English will be inexorably involved in whatever happens.

REVIEWS

REFERENCES

- Bolton, Kingsley (2003). *Chinese Englishes: A sociolinguistic history*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chang, Raymond, & Chang, Margaret (1978). *Speaking of Chinese*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- DeFrancis, John (1984). *The Chinese language: Fact and fantasy*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Kachru, Braj B. (1996). English as an Asian language. In Maria Lourdes S. Bautista (ed.), *English as an Asian language*, 1–23. Manila: Macquarie Library.
- _____ (1997a). Past imperfect: The other side of English in Asia. In Larry Smith & Michael Forman (eds.), *World Englishes 2000, Selected essays vol. 14*, 68–89. Honolulu: University of Hawaii East-West Center.
- _____ (1997b). Opening borders with world Englishes: Theory in the classroom. In S. Cornwell et al. (eds.), *JALT96: Crossing borders*, 10–20. Tokyo: Japanese Association for Language Teachers.

(Received 25 June, 2003)

Language in Society 33 (2004). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404504331052

PATRICIA COVARRUBIAS, *Culture, communication, and cooperation: Interpersonal relations and pronominal address in a Mexican organization*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2002. Pp. xxiv, 161. Hb \$60.00.

Reviewed by RICARDO OTHEGUY
Linguistics, Graduate Center of the City University of New York
New York, N.Y. 10016
rotheguy@gc.cuny.edu

For those who find it useful to conceive of a language as a meaning-conveying instrument embedded in a cultural system, this brief, well-written treatment of pronominal address in Spanish will hold few surprises, but it will provide welcome and well-reasoned documentation of the major positions, supplemented by equally welcome expansions and elaborations of familiar points. Speakers of Spanish tend to address some interlocutors on some occasions using second-person verb forms, while addressing others, or the same on different occasions, using third-person forms, variably reinforcing the verbal morphology with the pronoun *tú* in the first cases and *usted* in the second. The author investigates alternative forms of what she calls “pronominal address” (irrespective of whether the pronoun is actually used), with data obtained from observations of workers at a construction company in Veracruz, Mexico, and from their own explanations of why they use one address form or the other. A good sample of the data is provided, presented in standard Spanish orthography with good, readable translations into English. For theoretical underpinning, the author offers the ethnography of speaking (Hymes 1962) and speech codes (Philipsen 1997).

From these vantage points, workers at the company, when using the two forms of address, are seen as enacting well-understood cultural norms embodied in meaningful relational alignments, while at the same time reflecting and confirming those norms; and they are also seen as activating two distinct, though some-

times overlapping, speech codes designated with the Spanish words *respeto* 'respect' and *confianza* 'trust, confidence'. The author is also guided by a concern with organizational structure and the ways that workers and managers use these forms to collaborate in making sense of the workplace and carrying out the activities of the company. This focus on the workplace, and on the lives of Mexican workers, is seen by the author as an important element of originality.

Following ideas from Brown & Gilman 1960, Covarrubias organizes relational alignments under the spatial metaphors of vertical and horizontal relationships, instantiated by *usted* and *tú* respectively. These two dimensions subsume such relationships as vertical Age Inequality and Gender-Based Inequality, and horizontal Age Parity and Organizational-Rank Parity. Under rubrics of this type, the author provides detailed and nuanced illustrations of *usted*- and *tú*-inducing relational alignments. Some interesting generalizations emerge – for example, age outweighs rank as a motivating factor, so that supervisors who are generally addressed as *usted* will get *tú* when they are close to the age of the worker addressing them (p. 38).

Spatial metaphors and the generalizations they make possible are shown to be insufficient to capture the social meanings instantiated by the two forms of address. In one of the better sections of the book, Covarrubias shows the necessity of postulating “inverted power alignments” as well as “provisional realignments.” In the former, for example, female workers refuse offers by male supervisors to address them as *tú*, continuing to use *usted* as a way to fend off the advances that might be risked by acceptance of mutual *tú* treatment; or devout evangelical Christians insist on treating co-workers as *usted* as a way to signal that their faith calls them to remain separate (45, 48). Complementing inverted alignments, provisional realignments temporarily supersede the existing social norms. For example, a worker who normally treats a superior as *usted* will use *tú* when discussing a recipe for a favorite dish.

