

## REVIEWS

JENNIFER DICKINSON, JAMES HERRON, LAURA KUNREUTHER, MANDANA LIMBERT, ELLEN MOODIE, & PENELOPE PAPAILIAS (eds.), *Linguistic form and social action*. (Michigan discussions in anthropology, 13.) Ann Arbor: Anthropology Dept., University of Michigan, 1998. Pp. 283.

Reviewed by BONNIE URCIOLI  
*Anthropology, Hamilton College*  
Clinton, NY 13323-1218  
burciul@hamilton.edu

As noted in this volume's Introduction by two of the editors, Jennifer Dickinson and Mandana Limbert, their collection displays work by students, alumni, and faculty of the University of Michigan Linguistic Anthropology Program, founded in 1991. The program's nature and development is evident in the coherence of the contents of the book, which consistently address the nature of the connections of immediate, ethnographically detailed (micro-level) deployment of linguistic form with the (macro-level) processes, institutions, and structures that frame such deployment as linguistic action. The essays generally fall into three categories: those focusing on a single speech event, those dealing with linguistic ideology, and those examining the ways in which language structure influences the form taken by social action. All these are framed by contemporary work on participation frameworks, on contextual structure and process, on dialogic emergence of meaning, on indexicality, and on linguistic ideology as cultural process played out in linguistic action. Stressing the emergent nature of structures and the continual, complex processes of indexical creativity, the authors develop in various and connected ways the linguistic ecology frame, as initiated by Einar Haugen and developed in much contemporary work in linguistic anthropology.

There are four essays in the first category, examining a single speech event. Laura Kunreuther, "Married to dukha: Irony in the telling of a 'traditional' Newari tale," provides a Bakhtinian analysis of the play of voices in a narrative about marriage by a Newar woman in Nepal. Such tales of marriage are discourses of suffering, *dukha*. In the telling, the narrator scripts layers of irony as cultural critique – especially noticeable in uses of reported speech, where the narrator casts the words of others to set up her assessment of what being married means. The capacity to interpret the narrative's forms is inextricable from the realization of these cultural frames in particular lives.

Ironic commentary by a marginalized performer is also central to Charlene Makely, "The power of the drunk: Humor and resistance in China's Tibet." An impromptu parody by a passenger in a crowded jeep, returning from a monastery festival, is the point of action from which layers of state-formation institutions and practices are examined; different points in the parody foreground different

elements of these enfolding layers. “Resistance” is not a simple opposition, since the PRC has appropriated certain aspects of Tibetan-ness for the tourist industry – privileging a very few elite positions while marginalizing most Tibetans.

James Herron, “On the dialogic emergence of ‘resistance’: Participation, framing and collusion in a prison exit interview,” further explores issues of institutional framing and resistance. The participants are a young man being released from juvenile detention, his mother, and his social worker. Herron tracks the participation framework latent in the institution itself. The social worker deploys his therapeutic rhetoric to channel the interaction toward its expected goal, the youth’s declaration of compliance; but the latter derails the interview by declaring loyalty to his gang.

Jean DeBernardi, “Ritual, language, and the invention of community in a Chinese secret sworn brotherhood,” takes up issues of group formation and boundary maintenance among 19th-century Chinese migrant laborers in Southeast Asia. Drawing from eyewitness accounts, DeBernardi analyzes initiation rituals in a sworn brotherhood as both invention and re-creation of “tradition,” binding and setting apart its members. She details their oaths of allegiance, tightly scripted drama, and performance of social structure. By locating performativity conditions in historical process, she shows how ritual innovations took on “traditional” force and continuity.

The focus of the next three essays is linguistic ideologies. Penelope Papailias, “Do you want to go forward? Turn back! Etymology and neoliberalism in Greek language ideology,” positions the post-junta rhetoric of language purism in the context of post-Cold War Europe, beyond the right/left dichotomy of Greek politics. Like DeBernardi, Papailias historicizes the performative conditions in which “tradition” emerges: Greek takes on its own life, and its etymologies “naturally” invoke its ancient roots. This creates a “diachronically unified” Greek which connects past to future, without the problematic associations of *Katharevousa* (archaizing Greek) or the “incompleteness” of *Demotic*.

Barbara Johnstone, “‘Sounding country’ in urbanizing Texas: Private speech in public discourse,” looks at linguistic forms in terms of the projection of cultural personas, i.e. as a form of action beyond the formal sociolinguistic inventory. “Sounding country” results from the deployment of key rural-sounding forms in public discursive space. This works because the forms sound PERSONAL; indeed, some “personal” forms might not be specifically rural. Johnstone analyzes a newsletter written by a country-western singer to demonstrate the emergence of an overall rural effect.

Finally in this section, Laada Bilaniuk, “Purity and power: The geography of language ideology in the Ukraine,” takes up the social dynamics underpinning the definition of “good” Ukrainian in that recently independent country, relating the quest for language correctness to the quest for national definition. Through matched-guise tests and surveys of 2,000 respondents, and in interviews and public commentaries, Bilaniuk found a range of not entirely congruent rationales

and explanations concerning what the “best” Ukrainian is and where it is found, with assessments reflecting personal location and/or linguistic elements beyond awareness.

The three essays of the last section examine the effect of form on social action. Lesley Milroy, “Negotiating meanings with the least (collaborative) effort – or how conversationalists help each other along,” uses Conversation Analysis to examine structures framing talk between aphasic and non-aphasic speakers. In CA, the function of each piece of talk is assessed by what people do next; this de-emphasizes semantic models and focuses on the form of talk as social action. Especially salient here is the study of aphasic speech, in which conventional interpretation of meaning or intent is less accessible. Milroy’s use of the “least collaborative effort” principle shows the limits of speaker-oriented approaches.

Susan Blum, “Pearls on the string of the Chinese nation: Pronouns, plurals and prototypes in talk about identities,” examines pronominal reference (in conversations and interviews) to ethnic groups in China. Speakers tend not to be conscious of pronoun use, so pronouns provide a useful index of users’ perceptions and classifications. First person plural tends to index the dominant Han group; third plural, groups well known to the speaker; third singular, groups known mainly as types. The markedness relations thus uncovered in ordinary talk both reflect and re-create aspects of the state formation process.

Finally, Bruce Mannheim, “‘Time, not the syllables, must be counted’: Quechua parallelism, word meaning and cultural analysis,” teases out organizations of cultural and cognitive meaning accessible in Quechua semantic couplets, once the inherent poetic principle is grasped. Drawing on Roman Jakobson’s principles – focus on form, hierarchic organization, and word meaning generalizable across use – Mannheim shows how semantic couplets juxtapose unmarked/general and marked/specific meanings in parallel morpho-syntactic structures. Such pairings may bring to light basic dualisms in Quechua culture, along with the complex and varied dynamics that continually produce them.

Throughout this volume, macro–micro relations, close-grained linguistic analysis, and formal issues are treated in careful and innovative ways. The volume is unified by recurring and intersecting themes. In the essays by Kunreuther, Makely, and Herron, analyses of brief events result in rich assessments because context is treated as a manifestation of social/cultural dynamics, making large processes perceptible in apparently small moments of discourse. Another recurring theme is the assessment of collaborative processes, in the essays already mentioned and in that by Milroy, who is especially emphatic on this point. By drawing emphasis away from the notion that speech/communicative events are essentially speaker-driven, one also moves away from analyses that privilege lexical and syntactic form, i.e. what the speaker “produces,” as analytic starting points. Insistent attention is paid to links between identity formation and historically contingent

process, and to the discursive detail by which such links are enacted: the socio-historically specific performativity of ritual, as described by DeBernardi, and of satire, by Makely; the tensions and ambiguities of national definition, by Bilaniuk; rhetorical reconfiguration in a shifting world, by Papailias; shared presupposition as to what groups belong and how, by Blum; and reconfigurations of public language to index regional belonging, by Johnstone. Meaning itself is continually produced in complex and dynamic sets of relations, as Mannheim shows.

In all these essays, the reader gets a sense of form in processual flux, so that what is constant or appears fixed is not what one takes for granted, but what one must theorize. Forms are continually treated as emergent, as multiply worked out; analyses address form in perspective, in situated action – never simply forms per se. This is evident in treatments of narrative or conversational form as collaboratively produced; of formal inversion in parody and irony, and of formal innovation in ritual; and of private form that takes on new value when played out in public space. Forms must be assessed in relations of markedness, and in terms of users' ethnometalinguistic awareness as social actors. All this reinforces the sense of language as an ecology which runs throughout the volume, and which Mannheim makes explicit in his conclusion. This perception, which all the contributors develop, gives this volume its unity.

(Received 7 August 1999)

PER LINELL, *Approaching dialogue: Talk, interaction and contexts in dialogical perspectives*. (Impact: Studies in language and society, 3.) Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins, 1998. Pp. xvii, 330. Hb \$85.00.

Reviewed by ELIZABETH KEATING  
 Anthropology, University of Texas  
 Austin, TX 78712  
 ekeating@mail.utexas.edu

Linell argues that dialogism is the crucial path to theorizing and understanding discourse, cognition, and communication – particularly the study of conversation and other kinds of talk-in-interaction. One of the goals of his book is to develop an “empirically valid form of dialogism,” as opposed to an idealistic one, through the empirical investigation of communication. Linell develops a theory of “communicative projects,” a notion which incorporates aspects of individual agency as well as the idea of talk as emergent, collaborative work by co-present individuals. The notion of “communicative projects” is meant as a bridge across the oft-cited polarity between “micro” and “macro” – or as Linell formulates it, between “elementary contributions and local sequences on the one hand, and the global and more abstract notions of activity types and communicative genres” (233).

This work depends heavily not only on Bakhtinian ideas of polyvocality, voicing, and reported speech – ideas based on written literature – but also on ideas developed by ethnomethodologists, conversation analysts, and discourse analysts looking at oral speech production. Linell’s discussions range widely through literature on cognition, phenomenology, sociology, social constructionism, linguistic anthropology, and psychology: a truly cross-disciplinary approach. Building on his own research and the work of others, he adopts a position of “contextual social constructionism” (62) in which the concept of “re-” is central, as in “re-contextualization” (63). He focuses on the nested nature of communicative projects and aims to strike a “balance” between the social and the individual which contains resonances of the monologic and the dialogic. The goal is to develop some concepts for the analysis of spoken interaction on its own terms, and to look at structure within discursive practices.

