Language in Society **33**, 769–789. Printed in the United States of America

REVIEWS

Language in Society **33** (2004). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404504215056

J. K. Chambers, Peter Trudgill and Natalie Schilling-Estes (eds.), *The handbook of language variation and change*. (Blackwell Handbooks in Linguistics.) Oxford and Malden, MA: Blackwell. 2002. xii + 807 pp.

Reviewed by Rajend Mesthrie
Linguistics Section, Department of English
University of Cape Town
raj@humanities.uct.ac.za

This is the eleventh volume in the Blackwell series "Handbooks in Linguistics." Of the previous ten, one was devoted to general sociolinguistics (Coulmas 1997), making this the first in the series to deal with a specific branch of sociolinguistics. For many scholars, variation theory (including the study of change in progress) is the heartland of sociolinguistics, though not everyone would go as far as Chambers 2003 in equating sociolinguistic theory with variation theory alone. As the earlier Blackwell handbook suggests, the field of sociolinguistics is broader than variation theory per se. However, considering the richness of the handbook under review, one can understand why variation theory should hold the high ground in sociolinguistics. The handbook comprises 29 chapters, divided into five sections: methodologies, linguistic structure, social factors, contact, and language and societies.

An engaging prefatory chapter by J. K. Chambers places the study of variation within the history of linguistics, pointing to the brevity of this history, apart from the occasional contributions of what he calls "maverick precursors." The official history begins in 1963, when William Labov presented the first sociolinguistic research report at the annual meeting of the Linguistic Society of America and the field saw the publication of "The social motivation of a sound change" (p. 5). Chambers mentions, only to dismiss, the long tradition of dialectology and sporadic studies in adjacent disciplines, and he concludes strongly that "the emergence of an international movement for socially perspicacious linguistic studies belongs incontrovertibly to the last 40 years" (6). Contact linguists might disagree, and in my conclusion I offer some qualifications about the internationalism of the movement.

The first section of part I deals with fieldwork practices (Crawford Feagin), attitude studies (Dennis Preston), and studies based on written documents (Edgar Schneider) and corpora (Laurie Bauer). Feagin's chapter, a résumé of the guidelines and practices that ensure reliable data, provides a clear, helpful overview for first-time researchers in the field. By contrast, Preston's "Language with an attitude," coming this early in the book (chap. 2), seems a bit idiosyncratic,

expounding his longstanding interest in folk linguistics and beliefs about variation. Perhaps this might have fitted better in a more condensed form and coupled with the chapter on "Language and identity" in part III. The second section of part I deals with the tools of analysis of variation, somewhat cryptically entitled "Evaluation." Robert Bayley's chapter, "The quantitative paradigm," is an accessible overview of the VARBRUL program, while John Rickford writes equally insightfully about implicational scales, tracing their relative decline in use in variationist sociolinguistics, and arguing – correctly, in my view – that this state of affairs is to be discouraged. Rounding off this section is a useful chapter on instrumental phonetics and its grounding in laboratory phonetics. Erik Thomas suggests that the field is wide open and likely to develop beyond the current socio-phonetic interest in vowel segments, to other elements of a consonantal, prosodic, or voice-quality nature.

Part II deals with aspects of linguistic structure seen through variationist eyes: phonology (including chain shifts), syntax, and discourse. Using data from Finnish, Arto Antilla's chapter on variation and phonological theory critically surveys five approaches within Optimality Theory, suggesting how variation theory could shed light on these approaches (and vice versa). Although there are problems associated with each of these approaches, Antilla holds out hope that Optimality Theory "is beginning to answer some of the empirical questions raised by variationist linguists" (236). A whole chapter, by Matthew Gordon, is devoted to chain shifts and mergers, not surprisingly in view of the wholesale vowel changes going on in English in just about every continent in which it is spoken as an L1. Gordon's critical appraisal of the topic includes a discussion of near-mergers that later diverge, and the difficulties of establishing whether chain shifts involve interrelated or independent changes in spatial, temporal and social terms. Rather less attention is paid to discourse and syntax in variationist research: The chapters by Alison Henry (on syntax) and Ronald Macaulay (on discourse) are, however, important syntheses and foundations for future research.

Part III, "Social factors," deals with the central issues of social variation, with sections devoted to time (variation by age groups and the "apparent time" concept), social differentiation, and domains. The chapters in part III give an overview of the most significant social categories (social class, gender, ethnicity), the related categories of style and social network, and the less-studied areas of child language variation (Julie Roberts) and the family (Kirk Hazen). The handbook format, with its generous allowance of space for individual topics, allows a more nuanced and insightful account of issues like class (Sharon Ash), gender (Jenny Cheshire), and ethnicity (Carmen Fought) than is possible in the usual journal article or monograph focusing on language per se. The chapter on style (Natalie Schilling-Estes) seems to go beyond the confines of the variationist paradigm in its espousal of postmodernist conceptions that rely partly on Bakhtin and on recent updates by Alan Bell on the nuances of "audience design." These analyses do not take the vernacular as the starting point of analysis. Schilling-

Estes's insight that "stylistic variation is a powerful tool for social change" (392) seems a promising avenue for future investigation, especially in urban third-world settings. Sharon Ash's chapter on social class undertakes a much more detailed and robust analysis of the topic than is typically found in the variationist literature.

The subsection on domains has five chapters, covering well-established topics like social networks and speech community, as well as two newer ones on the family (Kirk Hazen) and communities of practice (Miriam Meyerhoff). The latter two are understandably somewhat tentative. Hazen dwells on a paradox: Why should the family be the focus of so much sociolinguistic interaction, yet have an apparently negligible influence on sociolinguistic variation and change (henceforth LVC)? Meyerhoff analyzes communities of practice (COP) as a subset of a speech community, defined in terms of the members' subjective experience of the boundaries between their community and that of others. The COP concept focuses on the mutual engagements of members of the subset: Practices emerge in the course of their mutual endeavors. This aspect of LVC studies is of wider interest to anthropologists and sociologists attempting to capture postmodern moments evident in ethnic and gender "crossing." In addition to citing the well-known work of Eckert and Rampton, Meyerhoff includes a discussion of crossing in the teenage hip-hop culture in New York (Cutler 1996) and among high school students in Los Angeles (Fought 1999). Peter Patrick's survey of the concept of speech community is a detailed one, doing justice to the complexity of a seemingly straightforward term. His conclusion is salutary: "We ought not to assume that speech communities exist as predefined entities waiting to be researched or identify them with folk notions, but see them as objects constituted by the researcher's gaze and the questions we ask" (593). The section on language contact is a short one, containing three well-chosen topics: space and spatial diffusion (David Britain), linguistic outcomes of language contact (Gillian Sankoff), and koineization and accommodation (Paul Kerswill).

