Language in Society **35**, 129–155. Printed in the United States of America

REVIEWS

Language in Society **35** (2006). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404506210054

MICHAEL CLYNE, *Dynamics of language contact: English and immigrant languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2003 Pp. xv, 282. Hb $65.00, pb $24.00.

Reviewed by CAROL MYERS-SCOTTON
Linguistics Program, University of South Carolina
Columbia, SC 29208
carolms@gwm.sc.edu

Ever since Thomason & Kaufman 1988 reawakened linguists to the role of external contacts in language change, and the origin and development of creoles became a major research topic (largely after Bickerton 1981), the field of contact linguistics has burgeoned. Sociolinguists have always been interested in the social side of language contact, but today the grammatical side of contact also is attracting researchers. Books published just since 2000 give some idea of the research activity. Three monographs exemplify the wide interest in grammatical aspects of codeswitching: Hlavac 2003 deals with codeswitching among second-generation Croatian speakers in Australia; and Kovács 2001 treats Australian Finnish and Hungarian in contact with English; and Canut & Caubet 2001 is a collection of articles on codeswitching involving French in various *francophonie* communities.

Other types of contact also are attracting a good deal of attention. For example, generalizations about the structure of mixed languages are debated in an edited volume, Matras & Bakker 2003. Renewed interest in grammatical aspects of first language attrition is also evident (e.g., Schmid 2002).

What Michael Clyne thinks of as codeswitching (but under a new label, "transference") is a main focus in the book under review. Drawing on his extensive experience in studying the language use patterns of immigrants to Australia, Clyne has produced a study with an impressive database. The ways in which immigrants to Australia, especially German and Dutch ones, incorporate English elements into their speech is the main subject.

Because of its wide scope, Clyne's volume is best grouped with a number of recent overviews of language contact (e.g., Muysken 2000, Myers-Scotton 2002, Thomason 2001, Winford 2003). Unfortunately, except for Muysken's volume, these were all too new for Clyne to consider their approaches in his own analyses. However, of them all, Clyne's volume may be the most theoretically ambitious because of the many topics that he stakes out as his territory. In some ways, this breadth is the real virtue of the volume; it certainly demonstrates the extent of Clyne's expertise. But breadth can also mean that when many topics are in-

© 2006 Cambridge University Press 0047-4045/06 $12.00

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404506270052 Published online by Cambridge University Press

troduced and copiously exemplified, there is less emphasis on analysis and fewer attempts to explain the data. It's not that I necessarily have serious criticisms of Clyne's analyses; rather, it is just that sometimes I find them too sketchy to evaluate and sometimes, even fully to understand. Knowing that Clyne has much knowledge to draw on, I wish he had been less reluctant to offer explanations.

The main thrust of the book is to illustrate the types of semantic and syntactic inroads made by English into the first languages of immigrants to Australia. English, of course, is the dominant language spoken in Australia, even though that society is one of the most multicultural in the world today. Clyne proposes the term "transference" as an umbrella term for most changes that are motivated by external contacts. As is clear in chap. 5, Clyne is most interested in what he has called "trigger" elements, which he argues facilitate a variety of structural changes. Let me outline the organization of the volume.

Chap. 1 is intended as an introduction, giving details about the corpus and the Australian immigrant situation. Clyne indicates that what he calls his "core data" were collected over nearly four decades from L1 speakers of German or Dutch, either bilinguals or trilinguals. The German corpus includes "data from different generations, vintages, and bilingual situations" (p. 6). For example, some data from the 1970s come from German-English bilingual children attending Saturday schools (privately organized classes intended to familiarize the descendants of immigrants with their ancestral culture). Some more recent corpora consist of conversations self-recorded by the bilinguals with their friends, and trilingual data come from interviews, with different segments conducted in different languages. In addition to bilingual data from German and Dutch L1 speakers, examples come from L1 speakers of Croatian and of Vietnamese. The trilingual data seem largely to come from Dutch-German-English, Hungarian-German-English, and Italian-Spanish-English speakers.

Few researchers can claim to have strictly comparable data (from similar consultants in similar situations) or data from situations that result in the truly "natural" combining of languages. But the diversity in Clyne's database (when and how speakers were recorded) is a potential problem when speech examples are cited to support critical points. Specifics about the source of a specific example are not always clear. For example, who is this speaker, and how representative is he or she?

Chap. 2 is a background chapter, dealing entirely with macro level features of language maintenance and shift in the Australian setting. It includes many statistics on such matters as which immigrant groups show the lowest percentages of shift by the second generation. Clyne, who has written a good deal about language maintenance and shift in Australia, is very much "at home" in this chapter, and he writes with more authority here than elsewhere in the volume. He does a fine job of synthesizing facts about what has happened in Australia. The chapter includes a lengthy section on predictive frameworks proposed by researchers elsewhere which take account of sociopsychological factors in regard to potential shift.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404506270052 Published online by Cambridge University Press

From chap. 3 on, the footing changes, and the subject matter for the rest of the volume becomes the grammatical and then the psycholinguistic side of language contact. Chap. 3 deals with many subjects, but most prominently with terminology and Clyne's proposal to replace existing terms, especially to replace "codeswitching" and "code mixing" with "transference" as the label for the contact process, and "transfer" as the label for the product of this process. He goes on to speak of transference at different levels of language (e.g., syntactic transference, morphological transference, semantic transference). The term "convergence" is also introduced; Clyne says that he will use it to mean "making languages more similar to each other (including through transference)" (79). I think it more accurate, however, to view convergence as largely a one-way street, but he does not consider this.

A nagging problem for me starting here, but continuing throughout the volume, is this: What is the status of the term "transference"? Is it intended as a cover term for ALL grammatical processes that happen during language contact, or is it meant just to replace "codeswitching" and "code mixing"?

In this chapter, Clyne also tries to survey the constraints proposed in the codeswitching/code mixing literature. He overviews the recent literature extensively, but in particular he discusses three models, those of Muysken 2000, Myers-Scotton 1997 (with Myers-Scotton & Jake 2000 also mentioned), and Poplack 1980 along with Poplack & Meechan 1988. Each model is discussed very briefly, and this seems to result in misinterpretations or enigmatic statements. For example, here are four points on which I disagree with Clyne's interpretation of Myers-Scotton 1997. (i) The MLF model was never intended as a model for ALL instances of elements from two languages in the same clause, so it is not relevant to much of the data Clyne exemplifies. It is a model only for classic codeswitching, meaning a model for data in which only one language is the source of the morphosyntactic frame in the relevant clause or CP (projection of complementizer, which through an editing error is stated in this volume as "complementizer of projection." (ii) The Matrix Language frame is a frame and no more; all the elements within the frame do not have to come from the participating language that is identified as the ML, only the elements that the model states identify the source of the frame (morpheme order and the critical system morphemes). (iii) The definition Clyne gives of these critical morphemes is "missing words" and therefore does not make sense. It should be "those system morphemes WHICH HAVE GRAMMATICAL RELATIONS external to their head constituent." Clyne's definition is "those system morphemes external to their head constituent." (81). (iv) The 4-M model (introduced in Myers-Scotton & Jake 2000) is not a revised version of the MLF model, but a new model on its own; yes, it has applications to codeswitching, but also to other phenomena.

Clyne seems to favor Muysken's model because it goes beyond what I have just called "classic codeswitching." He is particularly interested in one of Muysken's categories of contact phenomena, congruent lexicalization. This phe-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404506270052 Published online by Cambridge University Press

nomenon occurs when there is a good deal of structural equivalence between the participating languages, which results in a composite structure. Clyne notes approvingly that Muysken's model also takes triggering into account in its recognition that cross-linguistic similarities promote certain outcomes. Clyne has long written about triggers (from Clyne 1967 on). Triggering is a process that promotes a switch in languages within a clause. Such a switch occurs when the speaker uses a word that is a homophone with a word in the other language salient in the conversation, or a word that calls up the other language's saliency in some other way.

