REVIEWS

Jennifer Coates, *Men talk: Stories in the making of masculinities*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2003. Pp. xi, 219. Hb $59.95 Pb $29.95.

Reviewed by Scott F. Kiesling
Linguistics, University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, PA 15260
kiesling@pitt.edu

It is pleasing to see the publication of a book-length study of language and masculinity, a focus of research that literally did not exist ten years ago. But although this book is rich in its presentation of data and its description of narrative, I was disappointed. The book falls short of its goal of explicating and understanding men's talk; rather, it reifies stereotypes of men without challenging or questioning why these stereotypes exist.

Although the title is composed of the traditional scholarly two parts, the first part – *Men talk* – is all we see on the cover, and it is not until we actually open the book that we find out that the book is about men's conversational narratives rather than about all talk produced by men. The cover is thus somewhat deceptive in its simplicity. But the most important problem with the title lies in its intertextuality with Coates's earlier volume, *Women talk* (1996), which sets up a categorical gender dichotomy on the bookshelf and implies that men's talk and women's talk must be studied in separate books. That the titles are so dichotomous is unfortunate.

The book is faithful, however, to the second half of the title, and it analyzes many narratives told by men. In fact, a strength is that it presents so many different narratives to readers, giving us plenty of data to chew on. The first chapter comprises an overview which describes the author's main aims, a very short discussion about research in men and masculinities, and Coates's data and methods. She has employed a self-taping method similar to Pamela Fishman's (1978), in which participants were given a tape recorder and asked to record themselves. The size of the corpus is another strength of the book, as the patterns Coates finds are often very robust. Chap. 2 introduces the reader to the linguistic analysis of conversational narrative. This would make a good introduction for undergraduate students learning about narrative: It is clear without too much technicality but manages to present the important parts of a narrative.

The third chapter is the heart of the book, showing what features of narrative are common in the sample: certain topics (particularly staying away from the "personal"), male characters, attention to detail, and the use of taboo language, all which Coates claims create a stance of "emotional restraint." Example narra-

tives are presented that construct achievement, joking relationships, and competition, as are stories in which men are collaborative and "express vulnerability." Finally, the chapter provides stories in which men construct their heterosexuality by positioning homosexual men as the "Other."

Chap. 4 shows that men often tell stories in sequences, and that these sequences help build solidarity. Chap. 5 presents comparisons between the men's stories and the women's stories presented in Coates 1996, including "less typical" stories "in an attempt to achieve some balance" (p. 111). I was happy to see this attempt, but in the presentation of such stories as exceptional, the categorical differences become ratified and strengthened as exceptions proving the rule. Moreover, this view suggests that all-male conversations are where we see "real" masculinity, while other situations somehow cause deviations from this authentic male type. In fact, men have many different kinds of masculinities that can be modulated and presented differently depending on the stance they wish to take with their interlocutors. We can find patterns of the kinds of stances men typically take with each other, but none is more authentic than another (see Kiesling 2001). That men (and speakers in general) are assumed to be so one-dimensional and without agency is a serious weakness of the book's analyses.

Such problems are ameliorated somewhat in the next chapter, in which Coates turns to the question of "how the presence of women can affect men" (note the lack of men's agency here, though). More than in any other chapter, the analyses here provide a realistic picture of the variety and interactivity of men's lives. Coates finds that the "female effect" depends on what other participants are present in the conversation, and especially on the men's relationships with women. This is not ground-breaking sociolinguistic news, however, and there is no attempt to theorize about the reasons and directions of these shifts.

The narratives in chap. 6 are the most diverse, and they begin to show how the category of all-male talk is but a single part of men's repertoires. Women are also shown to have some agency by making fun of men who display "typical" or "hegemonic" masculinities. The section on family narratives nicely echoes and elaborates the findings of Ochs & Taylor 1995. We see that men do not just take up certain roles and tell certain types of narratives on their own; they are often supported and expected to play these roles by others, especially by women. Chap. 7 further destabilizes a neat picture of men's narrative by showing how men co-construct narratives with girlfriends and wives, and that the kinds of masculinity constructed in these narratives are not always the dominant sort. The final chapter briefly summarizes and concludes.

The stated aims for the book vary as it unfolds. The first formulation states, "I shall attempt to show how masculinity is constructed in talk, and to show how men's talk sustains and perpetuates 'hegemonic' masculinity, that is, 'approved ways of being male' " (4). Later in chap. 1, the aim "is to use stories told by men as a way into the basic cultural ideas which lie behind men's lives and masculine

identities at the turn of the century in Britain" (8). So is the talk or the masculinity primary? Or do they interact, and if so, how? This question is a central one for sociolinguistics, but it is not addressed, and the reader is left wondering.

Although Coates claims to "avoid sweeping generalizations and simplistic stereotypes about men and men's talk," she does not, unfortunately, succeed. "These are men's stories, not stories in general" she writes (35). There ARE some stark differences in the narratives along the lines that one would expect; men's narratives are described as "narratives of contest," while women "use narratives of community." But Coates often makes such sweeping, categorical claims that the previous claim to be uncovering tendencies is made suspect. Here is an example, chosen at random: "Example (5) shows that men will not automatically take the narrative floor when offered it by female peers if to do so would involve them in personal self-disclosure" (158).

Methodologically, Coates does not use participant observation, although she claims to do so. Taping people without meeting them is not participant observation. Even simply playing the narratives to the participants and asking their reactions would have been more ethnographic and probably would have yielded extensive insights. As it is, psychological motivations and states are often attributed to speakers that the data do not support. This is the most serious flaw of this book. We get the sense while reading Coates's analyses that she just doesn't understand what is going on in these men's lives, what they are feeling, why they are doing what they are doing, or even if they were putting her on. This occurs because her methods were NOT participatory, despite her labels. The book is clearly not the "first IN-DEPTH study of all-male conversation," as it is touted on the cover (emphasis added).

Another serious problem with this book is that, despite the stated aim of using "stories told by men as a way in to the basic cultural ideas which lie behind men's lives and masculine identities at the turn of the century in Britain" (4), there is very little in-depth discussion theorizing about masculinity, or the social world at all, for that matter. The analyses often claim that a narrative or a feature of a narrative is "creating" or "doing hegemonic masculinity," but it isn't explained how that connection is made, or why that image is hegemonic. "Hegemonic masculinity" is, in fact, a somewhat controversial term in studies of men and masculinities (see Whitehead 2002:88*ff*), but we have no discussion of this term, merely a simplistic and unproblematic adoption of it. Although some masculinity literature is cited, much is left out and none discussed critically. The concluding chapter, which does address masculinity, is no more than nine pages long. Finally, there is no theory, or even approach, about how language constructs or reflects social relationships and identity. It is merely assumed, it seems, that this creation and reflection happen.

Most disappointing is the evaluation of men's ways of talking as somehow deficient. One can understand wanting to give men a taste of their own historical medicine, but this is hardly scholarship, and certainly not leading by example:

So although it is acknowledged that men and boys have a lot of fun together, at the same time there is a sense 'of something missing emotionally.' This sense of something missing in men's talk is the strongest evidence of some kind of crisis in contemporary masculinity.... [I]t is crucial that speakers, both male and female, understand the role of talk as a means to relating to other people and expressing feelings as well as a means of exchanging information. (199)

One can imagine what would happen if someone would write that "women should learn that language is to be used for reason and logic as well as emotion." If Coates had only claimed that this unemotional way of being is somehow caught up in men's dominance of women (and had provided a theoretical account for such a claim), then it would have been understandable, because it is disadvantaging women. But telling stories in an unemotional way need not hurt anyone nor create dominance (although Coates could have highlighted instances where this does happen). Moreover, there IS emotion in men's talk, if one knows the men, and where and how to look for it.

In sum, despite the author's claims, this book has not produced an UNDER-STANDING of how men's talk works, WHY it appears as it is, nor HOW it constructs masculinities.

REFERENCES

Coates, Jennifer (1996). *Women talk*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Fishman, Pamela (1978). Interaction: the work women do. *Social Problems* 25:397–406.
Kiesling, Scott F. (2001). "Now I gotta watch what I say": Shifting constructions of gender and dominance in discourse. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 11: 250–73.
Ochs, Elinor & Taylor, Carolyn (1995). The "father knows best" dynamic in dinnertime narratives. In Kira Hall & Mary Bucholtz (eds.), *Gender articulated*, 97–120. London: Routledge.
Whitehead, Stephen M. (2002). *Men and masculinities*. Oxford: Polity.

(Received 22 October 2003)

ELEANOR SEMEL & SUE R. ROSNER. *Understanding Williams Syndrome: Behavioral patterns and interventions*. Mahwah, NJ & London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2003. Pp. xxi, 456. Hb $99.95, pb $45.00.

Reviewed by OLGA SOLOMON
Anthropology, UCLA
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1553
solomono@ucla.edu

"I never knew talent was a birth defect," Jonas Salk has been quoted as saying about Williams Syndrome (cf. Bellugi & St. George 2001:xii), referring to the

discrepancy between the extraordinary language abilities of persons with WS and their overall intellectual functioning, which usually falls within the bounds of mental retardation. The first of its kind, Semel & Rosner's very interesting sourcebook addresses the question: "How is it possible to conceptualize a group of children who test as though retarded, speak as though gifted, behave sometimes as though emotionally disturbed, and function like the learning disabled?" (p. 1). The insights into the origins and manifestations of this intriguing disorder discussed in this book have numerous theoretical and practical implications for understanding the molecular genetic and neurophysiological underpinnings of cognition, language, and sociability.

