Language in Society **31**, 777–815. Printed in the United States of America

REVIEWS

Language in Society **31** (2002). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404502215055

Alessandro Duranti, ed., *Key terms in language and culture*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2001. Pp. v, 282.

Reviewed by Chantal Tetreault
Anthropology, University of Texas
Austin, TX 78712
chantal@mail.utexas.edu

Key terms in language and culture (hereafter *Key terms*) is an ambitious collection of 75 short essays on concepts central to linguistic anthropology and related fields. This book began as an informational session at the American Anthropological Association meetings in 1998 and was first published as a special issue of the *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* (vol. 9, no. 1–2, 1999). Alessandro Duranti, *Key terms'* chief editor and architect, is an experienced navigator in the varied terrain of language and culture research; he is also the author of *Linguistic anthropology*, a comprehensive textbook that covers the discipline's major theoretical and methodological contributions. In *Key terms*, Duranti appeals to the expertise of 74 other scholars working on questions central to language and culture research. The result is a powerful and eclectic volume that brings together core concepts from anthropology, linguistics, folklore, philosophy, sociology, and psychology, among other fields.

Key terms serves first and foremost as a lexicon; however, each "definition" is contextualized by historical and theoretical discussion, adding considerable depth to the book's coverage. Additionally, because each essay includes a list of relevant readings, *Key terms* functions both as an extended annotated bibliography and as a "Who's who" in language and culture scholarship. At the end of each definition, related terms are listed so that readers can approach the book through a particular focus if they wish. Audiences for the volume are potentially quite diverse. The book will appeal especially to newcomers to the field of language and culture research, be they advanced undergraduates, graduate students, or established scholars. In addition, the book is a wonderful resource for readers who are familiar with the terminology but want to broaden their historical or theoretical understanding of a particular concept.

Individual essays in *Key terms* describe a variety of issues central to language and culture research. These include sites of linguistic practice (e.g. body, healing, dreams, music, space); modes of communication (gesture, literacy, orality, signing); discursive genres (narrative, oratory, poetry); formal features of language (codes, grammar, particles, style, variation); social processes of language use (conflict, community, gender, humor, identity, socialization); and ways that mean-

© 2002 Cambridge University Press 0047-4045/02 $9.50

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502235058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ing emerges through language (act, iconicity, indexicality, inference, performativity, reflexivity). Despite this heterogeneity, each concept is examined through a "language and culture" lens, which creates continuity and exemplifies an underlying premise of the book: Just as we experience linguistic and social practice as integrated, we must adequately represent this interconnection in our research.

In certain essays, this objective takes the shape of reinvesting "formal" or structuralist approaches to language with a practice-based approach. Jack DuBois, in the essay "Grammar," asks that scholars reconceptualize linguistic structures as "patterned speaking," and notes, "[G]rammar needs anthropology as much as anthropology needs grammar" (p. 87). Norma Mendoza-Denton, in "Style," notes the "explosion and rearticulation of its definition" in current scholarship, such that "linguistic style is defined not as still product but as relentless epiphenominal process" (235). Jack Sidnell, in "Competence," delineates sociolinguists' reevaluation of the concept as "not some timeless set of generative abstractions and formalisms, but rather a highly dynamic system which undergoes continual modification" (36).

Other essays in *Key terms* demonstrate the distinctive contribution that language and culture research makes to analytic concepts that pervade the social sciences. In "Gender," for example, Mary Bucholtz examines how language and culture research has contributed to current theories of gender as discursively constituted: "The link between language and gendered meaning is indexical . . . forged through repeated associations between gender and stance" (75). Similarly, in "Identity," Paul Kroskrity claims that "linguistic anthropology has contributed significantly to the appreciation of the role of linguistic and communicative microculture in the constructivist approach to identity" (108). In "Space," Elizabeth Keating notes the degree to which language practices contribute to spatial organization: "Spatial relationships and spatial frames of reference are construed not only through the organization of daily life, but through the grammatical properties inherent in languages" (232).

Many of the authors in *Key terms* engage with theoretical issues that were previously neglected in the gap between the analytical constructs 'language' and 'culture'. John Haviland, in "Gesture," observes that, although movements paired with speech were once considered either "involuntary bodily leakage" or "primitive 'attempted' language," new research has shown the validity of studying gesture as an integral part of language itself (83). William Hanks, in "Indexicality," notes the growing interest in "the pervasive context-dependency of natural language utterances" which are unique for their power to convey "relations between objects and contexts" (119).

Other essays indicate the long tradition of successfully integrated research on language and culture. Richard Bauman, in "Genre," examines the concept's central role to linguistic anthropology since the start of the Boasian tradition. Marjorie Goodwin's essay on "Participation" holds that, in moving away from the speaker-hearer dyad, Dell Hymes contributed "a critical dimension necessary for

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502235058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

an adequate descriptive theory of ways of speaking" (172). In "Variation," John Baugh explains that, following Edward Sapir's contributions, ethnographers of communication "affirmed incontrovertible linkages between linguistic forms and their social functions in speech communities throughout the world" (260).

Such is the theoretical dynamism of past and current language and culture research, a legacy that *Key terms* both preserves and perpetuates. *Key terms* both defines the terrain of language and culture research and challenges traditional disciplinary borders by contextualizing language and culture scholarship's eclectic theoretical origins. As such, the book will serve to make language and culture research available to neophytes and will help established initiates continue a rich and contested history of scholarship in the space between.

By way of concluding, I would argue that, in addition to this volume's usefulness for describing the theoretical contributions of language and culture research, it has important social and political consequences. Duranti's undertaking is purposefully inclusive, providing outsiders the tools to access diverse scholarship dealing with language and culture. Pierre Bourdieu, who figures ubiquitously in these essays, critiqued the elitist practices of academia, particularly philosophy, for making its specialized language, and thus its symbolic capital, inaccessible to non-practitioners (1991). Bourdieu is sadly no longer with us, but his life's work and his vision for accessible scholarship lives on in *Key terms*.

REFERENCE

Bourdieu, Pierre (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Trans. by Gina Raymond and Matthew Adamson. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

(Received 25 February 2002)

Language in Society **31** (2002). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404502225051

Patrizia Violi, *Meaning and experience*. Translated by Jeremy Carden. (Advances in Semiotics, Thomas A. Sebeok, general ed.). Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2001. Pp. xiv, 291. Hb $49.95.

Reviewed by Robert E. MacLaury
Anthropology, University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA 19104
maclaury@sas.upenn.edu
http://www.sas.upenn.edu/~maclaury/

In this clearly wrought translation from Italian, the philosopher Patrizia Violi analyzes and criticizes in exacting detail the development of lexical semantics from the classical models through structuralism, prototype theory, and frame semantics, to end at the threshold of cognitive semantics (cf. Violi 1997). Her critique expounds on both well-known and little-known concepts, but she does not innovate theory. Her account could be useful as a handbook to anyone who teaches

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502235058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

lexical semantics or who wishes to match his or her overview of this field with that of an accomplished academic who has given it vast thought; the work is too advanced for most students. The reader likely will disagree with some of Violi's explications, all of which, nevertheless, are sufficiently informed to force clarification of any contrary position. The book rivals the main synopses published in English (Durbin & Radden 1987, Hjelmslev 1953, Johnson-Laird 1983, Taylor 1989), but it adds a semiotic facet derived mainly from works of Umberto Eco, Diego Marconi, and Algirdas J. Greimas. Of its references, 248 are in English, 24 in Italian, 24 in French, and 16 in other languages; all but two are generally available. Many of the 277 notes are immediately germane to the text, although others are dispensable distractions. The nine-page index is taxonomic but cryptic; for example, *externalism* appears under both *Linguistics* and *Meaning*, each appearance with different pages, but *intension* and *extension* are elusive; because the book is a review of concepts, this handicap is grave. References omit page numbers from anthology chapters and fail to spell out non-English acronyms. A foreword (not provided) could have explained why this outlook is unique and important – and this might best have been delivered by another philosopher who could have prepared linguists, anthropologists, and other scientists for a diffuse essay alien to their styles. The reader might build an impression that Violi elaborates her thinking as she writes without later expunging her preliminary exercises.

In Part I, "Background theories: The many ways of considering meaning" (pp. 1–48), Violi sketches an overview of the approaches she will analyze, including succinct accounts of logical philosophical semantics, structuralism, and field theory. The experiential semantics that she alludes to in her title consists of the post-structuralist emphasis on perception, knowledge, and its cognitive organization, which people name as a positive construction of the way they make sense of the world and of each other. The experiential slant has strengths and failings, as do the schools that precede it. The twentieth-century history of semantics consists of a succession of radically different beliefs about meaning. Each revolution has reacted against its predecessors, so that experientialism adds to a concatenation of trial, revision, and insight, which Violi aptly portrays.

In Part II, "Formats of semantic representation" (49–136), Violi posits that concepts of the category are central not only to semantics but also to its underlying thought. She starts with strong treatment of componential analysis, features, and primitives, then moves to prototype models. Here her understanding weakens, especially in regard to the work of Eleanor Rosch. This example, being typical of lapses elsewhere in the book, is worth describing. First, Violi, drawing on Kleiber 1990, proposes that there was a debate about whether a prototype is a best example or a representative mental construct; the latter idea had to evolve. In my recollection (as a graduate student at the Language Behavior Research Laboratory, University of California, Berkeley, 1974–1978), no such debate occurred, nor is it attested in literature (including that cited by Violi). Both Taylor (1989:60) and Smith & Medin (1981:147) mention the exemplar model without

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502235058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

citing proponents and both explain why it is unfeasible: a prototype requires memory, which, in turn, requires an image; more than one good example can match the image equally well. Starting on p. 119, Violi reformulates some of her statements, coming closer to what Rosch concluded and reporting her discovery process (e.g., "The prototype is no longer a real object ... but a set of properties selected a priori as cognitively significant," 122).

Second, Violi disparages the work of Brent Berlin, ignoring his magnum opus (1992). Berlin 1972 identified and characterized the six ranks of folk biological categorization; of this work Violi observes that "many people have questioned its validity" (101); she cites Berlin's students Eugene Hunn and Robert Randall, plus Anna Wierzbicka. Rosch credits Berlin's early work for revealing the cross-cultural recurrence of her basic level before she further characterizes the concept among urban English speakers (Mervis & Rosch 1981:92–93; Rosch 1975:195; Rosch et al. 1976:386). Further, Violi (108) faults Berlin for claiming that 'tree', 'fish', and 'bird' are superordinate categories in languages such as Tzeltal, whereas they are basic-level categories in English – as Rosch et al. assert (1976:390–393), e.g. "What we had taken for the superordinate level for the biological items showed all the signs of being basic level" (390). However, Berlin's student Janet Dougherty (1978, 1979), while under Berlin's direction during the early 1970s (n.d.; cf. Berlin 1992:63 (n. 6), 71–2), determined that many urban residents who pay little attention to plants classify most trees at the life-form and intermediate ranks. Such speakers name them only 'tree', and assign salience to those levels ("classes that are seen as best reflecting objective structures vary according to the interests and attention of human groups and individuals," 1978:78).

Third, Violi discusses categories only in terms of properties. However, Hunn 1975 finds that natural folk generics are classified as gestalt percepts, whereas features are invoked to differentiate classes at subordinate ranks. Fourth, Violi sticks to Wittgenstein's depiction of family resemblance (e.g., AB BC CD etc.) when Rosch & Mervis 1975 adapt an intersecting variant to model the relation of the prototype to graded category structure. Consequently, Violi, unlike Rosch, does not reconcile the concepts (e.g., "The model is not applicable to a category like *bird*, given the presence ... of a common property," 117).

