REVIEWS

JONATHAN POTTER, *Representing reality: Discourse, rhetoric and social construction*. London (UK) & Thousand Oaks (CA): Sage, 1996. Pp. x, 253. Hb $65.00, pb $22.95.

Reviewed by ANGELA GARCIA
Sociology, University of Cincinnati
Cincinnati, OH 45221
angela.garcia@uc.edu

This is ALMOST two books in one. More than 100 pages are devoted to a critical review of approaches to the study of facts and descriptions. This review includes the sociology of scientific knowledge, philosophy of science, and constructionist approaches (e.g. Robert Merton, Harry Collins, Thomas Kuhn, Karl Popper); ethnomethodology (Harold Garfinkel, Melvin Pollner); conversation analysis (Harvey Sacks, Emanuel Schegloff, Gail Jefferson, John Heritage); semiology (Ferdinand de Saussure, Roland Barthes); post-structuralism (Barthes, Jacques Derrida, Michel Foucault); and post-modernism (Donna Haraway, Jean-François Lyotard). Potter is a skillful teacher, and I learned much from his discussion of these perspectives. However, even 100 pages are not enough for a thorough description and critique of such a wide range of perspectives; Potter leaves the reader wanting more – which is a pretty good place to leave a reader.

Potter's reviews summarize the main debates and issues of each perspective as they relate to the construction of facts and factual descriptions. These reviews are therefore intentionally, and justifiably, incomplete. Potter employs some necessary simplification, but not at the cost of introducing inaccuracies. His critiques are specifically designed to explore the ways each perspective is or is not useful for a study of facts and descriptions, rather than being a global critique of each perspective. This keeps the book nicely focused on its main goal.

For example, Chap. 1 uses Collins's study of scientists studying gravitation as an example of an approach to the sociology of scientific knowledge. Potter critiques Collins' "realist stance":

> Collins takes issue with the stories that scientists tell about gravity waves, the quality of experiments, and more generally how science progresses; yet, at the same time, he is accepting their general common-sense understanding of the relevant categories, objects, and processes . . . This is an important point, so it is worth spelling out carefully what is being suggested. Take categories of scientists, for example. It is possible to take a category such as "gravity-wave scientists" as a neutral descriptive term that collects together all the scientists who actually work on gravity waves. That would be to treat the category realistically. However, the category can also be treated as a construction; that is, as a category that different scientists use with different boundaries, say, and as

part of different activities. Some versions of the category may be widely accepted, while others may be fiercely contested. (31)

Potter seems to favor a more "ethnomethodological" approach to the study of science, facts, and descriptions, by advocating the investigation of common-sense understandings and the practical reasoning done by scientists, as well as their "work." His discussion of ethnomethodology (in Chap. 2) points out the necessity of understanding the indexicality and reflexivity of facts and descriptions:

> An emphasis on indexicality leads us always to ask, when addressing some description or report, what is the CONTEXT here? How is this description OCCASIONED? An emphasis on reflexivity encourages us to consider reports and descriptions BOTH in relation to the event or action they describe, AND in relation to what they are doing. What ACTIONS are they a part of? (66)

The discussion of ethnomethodology leads Potter to examine "the methods through which factual discourse is constructed, the occasions in which it is embedded, and the uses to which it is put" (44–45). Conversation analysis contributes the premise that "what is said is not the way it is accidentally, that forms of words are not rough and ready make-dos, but are DESIGNED IN THEIR DETAIL to be sensitive to their sequential context and to their role in interaction" (58). The chapter on ethnomethodology and conversation analysis is the only one of the review chapters that does not include a specific critique of the perspective. Potter seems to have concluded that these approaches are useful for the analysis of facts and descriptions; he adopts much from them in the analytical chapters which follow.

In contrast, Potter's discussion of semiology, post-structuralism, and post-modernism specifically points out that, while these approaches are useful for studying literary texts or abstract systems, they do not provide a means to study talk in its sequential context, or the orientation of recipients to utterances; thus, "there is a tendency in semiology to drift away from considering actual practices of language use to look for phenomena under the skulls of the actors" (72).

The second half of Potter's book contains his comprehensive analysis of descriptions in a wide range of social settings and media. His goals are to answer these questions (p. 1):

> "How are descriptions produced so they will be treated as factual? . . . how are they made to appear solid, neutral, independent of the speaker, and to be merely mirroring some aspect of the world? How can a factual description be undermined? And what makes a description difficult to undermine? . . . How are these factual descriptions put together in ways that allow them to perform particular actions? What kinds of activities are commonly done using descriptions? And why might descriptions be suitable for doing those activities?

Potter's analysis displays some tension between ethnomethodological and other approaches to the study of facts and descriptions. Specifically, he advocates the use of an inductive analytic method, and of an ethnomethodological approach

that does not rely on prior assumptions about the organization of descriptions or facts; but the mere fact that he precedes his analysis with such an extensive review of prior literature, and uses many concepts and observations from prior research in his discussion of data, suggests that Potter's method is not purely (or merely) ethnomethodological. For example, his research questions include these (p. 1): "How are descriptions produced so they will be treated as factual? . . . How are they made to appear solid, neutral, independent of the speaker, and to be merely mirroring some aspect of the world?" Does "truth" or "factuality" necessarily involve "separation from the speaker?" There may be occasions when a description could look more factual if it were presented as dependent on the speaker, rather than independent. For example, in describing an inner state or emotion, an independent description might be less convincing. How one makes a fact "solid and unproblematic" may depend on the interactional and social context, and on the type of fact being expressed or described.

At times, the research examples discussed in Potter's analysis chapters seem to be used to illustrate pre-existing concepts, rather than inductive analyses of data which lead to particular conclusions. Perhaps this impression simply results from the fact that there is no section or chapter describing the data used in the study. Such a description, and a statement of how the examples relate to the total collection of data, might clarify their status.

In addition, deviant case analysis would make the analysis more convincing, as would a greater emphasis on the orientation of co-interactants to the phenomenon being studied, to show that it really works in the way claimed by the analysis. For instance, Ex. 1 (p. 125) is an excerpt from a David Frost interview with Salman Rushdie. Rushdie uses the expression *they would, wouldn't they* to show that those who oppose him have a stake in maintaining that opposition. Potter argues that this expression is in effect a quotation from a court case tied to a famous British political scandal. Such an analysis involves going beyond the local interactional context for explanations of how participants formulated their utterances. Although Potter may well be right about Rushdie's use of this phrase, his claim cannot be demonstrated with this type of data, given that the participants (at least in the portion of the transcript we are shown) do not display an orientation to the phrase as a reference to the court case. Thus, in Potter's attempts to broaden his approach beyond the types of data and questions that ethnomethodologists typically pursue, he is sometimes led to assumptions or claims that cannot be verified or disconfirmed by his data. We can only agree or disagree with what look like reasonable interpretations. In general, however, the analytical chapters are very convincing. Potter's comprehensive analysis of the ways descriptions can be claimed, supported, or challenged is a major contribution.

In sum, this is a very useful book. Anyone wanting to understand the major approaches to the construction of facts or descriptions will find it useful, as will those studying how people make claims and defend or attack positions. The book is very reader-friendly: Arguments are summarized clearly, relevant citations are

given, and definitions are repeated when necessary. Transitions between sections and chapters make useful connections between the different theories, and humor enlivens the process.

<div align="right">(Received 6 September 1997)</div>

MARLIS HELLINGER & ULRICH AMMON (eds.), *Contrastive sociolinguistics*. (Contributions to the sociology of language, 71.) Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1996. Pp. 504. Hb DM 228.00.

<div align="right">Reviewed by MARK SEBBA
Linguistics, Lancaster University
Lancaster LA1 4YT, UK
eiams@msmail.lancs.ac.uk</div>

The strength of this large volume is its diversity: There is a wealth of papers covering different sociolinguistic and pragmatic topics from different perspectives. The range is such that few researchers in the area of the social use of language will not want, sooner or later, to refer to one of the articles in this book. All of them are by established researchers, but some give overviews of earlier research and important issues, while others report on specific pieces of sociolinguistic research.

This diversity is at the same time a weakness. Since this volume is the first collection of papers devoted to the topic of "contrastive sociolinguistics," it inevitably posed tricky problems for the editors as to what to include. They have opted for inclusiveness; as a result, the volume displays a wide range of concerns, methodologies, and orientations; yet even within each major division of the book, coherent themes and methods do not, on the whole, emerge. Perhaps this is itself the "big question" of the book: As the editors observe in their introduction (p. 9), "the papers tend to apply or refine methodologies developed in (empirical) sociolinguistics [. . . and . . .] tend to rely on existing sociolinguistic theories." As a result, "One of the urgent needs for future research is the explicit formulation of the theoretical basis on which sociolinguistic structures (from politeness phenomena to patterns of functional/status change and language policies) can be compared." That much is even clearer after a reading of this volume; but the book, taken as a whole, does no more than raise the issue.

The editors have divided the collection into three parts: "Bilingualism – Multilingualism," "Language planning and language politics," and "Cross-linguistic discourse analysis." In the first of these, there is a focus on individual or societal multilingualism across countries and/or communities. We find comparative papers on the centers of plurinational languages (U. Ammon), on linguistic minorities (Ludwig Eichinger), on characteristics of bilingualism/multilingualism (Jacob Ornstein-Galicia), on codeswitching of Mexican-Americans and Malaysians (Ro-

dolfo Jacobson), on internal and external migrant communities in Switzerland (Georges Lüdi), on language use and contact in the Alemannic area (Helga Bister-Boosen), and on language attitudes across a linguistic frontier in Belgium (Sonja Vandermeeren). Perhaps unintentionally, the editors have here chosen articles mainly dealing with northern Europe; as a result, there is a heavy emphasis on research involving a small number of languages, particularly on German and its varieties. Even "linguistic minorities" as discussed in Eichinger's contribution are autochthonous minorities rather than migrants from outside Europe. This does not necessarily reduce the potential for developing a contrastive methodology, but it does mean that many of the findings may not be generalizable beyond the relatively privileged and much-studied social environment of northern Europe.

In the section on "Language planning and language politics" we find articles on "Educational language choice – Multilingual diversity or monolingual reductionism" (Tove Skutnabb-Kangas), ecological and non-ecological approaches to language planning (Peter Mühlhäusler), the economics of language inequality (Florian Coulmas), language borders in northern France and Belgium (Roland Willemyns), feminist language planning (a study of the use of "Miss", "Mrs." and "Ms." in Australia and the Netherlands, by Anne Pauwels), pidgins and creoles as literary languages (Suzanne Romaine), and the typology of English-lexicon pidgin and creole dictionaries (Manfred Görlach). The first three deal with important general issues of language planning and language status, and they have a heavy ideological charge. Here, especially, some more detailed comments from the editors – some discussion, some synthesis – might have added to the interest and value of the volume as a whole. No matter, perhaps: Readers will enjoy reaching their own conclusions.

The last section, on cross-linguistic discourse analysis, has articles on "cultural scripts" (Anna Wierzbicka), German/English misunderstanding in discourse (Julianne House), politeness in French and Italian (Gudrun Held), concepts of communicative virtues in Japanese and German (Ichiro Marui et al.), "referential perspective" in German and Japanese (Kazuma Matoba), male-female speaking practices across cultures (Susanne Günthner) and narrative universals (Uta Quasthoff). Once again, a comparatively narrow range of languages is covered, with German, English and Japanese having prominence. Though Günthner's chapter covers a large number of languages, Quasthoff's is a search for a descriptive framework to allow cross-cultural comparison of narrative forms, and Wierzbicka describes a "semantic metalanguage" for stating "cultural scripts" in language-independent, universal terms.

Few readers, I think, will want to read this volume cover to cover. Many, however, will find it a useful addition to their shelves, and they will find themselves turning to it for reference in the future.

TEUN A. VAN DIJK (ed.), *Discourse as structure and process*. (Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction, 1.) London (UK) & Thousand Oaks (CA): Sage, 1997. Pp. xii, 356. Hb $75.00, pb $27.50.

Reviewed by JAY L. LEMKE
School of Education, Brooklyn College
City University of New York
Brooklyn, NY 11210
jllbc@cunyvm.cuny.edu

Substantial thanks are due to van Dijk for assembling his two-volume "Discourse studies" collection, which introduces this multi-disciplinary field to a wide readership. In this first volume, which focuses on theory and method, linguists, semioticians, communication theorists, and social and cognitive psychologists from the Netherlands, Austria, Germany, the UK, the US, and Australia have contributed to van Dijk's project of promoting dialog and collaboration in the development of discourse studies as an emerging field. Each chapter offers a useful introduction to the literature in its area and an exposition of theoretical perspectives, usually illustrated by one or more examples of text analysis. The volume is a treasure for newcomers to discourse studies, or to discourse analysis methodologies; in addition, it challenges specialists to connect their work more fully with approaches from other perspectives.

A short review cannot do justice to all twelve chapters, but I would like to highlight a few contributions. Van Dijk's own introductory chapter would be an ideal starting point for research students seeking to understand the historical origins and breadth of perspectives that contribute to the contemporary study of discourse. He presents a view of discourse as a phenomenon that is simultaneously linguistic, interactional, sociopolitical, and cognitive, and he gives a rough outline of the range and scope of the articles that follow.

A second overview is provided in Chap. 2, by Robert de Beaugrande, who contrasts the approach to language in discourse studies with the more decontextualizing traditions of formal grammar; he proposes very specifically why techniques that work for phonology and morphology must begin to break down for syntax, and fail utterly for semantics and discourse analysis. This chapter emphasizes the underlying theoretical, and indeed political, commitments of discourse studies as providing the motivation for its emphasis on naturalistic, contextually situated data, its resistance to reliance on native-speaker intuition, and its affinity with corpus-based and field linguistics. De Beaugrande shares with many in the field today the belief that the social value of discourse studies ultimately lies in uncovering the political ideologies at work in public and private discourse, and in offering people better tools with which to resist them.

Chaps. 3–5 introduce various approaches to the intersections of discourse studies with semantics, grammar, and stylistics. Chaps. 6–8 are organized around discourse studies of narrative, argumentation, and rhetoric more generally. I was particularly fascinated with Elinor Ochs's short chapter on narrative, which fore-

grounds an important Heideggerian view of narrative as constructing perspectives in which past, present, and future are always implied by and presented in relationship to one other. This approach, in turn, offers new questions and insights about the role of narrative in the construction of identity.

In Chap. 9, Suzanne Eggins and J. R. Martin offer a wonderfully rich account of the complexities of register and genre theory, with numerous text examples and an extensive bibliography. This is another ideal chapter for students and newcomers who seek a gateway to practical research methodologies. Implicitly, this chapter also raises the difficult question of how researchers should match their methods to the saliencies of their data. When so many meanings are available to writers and readers, which ones are worth analyzing? To what extent do frequency and markedness of textual features point to what's going on in a text, and to what extent is it more basically a matter of the interests that the analyst brings to the text? Many of the authors in this volume seem to view texts as objective data, and the methods described as equally relevant to every text. But we must realize that the great work of discourse analysis always lies in deciding what it is about a corpus of texts that would repay close analysis. As de Beaugrande points out, this is as much a political decision as a scientific one. Analyzing human meaning says as much about the analyst's interests and purposes as about those of writers and speakers.

This view is elaborated in Chap. 10, where Gunther Kress, Regina Leite-Garcia, and Theo van Leeuwen look beyond language to the general semiotics of discourse media. They argue, as I have also done (Lemke 1998), that we never construct discourse out of language alone, but always in integration with other semiotic codes (here, especially visual ones), because the materiality of signifiers always allows them to be interpreted multi-modally (as, say, both a word and a choice of typeface to print that word). This leads them to argue that in multi-modal discourse – such as their principal example, a two-page pictures-and-text magazine spread – the choice of signifiers is clearly not arbitrary, but rather is motivated by the authors' interest in choosing an apt signifier for their meaning. Although the meaning of a picture and the meaning of a verbal description may never be quite the same thing, all our signifiers point back to us indexically: We could always have chosen to convey a sufficiently similar meaning in some other way, whether in language as such or across multiple media. The particular signifier we choose is always a sign for US, as well as for whatever we choose to represent with it.

The extended analysis of the magazine spread by Kress et al. attempts to illustrate the rather intriguing hypotheses previously advanced by Kress and van Leeuwen 1996, regarding the basic semiotic conventions of modern Western visual layout and perspective, as well as the critical political stance of such work (cf. Hodge & Kress 1988). This effort is quite ambitious for the scope of a single short chapter; readers may find that this text offers alternative readings and interpretations that the chapter does not deal with in relation to its own particular

reading. From such differences are born the dialogs that move discourse studies forward.

After the social linguistics and social semiotics of Chaps. 9–10, it is a bit of a shock to return to the mostly mentalist and individualist perspective of three US cognitive psychologists (A. C. Graesser, M. A. Gernsbacher, and S. R. Goldman) writing in Chap. 11. What is the relevance, to discourse studies as a whole, of experimental studies of short- and medium-term retention of texts, and of inferences about salience and assimilation of texts to general models or schemas for texts of various types? For one thing, such studies bring a dynamic perspective to an otherwise synoptic view of discourse: Meanings are made in real time by real people, and they do not necessarily take the same form during these processes that they do on the printed page. Unfortunately, however, the disciplinary traditions of cognitive psychology assume an a-priori universalism regarding the organization of verbal meaning in memory, and regarding the processes by which we proceed from texts heard and read to texts remembered and paraphrased. This chapter's review of the literature reminds us that, as we move from cognitive psychology's older and still dominant symbol-processing models toward the newer connectionist and emergentist ones, we are also moving from models very closely tied to modern middle-class Eurocultural ideals about textual rationality, and toward more biologically inspired models that hardly constrain what a human brain might do with language.

Universalism assumes that it doesn't matter from whom you get your data, or what your social relationships with them may be; other researchers, however, may find it more likely that preferred principles of narrative organization or textual salience are learned as part of one's culture, and have very little necessary universal basis. If we follow Latour's analysis (1987) of how apparently universal scientific findings are manufactured by the apparatus of our own historically limited culture, then we might also wonder if a methodological focus on responses to prepared texts does not serve artificially to exclude the potential diversity of actual discourse processes that might be observed in spontaneous conversation, or even in original writing.

Some of these critiques are in fact mounted by Susan Condor and Charles Antaki in the final chapter, on social cognition and discourse. Taking the perspective more of social psychology than of cognitive psychology, and with a more European than American focus on the literature, these authors tell us of interesting work on how people make sense of texts – not in terms of universal unconscious processes, but in terms of socially learned and culturally specific norms, practices, and values.

Reading across the range of disciplinary perspectives represented in this collection, it is hard not to agree with van Dijk that discourse studies will become a truly mature and socially useful discipline only when we all accept the responsibility to engage with one another's data, assumptions, and interests across our self-protective disciplinary boundaries.

REFERENCES

Hodge, Robert, & Kress, Gunther (1988). *Social semiotics*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
Kress, Gunther, & van Leeuwen, Theo (1996). *Reading images: The grammar of visual design*. London: Routledge.
Latour, Bruno (1987). *Science in action: How to follow scientists and engineers through society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Lemke, Jay L. (1998). Multiplying meaning: Visual and verbal semiotics in scientific text. In James R. Martin & Robert Veel (eds.), *Reading science*, 87–113. London: Routledge.

TEUN A. VAN DIJK (ed.), *Discourse as social interaction*. (Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction, 2.) London (UK) & Thousand Oaks (CA): Sage, 1997. Pp. xii, 324. Hb $75.00, pb $28.95.

Reviewed by DAVID SILVERMAN
Sociology, Goldsmiths' College
University of London
New Cross, London SE14 6NW
soa02ds@gold.ac.uk

This collection aims to offer, in the words of its editor, "a first introduction" to the study of discourse. While its companion vol. 1, *Discourse as structure and process*, is mainly concerned with cognitive issues, the contributors to vol. 2 focus on social organization and social processes.

In such a diverse field, this collection is necessarily wide-ranging. After a helpful introduction from van Dijk, the student is offered a diverse meal which extends from pragmatics, to conversation analysis (CA), to sociolinguistics, to critical discourse analysis – and to the study of discourse involving specific settings, like organizations, and particular identities, such as race and gender. Van Dijk is to be congratulated in having obtained contributions from such "big names" as Paul Drew, Norman Fairclough, Anita Pomerantz, Candace West, and Ruth Wodak.

Even if the publisher's claim that "upper-level undergraduates" might use this text is a little ambitious, generally speaking, the contributors have managed well to write at a level appropriate for a student audience. To this end, as van Dijk notes, the chapters contain literature reviews, explanations of theoretical frameworks, and examples of actual data analysis.

Practitioners will, of course, refer to this text selectively, reflecting their own specific interests and biases. In terms of my own interests, I was particularly interested in three chapters. Shoshana Blum-Kulka offers a helpful review of pragmatics from Grice, Austin, and Searle to Brown & Levinson, showing how the approach can cover topics as diverse as politeness and cross-cultural communication. Paul Drew and Marja-Leena Sorjonen provide an account of "institutional talk" within CA which is a model of clarity. Finally, Anita Pomerantz and B. J. Fehr – in, to my mind, the outstanding chapter of the book – show beginners,

in a few short pages, how to do a CA analysis with a minimum of jargon and a maximum of accessibility. I liked several things about this chapter. First, it draws readers' attention to Harvey Sacks's seminal lectures (1992), which raise issues in interpreting language that no student of social science, let alone discourse, can ignore (see Silverman 1998). Second, by means of an extended example, it brilliantly links theoretically derived concepts to the often messy business of data analysis. I have already used this chapter successfully with my own graduate students. Finally, it refutes the canard that CA – and by implication discourse analysis (DA) – is concerned merely with "talk." As Pomerantz & Fehr comment (65),

> The organization of talk or conversation ... was never the central defining focus in CA. Rather it is the organization of the meaningful conduct of people in society, that is, how people in society produce their activities and make sense of the world about them.