Clyne recognizes that there is controversy in the literature over whether the same model should be able to provide constraints on switches of singly occurring words as well as of full phrases when two languages occur in the same clause or sentence. He interprets Poplack as holding that codeswitching operates on the grammatical constraints of both languages, while borrowing is constrained grammatically by the recipient language (84). Myers-Scotton 1997 holds that in a given data set, the same language, which is the recipient language for established borrowings and the Matrix Language in codeswitching, constrains the form of singly occurring words in both codeswitching and borrowing. The Matrix Language in codeswitching also constrains the positioning of Embedded Language phrases within the larger clause; its abstract grammatical features also determine whether the elements meeting a speaker's semantic and pragmatic intentions must occur as Embedded Language phrases or whether these can occur as singly occurring words (cf. Myers-Scotton & Jake 2001, Myers-Scotton 2002). However, Clyne is able to skirt the codeswitching vs. borrowing issue entirely by referring to singly occurring words only as a type of transference. But does this solve anything?

Finally, in this chapter Clyne introduces syntactic transference and convergence. He argues that there are many known examples of grammatical transference (i.e., what are called "outsider late system morphemes" under the 4-M model). In his discussion of transference, Clyne largely follows the five-stage classification of lexical to structural borrowing found in Thomason & Kaufman 1988, finding examples for all five stages. I dispute Clyne's claim that there are structural borrowings that are outsider late system morphemes (i.e., more or less what occurs at the fifth stage), but space does not permit the full argument here (cf. Myers-Scotton 2002).

Chap. 4 is a key chapter. It deals with how the language systems of some plurilinguals (speakers of three or more languages) converge and how this is resisted by some speakers, as well as with examples of different types of transference. Largely, the chapter consists of many interesting examples of different types of convergence and then transference. It finally seems to become clear how Clyne differentiates convergence and transfer. He seems to see convergence as the creation of a new form in a language, but under the influence of another language; in contrast, he sees transference as the actual surface transfer into a language of an actual form from another language.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404506270052 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Clyne emphasizes two points about convergence. First, bilingual commonalities are a major source of instances of convergence. For example, in speaking Italian, rather than using the Italian word *pronuncia*, the speaker makes the form closer to English *pronunciation*. The fact that Spanish has the form *pronunciación* is cited as a factor, too. The result is that the speaker says *pronunciazone*. Second, trilinguals show convergence in often extending to a third language a feature shared by their other two languages

The bulk of the chapter consists of examples of different types of transference. Many of the examples of lexical transference may be established borrowings in the speech of the immigrant community; that is, it is not clear whether one would even consider some or all of them to be examples of codeswitching. If they are still examples of transference, they are of a different order than elements or structures that may appear only once or twice. Clyne does not consider this issue. For example, if a speaker from a German enclave says "eine kleine *car*," is this an example of transference or an established borrowing, or both?

Many of the examples are of changes in word order (syntactic transference). I would refer to such examples as cases of convergence; that is, even though all the surface elements come from language X, the abstract features controlling word order come from another language. To me, this is convergence, an abstract process affecting the morphosyntactic frame. This is a change of a different order from the act of inserting a lexical element from another language, resulting in a clause with surface forms from both languages, but not any change in the abstract features of the frame.

When Clyne gets to his discussion of morphological features, it seems to me that it is hard to maintain a line between transference and convergence. For example, in certain cases (e.g., loss of accusative case marking in Hungarian) one could argue that this is a matter of convergence to English, which does not overtly mark accusative case. Otherwise, Clyne reports a number of interesting findings, too numerous to detail. One of them is that the case system is still intact in his urban German data in the first generation, an argument against rapid attrition of this type of morpheme.

Here as elsewhere, I wish that Clyne had spent more time elaborating on the point of interest that an example illustrates; he tends to present examples and leave it to the reader to understand their significance. Again, this makes me wonder if Clyne tries to cover too much territory in one book.

Chap. 5 is an important chapter for Clyne because it is here that he argues at length about the role of trigger words in facilitating change from one language to another within a clause. When a bilingual homophone comes up in the clause, the speaker may then switch to the other language. Although the idea that trigger words facilitate switching languages is attractive, and although Clyne reports quantitative evidence that such switches do occur after trigger words, the problem is that he does not report on all the possible opportunities when a trigger word does not result in a switch.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404506270052 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Chap. 6 is an especially ambitious chapter because Clyne attempts to survey a number of psycholinguistic models of language production and to relate them to his plurilingual data and the types of convergence and transference that occur.

Chapter 7 introduces a new topic, the ways in which certain aspects of language contact reflect cultural values and identity change across generations. That is, Clyne considers the pragmatic interpretations that using one form rather than another can convey. He touches upon pronouns of address, but also modal particles that may indicate the speaker's attitude toward a proposition, especially in German or Dutch. He also considers the pragmatic force of discourse markers in English in contrast with those in the immigrant languages discussed.

In a final chapter, Clyne summarizes his approach and the results he thinks he has achieved. He makes two points very clear. First, the degree of typological distance between two languages makes a difference in the type and extent of convergence and transference that occurs. Second, he argues it is more useful to speak of facilitation than of constraints ("e.g. syntactic overlap facilitates transversion, not: different syntactic structures constrain switching," 241). That is, he takes the position that when two languages are in contact, certain changes are facilitated by certain conditions, such as typological or genetic similarities; but he does not seem to see the researcher predicting outcomes in any absolute or even near-absolute way.

In sum, this book is admirable for its ambition, with many examples of contact phenomena. The chapter of most interest to anthropological linguists and sociolinguists is chap. 2, on language maintenance and shift. The core chapters have definite value, but they are for a more specialized audience of researchers who study the same phenomena and therefore are willing to slog through the many examples. In recompense for the slogging, the book has many virtues (e.g., not just data from bilinguals, but also from trilinguals).

REFERENCES

Bickerton, Derek (1981). *The roots of language*. Ann Arbor, MI: Karoma.

Canut, Cécile, & Caubet, Dominque (2001) (eds.). *Comment les langues se mélangent*. Paris: L'Harmattan.

Clyne, Michael (1967). *Transference and triggering*. The Hague: Nijhoff.

Hlavac, Jim (2003). *Second-generation speech, lexicon, code-switching and morpho-syntax of Croatian-English bilinguals*. Bern: Peter Lang.

Kovács, Magdolna (2001). *Code-switching and language shift in Australian Finnish in comparison with Australian Hungarian*. Åbo, Finland: Åbo Akademi University Press.

Matras, Yaron, & Bakker, Peter (2003) (eds.). *The mixed language debate*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Muysken, Pieter (2000). Bilingual speech, a typology of code-mixing. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Myers-Scotton, Carol (2002). *Contact linguistics: Bilingual encounters and grammatical outcomes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

_____ (1997). *Duelling languages: grammatical structure in codeswitching*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

_____, & Jake, Janice (2000). Four types of morpheme: Evidence from aphasia, codeswitching, and second language acquisition. *Linguistics* 38:1053–1100.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404506270052 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Poplack, Shana (1980). "Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y termino en español": Toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics* 18:581–618.
_____, & Meechan, Marjory (1998). How languages fit together in codemixing. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 2:127–38.
Schmid, Monika S. (2002). *First language attrition, use and maintenance: The case of German Jews in anglophone countries*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
Thomason, Sarah G. (2001). *Language contact: An introduction*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press. (First published in UK by Edinburgh University Press).
_____, & Kaufman, Terrence (1988). *Language contact, creolization, and genetic linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Winford, Donald (2003). *An introduction to contact linguistics*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

(Received 9 July 2004)

Language in Society **35** (2006). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404506220050

RICK IEDEMA, *Discourses of post-bureaucratic organization*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2003. Pp. ix, 234. Hb $82.00.

