REVIEWS

Daniel Nettle, *Linguistic diversity*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press, 1999. Pp. xi, 168. Hb $65.00, pb $19.95.

Reviewed by Patrick McConvell
Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies
GPO Box 553, Canberra, ACT 2601, Australia
patrick@aiatsis.gov.au

Why does linguistic diversity exist? This is the question to which this book is addressed. Nettle argues that, although aspects of the diversity of languages have been studied, the reason for this diversity has not been a subject of attention. To answer the question, he suggests that a multidisciplinary approach is necessary – a broad linguistic anthropology in which the linguistic map is explained by people's social behavior, which in turn arises largely from their ecological situation.

After an introduction, a simple "neutral" model of linguistic divergence is investigated, whereby geographically isolated groups innovate randomly because of imperfect learning. Pointing out problems with this, Nettle replaces it with a more realistic simulation that incorporates three processes: migration, to model contact between groups; social selection, or the influence of linguistic models as studied in sociolinguistics; and functional selection, modeled here in terms of chain-shift in a vowel system. Of these factors, social selection is shown to be the most potent.

Nettle then devotes one chapter each to several aspects of language diversity: geographical distribution, with emphasis on the numbers of languages per country; changes over time, including an overview of linguistic prehistory; phylogenetic diversity, or the number of stocks per continent; and structural diversity. Under the last-named, Nettle deals rather cursorily (as he admits) with typological difference, its distribution, and its possible causes; it is disappointing not to see a discussion here of, e.g., Lucy's investigation of linguistic diversity in the light of the Whorfian hypothesis.

Nettle has been strongly influenced by evolutionary and population genetics, as is evident from his statistical methods and terminology. The initial discussion places more emphasis on individual "items" (lexical items or structural patterns), which are transmitted and diffused, rather than on "languages," which are seen as being like "ecosystems." By Chap. 4, however, he no longer refers to this ecosystem-like character of languages, and they become firm units in the discussion of their distributional properties.

The notion of a language as an assembly of items facilitates the construction of a view of language contact in which items move between languages, and languages can ultimately converge. The model here is based on an ideal monolingual speaker/hearer, and the disadvantages of this unrealistic assumption are more

serious than Nettle allows. A realistic model of change induced by language contact needs to take into account bilingual behavior – for example, whether code-switching occurs, and the general principles by which new forms of language emerge from such input. Although Nettle states that word order is diffusible in the context of bilingualism, he does not embed this claim in a theory derived from bilingual interaction (cf. Myers-Scotton's 1993 theory, to which Nettle does not refer).

There is also a relative lack of attention given to language shift and language spread, as compared to diffusion of items. In fact, shift and spread are discussed only as "an extreme form of . . . social selection . . . between two whole languages" (111) – and in the context of recent language endangerment, associated with what Nettle refers to as "the industrial punctuation" of the last two hundred years.

The leading concepts of this book draw heavily on Dixon 1997 – especially the "punctuated equilibrium" hypothesis, according to which language family trees are formed only during rare "punctuations," such as the initial colonization of a continent, followed by millennia of equilibrium and convergence. A key piece of evidence for this position is Dixon's assertion (which Nettle elevates to a "finding") that, in Australia, it has been impossible to discover phylogenetic structures (9, 97–99). This is misleading, ignoring as it does the considerable progress in the establishment of high-level families and the reconstruction of subgroups. Of course, there are difficulties in applying the comparative method to some cases in Australia, as there are in most language families. The solution seems to lie more in incorporating elements of language contact within a cladistic inheritance model than in insisting that the classic model does not work.

The evidence from Australia and other continents also suggests that the languages of hunter-gatherers have expanded on a large scale in the past 10,000 years to form regular treelike structures, replacing other languages. This runs counter to Nettle's version of the "punctuated equilibrium" hypothesis, which has a social evolutionist twist – highlighting the "Neolithic punctuation" as the only event that spread languages in the Holocene. This aligns Nettle's hypothesis with those that identify the spread of agriculture with the expansion of widespread language families. Nettle's uncritical use of terms like "Palaeolithic" and "Neolithic" only reinforces his assumptions about hunter-gatherers, and it prevents the emergence even of alternative "punctuation" hypotheses that are not linked to agriculture or pastoralism.

In fact, Nettle's book deals mainly with correlations among distributions of languages today, and with economic (and ultimately ecological) characteristics of the regions concerned. The evidence is persuasive that such correlations exist, although Nettle uses a broad brush, e.g., when he averages out countries as climatically diverse as the US or Australia. He makes a good case for the main mediating factor – the size of socio-economic networks, particularly of exchange – and for the value of the concept of ecological risk in predicting the extent of these networks.

A weakness of this approach, however, is its lack of a true diachronic perspective for dealing with the dynamics of language spread. Even if certain networks are a response to ecological risk, they are still a social innovation which occurred at a certain point in history. The present nature of the networks cannot be used as an explanation for language spread that went on hundreds or thousands of years ago. Those events must be dealt with on their own terms, on the basis of reconstruction of situations in the past (although, of course, study of present-day language shift can help us with this task).

In some cases, as with the extensive spread of Hausa in West Africa, historical sources can be used to track an expansion. Here, Nettle chooses to stress horizontal exchange between households (74–76), and he plays down the rise of Hausa emirates and empires (as part of a general stance minimizing the role of such polities in language distribution). But even if household-level exchange is the key factor, its expansion must be tracked against actual language spread and language shift; and the growth of vertical flows of taxation and tribute must surely be linked to the extent of horizontal exchange patterns.

Reconstruction of language spread and its socio-economic matrix is no less necessary where state systems and historical records are absent. Nettle mentions language shift among the Central African Pygmies as if the present type of symbiosis between them and their farmer-herder neighbors were the relevant correlation (67). Bahuchet & Thomas 1986, however, have pointed out that present-day relations between most Pygmies and their neighbors are not of the type that would lead to language shift, and that discontinuities of space and time exist between Pygmy languages and the Bantu languages that are phylogenetically closest. The relevant economic relations between the groups were quite different several hundred or a thousand years ago, when language shift took place, and this prehistoric conjuncture must therefore be the focus of research.

Nettle's chapter on phylogenetic diversity takes issue with the position of Nichols 1990, which is taken to be one in which the number of language stocks increases through time at a constant rate. Some of his criticism is based on the fact that there are periods of more or less rapid change; but this does not materially affect Nichols's picture, which is of an average rate. Further, Nettle concedes that Nichols's model may be apposite for the Americas (for which it was proposed); however, based on the "punctuated equibrium" theory, he argues that this is because of the relatively short time of human occupation of the Americas.

Nettle's "alternative" to Nichols's view proposes that, although linguistic lineages may increase rapidly in the period after initial colonization, the number then peaks and begins to decline. He attributes the decline to "extinction," one cause of which is that "some groups might rise to local dominance ... and subsume other groups" (122); but he avoids putting this process among hunter-gatherers in the same category as "post-Neolithic" language spread and shift. As another cause of lineage extinction, Nettle suggests areal convergence. In the standard model of historical linguistics, areal convergence does not lead to lin-

eage extinction, although it may make the task of separating inheritance from diffusion arduous in some cases.

The general socio-ecological framework and modeling proposed by Nettle will certainly yield valuable results, especially if combined with other important contributions of recent years – for example, Nichols's 1992 theory of "spread zones," which is not given the attention it deserves by Nettle. But superficial correlations among languages, economies, and ecologies today are just a preliminary step in investigation; more attention should be directed to actual diachronic sequences. Some of the less well motivated proposals here, such as "punctuated equilibrium" and the exclusive association of widespread language families with the "Neolithic," might also need to be sacrificed to build a better theory.

REFERENCES

Bahuchet, Serge, & Thomas, Jacqueline (1986). Linguistique et histoire des Pygmées de l'ouest du Bassin Congolais. *Sprache und Geschichte in Afrika* 7(2):73–103.
Dixon, Robert M.W. (1997). *The rise and fall of languages*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.
Lucy, John A. (1992). *Language diversity and thought: A reformulation of the linguistic relativity hypothesis*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.
Myers-Scotton, Carol (1993). *Duelling languages: Grammatical structures in code-switching*. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press.
Nichols, Johanna (1990). Linguistic diversity and the first settlement of the New World. *Language* 66:475–521.
——— (1992). *Linguistic diversity in time and space*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

(Received 27 December 1999)

BAMBI SCHIEFFELIN, KATHRYN WOOLARD, & PAUL KROSKRITY (eds.), *Language ideologies: Practice and theory*. (Oxford studies in anthropological linguistics, 16.) Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press, 1998. Pp. xiii, 338. Hb $75.00, pb $35.00.

Reviewed by JACQUELINE URLA
Anthropology, University of Massachusetts
Amherst, MA 01003
jurla@anthro.umass.edu

This volume makes available to us a revised and expanded collection of essays originally published in 1992 as a special issue of the journal *Pragmatics*. In a masterful and greatly expanded introduction to the volume, Kathryn Woolard establishes the parameters of a field that seeks to advance the goal of linking work on language structure with that on language politics, as well as with linguistic and social theory more generally.

As Woolard usefully outlines it, ideology is a notoriously slippery concept. The definition of language ideologies in this volume borrows from marxist theory the notion that ideas or consciousness are fundamentally linked to social relations and power – but not in any necessarily direct fashion, nor solely in the interest of

class domination. Beyond this, she notes that the contributing authors do not necessarily share views on the meaning and utility of "ideology" to describe their field of investigation. What we have is not, as she says, a fierce commitment to terminology, but a common goal, the point of which "is not just to analyze and critique the social roots of linguistic ideologies but to analyze their efficacy, the way they transform the material reality they comment upon" (11).

The editors have chosen a pleasing tripartite structure to group the assembled case studies: Part I, "The scope and force of dominant conceptions of language"; Part II, "Language ideology in institutions of power"; and Part III, "Multiplicity and contention among ideologies." These parts are followed by lengthy commentaries by Michael Silverstein, Susan Philips, and Susan Gal respectively; these scholars offer substantive and thoughtful theoretical arguments which, together with the introduction, add critically to the value and coherence of the volume as a whole. Faced with the impossibility of synthesizing the often intricately detailed arguments and rich case studies of this volume, I hope only to suggest some of the major themes raised in them.

Part I brings together essays that examine two key questions for the study of language ideologies. One has to do with the question of sites for "sighting" language ideology. In general, our authors agree that the term "language ideologies" refers to the understandings and rationalizations that speakers or analysts have about the nature and use of language, but questions are immediately raised: Where are such understandings to be found? Is language ideology conveyed implicitly in the structure and uses of language, or is it better reserved for explicit statements made about language? Can it refer to both the said and the unsaid? There is no consensus on this important methodological and theoretical point, but rather an ongoing conversation among the authors. A second central question for the volume as a whole, and for Part I in particular, has to do with the "force" or efficacy of language ideologies: What consequences derive from language ideology in general, and from differences among particular ideologies?

Judith Irvine's opening essay, "Ideologies of honorific language," addresses both the question of efficacy and that of sites. Her careful, precise inquiry takes the reader through the complex terrain of honorifics to ask a very basic question: Why do we find grammatical honorifics, marking deference or status differences between speakers, in some linguistic communities but not in others? By comparing several cases, Irvine demonstrates that social stratification (the presence of royal courts or caste systems) is not by itself a sufficient cause. Rather, she shows that ideology – the ways that speakers understand and rationalize markers of deference and respect – constitutes a crucial explanatory variable.

Additional chapters in Part I by Jane Hill, Don Kulick, and Paul Kroskrity pursue the issue of the efficacy of language ideology and its linkages to gender, as well as to other modes of social stratification. Kulick and Kroskrity provide contrasting cases of how language ideologies can be forces for language shift or maintenance. Hill's analysis of Mexicano-speaking peasants who are undergoing

101

a transition to a wage-labor economy similarly links language behavior and ideology to social stratification. Hill identifies a "discourse of nostalgia," articulated almost exclusively by high-status men, which associates particular ways of speaking with a prior social and economic order – which, they claim, was more respectful than the present one. Hill's aim is to describe this dominant discourse, and also to identify the various ways it is "interrupted" by women and junior men, who have a less positive memory of the past. Her suggestive reflections not only dialog directly with some of the central questions in studies of hegemony having to do with the efficacy of "counter-discourses"; they also encourage us to be attentive to language ideology not just as a handmaiden to political and economic domination, but as a factor shaping the consequences of contestation.

The three chapters of Part II turn to the role of institutions as sites for the production and reproduction of language ideologies. Elizabeth Mertz takes on the institutions of law and education in her wonderfully clear and fascinating discussion of the Socratic method of classroom teaching. In Debra Spitulnik's chapter, the same concern – with how language ideology is implicated in the daily practices of language in social institutions – is carried to the arena of broadcasting. Her analysis of Zambian national radio examines language ideologies as these are explicitly articulated in policy, and as they are implied in the allocation of airtime and program content. Spitulnik's study demonstrates the importance of media as a site for language ideology and for the imagining of community, as does another chapter in this section by Jan Blommaert and Jef Verschueren. Her piece, in particular, shows how a combination of institutional ethnography and semiotic analysis can add much insight and theoretical rigor to a field well-traversed by language planning scholars.

The final group of essays, in Part III, brings to the fore issues of domination and contestation. How dominant is dominant ideology? How should we conceptualize relations of domination and processes of contestation? Charles Briggs argues forcefully, in his essay on Warao men's gossip, that contestation is inherent in any situation of ideological domination. For Briggs, researchers should not simply describe dominant ideology; they should also reveal how that domination is produced through discursive practices, and how contestation is expressed and suppressed. These tasks are taken up in the chapter by Joseph Errington, on Indonesian language planning, and in that by Bambi Schieffelin and Rachelle Charlier Doucet, on the debates surrounding the development of a standard Haitian orthography. Both chapters point to the ways in which processes of language engineering, at work in the creation of a national language "standard," entail processes of semiotic reinvention that are morally and politically loaded.

James Collins, "Our ideologies and theirs," brings us to a finale that I found especially interesting. Collins offers a modestly written yet very perceptive reflexive essay about his own linguistic fieldwork in a Native American community, the Tolowa of northwestern California; and he makes a powerful case for placing observers, as well as observed, under the analytic gaze. Indeed, a premise

of this volume as a whole is that researchers are bearers of language ideologies and interests of their own, and that these often differ from, and can actively obscure, recognition of the language ideologies of their subjects. (This is a point well illustrated in the chapters by Irvine and Kroskrity.) Taking his own fieldwork experience as example, Collins notes that the Tolowa speakers he studied were singularly uninterested in his research questions about grammar. In the past, and probably still today, linguists might have chalked this up to ignorance. But Collins suggests that the disjuncture may be an indication of differing language ideologies; i.e., he and the Tolowa had different views of what constitutes the core of language. It is noteworthy that Collins does not simply argue for relativizing native and scholarly views, or for placing them on an equal footing. As he clearly states, they are not. Many native communities are engaged in struggles of linguistic revitalization and cultural development that pit them against community organizers and government agencies in struggles for resources. In this context, linguistic descriptions produced by experts can and often do acquire a political significance that we should investigate rather than discount.

