

REVIEWS

K. MCCORMICK & R. MESTRIE (eds.), *Post-Apartheid South Africa. International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 136. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1999.

Reviewed by SUSAN M. SUZMAN
Linguistics, University of the Witwatersrand
Johannesburg, South Africa
104susan@muse.wits.ac.za

In South Africa, the transition from an apartheid regime to a popularly elected government in 1994 made possible wide-ranging changes in power relations in every sphere of human interaction, including language. Under the new political dispensation, there are 11 official languages (listed in order of numbers of speakers): Zulu, Xhosa, Afrikaans, Tswana, North Sotho, English, South Sotho, Tsonga, Swati, Ndebele, and Venda. They replace English and Afrikaans, formerly the 2 official languages.

The change from 2 to 11 official languages is part of a language policy that emphasizes equality among languages, a position severely compromised by leaving the details of language use to what is both “equitable and practical” in various domains. Contributors to the volume under review demonstrate that both continuity and change in status exist for particular languages. Daryl McLean succinctly summarizes the history of language and political interaction in South Africa, and his article and others explore emerging trends for particular languages.

Chief among languages whose status has changed is Afrikaans, whose role is considerably weakened by the demise of the government with which it was associated. However, Christo Van Rensburg argues that this now permits the “normalization” of Afrikaans as first language and lingua franca. The main beneficiary of the “demotion” of Afrikaans is English, increasingly recognized as the principal language of status and of social and economic advancement in South Africa. The promotion of 9 African languages to official language status has been undermined by the increasing hegemony of English. Despite 5 years of the new language policy, Athalie Crawford observes that language equity has not filtered down to doctor–patient discourse, where former power imbalances still characterize actual language interaction. For indigenous languages like Phuthi with no official status, lack of recognition may mean growing relegation to a status as “home” languages, with one of the official African languages being used at school and work.

Thus, a trend toward a three-tiered power dynamic emerges among the languages of South Africa. English appears at the top as a language of high status, followed by a tier of other official languages – Afrikaans and African languages –

and last, a tier of languages that have no official status and whose future is more precarious than that of the others.

This trend illustrates that legislating language equity is the easy part. It does not ensure, for example, that African languages will be used in all the domains that are potentially accessed by legislation, nor does it necessarily alter traditional power relations among languages. When language use is ultimately determined by practicality, change requires focused commitment of resources and expertise. Unless this happens, ad hoc and established power relations among languages will continue to dominate social discourse and language politics. In his article integrating South African language policy with African language policy, Russell Kascula uses the terms “endoglossic” (encouraging indigenous languages) and “exoglossic” (favoring former colonial languages) in classifying language policies. In these terms, South Africa ostensibly has an endoglossic policy while unofficially pursuing a *laissez-faire* exoglossic language policy that favors English.

The interplay among languages in the new South Africa in various domains is a recurrent theme in this volume. McLean and Kascula present comprehensive overviews and histories of language policy from past to present as background to language interaction. McLean then discusses language initiatives in secondary and tertiary education that are designed to redress past injustice and to implement language policy in education and training. The infrastructure for educational reform is embedded in the National Qualifications Framework (NQF), the educational and training arm of the Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP), a framework for policy development that attempts to meld social equality with economic development.

Through the NQF, an outcomes-based and assessment-led reform of education (similar to that found in Australia) was designed to ensure national standards in educational achievement. Standards were first developed in English and then extended to African languages, without consideration of different types of expression in the different languages or of the English bias of the types of materials used in outcomes assessment. Furthermore, English standards were based on English second-language competence, not on first-language competence. Their translation into standards for African languages meant lower thresholds of competence and opportunity in people’s first languages. The English bias to curriculum-free assessment compromises first-language standards and reinforces historical power relations among languages in South Africa. In tertiary education, English is the dominant language, and its hegemony over Afrikaans and the African languages is predicted to have negative effects on these languages, but no reversal of this trend is foreseen for the future. The conflict between potential and actual equity of different languages in secondary and tertiary education, discussed by McLean, provides a forceful example of the hypothetical endoglossic language policy and its exoglossic realization.

Crawford’s article on doctor–patient discourse highlights the fact – perhaps surprising, given that the post-apartheid era is five years old – of continued com-

munication problems between English- and Afrikaans-speaking doctors on one hand and rural Xhosa speakers on the other. In hospital and clinic, a nurse is generally coopted to translate the patient's complaint from Xhosa into the doctor's language. This is a job for which nurses are neither prepared nor trained, and for which they qualify simply by virtue of being native speakers of Xhosa. Being a native speaker is not sufficient to the translation task for a variety of reasons; for example, the nurse may speak an urban variety and translate for patients speaking a rural or *hlonipha* ('respect') variety of Xhosa. Nurses are often resentful of this additional and unpaid demand on their time. As Crawford points out, until provision is made for training translators in hospitals, patients' complaints will continue to be reduced to simple, selectively edited statements by informal interpreters. The lack of communication between doctors and patients is not a new problem, and it is not limited to Xhosa speakers. However, given the changed power dynamics and language boards that are dedicated to promoting the use of indigenous languages, it is disappointing that resources cannot be made available to remedy a clearly stressful situation that prevents effective health care.

Two articles explore the implications of post-apartheid language politics for particular languages. Van Rensburg discusses the probable future of Afrikaans, the most obvious casualty in the linguistic configuration of South Africa because of its link to the apartheid government. He predicts that with the depoliticization of Afrikaans, the language will naturalize as one of many languages in the rainbow nation, albeit as a lingua franca and a first language to a significant number of people. Simon Donnelly's article concerns Phuthi, a relatively poorly researched Nguni language with heavy Sotho borrowings, spoken in Lesotho and South Africa by a community of approximately 20,000 speakers. While children still appear to learn Phuthi as a first language, the small number of speakers and lack of official status may relegate this language to the status of a home language with limited use in wider social and economic domains. A language policy dedicated to the maintenance and encouragement of all the languages of South Africa may actually marginalize such unofficial languages.

Kascula integrates language policy in South Africa into the Organization of African Unity's (OAU) African language policy promoting indigenous languages alongside exoglossic languages. Endoglossic language policies promote African languages as "national" languages, a somewhat ambiguous term. In Kascula's view, South Africa pursues an endoglossic policy because of its commitment to eleven official languages, although it is too early to see whether this is an active or inactive policy. Botswana, Lesotho, and Swaziland "do not pursue an active endoglossic policy but have indigenous languages as national languages." The position advanced by this reviewer is that South Africa has adopted an endoglossic language policy with an exoglossic reality.

Eve Bertelsen's article on the role of language in advertising is an interesting addition to the major theme of language interaction. She explores language as vehicle of change in media perception. She shows how advertising has taken

powerful images from the apartheid years and converted them into slogans for an emerging elite. “Jobs, peace and freedom,” banners in the struggle, now market the image of the new consumers of commodities. From a theoretical location within postmodernist and Marxist approaches to cultural studies, she shows how the rhetoric of the struggle is used in the social construction of new discourses where political ideals get reinvented to the advantage of the advertiser.

In conclusion, this volume is a selective but informative collection of well-written articles. The editors are to be thanked for putting together this progress report on language in transitional South Africa, aptly described by them as a “linguistics laboratory.” The list of researchable topics is long, and the need for research is urgent. Research is important not only to investigate sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic language dynamics, but also to inform and guide socially relevant decisions and future language policy.

JAN BLOMMAERT & JEF VERSCHUEREN. *Debating diversity: Analysing the discourse of tolerance*. London: Routledge, 1998. Pp. xiv, 233 pp. Pb \$22.99.

Reviewed by MARY BUCHOLTZ
English, Texas A&M University
College Station, TX 77843
bucholtz@tamu.edu

Debating diversity, a pragmatic analysis of official liberal discourse concerning migration in Flemish Belgium, is a thorough, topical, and relevant treatment of the widespread yet near-invisible forms of racism that pervade public discourse on cultural difference. Electing not to focus on the far more widely recognized phenomenon of right-wing racism, the authors instead offer a careful critique that makes clear that the left is by no means immune to racism in its policies and practices. Following in the wake of research by a number of other politically oriented discourse analysts, this volume addresses how racism manifests itself in discourse. It therefore serves as an important reminder that ideologies are constructed, and hence contingent and changeable. Because of the broad scope of its inquiry and the relatively accessible methods it employs, it will be of interest to scholars in many fields, including anthropology, communication, political science, race and ethnic studies, and sociology, as well as linguistics. Despite its sometimes overwhelming wealth of detail, it may also appeal to a nonacademic readership, as did the Dutch version of the book when it was first published in Belgium.

Indeed, some of the book’s most fascinating discussion concerns the response of the Belgian public, press, and political structure to the authors’ unflinching analysis of racism as the inevitable outcome of arguments for “tolerance.” The book had a major impact in Belgium, winning a Flemish free speech award. Yet it also excited a great deal of controversy, and Blommaert & Verschueren were subjected to numerous attacks on their scholarship. These attacks perhaps explain

7a certain defensive tone that is taken at various points in the book (e.g., the description of a particular analytic inference as “not the product of a misguided analysis or an attempt to find bad intentions in every word,” p. 168). The authors, beleaguered in their own country, appear to be equally wary of their prospective audience elsewhere. Thus, it is a bit surprising that the Belgianness of the book is downplayed both in the title and in the presentation of the data, which are provided almost exclusively in English (the Dutch originals are supplied in the notes). Of course, this choice may have been a deliberate effort to counter another form of xenophobia: the parochialism of scholars writing in the English language. Yet to analyze discourse entirely in translation detaches the texts from their linguistic context. One effect is to universalize the phenomenon of liberal racism – a consequence that has a certain practical utility despite its dangers. Unquestionably, although the analysis is quite specific to the Belgian political and historical context, the issues that Blommaert & Verschueren raise apply to all post-industrial states with immigrant populations. Regardless of their nationality, readers will certainly find parallels between the Belgian situation and the public discourse on race in their own country.

The book is made up of eight chapters, which are arranged into three sections. The first two chapters introduce the issue of diversity in Belgium and set up the terms of the debate. Chap. 1 describes the “management paradigm” that prevails in this debate, as it has taken shape in media and other public discourse. Chap. 2 provides conceptual background and offers details about the ethnographic and historical context from which the data emerged. Despite the labeling of this contextualizing as “ethnographic,” this section focuses on generalities about the production of political discourse. More truly ethnographic details would be welcome, particularly information about the production and reception of the specific texts under analysis in the later chapters.

The second section examines the components of Belgium’s liberal ideology of race. Chap. 3 considers how “migrants” – not only temporary workers but even second- and third-generation residents – have come to be problematized in liberal discourse. Thus, some groups but not others are labeled “migrants,” a term freighted with connotations of essential foreignness and nonassimilation. In discourse, these terms are used to express implicitly negative attitudes toward immigrants and their descendants, even when couched in apparently positive terms. Here again, greater attention to textual production would be valuable, for without this information the authors must resort to speculations about why such texts often look and sound so unnatural. In analyzing a political text about cultural diversity, for example, they find syntactic oddities that they suggest may be due to struggles between political positions during the writing of the document. Being able to show that such struggles indeed shaped the document would strengthen this claim, as well as enriching the book by demonstrating how diverse perspectives are reduced and distilled to a homogeneous middle ground in public discourse.

Chap. 4 traces four key concepts (culture, nation, democracy/human rights, and integration) of the discourse of tolerance in the context of specific texts. The salient feature of culture, in this discourse, is the dichotomy it forges between foreigner and native: Cultures are viewed as clearly separate, static, and distinct; difference is dangerous; and migrants' cultures are inferior to the native one (conveniently homogenized for rhetorical purposes). The concept of nation, too, is deeply rooted in homogeneity. This has two results: Migrants are viewed as representatives of a national culture even when they are members of targeted ethnic minorities in their home countries; and because they disrupt the purported homogeneity of the Belgian nation, they can never become full-fledged members of Belgian society. Yet, paradoxically, the concept of democracy is presented in this discourse as a fundamental component of European, and hence Belgian, heritage. This paradox is explained by the authors as the result of the assumption that as a "culturalized" concept, democracy is viewed as the preserve of the native population. The collapsing of human rights into democracy justifies the failure to protect the rights of migrants, since migrants are seen as a threat to democracy. The notion of integration, which promises true equality, is similarly asymmetrical, demanding integration on the part of the migrant without guaranteeing assistance and adaptation on the part of the native. Because the integration process is in principle without limit, as the authors note, liberal discourse ensures that migrants will never participate fully in the life of the idealized Belgian nation.

Chap. 5 concentrates on the doctrine of homogenism, a principle that underlies the key concepts discussed in the preceding chapter. The basic elements of homogenism are the assumptions that both migrants and migration itself are aberrant, and that xenophobia is normal. As a consequence, diversity is seen as inherently problematic. This belief is particularly strong in Flanders, where group identity is rooted primarily in language as a result of the historical threat that French posed to Dutch speakers in Belgium. It is all the more remarkable, then, that many Flemish Belgians argue for the "Belgian model" as a way to avoid interethnic conflict in other regions of the world. The authors' neat debunking of this argument in the case of Yugoslavia is a tangent of sufficient interest to justify its inclusion.

The first 5 chapters develop an extensive analytic apparatus that is exemplified in two brief chapters of specific texts (chaps. 6 and 7). The authors consider these later chapters merely illustrative; however, the data are fascinating, and it is a pity that they are treated as an afterthought. A different organizational scheme might have made these valuable chapters more central to the book's argument.

Chap. 6 is an in-depth analysis of a multicultural training program for police officers. Blommaert & Verschueren argue that the program demonstrates the tension identified earlier in the book between liberal goals (promoting diversity) and implicit messages (problematizing diversity). As evidence, they examine training sessions and written materials as well as interviewing the program leaders. It is an odd omission, however, that the trainees were not likewise interviewed.

Moreover, despite having recorded 33 hours of interaction during the training sessions, the authors provide very little analysis that refers to this interactional dimension. The treatment of these materials is relatively abstract and decontextualized, and there is little sense that the discursive meanings analyzed in the chapter are in fact negotiable and interactionally contingent. In short, dialogical, interactional data are treated in monological, textual terms. Yet understanding how various participants positioned themselves at different moments in the discourse – including trainers of migrant background – would help move the analysis away from a model of discourse as monolithic and consensus-based.

Chap. 7 returns to textual data with its consideration of a government flier on migration. This flier makes explicit, despite its ostensibly pro-migrant tone, that migrant rights are in fact privileges that must be earned through integration. Strikingly, even the supposed evenhandedness of the flier reveals its bias: The enumeration of the “responsibilities” of both natives and migrants assigns natives the “responsibility” to repress and restrict migrants, while the migrants have the obligation willingly to accept this repression.

The eighth and final chapter considers the notion of tolerance in the context of anti-racism. As the authors point out (and convincingly show throughout the book), tolerance is an inadequate response to racism. In an analysis of three separate expressions of Belgian anti-racist efforts (a government anti-racist commission, an educational nondiscrimination policy, and immigrant asylum policies), Blommaert & Verschueren argue that the notion of racism in the liberal anti-racist movement is restricted to legal definitions, and often the rhetoric of anti-racism is itself used to justify racist practices.

The authors see little cause for hope in their data. The book concludes with the comment that current Belgian migrant policies are “a sure recipe for racism without end” (p. 189). But this gloomy statement is not the final word. In the epilogue, in which the authors comment on their dual roles as scholars and activists, they also provide some specific proposals for combating covert forms of racism. Readers who find themselves discouraged by the relentlessly racist discourse of the public debate on diversity may take some comfort in these constructive and concrete recommendations.

As useful as such recommendations are, however, the findings on which they are based are ultimately not very surprising. This may be because such discourse is so familiar, but it also raises the question of whether, in affirming what (we think) we know, we may also reify it. The view of the discourse that emerges leaves little room for other perspectives: There are few hints that anyone dissents from these ideologies, although many Belgians (both immigrants and otherwise) surely do. Readers may wonder, for example, in what sense all the discursive examples cited in the book truly reflect and construct a single ideology, whether “liberal” or “moderate” (the increasingly preferred term for a conservatism that doesn’t want to get its hands dirty). Some sense of the diversity of political positions in Belgium would lend nuance to such labels. Similarly, to what extent are

these and other key terms sites of struggle or contestation? How are they used outside of official liberal discourse at the most public level? How do they shape and respond to other kinds of discourse about migrants?

It is possible that the authors chose to limit their discussion of these issues in the interest of keeping an already complex argument as accessible as possible. And this is a valid and worthy goal, for it is clear that this book is intended to do political as well as scholarly work. In attempting to forestall potential criticisms from conservative scholars, however, Blommaert & Verschueren lose sight of the more important critiques of their work from the left, and especially from members and allies of the migrant population. The call for a more materialist analysis – a left-wing critique of the Belgian version of the book – is not answered in this publication. The work continues, however, and meeting this challenge is the goal of the authors' ongoing research. Such integration of the textual dimension with the material, the ethnographic, and the interactional realms will provide greater context for an analysis that is already a valuable resource for anti-racist activists and progressive scholars alike.

DEBORAH CAMERON, *Good to talk? Living and working in a communication culture*. London, Thousand Oaks, CA, and New Delhi: Sage Publications, 2000. Pp. ix, 213. Hb \$65.00, pb \$24.95.

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

Deborah Cameron's *Good to talk* is excellent: an innovative and insightful analysis of what she terms "communication culture" in Britain. With a few changes, it also works for the United States. Cameron analyzes how it happened and what it means that "a commonplace social activity has been transformed into a technical skill, with its own professional experts and its own technical jargon" (p. 2) – i.e., that talk has become technicized as COMMUNICATION. She asks two sets of questions. First, what are the ways in which people are encouraged or required to talk, what are these norms of talk, and who has established them? Second, why codify and regulate talk in these ways, and why has communication come to be seen as CAUSAL? By addressing these questions, she gives new direction to the literature on ideologies of English, beyond the examination of linguistic form and correctness issues.

Cameron traces the project of technicized talk to the saturation of education with corporate concerns, and to the advocacy of "oracy" in education; the latter predates the former by a couple of decades. The combined effect is a philosophy of education meant to socialize workers not so much with subject-specific knowledge but with unproblematic attitudes and styles of practice. She examines the operation of these "styled" communicative practices and ideologies in the do-

mains of work, schooling, and social/personal life. Drawing on research done by herself and four of her students, she demonstrates how coherently the technicizing of talk is ideologized (reinforcing the flexible workforce ideal) across all three areas, particularly in the ways in which “empowerment” is invoked in the ideological styling of interpersonal discourse. These data come from transcribed interaction, background interviews, and published sources, and they are consistently and lucidly located in the economy and symbolic power of occupation and educational structures.

Cameron treats the codification of techniques for talk as a manifestation of Giddens’s reflexive construction of self in late modernity, a project of which a central element is the ongoing production of a single coherent narrative stressing a unique, rational self. She locates the technicizing of communication within the enterprise culture of the past 20 years, in which the discourses of public life are increasingly those of the corporate-managerial sector. With certain communicative practices segmented, objectified, and labeled as “skills,” a workforce or potential workforce (i.e., students) can be held to a particular standard of accountability. This construction of “skills” facilitates the assumption of cause-and-effect scenarios, which in turn reinforces educational ideologies and workforce training policies. Looking past these assumptions, Cameron examines instructional manuals and training exercises, and interviews workers in communication industries. She finds that the repatterning of sentence structure, question formation, and paralanguage is more appropriately understood as “styling” – that is, the imposition of a standardized format. If anything, this is Taylorized deskilling: specific actions are prescribed by experts and reinforced by surveillance.

In Chap. 2, Cameron asks to what extent there exist codified practices that match the ideology of a unified, expert-certified skills set. It is not clear what constitutes expertise, since communication consultants come from a range of fields, selling heterogenous products united by a common ideology. She charts the history of teaching talk from a focus on linguistic art and etiquette to a focus on social utility, with the new expertise coming from counseling, therapy, and psychology. Linguists, she notes, are marginal to this project insofar as their concerns are descriptive, and the ideology of communication instruction is nothing if not prescriptive. The idea that problems are “caused” by poor communication is taken as axiomatic and generalized as unproblematic in therapeutic models.

Chaps. 3 and 4 examine the enforcement of verbal hygiene practices in customer service work. In Chap. 3, Cameron examines “styling” applied to greeting and question structures, tone of voice, and vocabulary. The problem with these enactments of what Norman Fairclough calls “synthetic personalization,” is that service people are not free to deviate from the script and adjust to context (which would be an exercise of communication skill) because deviations are monitored and criticized. Cameron offers two case studies illustrating this point: one a British retail outfit selling electrical appliances, and the other the Safeway grocery

stores (the latter is especially problematic because it relies on U.S.-style interactions though in the U.K.). Customer work, particularly when meant to be taken as natural friendly interaction, is emotional labor. Can people be trained for this, learning it as if it were a typing skill? The styling described in Chap. 3 is supposed at least to simulate natural interaction, but some consultants and managers argue that there is no substitute for actually producing emotions in service encounters. It is no accident that the workers assumed to be most naturally talented for this are women, and, as Cameron notes in the next chapter, such workers may be hired simply because they are women.

In Chap. 4, she examines “communication factories,” specifically call centers involving two major activities, talking to customers and inputting data. Like production line work, this is highly repetitive, involving Taylorized regimentation of time and routines. Politeness formulas and filler become part of efficient service (keep callers happy, move interactions along) and so are factored into the routines. Standardized interaction is seen as efficient, giving customers uniform and consistent dealings with the organization. The assessment of performance is entirely about how the performance is scripted; none of it is about content. Of particular interest is the fact that the people writing the assessments have no real metalanguage for speech. When they refer to vocal production, they use written-language terms, such as “pause between SENTENCES.” These call centers are particularly salient examples of communicative deskilling: Workers follow an interactional script, and the information they give customers is read from a computer. Skills are required: the capacity to focus, to stay on script, and not to respond negatively to upset or angry customers. Doing these well is hard work, but it is not, strictly speaking, transferable communication skills in the sense touted by the communication industry.