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

Discourses of post-bureaucratic organization represents an ambitious effort by Rick Iedema to synthesize the fields of discourse studies and organization studies. Not since Deirdre Boden's *The business of talk* (1994) has this feat been attempted in such depth by a scholar whose starting point is linguistics (as opposed to management theory). Of course, each of the two fields being synthesized includes a large number of diverse perspectives. Iedema develops his theoretical paradigm primarily by highlighting and intertwining the strands of social semiotics and conceptualizations of the "post-bureaucratic organization." He weaves these together with the aid of Foucauldian notions of discourse and governmentality. In this review, I will first summarize Iedema's argument and then offer an assessment of its strengths and limitations. My description of the book will go into some detail as a service to potential readers, because, in fact, this volume is not easy to read.

The central theme of Iedema's book is the identification and description of a phenomenon that he labels "textualization." This is a novel set of meaning-making practices that Iedema holds to be characteristic of organizations today. Before explicating these discursive phenomena, however, let me set the stage by summarizing the organizational side of Iedema's argument. In his understanding of the way organizations function under late capitalism, Iedema is strongly influenced by the critical management theory approaches of authors such as Heckscher & Donnellon 1994. He begins with their argument that shifts in the global political economy have led to a complex of organizational changes that include "the reduction of formal levels of hierarchy, an emphasis on flex-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404506270052 Published online by Cambridge University Press

TABLE 1. *The two poles of textualization.*

Pole 1	Pole 2
The particular	The general
The local	The distal
Discursive performances	Discursive products
Worker interactions	Accounts of the work
Diverse and locally embedded points of view	Delinguistified, dedifferentiated, and time-space distantiated discourse
Heteroglossia	Monoglossia
Face-to-face negotiation of meta-discourses about work	Resemiotization of meta-discourses into documents, physical artifacts like buildings
Increasing the *visibility* of workers by highlighting workers and deemphasizing the role of the organization	Increasing the *transparency* of the work, i.e. formalizing and making explicit procedures, benchmarks, competencies, etc.

ibility rather than rule-following" (Grey & Garsten 2001:230), increased reliance on work teams, and a shift to contract work and outsourcing. Iedema also accepts their claim that a new form of organizational control has emerged in which workers are called on not only to execute their tasks efficiently but also to display psychological engagement with and commitment to the work. The same phenomenon has been analyzed by followers of Foucault, using his concept of governmentality. Foucault argues that the most subtle way for institutions to exercise control over their subjects is to inculcate in these subjects a personal desire to carry out institutional goals, in the belief that they are acting in their own self-interest. In this way, subjects will come to "govern" themselves. Although Foucault is especially interested in state governments, later authors have applied the concept of governmentality to other types of organization as well.

It is in this context that Iedema argues that "textualization" is the central process shaping post-bureaucratic organization. He frames textualization as a dialectical negotiation between two poles; Table 1 summarizes some of the oppositional sets of terms he uses to express this dialectic. Furthermore, under late capitalism, Pole 2 takes on an increasing role in organizational life. Iedema claims that until recently, most employees mainly needed to communicate their work experiences to others who were relatively close to them in the work process. Thus, their conversation could highlight the local and the particular. In the post-bureaucratic organization, however, workers increasingly need to communicate their work to others who are in distant parts of the organization, or even in entirely different organizations. Such interactions require participants to bridge diverse local understandings and to describe their work in generalized terms that can be understood by a broad audience. Thus, employees are

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404506270052 Published online by Cambridge University Press

called on to shift articulations and outputs of their workplace activities and identities from Pole 1 to Pole 2.

Iedema argues that "textualization" is comprised of three related discursive processes, which he terms "delinguistification," "dedifferentiation," and "time-space distanciation." The first term refers to a shift toward generalizing and abstracting uses of language (Habermas 1987). "Delinguistified" discourse also elides information that speakers assume to be shared with their audience; it therefore naturalizes shared ways of knowing. The second term, "dedifferentiation," refers to discursive processes through which differences of opinion between conversational participants or stakeholders are deemphasized. Such differences of opinion may be due to contrasts in organizational positions, roles, professional expertise, or status. Third, "time-space distanciation" refers to a standardization and extension of structures and practices across time and space (Giddens 1984). Iedema offers grammatical metaphor, especially nominalization, as a key linguistic technique for achieving textualization.

According to Iedema, when employees learn to describe their work in generalized terms for a broad audience, they come to see themselves in a different way. By publicly affirming their identification with work practices which they have explicitly articulated, they connect more intensely with their job. This increased affiliation enables organizational power to flow through the "participative logic of governmentality" (46); as employees identify more with their organization, they enact its goals out of their own perceived self-interest.

The process of textualization contributes to two changes in the position of employees. First, textualization helps raise the "visibility" of employees inside the organization: The discursive spotlight is placed on their performance while the role of senior management is deemphasized. Second, textualization increases the "transparency" of work processes: The creation of generalized work descriptions enhances management's ability to measure the performance of employees against a norm. Employees can more easily be held accountable for following standardized work practices and meeting quantifiable targets. Although these shifts in the position of employees have been identified previously, Iedema illuminates the role played by discursive processes.

Iedema's argument has both strengths and limitations. I commend the author for reaching out to the field of organization studies from a home base in discourse studies. He has clearly thought deeply about the issues, and he provides an interesting synthesis of social semiotics and certain organizational concepts. His introduction to social semiotics is cogent, and he makes a strong case for the usefulness of this theoretical paradigm for organization studies. I find his argument especially interesting when it touches on the transformation of discourse as it moves from the particular to the general – for instance, the way in which talk in a meeting to plan a hospital building is transformed into written guidelines, which in turn lead to the design of an architectural plan, and then ultimately to

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404506270052 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the construction of the actual building (144). I would like to have seen this topic explored in greater depth.

The main limitation of this book is that the discussion of organizational life is rather thin. Iedema's use of existing literature is narrow, his examples are few, and his arguments lack a nuanced understanding of what goes on in organizations. The organizational literature he draws on consists mainly of two works on post-bureaucracy (Heckscher & Donnellon 1994, Grey & Garsten 2001). So, for example, he seems unaware that the argument he presents about workers being required to display an attitude of psychological engagement dates back to Tompkins & Cheney 1985, who identify the phenomenon as a new form of organizational control which they label "concertive control." Their insights were extended by authors such as Barker (1993, 1999) and subsequently diffused into the literature on post-bureaucratic organizations. Iedema's analysis would have been enriched by addressing the concept of concertive control, and doing so would have helped readers from organization studies follow his reasoning. The book also makes no reference to a large body of organizational research on language and power, whose leading authors include Mats Alvesson, Stanley Deetz, and Dennis Mumby. Much of what Iedema says overlaps with the concerns of this literature, and again, organizational scholars would have found his book more accessible had he engaged with ongoing discussions.

Iedema offers surprisingly few examples of actual interactions in organizations. Several of his examples are invented, and others are repeated from one chapter to another. It is telling that he describes the pros and cons of adopting computer-based medical record-keeping systems by summarizing discussions in the medical literature, rather than by presenting the story of the actual adoption of such a system. I find the lack of field data surprising, because he claims to have conducted several years of ethnographic and linguistic fieldwork (178). Furthermore, Iedema's data collection has taken place primarily in medical organizations, yet he does not address the ways in which such organizations function differently from corporations or other types of institutions.

In addition, Iedema provides little organizational context for his examples. It is hard to understand the significance of snippets of conversation without knowing the political situation in which they took place, or the effects that they had on the subsequent life of the organization. For example, chap. 5 describes a meeting in which an unskilled facilitator fails to unify the diverse viewpoints of team members, who all belong to different organizations. We do not learn contextual information such as what pressures the participants faced in their respective organizations, or how this shaped their attitudes and behaviors. What key events happened before the meeting that shaped its dynamics? What were the consequences of the meeting? Similar questions are left unanswered for all examples.

