

REVIEWS

Language in Society 35 (2006). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404506210200

JOHN M. KIRK & DÓNALL P. Ó BAOILL (eds.), *Travellers and their language* (Belfast Studies in Language, Culture and Politics, no. 4). Béal Feirste: Cló Ollscoil na Banríona [Belfast: Queen's University], 2002. Pp. 196. Pb £19.50.

Reviewed by PETER BAKKER
*Research Centre for Linguistic Typology, LaTrobe University &
Institute for Anthropology, Archaeology and Linguistics
Aarhus University
Nordre Ringgade, DK 8000 C
linpb@hum.au.dk*

The language of the Travellers in Ireland is in many respects shrouded in mystery, and its study filled with dilemmas and contradictions. It is a secret language, but quite a bit is available in print about it. Some speakers consider the mere existence of the language as secret, and they would deny having a language of their own. Whereas secret languages are mostly used to convey messages to other group members in the presence of outsiders, some of these Travellers would not use it in the presence of outsiders at all. Yet however secret it may be, or may have been, language researchers are welcomed today as the speakers see the use of the language declining. The present book is the result of cooperation between academics and Travellers. Six contributors are Travellers and eight chapters are written by academics, with no overlap.

Travellers are sometimes confused with Roma (Gypsies) because of presumed similarities in life style: traveling in caravans, trade, self-employment, and begging. There is, however, no historical or genetic connection between the Roma (who speak an Indic language) and the Irish Travellers, or between the Irish Travellers and European Travellers. Except for an occasional loanword, Romani and the language of the Irish Travellers are completely unrelated. The number of speakers of the language is unknown; estimates vary between 10,000 and 86,000 in Ireland, the United Kingdom, and the United States. The age of the language and the genesis of the ethnic group that speaks it are both controversial. Some suggest a connection with the upheaval of the Irish countryside resulting from the potato famine in the 1800s, whereas others suggest that the population and their language go back to Pre-Celtic times and even to the Stone Age. A minor part of the lexicon shows clear connections with Gaelic, but most of the vocabulary cannot be related to any known living or extinct language of Europe. Even the name of the language is unusual: It is mostly known under the name “Shelta” in the academic literature, based on the first publications on the language in the late 1800s, when speakers called the language this. Current speakers, however, do not know this name; they call their language “Gammon” or

“Cant.” The latter name is ambiguous, because there are several forms of Cant in Ireland and the United Kingdom, very different from one another, and only one of these is associated with Irish Travellers. This book deals with Travellers and their languages not only in Ireland, but also in Scotland and England.

The book under review is the result of presentations on a symposium on the language of the Travellers held in Belfast in 2002. It is the fruit of open collaboration between academic researchers (linguists, social scientists), language descriptivists, and nonacademic Travellers. Gammon words that have not appeared in print before have been removed from the printed version at the request of the Travellers. It can be seen as a sequel to McCann et al. 1994, whose focus is on both the language and the culture of Irish Travellers. The present volume contains revised versions of the academic papers and transcripts from the ensuing discussions, as well as tape recordings of spontaneous presentations by some of the Travellers at the symposium.

The documentation of Gammon goes back to the 1880s, when Charles Leland, a prolific writer on many subjects, reported his discovery of an undocumented language. Leland worked on many languages, including Amerindian languages and pidgins, and some of his work has been proven to be the product of his own fantasy, but this is apparently not in the case with Gammon. After publication, others soon presented documentation from the United States, Scotland, and England for what appeared to be the same unusual lexicon. The grammatical system, however, varied between that of Irish and Scottish Gaelic (in the British Isles and the United States), something unlike other languages (in Liverpool), and English (in most sources). Most of these sources were brought together by Macalister 1937, which is sometimes praised but usually severely criticized by many contributors.

Alice Binchy (pp. 11–16) is probably one of the best-informed outsiders with regard to Gammon. Her contribution describes the sociolinguistic context of the use of the language, for instance to exclude outsiders (*Krawdji a minute theres a byohr krushing* “wait a minute there’s a woman coming”), including police and customers. When asked when the language is used, Travellers answer that it is used in the presence of outsiders, but many examples and Binchy’s own experience show that often only Travellers are present. It is not the everyday language of Travellers, however. Early commentators called it a slang or jargon, but for the Travellers it is a real language.

Sinéad ní Shuinéar (20–41), an anthropologist working with Travellers, gives an overview of some early researchers on the language, especially the early period after its discovery, and the publication of Macalister. She points out a range of errors and shortcomings in their data, leaving not much leeway for their theories of origin either. She continues her historical overview with more recent studies from the 1980s, when only a few scholars did sensible research on the language. She pleads for informed research for both reconstruction and a realistic view of contemporary Gammon, in order to correct the mistakes that have been accepted as truth.

Mícheál Ó hAodha looks at Gammon from the perspective of Irish Gaelic (47–63). Some early scholars claimed great antiquity for the language because the identified Irish elements in Gammon seemed quite archaic. He focuses on words of Irish etymology in Gammon, and the “methods of disguise” used to make the words unrecognizable (e.g., addition of *sr-* or *gr-* to Irish words: Ir. *oinniún* > Sh. *grithiún* ‘onion’; reversal of phonemes: Ir. *cailín* > Sh. *laicín* ‘girl’; and metathesis: Ir. *coinneal* > Sh. *niukal* ‘candle’).

Marian Browne (65–78) compares present-day Gammon syntactic structures with those of Hiberno-English. Some of structures had been attributed to Gammon, or its reconstruction, such as the existence of verb-final construction (as in *have you the feen’s grade nyocked?*, the title of a 1974 literacy booklet). Browne first discusses some salient features of Irish English, then shows that Gammon, in an English-based framework, displays virtually all the structural features of Irish English, to the extent that they “share an identical syntactic structure.” She speculates that there used to be a different structure in the past, as reflected in John Sampson’s early recordings in Liverpool.

Mary Burke (79–100) provides an overview of mentions of the language in early historical literature, as well as in fiction written by Travellers and non-Traveller authors, discussing their sources and credentials. For linguists, the most interesting aspect may be the integration of Gammon words in the slang of a town in Galway, which has been used in drama and music.

Mícheál Ó hAodha (101–112) discusses the activities of members of the Gypsy Lore Society in the early 1900s, in particular Scott MacFie. These people had an interest in the Gypsies and Travellers because of their supposedly exotic culture but did not advocate their rights. They documented many aspects of the languages and cultures, and not all current Romany activists are happy with the results. There is not much linguistic information in this article.

Ricca Edmondson and Niall Ó Murchadha describe their fieldwork on the Gammon vocabulary in Ireland, Scotland, England and the United States, adding another contradiction. Where others stress the secrecy of the language, these authors relate how well the fieldworker Ó Murchadha was received by many groups of Travellers everywhere, who were also happy to share their language – even though he was an outsider and regularly located Travellers via local social workers or police officers, who sometimes brought him to the communities. Some data on the language are given, in Irish and phonetic transcriptions, but the focus is on the method and the sociolinguistic situation.

Sheila Douglas discusses Travellers’ Cant in Scotland (125–31), especially the few hundred words used by one family, providing the ethnocultural background of the speakers. Scottish Cant is clearly quite different from Shelta/Gammon. John M. Kirk and Gavin Falconer provide an etymological appendix (132–37). Just a handful of the more than 100 words are given a Romani etymology, but I counted some 25 clearly Romani words not recognized as such. Most other words are given Scots, English, Gaelic, and Gammon etymologies. Doug-

las also (139–49) describes her work on Scottish Traveller music and narration, embedded in the context of her “Traveller friends,” but without new information on the language.

Part 2 of the book contains three Travellers’ responses to the talks they attended, and three written contributions by Travellers from Ireland, Scotland, and England, on the basis of the talks and the (transcribed) discussions after the talks, providing a variety of perspectives. One of the talks has the Gammon words in it removed, even though some other talks contain such words. These talks provide interesting perspectives on the sometimes difficult life of Travellers and the stereotypes they confront. They also discuss language use and attitudes: Some insist that the language has very little in common with Gaelic, and some also give their (positive and negative) views on academic work on their language.

This book is a welcome addition to the scarce and often biased literature on Gammon and other languages of the Travellers. Its main virtue lies in the range of sociolinguistic perspectives on the language, and there are also some important additions to the documentation and description. It still remains an enigma where the language came from, and from the different accounts it does not become clear how, where, and when the language is used today. If this is the “state-of-the-art in Irish Traveller language . . . studies,” much more research needs to be done. Both Travellers and students of the language lament the decline in use and the subsequent loss of features. It is to be hoped that this book will contribute to more interest in and study of this highly interesting language.

REFERENCES

- Macalister, R. A. Stewart (1937). *The secret languages of Ireland*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (several recent reprints).
 McCann, May; Ó Síocháin, Séamas; & Ruane, Joseph (1994) (eds.). *Irish Travellers: Culture and ethnicity*. Belfast: Institute of Irish Studies, Queen’s University of Belfast & Anthropological Association of Ireland.

(Received 18 August 2005)

Language in Society 35 (2006). Printed in the United States of America
 DOI: 10.1017/S0047404506220207

GABRIELLE HOGAN-BRUN AND STEFAN WOLFF (eds.), *Minority languages in Europe: Frameworks, status, prospects*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003. Pp. xiii, 238. Hb \$69.95.

Reviewed by LUKAS D. TSITSIPIS
 Department of French, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki
 Thessaloniki 54124, Greece
 ltsi@frl.auth.gr

This volume continues and extends an interest in the dynamics of minority languages in Europe which has already appeared in related works in which some of

this volume's participants have been contributors or editors. The major theoretical framework that unifies and offers coherence to the contributions is that of a macro-sociological, macro-sociolinguistic perspective with links to political theory, and detailed discussions of policy in the context of European power structures. Against this emphasis, micro-interactional processes and linguistic ideologies emerging from within the local communities are not afforded the same degree of attention, even though they are not entirely absent from some at least of the volume's chapters.

The book is divided into four parts, beginning with the editors' Introduction and Camille C. O'Reilly's chapter, moving on to Part II on "Legal and policy frameworks," Part III on "Case studies," and Part IV with the concluding chapter. In their introductory chapter, "Minority languages in Europe: An introduction to the current debate," the editors set the agenda for the chapters to follow and provide an illuminating theoretical discussion of the issues emerging out of the increasingly unequal relations between majority and minority language speakers: The former have no need to worry about the status of their language, whereas the latter are in a much less advantageous position. While I agree with the editors that perceptions of speakers as to the status of their languages play a crucial role in affecting the future prospects of minority speech forms, such perceptions are not always or exhaustively described as they actually emerge in interaction in the communities studied by the various contributors. However, the tensions between functionality and social mobility, on the one hand, and cultural identity and symbolic dimensions of language choice, on the other, are properly foregrounded. The book is distinguished throughout by its sensitivity in avoiding simplistic, unidimensional, and one-sided interpretations.