Finally, noting that Rosch recognized graded representation as prototype effects, Violi regards this revision as a separation of category structure from prototypicality ("Category structure and prototypes are therefore clearly separated," 123–24). But Rosch (1978:40) instead proposes that while gradation is not a model of category organization, "prototypes must have some place in psychological theories." Violi does not entertain the implications of this paramount issue (e.g., Rosch 1981); rather, she switches discussion to the non-prototypicality of polysemy.

In Part III, "Proposal for an experiential and inferential semantics" (137–241), Violi holds that linguistic cognition is the same as other cognition: Experiential semantics will be encyclopedic and motivated by built-in restrictions on percep-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502235058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

tion and thought. She exceeds prototype semantics with discussion of interaction among kinds of semantic properties, such as essential vs. typical, perceptual vs. functional, and expected vs. possible. However, certain kinds, such as necessary properties, appear and disappear without systemic integration. A diagram of her typology might have guided the reader. Violi moves on to consider poles of encyclopedic vs. semantic competence in terms of the kind and number of properties that may delimit lexical meaning. Here, especially on pp. 169–75, Violi offers insight of use to an ethnographic semanticist regarding the conventional nature of properties (I recall eliciting Zapotec definitions of barn owl as 'bird that foretells death', manure grub as 'animal that appears where there was nothing before', and the word for both bat and butterfly as 'those that suck with the tongue'. Had I only grasped back then what she elucidates here! [MacLaury 1970]). Semantic competence is simply what a speaker is expected to know. Next, she considers agreed-upon default meanings of terms in such contexts as scripts, schemata, scenarios, fields, and frames, a notion she calls UNDERLYING REGULARITY. Any such relation provides the referential canon against which we can interpret variation. Like prototypes, the contextualized defaults depend on typicality. Finally, she expands on the contribution of lexical semantics to text comprehension by asking how semantic competence restricts interpretive activity: Frames apply either to words within an utterance, or to the entire utterance, as exhibited by distinct orders of negation. The final chapter ends flatly by reiterating some of the reasoning expounded earlier.

In sum, this is an eclectic walk through issues in lexical semantics. One may find nothing of worth or may discover arcane treasures. It suggests various points to include within a syllabus and, if read carefully, a number of ideas that might be developed into class exercises. Violi's section on conventional properties rewarded me for persevering.

REFERENCES

Berlin, Brent (1972). Speculations on the growth of ethnobotanical nomenclature. *Journal of Language in Society* 1:51–86.

______ (1992). *Ethnobiological classification: Principles of categorization of plants and animals in traditional societies*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Dougherty, Janet W. D. (1978). Salience and relativity in classification. *American Ethnologist* 5:66–80.

______ (1979). Learning names for plants and plants for names. *Anthropological Linguistics* 21:298–315.

______ (n.d.). Acquisition of ethnobotanical nomenclature. MS, University of California, Berkeley.

Durbin, René, & Radden, Gunter (1987). *Fillmore's case grammar: A reader*. Heidelberg: Julius Groos.

Hjelmslev, Louis (1953). *Prolegomena to a theory of language*. (University of Indiana Publications in Anthropology and Linguistics, 7.) Baltimore: Waverly.

Hunn, Eugene (1975). *Cognitive processes in folk ornithology: The identification of gulls*. Working Paper 42, Language Behavior Research Laboratory, University of California, Berkeley.

Kleiber, Georges (1990). *La sémantique du prototype: Categories et sens lexical*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Johnson-Laird, Philip N. (1983). *Mental models*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502235058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

MacLaury, Robert E. (1970). *Ayoquesco Zapotec: Phonology, ethnography, and lexicon*. M.A. Thesis, University of the Americas, Mexico, D.F.
Mervis, Carolyn B., & Rosch, Eleanor (1981). Categorization of natural objects. *Annual Review of Psychology* 32:89–115.
Rosch, Eleanor (1975). Universals and cultural specifics in human categorization. In R. W. Brislin et al. (eds.), *Cross-cultural perspectives on learning*, 177–206. Beverly Hills and London: Sage.
______ (1978). Principles of categorization. In E. Rosch & Barbara B. Lloyd (eds.), *Cognition and categorization*, 27–48. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.
______, & Mervis, Carolyn B. (1975). Family resemblances: Studies in the internal structure of categories. *Cognitive Psychology* 7:573–605.
______, ______ (1983). Prototype classification and logical classification: the two systems. In E. Scholnick (ed.), *New trends in conceptual representation: Challenges to Piaget's theory*, 73–86. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.
______; ______; Gray, Wayne D.; Johnson, David M.; & Boyes-Braem, Penny (1976). Basic objects in natural categories. *Cognitive Psychology* 8:382–439.
Smith, Edward E., & Medin, Douglas L. (1981). *Categories and concepts*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Taylor, John R. (1989). *Prototypes in linguistic theory*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Violi, Patrizia (1997). *Significato ed esperienza*. Milan: Bompiani.

(Received 10 February 2002)

Language in Society **31** (2002). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404502235058

Alison Sealy, *Childly language: Children, language and the social world*. London: Longman, Pearson Education, 2000. Pp. 229.

Reviewed by Lourdes de León
Center for Research and Higher Studies in Social Anthropology (CIESAS-Sureste)
San Cristóbal de las Casas, Chiapas, México
deleon@reed.edu

This book aims to explore discursive representations of childhood and how they contribute to create the social categories of 'children' and 'childhood'. It uses a combination of approaches and methods that range from textual analysis, to elicitation of utterances, to data from natural interactions. Although the title suggests that the study covers general phenomena, it is based exclusively on British English. Some of the findings may resonate in the wider cultural area of the First World, and there may be parallels with more global notions of 'children'; however, the subtitle should have made clear that the study is restricted to British English.

The author coins the term 'childly' to overcome some of the linguistic challenges posed by terms such as 'childlike' or 'childish,' and to emphasize the assumptions about children's place in the social world derived from such terms. She thereby tries to escape the connotations of 'childish' or 'childlike' to denote the RELATIONAL nature of the state of being a child, rather than any ESSENTIAL qualities attaching to that stage in the life span: "To denote any of these distinctive characteristics of children's place in the world I shall use the term 'childly'. However, I shall also argue that belonging to the category of 'child' or 'adult' will not necessarily define or determine our social and linguistic experience" (p. 9).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502235058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The coinage of the proposed term at a metalinguistic and textual level may be suggestive and of possible theoretical value; however, as we follow the ways in which it acquires life in the text, the term turns out to be problematic. The main difficulty is the fact that the author shifts back and forth from an objective analysis of 'childhood' through textual analysis, to a strong subjectivism fed by her own cultural biases about the nature of 'childhood' and 'childliness'. In the end, the term means many things: what belongs to children, how adults refer to children's qualities, how children project themselves, how children are projected in fiction created by adults, how children talk. We see why the new term may be different from 'childish,' but not what its advantages are over 'childlike' or 'pertaining to children.'

In her textual analysis, Sealy achieves some analytical distance; however throughout the book she argues for children's agency but at the same time provides arguments for their lack of power and autonomy. In line with some radical feminist analyses, she indulges in a militant researcher-centered approach in which the researcher wants to give voice to her object of study, but at the same time essentializes that object as powerless, different, and so on.

In my view, the author fails in her attempt to reconceptualize childhood through mere lexical and textual means. However, the exercise is suggestive, especially in the first three chapters of the book.

Sealy rightly argues that childhood is an under-researched period in people's lives. I find her study valuable because it brings together research from such disciplines as sociology, textual analysis, education, and children's language. Perhaps the attraction of the book lies in her effort to weave together different approaches to produce something new, although – since she is not a specialist in all of these fields – she tends to oversimplify some of them.

The book is divided into four parts: "Discourses of childhood," "Perspectives on children, language and the social world," "Children's talk," and "Conclusions and implications." For reasons of space, I will comment only on the ones I consider most relevant.

Chaps. 1 and 3 are based on the occurrence of the words 'child' and 'children' in two kinds of corpus data: one British national newspaper and some local newspapers, and the British National Corpus (100 million words). She looks at associations, connotations, linkages, and patterns of co-selection of words that produce units of meaning and the assumptions they embody; for instance, 'childish' is apparently associated with 'ill-mannered' and 'irresponsible' (46). Her analysis is thus in line with similar British discursive studies of newspapers that have covered a range of social actors such as ethnic minorities, women, and the poor (Stubbs 1996, Fowler 1991). Overall, Sealy finds that children are portrayed partly in terms of their physical existence or of their distinctive qualities, but predominantly as recipients or victims of the actions of others.

Chap. 4 deals with different research perspectives on children and language. The author is critical of pyscholinguistics because its approach to children's lan-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502235058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

guage is little more than the study of children's language acquisition. She finds more congenial social approaches (e.g. Halliday, Hymes) where "[i]nstead of the child as a conduit *for* language, language is a resource FOR the child" (84). She critically evaluates issues of language learning and pedagogy, reprising much of the debate about Bernsteinian sociolinguistics. In her section about "the family and socialization," she quotes Heath 1983, and Ochs & Schieffelin 1995, arguing that "[their ideas] share a rather transmissive representation of 'who is doing what to whom' " (95). From my point of view, she oversimplifies this influential line of work, interpreting it as classical socialization theory in which the child is just a "depository" for language. She contrasts Cook-Gumperz's and Halliday's work, suggesting that these scholars represent children as having their own role in the socialization process, and even in socializing others. She ends the chapter with references to sociological models of childhood.

In Chap. 5, Sealy weaves together literature on sociological realism to provide a context for her own empirical work, presented in Chap. 6. She argues in favor of the recognition of the tension between structure and agency, as social identities are mediated through language (123).

In Chap. 6, she explores the social status of 'child' in informal talk. She presents empirical data from children's interactions obtained through recordings made by the children themselves without the presence of the researcher. Here the author says, "It is noticeable that most of the roles adopted by the six children in these recordings move them 'up' the status hierarchy, so that they choose to be adults rather than younger children or babies" (138). She explores "a type of interactive exchange in which social status is fairly clearly marked – the request, or directive – to illustrate how belonging to the category of 'children' corresponds in patterned and predictable ways with how requests are formulated." She talks about requests and directives as inherently "childly" discourse, and as inherent to the structural asymmetry between adult and children, although, at the same time, she gives examples of children's using directives with toys and animals, and she also exemplifies directives between children (151). She argues that "the interactions recorded illustrate the existence, maintenance and negotiation of differential status and relationships through choices from the linguistic resources available." "In addition, there are glimpses of unchildly language, and of the children's testing of the limits of available roles and 'subject positions' " – what she refers to as the"porous nature of the boundaries of childly language" (158).

According to Sealy, this chapter represents the heart of her research. However, a major flaw is that she does not make clear how representative her examples are within the major sample. The overall picture is that, even in children's informal talk, structural factors such as the inherent asymmetry between adult and child (in, for example, requests and directives) seem to outweigh children's expressions of agency.

The major contribution of this book is the claim that children should not always be assumed to constitute a self-evident category in sociolinguistic research:

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502235058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

"We could suspend the adult-child dichotomy and explore the language of both groups, in a range of similar or equivalent discursive contexts, to discover how relevant a variable 'being a child' turns out to be" (213). I believe, however, that more is to be gained from Sealy's argumentation than from her own empirical research. Other research dealing with children's interactions has proved that ethnography should be at the core of such an enterprise (de León 1998, Goodwin 1990, Ochs 1988, Schieffelin 1990).

REFERENCES

de León, Lourdes (1998). The emergent participant: Interactive patterns in the socialization of Tzotzil (Mayan) children. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 8:131–61.