Highly readable and well organized, the book offers a wealth of information on the behavioral patterns of individuals with WS in four major areas: language, perceptual-motor functioning, specific aptitudes, and behavioral problems. The authors combine their own original research (the Utah Survey, a parent questionnaire study) with their extensive expertise in learning disabilities, speech pathology, special education (Semel) and developmental, cognitive, and clinical psychology (Rosner) to review, summarize, and organize the research literature on WS that has accumulated within several disciplines since the 1980s. Semel & Rosner draw upon both quantitative and qualitative research and effectively illustrate findings with real-life examples from personal accounts. Taking a lifespan developmental approach, the authors provide information on milestones of acquisition and change in main domains of functioning, and thus accomplish a comprehensive portrayal not only of the disorder but also of the children, adolescents, and adults who live with it.

Semel & Rosner succeed in making their book useful as well as informative. As often is the case with source books, however, it is unlikely that many readers will find it useful in its entirety. As their potential audience, the authors list parents and family members, teachers, practitioners of speech and language, physical, occupational and other therapies, psychologists, medical specialists in pediatrics, cardiology, psychiatry, genetics and internal medicine, and researchers in neurobiology, psycholinguistics, and cognitive psychology. Those working in the fields of linguistic and sociocultural anthropology, and especially those conducting interdisciplinary research in narrative analysis, pragmatics, and the neurobiology of language, will find parts of this book thought-provoking, shedding new light on such notions as "communicative competence," "perspective-taking," "narrative," and "self". Those interested in autism will find it valuable because of the dramatic contrast (as well as some similarities, and, in rare cases, coexistence) between these two disorders. Additionally, many readers will find informative Semel & Rosner's comparative approach to the similarities and differences between features of WS and other conditions such as Down, Prader-Willie, and Fragile X syndromes.

Chap. 1, "Introduction" (1–14), provides an overview of WS. People affected by this rare genetic neuro-developmental disorder have a distinctive pixie-like appearance, and they look much more like others with WS than like members of their own families. Subject from birth to serious cardiac, digestive, metabolic, and other medical problems, children with WS show delays in most areas of development. A brief historical overview (2) describes the circumstances of discovery of the disorder. Named after a New Zealand cardiologist, J. C. R. Williams, and independently recognized as a syndrome by German cardiologist Alois J. Beuren (2) and Swiss pediatrician Guido Fanconi (Bellugi & St. George 2001: xiv), it was initially presented as an organic, primarily cardiac condition involving supravalvular aortic stenosis (narrowing of the aorta), accompanied by mental retardation and certain facial characteristics. In spite of the atypical, extremely strong impulse toward social interaction and affective expression shown by individuals with WS, it was never seen as a disorder of "affective contact," as was the case for autism (Kanner 1943).

Chap. 2, "Language skills and problems" (15–63), delineates the unusual mixture of abilities and impairments across different domains of language, such as the pattern of language development, voice quality, articulation and prosody, syntax, semantics, pragmatics, and discourse competence. Early language development of most children with WS is characterized by significant delays, including a delay in prelinguistic nonverbal behaviors such as pointing, showing, and giving objects. Children with WS begin to speak before they are able to point, a reversal of the developmental sequence in most populations. The language delay is followed by a developmental spurt and a continuous language growth. Children with WS eventually grow up fluent and articulate and use grammatically complex, generally correct language. They also have extensive vocabulary and are avid storytellers. These abilities are especially remarkable when compared to their presumed low intellectual functioning. Especially notable is the discussion of pragmatics of language use and narrative discourse (48–62). Persons with WS show an impressive ability to use language creatively in conversation, especially in narrative discourse. Their grasp of the narrative genre, whether spontaneous imaginary tales or the retelling of a picture-book story, is in fact superior in some areas (e.g., affective expressions, elaboration, and evaluative devices) to the performance of unaffected children at the same age. Apparently adept at using their sociocultural background knowledge in narrative discourse, persons with WS are not able to put it to use when they are not the protagonists but the PARTICIPANTS in everyday social situations. There is no specific discussion, however, about the differences between their competence in telling everyday narratives of personal experience versus their retelling stories from picture books in laboratory settings. Their recognition of social group membership appears extremely limited, something that can be quite dangerous because individuals with WS approach strangers and family members alike with the same charming

enthusiasm. Like people with autism, individuals with WS are often oblivious to social conventions as they engage in incessant greeting behavior or use overly familiar forms of address. Semel & Rosner convincingly argue that language studies of individuals with WS, with its unique constellation of abilities and impairments, illuminate such theoretical issues as the unity or fractionalization of language and the modularity and dissociation of distinct language domains, contributing new information to established theories of child language acquisition and developmental psychology.

Chap. 3, "Intervention approaches for language problems" (64–107), describes interventions for each of the areas discussed in chap. 1. This chapter relies heavily on the reader's familiarity with numerous assessment tests and measures. Significant effort in intervention is directed to developing control of undesirable behaviors, and clinicians are advised to use socially based rewards (e.g., an opportunity to have a conversation with a favorite teacher) rather than material ones. A section on improving language pragmatics (88–105) is an informative accompaniment to the corresponding section in chap. 2. For example, a mediating strategy for inappropriate greeting behavior is to identify and become aware of the social-role differences of various membership groups encountered in everyday life.

Chap. 4, "Perceptual and motor performance" (108–86), addresses visuomotor performance, tactile defensiveness and sensitivity, auditory hypersensitivity, and psycho-educational interventions in these areas. There is a dramatic discrepancy between language abilities of individuals with WS and their ability to separate perceptually a coherent whole into constituent parts, as well as to integrate parts into a coherent whole. Such tasks as drawing and block constructions are especially telling because of the fragmented and disorganized images and patterns they produce. The difficulty appears to be with figure-ground relations, or being able to perceive a target figure against a background, as well as to infer a global figure from constitutive parts. Although there are some parallels in this information-processing style with the one present in autism (Weak Central Coherence theory, Frith 1989), no discussion of similarities or differences between the two is provided in this section. The remarkable face recognition and memory abilities of individuals with WS are attributed in part to the local processing of visual information, as well as to the special status of human faces for persons with WS.

Chap. 5, "Specific aptitudes" (187–251), discusses sociability, curiosity, memory, and musicality. Exceptionally friendly, outgoing, and sensitive, persons with WS have been characterized as "loving, joyful, with a great sense of humor," "always happy," as well as "hypersocial" and "socially disinhibited" (188). They may not know how to tie their shoes because of severe motor impairments, but they have a common love and talent for music, both in playing musical instruments and in appreciating performances of others. Additionally, the incidence of

perfect pitch seems to be higher in individuals with WS than in the general population. Empathy is considered to be an area of remarkable strength for individuals with WS. Social cognition as measured by theory of mind and false belief tasks is discussed; the results of these studies, however, are evaluated by Semel & Rosner as inconclusive.

Chap. 6, "Maladaptive behaviors" (252–96), describes behavior problems and compares them with behaviors characteristic of other disorders. A comparative account of autism and WS (281–86) gives a detailed overview of similarities and differences between the two disorders, although the authors admit that it "necessarily glosses over certain findings and individual differences" (284). Chap. 7, "Intervention approaches for maladaptive behaviors" (297–358), covers evaluation and diagnosis of the behaviors discussed in chap. 6, as well as clinical interventions appropriate to each type.

Chap. 8, "Summary and conclusions" (359–401), integrates the information covered in the book into an overview of a prototypical profile of WS, and discusses the genetic and neurophysiological processes associated with cardinal features of the disorder. Similarly, the educational and clinical guidelines are integrated into a broader framework, which provides a general intervention approach to education and treatment of persons with WS. A special contribution of this chapter is the discussion of Semel & Rosner's original research, the Utah Survey, in which parents of children and young adults with WS answered questions about four major themes of the book: language, perceptual-motor functioning, specific aptitudes, and behavioral problems. The results of the study indicate interconnectedness among behavioral categories. For example, there is an inverse relation between the domain of Maladaptive Problems and Social Skills and Empathy, and between Language Problems and Social Skills. The authors call for further research on the interconnectedness of behavioral domains and for further work on language difficulties, empathy, and narrative abilities. "The best predictor of future success is present behavior," the authors conclude optimistically (391), predicting an informative and productive future for WS research. Besides its significant contribution to the research on WS, the book exemplifies the value of the study of atypical populations to the study of language.

REFERENCES

Bellugi, Ursula, & St. George, Marie (eds.) (2001). *Journey from cognition to brain to gene: Perspectives from Williams Syndrome*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
Frith, Uta (1989). *Autism: Explaining the enigma*. Oxford & Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
Kanner, Leo (1943). Autistic disturbances of affective contact. *Nervous Child* 2:217–50.

