REVIEWS

Language in Society **32** (2003). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404503214056

RAJEND MESTHRIE (ed.), *Concise encyclopedia of sociolinguistics*. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2001. Pp. xxvii, 1031. Hb $237.

Reviewed by DAN BECKETT
Linguistics, Georgetown University
Washington, DC 20057-1051
drb24@georgetown.edu

Mesthrie's *Concise encyclopedia of sociolinguistics* (hereafter, *CESO*) is a newly edited, condensed, and updated offshoot of the *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics*, originally published in ten volumes in 1993. This laudable volume aims to "give a comprehensive overview of the main topics in an important branch of language study, generally known as Sociolinguistics" (p. 1). As theoretical background, the branch is traced from the Sanskrit scholar Pānini to more recent origins in historical linguistics, anthropology, rural dialectology, and the study of mixed languages. The field is further presented as the most proper of all branches for language study today, as Mesthrie – updating Labov's (1972) famous claim about the implications of the term SOCIOlinguistics – writes that "having 'human communication' as part of the definition of language makes it impossible to study language comprehensively without due regard to social contexts of speech" (1). *CESO* is an attempt to catalog the relevant components of those social contexts.

However, this book being an encyclopedia, such theoretical justifications of the discipline contra other branches of linguistics are generally not relevant to the text as a whole. Whether or not readers agree with the sociolinguistic perspective, they cannot argue with the claim that sociolinguistics is now a well-established and widely practiced academic endeavor. In the end, these are the only necessary conditions for the publication of such an encyclopedia. *CESO* details just how wide the practices of sociolinguists can be, while also establishing the shared elements of these practices.

Toward these ends, the volume is aptly divided into ten sections (not including the work's introduction quoted above), each containing about two dozen entries. The entries themselves are contributed by individual authors, most recognized as leading experts on the subject matter in question. The first section, "Foundations of society and language," attempts to come to terms with the foundational concepts relevant to all of sociolinguistics. Entries including "Language," "Speech community," and "Attitudes and behavior" succinctly summarize current research while exploring the complexities of the issues.

Section Two, "Language and interaction" features entries like "Identity in language," "Ethnography of speaking," "Conversation analysis," "Narrative, natu-

© 2003 Cambridge University Press 0047-4045/03 $12.00

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404503234059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ral," and "Discourse in cross-linguistic and cross-cultural contexts." These and others admirably sketch the roles that interaction plays in contemporary sociolinguistics. Curiously, an entry on "Interactional sociolinguistics" is conspicuously absent from this section (although there is an entry on "Interactional sociolinguistic methods" in Section Nine). There isn't even a mention of this important branch of sociolinguistics in the entry on "Discourse" in this section. Furthermore, the entry on "Identity in language" seems better placed in Section One, given that identity plays such a foundational role in many sociolinguistic theories.

Section Three, "Language variation: Style, situation, function," is best treated alongside Section Four, "Language variation and change: Dialects and social groups." Keeping these two sections separate is a particularly good idea. Although they are similar and involve many of the same issues, each topic is clearly rich enough to deserve its own 100 or so pages of the encyclopedia.

In Section Five, "Language contact;" Mesthrie intends to emphasize that "the idea of a pure and self-contained language is a poor simplifying assumption" (3). The section does a nice job of supporting this statement, and is the best in the encyclopedia at illustrating how rich, subtle, and complex sociolinguistic theories are. There are five separate entries detailing different aspects of linguistic codes, and three concerning pidgins and creoles. Additionally, there are thorough entries on "Koinés," "Language transfer and substrates," and the fascinating "Missionaries and language."

Sections Six, Seven, and Eight all stress the ways sociolinguistics has affected other fields in the social sciences and/or the sociopolitical world. Section Six is "Language, power, and inequality." The entry from this section on "Semilingualism" is a fair and reasoned account of a feverish sociolinguistic debate whose continuing relevance is proved by a recent article in the *Washington Post* describing some children of immigrants as "alingual" (Schulte 2002). Other interesting entries in this section include "Power and language," "Power differentials and language," and "Symbolic power and language." The first of these articles takes the perspective of Critical Discourse Analysis, the second sketches a macrosociological taxonomy of language and ethnicity, and the third looks at language through Bourdieu's (1991) idea of linguistic economy. All three illustrate how a single concept like "power" can be operationalized in multiple ways for sociolinguistic research.

Section Seven, "Language planning, policy, practice," has entries like "Language planning: Models," "National language/official language," and "Reversing language shift." Macrosociolinguistic issues are defined in this section in considerable detail. A particularly useful chapter is "Statistics: Principal languages of the world (UNESCO)," which summarizes the 1989 study undertaken by the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. Comprehensive statistics are given for the world's 12 principal languages, "principal" being defined as a language with either at least 100 million speakers, or three

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404503234059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

nations designating it as an official language. That there are just 12 principal languages underscores the overwhelming linguistic homogeneity of the contemporary social world. Although there are currently about 600 to 700 languages that are not endangered or moribund (Krauss 1992), it is striking that there are just 12 principal languages.

Section Eight, "Language and education," combines insights from subfields as diverse as variation analysis, interactional sociolinguistics, and language contact studies. Entries on "Black English in education: UK," and "Ebonics and African American Vernacular English" contrast interestingly, showing a startling difference between American and British policies for educating linguistic minorities. Much of the public furor over the 1996 Ebonics resolution by the Oakland School Board was against (mistaken) perceptions that Oakland schools would teach children Ebonics in lieu of Standard English. By contrast, the British National Curriculum has policies much like those employed in Oakland – recognition of difference over deficit and ultimately, assimilationist goals of bidialectalism/bilingualism. Regardless of whether readers believe these two policies don't go far enough to promote linguistic equality, or go too far, or are adequate, it is interesting to note there was apparently no public backlash in Britain like that accompanying the Oakland resolution.

Section Nine, "Methods in sociolinguistics," includes helpful discussions of data collection and analysis techniques in ethnography, variation, and interactional sociolinguistics. An entry on fieldwork ethics and responsibility is provided, as is one on statistical techniques in sociolinguistics. On the whole, this section does a good job of summarizing the ways sociolinguists historically have interacted with and modeled the social relations and language of their research subjects.