In Chap. 5, “Schooling spoken discourse,” Cameron examines the history of oracy in British public schooling. This is an especially interesting chapter, illustrating connections between the demands made by new capitalism on educational institutions, and contributions that good communication skills are supposed to make to a person’s development. Here we see spelled out the emphasis on skills devoid of content, as called for, for instance, by the Royal Society of Arts “Education for the 21st Century” report, which recommends adoption of a “competence-led curriculum” focused on learning, citizenship, relating to people, managing situations, and managing information. Although schools have long reflected workplace concerns, the formalization of skills training has never loomed quite so large in the curriculum, to supply workers with generic, transferable skills. These become, in Bourdieu’s terms, the cultural capital of the enterprise culture, with communication skills its linguistic capital. Such skills are distinguished from correctness per se. The allegedly inefficient and inarticulate age-graded discourse markers *like*, *you know*, *whatever?* come in for particular criticism: Good speech should sound like the scripted speech valorized by credentialed experts; it should not sound interactively emergent.

In Chap. 6, Cameron returns to the therapeutic ideology underpinning the scripting of communication. She examines U.S. folk notions of communication as inherently good, which neatly fits a theory of unique selves and pure relationships. Relating this to work by Tamar Katriel, Gerry Phillipson, and Donal Carbaugh, she examines the link between popular and therapeutic notions of talk as (drawing on Fairclough) a discourse technology. Talk organizes and connects feelings, making them available to those qualified to assess them and put them in order. Argument and disagreement are innately negative and need fixing through “conflict resolution” and “anger management.” What Cameron does then – and I cannot overstate the importance of this in understanding the pragmatics of hegemony – is to show how such discursive management can reinforce the status quo. Conflict resolution models operating on the assumptions that social relations are egalitarian, cooperative and nonjudgmental, and that consensus is normal and always good, can (while alleging to “empower”) effectively implement hegemonic saturation, to use Raymond Williams’s phrase, as shown in Cameron’s analysis of gender and power manipulation in a “better conversation” on p. 170.

As Cameron insistently demonstrates throughout the book, “The phrase ‘communication skills’ names a cultural construct, not a natural phenomenon with objective existence in the world” (145). Such skills are not to be confused, as she firmly notes in the Epilog, with what any ethnographer of language would recognize as COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE, open-ended and decided among speakers, not scripted by consultants for the benefit of management. Attributing causality to communication is a convenient way to elide issues of control or social injustice. As Cameron says, she finds such discourse on communication depressing (177). So, oh so, do I.

MARY BUCHOLTZ, A. C. LAING, & LAUREL A. SUTTON (eds.), *Reinventing identities: The gendered self in discourse*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999. Pp. xiii, 431. Pb \$35.00.

Reviewed by MARY M. TALBOT
Media and Cultural Studies, University of Sunderland
Sunderland, SR1 3SD, UK
Mary.Talbot@sunderland.ac.uk

This is the inaugural volume of a new series, *Studies in Language and Gender*. This substantial book is an edited collection of recent research in the field of language and gender, predominantly but not exclusively focused on language use in the United States. The research represented in its 20 chapters is wide-ranging, both in terms of the genres and media explored in them and in terms of analytic approaches. The genres, media, and locations investigated include, among others, American shopping channel talk (Mary Bucholtz), self-revelatory on-line journals (Laurel Sutton), office interaction (Deborah Tannen), Latina hopscotch in Los Angeles (Marjorie Goodwin), Irish-language community radio (Colleen

Cotter), British teenage girls' conversations (Jennifer Coates), and a Tunisian sociolinguistic interview (Keith Walters).

Given the maturity of language and gender as a field of study, a series devoted to it is long overdue and most welcome. The maturity of the field is reflected in the scope of this first volume on identity formation and in its engagement with theory. Many of the contributors directly or indirectly interrogate categories such as masculine, feminine, heterosexual, white, or middle-class. It is notable that all are conscious of theoretical shortcomings in earlier work by feminist linguists (for critiques, see especially Bing & Bergvall 1996, Cameron 1996). A careful avoidance of bipolar categories of gender and of the comparative approach that goes with them runs through the volume. Indeed, a striking feature of the book is its repeated rejection of gender identity as a static category. This conceptualization of identity as flux, strongly influenced as it is by poststructuralism, parallels developments elsewhere in linguistics, as does the flexible use of the term "discourse." Thus, the optimism in the introduction about a "rapprochement between feminist linguistics and feminist theory" (p.20) seems well founded. It would perhaps have been useful also to have made some connection with other areas of linguistics, and with cognate disciplines such as psychology, that are going through similar developments. The low profile of critical discourse analysis (e.g. Coulthard & Caldas-Coulthard 1996) in the United States no doubt accounts for its omission; the same cannot be said for social constructionism (e.g. Crawford 1995), which is mentioned just once.

The book reads as a sequel to *Gender articulated: Language and the socially constructed self* (Hall & Bucholtz 1995), a collection of studies of people actively constructing their gender identities through practices that include linguistic presentation of themselves as members of social groups. This earlier book was split into coverage of reproduction and change/challenge (in three clearly distinguished parts: Mechanisms of Hegemony and Control, Agency through Appropriation, Contingent Practices and Emergent Selves). In *Reinventing identities*, the focus is predominantly on the latter: on resistance and challenge to social reproduction by "bad subjects" (Althusser 1971) or, sometimes, on resistance to pressure from above to change, as in a study of letters by Native American women to federal authorities written during the period of enforced assimilation in the 1920s (Rebecca Dobkins). Many of the chapters focus on "marginal," often transgressive identities. For example, Kathleen Wood examines the narrative skeletons of lesbian coming-out stories on e-mail, showing how they both draw on and transgress heterosexist ideologies in constructing their narratives as coherent. Two of the other three chapters focusing on narrative examine gendered literacy practices among very young Latina/Latino children (Marjorie Orellana) and the distribution of narrative roles in an agoraphobic woman's family (Lisa Capps). Capps's study of narrative as interaction and its part in the construction of the woman's agoraphobic identity provides a valuable corrective to decontextualized psychiatric work, with its assumption that mental disorders are solely

individual pathologies. These three chapters are in the first part of the volume, Identity as Invention; the other three parts are Identity as Ideology, Identity as Ingenuity, and Identity as Improvisation. However, the distinction between these parts is not very clear, and there is a good deal of overlap among them (in contrast to the sharp divisions in Hall & Bucholtz 1995); hence, the headings seem to be present more for the pleasure of their patterning than to reflect any conceptual structuring.

A valuable and engaging feature of the book is that, at the same time as it contributes to the consolidation of new theoretical positions, it does not lose touch with earlier “moments” in the field of language and gender. Individual chapters revisit earlier categories, concepts and – perhaps most important – research findings, in order to critically reassess and reinterpret them. This seems preferable to the unconstructive dismissal of the efforts of scholars from earlier periods. For example, Sara Trechter revisits the distinction between sex-exclusive and sex-preferential differences, arguing that the distinction is an ethnocentric one and ultimately untenable. She reexamines the sex-exclusive differences in Yana identified by Edward Sapir (1949) and reinterprets them as differences in register. Then, on the basis of her own research among present-day Yana speakers, she presents the features, previously identified as sex-exclusive, being used by both men and women in everyday narrative performances of stereotypical femininity and masculinity. In a similar manner, Rusty Barrett returns to Robin Lakoff’s (1975) speculations about a stereotypical “women’s language” in a study of African American drag queens’ performances of an “uptown white woman” style. He reiterates the point that “women’s language” is a hegemonic notion of gendered speech (Bucholtz & Hall 1995) which, he argues, is used in the cultivation of an exaggerated “feminine” persona which is ultimately neither gendered nor ethnic, but CLASSED (321). Among other early concerns revisited in the volume from a late 1990s perspective are English language reform issues (Caitlin Hines, Anna Livia).

Overall, this is an impressive collection, which makes a useful contribution to the reworking of language and gender studies. It is particularly successful in bringing recent feminist theory to bear on earlier feminist and pre-feminist linguistics, and in continuing to bring together research on “bad subjects” – marginal voices and emergent transgressive identities.

REFERENCES

- Althusser, Louis (1971). Ideology and ideological state apparatuses. In Ben Brewster, *Lenin and philosophy and other essays*, 127–86. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Bing, Janet, & Bergvall, Victoria (1996). The question of questions: Beyond binary thinking. In Bergvall et al. (eds.), 1–30.
- _____, _____, & Freed, Alice (eds.) (1996). *Rethinking language and gender research: Theory and practice*. London: Longman.
- Bucholtz, Mary, & Hall, Kira (1995). Introduction: Twenty years after *Language and woman’s place*. In Hall & Bucholtz (eds.), 1–22.

- Cameron, Deborah (1996). The language-gender interface: Challenging co-optation. In Bergvall et al. (eds.), 31–53.
- Coulthard, Malcolm, & Caldas-Coulthard, Carmen Rosa (eds.) (1996). *Texts and practices: Readings in critical discourse analysis*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Crawford, Mary (1995). *Talking difference: On gender and language*. London and New York: Sage.
- Hall, Kira, & Bucholtz, Mary (eds.) (1995). *Gender articulated: Language and the socially constructed self*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Lakoff, Robin (1975). *Language and woman's place*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Sapir, Edward (1949). Male and female forms of speech in Yana. In David Mandelbaum (ed.), *Selected writings of Edward Sapir*, 206–212. Berkeley: University of California Press.

CHARLES ANTAKI & SUE WIDDICOMBE (eds.), *Identities in talk*. London: Sage Publications, 1998. Pp. ix, 224. Pb \$26.95.

Reviewed by BARBARA JOHNSTONE
English, Carnegie Mellon University
Pittsburgh, PA 15213-3890
bj4@andrew.cmu.edu

This is a collection of studies of identity in the framework of Conversation Analysis. Many of the essays make explicit use of Harvey Sacks's descriptions of the "membership categorization devices" by which people construct attributions of identity in the course of interaction, as a way of accomplishing particular, situated goals. Many mount explicit arguments against psychological accounts of personal identity and social categorization according to which people bring pre-existing identities into interactions. With one or two exceptions, the contributions are well argued, clearly written, and free of the jargon that sometimes makes work in Conversation Analysis inaccessible to outsiders. Readers of *Language in Society* should find the collection thought-provoking.

In the first chapter, Antaki & Widdicombe lay out the general theme: "Membership of a category is ascribed (and rejected), avowed (and disavowed), displayed (and ignored) in local places and at certain times, and it does these things as part of the interactional work that constitutes people's lives. In other words, the contributors to this book take it not that people passively or latently have this or that identity which then causes feelings and actions, but that they work up and work to this or that identity, for themselves and others, there and then, either as an end in itself or towards some other end" (p. 2). They discuss five principles that characterize the "ethnomethodological analytic attitude." First, to "have an identity" means to be placed, via one or more interactional moves, into a category with associated criterial features. One of the teenagers described by Widdicombe in her own later chapter shows how negotiations about identity can involve such moves. When an interviewer makes a bid to categorize her by asking, "Would you say that you were punks?," the teen rejects the bid by claiming not to fit one of the criteria: "You have to have a certain way of thinking you know to be a punk and . . . I certainly haven't got it . . ." (58). Second, moves that cast people into identity categories are indexical and occasioned. In other words, the meaning of a cat-

egorization can differ from moment to moment, depending on the situation and purposes at hand. For example, in their chapter about a radio interview with members of the National Rifle Association, Andy McKinlay and Anne Dunnett show how the NRA members cast themselves as “average” in several different senses. Sometimes their claim that they are “average” is a claim that they, like other members of the public, have a variety of opinions about guns. At other times, “average” means “not criminal” and serves to differentiate justified uses of guns from unjustified uses.

The third principle is that the casting of oneself or someone else into a category is a strategic bid to make the category relevant to the “interactional business” in progress. A good example is provided in Dennis Day’s chapter about multiethnic interactions in Swedish workplaces. When a worker mispronounces a Swedish word, others respond in a way that “ethnifies” him as a foreigner, teasing him about what the word, as mispronounced, could mean, and making up a series of humorous parallel neologisms. He responds by asking whether one of these phony words “is in Finnish or what,” making relevant the fact that not all the people teasing him are Swedish, either. This serves his particular, momentary self-defensive purpose in the interaction at hand. The fourth principle is that what it means to be “an x” or “a y” is what this identity accomplishes in the interaction at hand. Robin Woofitt and Colin Clark show, for example, that the key to being seen as having telekinetic powers, for the spirit medium they studied, was to manage to be identified by others as a “knowing recipient” – someone who already knew what people were telling her.

The final principle is that the evidence of the first four principles can be seen in the ways people make use of the “structures of conversation.” Speakers share expectations about what will happen at a certain point in conversation, and what it can be taken to mean. For example, Don H. Zimmerman explores the structure of calls to emergency response centers. Once connected with the center, callers can make use of a format that can include a self-identification (“this is security at thuh bus depot”) and/or a “proprietary” move (“An’ we got a guy down here that’s uh: . . . over intoxicated”). In his chapter on how teachers solicit school psychologists’ help with difficult students, Stephen Hester shows that teachers can use “category contrast” structures, setting the child in question against “most children” without ever having to use evaluative terms such as “deviant.” In a particularly striking chapter on how senility is interactively constructed, Isabella Paoletti shows how an interviewer talking to a younger person followed up on apparently incoherent statements, asking “What do you mean?” in order to reduce the incoherence, whereas with an elderly person, the interviewer allowed apparent incoherence to stand unchallenged, simply moving on to the next question. Thus, the interviewer’s initial categorization of the source of the incoherence (temporary conversational difficulty in the case of the younger person, senility in the case of the older person) led her to structure the succeeding talk in a way that inevitably confirmed her expectations. Other chapters show how conversa-

tional structure is mobilized in categorizing people in a marriage counseling session (Derek Edwards), in divorce mediation (David Greatbatch & Robert Dingwall), and in repartee between a mother and her daughter (Antaki). The last chapter of the book is an epilogue by Widdicombe.

Work like that represented in this collection is relevant and valuable for linguists and anthropologists who analyze discourse. It reminds us of the constantly rhetorical nature of talk, the ways in which what we ARE arises from and is constantly adapted to the interactional things we DO. It reminds us that what we have sometimes thought of as immutable social “facts” about people (even such things as their age) are constantly negotiable and resistible, and sometimes completely irrelevant. It also reminds us of the importance of listening to and looking at the talk and text we study with the conviction that some of the best evidence of what people are doing is in the details of what they say and how they say it.

But the contributors to *Identities in talk* go further than this. Rather than maintaining, with many other discourse analysts, that what people say is a useful source of evidence about what people mean and what actions they are involved in, these authors take it as axiomatic that talk is the SOLE source of evidence about meaning and social action, both for participants and for analysts. Antaki is particularly explicit about this. The meaning and force of the identity categorization moves in conversation, are, he claims, completely recoverable from what is “hearable” in the conversation; it is unnecessary to adduce any “extra-textual” knowledge. Antaki’s central example is a segment of conversation in which a mother says to her daughter, “You look like Fagin.” He argues that an analyst can figure out what the mother is accomplishing by this move solely by looking at what precedes and follows it, without needing to know who “Fagin” is, and that one need not attribute any literary knowledge to the participants in the conversation, either: “Even though the tease seems to invoke the cultural nugget of a fictional character-name (‘Fagin’), the untangling work it does is hearable and intelligible without resort to any sort of ‘cultural’ or ‘psychological’ analysis, where the former means something like the interpretation of a code and the latter means the evaluation of inner states” (p. 71). Antaki’s analysis is a useful reminder that it is possible to make sense of literary and other references in conversation without being able to identify the referent. For that matter, it is possible to make sense of words one does not know, odd syntax, foreign accents, and many other kinds of newness.

However, “extra-textual knowledge” is at the core of this process, at least in the form of the expectations about conversational structure to which Conversation Analysts themselves refer; and Antaki’s analytical work, like that of all the contributors to the volume, crucially depends on “cultural analysis,” if only because an utterance’s being “hearable and intelligible” as doing anything at all requires understanding English or some other language. Although many linguists and anthropologists would wholeheartedly agree that language is not “code,” neither would we want to say that people figure out the meanings of words and structures completely *de novo* in each utterance they hear. Grammar and culture

do not exist prior to discourse, determining what people can say and what it will be taken to mean, but people clearly make generalizations about structure and meaning on the basis of what they hear, and then refer to these generalizations in interpreting new things. The same is true of identity. Conversation Analysts are correct in pointing out that people do not enter interactions with preestablished identities that invariably become relevant therein. But to insist exclusively on the emergent aspects of identity is to ignore the ideological processes (which are at the root of racism and sexism, for example) through which certain identities do tend to become relatively fixed in meaning, and to be treated as relevant, no matter what. I recommend *Identities in talk* as a very clear exposition of the Conversation Analytical approach to identity, even though I think that this approach provides only a partial description of the forms and functions of social categorization in human life.

BILL COPE & MARY KALANTZIS (eds.), *Multiliteracies: Literacy learning and the design of social futures*. London and New York: Routledge, 2000. Pp. xi, 350. Hb \$90.00, pb \$29.99.

Reviewed by MICHAEL NEWMAN
Linguistics and Communication Disorders
Queens College/CUNY
 Flushing, NY 11367
 mnewman@qc.edu

The Multiliteracies (ML) Project is a response by eleven prominent literacy researchers, known collectively as the New London Group (NLG), to changes associated with the end of the Cold War and the information economy.¹ ML was conceived in 1994 at a meeting in New London, New Hampshire, US, and saw light with the publication of NLG 1996 in the *Harvard Educational Review*. With the appearance of the volume under review, we can now say that it is walking and has a promising future.

The volume consists of 16 essays – there are no reports of research – divided among five thematic sections, each with a brief introduction by the editors. The *Harvard Educational Review* article is reprinted as Chap. 1 and forms the entire first section. Although readers familiar with it may choose to skip this introduction, it is a needed starting point for those unfamiliar with ML, because it summarizes the entire project. For both groups, a reread after examining other articles may prove profitable, as it did for me.

Section 2 consists of five articles providing rationales for ML. The first two focus on changing political, social, technological, and economic realities. Jim Gee (Chap. 2) – almost in spite of himself – appears fascinated by what he has elsewhere called the New Work Order. The emphasis is on the possibilities accruing from the increasing distribution of decision-making that characterizes post-industrial workplaces and societies generally. Carmen Luke (Chap. 3) discusses

new technologies, also with a good deal of optimism. Both pieces may get criticized for backgrounding issues of social justice – though they are not ignored – and for not being categorical in their condemnation of inequities produced by the new economy. Still, their arguments are far more useful for making the case for educational reform to bureaucrats, politicians, and others who are unlikely to be swayed by appeals to critical theory. For example, I now feel better prepared to argue against one-size-fits-all assessments – a current issue in New York State – which these authors show are out of synch with the needs of information-based economies.

The remaining chapters in the section, by Joe Lo Bianco (Chap. 4), Martin Nagata (Chap. 5), and the editors (Chap. 6), discuss the ML aim of building pluralistic societies and how that goal relates to various aspects of the new economy and globalization. The arguments vary, though all relate to how traditional models of education – be they homogenizing, critical, or multicultural – are not sufficient to provide all students with equitable opportunities. Furthermore, as Nagata powerfully argues, pedagogy must be built on respect for the ability of people to direct the safeguarding and development of their own cultural and linguistic patrimonies.

The third section is on ML content, which is centered on the notion of DESIGN, meaning (roughly) the structuring of semiotic systems. Design is used both as noun and verb. As a noun, it is a set of resources (e.g., grammar, words, genre rules); as a verb, it refers to fashioning new resources (called “the Redesigned”) by using the original ones. There is an emphasis here on multiple levels of structure that interact and mutually influence one another. This view appears to owe a debt to Hallidayan linguistics, and Gunther Kress, who works in that tradition, has two chapters in this section. The first (Chap. 7) contains a useful definition of literacy as “socially made forms of representing and communicating” (157). The main emphasis, however, is on the development of a theory of semiosis that can account for concerns reminiscent of Wittgenstein’s (1953) inquiries. These include the dynamic instability of rules of communication, how reference is embedded in action, language as a goal-oriented system, and the meaning of nonlinguistic representations. This chapter is well argued and is among those most cited by other authors in their contributions.

Chap. 8, by Norman Fairclough, consists of an application of critical discourse analysis to understanding Design, particularly of language. Fairclough is particularly interested in the ideologies behind Design practices. Again, there is a kinship with Wittgenstein, this time through the concept of LANGUAGE GAMES. Chap. 9, Kress’s second contribution, concerns multimodality. One thrust is that the study of Design needs to be less constrained than traditional formalisms allow. This argument for lumping over splitting is convincing only up to a point. After all, Design assumes structure by definition, the plasticity of that structure notwithstanding. In fact, Kress bases his argument on a number of unconvincing claims and charges. For example, well-considered positions such as the assump-

tion that paralinguistic gestures “have no central role in the grammatical core of language” (193) are used as indictments of linguists’ narrowmindedness. In the end, perhaps a theoretical structure flexible enough for literacy Design simply has not yet been found. I argue elsewhere (Newman, in press) that Situation Theory, a theory of information (Barwise & Perry 1983; Devlin 1991) is promising in this regard. It can support a rigorous analysis of multimodality by formalizing the meaning of propositional content and the informational contribution inherent in the forms used to express that content. Nevertheless, however it is developed, the concept of Design is already an impressive contribution to literacy work. It responds to a foundational problem – what is literacy research to study? – in a multimodal era, and I have already found it essential in my own ongoing research.

The section closes with Chap. 10, by the editors, which interrelates Design, literacy education, multimedia, indigenous cultures, and phenomenology. The argument is again for a pluralistic social order as an alternative to those based on homogenization or fragmentation. The article begins strongly with a call for education to account for but move beyond “lifeworlds” – culturally embedded assumptions regarding the nature of reality. However, it later becomes speculative; controversial claims, such as a strong Whorfian conjecture concerning language structure constraining lifeworlds, are simply assumed. Fortunately, it ends with an interesting, and more grounded, description of how multimedia can be a force for pluralism.