(Received 13 October 2003)

STANTON WORTHAM & BETSY RYMES (eds.), *Linguistic anthropology of education*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2003. Pp. 288. Hb $69.95.

Reviewed by BEGOÑA ECHEVERRIA
Graduate School of Education
University of California, Riverside
Riverside CA 92521
b.echeverria@ucr.edu

In his introduction to this volume, Stanton Wortham argues for the value of a linguistic anthropological approach to education. After all, "a society's beliefs about language – as a symbol of nationalism, a marker of differences, or a tool of assimilation – are often reproduced and challenged through educational institutions" (p. 2). So too is language used in schools in ways that, often unwittingly, reproduce the inequities in society more generally; a linguistic anthropological approach is particularly well suited to pointing out the processes by which this happens.

Chaps. 2 through 4 show how fruitful the notion of indexicality can be in understanding educational outcomes. James Collins, in his examination of reading tutorials for middle school students, demonstrates how students index aspects of their identities in ways that affect the instruction itself. One student, for example, indexes his time-harried life outside school in such a way that his tutor eventually learns that "taking time, extra time, is one of the keys to connecting with this young man" (54). Rather than consider such tutorial sessions as closed off from the rest of the world, then, it would behoove educators to use references to that world to further their educational goals.

Kevin O'Connor, in his study of a multi-site engineering project, shows "how, in the detailed processes of moment-to-moment interaction, language is used to produce a world in which certain kinds of expertise are valued (or devalued) while at the same time speakers position themselves and others within those ways of understanding expertise" (63). That is, he finds that a working-class identity that is positively valued among Tech students is subsequently devalued during a teleconference with Institute students; specifically, the Tech students "become identified as less 'educated' persons than their counterparts at the Institute . . . as Institute students brought 'into play' potential but backgrounded – and to the Tech students, irrelevant – identities of 'experts' and used these as the basis for rejecting claims to expertise grounded in practical experience" (84–89). An "expert identity," in other words, is not something that exists prior to these interactions; rather, it emerges through the interaction itself.

Similarly, Agnes Weiyun He illustrates how knowledge – and teacher authority – emerge as interaction unfolds in a Chinese heritage language classroom. She is particularly interested in examining the extent to which Chinese-American

students are being socialized to value the "Way of the Teacher" that is so important in traditional Chinese culture. To do so, He examines a lesson about the simplified script used in China versus the unsimplified script used in Taiwan and elsewhere. While the teacher wants the student to use the simplified script, the student invokes the authority of the headmaster and textbook in using the non-simplified script: "by attending to interactional details moment by moment, we are able to see that ... the teacher's expertness and authority [are] not presupposed to the same degree at all times and [are] not readily accepted by the student at all times" (112).

These chapters deftly show how the indexing of "multiple relevant identities" (76) can affect educational processes and outcomes. Chaps. 5 through 7 focus on how language ideologies and practices interrelate in linguistic diverse classrooms. Betsy Rymes demonstrates how, even though they use very different methodologies, two reading teachers construct very similar visions of literacy as "unrelated to students' experiences outside of the literacy event" (128). One teacher, adhering to a strict phonics program, conveys this message by silencing or chastising students when they use extralinguistic clues in making sense of text. But even though she embraces a literature-based approach to literacy, another teacher ultimately conveys the same restricted vision of literacy: "despite the teacher's intent to draw on students' experiences related to the text, the teacher's own experiences are the only ones legitimized" (135). For instance, when trying to get a student to think about his favorite foods as a way to connect with a story that mentions an unfamiliar food, she accepts her own suggestion as correct, ignoring an answer given by another child. But even when students did draw on their own experiences in understanding the text, "the interaction that followed didn't build on possible entailed meanings, but instead closed off entailments to focus students' attention back on the text" (139).

In her investigation of a Corsican-French classroom, Alexandra Jaffe discusses the strategies teachers employ to deal with the weaker sociolinguistic position of Corsican vis-à-vis French. Jaffe finds that teachers try to create institutional and symbolic parity between French and Corsican in the classroom by "striving for equality in both the number of hours and the subject areas taught in the language" (157). The same attention is paid in both languages, for example, to pronunciation and delivery. Further, teachers rarely use a text without introducing it orally first; this allows students to develop an "authentic Corsican voice" (181). Teachers also try to give Corsican a privileged value as a language of cultural identity by, for example, evaluating literacy work in Corsican in a way that "confer[s] competence and cultural ownership of Corsican on a group of children with very uneven levels of linguistic skills in that language" (158). In contrast, students "are far more regularly forced to demonstrate their individual knowledge in French than in Corsican" (179); they

are also drilled in French grammar more often. Despite the teacher's moves toward leveling the linguistic playing field, then, students come to consider French the language of academic rigor.

Norma Gonzalez & Elizabeth Arnot-Hopffer, in their examination of a dual language program, demonstrate how even second graders "actively pick and choose among circulating ideologies, whether they are those expressed by their parents or circulating more widely in society at large, to develop their own critical counter-discourses" (236). One student, who began the program as a monolingual English speaker, even writes a bilingual letter to the editor targeting the proponent of English-only legislation. The target of the letter, however, does not believe a second grader is capable of formulating such opinions on her own. This chapter urges researchers not to make the same mistake, but, as Marjorie Harness Goodwin 1997 has charged, to "take children seriously and use the distinctive practices of anthropology to give voice to their social worlds and concerns" (quoted in Gonzalez & Arnot-Hopffer, p. 213).

While the above chapters show the effects language ideologies can have on language practices in bilingual settings, Karen Stocker's chapter about Matambugueños in Costa Rica demonstrates the impact ideologies can have on educational processes even when language differences do not exist. That is, in part because of the nationalist ideology of language that there should be a clear linkage between language and identity, other Costa Ricans attribute exclusively to Matambugueños linguistic features that are shared by neighboring groups, and the "fact of the social inferiority ascribed to Indians [on the Matumbu reservation] leads to a perception of their lesser linguistic capacity" (185). Teachers overlook the fact that the Matumbugueño students "are perhaps the most adept at changing registers of any students" (201). Regardless of how they actually speak, then, these students are perceived as speaking "worse" than other students.

In her very informative concluding chapter, Nancy Hornberger reviews the contributions made by early linguistic anthropology – especially the ethnography of community, interactional sociolinguistics, and micro-ethnography – to the study of education and the promise new approaches, such as those in this volume, hold for the future. In particular, she argues that "linguistic anthropologists of education have an obligation to bring their considerable analytical skills to bear on enabling change toward greater equity in our educational policies and practices" (266). This volume proves that linguistic anthropology does indeed offer a unique set of tools with which to tease apart the process by which schools, especially through their language ideologies and practices, reproduce social inequalities. One hopes that it will inspire others to develop educator-friendly programs and policies that can mitigate those processes.

(Received 4 October 2003)

ABRAM DE SWAAN, *Words of the world: The global language system*. Cambridge: Polity Press and Blackwell, 2001. Pp. xi, 253. Hb. $33.95.

Reviewed by MICHAEL A. MORRIS
Political Science (and Languages), Clemson University
Clemson, South Carolina 29634-1354
morrism@clemson.edu

There is a global language system that is a neglected part of the overall international system, according to Abram de Swaan, chairman of the Amsterdam School of Social Science Research at the University of Amsterdam. This book analyzes the nature of that global system in the first three chapters, followed by five chapters of case studies and ending with a chapter of "Conclusions and considerations." The concept of a global language system has been articulated by the author in some previous articles, but the treatment here is much more systematic and complete, and as a result more impressive. In a word, this book is important and deserves very careful attention.

The book's ambitious topic successfully integrates the social sciences with language, making the author a leader in the political sociology of language. The first three chapters develop this interdisciplinary approach by shaping a theoretical framework to guide the five case studies in subsequent chapters. The first chapter elaborates the concept of the global language system by identifying and ranking major linguistic groups in a hierarchy of global languages, which together constitute the global language constellation. At the top of the global language hierarchy is a "hypercentral" language, English, which allegedly holds the entire world language system together. Next in the hierarchy are about a dozen "supercentral" languages. Below and subordinate to the hypercentral language and the supercentral languages are "peripheral" languages, which are linked to the former through multilingualism. This language constellation is inherently unstable, especially because the language at the top, English, tends to expand at the expense of lesser languages. Yet although language diversity can be a casualty of such rivalry, the spread of central languages increases communication possibilities.

Chap. 2 adds the perspective of the political economy of language by elaborating the concept of the "Q-value" of languages. The Q-value provides a comparative yardstick to distinguish between rising and declining languages by identifying, first, the proportion of total speakers of a language in the global language constellation, and second, the proportion of multilingual speakers who speak that language out of all multilingual speakers in the constellation. A language with a greater Q-value by each measurement will tend to be favored by people because it provides them with greater communication advantages. It follows that gains or losses of speakers of a language very much depend on its relative position within the global language constellation.

Chap. 3 adds the concept of "collective cultural capital" to the general theoretical approach, which refers to conservation of the cultural heritage embedded in a language. Efforts to conserve languages face a dilemma. Support of a local language may help to preserve a cultural heritage but may entail the cost of limiting communication beyond the particular language community.