Perhaps because of this lack of data, Iedema presents a rather undifferentiated view of organizational life. His arguments have a tendency to simplify the experience of employees. One area in which this happens is his elision of differences

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404506270052 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in the contexts that employees move through during the course of their workday. For instance, in chap. 3 Iedema provides a four-line extract from a document of the Australian Department of Immigration. He argues that the grammatical metaphors it contains lead "the people who … are in charge of realizing the intentions of this discourse" to "reconfigure their agency" and their enactment of time and space (75). This is a rather sweeping statement. Employees may perform a particular discourse in one organizational context without necessarily acquiring a new sense of agency, time, and space in all moments of their work life. Iedema's argument does not take into account the ways in which employees engage in quite different performances of self depending on the organizational context in which they find themselves. For instance, their behavior among trusted coworkers is likely to be markedly different from their self-presentation in front of an audience of senior management or clients.

A second way in which Iedema's view of organizational life lacks nuance is his failure to distinguish consistently between employees at different levels in the hierarchy. At a minimum, it would be helpful to distinguish between workers and management. And, to the extent that he is writing about his knowledge of hospitals, it would be interesting to see an analysis of the status of doctors – they seem to share some characteristics of both workers and managers. Iedema never distinguishes between these different groups in terms of how they might experience the process of "textualization."

As these comments indicate, Iedema's writing has itself undergone a process of "textualization" – it is far removed from the lived experience of organization members. Much of the writing utilizes complex grammatical constructions, nominalizations, and passive verbs. Iedema uses jargon extensively. Also, the text relies heavily on direct quotes; Iedema often lets other authors voice his main points.

This book is likely to be of interest to scholars in both discourse studies and organization studies. In particular, it may be useful to those studying the ongoing transformation of Western medical institutions. However, they will need to accept the narrowness of Iedema's organizational perspective, and be willing to stay with a text that is challenging to read.

REFERENCES

Barker, James R. (1993). Tightening the iron cage: Concertive control in self-managing teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 38:408–37.

_____ (1999). *The discipline of teamwork: participation and concertive control*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Boden, Deirdre (1994). *The business of talk: Organizations in action*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Giddens, Anthony (1984). *The constitution of society outline of the theory of structuration*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Grey, Christopher, & Garsten, Christina (2001). Trust, control and post-bureaucracy. *Organization Studies* 22:229–50.

Habermas, Jürgen (1987). *The theory of communicative action 2: Lifeworld and system – a critique of functionalist reason*. Boston: Beacon.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404506270052 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Heckscher, Charles, & Donnellon, Anne (1994). *The post-bureaucratic organization: New perspectives on organizational change*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Tompkins, Phillip K., and Cheney, George (1985). Communication and unobtrusive control in contemporary organizations. In R. D. McPhee and P. K. Tompkins (eds.), *Organizational communication: Traditional themes and new directions*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

(Received 26 July 2004)

Language in Society **35** (2006). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404506230057

DIANA BOXER, *Applying sociolinguistics: Domains and face-to-face interaction*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2002. 244 pp. Hb $108.00, Pb $47.95.

Reviewed by KRISTINE L. FITCH
Department of Communication Studies, University of Iowa
Iowa City, IA 52242-1498
kristine-fitch@uiowa.edu

This book has many fine qualities, including careful attention to what is meant by APPLYING linguistics as opposed to APPLIED linguistics. The author's goal is to show readers how research findings in micro-sociolinguistic interaction can be applied to several domains of public and private life: family, education, religion, the workplace, cross-cultural encounters, and so on. Application, in this case, involves awareness of subtleties that go unnoticed in face-to-face interaction, particularly those that create or sustain a power imbalance between participants. That awareness, in turn, sets the stage for "transform(ing) the social order" (p. 22, italics omitted) by empowering "individual speakers in their ordinary day-to-day interactions in all spheres of life and in all stages of life" (222). Instead of a social or political agenda, the book suggests in each domain what would constitute more "humane" interaction: stories would be addressed to children, as well as told about them; collaborative ways of speaking associated primarily with women would be given more status in the workplace and used more often by both women and men; gatekeepers who deal with international students (and other U.S. Americans who interact with speakers for whom English is a second language) would be more sensitive to the potential for face threat to arise from misunderstanding.

The book's format is original and extremely useful. It begins with a detailed introduction of Joshua Fishman's notion of domains and a discussion of various research methods used in sociolinguistics. Each domain is described with a review of research in the area, followed by a case study of particular interaction practices relevant to the domain. In family interaction, for example, the case study is about nagging; in the workplace domain, about male banter and boasting in a stockbroker's office. The scope of the literature reviewed for this volume is staggering, given that there are decades of research within each domain from several different disciplines – anthropology, sociology, communication, and education, beyond the many subfields of linguistics relevant to these topics. The

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404506270052 Published online by Cambridge University Press

writing is accessible and articulate without being oversimplified. Both the reviews and the case studies are detailed and sophisticated in their presentation. There are fine, original insights offered throughout the book. Summing up a convincing exploration of the gendered attribution of the speech act of nagging, for example, Boxer notes: "In a world of cooperation women may expect compliance with reasonable requests; nevertheless, when confronted with the hierarchical style of boys and men, it just does not work. Requests need to become repeated reminders that turn into nagging." In the chapter on social interaction, she draws from previously published work to describe teasing as enabling bonding, which can nonetheless take a negative turn and progress from a "nip" to a "bite." Observations such as these both deepen respect for the analytic ear at work here and make for compelling reading.

One perhaps forgivable bias is the consistent focus on the effects of gender on interaction, with relatively little mention of other aspects of identity that are just as significant, such as class, age, and race. It is clear from this book that Boxer's previous work has concentrated on gender, and there is a great deal of research on that particular power imbalance, further justifying this emphasis. As broad as this book is already, it would not have been productive to try to give equal coverage to other dimensions of identity in their influence on social interaction. A more thorough justification of why gender is privileged to the extent that it is, however, seems called for.

The primary utility of this volume is as a textbook for advanced undergraduates and graduate students. It could fit well into courses on various aspects of linguistics, intercultural communication, and the area of language and social interaction as addressed by various disciplines. Students will find the book instructive in many ways. The contrasts between research methods offered in the introduction, and the references to and illustrations of those in the case studies, make it an excellent starting place for student projects in areas that will interest a great many of them. The literature reviews give manageable starting places for grounding such research projects in a variety of disciplinary conversations. The observations of subtle power imbalances in everyday conversational practices are worthwhile starting points for class discussions of students' own experiences in those arenas. The domains themselves are undeniably important and relevant, and will be persuasive evidence of the importance of micro level analysis of social life.

There are, however, limitations of the work that make it less useful as a scholarly resource. First, although one of the fields the book claims to draw from, and attempts to speak to, is communication, much relevant research from the field of communication is absent. To say that no one has studied couples' interaction, for example, is to overlook Mandelbaum 1987, Hopper and Drummond 1990, and many that have followed their lead. Ethnographic work in communication studies would have helped illustrate the contextual dimension described repeatedly as definitive of this approach. Studies conducted in organizational contexts

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404506270052 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(Ashcraft 1999, Cheney 1999, and others) would have contributed, for example, to the discussion of workplace interaction, as communication research focused on culture and intercultural contact (Carbaugh 1996, Lindsley 1999, Schely-Newman 1999) would have added to the chapter on cross-cultural interaction.

