

Language in Society 36 (2007). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404507070376

MIYAKO INOUE, *Vicarious language*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2006. Pp. xi, 323. Pb \$24.95.

Reviewed by JUSTIN CHARLEBOIS

Language and Communication, Aichi Shukutoku University
Aichi, Japan 480-1197
justinc@asu.aasa.ac.jp

Japanese Women's Language (JWL) is not a new topic of research in the social sciences, but Miyako Inoue's *Vicarious language* is an original contribution to the field. According to Inoue, women's language references linguistic forms distinguishing the speech of women and brings with it certain connotations of "femininity" such as politeness or nonassertiveness. In line with other current research, Inoue asserts that JWL is not part of the linguistic repertoires of many women.

Inoue's central thesis is that JWL is inextricably connected to Japan's modernity. Furthermore, women's language is one of the key features differentiating its modernity from that of other cultures. Inoue maintains that this discussion remains incomplete without consideration of the politics of women's language that creates hierarchy and inequality among women. Inoue skillfully develops the central components of her thesis through the division of her book into three parts. In part I, she disparages the common myth that "women's language" has ancient roots and traces its emergence to the late 19th century. Parts II and III discuss "women's language" in the late 1980s and early 1990s.

In part I, "Language, gender, and national modernity: The genealogy of Japanese Women's Language, 1880s–1930s," Inoue traces the roots of "women's language" to the speech of schoolgirls of the late 19th century. This is a clear example of how a stigmatized form develops into a prestige variant. In chapter 1, Inoue traces the development of "schoolgirl speech" to male intellectuals citing their speech. Chapter 2 concerns the relationship between the language modernization movement, *genbun itchi*, and the emergence of "women's language." In the space of the novel, "schoolgirl speech" was quoted and represented as "the voice" of a modern Japanese woman. The focus of chapter 3 is on how magazines targeted at young women became sites where they were exposed to "women's language." It is here that schoolgirl speech lost much of its stigma and became generic "women's language." Part II (chapter 4), "The nation's temporality and the death of women's language," focuses on the public mourning of the death of "women's language." Inoue's discussion focuses on public thoughts on the linguistic corruption of "women's language." In part III, "Re-citing Women's Language in late modern Japan," Inoue draws from her ethnographic fieldwork in a corporate office in Tokyo to demonstrate her hypotheses. Chapters 5 and 6 illustrate how actual women skillfully utilize JWL to suit their unique situations.

Inoue's training in linguistic anthropology makes this accessible volume appealing to both scholars and students in the social sciences. Detailed historical background is combined with ethnographic research, resulting in a complete picture of the various factors that have contributed to the development of "women's language."

(Received 23 October 2006)

Language in Society 36 (2007). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404507070388

LAADA BILANIUK, *Contested tongues: Language politics and cultural correction in Ukraine*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2005. Pp. xiv, 230. Pb \$ 24.95, Hb. \$59.95.

Reviewed by ANNA VERSCHIK

Department of Estonian Philology, Tallinn University
Narva Rd. 25, 10120 Tallinn, Estonia
anna.verschik@tlu.ee

This is a comprehensive ethnographic study of an immensely complex language situation in the post-Soviet Ukraine. Bilaniuk discusses subtle matters, such as language ideologies, the struggle

over status, compromise strategies, and highly stigmatized mixed varieties called *surzhik*, in a manner that makes the book accessible to nonspecialists in the field of sociolinguistics.

The book comprises six chapters, an epilogue on the languages of the Orange Revolution, and an appendix that is a short comparison of Russian and Ukrainian. It is essential that the languages in question, Russian and Ukrainian, are closely related and that the similarity facilitates compromise forms belonging to neither monolingual variety and increases the possibilities for linguistic creativity and negotiation. To make it even more complex, there are also regional varieties of Ukrainian, a version of Russian spoken in Ukraine, and a wide range of lects that may be tentatively called Ukrainian-accented Russian and Russian-accented Ukrainian.

The first chapter, "Language paradoxes and ideologies of correction," deals with the sociolinguistic history of Ukraine and with attempts to undo the harm done by Soviet language policy. The second chapter, "Lives of language," presents a fascinating analysis of four linguistic biographies that exemplify language awareness and language choices by an individual. The third chapter, "Language at the threshold," is dedicated to the history of standardization of Ukrainian and various periods of Russification. Bilaniuk demonstrates that various language policies were not limited to status planning, but, especially during the Soviet era, also expanded into corpus planning by making changes in orthography, introducing Russian-like derivation, and substituting original Ukrainian forms. Ukrainian became associated with the rural setting as opposed to urban, cultivated, "educated" Russian. As a result, the post-Soviet period witnesses a partial reversal of the previous language shift. Bilaniuk shows that the choice of language depends on a person's mood, skills, and context (99–100). The acquisition of Ukrainian is sometimes hindered by purist attitudes and stigmatization of "impure" varieties that, however, are inevitably in use by Russophones as an intermediate stage. Chapter 4, "Surzhik: A history of linguistic transgressions," reveals that behind a single language label there are several varieties with somewhat different structural characteristics. Here Bilaniuk shows that what is considered by speakers as one variety cannot be taken at a face value. Chapter 5, "Correction, criticism, and the struggle over status," describes attempts to discard Surzhik as a "non-authentic," "non-standard," and "impure" variety. Yet it has found a niche as a comical register on stage, as in the extremely popular *Verka Serdushka* TV show, where the main protagonist speaks Surzhik. Chapter 6, "Concealing tensions and mediating pluralisms," describes the dynamics of language laws, practices of non-reciprocal bilingualism (with a different degree of mixing), and possibilities of advertising where English enters the picture.

The study demonstrates that linguistic identities and behaviors are constantly changing, and that "normality" is never static (193). It is an excellent introduction into the sociolinguistics of Ukraine and into the complexities of post-Soviet language situations in general.

(Received 30 October 2006)

Language in Society 36 (2007). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S004740450707039X

KARIM MURJI AND JOHN SOLOMOS (eds.), *Racialization: Studies in theory and practice*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005. Pp. 307. \$39.95.

Reviewed by CHRISTINE MALLINSON
Language, Literacy, & Culture Program
University of Maryland, Baltimore County
Baltimore, MD 21250, USA
mallinson@umbc.edu

The 13 papers in this edited volume, written by noted scholars of race and ethnicity (mainly sociologists) from the United States and United Kingdom, center on RACIALIZATION – the "processes by which racial meanings are attached to particular issues" (p. 3). In their introduction, Murji and Solomos consider the term's origins and evolution and briefly review the development of race theory.

Chapters 1 through 4 take up issues of terminology, discourse, and rhetoric. Brett St. Louis's opening chapter, "Racialization in the 'zone of ambiguity,'" critiques the rhetoric of "special/target populations" in biomedical research as a case of "biological racialization." "Historical and contemporary modes of racialization," by Michael Banton, traces use of the term "race" in historical, polit-