Language in Society **36**, 105–134. Printed in the United States of America

REVIEWS

Language in Society **36** (2007). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S004740450721005X

MICHEL PARADIS, *A neurolinguistic theory of bilingualism*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2004. Pp. 293. Hb $138.00, Pb $39.95.

Reviewed by NORBERT FRANCIS
College of Education, Northern Arizona University
Flagstaff AZ 86011
norbert.francis@nau.edu

Researchers and students of applied linguistics and anyone interested in bilingualism and second language learning will find this nontechnical and accessible state-of-the-art survey useful. Regardless of which neurolinguistic theory of bilingualism ends up holding sway, it is in the central nervous system that the core mental operations that underlie language use are materially computed. So, as we do our work, it is good to keep an eye on what's going on here.

Chap. 1, "Components of verbal communication," starts off by setting out the general approach to the study to bilingualism in this book: the assumption that knowledge of language and our ability to use it can be studied analytically (not to deny that holistic approaches can also provide for useful points of view). Chap. 1 sets the stage for a version of modularity informed by findings from the author's branch of cognitive science. The first of a number of component/subsystem breakdowns that we are asked to consider is the distinction between two kinds of knowledge of language: (i) the internalized implicit system, acquired incidentally and not available to conscious awareness, and (ii) explicit knowledge and metalinguistic awareness. The first is primary and domain-specific, and consists of computational procedures unavailable to introspection – for example, the mental grammar structures of morphology and syntax. The second, more integrative and "flexible," would correspond, for example, to the declarative component of vocabulary, "secondary" in the sense that this is the kind of knowledge that we learn.

Chap. 2, "Implicit and explicit language processes," is where applied linguists, especially educators, will find the most interesting material to reflect upon. Picking up on the discussion from the previous chapter, Paradis offers another way to understand an ongoing debate in the area of second language (L2) learning. How learners might deliberately analyze a grammatical pattern is different from the way in which it will be "internalized" – that is, how it becomes an integral part of implicit linguistic competence. The underlying structure of this knowledge of language is "nowhere to be noticed" (p. 37). The language learner might be able to gain awareness of WHAT is produced (in the input and output of performance), but not HOW. And being a matter of two different kinds of mental

© 2007 Cambridge University Press 0047-4045/07 $12.00

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404507240059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

representation, explicit, declarative metaknowledge cannot be converted into procedural knowledge. Acquisition, then, is not a matter of "proceduralizing" explicit rules that were arrived at by means of analysis, inductive learning, memorization, or reflection; rather, what happens is a gradual shift from relying on metalinguistic knowledge to using implicit knowledge. Readers familiar with the various models of L2 learning will recognize this as coinciding, more or less, with the "non-interface" hypothesis, which draws a sharp line between "learning" and "acquisition." In its strongest version, it discards the usefulness of direct instruction, focus on grammatical form, metalinguistic strategies, corrective feedback, active monitoring and controlled practice. Paradis, however, leaves the door open to a number of different ways of conceptualizing how things might actually turn out in the modular "non-interface" (not a good metaphor) relationship between learned declarative knowledge and underlying implicit competence. A close reading of the two final sections devoted to this topic (45–53) should make both opponents and proponents of instructed L2 acquisition pause before assigning the author's modular theory to one camp or the other. For example, to say that formal instruction and explicit learning make an indirect or secondary contribution does not forcibly imply that these general learning factors are not necessary or strongly facilitative for SECOND language development. First language (L1) acquisition, though, would be a different matter altogether.

Chap. 3, "Bilingual aphasia," makes a strong case for another dimension of neurofunctional modularity, based on a comprehensive review of the literature on impairment of language ability. Bilingualism provides for a unique and privileged vantage point when we consider recovery patterns. Recovery is not always parallel (same pattern of proficiency and dominance before and after trauma); the various kinds of differential recovery (some of them at first seem strange and implausible) require a working hypothesis that assumes separate representations, of some kind and on some level, for each language subsystem. But since any explanation has to take into account both parallel recovery patterns and the entire variety of differential recovery, the idea of a localization of each language at a gross anatomical level would have to be set aside. (By analogy, different combinations of scratches or perforations to the hard drive of a computer would result in all sorts of compromises to a given network of information depending on how it is fragmented, distributed, and interconnected.) The leading hypothesis, then, is that first language and second language are subserved by separate and autonomous neural circuits interwoven into the same larger language areas, and that physiological inhibition is the common mechanism that can account for all of the findings.

Chap. 4, "Cerebral lateralization and localization," follows up on chap. 3 and gets into details that are well worthwhile plowing through. Figure 4.1, "Schematic representation of various models of the organization of languages," lays out the logical possibilities, as well as Paradis's Subsystems Hypothesis.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404507240059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Chap. 5, "Neurofunctional modularity," brings together the two major dimensions of how "knowledge of language" (quotation marks are the reviewer's) is componential: (i) the two different kinds of knowledge (explicit/declarative and implicit/procedural), and (ii) the separation of the L1 and L2 subsystems. Along another dimension, we need to reckon with the internal diversity of language, in the bilingual mind now differentiated into (instantiated by) separate networks/circuits. For example, "The morphosyntax module contains as many subsystems as the person speaks languages" (130). In the end, however the different vertical and horizontal dimensions, layers, and successive subsystems may come to be parceled out, the general idea is that knowledge components are isolable AND richly interconnected. To what degree and how they are will be settled empirically, and not anytime soon. In the meanwhile, there is plenty of room still for a number of competing and potentially compatible proposals for further research.

Chap. 6, "Neuroimaging studies of the bilingual brain," is an overview of central methodological questions and an assessment of where things stand in this brave new science, which is still largely at the "poking stage" (186).

Chap. 7, "An integrated neurolinguistic perspective on bilingualism," features the graphic presentation of the Three-Store Hypothesis (Figure 7.2). Two related models of the architecture of bilingual proficiency to which interested readers should refer as they study this concluding series of proposals by the author are Paivio's (1991) Bilingual Dual Coding Model and Cummins's (1991) Linguistic Interdependence Model. Despite important differences, all three try to capture key features of the two dimensions of modularity discussed so far. The objective here is to account for the fact that some aspects of language proficiency in bilinguals appear to be distributed between separate linguistic domains (autonomous subsystems comprised of two lexicons and separate subsystems for the respective morphosyntactic and phonological structures), while other aspects of proficiency appear to be "shared" (there being access to a common nonlinguistic conceptual domain). This chapter covers so much ground that it deserves two readings; it touches on a range of big questions, from a new way of thinking about the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis to explaining in a psycholinguistically coherent way the phenomenon of borrowing and interference in L2 learning.

What captures one's attention as an overall theme, perhaps unintended by the author, is the possibility of a more open cross-disciplinary discussion, even on some proposals that appear at first to be rather controversial. In a recent *Language in Society* review by Burling (2003) of Jackendoff's *Foundations of language*, there is a similar probe: an invitation to consider new developments in cognitive science that are redrawing the old lines of debate. *Foundations of language* makes a strong case for this possibility and should be studied together with *A neurological theory of bilingualism* for a different perspective on some concepts that are often dismissed as incompatible with, or not relevant to, sociolinguistic or anthropological approaches to problems of language use in society.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404507240059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

REFERENCES

Burling, R. (2003). Review of R. Jackendoff, *Foundations of language: Brain, meaning, grammar, evolution*. *Language in Society* 32:415–45.
Cummins, J. (1991). Language development and academic learning. In L. Malavé & G. Duquette (eds.), *Language, culture and cognition*, 161–75. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
Paivio, A. (1991). Mental representation in bilinguals. In A. Reynolds (ed.), *Bilingualism, multiculturalism, and second language learning*, 113–25. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

(Received 28 June 2005)

Language in Society **36** (2007). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404507220056

PAUL WALD & FRANÇOIS LEIMDORFER (eds.), *Parler en ville, parler de la ville: Essais sur les registres urbains*. Paris: Editions UNESCO and Editions de la Maison des sciences de l'homme, 2004. Pp. 276. Hb 27,00 €.

Reviewed by JACQUELINE LINDENFELD
Anthropology (Emerita), California State University, Northridge
Northridge, CA 91330
jlind@sonic.net

As indicated in the title – which can be translated as *Speaking in the city, speaking of the city: Essays on urban registers* – this multi-authored French-language collection of essays deals with the interaction of speech and the urban environment. It is the third volume in a recently created French series that aims at understanding the city through the analysis of urban discourse in its historical and sociocultural context. This particular book, co-edited by Paul Wald and François Leimdorfer, highlights the back-and-forth process between the city and speech: on the one hand, the urban environment is constitutive of certain "ways of speaking," and on the other hand, language plays a role in constructing an image of the city. Both facets of the process are well illustrated in the essays assembled here, which are informed by various disciplines: linguistics, history, anthropology, and sociology.

