

## REVIEWS

ALESSANDRO DURANTI, *Linguistic anthropology*. (Cambridge textbooks in linguistics.) Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997. Pp. xxi, 398. Hb \$59.95, pb \$19.95.

Reviewed by JOSEPH ERRINGTON  
*Anthropology, Yale University*  
New Haven, CT 06520-8277  
j.errington@yale.edu

This new textbook has upper-level undergraduate and graduate students for a focal audience. But as Duranti makes clear in his preface and first chapter, he aims neither at a synoptic presentation of the field's major paradigms, nor at a comprehensive review of its interdisciplinary significances. Duranti's selective foregrounding of topics and linkages makes for only a partial fit between this book's substance and the expectation of a "textbook treatment" which its title might raise. His purpose is instead to present the first accessible, generalized treatment of (culturally contextualized) conversation analysis at the juncture of ethnography and formal language description. As such, it is a welcome addition to the pedagogic literature.

*Linguistic anthropology* bears comparison in this respect with William Foley's introductory text, *Anthropological linguistics* (1997). In twice as many chapters, the latter covers a wide range of major paradigms, historical developments, and interdisciplinary connections; but despite its striking completeness of coverage, it leaves two areas largely undiscussed – conversation analysis and discourse-functional grammar. These are focal in Duranti's book, along with practical issues of recording and transcribing material. This complementarity between the two books may prove useful for teachers who can assign more than one text for upper-level courses. Foley's book introduces a wide range of perspectives on the field – structural, historical, institutional, biological etc. – while Duranti broaches particular, difficult questions about the nexus of language form, conversation analysis, and cultural description.

Certainly CA has a claim on the attention not just of linguistic anthropologists, but of cultural anthropologists as well. Whatever one considers culture to be, it surely happens (to paraphrase Whorf) in situated language use. With the increasingly common, variable appeals that are made to "practice" in anthropological writings, there has developed a parallel need to think through the full range of fine-grained patternings that constitute the core practice called "talk." As disciplinary boundaries shift, familiarity with new trends in anthropological linguistics can likewise help to develop a critical eye for cross-disciplinary work such as Bourdieu's sociological critique of linguistics, or Giddens's retro-appropriation

of a “Saussurean conception of the production of an utterance” (1982:37) in the service of his theory of “structuration.”

Thus there are grounds for seriously introducing a suitably adapted version of CA as an integral part of introductory courses in linguistic anthropology. An important strength of *LINGUISTIC ANTHROPOLOGY* is the accessibility of its presentation of the broadest goals, techniques, and theoretical grounds for relativized, ethnographically oriented CA. Unlike much conversation-analytic writing, Duranti’s book self-consciously addresses the large “outgroup” of non-CA scholars through multiple framings of it as an ethnographic endeavor.

Chap. 2’s cursory outline of “theories of culture,” for instance, needs to be read with an eye to the conversation-analytic concerns of later chapters. It also evinces Duranti’s broader concern with philosophical approaches to issues of consciousness and intentionality, which recur in later chapters. Sketches of Lévi-Straussian (called here “semiotic”), cognitive, and interpretive notions of culture are followed by longer discussions of metapragmatics, mediation, practice, and participation, all of which figure in Chaps. 7–9.

Under the rubric “linguistic diversity,” Chap. 3 presents a similarly synoptic discussion of linguistic relativity, the early development of anthropological linguistics, metaphor and cognition, and intercommunity language variation. Duranti explicitly excludes “sociolinguistic” issues and findings from his discussion; and he alludes only in passing to the broadly institutional grounds of linguistic hierarchy – through Bakhtin’s notion of heteroglossia, on one hand, and by sketchily rehearsing a few case studies in bilingualism, on the other hand.

In Chaps. 4–5, Duranti passes to an extensive outline of, and moral meditation on, ways of recording and writing down material in CA. He discusses the nature and practice of participant observation, native “blind spots,” the politics of the interview, and the broader ethics of ethnographic representation. His outline of the use of video technology in ethnographically oriented research is useful, as is his refreshingly practical discussion of the sometimes daunting notational conventions of conversation analysis. By frankly emphasizing the rhetoric of conversational transcription, he usefully opens up for later discussion the underlying interpretive grounds of contextualized conversation analysis.

Chap. 6 shifts to more traditional structural issues of linguistic description – though it touches only briefly on phonology, in ways that refer tacitly to the cursory mention of Jakobson in Chap. 2. More attention is given to transitivity and ergativity within a discourse-functional approach to grammar; these issues too could be linked to the brief discussion of linguistic relativity in Chap. 2. The chapter’s concluding review of sign-theoretic notions is presented quite independently of Peircian semiotic, and with only implicit reference to issues of cultural mediation discussed in prior chapters.

Chap. 7 shifts interdisciplinary discussion to an empiricist and relativist critique of speech act theory in the analytic philosophical tradition; as such, it is likely to speak more to readers with interests in that field than to novices in

anthropological linguistics. Duranti starts with Malinowski's theory of language and Lévi-Strauss-inspired criticisms of it by Tambiah (his name, unfortunately, misspelled). He then works toward an anthropological adaptation of Wittgenstein's notion of language game as a "unit of analysis." Many newcomers to the field will need further background and explication to gauge the effectiveness and broader relevance of Duranti's relativist, empiricist critique of Austin and Searle.

Chap. 8 shifts from philosophy back to core concerns of ethnographically grounded CA: the "mechanisms" and significances of conversational sequencing, and the cultural grounds for understanding conversational "preference." Here Duranti's ethnographic and relativistic concerns converge in a presentation of the concept of preference as a rubric for "interpretive frameworks within which members must operate at the very moment of engaging in the mediating activity of talk" (261). By acknowledging here a double hermeneutic of CA, Duranti sets his approach off from much conversation-analytic work founded on what he calls "the autonomous claim." By explicating this difference, he goes a long way toward showing anthropologists the potential of CA as an integral part of cultural description. This point also fits another of the book's leitmotifs: the longstanding affinities between various phenomenologies of language, on one hand, and broadly interactionalist approaches to social life, on the other.

Chap. 9's discussion of ethnographic-cum-psychological approaches to intentionality start from Vygotsky's notion of "participation" at the juncture where ensembles of (verbal) resources (vs. structure) meet with instances of social practice (vs. language use). By this account, "participation units" serve to link cultural knowledge to context through talk's various deictic anchorings. In this way, Duranti suggests, linguistic anthropologists can gain privileged entree to culturally variable understandings of self, intentionality, and responsibility. His concern to locate CA within anthropological linguistics and ethnographic description leads Duranti to leave to one side a wide range of questions about broadly institutional dimensions of the social life of language. Thus, though Labov is criticized for reliance on interview techniques, the broad significance of his variationist findings on sociolinguistic inequality go unmentioned. Duranti finds a place for Bourdieu's view of Heidegger, but not for the influence of his social theory in anthropological work on language and authority. In his effort to develop a sense of language's doubleness as cultural resource and practice, Duranti remains silent on the institutional forces that coarticulate and inform linguistic diversity within interactional process.

Thus readers will need to develop their own conclusions about conversational-analytic findings in relation to institutionally and ideologically shaped understandings of language and community. Teachers will likewise be obliged to draw on other sources to address crucial questions about the juncture between what Duranti passingly alludes to as the "micro-interactional level" and "macro-interactional" (290) levels of community. But thanks to its tight focus, this book fills a real gap among introductory texts in the field. It is more accessible in tone

than much conversation-analytic work; and while overtly ethnographic in its substance, it presupposes less collateral disciplinary knowledge than Moerman's essay (1988) in this difficult, important area. *Linguistic anthropology* should be of great help in opening up this dynamic branch of research to a broader audience.

REFERENCES

- Foley, William (1997). *Anthropological linguistics: An introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.  
Giddens, Anthony (1982). Action, structure, power. In *Profiles and critiques in social theory*, 28–39. Berkeley: University of California Press.  
Moerman, Michael (1988). *Talking culture*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

(Received 1 August 1998)

DAVID L. SHAUL & N. LOUANNA FURBEE, *Language and culture*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland, 1998. Pp. xiv, 303. Pb \$13.95.

Reviewed by SUSAN D. BLUM  
*Anthropology, University of Colorado*  
Denver, CO 80217-3364  
sblum@castle.cudenver.edu

This unusual and ambitious book attempts to define a field both more narrow and more broad-ranging than linguistic anthropology: the field of “language and culture studies.” Like a number of other recent works, including Duranti 1997, Bonvillain 1997, Salzman 1998, and even the edited volume of Brenneis & Macaulay 1996, this book is intended to introduce an often misunderstood field to a new generation of students. Each of these books begins with a discussion of how to title the field (anthropological linguistics? linguistic anthropology?) and how to justify the material included and excluded. While acknowledging kinship with sociolinguistics, formal linguistics, ethnography of speaking or ethnolinguistics, discourse analysis, and cultural studies, each book mentions studies belonging to these subfields but does not situate them at the center. The basic issue appears to be what these authors regard as fundamental questions; to fall within linguistic anthropology, the questions have to be anthropological. In other words, the aim is usually to uncover some aspect of a society through close examination of its language. Studies of language for its own sake might be interesting, important, even essential; but these tend not to be the focal issue in the works mentioned above.

S&F go further than the other works mentioned in carving out a domain. They identify two types of language and culture studies, both derived from “Boasian particularism” (xii): “the relation of language to other aspects of culture,” and “the use of models derived from the study of language structure as ways of analyzing other aspects of culture.” For them, culture is cognitive (Chap. 5); so when they say “language and culture,” “thought” is implicitly included. “Society” is much less present in their work, in part because they conduct their own research in small-scale communities where it is, to some extent, possible to disregard

social factors. They very briefly acknowledge that anthropologists do not all agree to regard culture as “all shared, learned knowledge” (97), and they state that “the only real evidence for culture is actual behavior”; however, following Boas, they “take culture to be knowledge” (*ibid.*). This accounts in part for their choice of material to include.<sup>1</sup>

The book’s principal strength lies in its presentation of a broad range of topics that S&F connect back to anthropological and linguistic ancestors, in particular Boas. Following an introduction and two preliminary chapters, the headings are: Chap. 3, “The Whorf hypothesis”; Chap. 4, “Linguistic relativity and lexical categories”; Chap. 5, “Structuralism and semiotics”; Chap. 6, “Signifiers in syntax”; Chap. 7, “The new relativism”; Chap. 8, “Cognitive anthropology”; Chap. 9, “Interpretivism,” an interpretive version of language and culture studies; and Chap. 10, “Integrations.” S&F’s strongest chapters include their summary of the work of Boas and Sapir (Chap. 2), along with those that rely on their own research – in which they have spent many years puzzling over theoretical issues, such as color term research or cognitive models (part of Chap. 4, and Chaps. 7–8). The final chapters, discussing “interpretivism” and other more recent developments in the humanities and social sciences, could also provoke much thoughtful discussion, especially in conjunction with works mentioned in the text.

In their attempts to define a field that has existed all along without our knowing it, S&F draw together strands that might match, once one is able to see the entire fabric. But for students unfamiliar with the material, the inclusions may be difficult to follow, while for those familiar with it, the textbook format is inappropriate. Some of the material they associate astonished me. For instance, they draw together Nostratic and basic color terms (Chap. 4) to illuminate tendencies in the two types of work, by pointing out how both historical linguistics and color studies rely on lexical categories. Sometimes the connections drawn need much greater elaboration, as in Chap. 3 on Whorf; the last two pages of this chapter deal with deictics, politeness, T/V pronouns, modals, and Australian English, without developing these ideas. S&F’s point is to show the lack of direct connection between grammatical categories and cultural categories, supporting their view of the weak form of linguistic relativity and their rejection of the strong form. Yet their examples are extremely wide-ranging and often rather abstract, so that it would be easy for a reader to get lost in the details. Thus there is a fascinating tidbit about diminutives in Australian English indicating not effeminacy, as in Britain, but rather the opposite (57). This sort of example is not usually associated with the Whorf hypothesis, and it may take great effort to see the connection. Although all textbook writers attempt to instill their own views into the material (consciously or not), it will be incumbent on teachers who use S&F’s book to point out how unusual their perspective is. My overall feeling when reading the book was puzzlement. What would come next? What would be connected with what? S&F’s choices are not at all deplorable, but they are not obvious either.

Some of my quibbles are editorial. The Introduction is hard to follow, in part because of the pioneering nature of the work; but it is also redundant in places and underdeveloped in others. But S&F have an important goal here: to situate a field they call “language and culture” within questions of reality. Although Chap. 1 introduces the material about to be treated, and cannot assume the reader’s easy consent, the final chapter does an admirable job of summarizing the material that has been discussed.

Some of the book’s weaknesses are related to its strengths, while other weaknesses are shared by other textbooks – an extremely challenging genre to master. In S&F’s attempt to carve out a new field, it is not clear who their audience is. It seems that a journal article might be an appropriate place to argue for this field, yet there is nothing inherently wrong with making this argument in a textbook; it’s just that the people they probably wish to persuade do not require the textbook apparatus that is of necessity included.

Like many textbooks, this one summarizes a huge range of other people’s research, situating it in the context of whatever topic is being discussed at the moment. The difficulty with teaching from such works is that there is not usually enough of any single topic to sink in; students emerge dizzy with terms and names, but with little solid material that they can remember. Thus it is necessary for instructors to select carefully from the works mentioned in the text. The book might be useful as a summary for advanced graduate students who want a synthesis of a large range of material, but for them the exercises at the end of each chapter would be far too elementary. I could almost imagine the book as a long version of an article in the *Annual Review of Anthropology*, but directed to a less experienced reader. Still, nonspecialist undergraduates are likely to find much of this material puzzling.

Of S&F’s examples, the one that has stuck most in my mind is an account of R. M. W. Dixon’s standing on a street corner in Edinburgh and uttering a statement in Dyrbal, which people interpreted either as a request or as a polite formula (203); this is in the context of showing how some utterances are overdetermined by context. A day or two before I read that, I had a similar experience. Passing a pedestrian on a sidewalk in the South (I am not from the South), I said *Hello*; he answered, *I’m doin’ fine, thanks*. My two children (aged 5 and 8, and literalists) went into gales of laughter at his “inappropriate” response. I took it as a sign that I’d uttered the wrong greeting in this context (it should have been *How ya doin’*), but he corrected it for me. S&F’s example is comparable.

Some of S&F’s offhand characterizations seem arguable, as when they introduce “cognitive anthropology” as “the intellectual descendant of linguistic relativity studies” (xii). On reflection, this makes some sense; yet there are many ways to view this relationship. Linguistic relativity studies may be one ancestor of cognitive anthropology, but the latter field has other antecedents as well, including philosophy, psychology, and some classic anthropology (such as the work of Lévy-Bruhl).

S&F's use of other scholars' works, or failure to use them, is perplexing: Saussure's example of words for meat and animals in English and French is used to make a very different point, about homeland studies rather than linguistic value (63). When they discuss the extension of linguistic models into culture (which they term the "linguistic metaphorist tradition"), one thinks immediately of Lévi-Strauss, yet he is mentioned only once in the book (115). Similarly, Roland Barthes is mentioned three times, once in the context of postmodernism; but his work is never described enough to give an idea of its nature. Again, John Lucy's work on color and cognition is not summarized; but Jane Hill's analysis of Doña Maria's "voices," in the context of a discussion on Bakhtin, goes on for two full pages. Chap. 6 includes a very good use of food to illustrate different types of semiotic systems – "breakfast" / "meals" / Passover seder vs. eucharist – but no credit is given to Mary Douglas.

Chap. 8, "Cognitive anthropology," is the most detailed. S&F are very interested in the fine shadings of interpretation here. They contrast fuzzy sets, prototypes, schemata, and scripts; they discuss consensus theory, multiple pathways theory, expert systems, metaphor, and metonymy. They raise issues of the nature of cognition; the question of whether culture is individual or shared; the question of whether one should focus on single terms or actions; and the contrast between covert, implicit categories vs. explicit, overt, named categories. Context is mentioned in their discussion of metaphor (157), but is not pursued.

This is a partisan portrayal of a new field, "language and culture studies," where "culture" is given a cognitive definition. As such, it is sure to attract both supporters and detractors. How beginners will be able to make sense of the arguments is unclear; but in the hands of skilled guides, the book may well find a place in courses on language and culture, linguistic anthropology, cognitive anthropology, cultural studies, and core courses in general social science or humanities.

## NOTE

<sup>1</sup> See Duranti 1997. Chap. 2, for a very different approach to defining culture. Duranti provides a set of models of culture that tend to be used by linguistic anthropologists, not always exclusively or consistently.

## REFERENCES

- Bonvillain, Nancy (1997). *Language, culture, and communication: The meaning of messages*. 2nd edn. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Brenneis, Donald, & Macaulay, Ronald H. S. (1996), eds. *The matrix of language: Contemporary linguistic anthropology*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Duranti, Alessandro (1997). *Linguistic anthropology*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Salzmann, Zdenek (1998). *Language, culture, and society: An introduction to linguistic anthropology*. 2d edn. Boulder, CO: Westview.

(Received 15 August 1998)

JOHN R. TAYLOR & ROBERT E. MACLAURY (eds.), *Language and the cognitive construal of the world*. (Trends in linguistics: Studies and monographs, 82). Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter, 1995. Pp. xiii, 406. DM 178.00.

Reviewed by MARGARET E. WINTERS  
*Academic Affairs, Southern Illinois University  
Carbondale, IL 62901-4305  
mew1@siu.edu*

This ambitious volume succeeds in pulling together diverse approaches to surveying and analyzing human culture through human linguistic ability, as viewed by linguists and anthropologists. It does not, by any measure, take an extreme Whorfian view – or, for that matter, an extreme anti-Whorfian view – of the relationship between language and culture; rather, it sets forth a series of ideas about the mediating role of cognition in the ways in which we view and talk about the world around us. This is not a surprising stance for the editors; Taylor has long been a proponent of the semantics-based theory of cognitive grammar (cf. Taylor 1995), and MacLaury has recently published a study (1997) of color terminology within an offshoot of cognitive grammar called VANTAGE THEORY.

A brief preface by MacLaury (vii–xiii) provides a perspective on the interactions of cognition and culture, ranging from early considerations of comparative conceptualization (e.g. Kroeber 1917) to the present volume. It is followed by Taylor's introduction (1–21), "On construing the world," which further contextualizes the essays in the collection, both within other lines of research and as they relate to one another.

