Most poignant of all is Jeutonne Brewer, who shed the researcher's cloak in her piece and chose instead to write as a caregiver wrestling with and watching her loved one battle the ravages of the ailment. Gone is the breaking down of language into discrete parts; absent is the analytic "researcher's" voice. What is palpable is one caregiver's anguish as she watches her partner struggle with the ailment. It was the language in this piece and the metaphors in Hamilton's essay (about how Alzheimer research has been dealt with) that moved my thinking to another plane and made me wonder: Is it perhaps time for those of us interested in the social aspects of aging to pay closer attention to our languaging about the disease? While we have needed to rebut psycholinguistic work by making nuanced arguments about the value of addressing interlocutors, settings, times, and caregivers, perhaps we can now begin to turn the critical lens on ourselves, assuming a self-reflexive position whereby we evaluate how we contribute to interactions with and images of AD patients. While I tried to do something like this 10 years ago in my book (Ramanathan 1997), I don't believe I had pushed myself far enough. Brewer's and Hamilton's pieces make me realize that our researching language sometimes falls desperately short and that this, along with the other discourse features that we analyze, needs critical examination as well.

Boyd Davis is to be congratulated on bringing these authors together into this book. It makes me want to be able to use it as a reader in a course, and doing that might mean that I would eventually find my way back to this research space.

REFERENCE

Ramanathan, V. (1997). *Alzheimer discourse: Some sociolinguistic dimensions*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

(Received 7 March 2006)

KEES DE BOT AND SINFREE MAKONI, *Language and aging in multilingual contexts*. (Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 53.) Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters, 2005. Pp.vi., 162. Hb. $99.95.

Reviewed by BOYD DAVIS
English, University of North Carolina-Charlotte
North Carolina, USA
bdavis@email.uncc.edu

This book raises many questions. Depending on one's disciplinary perspective, this slim volume could be seen as uneven in its coverage and, as one reviewer has commented, its intended audience is not always clear (Chen 2006). Notwithstanding, it is an important book, on two levels. Its ostensible purpose is to present a contextualizing summary of language and aging, designed to tug readers away

from a monolingual, Eurocentric focus. Beneath and through its chapters runs its second stream of thought, an effort to push readers to understand that many older people, and especially those speaking more than one language, are aging out-of-place, dis-placed, cut off by new caretaking venues and other-languaged caregivers, from their own places, those sites once indexed by their language (Lamb 2000, Neilson 2003). As Arjun Appadurai comments in an interview, "Sites, in the sense of secure locations for the practices of everyday life, may have largely vanished" (Baldauf & Hoeller 1999). What we have previously assumed about adult language, and about language and aging processes, may also need to change.

The introduction and conclusion bookend three sections: chaps. 2–5 set up a context examining language with, about, from, and to aging people. These chapters use sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic perspectives, with multiple citations to the research base developed by intersections between linguistics and communications sciences, on language and aging. Chap. 6 is the pivot to what the authors call their empirical section, chaps. 7–9, which are a set of studies chosen to display the complexity of multilingual aging: African Americans, Chinese in the United States, and the North Manhattan (NY) Aging Study.

Both the introduction and the conclusion refer to Dynamic Systems theory. Chaps. 1 and 10 are presented as a frame for the larger discussion: In the former, language is presented as a dynamic system, comprised of subsystems, and it is in terms of being part of multiple systems that language-in-aging is reconsidered. The final chapter underscores how, as different aspects of the fuller system diminish, such as the opportunity to present social skills through language interaction, subsystems, such as the ability to present appropriate pragmatic cues, will diminish as well. However, this is not a monograph about the theory, so it is not discussed in detail.

Chap. 2, "Language and aging, A dynamic perspective," emphasizes de Bot's and Makoni's infusion of a systems perspective into the language-across-the-lifespan approach, to maintain that a speaker's language will develop commensurate with the speaker's continued maintenance of environmental and cognitive resources. Chap. 3, "Language and communication with the elderly," draws on sociolinguistics and the wide-ranging research by Giles, Coupland, Ryan and others on accommodation to examine Elderspeak, a simplified register often used with older persons, frequently with negative results since older persons often report its use as patronizing. Chap. 4 is an overview of "Language use and language skills in the healthy and pathological aging." If connections between adult language production/comprehension and aging/dementia are new to your students, this is a nice introduction with brief but solid references; if they have a good background, they can bypass this chapter. Chap. 5, "Resources in language and aging," draws on psycholinguistics; it is not written for students who are well read in the psycho- or neurolinguistics of language and aging, speech pathology, or communication disorders. We must remember that students in psycholinguistics are all too often unfamiliar with sociolinguistic work and the reverse

is also true. Unanticipated unfamiliarity with issues of language, communication, and bilingualism or multilingualism is a common situation in elder care. For example, one might assume that nurse aides, who shoulder a great deal of the care for older patients, particularly those with dementia, are well versed in communicating with them. However, Dijkstra et al. (2002:53) note that "Nursing aides do not seem to make attempts to compensate for memory deficits of dementia residents in their conversation where they would need to do that most: providing cues and repetitions for late-stage dementia patients." (Such repetition, which several of us advocate [Davis 2005] is not Elderspeak as referenced above.)