The title of the final section, "Language and societies," perhaps promises more than it delivers. Peter Trudgill's innovative account of linguistic and social typology looks at LVC in high-contact and low-contact communities and, accordingly, might have gone better in the previous section. Sali Tagliamonte's chapter deals with the comparative study of dialect, stressing how constraint hierarchies in variationist analyses provide important tools for meaningful dialect comparisons and for comparative sociohistorical work on dialects. The final chapter deals with language death and dying (Walt Wolfram), a topic not traditionally associated with the variationist paradigm. Like Trudgill's article, this might have fitted better in the section on language contact. And the section on language contact, it must be said, fits less easily into this collection than the more overtly LVC chapters in the handbook. In this regard, the handbook does not dispel the qualms that many third-world scholars have about the way that the LVC ethos of the Western metropolises does not really resonate in their relatively nonstratified, rural, or multilingual settings.

In conclusion, this is an impressive handbook, which does justice to a central school within sociolinguistics in a way that no previous collection has. It is well edited, copyedited, and proofread (typos are few, and examples of bad style even fewer). It will stand for some time as the scholarly reference in the field, an indispensable resource to students and researchers. The editors and publishers are to be congratulated.

REFERENCES

Chambers, Jack (2003). *Sociolinguistic theory*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell.
Coulmas, Florian (1997). *The handbook of sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Cutler, Cecile (1996). Yorkville Crossing: A case study of the influence of Hip Hop culture on the speech of a white middle class adolescent. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics* 4.1:371–97.
Fought, Carmen (1999). A majority sound change in a minority community: /u/ fronting in Chicano English. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 3:5–23.

(Received 20 November 2003)

Language in Society **33** (2004). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404504225052

RODOLFO JACOBSON (ed.), *Codeswitching worldwide II*. (Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs, 126.) Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2001. Pp. ii, 371. Hb DM 178/EUR 91.01.

Reviewed by RUDOLPH C. TROIKE
English, University of Arizona
Tucson, AZ 85721
rtroike@u.arizona.edu

Widely impugned by an uninformed public – and even by many of those who practice it – with such derogatory terms as "Spanglish" or "Chinglish," or "Pocho" in Spanish, codeswitching (CS) has emerged from marginal obscurity to become a major topic of interest among linguists of a wide variety of persuasions in the past 30 years. Weinreich (1953) famously denied that a switch between languages within a sentence was possible; the MLA bibliography now lists 900 titles on the subject, half of which have appeared since 1995. The present volume – the third edited by the indefatigable Rodolfo Jacobson, a pioneer in the field since the 1970s – reflects both this growth and the increasing breadth of interest that has occurred along with increasing attention to bilingualism generally in its many aspects and implications.

Designed as a sequel to its predecessor, *Codeswitching worldwide* (1998), this volume consists of papers from the Fourteenth World Congress of Sociology, held in 1998 in Montreal, Canada, together with some (unspecified) solicited articles. Five of the same authors are present, some partially updating their previous contributions, but overall this collection complements the previous

one. The main exception is Carol Myers-Scotton's lead-off paper, "The matrix language frame model: Development and responses," in which she summarizes changes in her original (1993) model and responds to criticisms of it. Jacobson, in his lengthy Introduction, which summarizes and discusses each chapter, states that "the placement of her chapter at the beginning of this anthology is then intended to set the framework for what *codeswitching* means in the eyes of sociolinguistic scholars today" (p. 2).

This statement is misleading in two respects, particularly in the context of the present collection. First, though all but one of the chapters refer to Myers-Scotton's matrix frame model, some critically, only one expressly applies the model. Second, as sociolinguists seeking for an understanding of CS will be disappointed to discover, the article itself focuses entirely on technical issues of grammatical constraints, at points presupposing a knowledge of Chomsky's (1995) recent theories, and concluding on an almost Chomskyan note: "The discussion has emphasized that the matrix language is best understood, not as an actual language, but rather as a theoretical construct referring to the abstract morphosyntactic frame that structures bilingual utterances" (54).

Jacobson's chapter, which follows, argues for language "alternation" as a "third codeswitching mechanism" which is found where there is quantitative and structural parity between two languages within codeswitched communication. Jacobson's critique of Myers-Scotton seems to involve a misunderstanding of her use of Chomskyan terminology for clauses (CP, or Complementizer Phrase) and a confusion of the relation of the social determinants of language status to internal grammatical features of CS. The term "alternation" is better reserved as a neutral term referring to any kind of successive use of two or more languages or language varieties, including registers.

It should be noted that while syntacticians and psycholinguists have focused their attention strictly on CS within sentences – intrasentential CS – sociolinguists and anthropological linguists have taken a broader perspective, including in their purview any kind of language alternation. A word about terminology is merited here: Most U.S. linguists use the terms "intersentential CS" for switching between sentences and "intrasentential CS" for switching within sentences, but many non-U.S. linguists restrict the use of "codeswitching" to the former, and refer to the latter as "code-mixing". This latter usage is unfortunate, however, as it reinforces the public image of CS as "word salad", a random, grammarless mixture of two languages reflecting a speaker's popularly supposed incompetence in both.