The solid descriptive aspects of the work are not matched by an explanatory apparatus as strong as readers might have expected. The labels of the different types of alignments are good as descriptors of the basis for the choice of pronominal form, and of the cultural norms they reflect and reinforce, and may even qualify as local explanations for each type of choice. Grouping these alignments under the rubrics “vertical” and “horizontal” adds some explanatory force, but not much, since verticalness and horizontalness are clearly implicit in the labels for each alignment, and since the number assigned (ten vertical, four horizontal) are an arbitrary taxonomic convenience. Like the names of the individual alignments, the labels “inverted” and “provisional” do provide some measure of explanation as far as they go. And one might agree that the author’s terms are less susceptible than previously available constructs to the criticism of reductionism, or of not taking into account addressee effects or multiple meanings. But while some of these problems are ameliorated, and while the various terms of description bring order to an excellent array of data, it cannot be said that the work

represents a decisive explanatory jump forward beyond the already available theoretical terms (e.g., the dichotomies of T vs. V, familiar vs. formal, or power vs. solidarity).

In the most theoretically ambitious part of the book, Covarrubias overlays the notions of Code of *Respeto* and Code of *Confianza* on the theoretical apparatus initially provided by the four types of relational alignments. Uses of *usted* and *tú* respectively are said to be associated with these two speech codes, such that choice of address form activates a larger and deeper set of cultural meanings that dictate how one should live and relate to others. This is an attractive idea, but the author propounds it almost exclusively through assertion, stating simply that the codes exist, and that their existence is revealed by the reasons informants give for choosing address forms and the words they use in giving these reasons. We are led from these assertions to a treatment of all *usted* and *tú* usages as reflections of the two speech codes, which, supported only by the briefest argumentation, have now been elevated to the category of clearly established realities.

However, a persuasive presentation of a construct such as the Code of *Respeto*, and the claim that it becomes activated when *usted* forms are used, would require both a less assertive style and greater interest in substantiating hypotheses and subjecting them to falsification. If one desists from the receptive reading that can make this volume useful and informative, and moves instead to a mode that is more attuned to the importance of evidentiary standards, the value of the work tends to diminish with respect not only to speech codes but to other aspects of the presentation as well.

The study relies heavily on the respondents' own accounts of why they choose one or the other form. This may be a reasonable approach, but it leads, for example, to the rejection of the construct of "solidarity," on the grounds that none of the respondents ever used the term. If the scholar's work is to consist in part of recording the folk analyses proposed by informants, however, then one wonders whether it is true that the constructs that are adopted, such as vertical, horizontal, inverted, and provisional alignments, meet the test of being part of the respondents' untutored vocabulary. These Mexican workers say a lot about why they choose address forms, but the evidence is weak that they refer directly to "inversion of roles" or "verticality of relations," and one doubts that these terms are any more natural than the rejected "solidarity." Similarly, it is true that the respondents are at home with the notions of *respeto* and *confianza*, but they do not directly articulate the existence of the *respeto* and *confianza* speech codes, which are abstractions that would require much more theoretical and empirical grounding than is offered here.

In a similar vein, one is struck by the author's apparent lack of interest in confronting her hypotheses with potentially falsifying items. The ninth vertical relational alignment, the Gender-Based one, calls for *usted* to be used for women, as many informants recount, so as to show respect and avoid misunderstandings regarding intent. In contrast, the first two horizontal alignments – Age Parity and

Organizational Rank Parity – call for workers of the same age and rank to use *tú* with one another. If these notions are intended as explanations of observed usage or of the descriptions made by respondents, obvious empirical problems arise, for the analysis now permits men at the factory to address a woman of equal rank as *usted* under the vertical Gender-Based alignment, and also as *tú* under the horizontal Age Parity alignment. The only way to know which of these alignments is being enacted is by the choice of address form, a choice which in turn is explained by the alignment.

My point is not to hurl facile charges of circularity, since it is perfectly reasonable to maintain that, when external or referential circumstances allow for alternative alignments (addressee is a woman, addressee is of equal rank), speakers will choose address forms depending on which alignment they want to enact. However, the lack of attention to the analytical issues (especially falsifiability) that these situations bring up is one of the serious limitations of the work.

Moreover, little is gained by urging on one's colleagues theoretical or methodological paths not chosen, but throughout this book one is struck by the use of the notion of "likelihood" coupled with the absence of using even simple counts or statistics. According to the respondents, marriage and parenthood earn members heightened status, and so married women, especially mothers, are "more likely" to receive *usted* regardless of age (44). But in the absence of some quantitative evidence, the reader is left wondering what "more likely" means, and whether there is a claim here that a visit to the factory will not reveal any young male workers using *tú* with women of equal organizational rank, even if they are married and have children. This lack of interest in the rigors of falsifiability leads Covarrubias into contradictions. If age outweighs rank as a relational alignment that motivates the choice of address form, the reader will want to know why age does not outweigh marriage. Does the author really intend to say that age outweighs rank but that marriage outweighs age? And what method would be pursued, and what evidence adduced, to establish such orderings of alignments and their connection with choices of address form?

