

## REVIEWS

*Language in Society* 34 (2005). Printed in the United States of America  
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404505210229

JANET HOLMES & MIRIAM MEYERHOFF (eds.), *The handbook of language and gender*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2003. Pp. 776. Pb \$44.95.

Reviewed by PIA PICHLER  
*Department of English and Comparative Literature*  
*Goldsmiths College, University of London, New Cross*  
*London, SE14 6NW, UK*  
*P.Pichler@gold.ac.uk*

This extensive collection of articles is testimony to the continuing topicality and diversity of research in language and gender, spanning a wide range of disciplines, theoretical stances, and methodological approaches and examining gender in a vast variety of linguistic, sociocultural and group-specific contexts. Contributors draw on their backgrounds in linguistics, discourse analysis, anthropology, psychology, education, and even information science and thus reflect the interdisciplinary nature and appeal of current language and gender debates. The *Handbook* is unique in its endeavor to represent a wide range of languages and thus contains some in-depth analyses of and a large number of references to languages other than English, including Greek, French, German, Spanish, Swedish, Italian, Dutch, Gullah Creole, Guyanese Creole, Bislama, Tongan, Tagalog, Malagasy, Lakhota, Japanese, Chinese, Bengali, Hindi, Punjabi, Afrikaans, and Gaelic. This heterogeneity is reinforced by contributions that aim to go beyond a focus on adult, white, heterosexual, middle-class speakers, examining South African gay personal advertisements, the construction of Tongan transgendered identities, or the discursive practices of bilingual Central/Mexican American working-class elementary-school girls and of white Anglo adolescent high-school students from varying social backgrounds. Although the majority of chapters focus on spoken interaction in everyday and in institutional settings, the *Handbook* also examines grammatical gender and both the construction and the representation of gender in literary and newspaper texts as well as in online communication.

The editors structure the 31 chapters within the five main sections in a way that highlights both common grounds and differences in current language and gender research. On several occasions, one chapter in a section offers an additional or even alternative perspective on a specific issue discussed in the previous chapter, which turns the reading process into an enjoyable and stimulating debate. This thought-provoking effect, however, could have been rendered more accessible, particularly to undergraduate students, if some of these differences and similarities had been commented on explicitly in a brief introduction at the beginning of each section.

After an excellent introductory chapter by Janet Holmes and Miriam Meyerhoff, the first section provides historical and theoretical background of the field. The opening chapter in this section is Bonnie McElhinny's challenging scene-setter for many of the following contributions. McElhinny problematizes the notions of gender and sex dichotomies, but her discussion of current constructionist approaches to gender is balanced by her acknowledgment that cultural and economic factors can impose constraints on the agency and flexibility of individuals, particularly outside the linguistic realm. McElhinny therefore argues that both an activity-based and a practice-based approach to gender need to be reconciled with a theorization of gender as a structural principle which, similar to social class and ethnicity, "should be understood as a principle for allocating access to resources, and as a defense for systematic inequalities" (p. 32). McElhinny addresses one further question that dominates most of the subsequent chapters: When or how is gender relevant in interaction? She sums up her stance: "People's horizons of relevance are shaped by tasks in which they are engaged, and in part because knowledge of the world is shaped and regulated by power (Blommaert 1999; Smith 1999)" (36). Although the first part of this quote could support rather than challenge the rigid conversation analytic (CA) definition of relevance of which McElhinny is critical, the second part suggests that participants' realization of (gender) relevance can be influenced by dominant and therefore invisible supra-local discourses of knowledge/power.

Whereas many contributors in this book would probably feel restricted by an exclusive analytic focus on aspects of social identities made explicitly relevant by the participants, Don Kulick goes as far as to argue that analysis needs to include the unconscious. Kulick views (sexual) identities as "consciously assumed or consciously concealed" (5) and argues that a shift of analytic focus to the linguistic manifestations of "desire" is necessary to investigate the unsaid, non-intentional meanings expressed by speakers.

Although the editors view the first chapter in each section as a particularly clear and comprehensive lead-in, it is Mary Bucholtz's contribution in this section that will give undergraduates a more accessible introduction to the diversity of the field. Bucholtz introduces various approaches to discourse analysis, such as ethnography of communication, interactional sociolinguistics, ethnomethodology, discursive psychology, (feminist) conversation analysis, stylistics, and critical discourse analysis. Classical concepts in language and gender, such as the difference and dominance approaches, are tied into a refreshing review of qualitative analytical frameworks and current theoretical debates in the field, with illustrations drawn from a variety of linguistic backgrounds of both spoken and written interaction.

The chapters in part 2 of the *Handbook* are loosely connected by their focus on "Negotiating relations". Robin Lakoff investigates the relationship between women and power, exposing androcentric bias in her detailed analysis of a written academic text by Schegloff which critiques the political motivation of (crit-

ical) discourse analysis, and in her less well documented investigations of the media discussions surrounding a contentious theater play and women in positions of political power. The diversity of theoretical stances and analytical frameworks is particularly noteworthy in this part of the *Handbook*. For example, Tannen's exploration of the relationship between power and connection in intra-family interaction is largely restricted to the content level and reflects a comparatively essentialist notion of gender differences; this contrasts with Goodwin's CA-informed investigation of children's (argumentative) communication emphasizing the heterogeneity of gendered practices in relation to class, ethnicity, and interactional goals.

Interestingly, Susan Herring's clearly presented review of the past 13 years of research on gender in the relatively new media of the Internet mirror the findings of early language and gender research on gendered styles in spoken interaction, which was framed by the difference and dominance paradigms. Moreover, Herring shows that in spite of there now being an equal number of women and men users of the Internet, "Top-level control of Internet resources, infrastructure, and content is exercised mostly by men" (218). Thus, this review indicates that in e-mail, chat, instant messaging, and the World Wide Web there is neither gender equality with regard to power nor gender invisibility with regard to message content and style. One of the explanations that Herring offers for women's active role in maintaining gender differences in online communication is "gender pride," which is explained as "the social approval accorded to individuals for behaving in gender-appropriate ways" (219). This explanation links Herring's paper to one of the most interesting and significant discussions in this *Handbook* about the relationship between gender ideologies and actual language use, which is developed in Susan Philips's chapter and in part 4.

The first two contributions in part 3, by Niko Besnier and Miriam Meyerhoff, relate to the section heading "Authenticity and place" more explicitly than do the other chapters. Besnier and Meyerhoff explore the (linguistic) practices used by marginalized speakers in Tonga and Vanuatu to challenge ideologies of "authentic" identities and to claim a place of authority in their respective communities. The need to focus on marginalized or "exceptional" speakers is also highlighted by Kira Hall, whose refreshing review of classical concepts and findings in the field praises Robin Lakoff's frequently criticized work on women's language for including a range of deviant groups such as homosexuals, hippies, and academics (!) in her discussion of social and linguistic power asymmetries.

This focus on power is missing from Jack Sidnell's investigation of the male-exclusive culture of the Guyanese rumshop, in which he links conversation analytic and ethnographic frameworks. Sidnell's chapter demonstrates both the merits and the restrictions of micro-level analysis in the vein of CA. After giving some examples that demonstrate the extreme and, in my view, simplistic display of participant orientation that some CA analyses would deem necessary in order to accept the salience of gender or other contextual features, Sidnell subjects his

data to a refreshingly detailed analysis of turn-taking. His analysis reveals that (non-present and present but silent) women contribute to the male exclusivity of the setting, which Sidnell views as a “situated accomplishment” (383). However, he does not ask WHY women play an active role in the accomplishment of their exclusion, and he restricts his analysis to the observation that “FOR WHATEVER REASON Baby [a woman present in the rumshop] [. . .] fails to acknowledge the talk directed to her” (338; emphasis added). This omission undermines the exploration of gender in this asymmetrical interaction and should have led to a consideration of local and probably even supra-local patterns of power, which remain uninvestigated in Sidnell’s analysis despite the ethnographic information provided.

Nevertheless, Sidnell’s synthesis of analytic frameworks constitutes a valuable contribution to the debate about gender relevance/salience in linguistic data, a debate that is mirrored in Ann Weatherall and Cindy Gallois’s chapter in part 4. In their informative comparison of social-cognitive and discursive psychology approaches to language and gender, Weatherall & Gallois (489) explain that whereas the former approach would hold that language both expresses and reflects (gender) identity, the latter views gender as an interactional accomplishment and is influenced by CA theory and methodology. They take the stance that in spite of their differences, both psychological approaches offer “a link between larger social issues and local practices” (505) that is missing from other fields and even from the Community of Practice approach to language and gender.