I would divide the volume into three major sections, followed by a kind of afterword. The first part has to do with construal, with articles by Eugene Casad (23–49), Ronald Langacker (51–79), Savas L. Tsohatzidis (81–93), René Dirven (95–118), and Bernd Heine (119–35). The first two treat syntactic structure, and the next three the lexicon; the latter emphasize, in a way not surprising in cognitive grammar, the role of prepositions in making sense of the world. Underlying all the essays in this section is the belief that syntax is symbolic of meaning – and that, even more basically, all grammatical elements are meaningful, even if in ways different from full lexical items.

The next section takes up a second theme that derives more from what one might call the Berkeley flavor of cognitive semantics, through the study of metaphor, rather than from the San Diego flavor, based in lexical meaning and construal. Of the papers that address the metaphorical side of emotions, particularly interesting is the essay by Dirk Geeraerts & Stefan Grondelaers (153–79); this suggests that metaphors for anger, at least in western European languages, must be understood as mediated through the now-defunct folk theory of HUMORS. Thus, when we talk of anger as a hot liquid, we are using an image that figured in an earlier understanding of human emotion, and of interaction with the world, as operating through a balance (or imbalance) of physical substances within the body. The idea is presented here as a methodological hypothesis, and it certainly



warrants further historical study. But it is disputed in turn by Zoltán Kövecses (181–96), who sees no need to call on earlier theories of emotions to explain current thinking, since the metaphors are based synchronically (although he doesn't use that term) on human views of physiology and emotion; the physiological side may have some universal aspects, but the metaphors need not. One can reduce the question to an old one in linguistics: should diachronic data figure in synchronic analyses? Geeraerts (who is a historical linguist) & Grondelaers argue convincingly that these data do belong in our attempts to understand networks of metaphors. Such a debate within the pages of this volume actually opens new questions about the nature of so-called synchronic data, not only for linguistics but also for cultural studies that may fall under literature, anthropology, or other academic disciplines. Can we, finally, ignore history in our attempt to understand the present?

The third theme of the volume emerges in the last group of articles. Included is a long essay by MacLaury (231–76), setting out the refinement of cognitive grammar that he has entitled “vantage theory.” Here he talks about the function of LEVEL OF FOCUS – a refinement of what Langacker (1987 and elsewhere) has called “construal”: the viewpoint of the speaker (or subject) in relationship to the information in the utterance. MacLaury's contribution includes the transfer of the notion of vantages from strictly linguistic data to physical perceptions of the world, most notably as evidenced through the identification of color among speakers of non-European languages (cf. MacLaury 1997). Other essays in this section explore vantage theory further; thus MacLaury in collaboration with anthropologist Jane Hill (277–29) presents a close philological reading of some sixteenth-century documents, to explicate the evolution of Aztec thought during the Spanish colonial period. The theoretical point explored in this very interesting contribution is that vantage theory, with its emphasis on the level of focus of the observer, can shed light not just on construal but also on the more fundamental question of categorization. Two other articles – by Munekazu H. Aoyagi (331–63) and Jeff Lansing (365–75) – take up other aspects of vantage theory, exploring its potential for cultural studies and intellectual history as it functions in the history of ideas.

This last topic, taken up by Lansing as a brief history of the notion of category, reappears in a final essay by Nigel Love (377–89). This somewhat more ambitious contribution gives the reader tools for understanding the entire enterprise of situating language and culture within cognition. Although Love's essay is concise, and not to be used as a beginning text on the history of linguistics, it provides good information and insight into the topics that appear elsewhere in the volume.

The book is well arranged by themes (though the sections are not labeled), and it also provides the needed apparatus for readers who are not going to start with the first page and read through to the end – although a great deal can be gained by doing so. To aid more casual readers, and also those who want to return to specific ideas or topics, the editors provide an index of names (391–95) and a subject index (396–406). Finally, a list of contributors and their academic affiliations is

provided (407); their mailing addresses (electronic or snail) might also have been a useful addition, once the choice was made to add this final list.

There is a great deal to be gained from this collection, not least of which is its scope. It presents a balance of what we might call “pure” linguistics, anthropology, textual criticism and exegesis, and the history of ideas. It puts very new ideas – such as cognitive grammar and, even more, vantage theory – in the perspective of views of categorization and the nature of language that go back to the Greeks. I can imagine using it as a text in a graduate course in language, culture, and cognition. Such a course may not be taught often in many linguistics programs; but it should be, particularly now that this up-to-date and thought-provoking volume is available to serve as the basis of discussion.

REFERENCES

- Kroeber, Alfred L. (1917). The superorganic. *American Anthropologist* 19:163–213.
- Langacker, Ronald W. (1987). *Foundations of cognitive grammar, I*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- MacLaury, Robert E. (1997). *Color and cognition in Mesoamerica: Constructing categories as vantages*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Taylor, John R. (1995). *Linguistic categorization: Prototypes in linguistic theory*. 2nd edn. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

(Received 17 August 1998)

CHARLES A. FERGUSON, *Sociolinguistic perspectives: Papers on language in society, 1959–1994*. Ed. by Thom Huebner. (Oxford studies in sociolinguistics.) Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press, 1996. Pp. vii, 348. Hb \$75.00, pb \$35.00.

Reviewed by WALT WOLFRAM  
English, North Carolina State University  
Raleigh, NC 27695-8105  
wolfram@social.chass.ncsu.edu

This collection of Ferguson’s articles brings together his research over four decades. When Ferguson started writing about topics related to language and society, the term “sociolinguistics” was barely used and had no recognized status as a field of inquiry. Today, the term seems too diffuse for all the strands of specialization that range from the examination of micro-socio-phonetic detail to the consideration of broad-based macro-sociological and linguistic institutions. Perhaps better than those of any other individual scholar, Ferguson’s research interests reflect the breadth of the field. His topics of study have ranged “from Arabic linguistics to applied linguistics, from child language acquisition to language planning, from language and religion to language universals, from Bengali syntax to American sports announcer talk” (p. 3). His impact on the field is undeniable; but because of his expansive interests in an age of increasingly (and sometimes myopic) specialization, few readers are familiar with the full range of

sociolinguistic topics that bear this scholar's mark. In Huebner's selection of articles, Ferguson's overall contribution to the field is put in perspective, although the collection is hardly exhaustive of his impact. (See now also Huebner's 1999 obituary of Ferguson.)

The book is divided into four parts on the basis of quite broad subject areas; each section contains six reprinted articles. Part I, "Speech communities and language situations," contains the now classic 1959 article on diglossia, alongside a 1991 article that offers an overview of South Asia as a sociolinguistic area. Although Ferguson did not invent the term "diglossia" (according to Huebner, he borrowed it from the French Arabist W. Marcias), he is responsible more than any other individual for setting forth the construct, and for inspiring decades of sociolinguistic attention to a special type of language situation – in which one variety is used for largely formal, institutional roles, while another is used for a complementary set of largely informal ones. In a sense, the 1959 article is the prototypical Fergusonian approach to a topic of language use: a concise set of seemingly casual observations is offered in a relatively compact presentation format which, in turn, inspires years of probing follow-up inquiry. The discussion of diglossia is now a regular part of most texts in sociolinguistics (e.g. Holmes 1992, R. Hudson 1996, Wardhaugh 1996); and there are extensive treatments of the way this construct has been expanded and redefined (e.g. Fasold 1984), as well as comprehensive bibliographic reviews (e.g. A. Hudson 1992).

Part II, "Register and genre," covers topics that include baby-talk register (how adults talk to babies), syntactic dimensions of sports announcer talk, and politeness formulas, as well as explanations of copula absence in normal speech, baby talk, interlanguage, and pidgins/creoles. Again, Ferguson's observations in some of these articles have inspired decades of follow-up research. For example, I still find myself returning to his 1971 article on copula absence in different language contact and language development situations, to sort out how his observations might be factored into a reasonable historical account of the origin of copula absence in African American Vernacular English. I suspect that I am not alone in this regard, and that researchers in other specialized areas of sociolinguistics are doing the same thing with other articles authored by Ferguson.

Part III, "Variation and change," includes articles that range from the examination of cross-linguistic variation of particular phones (in particular [h] and [s]) to the role of standardization in language spread. Ferguson's approach to variation and change is inclusive, embracing detailed quantitative techniques as well as the examination of the broad-based role of standardization movements in the description and explanation of language change.

Part IV, "Language planning," includes articles on language policy and planning that cover topics ranging from sociolinguistic surveys to the consideration of the role of language in national development. In some respects, this section shows the most coherent thread weaving through all of the papers, but one is still impressed with the diversity of interests represented in the articles.

One might quibble about the organizational basis for the sections, the selection of representative articles for each section, or the imposed symmetry of precisely six papers per section; but these seem to be mostly matters of individual preference, rather than serious organizational flaws. I personally find Ferguson's work on language and religion underrepresented here, but this is somewhat mitigated by a bibliography of his works on this topic. I would have preferred a comprehensive list of his entire bibliography, rather than one that simply takes up where his festschrift (Fishman et al. 1986) leaves off: The festschrift is largely inaccessible because of its exorbitant cost. Nonetheless, the reader of this compilation can only be overwhelmed by the expansive scope of Ferguson's interests, and by his knack for making significant observations about all manner of topics related to language in its social context.

One of the best aspects of this book is Huebner's thoughtful general introduction to the collection, as well as his introductions to each of the sections. Anyone interested in the modern development of sociolinguistics as a field of inquiry should not fail to read this discussion of Ferguson's role in it. Huebner includes a discussion of the early uses of the term "sociolinguistics," and he catalogs significant activities by one of the first committees to be convened on this topic, the Committee on Sociolinguistics of the Social Sciences Research Council – formed in 1963, and headed by Ferguson. The introduction also discusses several themes of Ferguson's research, including his views on theory, data, and methods. We find that Ferguson was eclectic in his approach to data collection and analysis, driven by a strong belief that theory construction should derive inductively from data. He was not, however, atheoretical; he just felt that the requirements of empirical data for most linguistic theories were too lax (7).

Finally, we must recall the personal impact of Ferguson on colleagues and students. Huebner recalls how he would marvel at Ferguson's behavior at conferences or other formal presentations, as he would "gently, through tactful, self-effacing questioning, lead the presenter and the rest of us in the audience to new insights and implications for broader issues of language structure and use" (vii). This depiction captures the essence of Ferguson as a well-rounded, international, and humble scholar who has held academic appointments on five different continents, and was the fitting recipient of a festschrift edited by scholars representing five different continents and four different religious traditions (Fishman et al. 1986).

In the best sense of the word, Ferguson represents the approach of a sociolinguistic "generalist." He never authored a book-length exposition of a specific sociolinguistic theory, or developed a particular method of sociolinguistic description or analysis; yet his work has touched virtually everyone in the field. As exemplified in this collection, he was a master of the pithy article, full of enticing observations that inspire other researchers to follow up the empirical and theoretical implications of his comments. It is hard to imagine that the role filled by Ferguson could ever be duplicated by an individual scholar – given the historical

circumstances that came together in the development of the field, and the subsequent compartmentalization that has taken place. This collection of articles, along with Huebner's discussion of Ferguson's impact on the field, is a fitting tribute to a scholar who delicately combined "impeccable academic rigor, professional integrity, and human kindness" (vii).

## REFERENCES

- Fasold, Ralph W. (1984). *The sociolinguistics of language*. Oxford: Blackwell.  
 Fishman, Joshua, et al. (1986), eds. *The Fergusonian impact: In honor of Charles A. Ferguson on the occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.  
 Holmes, Janet (1992). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. London: Longman.  
 Hudson, Alan (1992). Diglossia: A bibliographic review. *Language in Society* 21:611–74.  
 Hudson, Richard A. (1996). *Sociolinguistics*. 2nd edn. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.  
 Huebner, Thom (1999). Obituary: Charles Albert Ferguson. *Language in Society* 28:431–37.  
 Wardhaugh, Ronald (1998). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. 3rd edn. Oxford: Blackwell.

(Received 16 July 1998)

RAJENDRA SINGH, *Lectures against sociolinguistics*. New York: Peter Lang, 1996.  
 Pp. xix, 180.

Reviewed by CHRISTOPHER MCALL  
*Department de sociologie, Université de Montréal*  
*Montréal, Québec H3C 3J7, Canada*  
*mcallc@ere.umontreal.ca*

Singh criticizes sociolinguistics, whether in its Labovian or its Gumperzian guise, for failing to take into account what he describes as LINGUISTICALITY and SOCIALITY. Thus variationism fails to take into account the underlying phonological laws that not only are a part of all languages, but are also specific to certain languages; and interactionism fails to take power and inequality into account.

The phonological point that Singh makes with respect to variants is that they are not really variants. Or at least, for them to be considered variants, there would have to be some one common form in respect to which they are variants: Variation presumes that we have established sameness. In fact, such variants tend to make sense (and to respect sound laws) within the framework of specific phonological or grammatical systems. Thus Irish English "variant" forms are not really variants at all, but an integral part of a system in its own right. Different dialects thus should be seen as different phonological systems, rather than as variants of some "common" system. They would also be subject to certain underlying universal laws relating to the human language faculty. The point therefore is not just to count variant forms, but to understand the phonological systems at work.

Linguisticity is also about lexical borrowing and morphology. In Hindi, for example, compounds that repeat native and borrowed words meaning the same

thing can be more than just examples of language contact. Within Hindi itself, reduplication is used to refer, for example, to “each” of something, thus *šahar-šahar* ‘each city’. In English or French this would be seen as a redundant compound, but not in Hindi. Thus we need to be sensitive to specific system rules. Contact studies “must pay attention not only to social needs, but also to the disposition of Universal Grammar and inherent guiding principles of each particular grammar that is involved in the contact situation” (70).

In addition, sociolinguistics is, or should be, about sociality, and this is where much of what passes for sociolinguistics comes to grief, in Singh’s view. For example, Gumperzian interactionism fails to take POWER into account. Singh gives the example of a series of misunderstandings between a non-native speaker of English and a television saleswoman in the U.S. In the classic interactionist perspective, the “problem” here is the language incompetence of the non-native speaker of English. What Singh points out is that there is also a power relationship involved, with the woman apparently not wanting to understand (or even hear) what the caller has to say: She is not “predisposed to understand” (94).

The trouble is that interactionism tends to presume equality as the basis of the relationship. It also presumes that each party to the relationship is trying to get something from the other, rather than being involved in a “participatory search for meaning” (96), and that their individual interests are blocked by communication problems linked to (cultural) competence or incompetence. In addition, it tends to see culture as “static,” “locked in,” and “objectified” (97). Singh suggests that power and inequality, which are an integral part of sociality, introduce “deafness” into the relationship, with one party not wanting to hear what the other has to say. Such deafness is generally ignored in interactionist sociolinguistics. What we need to do is to look for the “social, historical and economic conditions of non-repair” (94–95).

Singh thus challenges some basic assumptions in studies of cross-cultural communication: that linguistic differences cause problems; that we are “locked in”; that intravariety differences are smaller than inter-variety differences; that miscommunication occurs; that the communication is generally non-repairable; and that it is assimilative. He suggests instead that linguistic differences only appear to cause problems: that we are liberated and not locked in by our language capacity; that there are no more nor less intra-variety differences than inter-variety differences; that “deafness” occurs rather than miscommunication; that communication is always repairable; and that it is based on cooperation rather than assimilation. Thus, for Singh, linguistics should look at underlying processes, rather than just counting variants or doing other kinds of statistical analysis. Sociology, in turn, is not simply “taking social appearances for granted” (p.1). He describes his approach as “constitutive” rather than “regulative”: Regulative rules do not generate but describe, whereas constitutive rules generate a “blueprint for understanding new behaviors” (7). Singh is thus opposed to the reductionism that is to be found in variationism – “reducing language and society to an unordered, un-

structured set of independent variables” (31). Variationism has an empiricist bias, founded on descriptive categories that are seen as “non-derived primitives” (32).

According to Singh, “any description of socio-linguistic variability must describe that, and only that, which cannot be predicted from general propositions either about language or about society” (28). It is hence important to further our knowledge concerning these general propositions: “In order to do socio-linguistics that may have some explanatory potential, what we need to do is to look for propositions about the forms of human language and to look for propositions about the nature and structure of our societies” (29). These are the laws of form and the laws of sociality; e.g., laws of phonology “have their own life and must be respected” (58).

Singh’s position is thus that sociolinguistics, if it is to be anything, needs to be based on good linguistics and good sociology. The problem, in my view, is that there is a disciplinary frontier between linguistics (good or bad) and sociology (good or bad). It is not just a question of method, but of the way the object of the discipline is defined. Linguists (socio- or otherwise) are interested in the phenomenon of language, and they may or may not refer to the social context in which language “happens” in order to come to a better understanding of the way language works. Sociologists – even sociologists of language (insofar as they exist) – are not interested in language as such, but in social relations. Language is of interest to them to the extent that it is at the heart of social relations, being one of the principal means by which social relations are established, defined, communicated, and transformed.

Sociologists thus come to language as a WAY IN to social relations; they are far removed from the (socio)linguist who comes to social relations as a WAY IN to language. But is it really possible to dissociate language, as an object to be analyzed apart from social relations? Does it mean anything to say that one’s object of study is not social relations but language? It seems to me that it is possible to do something that could be described as linguistics if one constructs language as an object of study in the same way that legal codes or sacred texts are constructed: as closed systems, which are then explored and described in detail without necessarily making the connection with the way in which those systems are used in real contexts or arise out of real situations. But to construct such a closed system is to leave the realm of empirical social science.

Taking history, context, and power out of language is like removing a fish from its backbone. This is the trouble with interactionism – and, probably, with the study of variants, although it seems to me (in spite of Singh’s critique) that Labov frequently enters the realm of sociology precisely because the phenomena he is seeking to understand can be understood only in sociological terms. I couldn’t agree more with Singh, however, when he criticizes interactionism. What has to be done, as he suggests, is to bring society back in, notably in the form of history and power, without which the study of language and interaction is meaningless. That seems to me to be a plea not so much for a “genuine” sociolinguistics as for

a sociology of language, or for a linguistically sensitive sociology, or for a branch of sociology that would look specifically at language as social relation.

The critical-constructivist theme that runs through Singh's book opens the door not to an imperialist move by sociology to swallow linguistics as a subdiscipline, but rather to a joint venture within which linguistics would recognize its necessary sociological foundations, and sociology would recognize the importance of language. Singh's critique of interactionism establishes the parameters of such a joint venture: We are liberated, not locked in, by our language capacity; "deafness" occurs, rather than miscommunication; and communication is always repairable (among other things). This comes close to cutting-edge, sociological, critical constructivism. It's a good starting point for a joint interdisciplinary venture.