Readers will have much to learn from this rich and carefully edited body of research. Many of the subjects undertaken in this volume – language planning, honorifics, standardization, gossip, and oratory – are familiar to linguistic anthropologists. What these essays add is the ability to link their analyses, in explicit and often nuanced ways, to broader debates in social theory. They also add a stronger dose of semiotic analysis than we usually find in disciplines like cultural studies or subaltern studies, which typically are concerned with the study of ideology. There is something to be gained here, as well as risks. The risks can be a kind of narrowness of focus and audience, since the technical toolkit of semiotics can be daunting to many readers. But the gains lie in a much more precise analysis of the types of relations that are drawn among signs, symbols, and the world. In the present essays, the mechanisms of meaning-making through language are rendered in an exacting fashion.

In many ways, one could say that this volume demonstrates the point that discursive practices constitute – rather than simply reflect – social and material reality. This has been an argument forcefully made by poststructuralist theorists, but it has suffered from an overly vague notion of "discourse." The line of research pursued by linguistic anthropologists, with its much more specific analysis of discursive practices, promises to add depth to the theoretical claim. Readers will also want to look at a new book *Regimes of language*, which continues the conversation on this topic, with many of the same contributors.

REFERENCE

Kroskrity, Paul V. (2000), ed. *Regimes of language*. Santa Fe, NM: SAR Press.

JEF VERSCHUEREN, *Understanding pragmatics*. (Understanding language series.) London: Arnold; New York: Oxford University Press, 1999. Pp. xiv, 295. Pb £13.99, $19.95.

Reviewed by ALEXANDRA JAFFE
Sociology & Anthropology, University of Southern Mississippi
Hattiesburg, MS 39406-1000
ajaffe@ocean.st.usm.edu

As Verschueren writes in his preface, this book is an attempt to meet a double challenge: (a) to present a coherent theory of pragmatics, describing research to date and setting parameters for future research; and (b) to serve as a textbook that is accessible to all students with a basic linguistics background. This is no easy task, but Verschueren has managed to write a book that is accessible to the nonspecialist student and also provides a valuable synthesis of the pragmatic perspective for language specialists in a variety of disciplines. Most chapters have detailed summaries and are followed by suggestions for future research and additional reading.

As Verschueren makes clear throughout the book, its topic is not so much a field as it is a perspective on the nature of meaning in human interaction. It is the "linguistics of language use": a "general cognitive, social and cultural perspective on linguistic phenomena in relation to their usage in forms of behaviour" (7). There are no restrictions, in this perspective, on the kinds of linguistic data to be studied, since all linguistic phenomena, from phonemes to textual structures, are resources for the generation and interpretation of meaning in social life. Moreover, meaning "is not seen as a stable counterpart to linguistic form" (11).

Part I, "The pragmatic perspective," begins with Chap. 1, "Language and language use." Here Verschueren uses a transcript of a conversation to illustrate several classic topic areas treated in the pragmatics literature of the past twenty or thirty years. These include deixis, speech acts, implicit meaning, conversation, politeness, and argumentation. However, Verschueren argues that these traditional focal points should not be used as the organizing principles for a book on pragmatics because they are "different ways of speaking about common phenomena rather than different phenomena" (43). He instead proposes an analytical method which synthesizes a variety of pragmatic approaches to the phenomena of meaning, and which pays attention to both the production and the interpretation of meaning (intentionality) in cultural context. Chap. 2, "Key notions," describes language use as the continuous and obligatory making of linguistic choices at every possible level of linguistic structure. For Verschueren, pragmatics is concerned primarily with the notion of "adaptability," defined as "the property of language which enables human beings to make negotiable linguistic choices from a variable range of options in such a way as to approach satisfaction for communicative needs" (69). His pragmatic approach investigates the dynamics of adaptability, taking into account cognitive, structural, and contextual factors that affect the range of possible choices and the degree to which they are negotiable.

Part II, "Aspects of the meaningful functioning of language," comprises Chap. 3, "Context"; Chap. 4, "Structure"; Chap. 5, "Dynamics"; and Chap. 6, "Salience." On the topic of context, Verschueren makes the point that "any ingredient of a communicative event is a potential contextual correlate of adaptability" (112). Chap. 3 covers a wide range of such "ingredients": deictic language, physical context, culture, and the linguistic devices used to create contextual cohesion. The main point – that contexts are not fixed, but generated in language use – is an important one, illustrated with several good examples. The best examples (and the strongest sections in this chapter) are on deixis, recipient design, and contextualization, with some rather less satisfying treatments of culture. Chap. 4 reviews the kinds of structural choices available to speakers. These include choices of linguistic codes and styles (with their attendant social and cultural meanings); phonological, morphological, and syntactic choices; and choices of propositional structures. Verschueren uses the example of proposition-making to show that there is "no structurally basic unit of analysis for pragmatics" (133), and thus that the interpretation of the propositional content of an utterance must often be done at the sentential or suprasentential level. He also includes an interesting section on coherence in sentential and suprasentential utterance-building, showing how variations in the structure of these linguistic units frame or highlight topics and arguments, as well as conveying meaning about the newness and salience of information.

Chap. 5 is, in Verschueren's own words, the central chapter of the book. Here he looks at the dynamic generation of meaning in a speech activity or speech event. On the production end of utterances, Verschueren emphasizes how speakers strategically exploit the interplay between explicitness and implicitness in the generation of meaning (136). He uses examples of brief conversations at the opera in Budapest and in a Berkeley coffee shop to illustrate the interactive nature of meaning generation, showing how the unfolding of linguistic interaction itself gradually builds up a discourse-specific context – a "calibration between the reality 'out there' and the communicative needs of the moment" (164). This calibration leaves a variety of linguistic traces that are the subject of pragmatic investigation. A further example, involving the giving and receiving of road directions, illustrates the interactive nature of meaning.

Chap. 6 addresses the issue of salience from both cognitive and social perspectives. The cognitive correlates of salience include mental "scripts" involved in the perception, representation, planning, interpretation, and memory of utterances. Verschueren connects the cognitive to the social with a very strong section on metapragmatic awareness, discussing the ways it is manifested in linguistic forms such as shifters, discourse markers, and folk-linguistic ideologies.

Part III, "Topics and trends," pursues the analytical paths introduced in Chaps. 5–6 and offers several extended discussions of how a pragmatics perspective can be applied at both the micro- and the macro-level. These chapters are a critical component of the book; because they establish important methodological and

analytical criteria that illustrate Verschueren's defense of pragmatics as a coherent and rigorous analytical framework. Although at first glance the chapter headings appear to reify firm micro/macro distinctions, Verschueren handles this issue deftly. First, he shows how it is crucial to understand macro-level ideological and political issues and processes in order to be able to interpret micro-level events. At the same time, he provides examples of how the macro leaves linguistic traces that can be studied at the micro-level. Thus, in Chap. 7, Verschueren describes the pragmatic functioning of particles, showing in a Belgian example how "linguistic items that belong together conceptually tend to also occur in close proximity in linguistic structure" (206). He goes on to demonstrate that a pragmatic theory can predict the performative potential of linguistic action verbs on the basis of the amount of interpretive, evaluative, or conceptual "distance" between the description of a linguistic action and the action itself. Finally, he uses an interaction between father and daughter, as well as Charles Goodwin's 1994 analysis of the Rodney King trials, to show how different contexts of meaning-generation frame participants' choices of utterances and frames of interpretation.

Chap. 8 presents several brief analyses of metapragmatic discourse. The first focuses on Belgian newspapers' characterization of Jesse Jackson's style as "evangelistic" and "typically American." This characterization, Verschueren points out, assumes that habitual and "group-dependent" (European) norms of communicative behavior are culturally universal. The second example is drawn from Verschueren's previous work (1985) on American newspaper reporting of the 1960 incident in which an American U-2 spy plane was shot down over Soviet territory. He shows how moral evaluations are embedded in the choice of metaphors and linguistic action verbs used to describe Eisenhower's and Khrushchev's verbal behavior. Finally, he draws on work concerning Belgian discourse about foreigners (Blommaert & Verschueren 1998) to show that the ideological nature of discourse can be discovered in the "patterns of unquestioned meaning [that] emerge from the text" (239). This specific analysis leads to an important discussion of methodological and interpretive standards in pragmatic analysis. Verschueren argues that interpretation, though qualitative, must be rigorous. For data to count as evidence for ingredients of an ideology, it is first necessary that the researcher be able to establish coherence in terms of both conceptual connectedness and patterns of recurrence. Second, the analysis should be based on a variety of data types, from multiple levels of linguistic structure and from a fairly extensive corpus carefully selected for particular analytical goals. Third, results must be subjected to COUNTERSCREENING for potential implications that contradict the ones on which the research conclusions are based. Of course, it is impossible to specify fully all the necessary conditions for good qualitative research (e.g., how big a corpus is big enough?); but I found Verschueren's analysis compelling in that it discusses method and analysis along with concrete cases. Chaps. 7–8 would be an excellent introduction and basis for discussion in an advanced undergraduate or graduate course involving textual or discourse analysis.

Chap. 9, "The pragmatic landscape," is less a conclusion than a historical overview of the intellectual background of contemporary pragmatics. Though some readers may miss a conclusion of the book's main points, most points are succinctly summarized at the end of each chapter.

REFERENCES

Blommaert, Jan, & Verschueren, Jef (1998), eds. *Debating diversity: Analysing the discourse of tolerance*. London: Routledge.
Goodwin, Charles (1994). Professional vision. *American Anthropologist* 96:606–33.
Verschueren, Jef (1985). *International news reporting: Metapragmatic metaphors and the U-2*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

(Received 1 November 1999)

ROGER W. SHUY, *Bureaucratic language in government and business*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1998. Pp. xv, 190. Hb $49.95, pb $19.95.

Reviewed by JOANNA CHANNELL
Channell & Associates, PO Box 5494
Derby DE22 1ZQ, UK
joanna@channell.demon.co.uk

This is a great book. In it, Shuy describes some of the applied linguistics consultancy work he has undertaken in the past twenty years, mostly involving legal cases and public institutions in the US. He sets out to show how linguistics is a valuable tool in the analysis of bureaucratic language, in the hopes that that through this, "the intersection of law and linguistics may be furthered" (x), and that more fellow linguists will become involved in similar consultancy. Shuy gives a clear exposition not only of what he and colleagues have done but also of how they have negotiated working relationships. He is particularly strong on the ethics of consultancy, and his clear exposition of how the consultancy relationship should be set up merits attention from people well beyond the area of language study. Shuy's case studies and ethical points would be good preliminary reading for students undertaking language project work (for more on ethics, see BAAL 1994).

The book has ten chapters, nine of which are case studies in the following areas: Medicare Benefits notices, Social Security Administration (SSA), denying someone Medicare benefit (a study of how not to say "no"), physicians' disability report forms, telephone and in-person hearings, working with the insurance industry, legal agreements about property, the car sales event, and product warning labels. These activities are used to exemplify a variety of approaches, usually cross-disciplinary; they draw on sociolinguistics, syntax, pragmatics, discourse analysis, social theory, and psychology. The emphasis is always, however, on the search for practical solutions to real-world issues, rather than on their implications for theory.

As a consultant undertaking similar work myself, I approached the book with some personal questions. First, since the book is entirely based in the US, I wondered to what extent it would be relevant to readers in other countries, and more specifically to me in a largely European context. I also wondered whether Shuy's approaches would be similar to mine, and what I could learn that would improve my own practice.

On my first question, I was well satisfied. Shuy provides background for each case study that readers with some knowledge of analogous public institutions in their own country (e.g. social security) will easily understand this. The main difference is superficial, in that Shuy writes throughout about bureaucracy and bureaucratic language, while in Britain the relevant terminology includes plain English, plain language, and effective communication. The "Citizen's Charter" initiative of the last British Government and the Labour Government's "Best Value" policy both include the need for clear and effective communication from public institutions to their users (for more on plain English and effective writing in a UK context, see Cutts 1996, Channell & St. John 1996, St. John & Channell 1996, Channell 1997).

Another difference (and a pleasing one, from a European point of view) arises in Shuy's case study on car sales. It appears that consumers in the European Union are probably better protected from ambiguous written agreements by which the customer can be deceived into making a commitment. Shuy says, "In commercial business [as compared to government], taking the consumer's perspective appears to be a bit less strongly felt" (152). Contrast this with EC Council directive 93/13, which states: "In the case of contracts where all or certain terms offered to the consumer are in writing, these terms must always be drafted in plain, intelligible language. Where there is doubt about the meaning of a term, the interpretation most favorable to the consumer shall prevail" (cited by Cutts 1996:7).

In regard to approaches, I again found what I hoped for. Like many writers on the topic (but unlike many academic linguists), Shuy takes a campaigning stance on the issue of clear communication:

> Who has not been puzzled, even stymied, by awkwardly phrased messages put forth by a bureaucracy? In the honest attempt to communicate with the American people, those enjoined with the task of writing public documents often sink into a verbal quagmire, out of which they cannot seem to climb. English teachers have railed about such bad writing for decades, and rightly so, but little progress seems to have been made by bureaucratic communications. (ix)

The book provides many fascinating examples of ill-designed, inappropriate, difficult-to-understand texts. In some cases, these are accompanied by suggested new versions, with a discussion of which improvements were actually adopted by the institution concerned. Here is a typical example of an original text afflicted by bad writing:

> Despite an adverse determination concerning noncovered services, a provision of the law relieves a beneficiary from liability for payment for such noncovered services when it is determined that the beneficiary neither knew nor had reason to know that services received were not covered under Medicare. (49)

Lest it seem that Shuy has lost sight of the traditional objectivity of linguistic analysis, I should add that he is careful to spell out in his foreword the prime neutrality of a linguistic approach:

> Language is analyzed from a neutral position. Language is what it is, and it does not matter on which side of a legal case the linguist works. It is the legal system of advocacy that causes experts to work on one side or the other, not the training, beliefs, or ideas of linguistics. (p. x)

In Chap. 2, an account of a document analysis and training program undertaken for the US Social Security Administration (SSA), Shuy outlines some of the more important ethical guidelines an applied linguist should bring to consultancy:

(1) Start from where the clients are. Asked to design a training program, Shuy states: "Instead of bringing our theory and knowledge to the writers, we wanted to have them bring their writing issues to us. We would then create the teaching out of the real, daily issues encountered by the notice writers."