Chap. 6, "Multilingualism, aging and dementia," is designed to be the "bridge" between the contextualizing chapters, which the authors see as theoretical, and the empirical ones (61). Here, the authors "argue for more attention to multiple languages in elderly people in diagnosis and treatment" (77), having made a good case for linguistic and cultural biases in some of the most widely used assessment tools identifying cognitive impairment through language performance. And it is this latter point that sets up the three empirical chapters: 7, "Bilingual aging in older African-Americans," 8, "The effect of age and education on narrative complexity in older Chinese in the USA," and 9, "Language in an epidemiological study: The North Manhattan Aging study in New York City." Each chapter presents a different data-driven interpretive technique and highlights a different cultural and linguistic group. In each case, the authors review selected studies and then extend them with additional data, case studies, or interpretation. With neurocognitive assessment of African-Americans, for example, they suggest that the question of which is the best language of assessment for all the tasks is misleading. The question should be which language should be used to get a more comprehensive picture of cognitive status at a specific point in time (85). To extend studies of Chinese aging, they add a set of case studies of narratives elicited from Chinese living in New York, because narrative has been "susceptible to the effects of dementia and aphasia in ethnic minorities such as African Americans" (104). Informants could choose whether to use Cantonese or Mandarin, and several conversational partners engaged in code-switching. While no firm conclusions can be drawn, we know a little more about narrative performance in multilingual elderly, and we know also that we need to learn much more. In the third study, the authors look at "the complex effects of education on the judgments which raters make about the communicative effectiveness of the informants" (132).

I find myself returning to different claims, particularly in the empirical sections, arguing with the authors in my mind about what I think they left out or could have added, teasing out parts of their arguments and differentiating them from earlier studies. This will be a good, provocative text for students in several disciplines who are beginning to look at multiple languages across the lifespan, in multilingual contexts.

REFERENCES

Baldauf, Annette, & Hoeller, Christian (1999). Modernity at large: Interview with Arjun Appadurai. *Translocation /new media/art.* http://www.translocation.at/d/appadurai.htm

Chen, Liang (2006). Review of Kees De Bot and Sinfree Makoni, *Language and aging in multilingual contexts.* LINGUIST List 17.384, Saturday February 2, 2006:http://linguistlist.org/issues/17/17-384.html

Davis, Boyd (2005). So, you had two sisters, right? Questions and discourse markers in Alzheimer's discourse. In Boyd Davis (ed.), *Alzheimer talk, text and context: Enhancing communication*, 128–45. London & New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Dijkstra, Katinka; Bourgeois, Michelle; Petrie, Geoffrey; Burgio, Lou; & Allen-Burge, Rebecca (2002). My recaller is on vacation: Discourse analysis of nursing home residents with cognitive impairments. *Discourse Processes* 33:53–57.

Lamb, Sarah. (2000). *White saris and sweet mangoes: Aging, gender, and body in North India.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Neilson, Brett. (2003). Globalization and the biopolitics of aging. *CR: The New Centennial Review* 3:161–86.

MIKE BAYNHAM AND ANNA DE FINA (eds.), *Dislocations/relocations: Narratives of displacement*. Manchester, UK & Northampton, MA: St. Jerome, 2005. Pp. 262. Pb. £19.99.

Reviewed by ANDREEA DECIU RITIVOI
English, Carnegie Mellon University
Pittsburgh, PA 15213 USA
aritivoi@andrew.cmu.edu

Clearly announced in the title, the topic of this collection of essays is the experience of spatial displacement conveyed through narrative by the individuals who undergo it. The authors approach it as a theoretical and methodological problem in narrative studies, as well as an opportunity for reflecting on a social and political phenomenon – the (forced or freely chosen) movement of people – that has come to be seen as central to the experience of modernity (2). The project is very ambitious. It not only seeks to make a conceptual contribution to the already vast and multidisciplinary literature on narrative, but also hopes to address enough instances of discursive practices that involve migrants and minorities around the world to be able to claim that it sheds light on the general phenomenon of displacement. Overall, the book is stronger when it addresses its second objective, and it offers a multi-layered and comprehensive analysis of the phenomenon of dislocation as captured through narrative practices. What contributes to the success of the book are, in addition to the quality of the individual contributions, its rigorous organization in parts that cohere conceptually and thematically, the clear justification of the project offered by the two editors in an excellent introduction, and the concluding remarks by James Collins, which leave the reader with a sense of a consistent intellectual product.