In the second chapter of the introductory part, "When a language is 'just symbolic': Reconsidering the significance of language to the politics of identity," Camille C. O'Reilly discusses culture, ethnicity, and the politics of identity in a critical vein, with a focus on the experience of Celtic languages. Even though the author admits that essentialized notions about the relationships between the aforementioned "entities" are hard to avoid, she delves deeply into the workings of conflict and its management by calling for a broad theoretical understanding of language and ethnicity, paired with sensitive understandings of how such relationships play out in the complex processes of actual situations. For instance, underestimating the significance of the symbolic aspects of the relations among language, culture, and ethnicity may lead to underestimating the role of language in actual situations.

Kristin Henrard ("Devising an adequate system of minority protection in the area of language rights") offers an arresting examination of European and international conventions, declarations, and charters and a theoretical discussion of language rights in connection with human rights. The basic merit of this chapter is its distinction between rules that guarantee formal equality (prohibition of discrimination) and rules governing substantive equality (differential treatment

for people in different circumstances). Even though these two pillars of equality, as the author calls them, are indeed closely connected, the substantive concern is in need of more elaborate and concerted efforts for its implementation, as recognized in the chapter. Henrard's analysis is in line with the whole tradition of attention to human rights associated with liberal thinkers such as John Rawls, Ronald Dworkin, and Bruce Ackerman (see Taylor 1994).

M. Nic Craith ("Facilitating or generating linguistic diversity: The European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages") examines the Charter issued by the Council of Europe, focusing on various examples including Ulster-Scots. Various perspectives on languages complicate the picture, as, for instance, when Alsatian becomes simply a variety of German and Alsatian speakers a German-speaking minority in France, or when controversies arise related to the issue of whether Ulster-Scots is a language or a dialect. Identity issues are also foregrounded, and the situation with regard to linguistic diversity suggests that European initiatives facilitating it acquire a new potential.

In the chapter by John Packer on "The practitioner's perspective: Minority languages and linguistic minorities in the work of the OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities," the interesting novelty is that the author views linguistic minorities through the acts and interventions of a functionary. The High Commissioner of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe makes interventions on behalf of minority languages and linguistic minorities through public pronouncements, formal recommendations, general recommendations, public research reporting, and projects. Such interventions address important issues such as integrating diversity, citizenship, status, implementation of law, political participation, and education. The analysis shows great sensitivity to the problem of the actual implementation of the Commissioner's suggestions, taking account of the complexities of the situations involved.

Stefan Wolff and Karl Cordell ("Ethnic Germans as a language minority in central and eastern Europe: Legislative and policy frameworks in Poland, Hungary and Romania") trace the history of the German-speaking ethnocultural groups in these countries in both earlier and post-communist eras. Well informed on the historical details, the authors avoid simplifying matters, recognizing that in the post-communist era conditions surrounding German speakers in these countries have improved but are far from completely resolved. The sociohistorical and sociolinguistic perspective built through the analysis is complemented by tracing out differences between the various states functioning as host societies vis-à-vis the fate of their German speakers.

Analogous, but not identical, is the situation in the Baltic states as discussed by Gabrielle Hogan-Brun in "Baltic national minorities in a transitional setting." As in eastern and central Europe, the newly formed Baltic nations also emerged out of recent Soviet hegemony. This turnover, deeply affecting the new state formations and their matrix societies, is closely related to conflicts over language and citizenship. Given the emergence of Baltic languages as titular lan-

guages of the newly founded states, combined with the large numbers of Russian speakers in their respective territories (Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia), issues of ethnic consolidation, attitudes toward integration, national language learning, citizenship and legislation are all part of the complex picture that challenges these societies and their state apparatuses. Here too, differences between the states involved do exist, but no approach is going to have positive effects, as the author rightly recognizes, unless it seriously considers the complexities of the issues and is designed and determined to go beyond purely legal frameworks.

In one of the most interesting chapters, Vanessa Pupavac analyzes “Politics and language rights: A case study of language politics in Croatia.” We have here a combination of sociolinguistics, social dialectology, and political thinking at its best. The Croatian language in its adventurous relations with Serbian is embedded in a matrix of post-Yugoslavian states which do not yet feel securely established, as the author observes, and, as a consequence, are experiencing a “Thucydidean moment,” a moment when words are not perceived as representing ideas but as a sovereign, duplicitous force. The more conflicts and insecurities there are in a society, the more language issues are politicized. With regard to language rights for Serbs in Croatia, linguists and planners prove once more to be part of the political game, and only a sense of secure statehood can depoliticize the language question, as happened between Britain and the United States. One could, of course, argue that even with an improved agenda for ethnic and national linguistic minorities, language issues will continue to be political, but along other dividing lines, not necessarily along national boundaries. It is unfortunate that in this as well as in other articles of this volume, not all important analytical distinctions and their implications are explicitly drawn out. Are minority language communities facing the power or the authority of a hegemonic national or global formation? To what extent do power and authority intermingle, or are they kept separate? These two notions are not synonymous, and for a better understanding of authority we need to embed it in various power structures (see Tsitsipis 2004:569–94).

Carmen Millan-Varela (“‘Minor’ needs or the ambiguous power of translation”) makes the penetrating observation that planning and translation studies have developed past each other. She uses the Galician context to explore the subtleties of translation policy in a historical trajectory covering the period before and after 1980. The author recognizes the potential of translation to enhance the consolidation of an ethnocultural and linguistic identity, but also the fact that it exposes a culture and its weaknesses and contradictions. Crucial questions are dealt with, such as the contact with the Other that translation makes possible only by denying cultural and linguistic fragmentation.

The chapter “On policies and prospects for British Sign Language,” by Graham H. Turner, is one of the most stimulating, both because sign language communities do not figure prominently in collections on minority languages and communities of speakers and because the author combines sociolinguistic considerations

with sophisticated social-theoretic models. Turner examines the inadequacies and silences of official structures with regard to the British Sign Language community by exposing the weaknesses of education policy, employment policy, broadcast media, health policy, and social policy as parts of the policy web. He calls for a radical shift from inherited ideologies that focus on disability to an emphasis on sign language users as constituting minority language communities. Building on important work by M. Heller, Turner shows that a distancing is taking place from the earlier priorities on the politics of identity and suggests that younger-generation signers are much more pragmatic and instrumentalist than ideological. One can take issue with the manner in which the distinction between pragmatic and ideological is presented here, since pragmatic aspects of hypermodernity are equally ideological, as suggested in work on language shift.

The chapter on “The changing status of Romani in Europe,” by Dieter W. Halwachs, also discusses a nonterritorial language minority group. The Roma form a heterogeneous nation which has been marginalized and stigmatized, and which has never had the chance to develop a linguistic standard. Self-organization and some degree of acknowledgment of Romani organizations by national and international structures and institutions have brought some improvement in the status of the language and its speakers. However, for the enhancement of cultural and linguistic diversity, the people should be granted equal rights. The chapter’s major sociolinguistic distinction is between the internal and the external status of Romani. As the author observes, with regard to its internal status Romani has developed from a poorly perceived language to the most significant parameter of the Roma cultural identity. Codification, lexical expansion, and emblematic functions all contribute to important changes widening the pragmatic basis of the language functionally, and, as a consequence, affect the external, public status that is granted to Romani by the institutions of the majority population.

The concluding chapter by Stephen May, “Language, nationalism and democracy in Europe,” addresses issues of the nation-state, supranationalism, and multilingualism in the European Union, and discusses in some detail the case of Catalonia, with an eye on the prospects for enhanced ethnolinguistic democracy. The most striking feature of this excellent essay is its mature adoption of dialectical and diachronic thinking, focusing on human agency and political intervention, and declining to declare the nation-state dead. If we want to challenge cultural and linguistic homogeneity as a product of nation-derived linguistic ideologies, we cannot but focus on the workings of history and the diachronic character of sociopolitical eventfulness. If we are blind to the dialectic between the nation-state and supranational realities, we find ourselves automatically deprived of all these analytical and interventionist tools which can denaturalize and historicize minority languages.

This volume is a valuable contribution to minority language studies in their European context and will interest those working in macro-sociolinguistics, lan-

guage planning and policy, translation studies, political theory and sociology, and also language activists. However, if a focus on micro-sociolinguistic and micro-contextual issues does not also become part of such a framework, the whole enterprise may remain incomplete.

REFERENCES

- Taylor, Charles. (1994). The politics of recognition. In Amy Gutmann (ed.), *Multiculturalism and the politics of recognition*, 71–140. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Tsitsipis, Lukas D. (2004). A sociolinguistic application of Bakhtin's authoritative and internally persuasive discourse. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 8:569–94.

(Received 29 November 2004)

Language in Society 35 (2006). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404506230203

ADAM JAWORSKI, NIKOLAS COUPLAND AND DARIUSZ GALASIŃSKI (eds.), *Metalinguage: Social and ideological perspectives*. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2004. Pp 324. Pb Euro 30,79.

Reviewed by SALLY JOHNSON
Department of Linguistics and Phonetics, University of Leeds
Leeds LS2 9JT
s.a.johnson@leeds.ac.uk

It is commonplace in linguistics to argue that human language is unique in being able to represent itself, an insight that has underpinned much of the early work undertaken by sociolinguists in the area of language attitudes and folk linguistics. However, the increasingly interdisciplinary nature of sociolinguistics, informed not least by recent work in (critical) discourse analysis and language ideology studies, has highlighted the extent to which this central metalinguistic function represents more than a mere cognitive ability to reflect on language “as object.” This is because it is through metalanguage (ML) that we are able to convey our ideas not only about what language IS, but what we think it OUGHT to be. As such, ML shows itself to be more than simply self-serving: It is inherently ideological. Seen in conjunction with an increasing awareness of the nature of language as not only socially CONTEXTUALIZED but also CONTEXTUALIZING, the notion of metalinguistic competence is therefore closely bound up with hegemonic struggle at a particular point in history (late modernity) when many traditional social boundaries might well be being dismantled but where new ones are constantly emerging in their stead – a process to which language and discourse are indisputably central.