The theoretical approach developed in the first part of the book is applied to each of five case studies, and comparisons are made on this basis between the cases within each chapter as well as across chapters. The five case studies are nicely balanced to include languages at different positions in the language hierarchy in different parts of the world. Chap. 4 assesses the rivalry between Hindi and English in India; chap. 5 describes the triumph of Bahasa Indonesia; the persistence of colonial languages in Africa is the topic of chap. 6, and the survival of the old language regime in South Africa is analyzed in chap. 7. Chap. 8 describes how English continues to rise in the European Union even as new members increase the number of languages in the community.

The case study analysis is interesting, but it is necessarily summary in nature, since the case studies average around 20 pages. In addition, since the focus of each case study is on applying the theoretical framework, other factors relevant for the language dynamics in question but not for the theory are given short shrift. What is done in the case studies is done well and piques the curiosity of the reader, but doubt remains as to how well the theory would apply were the cases more comprehensive in scope. At the same time, de Swaan is correct in emphasizing that cross-regional comparisons pose different questions than do specialized monographs, so that the two approaches can be complementary. However, doubts remain, since the theory aspires to be comprehensive.

The final chapter integrates previous material, thereby constituting a strong, convincing argument for the main theses of the book. From a macro perspective, the present globalizing process includes the global integration of the language system, with the attendant rise of English. From a micro perspective, the theory systematically assesses the rise and decline of languages through reference to choices of individuals about particular languages that cumulatively either acquire momentum or contract. English enjoys pride of place by linking the system together from the top down and constantly attracting new recruits from the bottom up.

The importance of this book goes beyond the chapters reviewed above by suggesting how research about the political sociology of language can pose new kinds of questions and yield innovative results. Accordingly, how solid a foundation is laid here for the future of the political sociology of language? First, the book is of high quality, and the demands of an interdisciplinary approach are met. Yet although the future of lines of analysis laid out in the book benefits from its overall high quality, the question remains of how well theory fits reality. Here there are numerous uncertainties.

Languages around the world obviously interact with one another to varying degrees, and this interaction no doubt has tended to increase as globalization has

acquired momentum. However, de Swaan's theory goes well beyond this in arguing that global language interaction is so intense and systematic that it constitutes a global language system, and that the entire system is held together by one global language, English. This foundational element of the theory is repeatedly asserted, but is never really demonstrated in empirical terms. It is not clear, for example, that the concept of a global language system is anything more than a handy way of identifying and distinguishing rising from stagnant or declining languages. There is assuredly a global language HIERARCHY, and de Swaan's theory relies on this to analyze case studies in multiple regions, but this falls well short of demonstrating a global language SYSTEM. Since a language hierarchy always seems to have existed and simply reflects one aspect of ongoing interstate competition and power politics, this does not suffice to constitute an allegedly new global language system. As a touchstone of what is required in terms of evidence, the case studies certainly demonstrate that language hierarchy varies from region to region, but they neither demonstrate the existence of a system within nor across regions.

The concept of system itself poses problems. The global language system is presented as a subset of the international system, yet the latter is notoriously vague and lacking in operational importance. Just as globalization does not suffice to constitute an international system, so too mere interaction among languages cannot itself suffice to constitute a global language system (or subsystem). Should both system and subsystem really exist, the data that are presented constitute no more than a bare framework that would need to be elaborated as more data become available. Though no fault of his own, de Swaan's theory suffers from the lack of global language data. In the meantime, the assertion that there is an international system as well as a language subsystem is a slender reed on which to base future research. What we have here is a set of partially supported hypotheses that future research needs to test and verify. For example, how do system and subsystem interact? What is distinctive about each? How important is the language subsystem in the overall system? Is the language subsystem ascending or declining in importance?

Let us accept for the moment the assertion of both system and subsystem. The evolving global language system and its accompanying global language hierarchy still may be considerably more complex than is suggested by de Swaan's theory. The number of native speakers and multilingual speakers of a language captures one aspect of the importance of a language but omits numerous other determinants. For example, the evolution of state and regional varieties of nationalism can greatly influence the relative importance of languages over time, as in the cases of the Middle East and Latin America. In both regions, English may be regarded as very influential at present, while at the same time facing formidable limits to further extension of influence. The rise and fall of nations can likewise be a major variable influencing the importance of different languages. Just as the decline of Russia has led to a declining position of Russian in the world, the rise

of China is likely to promote the importance of Chinese. As de Swaan himself recognizes, the body of native English speakers is not large in global terms, and nonnative speakers of the language may soon outnumber them. This could mean, according to de Swaan, that the language will gain further momentum as its roots become more global in nature. Yet an opposite conclusion is just as plausible. Inasmuch as nation-states continue to be the principal vehicles for the spread of influence, including influence in the linguistic sphere, the relatively small size of the so-called inner circle of English-speaking countries by no means ensures the continued spread of the language in an increasingly competitive world. Individual choices of English as a second language have gained momentum in what might be considered a systematic way, yet over time this momentum could be reversed as the global balance of power becomes more multipolar. As it stands, the theory appears to be crafted too narrowly to accommodate such political realities.

If there really is a global language system, which moreover has been neglected, as de Swaan contends, it is imperative to determine its distinctive characteristics and how it will continue to evolve. De Swaan's book does address this question in a rudimentary way, but future research needs to fill in and verify the sketchy framework presented. What additional variables need to be integrated into de Swaan's theory? How can the importance of the global language system relative to other components of the international system be determined? Is the importance of the global language system in fact on the rise? Why? Is the global language system in fact becoming more interrelated and integrated over time? What does this augur?

Similarly, it is unclear how English holds together a global language system, since for many the expansion of English reflects an assault on local languages and cultures. This would not reflect a global language system as much as the latest installment of the longstanding game of power politics being played out in the linguistic arena. If a global language system indeed exists, it would need to be shown, among other things, that there is global linguistic interdependence and not just interaction, and that English benefits systematically from this interdependence. Of course, these propositions are debatable. It is not at all clear, for example, how different global regions with different languages are linked linguistically, except through the intrusion of English, which itself is highly uneven. Language dynamics are so different among these regions that it is unclear how all are part of a single global language system.

The concept of a language sub-system is closely related to the categorization of English as the hypercentral language of the world, which allocates to it a character of ongoing momentum that will gradually overwhelm other languages. However, this may not be the case over coming decades. Data about the rise of other languages in electronic media as well as the rising status of various countries around the world point toward a more multipolar world, including the linguistic sphere. Moreover, the current importance of English varies considerably

from region to region, and may continue to do so, with ongoing ascendancy in some regions and decline in others. A related point is that English currently may be at the apex of its influence because of a long historical curve that is now beginning to decline.

In no way are these questions and concerns meant to diminish the contribution of de Swaan's book. The book clearly opens up new avenues of research, and they should be vigorously pursued.

(Received 24 September 2003)

PETER TRUDGILL & JEAN HANNAH, *International English: A guide to varieties of Standard English*. 4th ed. London: Arnold; New York: Oxford University Press, 2002. Pp. i–xv, 1–153. Pb $22.95.

Reviewed by KENNETH C. HILL
Tucson, AZ 85719-2755
kennethchill@yahoo.com

This book provides a delightful survey of the global variety of pronunciation and usage of English as an educated standard. It focuses on the phonetics of the various Englishes, especially on the vowels, where so much of the variability resides, and on differences in usage, lexical and syntactic as well as orthographic. Although this small volume necessarily deals with most topics briefly, it includes a wealth of detail.

T&H's observations are largely accurate, but, even though the second author is American, they have something of a tin ear for the English of the United States (USEng). Consider the following examples illustrating the differential possibilities of coreferential pronoun deletion in English English (EngEng) and USEng (p. 79). The EngEng examples *This shirt has two buttons off* and *What kind is that tree with flowers round?* are said to correspond to USEng *This shirt has two buttons off it* and *What kind is that tree with flowers round it?* More expected USEng would be *This shirt has two buttons off of it* and *What kind of tree is that one with flowers around it?* Among other points of difference here, EngEng and USEng differ remarkably in the use of *round* as a preposition; this point is missed in another set of examples:

> ... normal British usage is to have a full-stop after a closing quotation mark, as in:
> *We are often told that 'there is not enough money to go round'.*
> while American usage has the full-stop (AmEng *period*) before the closing quotation marks:
> *We are often told that 'there is not enough money to go round.'* (p. 84)

In fact, in normal USEng usage the word *round*, again, would be expressed *around*; moreover, the authors do not attempt to reflect the different conventions for quotation marks in the two styles. Similarly strange examples recur throughout the discussion of USEng.

The book begins with the RP (Received Pronunciation) accent of EngEng, then proceeds to other (British and colonial) English varieties of the language: EngEng other than RP, Australian (AusEng), New Zealand (NZEng), South African (SAfEng), and Welsh English (WEng) (all in chap. 2); North American (NAmEng), including USEng and Canadian English (CanEng) (chaps. 3 and 4); ScotEng, Northern Irish English (NIrEng), and Southern Irish English (SIrEng) (chap. 5); West Indian English, including standard Jamaican English (JamEng), and, in a departure from the avowed topic of the book, a brief discussion of English-based pidgins and creoles (chap, 6); "Lesser-known Englishes," English as spoken in small settlements of long standing such as Bermuda, Pitcairn Island, and the Falklands (chap. 7); and second-language varieties of English where these are institutionalized, as in South Asia and the Philippines (chap. 8).