The encyclopedia's final section, "The profession," is the most unusual. This section is further divided into two subsections. The first, "Institutions and resources," provides useful and interesting entries on "Endangered languages projects (an inventory)," "Internet resources for sociolinguistics," "Professional associations," and "Sociolinguistics journals: A critical survey." The second subsection, "Profiles of sociolinguists," provides research biographies of some of the major names in the field, although it reflects, by Mesthrie's own admission, a bias for those "whose work has come to international recognition via writing in, or being translated into, English" (3). Nonetheless, recognition by *CESO* must be an honor for some of the pioneers whose biographies appear here, and the section can be of use to potential students in the field who wish to research academic programs.

Taken as a whole, the encyclopedia is a very useful product, offering both detailed summaries of specific sociolinguistic subject matter and more general summaries of larger concepts. Entries like "Language and society: An overview," at about 9,000 words, would make good introductions to the field for upper-level undergraduate or graduate students in introductory sociolinguistics courses, while

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404503234059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

more specific entries like "Verbal duel," at about 2,000 words, are good reviews for more advanced students and scholars needing refreshers. A complete subject index is provided and makes the perfect starting point for investigations into many sociolinguistic topics. Unfortunately, a retail price of more than US$200 most likely places *CESO* beyond many individuals' price range, but if kept at university, social science, and linguistic libraries, the encyclopedia would be accessible enough to students and scholars alike.

Throughout the course of the encyclopedia, there is a great deal of overlap between sections, since many entries reasonably could be placed in more than one section. For example, "School language policies" would be at home in either "Language policy, planning, practice" (where it actually has been placed) or in "Language and education." There is further overlap between many of the entries themselves, but on the whole this fact is more positive than negative. An encyclopedia is a reference text, not a programmatic statement, and an adequate summary of the field should show the interconnectedness of the primary theoretical constructs rather than aiming for ideal organizational elegance. *CESO* should be a good resource for researchers in the coming years.

REFERENCES

Bourdieu, Pierre (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
Krauss, Michael (1992). The world's languages in crisis. *Language* 68:4–10.
Labov, William (1972). *Sociolinguistic patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
Schulte, Brigid (2002). Trapped between two languages: Poor and isolated, many immigrants' children lack English. *Washington Post*, 9 June, A1.

(Received 31 October 2002)

Language in Society **32** (2003). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404503224052

Alastair Pennycook, *Critical applied linguistics: A critical introduction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2001. Pp. xv, 206. Pb $19.95.

Reviewed by Ronald Gray
English, Beijing Language and Culture University
Beijing, China 100083
mnenomic_2000@yahoo.com

There is little doubt that critical applied linguistics is one of the most controversial and contentious areas in linguistics today. This new book, *Critical applied linguistics: A critical introduction*, is an attempt to provide a much-needed detailed and comprehensive introduction to this emergent approach. It is written by Alastair Pennycook of the University of Technology, Sydney, who has been one of the major proponents of critical applied linguistics during the past decade.

Pennycook begins the book by carefully defining the terms "applied linguistics" and "critical." His conception of applied linguistics is considerably broader

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404503234059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

than the commonly used meaning. Pennycook views it as "an area of work that deals with language use in professional settings, translation, speech pathology, literacy, and language education; and it is not merely the application of linguistic knowledge to such settings but it is a semiautonomous and interdisciplinary domain of work that draws on but is not dependent on areas such as sociology, education, anthropology, cultural studies, and psychology" (p. 3). By the word "critical," he means "much more than just a critical dimension added on to applied linguistics: It involves a constant skepticism, a constant questioning of the normative assumptions of applied linguistics. It demands a restive problematization of the givens of applied linguistics and presents a way of doing applied linguistics that seeks to connect it to questions of gender, class, sexuality, race, ethnicity, culture, identity, politics, ideology, and discourse" (10).

The book is divided into seven chapters. Chap. 1, "Introducing critical applied linguistics," gives a general overview of the concerns and domains of critical applied linguistics (hereafter CAL). Pennycook states that his purpose is not to "develop a model for CAL. Rather, my aim is to explore its complexities" (21). According to Pennycook, CAL is concerned with critical social inquiry and theory, and both micro and macro relations; it is also self-reflexive, interested in preferred futures and heterosis, and grounded in an antidisciplinary view of praxis. The domains that constitute CAL are critical discourse analysis and literacy, language testing, teaching, planning, and rights, translation, as well as literacy and language in the setting of the workplace.

In Chap. 2, "The politics of knowledge," Pennycook examines the relationship between politics and knowledge in terms of how they are connected to language. His position is that language is closely linked with politics, and that "an understanding of language as central to human life is fundamentally tied up with the cultural politics of the everyday" (168). By politics, Pennycook does not mean policy-making or any of the more formal areas of politics; rather, his conception of politics is strongly Foucaultian. As a result, he sees the central concern of politics as involving "the notion of power and which views power as operating throughout all domains of life. Power is at the heart of questions of discourse, disparity, and difference" (27). He believes that CAL "needs ways of understanding how power operates on and through people in the ongoing tasks of teaching, learning languages, translating, talking to clients" (28).

To illustrate this connection among language, power, and knowledge, Pennycook presents in this chapter four different perspectives. The first is what he labels the "central-autonomous"; this position, Pennycook believes, is the most commonly held in applied linguistics. It is liberal and stresses structuralism, democratic egalitarianism, and objective rational inquiry. It also strongly holds that applied linguistics should always be kept separate from politics. The second orientation, "anarcho-autonomy," emphasizes positivism, reason, and realism. Exemplified by such linguists as Noam Chomsky, this position combines a "radical leftist politics with a view that this nevertheless has nothing to do with applied

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404503234059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

linguistics" (33). The next perspective, "emancipatory modernism," also insists on the importance of science, rationalism, and realism, moreover it "seeks to analyze relations between language and the social and political" (30).

