Language in Society **29**, 259–308. Printed in the United States of America

REVIEWS

William Downes, *Language and society*. 2nd edn. (Cambridge approaches to linguistics.) Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998. Pp. ix, 503. Hb $64.95, pb $24.95.

Ronald Wardhaugh, *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. 3rd edn. Oxford: Blackwell, 1998. Pp. viii, 404.

Reviewed by Ronald Macaulay
Pitzer College, Claremont, CA 91711-6101
rmacaulay@compuserve.com

Somewhere sociolinguistics must be flourishing. Here we have the second edition of a volume that first appeared in 1984, and the third edition of one that was first published in 1986. It is not as though there are no competing works in print. Hudson 1996 is a revision of a 1980 work, while Trudgill 1995 is the third version of a work that first appeared in 1974. Still in their first manifestation are Holmes 1992 and Romaine 1994. Clearly, there must be a market for these works, since altruism is hardly a common feature of the modern publishing world.

Both volumes under review are presented as "introductions" and cover many of the same topics, so it is reasonable to compare them in terms of content and presentation. The first problem is where such a book should begin, and how much prior knowledge it can take for granted in the reader. Downes's first chapter will be a severe challenge to anyone who has not already taken a course in linguistics. He adopts the device of highlighting in boldface new technical terms when they first appear. Chap. 1 contains 57 terms in boldface, from "universal grammar" to "critical linguistics," via such items as "entails," "I-language," and "language module." It is hard to imagine that anyone who needs to be told that voice is caused by the vibration of the "vocal chords" (*sic*, 7) will be able to follow D's brief explanations, especially since the reader is also expected to be able to understand phonetic symbols without a chart being provided. I am surprised that the editor of the series (Jean Aitchison) allowed this chapter to appear in its present form; it is too complicated and dense for a newcomer to the field of linguistics, and not very interesting for someone who is already familiar with the terminology. The style continues in Chap. 2, with 61 terms in boldface, but Downes begins to give fuller explanations, with several helpful examples. This will still be heavy sledding for the linguistically unsophisticated reader, but the concepts dealt with are somewhat easier to grasp.

In Chap. 3, "Language varieties: Processes and problems," Downes jumps straight into the specific example of Canada, with which he deals in considerable detail. This bold move allows him to introduce more technical terms in a clear

© 2000 Cambridge University Press 0047-4045/00 $9.50

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500272047 Published online by Cambridge University Press

manner with reference to a specific context, and he goes on to discuss diglossia and code-switching. Much of this is relatively easy to grasp, but only fairly knowledgeable readers will understand his reference to items such as "Canadian raising" and palatalization. By this stage, it becomes clearer what kind of reader Downes has in mind: someone with a fairly solid grasp of linguistic terms and concepts, but little awareness of the social aspects of language. I am sure there are quite a few students, not to mention instructors, who fall into this category, and for them there will be much to learn from this volume.

Chap. 4, "Discovering the structure in variation"; Chap. 5, "Rhoticity"; Chap. 6, "At the intersection of social factors"; and Chap. 7, "Change, meaning and acts of identity," mainly present the Labovian approach to the study of variation, including the Milroys' notion of networks. This is the core of the book, as regards sociolinguistics, and it is very well done. Downes is good at summarizing what he has read, though at times I wish he had taken a slightly more critical attitude toward some of the material. There is no hint that some scholars have questioned the methodology employed in identifying such notions as styles, networks, and linguistic insecurity. Downes presents the claims made in the original studies as if they had never been challenged. Perhaps that is appropriate in a volume of this kind, but elsewhere Downes does adopt a more critical stance toward the work he is summarizing.

Chap. 8, "The discourse of social life," introduces the notion of language use; it is a brilliant summary of the notions of conversation analysis developed by Sacks and Schegloff. This would be an excellent outline for anyone wishing to introduce these notions to a class. Having struggled to do this for many years, I am greatly impressed by Downes's exposition, and wish that I had had it available before. However, I might not want the students to read it, as I would prefer them to give credit to my brilliance for producing clarity in a notoriously muddy area.

The remaining Chaps. 9–11 deal with pragmatics, relevance theory, speech acts, and other topics in the philosophy of language. This is where Downes feels most comfortable (and critical); and he is, as elsewhere, extremely effective in summarizing the material, but I find these topics less relevant to the earlier part of the book, and I suspect many readers of *LiS* might also. Downes ends his book with an ambitious chapter entitled "Language and social explanation" (415–56), in which he attempts to integrate what he calls "two sorts of social description of language": (a) "empirical descriptions of variation in sociolinguistic surveys," and (b) "the pragmatic teleological-intentional level" (455). While this is admirable in intent, in the end I am not sure that Downes has said very much that is illuminating.

Wardhaugh begins in much the same way as Downes, but his pace is more leisurely and less intimidating to the reader, and his style makes easy reading. After the introduction, Chaps. 2–8 cover the usual kinds of topics: language and dialects, pidgin and creole languages, bilingualism and code choice, speech communities, regional and social variation, selected variation studies, and language

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500272047 Published online by Cambridge University Press

change. These chapters provide an accessible introduction to a wide range of topics, without excessive oversimplification.

Chaps. 9–12 diverge from this path to examine various aspects of language use under the headings "Language and culture," "Ethnography and ethnomethodology," "Solidarity and politeness," and "Acting and conversing." While they are effective in their own way, their relevance to the major thrust of the volume is less obvious, and the topics really deserve more extended treatment.

Chaps. 13, "Language and gender," and 14, "Language and disadvantage," return to more central sociolinguistic concerns. Neither is as successful as the earlier chapters; but then, these are topics on which disagreement is easy, and consensus almost unreachable. Chap. 15 is a splendid account of "Language planning," as might be expected from the author of Wardhaugh 1987. This is a chapter that I would recommend to anyone seeking enlightenment on the subject. This volume's concluding chapter is very different from that of Downes; Wardhaugh warns against premature theorizing on the basis of the limited information we have at present, and he emphasizes the need to keep an open mind.

Would I want to assign either of these books as a text? I would not be ashamed to do so. They are both admirable works with many virtues, and I am sure that advanced undergraduates and beginning graduate students would learn a lot from them. However, neither is ideal for my purposes. I would have been happier if they had concentrated more on language variation, as investigated by most sociolinguists, and omitted the topics that are generally dealt with by writers on anthropological linguistics, conversation analysis, or philosophy of language, who can give these matters the in-depth treatment they require (cf. Duranti 1997). Trying to deal with everything in one volume has the unfortunate effect of almost trivializing the whole enterprise. I would like more detailed discussion of empirical studies, with a critical examination of the methodology employed. The best example of this in these volumes is Downes's chapter on rhoticity, but even there I feel he could have risked a little more in the way of analytical comment. Both Downes and Wardhaugh are perhaps too gentle with their sources. This is very kind of them; but it's a rough world out there, and I would like my students to get some sense of that – so that I am not the only one pointing out to them the flaws in the mirror.

REFERENCES

Duranti, Alessandro (1997). *Linguistic anthropology*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.

Holmes, Janet (1992). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. London: Longman.

Hudson, Richard A. (1996). *Sociolinguistics*. 2nd edn. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.

Romaine, Suzanne (1994). *Language in society*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.

Trudgill, Peter (1995). *Sociolinguistics*. 3rd edn. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Wardhaugh, Ronald (1987). *Languages in competition*. Oxford: Blackwell.

(Received 25 January 1999)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500272047 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Ron Scollon & Suzanne Wong Scollon, *Intercultural communication: A discourse approach*. (Language in society, 21.) Oxford (UK) & Cambridge (MA): Blackwell, 1995. Pp. xiii, 271.

Reviewed by Christina Kakavá
English, Linguistics, and Speech
Mary Washington College
Fredericksburg, VA 22401
ckakava@paprika.mwc.edu

Designing for the first time an undergraduate Cross-Cultural Communication course for a liberal arts college, I was faced with the quandary of how to communicate to my students all that I wanted to teach them about face, politeness, power, communicative style, and discourse – without having to ask them to purchase a very expensive packet of readings. It seems that academic providence took care of me, because at that point the Scollons' book was published. Since then I have used it with great success in my class, which serves students across the spectrum of disciplines.

The Scollons' book has several strengths, along with some minor weaknesses; but its great value is the synthesis of key theoretical concepts found in sociolinguistics, pragmatics, and communication – along with their applications to intercultural communication, which the Scollons argue should be better viewed as a framework of "interdiscourse system communication" (163). It is this last contribution that makes the book of special value: It recognizes the importance of culture, but it also considers how other discourse systems intersect with culture, and add to the complexity of intercultural communication.

One of the book's minor weaknesses is its focus on North American and East Asian speakers. Readers interested in finding examples from many cultures will be disappointed in that the authors justifiably rely most heavily on what they are either familiar with or have done research on – in part (as they state in their introduction) because one of their targeted audiences is East Asian speakers of English and their teachers.

The book consists of seven theoretical chapters that pertain to communication among people from different cultures, and four chapters that apply the previously established theoretical points to corporate, professional, generational, and gender discourse. Chap. 1, "What is a discourse approach?" addresses the type of miscommunication problems that tend to arise when speakers do not share the same expectations about the organization of discourse, in particular the matter of topic and comment. Some North American students initially fail to assess the importance of topic-comment structure (the typical Western paradigm) vs. comment-topic (the typical Eastern paradigm); but they gradually learn to deconstruct what they have unquestionably accepted as the norm of information structure. The Scollons offer a synopsis of their argument that an INTERDISCOURSE framework can better account for the simultaneous memberships that speakers have in different discourse systems. They then illustrate very effectively different types of

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500272047 Published online by Cambridge University Press

linguistic ambiguity at the word, sentence, and discourse levels; and this leads them to the two approaches they adopt in the subsequent chapters: (a) increasing shared knowledge, and (b) dealing with miscommunication.

Chap. 2, "How, when, and where to do things with language," serves as the cornerstone for what the Scollons term the "grammar of context," which subsumes the slightly modified components of the ethnography of speaking. Their discussion of "scene," "key," "participants," "message form," and "sequence" concludes with the treatment of two important aspects of the grammar of context: co-occurrence patterns, and types of manifestation. This allows the Scollons to raise the issue of markedness, which is at the heart of recognizing patterns other than one's own, and to discuss the reasons why certain components of the grammar of context are communicated explicitly, and others tacitly.

"Interpersonal politeness and power" is the focus of Chap. 3. After introducing notions such as communicative style or register, face, and representative linguistic strategies of involvement and independence, the Scollons cover the three main dimensions – power, distance, and weight – whose various combinations underlie three politeness systems: deference, solidarity, and hierarchy. A major point is that power permeates all types of politeness (in either assessing or mis-assessing the hierarchy in a relationship), and this leads them to claim that "there is no NON-HIERARCHICAL communication" (49).

Chap. 4, "Conversational inference: Interpretation in spoken discourse," covers the nuts and bolts of discourse analysis – from low-level cohesive devices, such as verb forms and conjunction, to cognitive schemata and prosodic patterning. The chapter ends with a discussion of how we understand discourse, explicating notions such as message, metamessage, and contextualization cues. The authors conclude that speakers resort to "interactive intelligence," i.e. the ability to "draw inferences from ambiguous information" (73, a term borrowed from Stephen Levinson), in order to resolve the inherent ambiguity of communication. In this, as in the preceding chapter, the authors provide examples that illustrate differences between North American and East Asian discourse patterns. I found their treatment of the conjunction 'because' in Asian discourse rather illuminating, although some undergraduate students find it a little too technical.

In Chap. 5, "Topic and face: Inductive and deductive patterns in discourse," the Scollons discuss the connection between topic and face; and they delineate two well-known rhetorical strategies – inductive and deductive patterns of discourse. They map these onto the politeness systems introduced earlier by associating the deductive strategy with involvement, and the inductive with independence. This chapter addresses various related topics, such as parameters that affect these two strategies (e.g. ingroup/outgroup membership and Confucian teachings). It also refers to written discourse, in particular the essay and press release; and it highlights issues of "true" authorship by addressing the question of implied author and reader – an important aspect that tends to be overlooked in reading texts of this type.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500272047 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Chap. 6, "Ideologies of discourse," briefly addresses different definitions of discourse, and then focuses on discourse as "the study of whole communications" (95). The authors first identify four components of this type of discourse – forms of discourse, face systems, socialization, and ideology – and then discuss the historical and philosophical context that has given prominence to "CBS" style (Clarity, Brevity, Sincerity) as the preferred form of discourse within a broader "U" (Utilitarian) system of communication system. This chapter departs from the rest in that it takes a diachronic perspective in providing evidence of the emergence of the U system; this at times makes undergraduate students question its place within a cross-cultural communication course. However, it is only after students comprehend the consequences of blindly accepting one system as the norm that they realize how valuable and pertinent all this information is. The chapter concludes by making some important points about the impact of the U system on its members and non-members – as well as on other, concurrent discourse systems.

Chap. 7, "What is culture? Intercultural communication and stereotyping" is devoted to culture and its impact on the four components of a discourse system. Besides covering ideology and different types of socialization, the Scollons examine several binary oppositions that represent the component forms of discourse. For example, they discuss how language indexes information/relationship, negotiation/ratification, and group harmony vs. individual welfare. They then consider the role of non-verbal communication as a form of discourse; and they conclude with several categories of social organization (e.g. kinship, ingroup/outgroup) within the component of face systems. The chapter concludes with a discussion of different types of stereotypes, and with the motivation to look at communication as an interdiscourse system. In this chapter the authors emphasize, first, that it is individuals who communicate to each other, not cultures; and second, that the values and concepts presented are relative rather than absolute. Although I understand the motivation behind postponing the treatment of culture until this point, readers would have benefited if parts of this chapter had been incorporated into Chap. 1. If readers (especially those who are new to the field of intercultural communication) had learned from Chap. 1 the definition of culture, its effect on intercultural communication, and the dangers of lumping and solidarity fallacies, they could avoid falling into the trap of stereotyping; they would be aware from the beginning of the qualifications and disclaimers that the Scollons make.

At this point, the book shifts to cover specific interdiscourse systems – starting with two that the Scollons characterize as "voluntary" systems, in that a member may opt to participate in either or both. More specifically, Chap. 8, "Corporate discourse," and Chap. 9, "Professional discourse" (as applied to ESL professionals) act as exemplifications of the discourse system components discussed in Chap. 6. Both these chapters underscore several points that the authors want to convey: (a) the inability of the U system to account for all types of discourse systems and their respective ideologies, and (b) the conflict that may arise as a

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500272047 Published online by Cambridge University Press

result of a speaker's membership in more than one system. Another pertinent issue highlighted here is the dilemma that one faces when the values of the two systems, or the forms of discourse, or even the sets of face relationships are different. As the Scollons admit, these two chapters raise a lot of questions; e.g., how broadly or narrowly should one define "corporate discourse"? They give readers things to ponder, rather than solutions – which reflects the authors' disinclination to create rigid and unrealistic category boundaries.