In their Introduction, the editors state that the bi-directional process of interaction between the city and speech served as an organizing principle to divide the book into three parts – a somewhat artificial division, as recognized by Wald himself in the Conclusion. Part I deals with the emergence of new speech registers directly linked to life in the city; Part II documents situations of conflict regarding the designation of places in the urban landscape; and Part III focuses on the role played by lexicon and discourse in constructing the image of a particular city.

The three essays in Part I illustrate drastically different cases of evolving urban speech registers. In the first one – a shortened version of an English-language article published in the *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* in 1998 – Debra Spitulnik describes the emergence in Zambia, over the past half century or so, of a hybrid variety of Bemba (Bantu family) called Town Bemba, which is charac-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404507240059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

terized by great instability. Resulting from the fusion in urban settings of traditional Bemba and other African languages with English (the official language of the country and the symbol of modernity), Town Bemba serves as a lingua franca among speakers of different languages in multilingual Zambia and has become the first language of many city dwellers. This linguistic hybrid of a heteroglossic nature is a speech register in the making that is constitutive of an urban identity. It must constantly adapt to an expanding world and the ever-increasing heterogeneity of life in the city, hence its built-in instability.

In total contrast with this case, the essay by Sylvie Teveny shows the Inuit who live in Iqaluit, the newly established capital of the Territory of Nunavut in Canada, as fiercely defending their traditional language against the encroachment of English. Their strategy has been the conscious creation of an expanding urban lexicon primarily based on Inuktitut, thus constructing their own image of the city and their own identity as an urban population. Lexical building takes place at two different levels within the community: the spontaneous "folk" level, and the official level through institutionalized workshops in which experts methodically create new words in consultation with elders. Although this new urban register is somewhat unstable, it has enormous value not only in a pragmatic way, but also and foremost as a reinforcer of community ties, since the creation of new words is based on consensus.

The third essay in Part I, in contrast, shows the ongoing evolution of the repertory of terms referring to public places in Zagreb, the capital of Croatia, to be mostly under the control of municipal authorities. Dubravko Škiljan's diachronic semantic analysis, which is based on terminology used in successive maps of the city from 1825 to 1995, points to the fact that the "indigenous" (Croatian) vocabulary of new city dwellers with rural origins has been relegated to the designation of non-major streets or passageways. Most of the terminology has been created by administrators and urban planners, who have often borrowed foreign words or made up unimaginative Croatian lexemes meaning, for example, "first branch of the second path." Such control of the linguistic process by specific groups endowed with power is seen by Škiljan as an intrusion into the construction of an urban identity in Zagreb.

Part II of the book opens with an essay by Abderrahmane Moussaoui that pairs off nicely with the preceding one, since it deals with official and folk designations of some urban places in Algeria, but here the focus is on confrontation. Countering administrative efforts to impose a learned variety of Arabic as a way to unify the nation-state and reinforce Arabic identity, ordinary people have created many folk names to designate parts of the urban landscape. Some of these designations are either former colonial French names or derivatives of them, which goes counter to the Algerian government's effort since independence to shed any vestiges of colonial power. Other names are on-the-spot creations, such as Arabic *sha'bat annîlou* 'nylon vale', which designates a particular newly built neighborhood exemplifying shoddy and unaesthetic construction. In this for-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404507240059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

merly colonized country that has seen an enormous increase in urbanization in the last few decades, the city functions as a natural setting for the construction of national identity; but it is also a place in which contradictions and confrontations can be played out by various segments of the population – sometimes taking the form of linguistic battles.

The next article takes us to India, a part of the world well known for its linguistic and cultural diversity. After a summary account of four decades (1950–1990) of major language conflicts in the country, Gérard Heuzé focuses on polemics about names of cities, as has occurred in the capital of Maharashtra. His sociohistorical picture of repeated efforts through the years to change its name from Bombay (an English creation) to Mumbai (a Marathi name) reveals a complex web of political, religious, cultural, regional and linguistic factors. The official change of name (even in the English language) from Bombay to Mumbai, which finally occurred in 1996, symbolized the victory of Marathi regionalists over other segments of the local population that favored Hindi or English as the official language.

Part III of the book contains four articles. The first one, authored by Abdelhamid Henia, traces the semantic evolution of one particular lexical item (*rab'*) from its ancient use in classical Arabic to designate either an ethnic group's encampment or someone's abode, down to its current use (with the common pronunciation *rba'*) in the vernacular of Tunisia to designate the covered part of a souk in a traditional urban medina. Henia's detailed analysis, which always considers the sociohistorical context of use of the word *rab'*, shows the term to have acquired its specifically urban dimension after a period during which, in administrative and fiscal language, it referred to a valuable piece of property in any location. Its current popular use to designate a specific type of place in the city reveals a symbolic association in the speakers' minds between prosperity and traditional craft stores in the Tunisian urban environment.

The next essay takes us to a section of Naples, Italy, called Santa Lucia, whose working-class population designates parts of the city in a way that differs from the official terminology. Alessandra Broccolini examines, among others, the lexical item *quartiere* 'neighborhood'; it is a general and neutral term in the administrative nomenclature of Naples, but the inhabitants of Santa Lucia have appropriated it to designate their part of the city – despite the fact that it is not an administrative unit – giving it a contextualized meaning that emphasizes social ties. When they speak in their Neapolitan vernacular of *o quartiere nosto* 'our neighborhood', they are referring to a community whose members are united through a tight network of kinship ties and neighbor relations with interweaving informal economic activities, and who share collective memories as well as the protection of their religious patroness, Santa Lucia.

We now move to South America, first to Brazil. Maria Stella Martins Bresciani ponders the meaning of the term *melhoramentos* 'improvements' as applied to various kinds of urban development in São Paulo from 1850 to 1950.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404507240059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Her "genealogical analysis" of written discourse on the subject in three different registers – the specialized register of experts, the "cultured" register of journalists and politicians, and the folk register of ordinary people – shows the meaning of *melhoramentos* to vary through time and according to the social context. First applied to specific projects concerning public health or traffic, it has been used more and more to refer to overall urban planning, with increasing reference to aesthetics as São Paulo undergoes gentrification. However, the basic meaning always remains the same: the term *melhoramentos* refers to changes that are supposed to be beneficial for the city and its population. It can therefore be regarded as a broad metaphor with both rational and persuasive dimensions, and as such is constitutive of the image of the city.

The last essay in Part III of the book also deals with language in relation to urban planning, this time in Buenos Aires. Irène Vasilachis de Gialdino uses discourse analysis to examine passages of a 1927 book by Paolera, the introducer of urban planning in Argentina. Central to the analysis are concepts such as semantic network, argumentation (positive/negative expressions) and metaphor, which highlight the way in which language is both interpretive and constitutive of the social reality of the city.

In the Conclusion, co-editor Paul Wald reflects on the lessons to be learned (or relearned) from the preceding essays. One is the need to study lexical items not only in their linguistic context – particularly at the level of discourse – but also in their historical and sociocultural context. He also points to the somewhat artificial boundary between "language in the city" and "language about the city," since the latter is created within the city or at least within a discourse area which is linked to the urban environment. Another important point made by Wald is that the city is characterized by contradiction: it can be a locus of both linguistic diversity, owing to the different origins of its inhabitants, and of unification of speech varieties; it can also be a locus of conflict between speech registers linked to various socio-professional categories of speakers, and at the same time a locus of convergence toward a variety of speech that becomes characteristic of its inhabitants.

The book ends with an enlightening essay (surprisingly relegated to the Appendix) in which François Leimdorfer takes a historical look at the emergence of both urban speech and "registers about the city" in France. His vast picture of their evolution emphasizes the significance of power relations at various levels: city vs. countryside, Paris vs. the rest of France, highly positioned people vs. common folk, longtime residents of a city vs. newcomers, officials and experts vs. ordinary people, and so on. This essay serves as a good reminder of the need to take politics into account in many kinds of sociolinguistic analysis.

All in all, this book is a rich source of information about "speaking in the city" and "speaking of the city" that can certainly inspire future researchers. Generally well written, it provides a vast panoply of language phenomena analyzed in a thought-provoking manner by scholars representing various disci-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404507240059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

plines. The resulting variety of approaches and types of data analyzed, as well as the diversity of geographical sites, make this book relevant for all those who are interested in the complex relationship between speech and the urban environment.

(Received June 30, 2005)

Language in Society **36** (2007). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404507230052

MICHELLE M. LAZAR (ed.), *Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis: Gender, power and ideology in discourse*. Houndmills, U.K.: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. Pp. xi, 260. Hb $75.00.

Reviewed by DEBORAH CAMERON
English, Oxford University
Worcester College,
Oxford OX1 2HB, UK
deborah.cameron@ell.ox.ac.uk

As the title suggests, this is a collection of feminist work carried out within the paradigm of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), which Michelle Lazar glosses in her editor's introduction as "a critical perspective on unequal social relations sustained through language use" (p. 1). It does not seem to be a goal of the book to develop a distinctively feminist variant of CDA, or to engage in dialogue with its leading theorists (most of whom are men, and tend to be politically pro-feminist but not deeply influenced by feminism in a theoretical sense). Rather, contributors use established CDA methods to address questions about gender as one case of "unequal social relations sustained through language use." That in itself is not a new endeavor – gender features as one topic in most books and edited collections of CDA, and it is also the theme of numerous journal articles – but this, perhaps surprisingly, is the first book-length volume specifically dedicated to the subject.

