

## REVIEWS

*Language in Society* 33 (2004). Printed in the United States of America  
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404504212052

ROY HARRIS (ed.), *The language myth in Western culture*. Pp. 227. London: Curzon Press, 2002. Hb \$90.00.

Reviewed by PETER MÜHLHÄUSLER  
*General Linguistics, University of Adelaide*  
*Adelaide, South Australia 5005*  
*peter.muhlhausler@adelaide.edu.au*

This volume contains the contributions presented at the first plenary conference on Integrational Linguistics held in London in 2000, an event at which I participated. The basic tenets of Integrational Linguistics were developed by Roy Harris at Oxford in the 1980s and 1990s; while many aspects of this approach remain a matter of debate, its assumptions and practices have become sufficiently firm to be the subject of a couple of introductory texts (Harris 1998, Toolan 1996). Harris's agenda has been "to challenge the monumental complacency of mainstream linguistics" (p. 3) by pointing out that the discipline is no more than an elaborate edifice built on a myth. As Harris observes, this message is unlikely to be widely welcomed:

It is readily understandable that linguists should not take kindly to being told that what they are presenting to their students as up-to-date science is actually no more than recycled myth. (5)

The reluctance to embrace integrational criticism is reinforced by the fact that it challenges not only established views on language and linguistics but also common-sense views in numerous domains, such as art, law, and mathematics. This challenge is elaborated in a number of contributions to this volume.

As stated in the preface, "Integrationism . . . has its own distinctive contribution to make to the contemporary current of thinking that is often called 'post-modern'" (vii). Its postmodern nature is manifested in the following widely debated (e.g. in Barr 1995:3ff) characteristics:

- its critique of common sense knowledge;
- its insistence that our understanding of the world is contingent on history and culture;
- its emphasis on the social processes that bring into being and sustain knowledge; and
- the integration of knowledge and social action.

The common-sense knowledge about language that is challenged by integrational linguistics is what one finds in most introductory textbooks on linguistics, including the following characteristics:

- surrogationalism, or treating language as a system of signs that stand for or are surrogates of a set of things in the world or a set of ideas;
- instrumentalism, or regarding linguistic signs as tools; and
- contractualism, or emphasizing the contractual or conventional nature of the communicative signs (for details, see Davis's contribution, 142ff).

The communication model underlying this myth, the conduit model, in itself has a mythological character. It implies that we transfer a copy of our private message to our listeners ("telementation"), and that this transfer is enabled by a fixed code shared by the interlocutors. I note that this communication myth has been the target of extensive criticism in communication studies ever since Reddy (1979) castigated it for its pernicious nature. The continued use of the conduit metaphor by the vast majority of linguists would indeed seem a great error, though, as Reddy has illustrated, it represents common sense. The conduit metaphor, of course, is one of the key metaphors by which not just linguists but most educated members of Western societies live.

Harris, in his introduction, summarizes the arguments against the language myth, leaving out details discussed in earlier publications, in particular Harris 1981. Central among these criticisms is the contention that our ideas about language are not natural but historically contingent (the confusion of history and nature, or transformation of history into nature, has been identified by many scholars, beginning with Giovanni Vico in the Renaissance era, as the essence of myth); thus, Harris writes, the term "natural language" as the subject of linguistic inquiry seems to be a serious instance of mislabeling. The historical roots of the language myth date back to Classical Greek philosophy, as seen in Aristotle's model of sense perception (11ff.), and the myth has been reinforced by subsequent changes in technology, such as the invention of the telegraph (in Shannon & Weaver's model of communication) and more recently the biocomputer. That processing of information by human brains cannot be characterized in terms of units and rules for the combination of units is well established in neuroscience (Shanks 1993), but this has not prevented linguists from continuing to employ these notions as essential to their discipline.

Implicit in the criticism of mainstream or "segregationalist" linguistics is its status as a science. Crowley 1990, writing in an earlier collection of integrationalist papers, has called a science of language "that obscure object of desire." A science needs to meet the minimal requirement of having reliable criteria for demonstrating that two things are the same or different, and criteria for saying whether one is dealing with one or two objects. It is noted that Harris's first monograph in the integrationist mode was a critique of the notion of synonymy (Harris 1973), a privileged sense relation central to many theoretical arguments

about language – indeed, to rather futile arguments, such as the protracted debate between Chomsky and Lakoff (analyzed in Botha 1970) as to whether *Seymour sliced the salami with a knife* and *Seymour used a knife to slice the salami* do indeed have the same meaning. The failure to have non-arbitrary criteria for sameness has serious implications for type-token theory and for claims about allophones of the “same” phoneme or allomorphs of the “same” morph, as well as, at the macro level, the debate about language and dialects, as anyone seriously examining standard language inventories such as the *Ethnologue* will find.

The social processes that brought the Western language myth into being and sustain it account for a vast array of cultural practices, including, as Harris admits, “values and practices that Western culture would be poorer without” (1). According to Harris, “In its modern form it is a cultural product of post-Renaissance Europe. It reflects the political psychology of nationalism, and an educational system devoted to standardizing the linguistic behaviour of pupils” (1981:9).

One might want to argue that the contributions of the French Enlightenment scholars in the entries concerned with language in Diderot’s *Encyclopédie* (1751–1772) helped to elevate the myth to the status of scholarship. There are, however, many other, earlier factors, in particular “scriptism,” a fixation on written texts. A particularly graphic illustration of the fixation of modern linguists on written sentences, despite their insistence on the primacy of speaking, is seen in the examples used in linguistic textbooks. (Pop 1971 managed to write a comic play made up entirely from sample sentences culled from linguistics textbooks.) The dominance of the written word is also evident in the etymology of the term *grammar* (from the past participle of the Greek verb *graphein* ‘to write’). Text-based religion and popular understandings of communication technology have brought into being a text-oriented culture. Its impact on linguistic thinking is manifested in the separation of text from reader and context (segregationalism), and the reification of language as the code needed to produce texts.

All of these social and historical factors underpin the ideology linguists subscribe to, which makes it hard to conceptualize linguistics otherwise. Linguists need to understand how much of their subject is a product of such socio-historical forces, and to what extent the validity of their argumentation is dependent on unstated assumptions.

As postmodernists, integrationalists can hardly be expected to subscribe to a concept of absolute truth, and the justification of their emphasis needs to be assessed against (i) the success achieved by their demythologizing of linguistics, and (ii) their ability to integrate knowledge and social actions. Unexpectedly, several of the contributors address topics of social importance: Davis’s comments on the teaching of Standard English in British schools (a critique of John Honey), and Toolan’s discussion of its role in law and justice. Hutton highlights the relationship between the language myth and racist ideologies. Interestingly, Mufwene 2001, from a very different perspective, has castigated the racism implicit in many treatments of varieties of English spoken by non-British people.

At this point, the enterprise of demythologizing language – promoting social action through applied integrational linguistics (if indeed one can separate theory from applications) – remains underdeveloped. One reason for this may be its postmodern orientation and rejection of absolute values. I remain unsure how integrationalism would see linguistic human rights, language maintenance and revival, or the movement for biocultural diversity; the absence of discussion of such topical issues may be one reason why it has not received a wider audience. Taylor, in his contribution, raises an important issue when he asks how integrationists should deal with folk psychology and folk linguistics. Taylor's questions could be extended to how one should deal with names, folk beliefs, and metalinguistic systems from outside the European tradition. In spite of the positive comments on Whorf (33) by Harris, the volume remains Anglo- or at least Eurocentric. This seems to reflect the contributors' own backgrounds rather than deliberate decisions or inherent limitations. Indeed, as Weigand remarks (80), by looking at language as not separate from the world or from human beings, and by emphasizing the indeterminacy of meaning, integrationalism has humanized the subject of linguistics.