The other chapters in this section on “Stereotypes and norms,” however, do attend to the “ideological dimension” of gender (505), which Weatherall & Gallois view as being neglected in non-psychological research. Deborah Cameron’s chapter highlights the importance of integrating the foci on ideology, representation, and actual use of language in relation to gender. Cameron argues that there has been a recent shift in representation from a model of female linguistic deficit to one of female linguistic superiority (and male deficit), which supports ideologies of a gender dichotomy and of women’s “natural” predisposition to work in jobs that require good/feminine communication skills but earn them little money or status. This highlights that not only is it important to explore the dialectic between ideological representation and actual language use, but also that linguistic ideologies themselves can have very powerful effects on the “real” economic or social situation of individuals and groups. Mary Talbot’s chapter on gender stereotypes supports Cameron’s arguments in many ways by providing more detailed analyses of media texts that demonstrate how the representation of women as good communicators supports rather than challenges male hegemony. Anne Pauwel’s chapter focuses on a range of non-sexist language reforms in different languages and aims to investigate the extent to which the introduction of non-sexist generic nouns, naming practices, and titles has been successful in establishing new norms.

The fifth and final part of the *Handbook* is dedicated to the exploration of gender in institutional discourse. The institutional contexts being investigated range from the European Union Parliament (Ruth Wodak) and the courtroom (Susan Ehrlich) to education (Joan Swann). Whereas Shari Kendall's chapter contrasts the linguistic strategies employed by one woman in two different roles – mother and manager – Janet Holmes and Maria Stubbe present a comparison of “gendered” workplaces which shows that women managers switch between stereotypically “masculine” and “feminine” styles, controlling the talking time and displaying directness when giving instructions in meetings but making use of mitigation and indirectness when dealing with subordinates on a one-to-one basis. The frequent use of humor also serves this dual focus of creating solidarity and maintaining control. Thus, Holmes & Stubbe's own data as well as their review of a range of empirical studies challenge previous findings about stereotypical gender differences in public interaction (e.g. Holmes 1992) by demonstrating that the linguistic practices displayed in work meetings should not be linked to the gender, but instead to the status of the speakers and to the function of the speech event.

Joan Swann's investigation of language and gender in educational settings supports Holmes & Stubbe's deconstruction of the “collaborative/competitive” dichotomy. On the other hand, Swann demonstrates that current educational policy evokes a strict binarism by focusing on boys' (alleged) collective underachievement and thereby marginalizing the needs of girls. This policy, Swann (640) argues, might be difficult for educational researchers (505) to challenge without themselves “bolstering a binary position to gender.”

One of the most central questions that engages authors in the *Handbook* is how to conceptualize gender. Most contributors distance themselves from the traditional sociolinguistic notion of gender as an independent social variable and from what is frequently perceived as an “essentialist” notion of gender as a (biologically determined) binary. Thus, the majority of papers appear to take a broadly constructionist approach to gender, viewing gender as being accomplished in interaction rather than as a fixed social category. Many chapters also reject the concepts of “feminine” and “masculine” styles of language as being insensitive to the heterogeneity of gender and instead embrace the Community of Practice approach as the appropriate framework for this context- and practice-related conceptualization of performative gender. However, there are some scholars who contradict the overwhelming opposition to “gendered styles” (e.g., Herring, Tannen), and several authors warn against the danger of losing sight of what Holmes & Meyerhoff (9) call the “supra-local” dimension of gender (see especially McElhinny, Lakoff, Herring, Philips, Swann). Indeed, Holmes & Meyerhoff (9) take the stance that “No matter what we say about the inadequacy or invidiousness of essentialized, dichotomous conceptions of gender, and no matter how justifiable such comments may be, in everyday life it really is often the case that gender is ‘essential’ .”

These different conceptualizations of gender are reflected in the diversity and combination of qualitative and quantitative methodologies advocated by the con-

tributors, ranging from (CA) micro-level analyses and ethnographic case studies to variationist approaches and critical discourse analyses (CDA) of macro-level patterns, and attributing varying degrees of importance to issues such as context, participant roles and orientation, power, and ideology. This heterogeneity of theory and method is one of the main strengths in Holmes & Meyerhoff's *Handbook*, as it will encourage numerous fruitful debates in the area of language and gender. The chapters in this book constitute a rich resource for scholars and students in the fields of (socio)linguistics, discourse analysis, and applied linguistics, but also in sociology, psychology, anthropology, media studies, and education. Moreover, many contributions will also be relevant to readers outside academia, particularly to practitioners and policy makers in a number of institutional settings (education, media, information technology, law, business). In fact, it is the comparison of academic investigations in language and gender with the gender stereotypes, norms, and practices that prevail outside academia that I view as one of the most significant future directions in the area of language and gender, as it moves scholars toward a more active engagement with public debates and policies.

## REFERENCE

Holmes, Janet (1992). Women's talk in public contexts. *Discourse and Society* 3:131–50.

(Received 29 June 2004)

*Language in Society* 34 (2005). Printed in the United States of America  
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404505220225

PHILIP HERBST, *Talking terrorism: A dictionary of the loaded language of political violence*. Westport, CT & London: Greenwood, 2003. Pp. xvii, 220. Hb \$49.95.

Reviewed by ROBIN TOLMACH LAKOFF  
*Linguistics, University of California, Berkeley*  
Berkeley, CA 94709  
rlakoff@berkeley.edu

*Talking terrorism (TT)* is not the kind of book typically reviewed in this journal. It is not explicitly about the analysis of language; rather, it is an illustration of the way language can persuade, manipulate, and corrupt. Nor is it written in the expository form expected of scholarly discourse, but instead emulates the form (if not the function) of a dictionary: an alphabetized series of entries, many followed by cross-references.

For these reasons, readers of *Language in Society* might at first glance not see *TT* as a book they would read as linguistic scholars or use in linguistics classes. But I would argue that the content of this book is important to us in both of those capacities, and that the very eccentricity of its format strengthens the arguments its author is making.

A conventional dictionary offers succinct and authoritative definitions. *TT* presents instead essays of varying length (from a paragraph to nine pages or so). A conventional dictionary's organizing principle is "all the words in Language X"; *TT*'s could be expressed as "all the ways contemporary Americans speak and hear about terrorism and allied concepts: fear, aggression, xenophobia, stereotyping, killing . . . and much more." Where a conventional dictionary enhances its authority through the appearance of neutrality and objectivity, *TT*'s entries are explicitly political and polemical. Written from a left-of-center political perspective, much of *TT* is apt to enrage or at least irritate conservatives, although not all of it gives comfort to liberals either – all the more so, in both cases, if readers are beguiled by the dictionary format into an expectation of bland neutrality.

A conventional dictionary "defines" words: tells the reader what they mean, with the presupposition that a word has a distinct and agreed-upon meaning. But one of Herbst's points is that, especially with highly politicized language, it does not work that way. A word's meaning depends on who is using it, to whom, with what purpose, and how much power the speaker has. As he says in his definition of "terrorism" (p. 163): "The word *terrorism* defies precise, complete, objective definition."

By way of contrast, we might look at a conventional dictionary's treatment of the same word (*American Heritage Dictionary* 1992:1854): "The unlawful use or threatened use of force or violence by a person or organized group against people or property with the intention of intimidating or coercing societies or governments, often for ideological or political reasons."

The contrast between *TT* and the conventional dictionary should encourage the reader to consider not only the politics of the lexical item *terrorism*, but also the politics of dictionaries and other apparently "objective" scholarly implements, and finally, the politics of objectivity – actual or purported – itself. A dictionary gives us authoritative treatments of lexical items: definitions, spellings, usage notes. We consult the dictionary as a prescriptive source: It is there to tell us how to talk. We accept its prescriptions with gratitude, and usually without argument. But are dictionary definitions as objective and apolitical as they appear? Or are they more closely related than one might think to Herbst's tendentious and clearly polemical discussions of *terrorism* and other "loaded" words than at first glance the reader of both might imagine?

Consider the *American Heritage* definition given above. It sounds unbiased and apolitical. Yet how many of the words have presuppositions built in and therefore beyond examination? What, for instance, is "unlawful" behavior? Who decides what the laws are? What exactly is "force or violence," as opposed to friendly persuasion? Where does one draw the line between the kinds of persuasion that the First Amendment legitimizes and behavior that can be considered "intimidating" or "coercive"? And who decides? You and I? The Supreme Court? Congress? Does this definition include the events of 9/11? I think so, but others might not. Does it include many provisions of the Patriot Act? I think so, but

others might not. These are thorny issues, questions that come before trial and appellate courts in various guises all the time. Yet the very preciseness of the dictionary definition lulls the reader into the belief that *terrorism* has a clear, authoritative, and consensual definition. That lulling action is in itself a political act, and yet one that we are encouraged not to recognize as such.