As for the book as a whole, to simplify grossly, one may say that textbooks that claim to cover some "field" can be assessed by what they include and exclude. In these terms, one can criticize the range of the present collection in two ultimately conflicting ways. First, in some respects, the range is too narrow; e.g., in regard to DA, the French post-structuralist tradition through Barthes 1977 and Laclau & Mouffe 1985 is ignored, while Michel Foucault, Bruno Latour, and Michel Pecheux get barely a mention. Moreover, Sacks's analysis of membership categorization devices, despite its recent flourishing (Baker 1997, Watson 1997, Eglin & Hester 1992), does not rate even a reference.

By contrast, purists will quibble at any attempt to establish a unitary field out of approaches that range from CA to some of the politically involved types of DA represented here. This is not merely a matter of whether we take an ostensibly political stance toward language use; it relates to a range of analytic preferences. Nowhere is this more apparent than in the contentious issue of the "context" of talk. As Schegloff has reminded us (1991, 1992), analyzing members' local construction of context is not at all the same thing as stipulating an analyst's own sense of context, however intuitively persuasive. Here there is a gulf between CA and much DA – a difference made all the more obvious by van Dijk's apparent desire to have it both ways (12, 16).

However, arguments about the broadness or narrowness of a textbook's approach should ultimately be left to the guardians of intellectual "turf." In any book, some approaches will always have to be excluded; and in pursuit of practical alliances, some potentially indigestible ingredients will have to be mixed together. To my mind, therefore, a much more important and objective criterion in assessing a student text is that of accessibility. In this regard, the least successful chapters here are those that concentrate on literature reviews. One awaits with apprehension the students who, understandably, will rehash such reviews rather than reading the original articles on which they are based. This not only bores the

teacher, but it also means that the student ends up with superficial knowledge of the approach discussed. It is far better, then, to explain the concepts within a particular theoretical field by demonstrating how they can be USED in an in-depth analysis. In this regard, the chapters by Pomerantz & Fehr, by Paul Chilton & Christina Schaffner, and by Norman Fairclough & Ruth Wodak are exemplary models of the only true learning – learning by doing.

Because of the quality of such articles, *Discourse as social interaction* will constitute a very useful accompaniment to any course on discourse. The question of whether such a course is any longer feasible, given the divergence of positions to which I have already referred, is beyond the scope of this review.

REFERENCES

Baker, Carolyn (1997). Membership categorization and interview accounts. In Silverman (ed.), 130–43.
Barthes, Roland (1977). *Image, music, text*. London: Fontana.
Eglin, Peter, & Hester, Stephen (1992). Category, predicate and task: The pragmatics of practical action. *Semiotica* 88:243–68.
Laclau, Ernesto, & Mouffe, Chantal (1985). *Hegemony and socialist strategy*. London: Verso.
Sacks, Harvey (1992). *Lectures on conversation*. 2 vols. Oxford: Blackwell.
Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1991). Reflections on talk and social structure. In Deirdre Boden & Don Zimmerman (eds.), *Talk and social structure: Studies in ethnomethodology and conversation analysis*, 44–70. Cambridge: Polity Press.
———— (1992). On talk and its institutional occasions. In Paul Drew & John Heritage (eds.), *Talk at work*, 101–36. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.
Silverman, David (1997), ed. *Qualitative research: Theory, method and practice*. London: Sage.
———— (1998). *Harvey Sacks and conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
Watson, Rod (1997). Ethnomethodology and textual analysis. In Silverman (ed.), 80–98.

(Received 27 December 1997)

ELIZABETH COUPER-KUHLEN & MARGRET SELTING (eds.), *Prosody in conversation: Interactional studies*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996. Pp. xii, 471. Hb $74.95.

Reviewed by PAUL DREW
Sociology, University of York
York YO1 5DD, England
wpd1@yorkf.ac.uk

Turns at talk in conversation, and in any other form of spoken interaction, are designed to enable speakers to be understood in the way they wish to be understood by their co-participants. Talk is meaningful insofar as speakers design their turns so as to be recognizable as making an offer, closing a topic, agreeing or affiliating, being ironic, finishing their turn, continuing, being surprised or astonished at news, "just" asking a question, reproaching, indicating that there is something problematic about what the prior speaker has just said, and so on. (I take these activities from those that are variously studied in the chapters in this

collection.) So "turn design" is at the heart of how we mean what we say, what we communicate, in interaction.

"Turn design" refers to the construction of a turn-at-talk from a range of elements or components – including word selection, syntactic and grammatical features, phonetic and prosodic aspects, and (in face-to-face interaction) gaze, posture, bodily orientation, and the like. Couper-Kuhlen & Selting point out that prosody has largely been neglected in the empirical study of spoken interaction; despite its being no less important than other (linguistic) turn design components, research has tended to focus on lexico-syntactic features, perhaps because of the influence of literacy on studying language use (p. 11). The studies here go a long way toward redressing that imbalance: Along with CK&S's lucid and cogent account of an interactional perspective on prosody, and how such a perspective might resolve many of the difficulties associated with traditional prosodic analysis (Chap. 1), they demonstrate forcibly the significant contribution that a prosodic perspective might make to the study of talk-in-interaction.

We see throughout this collection that a theoretically grounded interactional approach can reveal features of prosody that intersect systematically with other linguistic components in the construction of activities and the production of meaning in conversation. The value of the collection lies not only in the particular substantive findings of each of the studies, but also in the model they offer of a methodology for future research into the role of prosody in conversational organization.

The volume coheres around the following theme (25):

> ... prosody can be seen as one of the orderly "details" of interaction, a resource which interlocutors rely on to accomplish social action and as a means of steering inferential processes. Prosodic features ... can be reconstructed as MEMBERS' DEVICES, designed for the organization and management of talk in social interaction. They can be shown to function as part of the signalling system which – together with syntax, lexico-semantics, kinesics, and other contextualizing cues – is used to construct and interpret turn-constructional units and turns-at-talk.

It is apparent from this quotation that the studies here adopt an approach that blends conversation analysis, as pioneered by Harvey Sacks, with contextualization theory, deriving from the work of John Gumperz. Thus prosody is treated in terms of the sequential context of turns in which particular prosodic cues are mobilized; and prosodic features are regarded as combining with lexico-syntactic features of turn design to cue the appropriate inferential context within which one can interpret what is being said.

These perspectives articulate together in this volume in the way each study explores the INTERACTIONAL SALIENCE of prosodic cues. The studies range across such contextual domains as "ordinary" conversation, radio phone-in programs, adults "instructing" children in picture-labeling, interaction in an airline opera-

tions room, and informal interviews – across languages including English, German, and Italian. In their respective essays, the authors explore the roles of specific prosodic features of a turn in relation to (i) prosodic features of the co-participant's prior turn(s), and (ii) their interactional uptake or consequence – in terms of the next speaker's understanding of what the speaker meant, or what action he or she is interpreted as doing.

The methodology through which contributors to the volume explore the interactional salience of prosodic cues involves distinguishing phonetic variations of the same or similar tokens or language forms (including such syntactic and sequential objects as continuations and repetitions) – as well as looking for whether there are systematic relations between these variations and the responses by next speakers. This is nicely captured in Selting's summary of her methodology:

> I shall present data in which similar initiations of repair in an unmarked and a marked version are treated as different activity types by recipients. This differential treatment of utterances which, aside from prosodic marking, are otherwise alike will warrant my analysis and serve as evidence for the interactive relevance of prosodic marking. (240).

A similar comparative approach to exploring the sequential or interactional consequences of a prosodic-variations approach is clearly and elegantly exemplified by each chapter in this collection.

This approach consists of a number of stages or forms, often used in combination in individual chapters. In some studies, prosodic features of a turn are compared with those of the prior turn, in order to investigate resemblances or correspondences (or alternatively, dimensions of contrast) between them – and thereby to demonstrate modes of recipiency. For instance, in cases where one speaker REPEATS all or some of a co-participant's prior turn, comparisons are made between the two speakers' (absolute and relative) pitch register and contour, intonation, accenting and stress, rhythm, speech rate, loudness, and a great variety of other aspects of phonation, including any overlap or measurable delay between the two turns. Such comparisons reveal ways in which the repeats may be designed prosodically to "stage" (or dramatically highlight) the prior turn, to mimic it, to indicate that the prior turn is accepted – or alternatively that it is in need of repair – or to express surprise at what the other has said, and so on. (Cf. the chapters by Selting, by Couper-Kuhlen, by Clare Tarplee, and by Marjorie Harkness Goodwin.) But such comparisons only begin to suggest such functions of repeats, or the activities being conducted through them. The next stage is to show that the ways repeats are responded to by recipients (i.e. the speakers whose initial turns have been repeated) manifest recipients' understandings of what prior speakers are doing/implying. That is, they show specifically how differences in understanding a repeat – e.g. as between "staging" or "mimicking," in Couper-Kuhlen's analysis, or between "accepting" and "initiating repair" on the prior turn, in Tarplee's – are systematically contingent on specific prosodic cues.

The methodological strategy at the heart of these studies is comparative. This may involve comparing prosodic features of linguistic items/turns that are otherwise similar or identical in lexico-syntactic construction, as well as relating observed prosodic differences to their sequential uptake or understanding by next speaker. An example is John Local's analysis of the different phonetic and prosodic realizations of the token *Oh*, produced in response to being told some news; these differences are shown to be related systematically to whether the production of an *Oh*-response terminates a news-telling, or instead pursues or encourages further telling. This approach also plays a part in the studies by Susanne Günthner, by Goodwin, and by Selting; thus Selting's chapter begins with some particularly clear examples showing how participants systematically orient differently to different prosodic versions of the same token.

Alternatively, comparisons are made between the different prosodic articulations of expressions that, although not identical, are members of the same type or class of turn (often sequentially similar turns), such as continuations, affiliations, acknowledgements, repeats, repair initiations, or informings. (Almost all the chapters involve some version of this approach, but notable examples are the studies by Peter Auer, Frank Ernst Müller, Susanne Uhmann, Couper-Kuhlen, and Tarplee).

Finally, many of these studies explore the ways that differently selected prosodic features are systematically interconnected with lexico-syntactic features of turn design – once again, relating these to variations in interactional or sequential uptake. A particularly clear and interesting example is Auer's study of how intonation contours associated with expansions beyond possible (syntactic) turn-completion points are systematically associated with the projection of turn completion (and transition); this analysis adds a subtle but significant dimension to our understanding of turn-taking processes in conversation (as does the chapter by Bill Wells & Sue Peppé). Other chapters that explore connections between prosodic cues and lexico-syntactic features of turn design include those by Local (e.g. pp. 204–206), Günthner, and Goodwin.

Quite apart from the high standard, rigor, and cogency of every study included, the real force of the volume as a whole derives from the coherence with which it demonstrates the interactional salience of prosodic features, through investigating how next-speakers' responses are systematically related to prosodic variations. It is beginning to be clear that, in the study of spoken interaction at least, the analysis of a single component of linguistic production, such as turn design, cannot be separated from other components without the possibility of obscuring important dimensions of organization.

This is a compelling, innovative, and outstandingly well-edited collection; it deserves to be read not only by those interested in all aspects of prosody, but also by those studying conversation (from whatever perspective) and other forms of language use in interaction. The message of this collection is that the study of conversation should take greater account of prosodic features of turn design – and

that here, as elsewhere, important connections are being made between the analysis of conversation and core areas in linguistics.

<div style="text-align:right">(Received 18 September 1997)</div>

ELIZABETH TONKIN, *Narrating our pasts: The social construction of oral history*. (Cambridge studies in oral and literate culture, 22.) Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992. Pp. xiv, 171. [Pb reprint, 1995; $16.95.]

<div style="text-align:right">Reviewed by ROBERT CANCEL
Dept. of Literature
University of California, San Diego
La Jolla, CA 92093
rcancel@ucsd.edu</div>

Tonkin treats a complex and timely set of ideas when she studies the relationships between oracy and literacy, oral narrative performance and written texts, memory and history and society. To discuss these areas of scholarly debate, she employs a multidisciplinary, sometimes contentious variety of studies and assertions. Her efforts mostly succeed in promoting her claims for the necessity of blurring past distinctions and categories in the study of oral history, and for taking a much more performative/interactive view of its construction in a living context.

  Moving effectively between theory and concrete examples, Tonkin supplies an informative and helpful introduction which sets the basic premises and debates to be covered:

> I argue that different disciplines must together be brought to bear on phenomena which are themselves multivocal and capable of being used in different ways, if we are to understand some crucial features of ourselves. This understanding in turn throws light on specific genres which can be labelled "oral history" as well as topics like the status of anthropological enquiry, the achievements of oral art, the construction of identity, self-awareness, and the nature of socialisation ... (16)

Tonkin sets up this ambitious project in an excellent, detailed first chapter which focuses on the Jlao people, living in "a small community in Liberia," who speak a dialect of the Kru language. After providing a brief but thorough sketch of the area's history, she presents examples of the ways that several speakers talk about themselves and about history of recent memory. Examining individual lives, social position, the complex contexts of oral narration/performance, the shaping of genres, and the role of memory or recall, she uses her Jlao subjects to initiate the intricate theoretical explorations of the rest of the book. The chapter is singularly successful in its evocation of a place and the people who shape its characteristics – past, present, and future – through their words and deeds.

Chaps. 2–4 cover crucial ideas concerning narrators, the creation of identities, the role of the subject in oral performance, notions of genre, and the designation of temporality in both social and linguistic structures. One of the key assertions in these chapters delineates the dynamic relationship between narrators and their audiences. This includes the establishment or elaboration of the teller's "authority" by the use of language or social status, as well as the kinds of claims the speakers can or choose to make. At even more complex levels of interaction, we find the notion of "truth" as it applies to what the speaker is proclaiming, and to how it is discussed by the listeners. Performers come to their narrations from different angles, in part on the basis of their style of speaking or choice of genre, but also of their social status and past reception by their audiences.

Two more concerns developed in these chapters are (a) the notions of the "self" or individual, and (b) the perception and uses of various genres. These ideas are set out in a nuanced discussion which moves from concerns of current reflexive ethnographic approaches to social and literary theorizing on memory and identity. Tonkin stresses the complex interactions of time, memory, society, the individual, and conceptions of the past as they intersect in several genres – such as history, lifestory, autobiography, reminiscence, and epic narration. Describing genres as "patterned expectancy," she uses literary ideas on the "dialogic" to emphasize the similarities of written and oral literatures. She also points to some crucial differences in these "texts": "As in literary genres, cues of form and style are much more important than cues of occasion, so in oral ones occasion is much more likely to be significant than form and style" (53). As the complex elements of genre and performance are carefully set out, so too are the notions and uses of temporalities within specific cultures and languages.

Tonkin's study is at its most assertive and combative when she treats questions of oral history's "accuracy" and chronological potential. This argument runs through Chaps. 5–7, to the end of the book. Tonkin interrogates notions of objectivity and subjectivity in oral narration first by looking at materialist approaches to history and concurrently examining premises of oral historians, in particular the seminal work of Jan Vansina. The material representations of the past are both physical, as in archeological artifacts, and cultural, as in linguistic, ritual, and social traces. Clues to the past are important in material terms: The serendipitous qualities of fleeting moments of individual assertion are overridden in favor of broader, older evidence of the "way things actually were." Tonkin also cites Vansina's distinction between oral reminiscence and oral tradition, the latter being defined as "the transmission of oral messages, at least a generation old." Using this methodology, historians look for recurring elements of fact or event in a number of accounts, particularly across generations; they then strip the narrations of assertions or recollections that are not corroborated over time but also based on their accounts.

In contrast, Tonkin emphasizes the social imperative to make and remake individual self-perceptions – as well as the wider phenomenon of creating histories,

"representations of pastness," the rough active and dynamic interactions in performance. She moves among oral historians, ethnographers, literary thinkers, and cognitive scientists. On one level, Tonkin asserts that making history is a form of cognition and creativity that characterizes both individual and social practice, or even praxis. This method of evaluation "permits us to situate people in time and change, in history. They become subjects and agents in the different senses of these words, able in different degrees to achieve action, and to be acted on" (106). By looking at the complex ways in which people create their past, present, and future, Tonkin articulates the presence and importance of symbols, allusions, and metaphors in various genres of discourse, particularly historical narrative and personal reminiscence. One of her central claims is that oral historians have heretofore been looking too literally at this material, and perhaps extrapolating too simplistically from it.

I find this study to be compelling in its main points. Having spent most of my scholarly time collecting and analyzing imaginative oral narrative performance, I identify closely with Tonkin's description of the Jlao society's oral art forms, and also with her notions of how personal and social identity is wrapped up in the multi-leveled processes of oral performance. Her work on memory, cognition, and constructions of the subject add a much-needed dimension to the work of literary and social science studies. The contesting of rather narrow theories of oral history is also effective, although at times not only Vansina, but also notions of what some scholars feel history IS, seem to be taken out of context.

Sometimes the oral historian is looking for information that may not directly apply to or reflect a wider scheme of social and individual interaction. For example, is a genealogical list of the same importance to a narrator in the present as it is to a historian looking for clues to a dynastic past? Obviously, one of Tonkin's points is that contemporary historical narration is intricately, complexly linked to the present. The representations of pastness are therefore an amalgam of things handed down, along with what those in the present choose or need to do with them. But a historian might easily be looking for clues to another interpretation of the past – not only the past of the society in question, but that of neighbors or groups with whom they used to interact, but do so no longer. In the same manner, linguists or archaeologists might be looking for a different order or level of information than the contemporary cultural scholar does.

A minor point concerning Vansina is, I think, simply outdated. Tonkin claims he is a "structuralist" in the way he looks at social systems and oral traditions; but his work over the past twenty years has moved away from strict adherence to that school of thought. Tonkin notes but partially dismisses some of Vansina's later efforts to revise his earlier ideas. His recent book on the "history" of African history as a discipline, *Living with Africa* (University of Wisconsin Press, 1994) revisits and re-evaluates some of his earlier thinking in this field of study; in the process, he adds a heavily autobiographic dimension, which relates to some of Tonkin's points about the assertion of self in oral history.

My sense of Tonkin's findings is not that these other approaches are necessarily wrong, but that they are often too narrow, being built on misconceptions about the nature of memory, oral performance, and dynamic social processes. In the framework she presents here, I must agree with Tonkin's claims; but I would emphasize that there are other frames that can be just as informative, when judiciously applied.

(Received 10 October 1997)

VAI RAMANATHAN, *Alzheimer discourse: Some sociolinguistic dimensions*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 1997. Pp. x, 138. Hb $36.00, pb $18.00.

Reviewed by RUTH LESSER
Dept. of Speech, University of Newcastle
Newcastle upon Tyne NE1 7RU, England
ruth.lesser@newcastle.ac.uk

Until the last few years, linguists' interest in the language of the neurologically impaired has been primarily from two orientations: psycholinguistic and neurolinguistic. The former has applied theories concerning the mental processing of language, using acquired language disorders as a test bed for exploring and expanding these theories. The latter attempts to correlate language (disordered or not) with functional lesion sites in the brain; it has recently received a major boost from the technical developments of functional brain imaging, but its main theoretical base remains that of psycholinguistic processing.

The past decade has seen an upsurge of interest in applying some dimensions drawn from sociolinguistics, particularly the techniques of ethnomethodology, to the study of developmental and acquired language disorders. This has flowered particularly in the study of aphasia – language disorders acquired relatively suddenly from stroke or other brain damage. The units of analysis have been extended from the phonemes, lexemes, and sentences favored by the psycholinguistic orientation to the levels of discourse and conversation. The latter in particular introduces the element of interaction, absent in the psycholinguistic approach. The impact of this new development has been so great that the analysis of conversations between aphasic people and their partners is becoming an important part of the resources on which many speech and language therapists draw to guide their interventions.

It has taken longer to apply this extension to the language of dementia. A pioneering work in this field is that of Hamilton's (1994) report on her conversations with a woman with Alzheimer disease (AD) over the latter's declining years. Ramanathan's book follows this paradigm; however, its emphasis is not primarily on conversational analysis, but rather on analysis of individuals' narratives of their life stories, as prompted by an interlocutor. The book focuses on

two individuals in different settings (with data from 14 others used for quantitative comparisons).

One patient, Tina, gave up her job as a teacher when she began experiencing confusion and disorientation; she was diagnosed as having mild to moderate AD. She began to attend a well-run day center and was assisted by a supportive husband. The other patient, Ellie, had a more checkered history, including running away from a hostile stepmother when she was fourteen, and having several relationships with men. The day center she attended was in a run-down part of town, and relied on aides who concentrated on the attendees' basic needs rather than on communicative interactions. Ramanathan twice recorded Ellie telling her life history at this day center, the second occasion being a year and a half later, when she was considered to have deteriorated significantly. With Tina the comparison was not longitudinal, but rather across settings and audiences: She was recorded with Ramanathan at home, in the day center, and with her husband at home.

New work of this kind requires a search for appropriate methods of analysis. For her micro-analysis of Tina's recordings, Ramanathan has used the notions of WELLFORMEDNESS, determined by divisibility into stanzas and by (dis)continuity elements – and, rather less successfully, the psychologists' distinctions between RECALL and RECOGNITION, as well as the study of REPAIRS extrapolated in a rather unusual way from conversation analysis. Tina's narratives are considered well-formed when they can be analyzed as a series of stanzas, in which each new stanza takes up a new perspective or introduces new information linked to the primary theme. The stanzas may be connected through continuity elements supplied by both Tina and the researcher, such as formulations which indicate that the listener has a grasp of what the speaker has just said. A marked difference was found between Tina's conversations with the researcher and with her husband at home, and between the conversation with the researcher at home and that at the day center. At the latter location, Tina was more distractable, required more prompting, and produced narratives that were more egocentric or did not lend themselves to segmentation into coherent stanzas. There were also extended pauses (of three or more seconds) during which Tina seemed to expect her listener to take the floor, but she resumed her turn when this opportunity was not taken. These pauses occurred three times more often at the day center than at home. Ramanathan does not tell us which recording (at home or at the center) was made first; and she does not discuss the influence of familiarity, rather than setting, on this contrast between predominantly well-formed narratives and predominantly ill-formed ones.