Linell’s own formulation is that dialogism is made up of three properties: sequential organization, joint construction, and the interdependence between acts (local) and activities (global). Interactions are “other-oriented,” where every act is “responsive to something” (35). This formulation uses Bakhtin’s idea of according a certain predominance to the hearer: “Primacy belongs to the response . . . understanding comes to function only in the response” (79). Even acts that appear monological are only “seemingly” so; in actuality there is a “virtual other,” a listener-as-co-author, to whom such utterances are a response:

I propose to deal with phenomena like discourse, communication, thought, interaction, language use, linguistic practices, etc., as primary, rather than as parasitic on language structure. That is, D-aspects are primary, and S-units must be seen as decontextualized abstractions, generalizations sometimes (implicitly) made by language-users but in many cases virtually “made” or at least further developed by specialists, especially linguists, for particular purposes, such as forming a basis for language standardization, language teaching, translation between languages, construction of formal languages, etc., or simply for building abstract models of language. (4)

Discourse can be analyzed from a number of different dialogical perspectives, determined by activity type.

The book is structured in three parts. In Part I, monologism (individuals as analytical primes) and dialogism (interactions in context as analytical primes) are contrasted. The development of monologism, according to Linell, is a direct result of a traditional written-language bias (cf. Linell 1982, 1988). The common division of “verbal” and “non-verbal” depends on writing, since “verbal” means what can be conventionally represented in writing (29). Rather than looking exclusively at “that which can be written down,” we should look at the ways that embodiment, temporality, and embeddedness in social action contribute to meaning-making (see also Schegloff et al. 1996). Austin’s Speech Act Theory, which Linell cites as the most influential theory of linguistic action to date (207),

is criticized for its attention to sentences as autonomous units, for its failure to cope with the multifunctionality of discourse contributions, for its lack of focus on utterances as responses to certain moves – or to the “language game” as a larger unit – and for its failure to recognize the collaborative accomplishment of talk. Linell’s theory of communicative projects is “opposed to speech act theory, as developed by Searle and others” (xiv).

In Part II (Chaps. 5–12), the properties of a dialogic view of language are introduced through excerpts from language in interaction, with an explication of the role of context and of the reflexive relation between discourses and their contexts (88). At the same time, Linell questions exactly how much, and to what extent, our communicative resources are dialogically produced. He engages the relation between lexical meaning and dialogism, i.e. the extent to which words can be said to have stable semantic properties (118), shared among language users. In an interesting excerpt from natural conversation, he shows how speakers negotiate the meaning of the term “open” in the context of a service establishment. A problem arises when personnel at a certain establishment are approached by customers when the building is open (accessible), but not technically “open for business.” An ensuing discussion about the problem at a staff meeting reveals that personnel have different notions about what “open” should mean in this context.

Issues of context are a key aspect in the empirical investigation of issues of understanding and the production of coherent talk. In Chap. 8, Linell discusses aspects of context and types of contextual resources, including co-text (discursive resources), surrounding situation (locally as well as socio-historically situated), abstract definition of situation (frame), prior discourse, and specific knowledge or assumptions (of both communicative routines and background knowledge). This discussion includes consideration of when these contextual aspects are in conflict, and of competing context spaces (152). Linell discusses the “double dialogicality of discourse – the social and physical space at a point of time and in cultural history” (132). Recontextualization, originally a text-based notion, is fundamental to understanding dialogism and how it works in interaction (155). There is a triadic relation among utterance, understanding, and contexts.

In Chaps. 9–12, Linell discusses units of discourse: utterances, idea units, and turns at talk. Also discussed are activity types, episodes, topics, topic progression, and coherence, as well as his previous work on “response links” (the relation of an utterance to prior utterances) and “initiative links” (contexts for possible continuation in discourse; 165). Linell looks at actual recorded interactions to discover what the dialogical units of analysis should be, and he puts forward a “partial” hierarchy of units based on talk in interaction. The thorny issue of “structure vs. practice/process” is conceptualized as a difference between what interactants share as experience in common (e.g. intersubjectivity) and what they do not (e.g. fragmentation, the presence of asymmetries).

Expanding our analysis of language competence and performance beyond a focus on individual speech production – “the speaker alone as the origin of the utterance” (xii) – has been a recent interest of those looking at language as a social phenomenon and as a means for accomplishing communication in various ways cross-culturally. However, as Linell points out, the enthusiasm with which dialogism has been embraced by many who work to discover the structures of joint achievement begs the question of what role individual agency and individual cognition play in joint interaction. Can we retreat altogether from our past habit of privileging the individual as the locus of communicative action? Linell argues that monologic practices, in science or elsewhere, can be accommodated within a general dialogistic framework. In Part III of his book, monologism and dialogism are “reconciled” – partly by acknowledgment of the role of individual agency in formulating plans and projects which get launched in interactions with others. The authority and domination of the speaker still have a place in the analysis of “certain situated activities.”

Linell has brought together a complex array of materials, and has related them in novel and productive ways. His transcripts are excellent resources for making his points and for establishing the complexities of the topic at hand. However, transcripts in Swedish were translated into English without representing the original language; this may restrict their usefulness for some types of research, or for classroom discussion in some contexts. The references are excellent (cf. pp. 29–31), and Linell’s history of the notion of dialogism is compelling. He is always careful to introduce and clearly define his terms, which is crucial in an interdisciplinary work such as this. The book could have benefited from even more examples to illustrate some of the complex ideas (and their relationships to each other), particularly those discussed in Parts I and III.

This book is an ambitious one, covering a broad field – not only monologism and dialogism. It brings together many strands of current research in talk-in-interaction and the analysis of discourse properties, as well as providing some new insights and ideas. The work is a real contribution to the study of language.

## REFERENCES

- Linell, Per (1982). *The written language bias in linguistics*. (Studies in communication, 2.) Linköping, Sweden: Department of Communication Studies, Linköping University.
- (1988). The impact of literacy on the conception of language: The case of linguistics. In Roger Saljo (ed.), *Human growth and the complex society: Notes on the monocultural bias of theories of learning* (Cultural Dynamics, 5), 43–56.
- Schegloff, Emmanuel; Ochs, Elinor; & Thompson, Sandra (1996). Introduction. In E. Ochs, E. Schegloff, & S. Thompson (eds.), *Interaction and grammar*, 1–51. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.

(Received 13 September 1999)

DAVID SILVERMAN, *Harvey Sacks: Social science and conversation analysis*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press; New York: Oxford University Press, 1998. Pp. ix, 222.

Reviewed by DOUGLAS W. MAYNARD  
*Sociology, University of Wisconsin  
Madison, WI 53706  
maynard@ssc.wisc.edu*

In his Introduction to Volume I of Sacks's *Lectures on conversation* (1992), Emmanuel Schegloff observes (1992:lviii) that his own effort at overview was "truly daunting," mostly because of "the extraordinary richness and multi-facetedness of Sacks's corpus . . . In its variety, depth, and freshness of vision it defies domestication into convenient guidelines to a reader." Such a statement – indeed, any reading of the two-volume set of *Lectures* – should give pause to someone attempting a textbook rendering of Sacks and his work. But such a text is precisely what Silverman has produced, and the effort is remarkably successful on its own terms.

In his Preface, Silverman quotes part of Schegloff's statement and sets a limited agenda for the book. It is not to discuss Sacks's work for those who are familiar with conversation analysis (CA), but to make Sacks and the lectures available to a wider group of "students and scholars" who presumably may be coming to the material for the first time. To its credit, accordingly, Silverman's book mostly points the reader to the *Lectures* and avoids, although not completely, its own interpretive or analytic approach. Thus Chap. 1 reviews a number of phenomena that occupy Sacks – from the organization of suicidal talk, to banal explanations for extraordinary experiences, to conversations involved in naming and categorizing people, to ways that children manipulate conversational rules. As a device for attracting the reader to the unusual reach and penetrating analytic eye that is represented in Sacks's work, it is an effective beginning.

After this auspicious start, Chap. 2 traces intellectual influences on Sacks, including most prominently Erving Goffman and Harold Garfinkel, and mentioning a range of others more extensively treated in Schegloff's Introduction. Unquestionably, Sacks's training in law as well as social science – along with his wide knowledge of Greek philosophy, Freudian theory, biblical studies and interpretation, anthropology, linguistics, literary criticism, ethnography, and more – renders the lectures intellectually challenging and fascinating, whether or not Sacks's overriding attempt to build a science of society is also the reader's primary interest. Still, in Chap. 3, Silverman proceeds to characterize how Sacks – by explicitly distinguishing his investigations from those of Durkheim, cultural anthropology, linguistics, ethnography, and sociology in general – pursued this effort to build a proper social science.

Having characterized Sacks's work as a "plea for the social sciences to reconsider their subject matter and, thereby, its analytic purpose" (56), Silverman moves on in Chap. 4 to consider "Method." Perhaps no other topic is so consistently



addressed in the *Lectures*, as one sees from a quick scan of the indexes in each volume. Under “methodological remarks,” the index for Vol. I has 73 entries, and that for Vol. II has 59. These numbers exceed those for any other topic; and when added to entries for such related subjects as “social sciences” and “work remarks,” they give a gross sense of how preoccupied Sacks was with method and methodology. Features that are well known in CA, and that are brought to the fore in Silverman’s discussion, are (a) Sacks’s urge to begin with “unmotivated” looking at interactional data, and (b) his proposal of “order at all points” to be appreciated in the data. As Schegloff (1992:xlvi) points out, “order at all points” challenges the orthodox social scientific view that pattern exists only at the aggregate level of distributional and statistical analysis; at that point, much of the detail that can be preserved in direct observational inquiry has been dispensed with. Once the analyst digs into the detritus of ordinary conduct, then organization that an investigator cannot theorize, imagine, or otherwise preconceive – but to which participants themselves are manifestly alive – begins to show itself.

Silverman borrows the Sacksian imagery that such pattern reflects the operation of an interactional “machinery,” and he offers seven methodological rules for gaining access to this machinery. With terminology slightly different from Silverman’s, I would gloss these rules as (i) gathering observational data; (ii) making recordings; (iii) being behaviorist, i.e. oriented to observable activities rather than psychological dispositions; (iv) describing “members’ methods” – the ethnomethodological influence; (v) appropriating members’ (rather than theoretical) categories; (vi) locating procedures and sequences of action; and (vii) building an analysis. Then, in the conclusion to his chapter “Method,” Silverman (still using *Lectures* materials) attempts to answer the criticisms that CA deals with trivial, non-random, and incomplete data, that it addresses trivial topics, and that it is devoid of concern with large-scale social structure. Coincidentally, just after Silverman produced his book on Sacks, Paul ten Have published *Doing conversation analysis: A practical guide* (1999), which is wholly devoted to a hands-on, “how-to” version of CA. So, for a compatible and more thorough treatment of topics akin to Silverman’s methodological rules, the interested reader has another new resource.

So far, so good. Chaps. 1–4 of the present volume take us nearly halfway through the book, and they point ardently to the *Lectures* as important source material for the reader to consult. The treatments of Sacksian phenomena, intellectual influences, mode of inquiry, and methods are brief and tantalizing, in the spirit of Silverman’s tutorial agenda. Inevitably, perhaps, the latter part of the book enters more troubled waters – but interestingly so. This is because dispute exists concerning the direction that the CA field is going, and concerning what can be projected for that direction from Sacks’s own work.