Second, although the ethnographic perspective described in the introduction is linked specifically to Hymesian ethnography of speaking, the case studies that claim to use ethnographic methods are generic qualitative efforts rather than accurately reflecting that particular tradition of research. The "ethnography of speaking" approach to conversational joking, for example, seems to refer (73) to practices of audiotaping conversations and collecting fieldnotes in naturally occurring situations. There is no specification of the group of people studied, nor even a sense that a particular group was the focus of study. There is also no attempt to specify any of the particulars of conversational joking among the people whose conversations were taped or observed. The description of joking and teasing, then, although intriguing and undoubtedly quite accurate in its representation of the interactions studied, is not in any way linked to patterns of interaction within any group, setting, or kind of event. The analysis centers on defining the characteristics of those two speech acts vis-à-vis previous research, rather than on the organic experience of a group of people. Similarly, despite framing the case study of gatekeeping encounters in an international office as "ethnography of speaking (Hymes 1962)," (196) there are no details about the particular international office other than its location at a large U.S. university and the fact that over half of the international student population at this university is Asian. There is no sense of a speech community under study, a defining feature of Hymesian ethnography since its inception.

A related problem is that the data analysis, though sometimes well developed and cogent, is in other places quite thin. A case study involving bar and bat mitzvahs, for example, which might have been truly ethnographic, reveals few profound cultural norms and explores the symbolism of the ritual at a fairly superficial level. For example, a moment in a bat mitzvah which sounds as if it would be particularly rich with meaning and feeling is presented thus:

> The segment in which the Torah was carried around the perimeter of the congregation celebrates the fact that the community has a Torah. It is a joyous segment. Aligned with this joyous feeling, the sub-event was an opportunity for the audience to begin to greet each other, converse, and generally talk to each other. The social aspect of the service was once again evident. (139)

Talk about what? Who talked to whom? Why is having a Torah something for the community to celebrate? How, verbally and nonverbally, is the moment made "joyous"? The analytic move at the end of the chapter essentially concludes that bar and bat mitzvahs are interactions within a religious domain, that such interactions are very important and meaningful to the people who participate in them, and that such domains are more significant to U.S. Americans than previous

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404506270052 Published online by Cambridge University Press

research has acknowledged. This lack of detail, unfortunately recurrent in other chapters, is disappointing for the researcher already involved in studies of interaction hoping to add what are clearly rich, unique case studies to the collection of such resources available for theory-building.

REFERENCES

Ashcraft, K. (1999). Managing maternity leave: A qualitative analysis of temporary executive succession. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 44:40–80. .

Carbaugh, D. (1996). *Situating selves: The communication of social identities in American scenes*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Cheney, G. (1999). *Values at work: Employee participation meets market pressure at Mondragón*. Ithaca, NY: ILR Press.

Hopper, R., & Drummond, K. (1990). Emergent goals at a relational turning point: The case of Gordon and Denise. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 9:39–65.

Hymes, D. (1962). The ethnography of speaking. In T. Gladwin & W. C. Sturtevant, eds., *Anthropology and human behavior*. Washington, DC: Anthropological Society of Washington.

Lindsley, S. L. (1999). A layered model of problematic intercultural communication in US-owned maquiladoras in Mexico. *Communication Monographs* 66:145–67.

Mandelbaum, J. (1987). Couples sharing stories. *Communication Quarterly* 35:144–70.

Schely-Newman, E. (1999). Mothers know best: Constructing meaning in a narrative event. *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 85:285–302.

(Received 2 August 2004)

Language in Society **35** (2006). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404506240053

ROBERTA FACCHINETTI, MANFRED KRUG, & FRANK PALMER (eds.), *Modality in contemporary English*. Topics in English Linguistics 44. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2003. Pp. xvi, 396. Hb. $132.30.

Reviewed by JUHANI RUDANKO
Department of English, University of Tampere
Tampere, Finland
fljuru@uta.fi

This volume is a collection of sixteen papers, mainly arising from a conference in Verona, Italy, in 2001. There is a nine-page preface, though no concluding section, by the editors. The preface is mostly devoted to summaries of the individual chapters, except for an initial introduction of about one page. In it the editors aver that "all of these papers offer fresh methodological impetus to a variety of current linguistic debates" but also refer to "differences in theoretical perspectives, terminology and topics." Differences in topics are of course desirable, but differences in core terminology are less so. An attempt on the part of the editors to comment on differences in terminology in studies on modality in general, or at least in those of the present volume, would have been welcome and might have enhanced the "methodological impetus" of which the editors speak. It would also have increased the interest of the volume for the reader wishing to

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404506270052 Published online by Cambridge University Press

gain a sense of the state of the art in the well-researched field of modality at the beginning of the new century.

However, the volume does contain several valuable and well-written contributions. The one that probably does more than any other to fulfill the promise inherent in the book's title is by Geoffrey Leech. In "Modality on the move: The English modal auxiliaries 1961–1992," he examines and compares the incidence of modals around 1961 and 1991, mainly on the basis of the LOB and Brown Corpora and the follow-up corpora prepared at Freiburg (FLOB and Frown), with additional data from two smaller corpora of spoken British English. On the basis of a careful study of the material, he concludes that the frequencies of modals have gone down in general, and those of certain modals, including *must* and *shall*, have gone down more dramatically than those of others (228 f.).

Yet Leech is also careful to note, on the basis of the same corpora, that it is not simply a case of semi-modals taking over. While certain semi-modals, including *need to*, have increased in frequency, some others, including *be to*, have in fact declined, and overall the rise in the frequency of some semi-modals does not make up for the losses of modals (229 f.). Leech is cautious in his comments but still offers the commonsense suggestion that the decrease in the use of *must*, for instance, may have to do with "a tendency to suppress or avoid overt claims to power and authority by the speaker or writer" (237). He places the changes in the frequencies of modals in the larger context of change in British and American English. While there are some pieces of counterevidence, Leech also endorses the highly interesting hypothesis that "many changes in recent English have been led by American English, with British English following on in its wake, rather than vice versa" (227). The article is well argued and stimulating.

In "Changes in the modals and semi-modals of strong obligation and epistemic necessity in recent British English," Nicholas Smith, working with much the same corpora as Leech, confirms the decline of *must*, and similarly suggests that "because it is prototypically subjective and insistent, sometimes authoritarian-sounding, root MUST is likely to be increasingly avoided in a culture where overt markers of power or hierarchy are much less in favour" (263). Smith also examines the role of genre distribution in the case of *must, have to*, and *need to* in the LOB and FLOB corpora (251 f.), noting that *have to* has largely maintained itself, and that *need to* has become more prominent (263).

In another valuable paper, "Pragmatic and sociological constraints on the functions of *may* in contemporary British English," Roberta Facchinetti draws on the British Component of the International Corpus of English to examine syntactic and semantic properties of the core modal *may* in current British English. She also takes careful account of genre in her study, and one of her findings concerns the important role played by *may* in expressing what she calls existential possibility: In the case of epistemic possibility "the speaker/writer puts forward his/her point of view quite overtly" (308), but as regards existential possibility, "the claims made with *may* can be tested and checked against objective data" (305).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404506270052 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Going beyond the study of core modals, three chapters deserve to be singled out for attention. Carita Paradis's "Between epistemic modality and degree: The case of *really*" presents a useful case study of *really*, based on solid empirical evidence drawn partly from the Bergen Corpus of London Teenage English, which is part of the British National Corpus. She identifies three different uses of *really*: "truth attesting of propositions," as in *Really, they are quite strange;* "subjective judgement of the importance of a situation involved in the proposition," as in *I really appreciate your support*; and "reinforcement of scalar property," as in *They are really nice* (194). She also carefully examines the intonational contours involved.

Jennifer Coates, in "The role of epistemic modality in women's talk," increases the interest of the volume for readers who are not hard-core grammarians of English. Adopting a broad view of the notion of modality, she examines the use of expressions such as *I mean, well, just*, and *sort of* in a corpus of women's conversation. It would have been helpful to have further information, perhaps in a footnote, about the nature of the corpus and whether it is available to other scholars, but she makes several valuable points in her article. For instance, drawing in part on earlier work by Edelsky 1981, she introduces the notion of a collaborative floor: While in the well-known Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson 1974 format, speakers speak one at a time, "the defining characteristic of the collaborative floor is that the floor is potentially open to all participants simultaneously" (342). The use of epistemic modality forms is then not a sign of weakness or of unassertiveness on the part of women, but "a resource of doing friendship" (346).

