Language in Society **35**, 297–306. Printed in the United States of America

REVIEWS

Language in Society **35** (2006). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404506210133

JOHN HOLM, *Languages in contact: The partial restructuring of vernaculars*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. Pp. xx, 175. Hb $75.00.

Reviewed by ANTHONY P. GRANT
Department of English, Edge Hill College of Higher Education
Ormskirk, Lancashire, England L39 4QX
granta@edgehill.ac.uk

The title of this book immediately puts the reader in mind of Weinreich's (1953) classic of the same name, a volume which (a little surprisingly) is not mentioned in the book under review. Though this similarity of title is misleading, both books are notable for their combination of first-hand observation based on solid descriptive work and their impressively well informed accounts of further case studies which illuminate the phenomena their respective authors discuss. It will be understood by any reader who goes beyond the front cover, however, that Holm's focus in this book is more specialized than the title may suggest.

Holm's interest in this book is in what he calls "semi-creoles," which are (at least in morphological terms) partially restructured forms of certain languages which frequently coexist with other forms of the same language that have not undergone the same degree of simplification and regularization (and in some cases, large-scale abandonment) of their morphosyntactic systems. Holm is eminently qualified to provide the first book-length survey of such languages, since in addition to his work on languages that are less ambiguously creoles (notably Miskito Coast Creole English), he has conducted research on such semi-creoles as Brazilian Vernacular Portuguese, as well as on what we may style "lightly creolized" languages such as Bahamian English. Five languages are the focus of the book, each one deriving from one of the five major lexifiers of the colonial-era European-lexifier Creole languages: African American Vernacular English (henceforth AAVE), various forms of the Dutch-lexifier semi-creole Afrikaans, Brazilian Vernacular Portuguese (BVP) – including the variety recorded from the village of Helvécia in Bahia, where the dominant whites were originally germanophone and francophone Swiss rather than lusophone Brazilians – Nonstandard Caribbean Spanish (NSCS, with special reference to restructured forms of Puerto Rican, Cuban and basilectal Dominican Spanish), and the Vernacular Lects of Réunionnais French (VLRF).

Holm begins with a preface in which he defends the idea that creole languages can be distinguished from languages that have undergone more quotidian rates of change, because "the structural gap between French and Creole French is at least as great as that between French and its source language, Vulgar Latin"

© 2006 Cambridge University Press 0047-4045/06 $12.00

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404506230136 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(p. xvi), and because the changes that gave rise to creoles took place in the space of a lifetime rather than in a millennium. Having set up an underlying distinction between creoles and "unrestructured" languages as points of comparison in the following chapters, Holm is then able to point out the ways in which semi-creoles differ from their lexical source languages (and, at least implicitly, from languages that everyone would regard as creoles). The emphasis of these comparisons in the following chapters is on structural (morphological and to some extent syntactic) features of semi-creoles, and specifically those features that show modification (usually through simplification, generalization of the use of particular morphological techniques, or abandonment of morphological elements) from the related "unrestructured" language.

Holm precedes this analysis with a chapter which outlines, taking one language after another, the history of the study, categorization, and description of these languages by creolists and others, while chap. 2 outlines the social and demographic factors which Holm suggests account for the way these languages have developed. Both these chapters document what are fast-moving and frequently controversial fields in contact linguistics and beyond (as all will recall who followed the Ebonics debates of the mid-1990s or the discussions about creoles and colonialist attitudes to intrinsic linguistic creoleness in *Language* in 2004–2005), and in both chapters (and indeed throughout the book) Holm demonstrates deep and up-to-date erudition in the gamut of literature on each variety and a solid understanding of the facts and issues involved. Numerous tables, maps, and sage references to research and hypotheses of Holm's predecessors in these investigations (including the work of young creolists such as Mikael Parkvall, Katherine Green, and Dante Lucchesi) make this vast terrain easy to navigate.

The heart of the book is in chaps. 3–5, "The verb phrase," "The noun phrase" (which covers personal and some other pronouns), and "The structure of clauses." Again the presentation of data is on a language-by-language basis, with a comparison of structural phenomena in each semi-creole and in its uncreolized counterpart language. The comparative "uncreolized" structural material is useful support for a reader whose Standard Portuguese, say, may be nonexistent, and translations of each item and sentence into English are provided throughout. However, the sources' own transcriptions are used (which implies a knowledge of the graphemics of English, French, Spanish, Portuguese, and Dutch, plus Afrikaans, which few readers may command), rather than the IPA. The structural information about the semi-creoles in these chapters will be new to many readers, and on occasion may give them pause when they reflect on what "simplification" actually amounts to. To take a striking example from chap. 4: The account of Afrikaans noun plural formation and adjectival gender marking on pp. 97–98 (which by no means exemplifies all the complications found in these topics) shows that morphological simplification and a certain degree of regularization of plural formation operate together with, but separately from, the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404506230136 Published online by Cambridge University Press

