

## REVIEWS

ELINOR OCHS, EMANUEL A. SCHEGLOFF & SANDRA A. THOMPSON (eds.), *Interaction and grammar*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996. Pp. xii, 468. Pb. \$29.95.

Reviewed by DON H. ZIMMERMAN  
*Sociology, University of California*  
*Santa Barbara, CA 93106*  
*zimmerma@sscf.ucsb.edu*

This volume encompasses work by researchers from three distinct but related areas of inquiry: functional linguistics, linguistic anthropology, and conversation analysis. Edited collections sometimes strain to provide a unifying theme connecting diverse contributions into a coherent whole. Happily, the editors and contributors to *Interaction and grammar* (the list of authors is impressive) have to a large extent solved this problem; and in the process, they have provided an important contribution that should have major impact in all three areas.

As the editors' introduction to the volume states (p. 2), the essays explore

a different way of approaching and understanding grammar . . . [as] a part of a broader range of resources – organizations of practices . . . which underlie the organization of social life, and in particular the way in which language figures in everyday interaction and cognition.

The introduction to the volume delivers a compelling discussion of the rationale that guides the collection, providing the reader with an overall sense of the intellectual project(s) addressed by the contributors. The editors carefully delineate the underlying unity of the chapters, as well as the authors' shared methodological commitment to rely on records of data drawn from naturally occurring interaction. This commitment distinguishes the essays in this volume from most work in their parent disciplines of linguistics, anthropology, and sociology. A focus on naturally occurring episodes of interaction permits consideration of the temporal features of conduct – the way elements of action are distributed across time, the way silence functions in interaction, and the directionality of interaction (the movement of an act of conduct toward an anticipated end-point) – as well as permitting close examination of the details of interaction: details of “the relationship . . . between activity, action, and the orderly deployment of language called grammar” (21). Included here are such features as vocal production and gestures. Language use is an activity in the world; these authors seek to locate grammar in the midst of that activity.

Such a stance leads to a new view of linguistic description and linguistic structure: As the editors say, “the import of the volume is that the interactional matrix of grammar requires a different understanding of what should enter into a lin-

guistic description and/or a different model of linguistic structure” (24). The aim is not so much to achieve an integration of current models of grammar as to TRANSFORM them.

One sense of this transformation is found in the focus on language practices, including grammar, as enabling social interaction. Indeed, since we are a chattering species which conducts its most ordinary and most momentous affairs by talking together, the question of how language performs this function is clearly important. This is not to say that language – grammar – is the sole organizational basis for talk as conduct, but rather that, as the editors have it,

interactional and pragmatic organizations play a PRIMARY AND FORMATIVE ROLE, rather than a residual one in the organization of conduct, including talk, and that grammar and syntax are, if not SUBORDINATE, then not more than COORDINATE with them, for example, by being among the available resources and practices informing the interactional and pragmatic organizations. (26)

Grammar, then, is not simply a co-organizing feature of conduct – and this is one of the collection’s most distinctive contributions – but is itself subject to the influence of interactional organization. Thus the contributors entertain, in varying degrees, not only the notion that grammar organizes social interaction but also that social interaction organizes grammar, and that grammar is a mode of interaction. These are not mutually exclusive formulations; e.g., grammar may organize interaction but also be subject to its contingencies and dynamics.

The nine chapters that embody this overall theme and their own particular foci are both too numerous and too detailed for an inclusive commentary. To provide a sense of the volume, however, I will briefly characterize several contributions and then consider three in more detail.

The chapter by Barbara Fox, Makoto Hayashi & Robert Jasperson focuses on “the syntax of repair from a cross-linguistic perspective” (185). The authors examine how the syntactic organization of Japanese and English distinctively shape repair practices in each language. Charles Goodwin’s chapter reports on the vocal deployment of “prospective indexicals” by colleagues as instructions for looking for particular events displayed on video screens in an airline operations center. Elinor Ochs, Patrick Gonzalez & Sally Jacoby explore the referential practices that working physicists use to “adapt language to their larger communicative needs” (360). Bambi Schieffelin focuses on the evidential particles of Kaluli (Papua New Guinea) as a mode of experiencing a post-missionary world. And Marja-Leena Sorjonen analyzes the Finnish particles *niin* and *joo* as grammatical/interactional resources for establishing linkages between current and prior, and current and next utterances/actions.

In somewhat more detail, Emanuel Schegloff suggests in his lead-off chapter that turns-at-talk are the natural environment for sentences, and he proposes that we take seriously the notion that grammatical structure be understood as “adaptations to that environment.” He argues (55) that

the grammatical structures of language should in the first instance be understood as partially shaped by interactional considerations . . . And one locus of those considerations will be the organization of the turn, the organizational unit which “houses” grammatical units.

Focus is thus shifted from the sentence, as an analytic unit, to the turn – and to the turn-constructive unit(s) (TCUs) that it houses. In a remarkable excursion though the various organizationally relevant positions of the TCU (beginnings, pre- and post-beginnings, possible completions, and pre- and post-possible completions), Schegloff works out the notion of “positionally sensitive grammar(s).” Part of what is entailed in such a notion is that the types of utterances or parts of utterances that occur in TCUs may be distributed relative to position within the TCU. As a research question, this notion asks “whether there is a describable orderliness between TYPES OF POSITIONS in a turn and TYPES OF UNITS occupying those positions” (64). Moreover, an element within a TCU may involve “extra-turn considerations such as sequence, interactional juncture, and the like” (70). Schegloff goes on to note that, if the choice of a particular type of TCU element “requires design by reference to the immediate sequential context, then the selection of a grammar for turn-construction is context-sensitive in the sense of [being] positionally specified” (76–77). Schegloff’s chapter, which addresses the question of grammar and interaction more directly than the others, is rich both in its conceptual and theoretical sophistication and in its abundant implications for empirical research.

The chapter by Cecilia Ford & Sandra A. Thompson also deals with properties of the TCU, specifically the terminal boundary of the unit. They identify the syntactic, prosodic, and pragmatic features that participants employ to construct and recognize possible completion; and they undertake to assess empirically how these elements function in terms of actual observed turn-transition. Ford & Thompson propose that turn transition is organized by what they call “complex transition relevance places,” or CTRPs, which display the convergence of syntactic, prosodic, and pragmatic (action) completion.

Although quantitative analyses require the definition of definite units in terms of which completion/transition can be assessed, Ford & Thompson’s analysis is informed by the understanding that the unit (with its manifest features) is an interactional achievement. One important consequence of this understanding is the recognition that completion points are POSSIBLE completion points: the production of a well-formed unit by a speaker does not compel a listener to begin speaking, either right away or at all. There are, as the authors note, strategic reasons for NOT taking a next turn, or at least not doing so at the opportunity afforded by a particular CTRP. This speaks to the stubborn fact that turn-taking, like talk-in-interaction more generally, is a joint, collaborative activity.

Gene Lerner’s chapter examines the question of what sorts of action can be accomplished by initiating speech at a point OTHER than the possible completion

of a TCU. Such an entry by another ordinarily involves completion of the turn, or of the TCU currently in progress. Such incursions are routinely fitted to the utterance in a way that displays orientation to the developing syntax. As a matter of grammatical PRACTICE, speakers can produce (and hearers can track) a particular type of two-part TCU (e.g. an *if-then* construction) in which

[the] preliminary component projects roughly what it will take to bring that component to possible completion and projects a possible form for the final component of the TCU as well, and thereby a shape for the TCU as a whole. (240)

The upshot is that the developing compound TCU furnishes the grammatical and prosodic resources that permit a hearer to enter the turn of a current speaker at the point of first component possible completion, and to produce a second component matched in form to that originally projected by the first component. Such incursions can be produced “in the clear,” since first component completions are often followed by a “rest beat” or brief pause.

Compound TCUs do not necessarily INVITE anticipatory completion by another, but their form furnishes the resources and the opportunity to do so. What kinds of action, then, can such incursions perform? Lerner observes:

Anticipatory completion can be used to demonstrate agreement, or preempt a disagreement-in-progress ... or it can be used to collaborate with a current speaker in explaining something to another participant. It can ... be used to heckle a story teller by, in effect, placing words in their mouth. (244)

Anticipatory completion is not the only action that can occur at the juncture provided by compound TCUs. We also find continuers or acknowledgment tokens, new turn beginnings (recognition point entries), and responses to earlier talk by current speaker: “preliminary component completion may be thought of ... as a TCU-internal place for recipient entry, where a variety – a RESTRICTED variety – of utterance forms may begin” (254).

Lerner’s chapter also considers two-part formats which do not provide preliminary completion places (e.g. disparaging reference + complainable actions), and unprojected recipient entry that occurs at points where the directionality of the utterance toward completion is stalled by elements that disrupt the pace of the talk and/or its syntactic development (e.g. between word laugh tokens, pauses, repair initiations, and word searches). This chapter, which has only been sampled in the preceding remarks, furnishes a strong example of how a concern for the interface of grammar and interaction can translate into research which decisively advances our understanding of how language and interaction interpenetrate.

Over all, *Interaction and grammar* is a superb collection. No one working in the area of language and interaction can afford to ignore it.

(Received 12 May 1999)

CHRISTINA BRATT PAULSTON & G. RICHARD TUCKER (eds.), *The early days of sociolinguistics: Memories and reflections*. (Publications in sociolinguistics, 2.) Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1997. Pp. xii, 362.

Reviewed by WENDY LEEDS-HURWITZ  
 Communication, University of Wisconsin-Parkside  
 Kenosha, WI 53141  
 wendy.leeds-hurwitz@uwp.edu

As a graduate student at the University of Pennsylvania in the 1970s, I took what everyone called the “Grandfathers” course, which provided an overview of the field through the work of individual scholars (Dell Hymes was the professor). It had a more proper title we all ignored, probably “History of linguistics.” Now, *The early days of sociolinguistics* provides an updated and more complete version of that course, except that it emphasizes sociolinguistics rather than all of linguistics; it presents substantial information about the development of the field, as seen through the eyes of one scholar after another. As we enter the new millennium, the discussion appropriately now includes “grandmothers” as well as “grandfathers.” This has the flavor of salvage linguistics: get the elders to report what they know before they die (or forget), in order to preserve the details for future generations. This goal is perhaps most obviously visible in the selection by Charles Ferguson. It is not a piece he actually contributed; rather, it is constructed from interviews conducted by his friends, colleagues, and students during his recuperation from a series of severe strokes (77). Given the centrality of Ferguson in the history of sociolinguistics – he is “identified by a majority of the contributors as the principal architect for the field” (321) – his inability to write his own summary of events justifies the remainder of the individual histories.

At the same time, much of this collection has the casual, unhurried feel of conversations with old family friends. On the assumption that most readers will actually know only a few of the authors, at best, perhaps it would be more accurate to say it feels as if the reader is eavesdropping on a conversation between old friends, or sitting in an archive reading letters written between old friends. In keeping with these contexts, some comments are quite blunt: Ervin-Tripp suggests, of herself and other Berkeley faculty, “We lacked some strategic acumen in promoting the field and our students” (75); Fishman comments on the loneliness of being “without a community of like-minded scholars” (88). However, as might be expected from such casual models, the essays are uneven in a variety of ways: length, clarity, breadth, interest in self-reflection, and depth of end-of-career evaluation. The editors made a specific choice to let the authors speak with their own voices, rather than molding the whole into a single, more coherent and cohesive presentation. The value is that readers learn what each author considered most significant; the drawback is that much of the information presented is redundant, and occasionally contradictory.

There are three “bookends” to this collection: Each of the editors has written a summary statement, and a brief history by Roger Shuy, originally published

elsewhere, supplies the framework within which we are to understand the separate chapters. Paulston explains the intent of the book as to provide “an account of the genesis of sociolinguistics” (p. 4); she is quite clear about the lack of assessment or analysis by the editors, and honest in her recognition that the oral history approach taken has its weaknesses. She clarifies the criteria for selection: scholars of the very first generation of sociolinguists, who took part in the creation of the field and had lasting influence on its development, as well as some representatives from major organizations (5). Listing the questions sent to potential contributors is quite helpful (6–7); however, the discussion of the logic of international participation is surprisingly confusing. Paulston’s lengthy explanation of why no Russian was contacted – “the only major initial school of thought on language and society besides the U.S.A. is not influential in present-day work” (5) – seems to suggest the book will be devoted solely to the development of sociolinguistics in the US. Thus, when we find that scholars from India, England, Sweden, France, etc. are included, this is something of a surprise and requires explanation. It is also not entirely clear why the editors chose to privilege Shuy’s version of history over the others that follow. It was perhaps more carefully written, since it was originally written for *Historiographia Linguistica*; but the final summary of trends by Tucker is more directly relevant and useful, and might fruitfully be read at the beginning rather than the end. Furthermore, Tucker’s essay has the advantage of being specifically drawn from a reading of the pieces in this book, so it is more appropriate to the context. I would recommend the Shuy chapter only to someone with little knowledge of sociolinguistics – though it is questionable how much this book would be of interest to such a person.

The book is organized into six sections. The prologue includes Paulston’s introduction and Shuy’s history; the epilogue includes Tucker’s analysis of all the other pieces. In between these are, first, “Pioneers”, arranged in alphabetic order, with pieces by Annamalai, Bernstein, Bright, Ervin-Tripp, Ferguson, Fishman, Friedrich, Grimshaw, Gumperz, Hymes, Jernudd, Kjolseth, Labov, Lambert, Lieberson, Macnamara, Marcellesi, Myers-Scotton, Neustupný, Pike, Polomé, Sibayan, and Tabouret-Keller. Second come “Journal editors”, with comments on the *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* by Fishman, *Language in Society* by Hymes, and *Language Problems and Language Planning* by Tonkin. The third section is “Early institutional supporters for the new field”: the Center for Applied Linguistics, by Troike, as interviewed by Paulston; the Center for International Education, by Thompson; the Ford Foundation, by Fox; the International Center for Research on Bilingualism, by Mackey; and the Summer Institute of Linguistics, by Kindell (also, separately, by Grimes). Fourth comes “Remembrances,” with descriptions of Haugen by Paulston, Kloss by Mackey and McConnell, and Weinreich by Fishman. Reading this list of names and organizations will give a clear sense of the breadth of the volume.

Aside from the unevenness noted above, most of the selections seem quite reasonable, with only a few exceptions. For example, I do not see the logic for Paulston's first stating that Labov did not have time to participate (8), but then including a short, very old publication of his (the 1972 Introduction to *Patterns of Sociolinguistics*). Either he did not wish to participate, in which case he should not have been forced to; or else he did want to, in which case he should have been expected to take the time to do so properly.

Several selections stand out for me, although readers will probably have their own favorites. I find Grimshaw especially good at articulating the questions driving his own research; and Fishman's discussion of Weinreich is a well-balanced presentation of one person's life and work, complete with interesting anecdotes, written in a lively fashion. Several other essays seem especially incomplete or abbreviated, particularly the summaries of institutions, which sometimes do not even mention what years are included, or simply try to cover too much time in too little space (as when Fox covers 36 years with the Ford Foundation in approximately a page).

A few structural critiques are in order. At least a name index, if not a subject index, would have been much appreciated by readers wishing to locate multiple references to the same person or topic in order to correlate them. Certainly this is not the sort of volume that most users will read in a single sitting, so some additional aid to the location of specific content would have been helpful. I found exactly one footnote (277) noting a contradiction between positions taken by two authors. Considering that numerous viewpoints are presented, together with the obvious contradictions this might imply, it seems bizarre to note just one such occurrence.

This volume is most useful either as a supplement to a single, more comprehensive history (Murray 1996 being the most likely), or as a resource to be mined for future histories. It will be of interest primarily to the current generation of sociolinguists – who have considerable knowledge of the major players, who already consider the field important, but who do not know all they might wish to know about how the field developed. For such readers, the book will reward the time spent reading. One additional audience: If Bright is correct that it is now important to find “ways to use sociolinguistics in an ever widening circle of neighboring fields” (60), then perhaps members of those fields will find this a useful supplement to their understanding.

## REFERENCE

- Murray, Stephen O. (1996). *Theory groups and the study of language in North America*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

(Received 21 June 1999)

IAN HUTCHBY & ROBIN WOOFFITT, *Conversation analysis: Principles, practices and applications*. Cambridge (UK): Polity Press; Oxford (UK) & Malden (MA): Blackwell, 1998. Pp. vii, 273. Pb \$29.95.

Reviewed by ANDREW L. ROTH  
1458 Augusta Drive  
Upland, CA 91786

In 1964 the late Harvey Sacks began to present his now-famous lectures on conversation at UCLA (Sacks 1992, vol. 1). By the decade's end, as he continued his lectures at UC Irvine (Sacks 1992, vol. 2), the first published instance of the work that had come to be known as Conversation Analysis (Schegloff 1968) introduced this developing perspective to a broader public. In the early 1970s Sacks and Schegloff, along with their colleague Gail Jefferson, pursued their research on the organization of talk-in-interaction and published a number of articles that remain foundational (e.g. Schegloff & Sacks 1973, Sacks et al. 1974).

Several decades later, at the end of the 1990s, Conversation Analysis (CA) continues to develop, now as an internationally practiced mode of research. As its practitioners undertake an increasingly diverse array of empirical work, the resulting studies constitute a cumulative body of findings that defies simple summary. Against this backdrop, the learning curve for those seeking an introduction to CA can appear quite steep; this is especially the case if the aim is not simply to acquaint oneself with CA, but actually to prepare oneself to begin practicing it.

Hutchby & Wooffitt join the growing list of authors who have recently offered book-length introductions to CA (cf. Nofsinger 1991, Psathas 1995, Silverman 1998; useful chapter-length introductions include Heritage 1984, Pomerantz & Fehr 1997). Describing the aim of their own contribution, Hutchby & Wooffitt write, "This book is not intended to be merely an account of the collected findings of previous work, but is primarily an introduction to, and illustration of, the craft of empirical research" (69). Evaluated in these terms, the book makes a distinctive and welcome contribution.

The authors organize the book into three sections, the first of which focuses on the PRINCIPLES of CA. Hutchby & Wooffitt provide straightforward definitions of CA and its aims: "CA is the study of RECORDED, NATURALLY OCCURRING TALK-IN-INTERACTION," and its aim is "to discover how participants understand and respond to one another in their turns at talk, with a central focus being on how SEQUENCES of actions are generated" (14; original emphases). They also offer a clear discussion of the "key insights" on which CA is based: talk-in-interaction is "systematically organized and deeply ordered"; its production is methodical; the analysis of talk-in-interaction should be based on naturally occurring data; and analysis "should not initially be constrained by prior theoretical assumptions" (23). Throughout this first chapter, the authors appropriately emphasize the sociological sensibilities that informed Sacks's foundational investigations.



The book's second section focuses on the PRACTICE of CA. The authors discuss (i) data and transcription conventions, (ii) building a data collection, and (iii) analyzing extended sequences and single cases of talk-in-interaction. An entire chapter devoted to CA transcription techniques might risk misrepresenting the use of transcripts in data analysis. Hutchby & Wooffitt forestall this potential misunderstanding by emphasizing that transcripts "are NOT thought of as 'the data.' The data consist of tape recordings of naturally occurring interactions" (73). From this perspective, practitioners of CA employ transcripts as "a convenient tool of reference" (74).