Of the other contributions, Philippe Bourdin's "On two distinct uses of *go* as a conjoined marker of evaluative modality" deserves mention. He draws partly on the British National Corpus and discusses the combinations *go un-V-en*, as in *go undetected*, and *go V-ing*, as in *go thinking*. Although he might have used a specific corpus or specific corpora more systematically, the article brings up fresh perspectives on two constructions in English that are still to be fully treated in the literature.

The chapters commented on above have been singled out for attention here because they are well argued and well researched, and because they examine important, well-defined questions in the area of modality in contemporary English. In addition, they are also among those contributions in the book that make essential use of authentic data as the basis of analysis. It bears noting that there are chapters in the volume that are largely – or even exclusively – based on introspection. Introspection remains a possible source of data in the study of language, and in some areas of syntax it is indispensable. However, in the study of constructions as complex and context-dependent as those involving modals, it is helpful not to rely solely on decontextualized examples invented by the analyst. By contrast, in corpus data modals can be viewed in their context of use, and the study of authentic examples, moreover, may bring up properties – for instance, about collocational patterns or preferences of modals – that the analyst

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404506270052 Published online by Cambridge University Press

relying solely on introspection may easily overlook. The articles singled out for attention above, in part because they draw on authentic data, do open up new methodological perspectives for the study of modals in the twenty-first century, making the present book a welcome addition to the voluminous literature on modality in English.

REFERENCES

Edelsky, Carol. (1981). Who's got the floor? *Language in Society* 10:383–421.
Sacks, Harvey; Schegloff, Emanuel A.; & Jefferson, Gail (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking in conversation. *Language* 50:696–735.

(Received 26 July 2004)

Language in Society **35** (2006). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S004740450625005X

ANA ROCA & M. CECILIA COLOMBI (eds.), *Mi lengua: Spanish as a heritage language in the United States*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press. 2003. 320 pp. $29.95.

Reviewed by NORMA GONZALEZ
Education, Culture and Society, University of Utah
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112-9256
norma.gonzalez@ed.utah.edu

The teaching of Spanish to native speakers has been packaged under diverse names, emerging most recently as "Spanish as a Heritage Language." Whether it is couched as developmental bilingual education, maintenance bilingual education, Spanish for native speakers, or heritage language development, advocates for programs of academic excellence in two languages have been dealt a stunning blow by recent federal school reform measures. The No Child Left Behind Act, passed in 2001, eliminates, for all intents and purposes, the Bilingual Education Act (Title VII), as programs for English language learners have been subsumed under Title III of NCLB. All reference to bilingual education has been expunged from federal parlance, replaced in both form and substance by English language acquisition programs. The former Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Language Affairs (OBEMLA), the repository of research on minoritized languages in the United States, has been transformed into the Office of English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement for Limited-English-Proficient Students. Needless to say, support for native-language instruction is not found in Title III, as English language acquisition takes center stage. Add to this scenario the referenda passed in California, Arizona, and Massachusetts dismantling bilingual education, as well as the anti-immigrant sentiment sweeping the country, and the prospect of fostering Spanish as a heritage language seems dismal indeed.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404506270052 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Notwithstanding this grim political scenario, editors Ana Roca and M. Cecilia Columbi have brought together a series of articles centered on the teaching and learning of Spanish for students who can claim a Spanish-speaking heritage. As evidenced in *Mi lengua: Spanish as a heritage language in the United States*, the terms "heritage language" (HL) and "heritage language learner" (HLL) have become increasingly common as applied linguists and teachers alike recognize that heritage speakers and learners require pedagogical practices that are distinct from those meant for foreign-language learners. Interestingly, neither the editors nor the chapter authors attempt explicit definition of heritage speakers, although I concur with Guadalupe Valdés, who states that this term is used to refer to a person "who is raised in a home where a language other than English is spoken, who speaks or merely understands the heritage language, and who is to some degree bilingual in English and the heritage language" (2000:1). The conundrum in this definition resides in what "to some degree bilingual" means in terms of language use and literacy. For example, several chapter authors reference a schema of students who enroll in courses designated "Spanish for native speakers" (Valdés 1997) that categorizes bilinguals along a range of skills in English and Spanish, problematizing the often-accepted modality of the term "bilingual." This heteroglossia within the Spanish-speaking populations in the United States is the undergirding for all of the chapters in this edited volume. Any serious reader of it will come away impressed with the multilayered complexity of tapping into the linguistic resources of communities.

Rather than summarize and comment on each of the thirteen individual chapters, I will highlight themes that cut across the volume. The book is made up of two parts: theoretical considerations and implications for K–16 instruction. Yet implicit within the theoretical constructs is a strong practice component, and this is the strength of the book.

True to the editors' ideological premise of positively valencing Spanish academic registers, four of the chapters are in Spanish, and several of those in English include untranslated quotations in Spanish, assuming readers who are biliterate.

The theoretical chapter by Andrew Lynch, "Toward a theory of heritage language acquisition: Spanish in the United States," provides the infrastructure for the other chapters. Nine basic principles are explored that are specific to heritage language acquisition (HLA). Although based on the interface of theory in the fields of second language acquisition and language contact, these nine principles go beyond the traditional reliance on cognitive and psychological models of language learning and take into account the linguistic funds of knowledge of heritage language communities. For example, within naturally occurring discourse patterns in neighborhoods and local social contexts, HLLs will encounter instances of Principle 2, "the incidental acquisition principle." HLLs will overhear conversations between other Spanish speakers outside the home, will come across media in Spanish, or will interact with immigrant family members. These are

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404506270052 Published online by Cambridge University Press

opportunities for language learning that are not often taken into account by foreign-language teaching, or even bilingual education programs. The principles that are laid out situate language learning clearly within the social realm, not a phenomenon that happens "between the ears" but one that is context-driven and inherently ideological.

These premises are carried through the other chapters in both Part I and Part II. Although many of the chapters reiterate the demographic imperative for marketing oneself in two languages, the more urgent community-based necessity is that communities not squander their linguistic resources. Language is a form of social capital that can be leveraged into both symbolic and material resources. The chapters that focus on specific pedagogical practices for increasing the academic achievement of HLLs rest on this assumption. For example, M. Cecilia Colombi's chapter, "Un enfoque funcional para la enseñanza del ensayo expositivo," argues that the informal conversational registers of students are often transferred into expository writing, limiting the development of advanced levels of Spanish literacy. As the metafunctions of textual production are carefully deconstructed, Colombi presents clear and specific strategies for HLL teaching and learning. Similarly, Bernal-Enríquez & Hernández Chávez, in their chapter "La enseñanza del español en Nuevo Mexico Revitalización o erradicación de la variedad chicana?" interrogate the language ideologies of linguistic purism that have permeated the denigration of nonstandard regional varieties of Spanish. Their call for a validation of local forms of language use within the pedagogical practices of academic Spanish is a necessary basis for constructing multidiscursive platforms of language use.

In Part II, "Community and classroom-based research studies: Implications for instruction K–16," the chapter authors deal with a range of heritage-language teaching and learning, from elementary students in a dual language program, to university students in courses offering Spanish for native/heritage speakers. All deal with issues specific to HLA: "How do we treat the home language? How should we build on it rather than criticize and/or eradicate its nonstandard aspects? Why do Spanish-English bilinguals experience difficulties in typical Spanish classes?"(172). Each of the chapters adopts the stance of critical pedagogy, typified by the statement that "Daily class themes should *not* be ones like 'Los participios pasados' or 'comparación de los adjetivos' but rather ones like 'la inmigración mexicana en California' or 'movimientos feministas en Latinoamérica' or 'la raza en el Caribe' "(42). In this way, students are active constructors of their own knowledge, marshalling linguistic resources to suit their own academic needs, rather than passive receptacles for ideology-laced prescriptive grammars that deny their competence as speakers of a language.