Integrational linguistics has been around for more than 20 years now. While the first generation of integrationists were all closely associated with the University of Oxford, it has begun to attract the attention of others, particularly those concerned with the issues of communication rather than with core linguistics. It is good to see that Carr, in his contribution on phonology, is prepared to enter a dialogue though disagreeing with many aspects of integrationalism.

Linguistics somehow has not experienced the crisis that some neighboring disciplines have as its leading practitioners have adopted the Galilean style, characterized by Chomsky thus:

The great successes of modern natural sciences can be attributed to the pursuit of explanatory depth which is very frequently taken to outweigh empirical inadequacies. This is the real intellectual revolution of the seventeenth century. (1978:10)

The message of this collection is that one needs not only to problematize the empirical inadequacies or methods of the discipline of linguistics, but also to examine the assumptions that underpin it.

## REFERENCES

- Botha, Rudolph P. (1970). *The methodological status of grammatical argumentation*. The Hague: Mouton
- Chomsky, Noam (1978). Interview with Sol Saporta. *Working Papers in Linguistics*, 4, Supplement. Seattle: University of Washington Department of Linguistics.
- Crowley, Tony (1990). That obscure object of desire: A science of language. In John E. Joseph & Talbot Taylor (eds.), *Ideologies of language*, 27–50. London: Routledge.
- Harris, Roy (1973). *Synonymy and linguistic analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- (1980). *The language makers*. London: Duckworth. [2nd ed., 1981.]

- \_\_\_\_\_ (1998). *Introduction to integrational linguistics*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Mufwene, Salikoko (2001). *The ecology of language evolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pop, Fom (1971). Memories from the collective subconscious: A tentative reconstruction. In Arnold Zwicky et al. (eds.), *Studies from left field: Defamatory essays presented to James D. McCawley*, 179–83. Edmonton: Linguistic Research.
- Reddy, Michael T. (1979). The conduit metaphor: A case of frame conflict in our language about language. In Anthony Ortony (ed.), *Metaphor and thought*, 164–201. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shanks, David (1993). Breaking Chomsky's rules. *New Scientist* 1858:26–30.
- Toolan, Michael (1996). *Total speech*. Durham & London: Duke University Press.

(Received 23 July 2003)

*Language in Society* 33 (2004). Printed in the United States of America  
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404504222059

KAPLAN, ROBERT B. (ed.), *The Oxford handbook of applied linguistics*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002. Pp. x, 641. Hb \$74.00.

Reviewed by ELIZABETH GRACE WINKLER  
*Department of Linguistics*  
*University of Arizona*  
*Tucson, AZ 85721*  
*winkler2@email.arizona.edu*

Since graduate school, I have seen applied linguistics (AL) treated by too many of my professors and colleagues as the bastard child of “real” linguistics – accused of being too interdisciplinary, too pedagogically oriented, and lacking in an all-encompassing theoretical framework. Sadly, even those practicing AL are sometimes apologetic or defensive about their supposed faults. In some ways, this book represents a coming-out party, a celebration of accomplishments and directions for future research and involvement.

William Grabe introduces the book by providing its rationale and portrays the discipline's strengths and weaknesses. I was troubled, however, by his use of the words “problems and inequalities” to describe the major areas of study. According to Grabe, the goal of the volume was not to provide a comprehensive treatment of every topic, but an overview of the main subfields of AL for which the editors were able to get submissions. This is noted because some chapters were never submitted – a problem most editors face.

Although early research in AL was overwhelmingly focused on second language acquisition (SLA) and pedagogy, AL has grown, and the book's scope reflects that in a limited way. Although the volume still manifests this bias (24 chapters out of 36, excluding the introduction and conclusion, are on these topics), other areas are represented: variationist studies, multilingualism, and language planning. However, coverage of these areas is sometimes quite limited, and other areas of AL are completely missing (e.g., forensic linguistics, artificial intelligence, speech therapy). A quick look at the table of contents reveals the emphasis on SLA.

The book begins with “Research approaches in applied linguistics,” in which Patricia Duff analyzes quantitative versus qualitative approaches to research from both philosophical and practical viewpoints. This is a very useful chapter for those beginning their study of AL. She follows with a portrayal of recent developments and the impact of technology.

“The four skills: Speaking, listening, reading, and writing,” is one of the most fully developed sections. On the acquisition of listening skills, Lynch discusses problems inherent in testing this skill considering how dissimilar real life listening and ESL testing are. Next Grabe outlines the different purposes for reading, including a section on “How reading works” – too brief because Grabe’s knowledge of the topic is clearly broad; if this were an introductory text, students would be well served by more exposure to his insights.

Part III, “Discourse analysis,” contains only one contribution, which focuses on the contribution of this subfield to SLA and its effect on teaching. Considering the scope of work being done in this area, a broader sampling should have been provided.

In Part IV, “The study of second language learning,” Alan Juffs shows how formal linguistics has contributed to the study of SLA by laying the theoretical framework for explaining how language works. Juffs focuses on developments in the study of morphosyntax and how the acquisition of SL morphology is guided by constraints. Although this is an intriguing and convincing piece of research, one wonders about its inclusion, since it is one of the few chapters that presents a study rather than a review of the literature and commentary on directions in AL past and present.

In “Sociocultural theory and SLA,” James Lantolf reviews research on SLA as a social process. He discusses the effects of mediation (by group and self) and activity theory, both of which reflect a shift away from psychological and structural frameworks of analysis toward a more sociocultural perspective. “Identity and language learning” by Bonnie Norton and Kelleen Toohey is an excellent chapter to follow Lantolf’s in that one aspect of the social process of SLA is the development of an L2 identity. Norton & Toohey are interested, however, in various identities of learners who are “gendered/raced/classed persons with diverse histories and identifications” (p. 116). This diverges from traditional perspectives that viewed learner communities as fairly homogenous. The authors provide a thoughtful analysis of how instruction may be shaped to fit this perspective.

Harrington continues with a review of the literature on L2 sentence processing and an analysis of two quite different approaches. One concentrates solely on syntactic processing in isolation, as a “symbol manipulation process” (127), a process that just seems to repeat itself until a correct meaning is magically achieved, without reference to any semantic processes or to the context of the utterance. The other approach involves constraint-based models of processing that are more holistic, encompassing connections to accessible sources of information, both linguistic and nonlinguistic. The constraint-based approach is more convincing

because it allows for differences among individual learners and for the many different contexts and styles of learning.

In “A variationist perspective on second language acquisition,” Dennis Preston extends competence models of L1 variation to L2 learners, noting that they are “managing” their various competences based on the sociocultural contexts in which they find themselves. He provides an astute assessment of how sociolinguistics can contribute to SLA research, and then gives an example of how such research would be carried out.

In chap. 13, Robert Gardner shows how L2 acquisition is connected to identifying with and integrating into another group. Gardner traces the shift in thought from a belief that aptitude and intelligence are the primary contributors to successful L2 acquisition to a greater focus on affective factors. Susan Gass continues by providing an interactionist model as a way of reconciling the often opposing models of innatism and environmental approaches by looking at how various approaches can contribute to a unified theory. Kathleen Bardovi-Harlig deals with the under-researched area of interlanguage pragmatics (IP). She describes how native and nonnative speakers use speech acts in different ways, which results in communication difficulties, and she examines the acquisition of L2 pragmatic competence. She lists the most important questions that drive research and discusses the issues that challenge IP at the beginning levels of acquisition. This is the most coherent and comprehensive of the book’s sections.

The following section, “The study of second language teaching,” is far less developed, though independently the chapters are worthwhile reading. In “Curriculum development,” Peter Medgyes and Marianne Nicolov assert that success centers on developing a curriculum that solves the conflict between “what is desirable and what is acceptable and feasible” (195) – in other words, the conflict among practitioners, theorists, and policy makers.