Once we begin to think about dictionaries and their definitions in this way, we have to recognize that the dictionary is, in its way, a political tool – not merely a source of unbiased information, but a means of persuasion or even manipulation. Discourses that are defined as informative (not only in dictionaries but also in newspaper articles and school textbooks, among many others) are all the more problematic because their biases are hidden.

That is one reason that Herbst has couched his discussion in dictionary form. By imitating a dictionary in form, yet using that form for the explicit expression of political content, he forces the reader to reflect on the nature of objectivity and its opposite, and to contemplate the existence of hidden agendas in many of our trusted forms of discourse. The language we are offered by media and governments as normal or inevitable may be no such thing, and may incorporate presuppositions that we would reject if we were willing and able to think clearly about the words we encounter.

Many of the entries in *TT* cover the broad areas of euphemism and dysphemism, as examples of the way consent and consensus are achieved. As an example of euphemism, there are the names the U.S. government gives to its military campaigns (Infinite Justice, Enduring Freedom) and to questionable legislation (e.g., the Patriot Act). Another kind of euphemism is the non-mention, seen in the U.S. government's refusal (as of May 2004) to use the word *torture* to describe the events at Abu Ghraib prison. As dysphemisms, think of the terms we use to convince ourselves that the other side is less than human, irrational, and scary: They are "animals" (*TT* has entries under "dog," "snake," "worm, and "ape"); they are "crazy," "madmen," "lunatics," "cranks," and many more (again, all annotated in *TT*). Or, notes Herbst, we dispose of our enemies by changing the connotations of words that originally were purely descriptive: We call them "medieval," and ourselves the bearers of "civilization," where they are "barbarians."

By the use of this loaded vocabulary, the powerful manipulate the powerless – there is no need for coercion. Governments become able to use words like *terrorism* in a weaselly way, implying that the word has a clear and precise "dictionary" definition, then extending it until it can be used to refer to anything and anyone they wish to bring into obloquy and destroy. *Terrorism* and *terrorist* have been used by the current U.S. government and its allies to describe providers of abortion. Is it any wonder that there are "patriots" willing to take the law into their own hands, since we all agree that fighting "terrorism" and destroying "terrorists" is patriotic and virtuous?

At the end of many of his definitions, Herbst has included cross-references, which not only strengthen the book's allusions to the conventional dictionary



but also create “texture” – that is, cohesion – by encouraging the reader to construct a connected narrative. Thus, after *Massacre*, we find cross-references to *Collateral damage*, *Genocide*, *Murder, 9-11*, and *War*, some of which might seem to follow naturally from the theme of “massacre,” others more tendentiously so. (*Collateral damage* might bring us back to “euphemism,” though this topic is not discussed in its own right in the text.)

The value of the book does not lie only in its explicit injunction to beware of governments bearing verbal gifts. Academics need to look closely at our own habits of language and thought. Most of the readers of this review are academics – scholars and teachers. Traditionally we consider “objectivity” both a requirement of our research and a desideratum in our teaching. We think, moreover, that we know it – or at least its opposite – when we see it. But the discussion in *TT* should make us suspect ourselves as objective persons, and even the possibility – and desirability – of pure objectivity. To think is to take sides, to prefer one perspective to another, to express our biases, whether explicitly or by tacit avoidance. We can operate like the conventional dictionary, and by using a deliberately vague and emotionless vocabulary, pretend to objectivity and absence of bias. Or we can operate like *TT*: recognize our biases and bring them into the open with full disclosure.

In short, this is in many ways an unconventional book, and a book of great courage and insight. While it is not the usual fare of linguistics courses, I can certainly see using it in a lot of the work we do. Its definitions can make for lively class discussions in semantics and pragmatics courses, and many of its themes and terms have bearing for sociolinguistics as well. As linguists and sociolinguists, we need full awareness of how we deform language and how it, in turn, deforms us. *Talking Terrorism* is an invaluable wake-up call.

Received 26 May 2004

*Language in Society* 34 (2005). Printed in the United States of America  
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404505230221

DEDAIĆ, MIRJANA N. & DANIEL N. NELSON (eds.), *At war with words*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2003. Pp. 479, Hb. \$94.00

SILBERSTEIN, SANDRA, *War of words: Language, politics and 9/11*. New York: Routledge, 2002. Pp. 224, Hb. \$69.95, pb. \$16.95.

Reviewed by P. KERIM FRIEDMAN  
37-30 81<sup>st</sup> Street, Apt. C-7  
Jackson Heights, NY 11372  
kerim.friedman@oxus.net

Daniel Nelson writes that “we talk our way into war and talk our way out of it” (Dedaić & Nelson [henceforth DN], p. 449). Drawing on a diverse array of methodological and theoretical perspectives and an equally wide range of subject mat-

ters, Mirjana Dedaić and Daniel Nelson's edited volume on the role of language in war, and the effects of war on language, is a sprawling, perhaps unwieldy collection that opens up a number of important avenues of investigation in this gravely important but as yet undefined field of study. Sandra Silberstein focuses her book much more narrowly on the language of politics and news media in the wake of the September 11 tragedy. Despite their differences, both books address similar themes: (i) declaring war, or the language used by political leaders to justify military action; (ii) propaganda, or the construction of a war narrative by the media, and the use of political discourse to divide populations; (iii) language politics, or how wars shape language policy; and (iv) controlling speech, or the language used to grant or deny legitimacy in political debates. With the exception of language politics, not touched on by Silberstein, these themes are addressed equally by both books.

**DECLARING WAR.** Paul Chilton's chapter in *At war with words* starts with a quote from a speech President Bush gave in 2000. Bush recalls a time when we knew who our enemies were: "It was us versus them, and it was clear who them was. Today, we are not so sure who they are, but we know they're there" (DN, 95). Although he doesn't discuss the quote explicitly, there is a striking contrast between Bush's binary moral universe and the nuanced complexity Chilton examines in President Clinton's speech justifying military intervention in Kosovo. Clinton's Kosovo speech eschews a "just war discourse" in favor of a "lengthy appeal to the need for self-preservation" (122). However, Bush's speeches declaring a "war on terrorism" in the wake of 9/11 reveal a remarkable consistency with the "us versus them" binary moral framework used in his 2000 speech. These speeches are the focus of Silberstein's first two chapters, although she does not seem aware of similar themes in Bush's pre-9/11 rhetoric. Silberstein focuses, instead, on Franklin D. Roosevelt's "Day of infamy" speech, made following the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor (15). By drawing on this speech, Bush was able to frame an ill-understood attack by a hidden enemy in terms of a ready-made war narrative. In his speech at the National Cathedral in Washington, D.C., the following Sunday, Bush further linked the "religious and military nature of his call [to war]" (53). Silberstein argues that it was with this second speech that Bush was able to finally overcome his "presumed inadequacies and his status as America's first appointed president" (39), gaining for himself newfound legitimacy as the nation's commander-in-chief, as well as its "national pastor" (53). Despite their complementary conclusions, stylistically these two authors couldn't be further apart. Silberstein is writing for a general audience and quotes liberally from the speeches she discusses. Chilton, in contrast, devotes himself to carefully mapping the underlying cognitive structure of the text. Unfortunately, Chilton's three-dimensional graphs of these cognitive maps are more befuddling than illuminating.

**PROPAGANDA.** In her chapter "Liberal parasites and other creepers," Kathryn Ruud informs us that the successful use of propaganda by the Nationalist Social-

ist Third Reich drew its inspiration from England's innovations during World War I (DN, 29). After laying out the central features of propaganda, she proceeds to demonstrate effectively that the discourse of conservative talk-show hosts, such as Rush Limbaugh, contains many of these same features. Although she is careful to trace a line back to England, Ruud seems guilty of damning by association with her constant parallelism between Nazi propaganda and contemporary talk-show rhetoric. She also overlooks American influences on Limbaugh and his compatriots, such as the vitriolic Father Coughlin, whose anti-Communist, anti-Semitic radio show had an audience of 45 million (more than twice that of Limbaugh) in 1930 (Neiwert 2003). Kweku Osam's chapter on the discourse of the Ghanaian Reform Movement similarly highlights key linguistic features employed in order to polarize public opinion. But Osam's list of features seem to be constitutive of ALL political discourse and fails to teach us anything specific about the rhetoric of the Ghanaian Reform Movement.

Both Renée Dickason's "Advertising for peace as political communication" and the fifth chapter of Silberstein's book, "Selling America," look at more positive uses of propaganda. Dickason explores a unique effort to use television ads to promote peace in Northern Ireland, and Silberstein analyzes efforts by the Ad Council of America to promote both patriotism and tolerance. But whereas Dickason restricts her analysis to the ad campaign itself, tracing how it changed over time, Silberstein includes an analysis of popular reception as well. Drawing from an online discussion hosted on the Ad Council's own website, Silberstein finds that ambiguity in their message led to differing interpretations. While some people felt that the ads celebrated America's diversity, others were upset that the ads left out important categories of Americans, including Muslim men and women in Islamic dress, turbaned Sikhs, and even members of the Armed Forces (118–19). In another chapter, Silberstein is similarly able to make effective use of the disjuncture between official and popular discourse. By employing exclusionary language specific to the predominantly white, Irish, and male firefighters' union to which he belonged (100–2), a New York City firefighter, Mike Moran, stirred up controversy. Commentators struggled with the contradiction of having to laud America's heroes without condoning such rhetoric (although some writers had no problems endorsing Moran's celebration of "brotherhood").