(2) No more than 15 participants in any given training program.

(3) Allow maturation time – in this case, a program spread over six weeks.

(4) Train internal people to take over the training so as to empower the organization (and create ownership).

(5) Involve participants in the process. The consultants set "homework" – participants were asked to go out and interview some SSA recipients, "sentence by sentence," about how they understood a particular official document.

The Social Security consultancy was a particularly successful one. In writing of it, Shuy acknowledges how well the organization performed; and in doing so, he provides the recipe for how an organization can get the best out of consultants:

> SSA admitted its weakness, co-opted the linguist who had been working against them in a lawsuit, asked for help, created a well-protected administrative entity that nurtured the project, took the advice of the trainers, and implemented a new language policy that had at the least the strong potential for continuation. (45)

A contrast to this is provided by Chap. 5, on benefit hearings, where the research was funded by a senior citizens' organization. The outcome mirrored some of my experience of research funded by UK government departments:

> One might easily speculate on the usefulness of research such as this to the government agencies that might make use of it. I have no idea whether or not the findings represented here were useful to the bureaucracy or, in fact, whether this

report was even read by them . . . [R]esearch merely reports its findings, somewhat like tossing bread on the water and hoping that someone finds it. (107)

A key challenge for linguists involved in consultancy is how to explain the technicalities of analysis in ways non-specialists can understand. In his chapter on insurance policies, Shuy describes how he tackled this issue, including the text of a talk he gave to a conference of life insurance specialists. He notes that the barrier to be overcome is that non-linguists' perceptions of language are completely different from those of linguists. In the case of the insurance specialists:

> Speakers viewed language as a bunch of discrete units, whether words or sentences . . . they had little understanding of the difference between clarity and simplicity, and . . . past efforts at improving insurance policy language focused on assessing text against readability formulas that were constructed on the principle that short is better than long. (112)

Chap. 10 provides an overview of bureaucratic language and its potential to change. A key point is that, in most cases, the motivation for an organization to look at its language practices is economic – legal action, the threat of damages, being competitive. Recent research shows, for example, that doctors who are better communicators (good listeners who spend time talking to their patients) are less likely to be sued for malpractice.

The book demonstrates well how academic language study provides a toolkit for practical consultancy tasks. What is missing is a discussion of the implications of the practical work for language theory, and this would have strengthened its interest for academic readers. In terms of Shuy's other goal, persuading the wider world that linguists have something important to contribute, some of the more technical analysis is likely to be inaccessible to a generalist reader (e.g. analysis of intonation, directness vs. indirectness, use of the expression "face-threatening"). Overall, however, the book will be a fascinating read for anyone interested in language in public settings, and it should be compulsory preparation for those who plan to undertake any consultancy work.

REFERENCES

BAAL (1994). *Recommendations on good practice in applied linguistics*. London: British Association for Applied Linguistics.
Channell, Joanna (1997). How to implement plain language in standards of competence. *Competency* 5:1.26–32.
——, & St. John, Maggie-Jo (1996). The language of standards. *Competence and Assessment* 31:2–6.
Cutts, Martin (1996). *The plain English guide*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
St. John, Maggie-Jo, & Channell, Joanna (1996). *Language issues in NVQs and SVQs*. (Competence and assessment briefing series, 12.) London: Department for Education and Employment, UK Government.

SUSAN PHILIPS, *Ideology in the language of judges: How judges practice law, politics, and courtroom control.* (Oxford studies in anthropological linguistics, 17.) Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press, 1998. Pp. xvii, 205. Hb $59.00, pb $29.95.

Reviewed by ELIZABETH MERTZ
University of Wisconsin and
American Bar Foundation
750 N. Lake Shore Drive
Chicago, IL 60010
emertz@abfn.org

In a time when some scholars are bemoaning an apparent drop in attention to the role of ideology in legal settings, Philips's new book comes as a welcome intervention. The author uses fine-grained analysis of courtroom language to reveal the pervasive influence of ideology on trial court judges' practices. Followers of Philips's pioneering work on legal language will not be disappointed; the volume lives up to the exacting standard she set for the field in her early articles on courtroom (and classroom) discourse. The study uses discourse analysis of guilty pleas in an Arizona criminal court to uncover how wider social-structural and political divisions are affecting the administration of justice – a process mediated by ideology and enacted in the minute details of linguistic exchanges.

Philips begins the analysis by tracing a historical shift in the US from elected to appointed trial court judges – a movement generally understood as leading toward "merit selection" and away from overtly political input to judicial selection. Indeed, Philips uses her interview data to document that the judges in her study generally see their activities on the bench as impartial and non-ideological. But the study goes on to demonstrate that this supposedly non-ideological element of our justice system is in fact deeply influenced by political ideology. Philips uses a sophisticated combination of attention to linguistic detail and thoughtful deployment of social theory to unpack the process. The result is a telling demonstration of how linguistic analysis can shed light on pressing social problems.

Philips continues with an interesting discussion of the connection between spoken and textual legal language. As Conley & O'Barr observed years ago (1990:11), scholarly attention to the relationship between textual and spoken language in US law – or, indeed, linguistic analysis of textual language alone – has been surprisingly sparse. Here Philips builds from foundational work on INTERTEXTUALITY by Briggs & Bauman 1992 to examine how trial court judges' spoken practices are related to the legal texts by which they are supposed to be bound. The texts at hand are Rule 17 of the *Arizona Rules of Criminal Procedure*, and case law interpreting that rule. Rule 17 governs "pleas of guilty and no contest"; it specifies that the trial judge is obliged to "advise the defendant of his rights and of the consequences of pleading guilty or no contest," to "determine the voluntariness and intelligence of the plea," and to determine that the defen-

dant understands the written plea agreement. The wording of the rule in several places requires that the judge "address the defendant personally in open court" and determine that the defendant understands all that is required by law for the procedure to be valid. However, the case law interpreting the rule does not appear to require that the judge personally perform this function; instead, appellate court opinions mandate only that the written "record" for the case as a whole shall contain evidence that defendants have been fully informed about and have understood all that was required by law, and that their decisions were voluntary.

Faced with what Philips dubs "genre-specific ideological diversity within the written law," trial judges settle comfortably in the middle – doing less than would be required by the rule, but more than specified by the case law. She outlines the ways in which trial court judges "organize the sequential structure of the procedure into topical COHERENCIES that index and create an intertextual relationship with the written law," and she argues convincingly that the judges have formed an interpretive community that shares core understandings about the relationship between written and spoken legal language. In the process, they manage to obscure a considerable INTERTEXTUAL gap (to use Briggs & Bauman's terminology) by describing what they are doing as if the indexical connection between governing legal text and spoken enactments were transparent and unproblematic. They also clearly exhibit some interpretive agency when they take approaches that are not completely dictated by the relevant legal texts.

Philips next documents structured differences among judges in the details of their approaches. All the judges in the study take some kind of middle ground between the different approaches indicated by legal rule and case law; but one set of judges, whom Philips terms "record-oriented," clearly come closer to the case law in their practices. These judges focus more on whether the legal record meets the stated requirements than on whether actual interactions with defendants reveal the legally mandated levels of understanding and voluntariness. Another set of judges, termed "procedure-oriented," focus much more on whether the process of verbal interaction in the courtroom itself evidences the requisite degrees of understanding and voluntariness on the part of the defendants. Philips documents these differences with both qualitative and quantitative methods, combining observational and interview data. For example, record-oriented judges report that they aim at using a relatively fixed verbal routine in handling guilty pleas, while procedure-oriented judges aspire to more variable verbal scripts. Indeed, procedure-oriented judges evidence more variability in sequencing of topics, in variation within topics, and in the wording of elements within topics. Employing a kind of questioning omitted by the other judges, they also ask defendants about their social and educational backgrounds (in an attempt to ascertain levels of comprehension). In inquiring about defendants' understanding of constitutional rights, these judges employ more comprehension checks and elaborate more on what the rights are than do the record-

oriented judges. When testing for an adequate factual basis underlying the plea, the procedure-oriented judges tend to use open-ended questions to invite a confessional narrative, rather than attempting to limit defendants' accounts through use of yes/no questions. In quantitative terms, Philips demonstrates that these judges use more *wh*-questions, elicit a higher average number of responses from defendants, and take a longer time with each plea (meaning that they also process fewer pleas per day than do their record-oriented counterparts).

It thus becomes apparent that there are patterned differences in the handling of guilty pleas by these trial judges – differences that Philips convincingly links to divergent political ideologies. The more conservative judges tend to be more record-oriented (a position predictable from a political approach that seeks to minimize state intervention), and they leave individuals more to their own devices in dealing with difficulties. The more liberal judges intervene to a greater degree, asking about defendants' social backgrounds, permitting defendants openings for developing their own narratives, and attempting to double-check the validity of the plea during the courtroom process. This approach has clear affinities with a political ideology that encourages more state intervention and is also differentially concerned with power inequalities that might limit the ability of individuals to handle difficulties by themselves. Thus, Philips reveals a fairly dramatic difference in legal practice, structured by political ideology, that is not overtly recognized by judges, by official accounts of trial judges' work, or by the general public.

Although Philips declines to focus centrally on the role of linguistic ideology in producing this outcome (194, n.11), she has brilliantly outlined a core position for metalinguistic constructs in the allocation and masking of power in legal settings. The judges, guided by professional norms, direct attention to very particular visions of intertextual relations; and it is precisely for this reason that the political structuring of their discourse is rendered invisible. Philips points to the increasing control of the organized bar over judicial selection as one factor in this process: when there is less overt involvement of political parties in choosing judges, there is more pressure for judges to represent their practices as above politics – as being more about "professionalism" than about raw political ideologies. As Philips ably demonstrates, this may mask the extent of political involvement at the levels of both judicial selection and actual courtroom practice. However, as she clearly recognizes, there is an even more fundamental level at which an emphasis on "professionalism" contributes to this masking of politics: the appeal to a monolithic "legal interpretive framework" that undergirds "the claims of lawyers to a universalistic scientific and moral epistemology and to direct apprehension of this epistemology by an individual mind rather than a SOCIOCULTURAL mind" (82). In other words, metalinguistic ideology regarding the relationship of text to spoken practice conceals the politically laden, structured diversity found in judges' actual use of language – despite judges' own

metalinguistic assertions to the contrary. The shared "professional" ideology about the role of governing texts at the level of trial courts plays a crucial role in creating the illusion of a shared, apolitical judicial praxis. Philips introduces the concept of "ideological polysemy" to capture the way multiple levels of ideology may be implicated in a single utterance.

Not content with this level of complexity and nuance, Philips moves on to examine judges' ideologies of courtroom control – conceptions that rely to a great extent on shared "common-sense" understandings. Once again, she unpacks a politically structured patterning that is not overtly acknowledged, this time connecting more liberal judges with practices that appear to invite more resistance from defendants, and that therefore open the possibility of more loss of control.

Surely this is more than enough ground to cover in any one study. Thus, in wondering about other aspects of the judicial practices that Philips analyzes, I am probably asking for another study rather than pointing to any deficiency in the present work. There are two areas about which I found myself wanting to hear more: the question of defendants' resistance, and the role of linguistic ideology. Although the study is clearly aimed at the top of the power hierarchy in courts, Philips does deal with the question of resistance, particularly in her analysis of courtroom control. Her poignant description of a defendant who refuses to withdraw his plea – even as the judge directs that the record show a withdrawal by the defendant – left me wanting to know more about defendants' perspectives on this entire process. Similarly, Philips provides us with much information on the role of linguistic ideology, as I have indicated; this also beckons those of us engaged in the study of language ideologies to further rumination on the important place of metalinguistic structuring in the dynamics that Philips analyzes.

For generations, scholars studying social theory, anthropology, law, and linguistics have struggled to map the structuring of social and power relations through language. As Philips points out, it has been a continuing challenge to link precise observations of language use and structure with meaningful social analysis. Important work by Michael Silverstein, Jane Hill, John Gumperz, Susan Gal, Bambi Schieffelin, Kathryn Woolard, and others has now pointed the way toward a more integrative approach to the study of language use, language structure, and social power. Achieving this integrative approach to the analysis of language and society is clearly a burning issue for the newest generation of scholars who work at this crucial intersection – and, of course, this is especially the case for those who study legal language. Although we have long understood that law is a key site for unraveling the interaction of linguistic detail and social power, it is only recently that research by fieldworkers like William O'Barr, John Conley, and Bryna Bogoch has pushed the field to ask how language practices in legal settings are systematically connected with law's role in structuring social inequalities. Happily, Philips now joins a handful of others – Gregory Matoesian and Susan Hirsch come to mind – in providing detailed analysis of the constitution of social power in and through legal language.

REFERENCES

Briggs, Charles, & Bauman, Richard (1992). Genre, intertextuality, and social power. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 2:131–72.

Conley, John, & O'Barr, William (1990). *Rules versus relationships: The ethnography of legal discourse*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

(Received 14 October 1999)

MIRIAM ISAACS & LEWIS GLINERT (eds.), *Pious voices: Languages among Ultra-Orthodox Jews*. (*International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 138.) Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1990. Pp. 187. Pb $46.00.

Reviewed by BERNARD SPOLSKY
English, Bar-Ilan University
Ramat-Gan 52900, Israel
spolsb@mail.biu.ac.international

Yiddish has attracted more public and scholarly interest than any other Jewish language. There are a number of reasons: its thousand-year history as a Jewish internal vernacular for Ashkenazi Jews; the development during the 19th and 20th centuries of an important literature in the language; the bitterness of the struggle with Hebrew, in the first part of the 20th century, for status as a symbol of Jewish nationalism; the tragedy of the extermination of most of its speakers by the Nazis; and the pain of its suppression under Stalin. It is no doubt a sign that Yiddish is no longer being seen as a threat to Hebrew that the Israeli Knesset established and funded, three years ago, the Natzionale Instanz fur Yiddisher Kultur. The first activities of this Authority (a series of concerts, lectures, and other events) have just been announced, after a long leadership struggle that has reflected the complex politics of the movement.

The irony is, of course, that none of the people written about in *Pious voices* – a new collection of articles on the status and revival of Yiddish among *Haredi* ('God-fearing') Jews – would be likely to go to any of the events organized by the Authority; nor would they be willing, I suspect, to read any of the Yiddish books that the Authority will presumably soon start publishing. Thus, on the one hand, a heritage cultural revival program is getting underway for Yiddish, spearheaded by people who are heirs to the ideology of the Yiddish nationalist movement; but on the other hand, in one small corner of the Jewish religious world, a major effort at Yiddish revitalization is independently alive and seemingly successful.