A brief summary of the core issues: Most CA investigators would agree that, although various streams of inquiry are present, “commonsense knowledge” of the social world and culture was of primary concern to Sacks in his early lectures.

Investigators (including Silverman) capture this concern with common sense by referring to Membership Categorization Analysis (MCA) – Sacks’s means for constructing an analytical apparatus to account for the “reproduceability” and understandability of descriptions, stories, and other units of talk. However, Sacks may have been moving away from MCA as inquiry into social action and interaction developed. Schegloff (1992:335) observes that, even in the early work, Sacks became concerned with components smaller and more visible than categories or categorization devices, as in this passage from Lecture 5 (Fall 1965):

... what I’m going to be doing is taking small parts of a thing and building out from them, because small parts can be identified and worked on without regard to the larger thing they’re part of ... these smaller components are first to be identified because they are components perhaps for lots of other tasks than the one they’re used in. (Sacks 1992a:159)

A priority is asserted here; and Schegloff reasons that the study of small parts was derived from an unusual approach to the status of commonsense knowledge, and to the categorical analyses embedded therein. To suggest that participants’ talk exhibits such knowledge – a way that investigations of everyday life customarily have reported findings – is not, in Sacks’s developing view, defensible social scientific procedure. Instead, investigators should approach an exhibit of common sense as a starting point, and work toward an analysis that captures the way participants accountably or warrantably use such knowledge, as shown in their displayed understanding of it.

This crucial and radical methodological shift is difficult to capture in the space of a review. It is a switch away from adopting the ANALYST’S understanding as a point of analytic departure, and toward utilizing PARTICIPANTS’ own understanding as that point. The shift, according to Schegloff (1992:xlili–iv), is only nascent in the earlier work; it begins to flower in Sacks’s emerging studies of turn-taking and other forms of SEQUENTIAL ORGANIZATION – e.g. tying structures as a source for coherence, and adjacently paired utterances as organized activities. Paying attention to sequences – and to what happens next at each moment in a developing course of action – is the primary way to draw on the participants’ local, displayed understandings, and to avoid a more abstract, top-down, or imposed interpretation.

At the risk of gross simplification, then, we can see two strong courses of inquiry in Sacks’s lectures: (a) Membership Categorization Analysis – the study of participants’ commonsense and cultural knowledge – and (b) sequential analysis. Given Sacks’s untimely death in a car accident in 1975, questions spring forth: What directions might CA have pursued if Sacks had lived longer? What directions should it have taken, given that he did not? And what directions has the

field in fact taken? The last question is the easiest to answer, because the bulk of work since 1975 has followed the course of sequential analysis. The answers to the other questions are more contested.

For example, Hester & Eglin have edited a volume on Membership Categorization Analysis; and in their introductory chapter, they suggest (1997:2) that the emphasis on sequential organization in CA has been “at the expense of the categorical aspects of conversation, although there is a small class of studies which have combined to varying degrees both forms of analysis.” Following Hester & Eglin, and more particularly Watson 1996, Silverman declares that sequential and membership categorization analysis are complimentary. My regret is that he does not treat this issue further, since it is a real and lively one of great scholarly interest; it ignites theoretical and methodological passions that traverse anthropology, communications, ethnomethodology, linguistics, sociology, and other fields. Prominent discussions about the role of ethnography in the analysis of discourse, and more or less friendly criticisms of CA for its inattention to the larger social forces that surround talk (recently, e.g., by Hanks 1996:218 and Duranti 1997:267–77) are related to the problem of what the balance was between membership categorization analysis and sequential analysis in Sacks’s work, and what it should be in present inquiry.

On the other hand, Silverman could hardly have entered the fray any more than he does without distorting the agenda of his book. Painstakingly even-handed, he clearly states his position of complementarity; the second half of his volume consists of two sets of paired chapters. Chap. 5 introduces Membership Categorization Analysis, and connects with Chap. 7 on “Using MCA.” Chap. 6 is on “Conversation Analysis” (sequential organization), and fits with Chap. 8 on “Using CA.” Chaps. 5 and 7 lay out Sacks’s own work in the two areas, while Chaps. 6 and 8 discuss studies of other investigators that embody, respectively, MCA and the analysis of sequential organization. The amount of space accorded the two kinds of inquiry is almost equal.

The final Chap. 9, on “Sacks’s legacy,” reminds readers to “turn to Sacks’s own writings to locate his legacy for themselves.” Among other tidbits in this chapter, Silverman articulates “Sacks’s aesthetic for sociological research,” which includes a concern for detail, a consuming interest in the mundane, clear and incisive analysis, and revelation of massive regularity in ordinary conduct. This is a legacy that invites students and scholars to read the lectures further – just as it charts a way to proceed, and an infinite set of topics for the language and interaction-based researcher. This book can be used to complement primary materials in upper-level undergraduate and graduate courses on language use and conversation analysis. At the time of writing this review, I have not yet had a chance to use the book in my classes, but particularly at the undergraduate level, where my use of Sacks’s lectures has met with varied reactions, I anticipate that Silverman’s introduction to the “aesthetic” and the “legacy” may help overcome some barriers.

## REFERENCES

- Duranti, Alessandro (1997). *Linguistic anthropology*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hanks, William F. (1996). *Language and communicative practices*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Hester, Stephen, & Eglin, Peter (1997). *Culture in action: Studies in membership categorization analysis*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Sacks, Harvey (1992). *Lectures on conversation*. 2 vols. Ed. by Gail Jefferson, with an Introduction by E. A. Schegloff. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1992). Introduction. In Sacks, I:ix–lxii.
- ten Have, Paul (1999). *Doing conversation analysis: A practical guide*. London: Sage.
- Watson, Rod (1996). Some general reflections on “categorization” and “sequence” in the analysis of conversation. In Hester & Eglin (eds.), 49–75.

(Received 11 September 1999)

JOHN CONLEY & WILLIAM O'BARR, *Just words: Law, language, and power*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998. Pp. xi, 168. Hb \$35.00, pb \$13.00.

Reviewed by MARCO JACQUEMET  
*Anthropology, Barnard College, Columbia University*  
 New York, NY 10027-6598  
 mj132@columbia.edu

Until recently, legal anthropologists have treated talk as a source of information about conflict rather than as a techno-political device used by participants in the conflict. From Malinowski to Gluckman to Bohannan, conflict – between social classes, ethnic groups, individuals and society, or individual interactants – has always been one of the major concerns of socio-cultural anthropology. Yet the classic studies yielded very little knowledge of how people actually manage conflict in interaction. They suffered from an absence of detailed primary data and elected to present summaries, reports by native sources, or reports from meetings held to resolve the conflict. In sum, those studies analyzed the law as a set of cases and rules, rather than a contested field of linguistic practices.

Fortunately, the past two decades have seen the emergence of linguistically rich legal ethnographies. Conley, a professor of law at the University of North Carolina, and O'Barr, a cultural anthropologist at Duke University, have collaborated since the early 1980s to study the interaction between law and language, focusing primarily on small claims courts in the US. In their new book, they present a critical argument for the importance of examining the linguistic details of legal practices. The bulk of the book is a review of some of the most important studies of communicative practices in the Anglo-American legal system: cross-examinations in rape trials (Chap. 2), the informal exchanges of mediation sessions (Chap. 3), the legal efficacy of assertive fact-driven descriptions (Chap. 4), and naming the source of conflict and assessing responsibility (Chap. 5). In these chapters, Conley & O'Barr discuss the deep-seated structural asymmetry of power among interactants, and they explore some of the roots of such asymmetrical distribution of communicative resources.

The authors' attention to power asymmetry, influenced by Foucault's notion of discourse (well summarized in their introduction), reflects new developments in the study of social interaction in institutional settings. These settings, once assumed to be neutral territory as regards differences in language use, are now considered more like linguistic war zones in which interactants are acutely aware of language use and power asymmetries. Talk is thus analyzed not only with regard to devices that ensure coherence and cohesion, but also for those mechanisms by which speakers/hearers achieve sudden shifts and underminings of contexts and bring about breakdowns of conversational coherence.

Among the many socio-cultural dimensions that produce social asymmetry, Conley & O'Barr concentrate on gender. Arguing that "speech style is a critical factor in the courtroom" and that "the relative credibility of witnesses is influenced by the manner in which their testimony is presented" (65), they show how the Anglo-American legal system penalizes the speech style routinely associated with women. They find evidence of this gender bias in the mechanics of cross-examination in rape cases, which "simultaneously reflect and reaffirm men's power over women" (37); in mediators' bias in "dismissing women's expression of anger" (50); and in the legal system's tendency to give "greater credence to witnesses who speak in a powerful and an assertive style" (75). These, the authors believe, are "manifestations of the law's patriarchy at the most elemental linguistic level" (75).

This emphasis on the relation between gender and power is Conley & O'Barr's greatest contribution to the field of law and language. However, it also limits their ability to analyze the full complexity of the relation between power and language. Class, race, and ethnicity – other key dimensions of power asymmetry – are mentioned only once, in the introduction, in a single sentence (14). The authors' treatment of gender in isolation impoverishes their analysis: It is only by looking at gender in association with ethnicity – and with the "experience-distant" (to quote Geertz) dimensions of education, cultural capital, and class – that we can arrive at a thick description of asymmetrical communicative behavior in judicial settings. (See Gumperz 1982 on ethnicity, Merry 1986 on class, Bourdieu 1991 on cultural capital, and Butler 1997 for a complex reading of the intersection of law and gender.) I raise this criticism because this otherwise excellent book claims to address power asymmetry, not just gender asymmetry. The authors should have been more specific about their aim, and "power" should have been replaced by "gender" in the book's subtitle. If they had done so, they would have been judged on what they wrote, not on what they elected to leave out.

Conley & O'Barr address law in cross-cultural perspective – the essence of legal anthropology – in the penultimate chapter, where they consider the "portability of legal discourse analysis to other places" (130). In reviewing some of the leading figures in legal anthropology (Malinowski, Llewellyn, Hoebel, Gluck-

man, Bohannan, Nader), they correctly fault them for not having understood that “in any culture a full appreciation of the law and its power depends on a thorough understanding of everyday linguistic practice” (115). In line with the authors’ statement, various studies in the past decade have developed sophisticated theory and methodology on the interplay between law, power, and linguistic practice. It is unfortunate that many of these works – which I and other linguistic anthropologists consider essential for the field of “law, language, and culture” – were not included in this chapter (see Brenneis & Meyers 1984, Watson-Gegeo & White 1990, Drew 1992, Kulick 1993, Hill & Irvine 1993, Duranti 1994, Briggs 1996, Jacquemet 1996). Conley & O’Barr instead focus on only two recent studies (Kuipers 1990, Goldman 1993) in their discussion of the relationship between verb forms, accidents, and responsibility.