Fowler, Roger (1991). *Language in the news: Discourse and ideology in the press*. London: Routledge.

Goodwin, Marjorie Harness (1990). *He-said-she said: Talk as social organization among black children*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Heath, Shirley Brice (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ochs, Elinor (1988). *Culture and language development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

______, & Schieffelin, Bambi (1995). The impact of language socialization on grammatical development. In Fletcher Paul & MacWhinney Brian (eds.), *The handbook of child language*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Schieffelin, Bambi (1990). *The give and take of everyday life*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stubbs, Michael (1996). *Text and corpus analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell.

(Received 11 March 2002)

Language in Society **31** (2002). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404502245054

Diane Belcher and Ulla Connor, eds., *Reflections on multiliterate lives*. (Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, Vol. 26, Series editors Colin Baker & Nancy Hornberger.) Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters, 2001. Pp. vii, 211. Hb $79.95, pb $29.95.

Reviewed by Elizabeth Scheyder[1]
Educational Linguistics, University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA 19104
scheydec@sas.upenn.edu

Many authors write books and papers about deficits in second language teaching and competence, shining a spotlight on what teachers are doing "wrong" or what students are lacking. In this volume, Diane Belcher and Ulla Connor set out to provide a model that bypasses these negative perspectives and showcases success stories in second (or *n*th) language learning. The result is a compilation of autoethnographies from 18 adults with successful professional careers who were asked to provide their "L1/L2 literacy autobiograph(ies)" (p. 209).

Most of the entries in this volume are presented as autobiographical essays, but a few are presented as interviews with one of the editors. The book divides the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502235058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

18 essays into two halves: Part I presents essays from 10 people whose professions revolve around language, while Part II presents 8 essays and interviews from people who are in fields that are not directly language-related. Each essay or interview provides a window into the personal joys and hardships experienced by these people as they learned their second or third (or twelfth!) language.

Part I begins with an essay by Suresh Canagarajah, a professor of English literature, who describes his trial-and-error development of a writing style acceptable to Western academic audiences. This was problematic for Canagarajah because the didactic and factual style of Western academic writing is very different from the style of writing that is valued in his native Tamil in Sri Lanka, where facts are presented so that the reader can "discover" the conclusions along with the writer, and where the style of writing is generally more emotional. The second essay is similar to the first; Vijay Bhatia describes his unlikely path to English and linguistics, chosen over physics and chemistry because it would allow more time for playing cricket in grad school. Bhatia presents a much more positive take on his introduction to academic writing in English, during which he found that his determination and willingness to take risks, along with the help of some talented advisors, enabled him to make the transition more smoothly.

The third essay is slightly different. Nils Erik Enkvist describes his trilingual professional career, straddling the Finnish and Swedish of his parents' home and the English that he learned in school. Enkvist attributes at least part of his interest in linguistics to his parents' insistence that he address them individually in their native languages – Swedish for his father, and Finnish for his mother. Håkan Ringbom, one of Enkvist's students who also grew up in Finland, contributes the fourth essay. Ringbom was raised in a Swedish-speaking home in Finland but never became fully bilingual in Finnish because of limited opportunities to use the language. Like Enkvist, Ringbom learned English in school, and like many other authors in this volume, he appreciates the development of electronic word processing for facilitating revisions, and the assistance of a native English-speaking colleague for reviewing documents.

Next, Anna Söter describes her experience in a German-speaking Austrian family that was transplanted to Australia when she was a child, and her subsequent professional life in the United States. Soter says that she recognizes influences of her native German language on her English writing to this day, and she is particularly sensitive to differences among academic English varieties because of her education in Australia and America.

The sixth and seventh essays concern people whose professional lives have been transplanted to Israel. Adina Levine describes growing up in Soviet-era Lithuania, where she spoke Lithuanian at home, attended a Russian-language school, and learned English at university. In each of these languages, writing that closely mirrored a model was valued, which was not very effective preparation for academic writing in English in Israel. Aside from being the only native speaker of English in this volume, Andrew Cohen presents a remarkable story of his

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502235058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

acquisition, to varying degrees, of twelve languages, but he focuses on his acquisition of Hebrew in Israel. After finding Hebrew classes in the US and Israel to be insufficient preparation for life as a researcher and instructor in Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Cohen resorted to a variety of means to increase his reading skills and speed and to hone his writing. He describes a very long and difficult process of acquiring the competences he needed, again relying on native-speaker colleagues for editorial assistance, but never ultimately reaching native-like use of Hebrew. Both these essays show that adult language learners can learn enough of a second (or twelfth) language to function professionally as long as they have some assistance, but without ever becoming really comfortable and confident in the language.

Ryuko Kubota and Miyuki Sasaki both deal with professional uses of English by native speakers of Japanese. Kubota received her Ph.D. in Canada and now teaches in the US. She credits her well-developed L1 literacy with helping her to develop L2 literacy in English, but she admits that she still seeks models of good writing and assistance from native speakers. Sasaki also came from a highly literate L1 background and also earned graduate degrees in North American universities, but she now teaches in Japan and uses English only because it is professionally necessary. Sasaki says that she plans and drafts papers in Japanese, then produces an English final product; Kubota, probably because of her immersion in English, performs the whole process in English.

The final essay of Part I is by Jun Liu, a native of China who obtained a Ph.D. and now teaches in the US. Liu describes his embarrassment at being placed in an ESL composition class during his first semester as a Ph.D. student in the US, where he was studying second language acquisition and was supposedly fluent in English. He provides hope, however, by describing how his continual practice of academic writing in English has improved his skill in this area so much that he was able to publish papers in English within a few years of moving to the US.

Whereas all the authors in Part I are professionals in language-related fields, perhaps giving them some additional insight into their own language learning, the authors in Part II are from fields varying from mathematics to medicine. Far from being naive about their own language development, however, these authors present pragmatic and unaffected accounts of their struggles and triumphs in second language acquisition.

The first author in Part II, Ming-Daw Tsai, wryly notes that his days are not those of the stereotypical chemistry professor, working at a lab bench for long hours, but instead are mostly spent writing for various academic and administrative purposes. He echoes the consternation of many of the contributors at their problems communicating when they arrived in the US after achieving high marks in EFL classes and high TOEFL scores. Tsai recognizes that learning English is a lifelong process, as is all learning, and he cautions other nonnative speakers of English to continue to read widely and participate in society, and not to allow their language limitations to limit their lives.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502235058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The second essay in Part II is one of the most interesting in the book. Here Louis de Branges describes his experiences being raised in Paris by parents whose L1 was English, but who communicated with him entirely in French. This plan was disrupted, however, when World War II broke out and de Branges and his mother and siblings returned to the US, leaving his father in France. Once back in the US, his mother quickly lost her command of French, and an unusual parent-child language gap developed. Thus, at the age of nine, de Branges became an ESL student in the United States, even though his mother was a native speaker of English. He now considers himself bilingual in French and English, but he attributes his mastery of English to his experiences learning other languages, including German and Russian, and he feels that multiple languages give learners insight into language learning that enables them to achieve a higher degree of competence in a third language than they would have been able to achieve if it were their only foreign language.

The third chapter in Part II is the first interview-format entry. Here Diane Belcher interviews Hooshang Hemami, an electrical and biomedical engineer from Iran. Hemami echoes some of the same sentiments expressed by Tsai, in the sense that he was motivated to learn English to a level that would allow him to express himself freely and enrich his life with literature, philosophy, and a variety of other fields.

In another interview, also conducted by Belcher, Robert Agunga expresses a desire to be able to do more than just his professional work in English. A native of Ghana, Agunga moved from studying agriculture in his native country to studying communication in the US. His studies and his use of English are all motivated by a desire to make a difference in the lives of agricultural communities in Africa.

Anahid Dervartanian Kulwicki describes her experience of growing up in an Armenian family in Lebanon, where she spoke Armenian at home but learned Arabic and English at an early age at school. Like other authors, Kulwicki emphasizes the importance of having a friend or colleague proofread work in a nonnative language, but she also cautions readers to be wary of hypercritical colleagues. Kulwicki describes a sort of experiment that she did after feeling that her writing was being unfairly criticized: She gave published work by people other than herself to these colleagues, presenting it as her own draft being submitted for review. Confirming her suspicion, even these texts came back with corrections. This is not to say that there might not have been true errors that escaped the text's editors, but it does point to an overly critical, even biased attitude among some of her peers.

Maria Juliá expresses some of the same frustrations of working in a nonnative language, but she has found that she has been somewhat freed by tenure. Being more secure in her position, she can now read in English for pleasure and has found that this has expanded and improved her use of this L2. This is followed by the first interview conducted by Ulla Connor, where she speaks to Luis Proenza,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502235058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

a neurobiologist and university administrator in the US. Proenza was raised in northern Mexico, so Spanish was his L1. Although his parents had very little formal education, Proenza's father had lived and worked in New York for several years, so he valued English as a requirement for success and was able to begin to teach it to his son. Even though Proenza has lived and worked primarily in English since he moved to the US at age 11, he still feels that his L1 Spanish improves his writing in English by suggesting metaphors and synonyms that enrich his texts.

The book closes with Connor's interview of Steven Beering, a professor of medicine and university president who echoes some of Proenza's ideas about language enrichment. In Beering's case, he was raised in a French/German bilingual family but moved to England at age 13, and then on to the US at 15. Despite being in a somewhat technical field, Beering reads extensively in poetry and literature, and credits this broader exposure to English with much of his development in the language.

Together, these essays provide an informative window into the language-learning lives of 18 very interesting people. Belcher and Connor have selected a good cross section of first languages and cultures, as well as family literacy backgrounds, and have crafted these into a logical progression of very diverse essays.

NOTE

[1] I am grateful to Nancy Hornberger for feedback on a draft of this review. I am solely responsible for the remaining shortcomings.

(Received 15 January 2002)

Language in Society **31** (2002). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404502255050

Dennis Ager, *Motivation in language planning and language policy*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters, 2001. Pp. vi, 210. Pb. $24.95.

Kas Deprez & Theo du Plessis, eds., *Multilingualism and government: Belgium, Luxembourg, Switzerland, former Yugoslavia, South Africa*. (Studies in language policy in South Africa.) Pretoria: Van Schaik, 2000. Pp. xii, 179.

Reviewed by Christina Bratt Paulston
Linguistics, University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, PA 15260
paulston@imap.pitt.edu

The two books under review, *Motivation in language planning and language policy* (*MLPP*) and *Multilingualism and government* (*M&G*), are both about language policy, at least at one level, and both are, or claim to be, based on case studies. That is the end of any similarity between them.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502235058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

MLPP is a curious book and difficult to characterize. It addresses a lacuna in the field of language policy: a motivational explanation, at both the individual and the group levels. In the best British tradition, it is written by a humanist (Dennis Ager was chair of the Department of Modern Languages at Aston University around 1974–1998) with wide reading in the behavioral and social sciences. Done well, this can be a superb genre, but I don't think this book is done well, and I shall explain why I think so. At the same time, I should add that I have a number of students writing theses on language policy and language attitudes, and they seem to find the book helpful.