The fourth perspective, which is Pennycook's own, is called "problematizing practices." Although it views "language as fundamentally bound up with politics, nevertheless, it articulates a profound skepticism about science, about truth claims, and about an emancipatory position outside ideology. This position, which we might call critical applied linguistics as problematizing practice, draws on post-structuralist, postmodernist, and postcolonial perspectives" (42). The final section is taken up with showing how each position would analyze the topic of the speech used by a learner of a second language. By doing so, Pennycook tries to show how the problematizing practices orientation offers a broader and more comprehensive understanding of this subject.

The next chapter, "The politics of language," examines how language is employed in varied circumstances. It looks at the topics of critical sociolinguistics, language planning and politics as applied to the global spread of English, language rights, linguistic imperialism, and postcolonialism and the notion of resistance. Among the conclusions Pennycook reaches is "that areas such as sociolinguistics and language planning do not automatically constitute background theoretical domains for critical applied; indeed, they are in many respects deeply inadequate for such a task. Rather than the dominant liberal framework of politics that underlies much of the work in these areas, a more critical framework is called for" (71, 72). Pennycook also argues that what is needed in current discussions about language is a general attitude toward the subject that is critical rather than merely descriptive.

Chap. 3, "The politics of the text," concerns the areas of critical literacy, critical discourse analysis, and language awareness. Here Pennycook also examines Foucault's theory of power and criticizes the massive influence that structuralism has had on the development of linguistics. Pennycook completes the chapter by giving a detailed argument for a post-structionalist and post-linguistic view of language – one that uses sophisticated critical text analysis, recognizes that literacy is always political in character, and comprehends that texts do not have meaning until they are interpreted, since they are rooted in social practices.

In Chap. 4, "The politics of pedagogy," critical approaches to education are investigated. Three alternative understandings of education and society are mapped out: the standard view of the classroom, and the "reproductive" and "resistance" perspectives. Pennycook also writes about the issues of agency, resistance, structure, and determinism, as applied to the classroom. He believes that we must view the classroom "as a microcosm of the larger social and cultural world, reflecting, reproducing, and changing that world" (138). "Everything we use in class is laden with meaning from outside and interpretations from inside. And these meanings and interpretations occur amid the complex cultural politics of the classroom" (129).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404503234059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The next chapter, "The politics of difference," attempts to describe how differences of gender, identity, language, and sexuality are shaped. Among the areas discussed are dominance, performativity, and difference, in regard to gender, and inclusivity and engagement as focuses and modes in dealing with problems of identity. Pennycook's point is that we need to approach identity not just as something that is mirrored in language, but also as something that is accomplished through language. And because power and identity have a fundamental relation to language, "it is important to consider research and pedagogical responses to forms of difference" (157).

The final chapter, "Applied linguistics with an attitude," is a summary of the major themes of the book as well as a strong argument for the development of a critical attitude toward applied linguistics in general. Pennycook also presents five ways that CAL might be implemented as a university class in applied linguistics. He ends by cautioning that his purpose throughout the book has only been "to provide a glimpse of the movable praxis that is critical applied linguistics. I see critical applied linguistics as a constantly shifting and dynamic approach to questions of language and education rather than a method, set of techniques, or a fixed body of knowledge" (173).

All in all, *Critical applied linguistics* is a comprehensive introduction to a very complicated branch of linguistics. I found the author's sections dealing with language planning and politics, the global role of English, and identity and subjectivity to be both informative and thought-provoking. The book is not an easy read, but each chapter contains useful charts that greatly help to illustrate the main points being made. There were, though, three general problems that I had with Pennycook's position. First, Pennycook claims several times in the book that a major advantage of CAL is that it circumvents the theory/practice problem that has plagued much of applied linguistics. But I have doubts whether Pennycook's solution is that viable – or understandable. According to him, "a notion of praxis may help us to avoid this divide. From this point of view, applied linguistics in all its contexts is a constant reciprocal relation between theory and practice, or preferably, 'that continuous reflective integration of thought, desire and action sometimes referred to as praxis (Simon, 1992, p. 49)' " (172). Yet it is not clear how this ongoing reciprocality actually results in transcending the split, and unfortunately, Pennycook fails to give any concrete examples that demonstrate precisely how CAL can accomplish this.

Another problem involves a fundamental tension between the two general functions he wants CAL to perform. On the one hand, Pennycook wants CAL to be strongly self-reflexive, critical of the received canon regarding values and knowledge claims, avoiding any form of essentialism, standardized methods, or techniques, and concerned not only with describing language but also critiquing it; that is, he requires CAL to be "a form of antidisciplinary knowledge, a way of thinking and doing that is always questioning, always seeking new schemas of politization ... it needs to avoid any static model building and

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404503234059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

instead is an approach to language and knowledge that is always in motion" (176).

In opposition to this, however, Pennycook also states that CAL from the outset "is always already political and, moreover, an instrument and a resource for *change*, for challenging and changing the wor(l)d" (176); "it is important to have a vision of language that not only reflects but also produces and therefore can alter social relations" (73); "to develop an adequate theory of critical applied linguistics, we do indeed have to engage with questions of morals and ethics" (65); and "it is also a view that insists not merely on the alleviation of pain but also on the possibility of change" (7). The obvious difficulty with all these functions is that they are ultimately contradictory. That is, Pennycook requires that CAL be critical, cleanly distancing itself from mainstream critical theory and normative codes; that it be incessantly questioning and doggedly skeptical; and that it stay clear of conventional methods or techniques – but he also wants it to be a tool, grounded in ethics, for change. In other words, Pennycook is, in effect, arguing for CAL to be prescriptive in nature. Pennycook stoutly denies that CAL is prescriptive, but it is impossible, in the end, for him consistently to do so, given the specific tasks he assigns to CAL.

A final reservation I have about the book is that it is difficult not to feel, after finishing this book, that Pennycook is simply trying to accomplish too much, that he is too inclusive, that he draws too many elaborate and minute connections to too many disciplines. In short, he wants his approach to be too many things to too many contemporary issues and problems – which may be one reason why Pennycook feels that he has "given myself a tough challenge here, and to be honest, I continue to have doubts about the extent that I have been able to meet it in this book" (27). As a consequence, the precise role that he wants linguistics, as a discipline, to perform, becomes, at the end of the book, so general that it is unclear.