A valuable feature of the collection overall is the diversity of the societies and domains of social practice from which discourse data are drawn, in most cases by analysts who are members of the society concerned. That gender identities and relations are differently articulated in different times and places is now axiomatic in language and gender studies, and there are regular calls for the field – historically a rather Anglocentric one – to adopt a more explicitly comparative perspective. *Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis* illustrates the benefits: Though the range of languages considered is not large (together, English, Portuguese and Spanish account for seven of the nine chapters), most contributions come from outside the dominant U.S.-U.K. nexus, and the juxtaposition of case studies dealing with broadly comparable discursive phenomena in societies as different as, say, Singapore and Hungary, Brazil and the United States, or Spain and New Zealand yields some interesting insights, as I will discuss in more detail below.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404507240059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Lazar has organized the material in two sections. The first, "Post-equality? Analyses of subtle sexism," contains five chapters examining the discursive construction of gender inequality in societies and settings – workplaces in New Zealand and Spain, the institutions of the European Union, U.S. college classrooms, family life in Singapore – where the "official" discourse proclaims that men and women are no longer unequal. The second, "Emancipation and social citizenship: Analyses of identity and difference," contains four chapters dealing largely with situations in which there are still questions about the entitlement of women and of sexual minorities to full "social citizenship." Dividing a collection of articles into neat thematic packages is often a problem for editors (in a book with fewer than a dozen chapters, one wonders if it is really necessary), and I have to say I did not find this section division particularly illuminating. Rather, the theme I found most thought-provoking cuts across the two sections.

That theme, in a nutshell, is the effect of globalization on the way gender relations are represented and lived in different parts of the world – or more exactly, the interaction between "global" and "local" influences, which is interestingly displayed in some of the discourse data presented here. For example, in two chapters dealing with gender and power in the workplace, both the New Zealand linguist Janet Holmes and the Spanish researchers Luisa Martín Rojo and Concepción Gómez Esteban discuss the hegemonic status in the international business world of a "modernizing" discourse on management, according to which the ideal modern manager should eschew the traditional "command and control" model and instead adopt a "relational" style, which emphasizes teamwork and interpersonal communication skills. Symbolically, this is also a shift from a more "masculine" to a more "feminine" norm, which is seen therefore as opening up opportunities for women to succeed in managerial roles: to be recognized as equal to, if not better than, men. But whereas the New Zealand women managers are able, up to a certain point, to profit from this discourse, their Spanish counterparts seem to have far more difficulty, because the global norm conflicts more markedly with local perceptions of both gender and proper workplace relations. These women cannot win: The "authoritative" linguistic behavior that is accepted in male managers is seen in women as unfeminine and dictatorial, but more "relational" styles are read by co-workers of both sexes as manipulative and inappropriately personalizing.

Another interesting example of the local impact of global or Western discourses is discussed by Michelle Lazar in her analysis of an advertising campaign produced on behalf of the Singapore government and extolling the joys of family life. The campaign targeted men and made extensive use of a discourse on "parenting" that is now very familiar in Western societies. "Parenting" is an equal-opportunity activity in which mothers and fathers are partners; this also entails portraying fathers as "new men," in touch with their emotions and skilled in caring for their children. Lazar shows, however, that this discourse of gender equality and similarity is undercut in the Singapore advertisements by a compet-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404507240059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ing discourse that recycles traditional norms of gender hierarchy and difference. Arguably, much the same could be said about the discourse of "parenting" in its original Western heartland (see, e.g., Sunderland 2000). What is more distinctive to the Singapore case, however, is the underlying motivation for the family life campaign. The government is concerned that the competitive, high-skill economy they have created, which demands a steady supply of educated and committed workers of both sexes, is discouraging young professionals from starting families and causing young professional men, in particular, to look for wives who are less educated and career-oriented than themselves. This worries the authorities for overtly eugenic reasons: They want to ensure a maximally intelligent population by getting people with "smart genes" to marry each other. Men therefore need to be persuaded to make concessions to intelligent women's need – and the state's need for them – to be active outside the domestic sphere. So whereas in the West, men's greater involvement in "parenting" is presented as a means of individual self-fulfillment and liberation from restrictive gender roles, in Singapore it becomes just as much a matter of collective duty, demanded by an authoritarian state whose pro-natalist and eugenicist views are by most Western standards highly illiberal.

In the Hungarian press, whose representation of feminism is the subject of Erzsébet Barát's chapter, we find a different relationship between "global" and "local." Rather than being appropriated and reinflected for local purposes, as in Singapore, global discourses championing gender equality are rejected by mainstream press commentators as threatening to local interests. Feminism is rhetorically identified with two totalizing global movements: the communism of the recent past, and the American or Western cultural imperialism of the present. Anti-feminism (which in some of Barát's textual examples amounts to outright misogyny) is thus presented as in keeping with, or even necessary for, the development of an indigenous Hungarian democratic politics. In post-communist societies generally, the fact that a form of feminism was part of the official ideology of state socialism remains a significant influence on discourse about gender; this is one illustration of the important point, well made in this volume overall, that global processes are in practice always shaped by local histories.

It may seem that in this account of *Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis* I have said rather little about LANGUAGE; and indeed, I would have to say that this is faithful to the book itself. The dominant strand in current CDA tends to concern itself primarily with relating discourse in the linguist's sense (i.e., organized stretches of spoken or written text) to the more abstract "orders of discourse" theorized by Foucault and his followers. This can lead, and in the present volume often does lead, away from fine-grained linguistic analysis. While some contributors (e.g., Holmes) look carefully at the interactional structure of their data, and others (e.g., Lazar) use categories derived from Hallidayan systemic functional grammar to uncover patterns in the semiotic organization of texts, many contributions are more akin to content analysis, paying relatively little

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404507240059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

attention to formal details. For readers who are linguists, and not strongly committed to the CDA framework, this may be something of a drawback. Nevertheless, I think that scholars with an interest in language and gender will find this collection informative and interesting, not least for the many striking textual examples reproduced in it. And for practitioners of CDA, whether or not they count gender among their primary interests, the book is an essential reference. Though theoretically it is not particularly ambitious or ground-breaking, in bringing together this range of international perspectives on both the topic and the method, *Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis* is long overdue – the first book of its kind, but I hope not the last.

REFERENCE

Sunderland, Jane (2000). Baby entertainer, bumbling assistant and line manager: Discourses of fatherhood in parentcraft texts. *Discourse & Society* 11:249–74.

(Received 6 July 2005)

Language in Society **36** (2007). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404507240059

ADAM KENDON, *Gesture: Visible action as utterance*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004. Pp. 410. Hb $90.00.

Reviewed by CHIHO SUNAKAWA
Anthropology, University of Texas at Austin
Austin, TX 78712
chihos@mail.utexas.edu

Written by one of the foremost authorities on the subject, this book gives a definitive account of gesture and its study. It is an excellent and thought-provoking work for all readers interested in everyday interactions across various disciplines. The book can be divided into two parts: The first six chapters present a detailed history of gesture studies dating back to Roman antiquity and continuing to the twentieth century, especially in the Western tradition. The latter half of the book provides micro-analyses of gesture practices occurring in everyday interactions in various settings.

Chaps. 1 and 2 articulate what the concept of gesture is in this book. Kendon explains that it is a set of bodily expressions employed as a component of an UTTERANCE. In other words, it is a VISIBLE BODILY ACTION that is recognized as a meaningful component in communication. In order to explicate the ways in which visible actions are recognized as gesture, he reports an experiment showing that the prototype of a gesture is a movement of deliberation, and that speakers can manage their actions depending on how they want these actions to appear in front of others. He also introduces four major themes developed in the history of gesture studies: the interrelation between gesture and speech, the significance

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404507240059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of gesture in interaction and communication, the relation between gesture and sign, and the idea of considering gesture as the origin of language.

Chap. 3 introduces the writings of influential scholars between the time of ancient Rome and the eighteenth century. Kendon mentions each scholar's contributions in accordance with the interests and concerns of their times, including oratory, art, and philosophy. Chap. 4 centers on the nineteenth century and introduces the works of Andrea de Jorio, Edward Tylor, Garrick Mallery, and Wilhelm Wundt. Indirectly or directly, all these scholars have influenced anthropological approaches to gesture. For instance, de Jorio's work on Neapolitan gesture was perhaps the first ethnographic study to describe gesture forms and their functions. He claimed that the use of gestural expressions played an important role in communication among Neapolitan people, and that such practices were inherited from their ancestors. In the end he suggested that gestures should be always considered in context because gesture forms often share some features of movement or shape of body posture, yet their meanings lie in their contrast with other gestures.