However, she does discuss the contrast between the home conversations with the husband and with the researcher. The husband clearly has an agenda: to get Tina to rehearse certain information about her life history. This results in a series of questions and prompts, with brief responses from Tina, which are not extended enough to be analyzed into stanzas. The difference in familiarity between the two

listeners recorded at home means that Tina becomes engaged in a process of recognition from her husband's prompts – rather than in recall, as with the researcher. Even when Tina attempts to talk to her husband about new events, he still contextualizes the information in his previous knowledge of her activities, and takes over the floor again. Ramanathan describes this as the husband's persistently engaging in "repair," using this term to describe his bringing Tina back to the expected factual information (rather than in the sense in which the term is generally used in conversation micro-analysis). The contrast between the two interlocutors (although in the same setting) is one that many readers will recognize. The familiar partner is concerned with getting the impaired speaker to convey correct information about her life history, at the cost of allowing her time to establish her own versions of events. Perhaps this is in response to the need to keep the AD person anchored in reality, a need that is less pressing for the less intimately engaged interlocutor.

For Ellie's repeated recordings, where the intention is to show longitudinal changes, Ramanathan uses a different form of analysis. She focuses on SCHE-MATA: units of autobiographical events which become closed chunks of information through their frequent retelling, and which incorporate bound links. In Ellie's first recording, for example, her move to California has become strongly associated with her sister's death and the jobs they both held. After she has deteriorated, although Ellie is no longer able to produce narratives, occasional utterances indicate that she has retained some of these schemata, particularly those concerned with her feelings of rejection and rootlessness. By this time her speech is characterized by minimal turns, repetitions, and undeveloped topics; but she is able to reveal a consistency of reactions to her life experiences. The repetitions can therefore be viewed "not as segments that contribute to meaninglessness in the patients' discourse, but as segments that capture, albeit in frozen ways, the teller's attempts at making sense of his or her own life" (115).

Ramanathan's methodologies thus lead to considerable insights into the nature of discourse in AD. The contrasts found between location, interlocutors, and times rest on single studies, since the other patients studied were recorded only once. Nevertheless, most language clinicians used to working with aphasic or demented people will recognize the ring of truth in Ramanathan's observations, and they may be motivated to repeat her methods with their own patients. In addition, Ramanathan has succinctly described some interventionist strategies that reinforce recommendations in the literature on communication in dementia. These emphasize developing listening skills in caregivers, learning to ask open-ended questions, monitoring one's own use of continuity and discontinuity elements, encouraging patients to recall parts of their life experiences, and avoiding cultivation of learned helplessness.

The dependence of language on context, whether of setting or of interlocutors, is well illustrated in this sensitively written book. It is to be recommended to

linguists and clinical linguists interested in the insights on the human condition that can be obtained by analyzing the language of the cognitively impaired.

REFERENCES

Hamilton, Heidi (1994). *Conversations with an Alzheimer patient*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.
Ramanathan, Vai (1994). Interactional differences in Alzheimer's discourse: An examination of AD speech across two audiences. *Language in Society* 23:31–58.

(Received 26 November 1997)

HAROLD SCHIFFMAN, *Linguistic culture and language policy*. (The politics of language.) London: Routledge, 1996. Pp. xii, 351.

Reviewed by ROLAND J.-L. BRETON
28, Les Figueras
F-13770 Venelles, France
atila@aix.pacwan.net

This is an important contribution to the growing debate about the close links of polities to LANGUAGE, which is the innermost component of a nation and its culture, and the main support of the latter. Thus the book will be highly attractive to anyone interested in sociolinguistics and nation-building. It contains four parts: a general reflection on how language policy and linguistic culture have been perceived by scholars up to now, followed by studies of three national situations where these problems have been faced – France, India, and the US – with emphasis in each country on an important regional case (Alsace, Tamil Nadu, and California). Schiffman is able to speak about each case through personal experience of living and working on the spot.

Although Schiffman is far from following the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis of linguistic determinism, he nevertheless stresses the predominant role of language as the support of culture: "The whole complex we are referring to as LINGUISTIC CULTURE, which is the sum totality of ideas, values, beliefs, attitudes, prejudices, religious structures, and all the other 'baggage' that speakers bring to their dealings with language from their background" (276). Taking this viewpoint, the whole book points out the central place of language policy for any polity eager, as they all are, to implement and reinforce nation-building, whether these language policies are OVERT (as a few are) or COVERT (as most are). In fact, a state without a language policy is as impossible to find as a society without language prescriptions and taboos. Schiffman notes that "many researchers (and policy-makers) believe or have taken at face value the overt and explicit formulation of and statements about the status of linguistic varieties, and ignore what actually happens down on the ground, in the field, at the grassroot level" (13).

Schiffman's meticulous and cautious inquiry through the chosen national and regional examples puts in evidence the strong parallelism of differences between what is formally exposed through legal status, and what occurs daily and constantly. France is the extreme case of the identification of nation with language for more than four centuries, where "language makes the nation" (105); and it is in France that LINGUISTIC TERROR (136; an expression coined by the main French historian of the French language) reached German-speaking Alsace, like other borderlands, and succeeded in establishing, at three distinct periods, the un-rivaled paramountcy of French.

Schiffman is rather severe about the contemporary language policy of India, which he calls a mere "importation of the Soviet language policy model," the source of a "fatal error" with "disastrous consequences." However, although the USSR exploded, India still survives – a unique nation, though multilingual as few are (whereas there never was a real Soviet nation). In fact, a certain failure in the promotion of Hindi – resulting both from the hostility of Hindi chauvinists to-ward Gandhi's ideal of Hindustani, and from resistance by speakers of other languages – may have been challenged and balanced, according to Schiffman, by India's long experience of multilingualism, diglossia, and oral transmission. These factors reveal the limits of the Tamil search for Tamilness (*tanmai*) and Tamil uniqueness (*tanit tamir̠*) in a society where multiplicity is a basic value.

Schiffman's analysis of American "masked policy" contradicts the claim that the US has, or had, no official policy in language matters; such a claim "totally ignores the very strong IMPLICIT policy with regard to the ENGLISH language (and other languages) that is obvious to any casual observer" (211). Despite the claims of the current "English Only," "US English," or "English First" movements, Schiff-man makes the following observation:

> The COVERT language policy of the United States is not neutral, it FAVORS the English language. No statute or constitutional amendment or regulatory law is necessary to maintain this covert policy – its strength lies in the basic assump-tions that American society has about language. These basic assumptions range from simple communicative competence in English to deeply held prejudices, attitudes, biases (often supported by religious belief), and other "understand-ings" that constitute what I call American linguistic culture, which is the locus of covert policy in this (or any) polity. (213)

Schiffman shows that there has been a long history of convergent behavior, in-volving Native American languages (spoken by peoples who were constantly cheated by blatant disregard of treaties), African languages (whose speakers were separated so they would not be able to communicate), and settlers from the Eu-ropean continent (who met little and short-lived tolerance, with immigrant paro-chial schools denounced by "nativist" elements of the "Know-Nothing" party). This constant tendency seems to have reached its peak during World War I, when decisions by state Councils of Defense instituted a ban "on languages other than

English (aimed at German) in schools, churches, on the telephone, in the press, etc." (233), with examples of people fined in Ohio for use of German on the streets (or, in Iowa, on the telephone) (314). Although the first constitution of the state of Louisiana had guaranteed rights to French, after secession that tolerance vanished: "Here the metaphor of English as a steam-roller seems apt, as American linguistic culture overwhelmed and overpowered languages in the rush to the Pacific" (235). This trend reached such a point that the Supreme Court, in 1923, struck down Ohio and Iowa laws and ruled that "forbidding teaching languages other than English until the eighth grade violated the 14th amendment." As Schiffman remarks, this meant that "language rights were individually protected, but, as [Heinz] Kloss notes, only for adults. Children do not have a right to language maintenance, only second-language learning. And it is a PERSONAL right, not a right of a group or a group confined to a TERRITORY" (237). Here we arrive at the crucial question of the various levels of multilingualism admitted in any society, as underlined by Kloss (the father of ethnopolitics, and an expert analyst of American language policy, among many others): personal access of adults to other languages, personal access of children to second-language education, personal access to a heritage language for the purpose of maintenance, personal access to public facilities in other languages, the collective rights of a group to maintenance of its own language, and finally, territorial establishment of a language in the native area of a population (either jointly with a superordinate official language, or not). These are various levels of guarantee that could be provided by a language policy.

In this respect, India (among very few countries) reaches the top level, and various provinces and communities of Canada reach some intermediate stage; but France and the US remain at lower ones. Even to reach these levels, America needed, besides the rise of ethnic awareness in the 1960s, the challenge of Sputnik: "This prompted investigations into the Soviet educational system. It was discovered that, lo and behold, the Soviets spent a lot of time learning languages. Congress then passed the National Defense Education Act (1958), which appropriated money for the study of specific areas of the world ('Area studies')" (239). But now, four decades later, those programs are forgotten, and the money is used elsewhere.

The case of California sheds light on the whole matter of language rights. Neither the Indian inhabitants nor the Spanish Californios, both submerged by the Anglo-Americans of the Gold Rush, ever retained any more than residual linguistic rights: "By 1879, when a new State Constitution was written, tolerance was almost gone" (268). Only since the Civil Rights Act of 1964 has some attention has been given to remedy linguistic inequity; but the 1986 California referendum on language, known as Proposition 63 (two years before similar activity in Florida and Colorado), brought a spectacular slowdown to this process (even though its "net result and the visible impact seem to be minimal"; 272). Schiffman's summation is that, in this state, "Language policy has been a hyper-acute

version of Anglo-American policy – just as California is just like the rest of the country, only more so" (274).

From a wider viewpoint, the conclusion seems to be: "In the USA we are presented with perhaps the murkiest of language policies" (278). If we ask why, the answer is this (279):

> The attempts to treat language rights as a civil rights issue, or as a freedom of speech issue, or any of the other rights protected explicitly in the US Constitution and the Bill of Rights have been consistently rebuffed. Simultaneously, the courts have not allowed laws to be passed that single out any particular GROUP, whether it be religious, linguistic or ethnic, for exclusionary or punitive actions.... Education and most of the other areas where linguistic rights are demanded remain non-federal rights: states and other jurisdictions are therefore free to pass legislation of various sorts, so long as it does not single out specific groups, and deny them their constitutional rights.... Language rights are not among those guaranteed explicitly in the original Constitution, because no linguistic group came to America for linguistic freedom.

The fact is that linguistic rights can ONLY be collective rights.

(Received 15 September 1997)

MICHAEL CLYNE (ed.), *Undoing and redoing corpus planning*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1997. Pp. viii, 520.

Reviewed by KINGSLEY BOLTON
English Department, University of Hong Kong
Pokfulam Road, Hong Kong
hraeklb@hkucc.hku.hk

Clyne has shown great skill in compiling and editing this volume; it contains a wealth of information on language planning and language policies, and will be widely cited in the future. The book contains fourteen case studies, apparently specially commissioned, on corpus language planning from a wide range of societies in a number of global regions: Southeast and East Asia (China, the Philippines, Vietnam), Western Europe (Belgium, Germany, Norway), Eastern Europe (Hungary, Moldavia, Ukraine), the Balkans (the former Yugoslavia), the Middle East (Turkey, Israel, Jordan), Southern Africa (South Africa), and Central America (Nicaragua), as well as the Jewish diaspora (in the case of Yiddish).

In his introductory chapter, Clyne informs us that "the term CORPUS PLANNING was devised by Kloss 1969 to denote changes by deliberate planning to the actual corpus or shape of a language" (p. 1). The term can thus apply to such language-planning processes as "standardization, codification of morphology and spelling, the development of specialized vocabulary, the creation of a new alphabet, and the imposition of certain terms propagating particular attitudes to some groups of people". UNDOING CORPUS PLANNING refers to "relaxing" previously imposed

controls on language, and REDOING CORPUS PLANNING refers to the adoption of new changes to languages. As Clyne points out, most of the present studies "relate to the issue of who owns the language" (3). The overtly political nature of language planning is highlighted by his admission that "corpus planning and replanning are generally motivated by political change" and that the volume includes "contributions on the world's political trouble spots or former arenas of conflict" (498). Many of these areas are troubled by issues of ethnic nationalism, racial and religious hatred, class conflict, war, and genocide. Indeed, the links between language planning and ethnic nationalism existed as early as the 1930s and 1940s, when Heinz Kloss was head of a Third Reich "publications office" on language and ethnicity. During this period, Kloss was an apologist for a number of Hitler's cultural policies (Hutton & Joseph 1998), and was also concerned with the position of overseas Germans in Europe and the US, whom he saw as threatened by the possibility of assimilation (Hutton 1999).

The Asian contributions in this collection are, for the most part, rather low-key. S. M. Lee-Wong's discussion of Chinese address forms focuses on the populist move in post-Mao China away from the use of *tongzhi* 'comrade' as an address form. Andrew Gonzalez's contribution, as detailed and solid as ever in the context of Philippine linguistics, traces the evolution of the national language of the Philippines through its various stages from the 1950s to the present. More clearly problematic is Nguyen Xuan Thu's chapter on "The reconvergence of Vietnamese", which discusses the role of the language planner in the following terms (160):

> In time of war ... all means to reach a given end, including corpus planning in language used as propaganda tools, may be accepted as good. However, in the post-war period, corpus planners should ... correct their past language strategies to manage their language problems properly, ... to cement any damage caused by their previous corpus planning, and ... to look seriously at issues in language planning such as alphabetization, standardization, codification, modernization ... in an attempt to consolidate their corpus planning and to enlarge the people's vision of language in the coming decades of the 21st century as well as ... to enrich their hearts and minds.

What is suggested here is that corpus language planners come in two types: Type One is the STATE PROPAGANDIST, ready to bend the truth or even do "damage" if required to "do his bit" for the war effort; Type Two is the CONCERNED LINGUIST, able to apply his expertise to the knotty problems of language planning. One may be skeptical of Nguyen's assertion that language planners can play both roles simultaneously, even in the service of totalitarian regimes, but his willingness to at least discuss the issue deserves our praise. This central dilemma is ignored in certain chapters of the book, and on occasion the reader is left wondering which role, "state propagandist" or "concerned linguist", the authorial voice is intended to represent.

In many chapters, the voice of the concerned linguist largely prevails. Kas Deprez surveys the history of the Flemish language movement in Belgium; from Norway, Ernst Håkon Jahr discusses the failure of the *Samnorsk* (pan-Norwegian) movement to unite the two standards of Bokmål and Nynorsk; and Clyne discusses the recent sociolinguistic effects of German reunification. The three chapters on the Ukraine (by Alexander Krouglov), Moldavia (by Miklós Kontra), and Hungary (by Marcu Gabinschi) share a common theme – one that parallels developments in Germany: the de-russification of languages that were once part of the Soviet sphere of influence. In such cases, where the politically constructed Newspeak of Communist regimes has been replaced by freer patterns of language use, the concerned linguist will applaud. But these are not the only good causes that have been advanced by the recent "undoing" and "redoing" of corpus planning, as shown by Dirk J. Van Schalkwyk's chapter on eradicating racism in Afrikaans.

In a number of the other chapters, questions of conflict and war dominate. Ran HaCohen presents a refreshingly non-nationalistic and entirely credible view of recent Israeli linguistic politics; he begins by identifying "the inherent link between the Jewish-Arab conflict and modern Hebrew" (390), then goes on to discuss the public discourses of "us" and "them", "armed conflict" and "occupation" (390–98). A paper on a similar theme by two Jordanian sociolinguists, Hassan R. S. Abd-el-Jawad and Fawwaz Al-Abed Al-Haq, reveals a distinct lack of distance between their position and that of HaCohen, but both chapters express great skepticism about the current peace process.

The chapter that caused me most concern was the contribution by Radoslav Katičić on "Undoing a 'unified language': Bosnian, Serbian, Croatian." Katičić's blunt view is "that 'Serbo-Croatian', in spite of steadfastly maintained opinions to the contrary, never was a 'unified language' " (179), and that " 'Bosnian', 'Croatian' and 'Serbian' did not come into being in our days. They have been in existence for centuries now" (190).

Given the thrust of many earlier accounts of the sociolinguistic situation in the former Yugoslavia, this appears to be a lop-sided view at best. Before the disintegration of Yugoslavia and the establishment of three distinct languages, two main varieties of Serbo-Croat were usually identified: the western variety, associated with the Croats and written in the Latin alphabet, and the eastern variety, associated with the Serbs and written in the Cyrillic alphabet. According to Corbett (1987:396),

[while] considerable differences exist, most of them are not absolute but are a matter of frequency of usage … The whole question of the status of the two varieties is very sensitive, because of the cultural and political implications. To the outside linguist, the numerous shared features between the two varieties, added to the ease of mutual comprehension, suggest one language with two varieties, and many Yugoslavs concur.

(See also Trudgill 1974:61). Levinger 1994 reports that civil war in Bosnia-Herzegovina in the early 1990s was accompanied, if not preceded, by linguistic differentiation and conflict:

> Ethnic groups started using " languages" (or rather lexemes) which had not been in use in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and even began reviving archaic words which had not been used for some time even in those geographical regions with a majority of a particular ethnic group. (1994:232)

Levinger then argues (ibid.) that "insistence on the use of these separate 'purified' languages was the first instance of 'cleansing' which will unfortunately progress into a drastic, anti-human form of dealing with people of 'other' ethnic origin."

The side of the story to which Corbett and Levinger point is not one that Katičić gives much space to, other than to note:

> all statements here are based on experiences in Croatia ... acceptance of the new state of language policy there corresponds strictly to the acceptance of the independent Republic of Croatia. Only the small minority of the population who do not accept the Croatian state also refuses to accept its language policy ... by making biting and frustrated jokes at the expense of those who overdo the Croatian stylization of their language, by complaining of a pressure to change their language and to adopt an "invented" one. (188)

Having thus expressed an avowedly Croatian perspective, Katičić goes on (ibid.) to decry "the constant denigration of Croatian language attitudes by leftist journalists and other intellectuals in the western media." Clyne's editorial comments seem fully to endorse the Katičić view, even to the rejection of international opinion, commenting:

> the partisian position taken by many linguists all over the world in propagating Serbo-Croatian based on a preoccupation with historical and structural (morphosyntactic) considerations obstructed the recognition of Croatian and Serbian as autonomous languages. (492)

Clyne's endorsement here of what appears to be a propagandist viewpoint is perhaps only explicable by his concerned linguist's attachment to linguistic nationalism. He describes the role of the linguist in language planning as primarily assisting in producing the codex for languages "newly declared and/or defined for purposes of national unity and identity", adding that other issues about the wider responsibility of linguists (whether they actually contribute to the success of corpus planning, or help solve problems) are questions "this volume is not in a position to answer" (491).

Joshua Fishman has recently asserted:

> the terrible ethnocidal occurrences that now plague Serbs, Croatians and Bosnians, as well as the Eastern and Southern European refugees who have fled to

Germany, and Georgians, Armenians and Azeris, among others, are in no way by-products of language maintenance or even of self-determination strivings among ethnolinguistic aggregates (1995:313).

Perhaps; but as a number of the articles in this volume indicate, ethnolinguistic aggression often overlaps with ethnic and racist violence, which to date has claimed 200,000 victims in the former Yugoslavia (Danner 1977). Bogdan Denitch, writing as a sociologist and contemporary historian, laments the impact of ethnic nationalism in the Balkans, noting (1994:200) that "today Yugoslavia is effectively dead. However, it is not clear why a fight for separate states was more logical than a fight for a democratic, multiethnic confederation." As concerned sociolinguists, we may also ask why the cause of linguistic nationalism is often promoted as more logical or more "natural" than the options of multilingualism, diversity, hybridization, or even assimilation. But that would be the theme of a very different book, one that foregrounded a humanist perspective. Languages may just fade away; in the former Yugoslavia, people die.

REFERENCES

Corbett, Greville (1987). Serbo-Croat. In Bernard Comrie (ed.), *The world's major languages*, 391–409. London: Routledge; New York: Oxford University Press.

Danner, Mark (1997). America and the Bosnia genocide. *New York Review of Books* 44:19:55–65.

Denitch, Bogdan (1994). *Ethnic nationalism: The tragic death of Yugoslavia*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Fishman, Joshua A. (1995). Good conferences in a wicked world: On some worrisome problems in the study of language maintenance and language shift. In Willem Fase et al. (eds.), *The state of minority languages: International perspectives on survival and decline* (European studies on multilingualism, 5), 311–17. Lisse, Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger.

Hutton, Christopher (1999). *Linguistics and the Third Reich: Mother-tongue fascism and the science of language*. London: Routledge, to appear.

———, & Joseph, John Earl (1998). Back to Blavatsky: The impact of theosophy on modern linguistics. *Language and Communication* 18:181–204.

Kloss, Heinz (1969). *Research possibilities in group bilingualism*. Quebec: International Center for Research on Bilingualism.

Levinger, Jasna (1994). Language war – war language. *Language Sciences* 16:229–36.

(Received 11 January 1998)

DAVID CRYSTAL, *English as a global language*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997. Pp. x, 150. Hb $9.95.

Reviewed by ROLAND SUSSEX
Centre for Language Teaching and Research, University of Queensland
Brisbane, QLD 4072, Australia
sussex@lingua.cltr.uq.edu.au

The international march of English is one of the leading sociolinguistic phenomena of our times. There have been internationally dominant languages before – religious languages like Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, as well as Sanskrit and Koranic Arabic – and politico-cultural languages, often linked to the religious cultures

with which they propagate: Greek and Latin again, French, and (in the 20th century until the fall of Communism) Russian. In the last years of the 20th century English has established an unprecedentedly powerful position, which has even grown stronger since the more circumspect evaluation of its position by McCrum et al. 1986. The extent of its quantitative and qualitative domination of international geopolitics, science, commerce, communications, technology, politics, and consumer culture is evident in journals like *English Today*, *World Englishes*, and *English World-Wide*. What Crystal aims to do in this book is to capture the big picture, in focus and in perspective, and to assess where English really stands as we enter the 21st century.