Section 2, "Linguistic aspects: From morphosyntax to semantics," contains four articles. Jeanine Treffers-Daller discusses the use of past participles in the Romance and Germanic varieties spoken in Brussels and Strasbourg, arguing that structural, rather than sociolinguistic, factors explain the differences in the respective varieties in these two areas. Shoji Azuma analyzes constraints on Japanese-English codeswitching within Chomsky's Minimalist Program frame-

work, concluding that a formal feature analysis can account for most restrictions, functional categories ([+F]) being resistant to switching, but word order can also be a factor in some cases.

Ol'ga S. Parfenova examines the extraordinarily interesting situation of Bulgarian communities in Ukraine, considering the impact of Russian on the Bulgarian spoken there. Statistical analyses of 17 speakers' interview data show that older speakers used the fewest Russisms, and younger urban speakers the most. Of these Russisms, 40% were nouns, 25% adverbs, and 13% verbs. A few examples illustrate various functional categories. The author finds the social-contextual effect of schooling in Russian to have a major influence on relexification, while structural factors serve as constraints. She speculates that Ukrainian policy to foster the teaching of Bulgarian while emphasizing Ukrainization will have variable effects in the future. Parfenova discusses the existence of German and Romanian settlements in Ukraine, and of Bulgarian settlements in Romanian-speaking Moldova, which would offer a fascinating laboratory for examining the relative effects of different language vs. different context on borrowing, code-switching, and language attrition. It is to be hoped that someone will pursue this opportunity.

In his significant contribution, Ad Backus, rightly noting that "the literature on codeswitching tends to deal more with the morphosyntactic integration of elements from another language than with the motivation for using exactly these elements and not others" (124), seeks to address this shortcoming by proposing a Specificity Hypothesis that "Embedded language elements in codeswitching have a higher degree of [inherent] semantic specificity," a claim that he tests and illustrates with Turkish-Dutch CS among members of the immigrant Turkish community in Holland. An interesting corollary, deserving further testing, is that "*high specificity* and *low specificity* can be equated with *higher-level vocabulary* and *basic-level vocabulary*, respectively" (129). Backus recognizes that there is often a cline between these two, and acknowledges that social connotations may also influence language choice.

Section 3, "Codeswitching as oral and/or written strategy," consists of two chapters. Erica McClure, noting the dearth of attention to differences between oral and written CS, provides valuable documentation of such differences in the Assyrian immigrant community in Chicago. Her analysis is informatively framed in a historical and cultural context, including technological and dialectal impediments to the use of Assyrian in e-mail.

Cecilia Montes-Alcalá gives an extensive classified sampling of switches from her own personal journal over a period of 17 months while she was a college student in California. The examples reflect a shift from primarily intersentential (or clausal) CS to more freely intrasentential CS as her fluency in English progressed. The data provide a rare real-time case study of change in the performance of an individual, but regrettably the author gives little information on herself or the contexts reflected in her isolated journal excerpts.

Sociolinguists will take most interest in the two chapters in section 4, "Emerging ethnicities." Robert Herbert, in the only contribution explicitly based on Myers-Scotton's model, analyzes how different types of CS may be used in Johannesburg to negotiate identity. The paper is richly illustrated with valuable contextualized examples. Missing only is crucial biographical information on the interlocutors, which would help in judging the accuracy of the investigator's analytical inferences and speculations.

Similarly rich in examples, but with minimal contextualization, is Miriam Ben-Rafael's paper on French-Hebrew switching – which she has labeled "Franbreu" – by French immigrants in Israel. Her categorization of examples by single word or phrase and by type of function provides only occasional glimpses into the purposeful or unconscious reasons for the switches.

Finally, in Section 5, "Communication codes in education," Diana-Lee Simon illustrates the value of CS in foreign language teaching in two settings: French in Thailand and English in France. More contextualization, using Thai rather than translations, would have been helpful.

It is useful to have a collection such as this eclectic sampler of the state and breadth of research on codeswitching worldwide as of 1998, reflected in the wide variety of languages, places, contexts, and analytic frameworks included, though prospective buyers will be deterred by the exorbitant price. Some chapters could have benefited from the vetting accorded by refereed journals, and several suffer from a frustrating dearth of contextual information. The papers by Backus, McClure, and Herbert provide the most original and significant contributions, and Parfenova's survey invites more in-depth and comparative analysis. Readers looking for rich qualitative data or emergent generalizations will be disappointed, for the most part. Nevertheless, the papers together provide a valuable corpus of examples of CS in a diversity of language pairs, and the 304 items compiled in the References section (343–364), some as recent as 1999, will be a useful resource. Rodolfo Jacobson, succeeding in his goal of giving a partial snapshot of worldwide research on codeswitching approaching the turn of the century, has produced a collection that also reflects the current diversity of perspectives and the regrettable lack of a cumulative consensus in our understanding of this intriguing and challenging phenomenon.

REFERENCES

Chomsky, Noam (1995). *The minimalist program*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
Jacobson, Rodolfo (1998) (ed.). *Codeswitching worldwide*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
Myers-Scotton, Carol (1993). *Duelling languages: Grammatical structure in codeswitching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Weinreich, Uriel (1953). *Languages in contact*. (Publication no. 2) New York: Linguistic Circle of New York.

(Received 23 November 2003)

Language in Society **33** (2004). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404504235059

ROBERT BAYLEY AND SANDRA R. SCHECTER (eds.), *Language socialization in bilingual and multilingual societies*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters Ltd., 2003. Pp. xii, 311. Hb $79.95, pb $29.95.

Reviewed by PAUL B. GARRETT
Department of Anthropology
Temple University
Philadelphia, PA 19122
paul.garrett@temple.edu

The title of this edited volume leads one to expect a timely contribution to the literature on language socialization, which has become increasingly concerned with bilingual and multilingual settings over the past decade or so. Some readers with general interests in bilingual and multilingual situations, or with special interests in education in such settings, may find this collection worthwhile. Those with a particular interest in language socialization, however, will be disappointed – and perhaps irritated to have been misled by the title. The volume's 16 chapters present a broad variety of interesting case studies, but very few among them can accurately be characterized as language socialization studies.

