Language in Society **31**, 277–306. Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017.S0047404501020188

REVIEWS

PENELOPE ECKERT, *Linguistic variation as social practice*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2000. Pp. xvi, 240. Hb $62.95, pb $28.95.

Reviewed by WILLIAM LABOV
Linguistics, University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6301
labov@central.cis.upenn.edu

The first quotation on the back cover of this book begins, "This long-awaited volume demonstrates that Eckert is *the* sociolinguist." Some people have expressed the view that this is an unusually strong statement. Since I wrote it myself, I am faced with the clear choice in this review of defending it or apologizing for it.

I will defend it. To be sure, this is a self-serving policy. Over the years, I have drawn heavily from Eckert's work and have incorporated many of her findings into my own reasoning about the nature of social stratification and the mechanism of linguistic change. If her results are not valid, or if they lack the importance I have attributed to them, I will have to rewrite much of my own work over the past ten years.

The defense is summarized by the balance of the quote that I supplied to the publisher: "No other student of language and society comes close to Eckert in providing social explanation for linguistic behavior and no other study has probed so deeply the social motivation of sound change. Eckert's unique combination of ethnographic practice and sophisticated quantitative analysis will be the target to emulate for many decades to come." The rest of this review may be read as a footnote on these two sentences. There will be some qualifications and criticisms, and a few downright disagreements, but they are footnotes to the footnotes.

The book is indeed long awaited: It is the synthesis of Eckert's ethnographic study of a suburban Detroit high school ("Belten High") in her 1989 book *Jocks and Burnouts*, and her analyses of linguistic change in progress within that school. Of her ten papers dealing with these sound changes from 1986 to 1995, only four appear in the bibliography of this volume, which effectively replaces them.

Chap. 2, "The social order of Belten High," is a concise and lucid summary of the 1989 social analysis. It introduces the reader to Eckert's basic insights into the polarity that governs social grouping in the high school: the Jocks who accept and participate in the adult-governed institutions of the school, vs. the Burnouts, who resist those institutional norms and strive to escape from them. It introduces readers to Eckert's special vocabulary ("the corporate structure of the school"). It also introduces them to Eckert's ethnographic techniques, with her powerful and convincing quantitative exposition of the use of space in the high school by Jocks and Burnouts, and social categorization by average jeans length. The reader could

© 2002 Cambridge University Press 0047-4045/02 $9.50

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502252185 Published online by Cambridge University Press

only wish that these quantitative studies had been treated in greater detail; fortunately, they are available elsewhere (Eckert 1980).

Eckert's third chapter is a vivid and entrancing view of her ethnographic method and what she did in Belten High. She takes issue with the "conventional wisdom" that schools are problematic sites for the study of the vernacular (p. 70; here meaning 'the basic style used among intimates'). The conventional wisdom, of course, holds true for work done within the classroom. Though Eckert spent several years in the hallways, cafeteria, courtyard, and surroundings of Belten High, she never actually entered a classroom. Eckert's techniques owe something to her personal history (she was deeply involved in the social structure of her own high school in Leonia, New Jersey); to her personal style (though some 20 years older, she appeared to the high school students as a slightly older version of themselves); and to her deep understanding of adolescents. She was thus able to capture their "impassioned discussions of teachers they hate, unfairness they have suffered, boredom they can't tolerate," with a depth and accuracy equal to the best studies carried out in local neighborhoods, far outside the school precincts.

This description of Eckert's methods brings home the painful fact that the use of the term "ethnographic" in sociolinguistic papers is more often than not a ludicrously inappropriate misuse of the term. Students of the speech community should be hesitant to talk about "ethnographic" methods until they have approximated Eckert's range of observation and analysis, and her commitment (though not stated explicitly here) to be on the scene every day in the school year.

A crucial problem of analytical method is developed in Chap. 4. Eckert used impressionistic scales to trace the progress of vowel shifts, and instead of setting up a quantitative index, she established a binary division into "extreme" and "non-extreme." This permitted her to use the logistic regression Varbrul program instead of multivariate analyses that employ quantitative input. Although a great deal of care was given to developing agreement between Eckert and the transcribers (Susan Blum, Jane Covert, Larry Diemer, Alison Edwards, and Becky Knack), no figures on reliability are given.

How reliable are these ratings? One way of answering this is to compare the Varbrul constraints on segmental factors, the topic of Chap. 4, with the regression analysis of a large body of data obtained by the Telsur project for the *Atlas of North American English* (ANAE). The left-hand side of Table 1 shows the Varbrul weights given by Eckert for the effect of a following consonant on the raising and fronting of /æ/. The relations of manner and place are independent, with a regular progression of place as velar > apical > labial, and of manner as nasal > voiced obstruent > voiceless obstruent > lateral. On the right-hand side, I present coefficients from a multiple regression analysis of the coda effects on F2 of /æ/ for the Telsur data, using exactly the same phonetic categories. The agreement between the relationships is remarkable: The only deviation is that, in the Telsur analysis, apical nasals have a stronger effect than velar nasals. These effects are almost entirely independent of dialect region, and also independent of social

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502252185 Published online by Cambridge University Press

TABLE 1. *Comparison of following segmental constraints on (æh) derived from Varbrul analysis of extreme values of 69 Detroit area high school students [N ~ 6000] and regression coefficients for F2 of 417 Telsur subjects [N = 15475].*

	Varbrul			Regression		
	PalVelar	Apical	Labial	PalVelar	Apical	Labial
Nasal	.927	.661	.597	202	**288**	239
Voiced obstruent	.805	.476	.370	69	40	−10
Voiceless obstruent	.542	.409	.251	−86	−25	−17
/L/	.172			−189		

factors. Consequently, the findings of Chap. 4 are independent of the rest of the book and have no consequences for Eckert's major argument. However, the value of Chap. 4 cannot be overstated, since the agreement that we find here leaves no doubt about the accuracy of the vowel ratings that are crucial to her social analysis in the chapters to follow.

The presentation in Chap. 5 of Eckert's main findings on the distribution of the linguistic variables in Belten High is clear, and it is good to have these results assembled here. The newest elements of the Northern Cities Shift (NCS), (e) and (ʌ), are correlated with social class (Burnouts leading Jocks), while the older elements (o) and (æ) appear to have lost most of their social class significance and are highly differentiated by gender. The relations of /æ/ and /o/ are not always so clear; this is understandable, given the recent ANAE finding that the area of short /o/ fronting extends considerably to the west of the raising of /æ/, instead of being nested within it as one would expect from a chain shift relation. Thus, the fronting of /o/, with its limited symbolic value, may be a precondition for the raising of /æ/ rather than a consequence of it. Similarly, the temporal ordering of (e) and (ʌ) are not yet well established. However, there is no doubt about the temporal ordering of these two pairs, and the intermediate position of (oh), the crucial elements in Eckert's reasoning.

The second half of Chap. 6 presents a wealth of data on four smaller studies in other schools, two closer to Detroit and two farther away. Here the patterns are not so clear, and the reader can easily be lost in a maze of irregularities and complexities, exacerbated by inadequate labeling and some downright errors in the figures. What does emerge is the generality of the NCS and the importance of the urban/suburban axis, with the Burnouts most strongly oriented to Detroit and the NCS. An even richer store of new material is found in the following chapter, in which Eckert ties the linguistic data to patterns of cruising along the roads that lead to and from the city center, and also to involvement or lack of involvement in school activities.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502252185 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Chap. 7 is at the center of the volume's main argument, a remarkable report on social networks in Belten High. Figure 7.1, a sociogram of several hundred girls, is divided into five clusters that exemplify the networks of Burned-out Burnouts, Burnouts, Jocks, and several types of In-Betweens. This is certainly one of the most substantial and most convincing tracings of social structure that one can find in the sociolinguistic literature. Eckert brings this structure to life with extensive and fascinating quotations from a wide range of high school students. These are coupled with elegant graphs that show the distribution of variables for the five clusters, and for a few "extreme" individuals. The discussion of extreme speakers leads us to a better understanding of the leaders of linguistic change, especially because some of them are not members of the polar groups, but In-Betweens. An unlabeled Table 7.1 of the eight most extreme speakers makes it difficult to follow the discussion; however, it is clear that the most flamboyant Burned-Out Burnouts are the leaders of linguistic change, and that female organization of social structure is much more tightly correlated with linguistic change than are male social relations, a conclusion that emerges from a number of other studies (Labov 2000). Perhaps most important is the fact that among the most extreme speakers are "brokers," members of the In-Between cluster who have extensive relations with members of other clusters and who specialize in the transmittal of information across local social boundaries. Eckert's portraits of these brokers are among the most vivid and insightful in the volume.

This book establishes four major findings that must influence any future research on linguistic change in progress:

(1) Social class is transformed in the high school setting to local forms characteristic of this institutional setting, with enough mobility to make class membership distinct from family background.

(2) Linguistic changes in progress are associated with two major categories, social class and gender; as changes develop, gender becomes more powerful than class.

(3) The most advanced and conservative linguistic patterns within this setting are used by those who display the most stereotypical features of both social categories.

(4) Individuals who have the highest degree of contact across social groups display the most extreme forms of individual variables.

Eckert's final chapter is devoted to more general questions of "Style, social meaning, and sound change." I cannot do justice to the careful reasoning and penetrating insights she brings to these questions, but among the points that demand further thought is the relation of her findings to the general mechanism of linguistic change. In my own efforts to understand linguistic change, I have been increasingly impressed with how little we do understand. We observe that in the heart of the great metropolis, linguistic changes advance steadily from one female age cohort to another. It is not yet clear how and why young girls advance

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502252185 Published online by Cambridge University Press

beyond the level of the older girls they take as models. Second, we observe that changes that must have originated in local groups spread to the outer limits of great cities, resulting in a remarkable geographical uniformity. The mechanism that brings this about is not yet clear. We also observe that change spreads outward from the great metropolis to smaller cities, but in a weaker rather than a stronger form. The machinery of this "cascade" pattern is still obscure.