Majorie Wesche and Peter Skehan look at developments in communicative language teaching (CLT), focusing on task- and content-based instruction. They provide a first-rate account of what constitutes CLT, as well as a comprehensive history of the methodologies that preceded CLT and the influences that necessitated a shift from the view that language learning was all about habit forming and the acquisition of structures. They continue with a analysis of what constitutes task-based and content-based language instruction, and how to make the interface between language and content successful for L2 learners. The section finishes with a thought-provoking contribution by Colin Baker, who challenges us to include bilingual education within a comprehensive framework that takes into account not only education but also language planning, politics, and economics. According to Baker, “Bilingual education is also part of manifest and latent national or regional language planning that sometimes seeks to assimilate indigenous and immigrant minorities . . . bilingual education is a major plank in language revitalization, language reversal, and language activism” (229). This chapter is well worth expanding to a full book.

The following section, "Variation in use and language performance," includes a chapter by Terence Odlin presenting universalist and relativist approaches to transfer; he asserts that the effect of transfer may not have been given its proper due by theoreticians. Although relativist positions are getting more attention, he believes that it is crucial that research continue on universal features of language. Next, in "Language uses in professional contexts," Mary McGroarty effectively shows how this is not a minor side issue of AL. She points out that "language use in the workplace is never only about work; it expresses and shapes the social realities experienced by workers and spills over into the understandings about work, life, and people" (273).

Part VII, "Bilingualism and the individual learner," begins with a philosophical appraisal by Christian Faltis of bilingualism in the school context. She examines the forces that come into play in the success or failure of students, including individual and community views on bilingualism and the roles of administrators and teachers. Then Kees de Bot looks at the language choice of bilinguals. His analysis of code-switching reflects a psycholinguistic orientation; however, the section on language choice provides intriguing links to more sociolinguistic perspectives. Finally, in "The bilingual lexicon," Judith Kroll and Ton Dijkstra discuss one of the most intriguing issues in bilingualism: how words are stored in the brain. This is a powerful chapter filled with charts, graphs, and explanations that thoroughly cover the issues.

The section on multilingualism comprises several excellent chapters, including a detailed discussion of language spread by Ofelia García. Jeff Siegel's chapter on pidgins and creoles successfully navigates the many difficult issues that trouble creolists. In "Ecology of language," Peter Mühlhäusler shifts the focus from internal factors affecting language to external ones, stressing that no aspect of language can be thoroughly evaluated in a vacuum. The particulars of each environment differ; thus, one-size-fits-all responses to language revitalization make little sense. This is an excellent overview of how the ecological framework operates, and how, because of its broad scope, it can be applied to many areas of AL.

The focus of Part IX is language policy and planning. "Unplanned language planning" is as intriguing as the title suggests. William Effington effectively illustrates how ignorance of non-institutional activities can limit effectiveness of intentional planning, so they must be recognized and their possible effects addressed. In "Limitations of language policy and planning," James Tollefson provides a thoughtful examination of why planning has been unsuccessful in practice, and how research is shifting to address the discontent of both scholars and practitioners. Previous research has shown how LP often leads to greater inequity between groups and often has not considered longstanding cultural and legal practices or national ideologies.

"Language assessment and program evaluation" is the one section on SLA that should have been expanded since this is of such significance to practitioners.



Geoff Brindley presents a well-constructed chapter outlining the extensive area of assessment. He focuses on defining the elusive quality of ability, measuring learner output, and changing curriculum development. In “Technology in standardized language assessments,” Micheline Chalhoub-Deville describes current computer-based tests (CBT). She assesses the validity issues that challenge CBTs (most are also challenges for paper tests).

“Technological application in applied linguistics” is an excellent choice to follow the essays on assessment. Jill Burstein and Martin Chodorow consider automated essay analyses and their validity. Like the section on assessment, this is “must” reading for practitioners curious about how a machine could “successfully” grade essays.

In the conclusion to the volume, “Where do we go from here?,” Robert Kaplan points out that the diversity of the contributions can indicate two things: that the field of AL really is not an “independent discipline,” or that this is evidence of healthy and critical reflection on the scope of the field. He lists the “commonalities” applied linguists share and supplies a series of questions that provide an excellent framework for continued discussion.

Many of the chapters in this handbook are well worth reading. Nevertheless, because of the disjointed nature of the contributions as a whole, the intended audience is not clear. The volume is inappropriate as an introduction to the field because many of the contributions assume a significant amount of background knowledge. On the other hand, practitioners in the field will often find simply a summary of the past, present, and future trends. There is little consistency between sections nor between chapters within the sections. Some contributions are simple reviews of the literature and others actual research reports. Because of this, and because of the cost, it is likely that this book be used primarily as a library reference book to which professors can send their students for a particular chapter.

(Received 25 July 2003)

*Language in Society* 33 (2004). Printed in the United States of America  
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404504232055

DAVID C. S. LI (ed.), *Discourses in search of members: In honor of Ron Scollon*.  
Baltimore: University Press of America, 2001. Pp. xv, 640. Hb \$75.00.

Reviewed by HAILONG TIAN  
Tianjin University of Commerce  
Tianjin 300134, PR China  
thailong@public1.tpt.tj.cn

*Discourses in search of members* is a festschrift presented to Ron Scollon on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday in May 1999. The volume is so titled, writes Li, in order to “reflect and unify all of Ron’s research endeavors to date, namely, the dynamic, dialectical relationship between, on the one hand, how members of a

myriad of overlapping Discourses (to follow James Gee's convention) acquire legitimacy of their memberships, consciously or otherwise, and on the other hand, how such Discourses maintain their vitality and viability through self-perpetuating social practices of their members from day to day" (p. ix). The editor has reached his goal, compiling 25 contributions that address a number of related topics in four core sections: educational discourses, critical and media studies, intercultural/interdiscourse communication, and language learning and comparative poetics.

"Discourse" is defined and redefined from various academic perspectives. Viewed from the perspective of critical discourse analysis (CDA), which draws on critical social sciences and systemic functional linguistics, discourse is not a mere text but "semiotic elements of social practices" (Chouliaraki & Fairclough 1999:38). To make this feature of discourse prominent, Gee capitalizes the term and defines "Discourse" as composed of distinctive ways of language expression coupled with distinctive ways of behaving and believing (81). Accordingly, an individual involved in verbal communication has to follow a certain mode of participation. The process by which an individual acquires his or her Discourse has two stages, one in earlier life ("primary Discourse"), and one in later life ("secondary Discourse"). Secondary Discourse is what Ron Scollon and his wife and collaborator, Suzanne B.K. Wong Scollon, call "secondary socialization," or education (Scollon & Scollon 1995:149), in which an individual learns how to acquire membership or identity in the discourse system. Under the subtitle of "Educational discourse," five contributions in the first part of the volume relate to membership in an educational setting. James Gee discusses discourses at school by providing a general, theoretical account, while Martin Cortazzi and Lixian Jin, in "Cultures of learning: The social construction of educational identities," approach this topic in a more specific way. They focus on students' perceptions of "good teachers," "good students," and "why students do not ask questions," and they observe how members of different discourse systems perceive each others' memberships in a multicultural setting. Basing their work on the notion that language, culture, learning, and identity are goals of education and at the same time a formative medium of education, the authors offer an insightful discussion on perceptions of cultures of learning.

In a world where education is often conducted in a multicultural situation, membership or identity in intercultural communication must become foregrounded. Accordingly, the third part of the volume – "Intercultural/interdiscourse communication" – includes six contributions that address the cultural practices of communication, of which three are to be reviewed here briefly. In "Moral norms in German-Chinese interaction," Susanne Günther explores the dialogical construction of morality in informal interaction between Chinese and German academics, and concludes that Chinese speakers often refer to exemplary stories and proverbial sayings when they illustrate moral norms and values. Arja Piirainen-Marsh's contribution, "Identity in

multicultural broadcast talk,” is concerned with ways in which practices of categorization and differentiation between relevant identity sets enter into the management of some key activities in multiparty, multicultural interactions broadcast on Finnish national television. By categorizing the interviewees through the use of explicit device for identifying, referring to, or describing them as members of collectivities, the author concludes, the host manages speakership and the development of topics on the show. Suzanne Scollon and Yuling Pan, in their discussion of the metaphor *Saa Taaigik* (Cantonese for a Chinese martial art, alternative to the boxing and battle metaphors in the West), argue that the conceptual metaphors are imbricated in the history of social practices of a society in which they have become codified as metaphors. They believe that these metaphors are articulated in language and used in socialization to build habitus and become cultural tools. Using data from business meetings, family dinners, and a meeting of tai chi friends, the authors provide an insightful discussion on the Chinese strategies for conflict resolution; they conclude that hierarchy is an important factor in Chinese interaction and forms a backdrop for social practices.