Before proceeding, I should make clear what I mean by "language socialization research." My frame of reference – and ostensibly a central point of reference for this volume's editors and contributors as well – is the theoretical and methodological paradigm originally formulated by Bambi Schieffelin and Elinor Ochs (Ochs & Schieffelin 1984; Schieffelin & Ochs 1986a, 1986b). Under their ongoing influence, this body of research has continued to develop, and has been taken in important new directions by various other investigators (see Garrett & Baquedano-López 2002). As Bayley and Schecter note in their introduction, these developments include the application and adaptation of the language socialization paradigm to bilingual and multilingual settings, to later stages of the lifespan (i.e., beyond early childhood), and to contexts associated with those later stages, such as peer groups, schools, and workplaces. A collection of studies that push the boundaries of language socialization research further in these directions would therefore be a welcome addition to the current literature. Unfortunately, this volume does not push those boundaries in any significant way (although some of the chapters are interesting and informative studies in other respects).

Without being unduly rigid or dogmatic, it can be asserted that three basic elements are essential to language socialization research: an ethnographic perspective, achieved in part through sustained fieldwork; a longitudinal research design; and the collection, transcription, and analysis of a substantial corpus of naturalistic audio or audio-video data. A study that does not have these three

features may be of excellent quality and a significant contribution in its own right, of course, but it does not constitute language socialization research. (See Kulick & Schieffelin 2004 in these regards.) Only two of the 16 studies in this volume can unequivocally be said to have all three elements: KimMarie Cole and Jane Zuengler's examination of identity formation in a multi-ethnic urban U.S. high school, and Agnes Weiyun He's study of Chinese heritage language classes in the United States. A third, Aurolyn Luykx's ethnographically insightful study of Aymara-Spanish bilingual households in Bolivia, may also have all three elements, but it is not entirely clear whether the author worked with naturalistic recorded data; the data presented are fragmentary, consisting mainly of isolated words and phrases interspersed with observations of a fairly general nature, and examples of situated interaction are lacking. A fourth study, María de la Piedra and Harriett D. Romo's examination of "collaborative literacy" in a Mexican immigrant household in the United States, is based on 10 hours of observation and a single videotaped literacy event, supplemented by an interview with each of the two oldest participants (mother and eldest sister); it thus has no longitudinal component, but does offer analysis of a limited amount of naturalistic data.

The remaining 12 chapters, comprising three-quarters of the book, make use of no naturalistic data whatsoever. Furthermore, only seven of these can be said to take a longitudinal approach of any kind (Lucinda Pease-Alvarez; Linda Harklau; Gordon Pon, Tara Goldstein, & Sandra R. Schecter; Donna Patrick; Juliet Langman; Jill Sinclair Bell; Sylvie Roy), and some are only marginally ethnographic. All rely heavily on interviews (Pease-Alvarez, Patricia Lamarre, Dwight Atkinson, Didi Khayatt, Christopher McAll) or some combination of interviews and observation, "ethnographic" or otherwise (Harklau, Pon et al., Patrick, Langman, Heather Lotherington, Bell, Roy). The methodological limitations of interviews – particularly interviews in which subjects are asked to give self-reports of codeswitching and other aspects of their own language use, or to articulate their language attitudes – are well known. Yet four of these studies (Pease-Alvarez, Lamarre, Lotherington, and McAll) rely heavily or exclusively on such self-reports. (McAll, in his study of language in the workplace in Montreal's aerospace industry, went so far as to ask his 20 interviewees at the end of the workday to "reconstruct" their interactions with co-workers and supervisors.) Some of the authors note that their research is ongoing (e.g., Lamarre, Atkinson), or that they are reporting on one component of a larger research project (e.g., Pon, Goldstein & Schecter); perhaps not surprisingly, some of these chapters strike one as having been written and published somewhat prematurely.

Like the volume as a whole, the editors' brief introduction, "Toward a dynamic model of language socialization," fails to deliver on the promise of its title. It offers little more than an overview of the 16 chapters, which the editors have divided into four sections: "Language socialization at home," "Language

socialization at school," "Language socialization in communities and peer groups," and "Language socialization in the workplace." These and a few other themes are pointed out, but very little is made of those themes. Most are of long standing in the language socialization literature anyway, which makes some of the editors' most prominent assertions seem poorly informed. Quoting contributor He, they assert, "A great deal of the earlier research on language socialization portrays a seamless process in which novices are conceived of as 'passive, ready, and uniform recipients of socialization' " (p. 4). This is simply untrue: Even the earliest language socialization studies stressed the agency (and the capacity for resistance and creativity) of the child or novice, and conceptualized socialization as a two-way process. For similar reasons, the editors' assertion that the studies in this volume "provide illustrations of language socialization as a lifelong process in which those being socialized often, indeed normally, exhibit considerable agency" (6) is far from compelling. Over the past two decades, researchers have never lost sight of the fact that language socialization is indeed a lifelong process; nor have they ceased striving for just the sort of "dynamic model" (or models) that the editors allude to when they express their hope that this volume will "contribute to the development of a more dynamic model of language socialization than heretofore available" (6).

Several of the contributors make similarly unfounded and apparently uninformed assertions about previous research. According to de la Piedra and Romo, for example, "Much of the traditional literature on language socialization has been conceptualized as a one-on-one, unidirectional process and has focused on … adult caregiver-child communication" (45); they thus overlook numerous accounts of multi-party socialization and of the socializing roles of older siblings, which would have been highly relevant to their own study. Lamarre – whose study is based entirely on ten interviews of 60 to 90 minutes each, in which the subjects were asked to report their own patterns of language use and language attitudes, as well as those of family members and others – speciously asserts that language socialization research, "while generally ethnographic, tends to be limited to one or two sites and to take place within a relatively short timespan. A further weakness in existing research is that "analysis fails to take into account that definitions of situations are rarely neutral or innocent" (63). (In her final paragraph, Lamarre acknowledges that her own study as thus far constituted does have some such limitations itself, and that further research is needed.) Langman asserts that previous language socialization research "outlines a developmental process by means of which children learn to become adults by speaking like adults, in a society whose rules, norms, and values are pre-determined" (182), and cites Schieffelin and Ochs 1986b, who in fact say nothing of the kind, but rather challenge precisely the sort of perspective that Langman describes.