Metalinguage: Social and ideological perspectives is divided into four sections. In Part One, “Approaches to metalanguage,” the various contributors flesh out the main theoretical issues in relation to the study of ML. Nikolas Coupland & Adam Jaworski begin with what is itself both a well contextualized and highly

contextualizing contribution that aims to synthesize the various approaches to ML as deployed in different domains of linguistic research, such as language attitudes and folk linguistics, language representation (i.e., Bakhtinian notions of “double voicing” but also work in stylistics on the representation of speech, thought, and writing), the poetics of style and stylization, and the language-ideological approach emanating from linguistic anthropology. Central to their reflections is the extent to which it is actually theoretically desirable, let alone possible, to uphold the distinction between language, on the one hand, and the so-called meta-zone, on the other, not least when it is clear that the relationship between the two is consistently one of symbiosis as opposed to parallelism. It is in this context that Coupland & Jaworski identify the language-ideological notion of “iconization” as a key theoretical tool in the transition from a descriptivist to a critical stance on social meaning in language, with its attendant shift from notions of naturalness, orthodoxy, and common sense to questions of intentionality and impact. This, in turn, suggests the concept of metalinguistic COMPETENCE to be similarly in need of recalibration, when one considers that judgments of competence are always formulated in the context of extant “orders/regimes of discourse.” A good example of this is provided in a later chapter by Adam Jaworski & Itesh Sachdev, which examines the metalinguistic evaluations provided by a number of UK schoolteachers writing references for their pupils’ applications for a place at university. Against the backdrop of a discursive regime that typically values talk over silence, the authors uncover a disturbing gender difference in the assessment of the communication skills of male and female applicants, with the latter emerging as less likely to be characterized by their teachers in terms of the positive qualities of loquaciousness and geniality.

Sadly, there is not the space here to comment on the individual chapters of the remaining three sections of the book, which gradually move the theme of ML forward from “ideological construction” to “social evaluation” to “stylization,” by which time it becomes increasingly vexing to try to distinguish between ML in its pure sense of “language about language” and notions of metapragmatics, metadiscourse, metacommunication, and metasemiotics, where language is employed in the representation and construction of a plethora of ideological values. Suffice it to say, however, that the quality of all contributions is high, and the diversity of areas on which the theoretical debate over ML has been brought to bear is impressive, ranging from the more traditional themes of language evaluation in the sociolinguistic sense of language attitudes to the functions of metalanguage/metadiscourse in the context of advertising and shopping.

The collection is brought to an apposite conclusion with a reflective commentary by Deborah Cameron. Here Cameron returns to the key question of the desirability of maintaining the language/metalanguage divide, which most contributors have problematized but by and large chosen to uphold (at least for the purposes of this book). Cameron also identifies two recurrent sociolinguis-

tic dimensions of ML, its moral and ludic functions. She then revisits the all-important question of “folk” versus “expert” conceptualizations of ML introduced earlier in the volume by Coupland & Jaworski, rounding the discussion off nicely with a personal account of the way in which professional self-reflexivity on the part of linguists can (indeed must) inform our discussions of the real-world applicability of our own academic linguistic knowledge. In this so-called real world, Cameron notes how folk notions of metalinguistic competence are typically rooted in the belief that language should be used to “tell it as it really is,” whereby any perceived deviation (for example, on the part of the media) is likely to be denigrated as manipulative and hence ideological (in the folk sense of the term). Yet while many professional linguists nowadays might want to critically explore, and most likely reject, the notion of language as a mere conduit for the communication of a fixed and preexisting reality, Cameron shows how, outside the confines of academe, such an insight may prove at best irrelevant and at worst counterproductive. Thus, describing how she was once approached by a group of psychiatrists frustrated with what they saw as vacuous and misguided changes in the language of the National Health Service (NHS) bureaucracy (for example, “patients” were referred to as “customers”), Cameron found herself confronted with the typical folk discourse whereby language was failing adequately to reflect the real world: The psychiatrists correctly contended that the word “customer” could only apply where patients had a choice of locations to direct their custom, which was clearly not the case. Though certainly able to achieve much in terms of raising general metalinguistic awareness among the psychiatrists in question, Cameron soon discovered that her own expert imperative to argue the case of language as not merely constituted by reality but also constitutive of it was largely beside the point. What the psychiatrists required to be truly empowered was not theoretical-linguistic enlightenment that would invert their arguably naïve view of the language–reality relationship. What they needed from their expert witness – as committed academic – was a heightened degree of critical metalinguistic awareness that would afford them the ability to tackle NHS managers within that self-same folk discourse. It is a fitting story with which to conclude this book, and one that echoes Cameron’s longstanding view of the need to engage with those outside of linguistics on their own metalinguistic terms if we are, as linguists, to see our insights usefully applied in the real world.

In conclusion, *Metalinguage* offers valuable insights into how we might, as linguists, achieve such real-world relevance, for it is only by understanding the theoretical form and function of ML that we can begin to reflect on our own ability to act in the midst of conflicting folk and expert discourses of language. The book first began life in 1998 as a Round Table in Sociolinguistics organized by the Cardiff University Centre for Language and Communication. However, it is considerably more than what publishers typically fear as an ad hoc collection of diverse papers arising from a conference. *Metalinguage* is a theoretically for-

midable and thoroughly edited collection by leading academics in the fields of sociolinguistics, discourse analysis, and media/communication studies. It is also a fine contribution to the already impressive “Language, Power and Social Process” series edited for de Gruyter by Monica Heller and Richard Watts.

(Received 13 December 2004)

Language in Society 35 (2006). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S004740450624020X

ZARINA ESTRADA FERNÁNDEZ et al., *Diccionario yaqui-español y textos: Obra de preservación lingüística*. Hermosillo, Sonora, Mexico: Universidad de Sonora; Mexico City: Plaza y Valdés Editores, 2004. Pp. 405.

Reviewed by WILLIAM BRIGHT
Linguistics, University of Colorado
Boulder, CO 80309
william.bright@colorado.edu

The Yaqui or Yoeme live historically in the state of Sonora in northwestern Mexico, and in recent times also in Arizona. They are well known ethnographically and ethnohistorically through the works of Edward Spicer (e.g., 1980, 1984), and ethno poetically through the work of Evers & Molina 1987. Their Uto-Aztecan language is closely related to that of the Mayo, in Sinaloa, and the two varieties are known collectively as Cáhita. Descriptive studies of Yaqui, including partial lexicons, have been published by writers including Johnson 1962, Lindenfeld 1973, Lionnet 1977, and recently by Molina et al. 1999; but no detailed reference grammar exists. The work by Molina et al. was, surprisingly, repudiated by one of its coauthors (Shaul 1999); yet, in spite of its shortcomings, it has been a useful reference for Yaqui lexicon. Now we also have the volume under review, by Zarina Estrada and coworkers, which contains no grammatical sketch but provides a substantial two-way dictionary plus a collection of texts.

This new book opens with a “Prologue” by Karen Dakin, placing Yaqui within the Uto-Aztecan family (13–20); a “Presentation” by Estrada (21–25), explaining the conventions of the dictionary; and an essay called “Semantics for a cultural document,” by Aarón Grageda Bustamante (27–43), which discusses the ethnographic and lexicographic background of the work. Next come a map of the Yaqui territory in Sonora (44) and a list of abbreviations (45–46), followed by the heart of the volume, the Yaqui–Spanish dictionary (47–206). Each lexical entry contains one or more illustrative examples. The “Spanish–Yaqui vocabulary” (207–93) is basically an index to the previous section. Appendices include “Names of animals” (297–300), “Names of plants” (301–3), “Kinship terms” (305–6), and “Spanish–Yaqui kinship terms” (307–8). The “Texts” (309–93) are mostly ethnographic, with a few traditional narratives; they are presented in a four-line interlinear format. With one exception, the authors of the texts are not named. The book ends with some pronoun paradigms (397–98), a list of bound

morphemes (399–400), and a copious bibliography (401–5), including reference to the dictionary of Molina et al. 1999.

Comparison of the two volumes, which I will refer to as “Estrada” and “Molina,” is inevitable. Molina’s Yaqui-English dictionary (17–184) contains only a few examples. It lists some entries that are not in Estrada, such as *aakta* ‘to put on head to carry; to gore’; these also include many loanwords from Spanish with partly Hispanic phonology, such as *affiler* ‘safety pin’ (from Sp. *alfiler*), and terms relating to religion, such as *Aleluya* ‘Easter Sunday’ (from Sp. *aleluya* ‘hallelujah’). Molina’s English-Yaqui section (185–282) functions as an index. The book ends with appendices on alphabet and spelling (283–97), sentence structure (299–315), word structure (317–35), and “sentence complexity” (337–51). One gets the impression that Estrada is focusing more on Sonora usage, and Molina on Arizona. Estrada’s book is more valuable in its inclusion of texts, Molina’s in its inclusion of the appendices on grammar.

Both works are useful in the area of language contact, where the Yaqui have provided much food for thought in the past. As pointed out by Johnson 1943 and Spicer 1943, they were missionized in the colonial period by Jesuits, who encouraged Hispano-European blending of both culture and language. The result has been that the Yaqui language contains not only Nahuatl and Spanish loanwords dating from the 17th century – such as *machta* ‘to learn’, from Nah. *machtia*, and *tomi* ‘money’, from Sp. *tomín* ‘one-eighth of a peso’ – but also 20th-century borrowings from Spanish and English (e.g., *inyeksionim* ‘injection’ with Yaqui *-im* ‘plural/collective’; *bejtab* ‘bathtub’).¹ In the classic paper of Dozier 1956, Yaqui’s openness to borrowing from Spanish is contrasted with the conservatism of Tewa, a pueblo language of New Mexico, and this contrast is traced to different types of sociocultural contact during the colonial period. This view has been accepted by other more recent writers (e.g. Brown 1999:9). However, further study of hispanisms in the southwestern United States has shown that Yaqui and Tewa are far from being polar opposites (Bright 2000:260). In fact, Tewa and the other pueblo languages contain rather more hispanisms than indicated by Dozier. In their acceptance of borrowed words, the pueblos can be considered moderate; by contrast, Yaqui and the neighboring O’odham (Pima-Papago) draw freely on the Spanish lexicon, while the Athabaskan languages of the area, Navajo and Apache, show almost no loanwords.

Hispanisms in Cáhita display lexical stratification, in which one old layer of words is clearly derived from a Nahuatl lingua franca spread by the Spanish conquistadores (Miller 1990a,b), for example Yaqui *tajkaim* ‘tortilla(s)’, from Nah. *tlaxcalli*. Other words, derived from Spanish, can be identified as old partly because they have not been common among hispanophones in recent centuries, for instance Yaqui *laaben* ‘violin’, from archaic Sp. *rabel* ‘rebeck, a stringed instrument’. Such words can also be recognized by the fact that they reflect Spanish phonology of the 16th century; an example is Yaqui *silla* ‘saddle’, from Sp. *silla* – not in the present-day pronunciation [síya], but rather in the earlier

pronunciation [síl^ʷa]. The Estrada and Molina dictionaries provide further examples of all these types: Yaqui *saami* ‘adobe’ from Nah. *xamitl*; *limeete* ‘glass’, from archaic Sp. *limeta* ‘flask’; and *na’aso* ‘orange’ (Mayo *naraaso*) from Sp. *naranja* ‘orange tree’ (earlier pronounced [naránjo]). It is possible that some words of Spanish origin did not enter Yaqui directly, but rather through colonial Nahuatl, which contains many words of Spanish origin such as *tomin* ‘money’, *xilah* ‘saddle’, and *tixeraz* ‘scissors’ (from Span. *tijeras*, cf. Mayo *tiseeram*). Some borrowings in Yaqui illustrate a recent partial loss of intervocalic *r* and *l* – a change that has not occurred in Mayo; an example is ‘orange’, above.