These theoretical shortcomings aside, the work is a commendable piece of descriptive field work, and scholars interested in Spanish, in address forms, in ethnographies of speaking, and in the instantiation of speech codes will find it rewarding reading.

REFERENCES

- Brown, R., & Gilman, A. (1960). The pronouns of power and solidarity. In P. P. Giglioli (ed.), *Language and social context*. London: Cox Wyman.
- Hymes, Dell (1962). The ethnography of speaking. In T. G. Gladwin & W. C. Sturtevant (eds.), *Anthropology of human behavior*. Washington, DC: Anthropological Society of Washington.
- Philipsen, G. (1997). A theory of speech codes. In G. Philipsen & T. Albrecht (eds.), *Developing communication theories*. Albany: SUNY Press.

(Received 11 June, 2003)

Language in Society 33 (2004). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404504341059

BENJAMIN H. BAILEY, *Language, race and negotiation of identity: A study of Dominican Americans*. New York: LFB Scholarly Publishing, 2002. Pp. ix, 294. Hb \$70.00.

Reviewed by BONNIE URCIUOLI
Anthropology and Communication Studies, Hamilton College
Clinton, NY 13323
burciul@hamilton.edu

Benjamin Bailey's *Language, race and negotiation of identity* is the first extensive sociolinguistic study of a Dominican-American communicative community, and is thus a timely and welcome addition to the literature on Spanish/English bilingual situations in the United States. Bailey conducted field work among second-generation working-class Dominican-American high school students in Providence, Rhode Island, from August 1996 to July 1997. (The school at the time of field work was 60% Hispanic, 20% Dominican, and the rest largely Puerto Rican and Guatemalan.) His investigation focuses on the ways in which linguistic deployments by these young people enact ethnic and racial identity. His data are drawn from videotaped activities of six high school students in school and in one nonschool setting, interviews about language use and ethnic/racial issues with high school and college students, and general participant observation in school, home, and community contexts (p. 36).

Bailey locates his consultants in a specific nexus of class, regional, historical, demographic, and institutional relations. He then shows how, within their specific locations, they enact a range of identities through the codes they speak – specific varieties of English and Spanish. Their use of Dominican Spanish functions as an ethnic/racial enactment of a “Spanish” identity distinct from U.S. white or black racial identity. In doing so, they explicitly resist U.S. binary classification, despite the fact that, to non-Dominican-Americans, Dominicans tend to be typified as “black” on the basis of what is perceived as their African-derived phenotype. This resistance is central to their identity. At the same time, they use (in various patterns) African American Vernacular English (AAVE) elements that mark nonwhite peer solidarity motivated by shared positions of economic and racial disadvantage and, at the same time, by a popular culture of hipness powerfully identified as African American. It is the combination of these positions that distinguishes the sociolinguistic identity of the second generation from that of their parents.

The book is organized into seven chapters and a conclusion. The first introduces the central sociolinguistic and racial points. The second lays out the field site and research procedures. The third reviews the linguistic repertoires of second-generation speakers vis-à-vis the community's immigration history. The fourth examines the ways that social and ethnic/racial inequality manifest themselves in linguistic identity enactment. The fifth contrasts Dominican and U.S. racial frame-

works, and examines the manifestations of each in second-generation identity negotiations. The sixth examines one particular student's deployment of linguistic varieties and social identities during a school day. The seventh examines ways in which six students play out being Dominican, thus revealing the variation within what is classified as a single ethnic identity. Central to all this is the understanding that racial and ethnic identity become real through social action: Where there is inequality, there are tensions between identities hegemonically imposed and the repertoire of identities that agents enact; the same social actor may enact different identities at different social moments, often but not necessarily in different relationships; any given identity may be enacted in a range of ways; and an identity desirable at one social moment may be less so at another. Language as embodied social process is a critical mode of identity enactment and is synergetic with dress, music, and forms of institutional participation. (For example, Bailey notes that religious participation is central in the establishment of one's identity as Dominican.)