Eckert is an extremely positive and clear-headed thinker on these questions; for her, they are not questions at all. In fact, there are no unanswered questions in this book. Her penultimate sentence is, "There is no mystery, therefore, to how linguistic change spreads systematically from urban centers, and there is no mystery to how each age cohort engages in this process of spread in a seamless fashion" (228). I find this optimism encouraging, and I wish that I could share in it. Eckert's final sentence completes the argument: "The social meaning of variation is built into the very means by which individual speakers are connected to their closest friends on the one hand, and the most abstract level of social organization on the other" (228).

This encapsulates the major ideological position of the book – and perhaps the only one with which I am in disagreement. It continues the argument of Chap. 1 that emphasizes the role of the individual as an "active agent" who is continually constructing "social meaning." To me, this stress on the role of individuals is problematic. I do not believe that it is Eckert's intention to return us to the focus on the individual that was the cornerstone of Paul's philosophy of language, or to reinstall the primacy of the idiolect that was the major target of the critique of Weinreich et al. 1968. In one sense, we all agree that sociolinguistics takes the individual as primary, because we begin with the observation and recording of individual speakers, not with general impressions of how people speak. At the same time, we all join in recognizing the fundamental dogma of sociolinguistics: that the language of individuals cannot be understood apart from the speech communities of which they are members. We recognize that the individual, as a linguistic object, is the intersection of all the social groups in which he or she has participated. The issue in dispute seems to center on how consciously and actively individual speakers participate in and influence the course of language change. I am particularly concerned here with the development of large-scale changes in linguistic structure, like the Northern Cities Shift.

First, we observe that no matter where and how the NCS enters a city, it quickly becomes characteristic of the city as a whole. Eckert suggests that Burn-outs may be the major agents of such geographic uniformity, since they are oriented to urban life in general, while Jocks are oriented to local institutions. But it is hard to see how changes can percolate upward in the social system through such agents, who are committed to practices that inhibit social mobility. It follows that the principal agents of uniformity must be those In-betweens who retain Burn-out symbols of nonconformity but adopt Jock attitudes toward institutional success and upward social mobility. In my own analysis of the dynamics of change in

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502252185 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Philadelphia (2000), I have drawn on Eckert's findings to help identify the individuals who appear to act as leaders of linguistic change for the wider community.

Unfortunately, the great metropolis is still too small a unit to account for the progress of linguistic change. As the results of the *Atlas of North American English* emerge, Eckert's work on the NCS begins to appear in a new and larger setting. The community of local practice that she has studied in the Detroit suburbs moves in parallel with 32 million other people, across a territory of 88,000 square miles of the Inland North. The validity of Eckert's findings, then, depends on the generality of her structural analysis of the high school. If we set aside variations in local terminology, it seems to me that this analysis will hold for a wide range of high schools within the white community, the community affected by the NCS.

It also follows that the "social meaning" that is attributed to the NCS must be quite general. Eckert is well aware of this problem. Her remarks on p. 223 imply that such a general social meaning may be "urban." Such an association could be common to cities as diverse as Milwaukee, Chicago, Detroit, and Rochester. Since, in the course of history, most innovations, linguistic and nonlinguistic, have spread from the largest cities, this would subsume the study of linguistic change under the larger question of how and why people adopt urban practices; for the Southern Shift, the question would be reversed. It is also possible, however, that Eckert's original selection of the social meaning "local" may apply generally throughout the Inland North. We have seen that speakers in Rochester have no idea that Syracuse has a dialect identical to theirs, and the equivalence of Buffalo and Chicago vowel structures is a secret hidden from everyone. Thus, the DELUSION OF LOCALITY may operate to produce a uniform result across vast regions.

Though Eckert does not rule out unconscious or covert values, much of her discussion of the negotiation of social meaning implies a conscious as well as active agent. However, conscious negotiation cannot apply to the NCS. In experiments on cross-dialectal comprehension, we have not found speakers, in or out of the Inland North, who can recognize the Inland North dialect (Labov 1989). The self-consciousness that New Yorkers display toward their sociolinguistic variables is missing: Indeed, most participants in the NCS shift to more advanced forms when they read a word list. On p. 12, Eckert cites an anecdote about her nephew, who could imitate the New York City dialect of Jersey City. This is far from typical of the Inland North; we find one person in a thousand who recognizes the nature of the NCS or can reproduce it. To demonstrate the existence of social meaning for the NCS, we will need to devise matched guise experiments that tap values well below the level of consciousness.

Eckert provides convincing evidence that individual variations in the mean backing of (e) or fronting of (o) reflect the speaker's social position in subtle and fascinating ways. In Chap. 6, however, she also recognizes that "the most robust social resources . . . are the most subject to conscious control." Negative concord and (ay) raising are featured most strongly in the sociolinguistic correlations,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502252185 Published online by Cambridge University Press

while "vowels that are part of the chain shift may be more limited in their availability for symbolic deployment" (170). Thus, elements of the NCS are locked into structural relations that insulate them from social pressures. (See in this connection the important finding of Scherre & Naro 1992, that subject–verb agreement in Brazilian Portuguese does not respond to educational pressures unless the tokens occur as isolated elements in discourse.) It is not surprising, then, to find that the regression coefficients for social dimensions (age, city size) are about one-tenth the size of the coefficients for internal constraints.

In order to show that speakers make use of the NCS to negotiate their social positions, Eckert would have to draw from recordings of individuals in social interaction with their peers, and show that shifts of individual vowel productions are predictable from the social situation, much as Friedrich 1966 showed us the shifting of pronominal forms in Russian novels. We know that this happens with negative concord, but we have no evidence of immediate response to the social situation in the sound changes of Philadelphia (Hindle 1980). The quotations from Eckert's interviews contain many tokens of NCS variables, but none are tagged with the phonetic forms that would show how speakers make use of these variables in interaction with the interviewer. Rather, Eckert links social stance with differences in the overall frequency of advanced and conservative forms that mark the individual.

I believe that some of the driving energy behind the continual renewal of linguistic change may be derived from social interaction, but we are far from demonstrating this as a fact. Imagine that our speakers were swimmers in an offshore current – some doing freestyle, others the backstroke, some moving with the current, others moving against it. We would not want to say that their individual movements are the CAUSES of the current. The great chain shifts sweeping across North America are more like ocean currents than local games. They spread with irresistible force across the Inland North, constrained primarily by the physical and cognitive factors embodied in the general principles of chain shifting. As we noted above, they are only slightly modified by social factors within their territory. But these currents are arrested abruptly as they reach the 150-year-old social boundaries like the North/Midland line. In some way that we do not yet understand, these large-scale sound changes are simultaneously governed by physical, cognitive, and social factors.

Eckert has provided us with an array of priceless information on the local social matrix in which change takes place. If we are not ready to answer every question that might be posed about linguistic change, the first step is to master the rich store of information and insight that she has given us, and to plan our future research with this in mind.

REFERENCES

Eckert, Penelope (1980). Clothing and geography in a suburban high school. *Michigan Discussions in Anthropology* 6:45–8. Repr. in Conrad P. Kottak (ed.), *Researching American Culture*, 139–44. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502252185 Published online by Cambridge University Press

_____ (1989). *Jocks and Burnouts: Social categories and identity in the high school*. New York: Teachers College Press.
Friedrich, Paul (1966). The linguistic reflex of social change from Tsarist to Soviet Russian kinship. *Sociological Inquiry* 36:159–85.
Hindle, Donald (1980). The social and structural conditioning of phonetic variation. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.
Labov, William (1989). The limitations of context. *Chicago Linguistic Society* 25, part 2, 171–200.
_____ (2000). *Principles of linguistic change. Volume 2: Social factors*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Scherre, Maria Marta, & Naro, Anthony J. (1992). The serial effect on internal and external variables. *Language Variation and Change* 4:1–13.
Weinreich, Uriel; Labov, William; & Herzog, Marvin I. (1968). Empirical foundations for a theory of language change. In W. P. Lehman & Y. Malkiel (eds.), *Directions for historical linguistics*, 95–188. Austin: University of Texas Press.

(Received 30 August 2001)

PAUL V. KROSKRITY (ed.), *Regimes of language: Ideologies, polities, and identities* (School of American Research Advanced Seminar Series). Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press; Oxford: James Currey, 2000. Pp. x, 411. Hb $60.00, pb $24.95.

Reviewed by TALBOT J. TAYLOR
English and Linguistics, College of William and Mary
Williamsburg, VA 23187
txtayl@wm.edu

An important addition to the growing literature on language ideology, this volume is the fruit of an advanced seminar held in Santa Fe in 1994 at the School of American Research. The seminar brought together some of the leading scholars in language ideology research: Richard Bauman, Charles Briggs, Joseph Errington, Susan Gal, Jane Hill, Judith Irvine, Paul Kroskrity, Susan Philips, Bambi Schieffelin, and Michael Silverstein. *Regimes of language* consists of revised versions of the papers presented at the seminar.

One should not think, however, that this volume reads as a disparate collection of conference pieces. On the contrary, the volume has been exceedingly well planned and put together. All the chapters keep to a well-defined topical focus; the sociocultural importance of language ideologies, and in particular, the role of language ideologies in the "imaginative" construction of political (especially national) identities. Language ideologies, according to Silverstein's definition (1979:193), are "sets of beliefs about language articulated by users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use." However, although its nine chapters converge on this single topical focus, one of the volume's most compelling characteristics is that the chapters approach this topic in a variety of ways, applying different discursive methodologies to different kinds of material and data. Some chapters present micro-analyses of the language-ideological features of concrete examples of ethnographic material, while others argue for language-ideological reinterpretations of particular anthropological, linguistic, or philosophical texts. All are of the very highest quality. The result is

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502252185 Published online by Cambridge University Press

an incisive, authoritative, yet multi-perpectival account of the powerful effects of language ideologies on the cultural and political imagination. Anyone interested in finding out about language ideology, and why it has attracted so much scholarly attention in the past decade or so, could not do better than to read the articles in this volume.