The internationalization of a language is an uncommon phenomenon; we don't have precedents close enough to provide much of a guide. At the international level, the macro-factors which seem best to explain this process are social, political, and economic strength. English, as Crystal says, happened to have the right profile and tools for global domination: a lead in manufacturing and global markets which passed from Britain in the 19th century to the US in the 20th, sustained by the appropriate political and military might. It also happened to be in "the right place at the right time" (110) – whether this was indeed achieved by imperialism, or by other less aggressive means (Phillipson 1992, 1994, Kachru et al. 1993).

Given the complexity of contemporary institutions, the speed of change, and the momentous consequences of getting things wrong, there is an urgent need for reliable, cheap, and effective communications at many levels (Chap. 1, "Why a global language?"). In this context, English is available, established, and the least compromised of the possible contenders. But there are certainly dangers in opting for English: an imbalance of language power, complacency among the possessors and gatekeepers of English, and the predictable death of perhaps 80% of the world's languages over the next century.

Chap. 2, "Why English? The historical context," deals with the familiar details of exploration and colonization, in which language hegemony was neither a goal nor a means. The numbers are based on Kachru's (1985) model of the three circles of speakers of English: the Inner Circle (traditional first-language speakers in the UK, the US, Ireland, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand); the Outer Circle (50 countries where English is part of the institutions, including Singapore, India, and Malawi); and the Expanding Circle (countries like China, Japan, Greece, and Poland, which have recognized the importance of English in international interchange, and where English as a second language is making rapid strides). On a very conservative calculation, the Inner and Outer Circles together provide 337 million first-language and 235 million second-language speakers of English, though the latter figure is quite probably closer to 350 million. The Expanding Circle numbers are anything from 100 million to 1,000 million. At the most conservative estimate, we arrive at 670 million, but the likely figures are probably between 1.2 and 1.5 billion, clearly ahead of Chinese.

The cultural STEPS by which English established its current position (Chap. 3) include familiar figures like Wallis and Mulcaster; Daniel's *Musophilis* of 1599; Hume, John Adams, and the case for the English language academy in the USA; and prescient affirmations of English as the future world language from known figures like Grimm and Bismarck. This growing cultural presence, however, is based squarely on politics and on the might of the British Empire (passing to the US by 1945) in science and technology; in information and access to information; in printing, transport, and banking. In contrast, the cultural LEGACY (Chap. 4) sees English in the League of Nations, the UN, and hundreds of other international organizations where English is used by almost all participants, and by far more than any other language. English dominates in science and technology (Kaplan 1993); in printed media, including the press and advertising; in radio (internationally, through the BBC and the Voice of America); in television and motion pictures (85% American-dominated in 1995); in pop music (99% of the pop genres listed in the 1990 *Penguin encyclopaedia of popular music* work entirely or mainly in English); in international transportation and safety (Seaspeak and Airspeak); in communications and computing (80% of machine-readable information is in English); and on the Internet.

Chap. 5 ("The future of global English") looks ahead. English has withstood the backlash of post-colonialism fairly well. In those countries which have de-Anglified – like Tanzania, Kenya, and Malaysia – English has persisted in international and many internal affairs. In Malaysia and Sri Lanka, at least, English is making a comeback; and in South Africa it is perceived as an additional force for democratization (de Kadt 1993). A more equivocal phenomenon is the US English movement, which has tried to install English as an official language in the US, and has indeed succeeded in a number of states. The proposed Emerson, Roth, and King bills, and the Serrano "English Plus Resolution", have not been passed by the US Congress; but lively debate continues about perceived threats to the hegemony of English from Spanish and other languages, particularly as the relative percentages swing against English over the coming decades. The notion of English as a national unifying influence is a strong pillar of American thinking, and fears of ethnic Balkanization will continue to drive some political agendas.

Paradoxically, this is happening in the US at a time when international English is moving strongly ahead – but in new and diversifying ways. The majority of English speakers now are not L1 speakers, and ownership of English is now spread over many countries and cultures. We already have a virtually standard international written English, with some local variation (especially in regional creative literatures). If spoken English starts to diversify and fragment (Abbott 1985), then Crystal anticipates that what he calls WSSE (World Standard Spoken English) will homogenize the spoken variants for the purposes of international communication. There are already indications of this development, as diglossic

speakers switch from local to more widely comprehended varieties, according to context.

On the current evidence, English is unchallenged and unstoppable; as Crystal notes (20), quoting Sir Sridath Ramphal, "there is no retreat from English as the world language; no retreat from an English-speaking world." Some smaller languages will be knocked aside in the process, as an indirect result of the hegemony of English; this we all deplore. There will certainly be some jostling for position among the languages just behind English: French (Kibbee 1993), German, Spanish, Japanese, perhaps Hindi, and especially Chinese. Russian has retired from the fray, at least for the time being, and the former Warsaw Pact countries are learning English. Crystal doesn't address the question of the ease with which English supplanted Russian as the dominant L2, without debate and almost by default; but it would merit further study.

How this scenario will play itself out offers fascinating perspectives in the dynamics of international language. We have had international lingua francas before, but not ones that had shared ownership to the extent of English. How will the common English international standard evolve: bottom-up, as English itself has done, presumably with a dominant American flavor? Or top-down, with some regulation – and if so, by whom and how? How will regional and local varieties of English orient themselves towards WSSE, and how far will they be constrained and influenced by it? Scholars of international English will be living in interesting times.

Crystal's position is that the factors affecting the rise of English to its present unique international status are social, historical, political, economic, and military. He has less to say about cultural factors like ausbau, abstand, historicity, vitality, and prestige, which we customarily look for in descriptions of national languages and competing national varieties. One can also ask whether social, historical, economic, and military factors are necessary or sufficient conditions for the emergence of a world language, and whether the theoretical models which have been built in these domains can be applied to this field of applied sociolinguistics. If Crystal is right, English has already succeeded in a shut-out bid, and will be the only international language for the foreseeable future. And yet ...

In 500 years' time, will it be the case that everyone will automatically be introduced to English as soon as they are born (or, by then, very likely, as soon as they are conceived)? If this is part of a rich multilingual experience for our future newborns, this can only be a good thing. If it is by then the only language left to be learned, it will have been the greatest intellectual disaster that the planet has ever known. (139–40)

This book is vintage Crystal. It addresses not only a professional audience, but also non-experts on English or on language: a language-curious audience which

Crystal himself has cultivated, and indeed partly created, in his writings over the past three decades.

REFERENCES

Abbott, Gerry (1985). Nuclear English and unclear English. *Multilingua* 4:143–49.
de Kadt, Elizabeth (1993). Language, power, and emancipation in South Africa. *World Englishes* 12:157–68.
Kachru, Braj B. (1985). Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the outer circle. In Randolph Quirk & Henry Widdowson (eds.), *English in the world*, 11–30. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.
———, et al. (1993). Review symposium: Symposium on linguistic imperialism. *World Englishes* 12:335–73.
Kaplan, Robert (1993). The hegemony of English in science and technology. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 14:151–72.
Kibbee, Douglas A. (1993). World French takes on World English: Competing visions of national and international languages. *World Englishes* 12:209–21.
McCrum, Robert, et al. (1986). *The story of English*. London: Faber & Faber.
Phillipson, Robert (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.
——— (1994). English language spread policy. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 107:7–24.

(Received 27 February 1998)

MICHAEL HERRIMAN & BARBARA BURNABY (eds.), *Language policies in English-dominant countries: Six case studies*. (Language and education library, 10.) Clevedon (UK) & Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters, 1996. Pp. ix, 244. Hb £49.00, $99.00; pb £19.95, $39.95.

Reviewed by JAN BLOMMAERT
African Studies, University of Gent
B-9000 Gent, Belgium
ipra@uia.ua.ac.be

This book presents six useful and very informative papers on countries in which English either is the single dominant language or assumes the role of a major language alongside others. The first category of countries includes Australia (discussed by Michael Herriman), Britain (Linda Thompson et al.) and the US (Thomas Ricento). The latter category includes South Africa, now notable for its eleven-language policy (Stanley Ridge) and Canada (Barbara Burnaby), where French has become a major competitor in the sociolinguistic field. New Zealand (Richard Benton) takes a kind of middle position as a predominantly English-speaking country in which Maori has become an official language.

The merits of this book are largely documentary. The different authors provide copiously detailed accounts of the history of language and society in their countries, of major policy steps, and of crucial issues and areas of dispute in the domain of language and society. In that sense, the book fills a gap in documenting a topic that has often escaped the attention of students of language planning and

124

language policy: how language is being politicized in countries that are usually categorized as the core parts of the "English-speaking" world. Except for South Africa, on which a rich body of language-policy analyses exists (Webb 1995 provides useful references), and Canada, which has been the object of many studies on societal multilingualism (cf. Heller 1994), the other countries have largely escaped the attention of language-policy studies, which have been directed primarily at non-Western multilingual societies and at new states such as Israel and Singapore (see Blommaert 1996).

The authors all put "policy" in the forefront of their discussions. Even in those cases where a "real," official and codified language policy is lacking (e.g. Australia, Britain, and the US), forms of policy development are sought. In their introduction, Herriman & Burnaby underline the vagueness and flexibility of the concept of "policy" (3–5). Mostly, this search for "non-official" policy is focused on that point at which societal ideologies, political power, and symbolic instruments such as language converge, namely education. H&B explain the relevance of this bypass by stressing the (somewhat circular) observation that attention to language regimentation in the field of education may demonstrate that "the most effective means of changing the status of any language is to involve it in changes implemented within education, either as a practice or a policy" (4). Measures taken with respect to languages in education can therefore serve as a useful entrance to implicit or non-official language policies, for they reflect in many ways the politically inspired sociolinguistic landscaping in a country. Thus the various chapters take us from policy paper to policy paper (or in the US, from court case to court case), mostly on issues involving the rights of aboriginal or immigrant minorities to have their languages introduced (or confirmed) as having some status in education and other public fields.

The overall perspective adopted in the discussions in the book is that of language rights. H&B state their ambition as follows:

> If comprehensive study could result in a rationalised policy that protected language rights of all groups appropriately according to their situations, and if clear explanations could be provided for unequal provision of resources according to need, then it might be possible to persuade a larger proportion of the population that everyone is winning through the measures. (13)

It is stated repeatedly that multilingualism is an asset and that minorities have an intrinsic right to use their languages in the public domain, as part of a general strategy of equality and full participation, because "a great deal of language policy is not about language at all" (H&B, 13).

With this overall perspective in mind, readers will find something valuable in all the chapters. Ridge's essay on South Africa is an excellent summary of the language-planning debate in that country, and it offers a very perceptive comment on the questionable value of the concept of L1 in urban Africa, where many

children speak creolized variants. Hence, "Teaching such children through the medium of their standard L1 may have the same affective and psychological arguments adduced against it as against using English" (31). Ridge thus calls into question the complex pluralist philosophy that underlies current language planning in South Africa, in which eleven idealized and, it is assumed, internally homogeneous languages are accepted as the units of planning and elaboration. Herriman's discussion of Australia makes an elegant case in which developments in (implicit) language policy reflect more general political/ideological preferences (this is similar to the argument of Pauwels 1996), noting particularly the connection between language policies and real or projected/desired international politico-economic alliances. In Benton's survey of policy developments in New Zealand, a similar field of tension between various ideologies appears with regard to the status of Maori vs. English; Maori has acquired a superficial emblematic status as an expression of New Zealand's multicultural – or rather, exotic – national character (e.g. in the campaign to introduce the Maori greeting *kia ora* as the "national greeting"). The discussion of Thompson et al. on British language policies highlights the internal contradictions (again, reflections of political/ideological developments) between an awareness of the importance of multilingualism and a strong ideology of standard (RP) English. What strikes the observer in the case of Britain is the interplay between policy-makers and civil society, in which important impulses for innovation (e.g. in the field of anti-racist education) are being launched by "the field" rather than from above. Ricento's chapter on the US gives ample space to a discussion of current controversies about bilingual education, the status of minority languages, foreign-language education etc. He notes that, "rather than producing fully competent bilinguals, schools tend to undervalue the non-English languages of students, helping to perpetuate pervasive monolingualism" (149). Perhaps more than in the other countries, an ideology of monolingualism seems to be a feature of the US situation (see also Silverstein 1996) – despite the presence of huge numbers of immigrant and aboriginal minorities, and despite an active awareness of minority rights and a tradition of mobilization on their behalf. Burnaby's copious chapter on Canada concludes the volume with a picture of a politically sensitive and fragile sociolinguistic climate in which, once again, language politics follow the tracks of larger socio-economic and political evolutions.

It is clear that none of the authors adheres to a naïve idea of language as the only or most important key to social success, progress, or equality. On the contrary, they all emphasize the deep connection of language policies to wider political and economic tendencies. In the absence of a formal language policy, in which one could assume that the political principles underlying a sociolinguistic image would be spelled out in all clarity, these connections remain implicit and buried in assumptions about idealizations such as that of a free, democratic, and prosperous society.

REFERENCES

Blommaert, Jan (1996). Language planning as a discourse on language and society: The linguistic ideology of a scholarly tradition. *Language Problems & Language Planning* 20:199–222.

Heller, Monica (1994). *Crosswords: Language, education and ethnicity in French Ontario*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Pauwels, Anne (1996). Language policy and linguistic minorities in multicultural Australia: Current directions. In Jan Blommaert (ed.), *The politics of multilingualism and language planning*, 40–51. Antwerp: UIA-GER.

Silverstein, Michael (1996). Monoglot "standard" in America: Standardization and metaphors of linguistic hegemony. In Don Brenneis & Ronald S. Macaulay (eds.), *The matrix of language: Contemporary linguistic anthropology*, 284–306. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Webb, Victor (1995), ed. *Language in South Africa: An input into language planning for a post-apartheid South Africa*. Pretoria: LICCA South Africa.

(Received 19 September 1997)

PADRAIG Ó RIAGÁIN, *Language policy and social reproduction: Ireland 1893–1993*. (Oxford studies in language contact.) Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press, 1997. Pp. xi, 297. Hb £42.50, $80.00.

Reviewed by NANCY C. DORIAN
Depts. of German and Anthropology, Bryn Mawr College
Bryn Mawr, PA 19010
dorian@henry.bowdoin.edu

Ó Riagáin has produced the sort of book that many have wished for but doubted they would see: a scrupulously dispassionate, comprehensive account of Irish language fortunes since the late 19th century, and of Irish language policies and outcomes since independence in 1922. Reading his careful, low-key book, one could easily forget that he is writing from and about a country where language issues rouse strong feelings, and also about the single most discussed case of attempted language maintenance and restoration in our time. His meticulous study allows efforts on behalf of Irish to be seen, appropriately, within a broad general framework of national development, in which the effectiveness of language policies is dependent in good part on their fit or lack of fit with the economic and social conditions of a given period.

Readers with an interest in language planning and in minority-language maintenance and revitalization will be greatly in Ó Riagáin's debt. He has rescued the Irish language from its uncomfortable position as the paradigmatic case for determining whether "language revival" can ever succeed, placing Irish language policies instead in a social and historical context peculiar to one small and peripheral European nation emerging from a colonial past in the early 20th century.

At the time of independence, Ireland was still predominantly rural and agricultural. Government economic policy between 1922 and 1960 was aimed at strengthening the agricultural sector rather than at altering the country's economic underpinnings. Since most native speakers of Irish were to be found in the

poorest reaches of the agricultural sector, the government hoped by supporting agriculture to support Irish as well. Introducing Irish into the schools and providing state services in Irish were likewise policies intended to support the existing Irish-speaking population, while training teachers and civil service employees to be Irish speakers was a policy aimed at bringing a middle-class Irish-speaking population into existence. However, state encouragement of agriculture did not produce an upturn in the fortunes of the farming sector. Persistent economic decline in rural Irish-speaking districts produced continuing out-migration, which maintained the attractiveness and utility of English. Still, by requiring Irish as an examination subject in public schooling – and by requiring satisfactory Irish examination results for entry to the national university and to state employment – government language policies "changed the 'rules' of the social mobility process" (275), creating an important middle-class sector with at least moderate competence in Irish.

By the early 1960s the need for new economic policies was obvious, in the face of declining viability in the family-farm sector of the economy, out-migration of young people, and low levels of participation in tertiary education. In place of protectionist agricultural policies and concentration on the internal market, Ireland began to develop the export market and small industries. This resulted not only in a decline in emigration and a rise in the proportion of young people in the population, but also in a shift away from agricultural employment to wage employment based on skills and educational qualifications.

In this changing environment, resistance to the linkage between educational success and competence in Irish grew, and in 1973 Irish ceased to be a compulsory examination subject at the conclusion of secondary schooling. Ó Riagáin points out a painful disjunction between economic policy and language policy, first prior to the 1960s and then after the 1970s. In the earlier period, such socioeconomic mobility as was available depended on inherited economic capital in the form of family land-holdings or small shops; thus the incentives for Irish built into the educational and government-employment systems affected relatively few young people. By the 1970s a considerably larger number of young people were looking to the educational system and to university training as a means of socioeconomic mobility, but the incentives for achieving competence in Irish had been weakened by changes in the language policy. Ó Riagáin's own research on language-planning outcomes in various parts of the country suggests that government initiatives in economic, social, and regional planning, undertaken independently of language initiatives, probably have more important effects on language patterns than do government language policies themselves. For example, in the Dingle Peninsula, in the Corca Dhuibhne *Gaeltacht* (officially Irish-speaking district) of southwestern Ireland, Ó Riagáin found that the localized social network patterns of the strongly agricultural pre-1960 economy – highly important to maintaining community use of Irish, especially in the traditionally most Irish-speaking western part of the peninsula – have given way to less local-

ized patterns. People in the more rural areas now travel by car to An Daingean, the peninsula's one town, for shopping and for services; children are sent there for secondary schooling, and a certain amount of commuting to work in the town takes place. Increasing rates of in-migration and return-migration produce a higher incidence of marriages to English speakers from other parts of Ireland. The extensive 1983 Irish language survey undertaken in Corca Dhuibhne by the Linguistics Institute of Ireland, where Ó Riagáin is employed, indicated that, while more Irish was being used in An Daingean at that time than had been the case earlier, LESS Irish was being used in homes on the peninsula, particularly in the key western region. Since Corca Dhuibhne homes in which both parents had high ability in Irish produced nearly twice as many high-ability children as homes in which only one parent had high ability, the changing marriage patterns of the region have major implications for social reproduction of Irish.

Ó Riagáin's research uncovers cause for concern about the future prospects for Irish, both in the rural *Gaeltacht* districts and in the city. Irish immersion schooling and an increase in the use of Irish in towns are not an adequate substitute for home transmission of Irish in the countryside, since they are less effective than the family as sources of social reproduction of Irish. In Dublin, where government jobs requiring competence in Irish are disproportionately available, a skewed class-distribution of high ability in Irish puts most such individuals in the upper middle class, and none in the working class. Reflecting this skewing, all-Irish schools have proliferated in Dublin since the 1960s, set up by groups of interested middle-class parents (rather than by state policy, as in the 1930s and 1940s). Linguistics Institute researchers have found that the schools do create networks of Irish-using friends among the families who enroll one or more of their children there. But while recruitment to Irish-speaking networks continues via the all-Irish schools, retention of network members is imperfect, in the absence of a broader Irish-language social environment.

Neither touting the Irish case as a success nor lamenting it as a failure, Ó Riagáin shows the enormous complexity of the social systems in which language policies and practices are embedded; he stresses that language policies "cannot be treated as an autonomous, independent factor" (283). Given the complexity of the social, economic, and political environments involved, he sees no obvious or easy routes to language revitalization. Rather, he concludes that, if language policies are to be effective, they must be devised so as to affect all aspects of national life and must be "sustained for decades, if not forever" (283).

There is a great deal to be learned from this book, and the lessons are mostly sobering. They also have considerable persuasive force because they are based on an enviably large body of data that permits Ó Riagáin to move from one time period to another and from region to region, as well as across a wide range of factors, in considering language outcomes in Ireland. The copious tables and figures are for the most part clear and well placed; they are so informative in and of themselves that the text seems almost to accompany them at some points,

rather than the converse. The reader must keep in mind, however, that the more particular case studies (which are in many respects the most illuminating sections of the book) represent a variety of time periods, and that none of them is very recent. The Galway *Gaeltacht* is looked at in detail for the period 1926–1971 and updated only very sketchily to 1981. For the Corca Dhuibhne *Gaeltacht*, the very fine-grained and rich coverage is for the early 1980s. The survey of Dublin families with children in all-Irish schools was undertaken in 1977. Furthermore, the changing economic and social climate arising from continuing development of the European Community may well produce another transformation that calls for Ó Riagáin to update his book before long. Currently he brings the picture up to date minimally at the book's close, noting that commitment to an Irish television broadcasting station was in place as of 1996 and that the all-Irish school movement has been steadily expanding; but he points out that, at the same time, pupils' avoidance of the Irish examination has been increasing nationally, and that the government continues to relax the curricular requirements for Irish in the schools and the professional requirements for competence in Irish among teachers. Proposals to restructure the National University of Ireland arouse concerns, too, about future adherence to the policy of requiring Irish as a matriculation subject.

Ó Riagáin's focus is firmly on policy and its effects, and his book is largely devoid of people. Actual quotations from survey responses appear only once, in connection with language-attitude questions in the Corca Dhuibhne study (125). A similar sampling of views from the parents who choose to send their children to all-Irish schools in Dublin, and from the children attending such schools, would have been of considerable interest. If there are any effects on language behaviors arising from such insubstantial causes as "the temper of the times," they are not to be found here. But especially in the often overheated Irish context, Ó Riagáin would most likely take this observation as more of a cause for praise than for blame.

(Received 4 November 1997)

AIDAN COVENEY, *Variability in spoken French: A sociolinguistic study of interrogation and negation.* Exeter, UK: Elm Bank, 1996. Pp. 271. Pb £24.99.