Unfortunately for newcomers, this "tool" often constitutes an initial stumbling block: In attempting to capture both the dynamics of turn-taking and the characteristics of speech delivery, CA transcripts represent a level of detail that may seem unnecessary, in a form that may appear opaque. Hutchby & Wooffitt provide good warrant for CA's detailed transcription conventions by comparing two different transcripts of the same interaction (85–92). The first transcript presents the words that were spoken in standard orthography, so that the transcript resembles the script from a play; by contrast, the second transcript employs CA notation conventions to represent not only WHAT was said, but also HOW it was said. Thus the CA transcript captures a number of details of production (e.g. pauses, overlaps, word intonation) that the first transcript omits. As the authors subsequently demonstrate, the simpler transcript proves to be inadequate for analysis of the interaction in question, precisely because it omits details of the talk to which the participants themselves oriented in conducting their interaction.

The chapter on building a data collection may constitute the book's most helpful lesson for aspiring practitioners of CA: "Conversation analysts use collections in order to reveal systematic patterns in talk-in-interaction across differing contexts and involving varying participants" (116). As such, collections of specific phenomena or practices are central to the CA enterprise. The authors elaborate three distinct steps in the process of developing a data collection: (i) identifying an object of potential analytic interest and collecting a number of instances of it; (ii) producing a description of a single instance of that object, encompassing both the sequential environment of the object and the action(s) that it accomplishes; and (iii) returning to other instances in the collection to determine whether the current description provides an accurate account of them as well (95, 110). As analysts consider each individual instance, they refine the description, with the ultimate aim of providing a formal account of the phenomenon under investigation. This way of working embodies CA's "insistence on building analytic accounts which are both PARTICULARIZED and GENERALIZED" (95). Hutchby & Wooffitt discuss Schegloff's research (1968) on the organization of telephone openings as an exemplar of this commitment, and of the analytic payoffs that it can yield. I can envision using this chapter, in conjunction with Pomerantz & Fehr 1997 and Schegloff 1996, as teaching materials to launch

(advanced) undergraduate and graduate students on developing data collections of their own.

The concluding section of this chapter, on the role of quantification in CA research (115–19), does not maintain the same high level of instruction. Though well intended, it deals incompletely with the methodological and analytic issues involved in quantifying CA research. Readers interested in this area are better served by Schegloff 1993.

The book's final section on the APPLICATION of CA research is not as strong as the previous two. Beginning their discussion of CA research on interaction in institutional settings, the authors perpetuate a conception of sequences of talk as "small" units of analysis, and of institutions as "larger-scale" units of analysis (145). On initially encountering this distinction, I thought it a minor lapse in the clarity of their presentation: After all, Sacks warned social scientists not to privilege "large-scale, massive institutions" when seeking to explain "the apparatus by which order is generated" (Sacks 1984:22). Hutchby & Wooffitt proceed by explaining CA's efforts to understand interaction in institutional settings in terms of variations in speech-exchange systems, and the participants' orientations to those variations; they note that this approach distinguishes CA from other sociological accounts of institutions and their organization. With this explanation, Hutchby & Wooffitt seem to have recovered from the lapse at the chapter's beginning. However, having established the groundwork for a thorough account of CA's treatment of institutional talk, they instead focus half the chapter on the issues of "asymmetry" and "power" in institutional interaction (160–71). This suggests (to me, at least) that the initial discrimination between "big" and "small" units of analysis was not a lapse in presentation, but rather a foreshadowing of the specific sort of analytic issues that Hutchby & Wooffitt deem most important when analyzing institutional talk. By comparison, Drew & Heritage 1992 offer a more systematic and comprehensive account of CA work on talk in institutional settings.

A chapter on the organization of "factual" accounts is presented as if this were a new area of inquiry for CA, despite an array of past research that addresses the issue (cf. Pomerantz 1984). However, Hutchby & Wooffitt present research from social psychology, and especially from discourse analysis. Without adequately discussing distinctions between the methodological and analytic commitments of CA and discourse analysis, this tacit shift in perspective gives a different tenor to the ensuing chapter, as evidenced in the authors' explanations of "stake management," "accounting for violence," and "active voicing" (219–28).

In a book which, over all, compares favorably with others of its kind, there is still room for improvement. The analyses of particular instances of data are sometimes imprecise; e.g., interested readers might compare Hutchby & Wooffitt's analysis of a pursuit sequence (42) with the analysis of the same datum by Heritage (1984:248–49). In another case, the proposal that one speaker "makes quite a big

issue out of what she perceives as an absence” (43) would seem to require a more formal account. At still other times, Hutchby & Wooffitt do not cite sources for concepts and phrases that should be properly attributed, even though they are now commonplace in CA; e.g., they incorporate the query “Why this now?” (202) without reference to Schegloff & Sacks (1973:299). Finally, Hutchby & Wooffitt introduce a theoretical distinction between the SEQUENTIAL ORDER of talk and the INFERENCE ORDER of talk (38–39) which seems contrary to one of CA’s core findings: namely, that inference – whether undertaken initially by participants in interaction, or subsequently by professional analysts – is at least partially A PRODUCT OF the sequential organization of conduct. Any of these shortcomings might go unnoticed by readers unfamiliar with CA, but all of them are likely to grate on the sensibilities of readers who are practitioners of it.

As CA continues to develop, and as the task of presenting a comprehensive summary of its findings becomes increasingly challenging, it may be that the best introductions to the field are those that provide the reader – as Hutchby & Wooffitt aim to do – with “the BASIC means of beginning on a piece of CA research” (142). On those terms, this book is a success and can be recommended, even as the prospective reader is alerted to some of its shortcomings.

## REFERENCES

- Drew, Paul, & Heritage, John (1992). Analyzing talk at work: An introduction. In Paul Drew & John Heritage (eds.), *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings*, 3–65. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Heritage, John (1984). Conversation Analysis. In J. Heritage, *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*, 233–92. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Nofsinger, Robert E. (1991). *Everyday conversation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Pomerantz, Anita M. 1984. Giving a source or basis: The practice in conversation of telling “what I know”. *Journal of Pragmatics* 8:607–25.
- \_\_\_\_\_, & Fehr, B. J. (1997). Conversation Analysis: An approach to the study of social action as sense-making practices. In Teun A. Van Dijk (ed.), *Discourse as social interaction*, 64–91. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Psathas, George (1995). *Conversation Analysis: The study of talk-in-interaction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sacks, Harvey (1992). *Lectures on conversation*, I–II. Oxford: Blackwell.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1984). Notes on methodology. In J. Maxwell Atkinson & John Heritage (eds.), *Structures of social action*, 21–27. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Sacks, Harvey; Schegloff, Emanuel A.; & Gail Jefferson (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language* 50:696–735.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1996). Confirming allusions: Toward an empirical account of action. *American Journal of Sociology* 102:161–216.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1993). Reflections on quantification in the study of conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 26(1):99–128.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1968). Sequencing in conversational openings. *American Anthropologist* 70:1075–95.
- \_\_\_\_\_, & Sacks, Harvey (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica* 8:289–327.
- Silverman, David (1998). *Harvey Sacks: Social science and Conversation Analysis*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

(Received 1 June 1999)

SHOSHANA BLUM-KULKA, *Dinner talk: Cultural patterns of sociability and socialization in family discourse*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 1997. Pp. ix, 306.

Reviewed by ANNABEL GREENHILL  
 Program in Applied Linguistics, Boston University  
 Boston, MA 02215  
 agrhill@bu.edu

The work of Elinor Ochs and Catherine Snow has demonstrated the central importance of dinner talk within a broad picture of language socialization. A fertile site for the intergenerational transmission of cultural values and identities, it fosters culturally specific ways of talking and thinking which have significance for children's lives far beyond the intimacy of family meals. Blum-Kulka brings to this rich speech event her insights about cross-cultural pragmatics and her deep knowledge of patterns of communication in Jewish communities in the US and Israel. What emerges from her multi-year study is a thoroughly Hymesian depiction of cultural continuity and change, as enacted in everyday talk. She demonstrates that the subtle differences and similarities in patterns of dinnertime talk found in each of three middle-class, secular Jewish speech communities of Ashkenazi heritage – Jewish Americans (JA), American immigrants to Israel (AI), and native Israelis (NI) – reflect entangled processes of cultural maintenance, cultural assimilation, and intentional breaks from the traditional values and practices of the Diaspora.

Building on Harshav's analysis (1993) of late 19th century Jewish immigration out of the European *shtetl* and into modernity in Israel and the US, Blum-Kulka asserts that the "modern Jewish consciousness" of these families forms a basis for understanding the similarities in their sociable and socializing discursive practices. Chief among these similarities is the child-centered, egalitarian nature of family interaction: Expressions of authority in all the families are tempered by non-positional, RATIONAL explanations. Highly involved yet rational talk is seen as crucial for socialization of children. This is a middle-class modernity: Conversations in the book will remind many readers of other researchers' discussions of the "decontextualized discourse worlds associated with Western literate tradition" (268).

The differences among the families form the bulk of the analysis. Blum-Kulka asserts that the differences bear witness to "historically shaped, culturally unique interpretations" of what it means to be sociable in talk and to socialize children through talk (33). In Part I, following an Introduction, she traces the differences through close analyses of the negotiation of participant structure and topic (Chaps. 2–3) and of the (co-)construction of narratives at the dinner table (Chap. 4). In Part II she focuses on differences in parents' pragmatic socialization of children, examining control acts (Chap. 5) and metapragmatics (Chap. 6).

Blum-Kulka's first three chapters are limited to demonstrating cultural divergence between the JA families, on the one hand, and the AI and NI families, on the other. For example, JA families engage in highly ritualized "today"-narratives

that involve specific role expectations (parent-controlled), stylized opening moves (*How was your day?*), and constraints on the kinds of contributions allowed. By contrast, the today-narratives of the AI and NI do not display “features of a proper ‘interaction ritual’” (112). Blum-Kulka attributes this difference to the larger cultural milieu of which the families are a part, and to the degree of formality ascribed to the dinner time speech event. JA families’ use of ritual today-narratives is taken to reflect broader American discourse patterns, which are highly scripted and pervaded by “ceremonial idiom” (122); but the AI and NI families both conform to the “less conventionalized” ways of speaking typical of Israeli society. AI and NI families also permit observers and guests greater levels of participation, as indexed by their higher percentage of topical actions in the ongoing talk, while JA families limit the role of outsiders in setting topics.

What accounts for these differences? JA dinnertime occasions highly ritualized and codified means for the socialization of JA children into speech practices favored in the wider socio-cultural context (American ways of speaking in public). For the NI families, however, greater attention is paid to familial interdependence, a pattern “in line with the ethos of solidarity in Israeli culture, which tends to minimize social distance symbolically” (94). Children’s status as “equal co-participants” (66) is indexed when children are allowed to participate in ways that are unmarked metapragmatically. NI children are socialized less by fixed routines, and more by being contributors to the ongoing talk and active listeners.

In Part II, Blum-Kulka treats the parents’ varying means of pragmatic socialization within a discussion of politeness and metapragmatic behavior at the dinner table. Politeness strategies vary with underlying assumptions about social roles: JA families emphasize children’s independence and autonomy, and thus favor conventional politeness markers (which highlight the “dictum of non-imposition,” 151); but NI families focus on interdependence and interpersonal involvement, and thus use solidarity politeness markers. The AI families diverge from both the NI and JA families in their more balanced reliance on both solidarity politeness and conventional politeness.

All three speech communities differ with respect to metapragmatic talk as well. JA families demonstrate a higher meta-awareness of turn-taking rights (“Is it my turn now?”). In NI families, however, children typically secure the floor through attention-getting devices, or through vocatives that do not refer to turn-taking procedures. In AI families, the pattern for requests and refusals shows a split between the older and younger generations. Although AI parents expend metapragmatic efforts toward discourse management, like JA parents, their Israeli-born children favor the attention-getting strategies observed in the NI families.

How do these patterns reflect the dialectics of “continuity and change” (269) that shape each of the speech communities involved? Blum-Kulka claims that the American Jews are almost completely assimilated; accordingly, they display the conventional politeness and high metapragmatic awareness that are characteristic of American society. Their distance-based politeness norms, as well as their

emphasis on conventional routines to regulate encounters, are in line with norms of the larger society. Israeli patterns, by contrast, are a complex mix of the new *dugri* 'straight' style (Katriel 1986) along with old patterns – associated with traditional, pre-Zionist norms that her subjects often explicitly reject. Blum-Kulka sees the NI families' preference for mitigated directness as serving the need for solidarity politeness while indexing the "ethos of directness" favored by modern Israeli society. In Chap. 8, she begins to explore the implications of her empirical work for the ideology associated with the *dugri* style; however, further discussion would be desirable to clarify this problem.

For the AI families, finally, the delicate balance between the competing demands of assimilation and of English-language maintenance is exemplified by the mixture of politeness strategies (solidarity-based and conventional) in their speech, and by the contrasting ways in which AI parents and children approach turn-allocation. Blum-Kulka is particularly fascinated with the AI families. These American parents and (largely) Israeli-born children are at the intersection of two cultures, and use both English and Hebrew. Chap. 7 details the unique intercultural style of talk constructed by the AI families, and begins to show how one would go about conducting a full-scale study of pragmatic development in a bilingual/bicultural setting.

Paradoxically, one problem with Blum-Kulka's book lies in her unquestionable and deep familiarity with the discourse patterns of her subjects. For readers who lack her familiarity with American or Israeli Jewish discursive norms, or who lack her ability to detect differences in the examples offered, her interpretations may seem subtle, and in some cases hard to follow or unconvincing. For example, she cites the AI parents' interim position with respect to control acts and politeness as evidence of their having a way of speaking at the dinner table that is different from both the JA families and the NI families: The AI parents use fewer direct requests than NI parents, but more direct requests than JA parents. Similarly, the AI parents favor a politeness style that evenly balances the solidarity politeness favored by the NI parents with the conventional politeness favored in the JA families. Blum-Kulka doesn't consider, however, whether the AI families could simply be at an interim stage in the acquisition of the pragmatics of the NI norm – so that their patterns of requests and politeness represent an imperfect approximation of Israeli/Hebrew pragmatics, rather than the development of a unique intercultural style. Although she uses both quantitatively presented data and interpreted transcript examples, some readers may be less than fully convinced of her claims. This, however, is a problem for all researchers whose interpretive claims rest on deeply rooted cultural and linguistic knowledge that is not shared by all their readers.

One other weakness of Blum-Kulka's book concerns the presentation of her methodology. Although in general her methods are well described, there are areas in which a more extensive treatment of the process of data collection and analysis would have been helpful. For example, she spends only one paragraph in Chap. 1

summarizing the series of pragmatic socialization interviews that she conducted. Readers would have benefited from a more in-depth discussion of the types of questions used, and the analytical choices made in constructing and conducting this interview – rather than just the allusions and examples that are embedded in the ongoing analysis presented in subsequent chapters.

Blum-Kulka's book is a valuable resource for both sociolinguists and sociologists of language who are interested in pragmatic socialization and cross-cultural analysis. The work will be of interest to those who explore the construction of cultural identity in talk, as well as those more specifically concerned with cultural divergence among American and Israeli Jewish communities. The study also serves as an excellent example of the micro-analytic approach to questions about the relationship between language and culture.

## REFERENCES

- Harshav, Benjamin (1993). *Language in time of revolution*. Berkeley: University of California Press.  
 Katriel, Tamar (1986). *Talking straight: Dugri speech in Israeli Sabra culture*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.

(Received 20 August 1999)

WAYNE A. BEACH, *Conversations about illness: Family preoccupations with bulimia*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 1996. Pp. vii, 148. Hb \$36.00, pb \$16.00.

Reviewed by ELIZABETH A. BOYD  
*Institute for Health Policy Studies*  
*University of California*  
*San Francisco, CA 94143-0936*  
*eaboyd@itsa.ucsf.edu*

Within the fields of health communication and medical sociology, there is growing interest in exploring the social and interactional character of health and illness. This interest results, in large part, from the recognition that the very foundations of a society's notions of health are inextricably rooted in the social. With the present book, we have one of the first interactional studies of a FAMILY'S EXPERIENCE with a particular illness: bulimia. Beach provides a glimpse into the way that family members both talk about, and talk into being, the health problems of one of its members. Removing the notion of illness from the individual, psychological experience is not an especially novel idea; but Beach's location of it in the interactional details of a conversation between a grandmother and granddaughter is quite notable.

Bulimia is an eating disorder that afflicts many women in the US; some researchers estimate its prevalence to exceed 10% among middle- to upper-class adolescent and college-age women (1). It is typically characterized by cycles of binge eating and purging (self-induced vomiting). Like other eating disorders, bulimia is often seen as an intensely private illness; many of those who suffer

from it work to keep others, especially family members, from finding out about it. But what happens when a family member suspects that another member is bulimic? How is this difficult topic approached, understood, and managed among those family members? In other words, how is this particular illness made into a social reality, particularly given what is often understood as its private character?

Beach's book addresses these questions through the case study of "Gramma and Sissy," a grandmother and granddaughter who struggle to define and negotiate the reality of Sissy's eating disorder. His detailed analysis is based on a 13-minute audio-recording of Gramma and Sissy as they engage in an otherwise mundane interaction one evening. Using the methods of Conversation Analysis, Beach explores the organization of this interaction – particularly as it relates to Gramma's pursuit of the topic of Sissy's eating disorder, Sissy's initial rejection of the accusation, and her eventual acceptance of its possible relevance for her. Throughout, Beach pays careful attention to the moves and countermoves of each participant as they negotiate this delicate topic.

As Beach says in the Introduction, his interest in the conversation between Gramma and Sissy is not motivated by a particular interest or expertise in eating disorders in general, or in bulimia specifically. Rather, his interest lies in the more generic interactional practices through which family members initiate talk about health problems, offer support, and encourage seeking outside assistance from health professionals, and in how those alleged to be ill agree and/or offer resistance to a family member's diagnosis (xiii). As stated, Beach's interests go beyond the specifics of this interaction to address the more general issue of how family members talk through their medical concerns. His work thus makes an important contribution to the now well-established CA literature on the organization of talk-in-interaction. Where Beach's work breaks new territory is in its focus on illness as it is talked into being in the ordinary setting of a family interaction. He offers a fascinating comparative case in which health and illness are negotiated OUTSIDE traditional institutional settings, such as a doctor's office or counseling session (cf. Drew & Heritage 1992 for numerous exemplary analyses of such institutional settings).

By focusing on the interaction at the level of each utterance (and action), Beach is able to offer an analysis that goes beyond typical characterizations. For instance, in his discussion of Gramma's approach to the delicate topic of bulimia, he shows specifically how she initiates a course of action that defines the topic as delicate – and, indirectly, how she brings to the floor her concerns about Sissy's weight. Turn by turn, and with slowly increasing directness, Gramma pursues Sissy's eating disorder, gradually moving it from the realm of possible "trouble" to the realm of a full-fledged "problem" with dire consequences. Matching her turn by turn, Sissy works to reject, avoid, and ignore the implications of Gramma's pursuits, and to avoid ownership of the problem. Beach's analysis thus provides a fascinating look into resistance, avoidance, and pursuit in interaction.



Throughout his book, Beach treats both parties' actions as coordinated, collaborative, and truly interactional. This is a refreshing treatment of a topic – health – which is still too often treated as individualistic and unidirectional.