The volume begins with a helpful introduction by the editor, Paul Kroskrity. In addition to orienting the reader to the book's overall goals and layout, Kroskrity articulates the collective desire of the contributors to "demonstrate the relevance of [linguistic anthropological] expertise in the linkage of microcultural worlds of language and discourse to macrosocial forces" (p. 2). The assumption underlying all the chapters is that language ideology is a primary tool in effecting this linkage. If one has the Goffmanian goal of illuminating the ways in which acts of language both manifest macrosocial structures and serve to construct and maintain those structures, one should look closely at how language users themselves make sense of what goes on in their verbal interactions – what types of acts and events THEY see as occurring, and the social functions THEY take those acts and events to have. If the language user's own, ideologically constructed understanding of the linkage between the discursive-interactional and the macrosocial is not made a primary site of investigation, the source and characteristics of that linkage will remain invisible. However, the important role in this process of language ideologies – and of their expression in reflexive discourse – has long been obscured because, as Kroskrity explains in the introduction (and Silverstein in his chapter), one of the foundational assumptions of modern linguistics and linguistic anthropology has been that language ideologies are merely forms of "secondary rationalization," and that, as such, they are a manifestation of something like a "linguistic false consciousness" that serious investigators would do better to ignore. It is interesting that, even though this kind of patronizing attitude toward the locals' own reflexive understandings of what they do and why they do it has long since been rejected in cultural anthropology, it has only recently lost its authority in linguistic anthropology, thanks to the pioneering work of Dell Hymes, followed by that of the contributors to this volume. As for "linguistics proper," an interest in "folk linguistics" is still regarded as an eccentric and scientifically irrelevant way to use one's research time and money. More's the pity.

Two of the chapters that most enthralled me – those by Irvine & Gal and by Schieffelin – examine the effects of contact between different language ideologies. The Irvine & Gal chapter, "Language ideology and linguistic differentiation," is a powerful addition to the work that the authors, both singly and jointly, have been producing on the role of language ideologies in constructing perceptions of social, ethnic, and national difference. Their article here is a perceptive and well-supported analysis of the influence of European language ideology on early accounts of multilingualism in Africa and in the Balkans. (My use here of the descriptive – but fundamentally misleading – term "multilingualism" is evidence of how hard it is to avoid the ideological constructs of linguistic Eurocen-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502252185 Published online by Cambridge University Press

trism in academic discourse.) The excellent chapter by Schieffelin examines the process and consequences of the introduction of literacy to the Kaluli in New Guinea, using this illustrative example as a means of addressing the question "How do speakers in societies with language ideologies based on oral traditions respond to the introduction of language ideologies based on literate ones?" (293). It is an important contribution to the burgeoning field of literacy studies, as well as to that of language ideology.

Another chapter that drew my particular attention is that by Bauman & Briggs. They look at the language ideologies informing two classic positions in Western philosophy of language: the linguistic empiricism inaugurated by John Locke in his 1690 *Essay concerning human understanding*, and the Romantic linguistics propounded in the influential writings of Johann Gottfried Herder. The linguistic thought of each of these two important figures is typically represented and studied as a decontextualized system of ideas. The standard historiographical perspective on each of these systems of ideas is to treat its cogency and significance as a matter exclusively of its truth – that is, of its representational correspondence to the linguistic facts at issue, to "how things really are." Bauman & Briggs, however, approach the writings of Locke and Herder differently; not as decontextualized systems of ideas, but as forms of metadiscursive practice – that is, as language ideology put into action as a means of regulating the production and interpretation of discourse itself (142). Similarly, one might look at the literary-critical interpretation of a particular text (e.g., Jane Austen's *Emma*) as a form of metadiscourse; that is, one might look at the ways in which that authoritative interpretation affects not only how readers read *Emma*, but also how they themselves write the texts that they subsequently produce. Accordingly, Bauman & Briggs examine how the ideologically informed metadiscourses of Locke and Herder manifest the normative intention of influencing the ways in which their readers see, evaluate, interpret, and produce instances of discourse. This approach to the analysis of philosophical texts is well captured in their dictum "Philosophy *is* language ideology" (202).

Their chapter focuses on a significant contrast between the different language ideologies informing the metadiscourses of Locke and Herder. Locke urges the "suppression of the indexical" characteristics of language (150), including such matters as who is producing the discourse, who is receiving it, what their relative status is, in what circumstances the discourse is occurring, and the connections it is taken to have to other instances of discourse – that is, those very characteristics whose exploitation in rhetoric is condemned so vehemently by Locke. Herder, in contrast, urges the recognition of what he takes to be language's ESSENTIAL indexicality and social grounding. In particular, Herder promotes the valorization of tradition and the celebration of the the associational principles of indexicality and intertextuality "as constitutive of culture" (196) and as a means of "giving voice to the national spirit" (198). In spite of this fundamental contrast, however, both Locke and Herder favor an elitist metadiscursive order, based on the rejec-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502252185 Published online by Cambridge University Press

tion of the "folk" metalinguistic understanding of the uncultivated masses and on the promotion of the rational metadiscourse of the educated elite.

Regrettably, there is not sufficient space in this review to discuss every chapter of this admirable volume; however, at least some indication of their contents must be given. Silverstein marries a reinterpretation of the linguistic relativism of Benjamin Lee Whorf with the analysis of political nationalism put forward in Benedict Anderson's *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism* (1991). Several of the chapters include some discussion of Anderson's book, which suggests that it was one of the ideas inspiring the original SAR seminar. One such chapter is by Errington, who examines the ideological role played by discourse about a standard Indonesian language in the politics of nationalism in Indonesia. Philips looks at the promotion of a Tongan nationalist ideal by means of the ideologically informed metadiscourse occurring in a Tongan courtroom. Hill reveals a telling contrast between "the discourse of truth" and "the discourse of theater" in the metadiscourse of journalists writing about George Bush's notorious "Read my lips" remark in the 1988 presidential campaign. Kroskrity's own chapter analyzes the language ideology underlying the ethnographic accounts of the Arizona Tewa published in the 1950s and 1960s by the "native" anthropologist Paul Dozier. The contrast that Kroskrity identifies – between the Tewa's own language ideology and the professional ideology informing Dozier's writings – is an excellent example of the danger for linguists and anthropologists of peripheralizing the reflexive "folk" ideologies of a language community and, in their place, imposing the elitist, "scientific," culturally neutral/neutered ideology of the language professional.

The School of American Research Press, the editor, and his co-contributors are to be congratulated on the quality of both this volume's contents and its production. Perhaps only a very small, academically focused press such as the SAR could – or would even want to – devote the amount of time and care to the production of a single book that this volume has clearly received. At the same time, one cannot help but wonder whether the SAR Press will be able to market the book as effectively as could a larger publishing house. This book richly deserves to be read and studied by a wide audience of anthropologists, linguists, rhetoricians, sociologists, cultural theorists, and political scientists. It has the potential to make a large contribution to the development of a more reflexively aware and culturally-focused field of language study, but only if its potential audience hears about it, acquires it, and reads it. Perhaps the readers of this review will help to get the necessary word-of-mouth going.

REFERENCES

Anderson, Benedict R. (1991). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. 2d ed. London: Verso.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502252185 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Silverstein, Michael. (1979). Language structure and linguistic ideology. In Paul R. Clyne et al. (eds.), In *The elements: A parasession on linguistic units and levels*, 193–247. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

(Received 13 July 2001)

THOMAS RICENTO (ed.), *Ideology, politics and language policies: Focus on English*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2000. Pp. 193 + index. Pb $29.95.

Reviewed by TARIQ RAHMAN
Linguistics and South Asian Studies, Quaid-i-Azam University
Islamabad 45320, Pakistan
trahman@sat.net.pk

This book is an outcome of a colloquium, held in 1997, on ideology and language policies with special focus on English. There are nine chapters, with a lucid introduction by Ricento and a bibliography at the end. Ricento also contributes a chapter on the theoretical aspects of language planning and policy. The other chapters touch on language policies in Australia (Helen Moore); colonial language policies (Chaps. 3 and 7, by Alastair Pennycook); language ideologies in the US (Terrence G.Wiley); linguistic imperialism with reference to English (Robert Phillipson); and policies and the role of English in Sri Lanka (Suresh Canagurajah), North India (Selma K. Sonntag), and South Africa (Stanly G. M. Ridge).

In his theoretical essay, Ricento proposes a useful classification of the literature on language policy and planning (LPP) – earlier scholars often did not often distinguish between planning and policy, and some used LP (language planning) for both (as in Cooper 1989) – under three subheadings: the macro sociopolitical, the epistemological, and the strategic. The first refers to events such as the formation or disintegration of states; the second to paradigms of knowledge such as postmodernism; and the third to reasons for research, such as supporting or finding fault with specific language policies (e.g., the use of English as a language for the elite in former colonies of Britain). This classification is useful in providing labels for research in LPP. Ricento has given a brief and interesting account of the way LPP research has followed a certain pattern since the 1960s.

Another useful classification is offered by Pennycook (Chap. 7). He views the notion of ideology in relation to six frameworks for understanding the global role of English. These are colonial celebration (English brings all the advantages of a rich, sophisticated, modern language); laissez-faire liberalism (everyone should have the choice to use English as well as other languages in different domains); language ecology (all languages should be preserved, and the spread of English threatens this); linguistic imperialism (English is dominant because of the power of English-using countries and their institutions); language rights (the use of one's language is a fundamental right, and English threatens it, as Skutnabb-Kangas 2000 argues); and postcolonial performativity (English should be seen in

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502252185 Published online by Cambridge University Press

particular contexts to understand how it is used and who is empowered by this use). This classification is useful for understanding not only the ideological and political consequences of the spread of English in the world, but also the assumptions different analysts have brought to their analyses of this spread. The postcolonial performativity model, in my opinion, is an especially powerful tool for understanding English in many former colonies of Europe.