Regardless of these shortcomings, the book provides a balanced discussion of the importance of gender and communicative practices for the study of judicial proceedings in Anglo-American law. It will be useful for readers interested in accessing a condensed and quite readable overview of the relationship among language, law, and gender.

## REFERENCES

- Bourdieu, Pierre (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Briggs, Charles (1996), ed. *Disorderly discourse: Narrative, conflict, and inequality*. (Oxford studies in anthropological linguistics, 7.) Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.
- Brenneis, Donald, & Myers, Fred R. (1984), eds. *Dangerous words: Language and politics in the Pacific*. New York: New York University Press.
- Butler, Judith P. (1997). *Excitable speech: A politics of the performative*. London: Routledge.
- Drew, Paul (1992). Contested evidence in courtroom cross-examination: The case of a rape trial. In Paul Drew & John Heritage (eds.) *Talk at work*, 470–520. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Duranti, Alessandro (1994). *From grammar to politics: Linguistic anthropology in a Samoan village*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Goldman, Laurence (1993). *The culture of coincidence: Accident and absolute liability in Huli*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Gumperz, John J. (1982). Fact and inference in courtroom testimony. In J. J. Gumperz (ed.), *Language and social identity*, 163–95. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hill, Jane, & Irvine, Judith (1993), eds. *Responsibility and evidence in oral discourse*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Jacquemet, Marco (1996). *Credibility in court: Communicative practices in the Camorra Trials*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kulick, Don (1993). Speaking as a woman: Structure and gender in domestic arguments in a New Guinea village. *Cultural Anthropology* 8:510–41.
- Kuipers, Joel (1990). *Power in performance*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Merry, Sally (1986). Everyday understanding of the law in working-class America. *American Ethnologist* 13:253–70.
- Watson-Gegeo, Karen Ann, & White, Geoffrey M. (1990), eds. *Disentangling: Conflict discourse in Pacific societies*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

(Received 25 August 1999)

ISABELLA PAOLETTI, *Being an older woman: A study in the social production of identity*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 1998. Pp. xiv, 94. Hb \$36.00, pb \$19.95.

Reviewed by HOWARD GILES  
 Communication, University of California  
 Santa Barbara, CA 93106-4020, USA  
 giles@sscf.ucsb.edu

In the past fifteen years, there has been an upsurge of interest in matters social-gerontological within both sociolinguistics and communication science. This is manifest in an abundance of books, and particularly special journal issues, in an international series of conferences (at its fifth venue in Vancouver, 2001), and in a handbook on the topic (Nussbaum & Coupland 1995). Paoletti's concise paperback – the eighth in a series, “Everyday communication: Case studies of behavior in context,” edited by Wendy Leeds-Hurwitz and Stuart J. Sigman – contributes to this growing literature in important ways, not least of which are its focus on the ACTIVE elderly and its recourse to Italian data.

The discourse analyzed arose mainly, but not exclusively, from videotaped committee meetings of the Older Women's Action Project (1991–94), in the mid-Italian city of Perugia, in which Paoletti herself participated – a process which, with all due caveats, she successfully defends. The origins of this project (in liaison with an English group, and supported by the European Community) lay in some women's dismay at the lack of their gender's involvement in a local Seniors' Center – here, a male-dominated institution. Funding allowed for females to organize new, creative activities, such as singing groups and theater performances embedded in the women's own experiences. Although local funding was ultimately withdrawn, the Action Project achieved enormous successes at many levels. A significant number of women left the social isolation of their homes to participate in ways that quickly and robustly enhanced their vitality. Women became leaders of various groups and involved themselves in decision-making at a growing number of Senior Centers. A European network of six countries was added to the English-Italian Action Project, besides the establishment of an Italian Association; international exchanges were multiplied, and so forth. The book opens with this fascinating slice of social history.

Taking an ethnomethodological stance, the study is aimed at examining how older women's identities are socially constructed and negotiated within the complex web of institutions that impinge on them. In two intriguing chapters, Paoletti shows how the women of Perugia creatively define their age identities by differentiating themselves from the institutionalized very old, by denying or postponing their somatic decline, by deconstructing negative images of the elderly, and by accentuating their special roles as caretakers. All too often, conceptual lip service is accorded to social identity as a negotiative process rather than a mere immutable given; empirical data are often conspicuously scarce or even absent. Paoletti's analysis, however, concretely and discursively illuminates some of the mechanisms and processes that are implicated. Thus her work should interest not

only those working in the age sphere but also all involved in the construction of social identity (gender, ethnicity, occupation etc.)

The volume continues by demonstrating how these age identities are affected (and interfered with) by the institutional agendas of other local social agencies, in addition to the important influence from male members of the Senior Centers' executives. In this regard, the analysis invokes a between-gender examination of how some (executive) males responded to this threat to their own identity and social dominance, and it presents the women's rhetorical responses. English translations of the Italian discursive data pay welcome interpretive attention to the important extra-linguistic forces at work – including divisive seating arrangements, gestures, and even accent. Paoletti also discusses how certain women appeared more communicatively competent in serving the Action Project's needs than did others who apparently had more limited, less assertive skills. The book concludes by discussing implications for social policy – particularly for the previously “invisible” women in this arena – and the ways in which communicative empowerment, if you like, could be the basis for preventing some of the epidemiological trends associated with elderly women (e.g. nervous disorders and arthritis).

This monograph has many strengths besides those mentioned above. First, the research program unfolds as an engaging narrative in its own right; it is a compelling model for provocative discussion of aging and gender issues in pedagogical (and other) settings. Some controversial issues here might include whether older women's attempts at social differentiation from their more frail counterparts are an unhelpful collusion, considering that they themselves will later experience decline. Another might be how best, at the outset, to have engaged the older males at the Centers whose status and power were under contention, at least from their perspective, if equality in institutional management was ultimately to be achieved. (It is interesting to note that this aspect of the development of the Action Project, within the confines of the male-dominant Centers, is hardly alluded to early in the book, in the historical background.) Notwithstanding the potency of Paoletti's claim that different women's communicative skills can fashion institutional affairs, another point for consideration might be whether women's INDIVIDUAL communication skills are at the core of successful negotiations with males, as contended by Paoletti. It seems, to this reviewer anyway, that a more fundamental root cause might not be the personal skills involved – which themselves are as situationally dependent as are social identities – but the “intergroup” understandings and sophistication that the women had of the complex dynamics unfolding around them. Yet another might be whether these revitalized women's positive identities would hold up as discursively positive in settings OUTSIDE the project's activities, which were of course deliberately engineered to achieve this.

Second, the book affords much-needed attention to the unique experiences of FEMALE aging. Likewise, it underscores the emancipatory potential we have for ameliorating negative age identities, even longstanding ones, into more healthy



ones under appropriate structural conditions. Third, and related, the work promotes attention to the heterogeneity of aging and goes some way toward redressing the current imbalance in the literature that depicts the elderly as victims of communicative deficits and discrimination (see Williams & Coupland 1998 for just such a critique). Fourth, besides being well grounded in current sociolinguistic and social gerontological research and thinking, the analysis is couched in an understanding of age identities in the context of social change and of the variable institutional agencies that interweave these; here we do not entertain any notion of the individual elderly as the necessary victims of ineluctable decline, outside historical movements.

That said, there may be further room for exciting theoretical maneuvers. The women's attempts to seek positive age identities through differentiation (and the like) highly resemble the "strategies for change" articulated in Tajfel & Turner's (1986) influential theory of intergroup relations and social change (see Harwood, Giles & Ryan 1995 for an extrapolation of their so-called "social identity theory" into the intergenerational sphere). The particularistics of the between-gender confrontations described by Paoletti could also be usefully construed in terms of this framework. Moreover, the Action Project's increasing influence in the other gender's spheres also reminds one of the burgeoning literature on female advancement in male-dominant professions, such as firefighting (see Boggs & Giles 1999 for a review of this, as well as an intergroup model of the non-accommodative cycles that can result in such situations). Other recent developments in the social psychology of intergroup relations as they relate to perceived prototypical behaviors, and especially to people who are included/excluded subjectively in social category constructions (Mummendey & Wenzel 1999), bear fundamentally on what is situationally defined as "being an older woman," an older person, an older immigrant, an Italian etc. Finally, variable notions of "space" are continually propounded in different conceptual terrains throughout the present book, and this tantalizing notion could be developed further in terms of communicative models of interpersonal and intergroup "boundaries" (cf. Petronio, Ellemers, Giles & Gallois 1998).

This is a cogent, well-written, and quickly digestible account of some of the ways in which sociolinguistic and communicative forces contribute to the social construction of aging. As such, it is not only essential reading for students and scholars interested in aging, or in generic social identities and discourse, but it is also thoroughly recommended to mainstream social gerontologists. Unfortunately the latter, in their interdisciplinary endeavors and policy pursuits following the "International Year of Older People" (1999), appear woefully unaware of the critical contributions that language and communication sciences can make to understanding aging processes (see Giles 1999). Paoletti's work clearly opens up new possibilities for studying lifespan sociolinguistic issues. It will, I am convinced, be mined by other investigators – and, one hopes, in other non-Anglophone communities too.

## REFERENCES

- Boggs, Catherine, & Giles, Howard (1999). "The canary in the cage": The nonaccommodation cycle in the gendered workplace. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 22:223–45.
- Giles, Howard (1999). Managing dilemmas in the "silent revolution": A call to arms! *Journal of Communication*, 49:170–82.
- Harwood, Jake; Giles, Howard; & Ryan, Ellen B. (1995). Aging, communication, and intergroup theory: Social identity and intergenerational communication. In Nussbaum & Coupland, 133–59.
- Mummendey, Amelie, & Wenzel, Michael (1999). Social discrimination and tolerance in intergroup relations: Reactions to intergroup difference. *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 3:158–74.
- Nussbaum, Jon F., & Coupland, Justine (1995), eds. *Handbook of communication and aging research*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Petronio, Sandra; Ellemers, Naomi; Giles, Howard; & Gallois, Cindy (1998). (Mis)communicating across boundaries: Interpersonal and intergroup considerations. *Communication Research* 25:571–95.
- Tajfel, Henri, & Turner, John C. (1986). The social psychology of intergroup behavior. In Stephen Worchel & W. G. Austin (eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations*, 7–24. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Williams, Angie, & Coupland, Nik (1998). Epilogue: The socio-political framing of communication and aging. *Journal of Applied Communication Research* 26:139–54.