Some careful definitions of terms are useful, as the editors and authors of this volume clearly realize (almost every article reiterates the terminological problems). The main focus of the articles is on Hasidic sects in Israel, England, and elsewhere – the contemporary heirs of a popular religious movement that emerged in eastern European Judaism in the second half of the 18th century. These sects form what is perhaps best described as "communities of practice": groups marked by common ideologies, values, dress codes and styles, living patterns, dietary

regulations, prayer ritual and melodies, and efforts to maintain separation. Each sect is generally known by the name of the town from which its first rebbe (leader) came: Lubavitch, Satmar, Belz, Vishnitz, Ger, and Stolin-Karlin, to name some of those treated in this book. Generally, each sect is led today by a descendant or successor of its founder. The contemporary sects are made up of the remnants who managed to survive the Holocaust by escaping to Israel, western Europe, or America, along with their descendants and new adherents. Their communities are in Israel (primarily in Meah Shearim and Bnai Brak, but other new enclaves are being established), in the US (mainly in New York), in England (mainly in London), and in Antwerp, Belgium.

At a wider level, the Hasidic groups are closest in practice and beliefs to the other groups that make up the Haredi world. (The authors and editors wisely prefer the Hebrew term over the misleading English "Ultra-Orthodox," which is associated with fundamentalism.) Haredim, as Glinert points out, are not more religious than other observant Jews, but they are more meticulous about the observance of certain ritual laws. The non-Hasidic Haredi Jews referred to in the volume (there is no mention of the newer Sephardic Haredim, perhaps because they are assumed to have no association with Yiddish) are variously called *Litvaks* (or *Litvish*, 'Lithuanian'); or *Yeshivish*, because they stressed the important of learning in yeshivas at a time when the Hasidim were still more concerned with joyous and spontaneous expression of religious belief; or *Mitnagdim* 'opponents', because they opposed the Hasidic movement.

All these Eastern European Haredim were originally speakers of Yiddish who studied *Leshon Kodesh* – the Hebrew and Aramaic in which Jewish sacred texts are written, and which provided the language of literacy for Ashkenazi Jews for a thousand years – and who picked up various levels of second-language competence in the gentile "co-territorial vernaculars" (the term coined by Weinreich 1980) with which they had contact. With the opening of gentile society to Jews – especially after migration to western Europe, Israel, and English-speaking countries – this second-language competence increased, finally becoming the home language and mother tongue of many if not most Haredim. In the Haredi world at large, Yiddish has maintained a special place, largely because many of the older rabbis and scholars continue to speak it and to use it as a language of instruction in the yeshivas they direct. If this situation were general, then the state of Yiddish among Haredi and non-Haredi Jews would be similar, and not very different from that of other immigrant languages. However, as this collection makes clear, there is a quite different phenomenon observable among a number of Hasidic sects (especially Satmar, Belz, Vishnitz, and Toldot Aharon): a strong ideological effort, through the educational system, to restore Yiddish vitality.

The essays in this book admit the difficulty of studying these closed communities. The authors may themselves be Yiddish speakers and religiously observant (Glinert notes that the Haredi community in London, in which he grew up, preferred German to Yiddish); however, they are studying a world not open to out-

siders, and so their data must come from visits and interviews. The numbers of people involved are always estimates, and the authors present views of school administrators about the proficiency and language-use patterns of their pupils, rather than the survey data, test results, or ethnographic data that sociolinguists prefer. All the writers are careful to remind us of these methodological problems, and they support their observations with full references to the fairly small number of other ethnographic studies available.

The overall picture that emerges is this. In the Haredi community, males start their education very young, and continue to study ten hours a day for as long as resources are available, even after marriage. In certain Hasidic sects, one of the first aims of education for boys is to reach a situation in which all instruction is given in Yiddish. If the boys start out not knowing Yiddish, this means a three-language approach: a text being studied is read out first in Leshon Kodesh (Hebrew-and-Aramaic), then explained in the boys' language, and then translated into the traditional Yiddish of the heder and yeshiva. The goals (which the authors believe are attained, in many cases) is to make Yiddish not just the language of instruction, but the boy's vernacular too. There are no formal language lessons in Yiddish (though Glinert notes exceptions in a boys' school in England), and no concern about the accuracy or purity of the Yiddish used. As Isaacs shows, Yiddish is as open to borrowing as English; thus, Israeli Haredi Yiddish includes borrowings from Arabic (cf. Kosover 1966), from modern Hebrew (called *Ivrit* to keep it distinct from the Hebrew element of Leshon Kodesh), and from English (in Israel, probably via Ivrit). As a general rule, boys are not encouraged to write in Yiddish, but in the traditional Hebrew. In these sects, then, males are likely to become fluent speakers of Yiddish, with less developed competence in the English or Hebrew that may have been their first language.

The strict division between the genders in the Haredi world produces a quite different pattern in the case of girls. Schooling for girls is, of course, a modern innovation in the Haredi world; the first Beth Yaakov school for Haredi girls was established in Krakow in 1917, and the system grew quite rapidly. But agreeing that girls could be educated did not mean changing their traditional role, nor were they permitted the Talmud education required of boys. As a result, the language of instruction did not need to be Yiddish, and most Haredi girls' schools taught in the co-territorial language. In the Hasidic girls' schools described in the articles here by Bryna Bogoch and Miriam Isaacs, this is generally also the case. However, in the hope of encouraging the use of Yiddish at home, the Hasidic girls' schools now provide Yiddish classes; they teach grammar (though not always, because Yiddish grammar is associated with secularism), writing, and reading of carefully selected texts (all the classic Yiddish literature is excluded as anti-religious). Teaching Yiddish to girls seems less successful; most continue, it appears, to speak Hebrew with their children.

I have summarized the general situation that emerges from reading this valuable collection. The discussions of the data are also very interesting. Isaacs makes

an excellent point with her analysis of the key concepts – *frim*, meaning religiously observant, and *haymish*, meaning not modern or alien to the community – and she suggests their importance in explaining priorities. Glinert, apart from his general introduction, reports on a study he has made of the views of Haredi educators on Yiddish. Joan Abraham complements this with an account of the case that was made by Belz schools when their curriculum was challenged by the Department of Education, and she reports on five discussions she had with Haredim about English and their language ideology. Miriam Isaacs reports her own observations of some Israeli Hasidic communities. Bryna Bogoch provides a survey of the role of Yiddish in Israeli government-supported secular and religious as well as Haredi schools in Israel, and she notes the paradox of the gender differences. As a bonus, and as a first hint of the major transformations that continue to take place in these outwardly traditional communities, Zelda Kahan-Newman presents the Yiddish text and English translation of a *badkhones*, an example of the genre of traditional songs sung to brides at weddings, but this one innovatively composed and sung by women.

Pious voices suffers from the usual problems of collections of articles: there is a great deal of repetition; there is no single voice or vision; and there are few cross-references. It is, nonetheless, an important pioneering study of a topic of central importance to the fields of language loyalty and multilingualism; it provides important new data and original views of the phenomenon of Yiddish language revival in Hasidic communities. One looks forward to more research on this topic, specifically on such intriguing puzzles as why only some Hasidic sects put this emphasis on Yiddish, and what prevents greater success in encouraging girls to adopt Yiddish.

REFERENCES

Kosover, Mordecai (1966). *Arabic elements in Palestinian Yiddish: The old Ashkenazic Jewish community in Palestine, its history and its language*. Jerusalem: Rubin Mass.
Weinreich, Max (1980). *History of the Yiddish language*. Translated by Joshua A. Fishman & Shlomo Noble. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

(Received 31 January 1999)

GENNADY ESTRAIKH, *Soviet Yiddish: Language planning and linguistic development*. (Oxford modern languages and literature monographs.) Oxford: Clarendon; New York: Oxford University Press, 1999. Pp. x, 217. Hb $70.00.

Reviewed by ROBERT D. KING
Linguistics, University of Texas
Austin, TX 78713
rking@mail.utexas.edu

Soviet Yiddish occupies a special place in Yiddish linguistics. It is different from *klal*-Yiddish – 'rule'-Yiddish, or normative Yiddish – in having certain orthographic peculiarities and a quite striking oddness in the spelling of words of

Hebrew-Aramaic origin. These differences, which were ideologically driven and enforced by the Soviets, are plain to see and visually startling even to neophyte readers of ordinary Yiddish. The older British spellings *gaol*, *kerb*, and *tyre* for *jail*, *curb*, and *tire* convey something of the effect to the American English speaker.

However, Soviet Yiddish is – we must now train ourselves to say "was" – different from other types of Yiddish in ways far more fundamental than orthography. It is as if Soviet Yiddish were an almost perfect clone of normal Yiddish, alike in most things but not in every detail: an orphan raised in a world completely different from the rest of Yiddish. The Soviet Yiddish language was Yiddish, of course: no one would ever have taken it for anything else (e.g. German or Russian), but neither could a reader or speaker of the other kinds of Yiddish ever feel altogether comfortable in the presence of this alien thing, even over the distance imposed by the medium of the written language. The differences in orthography and spelling strike the eye first, and Estraikh deals with these matters at length in *Soviet Yiddish*; but his richly detailed and thoroughly documented account of every aspect of Soviet Yiddish shows that the visual eccentricities were the tip of the iceberg, and what a complex and absorbing a history there is here for the linguist, the sociolinguist, and the student of the politics of language.

In the 19th century, virtually every Jew in Eastern Europe spoke Yiddish. It was the first language of most of them, and the only language for many, especially women. Yiddish could obtain food, lodging, and information from Hungary and Romania to the Baltic states, from Czechoslovakia through Poland and deep into Russia. There was linguistic assimilation among Jews, of course – to Polish, Russian, Romanian, Czech, and Hungarian in particular, and less so to Estonian, Lithuanian, and Latvian – and this increased as the nineteenth century passed into the twentieth. Even so, the 1897 census of Tsarist Russia reported that 97% of Russian Jews considered their mother tongue to be the "Jewish language," which ordinarily would have meant Yiddish rather than Hebrew. Only 1.3% claimed Russian as their first language, 0.9% Polish, and 0.4% German (p. 5). (Estraikh's book is packed with this kind of statistical data. He has condensed a mountain of archival research in Russian, Yiddish, English, and other sources – one of his book's sterling qualities.) In 1939, on the eve of World War II and with two decades of Soviet communism behind them, 41% of Russian Jews claimed Yiddish as their first language (a drop from 72.6% in 1926); at the same time, the percentage of those claiming Russian as their native language grew by over 200% (97).

Other countries of eastern Europe with large Jewish populations would show a similar decline in Yiddish in the same period, though I venture to guess that the decline would not be as sharp as in Russia. Russia under communism saw the heaviest kind of meddling in the lives of its peoples and their languages. Estraikh sets the stage by detailing the sociolinguistic environment of Yiddish in pre-revolutionary Russia, but the story of Soviet Yiddish begins with the Bolshevik Revolution (1917) and continues over the next two decades (1920–1940). Sta-

lin's increasingly undisguised and vicious anti-Semitism in the 1930s and the destruction wreaked by World War II on Jewish life and culture effectively shut the door on the future of Yiddish in the Soviet Union, and on its inclusion in Soviet linguistic policy and planning.

The focus in Estraikh's book, therefore, is on the interwar years, with supplementary observations on the state of Yiddish in the Soviet Union post-1945. The operative phrase for Yiddish in the post-war Soviet Union is "increasing marginalization": Yiddish printing was usually banned; instruction in Yiddish was not officially possible; and publishing in Yiddish was confined, by and large, to one pathetic party journal, *Sovetish heymland* ('Soviet Homeland'), which Estraikh estimates never had more than a hundred readers born after the war (174).

In the immediate aftermath of the Russian Revolution, however, Lenin had adopted remarkably liberal policies on language. His basic tenet was, at least on paper, that there be no special privileges for any one language. Let all languages flourish – Russian, German, Uzbek, Georgian, Yiddish. Thus, an educational system was established with Yiddish as the medium of instruction; committees were appointed to regulate normative usage; journalism and belles-lettres were encouraged; and institutes and university chairs were founded to advance the cause of Yiddish.

The most immediate change was lexical. All the *apparat*-words of Soviet communism had to be taken into Yiddish: *sovkhoz* 'State farm', *kombed* 'committee of the village poor', *sovnarkhoz* 'Council of National Economy', and so on. The Yiddish linguistic establishment argued back and forth in terms with which every student of language planning and "reform" is familiar. Should such words be taken over directly from Russian? Or should Yiddish loan-translations or calques be devised? Whatever solution was adopted, there were bound to be bitter disagreements. (When is anything about language planning in any language not accompanied by those?) As early as 1923, the Jewish Bureau was complaining that nobody could understand the language of the central Moscow Yiddish daily newspaper, *Der emes* ('The Truth') (47). Some very careful work on classes of neologisms and their acceptability was done by a leading Soviet Yiddish linguist, Ajzik Zaretski, and a surprising amount of this is still useful for the general student of language planning (47–50), as in fact much of Zaretski's other linguistic work is – though it is uncertain how much help this will be to any but a handful of linguists, since almost everything he wrote appeared only in Yiddish.

As I mentioned, Soviet Yiddish is best known for its orthographic peculiarities and its spelling of words of Hebrew-Aramaic origin. The former were fairly benign. Traditional Yiddish orthography, like the Hebrew on which it is based, has differently shaped graphemes for the word-final occurrences of a few phonemes: *f*, *m*, *n*, *x*, *t^s*. Yiddish spelling reformers, even in pre-Soviet times, had proposed abolishing the special final forms – some had gone so far as to advocate romanizing Yiddish orthography – so it was not a major departure from Standard Yiddish orthography when Soviet Yiddish adopted the change

(though, characteristically, accompanied by much violent arguing). The more radical deviation involved the spelling of originally Hebrew-Aramaic words in Yiddish, where these constitute some 20% of the vocabulary, depending on speaker, style, and register. Words of Germanic origin are spelled "phonetical-ly," with all the vowels marked. The Hebrew-Aramaic words, in keeping with Hebrew and Semitic tradition, mark no vowels, so that *kosher* is spelled ⟨ksʰr⟩, *milkhome* 'family' is spelled <mlxmh>, and *Talmud* is spelled ⟨tlmwd⟩. For ideological reasons (under communism, the equation was Hebrew = religion = bad), Soviet ideologues were determined to get rid of the traditional Hebrew spellings, and in doing do, they drove a huge wedge between Soviet Yiddish and the rest of the Yiddish-literate world.

All this and much more is recounted here. I am impressed by the archival research that Gennady Estraikh put into his book and the care he has taken with his exposition. There is much here of interest and usefulness for sociolinguists of every variety. In every case where I am able to judge independently, he has his facts and arguments right. The work is very solid, comprehensive, and magiste-rial. I cannot think of many questions about Soviet Yiddish that this book has not answered for me. Almost all the sources are either in Yiddish or Russian, and few linguists other than Estraikh – a former journalist in the Soviet Union, with native fluency in both Yiddish and Russian – could have brought this off. My hat is off to him.