A large part of the book is concerned with the former colonies, so let us deal with them first. Pennycook (Chap. 4) takes the cases of language policies in India, Malaya, and Hong Kong. He makes the important point, in keeping with his theory of postcolonial performativity, that one cannot equate multiculturalism with the liberal-leftist position and a pro-English stance with linguistic imperialism. One would have to understand language policies with reference to the crucial question of who they empower, and with what consequences. This is a point worth remembering; Canagarajah tells us that, in Sri Lanka, English can bring pluralistic and democratic values, whereas the Tamil chauvinists are interested in forcing Tamil on everyone they control. Thus, it may be possible to acquire and use English on one's own terms. Sonntag suggests similar possibilities in regard to North India in the course of an informative analysis of subaltern and Hindu-ideological political forces. In South Africa, Ridge tells us that English, though dominant in the sense that it is used for "high functions," tends "more and more to a dynamic hybridity" (p. 170).

The book does not mention a number of other former colonies, but I can add that, as far as Pakistan is concerned, English does favor the Westernized elite at present (Rahman 1996, Ch. 13). However, it also exposes Pakistanis to the liberal, democratic ideologies without which Pakistan would be in danger of becoming more rigidly fundamentalist, like the Taliban of Afghanistan. This is a point that is easy to ignore from the perspective of linguistic imperialism, as I note in Rahman 2001. In short, while simplistic analytical frameworks may be misleading in different contexts, it may be useful to suggest that power should be the focal analytical category. English is generally empowering for those whose mother tongue it is (as Phillipson points out correctly in Chap. 6), but in certain contexts this power may be countered only by appropriating it rather than by remaining ignorant of it. Thus, while the colonial (and contemporary) policy of teaching English very competently to the elite in South Asia may be resisted, it may be harmful to insist on not teaching English to anyone at all. If English is banished, the elite will continue to be exposed to it through the media and send their children abroad to learn it as well. Those who cannot afford either will be ghettoized and barred from lucrative employment worldwide. A more just policy might be to try to teach English to all children equally, while abolishing elitist English-medium schools.

What makes one react to English, however, is clear enough. In addition to the excellent work of Phillipson and Pennycook, Wiley makes it clear that, in the US, social, educational, and economic pressures operate in such ways that freedom of

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502252185 Published online by Cambridge University Press

linguistic choice is denied in practice, and non-English-speakers learn English and assimilate to English-speaking American society or remain powerless. For Australia, two language policies are analyzed, one pluralist and the other nationalist (with a focus on English). The latter, it is argued, was supported by powerful elite groups. In both the US and Australia, power can be fruitfully used as an insightful analytical device.

In summary, this book provides some useful theoretical insights as well as empirical data. However, although some of the classificatory models and theoretical frameworks are very useful, a coherent model using the concept of power as the main focus might have provided a more incisive analytical device. As for the empirical data, I find the omission of data from Pakistan, Nigeria, Kenya, and Bangladesh somewhat disappointing. Such data might not have changed the major conclusions, but their omission creates a sense of incompleteness. I also find the polemical criticism of Cooper's work (Chap. 3) rather excessive and not actually required in the context of the arguments advanced in the chapter. As for the bibliography, the omissions in it are those pertaining to the former colonies mentioned above; apart from that, it is up to date. On the whole, the book is a useful contribution to understanding the relationship between language and power.

REFERENCES

Cooper, Robert L. (1989). *Language planning and social change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rahman, Tariq (1996). *Language and politics in Pakistan*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.

_____ (2001). English-teaching institutions in Pakistan. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 22.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2000). *Linguistic genocide in education – or worldwide diversity and human rights*? Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

(Received 5 September 2001)

ISHTLA SINGH, *Pidgins and creoles: An introduction*. London: Arnold, 2000. Pp. xv, 142. Pb. £12.99.

Reviewed by ANDREI A. AVRAM
Department of English, University of Bucharest
Bucharest, str. Pitar Moş 7-13, sector 1
ala@pcnet.pcnet.ro

Recent years have witnessed an increased interest in pidgin and creole languages. One consequence of this is the growing demand for introductory textbooks. Singh's book joins similar introductions by, among others, Arends, Muysken & Smith 1995, Mühlhäusler 1997, and Sebba 1997.

In Chap. 1, "Definitions" (pp. 1–36), Singh introduces and defines a number of key concepts in pidgin and creole linguistics and places the study of pidgin and

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502252185 Published online by Cambridge University Press

creole languages within the context of linguistic theory. In particular, the author underscores the impact of the study of pidgins and creoles on historical linguistics and on theories of first-language acquisition and of second-language learning. A number of remarks and corrections are in order here. It is not Russian Russenorsk speakers who "would . . . reduce Norwegian consonant clusters in accordance with Russian phonotactic rules" in *mnogo li* 'many', which thus becomes *nogoli* (p. 3). Quite the contrary: The cluster /mn/ in Russian *mnogo li* is reduced by Norwegian speakers of Russenorsk. Singh claims (7) that what she calls "multifunctional terms" are incorporated in the expansion phase of pidgins. Multifunctionality is actually rather typical of jargons (Mühlhäusler 1986:146) – that is, of the earliest stages of pidgins. Singh contrasts Berbice Creole Dutch and Barbadian and writes that the latter "does not show . . . heavy substratal influence" (11). Although this is certainly true of the modern variety, early Barbadian did exhibit quite a number of such features (Fields 1995, Rickford & Handler 1994). Surprisingly, the author also states that "creoles may share certain fundamental characteristics that categorize them as a language type" (12), although most creolists would agree that creoles should not be defined on typological grounds but rather in terms of the sociolinguistic history conducive to their emergence. Singh further writes that "Moravian missionaries attempted to convert slaves on the island of Saint Thomas and in Suriname by using the latter's Dutch-lexifier creole" (14). In fact, the missionaries used Negerhollands, a Dutch-based creole, in Saint Thomas, but Sranan and Saramaccan, both English-based creoles, in Suriname. Finally, Old Norse was not a "related dialect" of Old English (23), but rather a language related to the latter.

Chap. 2, "*Once long ago, not too long ago*: Theories of genesis" (37–68), is an overview of some of the theories of creole genesis. The theories discussed are foreigner talk theory, the imperfect L2 learning hypothesis, nautical jargon theory, monogenesis, and, in particular, the language bioprogram hypothesis. No mention is made, however, of more recent approaches to creole genesis, such as the gradualist model of creolization (Arends 1993; see also Arends & Bruyn 1995), the creativist model (Baker 1990, 1994, 1995, 1997), and the fifty-year/three-generation language shift (Corne 1994). Let me also note, in passing, that Nicaragua is certainly not an island (60 and 62)!

In Chap. 3, "*An' den de news spread across de lan'*: The creole continuum" (69–89), the author first discusses topics such as basilect, mesolect, and acrolect, decreolization, implicational hierarchy, and implicational scaling; she then reviews the controversies focusing on the discrete or nondiscrete nature of the creole continuum, as well as on the unidimensional or multidimensional models of the creole continuum. Three brief remarks are in order here. It is not the case that "the mixtures present in mesolects are CAUSED by an IMPLICATIONAL HIERARCHY" (71; emphasis added). The vowel in *hang* is /æ/, not /a/ (75). Finally, it is not clear why the " 'horizontal' axis between careful and casual speech" is also said to be "theoretical" (83).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502252185 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Chap. 4, "*Crick crack, monkey break 'e back for a piece of pommerac*: Language planning" (90–118), deals with issues of corpus and status planning in the case of creoles, such as their use in education and their codification. It also includes an interesting case study on language planning in Trinidad. However, given that the book is so short, this chapter could have done without the rather lengthy discussions of language shift in Oberwart (70–71) and of the revival of Hebrew (92–94). Also, the "Russian republics" referred to on p. 94 were in fact Soviet republics. Finally, (French) Guiana is not an island (98).

The Appendix (119–123) consists of two texts in Trinidadian Creole English, dating from the first half of the 19th century. Regrettably and inexplicably, the texts are not accompanied by any analysis or even by explanatory notes. No translation is offered, nor are there any glosses of the less transparent words or of those that are not of English origin. The nonspecialist reader will be consequently put off by grammatical features such as the use of *say* as a complementizer, or by lexical items such as *kick-e-re-boo* 'to die'.

Some of the terms used in the book are defined and explained in the Glossary (124–129). Let me point out a number of errors. On p. 124, [hanbag] should be [hænbæg] and ⟨*hambag*⟩ should be [hæmbæg]. There is no alternate form *savvy* for the verb *save* in Tok Pisin (126). The term *synchronic* cannot be defined as referring only to "the study of language variation at a particular point in time" (129). Finally, it is not clear why it is only the abbreviation *TEC*, for "Trinidad's English-lexifier Creole" (129), that is listed, even though the author uses abbreviations for other creoles as well.

Let me note other shortcomings of Singh's book as a whole. As a general introduction to pidgins and creoles, it fails to provide a balanced treatment of these languages, since it deals mostly with English-based pidgins and creoles, in particular the Caribbean ones. It is also surprising that the author chooses not to discuss a number of important topics. Thus, there is no systematic discussion of phonology, except for brief remarks on such topics as the preference for CVCV syllable structure and the lack of tonal distinctions in pidgins (31). The only morphological and syntactic features presented – very briefly – are those identifed in Bickerton 1981 in support of his language bioprogram hypothesis. In a recurring and annoying pattern, Singh resorts all too often to lengthy quotations, some of them of almost half a page, from Mühlhäusler 1986, Holm 1988, Arends, Muysken & Smith 1995, Sebba 1997, and other sources. Moreover, on occasion, such quotations are superfluous. Clearly there was no need to quote from an introduction to pidgins and creoles (Arends, Muysken & Smith 1995:65) the following: "Since the end of the Second World War, a world wide process of decolonization has taken place' (96). Equally annoying, opinions, statements, definitions, and so on appear sometimes to be erroneously attributed to the authors referred to. This is especially true of Sebba, from whose 1997 book Singh quotes extensively. Occasionally, an author quoted is misunderstood. See, for instance, the explanation of Russenorsk *nogoli* (3), discussed above: The reader

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502252185 Published online by Cambridge University Press

is referred to Holm (1988:623–624), where the analysis is the correct one. Reference is too frequently made, in addition, to works not directly consulted by the author but cited in other sources.