Reviewed by WILLIAM J. ASHBY
Dept. of French, University of California
Santa Barbara, CA 93106
ashby@humanitas.ucsb.edu

Originating as a British doctoral dissertation, this work constitutes a meticulous, thoughtful, well-written, and sometimes critical application of variationist methodology to two domains of spoken French syntax: negation and interrogation. The work is of merit not only for the insights it provides into two key areas of French syntax, but also for the more general methodological issues it confronts,

often with considerable originality. As is well known, the application of varia-
tionist methodology to syntax is controversial, but Coveney has made a convinc-
ing case that the Labovian paradigm can indeed be insightfully applied to the
realm of syntactic variation.

A prime virtue of variationist linguistics is that it is perforce grounded in real
language data, rather than in decontextualized or constructed examples. French
linguists have not made much use of the variationist approach, and therefore
Coveney's work is especially welcome. The corpus and the methodology are
explained in Chap. 1 (4–28). The corpus consists of audio recordings capturing
the informal speech of workers in children's summer camps (*centres de va-
cances*) in Picardy. For the present study, Coveney recorded a total of 18 hours of
loosely structured "elicited conversations" with a total of 30 speakers, represent-
ing three social classes and three age strata (though the data are skewed toward
younger adults).

Chap. 2 (29–54) provides an excellent review and discussion of the contro-
versy surrounding the applicability of the variationist paradigm to grammatical
variability – where it is not always easy to identify whether the putative variants
really represent alternative ways of saying the same thing, or whether subtly
different meanings are attached to the variants. Coveney provides evidence (from
conversational repairs, correction, and repetition) that he is indeed dealing with
two variables, each with variant realizations.

Chap. 3 (55–90) then turns to the first variable, the presence or omission of the
negative particle, *ne*, "possibly the best known sociolinguistic variable in con-
temporary French" (55). In the contemporary French finite verb phrase, negation
is obligatorily signaled by a post-verbal mark, generally *pas*. Although the pre-
scriptive norm also calls for a redundant preverbal particle, *ne*, this particle is
frequently omitted, especially in unplanned spoken discourse. The two variants
of the (ne) variable are illustrated here:

(1) a. *Je ne   sais   pas si vous allez à Paris.*
      I   NEG know NEG if you go   to Paris
   b. *Je sais pas si vous allez à Paris.*
      'I don't know if you are going to Paris.'

The global rate of *ne* retention in Coveney's corpus is only 18.8%. This overall
retention rate is much lower than that found in the other studies of the variable
cited by Coveney (64), but it is very close to the 16% overall retention rate that I
found in a study of similar data recorded in Tours in 1995.

The global retention rate masks the full complexity of the variable, however,
because the retention or omission of the particle is constrained by a complex of
linguistic and sociolinguistic factors. Most of the linguistic constraints on the
(ne) variable found in Coveney's corpus have been demonstrated before; his
work thus provides sound confirmation of their effect. One interesting and par-
tially new finding is that "*ne* is considerably less likely to be retained in fre-

quently occurring collocations than in other contexts" (80). For example, the particle is present in only 17 of the 386 tokens (3.6%) of negated *c'est* 'it is'.

As for the sociolinguistic constraints on the (ne) variable, age appears to exert the strongest effect, with speakers of the youngest of Coveney's three age strata showing an overall retention rate of only 8.4%. Sex of speaker and social class seem to show lesser effects, especially in the youngest age strata. Although Coveney notes (87–88) that the results of his study are generally compatible with my own (Ashby 1976, 1981), he interprets them in a different way, concluding that the (ne) variable is subject to "age-grading, whereby each generation of speakers has virtually a zero rate of *ne* retention as children and adolescents, but then as they become older modify their speech, under pressure from, and in the direction of the written language" (90). I would uphold a contrary view, that the omission of *ne* is a linguistic change in progress.

The interrogative structures present a much more challenging test of variationist methodology – not only because there are many more variants, but also because the choice of variant is often constrained by discoursal and pragmatic factors, as well as by linguistic and sociolinguistic ones. Coveney has ventured to chart a course through these mostly uncharted waters, giving us a much more thorough and satisfactory itinerary than any previous quantitative study.

Both yes/no interrogatives and WH interrogatives are included in Coveney's analysis; these structures are presented in Chap. 4 (91–122). Yes/no interrogatives have three variants, illustrated below. (The first example is one of Coveney's tokens; the other two were constructed by me on the model of the first.)

(2) a. *Vous voulez la   tisane?*
        you   want   the herbal tea
     b. *Voulez- vous la   tisane?*
        want   you   the herbal tea
     c. *Est- ce que vous voulez la   tisane?*
        Is   it that you   want   the herbal tea
           'Do you want the herbal tea?'

The type illustrated in 2a is structurally identical to the declarative, but it has distinctive rising intonation; it includes the vast majority (79.4%) of Coveney's yes/no questions. The type of 2b entails a change in word order, consisting of a simple inversion of the verb and subject clitic in 2b, but requiring a more complex structural change when the subject is a lexical NP. It is of note that NONE of Coveney's tokens is of the type illustrated by 2b, even though this is the type most valorized by prescriptive grammar. The type illustrated in 2c entails the use of an interrogative prefix, *est-ce que*, and comprises 29.4% of the tokens.

Although they follow these same structural schemas, WH questions present even more variants in colloquial spoken French, because the position of the WH element is also variable. The illustration given in 3a is one of Coveney's actual tokens; the others are constructed examples.

(3) a. *Comment elles s'   appellent?*
    how   they themselves call
  b. *Elles s'   appellent comment?*
    they themselves call   how
  c. *Comment s'   appellent- elles?*
    how   themselves call   they
  d. *Comment est- ce qu' elles s'   appellent?*
    how   is it that they themselves call
    'What are their names?'

The type illustrated by 3a, involving fronting of the WH element with no other structural change, accounts for 23.8% of Coveney's tokens; that illustrated by 3b, where the WH element follows the verb, accounts for 15.6%. These figures are interesting, since neither of these types is recognized by prescriptive grammar. The type involving inversion of the subject clitic and verb, illustrated by 3c, accounts for only 6.6% of the tokens. The type involving *est-ce que*, as in 3d, makes up 48.4%. (Two other types not illustrated above make up the balance.)

Not content simply to report the distribution of tokens of the various types occurring in his corpus (which, for the most part, is similar to the findings of his predecessors), Coveney strives to find out whether these variants really represent "different ways of saying the same thing." One problem is that of "semi-variation" (120–21), where certain grammatical contexts preclude the use of a given variant. Another problem is the stylistic cost that may attach to certain variants. A third problem is that, even if the variants have the same truth value, they may differ in their communicative function. Coveney concludes that quantitative methodology must be supplemented by elicitation of native-speaker intuitions, in order to resolve these problems.

Chap. 5 (123–75) offers a taxonomy of the communicative functions of interrogatives, based on speech act theory, conversation analysis, and especially on the analysis of English interrogatives and negatives by Leech (1983:157–69). Coveney demonstrates convincingly that most of the interrogative tokens from the corpus fit into his taxonomy.

Chap. 6 (178–244) then takes the communicative functions into account in discussing the full range of constraints that bear on the interrogative variable. Coveney's corpus provides ample evidence that these constraints can be not only linguistic, but also discoursal and pragmatic. Despite the relatively small number of tokens of the various types per speaker, he also offers some tentative conclusions about the effect of social factors on the interrogative variable, and he also discusses the interplay among these factors. For example, women may tend to use more variants involving the *est-ce que* prefix, because the choice of these variants may be motivated by a politeness strategy (242).

The general reader may find this book somewhat tedious reading because of the wealth of methodological and factual detail. This becomes a virtue, however, for readers seriously interested in contemporary spoken French. (One can only regret that, because of a delay in publication, the extensive bibliography, 261–71,

is limited to items published before 1991.) Moreover, the book is a model of the judicious and creative application of the variationist method to the analysis of syntax. Coveney has convincingly demonstrated that the variationist paradigm is an invaluable heuristic, as well as an analytical model.

REFERENCES

Ashby, William J. (1976). The loss of the negative morpheme *ne* in Parisian French. *Lingua* 39: 119–37.
———— (1981). The loss of the negative particle *ne* in French. *Language* 57:674–87.
Leech, Geoffrey N. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. London: Longman.

(Received 27 December 1997)

TIMOTHY POOLEY, *Chtimi: The urban vernaculars of northern France*. (Applications in French linguistics, 2.) Clevedon (UK) & Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters, 1996. Pp. viii, 318. Hb $99.00.

Reviewed by DIANA L. RANSON
Romance Languages, University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30606
dranson@arches.uga.edu

Pooley sets out in this book to study Chtimi, the *drôle de français* 'funny French' (p. 2) of the Lille area, the northernmost region of France – and to show, through his analysis of two corpora of spontaneous speech, "the transition from patois to *accent du Nord*" in the speech of the working-class inhabitants of Roubaix and Rouges-Barres. The result, carried out with methodological rigor, is an important addition to the field of French sociolinguistics; it will be welcomed not only by scholars seeking a detailed analysis of the key features of northern Regional French, but also by those interested in ongoing changes in popular French. Pooley is particularly interested in tracing the obsolescence of Chtimi through its convergence with the closely related popular French register; in doing so, he provides a wealth of information about the phonological, morphological, and syntactical features of Chtimi, as used by his sources, and about popular French.

Pooley's interest in this particular Northern French dialect, Chtimi – a combination of two of its notable words, *chti* 'that one' and *mi* 'me' – began when he took up a teaching post in Roubaix in 1974. In 1982–1983, with the help of his wife (a native of this area), he collected 30 hours of spontaneous recordings with 61 speakers of working-class background in Roubaix – data that serve as the basis for the bulk of the study. The speakers were fairly evenly distributed according to gender (28 males and 33 females, although an unfortunate error on p. 85 indicates that there were only 3 women), educational level (25 had received the BEPC, roughly equivalent to a high school diploma, and 36 had not), and age (17 born after 1954, 21 between 1939 and 1953, and 23 before 1938). Hence various fea-

tures in their speech could be correlated with these speaker characteristics. Twelve years later, in 1995, Pooley returned to France from England to record a second corpus consisting of 6 hours of conversation in single-sex groups with 8 male and 7 female students in an alternative high school in Rouges-Barres, located in the département of Marcq-en-Baroeul, bordering Roubaix to the southwest. This new corpus contributes an additional time dimension to the first one; it also introduces the features of ethnicity, style, political views, and regional loyalty through the inclusion of four speakers of non-French background, the use of word lists and reading passage tasks, and the use of questionnaires regarding approval of LePen (a rightist politician) and regional loyalty.

The greatest strength of this book is Pooley's thorough analysis of the speech in these two corpora from both structural (Chaps. 5–8) and sociolinguistic (Chaps. 9–11) viewpoints. The structural analysis of Chtimi includes detailed descriptions of 12 phonological variables, 7 morphological variables, and 4 syntactic variables; their comparison with popular French; and a quantitative analysis of their overall incidence in the Roubaix corpus according to relevant conditioning factors. Of particular interest to all scholars of French are the discussions of Chtimi features that also occur in popular French, such as final liquid dropping (*table* pronounced [tab]), optional liaisons (*pas assez* pronounced [pazase] or [paase]), the use of *avoir* in place of *être* in compound tenses (*il a venu* rather than *il est venu*), and all four syntactic variables: *ne* deletion, subject doubling, various types of relative clauses, and the replacement of the subjunctive by the indicative. For example, one learns that the overall rate in the Roubaix corpus for optional liaison after *est* is 42% (138) and that for *ne* deletion with *pas* it is 94% (172). Although Pooley's references for each of these phenomena in popular French are not exhaustive (some representative omissions include Ashby 1981 on *ne*, Green & Hintze 1990 on liaison, and Auger 1993 on relative clauses), they are substantial enough to provide the reader with a good foundation.

Chaps. 9–11 will be of particular interest to sociolinguists, since Pooley here presents a general overview of the effect of education, gender, and age on speech. Then he analyzes the sociolinguistic variation in the corpora by correlating each of the previously described structural features with speaker variables in several combinations. For Roubaix, he considers education, gender, age, occupation, and then the combinations of education and gender, age and education, and age and gender; for Rouges-Barres, where all informants were of similar education, age, and occupation, he considers various combinations of style, gender, ethnicity, regional loyalty, and approval of LePen. These correlations are presented visually in no fewer than 45 bar graphs; this attractive presentation could have been enhanced if Pooley had indicated, either directly on the charts or in an appendix, the actual number of tokens produced by each group. These data reveal tendencies rather than sharp distinctions among different groups of speakers. As one would expect, the older speakers use more dialectal features, and more often; younger speakers use more popular French features (273, 306). Less well-educated speak-

ers tend to use more dialectal or vernacular features, according to age group, but this difference is less striking for the younger age groups (273). An interesting finding concerning gender is that older women use certain dialectal features more than their male counterparts – a practice that Pooley attributes to the greater involvement of women in the textile industry (258, 274).

An important issue in the interpretation of these data, found throughout the book (especially in the concluding sections of Chaps. 5, 6, 7, 8, 10 and in Chap. 12), is the increasing obsolescence of Picard features as they converge with or are replaced by popular French features. For example, in the summary of phonological variants, Pooley (147) states: "The most obsolescent variants are those which are conspicuously patoisant . . . The healthiest vernacular variants are those which are perceived first and foremost as French but which would nevertheless be favoured by any Picard substratum." If this is indeed the case, then Pooley could strengthen his argument by explaining clearly how the degree of dialectalness of a feature is determined – coding each feature studied for dialectalness, and then comparing the vitality of each one, in terms of its actual occurrence, to its assigned degree of dialectalness and to its presence or absence in popular French. Such a method would allow Pooley to demonstrate his point more clearly and also to avoid the possibility of a circular argument, i.e. of a feature being considered more patoisant because it is used less frequently. A further problem concerns Picard features that are the same as popular French ones, such as the pronunciation of *table* as [tab]. How does one know in such cases whether the Picard feature is gaining in strength, or whether it is converging or even being replaced by the popular French feature? Pooley (237) interprets the lesser liquid-dropping among the middle age group as evidence of its greater approximation to Standard French, as opposed to the older group's use of patois norms and the younger group's use of popular French norms. Yet how does one know that the older group was following one norm and the younger group another one, when the result is the same? The general issue of obsolescence – especially, as Pooley points out, in a situation where the obsolescent and dominant language are so similar – could benefit from greater clarification. A more in-depth discussion of the general framework used in the literature of language shift and language death and a comparison to other sociolinguistic case studies of these phenomena (found in articles like Tabouret-Keller 1972 and those by Campbell & Muntzel, Hamp, King, Woolard, and others in Dorian 1989, which Pooley cites) would no doubt be useful in clarifying these issues.

A few minor criticisms concern Pooley's practice of using spaces in phonetic transcriptions which correspond to written word boundaries, e.g. /le damz ãglɛz/ 'the English ladies' (137); the absence of italics or brackets on most occasions to set apart a sound within a sentence, e.g. "although a raising is a feature of Popular Parisian French" (146); and his presentation of Chtimi texts in orthographic form rather than phonetic transcription – a practice that could prevent someone unfamiliar with French orthography from imagining their pronunciation. The volume could also benefit from the addition of an index and from a list of the tables

and figures, especially since, e.g., Figure 3 is referred to on p. 17 but is not found until p. 33.

I found refreshing Pooley's honesty about his study's shortcomings and his willingness to share personal details with the reader; his tale of how he contacted the Rouges-Barres speakers was especially instructive (87–89). His greatest achievement, however, is the wealth of information he has assembled about the phonological, morphological, and syntactical features of Picard and popular French, their occurrence in two corpora of actual speech, and the social correlates of their occurrence. This work will be of great use to French linguists and socio-linguists and will perhaps encourage more researchers to take up the study of sociolinguistic variation in French.

REFERENCES

Ashby, William J. (1981). The loss of the negative particle *ne* in French: A syntactic change in progress. *Language* 57:674–87.

Auger, Julie (1993). On the history of relative clauses in French and some of its dialects. In Henning Andersen (ed.), *Historical linguistics 1993*, 19–32. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Campbell, Lyle, & Muntzel, Martha C. (1989). The structural consequences of language death. In Dorian (ed.), 181–96.

Dorian, Nancy C. (1989), ed. *Investigating obsolescence: Studies in language contraction and death*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.

Green, John N., & Hintze, Marie-Anne (1990). Variation and change in French linking phenomena. In John N. Green & Wendy Ayres-Bennett (eds.), *Variation and change in French: Essays presented to Rebecca Posner*, 61–88. London: Routledge.

Hamp, Eric P. (1989). On signs of health and death. In Dorian (ed.), 197–210.

King, Ruth (1989). On the social meaning of linguistic variability in language death situations: Variation in Newfoundland French. In Dorian (ed.), 139–48.

Tabouret-Keller, Andrée (1972). A contribution to the sociological study of language maintenance and language shift. In Joshua A. Fishman (ed.), *Advances in the sociology of language, II: Selected studies and applications*, 365–76. The Hague: Mouton.

Woolard, Kathryn A. (1989). Language convergence and language death as social processes. In Dorian (ed.), 355–67.

(Received 6 October 1997)

HARU YAMADA, *Different games, different rules: Why Americans and Japanese misunderstand each other*. Foreword by Deborah Tannen. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press, 1997. Pp. ix, 166. Hb $24.00.

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

A prevailing fear of ambiguity, coupled with a global business imperative, has given birth to a new readership for the Japan-book trade. This new market, a large and lucrative one, is for general-interest books targeted at those who read about Japan not because they want to, but because they think they must in order to

"succeed." However, another book focused on Japanese and American communication may still hold the potential to teach us something new and valuable. A recent addition to this burgeoning literature is the book under review. Yamada has a lively writing style, a graceful use of metaphor and stories, and a Tannenesque "linguistics for the masses" formula to lead the reader through a few areas of probable communicative misunderstanding. On the basis of anecdotes, fables, TV dramas, samurai movies, proverbs, and some of her own previously published findings on bank contract meetings, Yamada sets out what she sees as the crucial discrepancies between American and Japanese conversational styles. These are easily summarized with her repeated characterizations of each group: Americans are independent and individualistic, and use explicit language, while Japanese are interdependent and group-oriented, and use implicit language.

Given its status as a trade book, we should perhaps be forgiving of Yamada's simplistic treatment of an intricate subject, and of her failure to cite relevant research (one wonders if her discussion of the difference between Japanese and American views on "ownership of talk and writing," 60–61, is ironic or explanatory). Unfortunately, the book's lack of a particularly novel angle and its dearth of new or original information don't set it apart from the rest of the "How to" pack. The only distinguishing feature seems to be its baptism by Tannen, who states in her foreword that Yamada's "ability to identify and deconstruct the telling scene, together with her linguistic training and research, have given her the means to unravel the tangled threads that create the cross-cultural knots she so deftly describes" (xvi).

In Chap. 1, Yamada outlines the cultural differences that she feels informs Japanese and American conversational strategies. Americans have "strong independence," while Japanese have "sweet interdependence," which in turn influences the way talk and communication are structured and delivered. Chap. 2 describes differences in "communicative equipment" or grammar, and what Yamada believes each in turn "symbolizes." This entails a review of word order, differences in "Yes" and "No" as answers, honorifics, multiple negation, and the ellipses of subjects in Japanese. Yamada suggests that the systematic use of *I* and *you* in English "points out the distinction between two individuals," while the avoidance of pronouns in Japanese "blends distinctions in the group" (26). She also recasts the classic notions of Hall 1976 regarding high-context and low-context communicative styles, treating them as intensive communicative equipment (American) vs. light communicative equipment (Japanese).

In Chap. 3, Yamada discusses ways in which Japanese communication is listener-centered; she terms it "listener talk," while American speaker-centered communication is called "speaker talk." According to Yamada, Americans try to be honest, articulate, and to the point, while Japanese employ *sasshii* – the ability to understand, empathize, and fill in the blanks. Yamada contends that Japanese use alternatives to actually saying "No," while Americans will unhesitatingly use an unvarnished "No" (but cf. L. Miller 1994a). Japanese greetings are described

as exalting care and reflecting interdependence, whereas American greetings are said to evoke metaphors of action, as in *What's up?* or *What's happening?*[1]

Chaps. 4–6 are devoted to a review of differences between Japanese and American business cultures. Yamada gives examples of ways in which Japanese business is family-like, shared, cooperative, and team-oriented, while American business is customized, individualistic, and separate from private life. Research from her study of bank contract meetings is highlighted in Chaps. 5–6. Using translated excerpts of talk, Yamada explicates some differences in how meetings are structured and run, in how conversational topics are introduced and changed, and in the organization of floor allotment and silence.

Chap. 7 deals with differences in listening behavior and the use of laughter and smiling. According to Yamada, although both groups use laughter and smiling to indicate camaraderie, Japanese laughter is triggered by discomfort, whereas American laughter emanates from prior humorous remarks. Chap. 8 contrasts American and Japanese styles of praising, teasing, and repeating. For Americans, teasing is said to be a form of verbal competition used to establish status, while for Japanese it marks intimacy. She also cautions that Americans will pile on individual praise, while Japanese will be more modest (cf. L. Miller 1994b, 1995a).

The last two chapters shift to macro-level notions of culture and identity. Chap. 9 proposes that, in the American worldview, it is the male worker who is the national role model for desired behavior, while for Japanese it is the nurturing mother (but cf. Kelly 1986, L. Miller 1995b). Yamada also digresses into a discussion of the role of women in Japan; see Wetzel 1988, Edwards 1989, Smith 1992. The last chapter takes up issues of language and identity or ethnicity (cf. R. Miller 1982, Hildebrant & Giles 1983).

A reading of literature outside a narrow scope might have saved Yamada from making a number of naïve assertions. For example, she presents what is termed "stretch talk" – stretching out sounds to indicate hesitation or reluctance to say something – as a unique feature of Japanese conversation (90); but this is a classic example of what conversation analysts have called a "dispreferred response." Referring to theories of communication in linguistics, communication theory, and sociology, Yamada states, "Authors in all of these disciplines characterize the speaker as creating (and controlling) meaning, referring to the audience only secondarily or not at all" (38). Any discussion of women's roles and authority in Japan should be grounded in recent Japanese feminist debate and research; Japanese women's domestic budgetary control doesn't reflect female power, as Yamada suggests (123–24), so much as it reflects banking practices. As Kanazumi Fumiko has pointed out (Buckley 1997:73), it's an outcome of direct deposit of salaries, which makes it easier for wives to withdraw money during the daytime.