The concluding Chap. 10, "Generational discourse," and Chap. 11, "Gender discourse," serve as exemplifications of two "involuntary" discourse systems. Chap. 10 first presents four generations – Authoritarian, Depression/War, Baby Boom, and Infochild – and traces their similarities and differences in light of the four discourse components explicated in Chap. 6. The Scollons provide an accurate synopsis of broad categories of North American generations, although these are not matched in Asia (they only allude to informal Korean perceptions of similar trends). However, the authors acknowledge that the categories are very broad, and do not necessarily include people of other ethnic groups. As they put it, it is the impact that a population has had on American culture that makes it worth characterizing as "American."

The chapter on gender builds almost exclusively on the work of Tannen 1990, as informed by the cross-cultural model. In particular, it covers dimensions such as connection/status, rapport/report, and community/contest as they apply to American men and women. One is left to ponder to what extent these dimensions apply in Asia, despite the Scollons' claim that these differences between men's and women's talk exist in all cultures. Some readers may find the treatment of gender research to be rather narrow in scope, in light of the existing volumes of scholarly work on language and gender. However, the Scollons' intention was not to exhaust the issue of gender discourse, but rather to provide a theoretically powerful model as a point of reference to other types of discourse patterns that affect intercultural communication.

Chap. 11 concludes by highlighting some of the important claims the Scollons have made in earlier chapters, of which I will mention two: (a) one cannot be a FULL member of all the simultaneous discourse systems to which one belongs; and (b) one has to search for "differences AND commonalities" (251) within a discourse system, rather than expecting and discovering only differences.

Overall, I find this book unique, as the only work on intercultural communication, with a discourse analysis perspective, that integrates many theories yet offers new insights. From a pedagogical perspective, however, I found it lacking in the elements that make a real textbook. If the book was intended as more than a reference book for professional communicators with interest in interdiscourse communication (xii), then the inclusion of any of the following would have greatly enhanced its pedagogical value: questions for discussion or reflection, suggestions for exercises or projects, a summary of key terms and definitions at the end of each chapter, and suggestions for further reading grouped by topic.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500272047 Published online by Cambridge University Press

I did not expect the Scollons to address the question of how their theory of interdiscourse systems agrees (or not) with postmodern theories of the fragmented self, since their model assumes (or doesn't?) a unified self; but I couldn't help thinking in those terms. Could we argue that different types of discourse forms, as used in different discourse systems, represent different laminations of the self? Perhaps the Scollons will answer this question if they write a new version of their book, which I hope they will, with a broader audience in mind, and without the constant juxtaposition of two main cultures – which, despite the authors' best intentions (and as Tannen 1998 demonstrates), leads to binarity.

REFERENCES

Tannen, Deborah (1990). *You just don't understand: Women and men in conversation*. New York: Morrow.

______ (1998). *The argument culture: Moving from debate to dialogue*. New York: Random House.

(Received 5 March 1995)

RUTH WODAK (ed.), *Gender and discourse*. (Sage studies in discourse.) London (UK) & Thousand Oaks (CA): Sage, 1997. Pp. ix, 303. Pb $27.95.

HELGA KOTTHOFF & RUTH WODAK (eds.), *Communicating gender in context*. (Pragmatics and beyond, n.s., 42.) Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1998. Pp. xxv, 424. Hb $114.00.

Reviewed by JOANNA THORNBORROW
Centre for Language and Communication Research
Cardiff University, P.O. Box 94
Cardiff CF10 3XB, Wales, UK
thornborrowjl@cardiff.ac.uk

These two collections of articles offer a spectrum of current work in the field of language and gender. Contributors to both volumes include some leading researchers in sociolinguistics and discourse analysis from Britain, America, and New Zealand; the Kotthoff & Wodak book also contains work by contributors from Germany, Sweden, Holland, and Austria. Despite the latter volume's stated aim of bridging the gap in scholarly awareness between Europe and the English-speaking world, we are in effect still dealing with work from a particular section of Europe, i.e. essentially northern European and Germanic countries. With the exception of one study of Spanish women's talk, southern and Mediterranean Europe are still largely absent from the language and gender research scene presented here.

Between them, the two volumes contain a very broad collection of studies dealing with a range of different issues. There are analyses of grammatical gender and representation, of interactional communicative patterns, and of institutional discourse practices. *Gender and discourse* (*G&D*), as the title suggests, is more specifically focused on discourse, mainly spoken, although there is one textual

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500272047 Published online by Cambridge University Press

analysis of Australian women's magazines (Suzanne Eggins & Rick Iedema); *Communicating gender in context* (*CGC*) also contains studies of code-switching differences between men and women (Jenny Cheshire & Penelope Gardner-Chloros) and of the prosodic features of interruptions (Sylvia Moosmuller). Although the methodological approaches represented here vary considerably – from empirical studies of naturally occurring talk, to very broad discussions of women's role in education and academia – both collections are theoretically and critically concerned with the social construction of gender, and with the relationships among power, gender, and discourse as a social practice.

The opening chapter in *G&D* is a theoretical "scene-setter" by Deborah Cameron, who reviews the background to the difference/dominance debate, and discusses the implications of postmodernist notions of gender as performance. She argues for a move away from global generalizations about language and gender, toward more local accounts of discourse as "practice" which will reveal intra- as well as inter-group differences: "Though it is obvious gender relations (which are power relations) affect which practices people engage in and under what conditions, the introduction of practice as a variable makes the language-gender relation a mediated one" (34). Victoria DeFrancisco takes up this theme in a polemical call for feminist researchers in language and communication to make their work more clearly relevant to the real concerns of international women's movements and campaigns for human rights. She argues that this can be achieved by focusing analysis on power, and particularly on discursive strategies of resistance to power. Many of these studies are based on data collected from educational and academic contexts, from media discourse, and from talk in the workplace in countries where women's access to traditionally male-dominated domains is slowly beginning to widen; for these reasons, DeFrancisco's point is perhaps a pertinent one. Many of the "communities of practice" presented for discussion here (Eckert 1990, Eckert & McConnell-Ginet 1992) are still predominantly white, educated, professional, middle-class, and from industrially developed countries.

Inevitably, with such a diverse range of work, there are both strong and weak moments in each book. I found some of the analytic frameworks too cumbersome to be really useful, while others tended towards the over-simplistic. In some essays, possibly owing to problems of translation, the writing is rather opaque. However, rather than single out the disappointments, I will focus on those articles that I personally found most significant. These preferences are of course shaped by my own research interests and background, and other readers may disagree entirely.

From *G&D*, the high points for me included Bonnie McElhinny's challenging discussion of what constitutes "institutional" and "ordinary" discourse. In her account of private and public spheres of language as ideological, cultural constructs – which mask hierarchies of gender, class and ethnicity – she claims that "'institutional' and 'ordinary', like the terms 'public' and 'private', are best understood ... as cultural classifications and ideological labels that are differently applied in different social situations by different people" (127). McElhinny makes

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500272047 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the important point that the analytical division of talk into either one or the other category often obscures cross-contextual features of interaction; in other words, it obscures what might be discourses of resistance in institutional contexts (particularly those state welfare, legal, and medical institutions that serve mainly women and minority communities), and what might be discourses of power in ordinary contexts.

Amy Sheldon's study of preschool girls' dispute sequences challenges another dichotomy inherent in many accounts of gender "difference," in questioning the notion that girls' talk is necessarily motivated by a spirit of collaboration and cooperation. She found that the girls in her study neither avoided conflict nor were incompetent at resolving it; rather, they developed complex ways of negotiating dissent while maintaining their play (238). Sheldon argues for an analytic framework which can examine "the powerful and constructive ways that [girls and women] put opposition and resistance to work in their discourse and social interactions" (240); and like many other contributors to this volume, she proposes a re-theorizing of gender – away from stereotypical binary categories, and toward a more complex, diverse view of male and female behavior in the world.

Other essays in this volume include Shari Kendall & Deborah Tannen's review of research into discourse in the workplace, with suggestions for an approach to gender and power relations based on Goffman's (1977) notion of "framing"; Jennifer Coates's chapter on talk and women's friendships; and Nora Rathzel's discussion of gender and racism in students' perceptions of German and Turkish women and men.

In *CGC*, Susanne Gunthner's analysis of the function of complaint stories between women, when maintaining co-alignment in social relationships, is thoughtful and detailed; among other things, it deals very well with the problems of translation in transcription from German to English. (I suspect the whole question of how to translate data transcripts should be receiving a lot more thought and attention than is generally the case.) Christine Bierbach's study of communicative styles between women and men in meetings of a Barcelona neighborhood association is a step in the direction of shifting research focus away from middle-class professionals, and of looking at interaction in a working-class, Mediterranean culture. Bierbach found that the women in her study were active and dominant in talk in this particular context. She suggests that in Spain, as in many other cultures, high-status institutional contexts are not favorable to women's communicative styles and abilities (126). In the context of Bierbach's study, where the participants knew each other – and where there was close involvement with local issues, a clear function within the organization, and some previous experience of civic or political organizations – the women's discursive behavior contradicted widespread stereotypes regarding women's speech. Women's disadvantaged position in other institutional contexts is brought out by Helga Kotthoff's discussion of the interactional achievement of expert status on Austrian television, and in Britt-Louise Gunnarson's analysis of talk in seminars in a Swedish university.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500272047 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Also worth mention from *CGC* are Suzanne Romaine's wide-ranging discussion of gender, grammar, and "the space-in-between"; Friederike Braun's analysis of the "man" (male as norm) principle, based on translations of scholarly articles on Finnish, which is a "genderless" language in the sense that pronouns are not sex-differentiated and there are no classifying articles for nouns; and Ulrike Ahren's technical but well-supported essay on preference organization and interruption in contexts of impending or established disagreement. From a totally different methodological angle, the paper by Cheshire & Gardner-Chloros, on communicating gender in two languages, broadens the scope of sociolinguistic research into comparative studies of gender and code-switching patterns in Greek-Cypriot and Punjabi communities in Britain.

Although these two volumes present a view of current perspectives and concerns in language and gender research, they also point usefully to some future needs – most notably the need to extend research into the parts that most discourse analysts find difficult to reach, i.e. communities outside of those that have generally been the main focus of analysis to date; the need to be aware of diversity in contextualized practices of interaction; and, on a more technical note, the need to attend to details of accessibility of data through transcription and translation, if the gaps between all our cultures and communities of practice are to be usefully and successfully bridged.

REFERENCES

Eckert, Penelope (1990). The whole woman: Sex and gender differences in variation. *Language Variation and Change* 1:245–67.

______ & McConnell-Ginet, Sally (1992). Think practically and look locally: Language and gender as community-based practice. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 21:461–90.

Goffman, Erving (1977). The arrangement between the sexes. *Theory and Society* 4:301–31.

(Received 4 January 1999)

Anne Pauwels, *Women changing language*. (Real language series). London & New York: Addison Wesley Longman, 1998. Pp. xvi, 267. Hb £40.00, pb £14.99.

Reviewed by Deborah Cameron
Language in Education, Institute of Education
London University, 20 Bedford Way
London WC1H 0AL, England
d.cameron@ioe.ac.uk

This is a book about feminist language reform. The subject is not exactly neglected; since the late 1970s there has been no shortage either of practical guides to nonsexist language (for English see, *inter alia*, Miller & Swift 1980) or of historical, descriptive, and theoretical discussions (book-length examples include Nilsen et al. 1977, Vetterling-Braggin 1981, and Baron 1986). Pauwels's text is primarily descriptive, though it also has theoretical and practical elements; there is an appendix advising on how to draft nonsexist language guidelines.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500272047 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Like most previous work on this subject, it is written by a self-identified feminist, and one who is clearly sympathetic to the general project of feminist language reform. But that is not to say that Pauwels breaks no new ground: in fact, *Women changing language* has two important distinguishing features.

First, whereas the vast majority of existing texts deal exclusively with one language (or occasionally two, in the context of official bilingualism), Pauwels has set out to provide a wide-ranging comparative treatment of contemporary feminist language practices. Not surprisingly, she includes a good deal of material drawn from the (mainly European) languages that have already attracted most discussion in this context – e.g. Dutch, English, German, the Scandinavian languages, French, Italian, Spanish, Polish, and Russian; however, she also makes reference to less discussed and/or non-European languages such as Arabic, (written) Chinese, Hebrew, Japanese, and Lithuanian. The second distinctive feature is Pauwels's definition of feminist language reform as a type of language planning (LP). As she says, it is unusual for analyses of feminist linguistic reform to be situated in a language-planning framework: "To this day the fast-growing literature on LP has largely ignored the issue of feminist LR [language reform]" (xi). Conversely, writers on feminist LR itself have tended not to make links with other kinds of planned language change. Pauwels contends that both camps could benefit from making the connections.

The structure of the book reflects the LP approach. There are seven main chapters. Chap. 1 explains LP and its relevance to the feminist project; Chap. 2 surveys the forms that sexism takes across a range of languages; Chaps. 3–4 address the arguments for and against reform; Chap. 5 discusses implementation (including a useful analysis of a corpus of 136 sets of guidelines, dealing with six languages and produced in 14 different countries). Chap. 6 focuses on evaluation, and Chap. 7 assesses the extent of actual change. A strength of these chapters is their attention to detail. Sample guidelines from several languages are reproduced; varying solutions to the same problem are described and compared, both within and across languages; and resistance to feminist reform is illustrated with many real-life instances.

A number of Pauwels's general observations are worth highlighting. It is interesting that feminists in very different societies and language communities have developed strikingly similar concerns about the role of language use in reproducing sex inequality. Recurrent concerns include the unmarked or generic function of masculine-gendered terms – a consideration relevant to both "natural" and "grammatical" gender languages, particularly as it applies to personal pronouns; the persistent sexualization and associated pejoration of terms that refer to women; and the marking of women's status as subordinates (or property) through practices of naming and address. It might seem reasonable to suppose that, even if the perceived problems are similar across cultures, the proposed solutions would vary, being systematically related to the specific characteristics of particular language systems. However, Pauwels shows that this supposition is simplistic; structural con-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500272047 Published online by Cambridge University Press

siderations interact with ideological ones. Certain reforms may be advocated less because they work with the grain of a given language than because they symbolize important non-linguistic principles. Feminists who would like gender distinctions to become redundant may advocate gender-neutral terms wherever possible, whereas those who wish to emphasize women's difference may advocate the use of parallel feminine and masculine terms – whether or not this is the most "logical" approach to the language in question. (Both approaches have been suggested for English, though its grammar arguably makes the first by far the more logical choice.) Consequently, different nonsexist conventions may prevail in structurally very similar languages, or even in different varieties of the same language.

Pauwels herself seems to feel that feminists should pay more attention to systemic factors; she suggests that certain innovations have been poorly received for avoidable technical reasons. Thus advocating the adoption of gender-specific occupational titles is an effective strategy in German, where speakers can generate feminine terms easily; there is only one productive suffix (*-in*). But in Dutch there are several such suffixes, and uncertainty about which to use in a given case may prompt less committed speakers to return to the traditional generic masculine. The English all-purpose female title *Ms* remains relatively unpopular, which may partly reflect the simple fact that many people are unsure how to pronounce it – whether to insert a vowel, and if so, which. In France, Germany, and the Netherlands, the same goal of abolishing marital status distinctions has been pursued with greater success by selecting one of the existing terms as the standard title for all adult women. I would be cautious about any general claim that the most successful reforms must also be the most linguistically "natural"; I have argued elsewhere (Cameron 1995) that the impulse to verbal hygiene is a strong one, and regularly leads people to do some very unnatural things with their languages. But the question is certainly worth asking, and it shows what might be gained by adopting an LP perspective on gender issues.