Because Pennycook sets such a broad scope for the tasks he wants CAL to carry out, and because he covers so many domains and fields, he is constantly forced to be both overtly simplistic and extremely general in some of his conceptual descriptions and distinctions (especially regarding epistemological perspectives). Pennycook is aware of this problem, but he simply maintains that some of his central alternative framework descriptions "are as much caricatures as they are characterizations . . . these should not be taken as discrete configurations so much as convenient bedfellows" (44). Considering the great importance of several of these distinctions to Pennycook's overall argument, this justification seems weak.

In conclusion, the ultimate value of *Critical applied linguistics* lies not in the conclusions that Pennycook reaches, but in the hard questions he asks about language and the role of linguistics, and in the general critical and skeptical stance that informs the book.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404503234059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

REFERENCE

Simon, R. (1992). *Teaching against the grain: Essays towards a pedagogy of possibility*. London: Bergin & Garvey.

(Received 27 October 2002)

Language in Society **32** (2003). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404503234059

Salikoko Mufwene, *The ecology of language evolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001. Pp. xviii, 255. Hb. $65.00, pb. $22.00.

Reviewed by J. Clancy Clements
Department of Spanish and Portuguese, Indiana University
Bloomington IN 47405-7103
clements@indiana.edu

In this book, author Salikoko Mufwene offers a chronology of his views on language evolution as they have developed over the past 12 years. Mufwene understands the linguistic evolutionary process in terms of a language's external ecology – that is, its position relative to other languages with which it moves in and out of contact, the power relations among groups of different language varieties in the setting, and so on – as well as its internal ecology, or the coexistence in a given setting of the linguistic features, and their relative weight. Although Mufwene uses creole languages as a starting point, his purpose is to highlight general characteristics of language evolution; he argues that, in the essentials of language change, varieties such as pidgins and creoles differ little if at all from non-pidgins and non-creoles. To build his case, Mufwene draws from population genetics, seeing any given language not as an organism but rather as its own "species."

The main goals of the book are to argue that: "(1) creoles have developed by the same restructuring processes that mark the evolution of noncreole languages; (2) contact is an important factor in all such developments; and (3) the external ecological factors that bear on restructuring also bear on aspects of language vitality, among which is language endangerment" (p. 1).

In Chap. 1, the Introduction, Mufwene defines the terms "I-language" and "E-language" in population-genetic terms. I-languages are idiolects; they are first-level abstractions from speech, and are to a language what individuals are to a species. E-languages can be considered communal languages, higher-level abstractions, extrapolations characterizable as ensembles of I-languages. These are "internalized to the extent that we can also project a collective mind that is an ensemble of individual minds in a population" (2). One question he seeks to answer is: When do changes that appear in the I-language of individuals amount to communal change? According to him, an instance of language evolution would be the change from I-language to E-language. Such a change is also at the basis

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404503234059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of the speciation of I-languages, brought about by structural and/or ideological changes undergone by a set of I-languages, such that it becomes appropriate to consider the set of I-languages distinct from the original communal language.

If a language is its own species, then its features are analogous to genes. Mufwene sees a language contact situation as a mixture of linguistic features that make up a "feature pool." Koinés, creoles, pidgins, or other language varieties may evolve out of a contact situation. These vernaculars would be made up of certain features from the feature pool, which would be selected depending on their relative dominance in the pool, which in turn depends on a number of linguistic and nonlinguistic factors. Thus, an I-language speaker in any given contact situation would construct his or her idiolect on the model of blending inheritance in biology. If a language is a species, in its nature it is closest to a parasitic species, "whose life and vitality depend on (the acts and dispositions of) its hosts, i.e., its speakers, on the society they form, and on the culture in which they live" (16).

In Chap. 2, "The founder principle in the development of creoles," Mufwene explicates the founder principle, which was developed to account for language development in the slave populations in the United States, the Caribbean, and the Indian Ocean. Essentially, the first situations in which slaves were used for labor in places such as the U.S. were homesteads where the ratio of Black slaves to Whites was balanced enough that the slaves would have had sufficient access to the colonial varieties of English to learn it. Mufwene notes that the settlers in such colonies came in large part from the lower socio-economic classes and spoke various nonstandard sociolects and dialects. In the same way as the features of their various English varieties were in competition with one another, so too were the features of the substrate languages of the Africans in competition with the features supplied by the varieties of English spoken. Thus, the phenomenon of koinéization that took place among the English speakers also took place among the Blacks who were learning English there. This same phenomenon, Mufwene argues, took place in the anglophone, francophone, and lusophone Caribbean, as well as in the Indian Ocean, as pointed out earlier by Chaudenson 1992. Thus, according to Mufwene, creolization in these situations, if it occurred at all, was (at least partially) a consequence not of an abrupt development but of a long series of language learning situations in which the slaves of each generation learned an approximation of the developing language variety of the colonizers who owned them. With each generation, the vernacular of the slaves, who learned their variety from fellow slaves, would become, in terms of features, ever more distant from the vernacular of the colonizers. As this restructuring process continued, the slaves' vernacular became basilectalized and characteristic of its segregated users. While Mufwene adduces supporting demographic and linguistic evidence in favor of his position, he also recognizes that the founder principle "is one of several principles that must be considered as we try to account for the development of creole vernaculars" (75).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404503234059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In Chap. 3, "The development of American Englishes: Factoring contact in and social bias out," Mufwene focuses on certain American English language varieties. He challenges what he considers the erroneous belief that White American English Vernaculars (WAEVs) have been inherited almost intact from England, whereas African-American English (AAE) varieties have been seen as a "corruption" of English by contact with African languages. His argument is that both WAEVs and varieties of AAE developed following the competition-and-selection process. That is, both are the outcome of contact among different language varieties. As he states, all varieties are outputs of the same restructuring equation, and the differences among them can be accounted for by assigning different values to the variables involved. Thus, the differences among the varieties of American English are a matter of degree, not of kind. Although Mufwene acknowledges that there was African language influence in the development of AAEs, the influence of competition-and-selection remains the same. The outcome is, however, slightly different owing to differences between the feature pools of the populations involved.