This book brings together the best in both theory and practice to a field that, given the current political climate, can either flourish or fall by the wayside. By writing to a broad audience of teachers, teacher educators, applied linguists, and, we would hope, educational policy makers, this book carves out a coherent

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404506270052 Published online by Cambridge University Press

argument for building on linguistic capital and sets the stage for further levels of theoretical and pedagogical development. The development of students who are multidiscursive, who can choose from a range of linguistic repertoires, and who can appropriate discourses for specific ends is the vision of progressive educators. This book takes us one step closer to that vision.

REFERENCES

Valdés, G. (1997). The teaching of Spanish to bilingual Spanish-speaking students: Outstanding issues and unanswered questions. In M.C. Colombi & F.X. Alarcón (eds.), *La enseñanza del español a hispanohablantes*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

_____ (2000). Introduction. In *Spanish for Native Speakers, Volume 1*. AATSP Professional Development Series Handbook for teachers K–16. New York: Harcourt College.

(Received 19 July 2004)

Language in Society **35** (2006). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404506260056

LISA J. GREEN, *African American English: A Linguistic Introduction*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2002. 285 pp. Pb $31.99.

Reviewed by ALEXANDER KAUTZSCH
Department of English and American Studies
University of Regensburg
D-93040 Regensburg
Germany
alexander.kautzsch@sprachlit.uni-r.de

When I first saw Cambridge University Press's announcement of Lisa Green's book, I was quite excited, because a systematic, comprehensive introductory book on African American English had been lacking in the field for quite a while. But now one is available and – to start with my overall impression – it is very good. In what follows I survey the book's contents as well as offer critical assessment of its goals and how they are achieved.

The Introduction (pp. 1–11) has three parts: the aims of the book, a very informative survey of the various labels for the speech of black Americans, and a brief discussion of the variety's historical origins, all written in a catchy style, cautiously getting newcomers into the matter.

In Chapter 1, "Lexicon and meaning" (12–33), Green attempts to show how lexical entries should be structured, provides some examples, and contrasts them with "General American usage." She nicely shows how words can have different meanings in AAE in certain contexts (*steady, come, stay*, etc., feature as prominent examples here), and finally she opts for a treatment of verbal markers (*be, BIN, dən, be dən, BIN dən*) in the lexicon, which are usually dealt with only in grammatical descriptions.

Chapter 2, "Syntax, part 1: Verbal markers in AAE" (34–75) gives detailed usage information about the three types of verbal markers: auxiliaries (*have*, *do*,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404506270052 Published online by Cambridge University Press

copula *be*, *will/would, shall/should*, etc.), aspectual markers (*be, BIN, dən* and their combinations), and preverbal markers (*finna, steady, come*). For the first two sections, Green provides extensive "verbal paradigms" with Standard English glosses to show how the respective forms are used in unmarked, emphatic, and negative contexts. Although this sometimes feels like being taught AAE the Latin way, Green obviously wishes to drive home the message that AAE is a variety that has a regular grammar system. In fact, these paradigms make it easy for the reader to get quick access to this central part of AAE grammar. I have never seen this presented more comprehensively. After the paradigms, Green elaborates on aspectual *be*, remote past BIN, *dən*, and the combinations *be dən* and BIN *dən*. Here, a host of enlightening examples are used, each once again accompanied by a Standard English gloss and – somewhat surprisingly but very informatively – by frequent reference to wrong usage, which again underlines the fact that AAE has rules and one can make mistakes using it. A helpful feature is Green's Q-and-A style summaries at the end of the passages on aspectual *be*, remote past BIN, and *dən*. The chapter closes with an equally comprehensive account of the preverbal markers *finna, come*, and *steady*.

In Chapter 3, "Syntax, part 2: Syntactic and morphosyntactic properties in AAE" (76–105) the reader is introduced to five syntactic peculiarities (negation, existential *it/dey*, questions, relative clauses, and preterite *had*) and three morphosyntactic ones (past morphology, verbal *-s*, and genitive marking) of AAE, once again all done nicely, with innumerable examples and detailed explanations. Nonetheless, I would like to mention two tiny shortcomings. First, in the comparison of indirect questions in AAE and other varieties of English (87–89), the examples for the latter are taken from introductory textbooks with no mention of the respective varieties (which the author herself admits to be too unspecific). Second, the section on relative markers fails to mention the very important function of the relative pronoun in the relative clause, which is crucial in showing differences between standard and nonstandard varieties of English.

Chapter 4, "Phonology of AAE" (106–133), deals with the four most salient segmental phonological properties of AAE (final consonant sounds, devoicing, sound patterns, and *th*, and *r* and *l* liquid vocalization) and adds a welcome section on prosodic features, in which Green gives a comprehensive survey of the neglected areas of AAE intonation and stress. Of course, an accompanying CD-ROM would have increased the price of the book considerably, but still, some audio samples (possibly on a website) would have increased the value of the book, at least for people who get access to varieties in general and to phonetic features in particular more easily through the ear than through the eye.

Chapter 5, "Speech events and rules of interaction in AAE" (134–163), is definitely a highlight in the book. Green delivers a great overview of all those notorious speech events of AAE (signifying, playing the dozens, rapping, marking, loud-talking, woofing, toasts) and also of expressions in nonverbal communication (eye movement and giving dap). The chapter culminates in a well-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404506270052 Published online by Cambridge University Press

written account of "speech events and language use in AA church services." Once again, on the basis of good examples, Green explains the well-known call-and-response strategy, and indeed manages to get the feeling across. She can hardly hide her excitement about these verbal strategies which – as she states several times – "are just as important as the syntactic, phonological and lexical properties of AAE" (160). The remainder of the chapter deals with backchanneling in informal conversation, and language use and rap. Two additional points might have made the chapter perfect: the inclusion of pictures illustrating nonverbal communication (for pictures showing cut-eye and suck teeth, cf. Rickford & Rickford 1976), and maybe a little more cultural background information to help non-Americans understand some allusions to TV series, brand names, and the like (e.g., "Metrecal," 140).

The positioning of chapter 5 in the book could not have been better. It nicely foreshadows what Green tries to focus on in chapters 6, "AAE in literature" (164–199), and 7, "AAE in the media" (200–215): how linguistic blackness is represented in books, TV series, and films. Especially in the media chapter, it becomes apparent that in films (such as *The Best Man* or *Fresh*) and TV series (such as *The Fresh Prince of Bel Air*) "grammatical correctness" is not always necessary. It is rather the mere appearance of a "black feature" like aspectual *be*, besides the usage of certain speech events like signifying, that suffices to create "blackness." The literature chapter is very extensive, dealing exemplarily with a variety of AA texts to show how AA speech is presented as different from white speech. Up to the early twentieth century, this was mostly achieved by means of eye-dialect; from the Harlem Renaissance on, a broader variety of structures and rhetorical strategies was represented. This chapter would make a good starting point for a class on the history of AAE and the problems of obtaining speech data before the advent of recording machines (cf. Kautzsch 2002, chap. 2).

The final chapter 8, "Approaches, attitudes and education" (216–242), surveys four issues: how researchers have seen AAE through time (as a dialect of English, or as a separate system); how laypersons see AAE, including discussion of the King case in Ann Arbor and the "Ebonics" issue; how it is important to be bidialectal as an African American in order to get a job ("attitudes towards AAE and employment"); and – in the longest section of this chapter – how AAE should be dealt with in education.

This whole chapter seems to be designed as the culmination of an argument running throughout this book: Green over and over again emphasizes that AAE is systematic and that speakers of AAE follow rules, be it in the choice of lexical items or in the usage of syntactic or phonological features. For linguists this seems a little overdone at times, but Green obviously wants to bring this message home to newcomers in the field and to laypersons, which appears to be more than necessary in a social climate that does not accept AAE as a "proper" variety, but rather sees it as slang, broken English, and the like. And it is exactly this chapter that helps to illustrate that these stances could be worked against in a

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404506270052 Published online by Cambridge University Press

more open-minded educational system and with the help of open-minded and well-informed teachers.