As might be expected from this organizational scheme, the description of RP establishes a baseline for comparison. Using RP as the accent of orientation is useful in that many readers will be familiar with it – and it has been described elsewhere in detail (cf. Jones 1926, Jones 1997, Upton et al. 2001) – but it is an unfortunate choice in that RP is one of the most highly evolved of the present-day standard varieties of English, and thus comparisons are often a bit strained, at least from a historical point of view. Also, T&H tend to cite the phonemes of the various kinds of English using their RP phonetic values, so that, for example, the diphthong of *bout* is given as /ɑu/ no matter how it is pronounced, whether [æˈʉ] in NZEng (p. 17), [æˈə] in SAfEng (29), or [əʊ] in WEng (31), except that it is represented as /au/ for ScotEng (92), JamEng (109), WAfEng (125), EAfEng (129), Singaporean English (136), and Philippine English (139). The motivation behind this treatment seems to be that if there is no autonomous phoneme /ɑ/ in the accent in question, the representation is /au/ rather than /ɑu/. This makes little sense if /ɑu/ is a phonemic unit, as the discussion throughout would have it; but if /ɑu/ is a sequence of phonemes, then the elements surely should be represented in terms of what they sound like, for example, as /æu/ for NZEng [æˈʉ], or as /æə/ for SAfEng [æˈə], rather than in terms of what sounds an RP speaker would substitute.

This RP-centered perspective finds American English confusing and even bizarre. For example, "Foreign learners may find the distribution of /ɑ/ and /ɔ/ in USEng confusing and hard to learn" (37). This imagined confusion has to do with the fact that in the variety of USEng in question, /ɔ/ rather than /ɑ/ is found before a syllable-closing (i) voiceless fricative /f θ s/ or (ii) voiced velar /g ŋ/. The only difference between the American pattern and the RP described by Jones 1926 (e.g., *soft* [sɔːft], with a less common variant [sɒft]), is the extension of tensing to the environment before the velar nasal – *long*, *song*, *strong* –

and sometimes before the voiced velar stop: *frog*, *log*. The unsolved problem here is to explain exceptions such as *cog* (always with the lax vowel) and *dog* (always with the tense vowel). (Unless, of course, there is complete merger of /a/ and /ɔ/ as in much of USEng.) This may be imagined to be confusing to the foreign learner simply because it is counter to the tendency in RP of recent generations to suppress /ɔ:/ in favor of /ɑ/ in this environment; cf. Jones 1997, which has for RP only [sɒft] for *soft*.

By comparison, a far greater challenge for the foreign learner is in learning the RP distribution of /ɑ:/ and /æ/. How does one master alternations like *adv*[ɑ:]*ntage* but *adv*[æ]*ntageous* ~ *adv*[ə]*ntageous*? Why is it *p*[ɑ:]*th, p*[ɑ:]*ss* but *b*[æ]*ss* (the fish), *g*[æ]*s; sl*[ɑ:]*nder, Fl*[ɑ:]*nders, Alex*[ɑ:]*nder* but *p*[æ]*nder, g*[æ]*nder, Lys*[æ]*nder*? This differential tensing seems to represent a sound change in progress, but it is slow or frozen progress, at least within RP; there is no change between Jones 1926 and Jones 1997. It might also be noted that the environment for tensing to /ɑ:/ is almost exactly the same as the American and Jones 1926 environment for tensing to /ɔ:/, namely before syllable-closing /f θ s/; compare RP *after, path, pass* and USEng *often, cloth, cross*. Confusing the matter further is the fact that in other varieties of EngEng, the distribution of /ɑ:/ and /æ/ is quite different (12). It might be interesting to chart the progress of this sound change in what has become known as Estuary English, a near-RP variety widely spoken among educated people in southern England.

Rather than treating the many varieties of English from the point of view of how they differ from RP, how much more straightforward it would be to take a historical approach, deriving all varieties of modern English from a common ground – one that is surprisingly accessible, all the more so owing to the data presented in this rich small volume.

The discussion of /ɑ:/ and /æ/ above anticipates the reconstruction proposed. The /ɑ:/ in those examples results from the contextual tensing of a vowel that when not tensed results in RP /æ/. This reconstructed lax vowel is *a. It remains [a] in the two most conservative accents reported by T&H, ScotEng (92) and JamEng (113). (It is interesting to note, as reported by Upton et al. 2001:xii, that RP /æ/ appears to be reverting to [a], a reversal of a sound change; cf. the reversal of tensing in RP of *ɔ in *soft*, etc., discussed above.) The following is the reconstructable vowel system: six lax vowels *i, *e, *a, *ɔ, *ö, *u (as in *bit, bet, bat, pot, butt, put*); five tense monophthongs *î, *ê, *â, *ô, *û (as in *beet*, *made*, *yacht*, *boat*, *boot*); three front-gliding diphthongs *ei, *ai, *ɔi (as in *weight*, *bite*, *boy*); and four back-gliding diphthongs *iu, *au, *ɔu, *ou (as in *cute*, *bout*, *bought*, *know*).

There are many lexically specific departures from this basic system in different varieties of English. Examples include the development of /ə/ from *ö as in the adverb *just* (which for many speakers of USEng is distinct from the adjective *just*) or from *i, as in *sister*, which in some varieties of Southern USEng does not rhyme with *kissed her* (Hill 1962:21).

Within standard Englishes, *ê and *ei and *ô and *ou seem to remain distinct only in some varieties of WEng: *made* [me:d] < *mêd vs. *maid* [mẹɪd] < *meid and *nose* [no:z] < *nôz vs. *knows* [nọʊz] < *nouz (p. 32). Note that *ei and *ou fell together with *ê and *ô in conservative ScotEng and JamEng, where mid vowel monophthongs remain (92, 113), but in the other Englishes, *ê and *ô diphthongized, falling together with *ei and *ou. T&H phonemicize the WEng contrasts as /ei/ vs. /ɛi/ and /ou/ vs. /ɔu/ (32), resulting in /ei/ and /ou/ as orphans, there being otherwise no WEng phonemes /e/, /o/. This shows a hazard of the procrustean treatment of English monophthongal tense vowel nuclei as vowel + semivowel.

The reconstructable system of reduced syllabics is of less interest because differences in this system do not figure in differentiating different contemporary Englishes, except in minor details. This system centers on a reduced vowel or feature that I represent with the nonphonetic symbol /^/, which also covers the syllabic equivalents of the various resonant consonants: /^m ^n ^l ^r ^w ^j/ as in *bottom*, *button*, *bottle*, *better*, *yellow*, *many*. (Thus, I do not use /ə/ to represent this sound/feature/phenomenon. Final /^j/ in *many, fifty* is the syllabic equivalent of /j/, i.e., a weak [i] or, in RP, [ɪ], not a sequence [əj]. /sʌmp^m/ ['sʌ̃ʔm̩] derives from *something* *sömθɪŋ, /dɪd^nt/ ['dɪdn̩ɪt] from *did not*; there were never intermediate derivational stages *['sʌmpəm], [dɪdənt].)

It seems fair also to reconstruct variation in just which vowels are subject to reduction, just as in contemporary English; cf. *missile, evil, record, python, dictionary*: EngEng /'mɪsail/, /'iːvɪl/, /'rɛkɔːd/, /'paiθ^n/, /'dɪkʃ^n^r^j/; USEng /'mɪs^l/, /'iv^l/, /'rɛk^rd/, /'paiθɑn/, /'dɪkʃ^nɛr^j/. The only serious systemic changes seem to be the loss of non-prevocalic /^r/ in favor of simple /^/ in nonrhotic varieties of English; the differential treatment of /^j/ as high or not, with the consequent merger, it seems, of the pronunciation of *candid* and *candied* for such speakers; and, as in AusEng and much of EngEng, the phonetic change of /^w/ to front rounded (a new /^ɥ/?) in contrast with back rounded vocalized /^l/ (a new /^w/?). T&H note that in NZEng, word-final /^/ (their /ə/) has the quality of /ʌ/: *butter* ['bʌtʌ], *a cup* [ʌ'kʌp] (23); though interesting, this does not seem to represent any systemic change. The importance of a reconstruction such as this is not in the detailed phonetic values of the entities reconstructed but rather in providing an accent-neutral basis for the discussion of the variants of English.

The reconstruction of a non-back rounded vowel *ö underlying RP /ʌ/ is perhaps surprising, but this vowel is rounded in SIrEng (101), "retains some lip-rounding" in conservative JamEng (113), and is involved in the morphophonemic alternation with *iu, as in *punish/punitive, study/studious, consumption/consume*, which indicates the involvement of both frontness and rounding. Furthermore, the tense equivalent (/ɜː/ in RP) is often rounded, as in NZEng (24), SAfEng (29), and WEng (31).