There are quite a few typographical errors and inadvertencies. Russenorsk *I* 'and' (2) should be *i*. The Russenorsk preposition is *po*, not *pa*, and Russenorsk *tuoja* should read *tvoja* (3). *Superstrata* (25) should be *substrata*. The examples quoted (four on 56, four on 57, and five on 58) from the work referred to as Bickerton 1986 are in fact from Bickerton 1981. The Haitian Creole form *pwaso* 'fish' (58) should be *pwasô*. *Sandanistas* and *Sandanista* (60) should be *Sandinistas*, *Sandinista*. *Veenstra* is mispelled as *Veestra* (64). On p. 68, Crowley 1991 is in fact Crowley 1990. Bloomfield 1933, referred to on p. 80, is not listed in the bibliography. *Washabaugh* is mispelled as *Washabuagh* (83), and *Guyane* (98) should be *Guiana*.

The Bibliography (130–136) is also marred by a number of errors, too numerous to list here. I wish I could recommend this book, but it is a disappointment in too many respects.

REFERENCES

Arends, Jacques (1993). Towards a gradualist model of creolization. In Francis Byrne and John Holm (eds.), *Atlantic meets Pacific: A global view of pidginization and creolization*, 371–79. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

_____, and Bruyn, Adrienne (1995). Gradualist and developmental hypotheses. In Arends, Muysken & Smith (eds.), 111–20.

_____; Muysken, Pieter; & Smith, Norval (1995) (eds.). *Pidgins and creoles: An introduction*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Baker, Philip (1990). Off target? *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 5:107–19.

_____ (1994). Creativity in creole genesis. In Danny Adone and Ingo Plag (eds.), *Creolization and language change*, 65–84. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.

_____ (1995). Motivation in creole genesis. In Philip Baker (ed.), *From contact to Creole and beyond*, 3–15. London: University of Westminster Press.

_____ (1997). Directionality in pidginization and creolization. In Arthur K. Spears and Donald Winford (eds.), *The structure and status of pidgins and creoles*, 91–109. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Bickerton, Derek (1981). *Roots of language*. Ann Arbor: Karoma.

Corne, Chris (1994). Relativization and thematization in Tayo and the implications for creole genesis. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 9:283–304.

Fields, Linda (1995). Early Bajan: Creole or non-creole? In Jacques Arends (ed.), *The early stages of creolization*, 89–111. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Holm, John (1988). *Pidgins and creoles*, vol. 1, *Theory and structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mühlhäusler, Peter (1986). *Pidgin and creole linguistics*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

_____ (1997). *Pidgin and creole linguistics*. Expanded and revised edition. London: University of Westminster Press.

Rickford, John R., & Handler, J. S. (1994). Textual evidence on the nature of early Barbadian speech, 1676–1835. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 9:221–55.

Sebba, Mark (1997). *Contact languages: Pidgins and creoles*. London: Macmillan.

(Received 30 March 2001)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502252185 Published online by Cambridge University Press

MARVIN HERZOG (ed.-in-chief), *The language and culture atlas of Ashkenazic Jewry*. Vol. 3, *The Eastern Yiddish – Western Yiddish continuum*. Tübingen and New York: Max Niemeyer, 2000. Pp. x, 378; *8 (Yiddish pagination). Hb DM 486.

Reviewed by PAUL WEXLER
Linguistics, Tel-Aviv University
Tel-Aviv, Israel 69978
wexlerpaul@hotmail.com

When the Yiddish atlas project was initiated in the late 1950s by Uriel Weinreich, the prevailing view was that Yiddish was born in the Rhineland in the 9th and 10th centuries when French and Italian Jews adopted and adapted German; it then expanded to the Judeo-Italian settlement in Bavaria and reached monolingual Slavic territory in the 13th century. This third volume (volumes 1–2, 1992, 1995), subtitled *The Eastern Yiddish – Western Yiddish continuum*, is predicated on the belief that Eastern Yiddish (spoken in central and eastern Europe) is a "colonial" offshoot of Western Yiddish, remnants of which survive in Holland, Alsace, and Switzerland. The 148 linguistic and cultural maps permit the exploration of many questions – including the continuum hypothesis itself; paradoxically, considerable data here seem to disconfirm the hypothesis. The occasional commentary, though not customary in most atlases, is very welcome, though more could have been presented, given the blank space on many pages.

Herzog has worked on the atlas for over four decades and is committed to the traditional theory of Yiddish genesis. However, the Rhineland origin has recently been discarded in favor of a single genesis along the Danube (see King 1987, elaborating on Mieses 1924). I also agreed, in two preliminary studies (1991, 1993), that Yiddish was born in the East, but as a dialect of Sorbian that became "relexified" to High German between the 9th and 12th centuries (presently, I posit a second act of relexification in the 15th century to Sorbian Yiddish and High German by the Slavic-speaking descendants of Khazar Jews in the Kiev-Polessian dialect area [now North Ukrainian and South Belarusian]; see Wexler (in press)). Unfortunately, the editors ignore the "Danube only" hypothesis altogether and dismiss the "Yiddish-as-Slavic" hypothesis with a single sarcastic comment (p. 3, fn. 2). The evidence for relexification is threefold: (i) The source of the lexicon differs from that of the grammar and phonology (in Yiddish, German appears only in the lexicon). (ii) The superstratal relexifier language, here German, provides only phonetic strings, while the substratum, Slavic, provides the semantic, morphological, and derivational parameters (see Horvath & Wexler 1997). (iii) It follows from (ii) that, by comparing the Slavic substrata and the German superstratum, we can predict which German elements Yiddish is likely to accept; blocked Germanisms will be replaced by Hebrew and Slavic. Using a corpus of some 3500 German words, I made predictions about Yiddish receptivity; my predictions were confirmed 95% of the time by U. Weinreich 1968.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502252185 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The editors should have exploited the data not just to ILLUSTRATE but to TEST the very postulates of the continuum model (which, incidentally, needs more elaboration in the introductions) and competing models of Yiddish genesis. The atlas provides support for (i) the view that the linguistic, and often also cultural, divide between Western and Eastern Yiddish lay farther to the west than is generally accepted, which suggests different origins for some Western Yiddish and other Western–Eastern Yiddish dialects, rather than a "continuum", as well as (ii) the hypothesis of relexification from Slavic. The atlas cites Lowenstein's (1997) observation (33–34) that the internal Western Yiddish division is less important linguistically (but more so culturally) than the present-day Eastern–Western Yiddish linguistic border. On the latter, Herzog mentions Manaster Ramer 1997 and Manaster Ramer & Wolf 1997, but not the relevant and earlier Katz 1991, 1993, Wexler 1991, 1993, 1995.

The belief in an Eastern–Western Yiddish continuum is fueled by two misconceptions: (i) All Yiddish dialects are Germanic in origin; and (ii) "[Yiddish] and its associated folk-culture reflect the historical continuity of Ashkenaz . . . Thus, the atlas include[s] only those western data that lend themselves to mapping alongside comparable [Eastern Yiddish] materials. The materials . . . thus begin to uncover the linguistic unity of Ashkenaz, lost to us after some thousand years of existence" (9; why "lost"?). At its areal peak in the 17th century, Yiddish stretched from Holland to the eastern Slavic lands, from the Baltic to northern Italy; Herzog, however, makes no attempt to include Italian Yiddish data. The "unity of Ashkenaz" really means the "Yiddish unification" of the bulk of a territory that once spawned numerous Jewish languages: Judeo-Romance in the West German lands; Judeo-German (often called "Western Yiddish"), the successor of Judeo-Romance by the early 15th century, and, together with High German, also of most German Yiddish in the mid-18th century; Judeo-Slavic languages, attested in Sorbian (?) and Czech lands in the 11th–15th centuries, in the Eastern Slavic and Polish lands between the 17th and 19th centuries (see Wexler 1994), and in the guise of Eastern and some Western Yiddish; Judeo-(?)Turkic (Khazar, attested late 10th century and probably extinct by the 11th century, and Belarussian and Ukrainian Karaite (from the Crimea) since the 14th century. The continuum is certainly valid in the case of West German dialects that were brought east – for example, into Lausitz, the Baltic lands, and Silesia, where they sometimes constitute newly merged colonial dialects; but where is the evidence for the colonial nature of Eastern Yiddish?

It would have been helpful to show how the Western–Eastern Yiddish border changed through time and to map the *limes sorabicus* separating German control to the west and Slavic to the east in the 9th century, the shifting cultural and linguistic patterns prompting Jewish migrations from the (south)east (Regensburg) into the southwest (Rhineland, and eventually northern France, rather than the reverse direction), and then, in the mid-17th century, Eastern Yiddish moving into the west. The continuum model assumed here usually posits Western Yiddish

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502252185 Published online by Cambridge University Press

forms as being older than Eastern Yiddish forms, thus forcing a single interpretation on the facts: "Western items with no Eastern correspondents simply 'never made it'" (20). However, there are maps (e.g., maps 66, 69, and 71) where Western and Eastern Yiddish are separated by areas with either no Yiddish form, or a different form altogether. This suggests either that Western Yiddish lost the original term (still in the east, and thus the older term), replacing it with an innovation too late to reach the east; or that the Eastern and Western forms are independent. Consider Southwest and Northeast Yiddish *entl* 'duck' (< German *Ente*), separated by *kačke* (< Slavic; I substitute *e* for the Shwa symbol used in the atlas). Uriel Weinreich assumed (1962:13) that a late wave of Jewish settlers in the mid-18th century in Western Belarus acquired *kačke*, after *Ente* had been brought by an earlier wave of settlers to northeastern Belarus. The continuum model loses its *raison d'être* if Western Yiddish largely proves to be Germanic, and other parts of Western and all of Eastern Yiddish are relexified Slavic. Now, we might conclude that German *Ente* was a relexified acquisition that failed to push out all instances of the original unrelexified Upper Sorbian/ Belarussian *kačke*.