Two chapters in *At war with words* complement each other by, separately, addressing media and public discourse. Alexander Pollak's "When guilt becomes a foreign country" explores how Austrian newspaper accounts of World War II construct narratives "aimed at superseding guilt and responsibility" for the role of Austrian Wehrmacht soldiers in committing Nazi atrocities (DN, 205). Gertraud Benke and Ruth Wodak's "Remembering and forgetting" provides a related analysis of popular narratives on the same theme. Benke & Wodak analyze differences in how each generation responded to interviews conducted at an Austrian exhibition documenting the complicity of the Wehrmacht in committing Nazi war crimes. While these chapters work well together, it would have

been nice to have had some explicit discussion of the relationship between media-produced and popular narratives.

**LANGUAGE POLITICS.** Four chapters in DN investigate the effect of wars on language policy. Two of these essays look at how the separation of speech communities through war also furthers linguistic divisions. Keith Langston and Anita Peti-Stantić find that efforts to create a purer Croatian, free of Serbian influence, were only partially successful. Ordinary people had a much easier time identifying foreign loanwords as non-Croatian than words with shared Slavic roots which were identified as “Serbian” by Croatian linguists (DN, 267–68). Marilena Karyole mou highlights the irony of Greek Cypriots offering bilingual higher education in both Turkish and Greek when political separation of the two communities makes it unnecessary actually to implement such policies (DN, 367). The other two essays look at the shifting relationship between local and official languages on islands whose official language has changed with the fortunes of war. Rumiko Shinzato’s essay traces the rise, fall, and revitalization of Okinawan (DN, 305). Kazuko Matsumoto and David Britain’s chapter on Palau explores the effect of Japanese and American wartime occupation on the languages of the Pacific island nation of Palau. The Japanese sought to reduce the power and prestige of the local elite, offering education and economic opportunities to the whole population, while the United States sought to co-opt the local elite and foster economic dependency to turn the population away from the Japanese. Following independence, the Palauan elites used their Palauan linguistic capital to legitimate their own authority, while educating their children at English-speaking schools. Matsumoto and Britain argue that this serves to stabilize the elite’s social position, “while reinforcing the powerless position of the ‘others’ they pretend to support” (DN, 337).

**CONTROLLING SPEECH.** Silberstein’s chapter “The new McCarthyism” discusses a report by the American Council of Trustees and Alumni (ACTA; founded in 1995 by Lynne Cheney, wife of U.S. Vice President Richard Cheney) which includes a list of more than 100 quotes by scholars accused of being “short on patriotism” (138). Silberstein focuses on “common logical fallacies” found throughout the report. So scathing is Silberstein’s dissection of this document that, in the end, one wonders if the document itself deserves such a detailed line-by-line analysis. Although she does briefly discuss responses to the list, there is little effort to place the ACTA report within a larger context of debates over the supposedly “liberal bias” of American universities, or legal attacks on freedom of speech following the announcement of the “war on terror” (Lichtblau 2003, American Civil Liberties Union 2004, Rosenthal 2004).

The role of patriotism in controlling speech is also discussed in Mark Allan Peterson’s contribution to DN, “American warriors speaking American.” Examining the metapragmatics of congressional debate, he argues that congressmen never challenge the goals of a bill, only whether or not the bill will achieve these

goals (432). So, when Congressman Patrick Kennedy challenged the political motivations of an English-only bill before the House, he strayed from the unwritten ground rules of the debate (433). Peterson explores how Kennedy's lack of military service, as well as the complex turn-taking rules of the House, are manipulated by both sides in an effort to return the debate to its "normal routine" (436). The politics of congressional debate is, for Peterson, a "battle for control" (443) over the metadiscursive practices that regulate political speech.

Two articles included in DN don't easily fit into the four themes I've laid out in this review. Suzanne Wong Scollon's essay explores the coverage of the Taiwan missile crisis of 1996 in the Hong Kong news media. She argues that while both the government-run and independent media claim "objectivity," the "liberal press" uses more "strongly evaluative verbs of saying," while the government media use more neutral language. Finally, Robert Tucker and Theodore Prosise's chapter "The language of atomic science and atomic conflict" argues that our language is inadequate to deal with phenomena outside the range of human experience (130), such as subatomic physics or nuclear warfare. However, if our language is capable of producing vast amounts of discourse on the afterlife, the spiritual realm, utopias, and other nebulous topics, it is unclear why quantum mechanics, about which we know far more, should impose any special strain.

Whether one contemplates the twisted metaphors of war speeches, the half-truths of the news media, language policies and hate speech aimed at dividing populations, or attempts to silence dissent, after reading these two books one has a greater appreciation of the many ways in which language and war are interrelated. Silberstein's slim volume is the more accessible of the two, suitable for undergraduate students and nonspecialists. It is also a more tightly focused book. *At war with words* contains many excellent essays, including important contributions by prominent scholars, but the wide range of material included means that the book will likely be remembered more for its individual parts than for their sum. Taken together, these books lay the foundation for research into questions that, unfortunately, seem more pressing with each passing day.

## REFERENCES

- American Civil Liberties Union (2004). USA Patriot Act. Electronic Document (<http://www.aclu.org/SafeandFree/SafeandFree.cfm?ID=12126&c=207>), accessed 23 June 2004.
- Lichtblau, Eric (2003). F.B.I. Scrutinizes antiwar rallies. *New York Times*, 23 November.
- Neiwert, David A. (2003). Rush, newspeak and fascism: An exegesis. Electronic document (<http://cursor.org/stories/fascismintroduction.php>)
- Rosenthal, Will (2004). Panel tackles political bias in departments. *The Chronicle*. Electronic document (<http://www.chronicle.duke.edu/vnews/display.v/ART/2004/03/02/40447f42c6c5f>)

(Received 1 July 2004)

*Language in Society* 34 (2005). Printed in the United States of America  
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404505240228

JEAN AITCHISON & DIANA M. LEWIS (eds.), *New media language*. London & New York: Routledge, 2003. Pp. x, 209. Pb \$25.95.

Reviewed by LILY CHEN  
*School of East Asian Studies, University of Sheffield*  
*Sheffield, UK*  
*lili.chen@sheffield.ac.uk*

In recent decades, say Jean Aitchison and Diana M. Lewis in their introduction to this volume, the media have seen an unprecedented amount of change. New media modes have appeared; newspapers and radio have been joined by television and the Internet. The speed of transmission has increased, and many more readers/viewers participate both actively and passively in the ongoing process that is the dissemination and consumption of news.

Yet while a flood of publications has attempted to analyze the changing nature of the media – exploring underlying aims and attitudes, or examining ways in which the media might be misleading its readers/viewers – relatively few, Aitchison & Lewis say, have investigated the language of the media in any depth.

This volume arose out of a conference at the University of Oxford in April 2001 on “Language, the Media and International Communication.” Contributors include academics and some journalists, and the aim is to explore present-day media language, how it has changed or is changing, and how this affects our view of the world.

The 20 contributions are grouped under four topics. Part 1, “Modern media discourse,” looks at how media communication has changed in recent years; part 2, “Modes of the media,” deals with the variety of media modes through which the news is disseminated; part 3, “Representations and models,” looks at how the ways in which particular topics are represented can influence the perceptions of the audience; and part 4, “The effect of the media on language,” looks at ways in which the media might be affecting our everyday speech and even written records.

Although each section has a separate main theme, certain key points recur throughout the book, Aitchison & Lewis suggest. They single out two trends or “paradoxes” in particular. The first concerns what they call “globalisation versus fragmentation.” News reports now leap across the globe in seconds, they say – a phenomenon that has resulted in some similarities in media styles across widely separated geographical regions. In some cases, however, the reverse has happened, they write: “The immensity of the world has led to a tightening of small-scale networks, resulting in some fragmentation, as people try to maintain local ties and their own identity.”

The second paradox they note is that of linguistic expansion versus language compression. Extended reporting of major events is now the norm. Column inches have increased, newspaper pages multiplied; TV reports can now be accessed 24

hours a day. Yet at the same time, compression of information has become a major feature, with headlines summarizing a whole event in a few words, and dense noun phrases packing a variety of descriptive acts into a very few words. This is a powerful observation in itself.