Another interesting point concerns what is left out of most versions of feminist language reform. Most guidelines on nonsexist language concentrate on prescribing and proscribing the use of individual WORDS, with a secondary focus on general principles governing word-formation and gender concord, where those are salient issues. Sexism can also be manifested in other ways – e.g., analyses of the grammatical choices made in texts may reveal regular patterns in relation to phenomena like topicalization and transivity – but reformers rarely address such subtleties. Possibly this reflects the folk-lingustic tendency to equate language with vocabulary, so that anything above word level simply goes unremarked; it may also reflect institutional factors, insofar as many officially sponsored reform initiatives have been motivated by the need for nonsexist occupational titles in the wake of equality legislation. But in addition, sexism at the level of the sentence and text cannot easily be addressed using the strategy of "form replacement" – the simple substitution of one surface form for another in all contexts. That is by far the most prevalent strategy in all the materials that Pauwels exam-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500272047 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ines, and she is one of an increasing number of feminist linguists who are drawing attention to its inherent limitations (cf. Ehrlich & King 1992, Cameron 1998).

Pauwels, then, is not uncritical in her assessment of feminist language reform; like a lot of other language planners down the ages, feminists have made errors because their political enthusiasm for change exceeded their understanding of the systems in which they were trying to intervene. However, the positive quality that Pauwels wants to stress, in her account of feminist reform as a type of language planning, is the AGENCY of those involved. She observes that women have been persistently represented as passive in relation to language. Stereotyped as school-marms enforcing arbitrary prescriptions on behalf of male authorities, or as *précieuses* who resist "indecency" with lifeless euphemism and circumlocution, they are rarely credited with any active involvement in coining new terms and making rules of their own. Even some well-known feminist writers have tended to emphasize women's position as the hapless inheritors of an overwhelmingly "man made language" (Spender 1980). But the activities of feminist language reformers over the past 25 years – some of them extraordinarily successful, in the sense that feminist conventions have become the dominant conventions – give the lie to these stereotypes. Pauwels is to be commended, not only for giving us this thorough account of why and how women have gone about changing languages, but also for taking their aspirations seriously – offering criticism, as well as giving credit where it is due.

This is a useful teaching text, accessibly written and copiously illustrated with examples. With Pauwels on the reading list, there will no longer be any excuse for students to produce the naïve, anglocentric observations familiar to many of us who teach this topic. Nor will it be so easy for certain colleagues to maintain their erroneous beliefs about nonsexist language unchallenged. I wish I had a dollar for every time I have been told that linguistic antisexism is a peculiarly anglophone obsession; that it is irrelevant or impossible in languages with more elaborate gender systems than English; that its proponents all advocate the same changes on the basis of the same arguments; that it is doomed to be ineffectual in the real world – or conversely, that it has been so effective as to constitute a species of Orwellian linguistic tyranny. All this is nonsense; and thanks to Pauwels's scholarship, we now have the evidence collected in one place, in detail and in writing.

People who disapprove of women changing language may dislike *Women changing language*, but they will ignore its factual information at their peril. Others – researchers, teachers, and students interested in language and gender, as well as language planning scholars, feminist language activists, and anyone responsible for institutional policy on non-discriminatory language use – will welcome it as a valuable contribution to the literature.

REFERENCE

Baron, Dennis (1986). *Grammar and gender*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
Cameron, Deborah (1995). *Verbal hygiene*. London: Routledge.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500272047 Published online by Cambridge University Press

______ (1998). Lost in translation? In D. Cameron (ed.), *The feminist critique of language: A reader*, 2nd edn., 155–63. London: Routledge.
Ehrlich, Susan, & King, Ruth (1992). Gender-based language reform and the social construction of meaning. *Discourse & Society* 3:151–66.
Miller, Casey, & Swift, Kate (1980). *The handbook of nonsexist writing.* New York: Lippincott & Crowell.
Nilsen, Alleen Pace; Bosmajian, Haig; Gershuny, H. Lee; & Stanley, Julia P. (1977). *Sexism in language*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
Spender, Dale (1980). *Man made language*. London: Pandora.
Vetterling-Braggin, Mary (1981), ed. *Sexist language: A modern philosophical analysis*. Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Littlefield.

(Received 10 February 1999)

Susan Hoyle & Carolyn Temple Adger (eds.), *Kids talk: Strategic language use in later childhood*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press, 1998. Pp. xv, 290. Hb $75.00, pb $35.00.

Reviewed by Tony Wootton
Sociology, University of York
York YO1 5DD, England
ajw5@york.ac.uk

This is a book containing reports of original research on children aged somewhere between seven and eighteen. All the contributors are based in the US, and with one exception all the thirteen studies were also carried out in the US; the exception, by Marilyn Merritt, also incorporates material from work which she has done in various parts of the African continent. Taken together, the studies cover many aspects of these young people's lives – home, school, playground, voluntary group meetings and work schemes. In most cases, one is struck by the extensive fieldwork which lies behind these research reports. Long periods of observation seem to be commonplace; and the efforts are impressive because, as Shirley Brice Heath points out in her chapter, obtaining naturalistic data from young people of this age can pose problems regarding both access and quality of data. In almost all cases, a corpus of audio or audio-visual recordings forms a basis for at least part of the analysis, though chapters are generally written so as to focus on only a small set of conversation extracts – a strategy which often does little justice to the range of data gathered within the research.

The studies explore various specific themes. Several are concerned with gender differences, and one, by Marjorie Goodwin, takes this as its principal focus. Through close examination of games of hopscotch, she clearly shows how girls engage in various forms of dispute and conflict, and that these involve them in using and contesting rules in ways which belie their depiction within much prior research. A more common focus, however, is ethnicity, particularly the ways in which non-White children of various ethnic backgrounds construct and alter their speech in different social contexts. These studies range from Signithia Fordham's undersupported claims that some Black people switch their whole speech style (e.g. their

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500272047 Published online by Cambridge University Press

narrative structure) when moving into, say, educational circles, to Carolyn Adger's careful and lucid account of the circumstances in which Black children deploy morpho-syntactic dialect features in register shifting. Particularly interesting is Adger's claim that among fourth and fifth graders, standard English forms are adopted in classroom speech activities which involve the speaker in taking up an authoritative stance of some kind. Further studies, especially those of Lynn McCreedy and Shirley Brice Heath, investigate the consequences of engaging in different kinds of instruction regime. McCreedy compares, over time, two classrooms in which primary-level special education students were exposed to a new program for encouraging higher-level thinking skills; Heath examines some of the linguistic consequences for young people of working with adult trainers in youth training organizations. In both cases the chapter-length reports of these writers are clearly somewhat abbreviated accounts of what would be necessary in order to give some proper evaluation of whether their case is empirically compelling. This point is also true of the chapter by Ana Celia Zentella, on code-switching among the New York Puerto Rican working class, and that of Donna Eder, concerned with the connections between gender, youth culture and storytelling among middle-school children. These are something in the way of fragments from much broader research programs. Nevertheless, all these accounts provide us with a clear picture of the social processes in question, and Heath's chapter is full of useful information and balanced insight.

Other studies, or parts of studies, take as their focus the detailed investigation of more particular speech activities. For example, Susan Hoyle demonstrates the locally achieved and collaborative nature of register and footing changes in the pretence of three male 8–10-year-olds. Jennifer Schlegel examines the ways in which word searches are conducted among a group of children sitting around a table, and shows that the manner of their verbal and non-verbal execution has a number of implications for such questions as who are ratified participants, and whether the process succeeds in coming up with the word in question. The chapter by Catherine Emihovich contains, among other things, an interesting account of story-telling among 14–16-year-old black females.

Many contributions to the volume show a conceptual reliance on notions like FRAME and FOOTING, as used by Erving Goffman. However, the manner in which the writers use these concepts is variable. Some use them only in the course of glossing what is taking place in transcripts, implying that their significance and relevance are almost self-evident. Others – such as Goodwin, Hoyle, and Schlegel – take the position (more fruitful, in my view) that the job of the analyst is to demonstrate, from within the details of the talk, how the participants themselves are displaying an orientation to such matters. In the latter essays, one gets the sense that the analysis is built out of the materials of the talk. But sometimes when this strategy is attempted, as in the chapter by Stuart Tannock on noisy, overlapping talk in a youth writing group, this strategy is less successful; in part, this is due to the writer's unfamiliarity with the various properties of overlapping talk,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500272047 Published online by Cambridge University Press

especially those revealed within the literature on conversation analysis. Other facets of Goffman's interactional orientation are well represented in the piece by Marilyn Merritt. This has a useful discussion of the various contingencies which surround the teacher and child when the child wants to divert the teacher's attention from the latter's involvement with another pupil. Merritt draws our attention to cross-cultural comparisons in these respects, and her findings also suggest that the solutions to these contingencies could form a focus for developmental research.

One of my interests in reading this book was to find out more about dialogic aspects of children's development; and this interest was heightened by the editors' reference to this developmental dimension in their useful introduction. In part, my interest was prompted by research on pre-school children. This has focused around activity systems like requesting, narrating, and clarification; so one might expect to learn more about the subsequent development of these activities in a book of this kind. But my interest was also prompted by research on adults. For example, research on politeness and face, together with that on the various preference systems identified within conversation analysis, might lead one to expect careful exploration of these generic parameters in mid to late childhood. On both these counts, the book falls short of expectation. Developmental issues are touched on by Heath, and no doubt chapters like Hoyle's contain information that could become part of some developmental argument; but all in all, there appears to be a dearth of attention to what seem to be important lines of connection between the years immediately preceding ages 7–18 and those afterward. What this book does seem to do is give a good overview of current leading research in the US concerning the talk and interaction of children in mid to late childhood. For those with an interest in this field, it should prove most useful.

(Received 15 March 1999)

NANCY AINSWORTH-VAUGHN, *Claiming power in doctor–patient talk*. (Oxford studies in sociolinguistics.) Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press. 1998. Pp. xii, 212. Pb $19.95.

Reviewed by VAI RAMANATHAN
Linguistics, University of California
Davis, CA 95616
vramanathan@ucdavis.edu

Devoted to addressing various aspects of doctor–patient interactions, this comprehensive volume explores how patient-subjectivities get positioned and constructed as turns unfold into each other in ongoing interactions. Though recent research in conversation and narrative analysis has addressed features of patient-talk (Hamilton 1995, Ferrara 1994), few writers have seriously considered how issues of power are embedded in the language that patients and doctors use to

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500272047 Published online by Cambridge University Press

each other, as well as in the genres that contain the talk. AV adds to our knowledge of these critical issues through an in-depth, incisive analysis of her data.

AV sets up her theoretical framework in Chap. 2, where she addresses various ways in which power is claimed by patients and physicians. Using an excerpt of talk as her fulcrum, she explores the ways that power is couched in a series of turns – questions, responses, hesitations, and interruptions – as well as in the specialized knowledge that physicians have. Power, as she puts it, is a process that is "constructed moment-to-moment during interaction, with all participants being involved, in turn, either as its claimers or ratifiers" (42).

In Chap. 3, AV calls attention to the important question of how these interactions vary according to gender. Connecting her points to distinctions between coherence and cohesion, she establishes how cohesion is tied directly to listening and to the respect shown by the (male) listener: "Cohesion is important as a display of listenership. Listenership displays imply respect for other speakers' rights to co-construct the topic" (61). Placing various turns on a continuum (with unilateral moves toward one end of the spectrum, and reciprocal moves toward the other), she deduces that dominant behavior by male doctors, typically characterized by their initiation of topic changes, increases the risk that important medical decisions may be inappropriate.

Chaps. 4–5 are devoted to examining the multifunctionality of questions. In Chap. 4, AV examines how questions linguistically mark a claiming of power, and how previous research has shown doctor–patient interactions to be "interviews" in which doctors do most of the questioning. After a detailed quantitative analysis, based on questions raised by both doctors and patients in a variety of frames and contexts, AV concludes that the term "interview" is inappropriate to describe these interactions. Her data show that patients, on the whole, ask more questions than previously thought; thus she believes that doctor–patient interactions should really be termed "medical encounters," since this would partially acknowledge the increasing participation and power that patients demonstrate through their use of questions. Her analysis also accounts for the role of gender in doctor–patient talk: Patients tend to ask more questions of female doctors than of their male counterparts.

In Chap. 5, AV studies rhetorically ambiguous questions – which, she maintains, can serve multiple pragmatic functions: "We can have utterances that are ambiguous in discourse function (social meaning), as well as those ambiguous in referential meaning ... a third 'level of ambiguity' is the ambiguity of voice ... that is ... 'who is talking?' " (106). AV finds that physicians often use rhetorical questions to mitigate their commands ("Why don't you have a seat on the THRONE here," or "Why don't we just do THIS first?" – author's emphasis), or when making requests to examine patients' bodies. Patients, by contrast, seem to use such questions to criticize physicians or to engage in face-threatening behavior.

Other issues that AV covers include an examination of ways in which the co-construction of illness allows patients to make sense of their condition and the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500272047 Published online by Cambridge University Press

diagnoses offered to them (Chaps. 6–7). Doctors, through their general participation – interruptions, topic changes, evaluative statements, and particular uses of pitch – demonstrate involvement in the patients' lives and stories, which helps patients deal with their ailments and treatments better than they otherwise would. The book also includes a chapter addressing practical ways in which the "ideal" doctor should behave so as to generate a "successful" medical encounter.

Overall, this volume is valuable for all researchers in discourse analysis, but particularly so for those engaged in research in medical settings. Its style is engaging and readable, the analysis trenchant and penetrating, the overall argument critical and sound. I unhesitatingly recommend it.

REFERENCES

Ferrara, Kathleen (1994). *Therapeutic ways with words*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.

Hamilton, Heidi (1994). *Conversations with an Alzheimer patient*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.

(Received 30 October 1998)

Mara B. Adelman & Lawrence R. Frey, *The fragile community: Living together with AIDS*. (Everyday communication: Case studies of behavior in context.) Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 1997. Pp. xii, 128. Hb $36.00, pb $16.50.

Reviewed by Anssi Peräkylä
Social Psychology, University of Tampere
PO Box 607, 33101 Tampere, Finland
anssi.perakyla@uta.fi

In his book *The sacred canopy*, Peter Berger wrote, that in the last analysis, "society" is people banded together in the face of death (1967:51). Adelman and Frey have written a small but fascinating study about this very topic. Theirs is an ethnographic study on a residential facility called Bonaventure House (BH), run by a Catholic order, the Alexian Brothers of America. The residents suffer from AIDS; and during the time of the study, BH was for most of them their last home before death. Using participant observation, interviews and questionnaires, Adelman & Frey set out to study how community is built and sustained in these circumstances: People afflicted by a dreaded illness share their everyday lives; death occurs regularly; and the departed are replaced by new people, who become part of the community.

The empirical analysis is presented in three parts. In the first, the authors describe the entry experience and socialization of new residents. The discussion is linked with earlier theories about organizational behavior and socialization. Along with accounting for the newcomers' experiences, Adelman & Frey describe on a more general level the symbolic construction of a community at BH. Two key metaphors used by both staff and residents are "family" and "commu-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500272047 Published online by Cambridge University Press

nity," and the development of BH has entailed movement from the use of the former to the use of the latter.