In this kind of research, the volumes of Molina and Estrada can be used together to advantage. Above all, the work by Estrada and her colleagues is meticulous, attractive, and well designed for, to quote the subtitle, “preservación lingüística.”

NOTE

¹Examples from works on Cáhita other than the volume under review are given in Estrada’s orthography. The main differences are that Estrada writes *b* for the voiced bilabial fricative, while some others write *v*; and Estrada writes *j* for the voiceless velar fricative, while some others write *h*. Mayo examples here are from Collard & Collard 1962 and Freeze 1989.

REFERENCES

- Bright, William (2000). Hispanisms in southwest Indian languages. *Romance Philology* 53:259–88.
- Brown, Cecil (1999). *Lexical acculturation in Native American languages*. Oxford Studies in Anthropological Linguistics, 20. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Collard, Howard, & Collard, Elisabeth Scott (1962). *Vocabulario mayo: Castellano-mayo, mayo-castellano*. Serie de Vocabularios Indígenas Mariano Silva y Aceves, 6. Mexico City: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.
- Dozier, Edward (1956). Two examples of linguistic acculturation: The Yaqui of Sonora and Arizona and the Tewa of New Mexico. *Language* 32:146–57.
- Evers, Larry, & Molina, Felipe S. (1987). *Yaqui deer songs/Maso bwikam: A native American poetry*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Freeze, Ray A. (1989). *Mayo de Los Capomos, Sinaloa*. Archivo de Lenguas Indígenas de México, 14. Mexico City: Colegio de México.
- Johnson, Jean B. (1943). A clear case of linguistic acculturation. *American Anthropologist* 45:427–34.
- (1962). *El idioma yaqui*. Depto. de Antropología e Historia, Publicaciones, 10. Mexico City: Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia.
- Lindenfeld, Jacqueline (1973). *Yaqui syntax*. University of California Publications in Linguistics, 76. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Lionnet, Andrés (1977). *Elementos de la lengua cáhita (yaqui-mayo)*. Serie Antropológica, 29. Mexico City: Instituto de Investigaciones Antropológicas, Universidad Nacional Autónoma.
- Miller, Wick R. (1990a). Early Spanish and Aztec loanwords in the indigenous languages of northwest Mexico. In Beatriz Garza Cuarón & Paulette Levy (eds.), *Homenaje a Jorge A. Suárez: Lingüística indoamericana e hispánica*, 351–65. Mexico City: Colegio de México.
- (1990b). Early lexical acculturation in northwest Mexico. In Rudolf Filipovic & Maja Bratanić (eds.), *Languages in contact: Proceedings of Symposium 16.1 of the 12th International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences*, 237–46. Zagreb: Institute of Linguistics, University of Zagreb.
- Molina, Felipe S.; Valenzuela, Herminia; & Shaul, David Leedom (1999). *Hippocrene standard dictionary: Yoeme-English, English-Yoeme, with a comprehensive grammar of Yoeme language*. New York: Hippocrene.

- Shaul, David L. (1999). Letter: Yoeme dictionary. *Newsletter of the Society for the Study of the Indigenous Languages of the Americas (SSILA)* 18(2):3.
- Spicer, Edward H. (1943). Linguistic aspects of Yaqui acculturation. *American Anthropologist* 45:410–26.
- (1980). *The Yaquis: A cultural history*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- (1984). *Pascua: A Yaqui village in Arizona*. 2nd ed. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

(Received 20 December 2004)

Language in Society 35 (2006). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404506250206

CARLO L. PREVIGNANO & PAUL J. THIBAUT (eds.), *Discussing Conversation Analysis: The work of Emanuel A. Schegloff*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2003. Pp. 206. Hb \$72.00.

Reviewed by ANGELA CORA GARCIA
Sociology, University of Cincinnati
Cincinnati, OH 45221-0378
Angela.Garcia@UC.Edu

Emanuel Schegloff's life is like the conversations he studies: structures (e.g., graduate school, marriage) and plans (e.g., dissertation topics) blend with and give way to chance encounters (e.g., meeting Harvey Sacks his third year of graduate school at Berkeley), fortuitous and unexpected events (e.g., suddenly losing the data source for his dissertation and luckily finding another one), and tragedy (the premature death of Harvey Sacks). These and other events during the course of his intellectual life have shaped the context in which he made decisions about his work and developed his unique perspective on the study of language and interaction.

Conversations also involve individuals with goals and plans, who nonetheless create their actions on a moment-by-moment basis during the talk, in conjunction with and in response to the actions of others, and the ongoing and unfolding physical and social context the actors are both embedded within and create. Those with an interest in Conversation Analysis (CA) will find this account of Schegloff's life work to date, and how he got there, both fascinating and inspiring.

Schegloff started off in sociology, and although he never left it, he ended up providing a new way of looking at human action which builds from the work of Goffman, Garfinkel, Sacks, and others. His approach at least provides an alternative to sociology's previous areas of interest and attack, and perhaps a profound challenge to them. As John Heritage writes in the introductory chapter to this volume, Schegloff's CA has made a contribution to sociology which has eluded theorists such as Marx, Durkheim, Mead, Parsons, Bourdieu and Habermas: "to develop a conceptually coherent framework for the sociological analysis of interactional conduct, [and] . . . develop that framework into an empirical

discipline through a cumulative and interlocking series of empirical investigations” (p. 2). Heritage continues:

Schegloff’s development of CA has involved a major reconceptualization of extant perspectives on the nature of language and social interaction, of the kinds of data which are relevant and appropriate for the study of language, and of the analytic procedures through which empirical investigation may best be forwarded. This reconceptualization is based on the recognition that social interaction is, as he puts it, “the primordial site of human sociality,” and that the demands of social interaction are central in shaping the development and use of language. (2)

The concern of many, however, is how CA can be considered sociology when the traditional concerns of sociology (e.g., relationships between race, gender and class) are not prominently visible in his work. Schegloff uses Goffman’s concept of a membrane “that surrounds an interaction – that marks how and where it is bounded off from the surrounding setting and world – [and] can serve to filter out a lot of the things that are in some sense ‘objectively’ true about the individuals who compose the interaction” (42–43) to address this issue. Whether, in any particular instance, objective facts about an individual participant (such as race, gender, or class) are relevant depends on how the participants use and orient to these categories in their interaction – which does not mean they have to talk about them explicitly, but there has to be some way of showing each other, and hence also analysts of the interaction, their relevance for the talk. As Schegloff states in the second chapter, the purpose of his work is to develop “our understanding of how it is with humans in talk- and other-conduct-in-interaction, and how that relates to other disciplines whose activities intersect this domain.” (16). That is, it is not that race, class, and gender matter only when they are oriented to in the talk, but that they matter FOR THE INTERACTANTS AND THE INTERACTION when they are oriented to in the talk:

[M]y only objection to the conventionally claimed interfaces of the so-called micro-social with macrosociology is the insistence on the inescapable and often exclusive relevance of, to use the terms that are most powerful in contemporary American sociology, the intersection of race, class, and gender. My objection is only to people’s insisting that the only exclusive, centrally important thing is whether someone is a woman or a man, this or that ethnicity, and this or that social class. But that the co-participants can treat those on any given occasion, or some moment in it, as relevant (and potentially consequential) seems to me to be beyond question. As with everything else, it seems to me we have to put our analysis at the disposal of what the participants are actually doing. (44)

This focus on human action and interaction rather than on the individual permeates Schegloff’s approach to CA. Again picking up on Goffman (this time the distinction between “men and their moments” and “moments and their men”;

38, citing Goffman 1967:3), Schegloff argues that an approach to the study of social life which focuses on the individual and sees the settings or situations such individuals interact within as “contingent, transient, ephemeral contextual properties” (37) cannot be maintained when direct observations of what people actually do and say are made – for instance, via the use of tape-recorded or videotaped data. This kind of data forces us to understand the situated nature of human action rather than focusing on individual actors and their plans, goals, and intentions:

If one is committed to understanding actual actions (by which I mean ones which actually occurred in real time), it is virtually impossible to detach them from their context for isolated analysis with a straight face. And once called to attention, it is difficult to understand their source as being in an “intention” rather than in the immediately preceding course of action to which the act being examined is a response and to which it is built to address itself. (39)

Thus, Schegloff’s critique of the cognitivist stance of Western thought leads to a focus on studying interactions rather than individuals, and hence to the need for close analysis of electronically recorded data.

It is perhaps the insistence of Schegloff and other conversation analysts on this research approach and these types of data that results in the exceptional durability of CA research findings. Heritage, in his introductory chapter, points out that even Schegloff’s CA findings from 30 years ago have withstood the test of time. Much of the body of CA research that has been done over the years by Schegloff and others appears to be cumulative: CA is building a consistent body of knowledge about how interaction works which is providing an ever-broadening base for our understanding of human action.

In addition to its durability, CA is noteworthy for its potential for direct application to practical, real-world problems and issues. Ruth Lesser’s chapter on the use of CA for studying, diagnosing, and helping patients manage speech disorders such as aphasia highlights just one of the many practical areas in which CA has had a profound influence. She reports “that conversation analysis gave a clinically more useful result in identifying the communicative consequences of aphasia than did the structured methods [e.g., role playing and questionnaires]” (150). Preliminary studies in which CA was used to provide advice to aphasic patients and their caretakers have had promising results. Regarding conversation analytic research into speech disorders, Schegloff argues that it is necessary to understand how “normal” people converse in order to be able to understand the conversation of speech-disabled people. This is an additional practical justification for conversation analysts’ intensive study over the past 30 years of the basic structures of talk in ordinary settings. Schegloff reminds us that “no institutional domain is totally segregated from general social life” (47), and that the study of ordinary talk is necessary to generate analytical tools for understanding talk in particular settings. Thus, the knowledge base developed by conversation ana-

lysts on the organization of talk in ordinary settings is a vital precondition for understanding the talk of aphasic patients, doctor-patient communication, emergency calls to the police, and so on. As Heritage notes, “Above all, almost every paper he [Schegloff] has written underwrites the notion that because ‘language is the vehicle for living real lives,’ the primary research site for CA must be the ‘real life’ of ordinary conversational interaction.” (7)

This book begins with a brief introductory chapter by Heritage, followed by the main attraction, a lengthy interview with Schegloff conducted by Světlá Čmejrková and Carlo L. Prevignano, in turn followed by a chapter by Charles Goodwin. These three chapters will be of great interest to anyone interested in CA, and they would make good assignments in classes covering this approach. Ruth Lesser’s chapter on the role of CA in language pathology is also extremely useful as a demonstration of the advantages and challenges of applying the CA approach to practical real-world problems. The book also contains two chapters critiquing Schegloff’s work. They appear to be marred by inadequate understandings of his approach, and they detract from but do not remove the value of the book, which is worth buying for the four chapters mentioned above.