(Received 2 July 1998)

RUQAIYA HASAN, *Ways of saying, ways of meaning: Selected papers*. Ed. by Carmel Cloran, David Butt, & Geoff Williams. London: Cassel, 1996. Pp. vi, 248. Hb £45.00, pb £14.99.

Reviewed by PETER H. FRIES  
*English Language and Literature, Central Michigan University*  
 Mount Pleasant, MI 48859  
 peter.h.fries@cmich.edu

The book under review addresses the central concern of this journal: the nature of the relation between language and society. Hasan's conception of this relation is a wide-ranging one; it includes the relation between different social positionings and different styles of speaking, the ways that language contributes to the communication and maintenance of ideologies, and the relation between the language of a text and the structure of that text. In addition, one finds contributions to what some readers will consider "pure" linguistic theory. Hasan devotes one chapter to an argument for including lexis as a part of grammatical description, and a second to the necessity for having semantic networks in addition to having grammatical networks. Both "theoretical" issues form critical steps in Hasan's dream of describing the "continuity from the living of life on the one hand right down to the morpheme on the other." It is worthy of note that her argument regarding semantic networks is presented within the framework of a theory of linguistics that tends to semanticize grammar; thus this is a more significant claim than it would have been if she had been using a formalist approach.

The issues discussed in this book have been on Hasan's mind since the early 1970s (for example, an early version of Chap. 8 was presented at a meeting in 1975); but this is the first time that readers can find a relatively complete presentation of her views in one place. With one exception (Chap. 5, "Semantic networks"), these chapters have all been published previously, and the versions in this book have undergone minimal revision.



An introduction by the editors describes the three main trends they see in Hasan's work, and then provides the reasoning for including the chapters they chose. Eight chapters by Hasan follow, grouped into three parts. Part I ("Text and context") consists of Chap. 1, "What kind of resource is language?"; Chap. 2, "What's going on: A dynamic view of context in language"; and Chap. 3, "The nursery tale as a genre." Part II ("Tools") contains two sections: Chap. 4, "The grammarian's dream: Lexis as most delicate grammar," and Chap. 5, "Semantic networks: A tool for the analysis of meaning." Part III ("Language and society") contains three chapters: Chap. 6, "The ontogenesis of ideology: An interpretation of mother-child talk"; Chap. 7, "Speech genre, semiotic mediation and the development of higher mental functions"; and Chap. 8, "Ways of saying, ways of meaning." References for each chapter are kept with the chapters, which makes the book seem less unified; but it has the advantage of placing each chapter more closely within the context of its production, since the various chapters were written over a long period. There is a six-page index for the book as a whole.

Hasan draws widely on the work of others; she has clearly been influenced by the work of Bakhtin, Bernstein, Firth, Foucault, Halliday, Vygotsky, and Whorf, among others. But she firmly adopts the Systemic Functional model of linguistics as the tool for developing her theoretical description, and this model takes the social nature of man as fundamental. Language is a tool by which social interaction is made public and available. Hasan refers to this ongoing social interaction as the "context of situation," and points out its subjective social nature. Thus she distinguishes the context of situation from the "material interactional context": The latter necessarily includes the physical situation, while the former only potentially includes (aspects of) the physical situation. Furthermore, the context of situation necessarily includes the "motivational relevancies" (37) of the interactants. Motivational relevancies may seem to be subjective, since they concern the goals of the interactants (i.e., they are internal); but Hasan points out that individual motivational relevancies must be coded in order to be shared by other interactants:

A shared situation is by definition a coded situation – a fact to be kept in sight whenever we are reminded of the uniqueness of individual experience. For if emphasis on the subjectivity of focus highlights uniqueness, the need for coding functions as a corrective, indicating the limits on this uniqueness: whatever can function as a medium of communication must necessarily be a system of social conventions. So what is shared between individuals is conditioned not only by the unique identities involved; rather the filtering of reality is twofold. Reality is thus and thus because *I* see it thus and thus, but the *other's* perception of my perception of the thus-ness of reality must be filtered through the coded message, being in this process conditioned by the nature of the code. (38, emphasis in original)

Once Hasan has established the social and coded nature of the motivational relevancies in the context of situation, then she can use that coded nature as the

basis for a discussion of the constructive nature of language. Context is not something provided by the external facts of the interaction – facts that an outside observer can see and know before looking at the text (both linguistic and non-linguistic) that codes the interaction. Observers must wait for the coding before they can know the motivational relevancies. The coding *CONSTRUCTS* the context, in that it points out what portions of the context are relevant, and provides cues to how they are relevant.

It is important to notice that, for Hasan, context and the coding of that context in language (and other modalities) are objects of quite different orders of existence. The interaction and its context of situation are social cultural concepts; the coding in language is a linguistic concept. That is, Hasan is using a stratal model of language and culture, in which two strata are related through *REALIZATION*. This relation may be viewed by taking, as a starting point, either of the two strata under focus. Thus, if we take the interaction as the starting point, the interaction *ACTIVATES* certain language. In other words, if we know the motivational relevancies of the interactants, we can predict roughly the language they are likely to use. Alternatively, we can begin with the text – the language that is used in the interaction – and use that language as a means to reconstruct the motivational relevancies of the interaction. That is, the language *CONSTRUES* the interaction. Both directions are essential to the operation of language.

Given the coded nature of the relevant context, and the realizational relation between the coding and the context, it makes sense to examine in detail the ways in which the context is coded. If, in similar situations, different groups of people consistently use different codings, then we can infer that the motivational relevancies differ for these groups: They do not construct similar interactional contexts. Of course, the part of language that is most closely related to the interactional relevancies is semantics. Thus an examination of the language of a text entails relating the wording of the text to the meanings expressed. Since there is a complex relation between wording and meaning, this task is by no means easy. Further, in any textual interpretation, one needs to discover patterns in the choices of which meanings are expressed or not expressed. Such an exploration entails an exploration of what Hasan has come to call “semantic variation.” It is here that the usefulness of the notion of semantic network presented in Chap. 5 becomes apparent. One needs to see the range of choices available before one can examine meanings that do not occur in a text. Of course, one cannot simply list meanings, because they do not exist independently of their expression; thus, like other networks, semantic networks must be related to their means of expression in language. Unfortunately – and this is my major complaint about the book – the editors chose not to include any of Hasan’s articles that use a semantic network in a significant way. Part III does reproduce work on fashions of speaking and their relation to the culture of a group (an issue that semantic networks were developed to address); but none of the articles in this part makes use of extensive semantic networks. The result is that we are presented with a tool – indeed, a tool that is

very complex and difficult to create – but we are not provided with any extended example of how it might be used. Luckily, the references at the end of Chap. 5 point the reader to articles and dissertations by Hasan and her colleagues (esp. Cloran and Williams) which in fact make use of this tool.

In brief, this book is vintage Hasan: difficult to read, but well worth the effort.

(Received 26 May 1998)

RAIJA MARKKANEN & HARTMUT SCHRÖDER (eds.), *Hedging and discourse: Approaches to the analysis of a pragmatic phenomenon in academic texts*. (Research in text theory, 24). Berlin: de Gruyter, 1997. Pp. 280. Hb DM 188.00.

Reviewed by DWIGHT ATKINSON  
 English Dept., University of Alabama  
 Tuscaloosa, AL 35487-0244  
 datkinso@english.as.ua.edu

Hedging has become a topic of renewed interest recently among discourse-oriented linguists. Recent publications attesting to this fact include Salager-Meyer 1994, Hyland 1994, 1996, 1998, Crompton 1997, and Skelton 1997, not to mention work on modals (e.g. Stubbs 1996, chaps. 5 and 8), evidentials (e.g. Barton 1993), and “vague language” (Channell 1994). The present volume continues this trend, providing a wide-ranging and truly international set of perspectives on the phenomenon of hedging.

The book begins with a half-page editors’ preface which acknowledges the volume’s diversity in the treatment of hedging – and the concomitant lack of a single clear definition for the phenomenon. The editors disclaim any intent to try to provide a unified approach, setting as their goal instead to present a range of approaches representing different parts of the world and different linguistic frameworks. They also note that, because publication of the book was repeatedly delayed, most of the chapters date back to the early 1990s, although the concluding bibliographical essay covers work up to 1995.

In their introductory chapter, “Hedging: A challenge for pragmatics and discourse analysis,” the editors first review the history of the term “hedge” in linguistics since the 1970s, when it was coined by George Lakoff. This history parallels movement from formal linguistics (in this case semantics) to a more functional and interactional linguistics. They then briefly cover related notions such as modality and evidentiality, and afterward move on to consider various functions of hedging, particularly in academic writing. The chapter ends by discussing the treatment of hedging by applied linguists, especially as it relates to language teaching and translation.

The other chapters in this volume (with one or two minor exceptions, and excluding the last two) all follow a regular format. The author(s) first review and discuss different definitions of hedging, and then introduce their own approaches

to defining the phenomenon. This is followed by an account of an original empirical study – these descriptions typically take up the bulk of the chapter – and then a conclusion wraps up the whole. This similarity of format has both advantages and disadvantages: It allows the authors clearly to lay out their theoretical and definitional approaches and assumptions, but there tends to be repetition across their reviews of past work on hedging. In marked contrast, the authors' subsequent attempts to define hedging for their own purposes create (at least for this reader) a sense of entropy and isolation among the different perspectives. Having read this book, one can sympathize with calls for a stricter and more commonly shared concept of hedging (e.g. Crompton 1997), although it must also be acknowledged that willful diversity is perhaps the greatest strength of discourse analysis (see Tannen 1990).

John Skelton's contribution, "How to tell the truth in *The British Medical Journal*," begins with a definitional discussion which is both enlightening and confusing. It is enlightening because it contains some valuable insights – e.g. that "mitigators" (such as *moderately in I'm moderately sure that . . .*) and "boosters" (e.g., *totally in I'm totally sure that . . .*) are of the same natural kind; but it is confusing, because Skelton then limits hedging to the area of mitigators, a move that seems to violate the logic of the earlier identification. However, in the subsequent empirical part of the paper, Skelton does not then hold to the relatively strict definition he has set forth, and looks instead at all kinds of strategies for mitigating and boosting truth judgments. In a cross-time study of three articles in the *British Medical Journal* (from 1853, 1883, and 1991, respectively), Skelton finds that, in terms of the authors' approach to expressing truth judgments, these articles change radically with the changing discourse dynamics of the medical community. The nineteenth century report contains expressions of personal "doubt, judgment, and supposition" (49). In the late twentieth century report, truth-judgment comments have distinct functions depending on the conventionalized section of the research report in which they appear, but they tend to be impersonally expressed (e.g., *the analysis suggests . . .*). This latter development leads to ambiguity in terms of the position that the author(s) take on the claims being made.

Anna Mauranen's chapter, "Hedging in language revisers' hands," is an interesting example of the diversity of approach and topic represented in this volume. The subject of this chapter is translation: Mauranen is interested in how English native-speaker "language revisers" view and revise Finnish speakers' English academic texts across a number of fields. In general, she finds that the native speakers do very little revising in the area of hedging; she suggests that hedging strategies are highly specific to writers and their topics, and are therefore beyond the reviser's purview. Another interesting finding is that several writers either tended to hedge throughout their papers until they came to the conclusion section, at which point hedging basically ceased, or else they hedged primarily in their conclusion sections. Hedging was therefore seen as a means of foregrounding

conclusions, whether or not hedges actually appeared there. In her own conclusion, Mauranen makes the valuable point that much discourse research on hedging has based its findings on very small numbers of texts. This is, of course, quite understandable from a discourse-analytic point of view; the importance of contextual detail to the functioning of specific linguistic features (as pointed out by a number of this volume's authors) is central to this kind of work.

At the same time, it is good to see that several corpus-based studies appear here, one being William Grabe & Robert B. Kaplan, "On the writing of science and the science of writing: Hedging in science text and elsewhere." This study begins by rehearsing various claims from the sociology of scientific knowledge, including Shapin's 1984 account of the birth of hedging, as a major strategy in scientific and academic writing, in Robert Boyle's attempts to win converts to the "new (empirical) science" of the latter seventeenth century. The authors then review several studies of hedging in scientific writing before introducing their own study, which looks at the comparative frequencies of hedges and emphatics in 50 texts from five domains of writing (professional science, popular science, business reports, news editorials, and fictional narrative), selected via random sampling procedures. As the authors readily acknowledge, their corpus is quite small, and some questions might be raised about their coding of hedges and emphatics. (Why, for example, is the sentential conjunction *however* in the first example on p. 161 not counted as a hedge, while *indeed* in the third example is so counted?) Nevertheless, their results – which suggest that scientific writing has many fewer hedges and emphatics (and hedges and emphatics of quite different types) than the other text types analyzed – point in interesting directions and compel further research.

Grabe & Kaplan's essay also points to what is perhaps the real strength of this book: As a sampler of a wide variety of approaches to the phenomena of hedging and related concepts, it is highly suggestive of a number of different possible take-off points and methodologies in the study of hedging. In addition, most of the chapters are readily accessible; this is another advantage of their self-contained format. The volume could thus be used appropriately in a graduate-level discourse analysis course, as a primer of approaches to one kind of interactive discourse phenomenon; and the two closing chapters, one on the general concept of hedging and the other a bibliographical essay, make it more useful in this regard. To be sure, these emphases may also lessen the interest of this volume to scholars who have a prior background in the literature and are looking for extended treatments and expansive discussions; but some of the chapters will certainly satisfy individual scholars in this regard.

## REFERENCES

- Barton, Ellen (1993). Evidentials, argumentation, and epistemological stance. *College English* 55:745–79.
- Channell, Joanna (1994). *Vague language*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.
- Language in Society* 28:4 (1999)

- Compton, Peter (1997). Hedging in academic writing: Some theoretical problems. *English for Specific Purposes* 16:271–87.
- Hyland, Ken (1994). Hedging in academic writing and EAP textbooks. *English for Specific Purposes* 13:239–56.
- (1996). Writing without conviction? Hedging in scientific research articles. *Applied Linguistics* 17:433–54.
- (1998). *Hedging in scientific research articles*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Salager-Meyer, Françoise (1994). Hedges and textual communicative function in medical English written discourse. *English for Specific Purposes* 13:149–70.
- Shapin, Steven (1984). Pump and circumstance: Robert Boyle's literary technology. *Social Studies of Science* 14:481–520.
- Skelton, John (1997). The representation of truth in academic medical writing. *Applied Linguistics* 18:121–40.
- Stubbs, Michael (1996). *Text and corpus analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Tannen, Deborah (1990). Discourse analysis: The excitement of diversity. *Text* 10:109–11.

(Received 2 July 1998)

TONY CROWLEY, *Language in history: Theories and texts*. (The politics of language series.) London & New York: Routledge, 1996. Pp. viii, 215. Pb \$18.95.

Reviewed by JOHN E. JOSEPH  
*Theoretical and Applied Linguistics*  
University of Edinburgh  
Edinburgh EH8 9LN, United Kingdom  
john.joseph@ed.ac.uk

Crowley's research into eighteenth-, twentieth-, and especially nineteenth-century writings about the English language is rare in its almost philological coverage and depth. What makes it unique is that it is conducted within an intellectual framework that is solidly "marxist" (with a small m, as Crowley now spells it), though not entirely immune to other strains of Theory (with a capital T). Crowley's marxism falls within that British tradition whose last great exponent was the Cambridge critic Raymond Williams – who has also inspired much of Crowley's method and style, and from those work the main title is taken ("Language in history: That full field," Williams 1983:189).

This book is rich in highly original insights, backed up with solid documentation, about the role of language in constructing national identity. Crowley insists that we cannot understand languages, cultures, or nations in isolation from the discourses through which they have been constructed. Because I agree entirely and expect that a great many readers of this journal will too, and because I appreciate the light that Crowley's textual research and interpretation shed on periods of linguistic history that too often go ignored, I feel disappointed that I cannot write an entirely positive review of the book. However, I want to stress that there is much here to command admiration.

The opening chapter, "For and against Saussure," asserts that although Saussure's approach challenges the primacy of language change within linguistic inquiry, it is not one that "rejects altogether the significance of language in history" (27). Of course, much depends on what is meant by "history." In Crowley's per-

spective, it translates into a set of “institutional, political and ideological relationships” (28). Crowley never questions whether this might be ALL there is to history – since here, as on many points, he simply does not write for readers who might not share his particular ideological stance. He finds his argument about Saussure rather loosely on a series of comments, in an early chapter of the *Course in general linguistics*, which Crowley admits are intended to push “historical” questions into the marginal zone of “external linguistics.” Crowley is AGAINST the Saussure who conceives of *langue* as standing outside history in the sense of being static and monolithic, and FOR the Saussure who nevertheless lets an external linguistics appear “obliquely . . . though it is hardly developed” (27): not the firmest foundation for what is to follow. Nor does it help that Crowley’s knowledge of Saussure, although considerable, could be better. He is so fascinated by the fact that the only work Saussure published in his lifetime was his 1879 *Mémoire sur le système primitif des voyelles dans les langues indo-européennes* that he repeats it three times. This is so interesting that one wishes it were true: Saussure published another book in 1881, plus about 25 articles.

Chap. 2, “For and against Bakhtin,” asks why the field of language in history (which the previous chapter has told us does not yet exist) has been so resistant to the kind of theorizing that has reshaped literary analysis in recent decades (in some cases to unfortunate extremes, though that is not acknowledged here). Bakhtin is the one exception to this, and Crowley provides a concise introduction to the general Bakhtinian concepts of monologism and dialogism, along with the more purely linguistic ones of monoglossia, polyglossia, and heteroglossia – the last being the state of languages-within-languages considered by Bakhtin to be the ideal endpoint of the constant historical conflict which drives sociolinguistic evolution and gives rise to the very concept of a language. Crowley counterposes Bakhtin’s heteroglossic ideal of language to Saussure’s “static” conception, in the course of calling for what is indeed a much-needed recognition that languages do not exist apart from their speakers’ cultural representations of them.