The fourth section concerns pedagogy and begins with a third article (Chap. 11) by the editors. They lay out the four-part ML pedagogy: (1) Situated Practice, a form of immersion in practice; (2) Overt Instruction, encouraging conscious reflection; (3) Critical Framing, interpreting of social and cultural contexts of practice; and (4) Transformed Practice, a shifting of contexts of use. Apparently, the NLG have been criticized for eclecticism by those favoring purer approaches. Although it is reasonable to respond by defending eclecticism, it is worth noting that this pedagogy is not a bag of diverse tricks. The use of elements traditionally associated with different instructional philosophies responds to separate instructional needs; therefore, objections to the hybridity sound more doctrinaire than principled.

Chap. 12, by Courtney Cazden, discusses how the elements of ML interact with cross-cultural issues in existing pedagogical programs, such as Reading Recovery. She presents the issues as subtle and complex, and her proposals are sometimes rightfully tentative, though they clarify the general direction she believes literacy educators need to go. Chap. 13 closes the section, with a self-criticism by Sarah Michaels & Richard Sohmer of a previous study by Michaels on the science learning of four fourth-graders. They argue that the original work missed how the three children originally considered “less scientific” were actually engaged in the profoundly scientific enterprise of conjugating the unintuitive (and actually inaccurate) content provided in class with their intuitive understand-

ings of the world. This point is a good one, but some of the reanalysis is also flawed. For example, the remaining student, originally labeled “more scientific” in his approach to the material, is unfavorably compared with the others because he does not connect the science learning with his own intuitions. Yet science is not necessarily about getting an intuitively workable picture of how the world works. It often brackets off certain conceptual domains from our lifeworld sense, and establishes plausibility through unintuitive criteria, such as formal coherence and abstract principles (e.g., quantum mechanics). It was precisely here that this student appeared to me to have excelled.

The final section, on ML in practice, includes three articles. Chap. 14 consists largely of reactions by Denise Newfield & Pippa Stein’s South African students, mostly in-service English teachers, who read the original 1996 article and reacted in interviews and essays. Their responses are mostly positive but do contain some interesting critiques of ML. For example, one teacher points out that a pedagogy that leads students to question hierarchies generally may be incompatible with the values of cultures that assume authority based on age and nurturing. Chap. 15, by David Bond, and Chap. 16, by Cazden, are depictions of innovative programs that predate ML. Bond discusses a South African business education program designed to diversify the ranks of management in that country. Cazden covers four programs, including two in the US and two in Australia, ranging from kindergarten to college. The lesson in both chapters is that the elements proposed by ML are not entirely original, but that ML provides a metalanguage and a conceptual coherence for the ways we think about literacy instruction. Cazden’s chapter, which closes the book, ends sadly with the news that an exciting program discussed was terminated owing to government closed-mindedness. Yet this adversity shows the need for ML. Literacy educators and applied linguists have a poor track record in influencing public policy. We can blame all kinds of evils, from ignorance to xenophobia, for these failures. Nevertheless, in the end these dark forces are only reasons to be more innovative in argumentation and not to fall into predictable posturing that consistently fails to sway policy-makers or public opinion. The ML project has the potential to show how pluralist models of education may achieve goals – e.g., providing a better-educated work force – that have broad appeal. I hope NLG members, their students, and others will now provide a research base that demonstrates that this is the case.

I will close with two sets of complaints. The first should be laid at the feet of the publishers. The book suffers all the symptoms of being delivered as camera-ready copy. Academics are generally not trained to be copy editors, which results in typos and occasional incoherencies caused by incomplete revising. Also, the very brief index is entirely inadequate. Here the editors share responsibility; as I know from experience, it is time-consuming but not onerous to generate a book index. Finally, it would have been preferable for each article to have its own bibliography.

REVIEWS

The second set of complaints includes inconsistencies the NLG may already be struggling with. For example, Kress (Chap. 7) gives a multimodal definition of literacy, and Luke (Chap. 3) speaks of reading and writing as “print literacy,” assuming a similar multimodality for the general concept. Yet Cope & Kalantzis and Michaels & Sohmer retain definitions of literacy as reading and writing only. Furthermore, while each author assumes the jargon and conceptual structure of ML, each tends to import his or her preferred theoretical apparatus. Thus Gee speaks of “Discourse,” with a capital *D*, Fairclough of “Critical Discourse Analysis,” and so on. That is fine as far as it goes; but since no author picks up the theoretical constructs imported by the others (no one but Gee capitalizes “Discourse”), there is less integration than there might be. Finally, while Luke criticizes technological determinism, others fall into deterministic thinking, not about new technologies but old ones, particularly print literacy. Michaels & Sohmer (Chap. 13) and Kalantzis & Cope (Chap. 6) make the hard-to-sustain assumption that writing has transcendental effects on individual cognition and cultures (see, e.g., Street 1984, 1995). In the end, though, it is obvious that no book of this ambition and scope could satisfy any one reader entirely. *Multiliteracies* will surely be a landmark in literacy theory and practice, and we wish the ML project a long and productive future. All of us who are interested in literacy will benefit from their work.

NOTE

¹ They are Courtney Cazden, Bill Cope, Norman Fairclough, James Gee, Mary Kalantzis, Gunther Kress, Joseph Lo Bianco, Allan Luke, Carmen Luke, Sarah Michaels, and Martin Nakata. Allan Luke did not contribute to this book.

REFERENCES

- Barwise, Jon, & Perry, John (1983). *Situations and attitudes*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Devlin, Keith (1991). *Logic and information*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
New London Group (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: designing social futures. *Harvard Educational Review* 66(1):60–92.
Newman, Michael (in press). *The designs of academic literacy*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey (Greenwood).
Street, Brian V. (1984). *Literacy in theory and practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
Street, Brian V. (1995). *Social literacies: Critical approaches to literacy in development, ethnography, and education*. London and New York: Longman.
Wittgenstein, Ludwig (1953). *Philosophical investigations*. New York: Macmillan.

JEFF MACSWAN, *A minimalist approach to intrasentential codeswitching*. New York and London: Garland, 1999. Pp. xxvi, 305. Hb \$76.00.

Reviewed by MARJORY MEECHAN
Box 369, Bridgetown, Barbados
memechan@yahoo.com

In this book, MacSwan accounts for code-switching constraints between Spanish and Nahuatl, a Uto-Aztecan language of central Mexico, while testing two main

hypotheses: (1) Nothing constrains code-switching apart from the requirements of the mixed grammars; and (2) code-switchers have the same grammatical competence as monolinguals for the languages they use (p. 22).

Basically, the author proposes that code-switchers are grammatically indistinguishable from non-code-switchers, whether monolingual or bilingual. The analysis is based on the Minimalist Program (henceforth MP), which holds that all languages are subject to a universal set of principles, and that variation between languages results from mismatches between lexically based morphological features (Chomsky 1995). MacSwan notes that, in most cases, the MP predicts that surface equivalence of word orders between languages falls out from individual lexical properties. Although equivalence (Poplack 1980) is controversial, its influence has been observed in a variety of language pairs where systematic code-switching behavior has been studied. The MP also predicts that lexical features can account for constraints that would apply only to specific language pairs. If true, the Minimalist approach to code-switching is a strong competitor to models that appeal to purely surface restrictions on codeswitching.

MacSwan gives a comprehensive review of the relevant literature. Since his goal is to show that no extra-theoretical code-switching mechanisms are required, he focuses on the evaluation of formal theories for accuracy of their predictions (as determined by the existence of counter-examples) and for invocation of code-switching-specific mechanisms in their formalisms. His approach rests on a well-defined theory of language structure, and his clear elaboration of it is notable. Particularly convincing is the justification of his analysis with evidence from each of the languages in contact as it is spoken monolingually. The most interesting analyses appeal to a feature mismatch between Nahuatl and Spanish in regard to gender. Nahuatl has no gender, and Spanish has two. Thus, the MP predicts that switching involving gender matching will be sharply constrained.

Gender is first invoked in code-switching between subject pronouns and verbs. According to MacSwan, switching is prohibited between Nahuatl pronouns and Spanish verbs. While switching between Spanish 1st and 2nd person pronouns and Nahuatl verbs is also ungrammatical, switching between Spanish 3rd person pronouns and Nahuatl verbs is permitted. MacSwan relates this to the feature specification of Tense (T). Verbs carrying agreement morphology must raise (e.g. 1st and 2nd person) to check features of T that might lead to a feature mismatch, so only where the verb is unmarked and need not raise (3rd person) does the derivation survive.

More concretely connected to gender, only Spanish demonstratives or determiners marked for masculine gender can occur with a Nahuatl noun. If the determiner has ϕ features, which require checking, the noun is REQUIRED to move. Spanish masculine gender is a default form, and more compatible with Nahuatl's gender system. This is a more principled proposal than the Functional Head Constraint (Belazi et al. 1994), so it may account for reported violations of that constraint.

One area where the MP falters is that of noun–adjective order. Although MacSwan criticizes other theories for their failure to provide a consistent account of code-switching patterns in these structures, his approach too fails here. Furthermore, he erroneously asserts that both Poplack 1980 and Santorini & Mahootian 1995 predict unconstrained order. In fact, Poplack claims the order is constrained by equivalence as determined by the word order properties of both the adjective and the noun. Mahootian links the order to the argument status of the adjective. Neither proposes that orders are unconstrained.

MacSwan's criticisms of other theories are sometimes contradictory. For example, he alternately condemns and accepts the Free Morpheme Constraint.¹ Most of this confusion results from MacSwan's fuzzy distinction between code-switching and borrowing. This is problematic because, as MacSwan notes, confidence in the data on which a theory is based is important for determining its validity. His study is lacking in this regard.

MacSwan's examples are often ambiguous, for various reasons. The confusion as to etymological origin found between code-switching and borrowing also surfaces in complementizer constructions because Spanish *que* and Nahuatl *ke* are phonologically indistinguishable. Structures exemplifying gender influence are problematic as well. Examples showing acceptable switching between determiners and nouns are often semantically masculine (e.g. *hombre* 'man', *tlakatl* 'man'), while unacceptable examples with feminine gender are more arbitrary (e.g. *casa* 'house'). Do grammaticality judgments reflect some violation of gender assignment rather than feature matching? Even with careful construction of judgment items, their interpretation is often uncertain. This ambiguity puts MacSwan's results in doubt. Since the data are constructed, why not ensure that they are unambiguous?

According to MacSwan, judgments are preferable to conversational data because they reveal RELATIVE acceptability for investigating fine points of structure. He rejects the assertion that since code-switching is stigmatized, judgments about it are unreliable, stating that attitudes toward code-switching vary across communities, so eliminating judgments on this basis is unwarranted. However, social values DO affect speaker self-reports of language behavior. Where this has been investigated (e.g. Myers-Scotton & Jakes 1999), we find that speaker intuitions are unreliable regardless of the degree to which code-switching is viewed negatively (if at all). In fact, although his sample comprises just four speakers, MacSwan had to reject data from two – ostensibly because of their negative attitudes.

MacSwan states that, in any case, only judgment data are acceptable for testing hypotheses on formal structures, and he correctly asserts that conversational data cannot be used AS IF they were intuitive. However, he invokes conversational data to support his findings,² and, more disturbing, he DOES use them as if they were judgment data – i.e., he reports that structures either occurred or failed to occur with no consideration of how often they might potentially have occurred.

In an apparent turnabout, he proposes that conversational data can be used to falsify a theory if a forbidden structure occurs. However, just as the absence of a structure in conversational data does not mean that it is not permitted, the simple presence of a structure does not imply that it is, as a quantitative study might reveal.

MacSwan discounts quantitative analysis, stating that “(t)he frequency with which constructions (can) occur, apart from zero, says nothing about the underlying system of linguistic competence” (fn. 7, p. 24). However, conditioning contexts in variable structures have been shown to reflect grammatical systems (e.g. Kroch 1989), which is just as revealing as *relative* judgments on grammaticality (if not more so). The nature of the data aside, MacSwan’s methodology for obtaining judgments is flawed in and of itself. Before eliciting speakers’ judgments, he FIRST discussed code-switching as a social issue in the United States. Then, he gave them examples of “BAD” codeswitches. Both procedures may have affected their judgments. This overall disregard for speaker attitudes is a serious flaw.

Another troubling aspect of MacSwan’s thesis is the fact that his hypotheses are interdependent, thus leading to circularity. On the one hand, he concludes that because the MP CAN be used to account for his data, it is a good model for code-switching constraints. On the other hand, MacSwan concludes that code-switchers are no less grammatically competent than monolinguals BECAUSE their code-switching patterns reflect the MP. This is an assumption of the validity of the MP rather than a test of it.

Even so, MacSwan’s approach raises some intriguing possibilities. Of particular interest is his assertion that even under equivalence, other principled restrictions on code-switching may apply. This claim deserves careful consideration, but before being accepted, it must be tested on more reliable data. Ultimately, the uncertain predictions of the theory and the methodological problems surrounding the data undermine confidence in MacSwan’s conclusions. Future work circumventing these difficulties will determine the value of his contribution to code-switching research.

NOTES

¹ In fact, MacSwan claims that clashes in ordering of constraints in the PF component will exclude word-internal code-switching.

² Even if accepted, the comparison is suspect because it came from children, who have been shown in other studies to differ from adults (e.g. Poplack 1983). The speakers’ judgments should be compared with their own conversational behavior.

REFERENCES

- Belazi, Hedi M.; Rubin, Edward J.; & Toribio, Almeida Jacqueline (1994). Code switching and X-bar theory: The functional head constraint. *Linguistic Inquiry* 25(2):221–37.
 Chomsky, Noam (1995). *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Press.

REVIEWS

- Kroch, Anthony S. (1989). Function and grammar in the history of English: Periphrastic *do*. In R. Fasold & D. Schiffrin (eds.), *Language change and variation*, 133–72. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol, & Jakes, Janice L. (1999). The data wars: Grammaticality judgments vs. ‘the real thing’. Paper presented at NewWave 28, Toronto.
- Poplack, Shana (1980). Sometimes I’ll start a sentence in Spanish Y TERMINO EN ESPAÑOL: Toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics* 18(7/8):581–618.
- _____. (1983). Intergenerational variation in language use and structure in a bilingual context. In C. Rivera (ed.), *A sociolinguistic/ethnographic approach to language proficiency assessment*, 42–70. Avon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Santorini, Beatrice, & Mahootian, Shahrzad (1995). Code-switching and the syntactic status of adnominal adjectives. *Lingua* 96:1–27.

NUMA MARKEE, *Conversation analysis*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2000. Pp. xv, 216. Pb \$22.50.

Reviewed by HANSUN ZHANG WARING
Speech Communication
Mercy College
Dobbs Ferry, NY 10522
hwaring@mercynet.edu

Conversation analysis has opened up a new frontier for both Conversation Analysis (CA) and second-language acquisition (SLA). It is a gutsy and timely book. As a first endeavor of its kind, it ventures to apply an increasingly popular discourse analytic methodology to a field whose research has traditionally been governed by experimental paradigms. It also strikes an impressive balance between theoretical considerations and empirical analyses. The book begins with purely theoretical discussions on the larger issues that govern the two fields, then moves on to incorporate empirical data in illustrating the possibility of connecting them. The theory-to-practice continuum is completed by applying CA to two SLA-related collections of data. In a remarkable way, the author manages to become fully engaged in micro-analytic procedures without for a moment losing sight of the larger pictures that motivated these procedures.

The book is divided into four parts. In part I, “Issues and definitions” (Chaps. 1, 2, and 3), the author provides an overview of interaction-related SLA hypotheses, as well as a rather concise and practical account of the methodology of CA. Presented in contrast to both experimental and ethnographic approaches to research, Markee’s explication of CA seems strikingly lucid. In particular, he argues for the viability of applying CA to SLA by addressing three potential objections to such attempts: (i) CA deals with interaction, not cognition; (ii) CA studies use, not acquisition; and (iii) the turn is not a suitable unit for studying SLA because it is interactionally determined and does not reflect individual cognitive processes. In examining these objections, Markee follows Schegloff 1991 in claiming that cognition is socially distributed. He also identifies with Firth & Wagner 1998 in questioning the distinction between acquisition and use. He adopts

the sociolinguistic approach to SLA in arguing that great insights about processes of acquisition can be gained from in-depth investigation of use. Furthermore, he points out that Crookes's (1990) objection to using "turn" as an analytical category ignores the hearer's perspective on interaction, as well as the fact that cognition is collaboratively achieved. Finally, Markee proposes the need for re-specifying SLA research by adding an emic account to the dominant rationalist approach.

In part II, "Locating interactional competence" (Chaps. 4, 5, and 6), Markee highlights what he considers to be the connecting point between CA and SLA: the construct of interactional competence. He contends that "CA's concern with interactional competence converges with sociolinguistic notions of communicative competence" – an SLA domain (p. 64). He then proceeds further to connect CA and SLA by discussing the three components of interactional knowledge (sequential organization, turn-taking, and repair) within the context of equal vs. unequal power exchange systems that are of particular interest to SLA researchers (e.g. naturalistic vs. instructed SLA). These discussions are especially illuminating in that they revolve tightly around SLA issues such as the extent to which the differently patterned interactional practices generate opportunities for conversational restructuring, meaning negotiation, and eventually, language acquisition.

Part III, "Demonstrating conversation analysis" (Chaps. 7 and 8) contains a full-blown data-based illustration of how CA contributes to answering a specific SLA question that traditional SLA studies have failed to answer. Markee begins by reviewing Long's (1985) research agenda, which calls for confirming the hypothesis that interaction leads to comprehensible input, which in turns leads to acquisition. He points out that, despite the fact that SLA research has generally been successful in showing the role of interaction in promoting comprehended input, it has so far clearly failed to demonstrate the relationship between comprehended input and acquisition. He proceeds to show the instrumental value of CA in yielding evidence for precisely such a relationship. In fact, by applying CA to two extended transcripts of classroom talk, Markee is able to lay out the rather complicated role of negotiated comprehended input in SLA. Chap. 7 offers positive evidence of how such input successfully leads to one learner's acquisition of the word "coral." In Chap. 8, however, the results of analysis seem more mixed. Although negotiated comprehended input eventually helped the learner understand the literal meaning of the phrase "We cannot get by Auschwitz," its role in unveiling the phrase's symbolic meaning for the learner proved to be fairly limited. Through conducting such micro-analytic investigation into classroom talk extracted from complete transcripts, Markee convincingly makes evident the power of CA in pinpointing whether, when, where, and how language acquisition occurs in the course of negotiated interaction.

I have one minor concern about the book. Although Markee makes an admirable effort in summarizing interaction-related SLA studies into three neatly

titled hypotheses – the discourse hypothesis, the social interaction hypothesis, and the interactionist hypothesis – this presentation might be misleading in suggesting three distinct approaches to interaction in SLA. Note that the latter two hypotheses are never explicitly stated. In fact, the theories and research discussed under those headings seem to be merely extensions of Hatch's (1978) original contention that interaction leads to acquisition. And the last hypothesis, interactionist, is basically a model of SLA that synthesizes Hatch's (1978) view on interaction, Krashen's (1980) proposal of comprehensive input, Long's (1983) belief in the role of interaction in generating comprehensible input, and Swain's (1985) notion of comprehensive output. In a way, the three chronologically ordered "hypotheses" manifest an increasingly rich account of the role of input and interaction in second-language acquisition. My point is that Markee may be using the word "hypothesis" in a less strict manner than one would expect, and readers should simply be aware that the three SLA hypotheses presented in the beginning of the book do not stand for three distinct theoretical camps.

Nonetheless, *Conversation Analysis* is a groundbreaking attempt. Markee has made the case that CA is capable of providing insights into language-learning processes. The inclusion of CA as an SLA methodology will no doubt broaden the horizon of language acquisition research. As Markee suggests in the last chapter, L2 learners "probably learn far more than individual words as a result of a focus on lexis" in the course of talk-in-interaction (163). CA's potential for studying the acquisition of discourse competence and pragmatic abilities, for example, is not hard to conceive. Markee has indeed made an important contribution to both CA and SLA.

REFERENCES

- Crookes, Graham (1990). The utterance, and other basic units for second language discourse analysis. *Applied Linguistics* 11:189–99.
- Firth, Alan, & Wagner, Johannes (1998). SLA property: No trespassing! *Modern Language Journal* 82:91–4.
- Hatch, Evelyn (1978). Discourse analysis and second language acquisition. In Evelyn Hatch (ed.), *Second language acquisition: A book of readings*, 402–35. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Krashen, Stephen D. (1980). The input hypothesis. In James E. Alatis (ed.), *Current issues in bilingual education*, 168–80. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Long, Michael H. (1983). Linguistic and conversational adjustments to non-native speakers. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 5:177–93.
- (1985). Input and second language acquisition theory. In Susan M. Gass & Carolyn Madden (eds.), *Input in second language acquisition*, 377–93. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1991). Conversation analysis and socially shared cognition. In Lauren R. Resnick et al. (eds.), *Perspectives on socially shared cognition*, 150–71. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Swain, Merrill (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In Susan M. Gass & Carolyn Madden (eds.), *Input in second language acquisition*, 235–53. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

SRIKANT SARANGI & CELIA ROBERTS (eds.), *Talk, work and institutional order: Discourse in medical, mediation, and management settings*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter (Language, Power and Social Process Series), 1999. Pp. 530. Pb 24.00.

Reviewed by LORENZA MONDADA
Institute for Romance Languages, University of Basel
Stapfelberg 7-9, CH 4051 Basel
lorenza.mondada@unibas.ch

This very interesting and useful book proposes an interdisciplinary approach to professional talk and its constitutive role in various institutional settings. It aims at reviewing the available literature and at providing theoretical insights and methodological tools for further analyses, thereby building possible bridges between academic research and its practical relevance within institutions.

The book is well framed by a series of introductory texts by the editors, Roberts & Sarangi, which open the whole volume as well as each of its three sections – explicitly stating the theoretical and empirical purposes of the authors and locating them within the existing literature. The introduction makes explicit the common focus of interest and the disciplines that could approach it. Work settings are viewed as very complex contexts of activities, where communicative practices shape the emergence and display of identities, the establishment of social relationships, and the constitution and transformation of professional knowledge, through interwoven activities, divergent context definitions, and social conflicts. Therefore, in this compilation the goal is to describe these work-related settings' complexity by considering the interplay between two constitutive dimensions: the interactional and the institutional order. These dimensions account for the accomplishment, negotiation, and regulation of the order of the workplace: communicative practices shape the everyday management of work activities, but they also accomplish, reinforce, or transform the institutional order, which is reified, embedded, and locally achieved in the interactional order. This orderliness can be accounted for by invoking several disciplines and theoretical frameworks; the book defines a broad picture of these contributions, identifying the specificities of ethnographic, sociolinguistic, conversational, pragmatic, and sociological approaches. In this way, interdisciplinary heterogeneity is organized through the particular issues raised by each analytic orientation.