(Received 20 December 2004)

Language in Society 35 (2006). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404506260202

LEELO KEEVALLIK, *From interaction to grammar: Estonian finite verb forms in conversation*. Uppsala: Uppsala Universitet, 2003. Pp. 270. Hb \$57.50.

Reviewed by AULI HAKULINEN
Finnish Language and Literature,
University of Helsinki
FIN-00014, Finland
auli.hakulinen@helsinki.fi

This book – presented as a Ph. D. thesis at the University of Uppsala, Sweden – comprises analyses of eleven frequently occurring epistemic expressions in present-day spoken Estonian. The constitutive elements in these expressions are finite verb forms in any of the three persons – for example, *ma arvan* ‘I guess’, *ütleme* ‘let’s say’, *kule* ‘listen!’, *on ju* ‘(it) is surely’. In addition to the verb form, which is either in the indicative or imperative mood, there may be another element, typically a personal pronoun or verbal suffix (1st or 2nd person), and even a clitic particle (*on + ju*). Semantically, most of the verbs denote human cognition or speaking. An exception is the verb *olla* ‘to be’ (cf. *on ju* above).

The aim of the study is to show how these epistemic expressions have become or are in the process of becoming grammaticalized (de facto, often lexicalized) into fixed phrases, which the author alternately calls “particles,” “particle like expressions,” or “adverbs.” The phenomenon is not unknown in other languages (see, e.g., Kärkkäinen 2003 on *I think*, or Östman’s classical *You know*, 1981). Some of the Estonian expressions that Keevallik has studied have previ-

ously been looked into from a different theoretical perspective, such as cognitive linguistics. Keevallik's work is a first and at the same time an ambitious survey covering a vast area of conversational practices.

The data used in this study predominantly come from the author's own recordings, 324 phone calls altogether. In addition, she has had access to the spoken language corpus at the University of Tartu, Estonia. There are both private phone calls, and business (i.e. sales) calls, and the number of speakers is over 300. This will solve the problem of idiosyncrasy, but not quite the issue of genre specificity. The author has examined an impressive amount of nearly eleven hours of spoken data.

From the recordings Keevallik has isolated more than 2,000 examples of the items in question. In her database, some of them appear more than 350 times, while the two least frequent ones – *ütleme* 'we say' and *olgu* 'let (it) be' – have 49 and 58 occurrences, respectively. The criterion for deciding what to include in the study was the number of occurrences, so frequency was decisive for regarding the item as having become routinized. While the criterion is recommendable in itself, one would have expected more discussion of the great differences between the numbers of items under scrutiny, as well as the proportion of occurrences that still passed as "literal." There are expressions that are lexicalized beyond doubt – like *palun* 'excuse me' (lit., 'I ask') – and that are hardly ever used in the literal sense in a database of this size, while others are still evidently in the process of becoming fixed phrases. Also, the frequencies obtained could have been compared with those of such expressions that are unquestionable particles, like *ju* 'you know' or *ega* (not translatable).

The book is divided into four chapters, two of which are introductory, presenting the theoretical framework and the data. The theoretical chapter on previous work is well written and informative; however, more discussion of issues between grammaticalization and lexicalization would have been in order. The third chapter, "The analyses," includes all the analyses of the eleven items, in alphabetical order. In my opinion, many of the treatments would have deserved chapters of their own. The final chapter is a theoretically oriented summary of the generalizations that arise from the individual analyses.

The analytical sections have the following format: as a title, each of them has been given the name of one or two actions, presumably representing the most prototypical environments of the element in the database, such as "Focusing and explaining with *vaata/vat* 'look'" or "Expanding, resuming and repairing with *tähendab* '(it) means'." Subsequently, the presentation of each item proceeds from examples of what the author calls the "literal use" to the more grammaticalized ones. The line between literal and non-literal use is, of course, a hard one to draw. There is a lot of useful distributional information on each item: whether it can form a turn of its own, and whether it can appear turn initially, internally, and/or turn-finally. However, it remains an open question in what ways these different positions are tied to different interactional practices. The longest treatment, about 30 pages, is given to *tähendab*, whereas only 4 pages are devoted to the epistemic

expression *ma arvan* 'I think'. Should this be taken as an indication of the respective distances these items have proceeded on the grammaticalization path?

The main methodological approach used in the analysis is Conversation Analysis (CA), which presupposes a detailed analysis of the interactional situation, paying attention to the speakers' joint achievement in reaching understanding. This strictly empirical method resembles in many ways the so-called discovery procedure of linguistic structuralism as practiced in the 1950s and 1960s: The researcher is not supposed to appeal to the speakers' intentions, desires, or other psychological states in explaining the distribution of the forms, but all the information should be "there," observable on the surface. A major difference is, however, that CA emphasizes that the researcher should possess member's knowledge of the culture he or she is working with – so that, in an important sense, the analyst would be able to detect and understand the orientations of the speakers, however faintly they may be hinted at on the surface of the talk. Owing to the very extensive database used in Keevallik's work, quantitative information tends to dominate here over a detailed analysis of speakers' orientations.

In addition to CA (and interactional linguistics), the author makes use of some ideas of the theory of grammaticalization. Within this framework, it is mainly certain historical linguists who have looked into the typical ways that constructions emerge from less fixed expressions, or grammatical elements develop from lexical units. From another perspective, a growing number of pragmaticians and interactional linguists are working with synchronic data – that is, conversational material – and trying to extract chains of grammaticalization from variation. It is in this vein of scholarship that Leelo Keevallik's work belongs.

What makes the study of "particles" and fixed phrases so exciting is that they do not belong to the nucleus of syntax, nor do they undergo basic syntactic processes: They do not take part in the constituent structure of a sentence, and semantically they do not convey anything to the propositional content of a sentence. In other words, as far as traditional grammar is concerned, they are regarded as peripheral. However, the items play an important – often crucial – role in the constitution of utterances and turns, sometimes even "larger conversation structural units," the chunks of speech through which participants in a conversation carry out their actions and manage interaction cooperatively. Works like Keevallik's book are the beginning of building a bridge between historical linguistics and conversational studies. The work could be complemented with evidence from other genres such as dialogue in older literature and plays.

With respect to grammaticalization, Keevallik's work can be seen as a contribution to the line of thinking that there may be – at least for some items – a complex set of alternative grammaticalization paths. Her analysis is not totally without problems here, though. The postulating of diverging paths should, in my opinion, require more substantial support from specific empirical evidence. In this book, the reader must be content with cryptic claims of possible schemata, like the one for *kuule* 'listen' (73):

REVIEWS

attention getter → securing attention → phase-initiation (particle)
 |
 | for longer periods non-minimal second pair part (particle) or
 |
 → enhancing interpersonal
 involvement (particle)

Be that as it may, the picture emerging from natural conversational data is messier and much more complex than textbook examples of grammaticalization. The picture is particularly messy because there is much variation in the cognate forms of the “same” lexical-grammatical item (e.g., *oota* ~ *ota* ~ *ot* ~ *oot* ‘wait’). The relevance of phonological variation to the issue of grammaticalization would have deserved more attention. It is not necessarily a problem: In spoken Estonian, one easily finds instances in which any word gets abbreviated when quickly spoken, as in *hakasin* ~ *aksin* ‘I began’, or *sellepära* ~ *sellepst* ‘because of’. But I think it would be good to know more about the distribution of the respective particle variants, because the phonological truncation of forms is one of the criteria on which decisions are made as to whether an item has become grammaticalized.

Despite my critical remarks, I find Keevallik’s book an inspiring and provocative piece of academic work. The results would have been more robust had the author restricted her analyses to fewer items and inspected them with more care, especially from an interactional perspective. However, as it stands, it will open up many new lines of study, and it also makes us want to look for similar processes in the languages we study.

REFERENCES

- Kärkkäinen, Elise (2003). *Epistemic stance in English conversation*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
 Östman, Jan-Ola (1981): *You know: A discourse functional approach*. Pragmatics & Beyond 2.7. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

(Received 29 December 2004)

Language in Society 35 (2006). Printed in the United States of America
 DOI: 10.1017/S0047404506270209

JOHN AITCHISON & HAROLD CARTER (eds.), *Spreading the word: The Welsh language 2001*. Talybont, Ceredigion: Y Lolfa Cyf., 2004. Pp. 160. Pb. £8.95.

Reviewed by NIKOLAS COUPLAND
 Centre for Language and Communication Research, Cardiff University
 Cardiff, CF10 3EU
 coupland@cardiff.ac.uk

For three decades, John Aitchison and Harold Carter (A&C) have shouldered principal responsibility for interpreting the results of the decennial UK census as it relates to the use of the Welsh language in Wales. In this book A&C give their account of the 2001 census data on Welsh. First-level analysis of the 2001 data is available through an excellent government web site – <http://www.statistics>.

Language in Society 35:3 (2006)

449

gov.uk/census2001/ – but A&C’s further, mainly geographically based analyses have become the standard resource for reading patterns of Welsh language maintenance and shift.

The 2001 census data are widely held to represent a historic upturn in the vitality of Welsh speaking in Wales, reversing a long and ineluctable decline throughout the 20th century. This is “the word on the street,” although careful assessment is needed. Does an increase in the headline number of Welsh speakers constitute “revitalization?” If so, does it index a wider ethnolinguistic and indeed national revival? The devolved Welsh Assembly Government, now in its second elected term but of disputed effectiveness, has national integration, the protection of small “heartland” communities, and language planning initiatives as some of its key policies. So does a reviving Welsh language mark the success of political devolution and the cohering of a new Welsh polity around the Welsh language? In the wider sociolinguistic world, how should we theorize a remarkable reversal of language shift in Wales, with its long history of anglicization and its long and porous territorial boundary with England?