Yet Crowley opposes the Bakhtin who could write, “We live, write and speak today in a world of free and democratized language,” citing the examples of French, German and English, the products of “the linguistic revolutions of the Renaissance” (Bakhtin 1981:71). Crowley calls this “misleading optimism” and notes that “each of them became the language of an empire which elevated its own language and determined to stamp out the languages and cultures of the colonized” (36). The non-marxist reader is hard pressed to say which is more striking: Crowley’s insistence that freedom and democracy must be all or nothing, or his blanket condemnation of these empires’ stamping out the languages of the colonized. One would hope that an advocate of language in history might at least pause for a moment to consider the differences among the three cases – indeed, more than three, since surely English and French have been the languages of more than one empire each. But here as elsewhere, marxist thinking rules critical inquiry into these matters unnecessary.

Crowley argues that, contrary to the way in which Bakhtin is currently used by many anthropologists and sociolinguists, his concept of heteroglossia is not necessarily liberating. The basis for this argument is that Bakhtin on heteroglossia contradicts Antonio Gramsci, whose notion of hegemony appears to derive from his studies in spatial linguistics under Matteo Bartoli (see Lo Piparo 1979). Writing about his contemporary Italy early in this century, Gramsci contended that monoglossia was the road to social equality, and “argued for . . . the teaching of prescriptive grammar to the children of the working class and peasantry in order to empower them with literacy as a part of a larger radical project” (43). In perhaps his most radical moment, Crowley admits, “It is possible of course to differ from Gramsci in the specifics of his case (he argues, for example, that the working class and peasantry should learn the spoken standard language of the ruling class).” However, Crowley immediately returns to the orthodox fold: “but in the general drift of his argument he is surely right to put the case for empowerment through literacy. Even literacy in a unified, common and stable form of monoglossia” (45–6). Wait a minute: Literacy in Italy has never had to be monoglossic; but insofar as it has been, it was intimately bound up with the spoken standard language of the ruling class, as has indeed been the case in most historical times and places.

Crowley goes on to argue that Bakhtin’s heteroglossia provides the correct basis for analyzing only those historical cases in which repressive, centripetalizing forces deployed by an imperialist state have led toward a monoglossia that should be resisted by privileging heteroglossia. Britain during the formative period of Standard English is cited as an example. Analysis, in other words, must be politically driven. “But,” he writes, “the diffuse and politically disorganized situation of early twentieth-century Italy, in which lack of common literacy amongst the national-popular mass served the interests of the governing class, requires a quite different analysis” (46). One might expect some material to follow here about this “diffuse and politically disorganised situation,” and how it differed in kind from that of the other places and times with which Crowley is implicitly contrasting it. How much more uncommon was literacy among the “national-popular mass” in Britain during the formation of Standard English than in early twentieth-century Italy, for instance? But no such material follows; so the chapter’s key theoretical point is founded on an off-hand comment that must be taken on faith, from someone who has not demonstrated any knowledge of what he is talking about.

Matters do not improve when Crowley cites, as further counterexamples to Bakhtin, nations that have escaped “colonial rule and the historical complexities involved in such processes” (46). He argues that monoglossia was a good thing in the early history of the United States because it made possible the formation of a national identity which allowed the throwing off of the colonial cultural yoke. (England being the ultimate Evil Empire, anything constructed in opposition to it is good.) Crowley neglects to mention that there were a few people in America



who were not colonial masters or revolutionaries, and who didn't share the monoglossic language. One wonders, too: Has there ever, anywhere, been a people who didn't have some kind of "colonial rule," either without or within? Or who, in any case, escaped from "the historical complexities involved in such processes"? If so, who?

The *coup de grâce* for Bakhtin is that, not only does he contradict Gramsci, but on some points he actually appears to agree with Gramsci's *bête noire*, the aesthetician Benedetto Croce – for whom language was "scored through with poetic rather than political significance" (53). But why is the poetic excluded from the historical? Why can only the political be historical? Why can't the possibility even be entertained that the political status of a particular form of language, in particular historical circumstances, might be nil? Because marxism makes that unthinkable. SO WHY ISN'T THE POETIC ALSO POLITICAL? The same answer, apparently. In the end, Crowley's position appears to be that we should follow Bakhtin when he is right, and reject him when he is wrong, where "right" is when the historical circumstances (viewed in marxist black-and-white) do not make him contradict Gramsci, and "wrong" is when they do.

With Chap. 3, "Wars of words: The roles of language in eighteenth-century Britain," Crowley finally comes onto firm ground with the kind of textually based scholarship that has made his earlier work worth reading, in spite of theoretical fixations well past their sell-by date. Here the theory base stretches to include Jürgen Habermas and Pierre Bourdieu; but what is really compelling is the wealth of citations from eighteenth-century sources, from the well-known (Swift, Johnson) to the most obscure. Crowley marshals these into a narrative of how the English language came to be constructed as the vehicle of Britain's history and the guarantor of its identity. Still, the chapter is framed by a Bakhtinian model of a post-Reformation Britain where "a situation of polyglossia, in which Latin was the dominating language, had been replaced by one of monoglossia, in which the English language held sway" (55). It is difficult to see how this is so, if one applies the terms "polyglossia" and "monoglossia" with any kind of consistency for the periods in question.

Chap. 4, "Forging the nation: Language and cultural nationalism in nineteenth-century Ireland" (with an obvious pun in "forging") mercifully drops the marxist framework altogether to tell the story of the Celtic Revival and its nationalist roots in a perceptive way, again benefiting from deep textual research. The worldview is still an exceedingly simplistic one, in which England is evil incarnate, but we know by now that Crowley is incapable of any more nuanced political view than this. Linguistically, however, he shows himself capable of more subtle reasoning; and the chapter is a fine study of the internal reasons why English came to be the language of Ireland, and of how the fascinating discourse developed in which Celtic was held to be the language of Adam.

Chap. 5, "Science and silence: Language, class, and nation in nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Britain," brings us closer to the territory explored by

Crowley in his 1989 book (on which see Joseph 1992). Here we find one of the rare occasions on which he enters a dialog (however briefly) with a contemporary voice that is working on the same sorts of problems that he is, rather than with his heroes or anti-heroes. Thus he contests Stalker's (1985:45) assertion that, in the nineteenth century, "For the philologists, the study of language became removed from the social and rhetorical concerns of the eighteenth century, and thus became an abstract and objective study." This, for Crowley, is "simply wrong" (149): National identity was a central concern of their discourse. By the end of his exposition, it is impossible to disagree that Stalker's view is overstated, and comparison with Crowley's third chapter gives a sense of how the philologists' discourse on language and national identity had evolved since the eighteenth century. Crowley continues, as in his 1989 book, to argue that the "standard language" is a mid-nineteenth century invention (157 ff., esp. 160) – and more specifically, that the *Oxford English dictionary* "was itself to produce a term and concept for which many had appealed in the past . . . : 'standard English'" (157). The TERM, perhaps; but to cut the concept off from its previous 400+ years of history, as Crowley does, is like saying that people started engaging in sex in 1929, when D. H. Lawrence is first attested as having used that noun to denote an activity rather than an attribute. Nevertheless, Crowley makes a strong case that the activity of philologists in promoting and (re)defining standard English was not something apart from their theoretical interests, but intimately bound up with them.

A brief closing chapter looks at the importance of language and identity in Ireland today, drawing evidence from Brian Friel's play *Translations* and from an essay by Seamus Heaney. Its gives a tantalizing sense of how contemporary literary material might be used in arguments of this sort; but is rather too brief to be more than suggestive, and is really more of an afterword than the conclusion it purports to be.

Like any theoretical apparatus, marxist criticism can be put to good, enlightening uses. The trouble starts when theory becomes dogma and privileges a particular group of thinkers, who constitute an orthodoxy, by placing them beyond the range of one's critical gaze. Crowley's talents for observation and analysis are remarkable within the band of what his theoretical blinkers will allow him to examine. If only he would train his critical eye onto his mirror! Writing of Bakhtin's "misleading optimism," Crowley says that it was "brought about by rigid adherence to a teleological schema whose historical accuracy is disproved by even a quick glance at the conditions which prevail in our world" (36). One would like to tell Crowley: Dialectician, heal thyself. But "quick glances" are all that people with overarching, dogmatic theoretical frameworks ever need give to "our world." They know in advance what they are going to see; their predictions are incapable of disproof. One cannot help thinking that, if Crowley could only shake off this self-imposed limitation, while somehow holding onto the driving zeal that it obviously gives to his work, he could one day write a very great book indeed.

## REVIEWS

### REFERENCES

- Bakhtin, Mikhail (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Crowley, Tony (1989). *The politics of discourse: The standard language question in British cultural debates*. Basingstoke: Macmillan. [Published in the US as *Standard English and the politics of language*, Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1989.]
- Joseph, John E. (1992). Modern linguistics in postmodern perspective. *Language and Communication* 12:165–79.
- Lo Piparo, Franco (1979). *Lingua, intellettuali, egemonia in Gramsci*. Roma: Laterza.
- Stalker, James C. (1985). Attitudes towards language in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In *The English Language today*, ed. by Sidney Greenbaum, 41–47. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Williams, Raymond (1983). *Writing in society*. London: Verso.

(Received 5 May 1998)

RUTH WODAK, *Disorders of discourse*. (Real language series.) London: Longman, 1996. Pp. xi, 200. Pb £15.99.

Reviewed by NORMAN FAIRCLOUGH  
*Linguistics, Lancaster University*  
*Lancaster LA1 4YT, England*  
*n.fairclough@lancaster.ac.uk*

“Disorders of discourse” – practices that constitute “barriers to communication” – can be subjected to critique, and critique can lead to the suggestion of different practices. Such changes in discourse may contribute to changes in the “structures of organizations.” However, in the absence of such structural changes, changes in discourse may actually result in more subtle, and thus more effective, forms of domination. That is the central problem raised in this book. Interaction between doctors and patients, teachers and pupils, politicians and publics, etc., can change in ways that eliminate the more obvious forms of interactional asymmetry, domination, or manipulation; yet whether such changes contribute to substantive democratization – or only give an appearance of democracy, which can make relations of domination more effective because less obvious – depends on how such new forms of interaction fit within the overall network of practices that constitutes the institution concerned.

Wodak’s first case study is based on participant observation in an outpatient ward in a Vienna hospital. She analyzes features of doctor/patient communication in a number of encounters against the background of the institutional circumstances of their occurrence – e.g. the facts that work in the outpatient ward is intensely pressurized, that medical staff suffer constant interruptions while treating patients, and that the ward is not only a space for medical treatment but also a training ground for young doctors. The circumstances materially affect doctor/patient communication; thus its properties change markedly between the busiest and the quietest periods on the ward (patient initiatives are not encouraged, and tend to be interrupted), and inexperienced young doctors find it difficult to cope with communication problems that arise with what the medical staff identify as “difficult” patients. “Disorders of discourse” are therefore in evidence, and Wodak

suggests that a number of MYTHS emerge to obscure the contradictions of this form of medical practice. These myths include the positions that medical examinations are “normally” controlled, structured, and predictable events (medical practice on the ward is therefore judged as constantly failing to achieve normalcy); that doctors are busy professionals working under pressure; that everyone involved understands the procedures and circumstances of medical treatment on the ward (in fact, most patients manifestly do not); and so on. At the same time, doctors adopt various strategies to try to maintain their professional authority in the face of the threats to it which arise in interactions with patients under these difficult circumstances.

What is to be done? Wodak argues that discourse analysis is an effective means of highlighting the problems of medical interactions, and of suggesting solutions. Doctors and patients can be trained in communicative practices, and doctors can be shown that the myths with which they operate are themselves obstacles to improving their practices. Wodak claims at one point that Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) can have an emancipatory effect on all parties in these encounters (172); elsewhere, though, she makes the more cautious claim that more experienced patients may gain, but others “remain powerless” (31).

The second case is a project, commissioned by the Austrian Ministry of Education, to evaluate their “school partnership” scheme: a set of innovations in the governance of schools, intended to effect a partnership between teachers, parents, and pupils in response to concerns about the school system. The scheme involved a network of committees designed to ensure participation. The project directors found that these innovations were being implemented without any fundamental change in the rigid hierarchical structure of the schools; and the committees consequently did not operate as intended. They were dominated by head teachers, who were usually elected to chair them, and who took up most of the available discourse space. The participation of parents, other teachers, and pupils was inhibited in various ways; agendas were not circulated in advance; substantive issues were not discussed; crucial information for votes was withheld; and voting was framed in ways conducive to the results favored by head teachers. The research “illustrated the limits of critical linguistic research . . . a change in discourse alone does not necessarily . . . translate into a modification of power relationships . . . in fact a change in discourse meant a mystification of actual power: The meetings really assumed a perfunctory quality, which reinforced the appearance rather than the substance of participation.” What was missing were “changes in the attitude of agents and in the structures of the institutions” which should accompany changes in discourse (174).

The third case study, dealing with Austrian radio news bulletins, is also taken to indicate the limitations of language critique and change. The problem in focus is that, although dominant theories of democracy presuppose a well-informed citizenship, it appears that levels of understanding of one of the main resources for informed citizenship, namely news, are very low. It is claimed that 70% of

those who listen to these bulletins don't completely understand them. (Although Wodak offers a discussion of sophisticated hermeneutic theories of understanding, in the end understanding is rather crudely measured in terms of how many details of a report are recalled.)

In this case study, news reports were experimentally reformulated to simplify them. This did lead to higher levels of understanding; but it actually increased the gap between middle-class listeners, whose levels of understanding were high to begin with, and working-class listeners, whose levels of understanding were low. Thus it appears that a purely linguistic critique, with changes motivated accordingly, doesn't resolve the problem. What is needed is better education: more background information, a better understanding of politics, and an understanding of how the media work and of how certain topics are excluded or included.

The final case study applies ethnography and discourse analysis in a Vienna crisis intervention center. The study focuses on the longitudinal effects of therapy through analysis of patients' discourse in informal group-therapy sessions. Here Wodak interestingly presents talk in therapy sessions as combining three factors – the everyday communities that people belong to, the therapeutic group itself, and the individuals' personal life history and problems – as well as three associated domains of meaning: colloquial meaning, group meaning, and personal meaning. The study suggests that therapy leads to the emergence of a "mixed type" of problem-presentation discourse, combining these three domains; and that this is linked to cognitive and emotional resolutions of problems, evidenced not only in the way people operate in groups, but also in changes in their outside lives. In this case, changes in discourse had an emancipatory effect.

However, some broader theoretical issues may be raised. First, the title of the book: Are the language problems to which Wodak draws attention really "disorders"? The expression is a play on Foucault's title, *The order of discourse* (1971); yet the view of order comes from Habermas's concept of an "ideal speech situation" (and, conversely, "distorted" communication). A problem with construing the objects of language critique as "disorders" is that such discursive practices are in many cases "functional" for the existing social order, in the sense that they are part of what allows it to work as a system of domination. The theoretical issue in this case is the distinction between STRUCTURES and CONJUNCTURES. Although Wodak does refer to structural issues, the focus is mainly conjunctural – e.g. on the specific circumstances and difficulties of the outpatient ward in the first study, rather than on relations within the institution of medicine, or between medicine and other domains of social life. Wodak's recommendations for change in this case presuppose that the "disorders of discourse" are correctable conjunctural problems. For instance, it is recommended that doctors give up their "myths" in the interests of more effective communication on the ward. But are not such myths functional in maintaining the structural relations and distances within the field of medicine, and more generally the relations and boundaries between different fields which set professionals against publics? Do they not work ideolog-

ically? Are they not structurally generated and motivated? This theoretical question has practical consequences: If myths are (partly) structural and ideological, then doctors may not be easily persuaded to abandon them in the interest of more effective communication.

Another difficulty of interpretation is deciding whether problems and solutions are specifically problems and solutions in language, or in other elements of social practices (see Chouliaraki & Fairclough 1999). For instance, are myths language? Myths figure in the analysis as presuppositions, taken-for-granted assumptions, in what medical staff say and do. Myths might also be things that medical staff explicitly say to each other about their work; but Wodak gives no examples of such explicit mythical talk. So the problem in this case seems to be primarily what medical staff believe, rather than how they talk with patients, and the solution must lie in changing beliefs. But, of course, saying that the problem and solution are primarily matters of belief does not mean that language is irrelevant to them; the moments of a practice are dialectically linked. On the one hand, these beliefs are internalized within medical talk, and shape it; on the other hand, neither medical staff nor others (including discourse analysts) can identify them as beliefs without putting them into words, i.e. into some particular discourse. Nevertheless, what people believe is not simply the same as what people say, and changing beliefs is a different matter from changing language (though changing language will be a part of it).

There is an issue here of what can be claimed for discourse and for discourse analysis. Thus Wodak claims, as an insight from discourse analysis, that misunderstanding, and indeed anxiety, are regularly caused by the practice of discussing one patient while examining another; she suggests that medical staff should change the practice. Of course, it is true that looking closely at the talk in medical examinations can highlight the problems caused by this practice, but does that mean that the problem and solution are primarily linguistic? Wodak's study suggested instituting periods between examinations for discussion of patients among medical staff; but this is primarily a change in institutional routines, not language. Of course it affects language, but it does so most immediately in terms of the distribution and sequencing of different types of language practice; it implies a sequential separation of specialist talk about third parties vs. medical examination of patients, so it is most immediately a change affecting the ORDER OF DISCOURSE in its syntagmatic axis (Fairclough 1992).

The third case study (on news) illustrates the difficulties that critical analysts sometimes have in deciding what the object of critical concern is. In contemporary "Western" societies there is a widespread sense of a crisis in representational democracy, which is partly a crisis of civil society and the public sphere: People are not active citizens in the ways they are theoretically supposed to be, and the political system is widely perceived as flawed. From this perspective, the problem is in the whole network of political practices, of which news is just a part. It's not clear how improving people's recall of the details of news items would, in

itself, help to resolve this problem. This is primarily a problem of political structures, which includes the problem of whether the practice of news is effectively linked to other practices. But the way language is used is still a part of the problem, because the question of how the political is structured is substantively a question of what the discursive practices of politics are, and how they are linked (or not linked) to each other – how politicians address publics, what passes for political dialog and debate, what sort of language is used in news, and so forth. It's a matter of how to frame issues like how much (or how little) people get from news.

The great strength of this book (and of Wodak's research more generally) is this: The important issue of whether changes in discourse that appear emancipatory are actually emancipatory is traced through a series of case studies, each of which represents a rich research engagement with some part of contemporary social life, in some cases combining discourse analysis with ethnography. The book is an invaluable demonstration of CDA "in action" within substantial projects of critical social research, and it is essential reading for anyone in CDA or related fields. The drift of my comments is only to suggest that the case studies raise theoretical issues that are not resolved in the book.