Chap. 5 explains the decline in interest in gesture studies at the beginning of the twentieth century, followed by a return of interest toward the end of the century. With the development of structural-functional analyses of societies and cultural relativism as predominant alternative doctrines to Darwinism, there was diminished intellectual interest in natural or primitive symbols, including gesture and sign language studies, at the beginning of the century. However, during the 1970s, scholars in anthropology, psychology, and linguistics changed the intellectual climate and brought about a renewed interest in gesture studies.

Chap. 6 introduces representative schemes of gestures developed over the years, ranging from one established by Quintilian in the first century to others proposed during the eighteenth to twentieth centuries by scholars including Johann Jakob Engel, Gilbert Austin, Wilhelm Wundt, David Efron, Paul Ekman, Wallace Friesen, and David McNeill. Kendon compares these scholars in terms of their analytical units (e.g., they agree that hands are different from arms) and their different views on the relationship between bodily expression and speech. His primary critique of these schemata is that they tend to be categorically organized as a reflection of the development of quantitative statistical methods in the modern era. Although he acknowledges that there is broad agreement about the ways in which gesture is embodied, he also suggests that these typological categories are not universal schemes.

Chaps. 7 and 8 explicate the mutual relationship between gesturing and speaking. Here Kendon defines two analytical units: GESTURE PHRASE and GESTURE UNIT. A gesture phrase consists of a PREPARATION and STROKE, and a gesture unit consists of a GESTURE PHRASE and RECOVERY. In other words, the entire articulation of a gesture expression is like an excursion in which a part of the body moves away from a certain position of rest or relaxation (preparation) to a space in which a peak of the gesture is constructed (stroke), and then moves

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404507240059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

back to a rest position (recovery). By using these analytical units, Kendon shows how gestures and speech, two separate expressive modes, harmonize with each other in the process of making an utterance.

Chaps. 9 and 10 focus on representational aspects of gesture uses, such as the NARROW GLOSS (or EMBLEM), in relation to their referential meanings. The examples show how speakers fluently point to, depict, model, and enact the events they describe. Kendon claims that such fluency indicates that speakers smoothly shift from one representational technique to another in accordance with their semantic aims.

Chap. 11 deals with pointing gestures that index an object, a location, or a direction, or that depict the orbit of an event. Pointing gestures are conducted not only with the hands but also with the head and certain movements of the eyes, lips, elbows, and even feet. Kendon introduces seven different types of pointing gestures in terms of the shape of the hand in combination with the orientation of the forearm. The selection of types is determined by speakers' wishes about how they want the pointed objects to be perceived by hearers.

Chaps. 12 and 13 are devoted to describing the pragmatic functions of gesture. As spoken languages constitute speech acts, gestures can contribute additional meaning to propositions. Chap. 12 distinguishes between two gesture families. The G-family (or *grappolo* 'finger bunch') is a group of gesture forms in which all the fingers of a hand are gathered at their tips as if the hand makes a teardrop shape. It is usually employed when speakers construct a topic and grasp the essence of the topic. The R-family, or the ring hand shape, uses an index finger and a thumb attached at the tip making a ring shape. It is used to single out some exact fact or figure, or to make an idea very precise. The OHP (Open Hand Prone) family or the palm down family sets the forearm in a prone position, whereas the OHS (Open Hand Supine) or the palm up family sets the forearm in a supine position. Although both families use open palms, the pragmatic functions are different. The OHP is mainly employed in the context of denial, interruption, or stopping, whereas the OHS is used in the contexts of offering, giving, and receiving.

Chaps. 14 and 15 are devoted to sign languages in a broader sense. In chap. 14, two categories, PRIMARY SIGN LANGUAGES and ALTERNATE SIGN LANGUAGES, are introduced. Primary sign languages are codes developed in deaf communities, while alternate sign languages are the elaborate systems used in speaker-hearer communities particularly in situations where speech is not available for technical, religious, or cultural reasons. The examples include codes used between crane drivers and their guides, as well as in a sawmill and a monastery, and by the Plains Indians of North America and Aborigines in central Australia. Kendon claims that the various ways in which the alternate sign languages are developed depend on the complexity of the system and the spoken languages of its users. Chap. 15 draws parallels between gesture and sign, comparing phonological structures, the use of space, and the use of classifiers.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404507240059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Chap. 16 discusses how cultural aspects influence local gesture practices by providing an ethnographic account of Neapolitan ways of gesturing. Referring to Hymes's notion of "communication economy," Kendon concludes that researchers should take into consideration that formal varieties continuously change over time according to communicative purposes as the local environment requires.

The final chapter summarizes the book's theoretical points. At the end, two appendixes provide a detailed description of transcription conventions and ethnographic background for videotaped recordings.

Overall, this book is a complex and comprehensive survey of gesture. Both micro and macro perspectives on the subject are described in a clear, articulate, and accessible manner that, combined with the author's customary elegance of style, makes for a very enjoyable read and ensures that readers with different backgrounds can learn from it. The transcription conventions are succinct and well organized, and thus the analytical procedures and results are clearly represented. There are many categorical terms introduced, particularly in the middle of the book, but rather than treating these as necessarily definitive, Kendon suggests that the categories be considered as points on a continuum. The most useful and stimulating analytical terms might be "gesture phrase" and "gesture unit," given that they can be widely applicable to other communicative media, such as eye gaze, for which a gesture phrase may comprise different units. In conclusion, this book is invaluable in that it offers new insights for many disciplines, including anthropology, linguistics, psychology, cognitive science, communication, and semiotics, among others.

(Received 6 July 2005)

Language in Society **36** (2007). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404507250055

DAVID W. SAMUELS, *Putting a song on top of it: Expression and identity on the San Carlos Apache Reservation*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2004. Pp. x, 324. Hb. $39.95.

Reviewed by ANTHONY K. WEBSTER
Anthropology, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale
Carbondale, IL, 62901
awebster@siu.edu

David W. Samuels's *Putting a song on top of it* is at once an explication of current Western Apache practices and a study of how Western Apaches imagine and evoke "history" through music. Samuels's purpose is to describe and at times explain the multifaceted ways Western Apaches index continuity through music and talk about music. Samuels is interested in the "ambiguities" and "creative" uses of indexicality (p. 10). Crucial to his project is understanding the "feeling-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404507240059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ful iconicity" of discourses of and about expressive forms (11). This "feelingful iconicity" is based on the "emotional attachment to aesthetic forms" (11).

Chap. 1 concerns the ways Western Apaches on the San Carlos Reservation imagine, discuss, and evoke the past. In particular, this chapter discusses how songs can evoke the past and how songs can be placed in the past. Samuels writes: "One twelve-year-old girl told me her sense that if Indian people back then had heard certain songs by Bob Marley, Guns'n'Roses, and Mariah Carey, 'they wouldn't have lost faith'" (55). Samuels is at pains to point out that the distinction some ethnomusicologists and lay people make between "traditional" and "nontraditional" is relatively meaningless when one attempts to understand song as "feelingful iconicity." As Samuels writes, "Watching Big Bell's joyous possession of and by 'Mathilda,' I was forced to wonder: Who was I to say that this was somebody else's music" (134). It is this sense, the sense of music inhabiting, co-occupying, the present – and implicitly the past – that resonates throughout Samuels's work.

Chap. 2 develops the idea of the past not merely as a repository of knowledge and song, but as a place that is actively engaged. Here Samuels builds on the work of Keith Basso and the use of quotation as a way to evoke the past. It has long been known that in Southern Athabaskan languages indirect reported speech is uncommon, if not nonexistent (70–71). Samuels attempts to unpack the pragmatic functions of the Western Apache phrase *tah nnii*. As Samuels notes, many Apaches told him the phrase was "untranslatable" (81). Samuels shows that the form is used to key a joking frame, as when it accompanies "catch phrases of mass media" (82). Samuels's point is that the use of this form illustrates the "additive" nature of language, implicating a stretch of discourse within a wider horizon of meaning and implicature.

Samuels reminds us that language and song, aside from their referential properties, also function as evocations of mood and emotion, of "feelingful iconicity." In discussing "Geronimo's Song," which may or may not have been composed by Geronimo (and really, that is beside the point), and the performance of the song by a young Apache girl, Samuels argues:

> The wall dividing now and then becomes transparent, and the past becomes recoverable, not through linguistic reference, but through the iconic evocation of mood. In a sense, whoever composed the song *was* Geronimo, and whoever sings the song *is* Geronimo in that the song compacts the sweep of history into this sung moment of loneliness and longing for home. (93; italics in original)

Chap. 3 provides historical contextualization concerning the "band era" on the San Carlos Reservation from the 1950s through the 1970s. This was a time when a great many bands played and performed on the reservation and at border towns. When Samuels did fieldwork in the mid-1990s, however, there was only one band playing, the Pacers. One of the more interesting points that Samuels makes in this chapter concerns how songs are remembered. According to Sam-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404507240059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

uels, songs are not remembered in reference to the original artist so much as to the Apache band that played the song. Thus the music has become localized.

