

BOOK REVIEWS

Language in Society 43 (2014)
doi:10.1017/S0047404514000402

NANCY HAWKER, *Palestinian-Israeli contact and linguistic practices*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2013. Pp. 229. Hb. £85.

Reviewed by CAMELIA SULEIMAN
Department of Linguistics and Languages
Michigan State University
East Lansing, MI 48824, USA
csuleima@msu.edu

I was delighted to read Nancy Hawker's book on Hebrew borrowings in Palestinian Arabic. This is a much needed contribution. Many scholars would agree that in a situation of language contact, languages borrow from each other, with the language of the subordinate group often borrowing the most. Even fourteenth century Ibn Khaldun in his 'Muqaddama' draws a connection between subordinate and dominant groups and how the 'conqueror' dominates the 'conquered' in style of clothing, manners, language, and ways of life (Ibn Khaldun n.d.:ch. 23, p. 147). The Palestinians are no exception. As Hawker herself notes, however, there is little systematic research on the influence of Hebrew on Palestinian Arabic. In the spirit of Ibn Khaldun, Hawker is also right to point out that the national variable is significant to the process of borrowing from another language. However, she does not consider this factor to necessarily be the most decisive factor for borrowing. This position, as she points out, is contrary to the contemporary positivistic research tradition on language borrowing and code-switching, such as research inspired by the prolific career of Joshua Fishman (98). Hawker has a broad academic background in international relations and linguistics, in addition to fluency in both Arabic and Hebrew. She asks the simple questions: How is Hebrew influencing Palestinian Arabic, and what are the lexical domains and the language situations in which borrowing occurs? She conducted ethnographic field research in three refugee camps in the West Bank (Shu'faat near Jerusalem, Dheishe near Bethlehem, and Tulkarem near the city of Tulkarem) during 2012–2013, in addition to interviewing Palestinians from these camps. Her research focuses on the lexical borrowings from Hebrew.

Guiding Hawker in her research is her breadth of theoretical background from Charles Tripp's politics of migrant workers, to Michael Halliday's systemic linguistics, to Norman Fairclough's discourse analysis of the 'cultural political economy' (3), to Stuart Hall's employment of the 'tractor-trailer' analogy to describe the relationship between structure and agency (3)—the trailer as the political/linguistic

practice and the tractor as both the position of a group in a political economy, as well as the way the group views its position. Hawker skillfully links linguistic practices of using Hebrew to the political economy of the Palestinians under Israeli occupation.

Hawker was concerned that if she tells her participants the intentions of her research that this would skew her results, as people would be reluctant to speak spontaneously, and most likely would avoid Hebrew borrowings, lest they would be considered traitors of their national cause. Hawker notes the ambivalence that Palestinians feel regarding Hebrew. She only spoke generally to her informants of the purpose of her research—that she is studying the social and linguistic aspects of refugee-camp life. Therefore, she was able to gather her data from the unsuspecting participants. She justified her choice as a necessity and as something that did not hurt anyone in the end.

Hawker found that the domains of Hebrew borrowings consist of consumerism and technology, the military and securitism of Israel, the labor market, and prison life. Some of the participants were bilinguals, and others were monolinguals who still used some borrowings from Hebrew.

Regarding consumerism and technology, there are certain words that are used in Hebrew, such as the word for ‘mall’, to indicate participation in the consumerism market of Israel’s economy. In addition, it indicates participating in a less conservative life, such as going to nightclubs in Jerusalem (for the Shu’faat refugee camp, as they are considered residents of Jerusalem), particularly for male youth from the camp. The same is true for words in the domain of technology. Palestinians would use Hebrew words to signal their participation in the modern culture of technology and the consumerism that comes with it. Other borrowings were from the daily lives of Palestinians facing the Israeli checkpoints and the humiliation these checkpoints carry. Palestinians use the Hebrew word to indicate ‘checkpoint’. By contrast, they use the Arabic words for ‘settlements’ and ‘curfew’. Hawker speculated that in regard to the latter two, the Palestinian policy makers and media were actively and vocally resistant to them as practices, but they were not as vocal in resisting the checkpoints as a practice. Thus, the Hebrew expression for ‘checkpoint’ entered the Palestinian Arabic lexicon, but not the words for ‘settlements’ and ‘curfew’. She points out a directionality from above that triggers Hebrew uses or not, in regard to Israel’s securitism. As for the labor market, most people in refugee camps, if they manage to find jobs in Israel, work in manual labor. They would use Hebrew borrowings to indicate their experience of working in Israel. This can have multiple meanings, however: it indicates manual labor in Israel and the humiliation it signifies, but at the same time, it indicates hard work and sacrifice to make ends meet, particularly if it is a woman who has to go to the Israel labor market for work. Another reason would be the lack of institutions that can represent these laborers. They are under the mercy of the Israeli job providers, and they may have to speak Hebrew, as their employers may demand it, in addition to the employers’ lack of knowledge of Arabic. Finally, prisoners generally

learn Hebrew in prison. Thus, using it becomes a status marker, indicating ironically their Palestinian nationalism. Hawker concludes that while Hebrew borrowings are abundant in Palestinian Arabic, there are no indications of a language shift.

Regarding Hawker's informants not knowing the intentions of the researchers, I personally would prefer to tell them. I understand the risks taken either way, but overall, they should be informed about the focus of the research. But as they gain the trust of the researcher, the research question would become less of an issue to them.

Finally, while the national dimension is significant in the use of Arabic to all Arabic speakers, the Palestinians are no exception (see Suleiman & Lucas 2012). Hawker convincingly persuades us to think of the complex web of relations that force the language user (consciously or unconsciously) to use language in ways that are unpredictable, and definitely unscripted.

Overall, I enjoyed the book. It is well written, well researched, and in an area that needs some attention. The book would be of interest to scholars of language contact, sociolinguistics, Arabic linguistics, and Middle East culturalists.

REFERENCES

Ibn Khaldun (n.d.) *Muqaddamat al-'Allama ibn Khaldun. Prolegomenon*. Cairo: al-Maktaba al-Tijariyya al-Kubra.

Suleiman, Camelia, & Russell Lucas (2012). Debating Arabic on al-Jazeera: Endangerment and identity in divergent discourses. *The Middle East Journal of Culture and Communication* 5(2):1–21.

(Received 5 January 2014)

Language in Society 43 (2014)
doi:10.1017/S0047404514000414

NATALIE SCHILLING, *Sociolinguistic fieldwork*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013. Pp. xi, 313. Pb. \$36.99.

Reviewed by HANNAH COULTER and SALI A. TAGLIAMONTE
Department of Linguistics, University of Toronto
Toronto, Ontario, M5S 3G3, Canada
hannah.coulter@mail.utoronto.ca
sali.tagliamonte@utoronto.ca

Sociolinguistic fieldwork is perhaps the most mysterious aspect of doing sociolinguistics, the stuff of late-night in-group gatherings among the select few who have actually been there. Natalie Schilling's new book cracks open the Pandora's Box of fieldwork knowledge and we two authors—one researcher, one student—offer our combined perspective of its unique merits for the field.

Schilling's goal 'is to at last reveal the "secrets" of sociolinguistic fieldwork' (1). She sets out to accomplish this by providing readers with a comprehensive 'hybrid how-to guide' that delivers both practical and theoretical information. Throughout