(Received 1 October 1999)

COLIN BAKER & SYLVIA PRYS JONES, *Encyclopedia of bilingualism and bilingual education*. Clevedon, Avon, UK: Multilingual Matters, 1998. Pp. x, 758. £79.00. [Distrib. in the US by Taylor & Francis, Philadelphia.]

Reviewed by SUZANNE ROMAINE  
 Merton College, University of Oxford  
 Oxford OX1 4JD, England  
 suzanne.romaine@linguistics-philology.oxford.ac.uk

The authors have compiled a truly impressive amount of information pertaining to bilingualism and bilingual education in this single-volume, full-color encyclopedia. Attractively produced on high-quality paper, the book contains 117 main topics, 390 text boxes, 340 pictures, 35 maps, 98 graphs, and 14 diagrams. There are also a glossary, a bibliography containing more than 2,000 entries, and an index. The book is organized into four sections – "Individual bilingualism," "Languages in society," "Languages in contact in the world" (with "Language maps of the world"), and "Bilingual education" – each with many subsections.

It is important to point out that Baker & Prys Jones authored all of the material, instead of following the practice (more usual in encyclopedias) of commissioning a large team of experts. Their task cannot have been easy, but the result is a very coherent volume. The authors succeed admirably in their two goals of "promoting the subject of bilingualism in an attractive, comprehensible and comprehensive manner" and in "being academically sound while being as accessible to as wide an audience as possible" (vii).

In this short review, I can give only a brief sample of the wealth of topics covered. The first section defines bilingualism, along with concepts such as balanced bilingualism and semilingualism. Discussion is provided of related issues such as the measurement of bilingualism and the advantages and disadvantages

of bilingualism, with an examination of types of bilingual families and aspects of everyday bilingual language use, such as code-switching.

Section II features issues such as language maintenance, language policies, language planning, language minorities, linguistic imperialism, and language rights, along with topics like major world languages (Dutch, German, Spanish, Portuguese, French, Russian, Arabic, Chinese) and the spread of English as a world language. In addition, there are articles on information technology and bilingualism, translation and interpreting, bilingualism and the economy, bilingualism and the mass media, and bilingualism and tourism.

In Section III, the authors give detailed, country-by-country coverage of the incidence of multilingualism, together with maps and statistics from censuses and other surveys. Section IV contains a variety of articles on types of language policy and forms of bilingual education around the world. There is also a history of bilingual education in the US and the recent debate surrounding it, together with discussion of bilingual education for the deaf and other groups with special needs. Problems of assessment and evaluation are also dealt with, as are classroom practices and methodologies, bilingual literacy, critical language awareness, and second language acquisition.

This volume will be a handy reference work for all scholars with an interest in bilingualism and bilingual education, but it also merits a place in all school libraries as an essential reference tool for students. Section III, for instance, would be a useful adjunct to lessons in geography and social studies at the secondary and upper primary levels. Students of all ages, as well as ordinary readers, could learn a lot from simply browsing the photographs and text boxes. The latter, in addition to profiling the work of prominent scholars in the field of bilingualism such as Joshua Fishman and Einar Haugen, illustrate multilinguals from all walks of life – an Italian-American father/son pair operating a family butcher shop in New York's Little Italy; a Peruvian Quechua speaker spinning wool with her child; and personalities such as Sophia Loren, Pope John II, Gandhi, Martin Luther King Jr., and Jesus. These examples underline the importance of multilingualism to a wide variety of people and settings around the world.

Other text boxes also provide material of interest to a wide readership, such as examples of loanwords used in English, idioms in English and other languages, and languages spoken by referees in the European football cup, as well as the English Only movement and the Ebonics debate in the US. Other more technical topics presented in the boxes detail the results or methodology of particular studies, such as the matched guise technique for investigating linguistic attitudes; or they explain terms such as “additive” and “subtractive” bilingualism, types of loanwords, etc.

Baker & Prys Jones's encyclopedia is timely and much needed in view of the current trend towards globalism, fueled most recently by the spread of the Internet and related communication technology. In our global village, it is all too easy to forget that some 6,000 languages are in use in around 200 countries of the

world. However, many of the smaller language communities are losing their languages rapidly. To invoke the environmental slogan: We must think locally but act globally. That is, local languages should be used for expressing local identities, and global languages for communicating beyond local levels and for expressing our identities as citizens of the world. The active cultivation of stable multilingualism can provide a harmonious pathway through the clash of values inherent in today's struggle between the global and local, between uniformity and diversity. Baker & Prys Jones (205) adopt Ofelia Garcia's metaphor of the language garden, in which a wide variety of flowers are actively cultivated for their beauty and richness.

Naturally, any reviewer could quibble over the coverage of the encyclopedia, or disagree with the interpretations of controversial topics, or find minor inaccuracies on particular points. (For example, the entry on Papua New Guinea states that the country was taken over by Britain in the 19th century (452); this omits the period of German colonial rule from 1884 to 1914, over the northeastern part of the mainland and the islands of the Bismarck Archipelago.) But all in all, this is a magnificent book, a rich language garden, which I am sure will be widely used and appreciated.

(Received 13 September 1999)

TAKESI SIBATA, *Sociolinguistics in Japanese contexts*. Ed. by Tetsuya Kunihiro, Fumio Inoue, & Daniel Long. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1999. Pp. xvi, 489. Hb DM 248.00.

Reviewed by SACHIKO IDE  
*Linguistics, Japan Women's University*  
*Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo, Japan 112-8681*  
*side@lares.dti.ne.jp*

The assumptions made by readers of *Language in Society* and other English-language academic publications, when they begin to read, are so widely shared that they are seldom reflected on or made explicit. These assumptions have to do with European traditions of scholarship; and over time, they have made their way around the world because of the unquestioned belief in their universal applicability. But other approaches do exist, although most are never featured in publications in Western languages. I commented on this situation long ago, but it persists to this day: "The work done by Japanese sociolinguists is virtually unknown to non-Japanese readers. The reason is probably that this work has developed independently of the Western disciplines. The fact that Japanese researchers have worked independently of the Western tradition has inevitably resulted in unique assumptions, orientations or approaches when viewed from an international perspective" (Ide 1986:281).

Now, with this volume, it is for the first time possible for Western scholars to gain an insight into such an alternative approach. This book is a collection of

articles by Dr. Takesi Sibata, the father of Japanese sociolinguistics, compiled and translated by his students and their colleagues. It is not too much to say that most sociolinguists in Japan, with the exception of those trained overseas, are under the influence, indirectly if not directly, of the research goals, methods, and orientation set by Dr. Sibata. The major articles were completed and published on his sixtieth birthday in 1978, under the title *Shakai gengogaku no kadai* [Problems of sociolinguistics], and the book under review is a translation of most of the articles in that collection.

What made Sibata's works unique and independent of Western orientation? He once confessed to me that he would have been interested in the theoretical study of language if he had served at a university, rather than at the National Language Research Institute. He was always acutely aware of the fact that a large number of his fellow students had laid down their lives for their country in World War II, and he took seriously the purpose of the NLRI, where he worked. (It is not rare to find, among his contemporaries, men whose lives are dedicated to the memory of those who died in the war.) The NLRI was founded in 1949 for the purpose of doing scientific research on the Japanese language and on speech behavior in the daily life of the Japanese people, as well as establishing a solid basis for improving the Japanese language.

To appreciate the importance of Sibata's works, most of which are based on mass data, it may be useful to understand how sociolinguistics in Japan developed. It originated as the study of the language life of the Japanese people, as Sibata said (1978:i): "the language problems inherent to Japanese society in the approach indigenous to Japan." He defined the study of language life, which later came to be renamed "sociolinguistics," as "a method of linguistics directly applicable for real world problems" (ibid., ii). Furious over the strong government control of language standardization under the totalitarian regime of pre-war Japan, Sibata adhered to the principle of respecting local dialects. He wanted to see the individual faces of dialect speakers and to describe their dialects, in the hope of combating discrimination against local people based on their accents. His humanistic approach to the speakers has something of the fieldwork approach of the Western ethnographer. Thus, for Sibata and his fellow researchers, the problems of language to be investigated were those that contributed to the welfare of individual people in Japan.

The research design was based on the assumption that individual speakers in a community have different accents. In contrast to Labovian variationist study, Sibata did not integrate such social variables as socio-economic class into his research design, nor did he focus on such linguistic variables as particular vowels. What he did as the director of the NLRI was to take holistic descriptive data of people's language life, e.g. a woman's utterances on a certain day in 1975. "Sociolinguistic studies," he felt, "should not be the discipline for the sake of sociolinguistics per se. It should be the discipline to solve the immediate problems in real life [of Japanese people]" (Sibata 1978:8). Thus he claimed that the

approach to sociolinguistics in Japan should be independent of American sociolinguistics; it should be tailored to solve the problems of language variation in speech communities in the counties and cities of Japan.

The origin of Sibata's strong convictions about the approach to sociolinguistics can be traced back to his research experience as a young scholar. The editors' introductory chapter provides highly relevant information about a major influence that determined Sibata's later approach to sociolinguistic surveys. Just after World War II, a "Literacy Survey" was conducted in order to demonstrate that the Japanese people had waged a desperate war because their presumed low literacy rate, resulting from their complicated system of writing, had hindered the flow of accurate information. This survey was conceived under the guidance of the Civil Information and Education Section of the General Headquarters of the US Occupation Forces. But contrary to its hypothesis, the results of the survey showed a high literacy rate among the Japanese people, which led to the maintenance of their writing system, consisting of three types of symbols, Chinese characters plus two types of phonograms. This was the first large-scale survey in Japan that employed systematic random sampling and statistics, and it was carried out in collaboration with sociologists and statisticians. His experience with this survey led Sibata to recognize the impact that research designs might have on language policy for the Japanese people; and his later work as a major research designer at the NLRI followed the same line as the Literacy Survey. In short, Sibata always placed data over theory.

The orientation toward non-theoretical research espoused by Sibata and his students has not gone without criticism. But Sibata's answer was that a study of language that is to serve the people directly should focus on "parole," not on "langue." Lacking a sophisticated analytic method to investigate the "parole" aspect of language, Sibata gathered holistic data in painstaking fieldwork. When he said, "I wanted to look at individual faces of informants," he meant that his research hopes were placed not on certain aspects of linguistic phenomena, but on the informants' language life – the description of how they lead their life using their language.

Those familiar with Western scholarship might well wonder what was the coherent theme of Sibata's inquiry into the use of language. There seems to be no analytical thinking, or any theory by which one might deepen inquiry into language use. Instead, he made detailed investigation of the language life of speech communities. The foundation of Sibata's claim that his work was scientific was the application of random sampling and statistics, common to sociological research.