From the standpoint of speciation, Mufwene argues that there are good reasons for considering creoles as offspring of their lexifier languages rather than as genetically unrelated languages. In Chap. 4, "Legitimate and illegitimate offspring of English," he addresses the question of social bias in classifying new varieties of English, arguing that "the naming practice of new Englishes has to do more with the racial identity of those who speak them than with how these varieties developed and the extent of their structural deviations" (107). American English varieties, as well as new indigenized Englishes such as those spoken in India, Singapore, or South Africa, and English-lexified creoles such as those in the Caribbean, have developed, he argues, by the same kinds of natural restructuring processes. The structural differences among them are due to variation in internal and external ecological conditions, which have assigned different values to the variables of the language-restructuring equation, thus determining varying outcomes. Mufwene compares these varieties to native Englishes spoken in Scotland and Ireland. For all these English varieties, he suggests, one can make a case for their blended inheritance. Yet not all enjoy the same status. He points out that both the indigenized English varieties and the English vernaculars called creoles have a different status precisely because they are spoken by non-Europeans. Moreover, the same variety of English was not the lexifier for the different English vernaculars: for indigenized English varieties, scholastic English served as their lexifier, whereas creoles had nonstandard English varieties as their lexifier. This variation was the basis for different outcomes in different varieties.

In arguing in Chap. 5, "What research on the development of creoles can contribute to genetic linguistics," that creoles developed following the competition-and-selection process as other vernaculars, and that the substrate languages, nonstandard lexifier languages, and the founder principle had a hand in their formation and development, Mufwene seeks to challenge claims that (i) creoles formed

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404503234059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

more rapidly than other languages, (ii) they were created by children, and (iii) they were lexified by standard European-language varieties. I comment on the first two points. The first involves creolization, for which Mufwene (138) offers as the "most adequate" the following definition: "The social marking of a particular colonial vernacular of the seventeenth to nineteenth centuries from other colonial varieties because of the ethnic/racial affiliation of its primary speakers." As stated, the definition excludes any languages – currently also considered creoles – that formed before the seventeenth century, e.g., the Portuguese-based creoles in Africa and Asia. Mufwene thus redefines "creolization" and introduces the term "basilectization," which he defines as applying to any communal variety which diverges maximally from the local acrolect (i.e., every basilectal variety is identified relative to its own acrolect). In his suggested terminological changes, he leaves out of the definition of "creolization" the notion of "nativization" (adopting as a native language a variety that is native to no one), asserting that creoles were and are not created by children (131). It seems reasonable, however, to maintain the notion of nativization as part of the creolization process (cf. Andersen 1983): We know that children exhibit a tendency to regularize irregular forms (e.g., *goed* for *went*), which, to give only two general examples, arguably contributed to a highly regular verbal system in many Portuguese-based creoles (cf. Clements 1996) and played a significant role in the restructuring of Tok Pisin (cf. Sankoff and Laberge 1973, Sankoff 1977, Romaine 1992, Smith 2002).

In Chap. 6, "Language contact, evolution, and death: How ecology rolls the dice," Mufwene addresses in depth the notion of language as species. He takes evolution to be "the long-term changes undergone by a language (variety) over a period of time" (145), and sees language as changing through the natural selection of features carried out by their speakers. He argues for the language-as-parasitic-species metaphor because it can capture partial, differential, and variable-speed language variation, as well as fuzzy boundaries in a language, which the language-as-organism metaphor cannot handle. Additional arguments in favor of the language-as-parasite analogy are that both languages and parasites vanish when the host population disappears; they thrive or decline depending on the social habits of the hosts; they affect the behaviors of their hosts; and they adapt themselves to the hosts' behavioral responses. Moreover, both languages and parasitic populations are more likely to specialize into related subspecies than are their hosts; that is, the development of dialects happens more quickly than the development of different biological or ethnic groups. Finally, speciation into separate subspecies or species takes place when networks of communication have little contact with each other and increasingly select different features out of similar feature pools.

In terms of ecology, internal ecology, following Mufwene, involves viewing languages as complex adaptive systems consisting of numerous components that interact nonlinearly and are organized into complex structures and behaviors. External ecology, he notes, can also introduce material into the complex adaptive

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404503234059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

system. That is, through language contact, new features can enter into the feature pool and serve as "raw material," so to speak, as a language adapts to the new situation. Thus, the boundaries between internal and external language ecologies are porous.

Chap. 7, "Past and recent population movements in Africa: Their impact on its linguistic landscape," addresses the linguistic situation in Africa in reverse diachronic order, discussing the arrival of the European languages and African language movements from the perspectives of language ecology and speciation. Chap. 8, "Conclusion: The big picture," offers an overview of the main points covered in the earlier chapters.

The main contributions of this book are the cogent case built in favor of using the same set of measures for classifying all language varieties, and solid arguments in favor of viewing a language as a parasitic species with a feature pool and an ecology (a view independently advanced by Croft 2000). Mufwene also raises hard questions that go to the heart of the important topic of researcher bias in classifying language varieties. However, at times I believe he speaks in terms that are too broad. For example, his argument for gradual development of creoles may be valid for English- and French-lexified creoles, but it has limited application to the Portuguese- and Spanish-lexified creoles in Asia, which are very likely the result of abrupt creolization of a variety of Portuguese pidgin (Clements 1992, 1993, 1996). Moreover, the claim that creolization is not a restructuring process (113) depends on how the term is defined, as mentioned above. If creolization includes the nativization of a pidgin – a commonly accepted part of the definition – then the truth of Mufwene's assertion would have to be tested empirically. Last, given that the book is a collection of essays, the overall organization of the ideas sometimes gets lost. However, these drawbacks are minor compared to the exceedingly important contribution it makes to the conceptualization of language variety and language change.

REFERENCES

Andersen, Roger W. (1983) (ed.). *Pidginization and creolization as language acquisition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Chaudenson, Robert (1992). *Des îles, des hommes, des langues: Essais sur la créolisation linguistique et culturelle*. Paris: L'Harmattan.

Clements, J. Clancy (1996). *The genesis of a language*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

______ (1993). Rejoinder to Naro's 'Arguing about Arguin'. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 8:119–24.

______ (1992). On the origins of pidgin Portuguese. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 7:75–92.

Croft, William (2000). *Explaining language change: An evolutionary approach*. London: Longman.