*Conversations about illness* offers a first look in a very promising direction; in some ways, it can be seen as only beginning to scratch the analytic surface of this particular interaction, and this approach to health and illness in general. That said, however, it must be seen as a critical and exciting step forward in exposing previously unexamined interactional practices through which family members negotiate definitions of health and illness. The implications of Beach's analysis are most intriguing: Perhaps it is precisely in the struggles between Sissy and her grandmother that the very nature of Sissy's problem (and bulimia more generally) is constructed. In other words, the very medical definition of bulimia as a secretive illness is reflected in the way it is treated by Gramma and Sissy herself; and their treatment of it as secretive and delicate further constitutes it as such. This reflexive relationship between talk and illness is invisible if we ignore the interactional moments in which family health matters are of concern. Indeed, it is only through a close, detailed look at each utterance in a conversation about illness that we can begin to see, and truly appreciate, what it means to say that an illness is socially constituted.

## REFERENCES

Drew, Paul, & Heritage, John (1992). *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.

(Received 29 May 1999)

ROGER W. SHUY, *The language of confession, interrogation, and deception*. (Empirical linguistics series.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1998. Pp. vii, 205.

Reviewed by MARGARET VAN NAERSEN  
Graduate School of Education, University of Pennsylvania  
Philadelphia, PA 19106  
mvnaerss@sas.upenn.edu

This book hooks the reader (linguist and non-) through real-life, high-stakes cases and a very readable style. Shuy brings his scholarship and humanity to this work as he introduces us to the communicative event of the confession within the culture of the law enforcement community in the United States. His examples show us how linguists can apply their knowledge and skills. He also speaks to the law enforcement community, and to the interested non-linguist.

An academic book review is generally done by someone very knowledgeable in the area of the book, but not in this case: though experienced in work in applied

linguistics, I am a newcomer to the field of forensic linguistics, with only two cases so far. However, perhaps I'm typical of one of Shuy's target audiences – an applied linguist who, by virtue of being at a nearby university, fell into her first case, and whose initial learning curve was long as she tried to get inside the legal issues. Shuy's book can serve as a handbook to give us a jump-start.

First I will describe the contents of the book, noting assistance for linguists (i) on confession in the culture of the law enforcement, (ii) on tools and research, and (iii) on considerations for improving the validity of confessions. I also include comments on the book's accessibility to various audiences, along with several personal reactions.

In recent years there has been a growing acceptance of the need for linguistic assistance by prosecutors and law enforcement agencies, as well as defense attorneys (Shuy 1998:194). The door is open for making changes. Shuy has mentored graduate students and colleagues; and one by one, he has educated those with whom he has worked in the legal system. He has shared his ideas in conferences and articles. To have a still wider impact, he has now supplemented his earlier book, *Language crimes*, with the present volume.

Although Shuy does not specify a purpose or an audience for this book, he is clearly committed to justice – in particular, to improving the process of obtaining valid confessions. His strategies seem to include (a) increasing the number of linguists able to work effectively in the legal system; (b) raising awareness of those in the legal system about how linguistic analysis can be used; (c) making recommendations to the law enforcement community on improving the processes for obtaining confessions, and for assuring adequate confession documentation; and (d) raising awareness of the interested public about issues involving language and the law. I cannot speak for non-linguists, but the fact that my first reading of Shuy's book was at bedtime – and that I did not want to put it down – is some indication that he may succeed, in varying degrees, in reaching all four audiences.

The book addresses the language used in confession events by suspects and by their interrogators. Chap. 1 opens with a focus on the concept of confession. In a down-to-earth and personalized discussion, Shuy points out the differences between the popular concept of a religious confession (a Christian perspective) and the social confession (in the US legal system). He follows with a very accessible description of confession as a speech act. At this point we enter the culture of law enforcement; here, in contrast to confession, there is deception (lying). Confession takes place primarily as a part of police interrogation. It is through interrogation that police attempt to identify deception and to move the suspect to confession. Placing police interrogation in the context of intelligence gathering provides a very useful framework for considering the purposes of police interrogation.

In Chaps. 2–9, Shuy introduces critical concepts/issues related to confession within a law enforcement context. This introduces us to the social context, values,

and procedures of the law enforcement culture. Chap. 2, "Language of police interrogation," discusses interrogating vs. interviewing. Chap. 3, "Language and constitutional rights," treats eliciting acknowledgment of guilt. Chap. 4, "Language of truthfulness and deception," deals with research on detecting deception. Chap. 5, "Language of written confessions," discusses the role of stylistics. Chap. 6, "Language of implicational confession," is concerned with implicating another in the same crime. Chap. 7, "Language of interrogator as therapist," treats coercion by pretending sympathy. Chap. 8, "Inferred confession," discusses the situation where there are memories and perceptions but no actual confession. Last in this group, Chap. 9, "Unvalidated confession," deals with reconstructing events from other sources.

Each concept/issue is illustrated by cases on which Shuy has worked. Examples are supported by language samples, analyses, and outcomes which show us how various tools from linguistics can be applied. It becomes depressingly clear how little weight is often given to linguistic evidence, and how poor documentation can be. In fairness, then, Shuy describes in Chap. 10 an effective interrogation and a valid confession, recognizing the police department concerned.

Most of the chapters appear to be written for several audiences; but Chap. 10, "Some basic principles of interrogation, confession, and deceptive language," seems to be written for the law enforcement community. Based on his own experience working with various agencies, Shuy makes five critical recommendations. He then reports on progress in some areas and uses that to show that improved interrogation procedures are possible and desirable. Although this chapter does not speak directly to the applied linguist, it does provide linguists with useful insights on change strategy. We may at times be in a position to reinforce Shuy's recommendations, and we will also be able to speak in law enforcement terms.

I related immediately to Shuy's statement that he cannot tell if a speaker is lying:

Most liars are not good at prevarication, especially during complex and pressure-packed interrogation by law enforcement officers. They tend to slip up somewhere and become inconsistent. When they do, they can get caught in their inconsistent language. (78)

On my first case, I had to remind myself and my lawyer that we could not get inside the defendant's head to determine if the person was lying. But I could, by identifying patterns of consistency or inconsistency in language use, give a professional opinion that a judge or jury could use in coming to a conclusion.

In Chap. 1, Shuy indicates he is not presenting a treatise on the law of confession. Nevertheless, his scholarship is evident throughout the book as he synthesizes relevant research and critiques it in a very accessible way. One example is from Chap. 8, "Inferred confession," where Shuy summarizes re-

search surrounding the “Reid technique” of interrogation, in which body language is seen as a key to interpretations of deceitfulness, as well as the use of various expensive gadgets for voice analysis. Research has shown that certain body movements and signs of stress in a person’s voice reveal only stress, not lying (Ekman 1985:98 in Shuy 1998:148). There may be a reason other than lying for facial twitches, as I observed in my first case. Furthermore, the Reid technique does not allow for cultural and social differences in non-verbal behavior such as eye contact.

Shuy’s book will probably be, in general, very accessible to even to the interested non-linguist, but there are several points of possible difficulty. In Chap. 1, those without a background in sociolinguistics or communication may have some difficulty with Harris’s theory of intelligence analysis (p. 7). In Chap. 2, the discussion of who in a trial focuses on the defendant’s language, and who on the interrogator’s language (49–50), becomes difficult to follow. In Chap. 3, references to intonation patterns A and B appear in the text, but not with the examples, making a second reading necessary (71).

For non-linguists, some of the language samples may be a bit tedious to read. However, Shuy’s accompanying narrative summaries and interpretations will hold such readers. With the popularization by the media of court proceedings and law enforcement, even readers outside linguistics and law will find themselves drawn into the cases and issues.

On the other hand, some linguists may find the linguistic evidence and presentation somewhat simplistic. I would argue, however, that “simple” can be elegant and persuasive, not a sign of lack of depth on the part of the linguist. Furthermore, in order to make points accessible to non-linguists, Shuy’s presentation of his arguments and evidence HAS to be clear and simple. In my first case, what finally persuaded my lawyer was the percentage of incorrect uses of past tense, and a simple line drawing that mapped events and use of verb tenses. If linguists are to have an impact, we must keep things simple, identify the evidence that our clients need, and present it so they can understand it.

No doubt this book will soon make its appearance in sociolinguistics courses and in law school libraries, alongside Shuy’s *Language crimes*. A non-linguist on a commuter train might even be seen with her/his head buried in *The language of confession, interrogation, and deception*.

## REFERENCES

- Ekman, Paul. 1985. *Telling lies: Clues to deceit in the marketplace, politics, and marriage*. New York: Norton.
- Shuy, Roger W. (1988). *Language crimes: The use and abuse of language evidence in the courtroom*. Oxford: Blackwell.

(Received 25 June 1999)

DWIGHT ATKINSON, *Scientific discourse in sociohistorical context: The Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London, 1675–1975*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 1999. Pp. xxxi, 208.

Reviewed by GREG MYERS  
 Department of Linguistics and Modern English Language  
 Lancaster University, Lancaster LA1 4YT, UK  
 g.myers@lancaster.ac.uk

The language of science has been extensively studied by linguists and rhetoricians – as a distinctive register, as a set of genres that students and academics need to master, and as a discourse of powerful social institutions. Most of these studies have been synchronic, focusing on the structures or styles of more or less contemporary texts, particularly research articles. But if we rely on such studies, we may tend to reify some features of text (such as the Introduction–Methods–Results–Discussion form, or the tendency to passive constructions and nominalizations) as inevitable features of scientific communication. We may also treat scientific institutions – such as the lines between disciplines, or between professionals and amateurs – as given by the subject matter, rather than seeing them as changing and as constituted in part by their communicative practices.

Bazerman 1988 provided two highly influential models for diachronic studies, taking a sample of articles from the early years of the oldest scientific journal, *The Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London* (PT), and examining articles on spectroscopy from the past hundred years of *Physical Review*. For a linguist, these studies are rather limited, dealing mainly with rhetorical features of form, authorial stance, and relation to the scientific community. But they clearly established the need to consider the social and scientific context in choosing texts, features to analyze, and dimensions for interpretation. The line of research begun by Bazerman has now come to maturity with two major linguistic studies, both of *PT*: one by Valle 1999, and the other this book by Atkinson, following on his earlier article in this journal (1996).

Atkinson states his project as follows: “I adopt two independent approaches to the analysis of written discourse – from the fields of linguistics and rhetoric/composition respectively – and attempt to integrate and interpret the resulting findings in light of the history of the Royal Society and of British Science” (xviii). He samples the huge *PT* corpus at 50-year intervals, starting in 1675. He intends his linguistic analysis to be informed by rhetorical considerations (such as how authors present themselves), institutional considerations (such as the professionalization of the readership), and scientific considerations (such as the changing role of experiment). Rather than study one feature, such as noun groups or transitivity, Atkinson uses Multi-Dimensional (MD) analysis, developed by Douglas Biber (e.g. 1988) and his colleagues. The advantages of MD analysis are (a) that Atkinson considers a wide range of features in relation to each other, (b) that he has a number of analyses of contemporary texts to which to compare his findings, and

(c) that he can be unusually explicit about his techniques of corpus analysis, and about their limitations. It may also be that his discourse analysis of scientific texts has something to teach MD analysis, as MD analysis has something to teach discourse analysis. As far as I know, this is the first discourse study that links MD analysis to a detailed account of a changing genre and its contexts.

The core of the book is in two chapters which present a rhetorical analysis and a linguistic analysis. The rhetorical analysis focuses on three shifts: from “author-centered” to “object-centered” texts; from epistolary forms to current forms of the scientific article; and from dialogic relation to an immediate, present discourse community, to a focus on problems and theory of an implicit community. None of these shifts is surprising, given earlier historical work on scientific discourse, but it is useful to have them illustrated with such care (cf. the sequence of examples on pp. 76–79) and over such an extensive period of time.

The MD analysis raises the right questions, even where I have some doubts about the way it works. Atkinson has complex, if not always surprising, findings about the development from “involved” to “informational” production, and from “narrative” to “non-narrative” concerns (two of Biber’s dimensions). He also tries to establish the distinctness of two forms that occur in his corpus – epistolary articles and experimental articles – and to compare articles from what we would now consider physics and biology (he acknowledges the dangers of projecting current disciplinary categories back to other periods). To use MD analysis, Atkinson has to consider the interrelations among clusters of linguistic features, to operationalize these features, and to take a comparative approach.

I came to the book with some possible criticisms of MD analysis in mind, but Atkinson raises most of the issues himself in his notes. One potential problem is that the approach is sensitive to the particular selection of texts (118); so Biber’s corpus is weighted toward fiction, and one or two articles may skew Atkinson’s results for a period. Another problem is that it is sensitive to the sections of text chosen (70), so that results for a sample that includes “methods” sections may be very different from those based on introductions. There are complex issues of the weighting of features (135 n., 137 n.), when the analyst has to include rare features such as emphatics alongside common features such as present tense verbs. The apparent smoothness of the changes in these dimensions over time may result in part just from aggregation. These are all technical matters internal to MD analysis; Atkinson’s treatment of them will interest both MD analysts and other corpus researchers.

There are two more general problems in relating MD analysis to other approaches. First, the MD approach, like other statistical tools, assumes that the character of a text is most determined by more common features; but a rhetorical approach would argue that rare features, in some positions, can be highly salient (117, 139 n.). Also, though the MD dimensions may seem data-driven, labels must be treated with the same caution we would use with any interpretation: “The dimension labels used throughout the chapter (e.g. ‘involved vs. informational

production') are, strictly speaking, interpretive" (134, n.). One way Atkinson deals with these potential problems is by pursuing "post hoc" analyses of the texts, after interpreting the statistics and considering possible sources of anomalies – e.g. the apparent lack of change in the proportion of verb phrases (114), which he finds to mask a change in their function. An unexpected rise in the number of personal pronouns in the 1725 sample (the number is supposed to fall in each period) is traced to the polemical texts of the Newtonians who then dominated the Royal Society. These comments, where Atkinson again goes text by text, often contain the most interesting insights about the periods, the texts, and the analysis.

After these two core chapters, Atkinson returns to the historical context and tries to develop a synthesis of the rhetorical and linguistic analyses. His main historical claims are related to the role of gentlemanly culture in British science before the mid-19th century. This emphasis reflects a number of key historical studies (Atkinson has read very well in this area); but I can't help thinking that matters become rather oversimplified here, bringing out the broad trends rather than the tensions in each period. Who, exactly, was against the gentlemen in each period? What competing forums, and forms of knowledge, were available? What is the role of individual styles in relation to the norms that Atkinson studies? Nevertheless, he has performed a valuable service in his generalizations, since historians of science are usually reluctant to make broad links across periods, yet it is just such a broad overview that teachers need.

As far as I know, no other analysis attempts to take on such a range of texts in such detail, while maintaining a sense of the historical context in the interpretation of the statistics. Atkinson encourages us to ask two large questions:

(a) Is there a synthesis of rhetorical and linguistic approaches, or just the juxtaposition of two separate approaches? The two remain separate in the organization and argument of the book, and the support that the linguistic analysis offers to the rhetorical is on a rather general level (141 ff.). But the book does provide a rhetorically informed interpretation of the linguistic findings – and that is a major step forward.

(b) Does the analysis contribute to Atkinson's critical aim of opening up science, of helping students and researchers from other cultures participate by demystifying science? In my view, the findings are unlikely to have such direct applications. But they are part of a broader movement in discourse analysis toward seeing scientific institutions, texts, and objects as the product of contingent social changes. In that broader context, this book could well be useful critically.

Atkinson's main contribution is not any particular claim about scientific discourse or the history of science, but rather the rigor and scale he brings to analysis of corpora of scientific texts. His work and Valle's will now be the benchmark for historical studies of scientific texts, and they may persuade some corpus analysts to look more closely at the institutions and practices around contemporary texts.

## REFERENCES

- Atkinson, Dwight (1996). *The Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London, 1675–1975: A sociohistorical discourse analysis*. *Language in Society* 25:333–71.
- Bazerman, Charles (1988). *Shaping written knowledge: The genre and activity of the experimental article in science*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Biber, Douglas (1988). *Variation across speech and writing*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Valle, Ellen (1999). *A collective intelligence: The life sciences in the Royal Society as a scientific discourse community, 1665–1965*. (Anglicana Turkuensia, 17.) Turku, Finland: University of Turku.

(Received 17 August 1999)

ELIZABETH LANZA, *Language mixing in bilingual children*. (Oxford studies in language contact.) Oxford: Clarendon; New York: Oxford University Press, 1997. Pp. xv, 397. Hb \$90.00.

Reviewed by ROSEMARIE TRACY  
 Anglistische Linguistik, Universität Mannheim  
 68131 Mannheim, Germany  
 rtracy@rumms.uni-mannheim.de

Investigators of bilingual language acquisition have underscored the fact that the child growing up with two languages provides us with an ideal natural experiment. First, the bilingual child offers welcome opportunities for disentangling general cognitive and specific linguistic development. Second, the investigator can look at different language policies adopted by individual families and caregivers, compare features of the respective input, and relate these features to the child's emerging language systems and communicative behavior. Lanza's book addresses this second set of issues and provides us with valuable insights concerning what she calls "language socialization" and children's early sensitivity toward the acceptability of their language choice.

The first two chapters deal with the state of the art (up to about 1995) of current research in infant bilingualism. Chap. 1 provides an introduction to language "mixing," which has often been taken as evidence for bilingual children's inability to differentiate their two input languages – a hypothesis that Lanza rejects. She discusses previous studies which have either supported or criticized this hypothesis (including Leopold 1949, Swain & Wesche 1975, Volterra & Taeschner 1978, Vihman 1985, Meisel 1989, Genesee 1989, de Houwer 1990). Previous explanations for language mixing are considered, such as modeling through mixed input, the importance of sociolinguistically determined choice, and the child's growing metalinguistic awareness.

In Chap. 3, Lanza introduces the design of her own investigation of language mixing in two children, Siri and Tomas, growing up in bilingual families in Norway; both mothers are native speakers of American English, and both fathers Norwegian. Lanza provides detailed information on data collection procedures, analytical decisions, and problems of interpretation and language assignment.



The corpora selected for the current study (from about 1;11 to 2;7 for Siri, and 2;0 to 2;3 for Tomas) consist of audio-taped conversations between the children and their parents.

Chap. 4 focuses on forms of mixing. Predominant patterns involve combinations of English verbs or nouns with Norwegian suffixes; co-occurrence of Norwegian auxiliaries with English main verbs; mixing within the noun phrase (i.e. Norwegian determiners in construction with English nouns); and mixing that involves negative particles, pronouns, and other closed-class items. There is also a section on phonological blending of cognates. The predominance of Norwegian grammatical morphemes in combination with English lexical classes leads Lanza (following Petersen 1988) to conclude that there is a clear “directionality” of mixing, revealing Norwegian to be the dominant language.

Chaps. 5–6 discuss language choice, taking into account functional and contextual aspects of individual turns at talk, especially the particular demands of the children’s linguistic environments. Crucial variables in this environment are several parental discourse strategies. Lanza provides a thorough overview of the ways in which the parents of Siri and Tomas react to their children’s mixed utterances in both dyadic and triadic situations. What emerges is a “monolingual-bilingual context continuum” (heading of sec. 6.3.2), in which each parent negotiates a unique context and sets different standards of appropriateness of language choice. The last chapter summarizes various findings and relates them to current issues in bilingualism research.