The book's first section deals with how media communication has changed. Allan Bell's contribution looks at the media reporting of two similar events separated in time by almost 100 years: the expeditions to the South Pole of Robert Falcon Scott (1910 to 1913) and of Pete Hillary (1998 to 1999). Bell notes interesting similarities – pride in the achievement of national heroes, and the way in which headlines and the desire for a scoop drive the news agenda – but equally interesting differences. By the close of the 20th century, with the advent of 24-hour TV news coverage, reporting of events is almost real-time, and it is dominated by images rather than words. It is also more voyeuristic – with the waiting wives under much closer scrutiny – and there has been a shift away from relying on official versions of what happened to first-hand accounts. There is also, however, amongst the plethora of images and interviews, evidence of linguistic compression, especially in headlines.

Elsewhere in the book's opening section, journalist Raymond Snoddy examines a number of widespread beliefs about the media, such as that newspapers are doomed to collapse with the growing dominance of TV and the Internet, or that English will become the dominant language on the Internet and elsewhere. He concludes that they are largely groundless myths. Deborah Cameron suggests that certain discourse styles – such as an appearance of friendliness and informality – have spread through the media of different cultures, even when separate languages are used. Robin Lakoff asks whether political and other types of public discourse have grown less civil, concluding that what many call “incivility” is actually no more than the exuberance of certain groups, such as Blacks, women, and the non-middle classes, who have achieved “discourse power” for the first time. Finally, Martin Conboy investigates the language of the tabloid press and the development of a vernacular idiom through which the world is compressed into oversimple conceptual and linguistic categories.

In part 2, the emphasis shifts onto the various modes of the modern media, and how these affect the way in which media discourse is realized. John Carey looks at similarities and differences between newspaper reporting, general reportage, and literature, and concludes that in a sense, reportage is the modern successor to religion. “Arguably the advent of mass communications represents the greatest change in human consciousness that has taken place in recorded history,” he says (58). “The development, within a few decades, from a situation where most of the inhabitants of the earth would have no knowledge about how most of the others were faring, to a situation where the ordinary person's mental space is filled with reports about the doings of complete strangers, represents a revolution in mental activity . . . If we ask what took the place of news reporting in pre-modern man's brain, the likeliest answer . . . is religion.” David Hendy

looks at the UK's BBC Radio Four, its struggles to achieve a "middlebrow" voice, and the BBC's recognition that it is not always possible to bridge the gulf between an elite and a popular voice. Angela Kessler and Alexander Bergs examine love letters sent by text messaging, and deny that they constitute a threat to literacy. Naomi S. Baron looks at "e-style" (e-mail style) and shows how it overlaps with and differs from existing discourse modes; it resembles speech, she concludes, but that is in part because writing in general has become more "speech-like" in response to changing social attitudes: and so what? Diana M. Lewis herself, finally, argues that digital modes of communication (essentially "online news") are shaping a new discourse of news reporting – one that, because the Internet is so open to access by individuals, will be less dominated by the traditional mass media as more and more individuals find their voices.

In the opening contribution to part 3, the wine writer Malcolm Gluck takes a light-hearted look at the language of wine snobbery. Alan Partington examines the often acrimonious rules of engagement between White House "spin doctors" (official spokespersons) and the "wolf pack" (the press) and concludes that spin is little more than a new name for an old game. Jennifer M. Wei describes the metaphors used in news coverage of recent Taiwanese elections, a chapter interesting both for being a study of a non-English language media, and for what her study reveals about the different types of metaphors commonly employed in different cultures. Nuria Lorenzo-Dus examines how former BBC television talk-show host Robert Kilroy-Silk was able, by clever control of conversation and the use of specific questions, prompts, and evaluations, to ensure that traditional family and parenting attitudes were communicated through his show even though it appeared that participants were offering their own views. Catherine Evans Davies subjects U.S. media celebrity Martha Stewart to a similar examination.

The final part of the volume focuses on the way in which the media affect our language. Yibin Ni looks at the use of noun phrases in editorials and news reports. Douglas Biber examines how space constraints in newspapers have led to dense, structurally complex noun phrases which cram in information. John Ayto looks at the importance of newspapers in determining which neologisms find their way into modern dictionaries. John Simpson also attends to linguistic sources of data for dictionaries, this time specifically the *Oxford English Dictionary*. Jean Aitchison examines the media language used to describe the events of 11 September and concludes that few neologisms were coined during attempts to capture the horror of the incident, with reports falling back instead on existing words such as *apocalypse*, *cataclysm* and *outrage*. "The overwhelming final feeling of man is that words are unable to do justice to the emotions aroused by the events," she concludes (202).

A collection of essays examining the ways in which the language of the media is changing to keep pace with new technologies, new modes of discourse, changing social norms, and the shift in relationship between formerly dominant mass media modes and an increasingly active audience is to be welcomed. Some



contributions are necessarily of more worth than others (I particularly appreciated Robin Lakoff's contribution on the essential civility of incivility), and any specialist dipping into a volume as diverse and wide-ranging as this will inevitably encounter areas of work with which he or she is unfamiliar, and perhaps frustratingly little in terms of a solid contribution to his or her own specialized field. Taken as a whole, however, the volume is a significant contribution to the study of the changing nature of the media, and to the way in which the language employed in media discourse both influences and is influenced by the changing world the media is attempting to realize. It could serve as an invaluable introduction for anyone comparatively new to the field; for those with a longer record, it suggests several exciting new avenues for further research.

(Received 24 May 2004)

*Language in Society* 34 (2005). Printed in the United States of America  
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404505250224

JACQUES MAURIS AND MICHAEL A. MORRIS (eds.), *Languages in a globalising world*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. Pp. xiv, 345. Hb. \$75.00.

Reviewed by LUKAS D. TSITSIPIS  
*Aristotle University of Thessaloniki*  
*Thessaloniki 54124, Greece*  
*ltsi@frl.auth.gr*

This is an ambitious volume keyed to some of the most acute concerns of our time in regard to the linguistic condition of the world of late modernity. This collective effort is structured in such a manner as to offer the widest possible coverage of languages, broad geographical areas, and politico-economic blocks. It consists of 21 chapters, including the Introduction and Conclusion. Figures and tables provide useful supplements to the analytical parts of several chapters. It is unfortunate that the bulk and density of this work does not allow for a chapter-by-chapter review here.

One major, positive characteristic that immediately strikes the careful reader is that the volume editors and contributors have no illusions that they can claim to make hard and fast predictions of the future of our global linguistic condition, and this kind of theoretical sensitivity is in line with the actual, fluid, and unpredictable world circumstances of high or late modernity (Giddens 1991). In addition to an Introduction written by the editors and a Conclusion by Humphrey Tonkin on "The search for a global linguistic strategy," the volume is divided into three parts: 1, "Global communication challenges"; 2, "Major areas"; and 3, "Languages of wider communication."

The first and most theoretical part includes chapters by Jacques Maurais on a general view of the global linguistic order, by Mark Fettes on the geostrategies of interlingualism, by Douglas A. Kibbee on language policy and linguistic theory,

by Jean Laponce on geostrategies for minority languages, and by William F. Mackey on forecasting the fate of languages.

In the second part, the focus shifts to major areas such as eastern and central Europe, with contributions on linguistic geostrategy by Ferenc Fodor and Sandrine Peluau, issues of languages and supranationality in the European Union by Claude Truchot, language policy of Mercosur in South America and the question of English hegemony by Rainer Enrique Hamel, North American integration (NAFTA) and questions of linguistic diversity by Michael A. Morris, problems of sociolinguistic change in post-Soviet Central Asian societies by Birgit N. Schlyter, technology, language and script in Japan and East Asian countries by Stefan Kaiser, consequences of globalization on Sub-Saharan Africa by Roland J. – L. Breton, and discussion of Australasia and the South Pacific by Richard B. Baldauf Jr. and Paulin G. Djité.

The third part continues in the same general spirit but moves analysis to the discussion of languages of wider communication, which, in our inherited commonsense understanding and political awareness, are associated most readily with what have come to be known as the sources and causes of linguistic globalization. Thus, Ulrich Ammon examines the international status of German, Foued Laroussi the challenges and difficulties that Arabic faces in regard to new technologies, Vida Io. Mikhalchenko and Yulia Trushkova the unstable condition of Russian in the modern world, and Robert Chaudenson the geolinguistic and geostrategic situation surrounding French; Grant D. McConnell calls for a scientific geostrategy for English; and Maria da Graça Krieger discusses Brazilian Portuguese in the context of Latin American integration.