## REFERENCES

- Chouliaraki, L., & Fairclough, Norman (1999). *Discourse and late modernity*. Edinburgh: University Press.  
 Fairclough, Norman (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.  
 Foucault, Michel (1971). *L'ordre du discours*. Paris: Gallimard.

(Received 7 July 1998)

ANDRÉE TABOURET-KELLER, ROBERT B. LE PAGE, PENELOPE GARDNER-CHLOROS, & GABRIELLE VARRO (eds.), *Vernacular literacy: A re-evaluation*. By members of the International Group for the Study of Language Standardization and the Vernacularization of Literacy (IGLSVL). (Oxford studies in anthropological linguistics, 13). Oxford: Clarendon; New York: Oxford University Press, 1997. Pp. xii, 367.

Reviewed by HARRIET JOSEPH OTTENHEIMER  
*Anthropology, Kansas State University*  
*Manhattan, KS 66506*  
*mahafan@ksu.edu*

The group known as the IGLSVL, which has produced this book, grew out of a link between the Department of Language and Linguistic Science of the University of York, England, and the Institut de Psychologie of the Université Louis Pasteur of Strasbourg, France. The group has been meeting every other year since 1986 and disseminating workshop discussions in mimeographed form. It is our

good fortune that they decided, at their 1992 meeting, to publish the results of their work for wider distribution. The resulting volume, here under review, does an outstanding job of presenting an international survey, particularly rich in insider's views, of the advantages of vernacular literacy, as well as the difficulties of achieving it.

*Vernacular literacy* is an intensely collaborative work. While the four main editors have overseen the book's production, each chapter has a primary editor (or two), and every member of the working group has contributed to every chapter in some way. The book is divided into two main sections of four chapters each: Part I surveys general issues, and Part II provides examples and case studies. An introduction and a conclusion provide an overarching framework, setting out issues and drawing conclusions. Frequent cross-referencing of issues and examples makes for a very well-integrated whole.

The introduction by R. B. Le Page outlines the book, and contrasts the climate for work on vernacular literacy in the 1950s with that in the 1990s. Taking the 1953 UNESCO monograph, *The use of vernacular languages in education*, as broadly representative of attitudes and perspectives in the 1950s, Le Page reviews the shifting meanings of "vernacular" from "minority" or "dominated" language (in the 1950s) to "the everyday spoken language or languages of a community as contrasted with a standard or official language" (in the 1990s); the latter is the definition adopted by the authors of this volume. Even so, it is often difficult to determine what counts as a vernacular in a given situation. Where there are several, should only one be chosen? If so, which one? Will linguistic recognition have unexpected national and/or ethnic repercussions? Notions regarding orality (often in a vernacular) vs. literacy (more often in a standard) remind us that all varieties of language use are socially marked. Regarding the complex relationship between literacy and development, Le Page points out that while development may require some literacy, the decision as to whether it is most useful for that literacy to be in a vernacular or a standard depends on a wide range of variables. Of special interest is the observation that literacy is not a necessary precondition for development; more often than not, literacy follows development, and it is sometimes used to subdue and indoctrinate new urban populations, rather than to enhance communication among and between those groups. Finally, the thorny question of orthography is addressed, along with the degree to which orthography is inseparable from social, cultural, and religious questions.

Le Page is also the general editor of Chap. 1, which focuses on political and economic aspects of literacy. Noting the frequent linking of ethnic and linguistic nationalism, the chapter surveys several interesting cases, including Scotland, India, Africa (in particular postcolonial francophone nations such as Senegal and the Central African Republic), and Spain (in particular involving the Basque literacy movement). In each case a different mix of variables comes into play in determining the success or failure of literacy movements, and the concomitant



potential development of nationalist or ethnic loyalties. Beyond possible political aims, it appears that literacy of any kind succeeds when there is something to read, and an economic reward for reading it. Whether vernacular literacy provides rewards in and of itself is another question. More often vernacular literacy just provides a useful stepping-stone to literacy in a standard or a global language. Of special interest is this chapter's attention to the notion of visual literacy, and its suggestion that learning to read images (e.g. television, advertising) may be a necessary first step to learning to read the printed word.

Chap. 2, edited by Lawrence Carrington, explores the social contexts in which vernacular literacy might be attained. This chapter pays particular attention to the impact of colonialism on vernacular literacy, especially where the colonizers and colonized have not shared a language, and seeks to define the conditions for the successful implementation of vernacular literacy. When literacy is "adopted," its ideals may be transferred wholesale from vector culture to receiving culture, often bringing along unwelcome cultural impositions. In contrast, when literacy is "vernacularized," the receiving culture is more able to determine its own agenda with regard to literacy. More often one sees the former case (especially in francophone Africa) rather than the latter – with the result that educated elites prefer literacy in the dominating language, seeing it as a means to economic advancement as well as toward status enhancement, and resisting literacy in the vernacular. Even if a vernacular achieves legal status as an official or national language, such as Kreol in Haiti or Sango in the Central African Republic, this does not seem to provide sufficient incentive for learning to write it. In contrast, literacy is sometimes successfully "vernacularized" during periods of ideological transformation. Cuba, Nicaragua, Tanzania, Scotland, and Protestant northern Europe provide examples of such successes. The chapter concludes that literacy in a vernacular is a goal worth pursuing only if there are people whose everyday existence can benefit from it, and it is suggested that strategies based on this axiom will have more chance of succeeding.

Chap. 3, edited by Philip Baker, is one of the more fascinating, especially to those interested in writing and orthography. A brief review of the 1953 UNESCO recommendations on choosing writing systems reveals their underlying eurocentrism. Next, a survey of the development and spread of the world's principal writing systems shows how logographic, alphabetic, semi-syllabic, and consonantal styles of writing tend to have spread primarily along religious lines; insight is provided here into contemporary clashes between scriptal systems (e.g. between Roman, Cyrillic, and Arabic scripts in the former USSR). A lengthy section addresses the colonial spread of the European alphabetic system, particularly via missionaries and missionary linguists; the authors contrast anglophone and francophone approaches to overcoming the inadequacies of roman characters for writing African and other languages. It is interesting to note that many of the early missionary orthographies were essentially phonemic in nature, although most were developed prior to the identification of "the phoneme." As colonial govern-

ments, in particular the British, began to accept the idea that literacy should be taught in an “appropriate” vernacular, orthographies became a matter for colonial governments more than for missionaries. By the 1960s, decisions regarding vernacular literacy began to be made within ministries of education in the newly independent countries – by speakers of the languages in question, and by people familiar with phonemic principles. In francophone Africa, where literacy had previously been taught mainly in French, there was considerable activity in the area of orthography design by the 1970s. The aim was to develop a common reference script on which each country could draw, in order to establish an orthography for its vernacular language(s). Although the need for “harmonizing” with colonial orthography has become less important in many areas, it remains an issue in some more recently independent countries (see Ahmed-Chamanga 1976). The continuing clash between writing systems has led to some situations in which individuals develop multi-scriptal competencies; thus traders in India write in both Perso-Arabic and Devanagari scripts, and some individuals in the Comoros write their vernacular using French, Arabic, and phonemic scripts (Ottenheimer 1997). A minor failing of this chapter is its lack of attention to Native American writing systems, and to the many contemporary efforts to develop orthographies for endangered Native American languages. Incidentally, although this chapter indicates that Arabic-script digraphs do not exist, they are commonly used in the Comoros to write the local vernaculars.

Chap. 4, edited by Jeannine Gerbault, explores pedagogical aspects of vernacular literacy. The recent shift to learner-centered approaches in pedagogy is assessed, and its impact on literacy campaigns is discussed, particularly with respect to meeting the special needs of adult learners. Of special interest, although only briefly noted, is the importance of different traditional learning styles (e.g. demonstrative, contextual, repetitive) and their impact on pedagogical methods. Materials need to be culturally appropriate and must include guidelines for teachers. It seems to me that some of these materials could be generated by the learners themselves, who might be encouraged to write such things as memoirs, wills, or other documents of interest to them and their families. However, this is not mentioned. The need for pre-literacy skills is stressed, echoing comments in other chapters regarding visual literacy. The question of teaching literacy in multi-scriptal situations is raised; and the suggestion is made that children be taught first in their mother tongue (however defined), then encouraged to transfer these skills to the standard language. As is typical in writing about pedagogy, this chapter worries about the problems involved in assessing and evaluating the various approaches; although there are no good evaluation schemes at present, examples from India and Cameroon suggest that small-scale innovative approaches may be more effective in promoting vernacular literacy than large-scale, top-down, mass-literacy campaigns. The question becomes how to replicate successful programs, given the large number of cultural and linguistic variables.

Chap. 5, edited by Penelope Gardner-Chloros, examines issues of vernacular literacy for new immigrant populations in France, Germany, the U.K., and Scandinavia, and serves as the opening chapter for Part II. In the 1950s through 1960s, vernacular literacy was primarily thought of as a Third World problem; but by the 1980s and 1990s, it became clear that it was a problem in “developed” countries as well, as new immigrants and their children required integration in their adopted homes. This chapter points out the advantages of establishing literacy in an L1 before teaching it in an L2. Since literacy in one language appears to be transferable to others, the result is that both languages are well learned; students can become fully bilingual and biliterate. One difficulty with this approach is that the L1s of some immigrants are not written languages to start with. Another may be the fact that immigrants may speak a regional dialect, rather than a standard “mother tongue,” from their original country (this is particularly likely for Arabic speakers). Additionally, in many cases new immigrants in Europe (and the U.S. as well) prefer that their children be immersed in the language of the nation to which they have immigrated, rather than in the language that they have left behind. In any case, questions regarding the relationship between language and ethnicity need to be better addressed in order to begin sorting out the complexities of assisting new minorities to achieve literacy.

Chap. 6, edited by Jean-Michel Charpentier, explores literacy in pidgin-using countries of Melanesia and West Africa. Because pidgins are often intelligible over linguistically diverse areas, they have a certain advantage as languages of choice for vernacular literacy. However, to the extent that European colonial languages have higher status, there is a tendency to choose literacy in them instead. Of special interest here is the discussion of the varied and non-standardized means of writing pidgins, and the observation that many pidgin readers are easily able to read a wide range of spellings: “Living as they do in polyglot societies, pidgin speakers are accustomed to linguistic variation . . . all the scripts [are] equally accessible” (233). This observation, combined with the recognition that European languages were not always spelled in standardized fashion, suggests that Europeans have become rather less tolerant of variation than they may once have been. In any case, it appears that, as pidgins move closer to their lexifier languages, it becomes less and less relevant to promote literacy in the pidgins.

Chap. 7, edited by Ralph Fasold, includes studies of literacy campaigns in Kenya, Tanzania, the Central African Republic, and Nigeria, and examines the definition of “mother tongue” in multilingual nations. Often, as with Swahili or Sango, the vernacular chosen for literacy campaigns is not a “mother tongue” for everyone involved. This chapter also explores cultural and economic motivations for literacy, linking them to problems of standardization. P. Ndukwe’s concept of dissociation, mentioned elsewhere in the book, is particularly relevant to this chapter; it suggests that vernacular languages become dissociated from literacy, and therefore come to be thought of as languages in which one ought not (or

better yet, cannot) be literate. It is important, therefore, to assess the attitudes of speakers of minority languages toward literacy in those languages, as opposed to literacy in a dominant language. The surprise, which should not be such a surprise to anyone familiar with postcolonial African nations, is that many upwardly mobile middle-class Africans seek literacy in ex-colonial languages, and see little relevance in promoting or acquiring literacy in a vernacular. In my experience, this is also true of African expatriates and immigrants in Europe and the U.S.

Chap. 8, edited by Anna Kwan-Terry & K. K. Luke, examines the role of vernacular education in the context of standard languages in China, Hong Kong, Malaysia, and Singapore. The authors pay special attention to the ways in which vernacular education must compete for recognition in these areas, and to the shifting definitions of “vernacular” in each location; thus, in Malaysia the term does not refer to aboriginal languages, but in China it refers to minority and tribal languages. In addition, it is difficult to decide what constitutes vernacular education for children who are multilingual at home. Addressing questions of nationalism, intellectualism, and economic ideals, this chapter draws an intriguing contrast between Singapore – where English is the standard for education, and “symbolic mother tongues” are “assigned” in accordance with family background – and Malaysia, where Malay has become the standard and English is a compulsory subject in school. Both countries are working toward national unity through language, but one in a more monolingual fashion, and the other more multilingually. It will be interesting to see the results. With yet another reminder of the changing notions of literacy over the years, this chapter suggests that bilingual literacy may well be the wave of the future.

The conclusion, edited by Tabouret-Keller, reviews once more the important changes that have taken place since the 1953 UNESCO monograph, and attempts to develop a coherent cognitive framework for future discussions of vernacular literacy. Bilingual literacy continues to be a particularly interesting area: Although there are always issues surrounding the choice of languages, it is clear that biliteracy is far more common than supposed. This jibes with my own observations in the Comoros, where literacy in the local vernacular co-exists with literacy in French. In addition, vernaculars in the Comoros are multiscriptal, written – depending on context and situation – in Arabic script (learned in Koranic schools), in French script (learned in European-style schools), and/or in phonemic script (introduced in literacy campaigns in the 1970s). Nonetheless, as the authors point out, lay individuals, particularly in Europe and the U.S., continue to believe that monolingualism is “better” for children, and often take political action to ensure that their views are heard.

In all, this book makes it abundantly clear that the notions of vernacular education and vernacular literacy are far more complex and harder to define than they appeared in 1953 to the UNESCO group. The book does an outstanding job of identifying and exploring these complexities. It is highly recommended reading for anyone working in the area of vernacular literacy and/or education today.

REVIEWS

REFERENCES

- Ahmed-Chamanga, Mohamed (1976). Propositions pour une écriture standard du comorien. *Asie du Sud-Est et Monde Insulindien* 7:2/3.73–80.
- Ottenheimer, Harriet Joseph (1997). From Cousin Joe to the Comoros: Orthographic choice in the representation of dialect, discourse, and dictionary entries. Paper presented to the American Anthropological Association, Washington, DC.
- UNESCO (1953). *The use of vernacular languages in education*. (Monographs on fundamental education, 8.) Paris: United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

(Received 2 July 1998)

SARAH G. THOMASON (ed.), *Contact languages: A wider perspective*. (Creole language library, 17.) Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1997. Pp. xii, 506. Hb \$165.00.

Reviewed by BERNARD COMRIE  
 Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology  
 Inselstrasse 22, 04103 Leipzig, Germany  
 comrie@eva.mpg.de

In her editorial Introduction (1–7), Thomason notes that study of the results of intense language contact – as in pidgins, creoles, and mixed languages – has hitherto been heavily biased in favor of instances of pidgins/creoles in which the lexifier languages have been European. One aim of this volume is to redress the balance by considering contact languages that have not involved a European lexifier. More significantly, this brings to the fore social and/or structural properties that differ from those in the contact languages that have formed much of traditional lore. This volume brings together studies on the following 12 contact languages: Hiri Motu (Tom Dutton, 9–41), Pidgin Delaware (Ives Goddard, 43–98), Ndyuka-Trio Pidgin (George L. Huttar & Frank J. Velantie, 99–124), Arabic-based pidgins and creoles (Jonathan Owens, 125–72), Kitúba (Salikoko S. Mufwene, 173–208), Sango (Helma Pasch, 209–70), Swahili (Derek Nurse, 271–94), Michif (Peter Bakker & Robert A. Papen, 295–363), Media Lengua (Pieter Muysken, 365–426), Callahuaya (Pieter Muysken, 427–47), Mednyj Aleut (Sarah G. Thomason, 449–68), and Ma'a (Sarah G. Thomason, 469–87).

The article on Swahili notes that there have been several times in the history of mainstream Swahili when conditions were ripe for pidginization and creolization, but that there is no clear evidence that these processes form part of the history of mainstream Swahili. The essay on Callahuaya documents a language used by curers from Charazani (Bolivia) which is essentially Quechua in grammatical structure but has replaced most of its vocabulary, primarily from the otherwise extinct (and poorly described) Puquina language; given that so little is known about Puquina, and that Callahuaya materials are sparse and contradictory, it is hard to draw further conclusions. For each of the other articles, I will draw out salient points of interest – several of which, of course, recur in various articles.

An important point to emphasize, following from Thomason's Introduction, is that each of the language varieties described is a LANGUAGE; more specifically, each is learned as a distinct language and is (in general) not readily mutually intelligible with any other, including those involved in the contact that gave rise to it. This point is specifically addressed in each article. For instance, in his account of Media Lengua (Ecuador), Muysken notes that Media Lengua is not comprehensible to monolingual speakers of Quechua (including dialects with heavy Spanish lexical influence), or to monolingual speakers of Spanish, or even to speakers of Spanish with some knowledge of Quechua (375). Each chapter also documents, as far as is known, the origin, development, and current use of the contact language in question, distinguishing documented fact from plausible supposition.

In his study of Hiri Motu (Papua New Guinea), Dutton notes that, despite its current official name, the language (formerly called Police Motu) does not derive from a putative Motu-based contact language of the *hiri* "exchange" voyages. He argues that it probably arose in part from the unwillingness of Motu speakers to impart their native language to outsiders; they preferred instead to use a simplified variety of their language (Simplified Motu). Parallel phenomena are discussed in some of the other chapters, specifically with regard to Pidgin Delaware and Ndyuka-Trio Pidgin (Suriname). One structural point that particularly struck me in the account of Hiri Motu is the order of the basic constituents in the clause. Motu itself is SOV, and uses affixes for pronominal subject and object arguments. With nouns, Hiri Motu has the construction *S ese O V*; with noun subject and pronoun object, *O be S ia V* (less commonly *SVO*); with pronoun subject and noun object, *OSV*; and with both *S* and *O* as pronouns, *OSV* (less commonly *SVO*; 30–31). This might seem a mere idiosyncrasy were it not for the existence of somewhat similar variation in Ndyuka-Trio Pidgin. I have no explanation for the phenomenon, though it would seem to merit further specific study.