This diversity has consequences for possible ways of defining workplace and professional activities, as well on ways of identifying relevant observational fields and objects of analysis. Thus, the volume identifies a plurality of communicative activities within the workplace, focusing on different professional actors in the public sector (medical personnel, social workers, midwives, managerial staff, educators, trade unionists) and on different kinds of social relationships between them (professional–client encounters, communication within a professional group, communication across areas of professional expertise). This multiplicity shows that it would not be useful to differentiate the authors' contributions on the basis of professional domain alone (as medicine, management, or mediation), because

these domains are interrelated, and because they are characterized by common practices and procedures for dealing with and resolving problems, making decisions, displaying professional identities, and constructing knowledge and credibility.

The first section of the book deals with medical interactions, in an alternative way to the massive analysis of classical patient–doctor encounters found in the previous decade of medical interaction studies. On one side, activities other than consultations are considered – such as clinical case presentations and therapeutic decision-making, analyzed by Paul Atkinson and by Frederick Erickson; record-keeping and discussions in meetings, analyzed by Jenny Cook-Gumperz & Lawrence Messerman; management of information circulation in case talk or in telephone calls answered by receptionists who must decide the seriousness of symptoms in order to give access to certain medical services, analyzed by Aaron Cicourel. On the other side, these activities imply different pairs of identities than patient and doctor: young trainee and experienced doctor (Erickson, Atkinson, Cicourel); various team members, including seniors and nurses, eventually acting as chairs and minute-takers (Cook-Gumperz & Messerman); or receptionists, patients, and physicians (Cicourel). These social actors display various sorts of responsibilities, credibilities, expertise, and interpretations, which contribute to the distributed character of medical knowledge. The hybrid character of these activities lies not only in the fact that supervision, instruction, empowering, and everyday work become interwoven, but also in that medical relevance, institutional criteria, and organizational or bureaucratic constraints merge together.

The second section is a collection of papers dealing with medical and social care practices and with enterprise discursive practices. All address the way in which communicative activities contribute to the construction of socio-professional identities and to the configuration of context and of institutional reality, through the ways the tasks at hand are organized interactionally. All the articles share the view that identities are not given or preexistent to the actual interaction, and they show how roles, relationships, and professional profiles are accomplished through talk in the case of midwives and mothers (analyzed by Margareta Bredmar & Per Linell); mediators and clients (David Greatbatch & Robert Dingwall); social worker and parents (Christopher Hall, Srikant Sarangi, & Stefaan Slembrouck); managers, unionists, and employees (Christopher Candlin, Yon Mlaey, & Heather Sutch; Janet Holmes, Maria Stubbe, & Bernadette Vine). These identities are shaped by the task at hand, where discursive versions of present state of affairs and of projected actions are discussed, negotiated, and assessed. This is the case with the counseling practices analyzed in the first three chapters of this section, which deal with the “normality” of symptoms and of everyday experiences of pregnant women expressed by midwives (Bredmar & Linell); the disputed family issues discussed in mediation sessions, where mediators display “neutrality” and disputants orient to this feature as part of collective problem-solving (Greatbatch & Dingwall); or the assessment of sensitive topics such as child abuse, parental

deficiencies, and familial dysfunctions (Hall, Sarangi, & Slembrouck). But it is also the case in enterprise negotiations and bargainings, where future agreements, work conditions, and management decisions are discussed (Candlin, Mlaey, & Sutch; Holmes, Stubbe, & Vine). Tackling issues of the construction of multiple and often changing institutional identities, these essays draw from a variety of theoretical frameworks; Goffman is a prominent reference, but sequential analysis of categorization practices inspired by Conversation Analysis, and analysis of politeness phenomena and of other pragmatic processes (e.g. production of evidentiality, forms of quoting other voices, deictic reference) are also exploited.

These different analytical frames of reference raise the question of how to integrate them, or how to specify their particular insights or their own “analytic mentality.” Such an interdisciplinary project has to state whether the references it mobilizes are complementary or contradictory; whether their confrontation exposes flaws in ways of doing research; or whether they raise new problems to be worked out.

The last section of this book addresses precisely these kinds of questions, showing that workplace activities are a good place for raising more general theoretical and methodological issues. Questions are debated to assess more precisely the role of context and talk, the ways of grasping their mutually configuring relationships, and the ways of describing them, integrating ethnographic observation within discourse analysis or Conversation Analysis (CA). In this debate, all authors seem to recognize that context is locally shaped and achieved in a reflexive manner by the participants’ actions, but divergences arise when one has to assess the role of talk within this context. For instance, David Silverman defends a CA stance, where analysis avoids projecting on the data a priori interpretations of what their context is, preferring to show the actual members’ orientations toward the relevant context and their procedural consequentiality. He argues in favor of more detailed studies of talk at work, although – following Harvey Sacks’s “aesthetic for social research” – he acknowledges the interest of an ethnography that would deliver the “why” of the action AFTER a careful analysis of the “how,” i.e. the conversational mechanisms. John Gumperz also states the importance of careful analysis of the contextualization procedures accountable in participants’ way of organizing their talk; moreover, he stresses the importance of background knowledge, presuppositions, and assumptions intervening in conversational inferences. In contrast, Tony Hak criticizes overestimation of the importance of discourse in workplace research, denying that work activities can be reduced to talk and therefore stating the need for other kinds of analysis, especially ethnographic observation. But all authors are concerned with assessing the payoffs of careful conversational and linguistic analysis of talk data, and with the search for new ways of doing ethnography in a relevant manner, whether that is a “post-ethnomethodological ethnography” (Hak) or a “non-romantic ethnography” (Silverman).

REVIEWS

The final chapter, by Roberts & Sarangi, raises a further issue concerning the practical relevance of the knowledge produced by researchers and their ethical commitment to their fieldwork. This issue concerns the possible ways of being involved in the field studied, and particularly the possibility of developing a “joint problematization” between researchers and other professionals in the field studied, where researchers might take into account the way in which their theoretical and methodological agenda fits into the practical agenda of people engaged in the field, and where their relationship is considered as a collaboration within a participatory action-research framework. This line of thought suggests an alternative to the traditional application of theory to practice.

The book thus closes not just on a debate about complementarities and contradictions within an interdisciplinary framework, but also with a note on the possible links between theory and practice, researchers and researched, in a way that elaborates the notions of context and the local embeddedness not only of the professional talk observed, but also of the professional observation practices mobilized for doing research.

PAUL L. JALBERT (ed.), *Media studies: Ethnomethodological approaches*. Lanham, NY, and Oxford: University Press of America and International Institute for Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis, 1999. Pp. xvii, 284 [Studies in Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis, 5]. Hb 57.00.

Reviewed by PAUL TEN HAVE
Sociology & Anthropology, University of Amsterdam
O.Z. Achterburgwal 185
NL-1012 DK Amsterdam, The Netherlands
email: tenhave@pscw.uva.nl

This volume contains nine chapters offering ethnomethodological contributions to media studies. As such, it can be read as a demonstration of what ethnomethodology can contribute to this field. This raises two questions: First, what is it that ethnomethodology has to offer? And second, how well does the volume succeed in this demonstration?

Ethnomethodology, as currently conceived (e.g. Button, 1991), proposes that the established problems of the human sciences, such as “the problem of social order,” can be “respecified” as situated problems of ordinary practice. Or, to use a less jargonesque expression, rather than discussing such problems in the abstract world of theorizing, one can – or rather should – turn to an investigation of the ways in which they are dealt with in the ordinary practice of daily life.

For media studies, this lesson would imply, for example, that one should study instances of actual practices of media production, rather than theorize about the structural or ideological determination of media contents. Therefore, the studies collected in this volume focus on the mundane, practical aspects of the constitution of media “texts” (including images), in contrast to the more usual sociolog-

ical focus on ideological reproduction, media bias, class-based reception, etc. This theme is most strongly developed in the first two chapters. Wes Sharrock & Wil Coleman elaborate the opposition of the ethnomethodological focus on “structures of practical action” to the common sociological use of abstract concepts of “social structure” as somehow determinate of, for instance, an audience’s reception of media texts. In the second chapter, Jalbert himself explores the possibilities for a “critical” analysis of media texts that is NOT based on the analyst’s own political preferences. Both use an example of the genre they oppose as their polemical object, or straw man. In the first chapter, the objection centers on how common-sense interpretive devices masquerade as causal mechanisms in an abstract sociological framework. In the second, it is the neglect of the possibilities for multiple readings of media texts, based on the application of different background understandings and presuppositions, that is criticized.

Similar contrasts figure in the other chapters, but, happily, their focus is more on demonstrating ethnomethodological inquiry than on criticizing other approaches. Michael Lynch & David Bogen discuss one aspect of their investigation of the Iran-Contra hearings (Lynch & Bogen 1996), namely how the relationship between “writing” and “speech” was dealt with in those hearings. In this way, they offer an ethnomethodological respecification of this relationship as formulated by philosophers like Derrida and Searle. Jeff Stetson analyzes the use of categories like “victim,” “offender,” and “witness” as these evolved in a series of media texts concerning a dramatic incident in Japan. Liz Marr and colleagues report on a study of the daily “balancing act” of a soccer journalist among the pressures emanating from the players, the club manager, the paper, the fans, etc., as an essential aspect of his work. Douglas Macbeth discusses the local work of sense-making involved in the production of a long shot in documentary filmmaking. Stephen Hester & Richard Fitzgerald explore the opening of a radio phone-in show, especially how the host uses membership categories to generate debate. In the next chapter, Peter Eglin & Stephen Hester discuss the functions of categories as evident in the media coverage of a mass murder event. And finally, Dušan Bjelić respecifies the idea of media reality, as suggested by recent French media theories, on the basis of some media representations concerning the war in former Yugoslavia, relying partly on his own participation in the production of one of these.

The collection is thus quite varied in terms of themes explored and materials used. The characterizations given above do not, of course, do justice to the complexity and subtlety of the arguments offered in these chapters. An interesting idea that comes forward in a number of them – especially the one by Stetson and the two coauthored by Hester – is that various uses of “membership categories” are basic both to the production of intelligibility in media texts, and to their quality as “newsworthy” or “interesting” contributions. The notion of “membership categorization,” it may be recalled, was developed by Harvey Sacks in the 1960s (Sacks 1972a, 1972b, 1992). It refers to the use of categories like “male,”

REVIEWS

“young,” or “deviant,” organized in sets like “gender,” “stage of life,” or “(ab)normality,” which are invoked and relied on by members of society to understand social situations or to describe these in an intelligible fashion. Of special interest are the “predicates” associated with the categories, such as “category-bound activities,” presupposed knowledge, character traits, or moral qualities (cf. Hester & Eglin 1997). In news reports, unusual category combinations, category/predicate disjunctures, and so forth quite often serve as key points of interest, while the host in the call-in radio show relies on categorical associations and contrasts to kick off discussions. What is of interest, from an ethnomethodological point of view, is not the fact that such general common-sense categories play a role in social life, but the situationally adapted manner in which they are used.

It should be noted that the contributions to this collection have been selected from a specific part of the ethnomethodological corpus, while another, better-known part – the conversation-analytic one – is not represented. The selected studies focus on the productive organization of knowledge and intelligibility, while conversation-analytic studies of media events, like those by Steve Clayman, John Heritage, and others, try to elucidate the sequential and interactional organization in media productions and representations. My remark on this selective representation of ethnomethodology is not meant as a critique, however; rather, it points to a usefully restricted focus of the book.

The overall quality of these essays is high, but a number of them may not be too easy for the uninitiated to read. For those new to ethnomethodology, the collection would have been enhanced by a careful introduction, laying out the essential contribution each paper makes to an ethnomethodological understanding of media. I would suggest to such readers that they postpone reading the first two chapters and start with the less polemical and more concrete demonstrations of the ethnomethodological approach in chapters like those by Stetson or Hester & Fitzgerald.

This volume, then, offers a useful antidote to the pervasive top-down theorizing current in media studies, as well as “cultural studies” in general. Most chapters give a demonstration of the usefulness of a close scrutiny of the production details of media products. However, the editor, and some of the contributors, could have done a better job in helping the general reader to get this overall message.

REFERENCES

- Button, G., ed. (1991). *Ethnomethodology and the human sciences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hester, S., & P. Eglin, eds. (1997). *Culture in action: Studies in membership categorization analysis*. Washington, DC: University Press of America.
- Lynch, M., & D. Bogen (1996). *The spectacle of history: Speech, text, and memory at the Iran-Contra hearings*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

- Sacks, H. (1972a). An initial investigation of the usability of conversational data for doing sociology. In D. Sudnow (ed.), *Studies in social interaction*, 31–74. New York: Free Press.
- (1972b). On the analyzability of stories by children. In J. J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication*, 325–45. New York: Rinehart & Winston.
- (1992). *Lectures on conversation*. Vol. 1. Ed. Gail Jefferson. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

PETER AUER, ELIZABETH COUPER-KUHLEN, AND FRANK MÜLLER. *Language in time: The rhythm and tempo of spoken interaction*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999. Pp. xi, 236. Hb \$65.00.

Reviewed by CECILIA E. FORD
English, University of Wisconsin
Madison, WI 53106
ceford@facstaff.wisc.edu

To understand prosody in naturally occurring language requires an exceptional constellation of skills. One must have not only expertise in the analysis of pitch patterns and the complex signals that make up our perception of stress, but also a rich and informed perspective on how talk works. Although some phonologists are highly sophisticated in their approaches to prosody, empirical research in this area is both heavily based on laboratory-produced data (when it is empirical in that sense), and highly abstract in its descriptive procedures. For their part, analysts of spoken discourse, though basing their descriptions on naturally occurring language, often lack fundamental expertise in the close analysis of sound production and perception. The authors of *Language in time* are exceptional in the individual and collective skill they bring to their project. In this carefully crafted volume, Peter Auer, Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen, and Frank Müller offer an empirically grounded and innovative view of the interplay of prosody and action in spoken language use. The volume focuses on the functions of rhythm in spoken interaction, drawing data from English, Italian, and German, and concentrating on “conversational organization and verbal performance” (p. 33). The work provides a counterbalance to the prevailing dualism in linguistic studies, by which language is first and foremost understood as a system separated from time. These authors are not the first to draw attention to the need for understanding language as an embodied practice, but their work here is unique in its ambitious and informed combination of the analysis of prosody, grammar, rhetoric, and conversational structures.

The introduction, impressive in intellectual and historical breadth, presents a critique of “detemporalized” conceptualizations of language, which place referential functions at the center and add real-time aspects of language only as subsidiary and separate realms of analysis. In reviewing structural and post-structural research on rhythm, the authors emphasize the need for attention to actual use. The difficulty of approaching prosody in use is acknowledged through the dis-

discussion of the complex relationship between the acoustic signal and what is subjectively heard as rhythmic; hearing rhythm is an active process in which construction and perception function together. This chapter lays the groundwork for later discussions of the relationships between particular rhythmic features and culturally meaningful actions, activities, and genres in talk. The discourse analytic approach of John Gumperz, especially his notion of “contextualization” through prosodic devices, is offered as a guiding “semiotic framework” for the interpretation of the work of rhythm and tempo in talk (27).

Chap. 2, “Hearing and notating conversational rhythm,” provides a clear and accessible guide to the terms and methods required for doing research on rhythm and tempo in naturally occurring speech. The chapter leads the reader through the steps for determining whether hearable rhythm is present in a span of talk, and it also offers an educated viewpoint on the relative values of acoustic measurement and auditory analysis. The chapter rewards a careful read, both as a foundation for the chapters that follow and as a reference for anyone who hopes to incorporate prosody into analyses of spoken interaction. In light of the fact that the general stance of the volume clearly foregrounds connecting data and claims, there were one or two points in this chapter at which I would have appreciated reading more about the research behind fundamental generalizations regarding prosody (though this probably would have made the book itself much longer). For example, it is stated that the perception of rhythm requires “at least three prosodic prominences” (39). This may be obvious to others, but I was keen to know how this generalization was arrived at through prior research. (Given the interplay of context and rhythm developed throughout this book, it would be interesting to know whether associations between recurrent actions and regular rhythmic presentations might invoke perceived rhythmic “gestalts” even in the absence of a third prominence.)

Chaps. 3–5 (“Rhythm in conversational turn taking in English,” “Rhythm and preference organization in English,” and “Rhythm in telephone closings,” based on German and Italian data) significantly expand the description of classic conversational practices such as turn-taking, formulating affiliative versus disaffiliative actions, and coordinating closings of telephone conversations. These chapters present a picture of the ways that interactants monitor and exploit rhythm and tempo. Speakers are artful in establishing salient rhythmic displays near points of possible turn transition, such that a shift in rhythm in a next speaker’s turn, for example, can be interpreted as disaffiliative, regardless of whether there has been an overlap or delay with respect to the prior turn. It is easy to see that such findings have consequences for basic conversation-analytic transcription and interpretation, when one considers that what one might have transcribed as a “micro-pause” – interpreted as a unit of duration short enough that no measure is made – may indeed be the closest an untrained hearer can come to notating what is in fact a rhythmic shift. Although it has been well established elsewhere that seemingly minute details of turn production are critical for embodying the actions that turns

deliver, these chapters make a strong case that attention to aspects of tempo and rhythm is key to fully understanding the manner in which speakers give form to their actions.

Chaps. 6 and 7 demonstrate the lively ways in which the incorporation of detailed rhythmic analysis can expand our understanding of rhetoric and poetics in everyday talk. Chap. 6, “Rhythm in turn construction” (Italian data), examines SCANSION. Scansion is defined as “particularly marked rhythmic sequences” (153), spans of talk that stand out by virtue of strongly marked rhythmic structures. Longer stretches of single-speaker talk are found to be shaped and bounded by rhythmic saliences and shifts. Thus, for example, a speaker may use scansion simultaneously to emphasize a main point in an extended turn and to delimit the turn as approaching its close. In this manner, an approaching turn completion is at least partially projectable as the upcoming end point of that prosodically salient rhetorical unit. Chap. 7, “Rhythm and performance,” is a thoroughly enjoyable read, combining rhythmic and rhetorical analysis to elucidate the expertise of a popular Italian radio moderator in interaction with his callers. The chapter provides a profound demonstration of ways in which – simultaneously and reflexively – prosody and words can work to form topic nominations, transitions between callers, formulaic parallelisms within and across turns, and projections of the ends of extended turns.

It is interesting to note that the problem of separating time and language persists even in this innovative volume. Clearly, this problem is deeply rooted in the language we use for describing language (see my problematic formulation “prosody and words” in the previous paragraph). Thus, the very bias that this volume substantially redresses is at times subtly reinforced through the adoption of the “contextualization” framework in what Auer has called its “narrower tradition” (1992:4). By this approach, prosody is analytically separated from more traditionally word-based aspects of language; contextualization cues are “used for the understanding of a given utterance beyond its propositional content” (1992:27). In formulating the relationship in this way, one runs into the problem of reinforcing a rhetorical and analytic division between an atemporal propositional component of language and the temporal contextualizing work of prosody. The language through which these scholars present their findings varies throughout the volume: at some points it underscores the “reflexive and flexible nature of the phenomena involved in contextualization” (153), but at other points it suggests a one-directional process by which prosody contextualizes words, phrases, and turns. Since a major contribution of this work is to initiate an empirically grounded research agenda to counter the problematic but prevailing division of language and time, what we need now is a rhetoric for this perspective on language in/as practice. Perhaps this rhetoric will embrace Gumperz’s broader concept of contextualization, thereby bringing into focus the real-time simultaneity, mutuality, and reflexivity of prosody, gesture, activity, and lexical and grammatical selection in the temporal unfolding of talk.

REVIEWS

For those new to prosodic analysis, *Language in time* is a demanding read, but it richly rewards the effort. Auer, Couper-Kuhlen, and Müller set a new standard for discourse analysts and functionally oriented linguists with a serious commitment to rethinking linguistics such that it is both based in the data of use and accountable to conversational practices as they emerge in the production of natural and socially consequential activities.

REFERENCES

Auer, Peter (1992). John Gumperz' approach to contextualization. In Peter Auer and Aldo di Luzio (eds.), *The contextualization of language*, 1–37. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins.

CYNTHIA B. ROY, *Interpreting as a discourse process*. (Oxford studies in socio-linguistics.) New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. Pp. v, 141. Hb \$35.00.

Reviewed by HOLLY E. JACOBSON
Ph.D. Program in SLAT
University of Arizona
Tucson, AZ 85721
hollyj@u.arizona.edu

As indicated by the title, this book steers away from traditional, atheoretical, praxis-oriented frameworks for studying interpreting. Its strength lies in its call for research that DESCRIBES interpreted events as a means of moving away from prescriptive approaches to the discipline. The book discusses Roy's own application of discourse theory in her analysis of a videotaped interpreted event. The languages represented in that event are American Sign Language (ASL) and English, but the conclusions and recommendations made by the author are equally relevant to both signed and spoken language researchers, interpreters, interpreter trainers, and interpreters in training. Drawing on research in interactional sociolinguistics, Conversation Analysis, and ethnography of communication, Roy provides a rich description and analysis of a 30-minute meeting between a deaf student and a professor at a U.S. university. Through her analysis, Roy challenges the belief that interpreters serve as a conduit providing direct interaction between primary interlocutors.

In my view, the most important contribution of this study to interpretation research is its definition of the interpreted event as being altogether different from other events: it is driven by very different assumptions and expectations, and above all, the interpreter is indeed a direct interlocutor who must exchange turns with primary interlocutors and align herself with other speakers, as well as manage the flow of the conversation. In other words, this descriptive research on face-to-face interaction demonstrates that the interpreter is not the neutral, non-involved, "non-participant" she or he is commonly believed to be. Another virtue of the book is that it points out the scarcity of terminology for describing exactly

what it is that interpreters do. Roy's research represents a starting point for developing effective and useful vocabulary for the discipline.