The brief introduction gives us a sample of what to expect: Language and language behavior are divided into language-as-instrument and language-as-object. Language planning is concerned with the latter and has come to mean "the ways in which organized communities, united by religious, ethnic, or political ties consciously attempt to influence the language(s) their members use, the languages used in education, or the ways used in Academies, publishers, or journalists make the language change" (p. 5). There are three fields of language planning – status, corpus, and, acquisition – and three types of actors: individuals, communities, and states. The range of writings on motivation – expectancy value theories, goal theories, self-determination theories, and attitude theories, as well as basic human needs – are summarized in three pages, with a distinction of types of goals suggested as ideal (vision, intention), objective (mission, purpose), and target (precise, achievable). We then settle on seven motives for LPP: identity, ideology, image creation, insecurity, inequality, integration with a group, and instrumental motives for advancement. I know this literature well, but at this point my head is spinning, and I find it enormously difficult to understand what is being discussed, especially since no single actual case is mentioned. At one level, a major one, the monograph is a set of categories and subcategories of concepts from linguistics, social psychology, sociology and political science. Yet it never clarifies any theoretical – or, for that matter, pragmatic – rationale for inclusion of key concepts; it never makes clear what problem this amalgam of concepts serves to explain and clarify, or what research questions it can answer. Rather, it is a set of tablets handed down from the mountain.

Besides this magpie approach to basic concepts without a theoretical framework to keep them organized, many concepts are not explained at all, such as "territorial right" in a discussion of language rights. Others are given new names, like "mosaic countries" for multiethnic states (and they are not always so transparent). Still others have a shift in meaning, or key authors are not identified, as with Leslie Milroy's social network model. The result is an extremely laborious read without much clarification.

The case studies conceivably could have rescued the reader. As early as 1971, Joshua Fishman spelled out the importance of using case studies for contrast and comparison in studying language maintenance and shift, the basic underlying situation of most LPP concerns (see discussion of *MG* below). Ager, however,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502235058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

uses case studies as exemplars or standards. One basic requirement of such standards is that they be transparent, nonambiguous, nonquestionable – in short, absolute. Ager's case studies are not. For example, the language situation in Algeria, or all of the Maghreb for that matter, is not really comprehensible without the concept of diglossia, introduced in the discussion as far back as 1930 by Marçais. Nor is Classical Arabic the same as Modern Standard Arabic (MSA), any more than this review is written in Shakespearean English. At the very least, MSA deserves the note that it has no native speakers and so made possible, under French colonial rule, the substitution of French for MSA as the H (high) form. Altogether, Ager's is an inadequate if not erroneous description of today's Maghreb.

These questionable descriptions in the exemplars are then used to help "measure" motivation in LPP, a measurement that basically consists of the author's own judgment, using his own checklists, based on similarities to the exemplary case studies. I am not going to quibble about the meaning of "measure," but this is not what is usually thought of as measurement in social psychology or language motivation studies, although it does allow for a degree of reliability, if not complete validity.

In addition, the writing style leaves much to be desired. Apart from false plurals like *linguae francae* (*lingua franca* is Provençal, not Latin) and dangling participles, there are long sentences with endless prepositional phrases. Add the plethora of new concepts with old labels, old concepts with new labels, and difficult parsing of the syntax, and we have difficult reading that eventually becomes boring.

This is not to deny that there are many sudden insights. In a discussion of Ryan & Giles 1982, Ager points out that the origin of the motives of solidarity and status in effect lie with "the recognition of one's own social identity in relation to that of others" (148). There are many stray claims, not based on data, that I find quite convincing: "The greater the perceived contrasts between one's own situation and that of the reference group, the clearer the goals towards which the individual is striving, the greater the motivation to action" (156). It is for these novel insights the book should be appreciated.

Why, then, have my students read a book I have so many reservations about? Quite simply, there is no other book on the topic. Language attitudes in the context of language maintenance and shift is a sorely ignored matter, urgent in these days of endangered languages.

M&G is a very different book. It is a collection of essays, edited by a Fleming, the late Kas Deprez, and an Afrikaner, Theo du Plessis, and deals primarily with Belgium and South Africa. The collection is the outcome of an International Colloquium on Multilingualism and Government, held in Belgium in 1999, and is intended as the first in a series jointly sponsored by the University of Antwerp and the Unit for Language Facilitation and Empowerment of the University of Orange Free State. It consists of a general introduction, 16 essays with many

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502235058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

maps and charts, and an index. The essays are distributed in four parts: Part I, "Multilingualism and government in Belgium" (six essays); Part II, "Multilingualism and government in two other European countries" (Switzerland and Luxembourg); Part III, "Multilingualism and government in South Africa" (six essays); and Part IV, "Nation-building and language building" (former Yugoslavia and South Africa).

The main concern, or at least the main stated concern, is the elaboration of a "solid" language policy for the new democracy of post-apartheid South Africa. To that end, the main objective is to "design a series of books which offer an in-depth analysis of some European countries that have gone through a long history of multilingual engineering, analyzing how they have accommodated their languages in the different domains of public life . . . , and why they have taken such steps" (1). The main assumption, then, is that language planning and language policies (LPP) are a productive and successful way of achieving a "rainbow nation – a unitary state where all languages, cultures, and religions can flourish" (2). This review is not the place to argue against such an assumption – it would need a monograph of its own – except to note in passing that I am not convinced of the general efficacy of much LPP. Where language policies for multilingualism work at the state level, it is probably mostly in cases of recognizing and legislating already established situations.

The building blocks of the in-depth analysis are case studies: cases of countries, nations, and states, of federal organizations and local communities within an overall organizing principle of comparison and contrast in a carefully orchestrated point-counterpoint. It makes for fascinating reading, and actually at times almost reads like a whodunit, especially the last two essays, where Neville Alexander's controversial suggestion for "harmonizing" or standardizing all the major African languages into only two languages is contradicted point by point by Raymond Detrez's excellent essay on the various sociohistorical stages of Serbo-Croatian. It works like this: The reader gets involved with some claim, like "Nations come into existence by acquiring power" (19), which may or may not be accurate, and so in past or subsequent reading, he or she looks for support or contradiction in a veritable treasure hunt of evidence. There are no editorial comments past the Introduction, so the reader is left to hunt on his own – sometimes, I suspect, against the intention of the editors. In Part III, for example, a veritable exhortation for the necessity of LPP, the various chapters inadvertently document that at the local level of communities, the setting of language policy holds very low priority, and that South Africans are concerned with building a democracy, and that the language in which it is done has little importance to them. They function quite pragmatically through translation, with bilinguals acting as interpreters (in one place the mayor spoke four languages and willingly served as a resource). It is perfectly understandable that, in such task-oriented situations, the language spoken by the majority of participants will serve as the common denominator, so to speak, and this language is most commonly English.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502235058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Although mentioned in passing in the Introduction and in du Plessis's essay, the mostly unstated major concern is the spread of English. Reagan 2001 concludes, in an article on the same topic as Part III and IV, that "perhaps the clearest linguistic lesson that contemporary South Africa has to teach us concerns the overwhelming dominance of English, a dominance supported by both economic factors and by tacit government acquiescence in the face of considerable linguistic diversity" (63). Afrikaners are concerned about the future of Afrikaans. On the surface, this concern seems unwarranted; in 1996 Afrikaans had 5,811,547 speakers (14.4% of the nation's population) while English had not much more than half that, 3,301,774 speakers (8.2%) (101).[1] But historically, Afrikaans became associated with the hated apartheid policy, and so the preference of the indigenous African population (which holds the overwhelming majority) was for English as a lingua franca, and still is. The Soweto riots in 1976, the beginning of the end of apartheid, were after all triggered by the attempt to introduce Afrikaans as medium of instruction in schools attended by Black Africans.

There may also be a shift to English, although it is difficult to find any documentation. De Klerk and Bosch 1998 claim "Evidence of a rapid shift to English" and "point to an urgent need to monitor shifts in language allegiance" (from the LLB Abstract). Nor have Afrikaners forgotten the historical *taalstryd*, or "language struggle." One cannot understand Afrikaner language attitudes without awareness of their history under British colonialism, which reached a low in its treatment of Afrikaners. (It is rarely mentioned that concentration camps were an "invention" of the English, where they starved to death thousands of Afrikaner women and children.) The English despised and ridiculed Afrikaans, which was in fact neither standardized nor recognized in education until the 20th century. Afrikaner insistence on mother tongue education was at first to protect their own children from anglicization; later, it served the purposes of apartheid with its entailed segregation and contributed to Black African demand for English-medium education. It is not surprising, then, that when *M&G*, in Part III, also advocates strongly for mother-tongue education in post-apartheid South Africa, the reader views this plea with some suspicion. One is reminded of Sonntag's essay on India, another ex-colonial British country, where similar language policies may derive from very different orientations: "The left-right ideological distinction may help us understand English language politics; it is not necessarily a predictor of specific language policies regarding English" (2000:149). In South Africa, the policy remains the same; the rationale, or in more recent conceptualization the ideology, now is built on the need for indigenous cultural self-respect and the construction of a rainbow nation. English is never mentioned, but presumably mother-tongue education in the other nine official indigenous African languages will also serve to slow the spread of English as a lingua franca. Du Plessis claims autochthonous status for Afrikaans – technically, I suppose, this is accurate – while English is labeled a colonial language. Cynthia Marivate in her chapter "The Mission and Activities of the Pan South African Language Board,"

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502235058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

a board set up primarily to promote and develop the previously marginalized languages, describes how the complaints received by one subcommittee on Language Rights and Mediation have been mostly from Afrikaans speakers "about the dominance of English" (136). It is all a bit disingenuous.

Worse, I doubt that such efforts can be very effective in the long run. I cannot imagine a linguist (unless he is also a politician; there are a few such) who does not basically support the survival of Afrikaans and happily would say so. There is no need not to acknowledge such a concern in academic scholarship, and probably a considerable need to focus on exactly what kind of policy would contribute to a healthy status of Afrikaans 150 or 200 years from now. Riding the coattails of the languages of the indigenous population is not likely to be effective policy. The problem is twofold: maintaining the Afrikaans native-speaking population, and ensuring a niche for Afrikaans as a lingua franca at the federal level, which would induce some Black Africans to learn some Afrikaans in the years to come. The Introduction gets it partially right: a functional multilingualism, "a different use of the languages depending on location and type of service" (13). The effectiveness of territorial language rights in state bilingualism is documented throughout *M&G* as is a complementary functional distribution of languages in individual bilingualism. If you consider "type of service" to include Afrikaans as part of job qualifications, we know that this is also an effective policy. Working out such language strategies is what the next book in the series should address.

Part I and Part II, neglected for reasons of space in this review, are scholarly, solid, and informative. Especially, Deprez's chapter on "Belgium: From a unitary to a federal state" has a great many insights and openly discusses the possibility of a split between Flanders and Wallonia, not a discussion one commonly sees in the literature. François Grin, in his excellent chapter on Switzerland, reiterates the concern over the spread of English. Nico Weber, on Luxembourg, documents the effectiveness of the schools in achieving multilingualism within one ethnic group, and complementary functional distribution of the languages in maintaining multilingualism. (What is not mentioned is that such multilingualism comes at a cost to the sciences in the curriculum, perhaps not a concern at present to the government in South Africa; see Davis 1994).

In short, I can't think of a more thought-provoking, interesting, complex, and fascinating book on multilingualism that I have read in a very long time. *M&G* should be equally interesting to the novice in the field and to someone who is familiar with it. I shall use it as a text in my sociology of language course.[2]

NOTES

[1] The former so-called Coloured population is mostly Afrikaans-speaking; the Indian mostly English-speaking. Gandhi, born in South Africa, had to learn Hindi as a second language.

[2] I gratefully acknowledge patient answers by Carol Myers-Scotton, Theo Du Plessis, Carol Puhl-Snymann, and Albert Weideman in response to my questions. The interpretation is of course my own responsibility.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502235058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

REFERENCES

Davis, Kathryn Anne (1994). *Language planning in multilingual contexts: Policies, communities, and schools in Luxembourg*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

De Klerk, Vivian, & Bosch, Barbara (1998). Afrikaans to English: A case study of language shift. *South African Journal of Linguistics* 16.2:43–51.