It is dismaying that so many of the contributors, and above all the editors, did not take care to ground themselves more firmly in the research paradigm and

literature in which they claim to be working. And it is certainly regrettable that their failure to do so may cause some damage to the integrity of that body of work, insofar as this collection may be taken to be representative – or worse, to reflect the current state of the art – by readers (particularly students) who are unfamiliar with the previously existing literature.

Some chapters do offer insightful descriptions of situations that make excellent settings for language socialization research. For example, Patrick's study of motivating and constraining factors on second- and third-language acquisition among adolescents and adults in an Arctic Quebec community where Inuktitut, Cree, French, and English are in sustained contact; Atkinson's study of the changing and contested status of English as a target of mastery in a formerly elite college in South India that now serves students of diverse social and ethnolinguistic backgrounds; and Roy's study of how speakers of local vernacular varieties of French deal with the standardization of language and language practices in a bilingual telephone call service center in rural Ontario. A common theme taken up by these studies, and touched on less explicitly by a few others, is how speakers engage with changing political economies of language on multiple levels – a topic of broad contemporary relevance that can be very fruitfully explored through language socialization research.

Researchers from anthropology, applied linguistics, education, and other fields have all made substantial contributions to language socialization research, which from the outset has been resolutely interdisciplinary. It is likely that this particular volume will have the greatest appeal for an education audience: The majority of contributors have education backgrounds and/or affiliations, and 11 of the 16 studies deal with schooling, literacy, or vocational training. Furthermore, several of the chapters indicate areas in which pedagogical reforms or innovations are needed in order for speakers of minority languages, and bilingual/multilingual communities more generally, to be better served. This is surely the single greatest strength of a book that otherwise has few to recommend it.

REFERENCES

Garrett, Paul B., & Baquedano-López, Patricia (2002). Language socialization: Reproduction and continuity, transformation and change. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 31:339–61.

Kulick, Don, & Schieffelin, Bambi B. (2004). Language socialization. In Alessandro Duranti (ed.), *A companion to linguistic anthropology*, 349–68. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Ochs, Elinor, & Schieffelin, Bambi B. (1984). Language acquisition and socialization: Three developmental stories and their implications. In Richard A. Shweder & Robert A. LeVine (eds.), *Culture theory: Essays in mind, self and emotion*, 276–320. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Schieffelin, Bambi B., & Ochs, Elinor (1986a). Language socialization. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 15:163–91.

_____, _____ (1986b) (eds.). *Language socialization across cultures*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

(Received 25 November 2003)

Language in Society **33** (2004). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404504245055

MACHIKO ACHIBA, *Learning to request in a second language: A study of child interlanguage pragmatics*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters, 2003. Pp. xii, 223. HB £42.95/US $69.95/Can $99.95.

Reviewed by AKIKO KATO-YOSHIOKA
Gifu, Japan
akikoaz@yahoo.co.jp

The question of "how second languages are learned" (Gass & Selinker 1994:1) is central to second language acquisition (SLA) research; however, although a number of longitudinal studies have been carried out examining second language (L2) grammatical development, very little attention has been devoted to L2 learners' development of pragmatic competence over time. As Achiba points out, the majority of previous studies on L2 (or interlanguage) pragmatics have observed the single-moment pragmatic realization of a group of L2 learners with similar proficiency levels and compared it with that of native speakers or L2 learners with different proficiency levels or first language (L1) backgrounds. The current paucity of knowledge regarding the developmental aspect of L2 pragmatic competence has led to calls for detailed longitudinal interlanguage pragmatic studies (cf. Kasper & Schmidt 1996, Kasper & Rose 1999). Achiba's study, which carefully observes the pragmatic development in English requestive realization of a seven-year-old Japanese girl over a period of 17 months, certainly meets these essential needs.

In chap. 1, Achiba defines what is meant by a "request" in the context of the study and explains three types of strategies for making requests: direct strategies, conventionally indirect strategies, and non-conventionally indirect strategies (hints or requestive hints). Chap. 2 provides a review of L1 and L2 English acquisition studies on the development of request realization. In spite of the extensive literature on request behaviors in L1 and L2 acquisition, Achiba concisely yet concretely presents relevant past studies and makes clear points on key issues associated with the pragmatic development of requestive performance.

Chap. 3 describes the methodology of the study. Here, Achiba outlines the significance of and need for longitudinal case studies of the development of pragmatic competence, and emphasizes that her study observes an L2 learner's pragmatic use of language from the onset of L2 acquisition. Achiba studied a seven-year-old Japanese girl (her daughter, Yao) over a period of 17 months, during which time they lived in Melbourne, Australia. Yao attended a primary school in a middle-class community with minimal ESL support at school. Yao continued to be exposed to Japanese spoken by her mother and in a once-a-week Japanese school.

Achiba collected Yao's spontaneous request speech through audio- and videotaping and diary-keeping. The tape-recorded data, on which Achiba based her

analysis, include Yao's oral production while she played with friends at home after school. The interactions were performed on a one-to-one basis. Achiba played the role of participant observer. Yao's interlocutors, native speakers of English, are divided into three types: peer, teenager, and adult. One interlocutor of each type interacted with Yao for approximately one hour in each session, with sessions being separated by four to six weeks in most instances. Achiba analyzed a total of 42 hours of tape-recorded speech.

The tape-recorded data are supplemented by the diary data, which include Yao's spontaneous request utterances produced in contexts other than the play situation, along with detailed information on the manner and context of each request. The combination of tape-recording and diary-keeping is a methodological advantage of the current study. This approach greatly enhances the extent to which the study captures Yao's holistic speech ability in making requests, particularly in terms of her linguistic and strategic/pragmatic repertoire. Achiba comments that "an analysis from only one kind of data would have resulted in an underestimation of Yao's command of the pragmatics in English" (p. 186).