Readers familiar with bilingual research puzzles will find this book very stimulating, and most will sympathize with Lanza’s solutions to analytical problems. There are some areas, though, where the reader could do with more help. As Germanic sister languages, English and Norwegian exhibit many similarities, but there are also crucial differences. The differences most pertinent to issues dealt with here concern phonology (i.e. Norwegian word-level accents) and contrasts on morphological and syntactic levels. I would have appreciated a more systematic statement concerning the relevant contrasts at stake, since this would have helped me understand what kind of acquisition problem could (at least theoretically) be expected in the first place. I agree with Lanza that the question of whether the bilingual child starts with a single system or with two systems may be the “wrong question”; I would like to add that “either/or” answers are inappropriate because some language pairs simply make it harder for the child to discover critical structural contrasts in the input. Depending on the linguistic contrasts involved, some bilinguals may indeed start with one system, whereas others would never be tempted to do so.

Lanza reports that mixing suggested no word-order conflict (168). Looking at individual utterances, however, one finds cases that deserve further discussion. The appendix contains patterns like *pus holde* ‘kitten hold’ – where, addressing her mother, Siri combines a Norwegian direct object with an English verb bearing a Norwegian grammatical suffix. By Lanza’s criteria for language assignment, it

is the Norwegian items that are considered mixed into English; however, the syntax (OV) is definitely not target-like English. Here it would be helpful to have information on the children's word order in unmixed utterances in both languages.

Lanza suggests that dominance can (mainly) be inferred from the direction of mixing. I see two problems with this suggestion, one having to do with developmental asynchrony, and the other with principled contrasts between Norwegian and English. The children's development in English lags behind Norwegian in several areas of the grammar, at least with respect to pronouns, articles, auxiliaries, and inflectional paradigms. This asynchrony opens up ways of checking whether Lanza's notion of dominance involves more than differential degree of competence, and it would be interesting to find out what happens after English "catches up." However, there are also areas where English cannot catch up because it simply does not make corresponding forms available. When Lanza writes (169) that the dominant language may exhibit more structural variation, we have to remember that English (despite topicalization) is in many ways more limited – e.g., offering only residual V2 effects – and that we therefore would not expect utterances to exhibit equal ranges of variation in both languages.

Even though I gladly go along with Lanza's insistence on early separation of systems, I find her distinction between "differentiation" and "separation" at times confusing ("I contend that language differentiation is not necessary for language separation," 67). The need for conceptual clarification increases in later chapters, when "differentiation" is also used with respect to the child's ability to tell whether mixing or non-mixing is the appropriate mode of discourse (275).

Lanza considers different ways of coming to grips with base- or matrix-language assignment. She draws on the quantitative solution proposed by Myers-Scotton 1993, but she also continues to rely on criteria such as language of the interlocutor or conversation. Inconsistencies are probably hard to avoid, and the issue is certainly far from settled for adult code-switching. Lanza's claim that parents negotiate monolingual or bilingual contexts made me wonder, though: In the latter case, should one still count mixed utterances or mixed-in units, as though there were only one language in the environment at the time? I certainly hope that Lanza's interesting book will inspire future researchers to pursue these questions.

## REFERENCES

- De Houwer, Annick (1990). *The acquisition of two languages from birth: A case study*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Genesee, Fred (1989). Early bilingual development: One language or two? *Journal of Child Language* 16:161–79.
- Leopold, Werner (1939–49). *Speech development of a bilingual child: A linguist's record*. 4 vols. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Meisel, Jürgen M. (1989). Early differentiation of languages in bilingual children. In Kenneth Hyltenstam & Loraine Obler (eds.), *Bilingualism across the lifespan*, 13–40. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Myers-Scotton, Carol (1993). *Duelling languages: Grammatical structure in codeswitching*. Oxford & New York: University Press.
- Petersen, Jennifer (1988). Word-internal code-switching constraints in a bilingual child's grammar. *Linguistics* 26:479–93.
- Swain, Merrill, & Wesche, Mari (1975). Linguistic interaction: Case study of a bilingual child. *Language Science* 37:17–22.
- Taeschner, Traute, & Volterra, Virginia (1978). The acquisition and development of language by bilingual children. *Journal of Child Language* 5:311–26.
- Vihman, Marilyn M. (1985). Language differentiation by the bilingual infant. *Journal of Child Language* 12:297–324.

(Received 29 June 1999)

FRANS HINSKENS, ROELAND VAN HOUT, & W. LEO WETZELS (eds.), *Variation, change and phonological theory*. (Current issues in linguistic theory, 146.) Amsterdam: Benjamins. Pp. x, 314. Hb NLG 150.00, \$75.00.

Reviewed by JOHN C. PAOLILLO  
*Linguistics, University of Texas*  
 Arlington, TX 76019–0559  
 john@ling.uta.edu

Since the inception of Labov's variationist approach to the study of linguistic change, there have been two approaches to phonology: one theoretically motivated, addressing relatively invariant idealizations of language; and another empirically motivated, in which language is taken to be fundamentally variable. Since the time of the controversy over the incorporation of probability into grammar in the Variable Rule (VR) model, these two approaches have largely diverged. Critics have expressed skepticism about probabilistic rules, challenged their psychological reality, and rejected the variationist's methods of aggregating speakers (cf. papers collected by Singh 1996). Variationists have responded with improved methods, more thorough demonstrations of variability, and articulations of the relevance of variation to linguistic change (e.g. Labov 1994). The controversy continues today; and as readers of the present volume will see, it has entered new territory.

Beginning with a workshop on language variation and linguistic theory held at the University of Nijmegen, the three editors of *VCPT* have sought to bring together practitioners of both approaches to phonology in an attempt to catalyze a synthesis. The volume is comprised of the editors' introduction, "Balancing data and theory in the study of phonological variation and change," plus nine individual contributions. Four contributions apply the relatively new Optimality Theory (OT) model to a range of problems such as intralinguistic variation (A. Anttila, "Deriving variation from grammar"), historical comparison (S. Rose, "Featural morphology and dialect variation: The contribution of historical change"; N. Smith, "Shrinking and hopping vowels in Northern Cape York: Minimally different systems"), and stylistic variation (M. van Oostendorp, "Style levels in conflict resolution"). One contribution (T. Borowsky & B. Horvath, "L-vocalization in

Australian English”) applies both variationist and OT approaches to variation. Two contributions offer exclusively variationist perspectives on larger theoretical issues (G. Guy, “Competence, performance and the Generative Grammar of variation”), and on English (t,d) deletion in particular (W. Labov, “Resyllabification”). The remaining two contributions discuss co-occurrences among phonological variables (P. Auer, “Co-occurrence restrictions between linguistic variables: A case for social dialectology, phonological theory and variation studies”) and historical comparison using more modern phonological representations (M.-R. Lloret, “When does variability become relevant to formal linguistic theory?”). For those who are interested in theoretical accounts of phonological variation, or who wish to know the current state of the discussion of variation and phonological theory, this compilation will serve well.

However, those hoping to find a synthesis of these two influential approaches will have to wait for further installments of the debate. Over all, the dominant perspective in this volume is OT, which proposes to account for variation in grammar without a probabilistic component (seven of the nine contributions address OT, whereas only three address VR). Smith (p. 298) articulates this perspective most succinctly: “Variation can be accommodated in an OT model by allowing different rankings of constraints among different individuals, and among different speech styles within individuals. The place for statistics is outside, not inside, grammar.” In fact, it appears that the place for statistics is so far outside grammar that the OT contributions make relatively little effort to connect the observed quantitative patterns with the predictions of the theory. Even the hybrid essay by Borowsky & Horvath reads like two separate investigations, one variationist and the other OT. They explicitly dodge what must be taken to be the most important question of the enterprise (108): “We adopt Optimality Theory as a model within which we can begin to find explanations of variation and change. We make no claims about the best way to account for variation within OT.” When collaborating authors are unwilling to take a position on such an important issue, the starting positions of the two approaches must be far apart indeed.

Perhaps the contribution that goes furthest in the direction of bridging quantitative and formal approaches is that of A. Anttila, addressing the genitive plural endings in Finnish, which are variably strong and weak in different prosodic environments. Anttila’s account uses groups of unranked constraints to predict the proportions of each variant. The data are meticulously addressed, point by point (although the careful reader should be prepared to study many tables, which are at times hard to follow). The paper culminates in quantitative predictions, which are compared in a final set of tables with the genitive plural frequencies from the Suomen Kuvalehti 1987 corpus. The comparison does not employ a statistical model test, since it is problematic to apply one where the model predicts categoricity. Even so, deviances should have been calculated where possible; if one does this, some contexts reveal a fit poor enough to make a simpler VR model potentially appealing (e.g., for four-syllable *i*-stem nouns with light pe-

nults, 39 out of 273 tokens are strong; the model predicts 91, yielding a deviance of 44.57 at 1 degree of freedom). Worse yet, some environments that are predicted to be categorical are in fact variable; these alone should be fatal to the model, statistically speaking. Thus it appears that OT can “account” for variation as long as statistical rigor and precision are not one’s primary goal. All the same, *VCPT* does a very important service by making available Anttila’s and other OT analyses of variable data. These contributions articulate and expand the OT position on variation, going well beyond the few published analyses that have appeared previously.

Pure VR approaches are represented in *VCPT* by the contributions of G. Guy and W. Labov. Guy argues that the Saussurean dichotomy between langue/competence and parole/performance should be replaced with a unified theory of variable competence. The evidence comes from a number of variationist studies which identify variable constraints that parallel the categorical constraints of theories of invariant competence. Although Guy’s arguments are impressive, they are not likely to sway committed formalists like Anttila, who are not as bothered as Guy is about multiplying the number of constraints in the grammar, and thereby approximating the continuous predictions of the VR model within the discrete OT model.

Labov’s contribution argues from a range of empirical data that the well-studied phenomenon of variable (t,d) deletion in English cannot be explained away by sonority and resyllabification. Data both from perception (in a corpus of misunderstandings) and from production (from the Neighborhood Study of Philadelphia) show that the resyllabification analysis is empirically unsupported. The following phonological environment observes the sonority hierarchy for resyllabification/(t,d) deletion – except crucially in the glide class, where /y/ favors retention, as do vowels, while /w/ favors deletion, as do obstruents. Because of the failure of glides to conform to the predictions of sonority-resyllabification, Labov argues, the VR model is still the best to explain (t,d) deletion. Incidentally, this essay has the most up-to-date references in the volume for published work in variable OT (e.g. Nagy & Reynolds 1997, instead of the unpublished 1994 version); but oddly, it has few references to the position against which it appears to argue most strongly. Singh & Ford 1989, cited in the editors’ introduction, does not appear in this paper’s references.

For faithful followers of VR or OT, however, the arguments of the opposition may never be satisfying. Until direct comparisons can be made between VR and OT models, such that they can be evaluated by a common metric, it will always be possible for each camp to retreat to its own familiar territory in the face of arguments from the other side. For a real synthesis to take place, there will need to be consensus on what data are to be accounted for, and on how to evaluate the empirical adequacy of a given model; such issues comprise the better part of the editors’ balanced introduction. Perhaps a consensus could be reached in the future by gathering researchers such as those who contributed to *VCPT* and having

them address a common corpus of data. In the meantime, those interested in the current state of the discourse about variation, change, and phonological theory – and about VR, OT and related models – will doubtless find *VCPT* to be an important point of reference. The editors have done the field a service by producing this volume, and we can hope other collections will lead to a greater synthesis of divergent approaches to phonology.

## REFERENCES

- Labov, William. 1994. *Principles of linguistic change*. Oxford: Blackwell.  
 Nagy, Naomi, & Reynolds, William. 1997. Optimality Theory and variable word-final deletion in Faetar. *Language Variation and Change* 9:37–55.  
 Singh, Rajendra. 1996 (ed.) *Towards a critical sociolinguistics*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.  
 ———, & Ford, Alan. 1989. A closer look at so-called variable processes. In Ralph Fasold and Deborah Schiffrin (eds.), *Language variation and change*, 367–80. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

(Received 23 May 1999)

ANDRÉE TABOURET-KELLER (ed.), *Les noms des langues, I: Les enjeux de la nomination des langues*. (Bibliothèque des Cahiers de l'Institut de Linguistique de Louvain, 95). Louvain: Peeters, 1997. Pp. 274. FB 960.

Reviewed by ROBERT K. HERBERT  
*Anthropology, Binghamton University (SUNY)*  
 Binghamton, NY 13902  
 warthog@binghamton.edu

This collection of articles is the first in a projected series on the topic of language names – GLOTTONYMS, or occasionally GLOSSONYMS. The present volume owes its impetus to a 1994 colloquium organized by the Centre de Recherche Bretonne et Celtique, Université de Bretagne Occidentale. The book offers a reasonable treatment of general issues, but most of the authors treat European, particularly Western European, cases. As the subtitle of the volume indicates, the focus here is claimed to be largely a social one, having to do with the political, ideological, and social aspects of language naming. The book consists of an introduction by the editor, followed by four sections.

Tabouret-Keller introduces the collection and identifies a number of prominent themes. Drawing on a Saussurean distinction between “*langue comme institution sociale*” and “*langue comme institution pure*,” she covers familiar ground. The difficulties of distinguishing varieties/forms of languages to be named are noted, as well as the way in which naming, an act of intervention, has the effect of reifying the named (6). The intriguing question of whether it is necessary for languages to be named (the title of a later contribution to the volume), is considered, and a useful distinction is made among three onomastic domains: speakers, specialists (linguists), and institutions (9 ff.) Certainly the names used in each

domain may differ widely, and several of the contributions pursue this theme. The introduction also notes some of the recurrent themes in later chapters.

Section I consists of two essays on the topic of the scientific stakes of language naming. Robert B. Le Page's contribution, "What is a language?," the only chapter not in French, is a curious choice for inclusion here. Originally published in *York papers in linguistics* in 1988, it treats the role of stereotypes, usually politically or ideologically motivated, in the perception of rule systems such as language – and in subsequent behavior, including language description. The case studies focus on the role of a perceived homogeneous national language in the promotion of national unity, but the treatments are superficial. The second essay, by Daniel Braggioni & Marie Vanche-Roby, is an interesting survey of the approaches taken in reference works to the questions of naming, classifying, and counting languages. The difficulty of enumerating the world's languages is well known, with estimates ranging from 3,000 to 20,000. One suspects that there is indeed something interesting about an object of study that is deemed countable and delimitable yet defies both activities. The authors' approach is mainly historical, tracing the evolution of approaches from *l'Encyclopédie* through modern reference works. The interrelations among the tasks of counting, naming, and classifying are briefly pursued (58).

Section II includes three articles which examine the relationship between naming and the institution of a language. Renée Balibar's contribution treats the evolution (and eventual naming) of a form recognizable as *la langue romane-française* in the 9th century. Jean-Michel Eloy also considers French, but in its modern form. On the basis of parliamentary debates about the French language in 1994, he considers speakers' reference terms, particularly *langue française*, *le français*, and *notre langue*. There is some interesting discussion of the differing contexts in which these terms are used and the ideological responses that each engenders. Eloy also gives some analysis of references to English, especially American, which clearly reveal his perception of menace in the latter.

In this same section, Salih Akin discusses legislative references to Kurdish in Turkish law no. 2932, "Law relative to publication in languages other than Turkish" (19 October 1983). What makes such references interesting is that the naming of Kurdish has been formally prohibited since 1920, and the law therefore needs to refer to the unnamable. Article 1 explains the outlawing of certain languages on the grounds of needing to protect the integrity of the state and public order. Article 2 forbids the expression, circulation, or publication of opinions in all languages other than the primary languages of Turkey, with the exception of languages which enjoy (limited) protected status as a result of international treaties – notably Greek and Armenian, though the Law names neither. Finally, Article 3 declares that the mother tongue of all citizens is Turkish, and it forbids the use of other languages as mother tongue. Akin gives a very competent exposition of the history and current status of Kurdish in Turkey and neighboring countries. It is noteworthy that the inability to name/recognize Kurdish has resulted in a

view of Kurdish (an Iranian language) as a Turkish dialect – obviously, a much debased one. There are parallels in neighboring countries where Kurdish has been classed as a dialect of Farsi or Arabic, when convenient.

Section III treats “Political and ideological stakes”; here, essays by Yves Le Berre & Jean Le Dû (Breton), Arlette Bothorel-Witz (languages of Alsace), and Armel Wynants (Deutsch and Nederlands) cover familiar ground. The articles are all competent, tracing historical language names and changing perceptions of them. Wynants’s paper is particularly interesting because of the complication posed by the historical use of a single term to name all of Germanic (by outsiders), and the complicated (and shifting) politics of identifying common origin for languages associated with different nations: Germany, Netherlands, and Belgium. Patrick Sériot’s essay, “Faut-il que les langues aient un nom? Le cas du macédonien” is noteworthy and timely, providing a nice exemplification of attempts to tie Macedonian people to nation-states by classifying their way of speaking as a dialect of Serbian or Bulgarian, and of the linguistic stretches involved in this political question. Sériot also offers a good illustration of the difference between internal and external naming (endoglossy and exoglossy), and the ways in which the naming of spoken/written form has been seen as an integral part of the recent legitimation of national (state) identity.

Also in Sec. III, André-Marcel d’Ans investigates the extension of the Yucatec toponym “Maya” to ethnonym and glottonym, as well as its spread to include all of the present-day Mayan languages. This well-documented essay traces the role of evangelization and colonialization in the spread of the term. The final article in this section is by Cécile Canut, on the languages of Mali. The important issue of differences between internal and external naming is again examined here, although superficially; Canut reports some interesting generation-based differences in language naming.

Section 4 includes two contributions. The first, by Irène Fenoglio, is intended as a general treatment of the pragmatic aspects of a speaker’s naming a language. It is brief, and the basic idea is that the use of a particular name positions the speaker – a view that will hardly be surprising to readers of this journal. The second is an examination of the naming of Occitan, by Philippe Gardy. On the basis of earlier sociolinguistic research, Gardy notes two groups of names: the first refers to geography (*langue de pays d’oc, languedocien, provençal*), and the second to function/status (*patois, dialecte*). Gardy then examines references to mother tongue in the writings of Joseph Delteil, a mother-tongue speaker of Occitan. Perhaps not surprisingly, Delteil views the exonym “Occitan” as scholarly, whereas “*le patois est la langue de maman, ma langue maternelle*” (256). “*Il y a du social dans le patois . . . Dans l’{occitan}, en revanche, le social échappe*” (262–3).

In general, the present volume is a scholarly collection of case studies. What we miss, however, is a general onomastic overview, a description of the vital links



between the naming of ways of speaking and the naming of their speakers – between glottonyms and ethnonyms. Furthermore, the collection would profit from a fuller discussion of the internal/external distinction in naming and from more attention to the social aspects of naming (and of not-naming). Although this is an impressive collection, the quality of the articles is a bit uneven. The data are rich and varied, but many readers will be frustrated by the relatively low level of sociolinguistic expertise shown by many of the writers. Indeed, the absence of bibliographical references to the onomastic and sociolinguistic literatures is striking.

(Received 16 August 1999)

DENNIS AGER, *“Francophonie” in the 1990s: Problems and opportunities*. Clevedon (UK) & Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters, 1996. Pp. 215. Pb \$26.95.

Reviewed by ALBERT VALDMAN  
*Creole Institute, Indiana University*  
 Bloomington, IN 47405  
 valdman@indiana.edu

Francophone literature and culture have become the leading area of growth in French studies in the US; thus this broad-ranging critical examination of the notion of *francophonie* constitutes a timely contribution.