Marçais, W. (1930). La diglossie arabe. *L'Enseignement Public* 97.

Reagan, Thomas (2001). The promotion of linguistic diversity in multilingual settings: Policy and reality in post-apartheid South Africa. *Language Problems and Language Planning* 25:51–71.

Ryan, Ellen B. & Giles, Howard (eds.) (1982). *Attitudes toward language variation*. London: Edward Arnold.

Sonntag, Selma K. (2000). Ideology and policy in the politics of the English language in North India. In Thomas Ricento (ed.), *Ideology, politics and language policies: Focus on English*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

(Received 20 February 2002)

Language in Society **31** (2002). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404502265057

STEPHEN BARBOUR and CATHIE CARMICHAEL, eds., *Language and nationalism in Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. Pp. 319. Hb, $70.00.

Reviewed by JOAN A. ARGENTER
General Linguistics
Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona
E-08193 Bellaterra, Spain
joan.argenter@uab.es

As stated in the title, the topic of this book is the relationships between language and nationalism in Europe, and particularly the "significance of language for nationalism and national identity" (p. 9) – a topic qualified as "fascinating" by the editors (v) and in Barbour's initial chapter (16, 17). A question arises in the reviewer's mind: Is this a unitary, unequivocal subject? Of course, in a certain rather philosophical way it is unitary – which does not mean general agreement even from this philosophical view, but at least it may be identified as "a proper subject." However, it is not at all unequivocal insofar as the terms of the relationship are not clarified. This is precisely what Barbour's opening chapter intends.

Notions such as "ethnic group," "nation," "national identity," "nationalism," and "nation-state" charge the author to unveil their meanings, nuances, and relationships. Implicitly or explicitly, all contributors are confronted by the same issue. Unanimously, they adopt a historical stance and reject essentialist interpretations; as a result, leaving the first term aside, all the others are understood as the outcome of relatively recent processes in European history. A similar analysis applies to "language," "dialect," "standard language," and the roles these play in either defining or building up national realities, since "language is the main vehicle for a national culture – the wisdom of centuries preserved" (285). We can also consider the matter from the opposite perspective, since "the growth of nations and the sharp demarcation of languages are actually related processes" (13, in reference to language planning).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502235058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Specific topics dealt with throughout the book are recapitulated in Carmichael's closing chapter. A dynamic view of sociolinguistic processes emerges: (i) the "ways in which certain languages have become dominant as national languages"; (ii) "the relationship between language, ethnicity, and state formation"; (iii) "the stories of the waning of some peripheral languages"; (iv) "the codification of standard languages"; and (v) "the increasing use of English as a lingua franca" (280). She also sketches a brief critical review of scholars' statements on nationalism in the past 30 years.

The scope of this book is limited to Europe (it leaves out the Caucasus region because of its geography, geopolitics, and linguistic complexity), because Europe is taken as the historical paradigm of national development and also is a field where, apparently, issues of submerged nations, emerging nationalism, and nation-state building are still on the agenda. This is interesting at a time when a supranational polity is in progress in Europe, and globalization is overwhelmingly present in socio-economic, political, and communicative practices and relationships. In Carmichael's words: "We are witnessing two parallel and apparently contradictory phenomena: the abandonment of nationalism and the re-emergence of nationalism" (288).

The national groups and languages mentioned in the text are associated with land and permanence: a continuous area that they have occupied from ancient times. The claim to nationhood is supported on a territorial basis. Otherwise, diasporic and immigrant groups have only an ethnic status. Ethnic, national, state, and linguistic borders rarely coincide: they may maintain an inclusion relationship but also overlap, and they may or may not coincide or not with other – religious, cultural, or class – divisions. Thus, analysts may be led to understand a national conflict as, for example, a class conflict, but this does not mean that people view or live it this way. The opportunity given, language is raised to a salient position among markers of national distinctiveness and self-consciousness.

Things are never so clear-cut, however. The UK case is exemplary in showing "how nationalism may not be linked to language in any simple sense" (43). English has successfully acquired a dominant position, but this does not mean either ethnic or national uniformity. In contrast, Celtic languages – Irish, Scottish Gaelic, Cornish, Manx, and Welsh – are well advanced among the vanishing languages of Europe, with the exception of Welsh (Cornish, though the object of a recent revival movement, has been an extinct language since the end of eighteenth century, and the last fluent speaker of Manx died a few decades ago). Englishmen do not seem especially aware of their national language and identity, whereas some Celtic groups do, even if only to remember their linguistic past and their ancestors' language, or even if their national awareness is linked rather to social class or religious affiliation.

In many cases, new states have arisen out of earlier empires, such as Hungary and Austria out of the Austro-Hungarian Empire or Estonia and Georgia out of the former Soviet Union; in contrast, France (treated in a chapter by Anne Judge) is

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502235058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

an instance of the development of a nation from a state, to such an extent that the motto "one state, one nation, one language" has been, consciously or not, assumed by generations of French citizens. This has been both the result of history and national ideology. Since the French Revolution, the Jacobins' view of the state prevailed over that of the Girondins (72–73). Between equality and freedom, the French founding fathers chose equality, as far as language is concerned. Equality was thought of as the cornerstone of democracy. Citizens were to be equal before the law – and the law was written in Parisian French. Why so? By whom? Does equality equal uniformity and the interdiction of language differences? Are these irrelevant questions?

The linguistic history of France exposed here includes both institutionalizing French and pushing away regional languages (Occitan, Basque, Breton, Catalan, Alsatian, Corsican, Flemish, Franco-Provençal), as well as today's challenges. The chapter closes with a rather optimistic outlook for the near future.

France's centralized structure has been a model followed by other European states. Spain (discussed by Clare Mar-Molinero) is among them, even though after Franco's regime, the constitution of 1978, "a masterpiece of compromise and consensus" (98) – and of semantic trickery – is one of the most advanced in Europe in recognizing autonomy for "nationalities," or historical nations: the Basque Country, Catalonia, and Galicia, and "regions," and their linguistic rights. However, Linz's statement – published in 1973, two years before Franco's death – is quoted as still quite properly describing the situation: "Spain today is a state for all Spaniards, a nation-state for a large part of the population, and only a state but not a nation for important minorities" (104).

A particularly interesting area is northern Europe, reviewed by Lars S. Vikør, which includes five states (Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Finland, and Iceland). As a preliminary statement, there seems to be full correspondence between statehood and national identity, aside from the Sámi people, originally nomadic and spread through the north of Norway, Sweden, Finland, and the Kola Peninsula in Russia. These countries share a cultural and political history. Their languages belong to the Uralic (Finnish and Sámi) and Indo-European families, the latter being the extreme north languages of the Germanic branch (Danish, Swedish, Norwegian, and Icelandic). Since the formation of the kingdoms of Denmark, Sweden, and Norway in the Middle Ages, a hazardous history has united, partially separated, and partially reunited them, under the dominant power of either Denmark or Sweden. Their current status is a recent outcome, with Norway, Finland, and Iceland becoming independent as late as the 20th century. The linguistic evolution of the area is an instance of how language convergence or divergence may be achieved through language planning. Furthermore, Norway is a case of a multiple standardization: earlier Landsmål ("the language of country, or the countryside"), currently named Nynorsk ("New Norwegian"), represents traditional rural varieties of the language, and Bokmål ("book language" or "literary language") is associated with an urban and educated population.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502235058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The two modalities have to some degree converged, although unification has not been possible, and both are official. Language standards are markers of Norwegian national identity with regard to outside, but also of other criss-crossed identities in the home front.

A prima facie similar case, but different in detail, is represented by Greek diglossia, with its two standard varieties, Katharevousa and Dhimotiki, promoted by right- and left-wing governments, respectively, through the past century. Both standards are linked in a rather complex way to two different and competing perceptions of Greek national identity; to oversimplify, one stresses ancient and Classical Greece and its contribution to Western civilization (*Ellinismos*), and is associated with oligarchy and military elites, and the other focuses on the Byzantine heritage and the heroic struggle against the Turks (*Romiosini*), and is associated with peasant culture and Orthodox mysticism (248–9). Nowadays it seems that convergence in favor of Dhimotiki has prevailed.

Modern Turkey provides another interesting case of language planning. Kemal Atatürk, the founder of the modern state, advanced a language policy that was part of multiple moves toward modernization, secularization, and the adoption of a western European way of life. Persian and Arabic loans were eradicated from Turkish (an Altaic language), and the Roman alphabet substituted for the Arabic.

In Greece, as in Italy, several minorities live side by side, including the Greek-speaking population, speakers of Balkan Romance, South Slavonic, Albanian, and Turkish. In Turkey, there is an important Ladino community in Istanbul, and some groups of Greeks, Kurds, and Armenians remain, in spite of the traditional Greek-Turkish conflict and the massacre of Armenians in 1915, when about a million and a half Armenians were killed. Greece and European Turkey are treated in chapters by Carmichael and by Peter Trudgill.

Although this book does not deal directly with individual identity, it is clear that a multidimensional view of it is assumed. Nevertheless, national and ethnic, gender, sexual, religious, or other "hyphenated" identities are not considered to be on an equal footing. Carmichael acknowledges, in a concluding chapter, that "there is a strong emotional interface between language and identity" (285). Then, one may wonder whether it is true – and if so, why it is – that "questions of national identity still dominate the daily lives of some Europeans, whereas others have consigned the question to the back of their minds" (284). These seem not to be trivial questions, and they merit some answer. I guess that we confront threatened or unaccomplished national identities in the former eventuality, and political power-controlled mechanisms of ideological invisibility in the latter. I contend that what discourse conceals is as relevant as what it states explicitly. This explains why "to be a nationalist" is used in contemporary political discourse in Spain to designate the fact of being a Basque, Catalan or (to a lesser extent) Galician nationalist, whereas it does not apply to adherents of Spanish nationalism. In fact, according to power's discourse in Spain, to be a Spanish nationalist

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502235058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

is not one way of being nationalist, but just one way of being: the way of being that is to be NATURALLY expected from ANY Spanish citizen.

The editors' perception is right: The topic of this book is a fascinating one, and the cases described are as variegated as they are illustrative. The book itself is fascinating, too. The reader will be attracted not by an abstract and controversial subject, but by a clear exposition of lively stories of human communities in one region of the world. It is a readable book about an interesting story, from which we can learn to understand our world and to avoid former errors. For one thing, it may be sane for us to recall that "the denial of national self-determination is an act of denial that defines the actions of others as deviant, abnormal or irrational" (288) – so much more so if we live comfortably installed in an unproblematic setting, without having to struggle for evidence.

(Received 9 January 2002)

Language in Society **31** (2002). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404502275053

TESSA CARROLL, *Language planning and language change in Japan*. Richmond, Surrey: Curzon Press, 2001. Pp. 275. Hb. $40.00

Reviewed by PATRICIA J. WETZEL
Japanese Program, Portland State University
Portland, OR 97207
wetzelp@pdx.edu

The strength of this book (henceforth *LPLCJ*) is that it is filled with information about an important but little-understood aspect of Japanese culture: Japan's stance toward its own language. It takes as its point of departure "the study of language planning as a branch of the sociology of language" (p. 10). For reasons that I will outline below, I find this particular approach unsatisfying, but the book's strengths far outweigh its weaknesses, and I will outline the former here before offering my own opinion on how this topic should be approached.

LPLCJ begins by offering a critical review of frequently used terms that are often confused in describing the relationship between polities and their language: language planning, policy, reform (as a kind of planning), problems, and standardization, as well as linguistic pluralism, assimilation, internationalism, and vernacularism. In performing this service, the author establishes her own credibility as well as provisional definitions that will guide the book. One feels grounded.