Aside from many inadequacies in relating the work to the relevant literature, this book is marred by numerous technical errors and gaffes. The text of pp. 32–34 contains several cut-off sentences, sudden topic shifts where paragraphs seem to have been moved around, and unrelated sentences inserted here

and there. Other mistakes are harmless but irritating: attributing the movie *The funeral* to film director Ozu rather than Itami (61); characterizing mean-spirited water goblins (*kappa*) as "friendly" (108); and mixed-up word selection, such as confusing "tantamount" with "paramount" in "explicit communication is seen as tantamount" (46).

A more serious problem is that Yamada repeatedly confounds linguistic ideology with linguistic description. For instance, she claims that the use of obligatory pronouns in English reflects American independence (25–26). Again, she says that American English locks the speaker into an affirmative or negative reply by virtue of its grammar (SVO), while verb-final (SOV) Japanese allows speakers to alter their speech mid-stream (32–33), reflecting a unique Japanese propensity towards "other-centered interdependence." In fact, researchers who work with empirical conversational data report that speakers, regardless of the language, are constantly engaged in the transformation of talk even as it is uttered.

As a somewhat more sophisticated rendition of the basic "How to" book, Yamada's work is definitely an improvement over many of its predecessors. Yet it clearly falls into the ideological tradition of *nihonjinron* 'theories of the Japanese', representing a "cultures collide" school of thought, in which Japanese cultural and linguistic behaviors are presented as unique and diametrically opposite to whatever exists for Americans. For just about any of the grand dichotomies presented in this book, we can find numerous counter-examples and situated differences that challenge Yamada's framework. And sometimes language failures are just that – not a reflection of a deep cultural divide.

An important contribution of other research in the area of language and interethnic interaction has been to show how and where, in contexted talk, communicative styles or forms produce situated judgements. It is disappointing that Yamada, rather than using her data to point out which aspects of communication give rise to these interpretations and evaluations, continues the tradition of simply presenting all problems as reflections of a master list of reified stereotypes. Models of interaction such as this, which merely contrast unquestioned and one-dimensional notions of people and culture, will continue to overlook locally-occasioned causes for misunderstanding and misinterpretation.

NOTE

[1]If Japanese greetings don't entail "metaphors of action," how can we explain the ones most frequently encountered among friends? Tokyo and Kansai area versions include *saikin dô shiteta? / saikin donai shitotten?* 'How've you been doing lately?' or *nanka atta no? / nanka attan chau?* 'Anything happen?' And what about the widespread greeting *dochira e?* 'Where are you going?' These seem rather like Yamada's descriptions of crass American straightforwardness.

REFERENCES

Buckley, Sandra (1997). *Broken silence: Voices of Japanese feminism*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Edwards, Walter (1989). *Modern Japan through its weddings: Gender, person, and society in ritual portrayal*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Hall, Edward T. (1976). *Beyond culture*. New York: Anchor Press/Doubleday.

Hildebrant, Nancy, & Giles, Howard (1983). The Japanese subordinate group: Ethnolinguistic identity in a foreign language context. *Anthropological Linguistics* 18:294–304.

Kelly, William (1986). Rationalization and nostalgia: Cultural dynamics of new middle-class Japan. *American Ethnologist* 13:603–18.

Miller, Laura (1994a). Japanese and American indirectness. *Journal of Asian and Pacific Communication* 5:37–55.

———— (1994b). Giving good listening: Interaction and identity in Japan's bicultural workplace. *The World & I* 9:221–29.

———— (1995a). Two aspects of Japanese and American co-worker interaction: Giving instruction and creating rapport. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Sciences* 31:141–61.

———— (1995b). Introduction: Beyond the sarariiman folk model. *American Asian Review* 13:19–27.

Miller, Roy A. (1982). *Japan's modern myth: The language and beyond*. New York: Weatherhill.

Smith, Janet S. (1992). Women in charge: Politeness and directives in the speech of Japanese women. *Language in Society* 21:59–82.

Wetzel, Patricia (1988). Are "powerless" communication strategies the Japanese norm? *Language in Society* 17:555–64.

(Received 19 December 1997)

Nanette Gottlieb, *Kanji politics: Language policy and Japanese script*. London & New York: Kegan Paul International, 1995. Pp. 245. [Distrib. by Columbia University Press, hb $76.50.]

J. Marshall Unger, *Literacy and script reform in Occupation Japan: Reading between the lines*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press, 1996. Pp. xi, 176. Hb $39.95.

Reviewed by Timothy J. Vance
Box 5617, Connecticut College
New London, CT 06320-4196
tjvan@conncoll.edu

The Japanese writing system is frequently singled out for the dubious distinction of being the modern world's most complex, and the amount of time and effort that public figures in Japan have spent promoting and resisting script reform in this century seems to have been in direct proportion to the system's complexity. The two books under review are important contributions to the documentation and interpretation of this protracted and acrimonious struggle.

Gottlieb's work surveys the entire history of official Japanese government involvement in script reform from 1902 to 1991. The book consists of a brief Introduction (vii–ix), five untitled chapters, notes, separate bibliographies for English and Japanese sources, and an index. Chap. 1 sets the stage by describing the Japanese writing system and outlining the major issues over which the proponents and opponents of reform have clashed. The description of the writing system is, unfortunately, not adequate for a reader who does not already understand how it works. Gottlieb relies on categories familiar to Japan specialists in explaining how *kanji* 'Chinese characters' are used; but as she focuses on the

problem of determining the intended reading of a given kanji in a given context, the relevant linguistic units get lost in the shuffle. The important point is that many kanji exhibit the type of polyvalence that results from the well-known expedient of using a single written symbol to represent different morphemes (roughly speaking) with related meanings. Chap. 1 also reveals a disconcerting lack of linguistic sophistication. For example, Gottlieb says, "The word 'kanshô' ... has 22 different meanings" (6); in fact, these are 22 different words that happen to be homophonous (ignoring accent). In the next sentence she says, "Many words with the same [native Japanese] reading have different characters representing similar meanings assigned to them" (6); but it is characters that have readings, not words. The point here is that, in some cases, different kanji are used to represent different senses of a polysemous lexical item. In connection with changes in *kana* (syllabary) spelling conventions, Gottlieb says, "Symbols representing phonemes no longer in existence (for example 'yi' and 'ye') are no longer used" (8). Beyond the obvious confusion of syllables with phonemes, she presumably meant to cite /wi/ and /we/ here.

These shortcomings in Chap. 1 are serious; however, if a reader has the background to compensate for them, they detract little from what is otherwise a good book. Some readers may be annoyed when Gottlieb labels writing systems "phonetic" rather than phonological, but there is never any danger of confusion; and this use of "phonetic" is so firmly entrenched in the literature on writing systems that resistance is probably futile.

The remaining four chapters proceed chronologically. Chap. 2 begins with the early 20th century, when all the major ideas for script reform were already under discussion; it ends in the mid-1930s, when ultranationalism prevailed and reform efforts were suppressed. The paramount issue, of course, was the use of kanji. The more radical reformers wanted to abolish it entirely; some favored writing everything in kana, and others favored romanization. The more moderate reformers wanted merely to limit the number of kanji in use; for them, the conventions for kana spelling were a second important issue. The spellings in use at the time dated from the 10th century, and the sound-to-symbol correspondences were no longer transparent. This problem was relevant not only to schoolchildren, who learn to read and write in kana before moving on to kanji, but also to adults, because kana spelling is the basis for the order in which words are listed in dictionaries, indexes etc. Since Gottlieb does not go into the details of kana spelling, the brief lists of specific changes (78, 137) will be incomprehensible to readers who do not know the system well, but the essence of the controversy should be clear enough.

Chap. 3 covers the subsequent period of ultranationalism, which lasted until the end of World War II. The quasi-religious concept of *kotodama* 'spirit of the (Japanese) language' could be trotted out to squelch proposals for any sort of script reform, but intransigent allegiance to all the eccentricities of the traditional writing system came into serious conflict with the practical demands of military

conquest. As Gottlieb explains, the army adopted a simplified vocabulary and orthography for weapons nomenclature in 1940, after the problems that draftees and civilian munitions workers had with difficult kanji and traditional kana spellings had led to many mistakes and accidents. Gottlieb also notes the obvious benefits of orthographic simplification in connection with the wartime doctrine of teaching Japanese to the inhabitants of conquered territories, as part of the effort to turn them into loyal subjects. In spite of these external pressures, however, there was no wavering in the official opposition to script reform in Japanese civilian life. Chap. 3 concludes with a section on the teaching of Japanese as a foreign language in the empire – a lengthy digression that is quite interesting but seems out of place.

Chap. 4 focuses on the series of reforms that began during the Occupation by the US (1945–52) and reached their zenith in 1958. In 1946 an "interim" list of 1,850 *tôyô* ('current use') *kanji* was adopted, along with recommendations for "modern" kana spelling of native and Sino-Japanese words. The list officially restricted the number of kanji that could be used in government documents and schoolbooks; this was followed in 1948 by a list specifying the allowable readings for each kanji, i.e. the morphemes that each one could be used to represent. The new kana spelling conventions brought the system much more in line with modern pronunciation, although a few archaisms were retained. The reformers linked their proposals to democratization, but many influential people remained unpersuaded. Gottlieb convincingly rebuts the claim that the reforms were implemented because of American coercion.

Chap. 5 traces the subsequent policy revisions that have partially reversed the postwar reforms. Opponents of the reforms slowly built up a power base; in the early 1960s reactionary legislators began to show an interest, sometimes even claiming that the reforms were communist-inspired. The most interesting aspect of the debate is that the reform opponents succeeded in turning the democracy argument against the reformers, by claiming that "attempts to dictate what characters might be used contravened the freedom of expression guaranteed by the constitution" (25). The centerpiece of the revisions is the new list of 1,945 *jôyô* ('general use') *kanji,* adopted in 1981. Whereas the 1946 list had imposed a limit (*seigen*), the new list was promulgated as a guide (*meyasu*) to emphasize the flexibility of the policy behind it. The revised recommendations for kana spelling that appeared in 1986 were also labeled as a guide, but they were otherwise virtually identical to those adopted in 1946; Gottlieb is certainly right when she says that the postwar conventions were by then too deeply rooted to change.

Unger's *Literacy and script reform in Occupation Japan* covers a much shorter time period, but in much greater depth, focusing on Occupation-era events that take up only a short section of Gottlieb's Chap. 4. The book consists of six chapters, four appendices, a glossary, notes, references, and an index.

Chap. 1, "Introduction: Dreamers or realists?" begins by providing some historical context for the Occupation-era script reforms and a discussion of the re-

lationship between language and writing. Unger then moves on to an explanation of how the Japanese writing system works. Readers who know the phonetic details of Japanese will be troubled by the description of the moraic nasal as a 'vowel-like resonant' (17); but over all, this explanation is very well done, and the "Glossary of Japanese terms" (145–47) provides concise, helpful explanations for readers who need them. Unger concludes the chapter by attacking the widely-held belief that Japanese could not be written without kanji, and he likens "the doctrine of the indispensability of kanji" (23) to scientific creationism. Most linguists will find Unger's argument persuasive, but, of course, most linguists are already persuaded. Unger is not so naïve as to hope that kanji will actually be abandoned: "The practical obstacles to doing away with kanji entirely in Japan . . . are so great as to make such a development virtually impossible at this time" (22).

Chap. 2, "Literacy in Japan up to 1945," reviews the evidence for claims about high literacy rates in prewar Japan. Unger's aim is to undercut one of the most popular arguments against script reform, namely that the traditional writing system had not been an obstacle to nearly universal literacy. Unger shows that estimates of literacy rates were exaggerated, in part because of a failure to understand literacy as a matter of degree. The evidence suggests that the difficulty of the writing system did in fact restrict literacy, and Unger concludes that "the need for some kind of reform was undeniable" (37).

Chap. 3, "Script reform from within," briefly surveys the major ideas for script reform that had been proposed in Japan before the Occupation. This survey lays the groundwork for Chap. 4, "SCAP steps in"; here Unger, like Gottlieb, rejects the claim that the 1946 reforms were adopted under duress in order to forestall SCAP (Supreme Command for the Allied Powers) from imposing even more drastic changes. Chap. 4 also traces the idea for an experiment with romanization in Japanese schools to the work of the late Abraham Halpern, a linguist who worked in the CI&E (Civil Information and Education) Section of GHQ/SCAP in 1946–48.

Chap. 5, "The rômaji education experiment," reports the results of the experiment with romanization, which involved using romanized Japanese as the medium of instruction in elementary-school subjects. The students in these experimental classes did not perform dramatically better than students in ordinary classes on subject-matter tests; but the experiment was not very well controlled, and the results were certainly suggestive. Unger's provocative conclusion is that the American leaders of the CI&E deliberately discredited the experiment, thereby ensuring that the opponents of romanization would prevail.

Chap. 6, "Conclusion: The most literate nation on earth?" assesses the postwar reforms and the later revisions. In contrast to Gottlieb, who concentrates on the rhetoric and tactics of the adversaries, Unger focuses on the empirical issue that the romanization experiment tried to address. Since the amount of time children spend in school is essentially fixed, eliminating kanji would greatly increase the

amount of time that could be spent learning other things. Unger argues that "the school system and workplace still show signs of a trade-off between resources and the demands of kanji" (127), and he is thoroughly exasperated by the lack of interest in investigating the extent to which more radical script reform could improve the situation.

These two books afford an interesting contrast. Gottlieb provides an illuminating chronicle of the "eighty years of often vitriolic controversy over the relative merits of tradition and convenience in the area of script" (vii), scrupulously presenting arguments on both sides of every issue. In a few cases, it is hard to tell whether a particular sentence is her own opinion or her paraphrase of someone else's, but it is clear that her sentiments lie with the reformers. Unger is more passionate, and his willingness to work painstakingly through Occupation-era archives has paid handsome dividends. Both books provide the reader with genuine insight into the orthographic predicament of the ordinary Japanese citizen.

(Received 14 September 1997)

WEBB KEANE, *Signs of recognition: Powers and hazards of representation in an Indonesian society*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997. Pp. xxix, 297. Hb $50.00, pb $20.00.

Reviewed by JEAN DEBERNARDI
Anthropology, University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T6G 2H4
jean.debernardi@ualberta.ca

This book is an ambitious attempt to wed a semiotic metatheory with the close analysis of ritual language and ritual exchange on Sumba Island, in eastern Indonesia. Keane explores the paradoxes of ritual formality, which seeks to make social encounters predictable and formulaic but nonetheless faces risks and hazards in performance. At the same time, he examines "the power and value" of the objects exchanged by the Anakalangese people, concluding that "the materiality of objects and the social constraints on circulation prevent even the wealthiest Anakalangese from full mastery over the goods they transact" (24).

The past 20 years have seen a move away from anthropological models that privilege structure, rule, or cultural text, and a move toward process-oriented approaches. These approaches hold new perils, however, because they may overprivilege the role that individual agency plays in social life, while underestimating the enduring social forces (however we may name them) that shape action. In pointing out that representations (in particular, Sumbanese ritual exchanges) are limited by both circumstance and culture, Keane seeks to avoid an interactionist approach that would overestimate the power of individuals to achieve outcomes through skillful, strategic action, at the same time that he avoids reifying cultural

rules. Much of his ethnography is driven by his attempt to negotiate the Scylla and Charybdis of this interpretive dilemma.

In his introductory chapter, Keane develops a metatheory of representational practice, drawing concepts from Hegel, George Herbert Mead, Alfred Schutz, and Charles Saunders Peirce to develop images of the dialectical social processes by which people recognize and uphold social identities in interaction. Applying this theory to the analysis of Anakalangese social life, Keane emphasizes the hazards of ritual exchange for participants who seek recognition and affirmation of their status or authority. He avoids an overly individualistic application of this model, noting that in "scenes of encounters" in which two groups "confront, speak to, and exchange objects with each other" (7), people who attempt to exercise power are limited, both by the "contingencies of life" and by

> the difficulties that ritualized media impose on action. Ritual speech, for example, creates authority by enacting icons of imputed ancestral origins. By appealing to absent sources of authority, however, those who use ritual speech yield an agency that is ambiguously divided between the living and the dead. They cannot claim full authorship of the words they speak. (23–24)

In Chap. 2, Keane skillfully sets the ethnographic scene in Sumba and outlines many dimensions of Anakalangese social life, including ancestral villages, houses (patrilineal descent groups), affinal relations, and distinctions of wealth and rank. In Chap. 3, he focuses on exchange objects, which include cloth as well as the animals slaughtered at feasts, funerals, and rituals. After a detailed consideration of the meaning of these objects, he concludes that objects which circulate – which are detachable from their owners – can "stand for their owners" in ritual exchanges only if they are given value through human activity and interaction, including ritual speech.

In Chap. 4, Keane explores the functions of ritual speech, and the tension that often exists between the fixed texts of ritual speech and the exigencies of performance:

> I argue that the authority and difficulties of ritual speech arise in part from its mediating position between ancestral order and actual events. This mediation is dialectical insofar as it does not simply attempt to fit actual events into a pre-existing template but also works to construct in concrete forms the very ancestral order that it appears to reproduce. Correlatively, it mediates the actions of individuals and the agency of larger groups. Ritual speech – elaborating on certain common properties of language – works both to locate itself within a presupposable social context and to create a social context around the moment of utterance. This is the verbal aspect of the dialectic of recognition, the construction of given actions and actors as recognizable types. Through this double process, speakers help objectify the identities of the groups on whose behalf they speak and those that they face. Mutually constructing each

other as social subjects, they also mutually challenge one another to recognize them and be recognized. Such constructions are subject both to the slippages to which mediations are prone and to the politics inherent to interaction. (96)

In support of Keane's point, he observes that speakers use the canon of couplets innovatively; and in Chap. 5, he emphasizes the pragmatics whereby ritual speech is contextualized in the time and space of a specific ritual performance.

In the remaining chapters, Keane explores a range of social interactions and provides a close-grained analysis of specific "scenes of encounter." He lays out "rules of action," and he offers further insight into the use of words in the construction both of identities and of claims to authority. Finally, Keane explores the concept of *dewa*, which scholars translate as 'spirit', but also as 'character' or 'appointed fate'. He concludes that the Anakalangese discourse of *dewa* "provides a partial explanation for why wealth, cosmological power, and rank should co-vary" (208), and he explores the ephemerality of wealth.

Even though a great deal of Anakalangese formal speech occurs in a ritual context that often involves intimate contact with ancestors, Keane chooses not to present an analysis of the premises of ritual life, nor to formulate Anakalangese "beliefs" for the reader. While his analysis avoids many pitfalls that can be encountered when the anthropologist attempts to construct a theology for a society that has none, a deeper consideration of the cosmological dimension of ritual language would nonetheless have enriched this study.

Even for commonly recurring terms in ritual oratory, Keane provides little semantic exegesis. This exegetical minimalism is the product of his analytical choice, and he suggests that his pragmatic approach fits with Anakalangese views of their ritual speech – which, they often claimed, was impossible to "translate." Keane recounts a story that people frequently used in order to admonish him: Apparently an earlier ethnographer asked them for the meaning of the ritual texts, and they gave him literal translations, which they themselves found very funny. Keane concludes:

> a single-minded concern with semantics alone misses out on crucial pragmatic functions of speech: for example, how poetic style indexes a high register, how the iconic form of the couplet supports the association with ancestral completeness, how performance displays the authority of the speaker, how the right choice of words defines a context and brings results. (110)

Literal translation conveys none of these dimensions of Anakalangese discourse.

Keane's argument for pragmatic analysis is compelling, but he could have gone farther in elucidating the semantic meaning of Anakalangese representations. After all, a single-minded preoccupation with pragmatic use is as one-sided and limited as an exclusive preoccupation with semantic meaning. Process-oriented theorists have stringently critiqued semiotic models like structuralism, rendering these models NOT "good to think" for many anthropologists. While

Bourdieu 1977 undoubtedly was correct that structural analysis extracted systems of representation that had more significance for the anthropologist than for the "native," such an analysis may still offer insight into semantic structure and ritual metaphor. Keane's body of data would have lent itself readily to some variety of semantic analysis, and such an analysis would have given the reader a better map to Anakalangese meanings. Maps are, after all, very useful – reductionistic, of course, but also compact, portable, and indispensable for anyone seeking to find a way around a new landscape.

Keane's ethnographically rich and thought-provoking monograph offers extensive commentary on and interpretation of his ethnographic data, in what often is a remarkable display of theoretical virtuosity. However, the richness of his theoretical discussion sometimes overpowers the flow of his ethnographic analysis, and at times verges on the opaque; e.g., "This may be part of the authority of ancestors: They project into cosmological time the completedness of action that, for example, Schutz ascribes to ordinary self-consciousness and Bakhtin to "authoritative discourse" (231). I believe that Keane's point is that, in invoking ancestors, the Anakalangese construe ritual exchanges as replicas of an unchanging cosmological order – although in fact these exchanges are negotiated in the present and characterized by a high degree of "slippage and risk." But what exactly do these theoretical allusions to Schutz and Bakhtin contribute to this particular ethnographic argument? Ultimately, Keane's passion for theoretical commentary may lead to his losing an audience of readers whom he might have had, because most readers (in particular the theoretically uninitiated) will not have the patience to work through these complex layers of allusion.

Throughout this book, a fascinating subtext is provided by ethnographic vignettes which illustrate the ongoing tension between Anakalangese traditionalists and Christians – who, by the 1990s, were in the majority (Keane 1996:139). Although Anakalangese Christians participate in traditional ritual events, they often modify their forms, dispensing with ritual speech, offerings, or tokens of ritual obligation. These innovations rankle non-Christians, who feel that they have been treated with disrespect, or fear that the spirits will not understand words alone if offerings are not made. Keane's monograph captures images of a society in transformation with great skill and tact, and for me this is its greatest strength.