Romaine, Suzanne (1992). *Language, education, and development: Urban and rural Tok Pisin in Papua New Guinea*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sankoff, Gillian (1977). Creolization and syntactic change in New Guinea Tok Pisin. In B. Blount & M. Sanches (eds.), *Sociocultural dimensions of language change*, 131–59. New York: Academic Press.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404503234059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

———, & Laberge, Suzanne (1973). On the acquisition of native speakers by a language. *Kivung* 6:32–47.

Smith, Geoff P. (2002). *Growing up with Tok Pisin: Contact, creolization, and change in Papua New Guinea's national language*. London: Battlebridge.

(Received 30 October 2002)

Language in Society **32** (2003). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404503244055

ANN K. WENNERSTROM, *The music of everyday speech: Prosody and discourse analysis*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001. Pp. xix, 317, Pb. $24.95.

Reviewed by JOHN HELLERMAN
Department of Applied Linguistics, Portland State University
Portland, OR 97201
jkheller@pdx.edu

The music of everyday speech (hereafter *MES*) is a book for discourse analysts interested in incorporating a theoretically grounded account of sound production, or, prosody, into their research. Readers of *Language in Society* will find *MES* to be the first book of its kind. It includes an overview of phonological, discourse analytical, and interactional approaches to the analysis of prosody, as well as model prosodic analyses of the major research areas in discourse analysis. *MES* is a thorough presentation of how prosodic analysis can inform discourse analysis, unique in its coverage of material, excellence of presentation, and theoretical and analytical depth.

Much of the previous research on prosody in language has focused on defining the patterns of use of intonation in English (Crystal 1969, Bolinger 1986). Wennerstrom's work consolidates findings from research by these intonational theorists with that of phonologists (Pierrehumbert 1980, Ladd 1996) and more recent work on prosody in conversation (e.g., Couper-Kuhlen & Selting 1996, Ford & Thompson 1996, Schegloff 1998, Wells & Macfarlane 1998). From this broad theoretical and methodological understanding of studies of prosody, the author presents five chapters, each focusing on a specific area within discourse analysis and the ways that incorporation of prosody may add to the investigation of these areas.

After an overview of the contents (Chap. 1), Chaps. 2 and 3 give a complete presentation of the author's theoretical foundations for the study of prosody in spoken language. Here Wennerstrom displays her wide knowledge of the area of prosody, ranging from work in generative phonology to more discourse- and interaction-based approaches. The author doesn't directly attempt to make connections between the phonological and the interactionist programs, but her expertise as a phonologist and phonetician is clear from the theoretical rigor in which the analysis of prosody in discourse is grounded. The author has adapted a phonological model of pitch accent from Pierrehumbert 1980 to the analysis

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404503234059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of prosody in discourse, using iconic transcription conventions from discourse and conversation analysis for the representation of prosody. In this way, she makes a relatively abstract theory accessible to those without a background in phonology. Another theoretical foundation is the author's use of acoustic analysis and the display of pitch tracks as a check on analytical claims. In this sense, her methods resonate with work in conversational phonetics (Local 1996, Couper-Kuhlen 1996), which has applied auditory and acoustic phonetics to the study of conversation.

After the theoretical background, Chap. 4 discusses how intonation reflects mental representation, works as part of the linguistic system in achieving coherence across oral texts, and indicates given and new information. Although Wennerstrom sometimes follows the pattern of previous phonological research on intonation in using created examples to illustrate theoretical points, her work is notable for, and benefits from, the use of representative examples from her database of talk-in-interaction. This work also benefits from the author's understanding and use of acoustic analysis to illustrate her analysis and description of pitch movement graphically. In this way, her work gives empirical grounding to earlier theoretical treatments of these same issues (Halliday & Hassan 1976, Chafe 1994).

In the analytical chapters (5–9), Wennerstrom uses "guest" analyses (excerpts from other authors' published work) for the main analytical discussions. In each chapter, she gives complete background for the issue under discussion and highlights several "unresolved issues" – major questions and problems to be dealt with in future research. I found these sections of each chapter particularly helpful as a way to place the analytical issue dealt with in that chapter as one step in an ongoing research program. The author uses a prosodic lens to reexamine the following areas and incorporates guest analyses for support in chapters on "Discourse markers," "Speech act theory," "Conversation analysis," "Narrative," and "Second language acquisition." In this review, I touch on issues from only some of these chapters.

In my own introductory classes, when speech act theory is discussed, students quickly note the absence of nonverbal and prosodic analysis in the classification of speech acts. Wennerstrom's Chap. 6 shows the importance of the analysis of pitch movement in an empirically grounded speech act framework. She gives the example of a "representative," the statement *they wear those pants all the time*, which has a high rising pitch boundary. Such a statement with this high rising pitch is normally classified as an "indirect" command, but from Wennerstrom's perspective (pitch movement as part of the linguistic system in English) such a phonological pitch movement (rising boundary) is part of the locutionary act. This particular utterance, *they wear those pants all the time* is not, in its sound context (a rising pitch boundary), an "indirect" command. Rather, the conventional pitch contour gives the utterance the force of a directive. Wennerstrom

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404503234059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

calls for more such empirical investigation of speech act theory using such a prosodic lens, and this chapter – with its details on the relationship among interactional pragmatics, implicature, illocutionary force, and intonation – is a good starting point for anyone interested in taking up that call.

Chap. 7, on conversation analysis (CA), includes subsections on the prosodic organization of turn-taking, tone concord (speakers matching pitch level), pitch accent and cohesion, and rhythm as an interactive device. Subsections include summaries of important research since the 1980s on prosody in talk-in-interaction. The guest analysis shows how disruption in rhythm is part of the display of loss of face in Immigration and Naturalization Service interviews.

Even though all CA studies incorporate some degree of prosodic description into their analyses (pitch at the end of turns, timed pauses), there is a need for deeper understanding in CA research of how prosody works throughout a turn and across sequences of turns. Wennerstrom's understanding of prosody from studies in intonational phonology and discourse analysis is a valuable resource for conversation analysts interested in gaining that understanding. She notes that CA's focus on micro-level details of turns and sequences of turns in talk-in-interaction make CA research an ideal site for the investigation of prosodic phenomena in talk. I would add that CA's theoretical stance of grounding analytic claims in participants' orientation to those claims offers much to the study of prosody in talk-in-interaction. Showing how participants orient to the prosody of the talk gives perceptual and social salience to prosodic analyses.