The volume is rounded off by the Endnotes (245–254) for the respective chapters (a practice I personally am not in favor of because I don't regard skipping back and forth as user-friendly, but in an introductory book footnotes may indeed confuse new readers more than is necessary), an extensive list of References (255–268), Acknowledgments (269–270), and a helpful Index (271–285).

All chapters are structured in somewhat parallel fashion; there is always a "focal point" at the beginning and a clear summary and well-chosen study questions at the end, all of which will help teachers and students to focus on the most prominent issues. Summing up, Lisa Green has written an excellent book which will definitely be a standard reference and introduction for present-day African American English for quite a while. Let's just hope her message will also spread beyond academia.

REFERENCES

Rickford, John R., & Angela E. Rickford (1976). Cut-eye and suck teeth: African words and gestures in new world guise. In J. L. Dillard (ed.) *Perspectives on American English*, 347–65. New York: Mouton.

Kautzsch, Alexander. (2002). *The Historical Evolution of Earlier African-American English: An Empirical Comparison of Early Sources*. Berlin and New Yourk: Mouton de Gruyter.

(Received 30 September 2004)

Language in Society **35** (2006). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404506270052

WALT WOLFRAM & ERIK R. THOMAS, *The development of African American English*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2002. Pp. ix, 237. Pb $40.95.

Reviewed by JOHN BAUGH
Education & Linguistics, Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305
jbaugh@stanford.edu

Wolfram and Thomas (W&T) have produced a meticulous study of African American English and its development, based on extensive fieldwork and ensuing linguistic analyses in Hyde County, North Carolina. W&T worked in collaboration with Elaine W. Green, Becky Childes, Dan Beckett, and Benjamin Torbert. Any student of African American English, or of sociolinguistics in general, will find a wealth of knowledge in this volume that reflects advanced studies of African American English that connect synchronic studies with their diachronic relevance.

The book consists of ten chapters, and each chapter is carefully subdivided into an array of issues and diverse evidence that reflects on W&T's original study, as well as on the larger field of research on African American Vernacular English (AAVE). They correctly note that "No topic in modern sociolinguistics has en-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404506270052 Published online by Cambridge University Press

gendered more interest than African American Vernacular English" (p. xiii). Peter Trudgill, general editor of the Blackwell series "Language in Society" in which this volume is included, states: "This book is an example of the linguistic study of language in society at its best. Wolfram, Thomas, and their associates have produced a superb work in what we might perhaps call linguistic archaeology" (xii). In the opinion of this reviewer, his praise is not inflated.

Chap. 1, "Introduction," describes the status of African American English generally and places this work within the Hyde County Corpus, which the authors describe as "unique": "The community we examine here falls squarely within the tradition of enclave dialect studies, though it is a different kind of situation in that it involves a long-standing, relatively isolated biracial community in the rural Southern United States" (3). The remainder of the chapter introduces the nature of the data analyses, which employ VARBRUL extensively.

W&T are ever mindful of the extensive historical controversy regarding the origin of AAVE, and they take considerable care to describe the relevance of their findings within the larger arena of AAVE studies throughout the African diaspora. Chap. 2 is titled "Issues in the development of African American English." Those who are new to studies of AAVE, or those who seek to teach this subject, would be well advised to read this chapter closely. It contains the most balanced and comprehensive survey of hypotheses pertaining to the development of AAVE anywhere, as well as the specific sources of evidence that have given rise to different and, at times, competing historical interpretations. W&T are keenly aware that historical assertions about AAVE's development abound, and they cite John Singler's concern regarding the paucity of reliable historical evidence pertaining to the linguistic reconstruction of AAVE. They take these limitations seriously as they introduce readers, in chap. 3, to "Defining the enclave dialect community."

They offer an abundance of information regarding geography, economics, and historical continuity of the community, as well as social relations among groups with different racial and personal identities. Chap. 3 concludes with the integration of these components into the process of language change within an enclave community, culminating in some general sociolinguistic principles to consider when describing isolated dialects.

Chap. 4 describes "The social history of mainland Hyde County," including its Chesapeake Bay origins and other matters pertaining to settlement from colonial times until the present. This historical background sets the stage for describing the sociohistorical relevance of these events to the local language. Readers from diverse fields will benefit greatly from these opening chapters, and linguists and educators will gain a wealth of consolidated knowledge regarding differences of opinion on the linguistic legacy of the African slave trade in the United States.

Chaps. 5, 6, and 7 – "Morphosyntactic alignment in Hyde County English," "Vocalic alignment in Hyde County English," and "Consonantal alignment in

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404506270052 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Hyde County English," respectively – may hold the greatest appeal for scholars who study linguistic variation in socially stratified speech communities. AAVE scholars will benefit greatly from the thorough and rigorous analyses of various morphosyntactic and phonological variables that are contained in the Hyde County Corpus.

More precisely, W&T evaluate past tense *be* regularization, *was/weren*'t leveling, copula absence, and third person *-s* marking in Hyde County. Chap. 5 also includes much more in the way of cutting-edge variationist analyses of AAVE of any era. The phonological evidence in chap. 6 consists of vocalic studies that are quantitative in nature and are inspired by Labov's (1994) classic studies of linguistic sound change in progress. Chap. 7 describes new phonological variables, along with well-attested AAVE features such as the patterning of postvocalic *r*-lessness. W&T display quantitative and qualitative field sociolinguistics at its apex. Their groundbreaking research, however, advances detailed phonetic analyses as well.

Studies of "Intonational alignment in Hyde County English," described in chap. 8, exceed classical VARBRUL analyses and employ sophisticated phonetic analyses of AAVE intonation as it contrasts with European American intonation. W&T provide explicit accounts of their analytical procedures, which will allow others to replicate their important studies in other regions and perhaps with other groups.

The closing chapters, 9 and 10, are devoted to "The individual and group in earlier African American English," and to research and policy implications in "Beyond Hyde County: The past and present development of AAVE." W&T address one of the strongest concerns regarding studies of linguistic variation: Are they focused on the individual, or on the group to which that individual belongs? While their efforts may not satisfy readers who seek to resolve such matters completely, they take great care to account for their selection and analyses of various AAVE features as employed by the elderly African American speakers who served as their primary consultants.

The Development of African American English is a welcome and timely addition to studies of Black English in the wake of the contentious "Ebonics" episodes that stunned scholars, pundits, journalists, and educators in 1996 and 1997, when the Oakland School Board declared "Ebonics" to be the official language of black students in that school district. (Since then they have abandoned the term "Ebonics," although they continue to seek new ways to advance greater Standard English proficiency among African American students and others for whom Standard English is not native.)

W&T have raised the bar for empirical studies of AAVE, and they have done so while mindful of the intersection between linguistic research and the sociohistorical circumstances that surround language usage in any community. It may not be readily evident to readers who are unfamiliar with longstanding contentious debates among AAVE scholars that W&T are diplomatic and balanced in

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404506270052 Published online by Cambridge University Press

their generous accounts of the numerous other studies to which they pay gracious tribute.

I strongly recommend this book to scholars in diverse fields, including anthropology, education, English, American history, linguistics, sociology, and urban studies, among the many who truly seek to comprehend the linguistic sophistication and complexity that resulted from the African slave trade in America and elsewhere. W&T use linguistic evidence from the present to provide a vivid multidisciplinary window onto Hyde County's linguistic past. Anyone who plans to teach a course about African American Vernacular English would be well served to assign this book as a required text.

REFERENCE

Labov, William. (1994). *Principles of Linguistic Change: Internal Factors*. Oxford: Blackwell.

(Received 19 August 2004)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404506270052 Published online by Cambridge University Press