In fact, A&C are very circumspect – to my mind appropriately – about the extent of linguistic revitalization entailed in the new census data. Some of their reticence relates to familiar methodological limitations in census taking. New administrative boundaries and conventions in counting student populations complicate comparison with 1991 data. Then, A&C point out that the 2001 census elaborated the formerly used question, *Can you speak, read or write Welsh?*, by adding an *understand* dimension, and allowing discrete responses for each dimension of self-assessed competence. So we have more data on Welsh this time, but it cannot be unambiguously set alongside previous results. The overall new statistic of 20.5% “speaking Welsh” in Wales – that is, of the 2,805,701 people in Wales aged three and over on 29 April 2001 – in fact derives from adding data for three combined-skills statistics: *speaks but does not read or write Welsh*, *speaks and reads but does not write Welsh*, and *speaks, reads and writes Welsh*. It is not at all unreasonable to interpret the 2001 data as showing an overall increase in reported competence in Welsh over the 18.7% reported in 1991, but the comparison is indirect. Owing to a growing overall Welsh population, A&C say that there are 13.3% more speakers of Welsh since 1991. They summarize the numerical increase in Welsh speaking in 2001 as follows:

For the first time, since census enumerations were undertaken at the end of the nineteenth century, both the number and percentage of Welsh-speakers at national level show an inter-decennial increase. Indeed the advance in absolute numbers of Welsh-speakers [to 575,640] is such that the total now exceeds that recorded in 1971 (542,425). (p. 51)

More important caveats about revitalization, however, relate to how these increases were achieved. They relate to a range of demographic shifts which have unsettled the social arrangements that formerly PROTECTED Welsh, as well

as those that threatened it. A&C identify “the four core Welsh-speaking areas” of Wales (64), often referred to as *Y Fro Gymraeg*, which in fact show significant decline and fracture in their numbers of Welsh speakers since 1991: Carmarthenshire (−6.1%), Ynys Môn (−6.1%), Gwynedd (−1.6%), and Ceredigion (+ 4.8% in absolute numbers, but a decline in its proportion of Welsh speakers). Eastern Snowdonia and the Conwy Valley in the north produced among the highest falls, also Ystradgynlais, Pontardawe, and Pontardulais in the south. These losses were more than compensated for by huge percentage increases in reported Welsh language ability, albeit from very low bases in 1991, in historically much more anglicized areas of the southeast of Wales (e.g., +355.4% in Monmouthshire, +342.9% in Torfaen, +338.7% in Newport, +303.2% in Blaenau Gwent, +83.5% in Caerphilly, +76.8% in Cardiff, +64.2% in the Vale of Glamorgan, and +37.2% in Rhondda Cynon Taf ; p. 50ff.). Cardiff, the Welsh capital city, had 18,071 (6.6%) enumerated Welsh speakers in 1991, but 31,944 (10.9%) in 2001, a gain of nearly 77% (p. 75). A&C provide sophisticated geographical analyses of these and similar data, in the form of detailed tables and summative maps.

The data show that “the linguistic centre of gravity in Wales is shifting” (65), with use of Welsh becoming as much an urban as a rural practice. Even more strikingly, it is associated far more with speakers under 16 years of age than with any other age sector, clearly through the impact of compulsory Welsh teaching and learning through the primary and secondary school curricula (to age 16). Under-sixteens account for more than half of Welsh speakers in many parts of southeast Wales. Welsh speakers also have proportionally high representation in the category “professional occupations,” and there is a relatively large preponderance of non-speakers in the lower socio-economic class categories (p. 95). In summary, the overall demographic revitalization of Welsh in 2001 disguises continuing fracture of the old “heartland” zones in the north and west of Wales, where Welsh has been transmitted intergenerationally. It rests on proportionally huge increases in reported Welsh language competence, particularly relating to young speakers in the populous and otherwise anglicized southeast, where competences of a largely unknown extent are made available through compulsory education. A&C comment that “the real depth of the language within society can [therefore] be questioned” (132), and we certainly need to know more about post-age-sixteen tendencies in language choice in Wales.

The authors’ demographic analysis – the main rationale for their book – is meticulous and impressive. But their critical response to these sociolinguistic circumstances in their concluding chapter is, to my mind, highly questionable and detracts from the whole. Their assumptions are organicist and modernist; their policy inclinations are protectionist and nationalist. They endorse the organic model of “a truly living Welsh language” (quoting Saunders Lewis), which they see as threatened by and eroded by a more powerful organism, English (133). They argue that resistance to erosion requires a shoring up of indepen-

dent, dense enclaves of Welsh speakers, while they recognize but regret that cultural isolation of this sort is no longer feasible in a mobile world. They rue the sociolinguistic impact of in-migration, “invasion,” and “penetration” (135–36). In the book’s last five pages (where their tone has become markedly pessimistic), A&C invest heavily in “the need to create an association between being Welsh and speaking Welsh” and resisting the “problem” of multiculturalism in Wales (140). In short, they argue that “the language” can best succeed if it is promoted as the unique and necessary hallmark of “a Welsh identity.”

There is far more to be said in response than this brief review allows. First, whatever stance we take on nationalism – its seductive essentialism, its dangerous myopia, or its irrelevance in globalizing late modernity – it is evident that the sociolinguistic robustness of Welsh has NOT to date centered on its being spoken as a credential of national uniqueness, if that could be defined. “Heartland” Welsh usage in most of Wales has not generally been politicized, and it has readily accommodated English in code-mixed varieties, particularly in the south. “The language” does not have a simple integrity, either in its dialect varieties or in its formal and functional/genre relationships to English. Powerful strains of Welsh identity (of which A&C are quite dismissive) arose, notably in the South Wales Valleys, through industrialization, where the Welsh language was of marginal importance. The new, young Welsh speakers are by no means uniformly exposed to Welsh in education contexts where nationalist ideology predominates; for the most part, parents judge Welsh-medium schools to be educationally superior. In fact, it is clearly the WIDENING of the geographical, age-related, and class-related catchment area for Welsh that has generated the demographic revitalization that A&C document, and this open-access quality of Welsh will surely need to be extended in the interests of wider usage.

A&C’s appeal to “identity” misrepresents the language-ideological climate in contemporary Wales. Coincidentally, colleagues and I have substantial recent data (e.g., Coupland, Bishop, Evans & Garrett, in press) showing that Wales ALREADY benefits from strongly positive and widely distributed pro-Wales and pro-Welsh ethnolinguistic subjectivities. It is true that higher levels of competence in Welsh, and to some extent older vs. younger age, are positively associated with higher levels of expressed affiliation to Wales. But there is no strong pattern of ideological resistance to the advancing project of Wales, or disaffiliation with Welsh as part of that, on the part of non-Welsh-speakers. So the “identity” infrastructure in Wales, which A&C want to see enhanced, is already strongly consonant with Welsh language maintenance and revitalization. This makes the authors’ idea of hallmarking Welsh as the unique criterion for real Welshness far too pessimistic, as well as dangerously restrictive. Engineering more nationalist ideologies around the Welsh language is likely to be counterproductive.

One pattern we detect in our data is an increasing tendency for Welsh-affiliated people to endorse a broad ceremonial function for Welsh, such as using Welsh in names, songs, anthems, and cultural ceremonies. They give ceremonial use rather

higher priority than interactional use in homes or workplaces, but without dismissing these either. An interest in ceremonial usage, which might include facility in performing the mini-rituals of social interaction in Welsh, may well motivate some people's current enthusiasm for learning the language. This picks up on A&C's concerns (quoted above) about "the real depth of the language within society," if we equate ceremonial usage with "shallow" social presence. But we need to ask whether it is feasible to hold on to an ideal of "deeply" authentic language use, in "true bilingualism" or indeed elsewhere. Languages inevitably have to fill niches in whatever new markets open up to them, and ceremonial function may be an increasingly important part of minority languages' profiles, if they are to retain and even grow their vitality in the way that Welsh is doing so successfully.

REFERENCE

- Coupland, Nikolas; Bishop, Hywel; Evans, Betsy; & Garrett, Peter (in press). Imagining Wales and the Welsh language: Ethnolinguistic subjectivities and demographic flow. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*.

(Received 3 January 2005)

Language in Society 35 (2006). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404506280205

RICHARD BUTTNY, *Talking problems: Studies of discursive construction*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2004. Pp.ix, 214. Hb \$45.00.

Reviewed by BONNIE URCIUOLI
Anthropology, Hamilton College
Clinton, NY 13323
burciuol@hamilton.edu

Richard Buttney's *Talking problems: Studies of discursive construction* addresses the centrality of ordinary talk as a key site in the construction of human sociality and social reality. He characterizes talk about problems as a linguistic abstraction from actions or events that call for solutions. Such discourses have regular patterns which people routinely deploy as they tell their troubles and seek solutions to problems. How people structure such talk and position themselves and others in it provides insight into how those people identify themselves socially and operate within moral systems. Problems do not exist independently of the ways in which people perceive and evaluate both the problem situation and themselves. People position themselves as good, blameless, likable, and so on through what Buttney calls a "microlevel rhetoric." Examination of that rhetoric sheds light on the interests at stake, since positioning means casting oneself or another in terms of specific, often moral characterizations (dutiful, realistic, happy, etc.) which are in turn related to one's membership category (social role, ethnic identity, etc.). Buttney thus builds on work in ethnomethodology and conversational

Language in Society 35:3 (2006)

453

analysis to develop a particular set of methods for the analysis of trouble-telling. He focuses, as he puts it, on communicative practices, positionings and constructions: “*How problems get interactionally formed and oriented to, and how interlocutors position themselves in the course of such problem talk*” (p. 9, italics in original). Buttny examines three areas of trouble-telling: teens talking about being young parents, therapy talk among clients and their therapist, and talk among college students about race relations. The book is organized into eight chapters: an introduction (summarized above) and conclusion, and two main sections of three chapters each, the first focusing on talking about problems, the second on reported speech about race.

Chapter 1, “Ascribing problems and positionings in talking: Student teenage parent,” draws data from two segments of Frederick Wiseman’s naturalistic 1994 documentary *High School II*. In the first segment, a teen father discusses his situation with friends over lunch; the second presents a meeting among a teen mother with her baby, her mother, her brother, and school officials and teachers. Buttny’s central interest in the first segment is the microlevel rhetoric through which the central narrator positions himself with respect to how he became a father. The student father’s “rhetoric of necessity” (Buttny’s term) positions him as seeing and taking a course of moral necessity once the pregnancy was known; as his friends present less congruent perspectives on his past behavior, the narrator tries to find a coherent path through his conflicting category memberships by retelling his story and by variously avoiding and conceding to his peers’ perspectives. The meeting segment brings in the role of the institutional representatives and the institutional issues and authority they bring to bear in their construction of the student mother’s problem, in contrast with the formulation provided by her own mother: the girl’s mother proposes a practical solution to an existing logistical problem, whereas the school representatives raise questions about problems that might arise.