If many Yiddish Hebraisms prove to be motivated by the requirements of relexification, then Hebrew elements (especially innovative Yiddish Hebroidisms) cannot support a Western–Eastern Yiddish continuum. Map 64 'rich man', shows Western, Polish Yiddish *ko:cn* (< Hebrew 'officer, judge'), sporadic Southwest Polish, Western Yiddish *ojšer* (< Hebrew 'wealth'), Eastern Yiddish Hebroid *gvir* (< Hebrew *g-v-r* 'male'), and Western Yiddish (up to Northern Polish Yiddish) *betu(a)x* (< Hebrew 'certain'). Eastern Yiddish *gvir* is both formally and semantically an innovative Hebroidism, first attested on a Wrocław tombstone dated 1331–1332; though very rare in Polish Yiddish, it is still found nearby, at Jutroszyn). The other three are semantically innovative. Hebroidisms are a clear sign of blocked Germanisms in relexification. Upper Sorbian *bohaty*, Ukrainian *bahatyj* 'rich' ~ German *reich* 'rich' (= Yiddish *rajx*), but German has no derived noun ~ Upper Sorbian *bohač(k)*, Ukrainian *bahač, bahatij, bahatyr* 'rich man' (see German *reicher Mann*). These examples illustrate, crucially, that the results of relexification need not always be monolithic. Herzog fails to explain the change of *ojšer* from neuter abstract to animate noun; see also *malxes* masculine, neuter 'king' (~ neuter 'kingdom'< Hebrew), which I suspect Yiddish speakers invented on the model of Upper Sorbian *knježa* collective plural 'authority, gentlemen' < proto-Slavic **kьnežьja* feminine collective 'princes' < proto-Germanic **kuningaz* (> German *König*) 'king', Yiddish *srore* 'lord' < Hebrew *srārāh* 'rule'. The Hebraisms for 'rich man' suggest a deep Slavic Yiddish penetration into the West. Unfortunately, the atlas does not map *gvir(in)te* feminine 'rich woman' with a German and Aramaic suffix, modeled on similar Belarusian *bahacejka* or originally two separate forms, *gvirte* and *gvirinte*, perhaps to match the latter and synonymous *bahačka*; see also pleonastic feminine below. Map 66 'dowry' gives Western Yiddish *nedunje*, etc. < Aramaic (attested east of Kraków, but not in parts of eastern Germany) vs. Eastern Yiddish

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502252185 Published online by Cambridge University Press

nadn, etc., of "[Hebrew] origin" (i.e., a "pseudo-Hebroidism"). I suspect Eastern Yiddish *nadn* < Slavic **na-dan-* 'give' (see Ukrainian *prydane* 'dowry', *nadaty za moloduju* 'give a dowry'; Wexler 1993:148), which was reinterpreted as formally similar Hebrew *nadan* 'sheath' or 'harlot's pay'; it is hard to imagine a straightforward semantic shift from the latter to 'dowry'. Both Hebroid *nadan* and Aramaic *nedunje* 'dowry' could have been motivated by relexification from Slavic, since Yiddish blocks the synonymous compound, German *Mitgift*, apparently because of the blockage of German *Gift* 'gift; poison' itself (no single Slavic root has these two meanings).

Map 3 derives Western Yiddish *ša:let* ~ Eastern Yiddish *čolṇt* 'a Sabbath food', not cited in the index < Latin (how does Latin enter Yiddish?; see also *lej[e]nen* in map 7); it suggests "the *š/č* border may be considered exemplary of the East–West divide." Herzog rightly calls the Eastern Yiddish variants older; a single *č* form, without the nasal, is attested at Dürmenach, Alsace. The *š* reflexes are clearly from post-14th-century French, but the *č* forms need not be from pre-14th-century French (M. Weinreich 1973:56–9), but rather from Northern Italian or Rhaeto-Romance (Wexler 1992:48–9). The *č* forms, moving west, might have been adjusted to the French cognate that probably survived among southwestern German Jews until the 15th century. This would imply a "continuum" from Eastern to Western Yiddish. Akin to the Latin problem is the suggestion, in map 107, that *sgajes* 'non-Jews, peasantry' is of Gothic or Old High German origin (a cognate of German *Gau* 'district'); how does Gothic have contact with Yiddish, and does not Yiddish postdate the Old High German period?

Polish Yiddish often has newer forms brought by a later immigration from the west vs. an older Eastern Yiddish form in the eastern Slavic lands. Vol. 1 (1992), map 76, plots the *v* ~ *f* alternation in *hejfn* (in the west up to western Poland and Carpathian Ukraine ~ German *Hefe*) ~ Eastern Yiddish *hejvn* (uniquely plural) 'yeast' (this map is not mentioned in vol. 3, map 80). The pan-Yiddish plural points to a Slavic substratum, e.g. Upper Sorbian *drožḍže*, Ukrainian *drižḍžy* (uniquely plural). Map 68 gives Western Yiddish *tofes* vs. Eastern Yiddish *tfise* 'jail, prison' < a common Hebrew root (add Berlin *tofes* from map 120). Either we have here a common relexification to compensate for German *Gefängnis* (blocked because Slavic equivalents of the German base *fangen* 'to catch' [> Yiddish] do not express 'prison'), or relexification in the East vs. borrowing (for cryptic purposes) in the West.

Map 38 comments imprecisely on the mainly Eastern Yiddish periphrastic conjugations for Hebrew elements, by suggesting that (1) substantives, (2) participles and (3) [finite] verbal forms are integrated (a) normally or (b) usually periphrastically. Rather, in Eastern Yiddish, (1) and (3) undergo process (a), while (2) undergo (b). I suspect that the periphrastic conjugation comes from Turkic (Khazar?) and Iranian where it accommodates Arabic; it is also in extant 17th-century Judeo-Eastern Slavic. Within Yiddish, it appears to have diffused from East to West (see maps 44–47, and the parallel geography of Hebrew *pesaḥ*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502252185 Published online by Cambridge University Press

'Passover' used as a male name, reflecting a Khazar naming practice discussed in Wexler 1993:139–41.

Maps of religious practices are of special interest because they may indicate mutual cultural influences. Map 55, 'ego's child's mother-in-law', shows how Eastern Yiddish *m[a/e]x(e)téneste*, a kinship category typical of Slavic, Turkic, and Mongolian but not of German (even though the category is expressed only by Hebroidisms), has gone west, where its initial strangeness resulted in multiple masculine-feminine gender for *mexutn̤* masculine. The model is Ukrainian *svat* 'male', *svaxa* 'female in-law', both of which also denote 'matchmaker'. When Ukrainian dialectally distinguished *svaxa* 'female in-law' vs. *starosta* 'male matchmaker' (see Wexler 1993:174), Eastern Yiddish followed suit with Hebroid *šatxn̤(te)* 'male (female) matchmaker' vs. *m[a/e]x(e)téneste* and (now extinct in the East) **mexutn̤te, *m[a/e]x(e)ténes* 'female in-law', the geography of Y *šatxn̤[te]* would have been instructive. The shorter *mexutn̤te/ maxetenes* feminine became extinct in Eastern Yiddish, remaining in Western Yiddish only at Vel'ký Mager (Slovakia), Harderwijk (Holland), and Köslin, Pomerania (Koszalin, Poland; map 56 has Western Yiddish *mexutn̤te* feminine at locales not cited on map 55), perhaps when Eastern Yiddish *m[a/e]x(e)téneste* was coined on the model of Ukrainian *starosta* with a similar ending (*-ste* ~ *-sta*, though with a different gender and meaning). In map 78, Eastern Yiddish *par(e)ve* 'containing neither meat nor milk' has sporadic attestation in Western Yiddish alongside no known term, probably because the category was unknown, as among contemporary Sephardic Jews. Herzog accepts Gold's etymon Polish *parowy*, Czech *parovy* 'paired' (1985; should be *párový*), but this is unlikely, since the Polish form is not attested before the late 15th century (Urbańczyk et al. 1970–1973) – thus probably too late. I prefer Upper Sorbian *parować* 'do without' < German *(ent)behren* (German prefixes are frequently lost in Upper Sorbian; see Wexler 1993:133–4, ignored here).

Here are some of the numerous errors and problems in the atlas: *štrudl* 'kind of cake, pastry' (map 21) establishes no continuum; it is, not surprisingly, almost totally unknown in Western Yiddish, since the term is from Upper German. On the nasal(ized) reflex of *'ajin* in Hebrew words (map 58), Herzog cites a West Indonesian treatment of Arabic, rather than the more appropriate Judeo-Italian *ñ, ŋ* or Judeo-Portuguese *ŋ*. Map 29S1, 'horseradish', appears not to be complete; only *xrejn* forms are mapped, and there is no cross-reference to vol. 1, map 55. Maps 1, 1S, and 58 have confused use of symbols; the symbol || in the tables is printed as ■ on the maps. Map 59 does not cite explicitly that the labial plural < *n* (but the index does, 372). Map 41 has the wrong spelling for Hebrew 'read'; and Rashi did not live in the 10th but in the 11th–12th centuries (354). The superscript numerals on the maps are too small, and the locales can only be identified on the base map; if locales were not defined by five-digit numbers, they could be placed on the maps. Many placenames on the maps (though not the base map) lack diacritics. "Belorus" (p.148) should be "Belorussia" or "Belarus." The atlas fol-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502252185 Published online by Cambridge University Press

lows "official [Russian, Polish] designations [from] … 1918–1939" (40); why not native Ukrainian and Belarussian forms? Yet, interbellum Polish *Wilno* appears as Lithuanian *Vilnius*. Better proofreading would have replaced Jacobs's unpublished 1984 PhD dissertation by 1990, repaired the incorrect titles of Beem 1975 (> 1967/1992) and Lowenstein 1997, provided the place of publication for Labov and Weinreich 1980, U.Weinreich 1968, and others, given all first names, corrected Timm "Tokyo 1990" to Munich 1991 and Vasmer 1955 to 1953–1958, and noted that M. Weinreich 1980 is only a partial translation of 1973. Finally, the price of this volume is too high for a monochromatic atlas.