*u also underlies RP /ʌ/ but also RP /ʊ/, as in *put, bush, cushion*. The fact that the /ʌ/ of *southern* or *abundance* alternates with /ɑu/ in *south, abound*

points to its being from *u. Most examples of *u have merged with *ö. But in the Midlands and the north of England (12), it is the opposite: *ö has merged with *u, resulting in /ʊ/ from both sources. (Northern EngEng /ʊ/ is often remarkably fronted. Is this a holdover from a feature of *ö?) Laxing of *û has provided most of the extant examples of /ʊ/, as in *book, took* (*spook* remaining unchanged).

*iu survives in USEng as [ɪu] in what Trager (1972:41) calls an "old-fashioned American pronunciation," such that *rude* *riud [rɪu̯d] and *rood* *rûd [rʊu̯d] remain distinct for some speakers. (I find it intriguing that the OED uses *iu* for this vowel nucleus in specifying pronunciation.) In most accents, the center of syllabicity is in the second component of this diphthong, giving rise to an intermediate *jû. Then, in most accents, the *j is lost within the syllable after liquids and palatals – *lute, chews, yew*; cf. *loot, choose, you*. (Note the different syllable division in *value*, where *j is retained.) This loss of *j is extended in most varieties of NAmEng to the environment of a preceding dental or alveolar so that *iu has merged with *û, as in *tune*, *toon*; *dune*, *doom*; *super*, *soup* (44). There seems to be an unexplained exception with the archaic word *thews*, which in my experience retains *j after /θ/; compare *enthusiasm*, which, within this accent, follows the pattern of losing the *j. There are also unexplained exceptions like *sure, sugar* in which *sj have merged into /ʃ/, the regular pattern in other environments, as in *issue, fissure*. There is nothing novel about this account, but it needs to be stated because all too many observers coming at the description of the treatment of *iu in USEng from an RP perspective get hopelessly confused. (I've had an EngEng speaker express to me the expectation that Americans should pronounce *cute* as *coot* because Americans pronounce *dew* the same as *do*.)

The reconstruction of *ɔu for the first vowel of *law, daughter, August* should not be too surprising, given its typical spellings. It is retained as [ɔu̯] in what Kurath & McDavid (1961:22) refer to as the "Upcountry" of the U.S. South. *ɔu is a point of considerable instability in the system. In many accents, it merges with *ɔ – in much of USEng (37, 44), in Eastern New England English (46), CanEng (48), ScotEng (92), and to some extent in NIrEng (99). In New York City English (not in upstate New York English, which is like general inland northeastern USEng), *ɔu and the tense *ɔ which merges with it diphthongize to [oə] or [ʊə], as in *off* [ʊəf] (47), showing what might be thought of as a polarity reversal from the postulated source *ɔu.

*â is marginal, mainly "foreign": *do re mi f͟a sol l͟a ti do; y͟acht; obblig͟ato; gu͟ava; Gu͟atemala* (compare *Alabama*). The "foreign" flavor of this vowel does not mean that it is of recent origin. *Obbligato* is documented in English since 1724, *guava* since 1555, *fa* and *la* since 1325 (dates from the OED). Much of the development of the present-day varieties of English has to do with the expansion of the role of *â and changes in its systemic status. *Father* may have had *â from early on, but compare *rather, lather*, variably with /â/ or /a/. Monosyllables in *-al-* such as *calm*, *palm*, *half*, *calf* may have developed /â/ from *a (variably in

half, *calf*). The tensing of *a before tautosyllabic *r, as in *star*, *part*, is exceptionless but of uncertain antiquity in the system.

The tense vowels remain monophthongal in ScotEng and in JamEng. In other accents they are subject to various degrees of diphthongization. They may be further distinguished from corresponding lax vowels by having greater duration, as in RP.

In some accents, duration is a matter of syllable shape and morphological boundary phenomena. This is particularly true of ScotEng, in which vowels are noticeably longer before /v/, /ð/, /z/, /r/, and word-finally, and vowels so lengthened in word-final position retain that length even in the presence of an inflectional suffix, resulting in contrasts between short *wade*, *toad*, *mood* and long *weighed*, *towed*, *mooed* (93). A similar condition exists in USEng, in which vowels are lengthened before postvocalic voiced obstruents, resulting in the now famous pair *writer : rider*, in which the medial consonants reduce to identical taps and the contrast between the words is revealed by the fact that *rider* has a longer first syllable than does *writer*. A personal example illustrating this feature of USEng as compared with RP comes from a recent experience in Australia, where there were two colleagues named *Bob*. We jokingly referred to them as "short-vowel Bob" (the Englishman) and "long-vowel Bob" (the American), and some of us went so far as to refer to English Bob as [bɒb] and American Bob as [ba:b].

There is serious confusion in this book regarding the treatment of foreign words in NAmEng: "Many words felt to be 'foreign' have /ɑ/ in USEng corresponding to the /æ/ in RP. Thus *Milan* is /mɪlæn/ in RP but may be /mɪlán/ [sic; should be /mɪlɑ:n/ or better /milɑn/ or /mˆlɑn/ – there is no */ɑ/ in T&H's vowel inventory for USEng, and the first vowel is either tense or reduced] in NAmEng, and *Datsun* in USEng is /dátsn/ [same vowel representation mistake], as if it were spelled *Dotsun*" (37). Similarly, " 'foreign' words spelled with *o* tend to have /ou/ in NAmEng corresponding to /ɒ/ in EngEng" (37), with examples "*Bogota* EngEng /bɒgətɑ:/, NAmEng /bougətɑ/ and *Carlos* EngEng /kɑ:lɒs/, NAmEng /kɑrlous/." T&H treat NAmEng as the innovator here, but the *sol-fa* syllables cited above, in the language since 1325, provide the model of English tense *â for "foreign" /ɑ/, as in *fa* and *la*, and of tense *ô for "foreign" /o/, as in the name of the *do* note. It is further worth remembering that phonetically in NAmEng, *ɔ: has been lost in favor of *â, not the other way around. Thus /milán/ and /bóugətɑ/ can be seen as rather conservative pronunciations for words treated as "foreign" while /mɪlæn/ and /bɒgətɑ:/ are more nativized. (Part of the difference in treatment of foreign words doubtless has to do with the difference in the RP and USEng phonetic treatments of *ô. In Mexico City I heard an Englishman order [ʉ:nˈtækɛu̯] from a street vendor, I think unsuccessfully. An American who orders [ʊu̯nˈtɑkou̯] gets served correctly with only slight hesitation. Both the Englishman and the American are aiming at Spanish *un taco* /un ˈtako/.)

The tensing of the vowel of *can't* deserves special mention. It is somehow separate from the tensing in *path, pass*, and gets its own isophone in T&H's schematic chart of the relationships of major varieties of English (5). A form that was tensed prior to the Great Vowel Shift is found in the U.S. South and South Midlands, [kei̯nt] (Cassidy 1985:524). In RP the form shows post-Great Vowel Shift tensing with backing, [kɑ:nt]. In most USEng, the vowel of *can't* shows tensing, usually with raising, [keə̯nt], though this is part of a wider phenomenon of variable tensing of /æ/, the so-called Northern Cities Chain Shift, such that, for example, for some speakers *bad* [beə̯d] and *sad* [sæd] do not rhyme, and *Ann* [eə̯n] and *Ian* [iə̯n] are hard to distinguish (45). In all three accents *can't* remains distinct from *cant* [kænt].

Vowels plus *r have an intricate but rather straightforward development.

Other than in ScotEng, *e and *i have merged with *ö before tautosyllabic *r, such that the vowels of *fern*, *bird*, *hurt* that remain distinct in ScotEng (92) are not distinct in other accents.

Vowels tense before tautosyllabic *r. The result of the tensing of *ör is a tense monophthong which will later de-rhotacize along with the rest of the rhotic vowel nuclei in the ancestor of the non-rhotic accents. The tensing of the remaining lax vowels plus *r results in *âr (< *ar) and *ɔur (< *ɔ), the latter monophthong-izing except in the U.S. Upcountry South. The subsequent development of the vowels of *start*, *fort* is thus different from their counterparts not before *r.

Next comes the "breaking" (to use the term from grammars of Old English) of a non-low vowel before a tautosyllabic *r, as in *peer* *pîr > [pɪə̯r], *pear* *pêr > [peə̯r], *pore* *pôr > [poə̯r] (35). Low *a and *ɔ remain monophthongal in this environment: *star* *star > [stɑr], *port* *pɔrt > [pɔrt]. (Throughout I use [r] for the English sound, whatever the details of its phonetic manifestation. T&H some-times use the turned r symbol for this sound.)

In the inland north of USEng, vowels tense (and break) before /r/ even when /r/ is not syllable-final. Thus *er becomes [eə̯r]. *ær (< *ar) also tenses (and and breaks) to [eə̯r], since [eə̯] is the tense of /æ/ (cf. the above discussion of *can't*). Thus *Mary, merry, marry* merge, and *hurry* rhymes with *furry*. (The vowel of *merry* has a slightly different history in Philadelphia English, where it merges with the vowel of *hurry* and *furry*.) Note that *starry* (< *star + -ˆj) has a vowel that tensed (and backed) prior to this development so its vowel nucleus does not fall together with that of *marry*.