If the first and third parts of the volume can be said to address how members of a myriad of overlapping Discourses acquire legitimacy of membership, then the second part, with the subtitle “Critical and media studies,” is obviously devoted to the exploration of how Discourse as a key sociolinguistic factor serves as a significant tool to help one access, consolidate, and in some cases manipulate power. The critical study of discourse, based on the notion that discourse is socially shaping while it is socially shaped, attempts to reveal the relationships of causality and determination between discursive practices and social and cultural structures (Fairclough 1995:131–2). This critical study of discourse readily finds its echo in media studies. In his comparative study of news production between sociological approach and culturalist tradition, Anthony Fung, by discussing what news is, explores the similarities and differences of the two schools. Particularly concerned with this feature of discourse is how objectivity is viewed in news production. Though the two schools both admit that there is bias in news production, the culturalists go a step further. They hold that this purported objectivity is a kind of ideology, transmitted through the news made by the journalists who work as “persons” within their culture and environment. Fung also relates his discussion to power by saying that news is a construction of reality, but reality is seen through different news frames set by those who possess ultimate power in society. In other words, news frames fix the reality that constitutes the culture. Another contribution, in which Gu Yueguo explores the “backdoor practice” in China, relates discourse more directly with social practice. Viewing the backdoor practice as an interactive process which is substantiated in discourse, the author summarizes four discourse strategies: test the water, implicature, bartering, and delaying. These

strategies are accomplished by way of discourse as the members of certain groups attain their goals in the backdoor practice. The way in which discourse intervenes with social practice is thus revealed to some extent.

Scollon has contributed greatly to Chinese studies. Like Gu, who found himself repeatedly murmuring “unbelievable” to himself as he read Scollon’s papers for the first time (Gu, 1998), many Chinese scholars feel in debt to this American linguist for his contributions to Chinese rhetoric and composition. Possibly out of this consideration comes the fourth part, in which four out of five contributions address language learning in association with Chinese. Eli Hinkel examines the impact of advanced L1 literacy (mostly Chinese) on L2 writing. Andy Kirkpatrick and Yan Yonglin examine the use of citation conventions and authorial voice in articles selected from three mainland Chinese academic journals. Gertrude Tinker Sachs tells how she becomes an integrated member of the Hong Kong society by learning Cantonese. David Li recalls the pragmatic dissonance that he experienced when respecting and instantiating sociopragmatic norms and cultural values of L2 would entail a violation of those in L1, and vice versa.

Academic though the volume is, with a selected list of Scollon’s publications and activities and an index, it does not fail to be a festschrift in the true sense. Among the contributors are the honoree’s former students, his former professor, and his colleagues, who, coming from various regions including Finland, Australia, Japan, China, the United Kingdom, and the United States, truly represent an international community. Layne A. Longfellow, Scollon’s professor at the University of Michigan in 1961, and also a go-between for Ron and Suzanne’s marriage, praises his student by saying that “he has surpassed me in many ways.” Helen Frost, a poet and Ron’s former student, writes in her own genre, “Ron Scollon’s work – his serious thinking and his engaging way of presenting it – is crucial for our time.” With its inclusion of these informal writings in the Prelude along with the academic articles, the volume provides the readers a true picture of a rare man “on both sides of the Pacific, China or Alaska (two places that couldn’t be more different!)” (4).

## REFERENCES

- Chouliaraki, L., & Fairclough, N. (1999). *Discourse in late modernity: Rethinking critical discourse analysis*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis*. London: Longman.
- Gu, Yueguo. (1998). Preface to *Contrastive discourse in Chinese and English: A critical appraisal*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.
- Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. W. (1995). *Intercultural communication: A discourse approach*. Beijing: Blackwell and Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.

(Received 21 July 2003)

*Language in Society* 33 (2004). Printed in the United States of America  
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404504242051

JOY KREEFT PEYTON, PEG GRIFFIN, WALT WOLFRAM, & RALPH FASOLD (eds.),  
*Language in action: New studies of language in society: Essays in honor of  
Roger W. Shuy*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, 2000. Pp. xv, 608. Hb \$120.00,  
Pb \$37.50.

Reviewed by CHAOQUN XIE and BINGYUN LI  
*Foreign Languages Institute, Fujian Teachers University  
Fuzhou, Fujian 350007, China  
chaoqunxie@yahoo.com.cn  
li\_bingyun@yahoo.com.cn*

Many scholars and researchers doing sociolinguistics will agree that “Every language is a social product, and every society constitutes itself through language” (Coulmas 2001:563). In other words, many sociolinguists share the conviction that language should be accounted for in its social context for the simple reason that we live in reality instead of virtually. And Roger W. Shuy has set us an excellent example. Throughout his whole life, Shuy, “a living monument to the power of language in everyday life” (p. x), has attached great importance to investigating language issues in real-life encounters, insightfully claiming “that possibilities for linguistic research are everywhere, as language is used wherever we turn” (2). What is more important and more admirable is that Shuy has shown that sociolinguists can and should contribute to advancing social progress in various areas through their own research work. In other words, sociolinguistic researchers should have a social commitment to use their “linguistic ‘tool bag’ (his well-known term) to shed some light on real-world problems” (577). This finds expression in the volume under review, in which many chapters are contributed by his former students. The diversity of the topics covered provides insight into how language and various aspects of social life are closely linked together. This book should be of much interest and great value to those interested in language in society.

The volume is organized into six parts and 31 chapters. In the Introduction, the editors briefly review the honoree’s research work and describe the contents of each chapter. Part I, “Language and the fabric of society,” contains five chapters dealing with engendered dialects, sign languages, language politics, language planning for education, and bilingual education. Contributed by Walt Wolfram, Ceil Lucas, Reynaldo F. Macías, Anna Shnukal, and Wolfgang Wölck & Peter H. Nelde, these chapters express a more or less common concern that the number of world languages is getting smaller and smaller. Given the threatened status of indigenous languages, sociolinguistic researchers having a social commitment should make earnest and continuous endeavors to honor and preserve linguistic diversity. However, this is no easy matter. As shown by Wölck & Nelde (94–109), for example, even the introduction of bilingual education in some areas for the

purpose of defending local dialects turned out to be unsatisfactory. One source of pressure is English, growing as an international language. The acquisition of English is even regarded as requisite for a better career. The dominant position of English as a global language in the 21st century is beyond doubt (cf. Bruthiaux 2002). However, as insightfully pointed out by Trudgill 2002, English can also be an endangered language in the sense that many of its varieties are threatened by cultural homogenization, inattention to linguistic diversity, or disrespect to local dialects.

Part II, "Language and cultural belief systems," touches upon some areas of language that usually go unnoticed, including the study of folk beliefs (Dennis R. Preston), the relationship between literacy and religion (Marcia Farr), colonial memory embodiment (Paul Stoller), and "the greening of language studies" (John Robert Ross). Part III is devoted to "Features of language in communication." Its first chapter is "Indirectness at work" by Deborah Tannen, who demonstrates empirically that "indirectness does not necessarily evidence lack of self-confidence or powerlessness" (210). According to Tannen, there is no necessary connection between the way one talks and the inner psychological state it reveals: "Ways of speaking do not IN AND OF THEMSELVES communicate psychological states such as authority, security, or confidence" (206; emphasis in original). Tannen is fully aware of the dangers of indirectness when it comes to communication between subordinates and higher-ups, in the sense that the person in power may fail to understand the nonliteral or implied meaning intended by his or her subordinates. Another point made by Tannen is that it is simply a matter of preconception that men are necessarily direct and women are necessarily indirect in real-life interaction. Actually, both directness and indirectness are relative concepts rather than absolute ones. We agree with Tannen that indirectness is "a fundamental and pervasive aspect of conversational style" (210), and that cross-cultural, ethical, and geographical factors should be taken into account in analysis.