Herzog says "an explanation of plural *narónim* of *nar* 'fool' is … elusive; (cf. German *Narr, Narren*)" (154). Perhaps *-on-* is agentive (< Hebrew *-ān* and/or Slavic *-an[n]-* verbal noun), and/or inspired by the *-n* of Upper Sorbian *błazn*, Ukrainian *duren', blazen'* 'fool', or < Slavic *-an* 'quality', e.g. Belarussian *puzan* 'pot-bellied person'. Alternatively, Yiddish *nar* comes from the name of Iranian epic heroes mentioned in the *Russian Primary Chronicle*: *narci, nor(i)ci*, etc., with Eastern Slavic *-ьci* plural agentive (~ Persian *ner* 'man': Kunstmann 1996:229, 244), producing structurally equivalent Yiddish *nar-on-im* with Hebrew *-im* plural (~ *kapcn̤*, plural *kapconim* 'pauper' < Hebrew *qabc-ān-im* agentive + plural). The shift from 'man' > 'fool' could have taken place under the impact of German *Narr* and/ or when Iranian became obsolete among Slavic-speaking Jews (archaic ethnonyms often become pejorative, see e.g. Old Russian *dulěbi* Eastern Slavic tribe > Russian dialectal *duleb* 'fool'). It would be interesting to know how far West Yiddish *naronim* appears (it competes with Lithuanian Yiddish *narojim*, with *-oj-* < the Ossete nominative plural suffix *-æ*?).

Up to now, the first major contribution of Yiddish to general linguistics was the exemplary external history of M. Weinreich 1973; the present atlas, with its imaginative format and rich coverage, promises to be the second.

REFERENCES

Beem, Hartog (1967). *Sche'eriet; Resten van een taal; Woordenboekje van het Nederlandse Jiddisch*. Assen: Van Gorcum; 2nd ed., Amsterdam 1992: Nederlandse-Israelitisch Kerkgenootschap.

Gold, David L. (1985). Towards a study of two Yiddish synonyms of unclear origin: *Pareve* and *minikh*. *Jewish Language Review* 5:128–39.

Jacobs, Neil G. (1990). *Economy in Yiddish vocalism: The interplay of Hebrew and non-Hebrew components*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Horvath, Julia, & Wexler, Paul (1997) (eds.). *Relexification in creole and non-creole languages (with special attention to Haitian Creole, Modern Hebrew, Romani and Rumanian)*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Katz, Dovid (1991). The language of heth and the ego of linguistics – a story of seven Yiddish mergers. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 89:95–121.

_____ (1993). East and West, *khes* and *shin* and the origin of Yiddish. In I. Bartal et al. (eds.), *Studies in Jewish culture in honour of Chone Shmeruk*, 9–37 (English section). Jerusalem: Zalman Shazar Center for Jewish History.

King, Robert D. (1987). Proto-Yiddish morphology. In Dovid Katz (ed.),*Origins of the Yiddish language*, 73–81. Oxford: Pergamon.

Kunstmann, Heinrich (1996). *Die Slaven*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502252185 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Lowenstein, Steven (1997). The shifting boundary between eastern and western Jewry. *Jewish Social Studies* n.s. 4:60–78.
Manaster Ramer, Alexis (1997). The polygenesis of Western Yiddish – and the monogenesis of Yiddish. In Peter Michalove et al. (eds.), *Festschrift for Vitaly Shevoroshin, Journal of Indo-European Studies*, monograph series. Washington: Institute for the Study of Man.
_____, & Wolf, Meyer (1997). Yiddish origins: The Austro-Bavarian problem. *Folia Linguistica Historica* 17:193–209.
Mieses, Matthias (1924). *Die jiddische Sprache*. Berlin and Vienna: Benjamin Harz.
Timm, Erika (1991). Das ältere Jiddisch als Gegenstand sprachpragmatischer Forschung. In Yoshinori Shichiji (ed.), *Akten des VIII Internationalen Germanisten-Kongresses, Tokyo 1990*, 11, 500–13. Munich: Iudicium.
Urbańczyk, Stanisław, et al. (eds.) *Słownik staropolski* (1970-3). Vol. 6. Wrocław, etc.: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
Weinreich, Max (1973). *Gešixte fun der jidišer šprax* 1-4. New York: YIVO; *History of the Yiddish language*, translated in part by Shlomo Noble and Joshua A.Fishman, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.
Weinreich, Uriel (1962). Multilingual dialectology and the new Yiddish atlas. *Anthropological Linguistics* 4:6–22.
_____ (1968). *Modern English–Yiddish Yiddish–English dictionary*. New York: YIVO and McGraw-Hill.
Wexler, Paul (1991). Yiddish – the fifteenth Slavic language. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 91:1–150, 215–25.
_____ (1992). *The Balkan substratum of Yiddish (a reassessment of the unique Romance and Greek components)*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
_____ (1993). *The Ashkenazic Jews: A Slavo-Turkic people in search of a Jewish identity*. Columbus: Slavica.
_____ (1994). Judeo-Slavic frontispieces of late 18th–19th-century books and the authentication of "stereotyped" Judeo-Slavic speech. *Welt der Slaven* 39:201–30.
_____ (1995). Languages in contact: The case of Rotwelsch and the two Yiddishes. In R.Po-chia Hsia and Hartmut Lehmann (eds.), *In and out of the Ghetto: Jewish-gentile relations in late and medieval and early modern Germany*, 109–24. Washington & New York: German Historical Institute and Cambridge University.
_____ (in press). Two-tiered relexification in Yiddish. In *Khazars, Jews, Sorbs, and the Kiev-Polessian dialect*. Berlin & New York: Monton de Gruyter.

(Received 15 January 2001)

PATRICK STEVENSON & JOHN THEOBALD (eds.), *Relocating Germanness: Discursive disunity in unified Germany*. London: Macmillan, New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000. Pp. xvi, 290. Hb $69.95.

Reviewed by INGRID PILLER
Linguistics, F12, University of Sydney
Sydney, NSW 2006, Australia
ingrid.piller@linguistics.usyd.edu.au

Stevenson's & Theobald's volume, the outcome of a 1998 Southampton conference entitled *Disunification: Competing constructions of contemporary Germany*, is a rich and diverse collection of current sociolinguistic and discourse-analytic research into the German language. It aims to explore Germany's continued cultural and linguistic East/West divide, a decade after unification. The volume's 13 contributions are divided into two parts: critical discourse-analytic approaches to public discourses, and micro-analytic approaches to private or semi-public

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502252185 Published online by Cambridge University Press

speech genres and communicative practices. The contributions in the first part are presented as "part of the analytical creation of . . . discourses" which seek to "punctur[e] the dominant western story, and by this very act, creating space for the expression of other memories, experiences and historiographies, and the emergence of alternative discourses" (p. 8). In contrast, the chapters in the second part have the more descriptive aim of documenting linguistic difference in East and West. The editors contend that "profound differences in communicative practices and behaviours between east and west Germans" exist, or are perceived to exist, and that these differences "constitute a significant barrier to the project of bringing a united . . . Germany into existence" (18).

The eight contributions in the first part mainly deal with disunity in the media, including TV news (Ulrike Hanna Meinhof), TV drama (Kathrin Hörschelmann), advertising (Helen Kelly-Holmes), newspaper reports (Susanne Schabrack), and the newsletter of a group of GDR reform and peace activists (John Theobald); this section also includes studies of stand-up comedy (Joanne McNally), literature (Gerd Thomas Reifarth), and oral history (Beth Linklater). As is to be expected in a collection, the overarching focus on counter-hegemonic discourses is clearer in some chapters than in others. I found most compelling those analyses that aim to expose the contradictions and complexities inherent in their data.

Meinhof's multimodal analysis of the news on one of the two major public national TV channels on 9 November in the years 1989, 1994, and 1998 is a fascinating example. In the German public calendar, 9 November is a rich date: the simultaneous anniversary of two events central to nation-building discourses – the Pogrom of 1938 and the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989. Inevitably, the day of national atonement always provides a foil for the day of national joy, and vice versa. In the news reports, the discourses from one commemoration carry over into that of the other, resulting in confused and confusing "broken" statements; in one example, the report sets out with an admonition to commemorate the victims of violence in the course of German history, but then winds up grouping environmental protestors against a new traffic bridge in Berlin in the same category as the perpetrators of the Pogrom and the murderers of those trying to flee the GDR.

In the discourse of advertising, Kelly-Holmes explores the marketing strategies of some east German brands of beer and sparkling wine. In the GDR, consumer advertising (in contrast to political advertising) was virtually nonexistent, but by no means unknown, since Western TV channels were received in most parts of the GDR. The consumption utopia they portrayed gained in credibility as the government's portrayal of a capitalist dystopia lost in credibility. Consequently, after the fall of the Wall, east German consumers rushed toward Western products and quickly grew disenchanted with consumer advertising, which turned out to be less "exact, informative, and absolutely credible" (95) than they expected. Almost ten years on, an "anti-advertising, anti-west-German, anti-*Schicki-Micki* approach" (98) has become part and parcel of an eastern consumer identity. Consequently, successful east German brands such as Hasseröder beer run ad-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502252185 Published online by Cambridge University Press

vertising campaigns that purport to inform (e.g., about the brand's history), which highlight the brand's regional roots in east Germany or some region thereof, and which express authentic working-class solidarity. Rather ironically, and a fact that the author might have made more of, many of these "counter-hegemonic" advertising campaigns are designed by the west German parent company (as is the case for Hasseröder).

The five contributions in the second part, which mainly take an interactional sociolinguistic approach to speech differences between east and west Germans, address east German performances in job interviews as a western genre (Peter Auer), deixis use of west German talk show hosts on east German TV (Grit Liebscher), uncertainty markers of eastern and western politicians in federal parliament (Stephan Elspass), dialect accommodation of easterners in the west (Birgit Barden), and standard language ideologies (Jennifer Dailey-O'Cain).