The cynic might be tempted to view the notion as nothing more than an attempt by France, as it drifts down to the rank of a secondary power on the world scene, to retain worldwide influence. Without discounting its role in France’s strategy to remain a global player, Ager sets out to show that *francophonie* is a much more complex, three-pronged notion. First, most of the former French colonies are not properly francophone in the sense that French is their primary language; nevertheless, that tongue is the cement that binds them. Second, *francophonie* stands for a set of shared cultural values emanating from the French Revolution, and from the Enlightenment’s quest for individual freedom and human rights – factors which, today, stress a humanism opposed to global-market-oriented capitalism. Third, it is a loose association of affluent nations (the North) with economically devastated and politically troubled states (the South) that may provide a collaborative approach to alleviating these problems.

The book is divided into three sections. The first part provides a well-documented survey of the distribution of French worldwide, the second addresses the various problems that confront both the French language and the concept of *francophonie*, and the third considers the opportunities available if appropriate solutions are found for these problems. The survey opens with a historical sketch of the spread of French after it attained dominance in the Hexa-

gon and the contiguous areas of Belgium, Luxembourg, and Switzerland. Ager distinguishes the early colonization of the New World, motivated mainly by considerations of political prestige, from the economically driven foundation of plantation colonies in the Caribbean and the Indian Ocean. The linguistic byproduct of the use of imported multilingual servile labor in these plantocratic societies was the emergence of creoles. The historical treatment continues with the description of the establishment of protectorates and colonies in Africa, Indochina, and the Pacific, and the breakup of the French Empire after armed struggles (Indochina, Algeria) or negotiations that gradually led to independence through various constitutional changes. The survey closes with a glottodemographic account, made somewhat redundant by detailed appendices but punctuated by in-depth case studies: four independent countries (Lebanon, Algeria, Guinea, Mauritius); the francophone member of a bilingual confederation (Quebec); a “D.O.M.,” i.e. an overseas territory that is constitutionally an integral part of France (Guadeloupe, with some discussion of Martinique’s active local literature movement); and a “T.O.M.,” representing the remnants of the colonial empire (New Caledonia). The reader who discovers that certain obviously non-francophone but perhaps francophile states are members of *francophonie* – such as Bulgaria, the Cape Verde Islands, Egypt, Guinea-Bissau, Moldavia, and Romania – would have welcomed at least one of these being featured in a case study.

The second and third parts of the book are most conveniently reviewed by the joint treatment of matched problems and opportunities, with emphasis on linguistic and cultural issues. With about 100 million primary speakers, French ranks only twelfth worldwide. For it to expand beyond the confines of its ancestral European territories and the Quebec diaspora, it must become intimately linked with local cultures; and like its rival, English, it must accept geographic variants. Yet a pervasive monocentrism, freely accepted by the elites outside of France, impedes the development of endogenous norms. Only in Quebec is there is a timid movement toward linguistic autonomy – reflected by the publication of two general dictionaries, contrasting with the numerous differential lexical inventories that official *francophonie* is promoting for other areas. Even in Quebec, the local form of French that Ager claims has been adopted in the schools and the media (48) hardly reflects the highly deviant local vernacular varieties. The second challenge that *francophonie* must successfully confront is reaching a harmonious accommodation with English (its dominant rival) as the language of international communication, and, especially in Africa, with local vehicular languages. Increasingly, especially in the Great Lakes region – Rwanda, Burundi, and the Democratic Republic of Congo – vehicular forms of English are assuming vehicular functions with which French can compete only in a form that legitimizes deviations from the usage of the cultivated strata of metropolitan France. In Europe itself, the expansion of the European Union will require that French share its status as primary official working language with English and, perhaps,

with German. For French to maintain its place as a multifunctional language in *francophonie*, Ager suggests, France must turn away from the puristic interventionism reflected by government decree, aimed at eliminating English loanwords and preserving the “quality” of the language, i.e. adhering to an invariant metropolitan-based form; it must espouse wholeheartedly a *francopolyphonie* (i.e. a multilingual *francophonie*).

In the cultural and political sphere, the French establishment must overcome what Ager terms “Afropessimism”; it must take bolder steps to promote democracy and the rule of law in a continent whose huge population and enormous untapped resources make it the largest reservoir for potential influence. One of the obstacles to French cultural influence in the Maghreb and the Sahel nations lies in the conflict between Islam and the universalist values associated with French cultural influence, including the strict separation of state and religion. The continuation of de facto neo-colonialism in the T.O.M.s of the Pacific and the Comoro Islands, and in effect in the D.O.M.s as well, inhibits the creation of multilateral regional ties and forces these territories to remain in a state of dependence marked by transfer economies and bloated, overpaid bureaucracies. Ager also suggests that France should cease considering its sub-Saharan former colonies as a *chasse gardée*, a reserved zone of influence, in favor of the establishment of a framework for multilateral collaboration among them.

In view of Ager’s admirable mastery of massive and complex data, one hesitates to point out a small number of errors of documentation or interpretation. For example, he accounts for the subtle variations of the French spoken in Europe (Belgium, Luxembourg, Switzerland) in terms of pidginized or even creole forms of speech that developed in the northern and eastern peripheries of Gallo-Romania (8). In discussing the situation of French as a foreign language in the US, he characterizes it as a preferred elitist language, but he curiously adds that Japanese and other languages have a major role (178). In fact, French has been relegated to second place behind Spanish in US education (by a margin of 3 to 1, at both the secondary and tertiary levels); but it holds that undisputed second place well ahead of all other languages, the most dynamic of which are heritage languages like Korean and Chinese, used by growing ethnic minorities.

In sum, this broadly ranging survey provides readers of English with a useful and exceedingly well documented introduction to the complex linguistic, cultural, political, and economic issues that confront the large and widely distributed group of countries that historical circumstances have placed in the orbit of France. The detailed enumeration and description of the complex network of institutions that comprise official *francophonie*, together with Ager’s rich bibliography, make this book a valuable source for specialists in sociolinguistics, language policy, and language planning.

(Received 1 June 1999)

NANCY RIES, *Russian talk: Culture and conversation during perestroika*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1997. Pp. xii, 220. Hb \$39.95, pb \$16.95.

Reviewed by ANDREA ÁGNES REMÉNYI  
*Linguistics Institute, Hungarian Academy of Sciences*  
*Post Office Box 701/518, H-1399 Budapest, Hungary*  
*gyori@sunserv.kfki.hu*

What makes Russians Russian? Is it a special national character, or their common emotional or intellectual spirit? Ries helps us get rid of these slippery essentialist commonplaces with her interpretative anthropological study of Muscovites' everyday private talk around 1990. Her effort is outstanding in both description and theory: Few have undertaken to describe and analyze Russian (or Eastern European) urban everyday discourse from the anthropological perspective, as she does (though recent macro-studies and studies of public discourse are more numerous). At the same time, she creates and defends a thesis of everyday talk as a vital medium of social value creation and maintenance – as it constructs “Russianness,” in her example.

Quite unprecedentedly for a Western anthropologist before the perestroika era, Ries had the opportunity to spend nine months in Moscow in 1989–90, with the original aim to study everyday discursive constructions of war, peace, and “Russianness” – as they influenced political discourse, and thus US–Soviet relations and the Cold War. She came to realize that the inescapable and recurring narratives of poverty, suffering, and the absurd Russian world (“Anti-Disneyland,” 42) were more than normal reactions to the situation. Thus we can glimpse Ries's heuristic path as she develops her theory of discourse as social reproduction, emphasizing negotiations and challenges rather than common discursive structures or general cultural meanings and values. Though her structure of chapters is somewhat vague, she discusses the central themes, genres, symbols, tropes, and keywords that support the common core of a culture world as diverse as Russia.

She develops, for example, a two-dimensional schematic diagram of 34 genres that roughly characterize Russian discourses along the axes of power and gender (p. 37). Among these, a whole chapter is devoted to the most characteristic ones: litanies (of complaint) and laments, which serve multiple roles. Apart from helping to digest the turbulent times, and by their sub-genres and themes serving as identity markers, they “effected paradoxical value transformations through which suffering engendered distinction, sacrifice created status, and loss produced gain . . . [and thus] may have helped to sustain relative powerlessness and alienation from the political process at the same time as [they] lamented them” (83). The detailed analysis leads us to acknowledge the omnipresence of these genres in everyday Muscovite talk. However, although Ries targets the nature of the consequence that litanies “are a diffuse but very powerful reproductive agent of the politically destructive ideological paradigm that characterizes much of contemporary Russian politics” (114), i.e. the nature of the micro-macro link, unfortunately she does not discuss it in detail anywhere in the book.

Other genres analyzed include, for example, “tales of heroic shopping” or “mischief tales,” characterizing female vs. male discourse respectively – a field in which Ries specializes. The discursive construction of femaleness as orderly, enduring, generous, and heroic, but also dominating, is described as rooted in Russian history, where males were habitually absent because of industrialization, war, or exile. Maleness is constructed as mischievous, opposing the constructed female values and at the same time resisting the official Soviet values: “the iron-jawed, iron-willed man of socialist morality” (70). Another dimension of ideological oppositions appears to be that between praising pragmatic values and simultaneously sacralizing suffering and poverty; the latter is traced back not, as might be expected, to general Christian tradition, but to more particular Russian Orthodox ideologies (148–50, 160). Ries’s ideological examinations are illuminated with analyses of symbols, e.g. bread (136–40), or with historical and semantic analyses of keywords like *narod* ‘people’ (27–30) and *podvig* (approx. ‘heroic achievement’, 53–54).

Ries claims, and successfully defends her thesis, that private talk has been the essential mechanism of value creation in Russia; other anthropological domains have been restricted, partly because of poverty and partly from fear (21). But her thesis on the role of discourse is formulated even more strongly:

How, after all, was the entire Soviet project constructed, shaped, promoted, maintained, and challenged, if not through *talk*: discussion, argument, cajoling, and declamation? In any culture, people (whether peasants, workers, academics, bureaucrats, businesspersons, or national leaders) do not just act, they act in particular ways because discourse makes these forms of action meaningful, appropriate, and valued. (20)

However, to claim that “the entire Soviet project” was constructed through talk seems to be a gross oversimplification, as well as a denial of the terror and repression that lasted over seven decades in the Soviet Union, in which millions were executed or sent to labor camps (*gulag*), or the forty years or more of occupation in some satellite countries, including Hungary. A more fruitful approach would have been a discussion of the fact that, though only a part of the society has to face personal threat in a dictatorship, the rest of the process is carried out through words. What Ries describes as the world of talk that rationalizes inaction or suffering, or even valorizes it, may be a consequence of that historical context.

As far as methodological problems are concerned, Ries acknowledges that the “observer’s paradox” – the problem that her Russian interlocutors were always facing a foreigner curious about their lives and problems – partly caused the overflow of lamenting and complaint (84). She triangulates by using a wide array of other sources, including overheard conversations, contemporary plays and films, TV shows, periodicals, folk songs, and historical sources ranging from Russian literature (Chekhov, Dostoevsky, Solzhenitsyn) to a petition to the tsar dating from 1905. The latter sources are the most useful in Ries’s discussion of the

(pre-Soviet) Russian and Soviet influences on present-day ideologies and discourse. (The eight photographs, by John Einarsen and Robert Kowalczyk, do more than just support the message.)

The basic problem of Ries's argumentation is that it is weakly rooted in the numerous examples. Transcripts are only illustrative, withholding any chance of falsification. Since all the transcripts are presented in the monolog format, the reader tends to have the impression that Muscovites, contrary to the very title of the book, do not TALK or CONVERSE, but can only monologize to the attentive Ries. Unanimous identities and ideologies escape any possible conflict either with one another, or with Ries's rare (and failing) attempts to move the discourse toward problem-solving – a genre more frequent in Western discourse. Thus we are implicitly led to the assumption that the definitional NEGOTIATIVE aspect of discourse as creating values (19) is to be understood not procedurally, but mentally. The single dialog among Muscovites (192–93) is presented in the Epilogue, an assortment of illustrative excerpts which were collected in Ries's later visits (1994–95) and therefore lack an analysis.

The book is completed with an index and a rich bibliography, though the latter is sloppy on a few points; e.g., I could not find Basso & Selby 1976 (p. 1) or Willis 1977 (p. 38) in the reference list, or the listed Bourdieu 1991 in the text. Since Ries often alludes to political events of the era discussed (approx. 1985–1995), an appendix outlining those events would have helped the forgetful reader.

To sum up, I can definitely recommend Ries's book to those interested in linguistic anthropology. Chaps. 2–3 are worth adding to the reading list of general anthropology courses and women's studies anthropology courses, respectively.

(Received 16 June 1999)

ALI A. MAZRUI & ALAMIN M. MAZRUI, *The power of Babel: Language and governance in the African experience*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; Oxford: James Currey; Kampala: Fountain Publishers; Nairobi: East African Educational Publishers; Cape Town: David Philip, 1998. Pp. xii, 228. Hb \$40.00, pb \$15.25.

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

To understand this book, a little background information helps. I first encountered Ali Mazrui in 1968–70 when I was the first lecturer in linguistics at Makerere University in Kampala, Uganda; Mazrui, a member of the political science faculty, was already a famous orator, acknowledged by all as possessing “a golden tongue.” Since then, he has gone on to become probably the most famous African

studies professor in the United States; he was the presenter of the nine-part BBC/PBS television series *The Africans: A triple heritage*, and he is the author of many books and articles on Africa. He has taught at many universities around the world, and is now director of the Institute of Global Cultural Studies and Albert Schweitzer Professor in the Humanities at the State University of New York at Binghamton. His junior co-author (a relative?), Alamin M. Mazrui, was trained as a linguist and is an associate professor of Black studies at Ohio State University. Both are native speakers of Swahili from Mombasa, Kenya (they prefer to refer to the language as Kiswahili, with its noun class prefix, as it would be if one were speaking the language itself). Kiswahili, of course, is probably the best-known African language; many people in East Africa and other areas (e.g. the Democratic Republic of Congo) speak it as a second language. Furthermore, it is one of the few indigenous languages with official status in an African nation; it is the official language of Tanzania, and the co-official language in Kenya along with English. However, Kiswahili is spoken natively mainly along the East African coastline and on the offshore islands (e.g. Zanzibar), often by persons with a dual Arabic-African heritage similar to that of the Mazruis.

This collection of essays reflects the Mazruis' own backgrounds; even though the book claims to be about all of Africa, East African examples and the role of Kiswahili receive disproportionate attention. Furthermore, the importance of Arabic and the influence of Islam are also (overly?) stressed; to this end, the authors sometimes include the entire continent, not just sub-Saharan Africa, as their subject matter. *The power of Babel* follows in the tradition of Ali Mazrui's earlier writings and speeches in showing that he unquestionably has a way with words; the essays (including the co-authored ones) include many suave turns of phrase. For example, in the co-authored essay "Dominant languages in a plural society," the authors write (139), "For English in East Africa the struggle for legitimacy has been from the universal to the local. For Kiswahili, the struggle for international vindication has been from the local to the universal."

Over all, however, the volume is disappointing. The Mazruis consistently give the reader polemics rather than well-reasoned arguments backed by facts. For example, in "Roots of Kiswahili," Alamin Mazrui largely brushes off the work of non-African historical linguists regarding the origin of Swahili; he refers to "this Eurocentric tendency to ignore oral sources from the traditions of the Swahili society itself" (166). In his effort to stress Arabic influence on Kiswahili and to give it an ancient status, he completely ignores the recent, carefully detailed historical study of Kiswahili and related languages by Nurse & Hinnebusch 1993. Mazrui goes on to argue that Kiswahili could have begun "as a pidgin of Arabic as early as 100 AD or so" (167). Such a statement causes any linguist with a knowledge of the structure of Kiswahili (I include myself) to foam at the mouth. The language has only a few phonological features borrowed along with Arabic words; otherwise, it has a structure that entirely fits into the Bantu pattern. True, Kiswahili has many content morphemes as loan words from Arabic, but it also

has many more borrowed recently from English. These borrowings are most emphatically not evidence of a history of pidginization or creolization, but only evidence of strong cultural contacts.

For the most part, there is little specific in the essays that one can either argue against or agree with. That is, they are woefully superficial. They are also repetitive to the point that even the same sentences can be found in more than one place (e.g. reference to the Southern Sudanese on p. 18 and p. 76; the same quotation from Lord Lugard on p. 135 and p. 143). Part of the problem may be that 11 of the 13 essays were published elsewhere first, and little editing seems to have been done before putting them together in this volume.

In general, the theme is the same in most of the essays: Sub-Saharan African nations would be better off without an alien language (English, French, Portuguese) as the main/sole official language and as the medium in government and in the schools. No one can disagree with that. From the standpoint of national integration and cultural identity, it's clear that higher (or sole) official status for indigenous languages is desirable. The Mazruis cannot be faulted for pointing out that "language planning is always an aspect of a wider design of social engineering" (94); or for implying that, with high status being awarded to alien language, the result is alienation of the general population, and development of an elite at least partially based on proficiency in the alien language.

However, the Mazruis never bring up the main reasons why the goal of replacing the former colonial languages has not been attained in most of sub-Saharan Africa. The question is, which indigenous language or languages should have official status? Not only are most African nations highly multi-ethnic, each group with its own native language, but in most of these nations there is strong competition – among a cluster of ethnic groups of approximately equal size – as to whose language should be chosen as official. The Mazruis often cite Tanzania as an example to emulate: Kiswahili is the sole official language (although English has a major role in the schools beyond primary grades). Yet they fail to point out that Tanzania is a nation of many small ethnic groups, none large enough to claim an undisputed official status for its language. Since there also was a history of Kiswahili as a lingua franca in Tanzania, choosing Kiswahili as the sole official language was not difficult. If one understands that most African nations have neither the history nor the ethnic makeup of Tanzania, then one can understand why English, French, and Portuguese remain the official languages in most cases. They play a compromise role, and no workable solution has as yet presented itself.

One can sympathize with the Mazruis' position that language status is a major factor in perpetuating European influence in Africa. One can also agree with their suggestion that an indigenous lingua franca is a good choice for an official language; but not many African countries have such a candidate. However, the reader of a newly published book has a right to expect more than the same oratory that has been around since African nations achieved independence in the 1960s; the



reader wants a well-reasoned plan for change, and one that at least recognizes the facts of the situation.

Another recurrent pattern in this volume is the rather extravagant glorification of Africa. As an Africanist myself, I am sometimes overly partial to Africa; but there is a limit, and the Mazruis surpass it rather too often. At one point they write, "Africa can be credited with inventing human language" (69). This statement represents quite a leap from the recognition that many archeologists recognize Africa as the site where the human species emerged. East Africa receives too much attention, even to the point that the authors award Mombasa greater ethnic and linguistic diversity than Accra in Ghana (180). A recent study of multilingualism in Accra would argue otherwise (Kropp Dakubu 1997) – although the Mazruis offer no competing documentation for Mombasa. In general, facts are rare in this book; and often, when cited, they are out of date (e.g. the 1972 figures on the percentage of Kiswahili speakers in Uganda, 181).

Finally, what is the meaning of the title, *The power of Babel*? Clearly, the Mazruis argue that African languages should have more status in Africa, but they do not suggest that all languages should receive equal official recognition; nor do they go so far as to say that having many languages is a source of power. Like many of their arguments, the title seems to be only glib. I wish I could recommend this book, but it is a letdown – especially given Ali Mazrui's previously demonstrated perspicacity, and his co-author's promise as a sociolinguist.

## REFERENCES

- Kropp Dakubu, M. E. (1997). *Korle meets the sea: A sociolinguistic history of Accra*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Nurse, Derek, & Hinnebusch, Thomas J. 1993. *Swahili and Sabaki: A linguistic history*. (University of California publications in linguistics, 121.) Berkeley: University of California Press.