In Chap. 9, Wennerstrom notes that the study of prosody has important implications for second language (L2) research, especially regarding the production and perception of lectures by international teaching assistants at U.S. universities. English as a Second Language (ESL) textbooks have recognized the difficulty L2 learners may have in achieving target-like prosody and have begun to incorporate larger sections devoted to the teaching of connected speech phenomena.

Previous research studies (including Wennerstrom's own) are cited that show systematic, qualitative differences in both the perception and the production of prosody by nonnative speakers of English (NNSs). NNSs were given higher ratings on their pronunciation when they used paratones and when they used more native-speaker-like pitch shifts at topic changes. Even studies using different theoretical models found that NNSs tend to use a falling pitch at juncture points in discourse – places where native speakers would use rising pitch to indicate the dependent relationship between two parts of a text.

I have two points of criticism about the graphical representation of pitch. Although this may not fall within the scope of this book, I had hoped to find a discussion of the author's choice of a scale of absolute Hertz for the representation of pitch instead of a logarithmic scale in "semitones," which takes into ac-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404503234059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

count how hearers' perception differs from a physical signal on a scale in Hertz ('t Hart, Cohen & Collier 1990).

Second, although I find that including pitch tracks helps ensure reliability, allowing readers the most accurate channel to the prosody outside of hearing utterances, the pitch tracks supplied by Wennerstrom may be confusing for someone investigating prosody for the first time. The issue is the conflict between phonological and phonetic representation of pitch height; I mention it here because readers may see a disjuncture between the phonological representations for pitch accent and pitch boundaries (H* – L* and H% – L%, respectively) and the acoustic pitch tracks given, which could cause confusion (cf. 184). The author could have reiterated how the analyst determines H* or L* pitch accent, and how the acoustic representations for H* and L* may not always be transparently "High" or "Low" on a pitch chart.

These criticisms aside, *MES* is a thorough introduction to the analysis of prosody, well grounded both theoretically and empirically. I recommend this book to discourse and conversation analysts interested in understanding the theoretical underpinnings for the study of prosody in the linguistic system and as a discourse organizing device.

REFERENCES

Bolinger, Dwight (1986). *Intonation and its parts: Melody in spoken English*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Chafe, Wallace (1994). *Discourse, consciousness and time: The flow and displacement of conscious experience in speaking and writing*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth (1996). The prosody of repetition: On quoting and mimicry. In Couper-Kuhlen & Selting (eds.), 366–405.

______, & Selting, M. (1996) (eds.). *Prosody in conversation: Interactional studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crystal, David (1969). *Prosodic systems and intonation in English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ford, C. E., & Thompson, S. A. (1996). Interactional units in conversation: Syntactic, intonational and pragmatic resources for the management of turns. In Elinor Ochs et al. (eds.), *Interaction and grammar*, 134–84. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.

't Hart, J.; Collier, R.; et al. (1990). *A perceptual study of intonation: An experimental-phonetic approach to speech melody*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ladd, D. R. (1996). *Intonational phonology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Local, J. (1996). Conversational phonetics: Some aspects of news receipts in everyday talk. In Couper-Kuhlen & Selting (eds.), 177–230.

Pierrehumbert, Janet (1980). *The phonology and phonetics of English intonation*. Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistics Club.

Schegloff, Emmanuel A. (1998). Reflections on studying prosody in talk-in-interaction. *Language and Speech* 41:235–63.

Wells, B., & Macfarlane, S. (1998). Prosody as an interactional resource: Turn-projection and overlap. *Language and Speech* 41:265–94.

(Received 31 October 2002)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404503234059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Language in Society **32** (2003). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404503254051

Zoltán Kövecses, *Metaphor: A practical introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002. Pp. xvi, 285. Pb. $19.95.

Reviewed by Chienjer Charles Lin
Anthropology and Linguistics, University of Arizona
Tucson, AZ 85721
clin@u.arizona.edu

This is the first textbook on metaphor to appear after the cognitive linguistic revolution of metaphorical research launched two decades ago by Lakoff & Johnson with their pioneering work, *Metaphors we live by*. Much scholarship has since been devoted to this paradigm of research. Twenty years have passed, and Kövecses takes this as a good time to summarize the development of the field. Writing a textbook on metaphor certainly reflects the maturation of the study of metaphor within the cognitive linguistic tradition. Targeted readers are undergraduate and graduate students with interests in metaphor and cognitive linguistics. Experienced researchers may also find this book helpful in motivating new ideas.

As a practicing cognitive and cultural linguist, Kövecses introduces various aspects of the contemporary theory of metaphor, providing readers with rich linguistic examples from different languages. Topics include the linguistic, cognitive, psychological, and cultural aspects of metaphor. This book gives neophytes a picture of what sorts of metaphorical research have been done and what research possibilities are still out there. Many of its examples (especially for metaphors of emotion) are from Kövecses's own work; examples from other researchers and from languages other than English also abound.

Metaphor has 17 chapters. Each chapter is of reasonable length for classroom use – the longest is 22 pages long, and most are around 15 pages. Every chapter has a summary, a list of recommended readings, and exercises following the main text. The author also provides a glossary and solutions to the exercises at the end of the book. In addition to a general index, there is an index for metaphors and metonymies.

Chap. 1 introduces what metaphor is. It distinguishes between linguistic and conceptual metaphors (CMs) and defines the scope of the book. Section 5 of this chapter contains a list of questions to be answered in subsequent chapters. Each set of questions summarizes what one chapter is about. These questions are intended to give readers an overview of the book; however, they are extremely detailed, and so their appearance in the first chapter may be overwhelming for unprepared readers. It would be more helpful if Kövecses had restricted this section to a simple summary of each chapter, while placing the questions at the beginning of each chapter as a study guide.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404503234059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Chap. 2 surveys common source domains (SDs) and target domains (TDs). The reversibility of SD-to-TD mapping is also discussed. Kövecses allows reverse mappings from TD to SD (p. 25), which seems to be an unnecessary concession. When SD and TD are reversible, it simply means that certain conceptual domains could be SDs at some times and TDs at other times. That is, a concept that acts as an SD in one CM can be a TD in another. It should therefore be retained that an SD is always used to understand a TD; this direction is irreversible. What should be allowed for is that TDs are not always more abstract than SDs.