The data for the next two chapters are drawn from videotapes of therapy sessions. Chapter 2, “Clients’ and therapists’ joint construction of the clients’ problems,” explores therapist-client co-construction of client problems, the therapist’s description of the clients’ state of affairs or discussion of possibilities, and the clients’ response. Again, Buttny pays particular attention to microlevel rhetoric, here of therapeutic reframings, always contingent on the clients’ discursive production; the therapist persuades rather than dictates, offering, in Wittgenstein’s sense, a new language game. A particular strategy for such work is explored in chapter 3, “Therapeutic humor in retelling the clients’ tellings.” Here, Buttny examines the corpus of videotaped therapy sessions drawn from in chapter 2. He looks for the resources on which the therapist can draw to signal humor, he shows how humor is deployed to move clients in low-key ways toward more productive ascriptions, and he shows clients’ responses to such strategy. An important point emerging from chapters 2 and 3 is that however authoritative the therapist’s position may be, the therapist’s job cannot be done simply by exercising power.

The next three chapters explore reported speech as a conversational resource, particularly for constructing “portraits” of contrastive selves, for summarizing, dramatizing, crediting or discrediting, and epitomizing (96–98). Data are drawn from audiotapes which black, white and Latino students made of themselves discussing interracial communication in scenes from the video *Racism 101*. Chapter 4, “Reported speech in talking race on campus,” takes up the asymmetric perceptions of racism routinely expressed among blacks and among whites: Where black students are more likely to see an institutional or social problem, white students are more likely to see individual acts and faults, and to view black perceptions of racism as overinterpretation. Black and white students use quoted speech to typify not only the incidents but also their own evaluative responses. The point is not just what is reported but how that reporting is deployed – as a single quote or a summary quote, as something said by fellow group members, or generically by outgroup members, or by a speaker in whom authority is invested – all means to move the narrative along. Reported speech provides “objective” evidence which can hold the original speaker accountable, and which can also function both to involve the hearers and to distance the reporter (120). It also evaluates and reflects the speaker’s position, one social outcome of which is the reinforcement of the sense of racial distance and difference.

Chapter 5, “Demanding respect: The uses of reported speech in discursive constructions of interracial contact,” highlights a particular issue of a racially divided society, the imbalance of status and respect. In focus-group interviews as well as the self-taped data described above, African American students provide narratives about incidents of racial disrespect (such as being ignored or followed by salespeople). These are often incidents in which no action is overtly racist, and these are the kinds of incidents that whites are most likely to point to as overinterpreted, whereas African Americans see the difference between their own experience and what whites routinely encounter. Disrespect lies in that difference. In chapter 6, “Discursive constructions of racial boundaries and self-segregation on campus,” Buttny examines the emergence of boundaries in students’ experience, and how they characterize, justify, and criticize them. In effect, this is about the performative dynamics of talk about race and the emergence of racial ideologies.

Key to Buttney’s analysis throughout these chapters is the idea of POSITIONING, through which participants align or contrast elements of their identity with each other and with the issue at hand. Central to this process is the establishment of who is, who is not, or who should be accountable or responsible for what happens in the interaction described. This approach demonstrates the dynamic emergence of social identities, an important contribution particularly to understanding race, an area where it is all too easy to treat identities as static and given. Another important contribution made by Buttny’s analysis is his demonstration of the various functions of reported speech, such as summarizing, evaluating, and typifying. The book also makes the important point that what counts

as problems is emergent, not simply given, and analysis of the discursive emergence of problems sheds useful light on the roles, experience, and social and moral perspective of the participants.

It must be left to the reader to make more explicit theoretical connections to notions of performativity and thence to culture theory. I would encourage readers to consider Buttny's data and analysis in relation to Silverstein's notion of creative indexicality and Bourdieu's notion of habitus, particularly the second section of the book, which is very much about diagnosing the racialization of habitus. An especially useful contribution of this book is its examination of the discursive construction of the "new racism," in that it demonstrates how whites can tune out black social realities. Buttny thus sheds light on the discursive manifestation of various and subtle ways in which hegemony is re-created. It is especially important to contrast black and white characterizations of interaction and interpretations of their import, and to get a handle on what being black or white means in actors' particular experience. What race means has changed a great deal in the past half-century, but what has not changed is the unmarkedness of whiteness and the markedness of non-whiteness.

(Received 6 January 2005)

Language in Society 35 (2006). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404506290201

DENNIS R. PRESTON (ed.), *Needed research in American dialects*. Publications of the American Dialect Society, 88. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2003. Pp. vii, 261. Hb \$20.00.

Reviewed by NATALIE SCHILLING-ESTES
Linguistics, Georgetown University
Washington, DC 20057
ns3@georgetown.edu

This collection is the fourth in a series of volumes titled *Needed research in American dialects*, published by the American Dialect Society (ADS) in 20-year intervals since 1943. In addition, the book represents the continuing evolution of the state of American dialectology and related sociolinguistics as outlined in Dennis Preston's edited collection, *American Dialect Research* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1993), published in commemoration of the ADS centennial in 1989. The current volume is a striking compilation for several reasons. First, it (like the ADS in general) is to be commended for continuing with many of the themes first outlined in the 1943 volume, currently available as part of *PADS* 31 (1964), which also includes the 1963 *Needed Research* volume. This commitment to solving research questions and completing research and publication tasks outlined early in the society's history is remarkable in an era when it is all too easy to substitute research on the latest fashionable topic for good solid scholarship on basic questions and sustained research that provides valuable time depth. At

the same time, though, the current volume is not fettered by its commitment to historical continuity, and coverage of newer research areas whose importance has been recognized over the past couple of decades is comprehensive as well. Finally, Preston is to be commended for the slate of authors he has brought together in this volume. The chapters are written by leading researchers in the areas covered, and the authors are themselves responsible for some of the chief advances in the field since the publication of the 1983 volume.

Although the volume's title is *Needed research*, it is probably better titled *Significant accomplishments and needed research*, since the book serves as both an authoritative guide to needed research and a celebration of the many noteworthy accomplishments that have been made since the 1940s, and especially in the past 20 years. These achievements include (i) the near-completion of the well-received *Dictionary of American regional English* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1985–), with the final volume to appear around 2010; (ii) the completion of Lee Pederson's *Linguistic atlas of the Gulf states (LAGS)* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1986–1993); (iii) the implementation of William A. Kretzschmar Jr.'s interactive web site (1998) for working with materials from various Linguistic Atlas projects (<http://us.english.uga.edu>); (iv) the inception and completion of William Labov and colleagues' telephone survey (TELSUR) of language variation in North American English, culminating in the publication of Labov, Ash & Boberg's *Atlas of North American English* (Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2006); (v) the publication of several important dictionaries and other works on slang, including two of four volumes of the *Random House dictionary of American slang* by Jonathan E. Lighter (1994–); and (vi) the completion of the first national sociolinguistic study of American Sign Language (Lucas, Bayley, & Valli 2001). These accomplishments are discussed, respectively, in Joan Houston Hall's chapter on "Regional lexicon: *DARE* and beyond," Kretzschmar's "Linguistic atlases of the United States and Canada," Sharon Ash's "A national survey of North American dialects," Connie C. Eble's "Slang, metaphor, and folk speech," and Robert Bayley & Ruth King's "Languages other than English in Canada and the United States."

Bayley & King's chapter also makes it clear that there has been a great deal of research on non-English languages in the United States in recent decades, though much still needs to be done, partly because the ADS traditionally has focused on varieties of English and partly because North America is becoming increasingly multilingual as immigration levels increase. Bayley & King also note the important part researchers have played in legitimizing signed languages and demonstrating that code-switching between languages is not the unconscious result of linguistic deficiency but rather a purposeful linguistic strategy. Other chapters point to the important work linguists have done to assert the legitimacy and systematicity of African American English (e.g., Penelope Eckert's "Social variation in America"), although there is still much to do, and erroneous stereotypes about African American English (AAE) and its speakers unfortunately still

abound – as discussed, for example, in Richard W. Bailey’s “Ideologies, attitudes, and perceptions.”

Another noteworthy accomplishment over the past several decades has been the recognition of the importance of discourse analysis in language variation study, as discussed in Barbara Johnstone’s chapter on “Conversation, text, and discourse.” Johnstone maintains that the inclusion of discourse analysis and discourse analytic perspectives in dialect study is vital, since, as researchers increasingly are coming to understand, all language is situated in discourse, and the large-scale patterns of variation revealed in survey studies are the culmination of linguistic usages by individuals in discursual interaction. Also important has been the continued development over the past 20 years of studies of language attitudes, ideologies, and perceptions (Bailey), including the inception of the field of perceptual dialectology, spearheaded by Dennis Preston and Nancy Niedzielski (e.g., Niedzielski & Preston 2000). Finally, no discussion of important accomplishments in dialectology and sociolinguistics over the past 20 years would be complete without mention of the revolutionary work of Penelope Eckert (e.g., 2000), who demonstrates, in her research on variation and change in adolescent communities, that sociolinguistics must combine broad-based survey techniques with in-depth ethnographic study and case studies of individual speakers to arrive at a full understanding of the wide array of social meanings language variation can have.

Eckert’s chapter is one of the most insightful in the collection, and in addition to stressing the need for combining various approaches to sociolinguistic study, she urges that researchers pay more attention to speakers’ creative use of linguistic resources in shaping individual and social identity (rather than mere correlations between linguistic usages and pre-existing social categories), as well as more attention to the borders between well-defined groups and language varieties – for example, the borders between urban, suburban, and rural communities as well as different ethnic groups. This call for more attention to social and linguistic borders is also taken up in several other chapters. For example, Ash also urges more attention to geographic borders, while Michael Montgomery (“The history of American English”) notes, along with Eckert, that the sharp dividing lines between black and white communities and their language varieties may be more a research convenience than an accurate representation of actual relations between people of different ethnicities. Finally, Bayley & King urge continuing study of language and dialect contact, as well as of individuals’ use of different languages and language varieties in presenting and shaping their personal, interpersonal, and social identities.

Other needs identified by the authors in this collection include continuing research on the history of American English (Montgomery), as well as the history and ongoing development of AAE. For example, Montgomery urges scholars to search for and examine appropriate pre-20th-century sources for information on earlier forms of AAE, while Montgomery, Ash, and Eckert urge researchers

to give the same careful study to the phonology of AAE as has been accorded to its morphosyntactic features.