Pidgin Delaware is more properly a pidginized form of Unami, one of two Delaware languages belonging to the Algonkian family. The pidgin is extinct; most records come from the seventeenth century (one from the eighteenth), and require a fair amount of philological interpretation. Goddard suggests that deliberate simplification by Unami speakers may have played a role in the formation of Pidgin Delaware (80), e.g. in the systematic selection of inanimate singular as the sole representative of 3rd person; speakers of other languages, faced with the complexity of Unami morphology, might have been expected to make largely random choices. Another observation by Goddard may also be of general relevance: Pidgin Delaware makes use of expressions that would be considered "off-color" in Unami (80); this has obvious parallels in Tok Pisin (e.g. *bagarap* 'break, be spoilt', from English *bugger up*). This may reflect in part the general fact that non-native speakers rarely acquire the prejudices towards taboo words that native speakers have; compare the widespread use of *shit* as a mild expression of annoyance in Dutch, by speakers whose counterparts in English-speaking society would surely not use the word in the same range of circumstances.

Ndyuka-Trio Pidgin is a trade language used between speakers of Ndyuka (an English-based creole of Suriname) and Trio (a Cariban language). The syntax is basically Trio, including SOV word order – which shifts, however, to OSV with a pronominal subject (105). Since Trio would use a pronominal subject affix, this cannot be a direct transfer from Trio, and poses problems similar to those discussed above for Hiri Motu. The lexicon comes both from Ndyuka (and Sranan, another English-based creole of Suriname) and from Trio, with Ndyuka/Sranan predominating in pronouns, adverbs, and verbs, but both about equal in nouns. One interesting fact is that many of the words of English-based creole origin are closer to Sranan than to Ndyuka in form (113–14). The authors suggest two possible explanations: The forms could derive from an earlier form of Ndyuka, before Ndyuka had undergone the changes that now mark it off so clearly from Sranan; or they could reflect the Ndyuka tendency to use Sranan rather than Ndyuka in contacts with outsiders, as a means of protecting the Ndyuka way of life from the outside.

Owens suggests that the Sudanic Arabic-based pidgins and creoles all derive from a single common origin, which existed between the opening of southern Sudan to northern influence in 1854 and the expulsion of the Egyptian government in 1888 – a period when the military camps contained only a minority of speakers of Arabic (135). Juba Arabic, the lingua franca of southern Sudan, and East African Nubi (KiNubi, in Kenya and Uganda) form an Eastern branch; varieties spoken in and around Chad form a Western branch resulting from migration. The pidgins/creoles could have served as a social emblem of the soldiers and their circle, distinguishing them both from the Arabic-speaking Egyptian government officials and from the local speakers of Nilo-Saharan languages (145). Of the structural features noted by Owens, one of general typological interest is the formation of a passive by shifting stress to the final syllable of the verb (which otherwise lacks any inflectional variation; 150); the form may more strictly be an indefinite-subject form, since it also occurs with intransitive verbs, e.g. *gi-jeéré* ‘someone is running’, cf. *úmwon gi-jére* ‘they are running’. Owens emphasizes, incidentally, that Arabic-based pidgins and creoles must be clearly distinguished from Arabic dialects (126); in particular, Arabic dialects are closer to Classical Arabic than they are to Arabic-based pidgins and creoles.

Mufwene’s article on Kitúba, whose main lexifier language is Kikóngo (more specifically, the Kimanyánga member of the Kikóngo language cluster), is a rich structural and social account in which I want to concentrate on only one problem, addressed as such by Mufwene himself. One characteristic of Kitúba in relation to Kikóngo is that the former lacks much of the verbal morphology of the latter, particularly subject/object prefixes and aspect affixes – although the content of the former continues to be expressed by means of preverbal particles. What makes this surprising is that the neighboring creole language Lingála has not undergone such wholesale loss of inflectional morphology. Mufwene poses the question why. Some languages whose speakers participated in the genesis of Kitúba, such

as certain varieties of Kiteké and Kiyánsi, lack subject and object prefixes; but speakers of these same languages also participated in the creation of Lingála. Rather than trying to predict the precise outcome of particular configurations of inputs to pidgin and creole genesis, perhaps the more reasonable question is what range of outputs one might expect from a given input. In this case, the generalization would be that structurally similar languages might lose a category that they generally share and express in a similar way – but they might also keep it.

Another pidgin/creole that shows clear signs of morphological simplification relative to its lexifier is Sango, which has become the lingua franca of the Central African Republic, and is the main first language of its capital, Bangui. An interesting feature of Sango is the relatively low proportion of vocabulary that derives from the main lexifier language, Ngbandi (more specifically, Yakoma). Pasch notes (255) that the establishment of the political frontier between French and Belgian African territories on the Ubangi River effectively cut Sango off from Yakoma, forcing its speakers to resort to other lexical sources.

The article by Bakker & Papen includes a particularly detailed descriptive study of Michif, which stands as perhaps the clearest example of a mixed language; moreover, its social origin is reasonably clear – in the contact between French-speaking trappers and Cree-speaking women, and in the development of a sense of social identity among their descendants that is neither French nor Cree. The importance of a mixed language as an emblem of group identity recurs in the articles on Media Lengua, Mednyj Aleut, and Ma'a. Some points noted in the earlier literature are clarified and emphasized, e.g. that Michif really is an L1 normally acquired by children from their parents, and that many speakers of Michif do not speak French (perhaps two-thirds) or any variety of Cree (the vast majority); many learn English only after starting school. The language really does consist primarily of Cree verbs intertwined with French noun phrases, though with some interesting twists. For instance, within the noun phrases Cree demonstratives are used, and the word order Numeral–Article–Noun follows Algonkian rather than French patterns. (More generally, the syntax seems to be more Algonkian, with free word order of major constituents and frequent discontinuous constituents – though as the authors note, one's point of comparison should be spoken, rather than written, French.) Two structural aspects of the encounter between Cree and French struck me particularly. The expression of obviation in the noun phrase is much reduced in Michif relative to Cree (more specifically Plains Cree, the variety that provided part of the input to Michif). However, although far fewer noun phrases are marked as obviative than would be the case in Cree, verbs nonetheless make the same distinctions; thus a noun that is structurally obviative but morphologically unmarked will nonetheless require obviative indexing in the verb.

The interaction of Cree and French has left Michif with a particularly complex gender system. Any noun must belong to either animate or inanimate gender, since the Cree morphology is sensitive to this distinction; while all notionally



animate nouns belong to the animate gender, so do a number of notionally inanimate nouns. Any noun, including notionally inanimate nouns, must also independently belong to either masculine or feminine gender, to get the French morphosyntax right. Bakker & Papen make it quite clear, incidentally, that Michif nouns do need to be specified as masculine or feminine, since a number of items show agreement in terms of this gender opposition (articles, possessive pronouns, preposed adjectives); it is not just a case of frozen French articles as parts of Michif lexical items. There is a clear problem, which the authors note but do not resolve (315–16), when loans are to be incorporated from English – especially given that English itself is of no help in assigning grammatical gender, and that most Michif speakers know neither French nor Cree. This looks like a nice topic for further investigation. Incidentally, whatever the language knowledge of present-day speakers of Michif, it seems clear that the originators of the language must have been fluent in both Cree and French; Michif simply embodies too many of the finer complications of each language for the situation to have been otherwise (353).

The other mixed language presented in great detail is *Media Lengua*, which has essentially Quechua grammatical structure (including affixes), relexified by replacing Quechua lexical items with Spanish ones. Like Michif, it is a marker of social identity, for a community (or communities) of acculturated Indians in Ecuador who do not identify completely either with Indians or with Europeans. It differs radically from the interlanguage of Quechua-speaking learners of Spanish (405–07), and indeed some of its speakers are also fluent in Spanish. However, the nature of the mix is very different from that in Michif, since in *Media Lengua* the lexicon is almost exclusively of Spanish origin, while the grammar is almost exclusively of Quechua origin. *Media Lengua* is thus close to a canonical case of relexification. Indeed, some of the exceptions to the lexicon/grammar partition turn out on close examination to involve loans from Quechua into Spanish (e.g. names of local animals, which are thus also found in local Spanish) or loans from Spanish into Quechua (e.g. some conjunctions, also found in local Quechua); others may reflect loans from Spanish into *Media Lengua* after its initial formation. They would thus not be exceptions to relexification. While relexification seems to proceed relatively straightforwardly in the case of content words, Muysken notes complications in the case of function words, which sometimes involve more complex interactions between Quechua and Spanish; e.g., the forms of demonstratives are taken from Spanish, but their syntax involves a compromise between Quechua and Spanish patterns (390–95). Muysken suggests that this is because functional words typically do not exist in isolation, but form part of a tightly knit system that must be treated as a whole. In some cases, however, *Media Lengua* has relexified a set of function words with almost complete success, as in the case of the personal pronouns (394–95); so it could be that function words reflect rather an area where relexification might be expected to give differing results, perhaps even on the basis of the same input. Function words might

be subject to such interference between the original and the relexifier language, but would not have to be.

The two studies by Thomason are interpretations of others' data on the relevant languages, in particular taking into account new data and accounts since her earlier interpretations of these languages in Thomason & Kaufman (1988). Mednyj Aleut combines Russian verbal inflectional morphology with an otherwise Aleut frame; Ma'a (Tanzania) combines a Bantu morphosyntactic frame with a lexicon of largely Cushitic origin. In both cases, Thomason emphasizes the importance of the mixed language as a symbol of a social group: in the case of Mednyj Aleut, the "creole" community of mixed Russian–Aleut parentage, as distinct from both Russians and Aleuts; and in the case of Ma'a, the desire of its speakers to set themselves off from neighboring groups with whom they refuse to assimilate. Ma'a is in some respects the more tantalizing case, and since the language is still fully alive, there remains the possibility of doing further work on it; so I will concentrate on Ma'a here. The Mbugu people grow up bilingual in Mbugu and Ma'a (I follow Thomason in keeping the language terms distinct). Mbugu is a mainstream Bantu language close to the neighboring Pare. Ma'a is a language of basically Bantu morphosyntax, but with perhaps the majority of its vocabulary, and all of its basic vocabulary, from elsewhere. Thomason interprets Ma'a as having originally been a Cushitic language that has undergone heavy Bantuization, and she emphasizes that this violates no known general principles of borrowability; Ma'a has borrowed nothing that is not known to be borrowable in other cases, the only difference being the extent of the borrowing. The non-Bantu vocabulary is thus left over from the original language. Thomason does not hide the fact that there is one problem with this scenario, namely the fact that the non-Bantu component of Ma'a vocabulary does not come from a single source. Most of it is Cushitic, but some elements are South Cushitic, while others are East Cushitic; and even within the South Cushitic component, there are both Iraqw-like and West Rift-like elements. Some of the non-Bantu vocabulary is from the Nilo-Saharan language Maasai. One possibility suggested by Thomason, and attributed to Martin Mous, is that this aspect of Ma'a perhaps represents an originally mixed language (incorporating different Cushitic and Maasai elements; 480) – but it is unlikely that such a hypothesis will ever be testable. The most striking features in favor of Thomason's hypothesis are those involving chronologically ordered changes (482), though the possibility cannot be excluded that analogy explains some of the apparent relative chronology. The main alternative explanation is that the Mbugu were previously speaking Mbugu and subsequently relexified. This assumes that at least both Mbugu and original Ma'a were both still spoken in the community – perhaps distributed according to age, or perhaps with much of the society being bilingual.

This volume succeeds in demonstrating the importance of hitherto little-considered instances of language contact involving non-European lexifier languages for our general understanding of language contact. Such languages as

Michif are realities from which linguists hide at their peril. In addition to the details included in the chapters, a number of general questions arise. What determines when morphological simplification takes place as structurally similar languages come into contact? The contrast between Kitúba and Lingála is instructive. What are the possibilities for languages to intertwine? Michif represents an outcome very different from those that involve relexification, and relexification in turn involves important considerations concerning the boundary of lexicon and grammar. Clearly we need to find and investigate more examples of such languages.

## REFERENCE

Thomason, Sarah G., & Kaufman, Terrence (1988). *Language contact, creolization, and genetic linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

(Received 2 July 1997)

ROBERT MAGOCSI (ed.), *A new Slavic language is born: The Rusyn literary language of Slovakia / Zrodil sa nový slovanský jazyk: Rusínsky spisovný jazyk na Slovensku*. (East European monographs, 184; Classics of Carpatho-Rusyn scholarship, 8.) New York: Columbia University Press, New York, NY, 1996. Pp. xv, 1–79 in English; 16 pp. of illustrations (unnumbered); pp. xiv, 1–68 in Slovak. Hb \$28.00.

Reviewed by CATHERINE V. CHVANY  
*Foreign Languages and Literatures, MIT*  
 Cambridge, MA 02139  
 cvchvany@mit.edu

This bilingual volume (in English and Slovak) opens with the text of the January 27, 1995 “Declaration on the occasion of the celebratory announcement of the codification of the Rusyn language in Slovakia” – printed in Rusyn, in Cyrillic, facing the English translation. Since the occasion had as much political as linguistic significance, a little background is in order. The Carpatho-Rusyns are ethnic East Slavs whose area of settlement since medieval times has been criss-crossed by shifting political boundaries. Until World War I, they lived in the Austro-Hungarian Empire and the Russian Empire; today Rusyn populations are found mainly in western Ukraine (600,000 to 800,000) and in Slovakia (100,000), with smaller groups in Poland, Hungary, and Romania (much as the ethnic and linguistic community of Kurds straddles the national borders of Iran, Iraq, and Turkey). There is also a small Rusyn enclave in the former Yugoslavia, whose dialect is formally recognized as an official minority language (Bačka Rusyn, or Vojvodinian-Srem Rusyn), and part of this population now finds itself in still another country: Croatia. The Rusyn subgroups, from the Bačka Rusyns to the Lemkos of Polish Galicia or the Huculs who straddle the Romanian border, have

distinct dialects, as well as their own religious and literary text traditions. After World War I, most Rusyns found themselves citizens of the new republic of Czechoslovakia; but after World War II, a large part of their area was ceded to the USSR, becoming the Transcarpathian Oblast of the Ukrainian SSR. A sizable population in North America, mainly descendants of late nineteenth-century immigrants from the Austro-Hungarian Empire, variously called themselves Russian, Ukrainian, or Slavish [sláviš] – appellations determined mainly by the orientation of local émigré parishes. It was not until the monumental study of Magocsi 1978 that American Rusyns were provided with a history and an identity as Carpatho-Rusyns, rather than as speakers of substandard Russian or Ukrainian. Magocsi's work led to a scholarly mini-boom that includes the publishing program of the Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center, as well as a growing number of panels at national and international congresses devoted to various disciplines. This international scholarly activity has, in turn, provided support for the Rusyn movements in the Old World.

A brief introduction to the present book, by Nikita I. Tolstoj of the Russian Academy of Sciences (xiii–xv), tells us that the three main chapters were presented in Bratislava at a scholarly seminar immediately preceding the declaration. Chap. 1, Aleksander D. Duličenko, “Carpatho-Rusyn in the context of regional literary languages of the contemporary Slavic world” (1–18), places the Rusyns' claim to their own literary language on a par with other minority official languages (Duličenko is an authority on what he has termed the “microlanguages” of the Slavic world). The most informative chapter is Chap. 2, Paul Robert Magocsi, “The Rusyn language question revisited” (19–48); this outlines the history of the matter, and points out that the major motivation for the status of a standard language is a search for *dignitas* – recognition on its own terms. While sympathetic to those efforts, Magocsi points out that the Rusyns in the past have been far from unanimous in their linguistic orientations, nor have they shared a certainty that their vernacular had enough prestige (again, *dignitas*) to function as a standard literary language. Over the years, the scattered Rusyn intelligentsia has included, besides partisans of a separate Rusyn language centered in the university city of Prešov in Slovakia, supporters of varying degrees of solidarity or assimilation to neighboring groups – Hungarian, Slovak, Ukrainian or Russian – driven by cultural, economic, intellectual, political, or religious motives.

Linguistically, Ukrainian is the “standard language” that is closest to Rusyn; and during the era of communist rule (1948–1989), Slovak authorities placed Ukrainian (or Ukrainophile Rusyn) intellectuals in charge of Rusyn cultural institutions in Slovakia, including the schooling of Rusyn children. The Ukrainian school language was different enough from the Rusyn children's home language to require considerable retooling; but mastery of standard Ukrainian did not translate into better opportunities, especially after 1945, when the bulk of the Rusyn/Ukrainian-speaking territory, including the city of Užhorod, ended up across the USSR border. (As Magocsi has pointed out in other publications, this

policy led many Rusyns in Slovakia to send their children to Slovak schools that would prepare them to get jobs or continue their education in Bratislava, or in other cities of Czechoslovakia.) The conclusion of Magocsi's chapter cites a cautionary statement by Joshua Fishman, from a 1992 conference on Rusyn: "The replacement of one literary elite by another is never an easy or pleasant affair, and the old-guard self-defined Ukrainian elite can be expected to campaign vigorously against the 'Young Turks', Rusyn self-defining elites who [themselves] are self-declared candidates for the 'perks' that have until now supported the Old Guard's Ukrainian ethnic and linguistic orientation" (38).

The third and final chapter, Vasyl' Jabur, "Select aspects of the Rusyn language norm in Slovakia" (49–62), is essentially limited to remarks on the Cyrillic spelling conventions – without explicit comparison with standard Ukrainian, or with the Latin script used interchangeably by many Rusyns. One wishes that the volume had included a summary of the major features (phonological, morphological, syntactic, and lexical) that identify Rusyn as East Slavic, yet distinguish it from its closest kin among the East Slavic languages.

Four brief appendices by Rusyn activists all include assurances that the Rusyns in Slovakia are loyal citizens of that country. The first, "May the Lord bless our sacred act" by Nykolaj Ljaš, past chairman of the Rusyn Renaissance Society (65–66), is followed by three brief items from the Rusyn-language press. The most substantial and thought-provoking of these, Myron Sysak's "Codification and what next" (75–79), points out that, for all its symbolic significance, the celebratory declaration is only a step in what will continue to be an arduous and controversial process. Sysak's complaint that many Rusyn writers continue to use Ukrainian, "a language the people do not understand," confirms the Fishman-Magocsi conclusion cited earlier. One can predict that any imposed Rusyn standard will still require some outlying dialect groups to learn "a language the people do not understand." Only time will tell whether the effort will translate into enough economic or social advantages to make it worth their while.