(Received 29 January 2000)

PING CHEN, *Modern Chinese: History and sociolinguistics*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999. Pp. ix, 229. Hb $59.95, pb $21.95.

Reviewed by MARY S. ERBAUGH
Dept. of Chinese, Translation and Linguistics
City University of Hong Kong, Tat Chee Avenue
Kowloon, Hong Kong
ctmerba@cityu.edu.hk

China's program of language modernization has been as successful as that of any other nation, yet until Chen's book, we have not had a readable and comprehen-sive discussion of its reforms. Literacy has risen from about 10% in 1949 to around 80% today. Spoken Chinese dialects, from Cantonese through Hakka to Mandarin, vary as much as do the Germanic languages English, German, and Swedish; so it is a major achievement that 90% of Chinese people can now un-derstand Standard Mandarin, up from 40% in the 1950s (p. 8). The current re-forms have roots deep in the 19th century, but Chen discusses how early visions of reform became successful only in the past few decades. An unusual virtue of this compact volume is that it discusses language reforms throughout Greater China – not only in the People's Republic, including Hong Kong, but in Taiwan and Singapore as well.

Drawing on a very wide range of hard-to-find Chinese language sources, Chen clearly and dispassionately illustrates the scope, difficulties, and range of Chinese language policies over the past 150 years. *Modern Chinese* is unusual in discussing the reforms of the Japanese Meiji period and of the Soviet Union as models for China. The book also improves greatly on policy-centered accounts by focusing on critical sociolinguistic issues, especially dialect preference and degrees of bilingualism. Official accounts typically omit these for fear of fanning regional antagonisms between Cantonese and Beijingers, or between speakers of Taiwanese and of Mandarin. Chen brings these passionately felt issues into calm and welcome focus.

Demography makes a difference. Singapore welcomes Mandarin, which unifies a Chinese community that was previously almost evenly split between three mutually unintelligible dialects: Cantonese, Southern Min (close to Taiwanese), and Hakka. Since 23% of Singaporeans are non-Chinese, English is its other important common language. Hong Kong, in contrast, is more than 95% Cantonese-speaking; neither English nor Mandarin can rival it as common language. Beijing planners finally acknowledged reality in the 1950s when they promoted a broad, general standard of Mandarin pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary, known as Common Language or Putonghua. No common language had emerged in the 1930s from campaigns for an artificially designed cross-dialect, the "National Language" (comparable to Hindustani), nor from harsh bans on dialects and minority languages such as Miao and Yao. Tolerance for dialect bilingualism has proved more successful. In the Wu-dialect-speaking city of Shaoxing, not far from Shanghai, only 2% of people usually speak Mandarin at home, but 15% do so at work, and 28% do in school and public places (p. 55).

Two-thirds of *Modern Chinese* is devoted to the written language, especially to changes in Chinese characters. Standard written Chinese is basically written Mandarin, so dialect speakers have an especially complex task in learning to read. Chen assembles much useful information to remedy the too-common misassumptions about characters. In fact, about 90% of characters contain phonetic elements; but these are often irregular, so becoming literate takes about two years longer than learning to read an alphabet. Cultural attachment to the characters is so strong that alphabets are acceptable only as a supplement. However, students need to master fewer characters than is often supposed: 2,400 characters account for 99% of all those used in modern writing, and even university students need master only 3,800 (p. 136). Characters, however, are equivalent to morphemes, not words; about 54% of words are compounds that require two or more characters. Chen also includes character renderings of the many new loanwords, from *karaoke* to *website*, as well as regional variations, including the newly fashionable Cantonese.

Modern Chinese is directed toward Chinese language teachers and students, but it also contains much of interest to non-Chinese readers. Reading it some-

times requires more effort than it should: Too much terminology is given in Chinese, rather than being defined and translated. The many tables of romanization and pronunciation will interest mainly the specialists who may already know the information they contain. Chen's admirable effort at brevity leads to some omissions; it's too bad that there are no maps, and that the characters are in such tiny print. A tape or CD-ROM accompaniment would have been a valuable addition. Dialect differences are not described in much detail (cf. Norman 1988). About 8% of the Chinese people speak non-Chinese languages, but these receive little attention (cf. Ramsey 1987). Readers wanting an introduction to Chinese writing, including its sociolinguistics, might consult Chang & Chang 1980.

At a more abstract level, the focus on Chinese sources creates a Sinocentric focus; many readers would be interested in international comparisons, whether with India, Brazil, or Canada. Chen also accepts the claim that Chinese grammar has been Europeanized since the 1920s, but researchers have not yet subjected this hypothesis to empirical test. Japanese scholars often make similar claims of Europeanization in Japanese; yet analyses of texts, including successive versions of *The Tale of Genji*, fail to document European influence on Japanese grammar (Fujii 1991). Still, *Modern Chinese* whets our appetite for more and better analysis of language change. Until recently, the study of Chinese sociolinguistics has been neglected because of politics. Chen's unprecedented attention to sociolinguistics opens up insights on language and social relationships that are just now beginning to be explored.

REFERENCES

Chang, Raymond, & Chang, Margaret Scrogin (1980). *Speaking of Chinese*. London: Deutsch.
Fujii, Noriko (1991). *Historical discourse analysis: Grammatical subject in Japanese*. Berlin: Mouton.
Norman, Jerry (1988). *Chinese*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.
Ramsey, S. Robert (1987). *The languages of China*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

(Received 26 December 1999)

MARTHA C. PENNINGTON (ed.), *Language in Hong Kong at century's end.* Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 1998. Pp. xv, 449. US $33.40.

Reviewed by WILLIAM S-Y. WANG
Electronic Engineering, City University of Hong Kong
Tat Chee Avenue, Kowloon, Hong Kong
eewsyw@cityu.edu.hk

Hong Kong has received much world attention in recent years. After a century and half of colonial occupation, it was returned to China in 1997. Before British rule, it was an unremarkable seaside outpost of Guangzhou (Canton), the premier city in South China. Thus, the speech of its overwhelming majority is called "Cantonese" in English. In fact, Hong Kong and Guangzhou share essentially the same speech, the primary differences being lexical choices.

As Hong Kong became more and more prosperous over the past several decades, immigrants poured in from the surrounding regions, bringing with them various other Chinese dialects, especially Putonghua (Common Speech, Mandarin), but also Hakka, Min, and Shanghainese. After the historic return of Hong Kong to China, Putonghua has naturally become an official language. The official status of English is preserved as well, in line with the official policy of maintaining Hong Kong's tradition as an international city.

Little of the city's colorful sociolinguistic history can be gleaned from the volume under review. (For those who can read Chinese, Tsou 1997 provides a relevant historical perspective.) The volume begins with an extensive introduction by Pennington which highlights the two parts that follow. Part I, "Language use profiles," contains eight chapters reporting on various aspects of the linguistic situation in Hong Kong, including a section on code-mixing that I find particularly interesting. These are followed by two discussion essays. Part II, "Views and orientations underlying language use," contains six chapters: four on attitudes and motivations, and two on media of instruction. These also are followed by two discussion essays. The volume ends with a useful index.

In her overview, Pennington begins a long list of potential audiences with "scholars and graduate students in linguistics." However, I expect that this potential audience will be the most disappointed in her book, since they will be surprised to find virtually no Chinese characters throughout its 450 pages, and hardly any Chinese references in all the bibliographies. This is not surprising when one considers that only a small handful of the contributors to the volume are proficient in the language about which they are writing.

I wonder how prevalent such a situation is with respect to other languages. Would a book on "Language in Paris" be written mostly by scholars who have no proficiency in French? I raise the question not to detract from the contributions of those who have put together this volume, for which we should be appreciative; however, given the serious concern that Hong Kong society has repeatedly shown about language matters (especially since 1997), the time has come for indigenous linguists to become more involved in the issues touched on in this volume.

The audience of linguists will also note that, unfortunately, the volume contains very little discussion that builds on what is known about Cantonese phonology, morphology, syntax, lexicon, synchronic variation, or diachronic development – even though there is considerable scholarship in all these areas, both in Chinese and in English. For a graduate course on Chinese linguistics, like that I occasionally teach, there is not much in these pages that can be directly useful.

However, Pennington also lists, among potential audiences, "educators, language planners, businesspeople, and the general public in Hong Kong and other bilingual communities." It is quite likely that the volume will prove helpful to these audiences. This is especially so in the case of Part I, which contains several surveys. For example, E. A. Afendras reports on a survey made of 1,360 school-

children. The mealtime language used by these children is presented as a reflection of the linguistic situation at home. A cursory look at his Table 4.3, showing 45 categories of language use at mealtime (pp. 118–219), might give the impression of tremendous linguistic heterogeneity in Hong Kong. However, a closer examination reveals that most of the categories – such as German, Greek, Persian, and Polish – are found only among children studying at the English Schools Foundation. Putting these responses aside, we find only a single case of English use at mealtimes. All the remaining cases are dialects of Chinese – in fact, overwhelmingly Cantonese, as one would expect. There is a single case in which three dialects (Cantonese, Chiuchau, and Putonghua) are used concurrently, and several cases in which two dialects are used. As Afendras remarks, "The perception of the city as one with widespread bilingualism is quite common but far from accurate" (133).

We need to remind ourselves, however, that "bilingualism" here refers specifically to Chinese–English, and not to, e.g., Cantonese–Putonghua. From the strictly linguistic point of view, the mastery of Cantonese and Putonghua is no less an achievement in bilingualism than the mastery of, say, English and German. It is only for socio-political reasons that the first two are considered dialects, and the second two languages. Wang 1997 provides a fuller discussion of this issue.

The issue that I find most interesting in the volume is code-mixing, discussed in three articles by Kang-Kwong Luke, David C. S. Li, and Brian Chan Hokshing. Coincidentally, the names of these three Chinese scholars illustrate code-mixing quite well. The first author has not adopted a Western name and spells out his Chinese name in full in the Western order, surname last. The second author adopts a Western name and treats his Chinese given name in the way Westerners present middle initials. The third author adopts a Western name, which appears in first position, and follows this with the traditional Chinese order of surname preceding given name. Thus, we have three different forms of code-mixing in these names.

All three authors deal primarily with Cantonese–English code-switching: the embedding of English words or constructions in Cantonese sentences. Presumably, the converse situation also occurs in Hong Kong, though to a much lesser extent. Such embedding is a very prevalent phenomenon in Hong Kong. A particularly amusing example is a question I recently heard in an appliance store: *Ga-m-ga-rantee ga?*, which means 'Is there a guarantee?' Here the English word *guarantee* is put into a Chinese A-not-A question, where the syllabic /m/ is the negative. The *rantee* part in the first token of the word is deleted, as it would be in a polysyllabic Chinese word. The question then ends with *ga*, which is fused from the particles *ge* and *a*. The conversation flowed smoothly around this code-mixed question, showing that it was not in the least odd to the speakers.

In "Why two languages might be better than one," Luke distinguishes two major types of motivation for this behavior. One type is expedient, while the other is orientational. He also draws attention to degrees of formality in the indigenous

language, which he calls "high" Cantonese and "low" Cantonese, and discusses the role that these play in code-mixing. "While there are instances of language mixing which are essentially 'gap-filling'," Luke rightly emphasizes, "there are equally those which occur in spite of the existence of native equivalents" (157). As Luke suggests, the reasons for understanding why the latter should occur must be sought in a wider socio-cultural context.

"The most interesting feature at the level of phonology," Luke reports, "is a suprasegmental one" (151). The adaptation "can be stated roughly in terms of a rule which assigns the high tone to that syllable of an English-origin word which receives primary stress, the low tone to all, if any, of the syllables preceding the stressed one." Similar observations were made earlier for Putonghua by Chao (1976:180). Furthermore, Cheng 1968 showed that identifying weak stress with low tone actually triggered a rule of tone sandhi in speakers of Putonghua. In general, it is good practice to build on past scholarship, so that our advances can be cumulative in the long run.

In "The plight of the purist," Li is concerned primarily with the written language. In his conclusions, he reminds us that "code-mixing is a natural consequence of languages in contact," and he urges that we should "help promote and maintain monolingual written language norms" (185). The latter suggestion is particularly cogent. Although there are reasons for code-mixing to exist naturally, speakers must not remain in a kind of stunted "semi-lingualism" in two languages, so that they are judged to be linguistically incompetent in both speech communities. Both of the two monolingual skills should be developed to their maximum potential.

Li's very useful discussion is directed mostly to written Cantonese and English. It will be helpful also to study the issues associated with written Cantonese and Putonghua, especially the "low Cantonese" mentioned above. A Putonghua speaker from the Mainland typically cannot read a local newspaper in Hong Kong – not only because of the difference between simplified and traditional characters, but also because many high-frequency characters are local to Hong Kong, and because of grammatical differences between the two dialects.

In "How does Cantonese-English code-mixing work?" Chan examines the structural properties of mixed sentences. The English words that are embedded in Cantonese sentences are mostly nouns but also include verbs, adjectives, prepositions, and conjunctions; however, they do not include modal verbs, auxiliary verbs, pronouns, possessives, or quantifiers. The bulk of Chan's article is devoted to evaluating the Matrix Language Frame model of Myers-Scotton 1992, which is found "capable of explaining most Cantonese–English data, despite some problems" (191).

Some aspects of code-mixing were discussed perceptively decades ago by Chao, with respect to English words in Putonghua sentences. Thus, we find gems like *Ta fanzheng quali bu fy, hai con shenme sider ne?* (1976:203), which means roughly 'He is not going to qualify anyway, so what is there to consider?' Here the

English words *qualify* and *consider* are embedded in a Putonghua matrix sentence; but these two words are themselves matrices for embedding Chinese morphemes – the negative *bu* and the question word *shenme*, respectively. It would be instructive to compare code-mixing across the various Chinese dialects, since many of them have been affected by English.

In addition to code-mixing several other issues raised in the volume could be discussed at great length, but I will conclude with some brief remarks. A special strength of this volume is the inclusion of Indians, who are a significant minority in Hong Kong because of its colonial history. J. Pannu reports on the use of Cantonese, English, and Punjabi by eight secondary school students over a seven-day period. In another study, M. Patri and M. C. Pennington find that "Hong Kong Indian secondary students express similar but more positive attitudes towards English than do their Chinese counterparts" (339).

Another significant minority in Hong Kong in recent years has been formed by a large influx of women from the Philippines as domestic workers. A strong motivation for hiring them is their ability to speak English, which not only makes for easier communication with their employers but also raises the hope that they will teach English to the children. So, in addition to the varieties of English from the US and Britain, a new force on the linguistic scene in Hong Kong is the English brought in from the Philippines. Few studies have yet been done on this issue. Hong Kong will surely remain a fascinating laboratory for the study of language contact for many years into the next century.