application of phonological rules which simplify surface phonological forms in Afrikaans. Meanwhile, some irregular Dutch plurals are retained though they are phonologically modified (Dutch *stad:steden* versus Afrikaans *stad:stede* 'town:towns'). The result is that Afrikaans plural formation is considerably more complicated than that of Dutch, while the rules for the use or non-use of *–e* on Afrikaans attributive adjectives are all but impossible to pin down; the Dutch rule is simplicity by comparison. Data from other languages are included where helpful; thus, chap. 5 has comparative data on clause and sentence structure from Papiamentu (for comparison with NSCS) and Malagasy (for comparison with VLRF).

In the concluding chapter, Holm draws the social and structural threads together in an attempt to account for why these languages underwent partial restructuring. His answers are both social and linguistic: Semi-creoles arose in areas where neither native nor nonnative speakers of European languages were sufficiently numerous for one group to dominate the other, while semi-creoles arose in areas where both "unrestructured" and creolized forms of the same language were present and in use. But we have to wait until the table on p. 138 for a truly comparative presentation of structural phenomena across the five languages. Eighteen morphosyntactic features that have been discussed in the previous chapters are surveyed across the semi-creoles, their most likely substrate languages (Khoisan in the case of Afrikaans, Malagasy and maybe Bantu languages for VLRF, and a variety of Niger-Congo languages for the rest), and their "unrestructured" lexifiers. The most restructured language according to this metric is AAVE, with 15 out of a possible 18 points, while VLRF scores 14, BVP 13, and Afrikaans and NSCS both 9 points. Meanwhile, among the lexifiers, English, French, and Portuguese score 2 points each on this scale, Spanish 1, and Dutch zero. The volume concludes with an extensive bibliography and an index containing names, topics, and places all listed together.

The emphasis on inflectional morphological and syntactic features in this work is understandable, given that complex morphological systems in each language are the parts of each language that undergo drastic change in the course of semi-creolization, and what we have here are admirable morphological sketches of the semi-creoles. But one could have hoped for more information regarding other parts of the languages surveyed. To what extent do their phonetic inventories or segmental and canonical phonological systems differ from their "unrestructured" counterparts? What differences, if any, do we find in semi-creoles' range and use of derivational morphological techniques and morphs? Furthermore, given that some creoles, in an echo of their assured pidgin pasts, can occasionally use words that are nouns or adjectives in the lexifier language as verbs in the creole (for instance, Mauritian Creole French *koken* 'to steal' and *kontan* 'to like' from French *coquin* 'scoundrel' and *content* 'glad, happy'), do we find instances of similar behavior among high-frequency lexical items in semi-creoles, and if so, what are they?

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404506230136 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The standard of proofreading is generally excellent, but one wonders about the apparently random variation between full first names and initials for authors listed in the bibliography.

A comparative approach to creolistics is nothing new, and Holm is a past master at it, but this work, essential reading for all interested in creolistics, is the first classic (and let us hope, by no means the last) of the new field of comparative semi-creolistics.

REFERENCE

Weinreich, Uriel. (1953). *Languages in contact: Findings and problems*. New York: Linguistic Circle of New York. Repr. 1968, The Hague: Mouton.

(Received 8 May 2004)

Language in Society **35** (2006). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S004740450622013X

R. A. LODGE, *A sociolinguistic history of Parisian French*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. Pp. xi, 290. Hb $70.

Reviewed by RALPH GRILLO
Anthropology, University of Sussex
Brighton, UK, BN1 9SJ
r.d.grillo@sussex.ac.uk

Detailed longitudinal studies of urban sociolinguistic change are few and far between. They are intrinsically difficult and of vast scope and pose severe theoretical and methodological problems concerning the availability and reliability of data. Lodge's survey of how the speech of Paris "has evolved hand in hand with demographic and socio-economic change" (p. 250), over some 800 years, is a largely convincing attempt to overcome these problems.