(Received 29 June 1999)

SUSAN F. HIRSCH, *Pronouncing and persevering: Gender and the discourses of disputing in an African Islamic court*. (Language and legal discourse.) Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998. Pp. xiii, 360. Hb \$48.00, pb \$19.00.

Reviewed by GREGORY M. MATOESIAN  
*Department of Criminal Justice, University of Illinois  
 Chicago, IL 60607-7140  
 matoesian@uic.edu*

According to feminist writings, Islamic women lack agency and power, and are oppressed compared to their Western female counterparts. A major site of such oppression is in Islamic courts, where husbands possess authority to pronounce divorce – while their subordinate wives humbly accept the decree and persevere, silently enduring the hardships that result. In stark contrast to such stereotypic images of gender relations in Islamic societies, Hirsch's beautifully written and

powerful book focuses on the discursive production and reproduction of gender in Swahili Muslim courts. In so doing, it offers a quite different view of gender relations in Islamic society. In rich, fine-grained linguistic detail, Hirsch analyzes how legal processes in divorce cases not only reproduce but also undermine and transform dominant cultural images of gender.

The setting of Hirsch's analysis is Islamic courts in coastal Kenya. Her data consist of more than two hundred tape-recorded marital disputes, as well as numerous case records and interviews with court personnel. The appendix includes generous excerpts from transcripts of dispute resolution and case summaries.

Chap. 1 sets the methodological trajectory and analytic focus for the book. Here Hirsch provides an overview of linguistic approaches to law and introduces the reader to linguistic pragmatics, a branch of sociolinguistics "that addresses the relation between language and the active construction of social life" (p. 17). For those unacquainted with this body of work, the chapter gives an excellent and accessible overview of major concepts in the field – such as metapragmatics, indexing, entextualization, reported speech, linguistic ideology, and poetics – as well as an introduction to the major figures in one of the dominant (yet at times excruciatingly dense) strands of linguistic research: Silverstein, Briggs, Bauman, Mertz, Bakhtin, Jakobson, Goffman, Philips, Ochs etc. More specifically, linguistic pragmatics draws its inspiration from Jakobson's insights (1960) on the poetic and metalinguistic functions of language: the reflexive techniques through which language form draws attention to itself, such as parallelism, repetition, intonation, reported speech, and talk about talk. It also draws, just as significantly, on Bourdieu's work (1991) about symbolic power, or the social conditions for the production and reception of utterances – the cultural assumptions and broader sociopolitical context that speakers and hearers mobilize and negotiate to make their accounts count – and on Bakhtin's writings (1981) concerning intertextuality, ideology, and genre. Hirsch draws on this body of linguistic and social research to examine how poetic features of discourse narratives interact with an array of linguistic ideologies to index (or point to) gender in the situated details of interactional performance.

Chaps. 2, 3, 4, and 5 provide a historical and ethnographic overview of Swahili society in the post-colonial period. Here Hirsch introduces a central ideology, *heshima* – a cultural ideology regarding civilized behavior and manners, i.e. the impropriety of revealing too much about marital life; though this cultural ideology applies to both men and women, the burden of preserving it falls mainly on women. Chap. 3 extends the analysis of *heshima* as a linguistic ideology that prescribes proper linguistic behavior, showing how it constrains women's narrating and storytelling, especially as these deal with complaining and gossiping (such speech invites "devils," p. 67). Chap. 4 focuses on the different kinds of marital conflict among Swahili Muslims, and on the four discourses involved in marital disputes: Islamic law, ethics, spiritual health, and state law. Chap. 5 provides an overview of Islamic court structure, and of how the court operates as a

forum for Islamic women in troubled marital situations. Hirsch also provides statistics showing that women win or settle a significant number of cases.

Chaps. 6, 7, 8, and 9 constitute the main bulk of micro-linguistic research in the book, and illuminate the concepts discussed in Chap. 1. In Chap. 6, “Indexing gender,” women display and evaluate marital discord implicitly through poetic features of narrative, through parallelism, repetition, raised pitch, reported speech, historical present tense, and more variable intonation. In the process, they draw attention to the narrative itself, thus indexing social context and gender identity. For example, according to Hirsch, syntactic, lexical, and phonological repetition functions as an icon of the repetitive problems endured during marriage and the woman’s repeated efforts to persevere (p. 147: “And I have persevered a lot a lo:t with him a who:lot, ma:ny days”). Similarly, vowel lengthening and other aspects of expressive phonology, e.g. emphatic stress, function as icons of temporal duration. Women entextualize narratives – distinguish them from surrounding talk – through linguistic and stylistic aspects of verbal performance; and they employ these linguistically animated narratives to foreground and evaluate aspects of marital discord. Men, by contrast, index gender identity through metalinguistic commentary, e.g. “That’s a true story,” and through lectures about appropriate speech.

Chap. 7, “Constructing audiences,” deals with the Goffmanian concepts of footing and participation roles in legal discourse. Hirsch demonstrates how speakers (men more than women) shift footing in an effort to project the *kadhi* (Islamic judge) into a particular recipient role: as spectator, witness, commentator, or ally of speaker. Men employ reported speech in which legal issues are posed to the judge in order to index him as an ally (in reporting a conversation of a dispute with his wife, p. 169, line 49: “I will go to Kadhi I will ask if there’s a law a person can make herself and without agreeing on it with her husband”). Men also use affective tag questions and the address term *bwana* to index equality and create solidarity between themselves and the *kadhi*. Hirsch’s analysis reveals how these delicate shifts in footing accomplish specific interactional goals in context: Men are authoritative “insiders” with the *kadhi*, while women are outsiders in court and in the legal system (190–91).

Chap. 8 analyzes the functions of reported speech – direct and indirect quotes – in Islamic courts. This is one of the major research sites in linguistic pragmatics. Thus, although direct quotes purport to represent an “exact wording” of speech, they function more accurately as techniques for constructing meaning in talk, for evaluating the reported speaker’s actions, and for indexing the reporting speaker’s footing or moral stance through stylistic variation, while appearing to maintain a strict boundary between the quoting voice and quoted utterance. Hirsch shows how reported speech adds excitement to the narrative, gives authority to the speaker’s words, and contextualizes critical moments in the dispute.

Hirsch saves the most powerful and sophisticated chapter, “Ideology and meta-linguistics,” for last. She demonstrates how linguistic ideologies – “Words have no end,” “Words expose,” and “Words harm” – shape the interpretative force of

poetic discourse through an interaction among language, culture, and power. These linguistic ideologies reflect cultural and legal assumptions about how language should be produced, about what is appropriate and inappropriate speech; in so doing, they shift the metapragmatic footing of the interaction. For linguists interested in pragmatics, discourse, intertextuality, verbal art etc., this chapter makes an important theoretical and methodological point. Although it may appear that poetic discourse can be analyzed narrowly and autonomously through grammatical, stylistic, and phonological properties, Hirsch makes the point that even though women use poetic resources to foster a persuasive and authoritative impression on an audience, men attempt to steer negative interpretations of such talk through explicit megalinguistic ideologies of language, referring to female narratives as gossip or chronic complaining. Women are thus caught in a discursive double bind. They must use token forms of discourse in their narration of marital discord; but in the process, they violate ideologies of language in which storytelling itself creates marital strife, since “Words harm.” For example, after a wife quotes her husband’s abuse speech (token form), the *kadhi* says, “Leave aside those careless words” and “Don’t say those things here” (type forms). We can thus witness in vivid detail how males gain control over the interaction in court, devaluing women’s narratives and further legitimating male domination. A major implication of Hirsch’s analyses is that we need to look at poetic discourse within the broader configuration of discursive interaction and linguistic ideology. Thus reported speech may indeed reflect an array of linguistic ideologies (e.g. meaning as reference), and it may accomplish an array of interactional tasks; but the persuasive impact of such speech may be contextualized and recontextualized by other linguistic ideologies, unfolding sequentially in a discursive field. (It would be worthwhile to examine how such practices unfold in the more combative “question/answer” sequences found in adversarial courtrooms in the US.) As Hirsch demonstrates, a narrow linguistic focus on poetic discourse, outside of the unfolding, moment-by-moment negotiation and contextualization of discursive action, may lead, at least in real-time interactive genres, to an inaccurate depiction of such discourse.

Combining fine-grained linguistic analysis with a developed focus on social structure, and showing how these are linked, Hirsch demonstrates that culture is not an explanatory device, but is constructed, deconstructed, and reconstructed in the situated details of poetic performance. She shows how subject identity is implicitly negotiated in and through the subtle yet dynamic contextualization cues of discursive interaction. In the process, she debunks stereotypes about the injustices endured by Islamic women, and she shows how they use legal processes and language to transform their relationships, to transform representations of the persevering wife and the pronouncing husband. The depth of understanding and rich detail of *Pronouncing and persevering* have raised the bar of scholarship in the area of language, law, and culture to an unprecedented level of analytical sophistication.

REVIEWS

REFERENCES

- Bakhtin, Mikhail M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination*. Austin: University of Texas Press.  
Bourdieu, Pierre (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.  
Jakobson, Roman (1960). Concluding statement: Linguistics and poetics. In Thomas Sebeok (ed.), *Style in language*, 350–77. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

(Received 20 July 1999)

JAMES M. WILCE, *Eloquence in trouble: The poetics and politics of complaint in rural Bangladesh*. (Oxford studies in anthropological linguistics, 21). Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press, 1998. Pp. xix, 300. Hb \$65.00.

Reviewed by CLINTON B. SEELY  
*South Asian Languages, University of Chicago*  
Chicago, IL 60637  
c-seely@uchicago.edu

This is a very personal book, a poignant book, a compelling book, from beginning to end. The Preface sets the tone: self-reflexive and confessional. Wilce once wanted to be a medical doctor; he became instead a missionary in Bangladesh, but felt “guilt and pervasive disquiet” in that role; and while in Bengal – actually, in neighboring Calcutta – he suffered a “nightmarish” family tragedy involving medical practitioners. He later resigned from the mission and went to graduate school; then he returned to Bangladesh to study complaint and lament as expressed in one locality within the Bangla-speaking area. (“Bangla” and “Bengali” are two names for the same language. Wilce refers to the language as Bangla; so shall I.) In Wilce’s own words, this book is

about the social roots of discourses such as off-the-cuff complaint and lament; about social identities formed and revealed in such discourse . . . But, indirectly, it is about my transformation and also a means by which I make sense of the personal history into which I have given you a window. (vii–viii)

In his thirteenth and final chapter, Wilce turns his gaze outward to the shared worlds of humans, human rights, and academics, noting,

Anthropologists and postmodern literary critics have recently become more vocal in addressing links between their respective disciplines and human rights . . . Making such links seems particularly appropriate for those of us who study speech as a social and hence a political phenomenon . . . It is hoped that this book strengthens the hands of activists and legal reformers, particularly within Bangladesh, who will ensure the fair enforcement of current statutes protecting women and men. (239, 241)

Between the Preface and the last chapter, one finds plenty of evidence that Wilce is a very caring and concerned human being – not only interested in complaint

and lament from a professional anthropological linguist's point of view, but also sympathetic to the complainers and laments from a humanist's perspective.

Three interrelated themes run through the book: (a) Louis Dumont's *Homo hierarchicus* (1970) is for the most part wrong in essentializing South Asian selfhood as selfless and overly concerned with both hierarchy and group identity – sociocentric identity – to the detriment of egocentric identity; (b) complaints, and even laments, are forms of resistance; and (c) resistance, among other things, lends agency to the individual. In addition to these themes of selfhood, resistance, and agency, there is the overriding thesis of “eloquence in trouble.” Wilce is concerned that LAMENT – as a performative, poetic genre – is being suppressed in Bangladesh, perhaps frowned upon by the society to the extent that the genre (and subgenres, like *baramasi* and *jari gan*) may cease to exist, though crying and other less eloquent expressions of grief will no doubt remain. Thus he deplors

a process of “rationalization” entailing attacks on improvised, passionate forms of cultural expression, one that began in colonial Bengal (Banerjee 1989). In Bangladesh – by no means isolated from global forces – genres of eloquent protest are thus troubled by metadiscursive currents running through both rural and academic life. (232)

Wilce identifies the semiotics of Charles Sanders Peirce (1839–1914) as his chosen theory, but he also goes on to describe what he is doing as a translinguistic/semiotic anthropology of personhood. The book is in large part a running dialog with other academics in anthropology and related fields; e.g.,

Sansom (1982) argues that, by surrendering the right to narrate one's illness to one's chief caregiver, Australian Aboriginals create a reciprocity of symbolic goods. Even this sort of reciprocity reminds us of the central place of exchange and circulation in social life (Urban 1996). Fatima's incomplete forms of reference are yet another way in which sociality is invited. Where my account differs from Sansom's, however, is in adding the recognition that “difference” – particularly gender asymmetry in such systems of exchange, be it of words, encouraging questions (Fishman 1983), semantic gaps, or silence – cannot be understood apart from considerations of domination and resistance. That is, to the extent that “gappiness” is a tactic to which women like Fatima (in contrast with her dominant sister-in-law, the male exorcist, or the urban Bangladeshi elite) are restricted, “difference” takes on particular meaning in relation to, not in contrast to, dominance (Gal 1989). (92–93)

A major strength of this book resides in its presentation of specimens of rural Bangladeshi Bangla speech. These specimens are not in the privileged form of Bangla that normally finds its way into books; and therefore the Bangla of Matlab (the name of the area where the research was conducted) might never have been archived for the future, including future language-related research. Now we have

an archived specimen of that language, thanks to Wilce's efforts. There are, of course, many problems with re-presenting such speech, and Wilce candidly acknowledges difficulties not only in transcribing some of what he recorded, but also in interpreting what he thought he heard (his Bangladeshi assistant also had problems comprehending some of the speech). To his credit, Wilce does not tidy up the speech to make it make sense. Predictably, I suppose, it is with matters related to the Bangla presented on the pages of the book, and in the corresponding English translations, that I find myself most at odds with Wilce.

I shall cite one example, to suggest the character of the perceived discrepancies. On p. 55, Shefali, one of the troubles-talkers studied, says, *amar rogira more kharap kaibe*. This utterance translates literally: *amar*, 1sg.gen., 'my'; *rogira*, nom.pl. of *rogi* 'patient, ill person'; *more*, 1sg.obj., 'to/at me'; *kharap*, adj./adv. 'bad(ly)'; *kaibe*, 3rd pers. future of the verb 'to speak, say, tell, call'. My translation is 'My patients/rogis will speak ill of me'; but Wilce's gloss is 'Those people would speak ill of my rogi.' If the *ra* ending on *rogira* is not nom.pl., as it is in standard Bangla, but in fact objective singular in Matlab (or in Shefali's idiosyncratic Bangla), then it would be nice if that were mentioned in a footnote (or in the Appendix, "Transcribing Matlab speech.") The word *more* in that same utterance seems anomalous, but it could be simply ignored, I guess, as in Wilce's own rendering. Elsewhere in the speech of Shefali and others, I deduce that the verbal ending *bo*, indicating 1st person future in standard Bangla, is used in Matlab for both the 1st and 3rd persons future. Again, information like that, had it appeared in the Appendix, would have been useful.

The Appendix is not unhelpful, though I would have appreciated a more complete description of Matlab morphophonemics. The reader may be surprised to find in Table 1, under the heading "Bangla symbol," a column of Roman letters plus some odd markings, such as the paragraph sign. Apparently Oxford's compositors do not have a Bangla font, or they forgot to invoke that font when printing pp. 244–46. The transliteration used throughout the book, one familiar to Indologists, is easy to read.

All told, *Eloquence in trouble* is an eloquent presentation of an aspect of Bangladeshi society – a genuine contribution to our understanding of that society, and to an appreciation of the human experience generally.

## REFERENCES

- Banerjee, Sumanta (1989). Marginalization of women's popular culture in nineteenth century Bengal. In Kumkum Sangari & Sudesh Vaid (eds.), *Recasting women: Essays in colonial history*, 127–79. New Delhi: Kali for Women.
- Dumont, Louis (1970). *Homo hierarchicus*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Fishman, Pamela (1983). Interaction: The work that women do. In Barrie Thorne et al., *Language, gender, and society*, 89–101. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Gal, Susan (1989). Between speech and silence: The problematics of research on language and gender. *Papers in Pragmatics* 3(1):1–38.

- Sansom, Basil (1982). The sick who do not speak. In David J. Parkin (ed.), *Semantic anthropology*, 183–96. London: Academic Press.
- Urban, Greg (1996). *Metaphysical community: The interplay of the senses and the intellect*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

(Received 4 August 1999)

J. JOSEPH ERRINGTON, *Shifting languages: Interaction and identity in Javanese Indonesian*. (Studies in the social and cultural foundations of language, 19.) Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998. Pp. xii, 216.

Reviewed by KATHRYN A. WOOLARD  
*Anthropology, University of California, San Diego*  
La Jolla, CA 92093-0532  
kwoolard@ucsd.edu

Although Indonesia's New Order has been thrown into disorder recently, its project of engineering an Indonesian language has been deemed a miraculous success. At Indonesian independence in 1945, the artificial administrative Malay language – used by the Dutch to administer their East Indies colonial empire – was just one of several dialects of a language spoken natively by only a few million residents of the territory. Now its descendant, Indonesian, is a “fully viable, universally acknowledged national language . . . clearly ascendant over hundreds of languages spoken natively among more than two hundred million Indonesians” (p. 2). Errington, author of two earlier books on Javanese, here turns his attention to that modernist state project of building Indonesian, and to evolving patterns of bilingualism among the Javanese, the demographically and politically dominant ethnic community of Indonesia. He gives us not only a detailed analysis of language use, but also a fascinating ethnographic account of Indonesian national development as it is interactionally constituted in two aptly chosen villages in the region around Solo (Surakarta). This study exemplifies an ethnographically grounded, culturally nuanced approach to bilingualism and language change.

Throughout the book, Errington advocates a culture-specific (what he calls “relativized”) analysis. He urges that we take PEOPLE, with their interactions and ideologies, as our starting point, rather than putatively discrete linguistic codes. For example, he critiques the “standardist” view (51) held by some Western academics, and also by Indonesian nationalists, which holds modern national languages to be better suited than traditional languages for autonomous thought and discourse (62). He acknowledges the relevance of standardism for the Indonesian case – but as ideological project, rather than description. If Indonesian is particularly suited for impersonal uses, it is partly because Javanese speakers cultivate an interpersonal flatness in Indonesian (in contrast to their first language), eschewing available pronouns that “lack fit with Indonesian interactional dynamics among Javanese” (189). What the state has done is not directly to engineer a modern language, but rather to frame some interactional experiences from which



differences between Javanese and Indonesian speakership are shaped by Javanese linguistic ideology.

Errington's opinion on studies of language shift is similar: They do not err in their longitudinal predictions so much as they miss the point, ignoring bilingual practices as mere epiphenomenal ripples in changing large-scale patterns. Here Errington overlooks some previous ethnographic studies of shift (e.g. Gal 1979, Tsitsipis 1998); but he rightly insists that it is the details of interactions that are crucial – not just as places where we can see linguistic change occurring, but as themselves shaping the forces of change. Modern Indonesian perspectives are animated in local ritual life, e.g. through code-switched discourse on birth control in a traditional wedding speech. In turn, traditional *básá* Javanese can mediate state authority at a meeting in the village. As Errington shows us, it is through such interplay of linguistic authorities in interaction that Indonesia and Indonesian become part of villagers' everyday lifeworld.