The first chapter also introduces the principle policy-making and policy-influencing bodies in Japan, including the Kokugo Shingikai, the Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo, the Kokugoka within the Bunka-cho, and NHK. The interaction among these and their various responsibilities make a fascinating research topic for anyone interested in how policy of ANY kind comes into being in Japan.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502235058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Chap. 2 reviews the historical roots of language policy in Japan, tying it to the wave of intellectual and cultural influences that took Japan by storm in the Meiji era. This era also established themes that determined the tenor of debates over language policy throughout the 20th century, extending into the present. These themes include the manipulation of *kokugo* for ideological ends, the commitment to textbooks as vehicles for disseminating rules and regulations, the preoccupation with script as a motivation for even spoken language policy, and the unique place of *keigo* and women's language in the Japanese canon. Any one of these constitutes fodder for full exploration; Carroll does a very creditable job of juggling them all in trying to build a three-dimensional picture of modern Japan through its "official" language.

Chap. 3 assesses the current state of Japanese by addressing the very popular notion that the language is *midarete iru* 'confused, in disarray'. There are three areas in particular where critics tend to focus their energies: honorific language, young people's language, and women's language. Carroll capably describes the internal debates over all of these in both the popular imagination and government policy. A shortcoming is that she does not detail or critique the methodology by which research is carried out that feeds into government policy, nor the validity of fears that Japanese has somehow deteriorated over the past 50 years or so, although she does acknowledge the role(s) that ideology plays in debates over language.

In Chap. 4, Carroll returns to history and tries to outline some of the particular ways in which government at all levels has had a role and a stake in language policy. I found the evidence used in this chapter and the previous one a bit puzzling because the author doesn't ever really come to terms with the dichotomy between spoken and written language. Indeed, this makes for a certain unevenness in the book's flow; for example, we move from Chap. 3, "State of the Language, State of the Nation," to Chap. 4, "Language: State and Citizens." The first of these takes on primarily questions of spoken convention, while the second deals with issues of script and written style. Either spoken or written convention could be handily brought to bear on the socio-political issues the author intends to address here, so the reader is left feeling a bit perplexed as to why they are separated like this.

Chap. 5, the most ambitious chapter, views Japanese language policy as the embodiment of the notion that language is simultaneously a repository of culture and a tool of communication, and discusses how these two aspects play out in official recommendations for Japanese. Carroll observes that recent policy avoids rhetoric that smacks of *kotodama* 'soul of language' or *nihonjiron* 'theories of Japaneseness,' which influenced policy in the past. She also argues that the burgeoning interest in language for communicative purposes originated in the 1970s and resulted from societal changes that include internationalization, growth of mass media, and personal/family circumstances. It may reflect my own bias, but I wish that she had gone into more detail on the stultifying effects that the exam-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502235058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ination mentality has on language teaching, and therefore on spoken language skills in Japan.

The section in Chap. 5 on loanwords provides an excellent snapshot depicting how policy must simultaneously accommodate and endeavor to control linguistic drift. The notion that anyone in authority might actually control social convention is ludicrous, but governments have a great deal at stake in proclaiming what they hold to be representative of the good and the right. All policy bodies walk a very fine line in trying to maintain their credibility on this score, and loanwords in Japanese make for a rich and often amusing field of contention.

The balance of Chap. 5 assesses the role of two divergent "factors" in setting standards of language. The first of these is the broadcasting industry, particularly the state-supported NHK. The second is script and the unique problems that a writing system as complex as Japan's poses to language policy. The complexity of *kanjikanamajiribun* is difficult to describe to the uninitiated, and at every turn Japan seems to be willing and even eager to fine-tune the conventions – from varying the number of Chinese characters in common use to altering the method of their encryption on word processors. The advent of computers has made issues of script more complicated, not less, and as Carroll points out, "may lead to far greater challenges which . . . language planning bodies will not be able to ignore" (181).

Chap. 6 covers dialects and regionalism, which have a long history in Japan and play quite a significant role in people's sense of self and national identity. As Carroll points out, government policy has (predictably) varied tremendously over the years, stigmatizing regional variation when standardization was seen as a necessity, and more recently fostering it when local identity became threatened.

A short Chap. 7 attempts to draw from the history of language policy and the current socio-political climate some sense of where the Japanese language will go in the future. This is perhaps the least useful chapter in the book, since it doesn't contain any new information, nor does it make any startling predictions or concrete suggestions.

My only quarrel with *LPLCJ* stems directly from its approach, not from its execution. In this book, as in so much of what is called "the sociology of language," the analysis is ahistorical. It ignores or glosses over the specific context in which language is always embedded, assuming that the principles that govern language change AND language policy are timeless and universal. This leads to the flawed conclusion that the very enterprise is one that has immediate and measurable results.

In contrast to the blind-faith approach of *LPLCJ*, I think it prudent to ask, first of all, whether government policy is a product or a catalyst. Clearly, the answer is "a little of both," but depending on the tack one takes, the character of policy can be quite different. It is easy to dismiss policy (as some do) as simply the reflection of conservative voices carefully selected by the existing regime to maintain its

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502235058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

hold on tradition. But in an open and democratic society like Japan, policy can also serve to raise public consciousness by shining a light on the inner workings of culture, and eliciting voices from all areas of the political and intellectual spectrum. In fact, this is precisely what has happened in response to the most recent policy statements. Yet the current climate and national consciousness are surely quite different from the climate and consciousness of 1902, when the first national investigative body was sanctioned and linguistic consciousness had yet to take root. Do explanations of the current state of affairs apply 100 years ago? I am inclined to think not. At any point in time, we might ask the same questions and get very different answers: What effect does language policy have on the lives of everyday people? How have specific policies been implemented (e.g. through the education system)? How is success measured? How is consent manufactured? What are people actually doing with language? How does opposition from below affect attitudes, behavior, and policy itself? Unless we can answer these questions, policy remains an activity of mandarins whose potency rests in their ability to state the obvious.

These objections notwithstanding, Carroll has done the English-speaking and reading world a great service in shining her light onto a rich field of inquiry. Much remains to be done, but this is a good start.

(Received 2 February 2002)

Language in Society **31** (2002). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S004740450228505X

Hiroko Tanaka, *Turn-taking in Japanese conversation: A study in grammar and interaction*. (Pragmatics and Beyond New Series, 56.) Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1999. Pp. xiv, 242. Hb $87.00.

Hiroko Furo, *Turn-taking in English and Japanese: Projectability in grammar, intonation and semantics*. New York: Routledge, 2001. Pp. xvi, 247. Hb $70.00.

Reviewed by Shoko Ikuta
English, Meiji Gakuin University
Tokyo 108-8636, Japan
ikuta@ltr.meijigakuin.ac.jp

Both volumes under review cover the same topic, turn-taking in Japanese in comparison with English. While Furo compares Japanese and English data, Tanaka focuses on the analysis of Japanese data, but nonetheless keeps a cross-cultural perspective on turn-taking. Both are dealing with a now flourishing area, the interface of grammar and interaction, based on the model of turn-taking proposed by Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson 1974 and the work by Ford & Thompson 1996. Through the study of turn-taking, Tanaka aims at exploring the interrelationship of grammar and interaction, and Furo attempts to reveal how aspects of language – grammar, intonation, and semantics – and interaction influence one another, and how they are intertwined in discourse. Both volumes emerged from

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502235058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

doctoral dissertations, Tanaka's at Oxford and Furo's at Georgetown University. Despite many similarities, including some of the findings, their approaches and presentations are quite different.

Tanaka's volume is a tightly studied, comprehensive analysis of turn-taking from the perspective of Conversation Analysis (CA). It investigates "the complex interpenetration of grammar, prosody and social interaction through a comparison of turn-taking in Japanese and Anglo-American English."

Along with a review of the methodological strategies of CA, justifying its application for cross-cultural research, a description of data, and an outline of Japanese "conversational grammar," Chap. 1 contains a review of various works in the *Nihonjinron* ('popular studies on Japanese') genre in Japan, which emphasize the "uniqueness" of Japanese society, culture, or language, which Tanaka later relates to the findings from her study. Her data corpora consist of telephone conversations, multi-party conversations, and informal meetings. Chap. 2 examines the applicability of the turn-taking system proposed by Sacks et al. 1974 to Japanese conversation. Tanaka states, "Methods for allocating turns identified by Sacks et al. (1974) are also found in Japanese, and the components and rules of turn-taking in Japanese are found to be essentially the same as in English."

Chaps. 3–6 are devoted to comparisons between English and Japanese of aspects of Sacks's key notion of "projectability." In comparison with Ford & Thompson's study of conversations in American English, it is revealed statistically that in Japanese, syntactic completion points occurred with much less frequency than in English, and they matched more closely the numbers of intonational and pragmatic completion points. According to Tanaka, Japanese participants also seem to orient to complex transition relevance places or CTRPs – the conjunction points among grammatical, intonational, and pragmatic completion points (cf. Ford & Thompson 1996) – as possible transition-relevance places, or TRPs. In addition, while possible TRPs in English almost always occur at syntactically complete points, potential TRPs in Japanese include syntactically complete points as well as some syntactically incomplete ones.

Chaps. 4–6 deal with the relationship between grammatical structure and turn projectability in Japanese in comparison with English. Chap. 4 focuses on how grammar affects participants in constructing turns as well as projecting turn-shapes and TRPs in English and Japanese. Because of its fixed word order and canonical SVO structure, English has relatively early projectability of turn-shapes. In Japanese, on the other hand, it is claimed that the variability of word order, the predicate-final orientation, and the use of various postpositional particles may cause a delay to turn projectability, allowing the speaker to modify many aspects of the turn as it progresses. (Specific grammatical turn-ending elements and marked prosodic features may signal the arrival of a turn-ending.) In comparison with English, Japanese talk is thus characterized by the "incremental transformability" of turn-shapes and a relatively "delayed projectability" of turn-transition points. This point is further demonstrated through an examination of

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502235058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

case and adverbial particles in Chap. 5 and of conjunctive particles in Chap. 6. These Japanese particles are shown to be important resources in the construction, recognition, and projection of turns by informing participants of the moment-to-moment unfolding of a turn.

Chap. 7 summarizes the results and implications of the findings, and Tanaka relates the findings to the *Nihonjinron*. She speculates that features of Japanese grammar and interaction may have some relevance to stereotypes of Japanese patterns of interaction as equivocal or indirect, as commonly described in *Nihonjinron*. In addition to this kind of association of language use and patterns of interaction, this work could have benefited from incorporating resources from other linguistic branches such as (interactional) sociolinguistics, and communication studies. Ideally, there should be a consideration of social factors such as social or interactional roles of participants as well as gender, age, status, or institutional setting, which are all considered as interacting with grammar, prosodic, and pragmatic features in turn-taking. Tanaka's scope, however, stays in many respects within the framework of CA, as she aims at cross-cultural CA. It must also be mentioned that there might be disagreement among speakers of Japanese in the judgment of possible TRPs in the Japanese data (which may be a result of equivocality).

Being well aware of the need for balance, Furo's volume employs two approaches: CA and interactional sociolinguistics. It is well organized, empirical, and written in a more jargon-free style, though it is sometimes repetitious and retains much of its original format as a dissertation. Quantitatively and qualitatively analyzing data from English and Japanese conversation and political news interviews, Furo attempts to explore what turn-taking tells us about language and interaction. More specifically, the study is aimed at examining five questions: (i) how grammar, intonation, and semantics are interrelated; (ii) how participants negotiate roles and floor management in interaction; (iii) how grammar, intonation, and semantics relate to turn-transitions or speaker changes; (iv) how cultural context affects turn transitions; and (v) how situational context affects realization of turn-taking.