The second empirical part of the study deals with the dynamics of everyday life at BH. In particular, the authors focus on AFFECTION and POWER, which they consider "the dominant concerns of everyday interaction." They have identified some intriguing paradoxes. Quarrels at BH, they suggest, have dual functions: They are not only about discord, but are also displays of solidarity. Helping weaker residents is often done and appreciated, but it is also considered to involve a risk of "pampering." One of the residents is cited as saying: "Everyone wants their own private slave. They think they're dying and they can behave any way they want." Moreover, expressing concerns about others' health involves a dilemma: Supportive gestures can be interpreted as intrusive, and they may deflate the recipient's self-esteem.

In the third, empirical part, the book deals most directly with the theme raised by Berger thirty years ago. In the beginning of this section (the book's most original one), the authors remind us that the greatest threat to any community is the loss of its members. In this sense, BH constituted an extreme case: At the time of the study, it was to be expected at any moment that, in the following 6–12-month period, the majority of the community's members would die and be replaced with others. In their response to the recurrent deaths, the residents had to cope with what the authors call DEPRESSION BIND. Being a part of the community was considered to entail grief when a member died; however, the residents were aware that grieving would do no good to their immune systems. In part, Adelman & Frey argue, this resulted in avoidance behavior in relation to members whose condition was deteriorating. In their field notes and interviews, the authors identified two key metaphors that the residents used to describe their relation to the dying members: WALLS refer to various practices of separation and their justification, and MIRRORS refer to the experience of oneness with the dying member. The end of this part describes various bereavement rituals that have evolved at BH. One involves simultaneous release of colored balloons by the residents, in memory of a departed member. Adelman & Frey take this to represent "symbolic reversal" of the "sad occasion of mourning into a celebration of relief and release."

The fragile community is an elegant ethnography on a very sensitive topic. The authors have managed very well the delicate balance between empathetic understanding of the experience of suffering, on one hand, and analytical insight on the other. At many points of the study, I wondered whether the processes that were described were GENERIC, i.e. things that could happen in any community, or SPECIFIC, i.e. things that take place in communal response to the specific tragic circumstances of BH. To these questions, the study does not always give an answer. In methodological terms, *Fragile community* is a nice exemplar of traditional but skillful interactionist work, successfully capturing the members' view of their community. The authors have also adopted what they call (following Robert F. Murphy) a DIALECTICAL perspective on social life, seeking to identify

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500272047 Published online by Cambridge University Press

contradictory elements in the social organization that they are studying. The contradictions that they successfully show us include tensions between privacy and communality, involvement and detachment, death and its symbolic reversal. In theoretical terms, Adelman & Frey refer to a wide variety of sources, including Erving Goffman, Victor Turner, Michel Foucault, Erik Erikson, Arnold van Gennep, and even Paul Tillich. This eclecticism is not harmful; rather, the various concepts help to elucidate life at Bonaventure House as a process of community formation in extreme circumstances.

REFERENCE

Berger, Peter (1967). *The sacred canopy: Elements of sociological theory of religion*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

(Received 7 February 1999)

Rajendra Singh (ed.), *The native speaker: Multilingual perspectives*. (Language and development, 4.) New Delhi & Thousand Oaks, CA, 1998. Pp. 226. Hb $34.95.

Reviewed by Rajend Mesthrie
Linguistics, University of Cape Town
Rondebosch 7700, South Africa
raj@beattie.uct.ac.za

What is a native speaker? This question has been taken for granted in linguistics, which has frequently taken as its starting point the monolingual community in which the native speaker is one who speaks the language "from the crib" (Singh, 40) throughout his or her life. In the idealized case, even for sociolinguistics, the native speaker has one native language which s/he speaks fluently: s/he is a rather "sedentary" person who is "uncontaminated" in significant ways by speakers of other languages (Salikoko Mufwene, 114).

The book under review (henceforth *TNS*) attempts – very successfully, in my view – to problematize the concept of the native speaker, on both logical and socio-politico-linguistic grounds. With regard to the latter, assigning nativeness from outside the speech community is bound to be problematic (Otto Ikome, 74), especially where the assignment is done by people born in "stayed back home" (Western) anglophone communities. *TNS* points to a reality ignored by current definitions of "native speaker": that the world is largely multilingual, even if globalization threatens to upset the current balance of languages. In many societies, it is not just individual speakers who are multilingual, but cohesive communities as well. In Ikome's example from Cameroon, a child whose parents speak Nonni and Ewondo may have both languages as "first languages," and may be exposed to Pidgin and Cameroon English from birth. The child may "sharpen

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500272047 Published online by Cambridge University Press

his linguistic reflexes in English and French better than he would those of his parents' preferred ethnic languages" (72).

The genesis of this book lies in an exchange among Rajendra Singh, Jean D'Souza, K. P. Mohanan, and N. S. Prabhu in the *Journal of Pragmatics* 24 (1995, pp. 283–94), entitled "On 'New/non-native Englishes': A quartet"; and a response, on invitation of the journal, by Evangelos Afendras, Sharon Millar, Eoghan Mac Aogain, Ayo Bamgbose, Yamuna Kachru, Anjum Saleemi, Bent Preisler, Peter Trudgill, Florian Coulmas, and Probal Dasgupta. Unfortunately, only Singh et al. 1995 is reprinted in *TNS*, not Afendras et al. 1995. A better sequence (copyright permitting) might have been: "Singh et al. + Afendras et al. + Singh again (the current introduction) + the rest of the chapters of *TNS*." As it is, *TNS* has two introductions: a long one by the series editor, U. N. Singh, and the one by Rajendra Singh. I suggest that the series editor's introduction, comprising an incisive overview and critique of the contributions to follow, would have been better placed as a postscript. Introductions that summarize chapters to follow, before the reader has a chance to read them, have always seemed an anomaly to me. When the summaries contain close criticisms, there is all the more reason to give the reader a chance to digest the arguments of the contributors first.

Michel Paradis, though sympathetic to the traditional native/non-native distinction, cautions: "Properly speaking, one is not a native speaker of a language, but of a given sociolect of a particular dialect. For example one is not really a native speaker of English, but a native speaker of upper-middle or lower-class Irish English, Scottish English, Tennessee English or Bangalore English (the lects can be even more narrowly differentiated" (205). Paradis supports the Critical Period Hypothesis, and cites evidence that the acquisition of morpho-syntax is sensitive to the age of first exposure. He retains the distinction between English as L1 and EFL, while accepting some multilinguals as native speakers. A speaker's native language is "the dialect acquired from the crib . . . acquired incidentally, stored implicitly, and available for automatic use" (207). However, taking proficiency into account (not just age of acquisition), Paradis concedes that a "quasi-native speaker" cannot be easily distinguished from a native speaker; this suggests (for Rajendra Singh, 40) a convergence of the cognitive and the neurolinguistic. The issue of fluency gains importance in the context of the argument of *TNS*, which therefore does not abandon all distinctions between varieties of a language. In particular, there still seems to be room for categories like EFL.

In some multilingual societies, a child may be said to have several native languages, with the order of acquisition not being an indicator of ability. John Gumperz remarked decades ago that multilingual speakers may switch languages according to situation in the way that monolingual speakers switch styles of the same language. At the heart of *TNS* is the belief that monolingualism is the marked case, a special instance of the multilingual prototype. Today's ideal speaker lives in a heterogeneous society (stratified along increasingly globalized lines), and regularly has to negotiate interactions with all sorts of people, representing all

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500272047 Published online by Cambridge University Press

sorts of power and solidarity positions. What is the ideal speaker a native speaker of? It is surely a polyphony of codes/languages working cumulatively (and sometimes complementarily), rather than a single first-learned code. These codes are appropriate to different functions or intersections of functions (one can, e.g., discuss philosophy with a friend). Attempts to define the nativeness of English (or other languages) globally, according to expectations of a mostly monolingual metropolis, may be bad logic. Furthermore, for Thiru Kandiah (92), "The mainstream discourse on the native speaker . . . can be seen to be a strongly normative discourse that is heavily invested ideologically against considerable numbers of people on our globe."

In connection with the native/non-native distinction, Singh has long held that the concept of a non-native variety of a language is something of a contradiction in terms (26). For him, the grammatical deviations found among fluent speakers of "New Englishes" or "World Englishes" are not qualitatively different from those between dialect and standard English, or between one historical stage of standard English and another. In a mathematical formulation, Singh argues (61) the following: (a) There is no structural feature *alpha* such that all "non-native" varieties of English have *alpha* and no "native" variety does; and (b) There is no structural feature *beta* such that no "native" variety of English has *beta* but some "non-native" varieties of English do. Complementary to this argument is Mufwene's insistence that language as a system "is partly inherited and partly being made by its speakers" (114), and that "uncontaminated" native speakers have no more authority than their "contaminated" counterparts, especially in the modern world.

We have had to live with the recognition that our discipline's most basic terms – like "language" (as opposed to "dialect") and "speech community" – cannot be scientifically defined. *TNS* shows that we will also have to add "native speaker" to that list. Its use depends on who has the power to do the naming, and what type of society s/he believes to be the norm. Linguists have always spoken out against the stigmatization of dialects in the face of the power and prestige of standard languages. *TNS* argues that it is time to recognize that uncritical adherence to the native/non-native dichotomy is an act of legitimation that goes against scientific enlightenment. We may have to view the traditional definition of a native variety as the language of a monolingual society which once had a colonial army and navy.

Some articles in *TNS* are over-polemical (though this is not to deny that some polemics are in order). Thiru Kandiah goes on a tirade against a particular journal editor for making corrections in the English of his contributors. The point is surely that ALL writing needs editing, regardless of whether the writer is a native speaker (by whatever definition). There is a jump made in his chapter (and some others) between "native speaker" and "writer." It is not very useful to point to the repertoires of writers like Joseph Conrad when discussing questions of nativeness, since the debate is essentially over speech. The chapter by Alan Ford, "As-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500272047 Published online by Cambridge University Press

pects of the grammar of the native and non-native speaker," is a bit self-indulgent; he uses the logic of language games to deconstruct the notion of native speaker into 57 rather dense formulations. More signposting of his logic in ordinary language, in the spirit of this book, would have been welcome.

TNS is a challenging book that all sociolinguists should read. The approaching millennium is likely to see a new world order of languages, with the spread of the few to the detriment of the many – as linguists like Michael Krauss and Ken Hale have warned. The issue raised in *TNS* will therefore be of immense socio-political and theoretical sociolinguistic significance.

REFERENCES

Afendras, Evangelos A., et al. (1995). On new/non-native Englishes: A gamelan. *Journal of Pragmatics* 24:295–321.

Singh, Rajendra, et al. (1995) On 'new/non-native' Englishes: A quartet. *Journal of Pragmatics* 24:283–94.

(Received 11 January 1999]

JOHN H. MCWHORTER, *Towards a new model of creole genesis*. (Studies in ethnolinguistics, 3.) New York: Lang, 1997. Pp. xiii, 199. Hb $44.95.

Reviewed by DONALD WINFORD
Linguistics, Ohio State University
Columbus, OH 43210
dwinford@ling.ohio-state.edu

This is an informative and quite stimulating book, which offers a detailed look at the nature of creole genesis with particular emphasis on the emergence of Saramaccan (SM), one of the maroon creoles spoken in Suriname. McWhorter describes himself in the preface as a member of the third generation of creolists – a generation not afraid to challenge the conventional wisdom in the field, or to offer alternative theories. This book has the rather ambitious aim of proposing a "systematic account of creolization which integrates a number of the processes which creolists have identified as contributing the structural form of these languages" (10). In pursuing it, McWhorter re-examines two key areas of SM syntax – serial verb constructions and the copula system – to support his own eclectic view of creole formation. Despite the date of publication, the book is essentially the same as McWhorter's doctoral dissertation, completed in 1993. Hence it is somewhat dated, and omits mention of much recent and current work on creole genesis.

Chap. 1, the introduction, evaluates the traditional theories of creole genesis; some are discounted as inadequate, while others are deemed at least partly relevant to McWhorter's own conception. For instance, he is sympathetic to the idea that "foreigner talk" (the "baby talk hypothesis") as well as substratum influence and "universals of some sort" (though not a language bioprogram) played sig-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500272047 Published online by Cambridge University Press

nificant roles in the creation of creoles. However, he discounts the claim that creoles are descended from non-standard regional dialects of the superstrates (the "superstratist hypothesis"), and he is inconclusive about the claim that all New World creoles had a common origin in an earlier Portuguese pidgin (the "monogenesis hypothesis"). Later in the book, however, he argues for a common African origin for all English-lexicon creoles of the New World.

The second half of the introduction focuses on SM, and presents reasons for the choice of this creole to illustrate the process of creole formation. McWhorter argues that SM is daughter to "Sranan," the early coastal plantation creole which developed into modern Sranan Tongo. He rejects Byrne's (1987) bioprogram-based view of SM genesis, arguing instead that the Saramaka "brought into the bush a mixed creole which had already taken form on the [Portuguese] Jews' plantations" near the coast (13). The early split of SM from its parent creole and its continued isolation, according to McWhorter, make it "one of the world's purest creoles," and hence an ideal choice to demonstrate the nature of creole formation.

In Chap. 2, McWhorter builds a case for West African substrate influence as a key factor in the genesis of SM, with evidence from serial verb constructions (SVCs). He provides an interesting list of similar SVCs in SM and various West African languages – citing Akan, Gbe, Yoruba, and Igbo as the most relevant substrates. He also surveys SVCs in a variety of other languages, including Chinese and various Southeast Asian and Pacific languages, to show that the similarities between SM and West African languages cannot be accidental. McWhorter's view of the significant role played by substratum influence in creole formation reflects a widespread, indeed dominant, view in the field today. Though he still regards Bickerton's Language Bioprogram Hypothesis (LBH) as "the most far-reaching attempt to date to account for the structure of creole languages" (9), the fact is that most current research is devoted to investigating the role of substrate influence and attendant ("universal") processes of contact-induced change in creole genesis. Still, McWhorter must be credited for being among those who challenged the LBH in the early 1990s, in a return to more traditional comparative/historical approaches to creole formation. However, his account suffers from two limitations. First, his description of the socio-historical background for the emergence of early Sranan and its maroon offshoots is lacking in clear demographic information of the sort that has recently come to light (e.g. Arends 1995, Migge 1997). These accounts suggest that early Sranan owed much of its structure to Gbe in particular, with secondary inputs from Kikongo and Akan. Second, McWhorter's overview of the similarities between SVCs in SM and Kwa languages is rather general. We are told that the SVCs in all these languages cover the same semantic domains and have the same syntactic configurations, but this is not explicitly demonstrated. A comparison using a more rigorous set of criteria – e.g. the semantic ranges of each SVC, the classes of verbs that function in each, and their syntactic properties – would have strengthened McWhorter's case.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500272047 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Chap. 3 presents an evaluation of Bickerton's LBH, arguing that most of the evidence for it does not stand up to close scrutiny. A key piece of this evidence is Hawaiian Creole English (HCE), which is claimed by Bickerton to share certain structural features with Caribbean and other creoles, despite having no West African substrate. McWhorter disputes Bickerton's claim that HCE developed on plantations – where a highly rudimentary English pidgin was used, which provided inadequate input to children's L1 acquisition. McWhorter argues instead that HCE developed outside the plantations, and implies that it was actually a continuation of an earlier Pidgin English widely used as a lingua franca. (Recent work of Roberts 1998 lends support to this view, though it does not resolve the question of the precise role that children, and a putative bioprogram, played in the creation of HCE.) McWhorter also re-examines the structural features that Bickerton had identified as shared between HCE and Caribbean creoles, and argues that all can be explained in terms other than child invention. He explains several of these features – including tense-mode-aspect (TMA) marking, non-inversion in questions, and "passive marked by NV" – as manifestations of "universal fundamental categories" which are found "much too widely in countless languages and a great many adult-created pidgins to be regarded as child inventions" (66). But McWhorter's tendency to over-generalize, and his commitment to vaguely defined "universals" as the source of these key areas of creole grammar, will find little sympathy among creolists. His position here departs from his earlier acknowledgment that "creole genesis is most realistically accounted for by a combination of influences from the substrate and from universals" (55). His more specific claim that Bickerton's classic TMA configuration "appears consistently in expanded pidgins of all kinds" (66) is clearly an oversimplification, given the diversity of TMA marking across both expanded pidgins and creoles. In addition, McWhorter's claim that "West African substrates do not offer a valid model" for Caribbean creole TMA systems (66) would hardly be acceptable to creolists familiar with recent work of Lefebvre 1996 and others.