Distinguishing several types of code-mixing, Errington finds that some types neutralize for speakers what are contrasts from the viewpoint of discrete linguistic codes. A syncretic Javanese/Indonesian is partly allowed by the structural similarity of the languages and the many bivalent elements. But there is more to it. Errington argues that discourse markers, for example, are especially vulnerable to borrowing because they are read by Javanese as indexing transient subjective states. This interactional work makes discourse markers less salient as distinctly Indonesian or Javanese markers of talk, and so they flow across the linguistic boundaries.

An extended argument about the interpretation of style- and code-switching builds intricately across the second half of the book. Ultimately proposing a theoretical revision, Errington draws on Voloshinov/Bakhtin and Goffman, but he engages most fully with Gumperz 1982 and Myers-Scotton 1993. He starts with two kinds of footing shifts that occur fairly often in monolingual Javanese practice. First, in "speech modeling," speakers voice words that are not their own, in a linguistically unmarked shift that directly projects an imagined subjectivity. Second, in "modeled thought," speakers switch from *básá* ('polite') to *ngoko* ('basic') style in Javanese, in order to "think out loud" (139). *Ngoko* is construed as an experience-near, "first-person" form that privileges the direct expression of subjectivity. In contrast, *básá* is an addressee-oriented or "second-person" way of speaking which stresses the appellative function of language.

Errington was only occasionally able to elicit native speaker comment on why a speaker shifted perspective to model thought or speech (instead of using, e.g., indirect reported speech). This leads him to posit that such shifts/switches are not "overtly intentful" (128). Rather, he says, they are simply evidence of a cultural attunement to multiple voices in talk, except in special moments when speakers manipulate the familiar technique in service of a specifiable social end – e.g., when a speaker shows that she is a respected figure by directly quoting an earlier interlocutor's polite low *básá* addressed to her. In these latter cases, community

members' interpretations can usually be enlisted to confirm such interactional motivations. The point that not all (or even most) switching of codes and footings is consciously strategic has been argued many times in the past. Whether the analytic distinction should depend on community members' articulable consciousness is an important question brought out for debate in Errington's discussion. For many authors, "strategy" does not imply conscious intent; but that usage has long troubled some others. Errington proposes to distinguish the "weakly strategic," culturally sensible, but unremarkable practices from the "strongly strategic" practices that show the individual's interactional intent. Bakhtin's idea of multiple, socially grounded voices offers a way out of the problem of intent and consciousness; this has already been adopted by others, and Errington's cases are actually very compatible with the Bakhtinian approach.

Finally, with an understanding of perspectival shifting as grounded in a familiar Javanese ideology of language, self, and social life, we return to the more cross-culturally familiar territory of code-switching between languages, and the critique of both interpretivist and nomothetic approaches. From a comparative view, theorists have sometimes pointed to Javanese style-switching as a special case of code-switching. For Errington as ethnographer of things Javanese, the analogy works in the opposite direction. Javanese/Indonesian code-switching is a reflex of the particularly Javanese ideology of language and interactional identities that is found in speech- and thought-modeling.

Errington nicely fits Indonesian into the Javanese schema that he has established through the metaphor of person. If *ngoko* is first-person, and *básá* is second-person, then Indonesian is a third-person way of speaking, an objectifying "it" language that emphasizes the referential function. Indonesian's lack of a native-speaking ethnic community, its "un-nativeness," makes it especially suited to such objectifying, referentialist uses. According to Errington, this same un-nativeness makes Indonesia distinct from most other bilingual situations, and poses special problems for the analysis of code-switching.

Errington's analyses of specific data are acute, illuminating, and persuasive; but I wonder if they are always so different from what would be achieved through the other approaches he criticizes. Thus, rejecting Gumperz's widely used metaphor of "we vs. they" codes, he prefers a figure of "first vs. third person" as more appropriate to Javanese/Indonesian code-switching. This insistence is puzzling, given that "we" and "they" are, after all, first and third person pronouns. Errington overlooks the strong similarities between these figures because, for him, Gumperz's schema apparently invokes an image of actual bounded and exclusive groups of numerable native speakers, rather than shifting identities. Since no Indonesian-origin outgroup exists to be associated with Indonesian, no actual "they" exists, and Errington finds the fit poor. But his search for distinct, on-the-ground groups is for me a rather particular reading of Gumperz's trope. Gumperz has always treated identity as multifaceted and shiftable, and he has seen metaphorical conversational code-switching as a matter of speakers' shifting their own perspective

from experience-near (“we” or first-person) to experience-distant (“they” or third-person). Think, for example, of the analysis by Gumperz & Hernandez-Chavez 1972 of a Latina’s code-switching when she talks about trying to quit smoking. To the extent that bilinguals actually use the putative “they” code in “in-group” conversation, then it is almost always the case that “they is us,” as Pogo and Errington both put it. (Perhaps “we vs. us” better captures the metaphorical values of codes for conversational code-switchers, as relatively more “subjective” and “objective.”) We can see this in many code-switching American Latinos’ insistence on an identity linked to BOTH English and Spanish. In fact, it is precisely where the codes ARE distinctly identified with ethnic groups in tension – a real “we” and a real “they,” with boundaries patrolled by language choice – that metaphorical conversational code-switching is most inhibited (as in traditional Catalonia).

By highlighting the un-nativeness of Indonesian, Errington raises an important point that has often been overlooked in attempts to generalize across bilingual situations. It can indeed make a difference whether there are native speakers of a superposed language; this is probably one of the roots of the old controversy about whether diglossia is a necessity for minority language maintenance, or an impetus for minority language loss. Where there are no native speakers, the pressures of domination by a non-local or “high” language are likely to function differently than where there is such a group, and where minority speakers feel the need to “pass” as members by birthright. But again, Indonesia may not differ as much as Errington would have it from Gumperz’s classic analysis in the case of Norway (Blom & Gumperz 1972). The two situations of standardization are not identical, of course, and social class dialects complicate the Norwegian picture. Still, it is not clear that there is an ethnic Norwegian “they” who claim Bokmål (standard Norwegian) as their own, any more than there is an Indonesian “they” to lay ethnic claim to Indonesian.

Errington’s own framing of his incisive data analyses raises the question of just how exceptional language mixing is in the Javanese case. If we work upward from the Javanese ground to arrive at an understanding of code-switching as perspectival shifting, is that understanding so different from the one we achieve by applying Gumperz’s interpretive approach? Is Errington’s ultimate analysis, like Pierre Menard’s *Quixote* (Borges 1962), fundamentally different from other products it might resemble in uncanny detail? Even when his data fit quite well with patterns found elsewhere, he wants to emphasize their culture-specific roots, their subtle differences, the ways that they overflow known types. Surely this is right, and true for any situation we might study. I am less convinced that it needs to be an either/or choice – or that we can’t have an ethnographically rich, subtle, and appropriate analysis without rejecting the relevance of patterns and principles found elsewhere.

Quibble as I may, Errington’s work is superb research and most welcome, along with the debates that it provokes. In linguistic anthropology, there are, on the one hand, rich, detailed studies of speech practices in “traditional” commu-

nities which, as Errington says (xi), leave us with little sense that many of the people described are bilingual, or that their lives are being massively transformed by national and state development. On the other hand, we have studies of languages in contact and conflict; and these too often focus on political structures and economic process, neglecting the intricacies of everyday speech practice. Certainly, important work has crossed this divide, and more is coming now; but much more is needed. This book is a major contribution that shows how such work can be done. Much of the text is very accessibly and engagingly written – though as the theoretical argument develops, the writing can get daunting, even for specialists. While raising critical perspectives, Errington takes an attractive stance throughout the work, at once reflexive and modest. He weaves close, detailed analyses of several different linguistic phenomena into a book that coheres tightly. It succeeds as a fully realized study of socially, culturally, and politically grounded language phenomena. By the end, an intricate, holistic picture of Javanese/Indonesian language life has come into focus from the interplay of detailed micro-analyses. This rich accomplishment is itself the very best argument for Errington's analytic position.

## REFERENCES

- Blom, Jan-Petter, & Gumperz, John J. (1972). Social meaning in linguistic structures: Code-switching in Norway. In J. J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics*, 407–34. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Borges, Jorge Luis (1962). Pierre Menard, author of the *Quixote*. In his *Labyrinths*, 36–44. New York: New Directions.
- Gal, Susan (1979). *Language shift: Social determinants of linguistic change in bilingual Austria*. New York: Academic Press.
- Gumperz, John J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.
- , & Hernandez-Chavez, Eduardo (1972). Bilingualism, bidialectalism, and classroom interaction. In Courtney Cazden et al. (eds.), *Functions of language in the classroom*, 84–108. New York: Teacher's College Press.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol (1993). *Social motivations for codeswitching: Evidence from Africa*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Tsitsipis, Lukas D. (1998). *A linguistic anthropology of praxis and language shift: Arvanitika (Albanian) and Greek in contact*. Oxford: Clarendon.

(Received 20 July 1999)

KARL KROEBER, *Artistry in Native American myths*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998. Pp. xii, 292. Hb \$35.00, pb \$12.00.

Reviewed by ROBERT BRINGHURST  
 Box 357, 1917 West 4th Avenue  
 Vancouver, BC V6J 1M7, Canada  
 rbringhurst@compuserve.com\*

Karl Kroeber is a distinguished professor of English at Columbia University and the son of a distinguished anthropologist, Alfred Louis Kroeber. He has been listening to Native American stories since his boyhood, and writing about them (side

by side with his work on the English Romantics) for roughly twenty years. An anthology he edited in 1981, *Traditional American Indian literatures: Texts and interpretations*, taught me much when it appeared, and a statement Kroeber made in the introduction to that volume has stayed with me ever since. “It is our scholarship,” he wrote, “not Indian literature, which is primitive or underdeveloped.”

Kroeber’s 1981 anthology assembled four exceptions to his rule: Dell Hymes, Jarold Ramsey, Dennis Tedlock, and Barre Toelken. For as much as forty years, these scholars have been working with Native American materials in perceptive and sophisticated ways. In the present book, Kroeber is on his own. His scholarship is also on occasion quite insightful, but it is careless of detail, and on some fundamental points it is unexpectedly confused.

*Artistry in Native American myths* is an anthology of 23 stories around which Kroeber’s commentary is woven. (I do not know why the jacket copy rounds this 23 to “nearly forty.”) In his preface, Kroeber speaks of all these texts as though they were translations from Native American languages – and therein lies a problem. Originals exist for only nine of the 23. The majority are not in fact translations; they are paraphrases, syntheses, and literary adaptations. There is artistry in all – but in many, the artistry we meet is not the artistry of Native American mythtellers; it is the artistry of writers trained (in varying degrees) in the canons of English prose, and loyal (in some degree at least) to the expectations of English-speaking readers.

In a book called *Artistry in Classical Greek myths*, I would not expect to find Homer, Hesiod, and Sophocles displaced by Robert Graves, Roberto Calasso, and Edith Hamilton. In spite of grievous losses, the voices of Native American mythtellers exist in great abundance in manuscript, in print, and now on tape. In a book entitled *Artistry in Native American myths*, I was surprised to find these voices taking second place to the prose of George Grinnell, Clark Wissler, James Mooney, Walter McClintock, Carobeth Laird, and other writers.

Contact literature is, to be sure, a legitimate subject, and tracking how myths change as they migrate from culture to culture is among the central tasks of the intellectual historian. The odd thing here is that the data and analysis don’t match. Like the archeologist Heinrich Schliemann, Kroeber seems convinced that whatever he finds is what he is looking for, even when the rest of us might see it as something else.

Reflecting, for example, on a rather purple passage from Marie McLaughlin’s *Myths and legends of the Sioux* (1916), Kroeber says: “I know of no other Indian myth that uses the landscape in this way to dramatize social and psychological conditions.” But the dramatization he is struck by is no part of the myth, and there is nothing “Indian” about it. It arises from a highly literate, acculturated anglophone’s embroidering of the plot.

Kroeber’s commentary, broken into five parts, is extensive, filling nearly as much space as the texts that he presents. But the commentary often departs from the texts. It engages more extensively with the work of other critics – Tristram Coffin, Gerald Vizenor, Mikhail Bakhtin, Claude Lévi-Strauss, and Pierre Bour-

dieu among them. In the course of this discussion, Kroeber makes a number of salient points, and he makes them as a rule with great vigor. He insists on the individuality of Native American mythtellers, and the complexity and subtlety of their works. He explains what he calls the modularity of Native American myths, whose patterns of performance are primarily thematic, not acoustic. He describes quite well the indescribability of the trickster in oral culture, and he deftly illuminates some ways in which history and myth can reinterpret one another. He also undertakes – with less success, in my opinion – to articulate the difference between literature and myth.

This difference, for Kroeber, reduces all too easily to a gross sociological division between “them” and “us.” Native American myths, he says, are “imaginative forms . . . alien to our own” (p. x). “What we refer to as literature is ‘aesthetic’ discourse” (63). “Indian myths and our literature are both artifacts created by human beings – but the functioning of imagination in the two modes differs radically” (64). “I contrast the Blackfoot myth . . . with a famous parable about Death from our tradition” (67).

This overtly sectarian language may arise from a noble cause – perhaps a valiant effort, year by year, to forge a social bond with yet another crop of students – but the price is high. A world thus divided into “them” and “us” excludes not only me but all those who have taught me what I know of Native American languages, literatures, myths, and other traditions.

Kroeber’s belief that all his texts are faithful records of Native American myth-telling art may rest on inattentive reading as much as wishful thinking. Even where he deals with real translations, the translators are sometimes misidentified. So are the storytellers themselves.

The text that Kroeber says was translated from Kiowa by Elsie Clews Parsons was actually (like all of her *Kiowa tales*) taken down in English. Parsons says (1929:ix, 142) that the English in this instance came from Toage (Mark), the storyteller’s son. The storyteller himself (in Parsons’ orthography) is Ky’apaikibona, whose name among friends was shortened to Kiabq. (I do not know why, or on what authority, Kroeber shortens it further to Kaba.) Kroeber says that another of his texts is Robin Ridington’s translation from Beaver, as spoken by Antoine Hunter. But Ridington himself (who is not a linguist) has carefully explained how he transcribed the tape-to-tape translation, made at his request by an unnamed Beaver colleague. Another text, according to Kroeber, was told by Ayûnini (Ahy’îni) and translated by James Mooney from the Cherokee. According to Mooney, it was something else: an abridged conflation of several versions, all told through interpreters. The principal author, Mooney says, was Itagunuhi (John Ax). Then there is a story told in Kiksht by Victoria Howard, transcribed by Melville Jacobs, and retranscribed and translated by Dell Hymes. Here, for once, Kroeber gives too little credit to the scholar rather than too much; he speaks of Hymes’s meticulous translation as merely an analytical rearrangement of the earlier translation made by Jacobs.

Even the mythtellers, texts, and social practices mentioned in passing are subjected to some curious transformations. The great Haida mythteller Skaay (or Skaai) is consistently called Ksjaii (a spelling quite impossible in any Haida orthography, past or present). In speaking of the Tlingit, Kroeber tells us that a carved post in front of the house might have a lower figure with an open mouth that served as the doorway, and that sometimes the ashes of deceased family members were kept in the pole. This statement rests on a confusion between housepoles and mortuary poles; Europeans have called all such structures “totem poles.” In Northwest Coast societies, however, they are utterly distinct. The housepole is a Haida institution borrowed in the 19th century by the southern Tlingit, while the mortuary pole is a tradition of long standing among the Haida and Tlingit alike. There is no recorded instance of human remains being placed in a Haida or Tlingit housepole.

These details themselves are not, of course, the heart of the matter; but they are the route to the heart of the matter. They are the fissures in the rock through which the author and his readers stand their only chance of passage to the mythic realms beyond. The reason is that myths are stories utterly in love with the real world.

In a discussion of the widely traveled theme of the woman who marries a bear, Kroeber twice remarks how important it is not to confuse grizzlies and brown bears. Grizzlies and BLACK BEARS, of course, is what he means. Brown bears ARE grizzlies, a fact that university professors and staff editors at university presses, if they are interested in Native American culture, might, I think, be expected to know. In Kroeber’s view, however (144), “The ‘otherness’ of bears is not to us what the ‘otherness’ of bears is to Indians.”

To heal the discomfort and the injury created by that statement, I call on a Tlingit elder by the name of Daanawáak: *Ax éesh há:sx áwé sitee xóots*, I hear him say – “They are my fathers, those brown bears.”

I have a hunch that there is more to be learned about artistry in Native American myth from Daanawáak’s sentence than there is from Kroeber’s book – in part because the sentence is artfully constructed in a Native American language, and in part because the speaker of the sentence is addressing a deep connection, rather than tripping over a fence.

## NOTE

\*This review was written during the reviewer’s tenure at the Frost Centre for Native Studies & Canadian Studies, Trent University, Peterborough, Ontario.

## REFERENCES

- Mooney, James (1900). *Myths of the Cherokee*. (Bureau of American Ethnology, Annual Report 19:1.) Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Parsons, Elsie Clews (1929). *Kiowa tales*. (Memoirs of the American Folk-Lore Society, 22.) New York: Ridington, Robin (1994). *Dunne-Za stories*. In Brian Swann (ed.), *Coming to light: Contemporary translations of the Native literatures of North America*, 176–89. New York: Random House.

(Received 1 June 1999)

MICHAEL D. COE & JUSTIN KERR, *The art of the Maya scribe*. London: Thames & Hudson, 1997; New York: Abrams, 1998. Pp. 240. Hb \$75.00.

Reviewed by DORIE REENTS-BUDET  
*Smithsonian Center for Materials Research & Education*  
2211 Meade Lane  
Durham, NC 27707  
budet@gte.net

This book caps Michael Coe's distinguished career as a Mayanist scholar. In this book, he joins with Justin Kerr to present the formal, technical, and aesthetic characteristics of the art of writing as practiced by the pre-Columbian Maya of Mesoamerica. The collaboration of a renowned archaeologist with an equally illustrious photographer and dedicated student of Maya art has created a readable, highly informative, and well-illustrated text.

For more than eighty years, the field of Maya studies has been firmly in the hands of New World archeologists whose investigations are focused on the proposing and testing of models of social behavior and sociopolitical and economic systems. Because of the dominance of this methodological approach among pre-Columbianist academicians and in the traditional publishing venues, Mayanist art historians have had little opportunity to join the investigative fray on the established stage of intellectual exchange. Their work often has been viewed by the dominant voice as not scientific and thus not valid; some have gone so far as to view art historical investigations as pointless deliberations of minutiae or grandiose exegeses devoid of any demonstrable connection to ancient Maya social practice, thought, and intellectual history. As a result, the artistic process and aesthetic components of Classic Maya civilization (CE 250–850) have been understudied and, to a certain extent, unrecognized by the academic community. The only interested parties have been a handful of non-Western art historians, art collectors, and museums, as well as those who supplied the relatively small international market for Maya artifacts.

Coe is one of the few archeologists who, during the 1960s and 1970s, recognized the importance of the scribe and scribal arts to Classic Maya culture. He has extensively studied Maya scribes and their accomplishments in carved stone, bone, and shell artifacts and in painted polychrome ceramics, books, and murals. Many of his publications include the scribal component as a central aspect of pre-Columbian social process, sociopolitical systematics, and intellectual expression (Coe 1966, 1973, 1975, 1977, 1978, 1982, 1989). Coe also was one of a very few scholars during the 1970s who broached the subject of esthetics in Maya artifacts, revitalizing the progressive writings by Spinden 1913; this approach was followed by only a few other scholars (e.g. Kubler 1962, Miller 1986, Schele & Miller 1986, Reents-Budet et al. 1994).