Chap. 3 categorizes metaphors based on their conventionality (novel vs. conventional), cognitive functions (structural, ontological, or orientational), nature (knowledge-based vs. image-based), and level of generality (generic vs. specific). The term "cognitive function" may be a bit misleading because it is not transparent whether categorizing metaphors into structural, ontological, and orientational reflects the different "functions" of these metaphors at the cognitive level. A neutral term, the "cognitive basis" of metaphors, may be a better choice.

Chaps. 4 and 5 look at the realization of metaphors in literature and nonlinguistic media. Chap. 4 presents metaphors in literature, particularly poetic metaphors. Kövecses shows that literary metaphors are based primarily on CMs similar to those that generate metaphors in daily language. Chap. 5 examines how metaphors are commonly used in movies, cartoons, advertisements, and so on.

Chaps. 6–9 discuss the mappings between SDs and TDs. Chap. 6 explains why certain SDs are mapped onto certain TDs. Four relations between SDs and TDs are suggested: correlations in experience, perceived structural similarity, biological or cultural roots, and preexisting similarity. Chaps. 7 and 8 explain how only certain parts of SDs are mapped onto TDs. Chap. 9 explores how one SD is adopted for various TDs. In these chapters, Kövecses shows that the relations between SDs and TDs are many-to-many; that is, one SD could be mapped onto various TDs, and different SDs could be mapped onto one TD. Kövecses explains that primary metaphors (those that are based on correlations in experience), which compose complex metaphors, motivate certain elements in the SD to map onto the TD.

However, it remains rather obscure whether an unambiguous definition of "domain" is possible. The difficulty of delimiting domains is especially evident in the case of multiple SDs that are mapped onto one TD. Are these SDs of distinct domains? Are they subdomains of some larger unified knowledge or semantic field? Are they mental concepts? What is the scope of a mental concept? Could these conceptual domains be merely translations of different lexical items? These questions go to the heart of the definition of a CM, which is established based on a collection of linguistic metaphors, and named using a metalanguage (in this book, English). The scope of a domain is vague. This is a basic unsettled problem concerning the relation between language and thought. Kövecses could have acknowledged these difficulties.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404503234059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Chap. 10 further categorizes metaphor systems into those based on things (Great Chain Metaphors) and those based on relations (Event Structure Metaphors). Chap. 11 introduces metonymy and idealized cognitive models. Chaps. 12 and 13 discuss the universality and cultural specificity of metaphors. Data from various languages (e.g., Hungarian, Japanese, Zulu, Chinese) are drawn. Metaphorical universality is based on common bodily experiences; variations are found both across cultures and within a single culture (over time). On p.184, Kövecses tries to associate language (linguistic metaphor) with cultural behaviors (e.g., characters of speakers). Correspondences among language, culture, and behavior are appealing claims to make. It would be more convincing, however, if such claims were made with empirical evidence (e.g., from psychological experiments).

Chaps. 14 and 15 relate the study of metaphor to other linguistic studies. Chap. 14 deals with the conceptual basis of idioms and the implications for foreign language teaching. Chap. 15 discusses metaphor, polysemy, historical semantics, and grammatical phenomena. These two chapters place metaphorical studies within the larger linguistic enterprise. They show that the study of metaphor is not isolated; instead, it has implications for other issues in linguistics.

This book introduces most of the fundamental concepts in the first 15 chapters. Chap. 16 continues presenting state-of-the-art development of metaphorical theory: the Network Model (also known as the "blending theory") proposed by Fauconnier & Turner 2002. This theory focuses on the on-line understanding of metaphors and how imagination works. Metaphor is seen as one of the many relations that exist among domains. Chap. 17 recapitulates previous chapters, placing studies of metaphor at three levels: The superindividual level examines conventionalized linguistic metaphors; the individual level looks at the neural and psychological reality of metaphors; and the subindividual level focuses on the underlying physiological basis of metaphor.

Readers may find the classifications of metaphors in this book confusing. This is so because metaphorical research has been somewhat diverse; it gets rather intricate when one attempts to sort out what has been done. One important question that Kövecses has not dealt with at length is the relation between metaphor and analogy. This is related to how metaphorical processes should be treated in the realm of general human cognition, and should be of great interest to readers.

Overall, *Metaphor* as a textbook is wide-ranging and comprehensive. It ambitiously covers most of the important recent developments in metaphorical theories, and Kövecses does a good job presenting these issues using translucent, accessible language. It is also a valuable contribution to integrating current metaphorical research. As an active contributor to metaphorical research for the past two decades, Kövecses knows how to place different aspects of metaphorical research within a larger framework. He draws readers close to practical examples, while keeping them aware of what is going on at a higher theoretical level.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404503234059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Kövecses reserves the mention of most references until the "Further Reading" section. This makes the main text coherently readable in its own right; however, readers who are curious about which idea comes from whom may find it frustrating. The recommended references are up-to-date and useful. *Metaphor* is a good book for novices, and also a book with plenty of data from many languages (though mostly from English). Kövecses himself has done much research on emotion metaphors (e.g., Kövecses 2000), so many of the examples he uses in *Metaphor* are emotion-related.

Before the appearance of this book, *Metaphors we live by* has been a must-read in introductory semantics and cognitive linguistics courses. Kövecses's book adds to the list of required readings for any student of metaphor; it not only covers most of the topics found in Lakoff & Johnson's work but also introduces subsequent developments and findings up to the year 2000.

REFERENCES

Fauconnier, Gilles, & Turner, Mark (2002). *The way we think: Conceptual blending and the mind's hidden complexities*. New York: Basic Books.

Kövecses, Zoltán (2000). *Metaphor and emotion: Language, culture, and body in human feeling*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lakoff, George, & Johnson, Mark (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

(Received 31 October 2002)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404503234059 Published online by Cambridge University Press