The rest of Chap. 3 is devoted to counterarguments against Bickerton's dismissal of substratist accounts. McWhorter shows that a prediction of the LBH – that certain bioprogram features, such as SVCs, will appear in the the early stages of L1 acquisition – is not supported by evidence from acquisition studies. Finally, he reiterates a common criticism of the LBH as relying on vague and not easily falsifiable claims about the nature of the putative bioprogram and its relationship to UG. Still, McWhorter leaves open the possibility of some role for (unspecified) universals in creole genesis.

Chap. 4 discusses the emergence of copulas in SM. McWhorter proposes that equative copula *da* and a more general default copula *de* were the result of reanalysis of the resumptive pronoun *da* (< *that*) and adverbial *de* (< *there*) respectively – developments that were internal, and not the result of substratum influence. He argues that the main source of early Sranan and SM was in fact a pidgin variety which originated in West Africa, and which lacked copulas. The

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500272047 Published online by Cambridge University Press

copulas were the result of grammaticalization processes that operate cross-linguistically. While McWhorter is right to emphasize the role of simplification and grammaticalization in creole development, he seems to treat such processes as mutually exclusive with substrate influence. Hence he overlooks several indications that the latter did in fact play a role in this area of SM grammar – e.g. in the patterns of copula use with certain kinds of adjectival predicates, and in the derivation of true adjectives via reduplication of verbal items. Even the grammaticization of *da* and *de* may well have been prompted by their reinterpretation as copulas on the model of substrate copulas, as some creolists believe. McWhorter does in fact seem to acknowledge a role for substratum influence in structures involving "adjectival" predication, acknowledging that predicate "adjectives" are verbal in SM – a fact that most creolists ascribe to West African influence.

In Chap. 5, McWhorter elaborates on his thesis that early Sranan (SN), and hence SM, originated as a pidgin variety on the coast of present-day Ghana. He argues, first, that the Maroon Spirit Language (MSL) of Jamaica was in fact descended from an early form of SN, introduced to Jamaica by Surinamese slaves around 1671. He claims that the only possible source of this early form of SN must have been a pidgin created in West Africa – since the contact situation in Suriname between 1651 and 1671 would have allowed slaves to acquire L2 varieties of English servants' dialects, rather than creating either a pidgin or creole. McWhorter's socio-historical argument may appear reasonable at first glance, but it is essentially quite speculative. His argument in favor of a Gold Coast origin for early SN is based on the fact that there is a "disproportionate influence from the Lower Guinea coast languages on SN syntax" in areas like SVCs and spatial locative constructions. McWhorter claims that the primary influence on early SN and SM was Akan, while Gbe languages also had a heavy impact on SM later on (but not on SN). This account is contradicted in recent work by Arends 1995, Migge 1997, Bruyn 1994 and others, who show that Gbe was the primary input to the formation of early SN. The recent research also suggests that the strong Gbe influence on both SN and SM grammar resulted from the numerical dominance of Gbe speakers in the early period of Suriname's settlement, especially from 1680 on. But despite these shortcomings, McWhorter raises several questions here that must still be answered: the relationship between SN and the Maroon Spirit Language, and the reasons for a wide range of specific structural or lexical correspondences across Caribbean creoles. In addition to raising the possibility of their origin in a common West African-based pidgin, McWhorter reminds us of the need to examine patterns of diffusion within the Caribbean area itself.

In Chap. 6, McWhorter attempts to unite the various strands of his approach into a model of the process of creole formation. The model "incorporates processes like substratum transfer, structural simplification and diachronic change, as well as a small role for Bickertonian universals" (145). McWhorter proposes three stages in the development of a creole: a "pidginization stage," which yields a stable jargon "with limited structural machinery"; a "creolization stage," in-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500272047 Published online by Cambridge University Press

volving expansion of this jargon into a "full language"; and a "post-creolization stage," characterized by internal developments in the creole. McWhorter's aim is to achieve an explicit matching between the processes which gave rise to creoles and the stages at which they occurred. Hence he links processes of simplification, such as those that yielded zero copula structures, to the pidginization stage, but the emergence of overt copulas is assigned to the creolization stage. McWhorter also claims that substratum influence was a vital part of the pidginization stage, and that SVCs in particular emerged in this stage. Yet he provides no clear evidence for this, stating simply that "it would have been highly unlikely that they would not have been [incorporated at this stage]" (155). One exception is the *say* complementizer, which McWhorter ascribes to "internal change" rather than substratum influence, ignoring the rich evidence that the latter did in fact play a significant role.

On the whole, McWhorter's account of the origins of most SVCs in the pidginization stage, and others in the post-creolization stage, is unconvincing. However, his view of the creolization stage as involving a structural expansion resulting from increased range of functions, and as accomplished by adults rather than children, is in accord with most current thinking. He also argues that certain key features of creole grammar – such as TMA markers, question words, and articles (features which Bickerton ascribed to a language bioprogram) – were adult inventions that emerged at this stage. McWhorter ascribes at least one of these, the article system, to substratum influence. It's not clear which other features he also views as resulting from similar influence; but recall that, in Chap. 3 (p. 66), he makes it clear that TMA is not one of these. McWhorter also pays some lip service to the need to identify constraints on pidginization and creolization; but his contribution is limited to vague mention of salience and shared substrate structures as factors motivating the choice of certain creole features. Finally, he claims that the post-creolization stage of development is characterized by changes resulting from continued substratum influence, or from "independent" (internally motivated) changes. Changes of the first type are exemplified in Tok Pisin; but, according to McWhorter, they did not occur in Caribbean creoles because "it is most likely that West African languages were not spoken fluently by slaves after the first generation" (165). This is a surprising claim, which creolists generally will reject. As an example of "independent" changes, McWhorter cites once more the emergence of copulas – a development which he places within the creolization stage, but which for him involved no substratum influence (a dubious claim, as already mentioned). However, he is clearly right that creoles continue to change like any other language, though he provides little demonstration of this. It would have helped his case if McWhorter could have illustrated all these developments with detailed reference to SM, but he doesn't. On the whole, he fails to achieve his goal of presenting a "systematic model" of creole formation, "from which predictions could be made" (168). But he is at least on the right track with his view that the structure of a (radical) creole is based largely on that of its sub-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500272047 Published online by Cambridge University Press

strates, with superstrate influence limited (for the most part) to "lexical stock." He is also right to seek specific constraints on the selection of substrate features, as well as superstrate features, in creole formation; but he provides a very embryonic sketch of such constraints.

In Chap. 7, McWhorter concludes with a brief recap of the validity of the substrate hypothesis and the weaknesses of Bickerton's LBH. He ends with a call for further comparative-historical work on creole grammar, and more research on the possible role of West African pidgins in the formation of Caribbean creoles.

In general, McWhorter provides us with a stimulating and enthusiastic attempt at redirecting the focus of research on creole genesis toward a synthesis of approaches – taking into account both substrate and superstrate influence, as well as the role of social and linguistic constraints in shaping creole grammar. Though much of what he says is doubtful or unproven, and though he fails to take account of new developments in the field over the last five years or so, he must still be credited for taking a stand, and for voicing his own very personal view of what remains a highly controversial subject. For these reasons, his book is well worth the purchase.

REFERENCES

Arends, Jacques (1995). Demographic factors in the formation of Sranan. In Jacques Arends (ed.), *The early stages of creolization*, 233–85. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Bruyn, Adrienne (1994). Some remarkable facts in Sranan. Paper presented at the conference of the Society for Caribbean Linguistics, Guyana, August.

Byrne, Francis (1987). *Grammatical relations in a radical creole*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Lefebvre, Claire (1996). The tense, mood, and aspect system of Haitian Creole and the problem of transmission of grammar in creole genesis. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 11:231–311.

Migge, Bettina (1997). Substrate influence in creole formation: The origin of give-type serial verb constructions in the Surinamese plantation creole. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 13(2):215–65.

Roberts, Sarah Julianne (1998). The role of diffusion in the genesis of Hawaiian creole. *Language* 74:1–39.

(Received 1 December 1998)

Lenore A. Grenoble & Lindsay J. Whaley (eds.), *Endangered languages: Current issues and future prospects*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998. Pp. xvii, 361. Hb $69.95, pb $27.95.

Reviewed by Leanne Hinton
Linguistics, University of California
Berkeley, California 94720
hinton@socrates.berkeley.edu

Over the past decade, an increasing number of linguists have been turning their attention toward the plight of endangered languages. We are realizing that most of the small indigenous languages of the world are in great danger of disappearing over the coming century, if they have not already disappeared. Nor are linguists

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500272047 Published online by Cambridge University Press

alone in their concern; the media have become interested in the issue, as have international organizations – like UNESCO, the European Union, and even national governments that have in the past been instruments of the demise of indigenous languages. Clearinghouses are being set up (e.g. the International Clearing House for Endangered Languages at Tokyo University), and funds such as the Endangered Languages Fund. Most active in fighting language extinction are members of the affected communities themselves, who are working on their own, or forging new kinds of partnerships with linguists, in an effort to reverse language shift. In the context of these movements, this excellent book is a welcome and crucial resource. The volume gathers together a set of valuable articles by a group including some of the best scholars in linguistics and some of the best native language teachers: Nancy Dorian, Nora and Richard Dauenhauer, Kaia'titahkhe Annette Jacobs, Colette Grinevald, Marianne Mithun, Ken Hale, Christopher Jocks, Anthony Woodbury, Carol Myers-Scotton, and Nikolai Vakhtin. It is a must-read for anyone – native, linguist, teacher, or policy maker – who is involved with issues of language loss, maintenance, or revitalization.

The key points of inquiry are laid out in the introduction to the volume, and I will follow them as I summarize the contents of the volume.

Identification of the kinds of situations which will facilitate or hinder language loss/expansion. Grenoble & Whaley's chapter, "Toward a typology of language endangerment," discusses the external and internal pressures which they categorize as "micro-variables" and "macro-variables," respectively, and which combine to increase or decrease language vitality. They begin with a framework developed by John Edwards, in which he tries to take into account "the entirety of variables which can interact to sap the vitality of a language"; and they expand it in various ways, most importantly to develop a hierarchical arrangement. The authors stress the potential of economic issues to outweigh all others combined.

Dorian's chapter, "Western language ideologies and small-language prospects," names the cumulative effect of the "ideology of contempt" as a key factor in language shift. This ideology involves "ignorance about the complexity and expressivity of indigenous languages, . . . a belief in linguistic social Darwinism, and . . . a belief in the onerousness of bi- or multi-lingualism." This pervasive attitude works to lower the prestige of minority languages in the eyes of all, including the minority language speakers themselves.

What are the structural changes that occur in a language as it is replaced by another? Myers-Scotton demonstrates structural changes that occur in a language in co-existence with a language in social dominance – using her model of Matrix Language Frame to show that, on the road to language shift, the minority language becomes increasingly blended with the dominant language. Similarly, André Kapanga's paper on three subdialects of Swahili spoken in Shaba, Zaire, shows the influence of French on the dialects and what it portends.

It is of course not true that, when two languages co-exist in the manner discussed by Myers-Scotton and Kapanga, one will always replace the other. What

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500272047 Published online by Cambridge University Press

can happen in certain social circumstances is the stabilization of the blended form into a "mixed" language. The article by Vakhtin describes Copper Island Aleut, positing that it reflects a situation where language shift was arrested before it could become complete – thus leaving this fascinating new language with an Aleut lexical base and Russian morphology.

What happens in a speech community when its traditional language is replaced by another? What are the possible responses to the threat of language loss? These questions are addressed by the Dauenhauers, in their "Technical, emotional and ideological issues in reversing language shift: Examples from Southeast Alaska"; by England, in "Mayan efforts toward language preservation"; and by Jacobs, in "A chronology of Mohawk language instruction at Kahnawà:ke."

The Dauenhauers point out the emotional internal issues that contribute to language abandonment: unpleasant memories and fears, shame and embarrassment, and even the sense that God does not like indigenous languages. These are of course the internal responses to the external "ideology of contempt" described by Dorian. Within the context of language revitalization efforts, other attitudinal problems arise: conflicting messages to young people, with expressed ideals about the value of the language opposed to the anxieties and lack of real support by community members; avoidance strategies; and simplistic "bureaucratic fixes" or "technical fixes" that don't result in sufficient training or language learning. The Dauenhauers lay out an important general plan for language revitalization in their article, describing a program design where realistic goals are defined; then those goals are matched with methods, materials, and programs for motivating students.

England discusses Mayan language revitalization. Mayas in Guatemala are undergoing a very strong renaissance of cultural reaffirmation, centered on the Mayan languages. Their sheer numbers (as a majority of the population in Guatemala), along with the convenient fact that all the languages are closely related, allow them to have a large, centralized approach to language revitalization; this involves language standardization, a focus on literacy, the use of Mayan languages as the medium of instruction in the schools, support from university programs, and an effort to gain official recognition of the languages. The revitalization process has not been without controversy and factionalization, but significant progress is being made.

The process of language revitalization in small groups like the Mohawk can draw on much less in the way of financial, human, and professional resources than can large groups like the Mayas – whose situation might be compared in some ways to other large indigenous groups whose languages have potential nationalistic claims, as in Hawai‘i, New Zealand, and Ireland. Nevertheless, small groups can also find their way toward effective language revitalization, as illustrated by Jacobs's article on the Mohawk immersion school.

What should be the role of linguists? Since most of the articles in this volume are by linguists, they make the role of the linguist clear by example. They all see language death as both a human and a scientific loss, and they are responding to it in ways appropriate to their professions and to the communities with

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500272047 Published online by Cambridge University Press

which they work. The various roles displayed in this book include the study of the factors leading to language shift; documentation of the endangered languages themselves, both in their full form from the last of the fluent native speakers and in the reduced forms of semi-speakers during the decline; the development of language materials and writing systems for use by the community; and the training of community members to do their own documentation and to carry on revitalization effectively. Grinevald's chapter on "Language endangerment in South America: A programmatic approach" addresses the question of the role of linguist directly. She argues that decisions about language maintenance and revitalization must be left in the hands of the communities, and she stresses the importance of linguists' providing technical training to community people involved in these efforts. She also argues that the field of linguistics as a whole should give better support to linguists who work in the area of language documentation and revitalization – by improving training of fieldworkers, and by giving weight to fieldwork on endangered languages during hiring and promotion decisions.