Achiba reports and discusses her research results in chapters 4–9, with chap. 9 concluding the study. Chap. 4 describes the overall developmental course of Yao's request realization, with a focus on the range of linguistic repertoire and pragmatic strategies. By analyzing the course of Yao's progress in making requests, Achiba identifies four phases, each with distinct characteristics. Phase 1 (the first 12 weeks) is characterized by the frequent use of routine formulas such as *it's my turn*, *hang on*, and imperative phrases. In Phase 2 (weeks 13 through 31) there is a marked shift from formulaic language to productive language, as evidenced by Yao's use of longer, more elaborate, and more specific sentences, such as *can I have a look at that book please?* rather than *can I have a look?* Achiba also reports a remarkable increase in conventionally indirect strategies during this phase. In Phase 3 (weeks 32 through 61) Yao showed dramatic development in her sociolinguistic competence. For example, she started to use a mitigation strategy by choosing the *could you (I) . . . ?* form rather than the *can you (I) . . . ?* form. In addition, Yao began to differentiate request expressions appropriately according to social contexts such as the addressee and the goal of the request. Moreover, in this phase Yao became able to reiterate her requestive intentions by employing different request forms rather than merely repeating the same form. Phase 4 (weeks 62 through 75) is characterized by increasing sophistication in Yao's social use of language, with Yao's repertoire of conventionally indirect strategies becoming noticeably richer. Another distinctive characteristic of this phase was Yao's frequent use of the past-tense modals, which function as mitigation devices.

Chap. 5 is concerned with Yao's use of hints. In the investigation of hints, the qualitative analysis seems more important than the quantitative analysis because the overall frequency of hints used by Yao was very low (2.6% of all requests produced) throughout the study period. Achiba observes that, although Yao spec-

ified the desired objects or actions in the early phases, she veiled them with no grammatical reference in the later phases. In addition, Achiba notes that "Yao's use of hints appears to be independent of other strategies" (92). This observation is interesting, considering that other studies (e.g. Ervin-Tripp 1997) suggest that the use of hints is related to the overall development in request strategies. Ervin-Tripp argues that the frequent use of hints appears when children learn effectively to "unmark" requests – that is, when they become adults.

In chaps. 6 and 7, Achiba investigates the relationships between variations in the use of request and two social factors, request goals (chap. 6) and addressees (chap. 7), which are generally considered to be the most influential social factors influencing variation in request behavior. Achiba also looks at the development of Yao's request production in relation to these social factors. Overall, it was found that Yao differentiated her request strategies and forms according to the request goal and addressee.

Chap. 6 includes probably the most intriguing finding of this study: that Yao's request realization shows different developmental patterns depending on the type of request goal. Yao's strong tendency to choose direct strategies when requesting cessation of action did not change throughout the course of her pragmatic development. Also, her strong preference for conventionally indirect strategies when requesting joint activity did not change over time. In contrast, however, her choice of strategies when requesting goods or the initiation of action changed considerably over time. Yao was very likely to use direct strategies to request goods in Phase 1, whereas from Phase 2 on she showed a clear preference for conventionally indirect strategies. Regarding the request strategies for the initiation of action, Yao's strong preference in Phase 1 for direct strategies was weakened from Phase 2 on by her increasing use of conventionally indirect strategies.

In chap. 8, Achiba shifts the focus of the study to modification employed in Yao's request production. Here, Achiba particularly focuses on lexical/phrasal modifiers, reiterations, and support moves, and analyzes them in relation to developmental phases, request strategy types, request goals, and addressees. Overall, Yao's use of request modification was refined over time, as seen in the facts that the mere use of attention getters and repetitions decreased, and in turn, the deployment of reasons and toners (e.g. *just*, *maybe*) increased across the developmental phases. Another important finding provided in this chapter is the apparent existence of interrelationships among the use of modifiers, request strategies, and request goals. One of the most distinctive patterns was that Yao predominantly used *please* with conventionally indirect strategies and for the goal of requesting goods.

Probably because of the longitudinal nature of this study, which pays particular attention to what the learner comes to be able to perform with the target language, and not necessarily why, the study does not consider the learner's L1 influence in terms of either L1 positive or negative transfer. This aspect deserves further study. In addition, Achiba mentions limitations of her study resulting

from the use of the play situation as the setting for the core observations of the study. Because the study was based on play situations, which require less facework than other interactions, the results showed a lesser effect of the addressee factor on the request variation than expected. Overall, however, this study provides a number of important and illuminating findings on the pragmatic development of the L2 learner and methodological insights that should be of great value to researchers in this area.

REFERENCES

Ervin-Tripp, Susan (1977). Wait for me, roller skate! In Susan Ervin-Tripp & Claudia Mitchell-Kernan (eds.), *Child discourse*, 165–88. New York: Academic Press.

Gass, Susan M., & Selinker, Larry (1994). *Second language acquisition: An introductory course*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Kasper, Gabriele, & Rose, Kenneth R. (1999). Pragmatics and SLA. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 19:81–104.

_____, & Schmidt, Richard (1996). Developmental issues in interlanguage pragmatics. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 18:149–69.

(Received 3 November 2003)

Language in Society **33** (2004). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404504255051

ANDREW DALBY, *Language in danger: The loss of linguistic diversity and the threat to our future*. New York: Columbia University Press. 329 pages. Hb $27.95.

Reviewed by KEVIN J. ROTTET
French and Italian, Indiana University
Bloomington, IN 47405
krottet@indiana.edu

Recent years have seen several general introductions to the study of endangered languages, aimed primarily at readers with no special training in linguistics. This is true of Dalby's book as well, and he succeeds in providing the general public with a highly readable account of a current and important linguistic topic.