Most of the art historical writings published during the 1970s and early 1980s focused on iconographic and hieroglyphic analyses in the pursuit of the meanings encoded in these graphic forms, a trend that remains in vogue today. Coe and Kerr



were independently pursuing the esthetic scribal line of investigation in spite of its not being a favored topic among pre-Columbianists, be they archaeologists or art historians (e.g. Kerr & Kerr 1981, 1988). Justin Kerr's thirty years of experience photographing pre-Columbian art and studying Maya artworks places him in a unique position to know intimately and to understand the corpus of Classic Maya art (Kerr 1989, 1990, 1992, 1994, 1997). These two scholars make a logical and effective team.

*The art of the Maya scribe* comprises six chapters plus a seventh section featuring some of the finest examples of Classic Maya scribal art. Chap. 1 outlines the historical and cultural context of Maya scribes. The chapter begins with a brief description of the advent of village life and the development of Maya culture through the millennia, and continues with a detailed characterization of the complex societies of the Classic period and the roles played by writing and literacy therein. This chapter introduces the scribes and discusses their social, political, and intellectual place within Maya society during the Classic (250–850 CE) and Postclassic (850–1521 CE) periods.

Chap. 2 focuses on the origins and characteristics of Maya script. This is the most detailed study of Classic Maya writing that has appeared in print to date. The discussion includes reading order; the calendar and the calendrical framework of historical texts; the script's pictographic, logosyllabic, and phonetic components; and the linguistic structure and Mayan languages in which the texts were composed. The chapter concludes with a thorough summary of the contents of the carved and painted texts, including Classic period history, religious ideology and philosophy, warfare, human sacrifice, and name-tagging. It ends with a short description of the Primary Standard Sequence, the dedicatory phrase painted on Classic period polychrome ceramics. Particularly useful is the description of the evolution of writing in Mesoamerica and the place therein of the Maya script; this section ends with an elucidation of the Preclassic (1200–50 BCE) and Protoclassic (50 BCE–250 CE) origins and early developments of Maya writing.

Chap. 3 focuses on the scribes themselves. The reader learns how to recognize a scribe both pictorially and hieroglyphically. Having a prescribed place in Maya society, scribes wore specific types of clothing, especially headdresses, and they often are depicted carrying their tools of the trade. Some scribal artists signed their works; Coe and Kerr feature the hieroglyphic titles found in the nominal phrases of artists and the names of the renowned scribes of the Classic period. The authors employ these hieroglyphic phrases and their constituent titles of office to determine who the scribes were, and to elucidate their social positions and sociopolitical roles. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the association of scribes with various supernaturals or deities.

The tools of the trade are examined in Chap. 4. The authors consider first the stone inscriptions, describing the challenges presented by different types of stone and how they affected the final form of the carved texts. They also mention other materials carved by Maya artist-scribes (e.g. wood, bone, shell). The chapter goes

on to discuss the painted works executed on ceramics and paper. Writing tools have not received sufficient attention in the scholarly literature, and thus most Mayanists are unable to assess production methods when examining artifacts. Coe and Kerr present a clear discussion of tools, beginning with their pictorial representations in Maya art and connecting these with the kinds of markings (carved and painted) on the artworks themselves. This correlated study allows the authors to clarify details of scribal tools, and especially to affirm the presence of both a brush and a stylus among the writing (painting) implements of Classic period artists.

During the Classic and Postclassic periods the Maya painted hundreds if not thousands of books, now called codices. These tomes contained a wealth of historical, economic, scientific, and religious ideological and mythological/cosmological data. Tragically, the majority of these either did not survive the end of the Classic period or were destroyed by the Spanish during the 16th century. Chap. 5 presents a comprehensive description of these books, outlining their informational contents and technical specifics of production. Each of the four surviving codices is featured, including commentaries on the book's history, contents, production details, and relative artistic qualities. This chapter is succeeded by a photographic selection of some of the most artistically accomplished Classic period scribal artworks.

The final chapter closes the book, so to speak, on the pre-Columbian Maya calligraphic tradition. It begins with the 16th-century Maya prophecy for K'atun 11 Ahaw found in the Maya Colonial period *Book of Chilam Balam of Chumayel* (Roys 1967), in which Spanish oppression is recounted by native Yucatec Maya writers (scribes). Coe & Kerr outline the continuation of the scribal tradition into the 17th century, citing both known and previously overlooked Spanish Colonial documents.

*The art of the Maya scribe* is a fine testament to the artistry of the pre-Columbian Maya scribal tradition. The only negative aspects of the book are in design and production quality, both of which likely were out of the hands of the authors. First, the book contains high-quality line drawings of important monuments, hieroglyphic texts, and iconographic details. Unfortunately, these are printed in a gold color which, although esthetically pleasing, is too light in value for effective study. The light value also renders the drawings incapable of being reproduced via photography or photocopy, and thus these fine drawings of pivotal artifacts cannot be used by others in their research and teaching. Second, the photographic reproduction quality is lower than what is required to present the full esthetic quality of Classic Maya scribal works. This is especially notable when artworks, and especially their details, are presented in full-page format. The blurred photographs negate the artistry that is one of the authors' main theses. Given the cost of the book, the goals of the authors, and Justin Kerr's technically unsurpassed and sensitive photographs, it is a shame that Thames & Hudson did not achieve higher-quality reproduction for this fine book.

*The art of the Maya scribe* establishes the fact that Classic Maya scribes were artists and intellectuals. Perhaps, then, the term “scribe” should be eschewed in favor of “artist,” because the Western term “scribe” connotes a person with technical proficiency in a repetitive skill, downgrading to the level of tradesmen these creative men and women of knowledge. Certainly, less-accomplished writing specialists did exist during the Classic period, but the artifacts and discussions presented in *The art of the Maya scribe* feature the highest-quality expressions, far beyond the level of production and dexterity implied by the Western term “scribe.” These upper-echelon scribes were highly accomplished artists and intellectuals who certainly were at the center of Maya society, politics, science, and philosophical debates (see Reents-Budet 1998). European languages do not possess an appropriate nominal, but I would urge the use of the term “artist” in place of “scribe” to approximate more closely the cultural identity of these sages and the contributions they made, both of which are expertly presented in this fine book.

## REFERENCES

- Coe, Michael. 1966. *An early stone pectoral from southeastern Mexico*. (Studies in pre-Columbian art and archaeology, 1.) Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks.
- . 1973. *The Maya scribe and his world*. New York: Grolier Club.
- . 1975. *Classic Maya pottery at Dumbarton Oaks*. Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks.
- . 1977. Supernatural patrons of Maya scribes and artists. In Norman Hammond (ed.), *Social process in Maya prehistory: Studies in honour of Sir Eric Thompson*, 327–47. London: Academic Press.
- . 1978. *Lords of the underworld: Masterpieces of Classic Maya ceramics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- . 1982. *Old gods and young heroes: The Pearlman Collection of Maya Ceramics*. Jerusalem: Israel Museum.
- . 1989. The hero twins: Myth and image. In Justin Kerr (ed.), *The Maya vase book*, vol. 1. 161–84. New York: Kerr Associates.
- Kerr, Justin. 1989–1997. *The Maya vase book*. 5 vols. New York: Kerr Associates.
- Kerr, Barbara, & Kerr, Justin. 1981. The painters of the pink glyphs. Paper presented at the Fine Arts Museum of Long Island, February.
- , ———. 1988. Some observations on Maya vase painters. In Elizabeth P. Benson & Gillett G. Griffin (eds.), *Maya iconography*. 236–59. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Kubler, George. 1962. *Art and architecture of Ancient America*. Baltimore: Pelican.
- Miller, Mary Ellen. 1986. *The murals of Bonampak*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Reents-Budet, Dorie. 1998. Elite Maya pottery and artisans as social indicators. In Cathy Costin & Rita Wright (eds.), *Craft and social identity* (Archaeological papers of the American Anthropological Association, 8), 71–89. Washington, DC.
- ; Ball, J. W.; Bishop, R. L.; Fields, V. M.; & MacLeod, B. 1994. *Painting the Maya universe: Royal ceramics of the Classic period*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Roys, Ralph. 1967. *The Book of Chilam Balam of Chumayel*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Schele, Linda, & Miller, Mary Ellen. 1986. *The blood of kings: Dynasty and ritual in Maya art*. New York: Braziller.
- Spinden, Herbert. 1913. *A study of Maya art: Its subject matter and historical development*. Cambridge, MA: Peabody Museum. [Reprinted, New York: Dover, 1975.]

(Received 16 June 1999)

ALBERT VALDMAN, THOMAS A. KLINGLER, MARGARET M. MARSHALL, & KEVIN J. ROTTET, *Dictionary of Louisiana Creole*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1998. Pp. 656. Hb \$75.00.

Reviewed by FELICE ANNE COLES  
*Modern Languages, University of Mississippi*  
*University, MS 38677*  
*fcoles@olemiss.edu*

This extraordinary volume represents more than ten years of research on Louisiana Creole (LC) by a group of outstanding scholars from Indiana University, l'Université Antilles-Guyane, Tulane University, and Southeastern Louisiana University. Both historical and contemporary sources are used for indexing, alphabetically and trilingually (English, French, and LC), the spoken form of the LC lexical items. The resulting collection of material is astonishing in its scope of knowledge, and comprehensive in its depth of detail. With more than 5,000 entries, this excellent work provides access through vocabulary to the history and culture of LC communities.

The dictionary begins with a sociolinguistic sketch of LC today, including notations on variation resulting from regional distribution and/or language contact with English and French. A brief description of the phonology, morphology, and syntax of LC outlines the most common features of the language, indicating that LC is emphatically not a simplified or nonstandard form of French, but rather "a language in its own right which, when it was a lively form of speech, met all the communicative, expressive, and cognitive needs of its speakers" (18). The thumbnail sketch is useful in and of itself to readers interested in an overview of LC, but not necessarily prepared to delve into a detailed description or analysis (as can be found in Klingler 1992 or Neumann 1985). The authors simply and briefly cover basic topics, without highlighting any controversial issues. A discussion of the origin of LC examines the linguistic data in their socio-historical context. The African influence on LC is dealt with by describing postposed determiners, serial verbs, and the interrogative adverb *kofèr* 'why' without promoting any particular hypothesis. A brief mention is made of the acrolect/mesolect/basilect continuum, and a straightforward discussion of code-switching omits any social commentary on the influence of the English language on LC (the "insidious anglicism" type of remark that occasionally occurs in francophone literature). Likewise, the claim that following French orthographic conventions promotes a false sense of uniformity (cf. Brown 1993) is dealt with under the explanation of orthography in the User's Guide.

The philosophy of treating LC as a separate language is apparent in the User's Guide, which provides a wealth of information on the organization of the dictionary. English and French glosses are "not intended as an etymology" (23). Because the entries are so rich with information, the User's Guide provides an invaluable explanation and justification of the listings. The dictionary does follow the standard French alphabet "for the convenience of readers used to con-

sulting French dictionaries” (21) and in some orthographic conventions (*gn* for [ɲ], among others), but the concessions to standard French spelling are otherwise few (thus ‘yes’ is transcribed as *wi*). For those readers who insist on locating words according to French spelling, a fine index at the back correlates French to LC. No syllabifications or stress markings are attempted, but morphological boundaries are represented by dashes where the constituents may be recombined elsewhere. Over all, the language of the User’s Guide is straightforward, nontechnical, and brief, so that readers will not be overwhelmed upon looking at the detailed entries.

Each entry contains grammatical information on the part of speech of the head word, pronunciation and variations, definitions (with English and French equivalents), contextual information on regional variation, diachronic attestations and social register, and historical examples and their sources.

An entry looks like this:

**syèl** n. (CA; PC) 1. sky; ciel. Syèl-la tou bløe jodi-la. The sky is very blue today. (PC) 2. Heaven; ciel, cieux, paradis. Lanj-ye vès dan syèl-la. Angels live in heaven. (CA). ♦ Enfin, volonté du ciel soit fait. Well, may Heaven’s will be done. (T34). (443)

This indicates that the headword *syèl*, a noun, has two main meanings, with two illustrative quotations from the German Coast (CA) and Pointe Coupée (PC), and one historical quote from Neumann 1985 (T34). On occasion the reader must remember to adjust a variant or to remove a prefixed morpheme to locate the main headword; thus the word *lakous* ‘race’ (255) is listed under *kours*, although its illustrative quotation is *Zo kapab tire en lakous* ‘You all can have a race.’) Other entries are more detailed, but with the User’s Guide the text can be interpreted easily.

While definitions account for the bulk of its contents, this volume’s strength lies in the illustrative examples, which help to contextualize the words in utterances and explain their connotative senses. For example, *rakonte* ‘to tell’ (394) has a connotation of lengthy discursion or gossip that the succinct *di* ‘to say, tell’ (122) does not. The authors do not attempt to recast the historical examples in the phonetic alphabet, so that these phrases may look more “frenchified” than the contemporary data (e.g., the headword for *Li descende so la voiture* ‘He got down from his carriage’, from Fortier 1895, is *vwatur*); but they do even out some of the gross inconsistencies in transcription systems of modern examples. Leveling the entries to a uniform system does not mask the variability of the spoken code, however.

The dictionary also contains local place names; names of regional flora and fauna, often with their Latin nomenclature (*bitòr* ‘American bitter; *Lepomis macrochirus*’); and proper names of folktale characters (*Dahomey* ‘Brer Dahomey’). Obvious loanwords, e.g. *gòb* ‘gob’, are treated as integrated vocabulary without comment. Morphological creations such as onomatopoeia (*bap* ‘bam’)

are included, as are some animal noises (*koukouroukou* ‘cock-a-doodle-doo’) and a few expletives (*Bondyeu Sènyær!* ‘Good Lord!’). Where possible, at least one synonym per entry is found for English and French; otherwise, a brief explanation of the general meaning is given (*swip* ‘a kind of harrow; une espèce de herse’). Since the dictionary is a purely descriptive work, the authors have included taboo words and vulgarisms found in their corpora.

A set of indices following the body of the dictionary – cross-listing the vocabulary from English to LC, and from French to LC – is equally well prepared and useful. Anyone who is unfamiliar with LC may find a word in the index, then refer back to the main entry in the dictionary.

Marckwardt 1974 states that lexicography requires economy and precision: the painstaking accumulation of reliable data, its proper classification, and the formulation of sound principles from the material are a combination of art and science. A dictionary should be simple, professional, and strenuously scientific. This volume fulfills all three criteria in an outstanding manner. The dedication and rigorous standards of the authors, the commitment of the publisher to construct a quality product, and the wealth of information on both general and specific lexical items in LC create an enormously useful and interesting work. This volume is an incomparable asset to creole studies.

## REFERENCES

- Brown, Becky (1993). The social consequences of writing Louisiana French. *Language in Society* 22:67–101.
- Fortier, Alcée (1895). *Louisiana folktales in French dialect and English translation*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin. [Reprint, Millwood, NY: Kraus, 1974.]
- Klingler, Thomas A. (1992). *A descriptive study of the Creole speech of Pointe Coupée Parish, Louisiana*. Dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington.
- Marckwardt, Albert (1974). Preface. In *Funk & Wagnall's Standard College Dictionary*, iii–ix. New York: Funk & Wagnalls.
- Neumann, Ingrid (1985). *Le créole de Breaux Bridge, Louisiane: Étude morphosyntaxique, textes, vocabulaire*. Hamburg: Buske.

(Received 15 June 1999)

ANDREW DALBY, *Dictionary of languages: The definitive reference to more than 400 languages*. London: Bloomsbury; New York: Columbia University Press, 1998. Pp. xviii, 734. \$50.00.

Reviewed by PETER T. DANIELS  
P.O. Box 630108  
Bronx, NY 10463  
grammatim@worldnet.att.net

One suspects that the maps were the real reason for writing this book – nearly two hundred of them (accompanying nearly four hundred articles), ALL TO THE SAME SCALE (along with a few others at a much smaller scale for worldwide coverage);

even the software used for making the maps is fully credited (734). Almost every map plots several languages, making this a unique and valuable reference (the maps are vastly preferable to those in *Atlas of Languages* 1996, see Daniels 1998). It is of course not so comprehensive as Moseley & Asher 1994, but far easier to use because of the compact format.

The well-written, even absorbing articles range from half a page to more than eight pages. Their main content is the external history of the languages and families treated. Unlike the (apparent) competition, Campbell 1991 (see Daniels 1994), Dalby does not attempt grammatical sketches; occasionally he notes an interesting feature of a language, and he gives the etymology of each language's name(s). The "themes which emerge from the book as a whole" are described in the concluding Acknowledgements: "the multiple social uses of language and oral literature, and the complex ways in which languages have interacted with one another" (734). The number words from one to ten are given for many languages (often in tables comparing a few related languages), along with occasional quotations of proverbs or brief poetic passages. A number of script displays are included. The author is Honorary Librarian at the Institute of Linguists, London (and apparently no relation to the well-known Africanist, David Dalby); South and Southeast Asia and Africa seem to receive the most intense coverage. The only area that might be considered weak is the Americas.

From the jacket flap (but not from the text of the book itself) we learn that "every language that has official status is included, as well as all those that have a written literature and 175 'minor' languages with special historical or anthropological interest." Another criterion is that every language with at least one million speakers has its own entry (vii), but some reference is made to many more languages than receive separate articles; all mentions of languages and places are indexed (709–33). The Introduction (vii–xvi) succinctly but clearly presents information about language change and its study; it also gives a list of families and isolates (xiv), from which one can read every (alphabetically arranged) entry if one inserts BASQUE and SUMERIAN, plus cross-references for Andamanese (to AUSTROASIATIC LANGUAGES), Elamite (to DRAVIDIAN LANGUAGES), and Hurro-Urartian (to CAUCASIAN LANGUAGES). One of the few mistakes in the book is the entry under Altaic for "Tungusic languages (see MANCHU)," which should simply read "TUNGUSIC LANGUAGES." Most cross-referencing within articles is done within the narrative; for the largest families, languages with more than 100,000 speakers are named in lists: Austronesian, Bantu, Niger-Congo, Nilo-Saharan.

Only two real problems are apparent: Most of the script displays and many highlighted paragraphs are placed on a gray background that is simply too dark for the material to be easily read; and there are virtually no bibliographic references. Perhaps reliance on different sources is responsible for rare inconsistencies, such as the statements that there are five main dialects of Cree (p. 17, s.v. Algonquian) or four (p. 139, s.v. Cree). One of the few outright errors is the listing of Chipewyan as an alternative name for Ojibwa, alongside Chippewa

(470); elsewhere (434), it is correctly given as a Na-Dené language. The transliteration of Sumerian is badly misunderstood (588). Some cross-references and map references are not quite right.

This book provides the sort of information about the languages of the world that is most often sought by the curious reader, and as such it should be available in every library. It would be right at home in many a private collection as well.

REFERENCES

- Atlas of languages* (1996). London: Quarto; New York: Facts on File.  
Campbell, George L. (1991). *Compendium of the world's languages*. 2 vols. London: Routledge.  
Daniels, Peter T. (1994). Review of Campbell 1991. *Word* 45:245–59.  
\_\_\_\_\_. (1998). Review of *Atlas of languages* 1996. *Language in Society* 27:113–17.  
Moseley, Christopher, & Asher, R. E. (1994), eds. *Atlas of the world's languages*. London: Routledge.

(Received 29 June 1999)