What does the loss of language diversity mean for the world? The linguistic profession and the minority communities whose languages are endangered are well aware of the value of these languages; but few of the general public understand why language loss is an important issue. A number of articles in this volume discuss why the world as a whole should view language diversity in a positive light. Mithun's essay, "The significance of diversity in language endangerment and preservation," illustrates with Central Pomo how the death of a language is a loss of a path of valuable human creativity.

Hale, writing "On endangered languages and the importance of linguistic diversity," takes this argument even further by claiming that a decline in language diversity constitutes a huge intellectual loss for humanity; he uses the Damin language (of the Lardil of Australia) for his example.

In two separate articles, Jocks and Woodbury examine how loss of language entails cultural loss. Jocks, a Mohawk himself and a professor at Dartmouth, ends his article with an especially eloquent description of how loss of language means loss of knowledge. "To see this happening, as I have, is to see a people become truly impoverished."

Facing the reality of language extinction has already changed our field. Dorian's seminal work on "language death" in Ireland in the 1980s was especially important in bringing the study of language decline squarely into the linguistic profession. Linguists who had earlier focused on linguistic description and theory now also work in partnership with communities on revitalization. Dissertations are being written now on language decline and language revitalization. This volume is a vital addition to the literature supporting this important and growing movement within the field of linguistics and indigenous communities.

(Received 29 March 1999)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500272047 Published online by Cambridge University Press

RICHARD W. BAILEY, *Nineteenth-century English*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996. Pp. viii, 372. Pb $19.95.

Reviewed by EDWARD FINEGAN
Linguistics, University of Southern California
Los Angeles, CA 90089-1693
finegan@usc.edu

Treating the least well researched period in the history of English, Richard Bailey's groundbreaking book is an admirable success: wry in its humor, clear in its science, and compelling in its humanity. More than that, it is a sterling achievement of research, a model for all who write about the history of spoken or written English, a benchmark of scope and insight. Bailey's calculations suggest that, in the course of the 19th century, the number of English speakers increased from 26 million to 126 million, helping to make the century the "most transforming" period in the history of English: it was transformed "from merely a language to a valuable property, firmly incorporated into capitalist economies. Far more than at any earlier time, English could be bought and sold. It was even possible to earn one's livelihood by working with it" (22).

In his preface Bailey modestly acknowledges his reliance on electronic versions of literary texts by Twain, Austen, Hardy, Dickens and others, and on the *Oxford English Dictionary*. Truth to tell, without the late 20th century's saucer-sized CD-ROMs (and networked or WWW equivalents), Bailey's rich book could not have been wrought – at least not in a lifetime. Of course, electronic texts merely add a new-fangled tool to a researcher's workbench; they cannot provide insight, or be effectively utilized, without the instincts of a detective grounded solidly in the background facts. Bailey enlists an extensive knowledge of language, culture, literature, politics, and technology to plumb the most up-to-date linguistic resources (if "plumb" is an apt metaphor for wafer-thin CD-ROMs).

Certainly no technology alone can enable a researcher to ferret out and juxtapose what Bailey manages in his detailed portrait of development in the phonology, lexicon, slang, and grammar of 19th-century English. Besides chapters on each of those orthodox topics, he offers chapter-length treatments of writing and voice – matters of great interest and importance, but often treated only cursorily by historians, or neglected altogether. In the "Voices" chapter, readers discover compelling figures, among them Sojourner Truth. Born a slave at the end of the 18th century, not far from the Hudson River in Ulster County, New York, she became an eloquent abolitionist and woman suffragist. Bailey presents her through three tellings of an influential Akron speech she gave at a women's rights convention in 1851; in so doing, he burns into readers' minds her voice, and the perceptions of her three contemporary recorders. Here's Sojourner Truth's speech, as reported by Frances Dana Gage, who was present:

> "Dat man ober dar say dat women needs to be helped into carriages, and lifted over ditches, and to have de best place eberywhar. Nobody eber helps me into

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500272047 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> carriages, or ober mud-puddles, or gives me any best place," and, raising herself to her full hight, and her voice to a pitch like rolling thunder, she asked, "And ar'n't I a woman? Look at me. Look at my arm," and she bared her right arm to the shoulder showing its tremendous muscular power. "I have plowed and planted and gathered into barns, and no man could head me – and ar'n't I a woman? I could work as much and eat as much as a man (when I could get it,) and bear de lash as well – and ar'n't I a woman? I have borne thirteen chillen, and seen 'em mos' all sold off into slavery, and when I cried out with a mother's grief, none but Jesus heard – and ar'n't I a woman? . . . Den dat little man in black dar, he say woman can't have as much right as man 'cause Christ wa'n't a woman. *Whar did your Christ come from?*" (315–16)

Such dazzling eloquence brings the century and its speaker to life, and pushes social concerns dramatically into the limelight. In addition, and quite naturally, it gives voice to long-silenced speakers and re-creates a sense of how ordinary folks heard contemporary voices.

Bailey ranges across the Atlantic and Pacific, back and forth between the US and Britain, with excursions to Canada, Ireland, and Scotland, and with brief junkets to Liberia, South Africa, India, Australia, Hong Kong, and elsewhere. He forcefully demonstrates that the 19th century, whose English often differed from today's in subtle ways, was impressively vigorous and innovative, not only lexically but phonologically and syntactically. Throughout the book, Bailey places change "in its cultural context in the belief that ideas about English are as much a part of its history as the bare facts of sound, syntax, and vocabulary. Our language is our most nuanced gesture," he writes, "and, by understanding how people behaved and what they believed, we can gain a more profound knowledge of the past and acquire an illuminating perspective on the present" (vii). This promise, of a kind familiar to readers of book jackets, is more than justified in Bailey's tour de force. His discussions of society and culture range widely: urbanization and migration, printing and literacy, reading habits and household libraries, democracy and voting rights.

Bailey clothes pronunciations, as well as grammatical and lexical paradigms, in the dress of lively characters, both actual and fictional; and in so doing he brings back to life an earlier century's language. It is ironic that access to the 19th century, as Bailey uncovers and reconstructs it, depends in part on technology that has become available only late in the 20th century – with gigabytes of texts and powerful computers to handle them, with the availability of CD-ROMs, pressed with decades of corpus creation, now coursing ahead at breakneck speed with optical scanners and the World Wide Web. Excepting perhaps the genius of Otto Jespersen with his own corpus of examples, only serendipity or dedicated hunting by a battalion of readers could previously have uncovered the citations from the *OED* offered by Bailey in illustration of earlier syntactic innovation: for the progressive passive, *is being rapidly completed* (s.v. *annex*) and *is being car-*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500272047 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ried on (s.v. *campaign*); for the *get* passive, *get married* (s.v. *antimonarchal*), *get paid* (s.v. *periodical*), *got engaged* (s.v. *tent*), and *gets done* (s.v. *sonnet*). Such citations, and others from a variety of sources, electronic and traditional, enrich the syntax chapters in a way that made-up examples could hardly match. For lexicon and slang, Bailey achieves similar authenticity. For phonology, he looks for exemplification to literature, letters, and diaries.

On a topic of continuing interest on both sides of the Atlantic, Bailey reports that the 18th century's "easy tolerance for ways of speaking turned into harsh rigidity" (70) as the 19th century developed "an unprecedented obsession with correctness" (14). Usage books and dictionaries became "vehicles for social advancement" (13), and "the doctrine of pernicious and salubrious usage" (13) spread throughout the English-speaking world. Bailey rightly laments that the "educated and would-be educated" left "an enormous residue of anxiety about how people ought to speak their own language" (71).

Of special interest to sociolinguists, Bailey relates that, twelve years before the founding of the American Dialect Society, the English Dialect Society was founded in 1873; its purpose, in Bailey's words, was "to record local speech forms believed to be on the brink of extinction, an effort in a wider struggle to preserve, or at least document, the more romantic aspects of rural life" (71). But the English Dialect Society dissolved less than a quarter of a century later on the naïve assumption that Joseph Wright's six-volume *English Dialect Dictionary*, which began publication in 1896, had completed the task of documenting the rural dialects of England – British urban dialects were deemed unworthy of investigation. In America, by contrast, the very first issue of the American Dialect Society's *Dialect Notes* contained an article on "The English of the Lower Classes in New York City and Vicinity." Though Bailey does not say so, this article foreshadowed the mid-century fascination of American sociolinguistics with urban dialectology, with its genesis also in Labov's landmark study of New York City's lower and middle classes.

A few words about the aesthetics of Bailey's book. It is graced with a dozen decorative heads and more than a score of illustrations – contemporary book covers, frontispieces, drawings (of printing presses, public speakers), and posters (e.g. one announcing the lectures of Sojourner Truth). Thoroughly glossed so as to maximize accessibility and impact, these graphics create cultural texture. Chapter titles appear in different typefaces, mirroring experimentation with printing during the 19th century and adding to a reader's sense of the times.

"We mostly invent our images of the voices of the past," writes Bailey, and "even our best imaginative efforts and careful examination of the testimonies can scarcely bring them to life again" (317). *Nineteenth-Century English* displays Bailey's imaginative inventions, convincing readers of their validity with apt citations. His linguistic history is as informative and entertaining as the best history of any kind. It will interest not only students of the history of English, but also cultural historians, historians of the 19th century, and readers interested gen-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500272047 Published online by Cambridge University Press

erally in language evolution. His book is perceptive, human, and salted with wry humor. For anyone interested in the socio-culturally contextualized history of English or 19th-century language evolution, it is a must-read; for other sociolinguists and historians, it is a nourishing confection.

(Received 17 April 1999)

WALT WOLFRAM & NATALIE SCHILLING-ESTES, *American English: Dialects and variation*. (Language in society, 24). Oxford (UK) & Malden (MA): Blackwell, 1998. Pp. xvii, 398. Pb $29.95.

Reviewed by ALLAN METCALF
English Dept., MacMurray College
Jacksonville, IL 62650
aallan@aol.com

Can a textbook win the hearts as well as the minds of students? This one tries, and because of the richness of its material, it might could succeed. With copious examples of, and exercises in, the logic of nonstandard English, from Appalachia to Okracoke to African American Vernacular, the authors aim to replace linguistic prejudice with respect, if not admiration, for the varieties of American English that students will encounter.

This is an indispensable book, not just for students but for anyone who wants to know how the English language varies in the United States and how this variation has been studied. The book is a compendium of the best results and best practices of American dialectology, past and present. It is comprehensive, comprehensible and dense with detail.

One thing, however, it is not. Despite its title, *American English* is not about American English itself, but about variation within American English. The subtitle *Dialects and variation* makes that clear, but regrettably only the title appears on the cover. So the reader will not find a book about the history and general characteristics of American English, like Marckwardt 1958 or Mencken 1963. What the reader will find, instead, is a full course on *Dialects and American English*: the exact title of Wolfram's 1991 book, which the current volume extensively revises, augments, and supersedes.

It does so in an exemplary way, and I mean that literally. Page after page is punctuated with the phrase "for example." For nearly every assertion, the authors supply pertinent and welcome examples; three or four on a page are not uncommon. Thus p. 78 has four "for examples" to illustrate dialect variation in auxiliary verbs, double modals, transitive and intransitive verbs, and reciprocal verbs. The examples include completive *done*, *might could*, *beat* as an intransitive verb, and *learn* and *rent* as reciprocal ones. Such particulars, page after page, serve a larger cause: not so much to impart an exact picture of American dialects as to explain the nature and orderliness of dialects, and to make the reader properly conscious of them.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500272047 Published online by Cambridge University Press

This emphasis is clear from beginning to end. In fact, it is especially clear at the beginning and end. Chap. 1 is "The reality of dialects"; Chap. 2, "Why do languages have dialects?"; and Chap. 3, "Levels of dialect." Only in Chap. 4 does the focus shift to an overview of "Dialects in the United States: Past, present, and future." There follows one chapter on American regional dialects, one on American social and ethnic dialects, and one on gender and language variation. By Chap. 8 we are back to the general topic of "Dialects and style." Chap. 9 is "The patterning of dialect" (on inherent and systematic variability); Chap. 10, "On the applications of dialect study"; and the final Chap. 11 is "Dialect awareness in the school and community." With all this material, the present work is a textbook that aims not merely to inform its readers but to transform them. The readers are envisioned as linguistically naïve in both the technical and metaphysical senses.

The authors succeed in their aim of keeping technical terminology to a minimum, "even with respect to phonetics" (xiii), though that minimum includes phonetic symbols in IPA style for 26 consonants, plus 16 vowels and diphthongs. With the help of these symbols, almost always accompanied by representative words, a diligent student can accumulate a heap of information about variation in American English. In places, to be sure, the heaping is overwhelming and will require the help of an instructor, as in Figure 4.6 (p. 122), which shows dialect areas of the US based on Labov's telephone survey. That map uses 11 different symbols, three of them identical. Another challenging example is the explanation of the Northern Cities Vowel Shift (p. 138, repeated on 327–28), where the movements described in the text do not exactly match the arrows in the diagram.

Just to list the riches of this book would take all the space allotted for this review. Every chapter ends with a well-chosen list of some half dozen thoroughly annotated items for "Further reading." A 20-page appendix gives a detailed "Inventory of socially diagnostic structures," which is comprehensive and neatly organized (though the authors do not always give diagnoses for the structures they carefully explain). There is a glossary and a bibliography, each with more than 300 items. The index is good too.

A reviewer, of course, can always hope for more. In a book so concerned with attitudes toward language, it is regrettable that so little is said about perceptual dialectology – the study of perceptions of and attitudes toward dialects, pioneered by Dennis Preston. The discussion of Standard American English would be enriched by reference to Kenyon 1994.

The focus of the book, however, is not on learning what others have learned about American English, but on learning how to learn about dialects, and on transforming prejudice into respect. These goals, the authors think, go together: investigating dialects requires an open mind, and an open mind will respect rather than condemn differences.

While dispelling popular myths about language variation, the authors inadvertently perpetuate one: Usage books are neither as monolithic nor as palaeolithic as implied here. "Whenever there is a question as to whether or not a form is consid-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500272047 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ered standard English, we can turn to authoritarian guides of usage," they say. "Thus, if we have a question as to where to use *will* and *shall*, we simply look it up in our usage guide, which tells us that *shall* is used for first person questions (*Shall I go?*) and *will* is used in other contexts (*He will go*). At that point, the issue of a particular usage is often settled" (9). Usage guides indeed claim to be authoritative, if not authoritarian; but the authorities often disagree among themselves, as shown by Creswell 1975 and more recently by Meyers 1994, and as demonstrated in the detailed discussion of usage controversies in Merriam-Webster 1989. Consensus on controversial matters of usage is as much of a myth as the notion that you will always get the same answer when you look in "the dictionary," regardless of publisher.