In her prologue (Chap. 1), Roy provides a brief overview of the book's chapters. In Chap. 2, she delves into the history of the use of the term "discourse." She provides brief synopses of the discourse approaches used in her analysis of the videotaped student–professor meeting. This chapter seems to be geared to individuals in the interpreting field who have little or no experience in discourse studies (in my experience, this may constitute a majority). It explains the differences between structural and functional approaches to discourse analysis, and it contains textbook-style overviews of interactional sociolinguistics, Conversation Analysis, and ethnography of communication.

The work of discourse researchers in translation and interpretation is the focus of Chap. 3. These researchers call for greater consistency in the use of vocabulary to discuss translation and interpretation issues, and the application of discourse analysis methods to analyze interpreted situations, including the use of recorded data.

Chap. 4 discusses Conversation Analysis, in particular turn-taking, in more detail. The author describes the Sacks model developed by Harvey and his collaborators of turn-taking and turn categories, which she uses in her data analysis. She explains that her analysis merges the Sacks model "with a context-sensitive analysis of interpreted discourse" (p. 38), given that the model focuses purely on form and structure, leaving out such concepts as conversational style and cultural interpretation of overlap. Her purpose is to determine what is common, in terms of turn-taking, across interpreted events, as well as what is unique to her particular videotaped event.

The goal of Chap. 5 is to outline universal elements of interpreted events. Roy provides a classification of interpreted events "along interactional lines" (52) which includes two types of events: "single speaker interpreted events" and "conversational interpreted events." The single speaker interpreted event has as its central focus the delivery of the speaker's message, with little or no response from the audience. The conversational interpreted event, which is the focus of her analysis in following chapters, involves two primary interlocutors who generally are not social equals (e.g. employee/employer, student/professor), with the participant of lower status in most cases speaking a minority language. Roy contends that the boundaries of interpreted events are the same as those of discourse events within a speech community; for example, an interpreted medical exam has the same boundaries as a noninterpreted medical exam. In addition, an interpreted event is bounded by the presence of an interpreter: if the interpreter leaves, the event changes.

The strength of Roy's classification of events lies in the fact that it overcomes many of the limitations inherent in other systems. For example, definitions of interpreted events according to institutional setting (medical, legal, educational etc.) or according to number of participants (conference, community) often over-

lap, and they are potentially vague and confusing. However, it should be noted that Roy's categories are also limited and leave out a broad range of possible situations in which an interpreter's services would be required. For example, interaction during an international business meeting involving five or six participants would involve a structure, format, and interactional goals very different from the meeting she analyzes in her research – not to mention the differences in cultural and social assumptions and expectations (see Scollon & Scollon 1995). Nor does the business meeting fit into the category of single speaker interpreted events. However, Roy's intention is not to provide an exhaustive categorization of interpreted events, but rather to encourage a reevaluation of traditional terminology.

In Chap. 5, Roy also describes the procedure and methods of her study. She videotaped a meeting between a deaf graduate student and a hearing university professor, held in the professor's office. The meeting involved a third party, an ASL–English interpreter. Roy transcribed the videotape and analyzed features of turn-taking and role performance. To aid in her observations and qualitative analyses, she also interviewed all three participants afterward, showing them the entire video, asking questions about specific features, and having them define their particular roles in this face-to-face interaction.

Roy's videotaped interpreted event is the focus of Chap. 6. Here she attempts a "rich" description of the event by describing the physical setting and the meeting itself in detail. She also provides a brief biography of each participant (student, professor, and interpreter) and reports how each defined his or her own role in the event. These role definitions are perhaps the weakest part of the book: the participants provide vague, sketchy descriptions of their perceived roles. Although this may well be due to the general lack of terminology available to discuss interpreted events, it seems that the author could have extracted more meaningful information by asking for detailed clarification of responses. In addition, she draws some questionable conclusions from her interview with the interpreter. She contends that the interpreter's statements indicate a central concern with equality and justice and the status of Deaf people as members of a linguistic and cultural minority, but the information provided offers no clear basis for this conclusion. However, Roy's attempt to determine how the interpreter defines and perceives his or her own role is laudable, and comparing perceptions with actual role performance is an extremely important area of future research, as she suggests.

Both Chaps. 7 and 8 are dedicated to the actual analysis of the transcript of the interpreted event. Chap. 7 deals with turn-taking and the author's use of the Sacks model. In Chap. 8, Roy analyzes the videotaped segment from within the framework of role performance as defined by Erving Goffman's work. Roy conducts a perceptive, in-depth, descriptive analysis of the text, providing a model for other researchers in interpreting. Her explanation of the glossing system is somewhat confusing, however, and readers who are not familiar with ASL or ASL glossing

would benefit from more clarification and examples before attempting to follow her analyses. Her analyses are at times muddy and hard to follow; for example, her discussion of the context in which interpreters ignore turns is especially confusing and includes some contradictory statements.

Despite these limitations, Roy's work is groundbreaking in its premise that interpretation, far from occurring in a neutral, noninvolved manner, involves an active, direct interlocutor who is constantly shifting roles, aligning herself or himself with primary interlocutors, and managing the flow of the conversation. She or he creates and takes turns, manages overlap, and even initiates talk, based on her or his communicative competence in both languages. In short, the interpreter's role is that of cultural and linguistic broker. Roy calls for more research and discussion to determine how the interpreter's role is created and performed during the interpreted event.

This is a useful text for interpreters and interpreter trainers alike, and it would be excellent required reading in graduate classes in interpreting (both practice and theory) as an introduction to the importance and relevance of discourse approaches to the field. Her analysis is rich and eloquently demonstrates the wealth of information that can be extracted from one brief speech event. From a professional perspective, however, I find that it lacks much-needed discussion on ethics, and it ignores the need to establish professional norms of conduct within the newly emerging role of the professional interpreter.

REFERENCES

Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. (1995). *Intercultural communication: A discourse approach*. Oxford: Blackwell.

DEGRAFF, MICHEL (ed.), *Language creation and language change: Creolization, diachrony and development*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1999. Pp x + 573. Hb \$65.00.

Reviewed by LILIANE HAEGEMAN
UFR Angellier, Université Charles de Gaulle Lille III
Domaine universitaire du Pont de Bois, BP 149
F-59653 Villeneuve d'Asq Cedex, France
Haegeman@univ-lille3.fr

As the title suggests, the collection under review focuses on two related issues in current linguistic research: language change – with emphasis on diachronic syntax – and what seems to be the more elusive question of “language creation” as instantiated in Creole genesis. The central empirical domain of the latter inquiry, creolization, constitutes the link between the contributions, which are all written against a coherent, broadly generative theoretical background.

The starting point of the book is the assumption that language acquisition is mediated through an innate human-specific cognitive capacity, Universal Gram-

mar (UG). I briefly summarize this position here because it is crucial for the discussion. Linguistic knowledge is generally seen to be attained by young children on the basis of input that is deficient in at least three respects: (i) The input is not homogeneous; (ii) it contains ungrammatical material (performance errors, hesitations); and (iii) the child ultimately acquires linguistic knowledge that he or she cannot infer solely on the basis of the input (the so-called negative evidence problem). To account for successful acquisition in spite of the degenerate input, it is proposed that humans are innately equipped with a language capacity that mediates between the data in the input and the grammar of the language they ultimately attain. In the so-called Principles and Parameters theory (Chomsky 1986), abstract principles underlying the different linguistic patterns are factored out and attributed to UG. UG guides language acquisition by constraining the possible grammars that can be formulated on the basis of the input. Two types of UG principles are distinguished: invariant principles and parameterized principles. Invariant principles are universally fixed. Such principles may, for instance, impose universal constraints on syntactic structure. Other principles of UG are not fixed cross-linguistically; their interaction with the input is the basis of cross-linguistic variation. These variable components of UG are referred to as “parameters.” Depending on the parameter setting, a language does or does not display the corresponding syntactic property. For instance, the verb-movement parameter determines whether a verb can be separated from its direct object. In English, the parameter is set negatively (ex. 1), in French positively (ex. 2).

- (1) a. John always buys *The Guardian*.
 b. *John buys always *The Guardian*.
- (2) a. *Jean souvent achète *Le Monde*.
 b. Jean achète souvent *Le Monde*.

The principles and parameters model thus reduces the acquisition of syntax to parameter-setting on the basis of the linguistic input. Hence, the input data must be sufficiently robust to offer the child the evidence that can trigger parameter-setting (see David Lightfoot’s contribution to this volume for a number of different scenarios).

DeGraff’s collection addresses what appears to be an exceptional case of language acquisition. The core issue of the book is creole genesis, an illustration of what appears to be “language creation” in a situation in which the input is defective, i.e. not robust enough to allow for parameter setting. Restricting my discussion for expository purposes to the abrupt emergence of creoles in the plantation context (see Derek Bickerton’s contribution to the volume and the references cited there), such plantation creoles seem to emerge almost in spite of an impoverished input consisting of (i) a superstrate language, (ii) the substrate languages, and (iii) the pidgin(s) arising as *lingue franche* among the plantation workers and the colonists. Pidgin grammars are impoverished: they are the products of imperfect L2 learning. The pidgin data are particularly impoverished in that the

pidgin grammar is heavily reduced, and the input is chaotic because the grammar of each pidgin speaker reflects the interference of his or her first language. The creole that emerges in this contact situation goes beyond the impoverished grammar of the pidgin and seems to display a blend of syntactic properties, some related to the superstrate (the lexifier), some to the substrate languages, and some apparently independent of either (see the contributions by John Lumsden, by Viviane Déprez, and by Adrienne Bruyn, Pieter Muysken & Maaïke Verrips).

Three main hypotheses as to the nature of creole genesis are encountered: the universalist, the substratist, and the superstratist. In the universalist view, creole grammars instantiate default/unmarked values of the parameter setting. Confronted with the often contradictory and inconsistent linguistic input of the pidgin, the child will outperform the input and create a new language by implementing the unmarked options of his or her UG (cf. Bickerton's contribution). The substrate approach, illustrated here by Lumsden's chapter, highlights the role of the substrate languages in determining the creole grammar while restricting the role of the superstrate language to lexification. Lumsden illustrates the similarities between Haitian Creole grammar and the grammar of Fongbe, one of its West African substrates. In the superstratist view, which is not represented in its pure form in the book, the creole develops from the imperfect L2 acquisition of the superstrate. For each position, various arguments for and against can be advanced. For discussion I refer to DeGraff's introduction and especially to Bruyn, Muysken & Verrips.

Although the central theme of this collection is creole genesis, the originality of the book is that DeGraff widens its scope beyond creolization. The contributions also touch on diachronic syntax (Ian Roberts; Rex Sprouse & Barbara Vance; David Lightfoot), L1 and L2 acquisition (Luigi Rizzi; David Lightfoot; Alison Henry & Denise Tangney; Dany Adone & Anne Vainikka; Salikoko Mufwene; John Lumsden), and the study of sign language (Elissa Newport; Judy Kegl, Ann Senghas & Marie Coppola). By linking the question of creole genesis with other fields of enquiry, DeGraff's book shows how all these areas are related and thus sheds light on a wealth of interconnected questions for many areas of linguistic research.

The book is divided into five parts, each focusing on a specific theme. Part 1 contains core chapters on creolization and acquisition (Bickerton; Adone & Vainikka; Mufwene; Lumsden). One question that emerges concerns whether it is children – L1 learners (Bickerton) – or adult L2 learners (Lumsden) – who are the main agents of creolization.

Part 2 introduces other contexts of language acquisition in the face of impoverished input: the acquisition of sign language, and a particular context of second-language learning. The chapters on sign language acquisition, by Newport and by Kegl, Senghas & Coppola, provide compelling evidence for the role of the young L1-acquiring child (as opposed to the older L2-acquiring adult) as the agent in the creation of sign language. The authors show that the child learner outperforms the nonnative models of the input. Henry & Tangney discuss the L2 acquisition of Irish by children with English as L1. The particular interest of their chapter is that

acquisition takes place in a context where the input is provided by (highly proficient) L2 Irish speakers. The authors show that when input data are perceived to be inconsistent (for instance, copular predicates displaying a word order departing from Irish VSO order), learners ignore the input and simplify the grammar.

Part 3 consists of a chapter by Sprouse & Vance on diachrony. This chapter underlines the impact of relative frequencies in the use of certain forms and the role of the adult parser in selecting a construction from sets of “competing” constructions – constructions with overt vs. non-overt pronouns in Romance and Germanic. The authors show that the construction that is most likely to lead to parsing problems eventually gets eliminated.

The three chapters in Part 4 consider specific syntactic aspects of creoles in comparison with the superstrates and substrates: absence of V-movement in creoles (Roberts); and the widespread occurrence of double object construction in creoles (Bruyn, Muysken & Verrips). Both these chapters also speculate on general questions of (absolute or relative) markedness in syntax. The third chapter in Part 4 deals with negative concord in creoles with French lexifier (Déprez).

In Part 5, Rizzi’s and Lightfoot’s chapters offer general considerations of language acquisition in relation to creole genesis, linking strands from the chapters in the preceding sections and offering some general discussion of language acquisition. This chapter also contains DeGraff’s Epilogue.

I cannot provide a more detailed review of the individual chapters here, nor can a summary do justice to the empirical and/or theoretical richness of each contribution in the context of this book. Each chapter is of interest in its own right, but each gains more from being read against the multifaceted background of the volume.

Major assets of this book are DeGraff’s Prolegomenon and Epilogue. The Prolegomenon sets the scene and prepares the reader for the kaleidoscope of themes and insights offered in the chapters. The Epilogue shows that, in spite of apparent divergences and downright contradictions, the 15 chapters of this book are indeed complementary, and that apparent contradictions can be integrated into a coherent overall view. Furthermore, DeGraff also draws into his final discussion additional findings from other theoretical approaches, including the areas of L2 research and sociolinguistics.

This book is a real gold mine. A broad range of linguists will undoubtedly find something of interest here, be it in the specific area of the syntax of creoles, that of historical change, or that of (L1 or L2) acquisition. DeGraff’s overarching Prolegomenon and Epilogue allow the reader to situate the specific chapters against the broader interdisciplinary canvas; and, helped by the excellent citations throughout, the reader will be able to further pursue topics of particular interest.

REFERENCES

Chomsky, Noam (1986). *Knowledge of language*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Language in Society 30:2 (2001)

NANCY C. DORIAN

ANNELI SARHIMAA, *Syntactic transfer, contact-induced change, and the evolution of bilingual mixed codes: Focus on Karelian-Russian language alternation*. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society, 1999. Pp. 340.

Reviewed by NANCY C. DORIAN
German and Linguistics, Bryn Mawr College
1810 Harpswell Neck Road
Harpswell, ME 04079
dorian@henry.bowdoin.edu

The data that underlie Anneli Sarhima's excellent study were gathered between 1989 and 1992, under restrictive field circumstances. Visits to Karelia required what the author terms "intricate co-operation with academic and public authorities in Russia" (p. 76), and the duration of any stay was limited to a few weeks. From her home base in Finland, she made short visits to three Central Karelian villages in the summers of 1989 and 1991, working with additional Central Karelian speakers resident in the capital city of Karelia in the winters of 1990 and 1991; in 1992, a two-week trip allowed her to work in nine Tver Karelian villages in central Russia. That these compressed visits produced 30-some hours of taped interviews and 31 sets of translation-task data (15 Central Karelian, 16 Tver Karelian) does credit to her careful advance planning; the frankness with which she points to limitations in the resulting data does equal credit to her scholarly scrupulousness.

The great interest of Karelian for the study of syntactic transfer and mixed codes lies in the millennium-long contact between this East Finnic language and the North West Russian dialects of the same region. Conditions for mutual linguistic influence were enhanced not only by the contact's long duration but also by the fact that it was between a nonstandardized Finnic language and a dialectal form of Russian – i.e., between two genetically unrelated speech forms largely unconstrained by the norming of written communication and formal transmission. Sarhima points out that most studies of code-switching, code alternation, and their effects have involved at least one standard language (and often two), whereas long-continuing language contact occurs most often in peripheral border regions, between nonstandard dialects; constraints imposed by awareness of standard language norms tend to be weakest in such regions, yet discussion of contact phenomena is often couched in terms of standard-language features. For example, constructions incorporating loanwords, commonplace in such borderland contact, are too easily taken as indications of syntactic interference. (She instances a "Russified" Experiencer State Construction reported for one variety of Karelian because of the presence of a Russian-origin predicate nominal; yet the structure in question has an exact structural counterpart in Finnish, closely related to Karelian and very little influenced by Russian.)

Sarhima herself seems to have made no prior assumptions about direction or degree of influence and to have relied on careful data analysis. Since she was interested in the effects of spontaneous language alternation, she deliberately

spoke in both Russian and Karelian at initial meetings with potential interviewees, making them aware that use of either language was possible. She conducted the first half of a subsequent hour-long interview in Karelian, and the second half in Russian. She herself was entirely consistent about language choice in each half of the interview, but she did not attempt to impose her choice on her interlocutors; allowing them free choice of language seemed most likely to produce speech data resembling their ordinary speech behavior, since all Karelian speakers today are bilingual in Russian, and bilingual Karelian conversation partners are thus the norm.

Sarhima's book looks at one particular construction that turned up in the Central Karelian interviews gathered in 1989: a necessitative construction not native to Finnic languages but modeled on Russian, the Duty and Obligation Construction (DOC). Just 16 instances of the DOC appeared among 505 instances of necessitative constructions used by the Central Karelian interviewees, but in such highly inflected languages as Karelian and Russian, the construction was nearly ideal for an examination of linguistic processes in language contact. Its semantic and structural environments could be compared with those of the many Finnic necessitative constructions in the interviews; the degree to which the Russian loanword appearing as predicate was adapted phonologically and morphologically to Karelian could be evaluated; and the extent to which other Russian elements accompanied use of the loanword in question and the degree to which the Russian predicate did or did not affect case marking on other elements of the sentence (the Target and the Experiencer, in particular) could be examined. All this was done with an eye to shedding light on certain major issues in language-contact study: distinguishing code-switches from borrowings, distinguishing one code from another, illuminating syntactic transfer in bilingual language alternation, and evaluating the role of constant language alternation in the evolution of mixed languages.

The translation tests administered in subsequent research trips were modeled after the structures that produced the DOC instances in the Central Karelian interviews. Sarhima continued to interview speakers as well, so as to have a more general speech profile for as many translation-test sources as possible. She routinely recorded age, sex, educational history, degree of geographical mobility, and so forth, in order to build up a general sociolinguistic profile of each speaker. There proved to be no clearcut sociolinguistic or geographical features that correlated with use of the Russian-modeled DOC construction. Much more crucially for Sarhima's purposes, it proved to be impossible to state with certainty which elements in DOC-containing clauses or sentences were Russian, and which were Karelian. The Karelian and Russian phonological systems have in many respects converged over the centuries of contact, so that code assignments are imperfectly determinable on the basis of segmental phonology. First-syllable stress has spread from Karelian into North West Russian, while some long-established Russian loanwords with non-initial stress are indigenized in Karelian, so that stress place-

ment is also not an adequate guide to code assignment. Discourse particles, conjunctions, and adverbs are now frequently shared by Karelian and North West Russian. The morphology and syntax of these two languages, long in contact, frequently match each other closely enough that morphological or syntactic integration of Russian material into Karelian is not assessable. Rather, Karelian-origin and Russian-origin lexical and grammatical items have amalgamated to such an extent that the resulting syntactic constructions can be impossible to derive from one source or the other. Here are just two examples of the sort of subtle cases Sarhima encountered. First, there was an instance of the DOC in which a clearcut Russian system morpheme appeared on the loanword predicate (a plural suffix), yet the syntax of the clause was just as clearly Karelian, since the Experiencer was dropped, which would not be permissible in Russian. In the second example, there were instances of blending of the morphophonological rules of the two languages, with first-syllable stress indicating that speakers had assimilated the loanword predicate to Karelian, while the vowel of the final syllable was simultaneously lengthened in recognition of the final-syllable stress of the Russian original.

Sarhima finds the usual treatment of code-switching as an alternation between two distinct codes excessively simplistic, and in fact inapplicable to the Karelian–Russian context. The complexities of Karelian–Russian contact phenomena require her to recognize “multilayered code-switching” (Meeuwis & Blommaert 1998) with finely graded distinctions between codes. Ultimately she recognizes the following codes, with three to five of them typically used by any single individual: Traditional Karelian; Neo-Karelian (showing extra-sentential switches into Russian); Russian–Karelian (involving constant unconstrained alternation between Karelian and Russian grammatical devices, in effect a “mixed code”); Karussian (with amalgamation of Karelian and Russian grammars); Finnish–Karelian (a Karelian leveled somewhat toward Finnish); and Russian. She notes that most Karelians have full command of more than one variety of Russian, for that matter, so that in a study focusing on Russian rather than Karelian, it would be necessary to recognize distinct codes of Russian as well.

Sarhima encounters difficulties in applying both Peter Auer’s (1998) pragmatic codeswitching continuum model and Carol Myers-Scotton’s (1993) matrix language frame model in the Karelian–Russian setting. She suggests that, in dealing with a speech community without any monolinguals, it may not be appropriate to “see every switch as something that has to be accounted for in terms of alternation between two distinct languages” (245). She rejects attrition and semi-lingualism (confusing semi-speaker with semi-lingual, unfortunately, on p. 199) as explanations for her complex data, and she considers that having several parallel codes in the linguistic repertoire is more likely to represent linguistic richness than poverty, especially since the “Mixed Karelian” code, Russian–Karelian, is just one of several codes drawn on by its users. As for the prevalence of variable forms, they are to be expected in “truly bilingual mixed codes like Russian-

Karelian” because each speaker has more options to choose from (231). Late in her study, Sarhima reflects on the numerous gray areas encountered in her analyses of bilingual Karelian codes and suggests importantly that, given the length and intensity of the contact, the sorts of language blending processes to be observed in present-day Karelian were probably characteristic of Karelian and the North West Russian dialects in the past, too. That is, local language states cannot confidently be assumed to have been fewer or simpler a century or two ago than they are today.