One of the most original aspects of Dalby's presentation is his examination of two ancient cases, the spread of Latin and Greek throughout the Mediterranean world, for the light they can shed on modern cases. He calculates that of the approximately 60 languages that were spoken all around the Mediterranean in 100 BCE, only ten would survive, a rate of less than 17%. The ill-fated languages – such as Gaulish, Etruscan, Oscan, Tartessian, and Punic – are not usually considered in language death studies, in part because the antiquity of their disappearance puts them well before the perceived linguistic crisis motivating most studies of endangered languages today. Dalby brings together quotes from

various Classical writers and commentators, from Apuleius and Ausonius to Quintilian, for insights into the linguistic picture of ancient times. Some interesting parallels with modern cases emerge, including evidence that Gaulish and Lydian lingered on longest as languages of magical incantations and spells, or that parents of young children in the various colonies of the Roman Empire would have been motivated to speak Latin to their progeny rather than their traditional ethnic tongues in order to give them a head start in exercising the various rights associated with Roman citizenship. This desire to provide one's children with the tools necessary for success in the dominant society motivates language shift in many linguistic minority families today.

In a later chapter, "How to become a global language," the rise and spread of Latin in and after the days of the Roman Empire is compared with that of English, propelled to its global role during and after the heyday of the British Empire. Dalby identifies three routes of spread that these two cases share: colonization, "government and what it brings," and long-distance trade, notably trade by sea. After a discussion of how English loanwords have penetrated nearly every language on earth, Dalby catalogs a number of terms (mostly flora and fauna names) characterizing local varieties of English around the world, the primary purpose of which seems to be to show that the differences between such local varieties are really fairly trivial. He goes on to argue that the different world Englishes will not grow further apart, owing to television and the Internet (p. 206), thus implicitly rejecting the claim sometimes made that language death, even on a massive scale, is nothing to worry about because linguistic diversity will re-emerge sooner or later.

The comparison of the ancient spread of Latin with the modern spread of English goes only so far, of course, and Dalby makes it clear that the eventual outcome of the latter promises to be very different from that of the former. Early in his book, he hypothesizes that "large centralized political units" promote a decline in the number of languages spoken within their territories, and that as long as the world "goes on being apportioned among such units, the total number of languages in the world will go on falling" (38). Judging by his rather conservative estimate of around 5,000 languages spoken on earth today (ix), Dalby's view of the prospects for linguistic diversity is rather more pessimistic than most; if the number of languages is halved in 100 years, only national languages will be left in 200 years, and from there it won't be long until English is the only language still spoken (279–80).

Some of the mechanisms of linguistic decline are explored in chap. 4. After briefly surveying some countries where multilingual policies are in place, Dalby examines countries with a history of attempting to suppress linguistic variation within their borders. He considers the French Revolution to mark the beginning of the ideology of linguistic nationalism that would seek to wipe out all other languages and dialects from French soil in favor of the speech of Paris. The focus then turns to the long and all too successful policies of the American

government to suppress the indigenous languages of the United States. Dalby brings home the point that by the time such policies were officially altered, in the 1990s, it was too late to reverse the decline that most of these languages had entered.

One of the major tasks involved in writing a book about language endangerment for the general public is that of convincing readers that the large-scale loss of multilingualism would not be a good thing. The essay "When we lose a language" (chap. 6) develops the now familiar argument that important ethnobotanical knowledge is usually lost along with a language. A number of today's important drugs started out as local herbal remedies of small ethnic groups, and we may never know what other remedies have been lost along with the languages and traditional cultures of their speakers. Many now vanished languages enjoy a kind of "afterlife" in the form of loanwords that live on in the vocabularies of the languages that ultimately swallowed them up. Dalby illustrates this with English borrowings from a number of now defunct indigenous North American and Australian Aboriginal languages. Many other languages are "Lost without a trace" (239); they go into oblivion having left no legacy via lexical borrowing, and often without having even been recorded. Here the focus is on the indigenous languages of California, the region of North America where the scale of language loss is the most dramatic.

Another approach to convincing the reader of the tragedy of language loss is found in the essay "The loss of diversity" (chap. 7), which begins by discussing the difficulties of translation between different languages as a way of pointing to their inherent differences. This leads into a discussion of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, and Dalby argues in favor of the weaker version, linguistic relativity (the notion that different languages embody different worldviews), stopping just short of fully endorsing the stronger view, linguistic determinism (that speakers of a language are impelled by their language to think in particular ways). Linguistic relativity is an important part of Dalby's argument in favor of preserving linguistic diversity: "It is only a bilingual who can really show us what there is to learn from the way the world is mapped and classified in another language" (272). Dalby argues that we need linguistic diversity in order to keep our own language flexible; human creativity depends a great deal on contact with the other ways of conceptualizing reality that other languages represent.

Dalby's book does not seek to be a textbook for a graduate linguistics course, and owing to its largely nontechnical approach it would not lend itself well to such a course (for example, the term *semi-speakers*, a technical term in the linguistic literature, is defined simply as "people who know only a little of the traditional language" [248]). The book does, however, succeed in presenting its topic in an engaging and thoughtful way to the general educated public, and as such it is a very recommendable volume and an enjoyable read.

(Received 5 November 2003)

Language in Society **33** (2004). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404504265058

STEPHEN J. NAGLE AND SARA L. SANDERS (EDS.), *English in the southern United States*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003. Pp. xiv, 244. Hb $55.00

Reviewed by CHARLES DEBOSE
English, California State University, Hayward
Hayward, CA 94542
cdebose@csuhayward.edu

As I reflect on what is distinctive about this book, the word "seamless" comes to mind. Having experienced my share of multi-authored "readers," pieced together around a broad subject representing diverse and sometimes conflicting, even contradictory, approaches, I find it refreshing to encounter an anthology that succeeds in introducing major questions in which leading scholars are currently engaged, and presenting them in sufficient detail and sophistication to serve as an invitation to join in the work.

The various contributions effectively fuse into a seamless product with several major themes, two of which I discuss in detail below. One concerns the relationship of Southern English to British dialects, the so-called British retentions hypothesis. The other involves the relationship of Southern English to African American language.

The notion of seamlessness may be applied not only to the manner in which the various contributions relate to the above themes, but also the notion – implicit in one of them – that Southern dialect and African American language are subcomponents of a single complex diachronic development with overlapping synchronic features. A third way in which the book achieves a seamless quality is in its function as a teaching tool. In that capacity, it benefits from the familiarity with dialects that most readers have as a consequence of their everyday experience. Their commonsense experience of the DIFFERENCE of British English from all varieties of American English, including Southern, provides a great platform for introduction of the British retentions theme. At a more general level, the notion of dialect that lay learners tend to bring with them into the classroom – an exotic entity spoken by others – can serve as the basis for a seamless transition to the more technical ways in which dialect is treated in linguistics.