Even though contributors have carefully and laudably avoided committing themselves to uncritical forecasts and grand predictive schemes, they nevertheless embed their analyses in a more or less unified conceptual frame. Major notions that inform the whole enterprise are geostrategy, geopolitics, geolinguistics, expansion, interconnectedness, and so on (see in particular the Conclusion by Humphrey Tonkin and chap. 2 by Jacques Maurais, as well as the Introduction by Maurais & Morris for a critical assessment). These foundational concepts are analytically supplemented in the various chapters (particularly the theoretical ones of part 1, but reiterated and used in later chapters too) with notions intimately related to globalization processes, such as esperantism, interlingualism, language brokering, technologism, and critical juxtapositions of linguistic Darwinism and ecological linguistics. Such a conceptual unification does not come as a surprise, since most contributors to the volume share sociolinguistic and political interests by training and academic orientation. Thus, concepts such as geopolitics and geostrategy are tailored to suit references to worldwide linguistic phenomena, including economic, social, and cultural factors. Emphasis on terms such as *strategy* or *politics*, as constituents of compound words, indicates that the various components of the world system are embedded in networks of human agencies of various degrees of power and therefore can be affected and changed for the better.

In terms of more specific topics addressed in the volume under the broader conceptual framework presented above, the authors discuss issues related to minority languages and various models that have been proposed for their study in a dialectic with major, world, national, and regional languages, broad functional specialization of languages, new nation formations and linguistic planning, writing systems and technology, or the matrix of language shift and maintenance. But the contributors are united in a commitment to macro-sociolinguistics. This option is quite understandable in the context of a unified project and in the spirit of the academic division of labor. And, of course, one cannot expect a book to address just about everything. But the interested reader would expect rather more emphasis to fall on the micro-dimensions. What academic specialization dictates does not necessarily coincide with the complex condition of our world. More detailed discussions of linguistic interactions and functional aspects of languages at a level beneath the national, the regional, and the global would be useful and not irrelevant to global processes.

Furthermore, one would expect from the authors of these interesting, well-articulated, and informed chapters a higher degree of reflexivity. Errington 2003 argues that issues related to language rights, language diversity, language shift, and so on are theoretically formulated with an eye on what the audiences and the goals of the particular families of research are. And even though critical thinking is not absent from this volume, one would want to see more of that. Martel 2004, in a paper with a focus on globalization, strongly favors what she calls “solidarity views” of global order as against competition models derived from a Darwinian frame of mind and their taken-for-grantedness, particularly the dividing lines set up by nationalism. Authors of this volume are not completely indifferent to options such as those suggested by Martel, but the technical character of the book prevents these issues from being foregrounded as much as they should be, in this reviewer’s opinion.

This technical character of the book and its realistic treatment of globalizing language processes (not necessarily negative aspects of such a collective endeavor) have prevented to some extent a serious discussion of Western language ideologies per se (Dorian 1998), and the decisive role they have played and continue to play in influencing and shaping global language structures.

*Languages in a globalising world* is a serious work of a macro-sociolinguistic nature that will be instrumental in research by scholars and students interested in language policy and planning, international relations, questions of nationalism and transnationalism, political theory, and the sociology of the world order.

## REFERENCES

- Dorian, Nancy C. (1998). Western language ideologies and small-language prospects. In Lenore A. Grenoble & Lindsay J. Whaley (eds.), *Endangered languages: Language loss and community response*, 3–21. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Errington, Joseph (2003). Getting language rights: The rhetorics of language endangerment and loss. *American Anthropologist* 105:723–32.
- Giddens, Anthony (1991). *Modernity and self-identity: Self and society in the late modern age*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Martel, Angéline (2004). Linguistic diversity, global paradigms and taken-for-grantedness. *Collegium Anthropologicum* 28 (Suppl. 1):27–36.

(Received 1 July 2004)

*Language in Society* 34 (2005). Printed in the United States of America  
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404505260220

PETER LADEFOGED, *Phonetic data analysis: An introduction to fieldwork and instrumental techniques*. Malden, MA, & Oxford: Blackwell, 2003. Pp. xi, 196. Pb. \$34.95.

Reviewed by NATASHA WARNER  
*Linguistics, University of Arizona*  
Tucson, Arizona 85721  
nwarner@u.arizona.edu

This book teaches readers how to conduct phonetic fieldwork, from planning through data collection to analysis. Peter Ladefoged is eminently qualified to write this book, as probably the world's top phonetician, and as someone with an astounding quantity of phonetic fieldwork experience.

The book has eight chapters, beginning with a chapter on everything that comes prior to analyzing data: creating a word list, finding and choosing speakers, taking notes while in the field, equipment, and so on. This chapter includes crucial details such as how much to pay speakers, how to keep them from producing excessively prescriptive speech, and how to get human subjects' permission (even if the speakers have never held a pen and won't be comfortable with written consent). Although only one chapter is devoted to these logistical aspects of fieldwork, this may be the most important part of the book.

Subsequent chapters are divided by type of analysis. There are two chapters on articulatory phonetics: chap. 2 on place of articulation (palatography, with a subsection on photography), and chap. 3 on aerodynamics (oral and nasal airflow, oral pressure, electroglottography, and subglottal pressure). Four chapters on acoustic phonetics follow. Chap. 4 describes measurement of pitch, loudness, and duration; chap. 5, vowel quality; chapter 6, spectral acoustics of consonants; and chap. 7, voice quality. Chap. 8 summarizes equipment needs, briefly mentions some additional non-field methods, and covers more practical details (e.g., remembering anti-malaria medication, holding a party for the community when you finish your work).

The book is written in a very pleasant, informal style. I laughed out loud while reading it. The feeling is of sitting down with a very kind, knowledgeable senior professor, who proceeds to give you advice for the next several hours about how to conduct research, while you scribble notes down madly. A pleasant

feature is the anecdote boxes, which contain personal stories from Ladefoged's fieldwork experiences. These are even more amusing reading than the main text, and one tends to skip ahead to read them all. Most of these anecdotes contain good advice about conducting fieldwork, whether it is phrased as advice or not. The anecdotes themselves constitute a tutorial on cultural sensitivity in fieldwork. The anecdotal character of the writing spills over into the main text, but this is fine: Ladefoged has a tremendous amount of knowledge to impart about how to do phonetic fieldwork, and some of it is best transmitted through examples from his own experiences.

There is a great deal to say in favor of this book. It is extremely thorough, and it provides a great deal of detail about almost every step in the fieldwork process, from how to find subjects and construct a word list to how to work with the subjects, how to record, how to make most types of measurements, and what to do after the field trip. The downside of this thoroughness is that the information is probably excessive for most readers. Even phoneticians may never choose to do palatography or electroglottography in the field, and very few of us will ever measure subglottal air pressure even in the lab. For those who are not primarily phoneticians but do work with insufficiently documented languages, this much detail about so many methods may be overwhelming. Furthermore, for many articulatory methods, it may not be advisable to attempt them based on written instructions alone, no matter how good those instructions are. Some of these methods are best learned in person from an expert.

However, this is not necessarily a negative aspect about the book: The information is there for those who want it, and if readers focus on the techniques they might use, the other chapters need not be overwhelming. If one finds oneself working on a language with breathy or creaky voice, one could read the voice quality chapter, and if one used a good flat response microphone (chap. 1), one could measure voice quality without further instruction. For researchers whose primary interest is in discourse, language in use, sociolinguistics, and related fields, the most useful chapters might be 1, 4, 5, 6, and 8. This book could be especially useful to those not originally planning phonetic fieldwork, because following the equipment and recording recommendations would mean that acoustic phonetic analysis would still be possible afterward.

The methodological information is important for both fieldwork and lab work. For example, Ladefoged repeatedly emphasizes that one should first look over a reasonable sample of the tokens by eye before beginning measurements, so that one can choose good criteria for how to make the measurements (e.g., What counts as the onset of voicing? What counts as a pitch peak?). One must then stick to these criteria for every item, even if they do not appear accurate for some items. One should take copious notes while making measurements so that one can go back and change the criteria easily if necessary, but one should look at enough items before beginning to avoid this. This is the basis of phonetic measurement, and it is something one often struggles to teach students. Another ex-

ample is how to avoid counting a spurious pitch tracker error as a linguistically meaningful pitch peak, which is easy to do when one first looks at pitch data.

I value the strong respect for one's consultants and their culture that Ladefoged conveys. He reminds the reader that naive speakers with little formal education may grasp exactly what the linguist is doing and be very astute at finding patterns in their language. He also makes suggestions about broadening one's views in order to form a good relationship with the community. Another ethical issue, the effect of fieldwork on endangered languages, is tangentially addressed.

