

In addition to the various approaches suggested at the end of individual chapters, the last two chapters in the volume offer parents, caregivers, and schools specific strategies for supporting individual girls and tackling bullying problems as a whole. In combining theoretical explanations, analysis of case studies, and practical hints, this book may thus be particularly useful for educators, psychologists, social workers, and parents concerned with the issue of girls' bullying in school.

(Received 17 January 2007)

Language in Society 37 (2008). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404508080202

RUTH MACE, CLARE J. HOLDEN AND STEPHEN SHENNAN (eds.), *The evolution of cultural diversity: A phylogenetic approach*. London: UCL Press, 2005 Pp. x, 291. Pb \$34.95.

Reviewed by ANTHONY P. GRANT
Department of English and History
Edge Hill University
Ormskirk, Lancashire, England L39 4QP
granta@edgehill.ac.uk

This book is in two parts, the first of which presents papers on unified anthropological themes and the second, coevolutionary approaches to some anthropological questions, involving the integration of findings from more than one anthropological field.

Three chapters are case studies in linguistic phylogeny. Despite what the back cover copy says, none of the contributors seems to be a linguist per se (though several worked on projects involving linguistic material), and it shows. Simon Greenhill & Russell Gray's "Dating population dispersal hypotheses: Pacific settlement, phylogenetic trees and Austronesian languages" uses lexical material from Robert Blust's as yet unpublished *Austronesian comparative dictionary* and combines it with distance-based phylogenetic computer packages such as NeighborNet, in order to test the probability of the accuracy of five hypotheses so far advanced regarding the settlement of the Pacific by waves of speakers of Austronesian languages. Their Austronesian trees make several grave errors; for instance, they link Chamorro and Palauan together, but separate Niuean from Tongan, bundling Tongan together with Samoan, which they separate from its Nuclear Polynesian sister Rennellese, and they fail to recognize that Cebuano and Hiligaynon are more closely related to one another within Bisayan than either is to Kapampangan. This article provides three major Austronesian trees, all different, and all full of historical improbabilities.

Matters improve in "Comparison of maximum parsimony and Bayesian Bantu language trees" by Clare J. Holden, Andrew Meade & Mark Pagel. This chapter presents (broadly similar) trees compiled according to the methodologies outlined in the title, and relies on lexical evidence for 95 Bantu and Bantoid languages. But even here several languages, such as Mambwe, move around considerably within the tree branches depending upon whether Bayesian or other techniques are used, and whether morphological as well as lexical criteria are invoked.

"Untangling our past: Languages, splits, trees and networks" by David Bryant, Flavia Filimon & Russell D. Gray focuses on the modern Indo-European languages. Their data source comprises the Swadesh 200-word lists compared in Isidore Dyen, Joseph Kruskal & Paul Black's *An Indo-European classification of 1992* (Philadelphia: *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, 82[5]), covering material from more than 80 modern Indo-European languages. Some findings of the 1992 study were startling: Sets of pairwise percentages showed English and the Surinamese creole Sranan Tongo (nonexistent before c. 1650!) as earliest offshoots from Germanic; Aromunian alone rather than it and Daco-Romanian as first offshoot of the Romance languages; and no especially close historical relationship between Indic and Iranian languages. All of these findings, reproduced here on p. 82, demonstrably are ahistorical nonsense.

My overall conclusion is that phylogenetic software designed to construct family trees can produce sets of different-looking and mutually incompatible trees. Unfortunately, many software packages used here consistently fail to identify sets of exclusively shared innovations, which are the gold nuggets of linguistic phylogenetic work, and thereby misidentify the closest relatives of many lan-

guages examined. Certainly the character-based trees in various chapters of this book give much more solid results than the often wildly inaccurate (and inexplicably trendy) distance-based approaches. This book should provoke plenty of controversy.

(Received 17 January 2007)

Language in Society 37 (2008). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404508080214

ELISABETH LE, *The spiral 'anti-Other rhetoric': Discourses of identity and the international media echo*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2006. Pp. xii, 280. Hb \$138.00.

Reviewed by ALEKSANDAR ČARAPIĆ
Faculty of Philology, University of Belgrade
Belgrade, Serbia
acarapic@sezampro.yu

Focusing on an analysis of editorials from *The New York Times* and *Le Monde*, as well as of those published in three Russian newspapers (*Izvestija*, *Nezavisimaja Gazeta*, and *Segodnja*) from 1999 to 2001, *The spiral 'anti-Other rhetoric': Discourses of identity and the international media echo* aims to explain how the phenomenon of international media echo (IME) functions. The book is based on an empirical study of interactions between French, American, and Russian media. As Le puts it at the very beginning, its aim is “a linguistic analysis in search of context theory in the domain of CDA, and a media / international relations inquiry in search of a linguistic method of analysis” (xi).

The volume comprises six chapters and five appendices. Chap. 1, “Media, international relations, collective memories, and CDA,” offers theoretical preliminaries related to IME, introduces an interacting cascading model based on Entman’s work, and provides a brief presentation of IME in light of empirical study. As its title suggests, chap. 2, “National and international contexts for the IME,” describes contexts in which interactions between American, French, and Russian media occurred. Focusing on the textual part, chap. 3, “Russia in *Le Monde* and *The New York Times*,” performs a linguistic analysis of the content of editorials in French and American newspapers. Chap. 4, “*Le Monde*’s and *The New York Times*’ editorials in their national contexts,” is the ideational part that highlights the significance of editorials in their respective societies. Demonstrating how the Western media discourse was received in Russian newspapers, chap. 5, “Russian reactions to the West,” examines responses of Russian newspapers to the Western media discourse on Russia in a given period. The closing chapter, chap. 6, “Crossing cultural and disciplinary boundaries,” shows how an analysis of the interplay among the textual, ideational, and interpersonal discloses the influence of IME between France, the United States, and Russia on international political relations. The appendices present the editorials under analysis, a chronology of Russian and world events (August 1999–July 2001), linguistic methodology, various aspects of coherence analysis, content coding, and a list of sentences related to a negative representation of Russia.

This volume makes a remarkable contribution in several ways: As the first book on the IME phenomenon, it conceptualizes its interdisciplinary framework within CDA, comprising media studies, international relations theories, and Social Identity theory; it presents an exhaustive theoretical exploration of the IME phenomenon in media discourses in different contexts; and, finally, it opens up new possibilities for intercultural and interdiscursive comparisons according to the representation of the Other. It convincingly demonstrates that “anti-Other rhetoric” is dangerous because it can spiral into distrust, dislike, or hate “that exacerbates difficulties and helps them to escalate into a conflict that is more than just discursive” (162–63). In addition to containing well-structured arguments, this book is delightfully written, and it will be of interest not only to linguists but also to a wide range of students and scholars in social sciences and humanities.

Editor’s Note: Readers of this journal will be saddened to learn of Professor Čarapić’s death in 2007. BJ

(Received 29 January 2007)