The second half of the book, separately paginated, contains Slovak-language versions of the same texts. One regrets, however, that the fifteen facsimile signatures on the Cyrillic "Declaration" are not transcribed in legible print in either translated version. At the center of the volume, between the English and Slovak segments, are 16 unnumbered pages featuring facsimile frontispieces of Rusyn school grammars, readers, and dictionaries, with captions in English and Slovak, testifying to the long history and variety of Rusyn language movements. These include publications from Trnava (1698) and Buda (1830), a Rusyn–Hungarian dictionary from Budapest (1881/1883), a school grammar from Ungvár (Užhorod, 1901), readers from Mukačevo (1919) and Prešov (1921), a Galician–Ukrainian-oriented Rusyn grammar published in Prague (1936), a Russophile grammar from Užhorod (1924), a Lemko Rusyn grammar from L'viv (1935), another from Užhorod (1941), and a school rulebook from Novi Sad (1971), describing the Yugoslav Rusyn language. The section closes with a sample 1991 page of the

Rusyn newspaper *Narodný novinky* and the latest reader from Prešov for new Rusyn-language schools in Slovakia (1994).

While Rusyn and Ukrainian are not the same, they are no more dissimilar than are dialects of German or English or Italian whose speakers do accept a German or English or Italian literary standard (or standards) distinct from their own home language. Though there exists no linguistic definition of “language” as opposed to “dialect,” the case for a Rusyn literary language reshapes the old saw that “a language is a dialect with an army and a navy.” In modern terms, a language is a dialect with *dignitas* – prestige whose source is more likely to be cultural or economic than military.

The Rusyns, increasingly aware of their own literary and musical traditions, are tired of being considered marginal Ukrainians or Russians. Thanks largely to the efforts of international scholars and local activists, Rusyns in the home territories and abroad have acquired a sense of national identity, and they are beginning to sort through the tangle of claims and counterclaims, including those centered on religious affiliation and church property (Greek Catholic or Uniate or Eastern Rite Roman Catholics, vs. competing branches of the Eastern Orthodox Church). Rather than have their usage “corrected” to conform to other norms (as on my mother-in-law’s 1914 church school diploma from a Russian Orthodox parish in Passaic, New Jersey, where her name *Anna Vil’hovska* appears in its Russian analog *Ol’xovskaja*), Rusyns can now insist more confidently on norms of their own. But that does not mean these norms will find acceptance among all Rusyns for all registers or purposes. Their history, along with Sysak’s observation about many Rusyns’ continued preference for a literary standard based on Ukrainian, support Magocsi’s assessment: the future of a Rusyn standard will depend far less on linguistic features than on a social group’s perceptions of its dialect’s relative *dignitas*.

## REFERENCE

Magocsi, Paul Robert (1978). *The shaping of a national identity: Subcarpathian Rus’, 1848–1948*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

(Received 2 July 1998)

ROBERT D. KING, *Nehru and the language politics of India*. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1997. Pp. xvii, 256.

Reviewed by MICHAEL C. SHAPIRO  
Asian Languages, University of Washington  
Seattle, WA 98195  
hindimcs@u.washington.edu

Judgments regarding history do not figure prominently in the writing of many linguists whom I know. Such evaluations are rather the purview of world figures,

their biographers and acolytes, and historians. But it is precisely a historical judgment that is the central concern of the present work by a distinguished linguist. King has a cause to plead in this book: He believes that Jawaharlal Nehru has not been treated well in the court of history with regard to his language policy, and he means to change this largely negative assessment. From the title of the book, one would have every right to expect that the book would, at the least, contain a narrative of the substance and evolution of Nehru's thinking concerning language policy for India; and the book does provide precisely such an account. In fact, King states (xii) that telling this narrative is his principal goal. But advocacy is never far from the surface. King forthrightly states that Nehru did a far better job of joining battle in India's language conflicts than he is customarily given credit for (xiii). Convincing the reader that Nehru has gotten a bad rap with regard to language policy is, I believe, the central aim of this book.

There are two separate, albeit related, arenas in which Nehru's views on language were played out. The first of these had to do with the redrawing of the map of India, after independence, on the basis of language. There had been strong pressures on the leadership of the Congress Party to use language as a basis for defining state boundaries within India; this was the so-called linguistic states issue. The second arena was the matter of whether there should be a single national language for independent India, and if so, what it should be. King believes that Nehru got things right with regard to both these issues, although in very different ways. With regard to linguistic states, King believes that Nehru instinctively distrusted making mother-tongue demographics the primary consideration when redrawing state boundaries. Nehru intuited that language was too divisive an issue to serve such a function – and that lying just under the surface of claims for linguistic autonomy were more malignant assertions of caste or communal self-interest. To King, Nehru had the right instincts, but he vastly underestimated the emotional appeal that arguments based on language would have in the charged political environment just before and shortly after independence. King contends there was nothing Nehru could have done to prevent the eventual success of the linguistic states movement, but that he was wise to have been wary of it. Nehru's reticence over linguistic reorganization at least had the salutary effect of ensuring that, when language states were eventually created, they were created in a reasoned and intellectually justifiable manner. Nehru's heel-dragging, King says, minimized the worst potential problems of what Nehru thought – and King apparently agrees – to be a flawed policy.

The second matter, that of a national language for independent India, was every bit as dangerous a minefield as that of linguistic states. The colonial associations of English, the economic consequences to specific groups of empowering any one vernacular Indian language over another, the emotional and intellectual pull of Sanskrit as a unifying force within Indian civilization, the cultural and intellectual legacies of such languages such as Bengali, Urdu, and Marathi, and the resentment in parts of South Asia against Brahmanical hegemony (embodied

in the imposition of Sanskrit) – all ensured that the choice of a national language, if there was to be one, would be fraught with difficulty. In King's view, Nehru understood that the hasty imposition of Hindi as the sole national language would have been a practical disaster for India. Likewise, maintenance of English as national language, without appropriate acknowledgment of the symbolic importance of according national language status to a suitable Indian language, would have been a political disaster. The only workable policy was, in effect, to ensure a workable equilibrium between the forces in favor of Hindi and those against it. The compromise in the 1950 constitution, wherein Hindi was named as official language, but with provision for English to coexist with Hindi for official purposes of the Union until 1965, provided just such an equilibrium. Time was bought to allow a cooling of tempers on the matter of language policy. With the passage of the Official Language Act in 1963, provision was made that English would be maintained indefinitely for official purposes, along with Hindi; thus Nehru achieved what he wanted. To King, Nehru's efforts to pass the Official Language Act represented his last service to the cause of progressive language policy in India (131).

King's appeal for greater understanding of Nehru's role comprises seven chapters. Chap. 1, "Introduction," describes the linguistic makeup of India and recounts attempts, some dating back to antiquity, to describe and make sense of the Indian linguistic scene. Chap. 2, "Linguistic prolegomena," deals with three cases of attempted language planning: the successful development of Hebrew in Israel, the failed attempt to revive Irish, and language reform in Turkey. King uses these as benchmarks in assessing the success of Nehru's language policies. Chap. 3, "Language states and the national language," summarizes the histories and issues involved in the two major foci of debate for language planning in Hindi. The discussion of the national language issue deals at some length with what King refers to as "the Hindi-Urdu-Hindustani nexus" (74) – paying particular attention to the role of script, and to the relationship of Nehru's positions to those taken by Gandhi. The core of King's assessment of Nehru's thinking on language policy is set out in Chaps. 4, "Nehru at the helm"; 5, "The private Nehru"; and 6, "Nehru's essays on language." In Chap. 7, "Summing up," King reasserts his view of Nehru as a linguistic sophisticate and visionary – opining, by way of conclusion, "how fortunate India was to have had Jawaharlal Nehru as its guide and preceptor during the years of the creation of the independent India."

King writes with conviction, elegance, and persuasiveness. As an advocate (and in the end, this is by and large a work of advocacy), he is most effective. He is able to bring to bear a sophisticated knowledge of parallel instances of language engineering – from Israel, Ireland, Moldova, the old USSR, Turkey, Belgium, and the Austro-Hungarian Empire – in commenting on the exigencies of language policy in India. He is well-read in the literatures on language planning in South Asia, on Nehru's life and thinking, and on the political, psychological, and symbolic aspects of language politics in India and elsewhere. All this pro-



vides King with the ammunition to plead his case for Nehru in the court of history; and he does so well. It is a sophisticated writer indeed whose balanced assessment of the efficacy of Nehru's efforts on behalf of language is informed by Atatürk's policies on the modernization of Turkish; by observations on why the movement for the promulgation of Irish failed, whereas that for Hebrew succeeded; and by an understanding of the differences between Lenin's and Stalin's language policies for the Soviet Union.

In the end, however, an assessment of this book depends on the interpretation of a body of facts that admit of multiple interpretations. Many points can be easily conceded to King. Much of the stridency of the Hindi lobby has abated from the levels of the 1950s and 1960s. The realities of the world economy (with ever-increasing economic, technological, and educational interconnections) have created pressures for the maintenance of English far greater than anything foreseeable in 1947. Linguistic states reorganization – which Nehru initially resisted but later acquiesced to, once it could be carried out in a rational manner – has by and large succeeded, and except in a small number of residual cases, has ceased being the divisive matter it once was.

Nehru's thinking about language can readily be conceded to have been subtle and informed. Any political leader whose vacation reading included books by J. R. Firth could hardly have been called linguistically naïve. But exactly how much of the current linguistic landscape in India can be attributed to actions or policies instigated by Nehru? Where is the line to be drawn between indecisiveness or waffling – terms that many historians have applied to Nehru's language policies – and a deliberate strategy of delay and equivocation? Is the apparent success of Indian language policy (if one believes the current status quo in India with regard to language to be a success) the result of the deliberate application of reasoned policy, or the accidental result of worldwide changes in technology and economics? I could never presume to answer these questions in the context of a book review. I would argue, however, that available evidence can be adduced by a skillful advocate for either position. What King has done here, and splendidly, is gather together the evidence that Nehru knew precisely what he was doing. Nehru may have made naïve mistakes with regard to linguistic states reorganization; but he learned from them, and adjusted his tactics accordingly, while formulating plans of action.

It is someone ironic that, if I have some quibbles with this engaging book written by an accomplished linguist, it is in matters of linguistics and not of history. Admittedly, the book was not written for professional linguists or philologists; but still there are some infelicities and oversights that detract from the book's overall effectiveness. These arise in what I feel is at times an overly simplistic description of the linguistic realities of South Asia. A few examples will suffice. King is out on a shaky limb when he asserts (p. 9) that “scholarly opinion now tends to agree that the Indus Valley civilization . . . was Dravidian.” No such consensus exists. Likewise, he is inaccurate when he states (75) that the majority

of languages of northern and central India are written in Devanagari-derived scripts, when these scripts are in fact (like Devanagari itself) derived from the ancient Brahmi script. His discussion of the historical origins of Hindi, Urdu, Hindustani etc. makes no mention of premodern vernacular languages like Braj and Avadhi – language varieties that played prominent roles in the overall evolution of “Hindi.” King’s discussion of the linguistic scene with regard to Hindi and other languages would have been improved if he had made reference to important recent works of scholarship such as Rai 1984, Masica 1991, and C. King 1994.

Points of linguistic detail notwithstanding, this is an interesting, provocative, and thought-provoking volume. Whether in the end it will be successful in altering the weight of scholarly opinion about the success, wisdom, and deliberate-ness of Nehru’s language policies remains to be seen. But I am confident that the book articulates a point of view and marshals a battery of facts that will need to be taken into consideration by future scholars who take up the issues of Indian language policy, and Nehru’s role as a steward of it, in the formative years of Indian independence.

## REFERENCES

- King, Christopher R. (1994). *One language, two scripts: The Hindi movement in nineteenth century North India*. Bombay: Oxford University Press.  
 Masica, Colin P. (1991). *The Indo-Aryan languages*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.  
 Rai, Amrit (1984). *A house divided: The origin and development of Hindi/Hindavi*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

(Received 16 July 1998)

SUMATHI RAMASWAMY, *Passions of the tongue: Language devotion in Tamil India, 1891–1970*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997. Pp. xxiii, 303. Hb \$50.00, pb \$20.00.

Reviewed by STUART BLACKBURN  
 School of Oriental and African Studies  
 University of London, London WC1H 0XG, England  
 sb12@soas.ac.uk

In 1964 a South Indian man doused himself with kerosene and set himself alight, shouting, “Long live Tamil! Down with Hindi!” This act of self-sacrifice (followed by several more) provides the starting point for this long-overdue history of the Tamil language movement. In seeking to explain this extreme devotion to Tamil, Ramaswamy quickly points out that the usual answer of “linguistic nationalism” is inadequate. “Nationalism” is a blunt instrument, honed in the study of modern Europe, and “passions of the tongue do not readily map onto passions of the nation” (5). As a corrective, Ramaswamy sets out to write a “different”

history of this extraordinary, possibly unique language movement by introducing the concept of *tamilparru* 'devotion to Tamil'.

Ramaswamy then investigates the texture and varieties of "devotion to Tamil." In one chapter, the Tamil "devotional community" is broken down into four groups: The first two, which emerged in the late nineteenth century, are the religious revivalists, who were intent on establishing a particular brand of Hinduism as "Tamil religion," and the philologists, who painstakingly "discovered," edited, and published the classics of Tamil literature. On the basis of their attitude toward Sanskrit, the philologists are further divided into "compensatory" and "contestatory" subgroups. The third group consists of the nationalists, who coalesced a few decades later and came to political power in the 1930s. After 1947, the nationalists were overtaken by an even more popular movement, the Dravidianists, who captured power in the 1960s – and, despite numerous schisms, have yet to relinquish it. As Ramaswamy neatly sums it up, when the Dravidianists superseded the nationalists, the enemies of Tamil shifted from the British Raj and the English language to the Indian state and the Hindi language. This chapter alone contributes more than other entire books on the subject. At times, however, the social categories appear reified and threaten to take over the analysis: "Thus in contradistinction to radical neo-Shaivism, which adoted an oppositional stance towards Sanskritic Aryan Hinduism in the name of a 'Dravidian' Shaivism, Indianism linked the cause of Tamil to an inclusivistic neo-Hinduism" (53).

The centerpiece of the book, however, is a chapter on the feminization of language. Evidence of the deification of Tamil is found earlier, but specific concepts of *tamil t̄ay* 'mother Tamil' and *teyva tamil* 'goddess Tamil', appear to date from verses written in 1891; in 1970, one of those verses was declared the "prayer song" of Tamil Nadu state. Three modalities of a feminized Tamil are discussed: the divine, the somatic, and the erotic. Here, one feels, lies Ramaswamy's own passion, for she is both erudite and witty in discussing how this feminine Tamil embodies the "mother tongue" and linguistic desire; using reproductions of statues, posters, cartoons, and drawings, she also shows readers how "Mother Tamil" parallels and differs from "Mother India" and Hindu goddesses. "Mother Tamil" is finally discussed in the context of "bourgeois discourses of modernity" which split home from work – and which, in Indian nationalism, placed woman in the home, as the repository of the nation, safe from the incursions of the colonial state.

Ramaswamy then describes the modern political history of Tamil devotion in a series of explosive issues: the language of liturgy in temples, purification of Tamil, the renaming of Madras State as *Tamil Nadu* 'Tamil land', and national language policy in India. As she adds up the ironies, contradictions, and failures of the Tamil language movement (especially the political career of the Dravidian movement), Ramaswamy concludes that it has repeatedly failed to practice what it preached, especially to "Tamilize" the language of government and to oppose "Hindi domination."

These are fighting words, and Ramaswamy's assessment of the "costs" of the anti-Hindi movement will generate heated debate. The demonization of Hindi, she argues, may have conveniently erased the deep divisions within the Tamil movement, but it has also prevented schoolchildren in Tamil Nadu from learning Hindi at state-supported schools. Moreover, by defining itself through opposition (anti-Hindi, non-Brahmin), the Dravidian movement has obscured its own political vision: "Indeed, even those who disavow Tamil<sup>parru</sup> are admitted into the ranks of Tamil's devotees because of their opposition to Hindi" (178).

This last sentence refers to E. V. Ramasami Naicker, the energetic and eccentric campaigner for the Dravidian movement, whose rationalism and atheism precluded any "devotion" to Tamil as a language *per se*. His story is told in the penultimate chapter, which contains other brief biographies to illustrate the persistence of self-sacrifice in the hagiographies of Tamil's devotees. But Ramasami Naicker was an "anti-devotee" because he attacked the folly of devotion to a language (any language) and focused instead on caste and social oppression. Indeed, some will argue that his social critique was more inspirational to the Tamil language movement – that it moved more people, from a broader cross-section of society – than the concept of "Mother Tamil." This book is convincing about the dominance of "Mother Tamil" as a literary trope, but its existence as social practice is left in doubt.

Setting out to write "differently" the history of the Tamil language movement, Ramaswamy has achieved her goal with this well-researched and informative book, which will become the benchmark for future research. In her conclusion, however, she admits that the Tamil case only confirms Herder in its conceptualization of language as patrimony, as the life blood of a people to be passed on, preserved, and revived. But what else could one expect of a language whose vowels are termed "the breath," and its consonants "the body"?

(Received 2 July 1998)

IVES GODDARD (ed.), *Handbook of North American Indians, 17: Languages*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution, 1996. Pp. xiii, 957. Hb \$74.00.

Reviewed by REGNA DARNELL  
 Anthropology, University of Western Ontario  
 London, Ont. N6A 5C2, Canada  
 rdarnell@julian.uwo.ca

The *Languages* volume has been perhaps the most eagerly awaited of the Smithsonian Institution's monumental revision and updating, over the past three decades, of the *Handbook of North American Indians*, the original of which was produced by the Smithsonian's Bureau of American Ethnology (BAE) in the early years of the twentieth century (Hodge 1907). Linguists and ethnologists alike will find illustrative data on a range of language-related topics, accompanied by contemporary interpretations. Volume editor Goddard is to be congratulated

lated for the scope and detail of this effort to characterize the state of the Americanist linguistic art. The volume consists of an Introduction by Goddard (1–16), a series of what we may call “discursive” articles by several authors, and a set of “Grammatical sketches,” followed by a Bibliography and Index.