Reading this chapter reminds one of the relationship between indirectness and politeness, which remains a topic of concern and controversy. One widely accepted view is that politeness is the major motivation for indirectness, and Tannen here appears to equate indirectness with politeness (207). As argued by Sifianou 2001, however, this is not the case; rather, it is formality and distance that motivate indirectness. Indirectness, as we see it, does not necessarily entail politeness, because "highly indirect strategies, such as hints, are not intrinsically polite" (Escandell-Vidal 1996:633), and because different cultures, or even different members of a culture, may entertain different conceptualizations of indirectness and politeness. There exists a danger that some scholars are prone to quick generalizations, representing the whole of a culture on the basis of only a small portion of research results from a small group of subjects, gleaned with such unreliable methodologies as discourse completion tests, interviews, and questionnaires. As a matter of fact, recent work (e.g. Eelen 2001) has shown that the study of politeness, which is for us an eternal topic of human concern, is still

inadequate in terms of ontology, epistemology, and methodology. The definition and conceptualization of politeness remain a source of confusion, for instance.

At least the following points should be borne in mind when we attempt to account for various key issues pertaining to politeness studies. First, every person probably has more than one discourse system at his or her disposal, and he or she will resort to different discourse systems when communicating with different people; if one chooses an inappropriate discourse system, miscommunication or impoliteness may ensue. Second, what people say they do may not necessarily be consistent with what they do in practice. Therefore, the best policy we might adopt, in our endeavor to provide a full-fledged picture of the complexities of politeness in real-life interaction, is to collect data from naturally occurring speech. Only in this way can we draw convincing conclusions. We should be on guard against fitting our theoretical assumptions or presuppositions to empirical evidence; we must come from practical fieldwork to theoretical construction. Besides, conclusions drawn from one area may not necessarily be suitable for another, even if these areas belong to the same culture; regional divergences within a culture can never be overlooked.

The other essays in Part III are “Standard language and linguistic conventions” (Kenneth S. Goodman), “Reflections of language heritage” (Donna Christian), “When *you* means *I*: Manual and nonmanual gestures and shifting participation frameworks” (Evelyn McClave), “*Just* in English” (Bruce Fraser), and “On anaphora and methodology” (Ralph Fasold).

Part IV, “Places of language use in society,” focuses on varied settings where language use is studied. Richard M. Frankel examines cockpit crew conversations, while Bethany K. Dumas analyzes warning labels and industry safety information standards. Nora C. Leibold tackles pragmatics as “the grammar of rhetoric” (338) through the analysis of political argumentative discourse. Weiping Wu adopts a data-centered approach in an overview of the developing field of language and law, and Ronald Butters argues that intercultural taboos such as sex and violence can affect the outcome of a murder case.

Part V, containing six chapters, is entitled “Language in education.” Carolyn Temple Adger and Walt Wolfram, drawing on “naturally occurring talk in five elementary schools” (394), argue against the relatively established home/school language dichotomy in favor of functional distinctions between standard English and vernacular English. Yetta Goodman and Debra Goodman’s chapter reports part of “a longitudinal study of the dialect of six African-American students during their oral reading and retelling of stories and articles over a seven-year period” (409), arguing that “students of all ages are versatile at shifting styles and code switching influenced by a wide range of contextual differences” (431). This point is echoed in Belle Tyndall’s paper, which examines the use in compositions of past tense forms by two groups of high school students in the Caribbean. The papers by Stephen R. Cahir, Peg Griffin, and Joy Kreeft deal with “specific types of instructional sequences and strategies” (12). The late Stephen R. Cahir provides an

interdisciplinary perspective on classroom management of transitions. Peg Griffin discusses collaboration in classroom teaching, and Joy Kreeft Peyton touches on dialogue journal writing in various contexts. The last two chapters in this part are “A holistic view of foreign language planning” (Kari Sajavaara), and “Old tools, new uses: A VARBRUL analysis of class placement” (Barbara M. Horvath).

Part VI deals with “Language of the young and old.” The first two articles concern how children develop their pragmatic skills in child-adult interactions. It is increasingly recognized that naturalistic, multiparty, or even multigenerational settings are helpful to children in terms of language learning, language socialization, and pragmatic development (cf. Blum-Kulka & Snow 2002). For instance, as shown by Rosa Graciela Montes and by Debra Jervay-Pendergrass respectively, clarification questions on the part of the mother and past events told by the child help the child to construct much longer and more complex utterances and to develop narrative competence. The final chapter of this part and of this book, by Heidi Hamilton, is “Dealing with declining health in old age: Identity construction in the Oppen family letter exchange.” There is no index, but one would have been desirable.

To sum up, this volume convincingly demonstrates that language and society are inseparable, as evidenced in its diversified perspectives, data, and methodology; after all, language in action is language in society, and vice versa. At the same time, the book is unified in the sense that all the contributors endeavor to make use of their sociolinguistic knowledge to resolve real-world issues. It is admirable that these chapters display social commitment; all live up to Trudgill’s (2002:137) call that sociolinguistic researchers have the duty to apply their linguistic knowledge to help resolve specific social problems. It pays to bear in mind that we do not, and should not, study language in society for the sake of language per se, but for the sake of maintaining human equality, helping people learn how to maintain harmonious relations with one another, protecting languages in danger, providing good education for the younger generation, minimizing social injustice, and, ultimately, building a better world to live in.

## REFERENCES

- Blum-Kulka, Shoshana, & Snow, Catherine E. (eds.) (2002). *Talking to adults: The contribution of multiparty discourse to language acquisition*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Bruthiaux, Paul (2002). Predicting challenges to English as a global language in the 21st century. *Language Problems and Language Planning* 26:129–57.
- Coulmas, Florian (2001). Sociolinguistics. In Mark Aronoff & Janie Rees-Miller (eds.), *The handbook of linguistics*, 563–81. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Escandell-Vidal, Victoria (1996). Toward a cognitive approach to politeness. *Language Sciences* 18: 629–50.
- Eelen, Gino (2001). *A critique of politeness studies*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Sifianou, Maria (2001). *Discourse analysis: An introduction*. Athens: Leader.
- Trudgill, Peter (2002). *Sociolinguistic variation and change*. Washington: Georgetown University Press.

(Received 8 December 2002)



*Language in Society* 33 (2004). Printed in the United States of America  
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404504252058

NORBERT FRANCIS & JON REYHNER, *Language and literacy teaching for indigenous education: A bilingual approach*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters, 2002. Pp. viii, 275. Pb \$39.95.

Reviewed by CYNTHIA GROFF  
*Educational Linguistics,  
Graduate School of Education,  
University of Pennsylvania  
Philadelphia, PA 19104  
cgroff@dolphin.upenn.edu*

What is unique about education for the “indigenous” children, those who belong to colonized ethnic groups? Given its special limitations and opportunities, how can indigenous education effectively address the needs of these children and their communities? With an overall focus on this second question, Francis & Reyhner address the first question in Part 1, laying a foundation for both the practical classroom strategies and the curriculum and materials suggestions elaborated in Part 2. Their preface states: “The idea that language learning and literacy can be enriched with the inclusion of indigenous languages is what this book is about.”