The rest of the book shifts to Samuels's fieldwork and his participation in the Western Apache band, the Pacers. Of particular interest is chap. 5, concerning Boe Titla, an Apache who "composes and performs country songs, with lyrics in English, about places and events in and around the San Carlos Apache Reservation" (149). By all accounts, Titla is an "idiosyncratic" person whose songs resonate with many Western Apaches because they invoke places and moods important to many. One of the qualities of Titla's songs is his use of place and place names. *Contra* Keith Basso's *Wisdom sits in places* (1996), place names in the songs of Titla sometimes evoke unknown stories (see 157). However, as with much of this work there is also the evocation of the past, the feelingful iconicity. Concerning the song "Chiricahua Mountain," Samuels states: "The feelingful connection is not just to place, but more meaningfully to history because the assumption is that what you feel about the place now is the same as what people felt about the place then" (166).

Chap. 7 delves into the "battle of the bands" in which the Pacers participated while Samuels was doing fieldwork. In many respects it was the beginning of the end for the Pacers. It is to Samuels's credit that he acknowledges the tensions that his presence created within the band. For example, as Samuels notes, the presence of an Anglo musician often gave the band an air of reliability that allowed them to play border town bars. On the other hand, Samuels's presence also created friction with the lead guitarist, Pat, who did not participate in the "battle of the bands." Indeed, Samuels worries that his presence in the band may hurt their chances at the intertribal "battle of the bands." Such reflexivity is appreciated. Too often anthropologists disappear within the pages of their ethnographies, or conversely they overwhelm the narrative. Samuels does an excellent job of balancing that tension.

Samuels is also acutely aware of how micro-level linguistic choices can index identity in the context of music. For example, Steve Earle's version of his song "Copperhead Road" is sung with a " 'redneck' twang" that allows *Viet Nam* to rhyme with *plan* (227). This rhyme simply does not work for Marshall, one of the Western Apache singers Samuels worked with, because the "twang" indexed an identity Marshall was not comfortable with. Here and elsewhere, Samuels shows a keen ear for linguistic detail.

On the whole, this book is a remarkable accomplishment. It is well written and well researched. Samuels moves seamlessly from social theory to ethnomusicology to linguistics and back again, and in the process he brings various disciplines together on the central issue that his book aims to address: What is "Apache culture?" There are no simple answers. As Samuels states,

> "Apache culture," in this sense, is not a collection of indexically marked ideologies, values, texts, and practices. Rather, it is a deeply and feelingfully

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404507240059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

sensed identification with a shared history that flows through the present reservation communities. (261)

Such shared senses are circulated through discourse that takes a multiplicity of forms. It is to Samuels's credit that he has attended so carefully, so thoughtfully to that multiplicity of discourses, of voices.

REFERENCE

Basso, Keith (1996). *Wisdom sits in places*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

(Received 11 July 2005)

Language in Society **36** (2007). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404507260051

NANETTE GOTTLIEB, *Language and society in Japan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005. Pp. ix, 169. Hb $70, Pb $27.99.

Reviewed by JOHN C. MAHER
Linguistics, International Christian University
Mitaka, Tokyo 181-0015
maher@icu.ac.jp

If Japanese sociolinguistics can be likened in range and complexity to a forest, this book by the sociolinguist and Japan specialist Nanette Gottlieb would best be described as a Kyoto rock garden. It is cool and calm. It lies within a circumscribed landscape and gives pause for thought.

Language and society in Japan makes an important contribution to the study of the sociology of language in Japan, focusing on key sociopolitical issues affecting language use there in recent years. The connecting theme of the book is the relation between language and identity from the Meiji Period (beginning in 1868) to the present. Gottlieb introduces this theme by saying, "Language has played an important role in Japan's cultural and foreign policies, and language issues have been and continue to be intimately connected both with globalizing technological advances and with internal minority group experiences" (p. vii). With this in mind, Gottlieb examines the role of the institutions of media and schools in spreading the standard form of Japanese, and the role of the media in language engineering.

In chap. 1, the author introduces the social context of the Japanese language and its varieties. She proceeds down a well-trodden path, looking at the body of ethnocentrist literature known as *Nihonjinron*, a collection of cultural myths and folk beliefs in which Japan and the Japanese are characterized as uniquely different, existentially static, and racially and linguistically homogeneous. A useful addition to the excellent discussion on language varieties and Japanese in the world would have been some discussion of "new dialects" (different from standard Japanese, more frequent among younger speakers, and common in daily

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404507240059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

conversation), an important area of research (Inoue 1993). The author touches upon and might have elaborated further the issue of dialect attitudes. Dialect security/insecurity is a metaphor for the powerful center/periphery dichotomy of modern Japan. It is a canonical theme in sociolinguistics and is linked to what is known as *hoogen kompurekkusu* 'dialect complex'. Certainly, the theme winds through the author's discussion as in her mention of the imposition of dialect placards as punishment for the use of Okinawan.

Chap. 2 deals with the opposite of *Nihonjinron*: language heterogeneity, specifically languages such as Ainu, Korean, Okinawan, and Chinese, as well as the internationalization and foreign language learning. In chaps. 3 and 4, Gottlieb looks at the broad themes inherent in the ideology of language and identity. The author is right to include in the discussion of language planning not only Japanese as a national language alone but also policy relating to other languages in Japan (Ainu and English) and the teaching of Japanese as a foreign language, both inside and outside Japan.

Chap. 5 deals with the Japanese writing system – "maligned and praised by Japanese and non-Japanese alike" (78). The issue of literacy is of particular relevance to modern Japanese society. Particularly pleasing but hardly surprising is how Gottlieb goes to work on this topic. Diglossia prevailed in the prewar period, when college-bound secondary school pupils and college students were trained in *kanji* and *kango* to be part of the social elite. This set them apart from the masses with only primary school diplomas. In contrast, statistically, Japan is now considered to have perfect literacy ("almost 100%"; Adachi, quoted in Gottlieb, 91) from the point of view of literacy skills (decoding, comprehension, writing). This is based on the argument that *furigana* can be added to any *kanji* to provide its correct reading. However, as Gottlieb points out, "books and newspapers are never just written in hiragana, nor do they usually place furigana glosses beside the kanji" (91). From the point of view of functional literacy – literacy domains such as labels for objects, signs, official forms, instruction and explanations on medicine bottles, advertisements and receipts – there is increasing concern (confirmed in numerous surveys by the government's Agency for Cultural Affairs) that citizens are decreasingly confident about their literacy skills. This section brings to mind the influential film *Gakko* (1993 "A class to remember") by writer/director Yoji Yamada, which features a *yakan gakko* 'part-time night school' for people who had slipped through the literacy net. The film traces a junior-high night-school teacher's thoughts on the eve of graduation as he recalls the delinquent adolescents, aging laborers, learning-disabled and non-Japanese students who filled his evening class, trying to learn how to read. Y*akan gakko* still function as educational institutions for people in diverse social situations, such as retraining for Chinese-speaking recently repatriated orphans left behind in China and older Korean-speaking residents of Japan. Novels and the popular media have well and truly punctured Japan's postwar boast of "perfect literacy."

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404507240059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The push for language change and the "re-engineering" of discriminatory language in Japan was no less strong than in other countries, and the international movements for human rights, particularly in the United Nations, enhanced this debate. Chap. 5 deals with issues of discriminatory language in an interesting way, first discussing a social outcast group, the Burakumin, and proceeding to people with disabilities, women, and the Ainu. "Shifting electronic identities" (chap. 7) deals with the use of Japanese in word processing technology, in particular the Japanese language presence on the Internet: It is the third most common language of the Internet after English and Chinese. The implications for language policy – not easily recognizable by the nonspecialist – are teased out by Gottlieb (132): "People began to think differently about how they used kanji once this technology became available and its possibilities became clear . . . to consider a revised approach to script policy and character education might be appropriate, given that current script policy is premised on the fact that characters are hand-written . . . Characters can be easily called up on word processor without imposing a memory burden on their user. More characters than formerly are being used in word-processed documents. Would it not make sense, therefore, to change the policy so that a greater number are taught for recognition only and a reduced number for reproduction, rather than placing equal emphasis on both skills?"

The author is not afraid to grasp various species of nettle. On the (mostly Western) advocacy of the romanization of Japanese, she comments, "What would be lost by switching to the alphabet, however, is probably much greater than what would be gained . . . the implications for education and the publishing industries in particular are such that I do not think this will happen, especially when combined with the likely affective or emotional resistance to such a change" (144). This position is guaranteed to steam up the screens of every advocate of romanization from Tokyo to Glasgow.