Chapter 3, "Linguistic resources of Dominican Americans," tackles the thorny problem of what a code consists of and what code-switching means. Over the past half-century, since the work of Weinreich, a number of approaches have been developed to this fascinatingly messy area. As anyone conversant with the literature on bilingual situations knows, there are a few generally agreed-on basic principles and a lot of ethnographically specific treatments, often innovative, and often going in divergent and occasionally incompatible analytic directions. Nor could matters be otherwise. The very term "bilingualism" is misleading, privileging a discrete, bounded conception of language over the messy ambiguities of people's linguistic practices, not to mention the fact that the historical and situational dynamics giving rise to bilingual situations are notoriously fluid. The most ethnographically interesting and informative analyses also tend to be analytically idiosyncratic insofar as they try to illuminate specific dynamics in complex, often ambiguous structural and interactional dynamics. This is the situation Bailey faces in explaining the linguistic repertoires of his high school students. There are the "codes" as they are conventionally understood in the literature: Dominican Spanish (some elements of which are also general Caribbean Spanish), AAVE, standard American English, and forms of English that appear specific to these Dominican speakers. There is no easy isomorphism between any one student and any one code, and Bailey's focus shifts from code in the abstract to the patterns of and among actual speakers, which are illustrated in detail. For example, AAVE-associated forms (59 ff.) that lead others to perceive Dominican-American speakers as African American include habitual *be*, copula deletion, and use of stressed *bin*, as well as pronunciation and lexical features. At the same time, their English pronunciation is clearly shaped by Spanish (a point also noted in studies of Puerto Rican bilingualism in New York City). Bailey also notes instances where Spanish and English lexical and semantic formations inform each other, and where Spanish syntactic elements shape English usage. In his

discussion of code-switching, he takes issue with Gumperz-style typological approaches, arguing that the important dynamics lie not in the surface forms of the switch but in their interactional functions, which are open-ended and recombinant. He builds his own approach on conversational analysis and ethnomethodological work, e.g. by Schegloff, Jefferson, Sacks, Auer, Goodwin, Heritage, and Atkinson. He pays attention to the ways in which deployment of the linguistic resources under discussion may be marked or unmarked for particular participants.

In his discussion of second-generation identity formation (chap. 4), Bailey details students' personal experiences of the sociohistorical processes through which the Providence Dominican-American community formed, and their perceptions of what white/nonwhite means (as distinct from what it means to their parents' generation). He details the axes along which Dominican-African American friendships form and the ways in which this is linguistically indexed; he then shows how specific though not identical Dominican identities are formed and linguistically enacted. Here he takes up the issue of social meaning arising in unmarked in-group switching, noting that although speakers may not impute intent to their code deployment, their usage does shape how others perceive them. Chap. 5 locates students' understanding of race in an intersection of racial classification in the Dominican Republic and in the United States. These understandings are drawn from student interviews about their own and their families' day-to-day perceptions and experiences of race. Chap. 6 follows one student through a day of classes, in which we see him interact with other students and a teacher. The material presented here shows how code deployment works as a discursive manifestation of relationships structured by role, gender, age, and ethnicity/race. In chap. 7, Bailey takes up the problem of linguistic and racial/ethnic variation within general parameters by comparing the six major participants with whom he worked, in order to demonstrate how the identity of each as Dominican can play out variably.

Bailey's analytical rhetoric sometimes obscures contributions made by previous analysts of U.S. Spanish/English situations. In contrasting what he sees as productive in his own approach to what he sees as unproductive in the work of others, he occasionally sets up "straw interlocutors." For example, he uses Zentella's classification of switch types as an example of insufficient attention to interactional dynamics, though he notes almost in passing that she does "recognize the significance of sequential context." She does more than that, in fact: She draws heavily on Goffman's work on footing, which is nothing if not interactional, but Bailey does not note that. Along the same lines, he has a tendency to downplay the degree to which prior ethnographies of U.S. Latino bilingualism try to account for the ways in which social action draws on multiple codes. Analysts in this field have been trying to do this for a quarter-century, and if they have had varying degrees of success, it is because there is so much to account for. Analysts have long tried to reconstruct social dimensions of speech acts, but accounting for outcomes is an indeterminate business. Participants' statements of illocutionary

intent are as much about cultural ideology as about causality, and perlocutionary outcomes depend on complexities of action to which no investigator has total access and of which no participant is completely conscious. Bailey is somewhat dismissive of cultural analyses as based on “one-(cultural)-size-fits-all,” but much cultural-linguistic analysis of code-switching and identity formation has sought to relate interactive discourse functions to variations on cultural themes, a point that Bailey passes by.

The strength and value of this book lie in the richness of ethnographic detail and interactional nuance it presents, in its recognition of the effects of generation, age, racial formation, class situation, and geopolitical location on linguistic identity enactment, in its demonstration of the fact that ethnic and racial identities are differentially played out, in its understanding of code-switching as interactional work, and in the ways it addresses the linkage between macro-level socio-historical processes that structure racial classification and micro-level interactional processes through which racial identities become part of one’s persona.

(Received 11 June, 2003)