Chap. 1 sets out to introduce the purposes, data, organization, and methodology. Chap. 2 is a literature review on conversation, turn-taking, political news interviews, and Japanese discourse. Chaps. 3–6 focus on "systematicity" in turn-taking and interactional factors that trigger unsystematic instances in the four data sets. Furo also adopts Ford & Thompson 1996, with some modification for the analysis of Japanese. Chap. 3 shows the orderliness in the realization of turn-taking in English conversation. It proposes that the divergent instances between CTRPs and speaker changes are triggered by interactional factors such as disagreement or expression of active listenership. Chap. 4 also shows strong correlation between CTRPs and speaker changes in Japanese conversation. Speaker changes occur in systematic ways and are triggered by interactional factors. Chap. 5 indicates that, in US political news interviews, CTRPs are not strong indicators of

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502235058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

turn-transitions, and that participant roles affect realization of turn-taking. Interactional factors in the argumentative setting cause unsystematicity of the turn-taking system. Chap. 6 reveals a strong correlation between CTRPs and speaker changes in Japanese political news interviews; there is consensus among the participants, and unsystematic instances are triggered by situational and interactional factors.

Chaps. 7–9 compare quantitative results in the four data sets in terms of the interrelationship among grammatical, intonational, and semantic completion points, the occurrence of speaker changes, and the relationship between completion points and speaker changes. In Chap. 7, it is revealed that grammatical completion points occur far more frequently than other completion points, with English data showing many increments and the US political interview data having a relatively larger number of grammatical completion points than Japanese counterparts. Also, it is shown that the frequency of reactive tokens may affect the occurrence of completion points and the number of CTRPs. Chap. 8 demonstrates that role exchange and floor management are realized differently in each data set, and linguistic and cultural factors, as well as situational and interactional ones, affect instances of speaker changes. Examining the relationship between linguistic completion points and speaker changes, Chap. 9 shows that linguistic completion points have a strong correlation with non-floor-taking speaker changes, but not with floor-taking speaker changes.

In Chap. 10, it is demonstrated that English and Japanese data have different turn-taking patterns, and that linguistic and cultural factors – English as an SVO language and American society as a high-involvement culture, and Japanese as an SOV language and Japanese culture a high-consideration culture (cf. Tannen 1989) – play important roles in turn-taking. Chap. 11 suggests that the situational difference greatly affects the realization of turn-taking, showing the difference in conversations and political news interviews. Chap. 12 summarizes the main findings and concludes that language and interaction are intertwined systematically and dynamically.

Furo's work sheds light on situational differences in the study of turn-taking, comparing conversation and political news interviews. Relating turn-taking to floor formation in interaction is especially intriguing, as well as essential. It is regrettable, however, in this otherwise scrupulous work, that there is striking inconsistency regarding Japanese data transcription, especially word boundaries. In addition to the incomplete index, which is missing many of the volume's important key notions, some corrections are needed for bibliographical citations; Edelsky 1981 and Matsumoto 1988, for example, are referred to consistently as Edelsky 1993 and Matsumoto 1980.

Both Tanaka's and Furo's volumes take a quantitative approach in order to avoid falling into microqualitative-type CA analysis. As Furo admits, however, the difference in number of participants, gender, or topic in each data set may affect turn-taking and/or floor formation in interaction. It is strongly hoped that

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502235058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

more studies dealing with various types of interactional data will appear on this subject. To those who are interested in sociolinguistic competence, social factors such as relationships, gender, institutional differences, and so on all seem to influence speaker change.

Nonetheless, there is no doubt that both works contribute to establishing robust support for the field of grammar and interaction study per se, as well as for intercultural studies. We are fortunate to have these works on the same topic from different perspectives and approaches concurrently. Tanaka's work seems more inclined to grammatical aspects and more stimulating to those who are interested in the field of CA grammar and interaction. I found it especially intriguing in the analysis of turn projectability in relation to Japanese particles. Furo's volume is more devoted to situational and cultural factors, and her discussion of floor and intercultural analysis must intrigue not only those who are interested in the relationship between grammar and interaction, but also those who explore sociolinguistic competence in general (in this sense, the title of the volume could be somewhat misleading). The authors modestly mention that their works are a starting point, but what we can see in these volumes is already a good foundation for the cross-cultural analysis of English and Japanese grammar and interaction.

REFERENCES

Edelsky, Carole (1981). Who's got the floor? *Language in Society* 10:383–421.

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

Sacks, Harvey; Schegloff, Emanuel; & Jefferson, Gail (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language* 50:696–735.

Tannen, Deborah (1989). *Talking voices: Repetition, dialogue, and imagery in conversational discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

(Received 31 March 2002)

Language in Society **31** (2002). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404502295056

Rob Amery, *'Warrabarna Kaurna!' Reclaiming an Australian language*. (Multilingualism and Linguistic Diversity 1). Lisse, The Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger, 2000. Pp. xx, 289. Hb $63.00.

Reviewed by Christopher Loether
Anthropology and American Indian Studies, Idaho State University
Campus Box 8297, Pocatello, ID 83209
letchri@isu.edu

Many linguists believe that the revitalization of moribund languages, where there may only be a handful of elderly fluent speakers left, is a noble – if perhaps nearly impossible – ideal for native communities involved in such work. Even more challenging is the reintroduction of a long-dead language such as the South Australian language Kaurna (pronounced [ga:na]), spoken on the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502235058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Adelaide plains until the last native speaker, Ivaritji (a.k.a. Amelia Taylor), died in 1929. Rob Amery challenges the standards by which language revitalization programs are judged as successful, while giving us a step-by-step method for the reintroduction and revalorization of an extinct native tongue, which he calls the Formulaic Method. This detailed case study of what is, after all, just the beginning stages of Kaurna language revival will be of interest not just to linguists involved in the field, but especially to community members and other nonspecialists who are somehow connected with lesser-used languages and language revival efforts. Amery's work is also an important contribution to the emerging field of ecological linguistics and its application to language planning.

Amery's main thesis throughout the book is that the cultural constructs and worldview of linguists, especially of what constitutes a "natural language," along with the metaphors we employ in our terminology and professional jargon, have influenced and predetermined how we as a field view the "revival" of "dead" languages. They are often viewed as at best inauthentic copies of the original, or at worst merely relexified versions of "healthy" spoken languages. The criticisms leveled against Kesva an Taves Kernewek (the Cornish Language Board) and its promotion of Neo-Cornish, and the dearth of sociolinguistic studies of artificial languages, such as Esperanto (which now can claim native speakers, as well as different registers and dialects), provide two examples of how mainstream attitudes on what kinds of languages are worthy of study have affected the direction of research within the field.

Amery writes that we must take into account the language attitudes of the community members: Language programs should not outpace what the community is ready for or desires. In the case of the Kaurna community, they do not believe their language has died. It is merely "sleeping" and needs to be gently wakened. Amery uses the term "language reclamation" to stress the native community's efforts to reclaim their identity and heritage through the reclaiming of their native language. This terminology avoids any implication that the replacement of English by Kaurna as the everyday means of communication within the community is the only measure of success of Kaurna language revival efforts. The author has been the key linguist involved in working with the Kaurna community. His book reads at times like a personal confession, since he has included numerous quotes from his field notes and candidly discusses his mistakes and failures. He also allows the Kaurna people to speak for themselves throughout the book, both in praise and in criticism of the Kaurna language programs and the author's key role in them.

Amery looks to the emerging field of ecological linguistics to inform his ideas concerning language revival. The term "ecology of language" was originally coined by Einar Haugen (1972:325) and defined "as the study of interactions between any given language and its environment." Haugen stressed that the ecology of a language "is determined primarily by the people who learn it, use it, and transmit it to others." Amery sees the proactive nature of an ecological

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502235058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

approach as beneficial to applied linguistics and language revival activists, since "language revival involves reshaping the language ecology through a process of consciousness-raising and rebuilding relationships" (p. 39). Amery also stresses that language activists must be clear on the differences between the communicative functions of a language and its symbolic functions. It is much more feasible for a community to revive the symbolic functions of a language, without necessarily changing their language of communicative function. Amery believes that language revival efforts should "focus on more immediate goals that are achievable" (207), such as reintroducing stock phrases in Kaurna into the everyday speech of Kaurna people, the use of Kaurna in signage and cultural tourism, reintroduction of Kaurna personal names, and raising the visibility of the language in the non-Kaurna community in general.

He has achieved these small but important steps in the revival of Kaurna by using the Formulaic Method, which "entails building up a stockpile of speech formulas of increasing complexity that will gradually replace English in conversation" (211). He argues that this is the most practical method of reintroducing a language that is no longer spoken, although he does admit that "not too much progress has been made yet" (215), a situation he attributes to the identity politics and internal politics within the Kaurna community.

What has been more important in the limited but nevertheless impressive success of Kaurna revival, in this writer's opinion, is the role of the local schools in the Adelaide area. In 1986, the Australian federal government introduced a new policy stressing the importance of studying a foreign language. In 1989, funds were obtained through a federal agency for "awareness raising activities" in local Aboriginal languages within the greater Adelaide area. By 1992, Kaurna language workshops were being held to design and develop resources for teaching the language, and a year later courses in the language were being offered at a local community college. Shortly thereafter, Kaurna language programs were instituted at the senior secondary level, as well. The teaching of the language has created a need for Kaurna language teachers, and at the same time it has generated enthusiasm for the language and its revival within the Kaurna community. The Kaurna language activists have created both a niche for the language and, more important, economic opportunities for speakers of Kaurna. This has been one of the key factors in the overwhelming success of the Welsh language movement: One has to create job opportunities for speakers of minority languages in order to encourage the perpetuation of those languages.

The first contact between the Kaurna and Europeans occurred in 1836 with the establishment of the South Australia colony. Good relations between the Aboriginals and the European settlers were a serious concern of the colonial officials, and the Kaurna were afforded a certain amount of respect. There was general interest among some Europeans in the natives' language and culture. The first missionaries to the Kaurna arrived in 1838, and their work would prove to be fundamental to language reclamation efforts among the Kaurna

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502235058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

community in the 1990s. These two German gentlemen, Clamor Wilhelm Schürmann and Christian Gottlieb Teichelmann, from the Dresden Missionary Society in the former Kingdom of Saxony, produced within 18 months the most comprehensive linguistic records of the Kaurna language that are extant today. Kaurna was also used as the language of instruction in the missionaries' school from 1839 until 1845, at which time they were told to quit teaching in the language by the governor of the colony. Afterward, the Kaurnas' fortunes quickly changed as more settlers came to the plains surrounding Adelaide, along with other Aboriginal groups. By the 1850s and 1860s, the Kaurna were being described as "extinct." Then, in 1919, Ivaritji was discovered in Pearce Point by Daisy Bates. Ivaritji worked with two other linguists besides Bates before her death in 1929, at which time the Kaurna language was thought to have "died" with her.

The modern Kaurna language movement traces its beginnings to 1985, when a prominent member of the Kaurna community, Georgina Williams, approached the School of Australian Linguistics at Batchelor, Northern Territory, for help in reviving the Kaurna language. Amery documents events since that time in a very detailed fashion, describing how decisions on such issues as Kaurna phonology, syntax, neologisms, and borrowings from English have been made by the community in conjunction with the author as the community's "official" linguist. Most decisions have been based on the initiative of individual Kaurna people working with Amery, who tries to enforce a sort of "pure" Kaurna, or, as he writes, "only grammatically well-formed and complete utterances which draw to a maximal extent on Kaurna grammar as we know it from the nineteenth century" (209). He does admit that his own purism has often been at odds with the actual practices of Kaurna language enthusiasts: "I often introduce corrections and changes, much to the annoyance and frustration of language learners" (146).