REFERENCES

Bourdieu, Pierre (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice.* Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.
Keane, Webb (1996). Materialism, missionaries, and modern subjects in colonial Indonesia. In Peter van der Veer (ed.), *Conversion to modernities: The globalization of Christianity,* 137–70. London: Routledge.

PETER BAKKER, *"A language of our own": The genesis of Michif, the mixed Cree-French language of the Canadian Métis*. (Oxford studies in anthropological linguistics, 10.) Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press, 1997. Pp. xx, 316. Hb $80.00, pb $45.00.

Reviewed by ANTHONY P. GRANT
Social Anthropology, University of St Andrews
St Andrews KY16 9AL, Scotland
apg@lang.soton.ac.uk

This book, an extensively revised version of a 1992 dissertation from the University of Amsterdam, presents a wealth of information about the culture, documented history, and languages of the Canadian Métis – an ethnic group descended from French and other European fur traders and hunters and their Native American wives. The Métis live in several areas in the Canadian West, as well as parts of North Dakota, Montana, and further afield. This group has been a recognized and clearly constituted ethnic entity in the region since at least the mid-19th century. The focus throughout Bakker's book is on the nature and origin of Michif, the unique language that has brought the Métis (especially those who traditionally hunted buffalo and who came from the Red River of Saskatchewan) to the attention of students of intimate language contact. Michif has possibly been in existence as a language since the 1840s (p. 160), although actual attestations of linguistic material date only from the early 1970s.

Michif has been typified in popular books on linguistics as a language in which the nouns derive from French and the verbs from Cree. This is a gross oversimplification: There are also a small number of verbs of French origin, and some nouns of Cree, Ojibwe, Assiniboine, or English origin – indeed, nouns of English origin are replacing many French-derived nouns. This is certainly so now in the final stages of Michif, which has fewer than a thousand speakers and is faced with extinction within a few decades. The interest of Michif for linguists – apart from its primary importance as the repository of a unique culture (although one should bear in mind that many Métis groups always used French rather than Michif as their ingroup language) – is the way in which French and Cree elements have interacted.

The existence of close structural interaction of Cree and French is not unique, as Bakker demonstrates from examples of the variety of Plains Cree used in Île-à-la-Crosse, Saskatchewan; however, the patterning in Michif is unique. French nouns preserve the inflections that they had in the donor language, a form of Canadian French which was also the mother tongue of a considerable number of Métis who never spoke Michif; but Cree-derived verbs preserve much of the inflectional morphology of the Plains Cree verb – itself somewhat simplified, in regard to the number of overtly marked categories, from the complexities found in related varieties such as Woods and Swampy Cree. Pidginization of grammatical structures from the two source languages has not taken place. Furthermore,

French nouns participate in Cree-style obviation processes. Some nouns in Michif are obligatorily possessed (like body parts, for example, in Cree); and when nouns are used with the (Cree-derived) demonstratives, they are classified according to both French feminine/masculine and Cree animate/inanimate genders. A few verbs are borrowed from French, but these are used in a Cree grammatical framework.

The linguistic element of this book is built on extensive and varied fieldwork which Bakker carried out in 1987–88 and 1990. He attempted to carry out investigative work in as many Michif-speaking communities as possible, and the sheer geographical range of this work helps to extend our knowledge of the diatopic variation within the language. Most previous scholars have concentrated on the Michif used in a single community, often that of the Turtle Mountain Reservation in North Dakota; this is documented in the only available Michif dictionary (Laverdure & Allard 1983), which was compiled by native speakers of Michif. Bakker also spent a great deal of time in libraries and archives, in Canada and elsewhere, researching Métis history, the development of their communities, and their role in the fur trade. The historical backdrop is expertly covered and well synthesized here (Chap. 2, "European-Amerindian contact in the fur trade," 28–51, and Chap. 3, "The Métis nation: Origin and culture," 52–77).

Michif is spoken in communities with widely differing speech economies. In some, speakers of French and/or Cree and/or Ojibwe are also present, and these sometimes constitute a majority of inhabitants; in these communities, speakers of Michif may be multilingual, using French or a Native American language in addition to English, which is known to all Michif speakers. Other communities are less diverse linguistically, with only Michif and English in regular use – and with the former in decline everywhere. A chapter on variation in Michif (118–60) discusses such situations and illustrates the effects that the presence of speakers of the source languages, or Michif-speakers' own knowledge of those languages, can have on Michif language performance.

However, Bakker clearly demonstrates that variation in Michif, though not negligible, is confined within certain parameters; it is possible to distinguish genuine Michif, which is a stable language, from a form of Plains Cree with a high incidence of nouns borrowed from French, as is found at Île-à-la-Crosse, or from the French-Cree code-mixing of Lac la Biche, Alberta. One cannot "manufacture" Michif even if one is armed with a knowledge of Plains Cree and French. An entire chapter of the book is devoted to the discussion of the different structural manifestations of Cree and French language mixture in various communities (161–91). In the course of Bakker's investigations into the development of Michif and its place among the other languages that the Métis have been accustomed to use, he sampled local forms of Cree, Ojibwe, and Métis French (in addition to Michif), and he collected numerous responses to a 200-item grammatical questionnaire in sentence form – a tool which, unfortunately, he does not reproduce.

A description of the salient structural features of Michif, with due reference to the sources from which they derive, is provided in Chap. 4 (78–117); the last page provides a tabulation of the relative proportion of elements in Michif taken from the two chief donor languages. This is a useful summary, especially for readers who are unfamiliar with the major typological features of Algonquian languages. It is not a grammar of Michif; indeed, a primary descriptive source on the language – with grammar, lexicon, and culturally representative texts – has yet to be written.

Bakker takes special care to locate Michif within the still-evolving paradigm of contact languages, which he does in Chap. 7 (192–213). His approach is informed by social theory as well as by diachronic linguistics. Differing end-products of language contact are shown to be the results of differing approaches by social groups to their use of a particular language as a badge of identity, whether as a language of concealment or, among mixed groups, as a means of marking one's inheritance of cultural features from two societies. The overriding principle in what Bakker calls "language intertwining" among mixed groups is that lexicon is taken from the language of the fathers, while the grammar derives from the language of the mothers. Thus Michif, as a marker of a new ethnic identity, combines French stems with Cree affixes, since the structure of Cree was more familiar as a first or second language to the women who helped give rise to Michif. Because of the polysynthetic and affixal nature of the Cree verb, Michif verbs and their adjuncts are Cree in form, whereas the free-standing lexicon, of French origin, comprises mostly nominals.

By seeing where Michif fits into the patterns of language contact, one can more easily appreciate the social dynamics that led to the creation of such a language. The crucial factor in this case is that of intermarriage between indigenous but disempowered people (not only Crees but also Saulteaux/Plains Ojibwe, Gros Ventres, Shoshones, and Assiniboines contributed to the development of the Red River Métis) with members of a dominant group that was nonetheless small in number – at least in the relevant area – and was dependent on the people whose trade they had come to control. The consequence was the creation of a new ethnic group.

The book is smartly produced and written in generally graceful English. The maps at the beginning are especially welcome. Bakker's book will deservedly be the main point of reference on Michif for years to come. We hope that a full description of Michif will eventually be forthcoming.

REFERENCE

Laverdure, Pauline, & Allard, Ida Rose. (1983.) *The Michif dictionary: Turtle Mountain Chippewa-Cree*. Ed. by John C. Crawford. Winnipeg: Pemmican Press.

(Received 5 November 1997)

ANA CELIA ZENTELLA, *Growing up bilingual: Puerto Rican children in New York*. Oxford (UK) & Cambridge (MA): Blackwell, 1997. Pp. ix, 323. Pb $24.95.

Reviewed by VILMA SANTIAGO-IRIZARRY
Anthropology, Cornell University
Ithaca, NY 14853
vs23@cornell.edu

The past two years have seen the publication of three books on linguistic practices among different Puerto Rican communities in the United States, and Zentella's book is one of the three.[1] This sudden wealth within a particular disciplinary domain seemingly proves the first part of Gordon Lewis's (1963) pronouncement that Puerto Ricans are among the most researched peoples in the United States; but the sensitive ideological insights that guide Zentella's ethnography and analyses will certainly contribute to undermining the second part of his statement – that they are nonetheless the least understood.[2] Her documentation of the uses of language among Puerto Ricans in a New York City barrio greatly enhances our understanding of the Puerto Rican experience, as its meaning and place within "mainstream" US society is defined and contested through struggles over linguistic ideologies and practices.

Because the volume grows out of Zentella's work examining Puerto Rican languages for more than 20 years,[3] it represents a rich synthesis of her research. Yet the book is not merely a static rehash of previous publications, but a productive reformulation and expansion of recurrent themes in her work, now explicitly reframed in terms of what Zentella calls an ANTHROPOLITICS of language. It benefits from historical hindsight, and from the opportunity to revisit previous data and interpretations from a stronger transgenerational perspective. Drawing on her fieldwork among three generations of Puerto Rican speakers in New York's East Harlem (for some, the quintessential Puerto Rican urban barrio in the US), Zentella contextualizes the production and reproduction of the distinctive communal language practices (within the dominant ideological conditions, structural factors, and institutional practices of an English-speaking milieu) that impinge on Puerto Rican cultural and linguistic uses and beliefs. She brilliantly reconciles the tension between macro and micro approaches, theory and data, and qualitative and quantitative modes of analysis.

Growing up bilingual is a complex, thorough, and multilayered book which is hard to address adequately within the confines of a review. Zentella localizes the reader at the outset with ethnographic and linguistic accounts of the community, families, and language repertoires in question; this allows her to produce a critical examination of the existing literature on bilingualism and codeswitching in the production and use of so-called "Spanglish." She then focuses on individual life histories and trajectories to document her arguments about the place of lan-

guage in identity construction within the contextual factors that shape the Puerto Rican experience in the US; this strategy of individuation gives the material immediacy, and it documents how ideology plays out in everyday lives.

The subtext for the book, quite explicit in Zentella's idea of an anthropolitics of language, lies in the colonial status that is at the core of Puerto Rican consciousness. Because of their history, Puerto Ricans constitute a colonized and racialized "minority" in the US; their communal language practices, beliefs, and ideologies transgress the dominant monoglot norm of English-speaking society. Language thus becomes a major political terrain of social action in a long-standing struggle over cultural definition and maintenance, generated within a historical experience marked by the threat of subjugation and erasure.

Zentella's work is firmly grounded in linguistic and anthropological theory. Although she productively uses quantified linguistic data to sustain her arguments, her application of ethnographic methods is, in my admittedly biased view, the most fruitful: *Growing up bilingual* is an intensive, long-term, historically grounded study of an actual community and its members, in which the by now almost proverbial "native point of view" is prevalent – even while self-consciously mediated through the researcher's own frames of experience, knowledge, understanding, and disciplinary training. Zentella brings to bear on her data the considerable insight and knowledge derived from her position as a long-standing participant and adopted member of the community; she capitalizes on the insight that her insider/outsider status gives her, even while conscious of the status gaps that separate her from *su gente* 'her people'.

Living in a bilingual and multidialectal environment, Puerto Ricans in the barrio, as Zentella persuasively argues, produce and deploy language modes that constitute forms of cultural knowledge which allow them to establish a sense of identity, community, and belonging within a host society whose dominant linguistic ideologies are inimical to the actual performance of linguistic and cultural difference. Puerto Ricans become marginalized speakers because dominant practices and institutions in the United States are predicated on an ingrained belief in the primacy of English; an ideology of linguistic standards generates invidious distinctions and judgments about modes of speaking that are deemed to fall beyond the norm that Silverstein 1987 has characterized as the monoglot standard.

Zentella sounds this note from the outset when she begins her book by addressing the ironies that attach to Puerto Rican bilingualism. "*Hablamos los dos,* We speak both" is one barrio child's deceptively casual response to Zentella's question about her siblings' and her own linguistic competence. This formal and referential display of bilingualism and codeswitching – both core linguistic practices in the barrio – indexes how barrio children "naturalize" the complex linguistic skills into which they are being socialized,[4] and which shape their sociocultural experience by mediating their sense of personal and com-

munal identity. But in spite of widespread recognition that bilingual speakers accrue cognitive, sociocultural, and economic advantages in an allegedly multi-cultural US, the very same complex language skills that Puerto Ricans develop within their communities are misunderstood, unrewarded, undeveloped, de-fined as "problematic," and characterized as a particularly significant sociocul-tural factor which hampers Puerto Rican "progress" and "achievement" in the United States (p. 1). Language thus becomes, paradoxically, a highly distinc-tive and communally well-regarded marker of cultural identity and mode of action, but at the same time it is materially and symbolically instrumental to the marginalization of Puerto Rican communities in the United States.

Zentella contextualizes Puerto Rican bilingualism in its communal context, but also within the private sphere of *la casa* 'the home', thus linking public pro-duction and practices with cultural and linguistic modes of child socialization that are specific to Puerto Rican cultural understandings within the private fa-milial sphere. Drawing on current literature on child socialization (especially the extensive work of Ochs & Schieffelin 1984, Schieffelin & Ochs 1986, Ochs 1988, Schieffelin 1990, and Ochs 1995), Zentella shows how sociocultural dimensions of behavior and interaction – such as private and public senses of personhood, kinship roles, accountability, relationships, reciprocity, and normativity – are em-bodied in language socialization practices. Yet it is precisely children's perfor-mance that is discounted in the public spheres of the school and the workplace, not because of any intrinsic lack in the communicational and expressive force and productiveness of the linguistic forms themselves, but because of the extraneous factors through which Puerto Rican modes of speech are publicly perceived and judged wanting.

The notion of an anthropolitical linguistics that lies at the heart of Zentella's syntheses embodies her engagement with a committed disciplinary practice. Stressing the productive possibilities that lie in applying both quantitative and qualitative modes of analysis – predominant in sociolinguistics and in linguis-tic anthropology, respectively – Zentella defines anthropolitical linguistics as a way of understanding and facilitating "a stigmatized group's attempt to con-struct a positive self within an economic and political context that relegates its members to static and disparaged ethnic, racial, and class identities, and that identifies them with static and disparaged linguistic codes" (13).

This is not a self-interested political activism, extraneous to scholarly pur-suits. Zentella brings this perspective to bear especially in her incorporation and treatment of the barrio children's individual life histories, language competences, experiences, and trajectories. She thus draws on the diversity in language com-petence that she documents to undermine monolithic and typified perceptions about identity production and linguistic practices among Puerto Ricans in the US. If I understand her correctly, she is both explicitly and implicitly critiquing previous research that documents the practices, but does not link their deploy-

ment to larger issues of racism, discrimination, and educational impoverishment which affect everyday life and expectations among Puerto Ricans. Ultimately, an anthropolitics of language, she proposes, should be oriented to effecting change in language ideologies and policies – rather than settling, as previous works have, for documenting language phenomena in the sacred name of cultural and linguistic relativism.

If, as Geertz 1983 argued, only natives can truly know their own culture, then the best proof of worth for assessing anthropological work could very well be native reception of it. Having used Zentella's other publications in my courses, I can vouch for their resonance among young Latino speakers whose life histories are quite similar to those she documents. I confidently expect the same reaction from my students toward this book.

NOTES

[1]The other two are Urciuoli 1996 and Torres 1997.

[2]The books by Urciuoli and Torres are likewise valuable in this sense; but obviously, they are not under review here.

[3]It is interesting that, although both Urciuoli and Torres draw on Zentella's work, neither of these two authors cites the other. I point this out not to diminish their scholarship, but to stress how pivotal Zentella's work has become for scholars in the field.

[4]"Naturalization" is my term, not Zentella's.

REFERENCES

Geertz, Clifford (1983). *Local knowledge*. New York: Basic Books.

Lewis, Gordon K. (1963). *Puerto Rico: Freedom and power in the Caribbean*. New York: Harper.

Ochs, Elinor (1988). *Culture and language development: Language acquisition and language socialization in a Samoan village*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.

———, & Schieffelin, Bambi B. (1984). Language acquisition and socialization: Three developmental stories and their implications. In Richard A. Shweder and Robert A. LeVine (eds.), *Culture theory: Essays on mind, self, and emotion*, 276–320. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.

——— (1995). The impact of language socialization on grammatical development. In Paul Fletcher & Brian McWhinney (eds.), *The handbook of child language*, 73–94. Oxford: Blackwell.

Schieffelin, Bambi B. (1990). *The give and take of everyday life: Language socialization of Kaluli children*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.

———, & Ochs, Elinor (1986). Language socialization. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 15:163–91.

Silverstein, Michael (1987). *Monoglot "standard" in America: Standardization and metaphors of linguistic hegemony*. (Working Papers and Proceedings of the Center for Psychosocial Studies, 13.) Chicago: University of Chicago.

Torres, Lourdes (1997). *Puerto Rican discourse: A sociolinguistic study of a New York suburb*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Urciuoli, Bonnie (1996). *Exposing prejudice: Puerto Rican experiences of language, race, and class*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

(Received 24 November 1997)

WALT WOLFRAM & NATALIE SCHILLING-ESTES, *Hoi Toide on the Outer Banks: The story of the Ocracoke Brogue*. Chapel Hill & London: University of North Carolina Press, 1997. Pp. xiv, 165. Hb $29.95, pb $14.95.

Reviewed by DENNIS PRESTON
Linguistics and Languages, Michigan State University
East Lansing, MI 48824-1027
preston@pilot.msu.edu

In this book, W&S-E provide an account of the background research and field-work for – as well as the results, influences, and applications of – their work (and that of other collaborators) on the dialect of the Outer Banks of North Carolina, particularly on the island of Ocracoke. The reader of this review should keep in mind the readership that W&S-E have in mind: "We attempt to describe the language that is faithful to the detailed patterning of the dialect while making our account readable to the wide range of people who are interested in the speech of Ocracoke" (xii).

The Preface deals with a number of fieldwork and acknowledgment technicalities which would occupy a great deal more space in a scientific report. The meat of the book is organized into seven chapters. Chap. 1, "The roots of Ocracoke English," positions the dialect (or "brogue" as locals call it) in both historical and regional space. Here W&S-E are careful to dismiss myths about the "Shakespearean" quality of isolated regional varieties, while showing the historical connections of the brogue with parent varieties of British English. They also embed in this chapter a characterization of the relationship of the brogue to other US varieties – a task which allows them to characterize a dialect correctly as a variety with a unique combination of features (not necessarily a large set of unique features, as the folk notion of the term would often appear to have it). As we might expect, this initial chapter also emphasizes the systematicity of dialect, showing that patterns that might appear to be "incorrect" are the product of rule-governed behavior. Finally, this initial chapter also exposes the reader to the sociolinguistic idea that not all speakers of the same variety sound the same; special attention is paid to both age and sex. (Situation-based variation in a single speaker is not given as much attention as one might have hoped for in this work.)

Chap. 2, "What's in an O'cocker word?" deals with the most accessible area of linguistics to nonspecialists: vocabulary. Ocracoke does not disappoint in this respect, and W&S-E provide numerous examples of local exotica, e.g. *mommuck* 'to annoy', *meehonkey* 'hide-and-seek', *dingbatter* 'outsider'. In addition, however, they discuss the distribution of other regional expressions (e.g. *comforter*, *fixin' to*) and their place in the dialect, as well as the symbolic importance of local words, and the processes of word-formation and semantic change. There is also an "Ocracoke vocabulary list" (with part-of-speech labels, definitions, and short context examples). W&S-E note, justifiably, that they have not limited this list to words found only in the brogue; unfortunately, however, they have not always taken pains to indicate in the list which words are unique to Ocracoke and which

are shared with other regions. In some cases they are careful (e.g., *chunk* 'to throw' is identified as a "general southern" term), but in others they are not. Thus *to* 'at' (*Rena Dell is over to the restaurant*) is not identified as having any other provenience than Ocracoke; and W&S-E's comment, "generally used where *at* is used in other dialects," can easily be misunderstood to mean "all" other dialects.

I would also have liked to see some indication of the pronunciation, particularly of some words whose spelling does not unerringly guide us (e.g. *yaupon*, which W&S-E alternatively spell *yapan*, although that second effort still does not help me get to the right vowel). In the next chapter (55–56), the authors devote a paragraph to stating that they decided not to use phonetic representations and have relied on "slightly modified English spellings." Perhaps that is the right decision for a non-technical presentation; but, if so, it should have been mentioned much earlier (e.g. in Chap. 1, on pp. 7–8, where a number of such respellings were used). Perhaps a chart of at least the sounds represented in this work by such respellings (with familiar words as guides) should have been included as well.

Chap. 3, "Sounding like a 'Hoi Toider'," brings us directly to pronunciation matters. After a short introduction concerning interesting misperceptions of the brogue (fifteen English respondents tested by Peter Trudgill all misidentified it as "British" rather than "American" English!), W&S-E examine the brogue's /ay/ – which, particularly in "local words," yields a caricaturistic [ɔɪ], e.g. "hoi toide" (though before /r/ it is often [ɑ], e.g. "far" for *fire*). They also look in detail at the parallel development of /aw/, at /ɪ/ (before /ʃ/, which tenses and raises to [ij]), and at /ɔ/ before /r/ (also often realized as [ɑ]). They also compare the general southern and Ocracoke /ɛ/-/ɪ/ conflation (at /ɪ/) before nasals, as well as the realization of non-prevocalic /r/ (preserved in Ocracoke) in both varieties. This chapter also treats unaccented syllable loss (*skeeters*), the "-er" pronunciation of final unaccented syllables with shwa or /ow/ (in the same word), relic forms (the /h/ pronunciations of "hain't"), and analogical innovations such as *oncet* and *acrost*.

Chap. 4, "Saying a word or two," is the grammatical chapter of the work, and it opens with a paragraph illustration (from a narrative) to show that the brogue's characteristics are not all words and sounds. The plea for the understanding of nonstandard varieties as rule-governed is repeated here, as one might expect. The chapter is divided into sections which deal with verbs, adverbs, nouns and pronouns, and negation.