REFERENCES

Chao, Yuen Ren (1976). *Aspects of Chinese sociolinguistics*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
Cheng, Chin-Chuan (1968). English stresses and Chinese tones in Chinese sentences. *Phonetica* 18:77–88.
Myers-Scotton, Carol (1992). Constructing the frame in intrasentential codeswitching. *Multilingua* 11:101–27.
Tsou, Benjamin K. (1997). Sanyan liangyu shuo Xianggang [Language in Hong Kong]. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 25(2):290–307.
Wang, William S-Y. (1997). Languages or dialects? *CUHK Journal of Humanities* 1:54–62.

(Received 28 December 1999)

FRANCE MUGLER & JOHN LYNCH (eds.), *Pacific languages in education*. Suva, Fiji: Institute of Pacific Studies, University of the South Pacific, 1996. Pp. viii, 310. Pb US $8.00.

Reviewed by CHRISTINE JOURDAN
Sociology and Anthropology, Concordia University
Montréal, Québec, Canada H3G 1M8
jourdan@vax2.concordia.ca

This is a collection of 19 articles written by educators, policymakers, and linguists addressing the use of Pacific languages in education. The focus is on small

island countries, and so Australia is not included. The book, well illustrated and containing many useful maps, is edited by two scholars with extensive research experience in the Pacific. They have grouped the articles around three important themes relevant to local education systems: (a) the roles of vernaculars in formal education; (b) questions of policy, maintenance, and non-governmental programs; and (c) issues, problems, standards, and attitudes. The result is a book that presents a compelling picture of the linguistic situation of various education systems in the Pacific nations. To summarize the situation briefly: Nothing is simple.

Reading the book, one is struck by the fact that the Pacific nations seem to face problems very similar to those faced by many post-colonial nations in other parts of the world. These problems include a lack of financial and material resources, the need to harmonize language choice with ethnolinguistic vitality (see Vāvāo Futui and Afamasaga Mālia Mālaki-Williams, this volume), the need for adequate standardization of vernacular languages, the proper training of teachers, and the pervasiveness of colonial linguistic ideologies. Such obstacles make it very difficult – and, in some cases of high linguistic diversity, impossible – to educate children in their own vernaculars, with or without culturally relevant teaching materials.

From the outset, the editors make it clear that the linguistic situation of the Pacific is certainly not homogeneous. What are the factors that create and reinforce this diversity? Mugler & Lynch propose a few answers in their introduction: (a) A large number of vernaculars exist in Melanesia, whereas there is generally one vernacular per country in Polynesia and Micronesia; (b) these vernaculars coexist with metropolitan languages that have been inherited from the former colonial powers (mainly English and French), and that have often retained the status of official languages and media of education; (c) in Melanesia, there is a high degree of multilingualism; (d) pidgin languages (Tok Pisin in Papua New Guinea, Bislama in Vanuatu, and Pijin in the Solomon Islands) serve as the unofficial lingua franca; and (e) in Polynesia, particularly New Zealand and Hawaii, there are large migrant populations from other Polynesian locales.

With this complex linguistic situation as a departure point, and keeping in mind the limited resources that these small countries have at their disposal, the contributing authors (particularly Sam Drilë Léonard, Apolonia Tamata, Jeff Siegel, Richard Benton, and Pamela Gentry) ask themselves: Education for what? This fundamental question serves as guide to any language policy, even if it is often hampered by the practical difficulties of implementation. What are those difficulties?

In particular, the choice of the medium of education is central to any policy and reflects both ideological and pragmatic issues. Education in metropolitan languages has some distinct practical advantages: It ensures access to higher education outside of the country; it enables poor countries to benefit from existing education manuals or material produced in English or French; and it increases communication with other countries using the same language. However, for these

considerations to apply, teachers should be thoroughly proficient in the metropolitan languages; but as Ielemia stresses for Tuvalu, teachers' proficiency in these languages is not sufficient to ensure that the students will learn them. At the same time, the costs of choosing a metropolitan language are culturally high: Such a choice limits access to advanced education to those whose mastery of the language allows them to progress through the system. Moreover, it makes it difficult to obtain culturally relevant material. Finally, such a choice sends a negative message to the children and to their parents about the importance of their vernaculars for culture and social mobility; in the long run, it tends to isolate children from their cultural roots.

From an ideological point of view, it is clear that literacy in vernacular languages offers the best possible cultural anchorage and contributes to children's harmonious sense of cultural identity. But, as is made clear by Richard Benton (for Maori in New Zealand) and by Vāvāo Fetui & Afamasaga Mālia Mālaki-Williams (for Samoan, also in New Zealand), appropriate cultural anchorage should be available within the school curriculum as much as outside it. If ethnolinguistic vitality is not present, (see Fetui & Mālaki-Williams, 229), then the success of a vernacular-based education system is jeopardized. Obviously, education in the vernacular starts with standardization of the language – which is easier said than done, as clearly shown in the articles by Ernest Lee on Solomons Pijin, and by Alfred Capelle & Byron Bender on Marshallese. How can we choose the form that will become the standard, and how can we justify it in the eyes of the speakers of that language? But that is not the only problem. Multilingual nations like Papua New Guinea, the Solomon Islands, and Vanuatu struggle to find enough trained teachers who can teach in the vernacular of the village schools to which they are posted (see Pamela Gentry on literacy in Ontong-Java). And if that were not difficult enough, how can we find the financial resources to produce adequate materials for the schools in all these different vernaculars?

One option, of course, is for these multilingual nations to adopt the local pidgin language as the medium of education – or, even better, to use Melanesian Pidgin as a common medium of education for the Melanesian countries; I made this suggestion years ago. The practical and pedagogical advantages are obvious, as shown by Jeff Siegel's article on the use of Melanesian pidgins in schools. But, as Lynch points out in his article on the status of Bislama, there is strong resistance to using pidgin languages in schools. The most important reason is certainly ideological: Pidgins are still perceived more negatively than their source languages by speakers and policymakers alike.

This book is welcome because it fills a gap in the literature on the use of vernaculars in schools around the world; the editors are to be commended for making this possible. The book is eminently descriptive in its approach, and it seems to target an audience of policymakers and practitioners rather than simply academics. This is just as well because the issues discussed are practical ones that have only been theorized in some other contexts. I wish, however, that the editors

had provided a synthesis of findings in the form of a concluding chapter. As matters stand, readers are left to pull all the strings together, which may be expecting too much of a busy policymaker who needs quick access to findings. At an editorial level, one notes the presence of some small errors, such as missing references in the bibliographies of some articles (e.g. Léonard and Lee).

<div align="right">(Received 14 December 1999)</div>

JOHN BAUGH, *Out of the mouths of slaves: African American language and educational malpractice*. Foreword by William Labov. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1999. Pp. xviii, 190. Hb $25.00, pb $12.95.

<div align="right">
Reviewed by MARCYLIENA MORGAN
Harvard Graduate School of Education
Cambridge, MA 02138
marcy_morgan@harvard.edu
</div>

This volume is an important contribution to sociolinguistic analysis and critique. It explicitly addresses the challenge of Labov 1982 – made to linguists nearly twenty years ago – to tackle the persistent questions asked by the public: "What is linguistics about? And what is it good for?" Indeed, arguments presented in Labov's article, which appeared in this journal, quickly became the canon for many African American linguists on how to defend working in a field that studied a social and cultural system without talking about its social and cultural implications. Labov provided support for conducting sociolinguistic work when the Black Power movement, and public awareness of social injustice against Black people, were at their height. He also provided an arsenal of arguments to present to linguists on the importance of recognizing the politics and social consequences of our work. Baugh's text is in the spirit of Labov's challenge, and it represents a further demonstration of the ways linguistic research can be used to address social prejudice and injustice.

Baugh describes his book as "eclectic and narrowly focused." Though it is designed to appeal to a broad audience of educators, policymakers, and linguists, its purpose is most clearly stated at the beginning of his final chapter: "In my view linguistic science is socially active … linguists can challenge racism, poverty, and uninformed linguistic chauvinism" (151). The text is organized into five parts of varying lengths. Part I, "Orientation," wastes no time in confronting issues associated with both public and academic views of African American Vernacular English (AAVE) and of bias. In this section Baugh develops his view of the racial politics that surrounds the language of African Americans.

Chap. 1, on common misconceptions about AAVE, includes two social critiques that shape the text and explain its title. Here, Baugh argues that one cannot explain public and institutional reactions to AAVE without recognizing the im-

pact, complicity, and guilt that Americans feel about slavery: "The retention of unique linguistic forms, racism, and educational apartheid have since led to numerous misconceptions of this dialect, all of which amount to the opinion that all speakers of this dialect lack intelligence" (4). In contrast, he provides evidence that many African Americans value AAVE as a part of Black culture, and that they will do so until Standard English ceases to be associated with the abandonment of Black culture. He concludes: "Though we may believe that our misconceptions about AAVE are linguistic, they are fundamentally racial and lead even scientists and scholars to grossly erroneous conclusions about the intelligence of Black people" (6).

In Chap. 2, Baugh presents two persuasive examples of how psychologists and politicians link language and race, implicitly promoting biological theories that Blacks are not as intelligent as Whites. He subtly scolds linguists who provide correct public statements on language diversity but lack the will to confront the public's avoidance of language truths: "The linguistic ideal of equality among languages and races has never been reflected in social terms" (8). At the same time, Baugh demonstrates the power of linguistic analysis in refuting arguments that use language to justify racist and unjust practices. For example, he discusses the Linguistic Society of America's 1972 response to the claim of Jensen 1969 that, because of heredity, Black children are cognitively inferior to White children; this is an important reminder to students of education as well as of linguistics. He also uses linguistic evidence to expose and disprove the proposal by Farrell 1983 that ghetto schools should increase Basic English skills because "ghetto children have not developed the power of abstract thinking" (11). Baugh unravels the fallacies in Farrell's arguments, as well as Farrell's misunderstanding of linguistics and of the processes involved in speech and writing. Instead of presenting this as "déjà vu all over again," Baugh focuses on Farrell's presumed desire to help Black children, and he reveals how often and how insidiously language proposals and policies are shaped to reflect racial bias.

Part II, on the relevance of AAVE, provides a closer look at how the misconceptions outlined in Part I underlie many educational and social policies today. Beginning with his approach to resolving educational inequality, Baugh argues: "If we ever hope to overcome linguistic ignorance and uninformed assumptions about race and language, then educators must participate in systematic reforms that will ensure educational equity" (15). Intertwined in all his arguments is the belief that, when sociolinguistic research is employed, it is possible to implement meaningful and effective programs. When it is ignored, programs cannot be developed that consider and respect the language and culture of the Black child.

Baugh successfully makes his point through an exploration of what appears to be the unconvincing logic behind William J. Bennett's book *What works: Research about teaching and learning* (1986). Though Bennett describes the book as representing research on education, its exclusion of many issues involved in the education of urban, working-class, and minority children is particularly re-

vealing. Baugh deplores Bennett's pronouncement that, while excluding at least the public's notion of the main recipients of public education, he deals with the "'general' or 'usual' or 'average' situation." Baugh dispels Bennett's notion that the "average public education situation" is identical throughout the US, irrespective of social class and language background. He presents a multi-tiered taxonomy of the range of language backgrounds in schools, which includes dialects, languages, and contexts for language use.

Chap. 4, "Reading, writing and rap," is meant to represent a way to teach grammar and vocabulary in interesting ways that use AAVE as a resource; however, it seems out of place and would have been more appropriate as an appendix. Baugh gets back to his primary task in Chap. 5, where he anchors the text to his argument that the conduct of schools and politicians has resulted in educational malpractice. He cites case after case of what he refers to as "educational negligence," in which linguistic evidence and resources were ignored, and the language of students was used as a basis for denying them comprehensive education. Baugh focuses on the rights of the child, which he says have been ignored because of "the utter complexity of incompetence in educational contexts and considerable professional distaste for broaching the subject" (43). Baugh suggests that the negligence and denial of responsibility to educate Black children led to the Oakland Ebonics resolution and the public backlash against it. The section concludes with an examination of the consequences of dialect bias beyond the educational system.

Part III, "Cross cultural communication in social context," provides a cultural perspective on AAVE through analysis of greetings and naming. Baugh's analysis of the significance of the Black Power handshake is reminiscent of the cultural and symbolic meanings of Tuareg greetings in the desert (Youssouf et al. 1976) in that it represents speech community, power, position, and solidarity. The section ends with discussion of the widespread acceptance of the term "African American" to refer to descendants of slaves, and it gives reasons for the term's increasing use.

Part IV, "Linguistic dimensions of African American Vernacular English," updates the literature on the semi-auxiliaries *come* and *steady*, and on grammaticalization in AAVE. His chapter on hypocorrection explores AAVE as a symbol of cultural identity for Black middle-class students, and it identifies mistakes common to those who try to produce AAVE speech without linguistic socialization in African American speech communities. The text concludes with a review of research on AAVE that covers the fields of linguistics, anthropology, and education. Once again, Baugh depicts the American experience as a linguistically diverse one, where acceptance and incorporation of diversity can lead to a just society.

Out of the mouths of slaves is Baugh's complex yet satisfying demonstration of how linguistic research on AAVE is relevant and integral to the quest for equal, high-quality education for Black youth. It is both an argument against attempts to value one language variety over another, and a guide to developing non-biased language programs. Baugh's purpose is not simply to display his talents as a

linguist but to incorporate his knowledge of AAVE within his desire to improve life chances and quality of education for Black children. Thus, this text may frustrate the linguist interested in the details of a particular argument; and it may disappoint activists against educational and social injustice who insist on more detailed examples and indictments of the system. But Baugh speaks to many readers – even those who consider AAVE a "plague." He speaks to the possibility that some will listen. Baugh traverses the terrain between a quizzical public and linguistic science, offering not only a critique of public beliefs and political policy toward speakers of AAVE, but also linguistic evidence that refutes many positions and exposes them as mean-spirited and biased. He accomplishes this not by attacking theories and political pundits with whom he disagrees, but by championing linguistic and cultural research on African American speech communities. In the end, he unveils a complex picture in which the public's need and right to know what has gone on in linguistic science on AAVE are balanced with a body of work that is true to linguistics and makes sense to the linguistic analyst.