Surveys of the Japanese language are regularly hauled on stage by government agencies. In a 2005 survey by the government's Cultural Affairs Agency (*Asahi Shinbun*, 13 July 2005) of 3,000 adult (16–50 year old) citizens' view of the Japanese language, an increasing number of people said they thought learning kanji was important, indicating a national consensus that handwriting is still important in this age of personal computers. Those who said people should study kanji despite the prevalence of word processors and PCs totaled 56.6%, up 18.7 percentage points from the previous survey in fiscal 2002, but those who said they were not confident in using kanji correctly, at 41.3%, increased from the last time by 19.2 percentage points. Gottlieb has wisely avoided areas of heavy sociolinguistic traffic like *keigo* 'polite speech', which she contextualizes in gendered speech and subcultural variations. There are innumerable studies of *keigo*, from undergraduate theses to full-length books; to try to summarize it is to take a walk on the wild side. A result from the abovementioned survey is, however, utterly charming: 81% of respondents said that *keigo* is misused more widely than in the past.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404507240059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Well referenced and indexed, this volume is recommended to students and scholars alike. Nanette Gottlieb is well known for her works on the sociolinguistics of written Japanese, in particular the reform of written Japanese, the politics of kanji, and the role of kanji in the age of word processing technology. This recent book is both a summation of her thoughts on written Japanese and on developing multiculturalism and technology and a lucid introduction to many other aspects of the sociology of the language in Japan.

REFERENCE

Inoue, Fumio (1993). The significance of new dialects. *Journal of the International Society for Dialectology and Geolinguistics* 1:3–27.

(Received 13 July 2005)

Language in Society **36** (2007). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404507270058

ELISE KÄRKKÄINEN, *Epistemic stance in English conversation: A description of its interactional functions, with a focus on* I think. (Pragmatics & Beyond New Series, 115). Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2003. Pp. ix, 207. Hb $102.00.

Reviewed by MICHAEL P. LEMPERT
Anthropology, University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA 19104
mlempert@sas.upenn.edu

In this innovative study of epistemic stance marking in English conversation, Elise Kärkkäinen attempts to cross-fertilize discourse-functional linguistics with conversation analysis, and her effort bears fruit. She moves deftly between quantitative and qualitative methods, juxtaposing frequency tables with conversational transcripts, and comes out with a bold thesis in hand: "Showing commitment to the status of the information that one is providing, i.e. marking epistemic stance … [is] an essentially *interactive activity*" (p. 183).

The author is no less bold about her professed empiricism, declaring that she "abandons all preconceived notions or theories of function and strives to uncover patterns of epistemic stance in a strictly empirical study" (3). This is, of course, a familiar refrain in the research traditions she favors, and it is best viewed as a rejoinder to those who would impose a "pre-established top-down framework or taxonomy on a set of data" (15), as she charges linguistic politeness theorists with often doing; epistemic markers can't always be explained using putatively universal notions of face and Gricean maxims. Perhaps it is her fervent embrace of empiricism that also explains the lack of sustained theoretical reflection in this book. Readers should not expect lengthy or path-breaking discussions of such notions as "subjectivity," "commitment," "speaker" – or even, for that matter, "stance"; minimal, provisional definitions must suffice. But this

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404507240059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

weakness is also the book's strength, for in limiting its scope and tightening its methodological reins, the author is able to actualize its stated mission: to offer a corpus-based "description" of the interactional functions of epistemic stance in English conversation, as the book's title announces.

Kärkkäinen's primary data consist of five conversational segments, drawn from the *Santa Barbara corpus of spoken American English*, that total 1 hour, 43 minutes. At times, her modestly sized dataset may seem confining, yet she compensates for this by drawing on her previous research and by referencing larger-scale studies. After three chapters of preliminaries, which include reviews of literature that pass at a brisk pace, we reach the book's core, two data-heavy chapters that make up the bulk of this volume: chap. 4, "Routinization of stance marking at the linguistic and interactional level," and chap. 5, "Stance-taking as an interactive activity: The case of *I think*." In chap. 4, she begins with an overview of the form-types used to signal epistemicity in English conversation, including lexical verbs, adverbs, modal auxiliaries and quasi-auxiliaries. Most prevalent in her data are "epistemic phrases" like *I think*, which typically occur without the complementizer *that* and thus have in principle a degree of syntactic mobility (38–45); they don't need to occur clause-initially. The point about mobility is important because Kärkkäinen then wishes to examine patterns of placement – but not placement in respect of clauses or sentences. She finds intonation units (IU) to be more relevant, for "[the] encoding of epistemicity in intonation units exhibits great consistencies and recurrent patterns in the data; by far the most frequent position for speakers to express their epistemic stance is at the beginnings of intonation units" (4). Epistemic phrases (and epistemic adverbs) rarely occur in IU-medial or IU-final position in her data, and although they do occur with some frequency as separate IUs, in such cases they tend to have distinct pragmatic-functional effects.

After considering epistemicity in the compass of single intonation units, Kärkkäinen zooms out, as it were, to explore larger units: conversational turns. As she does this, she redeploys her tripartite framework, exploring epistemic stance markers in terms of "turn-initial," "turn-medial," and "turn-final" placement. (Since turns can be comprised of numerous IUs, the "medial" term seems to lose some of its explanatory power, however.) In pursuing what we might term a "multi-scalar" approach to epistemic stance in chaps. 4 and 5, Kärkkäinen often pushes hard against classic conversation analysis (CA). Not only does she grant intonation units and prosodic contextualization cues pride of place, but, more radically, she tries to escape CA's orbit around adjacency sequences: "... if we think of the aspects of sequential organization that are relevant for an interpretation of the functions of epistemic markers in discourse, there is definitely reason to look beyond adjacency pair relations or sequences of two consecutive conversational turns ... into longer stretches of discourse and into extended turns by one primary speaker, such as stories or other types of extended turns" (89). Kärkkäinen thus tries to expand our sense of the potentially rele-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404507240059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

vant co(n)text for the study of epistemic stance. For this alone, her work merits attention.

For some readers of *Language in Society*, however, her construal of context will still feel cramped. She contends that "ethnographic information … proved relevant for the actual analysis only sporadically," and writes instead that "what was of crucial importance was the sequential location of a given utterance or action, both locally, or in terms of what preceded (and followed), and globally, in terms of where the speech segment fitted in the larger sequence of events in the interaction" (6–7). She concedes, however, that she "was not directly personally involved (nor in many cases was any other researcher) in making the recordings" (6), and hence it is perhaps no surprise that we are provided with only the barest of demographic facts: age, sex, ethnic identification, occupation, and the like – facts that are corralled into a residual category termed the "extra-linguistic." In fact, we are never in a position to evaluate the relevance of this penumbral category, the extra-linguistic, owing to the limitations of the data. By no means does this derail Kärkkäinen's argument. It only means that she has narrowed somewhat the range of observable epistemic-stance effects. This narrowing also conveniently reinforces her thesis about the primacy of interactional motivation; after all, nearly everything extra-linguistic has already been removed from sight.

Considered in its own terms, however, the book's analyses are well executed. Only in a few places might readers desire more evidence. Consider, in this respect, one of her key observations: that epistemic markers (epistemic phrases like *I think*) tend to occur IU-initially. In chap. 4, she notes that a "few" (41) epistemic phrases in her data occurred with the *that*-complementizer. In tables that summarize the placement of epistemic phrases within IUs (56–57), however, the category of "epistemic phrases" is left undifferentiated; though infrequent, it is important to separate out epistemic phrases containing *that*-complements because they have syntactic constraints that could account for their IU-initial position. Her larger claim is that IU-initial position tends to be interactionally motivated, specifically by recipient design:

> … [the] speaker conveniently *sets up an orientation towards the utterance, or parts of the utterance, for the recipients*. If the current speaker's stance becomes clear before, rather than after, what it has in its scope, the recipients are more likely to observe this orientation and align with it, and are able to design their own subsequent contribution accordingly. (68)

It is a testimony to her thoroughness that Kärkkäinen entertains the possibility that IU-initial placement of epistemic phrases like *I think* might instead be the result of a "grammaticization process [that] has not advanced far enough: these phrases are really not yet like adverbs, of whose mobility in terms of IUs there is in fact more evidence in my data, but have preserved the erstwhile main clause + complement clause syntactic pattern" (99). She dismisses this possibility, however, adding that it is "more plausible" to "look for the interactional

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404507240059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

motivations behind such patterning" (99). An equally quick dismissal occurs when she discusses how IU-initial markers tended to be "uttered with clearly faster tempo than the rest of the IU" and were "reduced in phonetic form" (66). She uses these observations as (partial) evidence for the "unmarked" status of IU-initial position for epistemicity. Yet in a note (102), she acknowledges that IUs in general often (but not always) begin with anacrusis, and that involves reduction and acceleration too. To be fair, Kärkkäinen relies on multiple sources of evidence, and when the dust clears, I suspect her claims will still be standing. Yet these minor cracks in the edifice reveal the weight of her burden. Like variationist sociolinguists, Kärkkäinen must account and control for multiple sources of motivation – no easy task. And at times, her interest in interactional functions seems to come at the expense of these other sources.