As a teaching tool, the book has a number of advantages, including the fact that it is written with the conscious purpose of taking readers from an introductory to a more advanced level of understanding. A noteworthy example of how this end is accomplished is the inclusion of "Southern drawl" on several contributors' lists of core Southern features. At the same time that students learn the inadequacy of certain popular words for Southern dialect, such as *twang*, they learn that one such word, *drawl*, has a place in the technical lexicon of the field.

Students and other newcomers to the field of linguistics are provided a good introduction to many of the subtleties and complexities of the subject of lan-

guage in the opening chapter by John Algeo, "The origins of Southern American English." Algeo cautions readers to bear in mind that "Most talk about languages and their history – like talk about everything else – is metaphorical" (6). Against that backdrop, the importance of Algeo's point that "Southern American English is not a thing or a single entity" (8) is underscored, and students are better prepared to weight the specific arguments and supporting evidence presented in the following chapters.

The British retentions theme is developed by contrasting a default view that Southern English is composed of elements traceable to the British Isles, to the idea that many of the core features of Southern speech are innovations that occurred on American soil after the Civil War. The popular misconception that Southern dialect is a quaint relic of Elizabethan English is evoked by the title of Edgar Schneider's chap. 2, "Shakespeare in the coves and hollows?" Schneider's contribution is one of several that effectively utilize linguistic data from diverse sources to support their position on this issue. Schneider laments the limited availability of "direct written records of the speech forms of earlier days that we are interested in," as he proceeds to discuss several useful sources at length, including a collection of *Tennessee Civil War veterans questionnaires*, and *The Southern plantation overseer's corpus*. He concludes with a very firm rejection of the notion that "Southern English is essentially a retention of older British dialectal forms," insisting that such claims "simply cannot be upheld" (34).

Chap. 3, by Laura Wright, continues the interest in useful data sources begun in Schneider's piece. Without expressing a position on the British retentions issue, she presents data from London court and prison records which indicate that a number of features found in present-day Southern speech existed in the speech of prisoners included among the first settlers of the American colonies. The features selected for analysis call attention to the Southern vs. African American theme in that they include "invariant be," "third-person present-tense indicative singular zero," and "the zero-marked possessive." Wright weaves into her article discussion of relevant issues in African American language studies in a manner that is typical of most contributions to the book. The next two articles, however – by Salikoko Mufwene, and Patricia Cukor-Avila, respectively – deal directly with African American language.

Mufwene's contribution departs sharply from the data-oriented emphases of the previous articles in a manner faithful to its title, "The shared ancestry of African American and American White Southern Englishes: Some speculations dictated by history." While Mufwene's characterization of his argument as speculative is pretty accurate, he does cite "Evidence provided by the socioeconomic history of the United States" in support of "the Divergence Hypothesis." In a far-reaching argument based on such diverse factors as rice vs. tobacco/cotton agriculture and "the mulatto phenomenon," Mufwene makes the case that "AAVE shares many features with white nonstandard vernaculars and could not have developed from an erstwhile creole" (65).

Cukor-Avila's contribution, "The complex grammatical history of African-American and white vernaculars in the South," begins with a systematic discussion of the various schools of thought that have contributed to the debate, including a section on "the divergence controversy," and discusses recent research that has served "to keep the divergence hypothesis alive"; she notes that the term "linguistic innovations" has replaced "divergence." The main focus of Cukor-Avila's article is a corpus of data collected in Springville, Texas, from white and African American subjects, and analyzed for the presence of selected grammatical features. The data presented contribute to the need for precise formulation of the nature and extent of overlap in the grammars of Black and White Southern varieties by pinpointing structures found in "AAVE grammar" but "not present in white vernaculars."

The next chapter, by Cynthia Bernstein, focuses on three features which the author contends are "uniquely Southern": *yall*, *might could*, and *fixin to*. Following that are two articles on Southern phonology. The first, by George Dorrill, includes the above-mentioned treatment of "Southern drawl." The second, by Crawford Feagin, on "Vowel shifting in the Southern states," includes a brief section on "African-American vowel shifting" in which she points out that "Southern Shift is not taking place in the Black community" (128), an assertion that provides tacit support for the divergence hypothesis.

The following article, Walt Wolfram on "Enclave dialect communities in the South," deals primarily with dialects in North Carolina that Wolfram and his associates are currently studying. Inclusion of a brief reference at the beginning of the article to work by Poplack and colleagues on Samamá English is curious because that community is located in the Dominican Republic, outside the scope limited by the title. The omission of references to Samamá English data offered by other scholars in support of the creolist hypothesis contributes to the impression that subtle promotion of a pro-divergence view is an intentional feature of the book. If such is the case, anyone thinking about using it as a textbook would be well advised to assign supplemental readings that contribute to a balanced presentation of relevant issues.

The British retentions theme is picked up again in Jan Tillery & Guy Bailey's article (chap. 10), "Urbanization and Southern American English." It examines several phonological and grammatical features that support the conclusion that Southern English is "not a conservative dialect bound to its past, but rather a dynamic, innovative variety that has experienced rapid, fundamental change over the last century and a quarter" (171).

Neither of the last two chapters – "The Englishes of southern Louisiana" by Connie Eble, and "Features and uses of Southern style" by Barbara Johnstone – deals directly or covertly with either the divergence hypothesis or the British retentions theme. The latter article refers to the extensive literature on African American discourse styles and discusses possible ways in which particular features of African American discourse may have influenced speech styles of white

Southerners. Both pieces draw strength from the popularity of the subject matter and contribute to the book's pedagogical value.

Dedicated to Michael Montgomery, the book is a fitting acknowledgment of his iconic status in Southern language and cultural studies. Although none of the contributions bears his name, they all are replete with indications of his towering influence over the field.

(Received 11 November 2003)