By noting provisional analyses and then detailing the further data analyses that persuaded her to move on to subsequent positions, Sarhima’s exposition allows readers the stimulation of accompanying her through increasingly sophisticated stages of interpretation. She shows meticulous respect for her data, and in this as in many other respects, her work deserves to be emulated.

REFERENCES

- Auer, Peter (1998). Bilingual conversation revisited. In Peter Auer (ed.), *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction and identity*, 1–24. London & New York: Routledge.
- Meeuwis, Michael, & Jan Blommaert (1998). A monolectal view of code-switching: 7Layered code-switching among Zairians in Belgium. In Peter Auer (ed.), *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction and identity*, 76–97.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol (1993). *Duelling languages: Grammatical structure in code-switching*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

SHANNA POPLACK (ed.), *The English history of African American English*. (Language in Society, 28.) Oxford: Blackwell, 2000. Pp. v + 277. Pb \$31.95.

Reviewed by JOHN BAUGH
 School of Education
 Stanford University
 Stanford, CA 94305-3096

Poplack and other contributors to this important volume are to be commended for an exceptionally well crafted book, with a succession of groundbreaking studies of African American English (AAE). Although this work will undoubtedly add fuel to the flames of historical linguistic controversy that continue to swirl around African Americans, Poplack and her colleagues go far to advance hypotheses and analyses that argue in favor of the English origins of African American Vernacular English (AAVE).

The English history of African American English (EHAAE) consists of five sections, including an informative introduction by Poplack, and seven additional chapters that evaluate “Morphophonological variables,” (Part 1), “Morphosyntactic variables,” (Part 2), “Syntactic variables,” (Part 3), and “Sociohistorical context” (Part 4). The text will be of great benefit to any scholar who is interested in the history and structure of AAE, and the standard of research for this entire volume is consistently high.

The contributors, individually and collectively, are mindful of the racially sensitive terrain on which they toil, and the text is peppered with observations that show consideration of, and sensitivity to, the way that the linguistic plight of African Americans is linked to their racial circumstances throughout the North American diaspora. Those who have been skeptical of Poplack's previous historical interpretations in opposition to the Creole Origin Hypothesis and in favor of an English origin for AAE are unlikely to be persuaded by the affirmation of those views via the arguments put forth in EHAAE. However, each contributor to this edition maintains high standards of empirical verification, and each hypothesis is stated with sufficient clarity that advocates and critics alike will find a wealth of data and analyses to evaluate. Each study is presented with meticulous attention to combinations of historical, geographic, and linguistic detail. In addition, these studies represent Labovian sociolinguistics at its peak – although some have argued that this is a perilous perch.

Poplack's introduction lays out the scope of the book, as well as the parameters of the linguistic, diachronic, and regional issues that she and her colleagues specify. She introduces the concept of the "African American diaspora," which stands out to this reviewer because of the lack of any reference to the larger "African diaspora" of which the African American diaspora is a significant subset. I suspect that the description of the African American diaspora was introduced for the sake of framing these studies within North America and was not intended to artificially isolate American blacks from others of African descent throughout the global African diaspora.

Poplack draws attention to this matter in more thorough detail as she accounts for "tapping the vernacular." Anticipating concerns regarding "informant accommodation to the standardizing influences of the interviewers" (p. 11), she asserts that an interviewer effect, "if one exists, does not affect the results presented in chapters 2–7." Despite this, Poplack concludes this section stating that "discrepancies in data collection make the many linguistic parallels across varieties, detailed in ensuing chapters, all the more unexpected and compelling" (12).

The constellation of data sets utilized for these analyses is presented in a chart of cross-variety comparison (16) which lays out the linguistic, geographic, and historical relationships that connect the corpora and analyses found in chapters 2–7. Poplack uses the remainder of the introduction to outline the book, as well as to draw attention to the salient findings that her colleagues carefully articulate, all mindful of the manner in which they seek to reveal the English origins of AAE.

Chap. 2, by James Walker, is titled "Rephrasing the copula: Contraction and zero in Early African American English." As Walker correctly observes, "The copula is probably the most studied but least understood variable in sociolinguistics." Although Walker understands this variable more than most, his recounting of events in the history of copula analyses is at times incomplete or misleading. These misstatements have more to do with limitations in works

cited by Walker than with any lack of scholarly attention on his part. Walker's copula survey considers evidence from the broader diaspora of africanized English, including studies of Liberian English, Jamaican Creole, and Barbadian English, among others. Space does not permit an adequate account of Walker's exceptional contribution. It stands at the top of AAE copula analyses, at least to date, and he considers the combination of linguistic and historical accounts with meticulous attention to detail through analyses that are replicable and testable.

Poplack, Tagliamonte, & Eze author Chap. 3, "Reconstructing the source of Early African American English plural marking: A comparative study of English and Creole." While no less thorough than Walker in terms of analytic detail, historical claims associated with studies of AAE plurality are far less common than their copula counterparts, and this diligent chapter makes important and bold historical claims. The authors' hypothesis is explicit: "If the Early AAE plural-marking system is a creole heritage, only semantically plural nouns delimited by a possessive pronoun or a definite article [sic] should be marked morphologically" (82). My concern, and reservation, can be captured in a single word: "Why?" Would it not be possible for the Early AAE plural system to be a creole, even if contemporary forms of AAE violate the constraints described above? Stated in other terms, what if linguistic circumstances in these communities have changed? The analyses proceed on the assumption that rural black communities in Samana and Nova Scotia have preserved their antique structure, to the exclusion of considering that these communities reflect more recent linguistic changes that may bear less directly on the historical foundations of AAE and more on their centuries-long proximity and exposure to native English speakers who are white. The authors anticipate such concerns and offer extensive justification for their methods and their subsequent interpretation of the data. They conclude with the observation that their work "points up the problems involved in exclusive reliance on contemporary StE as a comparison point, without also considering the details of its development" (100).

Part 2, "Morphosyntactic variables," opens with a chapter by Howe & Walker entitled "Negation and the Creole Origins Hypothesis: Evidence from Early African American English." It, too, maintains the common historical theme that challenges the Creole Origins Hypothesis: "Our prediction is that if the underlying grammar of negation in AAVE derived from a prior creole, features such as *aint* and clause-internal negative concord, which exist in both EBCs, and non-standard English, should pattern in ways consistent with the former, but not with the latter" (111). Though many will disagree with such rigid historical claims, Howe & Walker provide the most comprehensive study of AAVE nonstandard negation to date. It is complementary to Chap. 5, "Old *was*, new ecology: Viewing English through the sociolinguistic filter." Here Tagliamonte & Smith take a slightly different perspective, comparing isolated varieties of early English in different parts of the world. More precisely, they write:

We submit that a much-needed and logical extension of the research program studying varieties of AAVE in the Diaspora is to explore the relationship of these enclaves to comparably isolated communities of speakers of British ethnicity, particularly at the source where many conservative dialect areas endure – Britain. Therefore, in this chapter, we study a dialect of English spoken in Buckie, northern Scotland, and provide a cross-variety comparison with three American English (Early AAE) spoken enclaves, and a neighboring rural variety of Nova Scotian Vernacular English (NSVE) whose speakers are of British ancestry.” (142).

The quantitative analyses maintain the standard of excellence that distinguishes the research in chapters 2–7, and Tagliamonte & Smith ultimately conclude that “use of *was* in all the varieties we have investigated here, including Early AAE, is the result of systematic internal linguistic conditioning. This argues against it being an alien intrusion in the Early AAE grammar as might be expected from an irregular lexical insertion in a creole system” (161).

As is to be expected of scientific scholarship that maintains high analytic standards, this is not light reading, and readers who are well informed about the history of Labovian sociolinguistics, and its ensuing evolution since the birth of variable rules (Labov 1969) will benefit most from this work. The novice will be overwhelmed but will also gain tremendous insight into the remarkable precision with which linguistic analyses can be brought to bear on studies of language in social settings.

The studies of “Syntactic variables” (Part 3) begin with a chapter by Van Herk titled “The question question: Auxiliary inversion in Early African American English.” Although the study of *was* has direct implications for question formation in AAVE, Van Herk takes a broader look at question formation and auxiliary inversion beyond that found with nonstandard usage of *was*, (e.g., *Was you sick?*) The historical hypothesis is explicit: “If the non-inverted forms, as in ‘Why she ain’ over here’, are a remnant of a prior plantation creole, they must have been more common in Early African American English (AAE)” (175). In order to test this assertion, Van Herk sets out “to replicate DeBose’s finding in three corpora (two diaspora, one baseline) of Early AAE which we consider to be precursors of contemporary AAVE: the ex-Slave recordings (ESR), Samana English, and African Nova Scotia English (ANSE). This replication, however, ran into a number of theoretical and methodological problems, which raise enough issues of general relevance to warrant detailed discussion” (176). Historical assertions notwithstanding, the analysis is highly informative in its own right. Quantitative comparisons of several “question” variables across all four communities are compared, resulting in a conclusion that the “system, as described in this chapters, shows striking and complex parallels to the grammar of Early Modern English *do*-support, which figures among the first variable systems studied in variationist sociolinguistics” (195).

The last variationist-oriented chapter, by Tottie and Harvie, is titled “It’s all relative: Relativization strategies in Early African American English.” They share significant insights regarding the use of several relativized forms in the same data sets that were compared in some of the previous chapters, and they speculate about the lack of previous research attention to this form: “Perhaps because most of its variants are neither particularly stigmatized, nor stereotypically associated with AAVE, it has not become a center of controversy as have other more salient variables, such as the copula, verbal *-s*, and the plural” (198). Careful comparative analyses of six sociolinguistic variables in four data sets are presented; again, the hypotheses are well articulated, and the corresponding methods and analyses are testable and replicable. Their conclusions, no less unequivocal, echo earlier findings in the volume: “We are thus convinced that our data add to the accumulating evidence based on other linguistic factors that these varieties of Early AAE are descended from the same genetic stock and that this stock is English, with strong representation of nonstandard features” (225).

This last comment bears directly on the Ebonics controversy, which emerged in the U.S. at the very same time that Poplack and her colleagues were penning these works. There is no mention of Ebonics in this volume, which may be difficult for U.S. readers to comprehend, since so much notoriety and publicity was heaped on Ebonics and the language of African American students within much of the very linguistic diaspora that Poplack and her colleagues suggest provides the English “genetic stock” for AAVE. Such a conclusion could easily have strong policy implications in the U.S., if not in other regions of the African American diaspora under study in EHAAE. Ironically, this work – perhaps more than any other – is uniquely positioned to address the Ebonics paradox: Is AAVE a dialect of English, or a separate language with a unique African history? Silence over Ebonics in this work is difficult to assess, but relevant to the central question regarding AAE’s status as a “language” or a “dialect.”

The final chapter, by Mufwene, coincides with Part 4 (“The sociohistorical context”) and is titled “Some sociohistorical inferences about the development of African American English.” Mufwene demonstrates his superb command of the full historical debate surrounding AAVE, and he draws inspiration from the work of Poplack and her colleagues through a qualitative survey of historical inferences. As should be clear by now, the authors are fully aware that their views may be controversial and unpopular; however, they have executed a series of meticulous and scientifically grounded studies that invite important historical conclusions. Mufwene goes beyond linguistic argumentation in support of his historical assertions, which build on the linguistic evidence presented in chapters 1–7, along with additional socio-economic and demographic evidence that further reinforces the suggestion that “Although they must have gone through interlanguage phases in acquiring colonial English, nothing in this particular kind of social history suggests that the Africans would have developed a pidgin or a creole” (237).

Poplack and her colleagues have raised the art and science of AAVE research to the highest level ever attained by variationist sociolinguists, and this book is essential reading for any linguistic scholar who wants to know about the history and structure of AAE throughout North America.

All too often, important books are branded with clichés that diminish the seminal contributions of their authors. It is not too soon to declare EHAAE a classic. Much more than a timely contribution to this field of inquiry, it raises the bar for conceptual and analytical rigor, and does so poised at the peak of social and linguistic significance.

Advanced graduate students and professionals will benefit most from reading this volume. Exceptional undergraduate students who seek precise and thorough awareness of AAE would also benefit greatly from reading this volume. Regrettably, its significance may be lost on readers who are unfamiliar with quantitative sociolinguistic research; however, this volume is not intended as an introduction to the topic. Rather, it is a formidable display of scientific sociolinguistic inquiry at its best.

REFERENCES

Labov, William (1969). "Contraction, deletion, and inherent variability of the English copula." *Language* 45:715–62.

GEOFFREY HUGHES, *A history of English words*. Oxford (UK) & Malden (MA): Blackwell, 2000. Pp. v, 430. Pb \$29.95.

Reviewed by ELIZABETH FALSBERG
English, University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98195
falsberg@u.washington.edu

In this ambitious book, Hughes extends and broadens the projects of his two earlier books, *Words in time: A social history of the English vocabulary* (1988), and *Swearing: A social history of foul language, oaths and profanity in English* (1991). The contents range from summaries of events in the history of English to specialized lexical studies; the work's real strength, as with Hughes's two earlier books, lies in its investigations of the English vocabulary. While moving in a generally diachronic fashion from the origins of English to present-day Englishes, Hughes devotes much of the book to snapshots of the English lexis at various points and in various registers, queries as to how these configurations came about, how they affect other areas of the language, and why they matter to speakers. The motivation for the book, and its great accomplishment, is to show that the English lexis is a rich historical repository. Chronological discussions can be found elsewhere, but the treatments of moments in the English lexis provided by Hughes form a special and engaging contribution. As the book jacket

states, Hughes interrogates the vocabulary “as an indicator of social change and as a symbol reflecting different social dynamics between speech communities and models of dominance, cohabitation, colonialism, and globalization.”

In Chap. 1, “History in the language: The vocabulary as a historical repository,” Hughes provides a terminological overview intended for newcomers to the field. Sociolinguists and other scholars can safely pass over this material, while students and general readers may prefer to consult it as needed after moving directly to subsequent chapters. That the English vocabulary is, in fact, a historical repository is demonstrated in far more interesting ways in other sections of the book.

The next two chapters take the reader from the origins of English as a Germanic dialect to the French lexical infusion into English attendant on the Norman Conquest. This material, geared primarily to students or generalists, includes discussions of sound change, register, and dialectal variation. An important point made in these sections – and one that arises throughout the work – is that English, from its “origins,” is a product of language contact. The fact of continual outside influence on English has ideological implications that readers will want to take into account in teaching or in their own research. Hughes’s role in this work is to unearth treasures from the linguistic archive, and so his focus is more anecdotal than theoretical. Because of this emphasis, the book is packed with excellent teaching material.

Some interesting tidbits with sociolinguistic implications include Hughes’s treatment of the low level of survival of Celtic vocabulary in English, the existence of pagan “fossils” in the language of christianized England, the impact of contact with the Danes on the Old English lexicon and syntax, and Anglo-Norman influence on English linguistic registers. Particularly enjoyable, even for those familiar with the material, is the subsection “The sociology of food,” in which Hughes demonstrates how lexis reveals the master–servant relationship between Anglo-Normans and the native English: “The animal in the field or on the hoof retained its Anglo-Saxon name, but when slaughtered for the overlord’s table it was transmogrified into Norman” (p. 117). A lexical table follows.

Chap. 4, “The lexical expansion of the renaissance: Exuberance and restraint,” is a major undertaking in and of itself, and it is perhaps the most difficult to link to an ostensibly sociolinguistic project, in that much of its evidence is drawn from the plays of Shakespeare. Although the Shakespearean corpus can be taken as one indicator of change in the Renaissance lexis, it may not be able to bear as much diagnostic weight as Hughes puts on it. Perhaps Hughes can claim an advantage in probing the lexis of plays because the works are designed to be performed. The lexically weighted literary criticism of the chapter is interesting, but this lengthy section seems out of place in the project as a whole. This lack of fit is not a dire problem, however; readers can either omit the section or use it to fuel their own literary investigations. This chapter may spark some useful teaching ideas, especially for generalists or for Shakespearean scholars who want to move their classes

in a linguistic direction, but the greatest strengths of the work lie in the following chapters.

Dictionaries of all kinds, from volumes on canting to Johnson's opus, are Hughes's focus in the second and better half of Chap. 5, "Licentiousness, decorum, and lexicographical order." I found particularly compelling his argument that the rise of dictionaries represented growth of an entire larger genre with importance for sociolinguists. Volumes on canting, which contained both definitions and anecdotal material, were ostensibly concerned with denouncing the underworld lifestyle, but they also "show a clear sense of illicit enjoyment in describing this *demimonde*" (249). These works repay study, then, not only for the lexical examples they provide – some of the words defined are still in use today – but also for what is known of their creators (one was a country magistrate) and for how they were pitched to potential buyers. Then as now, the forbidden was irresistibly interesting, and authoritative presentation marketed it with huge success. This discussion of canting, coupled with a thorough section on Johnson's achievement, forms an excellent and rarely provided context for the emergence of contemporary volumes such as the *OED*, the *Shorter OED*, and the *OED on CD-ROM*, and for specialized works such as the *Dictionary of Jamaican English* (1967), *The Erotic Tongue* (1988), or *A Dictionary of South African English* (1996). Querying not only the lexical examples provided in these dictionaries but also how they are positioned by their editors will reveal social perceptions around specialized usage, an important contribution to the history of English.

Chaps. 6–8 discuss the English lexis with regard to imperialism, present-day variation, and change in lexical structure. Chap. 6 is perhaps the strongest in the entire book. In these areas Hughes shines. Hughes has been criticized in the past for not spending time on South African English, but he redeems himself here. That Hughes has major contributions to make in this venue is evident from the 10 pages he devotes to South African English, past and present, writing with vigor and engaging detail. One can only complain that in a book of this length, a whole chapter on South African English – especially of the caliber found in this work – would have been most welcome.

Chap. 6 as a whole documents the interactions of colonial English speakers with the speakers and languages of the Americas, the Caribbean, Australia, India, and South Africa. As in earlier chapters, Hughes shows how language contact has enriched English at its core, but also how other Englishes have developed in former colonial territories. For all these discussions, Hughes has clearly done some impressive digging for evidence of surprising variety.

In the South African section, Hughes draws on an early glossary of South African English and on a magazine column by the novelist Jenny Hobbs, "whose idiolect was a very accurate, albeit stereotyped, rendition of Broad South African English" (310). Socially interesting as well is the subsection entitled "The lexical impact of apartheid." Here Hughes makes the case that the most basic of words, including *group*, *homeland*, and *immorality*, had their meanings forcibly changed

REVIEWS

in order to normalize the arrangements of apartheid. He also shows how the variety is changing since the triumph of the African National Congress in the first democratic election in 1994. One outcome is increased borrowing of lexical items from African languages.

All histories of English must choose where to focus, and with such choices come both advantages and disadvantages. Fortunately, no single history of English is ever expected to do the whole job. This book takes the lexicon as its primary material, and it is full of important details that the reader can pull out and ponder at will. It is to be commended particularly for its engaging treatment of such areas as the rise of dictionaries, the social implications of register, and language contact in colonial and present-day settings. Sociolinguists will find the work a useful departure point for research and teaching, particularly where it deals with areas outside their current expertise, and students and generalists will find it a good read and highly informative throughout.

REFERENCES

- Hughes, Geoffrey (1988). *Words in time: A social history of the English vocabulary*. Oxford & New York: Blackwell.
_____. (1991). *Swearing: A social history of foul language, oaths and profanity in English*. Oxford & New York: Blackwell.

PETER TRUDGILL, *The dialects of England*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell, 1999. Pp. x, 154. Pb \$26.95.

PAUL FOULKES & GERARD DOCHERTY (eds.), *Urban voices: Accent studies in the British Isles*. London: Arnold, 1999. Pp. xiii, 313. Pb \$24.95.

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

Reports of the death of heterogeneity in British speech have been greatly exaggerated. Most *Language in Society* readers are certainly already aware of this, and two recent books will help communicate this point to people outside the field.

Peter Trudgill is renowned for his success in making research in sociolinguistics and dialectology accessible to nonspecialists and even general readers, and *The dialects of England* illustrates well his commitment to this goal. In this book, he offers a descriptive overview of lexical, phonological, and grammatical variation in England. He considers both “traditional” and “modern” dialects. The former term refers to varieties that differ greatly from Standard English and are today used by mostly older, often rural speakers. They are what comes to most people’s minds when they think of dialects. Treating these together with the often more stigmatized “modern” varieties helps make the point that all dialect differ-

ences result from similar processes. This, in turn, reinforces the idea that all dialects “are equally grammatical and correct” and “differ only in their social significance and function” (p. 13), a dominant theme in Trudgill’s discussion, as in introductory linguistics classes everywhere.

For a relatively slim volume, the book contains a tremendous amount of information, including dozens of maps and example sentences, many taken from dialect literature. Among the notable features are the sections offering predictions about the future of English dialects and the exercises in localizing accents, where Trudgill provides a series of test words to be used, in the spirit of Henry Higgins, to pinpoint a speaker’s dialect region.

This second edition follows the same structure as the first (1990) and, in fact, contains virtually all the material from the original. The opening chapter introduces the fundamental concepts and themes and is followed by two chapters treating pronunciation (one for traditional dialects and one for modern dialects), and a chapter each on grammar and lexicon. Aside from changes in typesetting, which greatly improve the look of the text, the most significant difference in this edition is the addition of phonetic notations using the IPA. Reflecting the author’s concern for general readers, orthographic representations of speech differences have been retained (e.g., *night* as ‘*nite*’ vs. ‘*neet*’), but alongside these appear phonetic transcriptions. This addition eliminates the ambiguity of the original representations and adds greater precision to the descriptions, making the work more valuable as a reference for linguists.

Also new to this edition is a discussion of “Estuary English,” a variety that has attracted increasing media attention in Britain. As Trudgill explains, the term describes the accent of the lower middle class of southeastern England, his Home Counties dialect area. What is interesting to linguists and alarming to most others is that this accent appears to be spreading geographically and socially, despite the fact that it contains features that have long been stigmatized (e.g., glottalization of final /t/).