The authors' laudable attempt to focus on changing attitudes, rather than merely presenting heaps of information, raises the question: Can linguists erase or mitigate language prejudice? Evidently so in the case of an endangered dialect, the Okracoke brogue, which Wolfram, Schilling-Estes, and their colleagues seem to have rescued from disrepute and near extinction. "The brogue" is now championed on "Save the Brogue" T shirts and recordings, as well as in popular books and pamphlets.

Clearly, linguists can do much for the status of a dialect that is spoken by few and is outside the linguistic prejudices of most others. But what about the more widely spoken non-standard dialects such as that of New York City, or African American Vernacular? Against entrenched and widespread linguistic prejudices, an army of linguists seems to be able to make little difference. Yet the very fact that a school board would think of championing "Ebonics" – as Oakland, California, did in December 1996 – suggests that, over time, attitudes may have changed a little; and linguists may have helped to change attitudes towards acceptance of diversity. Works like the one under review can properly take some credit for any such accomplishments.

REFERENCES

Creswell, Thomas J. (1975). *Usage in dictionaries and dictionaries of usage*. (Publications of the American Dialect Society, 63–64). Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.

Kenyon, John Samuel (1994). *American pronunciation*. 12th edn., expanded and edited by Donald M. Lance. Ann Arbor, MI: Wahr.

Marckwardt, Albert H. (1958). *American English*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.

Mencken, H. L. (1963). *The American language*. Abridged and edited by Raven I. McDavid Jr. New York: Knopf.

Merriam-Webster (1989). *Dictionary of English usage*. Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster.

Meyers, Walter E. (1994). Usage items in current handbooks of composition. In Greta D. Little & Michael Montgomery (eds.), *Centennial usage studies*. (Publications of the American Dialect Society, 78.) Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.

Wolfram, Walt (1991). *Dialects and American English*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

(Received 8 April 1999)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500272047 Published online by Cambridge University Press

JOHN EDWARDS (ed.), *Language in Canada*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998. Pp. xvi, 504.

Reviewed by MONICA HELLER
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
University of Toronto
Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5S 1V6
mheller@oise.utoronto.ca

This volume is meant as a companion piece to three previous volumes published by Cambridge on language in various parts of the English-speaking world (the volume on the United States, edited by Charles Ferguson and Shirley Brice Heath, appeared in 1981, followed in 1984 by one on the British Isles edited by Peter Trudgill, and in 1991 by a volume on Australia edited by Suzanne Romaine). This collection contains 26 short articles, divided into three sets. The first set attempts to provide an overview of sociolinguistic issues in Canada from historical, demographic, and policy perspectives. The second set treats aboriginal languages and the two official languages, French and English; this set includes two articles on language teaching – restricted, however, to the teaching of international languages, mainly as first languages, and to the teaching of French as a second language through immersion methods. The third set offers language profiles of each of Canada's ten provinces, as well as of its two (now three) territories. The organization of the book is meant to provide different angles on sociolinguistic issues in Canada, but unfortunately the result too often is that material is either repeated or consistently left out.

The book seems to aim for an authoritative, objective description of the sociolinguistic situation in Canada. As a result, almost all the authors rely heavily on statistics drawn from the Canadian census, buttressed by some linguistic description. The following major concerns emerge from the themes treated here: (a) What are the chances of survival of minority languages in Canada – all languages other than English, and specifically French, aboriginal, and immigrant languages? And (b) what specific policy and practice initiatives, for example in the area of education, might increase the chances of minority language survival? What is never made clear is why it is that the vast majority of these authors are concerned with these particular themes; or put differently, why it is that these seem to be the most important questions to ask about language in Canada today. Only two chapters – one by William Mackey on the history of language contact in Canada, and one by Kenneth McRae on federal government policy regarding official languages (French and English) in the past 30 years – begin to illuminate these questions; these authors show how language in Canada, and in particular the relationship between French and English, is closely bound up with control over political power and with the legitimacy of the emerging Canadian state. Most of the other chapters speak from within the dominant linguistic ideology in Canada, namely that linguistic pluralism is a good thing so long as it does not upset current political structures, and that language is most properly a matter of

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500272047 Published online by Cambridge University Press

public policy and state regulation. One may or may not agree with these orientations; it does seem to me important, however, to make clear just what the ideological dimensions of the sociolinguistic situation in Canada are, what ideological struggles are occurring (and there are many), and why. This book does not provide such an analysis; instead, the reader must infer such information by reading between the lines, and the reader unfamiliar with Canada may therefore find much material difficult to understand.

One dimension of public debate regarding language in Canada is the dominance of Canadian census statistics. As is well known, Canada is one of relatively few countries to ask numerous questions about language knowledge and use. Demographers have convinced us that it is possible to measure assimilation by comparing mother tongue to language used at home, and most major debate about language concerns this measure – based on what a colleague of mine used to call "thermometer studies," that is, studies aimed at finding out just how close to its deathbed a minority language group is. There are two major types of problems associated with the use of these statistics in this way, but these problems are discussed only in passing in a few of the articles presented here. The first major type of problem has to do with whether the statistics actually portray what they say they portray; and here, as Charles Castonguay points out in his contribution, there are several difficulties. For example, the way in which the question about "mother tongue" has been worded has changed over the years, making longitudinal analysis difficult. Another associated problem is that the current wording of the question forces those who consider that they have lost their first language actually to claim a different one.

The second type of problem is perhaps even more serious; it has to do with whether it is even possible to measure assimilation in this way – or, put more radically, whether assimilation is really the central issue here. Measuring assimilation by this particular comparison assumes that people have one real mother tongue, and that language is really, authentically learned at home. However, as Mougeon points out in his paper, languages are used in a wide variety of settings, and it may be the case – as it almost certainly is for an increasing number of minority francophones in Canada – that the importance of speaking French comes from its role in the workplace or other settings, not at home. In other words, the sociolinguistic assumptions that underlie the census and its analysis are just assumptions, and a more sociologically or anthropologically informed census would ask different questions, in different ways. In addition, as we know, people answer census questions differently depending on how they see their interests, and these may change over time; this has been particularly problematic as regards aboriginal language groups, as is evident by the widely differing figures given in several chapters here for the same language groups. Again, the issue of interest and ideology – which is essential to understanding why the Canadian government does what it does with its census, and to why people answer it the way they do – would go far towards helping us understand the sociolinguistics of Canada; but this

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500272047 Published online by Cambridge University Press

issue is addressed only indirectly through allusions to aboriginal language revival movements, or to differences between Quebec and Canada.

The question of assimilation itself makes sense only in the context of a general acceptance of the idea that language is principally a matter of public policy, something that pertains centrally to the political domain, and which rests on the assumption that the state deals with something resembling nations which define themselves at least in part in terms of language. Both of these are interesting ideas, and their role in Canada deserves to be discussed. Why do we so readily enter the terrain of language in order to discuss issues which might better be understood as political and economic conflicts? Why do we so readily assume that the state is the appropriate interlocutor, that public policy is the best or right way to undertake those discussions? Why do we assume that Canada is about nations at all? Several authors in this collection – Philippe Barbaud, Raymond Mougeon, J.K. Chambers, and Gary Caldwell in particular, in their discussions of the history of French- and English-speaking groups – point to the complex history of language contact in Canada, and to the multiple ties that link Canadians to groups elsewhere. In some respects, one might argue that Canada is a good example of a postmodern state *avant la lettre*, in which people develop and exploit multiple identities. But public discourse has worked to suppress this dimension of language in Canada, and it seems that much of our intellectual life has been devoted to supporting that suppression.

In the end, I have to say that this is a book full of fascinating information, but it needs to be read between the lines. It is a book for developing questions, but their answers will need to be found elsewhere. Clearly, language is an important domain for the regulation of rights and obligations, for controlling the production and distribution of resources, and for defining criteria of inclusion and exclusion in Canada. Why this is the case, and how these processes work, are important questions – not just for Canada, but in general. This book helps point us in the direction of some particular ways in which we might address these questions, but its objectivist stance creates unfortunate obstacles to pursuing them.

(Received 11 January 1999)

MARI C. JONES, *Language obsolescence and revitalization: Linguistic change in two sociolinguistically contrasting Welsh communities*. (Oxford studies in language contact.) Oxford: Clarendon; New York: Oxford University Press, 1998. Pp. x, 452.

Reviewed by CAROL TROSSET
Office of Institutional Research
Grinnell College, PO Box 805
Grinnell, IA 50112
trosset@a1.grin.edu

Jones's book should fascinate two audiences: those concerned with the current state of the Welsh language, and those with a more general interest in the phe-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500272047 Published online by Cambridge University Press

nomenon of language obsolescence. Her presentation is both clearly readable and meticulous in its detail. The work centers on case studies of two sociologically similar but linguistically different communities, Rhymney and Rhosllannerchrugog, situated in different regions of Wales. These studies investigate, in parallel fashion, the varied retention both of Welsh and of its relevant local dialect across the generations. Jones demonstrates greater linguistic retention in the community where Welsh still plays a significant role in everyday social interactions (Rhosllannerchrugog), but her data also illustrate a strong trend in both communities toward the greater use of historically inappropriate forms by younger speakers. Both studies also reveal a recent loss of dialect-specific features, to the point where many schoolchildren in both towns fail even to recognize the local dialect as belonging to their own community. Jones's generational analysis is quite revealing, particularly because the current set of generations have experienced quite different social contexts with respect to the state of the language and its use in official settings.

Jones pays excellent attention to the complexities of methodology. Her techniques include interviews with both groups and individuals, surveys, and a matched-guise text using recordings in Standard Oral Welsh and a dialect. She provides details of her activities, including sampling, attention to the impact of the interviewer's speech style, etc.; she shows an awareness of the risks and benefits of each approach, and gives convincing arguments in favor of her choices. She makes excellent use of social networks to facilitate her research efforts, as is particularly appropriate in a study of what is essentially a feature of a speech community (language obsolescence). It would be interesting to know a little more about her own position in the society, such as her age and education history, so as to situate her more precisely with respect to the phenomena she analyzes; but this is a very minor point.

Jones's study shows a very appropriate awareness of the importance of integrating the study of linguistic features, speech behavior, and sociopolitical context. Her chosen methods, such as group interviews on topics unrelated to the state of the language, provide a reasonable compromise between the need to observe natural speech behavior and the benefits of controlled collection techniques. In terms of socio-political context, the book is notable for its revealing analysis of the impact of Welsh-medium schooling and broadcast media on the survival of Welsh, and on the nature of the type of Welsh that is surviving. General points – such as the high degree of involvement of the age 40–59 group in the language preservation movement, and their unusual stance in favor of regional dialects – add a cultural context to the linguistic shifts documented. This aspect of the study could have been enhanced by incorporating more sociological detail into an interpretation of which older speakers (in addition to how many) were retaining or losing particular linguistic features. Variables such as chapel membership, political affiliation, involvement with cultural activities such as eisteddfodau, education level, and the language of one's spouse, correlated with the linguistic features of the speech of individuals,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500272047 Published online by Cambridge University Press

could add important information about the cultural forces that encourage or impede the retention of both language and dialect.

The case studies are followed by a very interesting chapter discussing parallels between many different language contact situations around the world. This discussion includes a comparison of trends in language death with changes that have occurred in healthy languages. Jones also pays close attention to the relationship between features of obsolescence and the development of pidgins and creoles.

There follows a nice discussion of the historical developments of standard written and oral versions of Welsh. Here again, though the information provided is quite comprehensive and illuminating, additional sociological analysis would enhance the treatment of the topic of standard oral Welsh. It is clear that major changes have occurred in this arena in the past two decades (since my own field research in 1981, which pre-dated S4C television). Increases in broadcast media, Welsh-medium education, and the number of second-language speakers have brought about significant and rapid changes in speech behavior and how it is perceived. Jones provides fascinating information on these developments – tracing, for example, ways in which the broadcast media have changed the style of speech used on the air, apparently in response to the kinds of criticisms I often heard in the early 1980s (in which young Welsh speakers would laugh at "BBC Welsh," saying that no one spoke that way). Both Jones's discussions and my own fieldwork experiences make me wish for a detailed analysis of the impact of the linguistic environments at the Welsh universities; it is at those sites that many teachers, ministers, broadcasters, and other speakers with large audiences first moved away from their regional variety and developed a more standardized speech style, which they took with them to their subsequent places of employment. An examination of the impact of the University of Wales at Aberystwyth, and the dispersal of its graduates, would be particularly interesting, because it is situated very near the linguistic boundary between the northern and southern varieties of Welsh, and it has had a significant Welsh-language educational community for several decades.

The final substantive chapter draws comparisons with Breton and Cornish, the closest linguistic relatives of Welsh. Jones's discussion of the differences between the conditions of Breton and Welsh points out various circumstances of Welsh that appear to correlate with its relatively successful survival: the political dominance of native speakers over learners, the social mixing of these two linguistic groups, and the fact that standardized varieties of the language have developed largely in response to pragmatic needs, rather than being driven by political ideology. There follows an account of the death and revival of Cornish.

Jones's work is an excellent addition to scholarship, both on Welsh culture and on the status and progress of minority languages generally. It should be of great interest to linguists, sociolinguists, and Celticists, and should also inform studies of ethnic politics.

(Received 3 April 1999)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500272047 Published online by Cambridge University Press

NIRMALA SRIREKAM PURUSHOTAM, *Negotiating language, constructing race: Disciplining difference in Singapore*. (Contributions to the sociology of language, 79.) Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1998. Pp. viii, 294. Hb DM 178.00.

Reviewed by ANTHEA FRASER GUPTA
School of English, University of Leeds
Leeds, England LS2 9JT
a.f.gupta@leeds.ac.uk

Singapore has been much discussed as a highly developed, multilingual, multicultural city-state with a clearly articulated language policy, implemented by a strong government as part of its efforts at social engineering. Singapore's policies are variously derided and praised. Some of those who have written on the sociology of language in Singapore have reiterated government policy with little or no assessment of its meaning; thus one regularly reads that all children in Singapore receive education in English and in their mother tongue – a statement that cannot be understood without a grasp of what the concept "mother tongue" means in Singapore's socio-political system. PuruShotam's book comes from a group of scholars who are working with a theoretically informed perspective on language and ethnicity, which questions terminologies and seeks to understand how notions like "race," "mother tongue," and "language" work as social constructs. In Singapore this approach has been especially associated with the sociologists Geoffrey Benjamin, Sharon Siddique, Chua Beng Huat, and PuruShotam herself.

PuruShotam's main concern is to see how members of the "Indian" community in Singapore situate themselves within a society where they are a "minority," and how their construct of language relates to the articulation of "language" in government policy. Her approach, which draws on the theories of Alfred Schutz (e.g. 1932), requires the reader to contrast the view of the concepts as constructs with an official discourse of "race," "culture," and "language" which sees them as external, permanent, and unchanging. This is discussed with great clarity by PuruShotam in her final chapter.

The notion of Language as social construct is not likely to be a new one to readers of this journal. But general works in the sociology of language, when they use Singapore as an example, tend to present a simplified picture in which concepts are taken for granted. PuruShotam's book gives a much more complex picture of how individuals operate linguistically within a society. To understand the book, readers may be required to set aside some assumptions.