The importance of language revitalization is strong in the authors’ discourse. In chap. 1, they stress the value of bilingualism and provide a framework for visualizing the domains of language use and language learning, highlighting sources of input for first and second language development as well as basic and higher-order language development in bilingual children. This distinction between higher-order language abilities and the language of basic communication remains a theme throughout the book, as does the importance of school as a major source of input, especially in late childhood. Shedding light on “the state of the languages” in chap. 2, Francis & Reyhner provide representative surveys of indigenous language status and educational strategies in various countries in the Americas. Though describing diverse situations, they highlight the similarity of issues faced by indigenous peoples throughout the Americas, an emphasis further exemplified in chap. 3 through a discussion of historical perspectives on bilingual education and the influence of language policy and planning in specific contexts.

Even while this universality of circumstances for indigenous peoples provides space for some guiding principles for language revitalization and education, the authors do not ignore the fact that each situation, being found in a different context and in a different stage of language revitalization, will require unique action. The need for such action reminds us that the involvement of the speech community provides “the ‘final word’ on the question of language preservation” (p. 19). Common to indigenous speech communities is the question of the value of bilingual education. The authors reject the “backward-looking preservationist” perspective, which seeks to maintain diglossia by keeping indigenous languages within their traditional domains. Instead, they highlight the new power available

to indigenous languages as those languages enter new domains, “a TRANSCENDING of the standard diglossic framework” (62).

How can the resources of indigenous languages be used to meet the linguistic and cognitive development needs of children in the modern world? Pedagogical approaches that make use of the indigenous language help children in learning the national language, help them develop advanced cognitive skills, and at the same time promote the preservation of the language.

Upon this foundation lies the core of the book, the discussion of classroom strategies for effective bilingual education, addressed in Part 2. Even while constrained by unequal language status and other limitations, teachers can make use of some unique opportunities available in indigenous language education. Some of the strategies offered in this book are relevant to second language and literacy instruction and to bilingual education in general: the use of language in context, challenging language tasks, and appropriate grouping of multilevel learners. The authors deliberately focus, however, on issues and teaching strategies specific to indigenous education.

The most powerful evidence for the enrichment provided by the use of indigenous languages in education is presented through the authors’ continued reference to the building of Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP). As restated in the conclusion (chap. 8), the authors apply J. Cummin’s Common Underlying Proficiency Model throughout the book to indigenous language bilingualism. They build on the premise that CALP-type language proficiencies exist in all languages, including those without written discourse, and that these “academic-type discourse proficiencies and analytical abilities, since they are not strictly ‘language bound,’ are at the disposal of the bilingual child” (189), and thus transferable to academic work in another language.

A perfect opportunity to build on higher-order discourse proficiencies already present in indigenous cultures comes through the use of traditional oral discourses. The authors present Coyote stories as flexible teaching tools, describing two unique stories and some teaching points that can be pulled from them. Through traditional oral discourses, teachers can present elements of literature, providing opportunities to focus on two major educational objectives: academic discourse proficiency and second language proficiency. The authors discuss specific strategies for the use of traditional texts to expand academic discourse proficiency, including text-processing strategies, predicting strategies, conscious reflection on discourse devices, and discovery of structures and patterns to use in students’ own writing. For the development of second language proficiency, teachers can make use of these authentic, complete texts, particularly aided by the repetitive structures in the traditional stories. This applies to indigenous language learning for some students and to national language learning for others, who can use translations of traditional stories. The authors provide specific follow-up activities for traditional stories, along with a description of how cloze activities can be applied for indigenous-language literacy.

Francis & Reyhner touch on numerous issues, not excluding additive versus subtractive bilingual development, cross-linguistic interference and transfer, code-switching, the immersion approach, language and academic assessment, and the differing needs of children dominant in the national language versus those dominant in the indigenous language. Their practical suggestions include a description of Language Learner Sensitive Discourse, suggestions for monolingual teachers in bilingual classrooms, ways to understand cultural miscommunication, and insights into distinguishing and addressing global and local errors. In their final chapter, Francis & Reyhner provide a manageable list of school and community resources, including books, articles, Internet sites, and programs and organizations related to indigenous language education. Extensive notes elaborate on various points of interest, and the glossary clearly defines field-specific terminology.

Although it presents many relevant topics from which insights can be drawn, the book often leaves the reader searching for connections. The material would be more accessible with clearer organization of and connection between points within the chapters. Still, the authors bring an optimistic perspective to the bilingual teacher's challenges, seeing problems as "CIRCUMSTANCES that the creative teacher turns into OPPORTUNITIES" (78).

Francis & Reyhner defend the potential of and provide practical resources for the use of indigenous languages in the classroom, emphasizing the value of language revitalization and of the use of children's multiple language resources for the development of cognitive academic skills. "Independent of the degree of social prestige and utility of writing in a particular indigenous language, bilingual children's academic and cognitive development is tied to opportunities that they will have in school to learn about, and be proficient in, reading and writing in the two languages they speak or understand" (131).

(Received 21 July 2003)

*Language in Society* 33 (2004). Printed in the United States of America  
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404504262054

ARIN BAYRAKTAROĞLU and MARIA SIFIANOU (eds.), *Linguistic politeness across boundaries: The case of Greek and Turkish*. Pragmatics and Beyond New Series, 88. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2001. Pp. xiv, 439. Hb \$125.

Reviewed by MARINA TERKOURAFI  
British School at Athens & University of Cambridge  
Soudias 52, Athens GR-10676  
mt217@cam.ac.uk

Outlining potential applications of their politeness model toward the end of their seminal essay, Brown & Levinson wrote:

[Our] analysis focusing on the non-arbitrary order evident in linguistic styles allows for the relationship between language styles and social structure to be

spelled out in detail. It is along these lines that we hope to be able to use our model of the universals of linguistic politeness to characterise the cross-cultural differences in ethos, the general tone of social interaction in different societies. (1987 [1978]:252–3)

In a response to this invitation that may well be seen, in a broader context, as a statement as political as it is scientific, the 12 original contributions to this volume begin to chart this terrain for two neighboring societies/cultures/languages: Greek and Turkish.

The political dimension of this enterprise is brought out in Sachiko Ide's short Preface: "An analysis of the communicative behaviour of each [of two neighboring peoples with differing backgrounds] makes a comparison of the two systems possible, and by bringing the mechanisms of their differences to light, makes understanding possible" (pp. xii–xiii). The pace of the volume is set in the editors' Introduction, where, following a brief critique of the Brown & Levinson model – mainly as to its cross-cultural applicability (3–5) – the editors emphasize the need "to test politeness in areas other than English," clearly stating the empirical perspective from which the ensuing papers approach this task (7). This volume, then, is proffered as an opportunity not only to move away from the theory-makers' favorite "playground," but also to observe interesting "regional patterns of behaviour . . . located between the East and the West" and to investigate "the results of cultural interaction" (7). To this end, alongside the traditional overview of chapters, the Introduction indicates a potential framework for comparing their findings: Hofstede's (1998) four-way grid incorporating the dimensions individualism/collectivism and masculinity/femininity.

In "Freedom, solidarity and obligation: The socio-cultural context of Greek politeness," Renée Hirschon uses verbal evidence (token gift-receipts, thanking, and hedges of the *if-you-wish* type), supported by anthropological observation, to establish on one hand autonomy and personal deliberation (with their concomitant disdain for hierarchy), and on the other, solidarity and involvement, as the two opposing poles against which verbal interaction is played out in Greece. Indeed, "played out" is an appropriate term, Hirschon claims, because in Greece the two are reconciled by opting for a degree of verbal laxity and non-accountability, attested in Greeks' responses to insults.

Hirschon's hypothesis that a different balance between individual and collective face may well underlie the increased threat entailed by insults in Turkey (32–3) is corroborated in Denis Zeyrek's "Politeness in Turkish and its linguistic manifestations: A socio-cultural perspective." Discussing a wide range of lexicogrammatical and discourse devices, Zeyrek establishes Turks' accordance of priority to group consciousness and concomitant assent to power (56), while being careful to point out that ongoing changes in gender roles and urban vs. rural lifestyles necessarily relativize any conclusions in this respect (45, 54, 58ff.), as well as producing novel forms of expression (address terms, "calque" formulae).