This book offers much food for thought to those of us directly involved in language revitalization efforts by offering an alternate model to communities involved in language revitalization efforts – one that potentially promises a much higher rate of success because of its much more realistic expectations. Amery encourages us to see "reclaimed" languages not as a replacement for currently spoken languages, but rather as auxiliary languages with their own special niches that carry heavy symbolic weight within their communities. As Amery points out, reclaiming one's language is an important step in reversing the legacy of colonialism, promoting a people's identity, and celebrating their survival.

REFERENCE

Haugen, Einar (1972). *The ecology of language*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

(Received 20 January 2002)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502235058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Language in Society **31** (2002). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404502305050

Mimi Nichter, *Fat talk: What girls and their parents say about dieting*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000. Pp. xi, 263. Hb $22.95.

Reviewed by Mary Bucholtz
Linguistics, U.C. Santa Barbara
Santa Barbara, CA 93106
(bucholtz@linguistics.ucsb.edu)

The relationship between language and the body has become an increasingly prominent area of research within linguistics and related disciplines. Some investigators of this question have examined how facts about the human body are encoded in linguistic structure, while others have explored the use of the body as a communicative resource in interaction. Surprisingly little, however, has been written about the role of language in constructing the body as a social object. In *Fat talk*, Mimi Nichter, a medical anthropologist, addresses this issue by examining the discourse of dieting among American teenage girls. Although language itself is not the center of the analysis, Nichter draws on a wide range of sociolinguistic research to investigate how the body is constructed through talk – a question that will be of equal interest to scholars of language, culture, and society.

The book's introduction summarizes the three-year collaborative study from which the book emerged and surveys the cultural context of media saturation, social competition, and fat phobia that makes the volume so necessary. The introduction also explains why girls are the focus of the study, providing a wealth of valuable facts and statistics that debunk many of the popular images of girls as obsessive dieters. The first three chapters focus on interrelated aspects of girls' relationship to their bodies: gendered cultural ideologies of the ideal female body (Chap. 1); peer-based discursive practices – the "fat talk" of the title – that display girls' orientation to these ideologies regardless of their subcultural identities (Chap. 2); and the actual weight-control practices in which girls engage (Chap. 3). The next two chapters focus on the role of body size in girls' family relationships. Chap. 4 considers the ways that discourses of heredity circulate in girls' projections of their future "risk" of fatness, while Chap. 5 examines how mothers, fathers, and siblings monitor and manage girls' weight in the home.

Most of the data in the first five chapters are from European American girls (and to a lesser extent Latinas). In Chap. 6, Nichter demonstrates the cultural specificity of the ideologies and practices she outlines in the preceding chapters by describing a supplemental study of body image and dieting among African American girls. The chapter usefully enlarges the scope of the study to include non-hegemonic views of beauty and the body, although Nichter's reliance on out-of-date and widely critiqued research on African American interactional practices weakens some details of the argument. African American girls' elevation of personality and "making what you got work for you" over a single ideal body type forms the basis of an intervention program, described in Chap. 7,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502235058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

developed and implemented by Nichter and her colleagues to address the conflicts and questions about body size, weight control, and self-image that confronted the girls who participated in the study. The appendices provide a richly informative description of the rigorous multiple-method research design (which included surveys, individual and focus-group interviews, food intake records, and participant observation in schools) and detailed statistical results of the study. Researchers concerned with language would perhaps want to see the already impressive research design augmented with some consideration of language in interaction, in addition to the interview reports of interaction on which the analysis is based. Nichter makes use of the work of a number of sociolinguistically oriented scholars, such as Eckert 1993 and Eder 1995 on the regulatory practices of image management among European American middle school and high school girls. Such work could easily provide a model for a similar kind of analysis of an actual sequence of "fat talk."

Language-based analysis could also contribute to the discussion of how family members comment on girls' bodies through teasing, advising, and other discourse forms. The gendered roles of mothers and fathers in such interactional routines recall the work of Ochs & Taylor 1995 on family dinnertime conversations, in which fathers in particular claim the right to evaluate other family members. Nichter instead emphasizes the supportiveness of mothers' linguistic practices by alluding to much-contested cultural feminist research within linguistics that argues that "rapport and connection ... [are] particularly characteristic of women's speech" (129). This perspective obscures the extent to which mothers, like fathers, use language to shame or control their daughters, a phenomenon that Nichter also describes. Ochs & Taylor's work would also help establish more fully the socialization of surveillance, for which Nichter finds evidence in the interviews: Girls report that just as their parents monitor their eating practices, they in turn monitor the practices of their younger sisters.

Nichter frequently draws on controversial feminist work to support her argument, as she does in the discussion of family interaction, yet she does not enter into the debates about these studies, a decision that causes her to miss an opportunity to locate her work more explicitly within feminism. A fuller engagement with feminism might also have led her to a different view of her relationship to the girls she studied. She clearly feels a certain ambivalence about the responsibility of the researcher to the community she studies: While she is concerned about the misinformation and negative self-assessments that were prevalent among the girls in her study, she understands the role of the researcher as one of disengagement that conflicts with a critical stance. Her own solution to this dilemma, to develop an intervention program, suggests that researching a community and giving back to it in some tangible way are separate and not easily reconciled. But given the tradition of feminist and other forms of activist research (e.g., Cameron et al. 1992), it is unclear why engaging with interviewees about their responses could not be defined as part of the research process. Indeed, from a feminist perspec-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502235058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

tive, the dialogue that Nichter found so beneficial for girls both during the interviews and in the intervention program is nothing more than what used to be known as "consciousness-raising," the quintessential discourse genre of feminism. This is not to say that Nichter does not exemplify a feminist stance in other ways. Most notably, she steadfastly resists pathologizing girls' practices of bodily self-discipline, which is evident both in her decision to look at "normal" girls rather than those with eating disorders (who are only 1 to 3% of the population, despite sensationalistic media reporting) and in her repeated assertions that girls' eating practices and talk about their bodies are generally harmless and often even healthy.

The most relevant chapter for sociolinguists and linguistic anthropologists is Chap. 2, which describes the practice of "fat talk," in which girls ritually lament their own bodily flaws. Rather than represent this widespread practice as pathological or indicative of girls' low self-esteem, Nichter argues that it is a rich and complex resource for expressing solidarity – a social phenomenon that, despite her suggestion to the contrary (51), is no more salient in adolescence than at other life stages, as a wealth of sociolinguistic research can attest. Among the uses of fat talk that she describes are to request peer support or index equal status through the performance of vulnerability; to ward off criticism before eating; and to display a culturally approved orientation toward self-improvement.

The parallels between language and the body are striking. As Eckert 1989 notes, girls are evaluated on who they are rather than what they do, and so they must pay close attention to self-presentation, both physical and linguistic. Hence, the widely observed (but by no means universal) sociolinguistic pattern in which women's speech is more standard than men's corresponds to the greater concern of women to maintain a normative body size: both, in some sense, are symbolic capital. By the same token, women's greater "linguistic insecurity," as measured by their greater inaccuracy in reporting their language use, may seem to find its match in girls' greater bodily insecurity, as indicated by their greater inaccuracy in reporting their body size (25). However, just as the concept of linguistic insecurity has been called into question in sociolinguistics, so is girls' apparent misperception of their own bodies more complex than it first seems. Nichter notes (52) that fat talk occurs among girls who feel overweight but aren't, but it does not occur among or to girls who really are fat (or those who are very thin); hence, girls are well aware of their body size and are able to calibrate their linguistic practices accordingly.

Nichter is attentive to the details of discourse, and as a result her analysis is richly nuanced and geared to the context of discourse production. At some points, however, she unnecessarily moves the discussion from society and culture to a reductive form of psychology, where many sociolinguists and linguistic anthropologists may be reluctant to follow. Thus, girls' use of "I don't know" to preface the expression of opinions may not require recourse to the work of cultural feminist psychologist Carol Gilligan (22), and the interactional functions of laugh-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502235058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ter need not involve an appeal to psychological states (33). This psychological turn also gives up some of the important ground Nichter claims in challenging pathologizing views of girls' body practices, as when she writes, "Although it is not acceptable for a girl to speak highly of herself, it is acceptable for her to say self-deprecating things and have others correct her .... What effect might this linguistic strategy have on an already fragile sense of self?" (55–56). But there is no more reason to think that fat talk may be psychologically damaging than there is to suppose that rising terminal intonation may create a sense of uncertainty in speakers who use it – or, as Nichter herself demonstrates, than to imagine that fat talk is an indicator that a girl is dieting obsessively. In fact, Nichter shows that most girls diet rarely and only for brief periods. Instead, most girls "watch what they eat" but do not diet; they are concerned with health rather than calorie restriction. (One wonders, however, whether the discourse of health might itself sometimes be unhealthy.)

The emphasis on adolescence as a developmental stage likewise limits the argument's utility for sociolinguistic readers. For example, this perspective is invoked to account for apparent inconsistency or inarticulateness in the interviews that might be better explained in interactional terms (e.g. 18, 214). This interactional perspective is also more useful than the developmental view in accounting for what Nichter terms girls' "egocentrism" (e.g. 199). Where she sees girls' self-consciousness about their bodies and their "hypersensitivity" to others' comments as distortions of reality that are characteristic of adolescence, in light of the degree to which parents and peers monitor girls' body size, it is likely that these perceptions are entirely accurate and are social and cultural rather than cognitive and developmental. Indeed, a number of scholars, including several that Nichter cites, have criticized the reliance on a developmental paradigm in the analysis of young people's lives, since this framework casts youths as incomplete adults rather than as full-fledged social actors in their own right. In Nichter's work, this perspective also misses the strong connection between adolescent and adult views of fatness: for example, Nichter attributes to adolescents the view of fat people as morally weak, but this same attitude is plainly shared by adults.

Despite these limitations from a sociolinguistic standpoint, *Fat talk* is a valuable addition to our knowledge of teenage girls' linguistic and cultural practices. Although ostensibly a book about body image, it is much more than that: It is a closely observed and sympathetic description of the gender ideologies that shape the lives of teenage girls, from same-sex friendship to family dynamics to heterosexual romance. Nichter has done important work in opening up new avenues for researchers of language, culture, and society to pursue concerning the ways in which the body enters the social realm through discourse.

There is one small but significant typographical error in the book: On p. 232, n. 22, Norma Mendoza-Denton's (1996) study of gang girls' discourses of the body is cited as appearing in *Ethos*; in fact, it was published in *Ethnos*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502235058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

REFERENCES

Cameron, Deborah; Frazer, Elizabeth; Harvey, Penelope; Rampton, M. B. H.; & Richardson, Kay (1992). *Researching language: Issues of power and method*. London: Routledge.
Eckert, Penelope (1989). The whole woman: Sex and gender differences in variation. *Language Variation and Change* 1:245–67.
Eckert, Penelope (1993). Cooperative competition in adolescent "girl talk." In Deborah Tannen (ed.), *Gender and conversational interaction*, 32–61. New York: Oxford University Press.
Eder, Donna (1995). *School talk: Gender and adolescent culture*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
Ochs, Elinor, & Taylor, Carolyn (1995). The "Father Knows Best" dynamic in dinnertime narratives. In Kira Hall & Mary Bucholtz (eds.), *Gender articulated: Language and the socially constructed self*, 97–120. New York: Routledge.

(Received 11 March 2002)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502235058 Published online by Cambridge University Press