REFERENCES

Bennett, William J. (1986). *What works: Research about teaching and learning*. Washington, DC.: US Department of Education.
Farrell, Thomas (1983). IQ and Standard English. *College Composition and Communication* 34: 470–84.
Jensen, Arthur (1969). How much can we boost IQ and scholastic achievement? *Harvard Educational Review* 39:1–123.
Labov, William (1982). Objectivity and commitment in linguistic science: The case of the Black English trial in Ann Arbor. *Language in Society* 11:165–201.
Youssouf, Ibrahim; Grimshaw, Allen; & Bird, Charles (1976). Greetings in the desert. *American Ethnologist* 3:797–824.

(Received 3 January 2000)

WALT WOLFRAM, CAROLYN TEMPLE ADGER, & DONNA CHRISTIAN, *Dialects in schools and communities*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 1999. Pp. xi, 239. Hb $49.95, pb $24.95.

Reviewed by COURTNEY B. CAZDEN
Harvard Graduate School of Education
Cambridge, MA 02138
courtney_cazden@harvard.edu

This book is something we've needed for a long time. It lays out what everyone – the public as well as professionals in all fields – should understand about dialects and dialect differences in our increasingly diverse encounters. It is written with technical sophistication, wise judgment, and a clear style, with rich examples that make it accessible to students and clinicians (and maybe even marketable as a trade book). *LiS* readers may learn little new to them, but they can assign this book with confidence to any class, and they can read it profitably as a model of

how to talk about this controversial topic to non-linguists. Given this kind of book – NON-controversial to linguists themselves – it seems most useful for a review to indicate the scope of the eight chapters and Appendix.

Chap. 1 sets forth all the important definitions, such as dialect vs. accent, or regionalized informal standard English (as it's actually spoken) vs. formal standard English (as a largely written norm). Chap. 2 details the features in which regional, social, and age-graded dialects are likely to differ, with extended examples from an Appalachian ghost story and from the conversation of an 11-year-old African American boy. This chapter also includes even-handed discussions of different hypotheses about the origins of AAVE, and whether it is currently becoming more or less divergent. A 20-page Appendix provides further facts on vernacular structures. Chap. 3 is on communicative interaction. In contrast to some narrower definitions that restrict dialect to accent, vocabulary, and syntax, the authors include cultural differences in use as well – a wise decision, given their importance of such matters in all clinical and public settings. "Dimensions of appropriateness" here include politeness (Brown & Levinson), making meaning (Grice), and contextual factors (Hymes).

The second half of the book, Chaps. 4–8, is especially valuable for applied linguistic work in schools: on difference versus deficit, guidelines for oral language instruction, and how dialect differences may affect writing and reading. Chap. 8 is an unusual contribution: Based on dialect research and teaching on Ocracoke Island (North Carolina) by Wolfram and his colleagues, these 30 pages constitute a manual, with well-honed examples, of lessons on dialect awareness for students.

Throughout the book, and especially in this final chapter, the authors encourage non-linguists – especially teachers – to engage themselves and their students in language study, a form of scientific inquiry in which data for theory-building are close at hand. Although one might be tempted to teach from Chap. 8 as a free-standing set of lesson plans, its successful use and reception undoubtedly will depend on the understandings and general perspective with which the authors infuse it. For readers who want more, each chapter has a short annotated list of accessible further readings.

The three authors are, or have been, associated with the Center for Applied Linguistics and have worked together over many years. Their collaboration as researchers and teachers undoubtedly has contributed to their successful collaboration here as writers.

The end of the 1997 position statement of the American Association of Applied Linguistics (AAAL) on "application of dialect knowledge to education" (116–17) reads: "Members of the AAAL should seek ways and means to better communicate the theories and principles of the field to the general public on a continuing basis." This volume superbly carries out that mandate. Its only limitation is that non-US readers will need to supplement it with local examples.

(Received 3 November 1999)

CLAIRE LEFEBVRE, *Creole genesis and the acquisition of grammar: The case of Haitian Creole*. (Cambridge studies in linguistics, 88.) Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998. Pp. xviii, 461. Hb £45.00, $74.95.

Reviewed by ADRIENNE BRUYN
HIL/Spinoza, Leiden University
PO Box 9515, NL-2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands
abruyn@let.leidenuniv.nl

In the continuing debate on the origins of creole languages, Lefebvre has long taken a strong stance in favor of an essential contribution of the West African substratum to the grammatical makeup of Haitian Creole; thus, she opposes both a universalist account along the lines of Derek Bickerton's bioprogram (e.g. 1984), and Robert Chaudenson's superstratist approach (e.g. 1992). Lefebvre's present book summarizes the main findings of two decades of research by herself and others (such as John Lumsden and Anne-Marie Brousseau) through various projects carried out at the Université du Québec à Montréal. The overall aim of this enterprise has been to test the hypothesis that adult speakers of the substratum languages, in creating a new creole language, use the properties of their native lexicons as well as the parametric values and semantic interpretation rules of their native grammars (9). In order to test this hypothesis, Haitian Creole is compared, on the one hand, with its superstratum or lexifier language, French, and on the other hand, with Fongbe (or Fon, belonging to the Gbe cluster of Kwa languages), as a representative of the substratum. Most of the book consists of the presentation of such three-way comparisons in regard to nominal structure (Chap. 4), the marking of tense, mood, and aspect (Chap. 5), pronouns (Chap. 6), clausal operators and the structure of the clause (Chaps. 7–8), the properties of verbs (Chap. 9), derivational affixes (Chap. 10), compounds (Chap. 11), and parametric options (Chap. 12). In all these areas, striking similarities between Haitian and Fongbe are revealed.

After having situated her research agenda with respect to other approaches in Chap. 1, Lefebvre in Chap. 2 introduces the processes she claims are involved in creole genesis: relexification, reanalysis, and dialect leveling. The pivotal process of relexification consists of the building of new lexical entries by copying entries from the lexicon of the native language; the creole retains the syntactic and semantic properties of the original entry, but it relabels them with phonetic strings from the lexifier language, on the basis of semantic overlap and distributional similarities, occasionally supported by phonological similarity. The Haitian noun *tèt* illustrates the relexification of a major-category lexical entry: while its phonological shape or "label" derives from French *tête* 'head', it means not only 'head' but also 'roof', like its Fongbe counterpart *tà* (71). An example of a relexified functional-category entry is the Haitian nominal and clausal determiner *la* (plus allomorphs); its semantic and syntactic properties – specified [+definite] and [+anaphoric] in both functions, appearing post-nominally and clause-

finally, respectively – correspond to those of Fongbe *ɔ́*, rather than those of the French adverb *là* that provided the phonological form (79–84, 221–40).

Particularly with respect to functional categories, Lefebvre's concept of relexification departs from that of Muysken (e.g., 1988), from which it is adapted. Muysken invokes relexification to account for Ecuadorian Media Lengua, a mixed language which has Quechua grammatical structure and morphology but derives its content words from Spanish. If function words are relexified, there is concomitant restructuring, because the semantics of function words are inextricably bound up with the grammatical system to which they belong. Therefore, Muysken does not expect that syntactic properties related to substratum function words will be transmitted intact into a creole through relexification (1988:208–9). According to Lefebvre, however, differences in the situations in which new languages emerge can explain the differing effects of relexification (29). Mixed languages are created as in-group languages in a bilingual context; a creole, by contrast, typically arises in a multilingual situation where a lingua franca is needed. Since there is no single substratum language that can provide the functional items without hindering communication between speakers of various languages, functional categories as well as content words need to be relexified. Lefebvre rightly points to the fact that L2 acquisition is not involved in the creation of mixed languages; but she does not always take into account the implications of her assumption that creole genesis constitutes a particular case of L2 acquisition. On the one hand, she claims that limited access to French precludes the identification of functional categories as such and renders it possible for French forms to be used as labels for Fongbe lexical entries with which they share only a superficial similarity. One might even suggest that this may foster the retention of the substratum entries in relatively intact form, compared with cases like Media Lengua. On the other hand, Lefebvre alleges in some cases that a rather abstract level of analysis is relevant to the eligibility of a French form. For example, to explain the fact that French *même* was not selected to figure in the Haitian reflexive construction pronoun+SELF, which occurs in Fongbe (even though there is a Haitian reflex, *mèm*), Lefebvre refers to a possible analysis of French pronoun+*même* as not having anaphoric status; this would render *même* inappropriate to relabel anaphoric Fongbe SELF (164–65). However, such an account implies a fairly sophisticated knowledge of French on the part of the creators of Haitian; it is difficult to reconcile with the idea of limited acquisition, or with the assumption that the lexifying form is deprived of syntactic features.

In Lefebvre's scenario, copies of functional category entries that lack semantic content, or for which no appropriate lexifier item can be identified for other reasons – in particular, the lack of an appropriate lexifier item (cf. the argument about *même*) – may be assigned a null form. At some point, the null entry may be filled with the phonological form of another entry through reanalysis or grammaticalization. Because the latter is sometimes supposed to play a significant role

in creole development, it may come as a surprise that this turns out not to be the case with respect to the phenomena analyzed by Lefebvre. This is understandable, however, in light of her argument that many substratum entries already receive overt labeling at the point of relexification.

The other process appealed to, in addition to relexification, is dialect leveling. During the formative stage of Haitian, around 1700, speakers of various languages were present in Haiti. In Chap. 3, "The research methodology," demographic data (mainly from work by John Singler, e.g. 1996) are presented to support the conclusion that Gbe speakers were predominant, alongside speakers of other Kwa languages and of Bantu languages. Lefebvre argues that, though typologically the substratum was relatively homogeneous, several substratum languages must have been relexified initially, and that dialect leveling has subsequently reduced the resulting variation among the lexicons. The use of the 3pl. pronoun as nominal plural marker, which occurs in Haitian and in several West African languages (but not in Fongbe), is explained in this way. It is certainly appropriate to acknowledge the possibility of contributions from other languages, but it is not clear what exactly Lefebvre believes was the role of Fongbe. She stresses that she made a methodological decision to conduct an in-depth study of one substratum language, but that this decision does not imply that Fongbe was the only substratum language of Haitian, nor that Haitian is a relexified version of Fongbe (67). However, it appears difficult to separate the methodology entirely from the hypothesis, since the latter is tested through the comparison of Haitian with Fongbe, and other languages enter the picture only if Fongbe fails to provide a satisfactory account.

Thus, although Lefebvre's hypothesis appears a strong one, it turns out that several mechanisms provide opportunities to account for lack of correspondence between Haitian and Fongbe. Unfortunately, it is not always clear whether independent evidence exists to support a resort to null entries, or to abandonment of entries, or to dialect leveling. Furthermore, sometimes one cannot escape the impression that a particular analysis of the data is preferred because it accords with a relexification account; and in fact, some of the data are judged by others not to be representative.

All this notwithstanding, the approach pursued by Lefebvre and her associates has important merits. The systematic comparison of Haitian, French, and Fongbe – conducted within the Chomskyan framework of principles and parameters – gives rise to insightful analyses; and through its broad scope, it sheds light on the range of aspects that are subject to substrate influence. As shown in the data chapters of the book, there are too many similarities between Haitian and Fongbe – or other possible substratum languages, especially Gbe – to be ignored, whether one believes them to result from relexification as hypothesized, or from interference conceived in some other fashion. At any rate, the relexification hypothesis surpasses the impressionistic substratum accounts too often provided, and it is valu-

able in its attempt to provide a coherent account. Of course, the more explicit and powerful a hypothesis is, the more likely it will be to meet with strong opposition; and, indeed, Lefebvre's work has been at the center of various controversies. It is to be hoped that heated arguments do not distract too much from the challenges posed by the hypothesis.

As Lefebvre indicates in her closing Chaps. 13–14, where the hypothesis is evaluated and theoretical consequences are discussed, the results of the research reported in the book (and in numerous publications referred to) call for further research – in particular, systematic comparisons of other creoles with their substratum languages. Throughout the book, similarities and differences between Haitian and other creoles are occasionally mentioned. The relexification hypothesis invites further exploration of such differences and similarities, taking into consideration not only creoles with other substratum languages, but also creoles with other lexifier languages. For example, it is generally assumed that the substratum for the Surinam creoles (Sranan, Saramaccan, Ndyuka), like Haitian, was dominated by Gbe languages in the formative period. However, some properties of Haitian that are related to Gbe under the relexification hypothesis (such as the post-nominal and clause-final determiner mentioned above) are absent from the Surinam creoles, whereas the latter exhibit features that must be attributed to influence from Gbe but are not attested for Haitian, e.g. post-nominal locative items such as Sranan *baka* in *na a oso baka* (lit. 'at the house back') 'behind the house'. Even though it may sometimes be argued that properties of the respective lexifier languages – French vs. English, in this case – explain such different outcomes of relexification, the relexification hypothesis may be considerably weakened once other creoles are systematically considered and compared with Haitian. However, to the extent that the work of Lefebvre and her associates inspires such comparative research, we are likely to know a great deal more in the future about the extent and the ways in which creoles are determined by properties of the contributing languages – thanks to the statement of the relexification hypothesis in the first place.

REFERENCES

Bickerton, Derek (1984). The Language Bioprogram Hypothesis. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 7:173–221.
Chaudenson, Robert (1992). *Des îles, des hommes, des langues*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
Singler, John (1996). Theories of creole genesis, sociohistorical considerations, and the evaluation of evidence: The case of Haitian Creole and the Relexification Hypothesis. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 11:185–230.
Muysken, Pieter (1988). Lexical restructuring in creole genesis. In Norbert Boretzky et al. (eds.), *Beiträge zum 4. Essener Kolloquium über "Sprachkontakt, Sprachwandel, Sprachwechsel, Sprachtod,"* 193–209. Bochum: Brockmeyer.

(Received 31 December 1999)

CECIL H. BROWN, *Lexical acculturation in Native American languages*. (Oxford studies in anthropological linguistics, 20.) New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999. Pp. 259. Hb. $55.00.

Reviewed by CATHERINE S. FOWLER
Anthropology, University of Nevada, Reno
Reno, NV 89557
csfowler@scs.unr.edu

Lexical acculturation has received moderate attention through the years, but largely from the perspective of acculturative studies of individual languages, or from that of the incorporation of loans from one specific language into another. A few authors have attempted comparative studies of patterns across regional areas or several languages, but rarely on the scale represented by Brown's study. In this volume, he looks at 77 concepts and items of acculturation from European sources in 292 Native American languages, covering the whole of the New World. But this work is more than a catalog of these items in the native languages: it is also a thorough discussion and analysis of the apparent processes and principles by which such transfers take place. Brown hopes that, through such massive comparisons and analyses, the basic principles and processes of linguistic acculturation will become better understood and thereby take on some predictive value in specific situations.