Investigating disagreements and corrections between status unequals in classroom and work settings by using a purpose-built discourse completion test is the subject of “Linguistics of power and politeness in Turkish: Revelations from speech acts” by Seran Doğançay-Aktuna and Sibel Kamlı. They find a general preference for going on (rather than off) record using positive or negative strategies (though bald-on-record realizations as such were rare). Though not discussed in this light, this finding may well be interpretable with recourse to Blum-Kulka’s (1987:141) principle of pragmatic clarity, attesting to a preference for directness similar to that found in Hebrew. Another interesting finding of this study pertains to inferiors’ preference for positive strategies contrasted with superiors’ preference for negative ones in work settings. Though mentioned only as running contrary to Wolfson’s (1989) claims, similar findings have been noted for Japanese (Matsumura & Chinami 1999); this may be explained as part of interlocutors’ identity-constructing efforts, which are necessarily constrained by their socioculturally defined habitus (Terkourafi 2001:183ff.).

The theme of power-laden interaction is taken up by Theodossia-Soula Pavlidou in “Politeness in the classroom? Evidence from a Greek high school.” Pavlidou’s use of recordings of naturally occurring talk between teenagers and their teachers in a semi-urban classroom setting may be at least partly responsible for differences between her findings and those of Doğançay-Aktuna & Kamlı, which were based on a DCT administered to university students. In particular, her finding that teachers attend more to students’ positive face wants, whereas students attend to the teacher’s negative face wants, if at all (117–8), contrasts with their finding that positive-type tag questions predominate in students’ corrections to the teacher (88–9). At this point, the two studies’ combination of qualitative and quantitative analysis deserves a mention, since this is what makes possible an assessment of the relative weight of each strategy in the two cultures. On the whole, Pavlidou’s finding of minimal politeness investments in the Greek classroom acquires added importance when juxtaposed to Hirschon’s claim regarding Greeks’ unwillingness to concede authority.

In “Congratulations and bravo!” Marianthi Makri-Tsilipakou presents an anatomy of two expressions, *sinxaritiria* and *bravo*, which are propositionally equivalent in expressing approbation and praise, but differ in usage, as reflected in their combinatorial possibilities with verbal and nonverbal items. More formal, institutionalized situations call for *sinxaritiria*, while requirement for agency is applicable in the case of *bravo*. To confirm these intuitions, spontaneous occurrences of the two expressions reveal instances of abuse, mainly in media discourse, which are interpreted as exaggerated manifestations of the premium placed on involvement and positive politeness in Greek society.

A similar emphasis on supportiveness occupies center stage in “Advice-giving in Turkish: ‘Superiority’ or ‘solidarity’?” by Arın Bayraktaroğlu. Drawing on recordings of informal interaction, Bayraktaroğlu shows how such relationship-building potential exists alongside the face-threatening aspect of advice-giving,

previously emphasized by studies of other languages. She further surmises that the dual potential of this act is universal, while which of these two aspects is foregrounded depends both on cultural norms and on the distance between particular interlocutors.

Service encounters constitute the focus of the following two articles, which reveal shared gender-specific norms: In both cultures, men show greater awareness of transactional dimensions and lean toward fewer/lower politeness investments. In “The use of pronouns and terms of address in Turkish service encounters,” Yasemin Bayyurt and Arın Bayraktaroğlu investigate socio-economic aspects of the encounter against the backdrop of Watts’s (1992) distinction between politic and polite behavior, and with the help of a questionnaire covering a range of less to more formal settings. Explaining minimal politeness investments in exchanges with a kebab-kiosk owner with recourse to culture-specific knowledge of prejudices targeting particular social groups, they remind us, once more, of the value of situated/emic interpretation, above and beyond universalizing trends in politeness research. By contrast, in “Brief service encounters: Gender and politeness,” Eleni Antonopoulou draws on an extensive corpus of spontaneous exchanges in a single shop, to propose – contrary to an established orthodoxy in gender research – that men are equally accommodating to their addressees. In her data, each gender shifts toward the other’s norm in cross-gender encounters.

The next pair of contributions, “What you’re saying sounds very nice and I’m delighted to hear it: Some considerations on the functions of presenter-initiated simultaneous speech in Greek panel discussions” by Angeliki Tzanne, and “Analysis of the use of politeness maxims in interruptions in Turkish political debates” by Alev Yemenici, use unscripted television broadcasts to analyze overlapping talk in media discourse. Once more, this appears to be motivated by positive politeness considerations in a Greek context, while serving rather more competitive ends in a Turkish one. This finding, however, may well be related to the particular topics dealt with in the recorded broadcasts, which left little space for political “point scoring” in the Greek case but had everything to do with it in the Turkish one (303).

The final pair of contributions, “Relevance theory and compliments as phatic communication: The case of Turkish” by Şükriye Ruhi and Gürkan Doğan, and “‘Oh! how appropriate!’: Compliments and politeness” by Maria Sifianou, deal with complimenting in the two cultures, which the authors view as encompassing a strong interpersonal component. From a relevance-theoretic point of view, this component may be captured with reference to the notion of phatic communication; from a politeness-theoretic one, the same intuition motivates a conceptualization of compliments as offers. Similarities between the two cultures concern a prevalence of formulaic compliments in institutionalized “compliment” slots and to less familiar addressees, with a concomitant move away from formulaicity between intimates, and the female sex-preferential pattern familiar from studies of compliments in other languages.

## REVIEWS

All in all, the contributions to this volume represent a mosaic of methodological and theoretical approaches, which cover, if sometimes only in passing, mainstream views on linguistic politeness. Though it is not primarily intended as a theoretically oriented work, points of agreement or disagreement with previous proposals are noted in most articles. The main strength of the volume, however, resides in the breadth and wealth of the empirical data adduced, as well as the detailed analysis of these data guided by both politeness and conversation-analytic considerations. Finally, the editors should be praised for having masterfully coordinated such a project, as evidenced by the many cross-references between articles, which allow common themes to emerge.

## REFERENCES

- Blum-Kulka, Shoshana (1987). Indirectness and politeness in requests: same or different? *Journal of Pragmatics* 11:131–46.
- Brown, Penelope, & Levinson, Stephen (1987 [1978]). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hofstede, Geert (1998). *Masculinity and femininity*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Matsumura, Yoshiko, & Chinami, Kyoko (1999). Politeness in Japanese conversation between people with different social ranking: A discourse-based review of Brown and Levinson. Paper presented at the International Symposium for Linguistic Politeness, Bangkok, 7 December 1999.
- Terkourafi, Marina (2001). *Politeness in Cypriot Greek: A frame-based approach*. Dissertation, University of Cambridge.
- Watts, Richard (1992). Linguistic politeness and politic verbal behaviour: reconsidering claims for universality. In Richard Watts et al. (eds.), *Politeness in language: Studies in its history, theory and practice*, 43–69. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Wolfson, Nessa (1989). *Perspectives: Sociolinguistics and TESOL*. New York: Newbury House.

(Received 21 July 2003)

*Language in Society* 33 (2004). Printed in the United States of America  
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404504272050

JAMES LOCKHART (ed.), *Grammar of the Mexican language, with an explanation of its adverbs [Compendio del arte de la lengua mexicana]* (1645), by Horacio Carochi, S.J. UCLA Latin American Studies, 89. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001. Pp. 544. Hb \$65.00

JAMES LOCKHART, *Nahuatl as written: Lessons in older Nahuatl, with copious examples and texts*. UCLA Latin American Studies, 88. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001. Pp. 264. Hb \$45.00, Pb \$29.95.