Once readers’ appetites for dialect study have been whetted, they may wish to turn to the collection from Foulkes & Docherty. This volume is clearly targeted more for specialists, but the editors have taken steps to make it accessible and useful to a variety of readers. The unusual format of the book reflects this kind of outreach. In addition to an introduction by the editors, *Urban voices* contains 14 chapters discussing the accents of 15 cities across the British Isles. For each location, a fairly comprehensive overview of the accent is given following a common format. These descriptive accounts list the realizations associated with vowels in key word classes, based on Wells 1982, and discuss the behavior of a more restricted set of important consonantal variables (e.g., ‘*h*-dropping’, glottaling). The data have been compiled from empirical sociolinguistic studies, most of which were conducted in the last decade. Following these general accounts, the authors discuss more particular issues raised by their research. Thus the collection is really two books in one. It serves as a reference whose uniform format

facilitates comparisons across accents, which makes it a good companion to Trudgill's book or the more detailed work of Wells (1982). It also serves as a collection of studies addressing a range of methodological and theoretical issues facing scholars in the field. In addition, it comes packaged with recorded samples (on cassette or compact disc) of speech from the 15 cities discussed in the book and other locations. Although the sound quality of these recordings is not uniformly high, they are a bonus and will be of particular value to those using the collection as a textbook.

Language change constitutes a dominant theme in this collection. Most of the studies examine cases of sound change in progress, exploring social and/or linguistic aspects of the process. A good starting place for readers might be Trudgill's contribution, which focuses on Norwich but offers a broader historical and geographical perspective as well. Trudgill discusses several recent innovations by way of distinguishing "endogenous" changes, which are internal to the local system, from "exogenous" changes, which are "the result of influence from other external varieties" (134). An example of the former type is provided by Anne Grethe Mathisen in her study of the (ng) variable in Sandwell (West Midlands). Mathisen documents the leading role of women in promoting the local variant, which includes an oral stop (i.e., [ŋg]), an interesting exception to the usual sociolinguistic pattern of men's leading in the use of local vernacular forms. Examples of exogenous change are more common in this collection. Inger M. Mees & Beverley Collins explore such a case in their study of the spread of glottalization to Cardiff. This work is important as a rare example of a longitudinal study of the same speakers as children, teenagers, and young adults. Furthermore, the authors provide evidence of changing usage – increased use of glottalization over time – among some speakers, a finding that challenges the assumption undergirding the apparent-time reasoning of many reported cases of change in progress.

Several of the chapters examine patterns of language change from the perspective of accent leveling, which Ann Williams & Paul Kerswill define as "a process whereby difference between regional varieties are reduced, features which make varieties distinctive disappear, and new features emerge and are adopted by speakers over a wide geographical area" (149). We expect to see leveling in socially fluid communities such as Milton Keynes, a fast-growing "new town" founded in 1967. However, as Williams & Kerswill demonstrate in their comparative study of Milton Keynes, Reading, and Hull, some evidence of leveling can be found even in communities where close-knit social networks normally resist exogenous changes.

Fears that leveling will result in the complete homogenization of British accents may be put to rest by studies like that of Dominic Watt & Lesley Milroy, who investigate Newcastle. As their work makes clear, although younger speakers may be abandoning features associated with the traditional local accent, they do so in favor of features with broader regional currency. In the Newcastle case,

the leveling is toward a general northern pattern. Thus, regional variation endures. The Watt & Milroy study also makes clear the fact that leveling is not the same as standardization, since Newcastle speakers show no movement toward increased use of RP (received pronunciation) variants.

The spread of supralocal features like those detailed for Newcastle forces us to reexamine the notoriously fuzzy notion of prestige, a theme addressed in the two studies of Hiberno-English communities. In (London)Derry, as Kevin McCafferty demonstrates in his chapter, the ethnic division between Catholics and Protestants is reflected linguistically in the latter's adoption of regional features heard throughout Northern Ireland, while local features are more prevalent among Catholics. These findings counter the usual expectation that Protestant speech would be oriented toward British forms and Catholic speech toward southern Irish forms. The (London)Derry research is also interesting because it demonstrates the leading role played by middle-class speakers in the spread of language changes. A similar tendency is described by Raymond Hickey in his discussion of vowel shifting among "fashionable" speakers in Dublin. In this chapter, Hickey makes some intriguing, albeit speculative, suggestions about the active role of speakers in advancing sound changes as a means of distinguishing themselves.

As might be expected, several chapters deal with phonetic and/or phonological issues. Particularly noteworthy are Laura Tollfree's approach to the phonological modeling of consonantal variation in South East London, Jane Stuart-Smith's examination of the Glasgow accent in terms of voice quality, and the study contributed by the editors, which offers an acoustic analysis of glottalization in Derby and Newcastle. In each of these cases and others, however, the reader may be left wanting further explanation. The authors attempt to provide some background for their approaches but may assume too much for readers new to their topics. These examples illustrate the main disadvantage of the book's format: Including general descriptive accounts of the accents reduces the amount of space available to explore issues raised. Nevertheless, to help counter this deficiency, the chapters are generously referenced, and a common bibliography has been compiled by the editors.

Given the breadth of research issues (and geographical coverage) treated in this volume and the overall high quality of the contributions, the editors have certainly succeeded in providing a cross-section of recent work that brings readers up to date not only on linguistic developments in British speech, but also on the growth of the field. It should inspire further innovative research on accent variation in the British Isles and beyond.

REFERENCES

Wells, J. C. (1982). *Accents of English*. 3 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

REVIEWS

MARNIE HOLBOROW, *The politics of English*. London: Sage, 1999. Pp. vii, 216.
Hb \$78.00.

Reviewed by RON SCOLLON
Department of Linguistics
Georgetown University
Washington, DC
scollonr@georgetown.edu

The politics of English is an oddly unifying book. If one were to wonder what Fairclough and Tannen, Bernstein and Saussure, Crystal and Kress, the Milroys and Foucault, Kachru and the British Council, Hume and Pennycook, Conrad and Fishman, Pinker and Chomsky, Cheshire and Trudgill, Holmes and Schiffrin, Lakoff and Labov, and a rather lengthy roster of others have in common, it would be the scorn for their work manifested by Holborow. This low esteem is based on the failure of these scholars to have given Marx and Engels, Voloshinov, and (“some”) Vygotsky a careful enough reading. In the author’s view, there is little to be said – not just about English or the politics of English, but about applied linguistics, discourse, and sociolinguistics more generally – that was not already laid down by these very few authorized writers. This book will find few readers within these fields, I would think, since most of the practitioners would find the arguments made against their work oddly authoritarian, coming as they do from an author who argues that a materialist, economic argument is the only valid one.

The book is not titled accurately, if one takes into consideration that the subject of the politics of English is not mentioned until p. 45, and then simply to say that the subject will be taken up in later chapters, once a solid and thoroughly corrected materialist view of language and society is laid down. Chap. 3 does get around to the “Politics of World English,” but there is surprisingly little in this chapter that would be new to readers of this journal. Chap. 4 is not about English at all but is a lengthy critique, again based in the texts of Marx and Engels, of feminism. English is not mentioned in this chapter; it is presupposed in that the work of the “feminists” selected has been done in and on situations in which English was the language used. This chapter is surprisingly narrow, considering the author’s concern to critique feminism in general, in that virtually no feminist (linguistic) work from Europe or Latin America, for example, is cited. Chap. 5 comes back to “The politics of Standard English,” but again, there is little that would be new to readers of this journal except the tone of the argument. Not surprisingly, Chap. 6 concludes the book with a credo which begins by arguing that Voloshinov’s great wisdom was “the return to Marx’s view” (190), after which we are enjoined to go and do likewise.

The politics of English is, for me, a very disappointing book. This is not simply because it dismisses the vast amount of work done in the past four or five decades in sociolinguistics, discourse analysis, and applied linguistics. It is disappointing to me because the problem which the book purports to address, and which so many of the scholars cited have taken as central to the sociolinguistic enterprise,

is quickly swept aside in the author's zeal to show loyalty to a few scriptural texts. One comes away from it with little new insight into the politics of English.

GLORIA NARDINI, *Che bella figura!: The power of performance in an Italian ladies' club in Chicago*. (SUNY series in Speech Communication & SUNY series in Italian/American Studies.) Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1999. Pp. x, 164. Pb \$19.95.

Reviewed by MARIANNA DI PAOLO
Linguistics, University of Utah
255 S. Central Campus Dr., Rm. 2328
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112-0492
m.dipaolo@m.cc.utah.edu

In this book, Nardini presents "a 'thick description' of the Collandia Ladies' Club" from an ethnographic, feminist perspective (p. 127). Using data she gathered as a participant observer in this women's auxiliary to an Italian-American men's club in Chicago, Nardini shows that "examining language use in this 'community of practice' allows us to revise our notions of women as powerless users of language" (128). In fact, these immigrant and first-generation Lucchese-American club women are shown to wield a considerable amount of power over one another and over the men in the club by using communicative tactics such as indirect speech to support the cultural norms of the club community.

The book consists of a short introductory chapter, "My Methodology: The ethnography of communication"; five numbered chapters – "A definition of *bella figura*," "The conceptual framework of this study and related literature on women's language," "A history of the Collandia Club," "*Bella figura* at the Collandia Club," "The transcript: a linguistic event transformed by *bella figura*"; and a Conclusion and Appendix.

The chapter defining *bella figura*, "the most important metaphor encoded in the social context of [the author's] language research," is the strongest part of the book. In it Nardini presents an extended definition of *fare bella figura*, literally 'to make a beautiful figure', demonstrating that its meaning has been generalized to include both a favorable display of one's appearance and overall presentation of self. Nardini develops the cultural context for this metaphor by examining Italian culture broadly. Especially noteworthy is her use of Castiglione's *Il Cortegiano* (*The Courtier*), a Renaissance how-to classic in the art of courtly appearance, personal visual display, and good manners. (All the Italian quoted in the book is skillfully translated and thus fully accessible to English-only readers.) Nardini argues that the metaphor of *fare bella figura* is crucial to understanding the power dynamics within the Collandia Club, a bilingual/bicultural community that places a high cultural value in public performances of *bella figura*, more reminiscent of Italian than of "American" cultural practices.

Although Nardini writes that "*bella figura* is a flaunting of self" (32), the evidence presented suggests that it is not selfish behavior. Rather, as a type of

positive facework played out in a high involvement culture, *bella figura* might best be considered cooperative behavior. It requires thoughtful, studied control of oneself and requires helping others, especially family members and close associates, to maintain the same control of themselves. The interactions described suggest that all club members must cooperate to ensure that “any public appearance be one of artful grace and style” (77). From outside the Collandia community, such careful control of outward appearance may seem to be deceptive, but making a *bella figura* is no more deceptive than other presentations of self.

As an ethnographer, Nardini sets the social context very well. However, as a (socio)linguist, I was disappointed that a book that attempts to carefully describe communicative interactions shows a rather unsophisticated understanding of linguistics and presents relatively little explicit analysis of actual conversational data. Some of Nardini’s references to language are at best naive. For example, attempting to explain why even a sixth-grade education results in a higher level of literacy in Italian than in English, she refers to Italian as a “phonetic language” (68).

Other considerations of language, especially of the relationship between language and thought, are confused. Nardini explains the role of the Whorf-Sapir hypothesis in her conceptual framework by summarizing from Fasold 1990 and culminating with his conclusion: “To a large degree, the argument has become one of how strong a version of the Whorf hypothesis is credible, rather than whether Whorf was right or wrong” (Fasold 1990:53). But then Nardini immediately makes a false leap from Fasold’s conclusion to her own statement: “I agree: there is no meaning for language outside of cultural meaning. That is, there is no abstraction of the formal system of language outside its cultural context or use” (p. 36). Confusingly enough, this seems to be a dismissal of Fasold’s statement rather than agreement with it. Just a few pages later, in explaining that *bella figura* can be done in fluent English (41–42), Nardini provides evidence, perhaps inadvertently, that worldview is not necessarily determined by language. But soon she reaffirms her belief in the Whorf hypothesis: “That language and culture are inextricably bound is the principal tenet of my conceptual framework, but culture remains primary” (47).

The review of the literature on language and gender is rather dated and is limited, for the most part, to one or two anthologies. This is especially evident in the section called “A history of women’s language studies,” in which the most recent reference is from 1992. In contrast, other topics referred to in the book, such as Lucchese culture, have references as recent as 1998.

Another language-related problem in the book is the relative lack of attention to conversational data. The irony is that Nardini reports making 31 tapes during her field work with the members of the Collandia Ladies’ Club, but the only language text actually presented and analyzed in the book is a portion of a Collandia Officer’s meeting consisting of about five minutes’ worth of actual conversation (about 125 breath groups). The reader finally sees the annotated transcript

in Appendix A and the analysis of the text in Chap. 5. Believing that this book was about language and power and that a microanalysis of language is crucial to understanding how power is played out (Conley and O'Barr 1998), I was very frustrated by the time I got to the fifth chapter.

In spite of this, Nardini succeeds in developing an interesting and sophisticated analysis of the conversation in which an officer of the women's auxiliary, Rita, uses *bella figura* to win an argument with the president of the men's club, Ciro, at the women's auxiliary officers' meeting. However, Nardini's analysis of the argument is understated. The line of reasoning in the analysis of the transcript seemed clear to me – I am to some extent a cultural insider – but it is complicated, and most readers might need a fuller step-by-step explication to understand how Rita uses language to call up *bella figura* as the weapon that wins the argument against Ciro. Some readers will probably be left to ponder how the full definition developed for *bella figura* early on can be applied here. The conversation might also be more revealing if we knew more about Ciro, such as his age relative to the others and whether he has a kin or godfather/mother relationship with any of the women participants in the conversation. After all, people who do *bella figura* skillfully capitalize on relationships such as these.

To some extent, Nardini's relatively unsophisticated style detracts from her presentation of the analysis of the conversation. For example, because the lines of the transcript are not numbered, the only way the author has of referring to portions of the conversation is to cite them in the text. This results in the inclusion of the same set of conversational turns three times on three pages (118–20), and not necessarily in chronological order.

In the Conclusion, Nardini continues to develop the notion of the covert use of power by the club women. In particular, she explains that her mentor, Toni, told her on many occasions that certain members would like to be *considerata* 'held in esteem' – in other words, be given the opportunity to make a *bella figura* so that others could show them their high regard. Thus, the culturally skillful, such as Toni, know that part of their social power is based on the ability to help others make *bella figura*, presumably without ever saying such a thing out loud.

In various parts of the book, Nardini argues convincingly that the president of the Collandia Ladies' Club (a Slavic-American married to an Italian-American) does not behave as if she understands *bella figura*, which leads to a number of misunderstandings. But if making a *bella figura* is important in wielding power in the Collandia Club, how did this woman become president? Is the club presidency not a position of power? Are the real power brokers the other women (such as Toni) who work indirectly, and very effectively, to achieve their agenda? These are important questions that the author does not even raise.

Nardini's ethnography naturally leads to a consideration of whether presentation of self in the Collandia Club is similar to that in other communities in the United States. Two similar sorts of interactional strategies come to mind. First, *bella figura* is similar to the concept of "cool" in African-American culture: "cur-

REVIEWS

rent and trend setting, calm, detached, yet in control” (Morgan 1998:252–53). Second, a particular manifestation of *bella figura* discussed by Nardini is the public display that women perform when thanking each other for thoughtfulness. Strikingly similar public thanking displays, which perplexed me for years before reading Nardini, are exhibited by two other U.S. female-dominated communities of practice familiar to me. One is a Catholic women’s club which regularly practices anonymous (“Secret Sis”) small gift exchanges, followed by thank-you notes from the recipients to the anonymous gift-givers. The thank-you notes are published in the church bulletin for everyone to read – much to my amazement. The second is a highly professional group of public school administrators (mostly Mormon women) who thank each other regularly and very publicly for small acts of thoughtfulness.

On the other hand, *bella figura* does not figure as prominently in my Abbruzzese-Italian home community on the Colorado piedmont as it does in Nardini’s Lucchese-American Chicago community (nor may women play *bocce* in my hometown). However, this book made me realize that *bella figura* still governs some of my own behavior and expectations, even after officially leaving my home community almost a quarter of a century ago.

REFERENCES

- Conley, John M., & O’Barr, William M. (1998). *Just words: Law, language, and power*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Fasold, Ralph (1990). *The sociolinguistics of language*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Morgan, Marcyliena (1998). More than a mood or an attitude: Discourse and verbal genres in African-American culture. In Salikoko Mufwene et al. (eds.), *African-American English: Structure, history and use*, 252–3. New York: Routledge.

MIRANDA STEWART, *The Spanish language today*. London & New York: Routledge, 1999. Pp. xiv, 237. Pb \$25.99.

Reviewed by JOHN M. LIPSKI
Spanish, Italian & Portuguese
Pennsylvania State University
University Park, PA 16802
jlipski@psu.edu

This book sets out to describe the Spanish language as it is used in the world today, including regional and social variation, pedagogical and political issues, mass media and communication, and language planning. The book is divided into nine chapters, a glossary, and a bibliography.

The first section, “Spanish as a world language,” contains a brief chapter which describes the many countries and regions throughout the world where Spanish is spoken, and a longer chapter devoted to language standardization. The former

covers nearly all the areas where Spanish is or was recently used; however, the Spanish-speaking western Sahara community, now living principally in Algerian refugee camps, is not mentioned, while the Oceanic language Chamorro, spoken on Guam and recipient of numerous Spanish lexical borrowings, is inaccurately described as a “predominantly Spanish-lexified creole.” The vitriolic “English only” anti-Spanish movements in the United States are erroneously ascribed to the Republican Party (the movement is not affiliated with any particular political party, but rather cuts across several ideological and political strands). The second chapter covers the role of the academies of the Spanish language, technical and professional guidelines, the language of the media, and the drive toward nonsexist language. The last topic is rarely mentioned in global descriptions of official language planning, but the description reveals the extent to which anti-sexist consciousness-raising has penetrated the Spanish-speaking world. Many dialect atlas and database projects representing Spain and Latin America (including the *norma culta* project documenting the speech of major urban centers) are mentioned, leaving aside the often charged discussions of the sampling techniques and ideological underpinnings of such studies. The projected linguistic atlas of the Spanish Caribbean is not mentioned, although it is linked to the Latin American Spanish dialect atlas project of Manuel Alvar and Antonio Quilis; the Linguistic Survey of New Mexico and Southern Colorado, housed at the University of New Mexico and reported in many publications, also escapes notice, as do other embryonic attempts to document systematically the Spanish of the continental United States.

The second part of the book, on variation and change in Spanish, contains chapters on phonetics and orthography, the lexicon, and morphosyntax. The phonetics and phonology chapter comments on the major regional and social differentiators of Spanish pronunciation, including the opposition /λ/-/y/, erosion of syllable-final /s/, velarization of final /n/, neutralization of liquids, the /s/-/θ/ opposition, and the many realizations of /y/. Only a single dialect map, outlining the realizations of /s/ and /θ/ in Spain, complements the discussion; additional diatopic maps would enhance the presentation for readers not familiar with Spanish regional phonetic variation. Spelling conventions, including recent changes to official orthographic norms, also receive mention. Intonational differences between styles and dialects – at once instantly recognizable and difficult to describe empirically – are included. The chapter devoted to the Spanish lexicon includes variation by region and social class, the formation of neologisms, taboo words, affixation and rules of word formation, variation in diminutive suffixes, and other topics properly considered as derivational morphology (e.g. specific uses of individual derivational suffixes). The morphosyntax chapter deals primarily with object clitics (including clitic doubling, and substitution of direct object clitics for indirect objects and vice versa), special uses of verbal mood, the expression of overt subject pronouns, alternate forms of the pluperfect subjunctive, and varying usage of prepositions and relative pronouns. Although accu-

rately identifying the issues involved, the treatment is too brief to serve as much more than an index of possible topics.

Part 3, “The Spanish language in use,” consists of three chapters. The first describes forms of address, including the pronouns *tú*, *vos*, *vosotros*, *usted*, *ustedes*, as well as titles and alternative forms. Regional examples from Spain and Latin America illustrate the range of variation, which in reality is considerably more extensive than reflected in the short overview. The chapter “Discourse and genre” describes the linguistic peculiarities of specialized discourse modes – such as legal documents, political rhetoric, newspaper reporting, and business correspondence – and the use of euphemisms and taboo expressions. In each case, lexical and morphosyntactic correlates of the particular genre are incorporated into the discussion, and several texts are deconstructed part by part. This chapter would be particularly useful in classes on translation and commercial language. The chapter entitled “Conversation, pragmatics and politeness” includes regional and social norms for formal and informal conversations, planned and unplanned discourse, and rules of politeness. Many actually occurring examples are discussed in detail, and the chapter could serve as a mini-course in Spanish speech acts. As in the preceding chapters, the majority of examples discussed in detail come from peninsular Spain.

The final section, “Spanish in contact,” contains a single chapter. The first portion deals with the three acknowledged Spanish-based creoles, Philippine Creole Spanish, Papiamentu, and Afro-Colombian Palenquero. Some of the possible creoles mentioned in passing are questionable: there is no (Spanish-based) “Trinidad and Tobago creole,” although some Spanish is spoken vestigially on Trinidad. Nor was there ever a Nahuatl-Spanish creole in Nicaragua or elsewhere in Central America; rather, much-cited texts such as the anonymous colonial play *El Güegüense* exemplify Spanish-Nahuatl code-switching. The designation *ternateño* as “used in the Moluccas between Spanish and Portuguese speakers” (p. 183) is also misleading, since nowadays *ternateño* refers to the nearly moribund Philippine Creole Spanish (Chabacano) dialect of Ternate, on Manila Bay. The name of the town indeed comes from an island in the Moluccas whose Portuguese (creole?)-speaking population was evacuated to Manila more than two centuries ago, long before any contact with Spanish (Molony 1977a, 1977b; Whinnom 1956). Afro-Colombian Palenquero is not “tonal” (184), although the postposed negator *-nu* is normally pronounced with a distinctive high tone. The tonal contrasts in Papiamentu are limited to particular morphological distinctions (e.g. between infinitive and past participle), and they do not affect all syllables in all words, as they do in true lexical tonal languages. Individual sections cover Spanish in contact with Italian (in Argentina), Catalan (in Spain), Portuguese (in Uruguay), Mayan languages (Yucatán), and English (in the United States). The arguably more striking bilingual phenomena found in the Spanish of the Basque country in Spain (along with Euskera), Gibraltar (English), the Andean zone (Quechua

and Aymara), Paraguay (Guaraní), and central Mexico (diverse languages) are not mentioned, despite the fact that Mexico, Paraguay, and the Andean countries are the dialect zones most commonly associated with language transfer phenomena. Mexican-American *caló* or Pachuco argot is placed midpoint on a continuum between standard Spanish and standard English (190), although most *caló* elements are based on Spanish and show little or no influence of English. “Popular Chicano Spanish” is described briefly with actual examples, but it is not possible to present in so little space the wide range of regional and social variants of this broad cover term. Borrowing and code-switching receive a special section, exemplified by English-Spanish and Spanish-Catalan bilingualism. There is no working definition of the difference between borrowing and code-switching (admittedly a nearly impossible goal), but the examples include both phenomena. Code-switching is described primarily in functional and pragmatic terms, i.e. the motivations for switching between languages and the circumstances in which this is done.