Although this review will focus on matters of concern to sociolinguists, these fall within a broader scope of the ongoing history of Americanist research. The first “discursive” article by Goddard, “The description of the native languages of North America before Boas” (17–42), is followed by Marianne Mithun, “The description of the native languages of North America: Boas and after” (43–63); these essays point to the significant Boasian watershed, which, of course, corresponds to the professionalization of American anthropology (including linguistics). Michael K. Foster, “Language and the culture history of North America” (64–110), discusses the uses of language in reconstructing North American culture history, i.e. linguistics as handmaiden of ethnology. Goddard’s article, “The classification of the native languages of North America” (290–323), concludes the discursive section of the volume with a current “conservative consensus classification” (290), closely following Campbell & Mithun 1979. There are two maps; one shows John Wesley Powell’s 1891 classification for the Bureau, and the other, Goddard’s own synthesis. In all his contributions, Goddard implicitly reclaims for government anthropology something of the synthetic mystique that the Bureau of American Ethnology held from its founding in 1879 until the death of Powell in 1902.

Virtually all the process- and substance-oriented articles that constitute the core of the volume take a sociolinguistic viewpoint, relating linguistic structure to social usage in some way. This consistent emphasis attests to the success of the “ethnography of speaking” perspective in reorienting the thrust of Americanist linguistics since the 1960s. However, “The ethnography of speaking,” by the late Wick R. Miller (222–43), suffers from Miller’s inability to edit and update the final version. It reflects its composition in an earlier period in which taxonomic concerns outweighed processual ones, and when demonstrating the mere existence of diversity in speech use and context was a revelation. Miller pays particular attention to the unboundedness of speech communities in small-scale societies with shifting nomadic settlement patterns. He carefully notes the gradual but inexorable shift of many modern speech communities to English and the emergence of “Indian English” (which has received considerably more attention since the early citations given in the article). Miller’s references cluster around 1970, with a few nominal recent additions; thus this essay cannot be seen as a continuous report on the emergence of a database for generalization about variability within and among Amerindian speech communities.

Perhaps the most contemporary synthesis of the interaction between language and society is found in “Discourse” by M. Dale Kinkade and Anthony Mattina (244–74). Acknowledging the overlap that “linguistics beyond the sentence” has with the ethnography of communication, they set out the theory and practice of

the Americanist text tradition. They argue that the BAE text volumes of the early twentieth century were presented without context, whereas outsider, non-linguist context operates without texts (e.g. in historical documents); the two absences are in complementary distribution (247). Each model fails to value a vital part of the meaning and significance of the oral traditions recorded.

Kinkade & Mattina give considerable attention the degree to which genre terms and translations reflect aboriginal categories and perspectives. Discussion focuses on work done by, or in collaboration with, native speakers of various Native languages. Examples are presented of a variety of structural analyses and presentational formats, foregrounding studies of textual organization according to logic and prosody, interaction and performance, by Richard Rhodes, Dell Hymes, and Dennis Tedlock, among others. Kinkade & Mattina also note the documentary thrust of corpus collection, with its quantitative appreciation of numbers of speakers, numbers of texts, and numbers of versions. This is juxtaposed with the rare capabilities of the best Native American storytellers in traditions now living.

Allan R. Taylor's discussion of "Nonspeech communication systems" (275–89) serves effectively as a footnote to the articles on ethnography of speaking and discourse, moving from language to the rest of communication. Taylor presents examples of sign language, distance signaling, and pictography – the last ranging from the unique symbol system of the Western Apache visionary Silas John to the Dakota winter counts which recorded communal history.

Catherine A. Callaghan & Geoffrey Gamble discuss "Borrowing" (111–16) in terms of the "coequal" status of cognates and loanwords "in recovering prehistory" (116), cautioning that diffusion "can potentially be mistaken for the residue of deep genetic relationship" (111). They are hesitant to postulate causes for the development of diffusion areas, or to distinguish the results of historical contact from those of universal features of language development.

Michael Silverstein, "Dynamics of linguistic contact" (117–36), begins with the undeniable context of shift to Euro-American languages as the "communicating presence of more powerful newcomers seems inevitably to rearrange the communicative economies of whole regions" (117). He suggests that *linguae francae* develop under conditions of constant, more or less sedentary interaction, rather than in areas of nomadic mobility such as the Plains. The proposal is attractive, although the particular case is unpersuasive, given the recency of the Plains buffalo culture dependent on the horse. Silverstein's discussion of a series of pidgins and jargons is particularly useful; he suggests that Chinook Jargon, at least, functioned as "a mechanism for the learning of English by the Indian population" (121). He ends with a fairly pessimistic assessment regarding the replacement of Native languages by English, "notwithstanding increased sensitivity to heritage languages as important aspects of group culture" (136).

Willard Walker, "Native writing systems" (158–84), describes a variety of native scripts, emphasizing that they are rare, being often "overshadowed" by English literacy in secular contexts, and by oral tradition in sacred ones (158).

Patricia O. Afable & Madison S. Beeler, "Place-names" (185–99), present a range of examples of the "cognitive, metaphorical, and verbal artistic qualities" of naming systems and practices (186), although systematic study in particular areas is only beginning. They highlight the need for widely traveled and highly fluent native speakers to amass such documentation. David H. French & Kathrine S. French, "Personal names" (200–21), discuss personal names, suggesting a few limited generalizations. They stress that names have a social or community dimension as well as an individual one, reflecting "an individual's relationship with history, with the world, with society, with others, and with himself" (220).

Marianne Mithun, "Overview of general characteristics" (137–57), attempts an survey of Amerindian grammatical categories, but finds generalization elusive. Grammatical categories are "not entirely random," but are products of use over time (157). Mithun does not turn to the Sapir-Whorf-Swadesh tradition, which attempted to go beyond descriptive grammar to semantics in the context of worldview and social organization.

The final two-thirds of the volume is dedicated to grammatical sketches of selected languages, including Central Alaskan Yupik (Eskimoan language family), by Osahito Miyaoka; Hupa (Athabaskan), by Victor Golla; Cree (Algonquian), by H. C. Wolfart; Lakhota (Siouan), by David S. Rood & Allan R. Taylor; Zuni (a language isolate), by Stanley Newman; Eastern Pomo (Pomoan family), by Sally McLendon; Seneca (Iroquoian), by Wallace L. Chafe; Wichita (Caddoan), by David S. Rood; Thompson (Salishan), by Laurence C. Thompson, M. Terry Thompson & Steven M. Egesdal; Coahuilteco (a language isolate), by Rudolph C. Troike; Sahaptin (Sahaptian family), by Bruce Rigsby & Noel Rude; and Shoshone (Uto-Aztecan), by Wick R. Miller.

Ironically, given the historicist flavor of the volume, the grammatical sketches are presented without noting that Franz Boas's *Handbook of American Indian languages* was also published by the BAE, with the first two volumes appearing in 1911 and 1922. Powell's 1891 classification settled, at least for his generation, the question of the genetic relationships of American languages; by contrast, Boas's grammars, with brief illustrative texts, were intended to represent the diversity of linguistic structures within the continent, and to clarify the "psychological" types that they illustrated. Whether intentionally or not, the organization of this volume recapitulates that division of linguistic questions about the American Indians.

In all, this volume is an invaluable reference work, summarizing a century of ethnographic and linguistic investigation dedicated to mapping the linguistic and cultural diversity of aboriginal North America. It documents the history and present status of the linguistic and anthropological disciplines; and for readers of the other volumes of the *Handbook*, which are organized around the concept of culture area, it clarifies that linguistics is inseparable from the study of the American Indian. It also suggests that cutting-edge Americanist research lies at the intersection of linguistics and anthropology, of language and society.

## REFERENCES

- Boas, Franz (1911–22), ed. *Handbook of American Indian languages*, vols. 1–2. (Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 40.) Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Campbell, Lyle, & Mithun, Marianne (1979), eds. *The languages of Native America: Historical and comparative assessment*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Hodge, Frederick W. (1907). *Handbook of American Indians north of Mexico*. 2 vols. (Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 30.) Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Powell, John Wesley (1891). *Indian linguistic families north of Mexico*. (Bureau of American Ethnology, Annual Report, 7:1–142.) Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

(Received 2 July 1998)

ANATOLE LYOVIN, *Introduction to the languages of the world*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997. Pp. xx, 491. Pb \$35.00.

Reviewed by PETER T. DANIELS  
 P.O.Box 630108  
 Bronx, NY 10463  
 grammatim@worldnet.att.net

It used to be that first-year linguistics students would be exposed to data from a wide variety of languages – in the classic textbooks of Bloomfield 1933, Gleason 1961, or Hockett 1958, and in the workbooks of Gleason 1955 and of Merrifield et al. 1967. We may not have known exactly where Nupe or Sierra Popoluca were spoken, but we knew something of how they operated. We learned about agglutination in Turkish and Swahili; we worked the notorious Nahuatl phonology problem in which Gleason insisted there were no misprints. Non-majors who wanted to learn something of linguistics might be offered a course called “Languages of the world.” In the guise of a survey of exotic peoples, they might be introduced to some of what linguists have discovered about the differences and similarities among languages and to techniques useful in describing them that might also apply to cultures in general.

But that largely changed with the hegemony of English-based theoretical linguistics. Its aim was no longer to describe and begin to account for the diversity of human language; it was to discover the underlying unity of all languages. Since all the pioneers of the new outlook spoke English, and since English is as much a human language as any other, the underlying unities might as well be investigated in English first, and then brought to other languages as they came to the attention of researchers – or, as it happened, as their speakers came to be graduate students of the researchers. Thus entered (notably) Japanese, Hebrew, Italian, and Icelandic into the theoretical linguistic canon. Gone, though, were the days when Bloomfield, Sapir, or Haas would send their graduate students out for a summer among elderly Native Americans, to return with sufficient materials for a linguistics dissertation, a sense of the possibilities of language, and a respect for alien cultures. Data from such alien languages now entered the theoretical literature through reanalysis of previous generations’ publications – always excepting a



few honorable scholars who continue to pursue fieldwork, as well as the missionary linguists for whom grammatical description remains on a practical level, and for whom present theoretical approaches have provided little that is useful.

Lyovin has not accepted this state of affairs. The opening words of his preface are, without saying so, a scorching indictment of the available textbooks and syllabi for introductory linguistics courses: “This book is intended to be used in a course designed for students who have mastered the basic principles of linguistics but lack background information about the broad range of language phenomena (vowel harmony, ergative constructions, etc.) found in the world’s languages, and who also need to learn a few facts about the existence of major language families, the distribution of major language groups, and so forth” (vii). Lyovin’s attitude seems to correspond to mine: If after a year of linguistics, students have not been exposed to vowel harmony and ergativity, then first-year linguistics courses are a failure.

For his “advanced” languages of the world course, Lyovin provides two sets of materials: language family surveys and grammatical sketches. Five chapters organized by continent and one for pidgins and creoles are preceded by chapters on classification of languages and classification of writing systems. Each of the continent chapters includes two sketches of representative languages, and the last chapter includes one. Each chapter ends with up to six exercises, most dealing with additional languages, and an annotated bibliography; it is not clear why most works are listed both in the chapter bibliographies and at the end of the book, while some are listed only at the end. Internal evidence suggests that Lyovin is a native speaker of Russian (missing and misused definite articles are ubiquitous in his English) with much early exposure to Finnish, and that Sino-Tibetan is his specialty; he has directed at least one dissertation on the local language at the University of Hawaii and has done fieldwork in Yup’ik Eskimo.

Chap. 1, “Classification of languages” (1–28), covers both genetic classification (including subgrouping, with a glance at lexicostatistics) and typological classification (phonological, morphological, and syntactic) and includes a note on sociolinguistic classification. Chap. 2, “Classification of writing systems” (29–44), is likewise divided into typological (with a welcome discussion of my own scheme, albeit drawn only from the earliest published version) and genetic (wisely eschewing a survey of known scripts).

Chaps. 3, “Languages of Europe” (45–108); 4, “Languages of Asia” (109–84); 5, “Languages of Africa” (185–244); 6, “Languages of Oceania” (245–308); 7, “Native languages of the Americas” (309–400); and 8, “Pidgin and creole languages” (401–38) all follow the same pattern. The language families found on each continent, usually in order of population, are listed with their internal classificatory structure; many of their languages are named and provided with population figures. This information is taken by and large from the Summer Institute of Linguistics *Ethnologue* (12th ed., Grimes 1992) and the Oxford *International Encyclopedia of Linguistics* (Bright 1992) – apparently without recognition that

these two sources draw on the same database.<sup>1</sup> In many cases a paragraph is appended to the family listings with some descriptive information. (On pp. 119–120 may be the fullest compendium on the Hmong-Mien family available in a general work in English: there are seven numbered points about the family, six about Hmong, and five about Mien – though several of the points are found in two of the three lists.) Lyovin is an extreme splitter: Chap. 7, agreeing by and large with Campbell 1997, includes 62 families and isolates in North America, nine in Meso-America, and 118 in South America.

The languages chosen for a grammatical sketch and a fairly extensive sample text are Russian (61–78), Finnish (78–101), Mandarin Chinese (127–46), Classical Tibetan (146–72), Modern Literary Arabic (201–17), Swahili (217–36), Hawaiian (257–82), Dyirbal (282–302), Yup'ik Eskimo (354–64), Ayacucho Quechua (364–93), and Tok Pisin (416–34). One can only wonder what the selection criteria were: Asia includes two representatives of Sino-Tibetan, but nothing Altaic, Dravidian, or Southeast Asian; Africa's representative of Afro-Asiatic is chosen from the non-African branch of the family; and none of the prominent American Indian languages made the cut.<sup>2</sup> A larger number of chapters would have permitted a wider selection of languages, following for instance the classic divisions of either *Current trends in linguistics* or *Languages of the world* (Sebeok 1963–73 and Voegelin & Voegelin 1964–66, respectively; details gathered in Daniels 1997).

The grammatical sketches may be fairly reliable, but some problems are apparent. No instructor will be able to make all necessary corrections, or explain all the apparent inconsistencies; they can be illustrated from the Russian sketch.

(i) “/l/ is heavily velarized in all positions so that phonetically there is really no plain l-sound in Russian” (64); attached to this is note 5, which reads: “This goes counter to the hypothesis that a language cannot have phonetically ‘marked’ (i.e., less common or articulatorily complex) segments unless it also has their ‘unmarked’ counterparts” (104). But has it been established that “dark” [ɫ] is marked and “light” [l] is not?

(ii) “/i/ has the allophone [ui], a diphthong whose first, nonsyllabic element is a high back unrounded vowel” (65). Can a vowel be a nonsyllabic?

(iii) A sample noun paradigm includes *vody* ‘water (gen.sg.)’ (66). But this chart is otherwise phonemically transcribed (it does not claim to be a transliteration), and the vowel phonemes of Russian are given as /i e a o u/ (65).

(iv) The topic of word order variation includes *Tvojú sobáku ukusíla mojá kóška* ‘Your dog bit my cat’ (71) – but the gloss has to be ‘Your dog, my cat bit’ to illustrate the point about topicalization.

Lyovin has not been well served by the publisher. His Russian “accent” has been mentioned; there is much repetition, even on a single page (e.g. the hypothesis that Ainu is Altaic appears twice on p. 113), and inconsistency: two successive examples on p. 287 gloss Dyirbal *-ŋaŋaŋ* as “privative” and “private” suffix. This also illustrates carelessness in typography: phonetic characters in italic contexts are not italicized. Moreover, misprints are rife (in linguistic data they are

inexcusable, as when Arabic Pattern III is given as SaLaMa instead of Sa:LaMa [210]). Most importantly, the design of the book gives the student almost no help in navigating its complexities. Chapter endnotes are easily confused with notes to the texts; the subparts of chapters do not begin new pages or even receive distinctive treatment of their headers; the running heads give only the title of the book and the name of the chapter, so one cannot tell what grammatical sketch one has opened the book to without hunting for its beginning.

Another disservice is the insertion, apparently without the author's knowledge (they are not mentioned in the text) of nineteen maps from the *Encyclopedia* (440–55), reduced in some cases to near illegibility. These were not created as a set, nor intended to be viewed together; they use differing graphic techniques to show differing kinds and amounts of detail, and in some cases, as for South America, they do not agree with the information provided in the text.<sup>3</sup>

Overall, Lyovin's work is ambitious and will be a valuable resource for its intended purpose as a coursebook, supplemented perhaps by sketches from the instructors' particular competences. An updated, corrected, and expanded edition would be welcome.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> What compromise is represented by the statistics that Iranche is spoken by "150 to 194" speakers, and Trumai by "60 to 71" (p. 350)? The *Ethnologue* gives 191 and 78 respectively, as of 1995.

<sup>2</sup> Works aiming at a typological survey of the world's languages, from Finck 1910 to Shopen 1979a,b, have achieved more variety in a similar compass: in the former, Mandarin Chinese, Greenlandic, Subiya (Bantu of Zambia and Botswana), Ottoman Turkish, Samoan, Egyptian Colloquial Arabic, Modern Greek, and Georgian; in the latter, Jacaltec, Maninka, Malagasy, Guugu Yimidhirr, Japanese, Mohawk, Hua, Russian, Cape York Creole, Swahili, and Chinese.

<sup>3</sup> Some of the same maps are also re-used in another book (Campbell 1997) from the same publisher, along with maps from other sources; but they are all redrawn for consistency with one another and with the text they support.

## REFERENCES

- Bloomfield, Leonard (1933). *Language*. New York: Holt.
- Bright, William (1992), ed. *International encyclopedia of linguistics*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.
- Campbell, Lyle (1997). *American Indian languages: The historical linguistics of Native America*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.
- Daniels, Peter T. (1997). Surveys of languages of the world. In Jane H. Hill et al. (eds.), *The life of language: Papers in linguistics in honor of William Bright*, 193–219. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Finck, Franz Nikolaus (1910). *Die Haupttypen des Sprachbaus*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Gleason, Henry Allan, Jr. (1955). *Workbook in descriptive linguistics*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- (1961). *An introduction to descriptive linguistics*. Rev. edn. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Grimes, Barbara (1992), ed. *Ethnologue: Languages of the world*. 12th ed. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics. [13th ed., 1996.]
- Hockett, Charles F. (1958). *A course in modern linguistics*. New York: Macmillan.

- Merrifield, William R., et al. (1967). *Laboratory manual for morphology and syntax*. 6th ed. Santa Ana, Calif.: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Sebeok, Thomas A. (1963–73), ed. *Current trends in linguistics*, vols. 1, 2, 4–10. The Hague: Mouton.
- Shopen, Timothy (1979a–b), ed. *Languages and their speakers; Languages and their status*. Cambridge, MA: Winthrop.
- Voegelin, C. F., & Voegelin, F. M. (1964–66), eds. *Languages of the world. Anthropological Linguistics* 6:3–8:7 [except 8:1].

(Received 2 July 1998)