I should note, finally, that the alleged primacy of interactional motivation in epistemic stance-marking is also central to the book's programmatic message, which Kärkkäinen announces in the closing pages. She sees her blend of discourse-functional linguistics and conversation analysis as representative of a new, hybrid field of inquiry: "interactional linguistics." Not all readers will share the author's enthusiasm for this research program, but they will surely find the book's empirical findings valuable, and its combination of methodologies especially stimulating. As such, this book is a welcome contribution to the burgeoning literature on epistemic stance.

(Received 26 July 2005)

Language in Society **36** (2007). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404507280054

ANNA DE FINA, *Identity in narrative: A study of immigrant discourse*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2003. Pp. xiv, 251. Hb $102.00.

Reviewed by CÉCILE B. VIGOUROUX
Simon Fraser University
Burnaby, BC, Canada
cevigouroux@yahoo.com

Narrative has now won its spurs within the social sciences, as evidenced by the number of publications, by the diversity of disciplinary approaches (e.g., linguistic, sociological, and psychological), and by the wide range of theoretical frameworks applied to its study. Similar remarks apply to studies of identity issues focused on the individual or a group, as shown by the range of foci such as social, ethnic, gender, national, racial, and institutional identity. Anna De Fina's *Identity in narrative* appears to be a useful resource for students of these topics and, more specifically, for anyone interested in the study of immigration.

Based on the study of narratives of 14 Mexican immigrants living in Maryland (USA), De Fina explores group identity constructions, representations, and negotiations through elicited narratives. The study is based on two sets of data:

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404507240059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

stories of personal experience and chronicles on border crossing between Mexico and the United States. The style of the book is extremely clear and the line of arguments well structured. Unfortunately, what is generally considered as a strong quality for a book may sometimes turn out to be its weakness. Indeed, *Identity in narrative* tends to reflect a "dissertation style," with unnecessary repetitions and precautions that not only slow down its reading but at times make the author's writing somewhat "uninformative." These drawbacks unfortunately weaken the quality of her study.

The book consists of seven equally long chapters, including the conclusions (chap. 7). The first chapter (pp. 11–30) gives a concise survey of different theoretical models of narrative studies and discusses how identity issues have been approached in the social sciences since the poststructuralist and social constructivist positions in the 1960s and 1970s. It also discusses the relation between the local and global contexts, which, as I explain below, is less clear than the author assumes.

Chap. 2 (31–50) starts with an overview of Mexican undocumented migration to the United States since the nineteenth century in order to provide a historical and sociocultural background useful to understanding the construction of migration discourse in narratives. Two sides of the discourse are presented in complementary terms: the story of the "newcomers," the Mexican migrants, and that of the "host country" through public discourse. This two-sided presentation aims at giving enough material for further analysis of the connections between the local expression of identities in narrative discourse and the social processes that surround Mexican migration in the United States.

A second part of this chapter is devoted to the presentation of the author's investigation: De Fina gives brief accounts of her fieldwork methodology and of her data construction through elicited interviews. She uses the "snowball" technique to construct a homogeneous group of "friends of friends." This important aspect is surprisingly not theorized in her study of group identity. Indeed, several questions remain unasked. For instance, does this interconnectedness between interviewees contribute to shape a group identity among these migrants? Does this network of acquaintances and friends create a "group identity," or does a "group identity" emerge from this network? These are important questions that must be addressed in the kind of ethnographic approach assumed by De Fina. Ethnography shouldn't be considered – as it often still is – as only a method for "gathering data," but should be regarded as a mode of investigation and comprehension of linguistic and cultural phenomena. It requires close attention to all the different levels likely to explain the dynamics the researcher seeks to explain.

The last part of the chapter deals with data selection and transcription. De Fina explains her choice of Labov & Waletzky's (1967) theoretical model to define narratives, to analyze the narrator's beliefs and attitudes, and to divide the stories into clauses.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404507240059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The next four chapters are devoted to different perspectives on Mexican group identity. Each of them has a specific linguistic focus. Chap. 3 (51–92) is on the narrator's representation and negotiation of social role through pronoun switches, *yo* 'I' versus *nosotros* 'we', and through self-repairs. Chap. 4 (93–138) deals with the presentation of self and others in the story world through the use of reported speech in border-crossing chronicles. Chap. 5 (139–80) focuses on immigrants' self- versus other-ethnic categorization. Chap. 6 (181–216), an extension of the previous chapter, is focused on the category "Hispanic" as a narrator's self-categorization as well as its application to others in different story worlds.

As informative as the discussion generally is, there are a few points that do not appear to be very convincing or are simply problematic. They have to do with identity in the interactional context of the interviews from which the studied narratives were extracted. De Fina's position not to take into account the intra-interactional dynamics of the interview is clearly explained (30). Much to her credit, she acknowledges the theoretical importance of this dimension in the construction of her interviewees' identity repertoire. She argues that she is more interested in the connection between the narrative and the wider social context in which the narrative is embedded and to which it responds. Although I favor, a priori, an interactional approach to any discourse elicited in interviews, De Fina's monologic and partially decontextualized perspective fosters an analytical problem. Aside from framing discourse (see, e.g., Schegloff's 1997 critique of Labov & Waletzky's seminal article on narratives), it also categorizes narrators as interviewees or respondents (an interactional category par excellence), and in the case of De Fina's study, as Mexican immigrants: It is in fact because they are Mexican migrants that interviewees were chosen, and probably why they (partly) decided to engage in such a specific communicative event. The interview format has thus to be factored in the shift from *yo* to *nosotros* in reported speech in which the interviewees take on the role of spokespersons, talking on behalf of other Mexican migrants. Another important aspect that can be taken into account to explain this linguistic shift is the transformation of the status of the narrative in the process of the interview. It becomes an "on-the-record" narrative, that is, a speech that can be reiterated and entextualized and thus undergoes decontextualization and then recontextualization to create a new discourse. The migrant's narrative becomes a public event that could be reproduced and shared with others who constitute a third party. Indeed, both the interview format and the narrative itself construct the figure (Goffman 1974) of the Mexican migrant in the *hic et nunc* of the speech event. Taking into account these two dimensions would certainly downplay the collective agency which, according to De Fina, takes the place of her speakers' individual experience in the narrated story. It would also explain why this generalization of experience is not peculiar to De Fina's group but is a pattern observable in other migrants' narratives in different migration settings. I have observed similar shifts in narratives of a wide range of francophone African migrants in South Africa, especially when they recount their

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404507240059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

migration trajectory from their country of departure (Vigouroux 2003). Greater attention to the context of the interview could have shown how narrators "display" their Mexican migrant identity within a universe of representations (Hall 1996), both outside the interaction – which De Fina emphasizes – and inside its here-and-now, using a wide range of categories, including gender. This perspective would probably have shown De Fina's group of migrants to be less homogeneous than her study claims.

This leads to a second problem on which I will comment only briefly: the relation – or should I say the interaction – between the LOCAL context of the narrative and the GLOBAL context of the society in which these discourses are (re)produced. The dichotomy between these two dimensions has been discussed in a growing body of literature on globalization, in which the migration process can be approached as a "product" or an outcome of a changing world order (e.g. Kearney 1995). An important question is whether this distinction between local and global is as relevant as scholars have tended to assume. Where does one draw the boundary between the two notions? Does the local stop where the global starts, and if so, where is that? Or is the global a collection of multiple localities? If we assume, like De Fina, that the local informs the global and vice versa, or that it is part of the construction of the other, doesn't it become more difficult, if not irrelevant, to maintain a conceptual contrast between the two notions (Massey 1992)? How does this distinction apply to identity construction and display? Can one posit, as the author does (without clearly explaining what she means), the existence of GLOBAL IDENTITIES? If so, what does this notion stand for?

One of the most valuable qualities of De Fina's book is her openmindedness in the way she examines her linguistic and ethnographic data and the nonrestrictive analytical models she uses. She seems to have examined the data from different perspectives before settling on a particular interpretation. *Identity in narrative* shows to those who still wait to be convinced the extent to which data must inform theory. This well-documented book is worth reading in order to understand the interplay between social and linguistic dynamics in narratives. It makes a valuable contribution to our postmodern reflection on multilayered identity, despite the shortcomings I highlight here.

REFERENCES

Goffman, Erving (1974). *Frame analysis*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Hall, Stuart (1996). Who needs 'identity'? In Stuart Hall & Paul du Gay (eds.), *Questions of cultural identity*, 1–17. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Kearney, M. (1995). The local and the global: The anthropology of globalization and transnationalism. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24:547–65.

Labov, W. & Waletzky, J. (1967 [1997]). Narrative analysis: Oral versions of personal experience. Reprinted in *Journal of Narrative and Life History* 7:3–3.

Massey, D. (1992). A place called home? *New Formations* 17:3–15.

Schegloff, E. (1997). 'Narrative analysis' thirty years later. *Journal of Narrative and Live History* 7:97–106.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404507240059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Vigouroux, C. (2003). Réflexion méthodologique autour de la construction d'un objet de recherche: La Dynamique identitaire chez les migrants africains francophones au Cap (Afrique du Sud). Dissertation, Université Nanterre, Paris.