The attempt to describe nearly every facet of the Spanish language in use today in fewer than 200 pages inevitably leads to inconsistencies and incomplete treatment, which at times shades off into inaccuracy. The book’s main strength is the breadth of the topics covered, a range considerably wider than found in other books on Spanish language usage and variation. Its principal weakness is this very breadth, which ensures that few topics can be fully grasped; to use this book in a classroom setting would require supplementary readings at many junctures. The relative predominance of peninsular Spanish over Latin American examples is both a complement to many other works on Spanish language variation and a possible concern for students in North American universities, where interest in Latin America runs high. These reservations notwithstanding, *The Spanish language today* fills an important niche in the study of contemporary varieties of Spanish. The bibliography is comprehensive and helpful, and the range of topics will be attractive to a wide range of students, not just those interested in the formal study of language variation. This book would be an excellent introduction to the linguistic study of Spanish, since it captures much of the fascination and multifaceted approaches which attract scholars, while never losing sight of the “why things are the way they are” curiosity experienced by the nonspecialist.

REFERENCES

- Molony, Carol (1977a). Semantic changes in Chabacano. In Jürgen Meisel (ed.), *Langues en contact—pidgins—creoles—languages in contact*, 153–66. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- (1977b). Recent relexification processes in Philippine Creole Spanish. In Ben Blount & Mary Sanches (eds.), *Sociocultural dimensions of language change*, 131–60. New York: Academic Press.
- Whinnom, Keith (1956). *Spanish contact vernaculars in the Philippines*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University.

REVIEWS

ROLAND J.-L. BRETON, *Atlas of the languages and ethnic communities of South Asia*. Walnut Creek, London & New Delhi: Altamira Press, 1997. Pp. 231. Hb \$65.00.

Reviewed by HAROLD SCHIFFMAN
South Asian Regional Studies, University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia PA 19104-6305
haroldfs@ccat.sas.upenn.edu

This is an English version of the author's French work, *Atlas géographique des langues et des ethnies de l'Inde et du Subcontinent*, (Les Presses de l'Université Laval, Québec, 1976.) Since it was originally based on data from the 1971 (or even earlier) censuses of India, Nepal, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka (and since Bangladesh was part of Pakistan in 1971, and Bhutan data were not reliable earlier), it has been updated to include data from various regional census sources, mostly those conducted in 1981 and 1991. One notes that there are various censuses of Nepal (1952/54, 1971, 1981, 1991) cited, but that Sri Lanka does not seem to have done one since 1953. The cartographic techniques have also benefited from this updating, with new methods of representation not previously available. This makes it possible to compare various increases of speakers and languages in various parts of the subcontinent, in tables added for this purpose. This version also includes a very useful bibliography of sources – not only various censuses, but also other studies of language distribution, language classification, ethnicity, and language issues. There are also a language classification and plate index, a subject and author index, and material on the diffusion of South Asian languages and scripts outside the subcontinent proper.

Breton is a geographer of ethnicity, not a sociolinguist or dialectologist, so his approach is one that relies on data gathered by others, especially by the censuses of India and the other polities. Since census bureaus around the world often have political agendas, or do things that arouse political controversies (usually by underrepresenting or overrepresenting certain populations), the data have to be taken with a grain of salt, and that goes for this material as well. Unfortunately, we have little other data to go on, so if one wants to know how many Hindi speakers there are in India at the moment (whatever "Hindi speaker" means), one can consult the Census of India material (which tells us, incidentally, that there are 337,272,114 Hindi speakers, or 40.22% of the population), or one can make one's own guesses. Everyone who works on sociolinguistic or sociopolitical issues in South Asia knows that the question of what constitutes a "language" and what constitutes a "dialect" is problematical, and that we are often dealing with constructs arrived at during British colonial times, but which governmental agencies in independent India (or other states of the subcontinent) have not known how to modify, unless by aggregating certain ones (e.g., amalgamate all Hindi dialect speakers with Hindi, which is how the 40.22% figure is arrived at in the GOI figures) or disaggregating others (e.g., treat the various kinds of Tamils in Sri Lanka as different, thereby reducing the sum total of Tamils).

The fact that Breton includes maps that try to represent accurately the spatial distribution of languages and ethnic groups in the subcontinent reminds us that the censuses of India and other polities do *not* do this; even the maps available on the Census of India website (<http://www.censusindia.net/india.html>) give only administrative boundaries, i.e. districts, but no language distribution data. One wonders whether the government of India, or for that matter, any of the polities in the area, are shying away from the task of representing anything graphically for fear that such representations will arouse political turmoil. It is, of course, no easy task to represent these data, since there is so much multilingualism, and therefore overlapping of categories.

This work is one that necessarily raises almost as many questions as it answers, but it is good to have the English version, with its helpful updates, to give an alternative point of view from that given by the various national censuses.

M. ISHTIAQ, *Language shifts among the scheduled tribes in India: A geographical study*. (MLBD Series in Linguistics.) Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, Pp. xii, 183. Rs 450. \$32.00.

Reviewed by ROLAND J.-L. BRETON
Geography, University of Paris-8, (Vincennes – St Denis)
28, Les Figueras
F-13770 Venelles, France
roland.breton@fnac.net

This book, by a geographer, is a rather complete study of the linguistic behavior of an important population group, the so-called Scheduled Tribes of India, numbering 68 million people in 1991, and more than 90 million today, i.e. as much as the population of Germany – but a population split into distinct units, spread in various patches of territory all over India, where they speak more than 60 indigenous languages. Spatially and culturally divided, they have also long been socially marginalized, and despite many official schemes of development, they are still undergoing a very important process of deculturation. The most noticeable manifestation of this process – the language shift that is the subject of this book – had, at the period of the author’s fieldwork, already affected nearly 60% of this population and is leading to the gradual disappearance of local languages in many places.

After a short presentation of his method and fieldwork (Chap. 1), Ishtiaq gives a general view of the language shift phenomenon as a conceptual framework, through its directions and processes, and the literature dealing with it (Chap. 2). He then takes a general approach to the spatial and numerical distribution, in 1981, of the “tribal” languages of India, through each of the four language families to which they belong (Chap. 3). He devotes Chap. 4 to the Austric family (the only one specific to the “tribal” population), including its distribution and patterns of language shift as of 1961. In Chap. 5, a discussion of the typology of

language shift and maintenance concentrates on four main tribes, one speaking an Indo-Aryan language and three speaking Austric languages. After these case studies, the author turns to the general determinants of language shift, such as linguistic diversity and exposure, and their correlates (Chap. 6). Next, the main tribal belt is taken as example of the implications and explanations of language shift linked to development, urbanization, and regionalism (Chap. 7). Finally, Ishtiaq argues in favor of planning for the preservation of tribal languages (Chap. 8) and concludes with a general policy of integration (Chap. 9). To support and illustrate the text, 43 statistical tables are included, mostly from the Indian Census, and 28 maps at district or state level, plus two conceptual diagrams. Most of the demonstration is based on percentages in census figures of mother tongues used at the district level within each tribal group, illustrated with maps of each language group, or language family group, showing details of this situation, and accompanied by different mathematical indexes of this acculturation process.

Because 5.3 million people – 77% of the Austric tribes – in 1961 still declared their traditional languages as their mother tongues (53), it was necessary to have a survey, at least at the district scale, of the distribution of these dozen languages through their “concentration index,” and then to evaluate how this language maintenance may vary and allow certain changes in linguistic identity. Especially instructive in this regard was the distribution of the percentage of people declaring other mother tongues than the traditional one of their tribe: either the language of another tribe (200,000, 3.3%), or the regional state language (1.25 million, 18.2%), or the language of another state (100,000, 1.5%).

Another valuable inclusion is the decadal variation of language shift between the census years 1961, 1971, and 1981, especially because it allows one to compare, within each tribe, the different growth rates of the tribal language and of the entire tribal group. This comparison is done as an attempt to correlate, in a common matrix, these two growth rates with external factors measured in various percentages: of urban population, literates, Christians, non-primary workers, male population, and population over 45 years of age. Patterns of language shift and maintenance are studied in 1961 in the case of four of the more numerous tribes – Bhils, Korkus, Mundas, and Santals – in each of the districts where they are settled. Areas are classified in four types from very high maintenance (over 75%) with low shift, to low maintenance (below 25%) and very high shift. In most cases, the variation in magnitude is rather high between the central homeland and peripheral regions.

The processes of language shift do not operate everywhere with equal intensity, so determinants and correlates are looked for in a set of socio-economic variables that may lead to various degrees of linguistic exposure, including linguistic association with parental groups of language, language dependence for practical purposes, and linguistic diversification of use in different domains inside multilingual societies. Measuring this linguistic exposure leads to the elaboration of an exposure index that can be applied down to the village level.

Bilingualism/multilingualism is regarded as mainly a product of necessity, but, in the Indian context, it is also tied to the two distinct tendencies called “nationalism” and “nationalism,” as well as to the roles of major languages, of the regional “linguistic areas,” and so on. The various correlates of language shift are analyzed in a new set of percentages inside the tribal population, based on household data. This leads to a regression analysis showing the weight of income and, especially, literacy. But other factors, such as location and access to nontribal areas and centers, are also important.

Adoption of nontribal languages by the tribal population has, for the author, two possible outcomes: assimilation, detribalization, and the vanishing of tribal culture and loss of tribal identity; or integration, unification and consolidation of the tribal communities with the development of their culture. Ishtiaq writes, “Unlike assimilation, the process of integration is not due to external forces or any compulsion, rather it is a type of voluntary change undertaken in order to become part and parcel of the mainstream of the national culture” (119). The chosen site of a detailed analysis of this process is the Chotanagpur Plateau, with its “high concentration of the tribal population and bountiful natural resources” that explains why “the region has emerged as the main focus of industries in India.” The comparison of a dozen economic development indicators with the choice of traditional or nontraditional languages, and a correlation analysis with level of urbanization, bring the author to the following assessment: “To conclude it may be pointed out that although the urbanisation is one of the most important factors influencing language shift among the tribal communities, it did not show a linear positive correlation in this exercise” (131).

On the contrary, Ishtiaq insists on tribal peoples’ growing consciousness of their languages as a relatively recent phenomenon, claiming that politics is the force behind language consciousness (132). Thus, language regionalism and language revivalism, like demands for separate tribal territory, are considered as important factors in direction of the Jharkand (Chotanagpur) recognition, but also of a Bhil Raj. But, as far as that concerns the central region, “surrounded by areas in which the highly cultivated and advanced Indo-Aryan and Dravidian languages are spoken,” it is still dubious that the “demand for separate administrative units on the basis of language” could be fulfilled as it has been in north-eastern India (136). The decisive question is “What do the Tribals feel?” Planning for the preservation of tribal languages is finally the main concern, implying classification of the tribal language, choice of a written script, adoption as a medium of instruction, and identification of a linguistic area – all objectives that could be reached through only active government support and tribal group involvement.

As a conclusion, Ishtiaq – taking account of the large range of disparity between tribes in their linguistic exposure and their political consciousness – suggests that their “languages may serve a better purpose if they are assigned uniform scripts irrespective of their regional variations and are also made the media of

REVIEWS

education up to the primary level in those areas in which they are spoken overwhelmingly” (150). This possibility is perfectly in agreement with the framework of the Indian Constitution and legislation.

TARIQ RAHMAN, *Language, education and culture*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press and Sustainable Development Policy Institute, 1999. Pp. xvi, 318. Hb \$26.95.

Reviewed by HAROLD SCHIFFMAN
South Asian Regional Studies
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6305
haroldfs@ccat.sas.upenn.edu

This is a compendium of articles, originally published elsewhere, that focus on language, education, and culture in Pakistan, where the author has spent most of his career. As he admits in the general introduction, the articles were not initially written as chapters for a book, so they do not each focus on a single argument; but since they have these three themes as they relate to Pakistan as their organizing idea, with few other sources to guide us, we can get some general ideas about these issues as they play out in Pakistan.

The book is organized into three sections, the first devoted to background about language and linguistics in Pakistan, the second about language teaching policies, and the third on language and power issues. The author provides an introduction to each section. In the first, he reveals that there is not even a single university department of linguistics in Pakistan; the rest of the section is devoted to another burning issue: What was the language of the Indus Valley, and what do we know about this “highly intriguing but forbiddingly difficult subject”? In the introduction to the second section, we are made aware of controversies involving medium of instruction, such as why the state teaches English to the elite and Urdu to nonelite children (in Sindh, Sindhi is also taught, but other indigenous languages are ignored). There are other political issues as well, such as the content of language-teaching texts both in national schools and in religious seminaries. In other chapters, the question of universities and their place in society is raised; Rahman argues that, though academics are paid the same scale as bureaucrats and military personnel, other goods and services available to them are of lower value, contributing to a kind of brain-drain, in that academia in Pakistan does not attract the brightest students.

The third section of this collection, “Culture,” is probably the most interesting, since it deals with the place of women, sociolinguistic issues such as the use of honorifics, and political issues such as cultural identity, cultural and linguistic assertion, and, in general, issues of power in modern-day Pakistan.

This collection, though it contains some contents adapted for Pakistani readers from material available elsewhere, also holds much to enlighten us about lan-

guage and linguistic issues in Pakistan that is not available anywhere else – and without any attempts to varnish the truth. I looked in vain for a source like this only last year, while teaching a course on the subject of language, education, and culture in South Asia. Would that there were compendia of a similar nature for some of the other polities as well.

LISA PHILIP VALENTINE & REGNA DARNELL (eds.), *Theorizing the Americanist tradition*. Toronto and Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1999. Pp. 397. Hb \$29.95.

Reviewed by JULIE CRUIKSHANK
*Anthropology and Sociology, University of British Columbia
Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z1, Canada
cruj@interchange.ubc.ca*

A recurring theme in late twentieth century anthropology has been the need to reinvent questions, subject matter, theoretical underpinnings, methods, and ethics central to our research. While all disciplines have their own historical narratives, those told about anthropology are especially fractured along lines of continuity and transformation. Narratives of rupture gained an upper hand during the final decades of the twentieth century, undoubtedly as part of an effort to construct a disciplinary future not so inevitably shaped by forces of a colonial past. But one consequence of imaginative reinvention can be forgetfulness that merges with hubris when we fail to acknowledge how old legacies contribute to current work. Narratives of connection are emerging again, reclaiming a legacy grounded in critical ethnography that engages the lives of real people, partly as a reaction to the detachment of text-based “cultural studies.”

The 25 essays in this volume indeed contribute to “timely conversations,” in the words of volume editors Lisa Valentine and Regna Darnell. The book emerges from a conference they organized together, and the thematic coherence of the collection is a tribute both to their guiding hands and to the dedication of participants who clearly listened to and read one another’s papers when they were preparing their own final versions for publication. The contributions directly address this tension between naive presentism and the search for closer connections between contemporary and historical questions. Each author sees his or her own ideas as part of an ongoing tradition, and tradition itself as “constituted in the flux of ongoing social relations” (9).

The essays are written by mature scholars from Canada and the United States, most of whom bring several decades of ethnographic experience to the discussion. Many were graduate students during the 1960s and contributed directly to debates about reinventing anthropology during the 1970s and 1980s, so their reflections at the end of the 1990s enrich our understanding of those historical connections. Each addresses some of the questions that shaped his or her own intellectual development, constructing a genealogy that creates “new discourses

about old discourses within the Americanist tradition” (10). At a time when North American anthropology grapples with connections between contested histories and uncertain futures, these essays make powerful arguments for the significance of an axis grounded in cultural anthropology, linguistic anthropology, and interactions between these two fields.

Three key themes stand out for me, as a reader. First, the authors grapple with the distinctiveness of an “Americanist” tradition that incorporates “Canadianist” history as well, and it is significant that the conference from which the volume emerged was held in Canada, where almost half the contributors teach or work. Second, the authors insist that many of our pivotal contemporary concepts (discourse, personhood, reflexivity, collaboration) have long historical roots in work done here earlier in this century. Third, they stress the dialogic nature of a tradition that they suggest originates in a space shared by Native American intellectuals and the anthropologists they attempted to educate.

What, then, is the Americanist tradition? And why should we care? North Atlantic anthropology is very often homogenized in discussions of historical continuities and discontinuities that fail to account for different national traditions. “All too often,” Darnell notes, “the Americans, the British, the French, and the Germans have seemed to talk about the same things. But they have used different professional terminologies and have laid claim to different intellectual genealogies. Our wheels have been invented many times (although they have also been borrowed, thereby obscuring their histories)” (42–3). Early in the history of anthropology, she contends, spaces opened differentiating the “God’s-eye-view” positivism and behaviorist assumptions more characteristic of British social anthropology from the interests emerging in North America. Sapir addressed this early on, contrasting the “smoothed over” versions generated by totalizing functionalist paradigms with his own preference for what he called “the stuff in the raw” – “the genuine, difficult, confusing, primary sources” (Darnell, 39–40). Stephen Murray, in a similar assessment, draws the contrast between overseas colonialist imperatives that brought anthropology its problems and work done “at home” (grounded in ethnopoetics, ethnography of speaking, and linguistic anthropology more generally). Ray Fogelson suggests that, despite the robustness of the colonialist model of anthropology, we should look at the different traditions of nation-building that account for different national traditions. He goes on to make the provocative suggestion that Americanist anthropologists had better prepare themselves to declare to new nationalisms, specifically to those Native American communities where they work.

In order to unpack the rhetorics of continuity and discontinuity, several chapters address the historical roots of contemporary concepts. Dell Hymes’s essay traces connections between contemporary ethnopoetics and work by Franz Boas. Robin Ridington looks at how, despite a long tradition of collaboration, we have historically privileged only particular kinds of partnerships – shared ethnographic authority, perhaps, but rarely shared theoretical authority. The emerging

attention to narrative, he suggests, raises probabilities for genuine theoretical collaboration with indigenous consultants. Richard Preston notes that current debates about authenticity have long been with us, and he urges us to do our own archaeology of our anthropological legacies. “Traditions,” he reminds us, “are like icebergs; we only see the tip, unless we delve deeper. We can reinvent the appearance of the tip fairly easily, but all that other stuff is still attached, underneath.” (150). Darnell points out that life history has recently been rehabilitated with no acknowledgment of its older methodological roots: during the interwar years, for instance, it played a significant role in efforts to disentangle relative influence of culture and individual psychology on human development. To ignore these historical developments when we use concepts like “person-centered ethnography,” “life story,” “discourse,” or “collaboration” is to weaken contemporary work.

John Cove returns us to an older modernist concept which, he argues, has had surprising theoretical force in postmodern debates. Cultural relativism, he insists, is now too routinely dismissed as disempowering, just at the time that indigenous people have given it theoretical force as a strategy of empowerment. Often associated with Americanist anthropology, its roots can be traced to a German idealism which Boas shared with Weber, and which both used as a point of entry for investigating phenomenological questions. In Boas’s practice, it came to mean understanding the variety of concepts people used to make sense of the world – one way (and only one, Boas stressed) of understanding culture on its own terms. But the real force of that concept came with a postwar turn away from an anthropology applied to colonialist projects. Sol Tax’s “action anthropology,” with its explicitly emancipatory overtones, called anthropologists to take the side of indigenous peoples and to engage in “deliberate interference” in relations with dominant institutions (112). This explicit use of cultural relativism to serve indigenous ends, Cove suggests, was a watershed that fundamentally distinguished Americanist anthropology of that period from British and French social anthropology. Since the 1970s, of course, British social anthropology has adopted similar approaches, and he points to some of the political and ethical dilemmas that are arising in Canada and New Zealand now that Americanist concepts have spun out well beyond the discipline. Regrettably, some anthropologists have begun to silence their own voices, ostensibly to create spaces for indigenous voices, but ultimately to everyone’s detriment.

Other essays by Barbara Tedlock, Dennis Tedlock, Jane Hill, and Blair Rudes examine the changing meanings of writing, text, oral literature, and life story in the Americanist textual tradition, particularly given the new tools available for sound recording, and local requests from indigenous audiences for this kind of work. Hill’s chapter, for instance, historicizes interactions between ethnographers and consultants, looking at how those relationships become reinterpreted many years later, and the role that “the materiality of written texts . . . the principal artefacts of its practices” plays in this process. Bea Medicine, Ray Demallie, and

REVIEWS

Douglas Parks each return to specific work done by Native American writers – Ella Deloria (Lakota), James Sword (Oglala), and James Murie. Essays by Barbara Burnaby, Danielle Cyr, Margaret Seguin Anderson, and Deanna Nyce look at the hard policy issues involved in introducing anthropological linguistics and text collections into contemporary educational programs in Canada. Lisa Valentine applies these approaches to analysis of speeches by contemporary mainstream Canadian politicians whose rhetoric ultimately has enormous significance for indigenous communities. Ellen Basso and Charles Briggs each demonstrate applications of Americanist methods to understanding contemporary narratives told in South America.

Theorizing the Americanist tradition can be read as the critical reflections of linguistic anthropologists on a tradition that has shaped their professional lives. It can also be read as a series of reflexive personal narratives about the development of individual and collaborative work. The essays are wide-ranging and provide thoughtful reading for anyone interested in the history of anthropology at the end of the twentieth century. As Stephen Murray concludes, “Stories people tell about their experience have become not merely respectable but the preferred object of anthropological attention” (63). This book provides us with a fresh perspective on how narrative has returned to the center of our discipline.