The section on verbs first deals with *a*-prefixing (an area investigated in other regions and in considerable detail by W); as he has shown in previous work, this is a good example to show the rule-governed character of dialect forms (although, as W&S-E admit, the construction is waning in Ocracoke itself). In the section on "Subject-verb agreement," the historical record is again provided, and the Ocracoke use of *-s* marked forms on 3rd person plurals is noted. *Be* in Ocracoke agreement is more complex; W&S-E argue that it uses a *was*-positive and *weren't*-

negative system (regardless of person and number), like some varieties of British English. This presentation seems somewhat weakened by the unjustified comment that the pattern "improves" on the possible confusion of the similarly pronounced *was* and *wasn't*. The section on auxiliary verbs treats features which are well-known in other varieties (e.g. double modals, perfective *done*).

Finally, in "Negatives," the question of multiple negation is raised (again with a historical prelude), and the stigmatized *ain't* is treated, though with the perhaps unfortunate comment that its survival is likely due to its "useful language function" – a line of reasoning even further developed in this section, without particular reference to Ocracoke (94–95). Relic forms (e.g. *nary*) are noted, as is an interesting preference for contraction of subject + auxiliary (rather than auxiliary + negative), e.g. *I'll not* rather than *I won't*.

Chap. 5, "No dialect is an island," takes advantage of the review of linguistic features of the preceding chapters to repeat (and chart) the assertion of Chap. 1: that a dialect is better characterized as a unique arrangement of features than a collection of unique features. W&S-E carefully compare the brogue to other varieties at each linguistic level to re-establish this important point.

Chap. 6, "Ebb tide for Hoi Toide?" begins with the "social" rather than linguistic part of the book (although it would be remiss to suggest that discussion of the linguistic features in the preceding chapters did not make use of the social setting). Here W&S-E make the claim that "endangered dialects" (and "endangered languages") are like "endangered species": "A window of scientific opportunity closes when a language dies" (118). They go on to make the more "human" point that when a dialect dies, a "unique part of human culture dies with it" (119). The remainder of the chapter characterizes even more carefully the demise of the brogue and argues for efforts, both scientific and human, to preserve it (and others so endangered).

An important part of the Ocracoke work by W and his collaborators has been an attempt to "raise the consciousness" about language and language variation among locals and to help instill in them a sense of local pride. These efforts have taken place among the general public and in the schools as well, and both teachers and students are cited in the last parts of this chapter for having acquired both scientific and personal appreciations of language variation. This aspect of the research program on Ocracoke is nearly unique in large-scale sociolinguistic research projects, and this chapter provides a good summary of it.

Chap. 7, "The voices of Ocracoke," is a collection of four narratives told by respondents for this study. Although ethnographers, folklorists, and anthropologists may not be happy with the fact that these narratives are "unanalyzed," I find them a welcome addition to the book – longer samples of what has been discussed in greater detail in the preceding chapters.

An appendix contains an "Ocracoke IQ test" which will sample the reader's knowledge of the Ocracoke vocabulary; this will be a familiar exercise to those who have taken the "chittlin" test or others like it. Technical ("linguistic") refer-

ences are given at the end (in a prose format), and general historical and cultural references are provided in a short bibliography.

Readers who have a "local" interest should find this little book attractive (there are very nice photos of the fieldworkers, the sites, and the respondents); W&S-E have done a good job of making much of the information of the research program accessible to the non-specialist reader. In addition to being attractively packaged, this book is relatively free of editorial error – although one wonders how a modern version of the Lord's Prayer – "may your named [sic!] be sacred" – slipped by (p. 4).

(Received 27 October 1997)

NANCY H. HORNBERGER (ed.), *Indigenous literacies in the Americas: Language planning from the bottom up.* (Contributions to the sociology of language, 75.) Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1997. Pp. 394.

Reviewed by ANDRÉE TABOURET-KELLER
*Faculté de Psychologie et de Sciences de l'Education
Université Louis Pasteur, 67000 Strasbourg, France
andree.tabouret-keller@psycho-ulp.u-strasbg.fr*

This book is an important step in the literature of literacy – both for its rich and multi-faceted information and analyses, and for its approach. It deals with efforts to develop alphabetic literacies in traditionally unwritten languages that were already present in the Americas at the time of the arrival of the Europeans in the 15th century. Three complementary areas of scholarship are concerned: language planning and bilingual education; literacy studies, especially "new literacy" studies, with their emphasis on multiple literacies and their local meaning; and Native American studies, in particular the exploration of Native American ways of knowing. A broad array of case studies is offered in a three-part arrangement: North America (5 papers: Yup'ik [2], Navajo, Hualapai, Cochití); Meso-America (four papers: the CELIAC project in Mexico [2], Nuu Savi, a Mixtec language in Mexico, Mayan in Guatemala); and South America (7 papers: Quechua in Peru [3], bilingual education in Ecuador [2], Quechua in Ecuador and Bolivia, Guaraní in Bolivia). The book has an introduction and conclusion by Hornberger, and an afterword by Brian V. Street.

This large array of situations has a common denominator: literacy implemented from the bottom up, or how indigenous peoples can actively find ways to incorporate alphabetic literacies into their own languages and ways of knowing. The efforts described in this volume have in common the premise that the promotion of indigenous literacies increases the potential for fuller social participation by hitherto marginalized sectors of society. It is suggested that local literacies will thrive where multiple literacies are seen as a resource, and not a problem. "Local literacies" refers to practices that are closely connected with local and

regional identities (Street 1994); "multiple literacies" denotes literacy as not a single, uniform technical skill, but rather as something that varies depending on the context and society in which it is embedded (Street 1984).

I will briefly present three of the sixteen studies in the book which inform the reader on aspects of a literacy experiment in Mexico, the CELIAC project:[1] "Language preservation and publishing" by H. Russell Bernard; "Experiences in the development of a writing system for Nuu Savi" by Josefa Leonarda Gonzales Ventura; and "Saving and strengthening indigenous Mexican languages: The CELIAC experience" by Jesús Salinas Pedraza. Bernard's paper is a general presentation of the topic of language preservation by publication in the language to be preserved, and the papers by Gonzales and Salinas are applications of this precept. The Mexican situation is the only one in the book that I know personally, from teaching in Mexico City and from some fieldwork in an Otomí region; hence my choice.

Bernard's essay sets forth reasons why we must take decisive action, and why part of that action is to publish books in previously non-literary languages. After a brief overview of the political argument on whether linguists should work to preserve vanishing languages – and on the evolutionary perspective for linguistic and cultural diversity, at a time when 95% of the different ways of seeing the world are vested in under 5% of the people – Bernard advocates activities of archiving and vitalizing, rather than preservation. He makes it clear that bilingual education and teaching people to write their previously non-literary languages is not, in itself, a solution; but his thesis is that, if oral languages do not develop a written literary tradition, most of them will soon die. This development implies building dictionaries and establishing orthographies, but a perfect orthography is not required to begin developing a literary corpus:

> . . . when texts are written on word processors, they can be studied for their grammar with all the power of computer-based tools. Teaching highly educated native speakers of non-literary languages to use computers for writing large texts in those languages is thus the fastest, and most accurate, way to get data for studying the grammar of a language (147).

But where does the money come from? Bernard advocates "commoditizing non-literary languages – turning them into things for sale" (149): "the faster native languages and cultures become salable commodities, the better chance they have of not disappearing" (151).

Gonzales Ventura, the author of an ethnographic study written in the Mixtec language (1992, 1993) as a CELIAC experiment, writes of her conviction that women, as preservers of culture, are the base for the cultural evolution of a community. She knows of the poverty of village people and of female elders' suspicion that school education destroys the family environment, because women who have been to school no longer want to speak their own language. She tells of her own efforts to begin the work of writing, and of writing in Mixtec about marriage

and wedding ceremonies – a project that made her embark on writing first of all about daily life. The first thing, she says, is just to start writing; the second is to agree with other writers on an alphabet; the third is to learn to use the computer; and the final step is to advertise the book, and more generally books written in Mixtec. Her belief is "that to publish quality books by local people is what is needed most, because a large percentage of the population is not literate, and this alternative to literacy, through their native language, is the only hope they have to become literate" (165). But she also sees the difficulties of the task: People are not convinced that they need to be literate to survive. Nevertheless, she believes that "the method of computer-based reading and writing is an effective, indispensable resource for strengthening that part of indigenous life dealing with intercultural relations" (166), and she suggests the establishment of women's schools.

Jesús Salinas Pedraza's paper is a mirror image of Bernard's: whereas Bernard is an American from the University of Florida, Salinas is a Mexican Indian who, for three years, walked a 24 kilometer round trip each day to attend the only secondary school within a radius of 40 kilometers. While Bernard sees the CELIAC experiment as an experience of language preservation, Salinas sees it as fundamental to the consolidation of ethnic or national unity: Lack of literacy is the most important factor in the deterioration and abandonment of indigenous languages, and writing the languages will open possibilities for enriching and developing the spoken language. In the first part of his paper, Salinas briefly presents the situation of the native languages of Mexico; the link among language, identity, and writing, as he sees it; and the link among technology, literacy, and the necessity of bilingual education. Salinas gives an account of the Oaxaca Literacy Project, which began in 1962 when he first met Bernard, and which now works in cooperation with CELIAC – an institution currently well established in the town of Oaxaca with regional, national, and American support (in what proportions is difficult to tell). In the words of Salinas, CELIAC is a program for action; its central objective is to preserve and promote indigenous language writing through the publication and distribution of literary works by indigenous authors.

These three papers are in harmony with the generally hopeful tone of the book: Despite the recognized difficulties, bottom-up literacy does and will help the survival of indigenous languages and cultures. Despair has no place in this discourse; nevertheless, I wonder if it is not present. In Salinas's paper, it can be heard in the use of the word "must," as in "...native communities must be respected. This must be done in conformity with the rights established in the constitution"; or "[local] populations must also take responsibility for strengthening their own education." In Salinas's conclusion, we have on one page (184) nine such *must*s: "the indigenous people must be assured ... must also receive ... Ethnodesarrollo must be able ... must be supported ... The modernization of the state must not marginalize the native languages and cultures ... we must develop without abandoning our roots ... the original languages must be rescued, recog-

nized .. native people must be given technology ... Our object must also be to break down the barriers."

During the first period of the establishment of the USSR, bottom-up activities were an agenda for the young Bolsheviks; we do not know much about their experiences, except that huge rates of illiteracy had to be faced. It would be interesting to know how they were dealt with. In a Russian novel by I. Ilf and E. Petrov, *The twelve chairs*, one of the heroes, Ostap Bender, organizes a chess contest to make some money. The contest takes place in the hall of a small provincial town, and the slogan of the previous meeting can still be seen on the wall: "Rescuing the sinking must be the task of the sinking themselves!" But learning to swim seems a realistic solution, as long as there is water to swim in.

NOTE

[1]CELIAC stands for Centro Editorial de Literatura Indígena, Asociación Civil (in Mexico, *Asociación Civil* means 'non-profit corporation').

REFERENCES

Gonzales Ventura, Josefa Leonarda (1992). *Na kaai iyo chi Nuu Chikua'a* [Vida cotidiana de Jicayan]. Oaxaca, Mexico: CELIAC.
———— (1993). *Vida cotidiana de Jicayan*. Vol. I. Oaxaca, Mexico: CELIAC.
Ilf, Ilya, & Petrov, Evgenij (1928). *Dvenadcat' stulev* [The twelve chairs]. Riga: Kniga dlja Vsex.
Street, Brian (1984). *Literacy in theory and practice*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.
———— (1994). What is meant by "local literacies"? *Language and Education* 8:9–17.

(Received 27 October 1997)

GREG URBAN, *Metaphysical community: The interplay of the senses and the intellect*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1996. Pp. xvi, 288. Hb $40.00, pb $19.95.

Reviewed by ASIF AGHA
Anthropology, University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA 19104
asifagha@sas.upenn.edu

Urban's book may be regarded, at one level, as an exploration of certain traditional anthropological themes – such as social structure, myth, and ritual – in the context of an Amerindian community in Brazil. What makes the book highly non-traditional, however, is how these themes are worked into a discussion of very basic epistemological and methodological concerns: the nature of ethnographic inquiry, criteria for the truth or correctness of ethnographic claims, and the role played by discourse in organizing cultural experience and shaping the outcome of fieldwork.

Urban's approach to discourse involves two levels of analysis, which he refers to as "the intelligible" and "the sensible." The realm of the intelligible is the

realm of significance, of meaning and describable import; it involves abstraction, cogitation and, pre-eminently, language. The realm of the sensible is the realm of relatively direct, relatively palpable experience. It is the realm of the sensory – e.g. the visible, audible, and tactile – features of experience, of which the experience of language is an example, though perhaps not the most salient one; we tend to think instead of rocks, plants, or physical artifacts, i.e. of objects that are sufficiently discrete and perduring to linger in the scrutiny of the senses. Yet language too is an object of sensory perception, even though it is more evanescent than others, especially in its spoken form.

One thread runs through the work as a whole: Ethnography has failed to grasp something basic about itself. It has tended to think of itself as a discourse about "the sensible": what the ethnographer sees, or perceives through the senses, during the course of fieldwork. Yet what ethnographers see is mediated by "the intelligible," i.e. by what they grasp intellectually about those experiences. Since language is central to the intelligibility of experience, this claim, by itself, would commit Urban to arguing for the primacy of conceptual language over so-called "brute" sensation. Yet this is very far from his intent, and this brings us to the second main thread that runs through the work.

Urban presents an elegant critique of the view that language is exclusively a device of the intellect, itself devoid of sensory qualities. What makes language special is not simply the role it plays in making the world intelligible; this is only half the story. Language is special because it belongs to both realms, being intelligible as well as sensible. Language makes experience intelligible by virtue of its referential functions: It denotes, describes, classifies, and catalogs elements of experience. Yet language is also an object of sensory experience: visible as marks on a page, audible as sound.

The intelligible aspects of language have been central to all linguistic theories since Saussure, but its sensible side has largely been ignored or considered epiphenomenal, irrelevant to its mental or social functions. Part of Urban's effort is to show that the sensory qualities of language have important consequences for its role in society. For example, insofar as language is a sensible (visible, audible) thing, it is experienced in discrete utterances; utterances, once produced, can be reproduced and circulated in society. It is in the form of circulating discourse – discourse that is replicable and capable of transmission from person to person – that language connects large groups of people.

Thus Urban's approach links the question of the existence of social groups quite explicitly to the circulation of discourse. The notion of the circulation of discourse is a powerful one because it provides an empirical method for the study of several issues which have long been taken on faith by social scientists, e.g. the degree of shared-ness of representations, or the relationship between shared representations and group cohesion. Urban suggests that the connection that discourse seems to create between people depends on both its sensible and intelligible aspects, as well as on relationships of "interconversion" between these two as-

pects. One way in which the intelligible aspects of discourse are made sensible is through processes that FIX THE FORM of linguistic expressions associated with a given cultural phenomenon, e.g. names, formulaic phrases, and idioms, as well as genres and registers of speech. Here replicability of sensible form creates, to different degrees, the feeling of sharedness of intelligible content. A second principle of interconversion involves the ENACTMENT of intelligible meanings in channels of semiotic activity which are more easily accessible to sensory perception – such as the glossing of a phrase by a gesture, or the depiction of the intelligible attributes of a deity in sensible form, as in a statue.

Much of the detail and richness of Urban's account comes from the fact that he does not regard the connection between the intelligible and the sensible as being of just one kind. His strategy, rather, is to compare multiple relationships that intersect in a single area of cultural experience. His exploration moves to and from this point, locating a cultural datum in a network of relationships of intelligibility and sensibility, and linking a particular facet of cultural experience to a range of experiencing subjects – each capable of experiences both concrete and abstract, each locatable in a specific historical and contextual locale, and each linked to others along describable trajectories of discursive contact.

Urban's discussion of the problem of "autodesignation" (i.e. "what the natives call themselves") is exemplary in this regard. The Amerindian community with which Urban is here concerned has been called by different names: Bugres, Botocodo, glòkòzǐ-tõ-plèy, Shokleng, Kaingang, and Aweikoma. Yet none of these names is used by the community to describe itself. Some of these names are Portuguese words; others are words of different Amerindian languages. Some are based on "sensible", especially visible characteristics (e.g. the wearing of lipplugs). Others are names reappropriated from the names of adjacent groups, and hence more dependent on the referential properties of language – its power to confer "intelligibility" on classes of experience. Some are words that become names for communities only after they are borrowed into another language. Once they are constituted as group names, these words are capable of conferring an ethnic identity on a person. Yet the natives themselves do not use any group name to describe themselves.

From a culture-internal point of view, the absence of an EXPLICIT self-designating label does not imply the lack of a sense of group unity. Urban discusses a number of social activities – varying in participant type, social scale, semiotic composition, and cultural import – which confer an IMPLICIT group sense on members of the community. These activities fashion a sensible experience of group unity in each context of their enactment, but they do so without making ideas of ethnicity central to the experience of group unity. It is only from the standpoint of other cultures (whether of their neighbors, or of European visitors) that the question of ethnic identity or difference arises. Here Urban discusses several interrelated themes: the circulation of such terms in

situations of cultural contact and exchange; alterations in the pronunciation and connotation of terms, especially in cases of word borrowing; and historical changes in the trajectories of circulation of group names, and in the interests and agendas of those among whom these terms circulate.

The notion of explicit vs. implicit meaning is explored further in Urban's discussion of native terms describing social roles and relationships, such as kin-terms, or terms for clans and lineages. The traditional approach here has been to treat such role terminologies as comprising a denotational code for the classification of social kinds. Urban's focus, however, is on the social circulation of kinterms and other role-labels, not simply on their denotation. The main idea is that the social circulation of terms describing society is just as important – in some respects, more important – than the denotation of such terms. To the extent that such terms circulate widely (e.g., the more people who use them), a larger number of people are able to describe and recognize mutually intelligible social relationships. Yet the sharing of such terminologies permits more than the sharing of intelligible content: It makes possible the enactment of intelligible roles in more concrete, often visible public behaviors, whose prototypical form remains comparable for many members of society. Thus the spread of role terminologies across some domain of social actors has consequences not only for how relationships are understood, or rendered intelligible through description, but also for how they are enacted, or rendered sensible in behavior.

Since such terms are themselves used in more extended and elaborate genres of speech about society, the next question to which Urban turns is the question of the circulation of genres that employ such terms; he discusses such genres as origin myths, official doctrines linking naming practices to descent rules, and publicly circulating stories whose plots depend on the existence of kinship ties. Urban suggests that such genres of discourse about society make social structure intelligible to members of a society. His emphasis here is on STANDARDIZED public discourses, i.e. those that are comparably narratable by many members of society. These discourses not only disseminate standardized accounts of the nature of social relationships; they also serve as intelligible standards for the enactment of social relationships in sensible behavior.

The trajectories of circulation of any discourse genre depend on how people relate to each other – e.g. on who talks to whom, and when; hence any publicly circulating discourse that makes social relationships intelligible and enactable acquires a special status in society: "The discourse that most obviously lays down the conditions for its own circulation is discourse about social organization . . . It creates, thereby, the conditions for circulation of all other discourses, and, consequently, for the transmission of culture" (138). This is perhaps the most original idea in Urban's book, and one that he discusses and elaborates at great length.

The treatment of myth and cosmology, forming Chap. 3, is equally refreshing. We are introduced to a young Greg Urban arriving in central Brazil to do his

doctoral fieldwork. The year is 1974. The young ethnographer is well acquainted with a particular genre of ethnographic writing, a genre that depicts, often with the aid of diagrams and pictures, what anthropologists used to call "the native model of the universe." This genre seeks to describe the structure and parts of the universe as the natives really "see" it. Inspired by the possibility that he may yet be able to draw a picture of the native view of the universe – the exact picture that they carry about in their heads, as it were – the ethnographer attempts to elicit direct answers from his consultants (e.g., " I asked him point-blank whether there was a world above this one ...") In answering such questions, often with an emphatic "Yes", Urban's consultants frame their responses by explicit appeal to the name of the person who told them about such things; thus an answer to a question about the universe becomes an answer about the source and authoritativeness of certain narratives. It is an answer that is as much about discourse as it is about cosmology.

Such experiences lead Urban to challenge certain traditional assumptions about the writing of ethnography. One such assumption, particularly germane to studies that concern themselves with "native models" of experience, is the assumption that the cultural point of what the natives tell you is the referential content of their utterances – or even that narratives describing the universe may be taken, at face value, as evidence for a "native model" of the universe.

Urban finds plenty of evidence in his own materials to suggest otherwise. First, insofar as cosmological narratives contain metadiscursive accounts of their social origins (e.g., they name the social person who first told the story to the current narrator), such narratives allude to their own trajectory of circulation within society. Second, such narratives contain a good deal of detail in addition to their purely cosmological content: They describe named social actors who traverse these "physical" regions of the universe, engaged in social interactions with other social beings. Narratives that first appear to Western eyes to be about physical space turn out, on closer examination, to have a cultural point that pertains more to ethical and moral issues than to the organization and arrangement of the physical universe.

But Urban's main point is NOT that these narratives are really about society instead of being about physical space. They are obviously about both. The point, rather, is that the most transparent and explicit denotational content of such narratives (e.g. their overt topics and plots) does not constitute their main cultural point. Urban suggests that every publicly standardized discourse has implicit as well as explicit content. The explicit content is in principle subject to dispute by hearers, especially when the narrative describes everyday experiences that anyone can have. The implicit content is, by definition, less transparent to consciousness. It cannot be described, identified, or discussed easily enough to become a topic for potential dispute at every link of the chain of circulation; and it is therefore more likely to find a wider circulation.

The book itself presupposes little or no background in either linguistics or anthropology. It is fairly accessible to the educated general reader. It is very rich in ethnographic detail and includes many amusing anecdotes from the field. It succeeds in presenting a sophisticated and nuanced theory of the role of discourse in culture. The book works well at many levels at once, and this fact itself – in addition to the compelling theory of discourse it advances – is likely to find for it a wider circulation than most.

(Received 27 September 1997)