(Received 26 July 2005)

Language in Society **36** (2007). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404507290050

JOEL WALTERS, *Bilingualism: The sociopragmatic-psycholinguistic interface*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2005. Pp. xi, 323. Pb. $37.50.

Reviewed by SUSAN MEREDITH BURT
English, Illinois State University
Normal, IL 61790-4240
smburt@ilstu.edu

In the Preface to this volume, Joel Walters explains why we need "yet another model of bilingual processing" (p. viii): The field of bilingualism is divided between researchers focused on the social situating and functions of bilingualism and those concerned with mental structures of bilingualism. Yet bilingual speakers function linguistically at the intersection of these two realms; Walters is concerned to construct a map of cognitive processes at that intersection. In other words, Walters takes on an enormous task: to construct a psycholinguistic model of bilingual processing that includes the wealth of social and pragmatic information that plays a role in bilingual speech and interaction.

Chap. 1 asserts the difficulty of describing bilingualism, comparing it to a "mesmerizing piano-violin duet" (1). While utterances are linear, the knowledge underlying them is "densely layered and largely non-sequential" (1), which must be accounted for in an integrative model. The Sociopragmatic-Psycholinguistic (SPPL) model thus undertakes to account for specific bilingual phenomena such as codeswitching, interference, and translation, as well as for functions affected by bilingualism, such as computation and cursing. Following a brief overview of the various approaches he wishes to integrate, Walters describes terminological differences between the fields he is attempting to bridge, and argues for integrative work nonetheless.

The second chapter, the review of literature, begins with an acknowledgment that the chapter will be selective: There is too much work on bilingualism to review in one chapter. Walters selects ten researchers or teams and classifies their work into four categories: (i) those whose work is linguistic and structural, at least implicitly touching on both sociopragmatic and psycholinguistic areas, (ii) those whose work is ethnographic, (iii) those whose work is laboratory-based, and finally, (iv) models of monolingual processing adaptable to bilingualism.

The work of Carol Myers-Scotton is described as having the "widest scope" (34) in that it examines motivations and constraints of codeswitching and the cognitive organization and processing that underlie it. Walters describes the stages

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404507240059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of development of Myers-Scotton's model, and what he sees as its strengths and weaknesses. Curiously, he makes no mention of the Markedness Model (Myers-Scotton 1998), which explicitly connects social motivations to speakers' linguistic choices and thus is highly sociopragmatic; instead, he concentrates on more psycholinguistic aspects of her work. In the same section, the work of Michael Clyne is assessed as broad in scope and functional in orientation, giving some attention to processing issues, while that of Peter Auer, "a card-carrying functionalist" (48), is not oriented to processing concerns.

It is a mark of the difficulty of his integrative task that Walters undertakes to "dig deeply" (58) in the work of sociolinguistic researchers for their notions on psycholinguistic processing. In the cases of both Rampton and Zentella, processing seems not to have been their focus; Walters's attempt probably indicates the size of the disciplinary divide he is trying to bridge. Similarly, the psycholinguistic models discussed in the rest of the chapter are examined for any attention they might give to sociopragmatic concerns, as well as for the processing issues (control, activation, inhibiting) that the models address. Walters concludes the chapter by observing that researchers from all four groups have shown willingness to alter their models to address concerns from outside their primary focus areas, but a new integrative model is still needed.

Chap. 3 outlines Walters's own model. Two large modules are accessible at all stages; they contain information about language choice and affect. Five components are arranged sequentially, containing "social identity information," "context-genre information," intentional information, a formulator, and an articulator. The assumptions behind this model are that bilingualism needs its own specific processing model, and that identity information and sociopragmatics need to be integrated into speech production models. This information should be organized into autonomous but interacting modules; the model should permit both sequential and parallel processing. Finally, the system needs redundancy as a check at all levels.

Throughout the rest of the chapter, Walters gives data that support each of the components of the model, such as the individual case history of "Yulia," an Israeli of Russian origin, showing how identity issues affect her language use. Walters's discussion of the evidence for each of his components is broad, in that he both cites studies that focus on the phenomena covered by a particular component (such as genres or the roles of topics) and also describes the kinds of research methods he sees as most useful in exploring these phenomena. Appropriately, he sees the usefulness of multiple approaches in data collecting and analysis, a position similar to that of the pragmatic researchers Kasper & Rose 2002.

Chap. 4 focuses on processing mechanisms in the SPPL model. Walters briefly defines the four mechanisms he sees as central: imitation, variation, integration, and control. Having justified the "boxes" of his model diagram in chap. 3, Walters devotes chap. 4 to the "arrows." For each of the four mechanisms, Walters "walks

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404507240059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

through" the arrow linking one of two modules (Language Choice or Affect) to one of five components (Identity, Context/Genre, Intentions, Formulator, or Articulator). For example, the Language Choice module is linked by imitation to the Intentions component. An illustration of this link is the case of the Chinese linguist who wrote to Walters in English to request reprints of publications, including in his request a very Chinese-L1-like lengthy apology.

In the second part of chap. 4, Walters expands on the four processes themselves, citing other theories, frameworks, and examples in which functioning of these processes is central. Thus, in discussing imitation, Walters cites Speech Accommodation Theory/Communication Accommodation Theory (Giles & Coupland 1991) as a (sociopragmatic?) framework in which imitation plays a central role. Tannen 1989 offers a more "linguistic" approach, but imitation is nevertheless central. Walters sums up: "Acts of linguistic choice, motivated internally by the social needs and externally by pressures of social comparison, draw heavily on processes of repetition and imitation" (173). Both imitation and its partner mechanism, variation, are essential to the bilingual phenomena Walters is concerned with – codeswitching, interference and translation. Two other processes, however, are required to create the relationship between imitation and variation, according to Walters, these being integration and control. These "executive mechanisms" are also discussed from several different theoretical standpoints, and a version of Perceptual Control Theory for bilingualism is sketched.

Chap. 5 turns the focus to the bilingual phenomena Walters hopes to account for with his model: codeswitching, interference, translation, and bilingual computation and cursing. Walters distinguishes between intentional and performance codeswitching, the former a matter of skillful choice motivated by identity or contextual considerations, the latter likely to be accompanied by hesitation phenomena or other evidence of dysfluency. Both types can be accounted for with the SPPL model. Walters's discussion of interference is somewhat less conclusive: He calls for an integrated investigation of interference combined with fluency, since we need to understand these notions together; we can infer that the SPPL can provide a model to guide this research. Similarly, the model can help distinguish between interpretation, which is "more ostensibly social and interactive," and translation, "more individual and psycholinguistic" (210). The discussion of the sociopragmatics of interpreting seems somewhat limited; Walters seems to assume "conference interpreting" as the norm, whereas articles in Mason 1999 show the variety of sociopragmatic challenges in dialogue interpreting that arise if one also considers medical, police, and court interpreting. Nevertheless, Walters's discussion of the psycholinguistic/cognitive aspects of interpreting shows that the SPPL model may well foster further research in this area. Similarly, the SPPL model raises research questions for exploring bilingual computation and cursing. The chapter ends with a discussion of methodology appropriate for the research programs proposed.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404507240059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Chap. 6 connects the SPPL model with real-world issues of language acquisition, loss, and disorders, showing how specific questions provoked by the model could lead to increased attention to questions of identity and affect in language teaching, the nature of fluency, language attrition vs. gaps in acquisition, and so on. Understanding these phenomena would benefit researchers and speakers alike.

In each chapter Walters focuses on a different part of the model, defining components, understanding processes, elucidating bilingual phenomena themselves; thus, each chapter functions as a different lens to turn onto the object, the SPPL model itself. It is helpful that each chapter contains a chapter summary; the reader can lose focus in the breadth of discussion as Walters moves from model architecture, to evidence for that particular architecture, to research results and methodology, for each box or arrow of the model. While this thoroughness is appropriate for his goals, the periodic return to the overall view of the model that the chapter summaries provide makes these sections particularly welcome. Although the volume is impressive in the scope of its inquiry, I suspect that it will be of greater interest to psycholinguists than to sociolinguists; nevertheless, the work serves as useful reminder of the wisdom of casting frequent glances across disciplinary borders.

REFERENCES

Giles, Howard, & Coupland, Nikolas (1991). *Language: Contexts and consequences*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Kasper, Gabriele, & Rose, Kenneth R. (2002). *Pragmatic development in a second language*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Mason, Ian (ed.) (1999). *Dialogue interpreting*. Special issue of *The Translator: Studies in Intercultural Communication* 5(2). Manchester, UK: St. Jerome.

Myers-Scotton, Carol (ed.) (1998). *Codes and consequences: Choosing linguistic varieties*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Tannen, Deborah (1989). *Talking voices: Repetition, dialogue and imagery in conversational discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

(Received 10 August 2005)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404507240059 Published online by Cambridge University Press