Perhaps a comparison of the approaches in the West and the East might make it clearer. It could be said that Western scholarship pursues the truth from a bird's-eye perspective, with scholars attempting to gain the whole picture of the topic in question. In contrast, the Japanese philosophical tradition is based on Buddhism, where there is no aspiration to analyze the whole; human beings are considered so trivial and tiny that they can know nothing, and scholars in this tradition have a

humble attitude. While Westerners look at things from top to bottom, the Japanese approach things from the bottom up and want to investigate what is going on. In the West, theory-driven research is preferred; but in the East, at least in Japan, data-oriented findings are the favored method of research. In addition, Sibata justified the orientation of his research by his particular goal of describing variations of language life of every member of contemporary Japanese society. He wanted not just to find out facts about the Japanese language in general, from a bird's-eye view, but also to look at people and their language life, just as he would examine every tree in the forest.

In this volume, his writings are organized into five parts and 24 chapters; an introduction by the editors precedes each chapter. The diversity of the topics covered provides insight into what are considered sociolinguistic problems in Japan. Part I, "The study of sociolinguistics," consists of "The language life of the Japanese," "The survey of speech community and its methodology," "A twenty-four-hour survey of the language life of the Japanese," and "Individual differences among investigations of linguistic geography." Part II deals with honorifics – the intersection of grammar and pragmatics; the fact that the use of honorifics is a major concern for Japanese speakers is well documented in this chapter. Articles include "Honorifics and honorifics research," "The honorific prefix 'o-' in contemporary Japanese," "Learning to say 'haha' [the formal word for 'mother']," "The language life of Machino – the social psychology of honorifics," and "Honorifics in a community." The survey on the use of honorifics found that the strongest social variables influencing the choice of linguistic forms are gender and the standing of a family, not socio-economic class.

Part III deals with language change. It includes "The rise and fall of dialects," "The age structure of the speech community," "Twenty years of the Itoigawa dialect," "The evolution of common language in Hokkaido," "Dialect formation in a settlement," and "Place names as evidence of Japanese settlement in Ainu areas." Sibata carefully examined dialect variation in communities (a) according to the age difference of the speakers, and (b) by conducting the same survey over a 20-year timespan.

Part IV deals with sociolect and idiolect; it consists of "Group language," "Group language and its emergence," "Fad words and language bosses," "Urbanization and language differences in social classes," "Changes in life and changes in language – stabilization of new expressions," and "The microtoponymy of a limited area considered as part of the vocabulary of an idiolect." Part V deals with norms of language; it consists of "Consciousness of language norms," "Standards of pronunciation," and "Discrimination words and linguistic taboos." Discussing the pros and cons of the standardization of language forms and pronunciation, Sibata strongly argues for the maintenance of varieties and against the standardization of language – for the benefit of the community and the country, or in institutional frameworks.

Sibata's work is an excellent example of a non-Western approach to scholarship in general and to sociolinguistics in particular. His lack of references to overseas publications is but one more indication that his research must be interpreted within the context of Japan. Any criticism that Sibata's works lack theoretical or analytical linguistic thinking must be balanced by the realization that they have not been confined to the ivory tower, but have had a positive influence on Japanese people, from Hokkaido to small islands in Okinawa Prefecture. Sibata paid respect to the people's indigenous language variations, which are their means of representing their social and psychological identity.

In the 21st century, when the world needs a new order for coexistence on this globe, one agenda to which students of language might be able to contribute consists of ways to solve conflicts among ethnic groups from the perspectives of language use and language contact. We could begin by describing how people use a language or languages to lead their lives, which should be understood as an important means of representing their identity. The indigenous methods of Sibata's work may not be a model for application elsewhere; but the humanistic spirit embodied in his work – accepting and respecting linguistic variation, and using this to aid local people in their fight against social injustice – points in a direction that should be followed by sociolinguistic research the world over.

## REFERENCES

- Ide, Sachiko (1986). Background of Japanese sociolinguistics. *Journal of Pragmatics* 10:281–86.  
 Sibata, Takesi (1978). *Shakaigengogaku no kadai* [Problems of sociolinguistics]. Tokyo: Sansaidoo.

(Received 29 August 1999)

DAVID MCKNIGHT, *People, countries, and the Rainbow Serpent: Systems of classification among the Lardil of Mornington Island*. (Oxford studies in anthropological linguistics, 12.) Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press, 1999. Pp. x, 270. Hb \$75.00.

Reviewed by CHET CREIDER  
 Anthropology, University of Western Ontario  
 London, Ontario N6A 5C2, Canada  
 creider@julian.uwo.ca

Anthropologists have long recognized that Australian aboriginal cultures have a rich repertoire of cognitive achievements, and they have contrasted this richness with the relative impoverishment of their technological repertoire. However, despite the richness of the cognitive repertoire, the anthropological literature contains no overall inventory for any aboriginal cultural group. McKnight's monograph is the first work that covers everything: social structure (including kinship), myth, ritual, dancing, property structure, and biological classification.<sup>1</sup> The quality of the scholarship is very high. At the time of writing, McKnight had



worked with the Lardil for 30 years, including 16 field trips, with a total time of residence among the Lardil of more than five years. After completing an MA on West African materials under Darryl Forde, he switched to Australia, where he also worked with the Wik-mungkan and a number of other groups. The present monograph is the first of a projected trilogy; work is under way now on the second volume, a monograph on marriage, sorcery, and violence. In recent years, McKnight has been involved, on behalf of the Lardil, in negotiations with the Australian government for land claims.

Multilingualism was not uncommon in the Australian scene, and at the time of McKnight's first fieldwork with the Lardil, there were some older people who spoke five or more languages; but what was most remarkable was that this was a society with more than one language of its own. In fact, it may be said that the Lardil were native speakers of three languages, all of which, in subtly different ways, were expressive of their culture. In addition to the Lardil language, there were two auxiliary systems – a sign language called Marlda Kangka, and a verbal language, Demiin. The first of these was learned by young men as part of their first initiation (circumcision). Demiin was learned later in association with the second initiation (subincision). The three languages thus present three overlapping but distinct doorways into the minds of the Lardil. McKnight was aware of this fact as early as the 1970s, and a substantial portion of his monograph is devoted to an exploration of its ramifications. A fresh and precise take is now possible on the old question of how accurate a picture linguistic analysis can give of the semantic organization of a culture.

The book consists of twelve chapters plus an epilog. The chapters are grouped into Part I, "Individuals and groups," dealing with matters of kinship, naming, and the associations of individuals and groups to land; Part II, "Animals and plants," dealing with ethnozoology and ethnobotany from the viewpoints of Lardil, Marlda Kangka, and Demiin; and Part III, "Totemic thought," dealing, *inter alia*, with totemic classification, disease theory, Thuwathu (the Rainbow Serpent), and the symbolism of decorative art – a fourth language of these remarkable people. McKnight's general strategy is to discuss data in depth, give the data the best possible analysis, and then discuss, with great modesty, relevance to theoretical issues in the literature.

In Chap. 3, "Personal names and nicknames," McKnight notes that most Lardil personal names are based on the major flora and fauna identified with the Country (land unit with which an individual is associated). It is often the case that a name highlights a particularly interesting characteristic of the animal or plant which is its basis. Thus *Ketharrjakirrija* 'never gets feet wet in the creek' refers to the fact that "flying foxes never go in the water, even though they habitually roost in the mangroves on the banks of creeks. They hang upside down so that their feet/claws never touch water" (60). Nicknames, on the other hand, typically refer to physical peculiarities on the part of their bearers, e.g. *Bunjiwangalkur* 'hit on the back of the neck by a boomerang' (65). McKnight analyzes these terms, which

are the naming forms in most common use, as a leveling mechanism and as part of the “aggressively egalitarian” (67) nature of Lardil society: “Whatever good opinion people may have of themselves, to others they are ‘hit on the head with a boomerang’, ‘bandy legs’, ‘foot caught in a net’, ‘squint eyes’, and so on” (67).

The relationships among Lardil/Marlda Kanga/Demiin are probably the material of greatest interest to the readers of this journal. These relationships are many and subtle. Although one might expect that, except for some simplification in the auxiliary languages, these three languages would be identical, this turns out not to be the case. There are higher-level categories present in Demiin – e.g. *wuu* ‘shellfish’ and *wum/i* ‘crabs’ (Demiin contains nasal clicks such as *m!* and *n!*) – which are not lexicalized in Lardil; and it is the non-verbal auxiliary language, Marlda Kangka, that makes the most finely grained distinction in the case of terms for mudshells and oysters (159). Even when all three languages make the same distinction, they present different information. It is not at all obvious from the terms for ‘shark’ and ‘stingray’ in Lardil (*thurarra*) and Demiin (*thii*) why these animals are classed together in the two spoken languages, but the Marlda Kangka sign (one hand cupped and the fist of the other hand placed in the cupped hand) provides an explanation: the sign indicates a liver being shaped into a ball – and indeed, the livers of both sharks and stingrays are eaten by the Lardil (159).

A characteristic that stands out overall from the material covered in Part II is the close relationship between the social and economic life of the Lardil and the categories of the three languages. The term *kendabal* covers dugong and sea turtle, the two large sea mammals taken by the Lardil; the term *diwal* covers food-bearing trees, including a species of mangrove with an edible fruit, and is opposed to *murnda*, a cover term for all other kinds of mangrove trees. McKnight makes the point that these are not biologically based units: “*Kendabal* is a hunter’s taxon, and *diwal* is a gatherer’s taxon” (141). He is also able to show convincingly that, in some cases, the divisions found in a particular language are adapted to a context in which that language is used. Thus the Demiin language has only five kinship terms; and McKnight, rather than producing (as others have attempted) a tortuous explanation in terms of section and subsection systems, shows that each term covers categories of kin having (or lacking) a particular role in initiation rituals, particularly subincision. For example, people in the *kuu* category have a major say in whether an initiation may take place; and people in the category *n/n!a* are those on whose backs the initiate is circumcised and subincised (51).

The material in Part III, “Totemic thought,” will be of interest primarily to social anthropologists. However, I would like to discuss briefly the “language” of bodily decoration, treated in Chapter 12: “Among the Lardil dancing is a form of religious thought – it is religious thought in action. In dances, complex religious beliefs are expressed in an attempt to surmount the restrictions of the spoken word” (227). McKnight refers here to the linear character of spoken language, which prevents more than one word or assertion being made at one time, and the

linear character of auditory reception, which prevents two speakers from saying different things at the same time. Dance surmounts these limitations and makes possible multiple statements, even multiple contradictory statements. It is not surprising that even the constructional elements of bodily decoration are polysemous: A circle “may represent [a] water hole, [a] shooting star, Rainbow Serpent’s eye,” or it may represent “all three at the same time, for they have a common identity.” A circle may also represent an egg, “particularly the egg of a totemic dreaming associated with the dancer’s Country . . . A circle may indicate an animal’s track or lair” (234).