Then comes the sound change that has done the most to restructure the under-lying vowel system: de-rhotacization, the loss of tautosyllabic postvocalic *r. For most non-rhotic accents, the loss of *r is suspended when the following word begins in a vowel ("linking r"), and non-etymological *r may be inserted between words to break up vowel clusters ("intrusive r"). SAfEng has evolved one step further, losing *r in this position absolutely (29). De-rhotacization defines the "English" varieties of English discussed in chap. 2 (see above) as well as East-ern New England USEng and several varieties of coastal Southern USEng. It is

also a feature of many other varieties of English that lack a straightforward genetic connection with any specific accent of (British) English, such as South Asian English and creolized African and Caribbean varieties of English.

The vowel systems that result from de-rhotacization are remarkably rich and remarkably different from the proposed underlying system above, especially when an additional sound change, "smoothing" (11), occurs. Smoothing converts triphthongs to monophthongs, e.g., *tower* *taur > /tɑuə/ > /tɑ:/. For a Southeastern accent of USEng, the following series of contrasts is reported: *fear* [ɪə], *fare* [æə], *fire* [aə], *far* [ɑə], *for* [ɔə], *four* [oə], *sure* [ʊə] (Hill 1962:111). (In this accent *tower* remains disyllabic.)

It should be emphasized that the other varieties that remain rhotic – most of NAmEng, ScotEng, IrEng, JamEng, EngEng in the southwest of England – do not form a natural class; they simply have not undergone this catastrophic sound change.

The development of *i in the Antipodes is worthy of mention. AusEng has a rather high vowel for *i, almost [i] (17). NZEng has [ə] for this vowel (23). Not surprisingly, this difference has become a focus of popular culture. In graffiti seen at the beach at Bondi, perhaps during the 2000 Olympics, a Kiwi wrote *Australia sux* ('sucks'), and another hand added, *New Zealand nil*.

This book is a fourth edition and as such should be fairly free of typographical errors, but it suffers from an excessive number of them. In discussing the difference in the use of capitalization after a colon in British and American usage, the supposedly contrasting examples both have a capital letter after the colon (84). *Bown* appears for *bowl* (88). [θ] and [t̪θ] seem to be reversed in describing a possible SIrEng rendition of the contrast between *tin* and *thin* (102). /ə/ should be /θ/ on p. 115. *The like themselves* should be *They like themselves* in West African English (126).

Overall, however, this book is a wonderful reference for anyone interested in varieties of English. I had more fun with this book than with just about anything else I've read on this topic.

REFERENCES

Cassidy, Frederic G. (ed.) (1985). *Dictionary of American regional English*, *volume I*. Cambridge, MA & London: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Hill, Archibald A. (1962). *First Texas Conference on problems of linguistic analysis in English*. Austin: University of Texas.

Jones, Daniel (1926). *An English pronouncing dictionary*. Rev. ed., with supplement. (Repr. 1934.) London & Toronto: J. M. Dent; New York: E. P. Dutton.

——— (1997). *English pronouncing dictionary*. 15th ed. Ed. Peter Roach & James Hartman. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kurath, Hans, & McDavid, Raven I., Jr. (1961). *The pronunciation of English in the Atlantic states*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Lambert, James (ed.) (2000). *Macquarie book of slang*. Rev. ed. Macquarie University: Macquarie Library.

Oxford English Dictionary (1971). *The Compact Edition of the Oxford English Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Trager, George L. (1972). *Language and languages*. San Francisco: Chandler.

Upton, Clive; Kretzschmar, William A., Jr.; & Konopka, Rafal (2001). *The Oxford dictionary of pronunciation for current English*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Received 28 October 2003

RAJEND MESTHRIE (ed.), *Language in South Africa*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2002. Pp. xvii, 485. HB $75.00

Reviewed by CHRISTINA BRATT PAULSTON
Linguistics, University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, PA 15260
paulston@imap.pitt.edu

Language in South Africa (LinSA) is a very handsome book, beautifully edited, carefully proofread, and produced on thick paper in elegant fonts. It is in fact the same book, although revised and updated, as *Language and social history: Studies in South African sociolinguistics* (Mesthrie 1995). Just looking at the two volumes, side by side on my desk, I could write an essay on publishing and face validity. I am happy that this book has found an international publisher, because it deserves wider reading and better promotion (I never saw the first book reviewed or promoted), but the easy conclusion that the book under review is a better book is not necessarily warranted. As the Irish say about their horses, handsome is as handsome does, and both volumes do handsomely indeed.

In fact, I prefer the title of the first volume. The irrefutable fact is that you can understand nothing about the language(s) situation in South Africa (SA) unless you are keenly aware of its social history: The genesis and history of Afrikaans is social history; the relationship, ever-changing, ever-ongoing, of Afrikaans and English and of their speakers is social history; the basically tribal (a politically incorrect term never used in the present book) relationship between Inkatha and the ANC, between Zulu and the other eight official African languages, is social history; and of course, above all, the relationship among white, colored, Indian, and black, the former apartheid official categories that are now history, is social history, without an understanding of which nothing makes sense of the role of language in South Africa. Just how to write these four categories is controversial, and Mesthrie carefully explains the rationale for his choice in the introduction. Not really discussed is that they never made any sense. I was amazed to hear that you could apply for a reclassification which, if granted, was published in a long list each year; or that Japanese were white and so could frequent white restaurants and hotels, while Chinese were not – presumably a decision made on the basis of volume of trade.

None of apartheid made sense, and it was indeed an abomination, but it does not follow that all Afrikaners should be blamed for it. The contribution of Afrikaner linguists in the rebuilding of South Africa is noticeable for their dedication, but I get very little sense of it in this volume; they are mostly ignored, and so is the process and excitement in the rebuilding of SA as a rainbow coalition. Keith Chick, one of the contributors, in another piece ("Constructing a multicultural national identity: South African classrooms as sites of struggle between competing discourses," 2002), does catch the difficulty and excitement of what is happening about, around, and in language in SA today, at the same time as he makes clear (as he says himself) the tendency that the more it changes, the more it stays the same. This is an enormously significant and problematic time in the social history of SA, and for better but probably worse languages index all the injustices and values of past racial, tribal, ethnic, and ultimately economic relationships and so signal future tensions, especially between Afrikaans and English. Afrikaners are concerned about the future of their beloved language, with English at present taking over all domains, including schools, government, courts, and even the army. Mesthrie knows all this better than I do, but I find no sense of it in his book (as the reader can, for example, in Deprez & du Plessis 2000). I think there are two reasons for this. The first version of this volume was published in 1995, which means it was written in 1993–1994 (or in some cases even earlier), before this struggle of reconstruction had really begun. The more significant reason is probably the genre, which is more that of a "Handbook of languages in SA," with the focus mostly on linguistic description with attention to social factors rather than on the process and relationship among the languages – an awkward way of saying "among the speakers, white, colored, Indian, and black."

Therefore, rather than criticize *LinSA* for what it is not, let me attempt an account of what it is. *LinSA* consists of an "Introduction" by the editor; 24 chapters in three parts; three indexes (names, languages, and subjects); and wonderfully, many maps.

Part I, "The main language groups," begins with a very good sociolinguistic overview by Mesthrie, followed by chapters on the Khoesan languages, the Bantu languages, the origin of Afrikaans, South African English, South African Sign Language, Indian languages in SA, and (somewhat out of place) German speakers in SA, a chapter that once again documents shift among an immigrant group and is of not much interest in this connection.

It seems to me rather strange that there should be so much disagreement about the origin of Afrikaans. Paul Roberge gives a brief history with dates and an objective, informative overview of the various positions – the superstratist hypothesis, the variationist/interlectist hypothesis, and the creolist hypothesis – of which he favors a reformulated creolist position. It also seems strange that no one in this entire volume, where terms like "creole," "semi-creole," "koine," and so on are frequently bandied about, mentions the theories of the French creolist Robert Chaudenson for Réunion Creole. Simplified greatly, he holds that the creole began

life as an L2 version of French, but as the number of slaves increased and fewer people had access to mother-tongue speakers of French, the L2 began creolizing over several generations – and without a pidgin stage (Mather 2000). The same conditions seem to fit Afrikaans quite well, and Chaudenson should at least receive a nod, especially as his notions seem compatible with Roberge's own.

Totally missing is any consideration of the standardization and the *taalstryd*, or "language struggle" for the official use of Afrikaans in education and government, which explain much about Afrikaner language attitudes. I am not saying this should have been in Roberge's chapter, but that it should have had a chapter of its own. Another missing topic I would have liked to see included is that of South African Jews, rarely mentioned in the literature. SA has a population of about 90,000 Jews (Theo du Plessis, personal communication, 2003), many of whom are involved in the diamond trade. We know that many of the Jewish members of the diamond trade in New York City and Rotterdam and Amsterdam are ultra-Orthodox and Yiddish speakers, a nice example of ethnic language maintenance as a result of the effectiveness of the double boundary maintenance of language and religion, similar to the case of Pennsylvania Amish. I know that this SA population is English-speaking, but what else? And what is their role in the construction of a multicultural national identity?

Aarons & Akoch's chapter, "South African Sign Language: One language or many," is a welcome addition. It does not really answer the question of the title, but it is a clear, sound introduction to Deaf culture and the role of language, and it applies equally to American Deaf culture.