A potential negative point is the book's emphasis on careful speech, primarily single words in a frame sentence. For basic phonetic description of an undocumented language, this unnatural speech style is probably ideal, but the field of phonetics has recently been moving toward more natural speech. Ladefoged recommends not recording more than a few sentences of connected speech. Anyone studying language above the level of phonetics and phonology will be recording connected speech anyway, but even for purely phonetic investigations, it might be useful to record casual connected speech as well. While telling traditional stories might distract speakers for a while, if one can get a good transcription, this would allow study of intonation and fast speech reduction. (Also, if the language becomes extinct and community members later wish to revitalize it, they will be grateful for connected speech recordings.)

A few topics are omitted from the book, such as statistical analysis and thorough information about experimental design. Of course, statistics is a large topic and cannot be covered within this book. However, more on experimental design would be useful. This could help to prevent returning from the field and consulting a statistics expert only to find that one does not have the right data, or enough data in each condition, to test the main hypothesis. Another thing left out (intentionally) is theory. The book is about methodology and does not purport to discuss theory. This is fine, but readers need to have enough background to understand why one would be doing the research described in the book. Finally, speech perception is omitted. Although perception research is less common in the field than acoustic research, field perception research is possible, and some suggestions on how to do basic perceptual research would be useful.

To sum up, this is an extremely useful book for anyone who plans to record speech under any circumstances. It is most useful for those doing phonetic studies on little-documented languages in the field. However, it would also be very useful to non-phonetician field researchers who might want to check out the stress vs. tone system of their particular field language, or some funny-sounding consonants that might be implosives, or whether and how far nasalization spreads, or anything else about sounds that one might notice while doing fieldwork. The book would even be quite useful to fieldworkers who don't do any phonetics, for the chapters on equipment and logistics. Furthermore, this is an excellent resource for anyone using a particular phonetic method, even in the lab. If a stu-

dent needs to measure voice quality, even if it is voice quality of Standard American English recorded in the lab, that student should absolutely read the voice quality chapter. This is not only the case for students: This book could serve as a standard manual for making phonetic measurements. I am considering using it as one textbook for my introductory graduate phonetics course, because it covers so much methodology most textbooks don't. To conclude, all researchers who record speech should have a copy of this book, even though not everyone needs to read every chapter.

(Received 20 June 2004)

*Language in Society* 34 (2005). Printed in the United States of America  
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404505270227

MARCEL DANESI, *My son is an alien: A cultural portrait of today's youth*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 2003. Pp. 240, Pb \$22.95.

Reviewed by CECELIA CUTLER  
*Department of Linguistics, Stony Brook University*  
*Stony Brook, NY 11794-4376*  
*cacutler@notes.cc.sunysb.edu*

Marcel Danesi's *My son is an alien* is a concise, informative guide for parents and teachers seeking to understand adolescent behavior. In what is largely a descriptive account of the teenage experience, the author touches on a range of topics from adolescent sex to gang involvement and drug abuse. Danesi and his research assistants interviewed 200 young people in nine North American cities between 1999 and 2002 to explore their attitudes toward sex, music, drugs, school, and a range of other subjects. The participants ranged in age from 12 to their early 20s and were evenly divided along gender lines and among early, middle, and late teens.

The author's central contention is reminiscent of the work of Philippe Ariès, who argues in *Centuries of childhood* (1962) that our modern conception of childhood is in fact just a recent invention. Here, Danesi asserts that our view of adolescence as a transitional period between childhood and adulthood characterized by emotional *Sturm und Drang* emerged only around 150 years ago, coinciding with the spread of education beyond the primary years. In fact, the term *adolescent* entered common usage only in the 1880s, to refer to those who stayed in school beyond puberty. The result – according to Danesi – has been that adolescents have increasingly come to be viewed as “older children” rather than adults, despite the fact that biologically, they have already reached sexual maturity.

The author goes on to describe adolescence as a “failed experiment” that has had dire social consequences. The construct of adolescence effectively alienates young people from the adult world and drives them to a host of risky, antisocial behaviors, from drug abuse to reckless sex. Accordingly, a host of psychological theories emerged in the work of G. Stanley Hall (1844–1924) and Sigmund Freud

(1856–1939), seeking to justify the existence of adolescence and to explain its attendant pathologies.

Danesi blames the “failed experiment” of adolescence for the increasing “juvenilization” of adult behavior. The mass marketing to the current generation of “tweenies” (7–12-year-olds), teens (13–19), and “middlescents” (20–30) has permeated the culture at large and pushed adolescent tastes on the wider population. Perhaps equally disturbing is the trend to view people as old as 34 as part of the adolescent generation, a trend noted for groups such as the Society for Adolescent Medicine and the MacArthur Foundation.

In Danesi’s opinion, the remedy for adolescent social problems such as gang membership, rebelliousness, drug and alcohol abuse, unsafe sex, bulimia, anorexia, lack of interest in school, and suicide is to treat these young people as adults rather than “adults in waiting.” Pampering teens, targeting them primarily as consumers, and allowing them to defer the responsibilities of social adulthood until after the high-school years has created the social conditions that favor the undesirable emotional behaviors we associate with adolescence. We should, in short, abandon the failed experiment and adopt what the author calls a “Gramscian” view of human life. Antonio Gramsci (1891–1937), the Italian political theorist, described the human life cycle as consisting of just two periods: pre-puberty (childhood) and post-puberty (adulthood).

The book is organized into 10 chapters. Each starts with a short quote from one of the interviewees, followed by a brief overview of the topic and an “insight” or discussion section driven by short quotes from young people interviewed for the study. The first chapter explores the historical emergence of adolescence during the Industrial Revolution, its recognition by many psychologists in the early 20th century as a distinct period of development in the human life cycle, and its more recent identification as a mass market by the ad industry in the 1950s and 1960s.

Chaps. 2 and 3 look at sex and body image. Given that young people are sexually mature after puberty, it is arguably futile to try to limit their interest in sex. As sexual taboos have disappeared, the rate of sexual activity among teens has increased so that now it is not uncommon for 12-year-olds to have had sexual encounters. Similarly, the obsession with body image and the awkwardness many teens feel is, in the author’s view, a result of the artificial nature of adolescence itself. Treat adolescents like adults, talk to them about sex and the changes that are going on in their bodies, and presumably they will act responsibly and no longer feel so self-conscious.

From a linguist’s perspective, chap. 4 on adolescent language is largely descriptive. Danesi’s point about the importance of recognizing youth language as a social dialect rather than what most laypersons call “slang” is certainly valid. The remainder of the chapter consists of a lengthy discussion of the vocabulary used by young people, including hip-hop expressions like *dog* ‘buddy’, *ill* ‘to be obnoxious’, and *player* (glossed as ‘promiscuous male’ although it has a few



other meanings as well). Danesi also offers a brief analysis of adolescent discourse strategies, which he classifies as “emotivity” and “figuration.” The former refers to the tendency among teens to structure their verbal messages so as to draw attention to their feelings and the mood they are in. This is achieved through the use of rising terminals (what Danesi calls “tagging”), vocalism or the use of highly charged expressions like *Awesome!*, hesitancy or the use of hedges and fillers, and profanity. “Figuration” refers to the fact that teenagers use words to “draw pictures of” people and events in “graphic fashion.” Expressions like *MLA* (an acronym for Massive Lip Action, i.e. passionate kissing), *grille* ‘face’, and *stain* ‘useless person’ are, according to Danesi, comparable to one-word or one-phrase poems that characterize the adolescent predilection for irony and satire. This is indicative of the realization at puberty that language can be used as more than a tool to understand the world; it can also be deployed in defensive and aggressive ways. The chapter ends with a warning to parents about “verbal danger signs” such as an increase in the use of profane language, aggressive discourse, macabre content, and hate expressions. These could be a sign of gang participation or serious personal difficulties. There is little in the way of analysis of how class, gender, ethnicity, and orientation to the mainstream school culture affect language use patterns among young people. Thankfully, the author does not try to connect his observations about adolescent language to the book’s main premise. This would place him as a semiotician in the methodologically awkward position of having to treat youth language as one more unfortunate outcome of the failed social experiment of adolescence rather than as an object worthy of analysis in its own right.

Chaps. 5–9 examine teenage musical preferences, cliques, gangs and cults, drug and alcohol use, school experiences, and the juvenilization of the media. The insights offered in these chapters are certainly useful to baby-boomer parents and to those who may be disconnected from teen culture past and present. But the tone is at times wistful, betraying a rather naive desire that subcultures like hip-hop would simply go away. Furthermore, the discussion of hip-hop leaves out any reference to its progressive message and potential for encouraging youth activism and awareness. The discussion of gangs as a “sociopathic outgrowth of adolescence” that would disappear if adolescence were eliminated seems simplistic (108). Finally, characterizing a television program like *South Park* as nothing but a “comedy of vulgarity” misses the subversive, biting social criticism it contains (151). Given the absence of truly honest social and political critique in the popular media in the United States, programs like this come as a breath of fresh air to many young people and adults alike. The final chapter exposes several myths about adolescence and proposes that we end the “experiment” by strengthening the family institution and treating adolescents as mature citizens.