The monograph has been beautifully produced and contains very few typos: “uvalar” for “uvular” (27) is the one most likely to be noticed by linguists. In style, the writing is carefully crafted, sentence by sentence; it is personal and unassuming, with frank discussions of shortcomings in data. One is reminded of Evans-Pritchard’s three great works on the Nuer. Like those works, McKnight’s book will live on as a classic long after more jargon-filled monographs have lost their usefulness.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup>In this review I have concentrated on aspects of this monograph which are likely to be of interest to readers of this journal. There is much to interest social anthropologists as well – discussion of section and subsection systems, issues in the association of land and people, myth analysis, totemic classification, and much more. As this work will undoubtedly be reviewed in major journals of social anthropology, it is there that readers interested in such material should look.

(Received 13 September 1999)

JEAN-LOUIS CALVET & ROBERT CHAUDENSON, *Saint-Barthélemy: Une énigme linguistique*. Paris: Diffusion Didier Erudition/CIRELFA-Agence de la Francophonie, 1998. Pp. 165.

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

Saint Barthélemy (SB) has long remained a linguistic enigma. This islet – home of an indigenous, mostly White population of about 3,000 – is divided into at least three linguistic zones: one whose vernacular is a French-based creole; the second, a northern French (*oil*) dialect; and the third, English. Calvet, a leading French sociolinguist, and Chaudenson, an eminent French creolist, have set out to explain how, as a result of social insularity triggered by intertwined geographical and economic factors, an apparently ethnically homogeneous population, established on a 25-sq.-km. isolate, became so linguistically diverse. They also pro-

vide a brief comparative description of the French-related varieties used by this population, and an indication of its linguistic attitudes (as reflected by the testimony of teenage members of its two subcommunities).

The first chapter provides a convincing explanation of the linguistic differentiation of SB, which, unlike Maher 1996, the authors view as tripartite: Standard French (SF), the French dialect (Saint Barth Patois, SBP), and the local creole (SBC). English is not, so to speak, an endogenous language. Its use coincided with the establishment, during the early Swedish colonial period, of a free port in Gustavia settled by a mobile population of traders from the neighboring English islands – most of whom left with the demise of the colonial mercantilistic system that made free ports prosperous. The population of French origin, with roots going back to the original settlement of SB from the first French West Indian colony of St. Kitts (Saint-Christophe) in 1648, is divided between one group speaking the reflex of a 17th-century vernacular koiné, SBP, and the other speaking SBC; the authors do not mention the older variety, intermediate between SF and SBP, identified by Maher.

The main body of the work (Chaps. 2–4) provides a sort of comparative structural sketch of SBC and SBP, drawn not from an extensive corpus-based descriptive study but rather from speaker responses to a 40-item questionnaire couched in French. The impressive breadth of the comparative analysis – which incorporates richly documented etymological considerations and adduces evidences from all French-based creoles, particularly those of the Indian Ocean – contributes to current discussions about creole genesis. It supports the view, held by the so-called superstratists, that French-based creoles developed from the imperfect acquisition of vernacular French, rather than from a pidgin.

The authors' comparison of a set of SBC phonological, lexical, and morphosyntactic features, with equivalents from Martinican (MC) and Guadeloupean (GC) creoles, does not support the claim by Lefebvre 1976 of an endogenous nature for SBC; instead, it justifies native speakers' sentiment of a closer affinity with MC than with GC. Although SBC shows equally as many similarities with either of the neighboring creoles, most of the features shared with Martinique are morphosyntactic and hence carry more weight, e.g. the absence of the preposition *a* in linking the postposed possessive to the head noun: SBC *kaz yo* 'their house', MC *kay yo* vs. GC *kaz a yo*. The authors' caution in advancing this conclusion is warranted by the admittedly superficial nature of the comparison. However, two interesting observations arise from an independent review of the comparison. First, the SBC features that differ from these two creoles at the lexical level tend to be closer to French, e.g. GC *timoun*, MC *timanmay* 'child' vs. SBC *zanfan* (*enfant*); MC *épi*, GC *èvè* 'with' vs. SBC *avèk* (*avec*). Second, several of the differences that do not match French forms or structures correspond to features found in Haitian Creole – e.g. SBC and HC *koté mwen* 'by my side, near me' vs. GC *owa an mwen*; SBC and HC *mwen* 'I, me' vs. GC *an*, MC *man*; SBC and HC *yon* 'indefinite article' vs. GC *on*, MC *an*.

On the basis of sociohistorical facts presented in Chap. 1, the authors conclude that SBC was imported from both Guadeloupe and Martinique by slaves purchased in these two islands during the period of agricultural boom in the first part of the 19th century. SBC then underwent decreolization as a result of its contact with the original speech of the early settlers, SBP. Invoking the concept of different creole “generations” (Chaudenson 1992), they posit that, with St. Kitts French Creole as an initial variety, GC and MC are second-generation creoles, while SBC and Saint-Domingue Creole (the ancestor of present-day HC) constitute a third-generation creole. However, a partial disclaimer must be registered: Because of the peripatetic penchant of settlers of the Caribbean European colonies, there was direct contact between St. Kitts and Saint-Domingue, on the one hand, and St. Kitts and Saint Barth, on the other. Consequently, the creoles that developed in the islands settled later might best be characterized as “second generation and a half.”

The SB linguistic situation resembles that of Francophone Louisiana. In both cases the creole, which coexists with a variety of French originating in vernacular and regional *oïl* speech, has White speakers. The two varieties share an extensively overlapping lexicon and differ principally at the morphosyntactic level. To be sure, the illustrative lexical comparisons – designed to determine the extent to which the information contained in Lefebvre’s unpublished dictionary is still current – reveal some differences at the lexemic and semantic level; e.g. a small fishing boat is called *kannot* in SBP, but *bot* in SBC (presumably not derived from English *boat*).

The final chapter reports on a sociolinguistic study conducted with all the island’s middle-school pupils (a total of 138), focusing on language attitudes and language use. Although the youngsters maintain the local languages at the rate of 83%, they evidence linguistic insecurity, which is more pronounced for SBC speakers. On the one hand, like their fellow islanders from the leeward section, they consider SF the only legitimate norm (it is characterized as better than the local variety); but on the other hand, they recognize SBP, rather than their own speech, as symbolizing Saint-Barth identity. Particularly noteworthy are well-entrenched stereotypic characterizations of the local varieties, centering on the encoding of the durative/progressive aspect: SBP *oti k té ki va*, SBC *kote ou ka alé* ‘Where are you going?’ (cf. Pressman 1998).

In addition to providing a model for rigorous sociohistorical research, this study constitutes an invaluable contribution to the field of creole studies. It opens a window on the *terminus a quo* of Caribbean French-based creoles: the vernacular koiné French of the 17th–18th centuries, which the relative isolation of this insular population has helped to preserve. The small size of the SB indigenous population makes the island a sort of linguistic laboratory for investigating the relationship between social and linguistic differentiation. As the authors conclude, linguistic differentiation does not drive social change. On the contrary, it is social factors – in the case of SB, the development of a small-scale agro-industry

in the more geologically suitable windward part of the island – that triggered economic changes and linguistic differentiation.

## REFERENCES

- Chaudenson, Robert (1992). *Des îles, des hommes, des langues*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Lefebvre, Gilles (1976). Français régional et créole à Saint-Barthélemy. In Albert Valdman & Émile Snyder (eds.), *Identité culturelle et francophonie dans les Amériques*, 122–46. Québec: Presses de l'Université Laval.
- Maher, Julianne (1996). Fishermen, farmers, traders: Language and economic history on St. Barthélemy, French West Indies. *Language in Society* 25:373–406.
- Pressman, Jon (1998). Classification and counter-classification of language on Saint Barthélemy. *Language in Society* 27:459–94.

(Received 11 September 1999)

REGNA DARNELL, *And along came Boas: Continuity and revolution in Americanist anthropology*. (Amsterdam studies in the theory and history of linguistic science, 86.) Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins, 1998. Pp. xviii, 331. Hb \$89.00.

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

All researchers observe a balance between continuity with prior tradition (so others will know enough to understand and value the work) and innovation (such that only new contributions are generally deemed publishable). This balance can be difficult to recognize at times of disciplinary revolution, when a previously accepted paradigm is rejected in favor of a newer one – the sort of change in assumptions described by Kuhn 1962. At such times, it requires considerable subtlety for the disciplinary historian to unearth the substantial influence of previous research generations, since the rhetoric emphasizes revolution and change to the exclusion of all else. In the present book, Darnell studies one such critical point: the shift to professionalization within anthropology that occurred at the beginning of the 20th century. It is to her credit that she documents substantial continuities between the research conducted in the immediately pre-professional stage by John Wesley Powell and others in the Bureau of American Ethnology (BAE), and that of Franz Boas and his students, despite decades of rhetoric – from the participants, as well as their students – that have emphasized only the differences. Despite the fact that “oral histories of American anthropology have generally assumed that . . . professional anthropology in America sprang forth full-blown about 1900 when Boas began teaching at Columbia” (p. 6), Darnell demonstrates that professionalization was a more gradual process. It makes sense that there would have been substantial overlap with prior interests, and it is this

overlap that she documents, through reconstruction of the context within which Boasian anthropology emerged.

As Darnell explains, “The pivotal variable distinguishing amateur from professional [anthropological work] proved to be academic training” (xi); thus, a concern of this book is to document the establishment of academic departments of anthropology. But this is only one of the book’s four major sections. Part 1 begins with the BAE, documenting who was studying anthropology and in what ways from its founding in 1879. It includes discussion of the constraints once imposed on anthropology by government sponsorship, by the ways that Powell and others wanted to map North America (mainly via languages and myths), and by the role that the BAE played in the initial organization of US anthropological research. Part 2 documents the gradual development of a series of institutional alternatives to the BAE, from Columbia University to the Peabody Museum. Part 3 returns to the interest in mapping, documenting the ways in which Boas and his students maintained that early focus, as well as the gradual shifts in linguistic classification systems. Part 4 describes the establishment of formal organizations to accompany professionalization – primarily a national journal, and several related associations – and it provides a clear summary of the major ideas included in the new Boasian paradigm; in this final section, intellectual changes are emphasized over institutional continuities. Each part begins and ends with a clear synthesis, so the content should be accessible even to those with minimal prior knowledge of the players and their sympathies. Other important sections, in terms of clarifying larger issues, are the Preface, the Introduction, and the summary of the content of the Boasian paradigm in Chap. 14.

Many issues of concern to Powell remained on the agenda set by Boas. Most critical among these was “a commitment to mapping the cultural and linguistic diversity of the continent” (xii). This was linked to the felt need for salvage ethnography and salvage linguistics, as various Native American tribes were put into a position of gradually losing their traditions and languages. Language was given pre-eminence in the topics studied; not only was it accepted as the most central symbolic system, but it also provided the means to classify Native American cultures. As a result, the book gives priority to documenting the various language classification systems proposed.