Reviewed by HENRIK BERGQVIST  
*Linguistics, Stockholm University*  
*Stockholm, Sweden*  
*four.mount@swipnet.se*

An edited, modern edition of the Jesuit Horacio Carochi's *Arte de la lengua Mexicana con la declaracion de los adverbios della* from 1645 has been eagerly awaited by scholars with an interest in Mesoamerican culture in general, and by

*Language in Society* 33:2 (2004)

307

those interested in the Nahuatl language in particular. Carochi's grammar on what nowadays is called "Classical Nahuatl" is undisputedly the finest of all grammars produced in the centuries following the conquest of Mexico by the Spaniards in 1521. Its clear and concise explanations of all aspects of Nahuatl grammar are in many respects unparalleled even to this day. The problem up until now has been to get hold of a copy of either the 1892 edition or the facsimile edition of 1983. They are both out of print and somewhat hard to read because they require some familiarity with older Spanish. The volume under review remedies all this.

Carochi's grammar is divided into five "books" containing information on the grammatical properties of nouns and verbs, their derivation and inflection, the meaning and use of prepositions (i.e., locative morphemes), and the way compounds of nouns and verbs are made. The last "book" is concerned solely with the explanation and exemplification of adverbs – particles and expressions that account for the added subtitle of the work, "with an explanation of its adverbs." The grammar is modeled on the conventions of a 16th-century Latin grammar, but it shows a profound understanding of linguistic phenomena that was rare in Carochi's own time and sometimes even in our own. A valuable aspect of Carochi's grammar for the study of Classical Nahuatl is the consistent treatment of vowel length and the glottal stop. These two features are, with one exception (Rincón 1595), neglected in other grammars and dictionaries of Nahuatl from the colonial period. Many modern grammars, such as Angel María Garibay's *Llave del Nahuatl* (1940), also lack a thorough treatment of this topic. It was, in fact, not until the 1970s that vowel length and the glottal stop became integral parts of descriptions of Nahuatl (Andrews 1975, Launey 1979, Karttunen 1983).

Apart from this aspect, Carochi's grammar also includes an abundance of examples of phrases and parts of speech, together with explanations and translations that supply illustrations for topics presented throughout the grammar. Carochi usually starts a section by giving the general rules for a phenomenon and then discusses its exceptions and variations. This allows the reader to extract information easily without having to read long sections of text to find specific rules and basic grammatical information.

The translator and editor of Carochi's grammar, James Lockhart, has published a staggering amount of research on Nahua culture and on the Nahuatl language over almost 30 years. He is mainly considered an historian and philologist, but he has worked closely with linguists such as Frances Karttunen ever since the 1970s. Everything I have read previously by Lockhart has been of fine quality, and the volume under review is no exception.

This translated edition of Carochi's grammar is very nicely designed in everything from the meticulous reproduction of the original layout of the front page, to the highly useful index in the back. The text is presented with the original and translation on facing pages, so that the original Spanish text runs parallel with the



modern English one. The translation is based on a photocopy of the original edition from 1645, and the errors contained in that edition have been corrected by Lockhart. They are mentioned in footnotes, but with silent adjustments in the body of the text.

The edition is first and foremost an attempt at providing a reference grammar for anyone interested in the Nahuatl language without the need for the reader to understand Spanish. Second, Lockhart wishes to publish his own thoughts and insights that are connected to the information content of the grammar. He does this in abundant footnotes that consist of comments and further explanations that he has accumulated while working on the translation. The edition is in this way supplied with a commentary that runs alongside the original text. Through the commentary, Lockhart provides his own explanations, placing them more or less on a par with the information provided by Carochi's original. The comments do not stop at explanations of the basic structure of Nahuatl, but also includes thoughts on the origin and meaning of words and particles, together with alternative translations of certain Nahuatl passages. Some of these notes may seem excessive or uncalled for, but the edition is in all other respects excellent.

This edition of Carochi's grammar is meant to function as the primary source of grammatical information for students of colonial and historical Nahuatl texts, but alongside it, Lockhart has also published a complementary workbook with examples of text. This volume, *Nahuatl as written: Lessons in older written Nahuatl, with copious examples and texts*, is aimed at getting students of Nahuatl and Nahua culture started on the translation of colonial documents as quickly as possible.

The book contains 20 progressive lessons structured with precisely this aim in mind. It also has an appendix including examples of text and an explanation of how to use existing dictionaries. Finally, there is a short vocabulary, influenced in layout by Alonso de Molina's *Vocabulario* (1571), but with vowel length and the glottal stop marked; it contains words and morphemes found within the present volume.

Lockhart is clearly an experienced classroom teacher, a fact reflected in the formulation of the separate lessons. His explanations are concise and lucid, and often less exhaustive and lengthy than the ones found in Carochi's grammar. They are focused on actual texts, from which there are many examples and passages, but these passages do not preserve the original appearance of the texts, since Lockhart has already done the transcription.

As Lockhart states in the Preface, "Nahuatl as Written" is meant to function as a teach-yourself-guide to translating Nahuatl text documents. Together with his edition of Carochi's grammar, it is a course in the foundations of understanding Nahuatl with regard to older texts, complete with the teacher's explanations, since Lockhart himself no longer gives courses in Nahuatl, and many interested students may not have access to an experienced teacher.

Even though one of the more prominent qualities of Carochi's grammar is the treatment of vowel length and the glottal stop, this is almost completely absent from *Nahuatl as written*. In the lessons (but not in the appendices or the vocabulary), indications of vowel length and glottal stops are not reconstructed for any of the example texts. This is no doubt a conscious decision on the author's part, and it is also in accordance with Lockhart's general methodology. Lockhart takes the position that since the texts lack diacritics indicating vowel length and glottal stops, modern readers of these texts should translate them without bothering to add such absent diacritics, except in certain ambiguous cases.

This somewhat shallow, intuitive analysis of passages of text contributes little to the advancement of the study of Nahuatl, both with regard to "classical" and contemporary dialects. Lockhart's method omits one important stage: one where a systematic discussion of the analysis is made together with a careful consideration of what omitted diacritics should be reconstructed for the constituents of a phrase. Without this stage of analysis, a full picture of the grammatical and lexical possibilities of the Nahuatl language is impossible. This leaves only the intuition and experience of the author himself, which, although considerable, is of little use to the study of Nahuatl or to an aspiring student. Lockhart's long experience with the translation of Nahuatl texts makes the translations provided in the volume reliable, but for a student to teach himself or herself Nahuatl using the same method would in all likelihood not result in the same facility at translation.

I am sure that Lockhart would be the first to admit that there are very few older Nahuatl texts that are without ambiguity and thus not open to the interpretation of the translator. This is precisely the reason for a mode of analysis that thoroughly takes into account all relevant aspects of the language in a way that allows discussion and evaluation.

Nonetheless, I still consider *Nahuatl as written* useful to anyone interested in learning about Nahuatl for whatever purpose, since it supplies a great amount of information on Nahuatl texts from the centuries following the conquest. The enthusiasm and joy that Lockhart expresses in working with Classical Nahuatl is also apparent, and this makes both volumes inspiring and valuable.

## REFERENCES

- Andrews, J. Richard (1975). *Introduction to Classical Nahuatl*. Austin: University of Texas Press.  
 Garibay, Angel María K. (1940). *Llave del Nahuatl*. Mexico: Porrúa.  
 Karttunen, Frances (1983). *An analytical dictionary of Nahuatl*. Austin: University of Texas Press.  
 Launey, Michel (1979). *Introduction à la langue et à la littérature azteques. Tome 1: Grammaire. Tome II. Littérature*. Paris: L'Harmattan.  
 Molina, Alonso de (1571). *Vocabulario en lengua castellana y mexicana y mexicana y castellana*. México, D.F. [Facsimile repr. edition, México: Porrúa, 1970.]  
 Rincón, Antonio del (1595). *Arte Mexicana*. México, D.F. [Repr., Antonio Penafiel, México, Secretaría de Fomento, 1885 ].

(Received 21 July 2003)