The other chapters in Part I are basic language description, exemplifying William Labov's point that you can't adequately do linguistics without considering social factors, and they are more suitable for reference than for understanding the present language situation in SA, but of course a very necessary first step.

Part II, "Language contact," the major part of the book, is divided into four subparts: "Pidginization, borrowing, switching, and intercultural contact," "Gender, language change and shift," "New varieties of English," and "New urban codes." It is clear from all these chapters that there is a lot of language "mixing" taking place, and that the processes, functions, meanings, and kinds of this mixing are poorly understood and documented; virtually all the chapters point out the need for a new direction of research, or simply more research. In this context, it is illustrative to cite a passage from Sarah Slabbert & Rosalie Finlayson's chapter, "Code-switching in South African townships," where they in turn are citing the work of David Brown (1992:71):

[Brown] argues that it is necessary to consider language, in all its modes and forms as a social product (Dittmar, 1976). For him a critical analysis of linguistic theory in South Africa and its practices is needed to reveal the social perspectives and ideologies which have underpinned it. This remark is apt in the context of African language research. Initially, interest in the African lan-

guages stemmed from a strictly structural perspective . . . with a strong empha-
sis on what was regarded as "the exotic" and the unusual. More recently,
however, interest has shifted to the social and functional use of the African
languages in South Africa. This shift is indicative of parallel developments in
social history. (p. 236)

This is virtually the only passage in the entire volume that hints at the existence
of Critical Theory. Besides a critique of modernity and a commitment to the
centrality of discourse in constructing social order, the two characteristics Philip
Smith outlines for this school of thought are the belief that "theory is part of a
moral and political enterprise" and a "recognition of the perspectives, voices,
and cultures of subordinate groups" (2001: 233). To this I would add a frequent
romantic idealism concerning specific remedies in specific language situations.

If there is one country in which the language situation lends itself to a critical
analysis, it must be SA, but it is remarkable by its absence in this very conserva-
tive work. Chick 2002, mentioned above, or a quick perusal of the latest AILA
Review, *Africa and applied linguistics* (Makoni & Meinhof 2003), gives a very
different view. I for one would rather have romantic idealism than stoic descrip-
tion of languages that ignores the speakers.

Finlayson's "Women's language of respect: *Isihlonipho sabafazi*" (granted,
in a chapter revised from an article first written in 1984), offers exactly what
she criticizes now: a description of exotic language use, women's avoidance of
the same syllables as found in their in-laws' personal names. This usage is now
disappearing in urban environments – "In this modern world of ours, there
appears to be no time for the finer details of customs of respect" (294) – but if
you consider the social circumstances for its continuance ("a patriarchal order-
ing of society uninfluenced by any feminist perspectives or demands" [Dowl-
ing 1988:145 cited in Finlayson 294]), I say hurrah and good riddance. I have
long questioned linguists' dismay at the disappearance of language use and
even languages, considering the social circumstances that speakers must remain
in to continue that use.

Robert Herbert's "The political economy of language shift: language and gen-
dered ethnicity in a Thonga community" is one of my favorite chapters, but I am
partial both to functional explanations and to women who stand up for them-
selves. In brief, Thonga men's shift to Zulu – in the area just south of the Mozam-
bique border – follows the norm of shift to the language of prestige and power,
while "the women's non-shift to Zulu and their historic maintenance of Thonga
has gone largely unexamined" (320). These women have now, under some duress,
given up Thonga but speak "very bad Zulu" (according to Thonga men), and
Herbert asks, "What are the rewards associated with very bad Zulu?" Part of the
theoretical interest of this question lies in the role women play in language main-
tenance and shift, which is still far from clear. In some cases, women are more
conservative and maintain the language the longest, but in other cases they orig-

inate a shift. Herbert's explanation is simple and elegant and very convincing. A Zulu woman is a "perpetual minor" who moves at marriage from the control of her father to that of her husband; Thonga women, in contrast, traditionally enjoyed a number of rights and showed a great deal of independence (331). "For women to embrace Zulu identity, ethnicity and custom as their men do would involve a marked diminution of their status and power" (331), so the women maintain their Thonga identity – and independence – and mark this nonconvergence of male and female domains with maintenance of "very bad Zulu." Three cheers for Thonga women!

The last two chapters in Part II – "An introduction to Flaiitaal (or Tsotsitaal)" by K. D. P. Makhudu, and "Language and language practices in Soweto" by Dumisani Krushchev Ntshangase, both very brief – return to the topics of code-switching, mixed languages, and convergence or harmonization. I am purposefully vague, as are the authors, because it is clear that much basic linguistic description and analysis is needed to clarify the large-scale language change taking place in South African townships (253), even in regard to something that should be fairly obvious but apparently is not: whether Iscamtho is the same language variety as Flaaitaal, a point on which Makhudu and Ntshangase disagree.

On the same topic, Slabbert & Finlayson point out that, in their code-switching data from Botshabelo, it is impossible to distinguish a matrix language based on the norms of Carol Myers-Scotton's (1993) matrix language frame model, and they state that it is difficult to classify the discourse as code-switching between dialects or languages, or as a new interlanguage (253). Makhudu wonders whether Flaaitaal, like Creole languages, will stabilize into a first language. The underlying cause of the fluidity of the language situation has a positive aspect, a cooperative multilingualism: "The important point is that people in the townships are prepared to accommodate each other and believe that it is important to do so because the issue of communication is at stake" (Finlayson et al. 1998: 403).

Part III, "Language planning, policy and education" (LPP), is the topic I find most significant from the viewpoint of reconstructing SA as a rainbow nation, of the "prospects of South Africans being able to construct a truly multicultural national identity" (Chick 2002:476). But in spite of all planning, we find, de facto, what Timothy Reagan elsewhere calls "the overwhelming dominance of English" (2001:63); in spite of all planning for mother-tongue education for all, we find black African insistence on English-medium education. In the educational institutions, however, the administration does have some control over language use in textbooks, test-taking, language proficiency of teachers hired, medium of instruction, and so on. Schools can be quite inefficient in maintaining a language in a shift situation; on the other hand, they can be enormously efficient in providing access to the language of choice, and the black African parents' choice par excellence is English.

Reagan, a frequent writer on LPP and education in SA, has another fine chapter on basic issues, demonstrating his customary sound scholarly judgment in an

excellent overview. Sarah Murray's "Language issues in South African educa-
tion: An overview" is interesting for an update on educational language policies,
but it again demonstrates a need for more explicit description of language use in
the classroom. She presents no data, but having observed untold bilingual class-
rooms, I very much doubt that the teachers code-switch. As teachers, they will
have a low opinion of Flaaitaal and similar varieties. What bilingual teachers do
in the classroom when their students don't understand is to translate into the L1
of the children, which is not the same as code-switching.

What is happening in South Africa today is societal change from a caste-like
social stratification to one based on social class. One of the more interesting
phenomena is the growing middle class of people of color and the concurrently
growing number of private schools. It is exactly the educational institutions that
will be one of the major mechanisms for facilitating this new social mobility:
"The emerging class story comes out most clearly in the middle-class black
youngsters we have at university at present" (Albert Weideman, personal com-
munication, August 2003).

For this reason, for better or worse, the importance of language-in-education
planning cannot be exaggerated for the future of SA, for government and the
legal system, for trade and economy, for quality of life. Curiously, not one of the
three chapters in Part III refers to the growth of the private education sector and
its likely role in the transformation of the new SA.

REFERENCES

Brown, David (1992). Language and social history in South Africa: A task still to be undertaken. In
    R. K. Herbert (ed.), *Language and society in Africa*, 71–92. Johannesburg. University of the Wit-
    watersrand Press.
Chick, J. Keith (2002). Constructing a multicultural national identity: South African classrooms as
    sites of struggle between competing discourses. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Devel-
    opment* 23:462–78.
Deprez, Kas, & du Plessis, Theo (eds.) (2000). *Multilingualism and government*. Hatfield, Pretoria:
    van Shaik Publishers.
Ditmar, Norbert (1976). *Sociolinguistcs*. London: Edward Arnold.
Finlayson, Rosalie; Calteaux, Karen; & Myers-Scotton, Carol (1998). Orderly mixing and accom-
    modation in South African code-switching. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 2:395–420.
Makoni, Sinfree, & Meinhof, Ulrike H. (eds.) (2003). *Africa and applied linguistics*. (AILA Review,
    16.) Amsterdam: Benjamins.
Mather, Patrick-André (2000). Creole genesis: Evidence from West African L2 French. In D. G.
    Gilbers et al. (eds.), *Languages in contact*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
Mesthrie, Rajend (1995). *Language and social history: Studies in South African sociolinguistics*.
    Capetown & Johannesburg: David Philip.
Myers-Scotton, Carol (1993). *Dueling languages: Grammatical structure in code-switching*. Oxford:
    Clarendon Press.
Reagan, Timothy (2001). The promotion of linguistic diversity in multilingual settings: Policy and
    reality in post-apartheid South Africa. *Language Problems and Language Planning* 25:51–71.
Smith, Philip (2001). *Cultural theory: An introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.

(Received 26 September 2003)