The data are drawn from long-term, in-depth fieldwork in which the primary data are "narrations" by members of the "Indian" community. Extracts from these narratives are extensively used in three of the seven chapters (starting at p. 102). These narratives give the book an interest and complexity which can only come from this kind of ethnomethodological insight. The first three chapters, which develop the theory and give the general background to Language in Singapore, are harder to read, and may present difficulties of comprehension for those not familiar with the Singapore situation. The historical background seems to pre-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500272047 Published online by Cambridge University Press

sume knowledge which some readers may lack. For example, the discussion of migration to Singapore from India (44–45) doesn't mention migration from Ceylon – although later in the book (e.g. 85) migration from Sri Lanka is referred to. The definitions of terms in Singapore are so complex that PuruShotam herself sometimes falls into traps; e.g., she describes former prime minister Lee Kuan Yew (35) as "a native speaker of Hakka," although later (53) she describes him as a " 'Straits born' 'Hakka' 'Chinese' ". This very scare-quoted identity is a danger sign: It is unlikely that Lee is a native speaker of Hakka.

A major part of this book is devoted to the respondents' concept of a "mother tongue." In Singapore, "mother tongue" is principally identified as the symbolic language of the group of one's paternal ancestry, rather than the language of one's primary socialization, or one's "native speech" (49–50). PuruShotam's respondents typically have a strong sense of their "mother tongue," and are able to talk about their skills (or absence of skills) in it. They are also able to talk about the language(s) they speak. Knowledge of languages functions in a pragmatic as well as an ideological arena. English is taken for granted in this community as an important (often the most important) household language, as a major language of the wider community, and as the language of education (113–14). Non-"mother tongue" languages (whether English, Malay, Chinese, French, or German) are seen in terms of their usefulness in material and cultural terms. But ignorance of the "mother tongue" (Tamil, Malayalam, Telugu, Bengali, Punjabi etc.), which is widespread, is often seen as a source of shame, and effort may be made to reintroduce a "mother tongue" to a family nexus that has lost it.

PuruShotam sees the family, and the lifestyle of the individual within the family, as the main locus of culture; and it is through the individual as a family member that we see how individuals interact with the wider society. Children were among the interviewees, giving a rare opportunity for their voices as members of society to be heard. PuruShotam is constantly aware of the importance of gender and age in establishing the individual's relationship to culture. Some of the extracts from the interviews are almost short stories; we see real people negotiating "mixed marriages," optimizing their children's "success," and manipulating each other. We see how they make their choices, especially their choices within the constraints of Singapore's competitive and highly organized education system. In this arena, "Indians" have a greater degree of choice than the two larger ethnic groups of Singapore, the "Chinese" and the "Malays." The discussion of how they choose which language their children will study at school (other than English) highlights how this freedom is constrained by Singapore's racial policies, by geography, by demography, and by societal attitudes and assumptions. PuruShotam does not adopt a polemic approach to the social and political issues which she explores. Potentially explosive topics – such as language shift, race relations, and government directives – are explored through the interviewees, in a way that allows the reader to understand the social and political minefield of Singapore, but does not force anyone into facile "solutions" to problematical situations.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500272047 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Perhaps because PuruShotam is a sociologist, she does not refer to some of the sociolinguistic work on the social construction of language, and on language shift, which one would expect if she were a linguist. In particular, I feel that the work of Le Page & Tabouret-Keller 1985 comes from a similar ideological world, and that PuruShotam would have benefited from some of their insights. Her discussion of the languages of education flies in the face of much received wisdom about mother-tongue education; a linguist would have wanted to engage with the views of such scholars as Jim Cummins, Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, and Robert Phillipson. PuruShotam's foreword is dated 1996, but the book may have been completed somewhat earlier, since she does not refer to a number of books, using theory sympathetic to her own, that appeared around 1995 – e.g. Chua 1995, Pennycook 1994, and Gupta 1994. The work of Vasil 1995 is not in the bibliography, but is quoted in the text.

Mouton de Gruyter seem to have a hands-off approach to editing. There are a number of spelling mistakes – mostly, but not exclusively, in proper names (e.g., "Chiam Herzog," "Hans Christen Andersen," "Ronald Wardhough," "Roy Harrias," "R. A. Husdon"). Sometimes two spellings of the same item appear (e.g. "Schuetze" and "Schütze", "*bahasa*" and *bahsa*," "*guoyu*" and "*kuo yu*," "Bawanese" and "Bawaenese.") Except for one very welcome "nexuses," the plural of *nexus* is "nexii" throughout (there is also a new plural of *focus*, i.e. "focii"). Numerous books are referred to in the text or in footnotes which are not in the bibliography; e.g., the first twenty footnotes refer to eighteen items, of which six are not in the bibliography. The ordering of references in the bibliography also breaks down at times. In the extracts from the interviews, the word *it's* consistently lacks its apostrophe. Such a number of bibliographical, typographical, and spelling errors is unacceptable: It's time that publishing houses cleaned themselves up in this respect.

This interesting (and at times very entertaining) book will have value for a number of different readers. It is a case study of how a heterogeneous minority operates and constructs itself linguistically within a very diverse and complex wider community. It is also a study of the dynamics of language shift, and of how attitudes to language are shaped by government, by pragmatism, and by emotional affinity. Too much of the literature on language shift has focused on English as a killer language, and on the relationship of communities in post-colonial settings to English. In this account we see other linguistic players, and we see how English operates as one of several forces, in a linguistic ecology operating in a complex society. I urge the audience of *LiS* to read this book, and to recommend it to students, as a sophisticated analysis of what it is like to be a member of a multilingual society in which all aspects of linguistic life are open to negotiation and change.

REFERENCES

Chua, Beng-Huat (1995). *Communitarian ideology and democracy in Singapore*. London: Routledge.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500272047 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Gupta, Anthea Fraser (1994). *The step-tongue: Children's English in Singapore*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
Le Page, Robert B. & Tabouret-Keller, Andrée (1985). *Acts of identity: Creole-based approaches to language and ethnicity*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.
Pennycook, Alastair (1994). *The cultural politics of English as an international language*. London: Longman.
Schutz, Alfred (1932). *Der sinnhafte Aufbau der sozialen Welt*. Vienna: Springer. [Translated as *The phenomenology of the social world*, Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1967.]
Vasil, Raj (1995). *Asianising Singapore: The PAP's management of ethnicity*. Singapore: Heinemann Asia.

(Received 4 April 1999)

JOEL C. KUIPERS, *Language, identity, and marginality in Indonesia: The changing nature of ritual speech on the island of Sumba*. (Studies in the social and cultural foundations of language, 18.) Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998. Pp. xvi, 183. Hb $59.95, pb $19.95.

Reviewed by RICHARD J. PARMENTIER
Anthropology, Brandeis University
Waltham, MA 02454-9110
parmentier@brandeis.edu

Kuipers' book is based on ethnographic fieldwork carried out in the Weyewa Highlands of western Sumba, an island in eastern Indonesia. His initial fieldwork in 1978 resulted in his work *Power in performance* (1990), about Weyewa "ritual speech" (*tenda*) – a set of political, religious, and personal verbal genres utilizing a large stock of traditional couplets, in which the two lines are parallel in both rhythm and meaning. Returning to the field in 1989, 1990, and 1994, Kuipers discovered that the obvious loci of change – new schools, roads, economic activities, and religious ideas – could not by themselves account for the direction of change in Weyewa language practices. Stimulated by a recent body of literature in linguistic anthropology dealing with "linguistic ideology," Kuipers attempts in the present volume to show that changes in ritual speech genres – reinterpretations, erasures, refunctionalizations, and condensations – cannot be explained without taking into account local and imported beliefs about the nature of language.

It might seem unusual to focus on traditional ritual speech in a book on contemporary language change; but Kuipers argues persuasively that ritual speech – with its heightened aura of sacredness, tradition, and power – provides the occasion for Weyewa reflection on language in general:

> The particular direction and character of these changes cannot be simply reduced to political coercion, economic necessity, or religious commitment. Instead, these transformations can be placed in the framework of shifting communicative ideologies about setting and place, emotional expression, audience participation, naming and learning as a way of interpreting the particular ways in which ritual speech has moved from the (exemplary) center to the social and moral peripheries of their communicative world. (150)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500272047 Published online by Cambridge University Press

For Kuipers, linguistic ideology includes a range of related phenomena, e.g. assumptions about the completeness of language as a system, classifications of language varieties, ideas about the linkage between language forms and socio-political activity, beliefs about the power of language to express transient emotion and more permanent social status, norms governing ceremonial performance, and spatial metaphors for central versus marginal epistemological zones. Of course, linguistic ideologies promulgated by the Dutch, Japanese, and Indonesian authorities can be gleaned from published documents, philological practices, travel records, political rhetoric, and patterns of institutional regimentation; but detailed ethnographic research is required to discover corresponding Weyewa ideologies. Kuipers presents a rich display of linguistic data, with a central focus on textual products such as stories, songs, chants, laments, oratory, lexical sets, names, informal conversations, exegetical commentaries, and school lessons – most of which are reproduced in the original languages and in English translation.

As a result of the violent "pacification" of Sumba by the Dutch military in the early decades of the 20th century, along with the dispersal of the rapidly rising population of the Weyewa Highlands from large "ancestral villages" to smaller "garden villages," ritual speech became increasingly marginalized – not only in the sense that many ritual genres could not be properly performed at a distance from the ritual centers, but also in the sense that the Weyewa language itself came to be seen as a low-ranking local tongue, hierarchically encompassed by Malay (the official language of the Dutch colonial administration). By analogy, speakers shifted their understanding of ritual speech from being an autonomous entity, anchored at an exemplary center, to being a specialized part of the Weyewa language. The Dutch considered the forceful vocal expression of Weyewa leaders to be particularly objectionable, both because they misconstrued this loud, direct, and non-dialogical speech style as proof of Sumbanese "essential" lack of public civility, and because they regarded such leaders as a challenge to their own political supremacy. Weyewa speakers adapted to these colonial ideological strictures by cultivating a "clever" speech style more appropriate to the needs of Malay bureaucracy, and by expanding the soft, halting, and sad "lament" genre of ritual speech, which now expresses dependency, self-denigration, and humility.

Note especially that, in these intercultural struggles, the colonial imposition of a proportionality between socio-political marginality and linguistic marginality is interpreted by the Weyewa in two ways. First, they continue to CALIBRATE change according to the model of ritual speech (e.g., ancestral narratives can be only three generations deep in garden villages, seven in corral villages, and maximally deep in ancestral village centers). Second, they continue to REPRESENT social change in metapragmatically loaded metaphors and genres. The denial of political agency to the broad spectrum of the Weyewa populace, which began during the Dutch colonial period and intensified during the Japanese occupation (1942–45), was countered by the analogical transfer of "spectatorship" from the register of ritual speech to the register of political communication. Just as the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500272047 Published online by Cambridge University Press

audience's formulaic response and experiential witnessing were necessary for the discursive completeness of ritual performance, so political audiences could interpret their collective "cheers" as a dialogic complement to the authoritative rhetoric of colonial and nationalist orators. At the same time that the frequency and fullness of ritual speech genres declines, one of the basic pragmatic routines attached to ritual speech is re-applied in communicative situations that would otherwise signal only disempowerment.

The majority of Weyewa adopted Christian baptismal names in the 1990s for use as address forms in public settings, and the continued use of honorific "prestige names" for persons now carries the negative and oppositional connotation of "pagan," i.e. as still invoking ancestral spirits. These traditional prestige names have recently been refunctionalized to refer not to people but to a limited class of valuables (racehorses, pickup trucks, and small businesses), the possession of which implies a degree of autonomy from public authority. Kuipers's chapter on naming, itself a model of diachronically rich and contextually delicate ethnographic analysis, is marred by a small terminological confusion. The change discussed is not, as he labels it, one of "semantic" names that place an individual within a system of social classification and personal history vs. "indexical" names that pick out a particular individual denuded of these social and personal meanings. Both these functional models are properly indexical; the difference is that traditional names are strongly metapragmatic, while the modern Christian names are simply "dicent indexicals." Also, a correction is needed to Kuipers' apparently approving citation (96–97) of Lévi-Strauss's objections to Peirce's analysis of proper names: Far from suggesting that names are merely "indices," Peirce detailed the progressive shift from "degenerate" indexicality, to iconicity, and at last to fully symbolic status, as proper names gain acceptance within a community of speakers.

In the end, then, to say that language change and sociopolitical change are "mediated" by locally salient ideologies with significant historical depth – as well as by hegemonic ideologies imposed by Dutch, Japanese, and Indonesian forces – is not to argue that these various ideologies are themselves static objects with fixed refractive indices. Rather, the data so elegantly presented here show that the process of change, i.e. shifting indexical signs in social action, itself stimulates the production of ideologies that metapragmatically re-construe these new indexical patterns in terms of "rationalizing, systematizing, and . . . naturalizing schemata" (Silverstein 1998:129). As historically grounded representations of speech and action (or speech "as" action), ideologies of language offer both marginalized and dominant groups a brief resting place in which the complexities of change can, for a moment at least, be rendered stable. Of course, it is only from the perspective of this quiet moment that ideologies appear as "a way of naturalizing, regularizing, and neutralizing the disruptions of change" (150), or that the creative coding of marginality is a successful counter to dominant nationalist ideas. The facts that marginalized ritual speech genre continues to index the sacred

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500272047 Published online by Cambridge University Press

center by the very fact of their graded distance from it, that the loss of political agency is mitigated by the renewed focus on the audience's power of collective assent, that traditional prestige names are re-applied to the most evident symbols of economic autonomy, and that performances of ritual speech in contemporary school settings perpetuates an "image" of tradition only at the cost of erasing its pragmatic effectiveness – all these are solid evidence that linguistic ideologies, for all their metapragmatic cohesion, are indexical "all the way down" (Silverstein 1998:138).

In organizing his analysis, Kuipers finds particular usefulness in a set of generalizations about specific "semiotic processes" that constitute linguistic ideologies, proposed by Gal & Irvine 1995 and by Irvine & Gal 2000. While this empirical confirmation is a valuable contribution, I feel that *Language, identity, and marginality in Indonesia* also demonstrates that the important task for the future is not just to list various semiotic processes, but to explore more systematically the interaction of imposed or "regimenting" ideologies vs. refunctionalized local adaptations. Careful consideration of comparative ethnographic cases might lead toward a "final theory" that merges notions of regimentation, hegemony, marginality, and resistance as closely linked metapragmatic dimensions of semiotic mediation.

REFERENCES

Gal, Susan, & Irvine, Judith T. (1995). The boundaries of language and disciplines: How ideologies construct differences. *Social Research* 62:967–1001.

Irvine, Judith T. & Gal, Susan (2000). Language ideology and linguistic differentiation. In Paul Kroskrity (ed.), *Regimes of language: Language ideologies and the discursive construction of power and identity*, 35–83. Santa Fe: School of American Research.

Kuipers, Joel C. (1990). *Power in performance: The creation of textual authority in Weyewa ritual speech*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Silverstein, Michael (1998). The uses and utility of ideology: A commentary. In Bambi B. Schieffelin, Kathryn A. Woolard, & Paul V. Kroskrity (eds.), *Language ideologies: Practice and theory* (Oxford studies in anthropological linguistics, 16), 123–45. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.

(Received 17 April 1999)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500272047 Published online by Cambridge University Press