Auer uses the concept of "communicative genre" as his analytic level, which mediates between linguistic performance and social categories (east and west Germans, in this case, but it goes equally for women and men, Asians and Westerns, etc.). He tries to show how members who were socialized into a particular communicative culture deal with changes in their linguistic ecology and acquire new communicative genres, such as the job interview, which was virtually nonexistent in the GDR but is of paramount importance in the rapidly shrinking job market of unified Germany. In authentic job interviews dating from 1994–1995, typical east German stylistic features were absent. Such stylistic features include the generalized use of the 1st person plural possessive pronoun (e.g. *unsere Kinder* 'our children', i.e. all the children in this society), and complex syntactic structures of a nominalization as prepositional object and a semantically empty verb (e.g. *zur Ausführung bringen* instead of *ausführen* 'carry out'); these are much in evidence in a corpus of journalistic interviews from 1970, and present, but rare, in role-played job interviews dating from 1992. While the interviewees thus do not exhibit stigmatized stylistic features of east German speech, they do exhibit pragmatic problems with the genre. Specifically, most of them do not treat the interview as a personal promotion opportunity, but as a fact-finding exercise: They fail to (or refuse to?) engage in self-praise when asked about their strengths, and they exhibit great frankness and offer much detail when it comes to exploring their weaknesses.

A similarly intriguing study of the interrelationship between socio-political and linguistic change is provided in Barden's longitudinal study of the dialect accommodation of 56 east Germans who have come to live in west Germany. All the participants were native speakers of Saxon, a dialect with traditionally very low prestige. During the two-year period during which interviews were conducted, the participants lived in two southern cities where the majority of the population are also dialect speakers, but of varieties of Alemannic and Moselle-Franconian. On average, all the interviewees reduced their nonstandard realizations during the research period, as well as their use of strong realizations of Saxon. Barden explains these findings with reference to a network and attitude

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502252185 Published online by Cambridge University Press

approach; she carefully exemplifies this approach in a case study of an outlying case, that of a man who actually increased his use of nonstandard and strongly Saxon features over the period. During the first year, when he was happily integrating into his new environment, he reduced his accent like everyone else; however, when he had an accident, he experienced intense frustration with the western bureaucracy, felt deserted by his new friends, and decided to return to his native Leipzig. During that second year, his dialect features continually increased, and during his last interview, he exhibited even more nonstandard and dialect features than he had in his first interview.

As a whole, the collection is a treasure trove of research into sociolinguistic aspects of contemporary German, and as such I readily recommend it to the readers of this journal. At the same time, I have two problems with the explicit focus of the collection. First, any inquiry into speech differences between social groups risks the trap of homogenizing the groups in question. Only a few contributions explicitly address this as a methodological problem (e.g. Auer), and even fewer make reference to the fact that users of German, as of any other language, do not only consist of *Ossis* (easterners) and *Wessis* (westerners), but also of *Wossis* (non-commuting westerners now living in the east); and these are in themselves classed, gendered, ethnicized, and so on, and they engage in many different communities of practice. Hörschelmann's chapter on TV dramas is the only exploration of how discourses of eastern and western identity are gendered; she briefly alludes to discourses of ethnicity, since one of the (non-marriageable) characters in one of the dramas seems to be Vietnamese. Second, the volume is permeated by a sense of surprise that there should be discourses of disunity and communicative differences in unified Germany. It is not quite clear to me why the complexity and heterogeneity of any living language should not be expected in German also. Given that in the US, southerners and northerners continue to construct different identities for themselves and speak differently more than a century after the Civil War, or that in the UK, the Welsh and the English do so almost a millennium after Wales became an English principality, surely German unity and homogeneity a decade after unification would come much more as a surprise than do heterogeneity and differences.

(Received 28 June 2001)

YULING PAN, *Politeness in Chinese face-to-face interaction*. (Advances in discourse processes, 67.) Stamford, CT: Ablex, 2000. Pp. xiv, 169. Hb $73.25, pb $29.95.

Reviewed by NING YU
Modern Languages, University of Oklahoma
Norman, OK 73019
ningyu@ou.edu

This book makes an important contribution to understanding the complexity of the sources of power that govern Chinese politeness behavior in different set-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502252185 Published online by Cambridge University Press

tings. To answer the question of why Chinese seem to be inconsistent in their politeness behavior, the author conducted ethnographic research in southern China over a period of eight years in the 1990s. Through discourse analysis of data in both Cantonese and Mandarin, Pan describes Chinese politeness behavior across three social settings – business encounters, official meetings, and family gatherings – that represent a variety of situations and power structures. Taking into account the social factors of age, gender, rank, ingroup identity, and setting, Pan brings in the perspective of situational variation and looks at Chinese politeness practice in the larger framework of social context.

The book consists of six chapters. In Chap. 1, the Introduction, Pan reviews two main approaches to the study of politeness. The first, the language-based approach, compares and contrasts linguistic strategies that attend to face needs in various cultures by focusing on syntactic structures and lexical items that signal politeness in a particular language and manifest face strategies in a particular culture. The second, the society-based approach, outlines the cultural conditions for the use of different politeness strategies, with power relationships in communication in different settings as the core of its politeness systems. It is suggested that, while both of these approaches provide significant insights into the understanding of politeness, their consideration of situational factors is insufficient. The concept of politeness exists in all cultures, whereas cultural difference lies in the preference for a certain type of politeness strategy in a specific situation. In essence, politeness is dealing appropriately with others in a given communicative situation. Arguing that differences in politeness behavior arise from situational as well as cultural variation, Pan proposes a situation-based approach that emphasizes variation of politeness behavior across situations. This approach thus "allows internal diversity within a culture, treating culture as being distributive rather than being uniform and stable" (p. 16).

Chaps. 2 through 5 present the author's research that demonstrates which factor dominates politeness behavior in three different settings within Chinese culture. Both Chaps. 2 and 3 deal with Chinese politeness behavior in service encounters, concentrating on the issue of social distance, and how inside and outside relations play a key role in the employment of politeness strategies. There are two types of service businesses coexisting in China; state-run and private. These two types, under two different organizational systems, produce a great deal of difference in how the service person and the customer deal with each other. Chap. 2 presents findings from service encounters in state-run stores and shows the interaction patterns distinctive to inside and outside relations, with social distance as the main sociological variable in the consideration of politeness strategies. As manifested in language use, facework is almost always missing in an outside relationship, but often elaborated in an inside relationship. It is suggested that the politeness behavior reflects two contributing social factors: the Chinese cultural norm of distinction between inside and outside relationship, and social practice under the socialist system in state-run businesses. A change in either

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502252185 Published online by Cambridge University Press

factor leads to a quite different situation. Chap. 3 describes politeness phenomena in privately owned stores, which started to grow in the 1980s in China as a result of economic reform. Pan shows that, in business encounters in the private sector, excessive facework is performed by the salesperson to turn the outside relationship into an inside one, with the motive of improving sales. That is, larger societal changes have affected the way facework is applied in the interaction between service people and their customers. Pan makes the point that politeness practice is a reflection of historical and social development, and, therefore, it is almost impossible to study politeness without analyzing the social forces behind it.

Chap. 4 examines patterns of politeness behavior in a formal setting, exemplified by official meetings. In verbal interaction in an official environment, the sociological variable of power comes to have a crucial effect: Hierarchical order is defined by the participants' position in the power structure, and official rank is the dominant factor that overrides power coming from other factors, such as age and gender. Pan shows that there is a correlation of rank hierarchy and linguistic behavior in the decision-making process, which is an example of how institutionalized power affects linguistic choice in politeness behavior. As Pan observes, there is an asymmetrical use of face strategies in the application of politeness rules in the official setting. The superior has the choice of showing authority over or claiming solidarity with the subordinate, while the subordinate has no choice but to recognize the power distance and to show deference to the superior.

Chap. 5 focuses on the interaction pattern in family gatherings, using examples from family dinner-table conversations. It shows how family members of both sexes and different generations interact, and how power is structured based on the factors of age and gender, which are perceived as important dimensions in the hierarchical structure in the home domain. Junior and female members of the family choose linguistic strategies that show their respect to senior and male members. This reflects the pattern of a traditional Chinese family that is "structured on the basis of a patriarchal system, with power descending from the older male to the younger male" (106).

The analyses presented in Chaps. 2 through 5 show that politeness in Chinese culture is a dynamic process that is situation-sensitive. That is, "there are different social requirements for politeness practices in various situations, and speakers constantly adjust their roles and speaking strategies to fit the social expectation imposed upon the individual in a particular situation" (140). The situational variation in Chinese politeness behavior, therefore, makes it hard to give a clear-cut definition of the Chinese way of being polite. In Chap. 6, the concluding chapter, Pan presents the situation-specific model proposed as an alternative approach to explaining politeness phenomena. This approach "looks into what social factor weighs most in consideration of the use of politeness strategies in a particular setting in a cultural group and explains cultural differences in terms of relativity and situation variation" (24). Pan suggests that there are at least four dimensions governing the choice of linguistic politeness: situation, social distance, power

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502252185 Published online by Cambridge University Press

relation, and power source. Face strategies should be applied considering the relative weight of each of these dimensions in a specific situation in a particular culture.

In this study, Pan examines linguistic politeness not only at the syntactic and lexical levels, but also at the level of discourse. It is argued that discourse strategies such as opening/closing, topic introduction, turn-taking, response, and conflict management are as closely related to face concerns as are certain syntactic structures and lexical items that serve as politeness hedges. It is found that discursive features contribute more to the signaling of politeness than do syntactic or lexical items in the Chinese language.

In writing this book, the author had in mind a wide range of audiences, including professionals in various fields dealing with people from Chinese culture on a daily basis or on business trips, as well as students and scholars interested in intercultural communication, sociolinguistics, pragmatics, discourse analysis, and China studies. As written, the book indeed appeals to both scholarly and professional interests.

(Received 1 May 2001)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502252185 Published online by Cambridge University Press