Darnell is especially skilled at handling detail, demonstrating her extensive knowledge of the issues relevant to understanding anthropology in the early 1900s. She makes good use of archival research, relying heavily on letters and other informal documents contemporary to the story she tells, found in various archives and carefully annotated. As she says, “I quote a lot” (xv), and thus she presents the full flavor of the original statements to readers who may never have read them. But there is still plenty of original writing here; Darnell is a clear thinker and excellent writer on her own, hence a good guide to the material. There is some overlap with her previous publications (especially her 1990 biography of Sapir), and this book is in fact a revised version of her 1969 dissertation. However, as

evidenced by the many recent citations in her bibliography, she has integrated relevant publications from the last 30 years. The content also reflects the historical understandings reached in her own later research. The overlap with the Sapir biography actually contributes to, rather than hurts, the final product, since Sapir was part of many of the contexts that Darnell describes; at different times, he was at Columbia, Pennsylvania, Chicago, California, Yale, and the Geological Survey of Canada, all of which are important to the story.

As is often the case in historical research, Darnell highlights wonderful small moments. For example, anyone who nowadays complains of the quality of student preparation but assumes that students used to be better trained will be amused by Sapir's comments (151–52) on the lack of sophistication among his students at Berkeley in 1917. And anyone with an interest in censorship will appreciate learning that Boas's Tsimshian texts were investigated on suspicion that he was sending obscenity through the mails (31). Several sections demonstrate the extent to which personal conflicts shaped the field (as in the summary of the George Gordon/Frank Speck dispute at the University of Pennsylvania, 161–66). Although politics is an integral part of academic life today, we often forget that it always has been so.

I do have several small reservations related to matters of presentation. First, six figures are provided, but they are oddly used. They appear to be an afterthought, since no mention is made of most of them in the text; they just show up – except for Figure 3, which is referred to on p. 118 but does not actually appear until pp. 171–73. Instead, Figure 2 appears on p. 117, though it is not referred to at all. Second, the photographs are also oddly used: Boas is at the front, as might be expected, but Powell does not appear until Chap. 4. Chaps. 1–3, 8, and 13 have no photos. Brinton, Dorsey, Cushing, Mooney, Sapir, Lowie, Kroeber, and a second photo of Boas as Hamatsa dancer accompany the other chapters. The logic escapes me; in most cases, there is no obvious connection between these individuals and chapters. It might have been better simply to put all the photos in a single section. Furthermore, in a monograph series so careful to provide birth and death dates even for minor characters (to the point where it is sometimes intrusive), providing dates for the photographs would seem appropriate. Finally, a few points could have used more explanation, as when Kroeber is quoted describing the failure of the Bureau in “systematic coordination of knowledge, cooperative *sammelwerke* of which it is both trigger and rallying point” (131). The meaning of the German word may have been obvious to Kroeber and many of his many colleagues, but most modern readers will not know that it means “compilation.” The issue is actually a central point: The BAE failed in what should have been one of its major tasks, the systematic compilation of the research that had been collected under its auspices. Yet the monolingual English reader may miss the point.

Despite these minor quibbles with the presentation of the material, I have no complaints about the content. Darnell has done her usual excellent work, and the book is a major contribution to our understanding of the history of anthropology.



It will be of interest not only to historians but also to anyone in anthropology – especially linguistic anthropology, since there is so much emphasis on the study and classification of the many languages on the continent. It will also be of interest to anyone in any discipline who wants to understand more about what occurs at the critical junctures when theories change: How exactly do we move from one paradigm to another? What needs to happen for a discipline to change its assumptions? As summarized here (p. 4), “An adequate disciplinary history must include: (1) the theoretical and substantive content of the science, (2) the social organization of the scientific community, and (3) the institutional structure within which it operates.” Darnell’s discussion of anthropology at the beginning of the 20th century illuminates all three, and she gives enough details here that even those already familiar with the time period and the characters should learn something.

## REFERENCES

- Darnell, Regna (1969). *The development of American anthropology 1880–1920: From the Bureau of American Ethnology to Franz Boas*. Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.  
 ——— (1990). *Edward Sapir: Linguist, anthropologist, humanist*. Berkeley: University of California Press.  
 Kuhn, Thomas (1962). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

(Received 15 September 1999)

ROSALEEN HOWARD-MALVERDE (ed.), *Creating context in Andean cultures*. (Oxford studies in anthropological linguistics, 6.) Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press, 1997. Pp. xiii, 255. Pb \$29.95.

Reviewed by KENDALL A. KING  
 School of Education, New York University  
 New York, NY 10003-6674

This excellent collection of twelve papers is sure to be of keen interest to Andean scholars from a range of disciplines. Howard-Malverde has succeeded at two difficult tasks: compiling a substantial number of academically outstanding papers and, perhaps a greater challenge for an editor, creating a volume which reads as a coherent whole. The latter feat is even more impressive given the breadth and depth of the contributions and the varied academic backgrounds of the contributors. The volume’s authors are scholars of anthropology, linguistics, history, and literature, reflecting the academic traditions of nations both in Europe and in North and South America. All but two papers were originally presented at the 1991 conference, “Textuality in Amerindian cultures,” convened by RHM and William Rowe.

The coherence of the volume results largely from the shared focus and subject matter of the papers. Each contribution analyzes an aspect of indigenous

cultural expression in the Andean highlands, and each author explores the textualizing processes and textlike characteristics of such expression. Precisely what is meant by “text” and “context” is the focus of RHM’s introduction to the volume, “Between text and context in the evocation of culture.” She understands text not so much as a discourse product fixed in time or place, but rather, drawing on Hanks 1989, as a process – and more important, as a form of social action in which humans can both exercise power and shape their reality. In this view, context is not conceptualized as exterior to the text, but rather as critical to and at times part of it: “While, on the one hand, context can rightly be said to be CONSTRUCTIVE OF text, from another perspective, context can also be taken to be CONSTRUCTED BY text in processes of interactivity” (p. 6). Many essays in the volume elaborate on how texts and the processes of textualization, through linguistic or other symbolic means, can both create the content and shape the experience of social actors.

Numerous papers also focus on the hybridization of indigenous and European systems of language, thought, and religion, as well as political and social organization. Hybridization is closely connected to the creation of new texts and contexts because, as RHM notes, hybridization “generates a space for the formulations of new meanings, by combining re-use and transformation of the indigenous ... with appropriation and adaptation of symbols originating with the dominant culture” (15). Many (but not all) articles emphasize how hybridization allows indigenous groups to wield culture and language as political tools in resisting the dominant discourse of the nation-state.

The volume is divided into four parts, each with a slightly different emphasis. Papers in Part One, “Textualising histories and identities in cultural performances,” addresses the unofficial and indigenous meanings in collective ceremony and art. Joanne Rappaport provides a rich analysis of theatric art for indigenous consciousness-raising in Columbia; she shows how the artistic performances of ethnic militants, which typically depict themes such as the atrocity of the conquest and the gains of the modern land claims movement, create a space in which history can be interpreted freely and publicly shared. Penelope Harvey analyzes the textual and non-textual practices surrounding the ceremonial commemorative events of Peruvian Independence day in one village. Luis Millones, “Saint Rose through the eyes of her devotees: From Flower of Lima to Mother of Carhuamayo,” examines how a colonial mystic has been transformed into a particularly indigenous object of devotion.

Part Two focuses on the contexts for the production and interpretation of ritual and textiles. Catherine Allen explores ritual playing and pretending during an interlude in the Corpus Christi pilgrimage; through her detailed ethnographic description, she reveals the different assumptions and orientations held by the pre-Columbian world, and contrasts them with those that underlie the Western alphabet. “Cultural transpositions: Writing about rites in the llama coral,” by Penny Dransart, offers a rich description and interpretation of the text of the

annual llama ceremony in an Aymara community of northern Chile. Denise Arnold provides a detailed description of the practices of textile weaving; she analyzes the functionally differentiated texts and textiles of men and women, arguing that these gendered activities are parallel and complementary, rather than hierarchically bound. Arnold illustrates how women, through weaving textiles, are able “to order and define, within the symbolic domain, the relative powers of production and the relative generative powers of reproduction of each gender, and to decide on their relative hierarchical value” (100). Women are thus able to symbolically “define for themselves the central place of power” (130).

Part Three addresses the processes of textualization in written Quechua discourse. Both papers in this section are concerned with the Huarochirí manuscript, a 400-year-old Quechua colonial document which describes pre-Hispanic religious traditions. Willem Adelaar analyzes syntactic and morphological aspects of the document which convey speaker orientation and spatial references, and shows the emergence of a Quechua literary tradition. Sabine Dedenbach-Salazar Sáenz analyzes what the use of evidentials (reportative and conjecture suffixes) reveals about the text and its content.

The Fourth section focuses on orality and literacies as reflexes of colonization and resistance. Tristan Platt presents the text of a shamanic dialog and demonstrates the ways in which “the participants in the séance negotiate their relationships and collaborate to create the preconditions for successful communication” (223). This section also contains two papers which address indigenous letter writing. Martin Lienhard demonstrates how, in colonial times, indigenous authors of letters, proclamations, and manifestos successfully inverted the official terms and discourse “to give expression to the persistence of an indigenous, autonomous interpretation of society and history” (183). Sarah Lund provides a rich description of the contexts and written texts of current letter exchanges among non-literate family members living apart. Lund finds that memory plays a central role in the oral delivery, while the written form is potentially a source of both legitimization and sorcery.

The essays vary in scholarly approach and focus, yet they are complementary, and together they make a well integrated and interesting volume. Frequent crosslistings assist the reader in making thematic connections from one paper to the next. Potential readers should bear in mind that, although the volume is part of the Oxford Studies in Anthropological Linguistics, many of the papers are oriented more toward cultural anthropology than anthropological or general linguistics. This is evident in the focus of many of the contributions, as well as the level of attention to linguistic details in some of the papers. Although glosses for non-English words are usually provided, many of the authors do not indicate whether the words are Spanish, Quechua, or Aymara. A final glossary provides translations and information concerning word origins, but it does not include many non-English words that appear in the volume. Additionally, as RHM notes at the outset, many authors opted not to represent Quechua and

Aymara in their nationally unified forms. This is unfortunate; the regular use of the standardized variety may be an important step in the development of a literary tradition, and possibly in the maintenance of these threatened languages.

Nevertheless, the volume stands as a strong and important work. The contributors are to be commended for their well-researched, clearly written, and insightful papers, and Howard-Malverde for her work in compiling this well-organized, carefully edited, and cohesive book. The volume is sure to be well received by Andean scholars from a range of backgrounds.

REFERENCE

Hanks, William (1989). Text and textuality. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 18:95–127.

(Received 2 September 1997)