One of the most interesting findings in recent American dialectological research is that, despite popular (and often scholarly linguistic) beliefs to the contrary, dialect diversity in North America is not dying away in the face of increasing mobility, intercommunication, and the widespread influence of the popular media. Rather, large regional dialects seem to be becoming more rather than less different from one another (Ash), and even some quite small dialects are maintaining or even strengthening their distinctiveness (as discussed, e.g., in Eckert and Eble). The surprising impact of globalization and the threat of increasing cultural homogenization to linguistic differentiation demand a reconsideration of the sense of the “local,” with increased emphasis on socially constructed notions of “place,” including virtual place, as opposed to physical, geographic space, since, as Johnstone puts it, “regional identity is more and more a matter of choice” (91). Along with this reconsideration of “localness” will come increasing attention to the role of the media in the diffusion of linguistic innovations, including a reexamination of the widely held sociolinguistic belief that media such as television and the Internet have only superficial effects on language variation and change.

New media channels that have grown in importance over the past 20 years are also of growing importance to dialectologists in other ways, as sociolinguists increasingly use media such as the Internet to conduct linguistic research (as discussed, e.g., in Hall) and to disseminate findings (e.g., Kretzschmar’s web site for the Linguistic Atlas Projects). Further, changing technologies have meant changing (and one hopes improved) methods of data collection and storage; and since 1943 researchers have moved from gathering data via hand transcription and written surveys to analog tape recordings, then to digital recording and the archival preservation of older and current recordings in digital format. In addition, digitized data from spoken and written sources can now be organized into computer-searchable corpora or incorporated into existing linguistic corpora, for use by a range of researchers including speech scientists and computational linguists. Ralph W. Fasold (“Language change and variation in formal syntax”) also points to the usefulness of data on language variation for theoretical syntax, especially research into syntactic change, as well as the insights theoretical perspectives can bring to variation study. Dialect researchers are working steadily to digitize older data and organize these data into widely usable corpora; and in addition, though there has been some collaboration between dialectologists/variationists and theoretical linguistics, more connections between subfields of linguistics, and between linguistics and fields such as anthropology, psychology, and history, should yield fruitful results in the future.

As this collection amply demonstrates, the future of American dialect research promises to be exciting indeed, thanks in large part to the outstanding foundations that have been laid for us over the past century and more.

REFERENCES

- Eckert, Penelope (2000). *Linguistic variation as social practice*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
 Lucas, Ceil; Bayley, Robert; & Valli, Clayton (2001). *Sociolinguistic variation in American Sign Language*. Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.
 Niedzielski, Nancy A., & Preston, Dennis R. (2000). *Folk linguistics*. Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

(Received 10 January 2005)

Language in Society 35 (2006). Printed in the United States of America
 DOI: 10.1017/S0047404506300206

KINGSLEY BOLTON, *Chinese Englishes: A sociolinguistic history*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. Pp. xviii, 338. Hb US\$70.00.

Reviewed by JAMES STANLAW
Anthropology, Illinois State University
Normal, IL 61790
stanlaw@ilstu.edu

Almost everyone knows that many places in the non-Anglophone world have had a long and tumultuous love affair with English, yet few are aware of China's flirtation, if not infatuation, with it. But with at least 200 million students of English in mainland China alone (Yong & Campbell 1995) – more than two-thirds of the population of the United States – the romance could hardly have been hidden for long. Kingsley Bolton has been letting the secret out for the past decade. This fascinating, timely, and very readable new book is the result of his many years of perseverance. In short, English in China has had “a long and barely remembered history” (p. xiii) which stretches back to the beginnings of maritime trade of Britain with Canton and Macao.

Bolton is Professor of English Linguistics at Stockholm University and past president of the International Association for World Englishes. For many years he was on the faculty of the University of Hong Kong, where he had an opportunity to witness at first hand many of the linguistic changes taking place in China and its environs. He has written extensively on the use of English in Asia, including his groundbreaking edited volume on autonomy and creativity in the English used in Hong Kong (2002).

Bolton approaches Chinese Englishes by focusing on five key issues, each receiving its own chapter. Chapter 1 gives a theoretical overview of the study of what is sometimes called “new Englishes,” “World Englishes,” or “English as a world language.” The basic argument is that many of the localized varieties of English used around the globe have developed into something autonomous, often quite different from what native speakers use in the United States, the United Kingdom, and New Zealand (to say nothing of Canada and Australia). These international varieties are thought to be not just dialects of “standard” English (however that might be defined), but to differ greatly from it in their social functionality, cultural ecology, and historical context.

Bolton does an excellent job of sorting through the current approaches to world Englishes, and his literature exegesis alone is an important contribution. Though often eclectic, he basically takes a pluralistic or “Kachruvian” (18–20, 43) stance, claiming that not only is English now part of the world’s linguistic and cultural heritage, it is very much an ASIAN language (e.g., Kachru 1996, 1997). This position emphasizes the creativity of bilingual users of English, or those in contact with English. It also shows how English is nativized – or modified – to be used in a local context while at same time leaving its own mark on local languages in various ways.

Although English has had a long presence in southern China and Hong Kong, local linguists have been reluctant to admit the existence of an actual local variety until very recently. Bolton tells us that as late as the mid-1990s, some argued that “That there is no social or cultural role for English to play among Hong Kong Chinese; it only has a role in their relations with expatriates and the outside world” (41). He clearly dispels such claims when he discusses the development of a Hong Kong variety of English, starting from 1980 and extending to 1997 (chap. 2) and its emergence as a “new English” after the return of the colony to the People’s Republic of China in 1997 (chap. 4).

Though the handover of Hong Kong was international news, often ignored was the role language – especially English – played in the rise of *hēung góng yàhn*, a distinct cultural identity as “Hong Kong people,” in the last years of the 20th century. Most Hong Kong residents are immigrants from Guangdong, Fujian, and other southern Chinese provinces, or are descendants of those immigrants. Cantonese – admittedly a very ambiguous term – is the native language of the majority of the people in Hong Kong, and it is very different from Mandarin (or Putonghua, the national language of the PRC). For example, in the Cantonese dialects there are nine tones compared to Mandarin’s four, direct objects precede indirect objects, and certain adverbs follow verbs (the opposite order from Mandarin; Ramsey 1987:102–4). As 1997 approached, the use of Cantonese reified the solidarity of the Hong Kong residents who were uncertain about what the future would bring.

Oddly, the turnover has been beneficial for English. In 1995 the PRC announced that upon assuming control it would make Hong Kong biliterate in Mandarin and English and trilingual in Mandarin, Cantonese, and English (93), a policy that is still in force. English continues to be the main language of instruction in most Hong Kong universities. In 1999, instead of encouraging Hong Kong’s identity as a southern or Cantonese city, Beijing decided to promote Hong Kong as a “world class” or “global” city, necessitating the use of English if only for business reasons. As Bolton says, “It seems, therefore, that in Hong Kong’s rapidly changing society English is here to stay” (200). And it should be noted here, too, that Cantonese also benefited from the presence of English. As PRC policy has traditionally been to promote Mandarin at the expense of local “dialects,” having another official language to compete against has weakened Mandarin’s dominance, allow-

ing Cantonese to take up numerous other sociolinguistic roles and functions that would have been denied it otherwise.

But does this translate into a true Hong Kong variety of English? Yes, claims Bolton, and he describes numerous formal features that give Hong Kong English its special flavor, including accent, vocabulary, and the way new coinages are made. But not all agree. Some, for instance, still see Hong Kong as a society where two largely mutually exclusive monolingual speech communities coexist, with a small number of linguistic middlemen serving as language and culture brokers. Bolton rejects such claims. Hong Kong is becoming increasingly multilingual and multicultural since the 1990s, even for ordinary families, for dozens of reasons. Besides the obvious advantages of knowing English for business or for professional advancement, other reasons why English is ubiquitous include the traditional bilingualism of Hong Kong's elite, overseas education for increasing numbers of students, biracial marriages, the importation of hundreds of thousands of English-speaking domestic helpers, and the use of English in international electronics communications (from the Internet to DVDs to video games).

In chapter 3, Bolton attempts to conduct an "archaeology" of Chinese Englishes since the mid-17th century. Using standard historical methods in examining British trade and settlement in China, and examining extant texts to reconstruct what the contemporary speech might have been like, he uncovers the "forgotten past" (47) of English in China, in particular in the south. Among these texts are missionary writings, sailors' or administrators' diaries, glossaries or dictionaries of pidgin Chinese English, and – as one commentator of the time quaintly called them – "native vocabularies published for the benefit of compradors and servants." Almost all of these have fascinating stories in their own right. One example is "The common foreign language of the redhaired people," the complete text of which is included as an appendix. This was published in Canton around 1835 and is probably the earliest Chinese glossary of the English language. One of the remarkable things is the number of items that are not English, but Portuguese or even Swedish (172).

Bolton discusses the current state of English in China, as well as mainland Chinese English, in chapter 5. There are some interesting surprises here as well. For example, missionary schools and Christian colleges were instrumental since the 19th century in bringing English to the Chinese, so the language has always been associated in some ways with evangelism. But I wonder if anyone would have been ready for the likes of Li Yang at the turn of the 21st century. Li is a combination New Age guru, motivational speaker, self-help therapist, and get-rich-quick late-night TV barker. The product this mega-showman sells is Crazy English, and he has turned this teaching method into a multimillion-dollar business in the PRC. His huckster nationalism fuels his public appearances – as well as the sale of his books and tapes – and has given him rock star celebrity status. He claims that by studying Crazy English – basically just saying a lot of simple things loudly and physically – one's confidence is boosted, and one is likely to

REVIEWS

become wealthy. As Bolton points out, “In the case of Li Yang’s ‘Crazy English,’ we see another modernity at work, that of a rapidly industrializing China in which capital and capitalism serve the needs of the Maoist Marxist-Leninism reinvented as ‘socialism with Chinese characteristics.’ . . . Li Yang’s approach appears to give voice to the material hopes of millions of Chinese in a variety of brash English that twangs American but rings global with its exhortation ‘Make the voice of China be widely heard all over the world!’” (257). Bolton’s new book will help the rest of us, whether scholars or students, take notice of what could potentially be the largest English-using country in the world.

REFERENCES

- Bolton, Kingsley (2002) (ed.). *Hong Kong English: Autonomy and creativity*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Kachru, Braj B. (1996). English as an Asian language. In Maria Lourdes S. Bautista (ed.), *English as an Asian language*, 1–23. Manila: Macquarie Library.
- Kachru, Braj B. (1997). Past imperfect: The other side of English in Asia. In Larry Smith & Michael Forman (eds.), *World Englishes 2000, selected essays Vol. 14*, 68–89. Honolulu: University of Hawaii East-West Center.
- Ramsey, S. Robert (1987). *The languages of China*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Yong, Zhao, & Campbell, Keith (1995). English in China. *World Englishes* 14:377–90.

(Received 16 January 2005)