This is a complex work, with a number of specific as well as general conclusions drawn throughout, so a brief review only gives some highlights. On the whole, the book is clearly written and well argued, with summaries and conclusions in nearly every chapter. It is peppered with tables that count and provide percentages for the 77 terms and the 292 languages in several different ways. These are clearly organized, and most are easy to follow and understand. Two appendices – one organized by item/concept, and a second by language with its sources – give additional details in another format. The bibliography is extensive, and an index of languages, items of acculturation, and personal and geographic names is a useful finding aid. Although there are several minor points that could have been clarified, and there may well be minor errors in such a large undertaking, this is on the whole a very worthwhile volume that adds significantly to the literature.

The study is divided into 12 chapters, plus the two appendices. After introducing the topic (Chap. 1) by reviewing previous studies of linguistic acculturation in individual languages as well as the few comparative studies, Brown provides a chapter (Chap. 2) on methodology. Here he reviews criteria for selecting the 77 items (of Old World origin, incorporated in two or more of an initial sample of 20 languages, thought to be more than regionally distributed, referentially unambiguous, etc.). The items are roughly equally divided between "natural kinds" (livestock, vegetables, etc.) and "artifacts" (tools, time, etc.). Additional criteria were applied in selecting the 292 languages, such as representativeness

(diverse families, geographic areas) and reliability of the sources/data, and the requirement that each language had to reflect at least 31 of the 77 items in question. Brown also had to determine, through the sources or by other analytical means, whether the forms recorded were loans from European languages or native coinages, and if the latter, their approximate etymology.

Chap. 3 presents the bulk of the data, analyzed according to standard, recognized acculturative processes: adoption of loan words, use of loan shifts, extension of terms, coinages, and onomatopoeia (a minor process). Brown provides a detailed discussion of each process, illustrated where pertinent with tables from the database showing the percentages of language cases in which each process is operative for the 77 items. He notes that Native American languages have adopted loanwords for acculturated items from Basque, Dutch, English, French, German, Norwegian, Portuguese, Russian, and Spanish (19–20), either directly, or indirectly through another Native American language. The adoption of loanwords is shown to be a common process, although for these 77 items, it is a little less common than descriptive coinage. Extension of indigenous terms in various ways (marking, marking reversals, etc.) is also well illustrated by the data sets, with loan shifts and onomatopoetic forms being rare. Based on the statistics for terms involved in these various processes, Brown is able to discern several patterns that seem to separate the way "natural things" vs. "artifacts" are handled in acculturative situations. These findings and others are further explored in the next eight chapters.

Chap. 4 concentrates on lexical universals, exploring the role of commonalities in perception and analogical thinking in developing names for items and concepts of acculturation across languages. This is seen particularly with the natural-kind terms, which were found in Chap. 3 to be more frequently the subjects of analogical loans, referential extensions, and marking reversals. Chap. 5 explores lexical borrowability, or "why some words for acculturated items should be more borrowable than words for other introduced things" (55). Again, results in Chap. 3 suggest that items for natural things are more borrowable than those for artifacts, animals are more borrowable than plants, etc. Brown suggests that the reasons for this are not clear, although certain historical factors as well as use frequencies may be involved. Chap. 6 explores various apparent regional patterns and the possible contribution of bilingualism to these and to the more general acculturative process. He argues, based on these data, that the older idea of the importance of linguistic structure as either promoting or inhibiting borrowings is secondary to the effects of bilingualism, the nature of the contact situation, and other sociological factors. The influences are most clearly seen when regional patterns are examined.

Chaps. 7, 8, and 9 – on lexical replacement, native term diffusion, and European loan diffusion, respectively – explore additional patterns observed in the data. Again, the importance of bilingualism and the use of lingua francas is argued, and there is a cautionary note to historicists to be suspicious of widespread

lexical commonalities in related languages as perhaps more reflective of these patterns than of true cognate relationships. Chaps. 10 and 11 continue with historical discussions, devoting time to a case study in Southeastern US languages of the peculiar regional patterns of adoption (and marking reversals) in the terms for "peach" and "plum" (Chap. 10), and to constructing post-contact linguistic areas based on lexical acculturation. In both these chapters, cautionary notes are again sounded, warning scholars to distinguish areal phenomena from true cognate relationships. The acculturative data seem to be a good test of just how much diffusion has occurred, and how complicated the history of linguistic contact and exchange has been in the New World – a result with general applicability. The final chapter (Chap. 12) summarizes in concise fashion all the findings of the study and then turns to the larger arguments, such as the importance of universals in the acculturative processes, bilingualism and other social factors, and the implications for historical reconstruction based on finding extensive lexical diffusion in acculturative items. The chapter nicely ties together the book's disparate threads and places them firmly in a wider context.

This is a complex effort, and one can only marvel at the amount of work required to gather the data, analyze them, sort them into meaningful categories, and then draw some general conclusions. Obviously, the comparative exercise – over and above the studies of linguistic acculturation in the individual languages – was a fruitful and fulfilling one. Certainly Brown, who has separately or jointly authored a number of articles on lexical universals and other broadly comparative topics, has accomplished a major task, and one that is an excellent demonstration of method as well as results. This volume should be of considerable use in courses on Native American languages, acculturation, comparative methods, and historical approaches. For readers of this journal, the points made about the importance of social situation, the nature of contact, developing bilingualism, and/or lingua francas merit attention in the classroom and in research efforts.

(Received 12 January 2000)

Reviewed by Judith M. Maxwell
Anthropology, Tulane University
New Orleans, LA 70118
maxwell@mailhost.tcs.tulane.edu

This volume presents four case studies of language use in communities that speak Kaqchikel (also spelled Cakchiquel), a Mayan language of Guatemala; the authors provide a rich picture of the varying patterns of language shift within a

single language group. They situate the current practices in both time and space, reviewing linguistic policy from Spanish colonial times to the present, and they demonstrate how state-level programs have played out differently within different communities. Universalistic considerations of hegemony, nationalism, economic pressure, and availability of educational resources are balanced against local realities of micro-economics, municipal politics, and the job market. A Kaqchikel author, Wuqu' Ajpub', contributes a personal history which grounds the generalizations and historical particularities of the community-based case studies in human terms. The time depth of the case studies emphasizes the constantly changing nature of language interactions within the Kaqchikel region. Each of them brings one to the conclusion that the community is currently on a cusp where Kaqchikel language maintenance within the next generation is an open question. The authors strive for a positive perspective and champion linguistic revitalization; however, their data do not predict a resurgence, though they do not preclude one.

The life of our language clearly documents the health of Kaqchikel a few years ago. The rapidity with which language patterns in Guatemala are changing makes this documentation extremely valuable as a template against which to measure the pulse of the language in the next few years. Ongoing factors include language revitalization efforts and the integration of the test communities into a larger, self-conscious Kaqchikel body and into the nation – which, after the Peace Accords, is now including indigenous peoples more directly in the national political project.

In her overview, Garzon succinctly categorizes the socio-economic position of the Kaqchikel (and, by extension, other indigenous communities of Guatemala), noting how "traditional" roles and lifestyles are significantly affected by modern technology and market pressures. Next, she categorizes the history of language contact within the region, beginning with Proto-Mayan speakers of the Cuchumatanes around 4,200 years ago. She develops a model for understanding the patterning of bilingualism, noting that the hegemonic group will learn the language of the subordinated group only when those in power are few, and when the subordinated language is spoken over a large area, so that it offers an effective medium for communication and control. Conversely, the subordinated group will become bilingual when in frequent contact with the dominant group. Where integration is possible, language shift may result. Garzon suggests that community autonomy and cultural support for in-group maintenance can successfully counteract the pull to adopt the hegemonic tongue to the exclusion of autochthonous languages – especially if the indigenous dominant society is tolerant of diversity, or if the indigenous language has an internal prestige base, such as a literary tradition. Garzon anecdotally draws on examples of contact situations from around the world to illustrate her points.

Brown summarizes the culture history of the Kaqchikel region from well before European contact. He points out that the Kaqchikel have been constantly

exposed to "outside" cultural influences and have forged their identity in a cauldron of mixed imperial pressures. In outlining the ebb and flow of politico-military power across Mesoamerica, he warns against the intellectual pitfall of defining "Indian" (or "Maya," or "Kaqchikel") as only that which is pre-Hispanic – not only because of the inaccuracy of this, but also because of the contemporary political consequences of such postures.

The first case study is of San Marcos La Laguna, by Richards. Arguably the most conservative community surveyed, San Marcos offers a complex linguistic picture. Richards notes that San Marqueños equate language and social identity, recognizing a sliding scale of inclusiveness based on shared features of speech; the broadest division is between humans and non-humans, the next between Mayans and non-Indians (Ladinos), and finally San Marqueños vs. those of other communities. Richards also discusses gender-linked language traits, including perceived skill in oratory. She notes differential use of Spanish by men and women, and differential fluency in public genres of Kaqchikel. Though the expressly stated ideal is that both women and men may be good speakers of Kaqchikel, only men are identified as such. Interestingly, code-switching to Spanish, a tactic used more by men than by women, is most employed by two discontinuous sets of speakers: (a) young single men, who discard social norms and obligations, effectively orienting themselves to goals, jobs, and mores outside their community; and (b) older prominent men, who eschew vulgarity in Spanish but invoke the weight of the dominant code to lend authority to their pronouncements. Ironically, it is the latter speakers who are categorized as the "best" speakers.

The next case study is by Brown, on San Antonio Aguas Calientes and the Quinizilapa Valley. San Antonio is a weaving center close to the city of Antigua Guatemala, easily accessible to tourism even at the time of Brown's work, and equally easy to commute from for work and education. A new four-lane highway will heighten these pressures. Brown notes that, despite centuries of bilingualism in these communities, the past three generations have seen wholesale language shift. Brown identifies a "shift" generation who speak Kaqchikel primarily with relatives of the ascending generation but do not speak the language to their children. He examines correlations of language fluency with economic and religious factors. He finds that economics and religion may be associated – Protestantism is correlated with diversification of the traditional economic base and with integration into the cash economy – but that language fluency is not so linked. Research done by Langan 1990 in the K'iche' area, by Powell 1988 in the Kaqchikel zone, and by Hemingway 1993 in the Mam area indicates that the switch generation was directly affected and influenced by the *violencia* (the military attacks against Indians), and that the perception of "safety in Spanish" also weighed in the choice of native-language suppression.

In the third case study, San Juan Comalapa is characterized by Garzon as undergoing shifts in the pattern of language use among children, teens, and women. For two generations, parents have opted to suppress their use of Kaqchikel around

their children, so that the children can enter school speaking Spanish well; but they expect their children to pick up Kaqchikel in other domains, such as the market, the soccer field, or the street. However, patterns of language use have changed so that Kaqchikel is not the dominant language in these domains, and the children are left with no sure source of Kaqchikel language modeling. Garzon also observes a core/periphery difference in perceived genderedness of Kaqchikel. In *aldeas* (hamlets), women are still said to be the best Kaqchikel speakers and to use Kaqchikel more often; this had been the model for the urban center as well in previous studies, such as Farber 1978, but now speakers from the *cabecera* (administrative center) report that men use as much or more Kaqchikel. Garzon points to some signs of linguistic and cultural revitalization in the town: the use and marketing of Kaqchikel designs in textiles, the teaching of Kaqchikel in the town schools to both Indians and Ladinos, and the choice made by many young professionals who work in the capital to maintain homes in Comalapa despite the long commute. She concludes astutely that language use still marks ethnicity: Kaqchikel identity is bound up with language (both in Kaqchikel and Spanish usage), but Indian identity is itself changing.

Following the case studies, Brown gives an overview of Mayan language revitalization. He notes that most of the leaders of the movement are relatively young and have studied at universities; but he glosses over the problems that this presents for traditional structures that reward length of service to the community and respect wisdom gained through experience. Brown follows the lead of his Mayan colleagues in rejecting an essentialist trait list of "Mayan-ness"; he notes that Mayan perspectives differ from that of Mayan "Western" scholars. The Maya prefer to focus on elements of continuity, such as dress and language, rather than to emphasize changes in Mayan culture and identity over time. This "othering" of Western scholarship empowers the Mayan researchers, and it is especially interesting in light of recent pro-Mayan publications such as Warren 1998 and Fischer 2000. Whereas Western scholars are accused of seeking to further divide the Maya by "discovering" new linguistic groups, Brown notes that the revitalization movement seeks to overcome factionalism in its varied forms, from language-based loyalites, to religious schisms, to political boundaries of municipality and department – and perhaps, though less explicitly, nationality. Brown finds that the Mayan movement shares traits with revitalization movements in other parts of the world: the leadership is largely urban, highly educated, a minority of the ethnic group, and apolitical.

Ajpub' contributes an autobiographical capsule of his life in Comalapa, his progress through the educational systems, and his eventual receiving of the university degree of *licenciado.* This personal account not only illustrates how the macro-forces outlined in the case studies play out within an individual's life. It also emphasizes the intellectual commitments espoused by the revitalizationists and identified in the earlier chapters: commitment to a shared spirituality and to the Mayan community (Ajpub' attributes his eventual success in school to the

"Heart of the Heavens, to the Maya people"), rejection of divisionism, and dedication to action. He perceives the Maya, along with other First Nations, as "forgotten" peoples – a particularly telling observation from one so integrated in the stream of Western scholarship that he has tutored anthropologists in his language, given professional papers at Mayan conferences, worked for the Ministry of Education as a supervisor, travelled to the US as visiting scholar, assisted with ethnographic videos, and contributed to an anthology. Moreover, his concluding paragraph is an exhortation to Kaqchikeles and Maya (more than to Western scholars), suggesting that addressing them as a legitimate audience must become central to Mayanists in any country: "It is important to be conscious of the fact that we ourselves are responsible for our own development" (187).

In her conclusion, Garzon struggles to project a sunny future for Mayan languages against the backdrop of the case studies. She notes an irony – foreshadowed by Smith's (1990) historical recap of the relative freedom and equality of the "years of spring" – that, as Guatemalan society becomes more open and the Maya less systematically marginalized, separate Maya/Kaqchikel language maintenance becomes ever more precarious.

REFERENCES

Farber, Anne (1978). *Language choice and problems of identity in a Highland Mayan town*. Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University.
Fischer, Edward F. (2000). *Maya cultural logics and identity politics in Guatemala*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
Hemingway, Thomas (1993). Language shift in the Highland Maya community of Tacaná, Guatemala. MS.
Langan, Katherine (1990). *Language proficiency, use, and attitudes in Santo Tomás Chichicastenango: A study in language competition*. Ph.D. dissertation, Georgetown University.
Powell, Patricia (1988). Language use patterns in two Cakchiquel counties. MS.
Smith, Carol A. (1990), ed. *Guatemalan Indians and the state, 1540 to 1988*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
Warren, Kay B. (1998). *Indigenous movements and their critics: Pan-Mayan activism in Guatemala*. Princeton: University Press, 1998.

(Received 19 December 1999)