Danesi’s main claim – that adolescence is an artificial construct – is intuitively appealing. The connected argument that the innovation of adolescence itself is to blame for the pathologies we associate with it is more tenuous. After

all, as Danesi tells us, the Greek historian Herodotus mentioned the insolent, indifferent, and defiant behavior of youth more than two thousand years ago (x). Perhaps these behaviors are not a product of the modern experiment but rather of some demonstrable physiological changes that young people have been experiencing for a long time. The fact that the turmoil of adolescence is absent from many cultures does not mean that it is not a difficult transition for all. Furthermore, there is no treatment of the role of ethnicity, class, or any other social factors in the analysis, and the overriding impression is that one is reading primarily about the white middle-class experience. It seems very likely that different ethnic groups within this society have somewhat different ways of experiencing the transition to adulthood. That said, the value of this book to the general reader lies in its frank, nonjudgmental discussions of adolescent behavior and the tempered advice it offers to parents. Its value to social scientists is in challenging us to examine what merit, if any, can be found in hanging onto the concept of adolescence, whom if anyone it continues to benefit, and how much longer it will remain a defining part of our culture.

REFERENCE

Ariès, Philippe (1962). *Centuries of childhood*. New York: Random House.

(Received 1 July 2004)

*Language in Society* 34 (2005). Printed in the United States of America  
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404505280223

PATRICIA MAYES, *Language, social structure, and culture: A genre analysis of cooking classes in Japan and America*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2003. Pp. xiv, 228. Hb. \$102.00.

Reviewed by LAURA MILLER  
*Anthropology, Loyola University Chicago*  
Chicago, IL 60626  
lmille2@luc.edu

In 1979, I attended a Sunday afternoon cooking class in Osaka with a small group of Japanese friends and coworkers. There were fewer than 10 people present in the kitchen showroom to learn how to make *chanko nabe*, a hearty one-pot stew. I do not remember the recipe, or much else about the occasion, except that we traded casual jokes and asides with the instructor, some of them playing off the fact that the dish is well known as standard fare used to bulk up sumo wrestlers. It is astonishing yet gratifying that scholarship on language and culture has advanced to the point that there is now a book entitled *Language, social structure and culture: A genre analysis of cooking classes in Japan and America*. The reader looking for insights into Japanese or American culture, social structure, or cooking classes as cultural events, may be frustrated or disappointed with this

book, but for scholars interested in reading a forthright essay about genre theory, supported with transcripts and exhaustive counting of clause types, it will offer useful and stimulating reading.

Mayes sets out to accomplish an ambitious task. Her stated goal is to examine a common genre across two radically different cultural settings in order to discover how people instantiate social reality through spoken language. In chap. 1, she provides the context for the study, discussing genre theory, data sources, and giving an outline of the book. The data are comprised of cooking demonstrations from three Japanese classes and three American classes, which were audiotaped. Mayes attended two of the Japanese classes and all the American classes, and a research assistant attended the third Japanese class. Mayes transcribed selected segments of the American data, and another research assistant transcribed selected segments of the Japanese data. Chap. 2 presents a straightforward overview of the concept of genre in the social sciences, as well as some discussion of other relevant terms such as speech activity, frame, and schema.

Chap. 3 begins with a short summary of scholarship on participation structure and social position and then moves to an analysis of the data. The primary finding is that cooking classes in both cultures entail a type of “default” pattern of student-teacher role, which is constructed through a regularly patterned configuration of teachers as speakers and students as recipients/addressees. Mayes notes that while the participation structure stays uniform throughout the duration of the Japanese classes, it shifts over time in the American case, gradually incorporating other participation structures. She finds that the Japanese participants have more formalized or “professional” teacher-student relationships, with no stories, joking, or gossiping going on at all, while the American setting permits the development of “friendly relationships.” The comments, questions, and jokes in the talk of the American participants allow for digressions away from the recipe at hand, which in turn relates to changes in the participation structure.

Chap. 4 looks at the level of discourse, comparing similarities and differences in the patterns in the content of talk. Mayes finds that the Japanese view the cooking class as a serious, task-oriented event, while the Americans see it as an enjoyable social event. These patterns in content are said to reflect different expectations participants have about the cooking class genre. Chap. 5 examines the level of grammar by analyzing the task-oriented talk of teachers. The chapter includes several tables that document the frequency of clause types, with a particular focus on transitive or intransitive clauses. Chap. 6 summarizes the findings, emphasizing that recurring linguistic patterns constitute the structure of the cooking class genre.

One laudable aspect of the research is that Mayes laboriously probes the collected language data from the cooking classes to pinpoint where aspects of linguistic structure become conventionalized as part of the genre. Whether or not one agrees with her conclusions and assessments, the data are not hypothetical or remembered, and are available in transcripts for us to ponder or

reanalyze. We should also be grateful that Mayes did not interpret the differences between Japanese and American cooking classes as stemming from any inherent, monolithic difference between Japanese and American “culture,” but rather from how the respective participants understand the particular social situation. I imagine that some scholars will welcome this book for its detailed linguistic analyses, painstaking quantification of clause types, and challenge to the scholarship on transitivity.

The primary weaknesses in the book relate to the author’s overreaching aspiration to trace the creation of culture and social structure through situated talk. Although there is some discussion of social structure as it is understood in sociology, that material largely disappears in the ensuing linguistic analyses, and “culture” is even harder to locate. A roughly three-page section with the subheading “Previous work on Japanese culture” (104–7) reviews a few minor linguistic studies of Japanese speech events. Although Mayes says that she is investigating social structure, she attends to just one aspect of social life, the roles of teacher and student and how they are mutually constructed through speech. But even in this limited sense there is insufficient groundwork provided for us to understand the cultural and social meanings of this relationship. Mayes uses outdated research on Japanese high schools as the basis for characterizing the Japanese student-and-teacher model, even though adult cooking classes fall outside institutional school settings. The ethnographically rich articles in *Learning in likely places* (Singleton 1998), a book considered seminal in educational anthropology, describe how instruction is accomplished in the Japanese tea ceremony, calligraphy, classical comedy, pottery making, garage mechanics, and folk weaving, many of them learning situations that have much in common with the cooking class. An important finding in this volume is that mentorship, apprenticeship, and instruction are most often instantiated through observation and practice rather than through talk. By focusing on the cooking teacher’s precise words and grammar, Mayes misses the primary Japanese cultural emphasis of adult instruction. When Mayes discusses use of honorifics by the Japanese teachers, she ascribes it to their high instructor status and gender, ignoring critical socioeconomic and regional dimensions. In a society where a large proportion of married women work, these nonworking housewife-students represent a specific social and class position. It would seem that accounting for the social placement of the participants, not just positioning them as “students” and “teachers,” would be part of our investigation of the social structures that are relevant to the use of language in these settings. Since Japanese teachers generally do not use honorifics with students, this is part of the social situation that requires much more discussion as well.

A major claim for distinction made by the book is that, unlike other studies, it compares empirical data from similar events. Yet closer attention to the ethnographic details reveals that these are not such similar events after all, despite their common categorization as “cooking classes.” The presumably affluent Jap-

anese women in this study paid fees to take these classes, while the Santa Barbarans were enrolled in a free, state-funded course (aside from a nominal fee for materials). The Japanese classes were large and allowed students to enroll at any time, precluding the possibility of “friendly relationships” developing, as they did in the small Santa Barbara classes. It is not until halfway through the book that Mayes admits that student motivations for taking these classes were not at all comparable. The serious-minded Japanese women studying for their homemaker profession are more akin to the ambitious chefs at the Chicago Culinary Institute, whereas the Santa Barbara crowd looking for dates and distraction are similar to my group of Osakan friends, who learned to make *chanko nabe* solely as a leisure and social activity. Perhaps in the future someone might take a slightly different approach by comparing similar teaching events across cultures, regardless of the type of labeling used to identify them. Settings could be selected in terms of the similarity of type of learners and instructors involved, their motivations, their backgrounds, whether it is paid or unpaid instruction, and so on, regardless of whether it is classified as a cooking class or calligraphy lesson.

Mayes is only minimally successful in tracing the interrelationships among culture, social structure and language. She provides a detailed and thoughtful analysis of the grammar used by some speakers in a type of genre, yet presents a cursory and flattened understanding of the culturally embedded roles of “student” and “teacher.” Notwithstanding a reliance on empirical evidence, the manner in which real-life cooking classes are apprehended and represented is peculiarly bloodless, effectively stripping them of the emergent or inherent culture and social structure which is the putative aim of the study.

## REFERENCE

Singleton, John (ed.) (1988). *Learning in likely places: Varieties of apprenticeship in Japan*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.

(Received 1 July 2004)