Theoretically, Lodge draws on the British sociolinguistic tradition associated with Trudgill, using analytical terms such as "koinéisation", "dialect-levelling", and "reallocation". He also looks to the Milroys on language and social networks, and in an excellent account of *argot* in nineteenth-century Paris, to Halliday on "anti-language." Labov figures prominently and Gumperz puts in an appearance, but otherwise the U.S. tradition of linguistic anthropology, which might have provided an entrée to some key questions, is missing, as is the extensive corpus of transatlantic writing on language and gender. For a socio-historical framework Lodge turns to Hohenberg & Lees 1985, who proposed three phases of urban development in Europe: pre-industrial (eleventh–fourteenth centuries), proto-industrial (fifteenth–eighteenth), and industrial (nineteenth–twentieth), though Lodge declines to take the story beyond about 1950. These epochs are, in effect, ideal type configurations of socio-demographic, economic, political and cultural change which Lodge uses to map and interpret sociolinguistic developments.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404506230136 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In both France and Britain, there was from the fourteenth century onward what might be called a "triple development" involving the rise of a standard literary language and language of state, the increasing separation of the spoken language into class and status-based varieties, and the consolidation of these at the expense of minority languages and dialects. Although some French writers have argued that the evolution of a written standard language was a crucial early development, Lodge contends that is unlikely that such a standard emerged first. He adopts instead a "spoken koiné hypothesis" which argues that "the earliest sources of standardisation in French are to be found not in a composite written variety elaborated at a very early date by a coterie of scribes, but in a dialect mixture which developed spontaneously through real-life interactions between speakers" (76). There is thus a complex dialectical relationship between the Paris vernacular, the written standard, and the spoken standard, and Lodge documents the changing form of this relationship from the twelfth century on.

"The speech of Paris", says Lodge, "looks to have always been heterogeneous, with multilingualism, dialect-mixing, code-shifting and style-shifting taking place there as a matter of routine" (15), but one important change notably in the proto-industrial period was in the evaluation of these different ways of speaking. Of particular interest is Lodge's account of opposed "prototypes," as he calls them, of the good and bad speaker, represented by the Gentleman (*l'Honnête Homme*) and the "Peasant," who even if town-dwelling was not "urbane." The Gentleman distinguished himself by avoiding low words, the words of trades, and legal jargon, "reject[ing] the vernacular in all its manifestations . . . distancing oneself as far as possible from 'everyday' modes of expression" (152–53). Under the Ancien Régime rigid social hierarchy went with rigid linguistic hierarchy, and furthermore, eighteenth-century Enlightenment philosophies of language encouraged the belief that the vernacular signaled an "inability to think clearly and logically"(162). The industrial period in many ways carried forward these distinctions, albeit in other guises. After 1800 the gulf between high and low culture became more marked; the gradual expansion of public education spread the use of the emergent standard/national language and, *inter alia*, "lowered the levels of tolerance" for popular speech (210).

If it appears from this that Lodge is good on class, or rather social stratification, it must be said he is weak on gender and ethnicity and, aside from some remarks on politeness, says little about discursive practice. The omission of ethnic diversity seems to be the result of its relative absence from the social reality of Paris. Lodge argues that ethnic differentiation was not really important until after 1950, though perhaps he underestimates the significance of minority ethnic groups (e.g. Bretons), and of immigrants from outside France (e.g. Italians), in the second half of the nineteenth century. Paris always was to some degree polyglot, and, as Lodge puts it, a "mosaic of disparate groups struggling to maintain their identity" (200). It could, of course, be argued that gender difference, and women, are simply missing from the record, yet Lodge himself notes numerous

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404506230136 Published online by Cambridge University Press

examples which though scattered could be pulled together more systematically. Thus, the ideas that the *douceur* of courtly speech owed something to the presence of women, that hypercorrection and "assibillation" were attributed to female speakers, that the speaking of argot was associated with masculinity, and so on, all suggest that gender and class were complexly interrelated in both representation and (probably) practice, and that this requires further investigation.

The lack of direct evidence gathered by professional linguists (and until the twentieth century the lack of any audio material) means that the historical sociolinguist must "make the best of a very bad job" (249). "As soon as we come near the vernacular", says Lodge, "it slips away, leaving only the faintest traces of its passage" (22). Even for the nineteenth century, the data are problematic, if more abundant. Lodge supplements the scanty direct evidence by gleaning what he can from indirect sources, including metalinguistic commentaries. In doing so he locates a wealth of fascinating texts which give clues to the evolving nature of the (often stigmatized) vernacular grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation. A great deal of such data, however, is in texts which claim to represent low-class speech, and these are difficult to handle. On the one hand they may be read, with some difficulty, as evidence for the speech they purportedly represent; on the other they reveal how that speech was represented by others – how literate Parisians, for example, portrayed the speech of the illiterate, how they "heard" them, how they thought they spoke, or simply how they orthographically represented the vernacular. These representations of speech were often also representations of character, conveying what kind of people vernacular speakers were presumed to be. Lodge records "an enduring literary convention which made argot an indispensable component in any portrayal not only of the criminal fraternity, but of working-class males in general" (247). It represented their supposed masculinity. Often this meant denigrating or satirizing them, but sometimes, as in eighteenth-century pamphlets, vernacular forms were used to "express the voice of the Common Man" (211). Such mimesis is widespread and worth exploring in its own right.

"Writing a sociolinguistic history of a city as large and complex as Paris is a risky, even foolhardy undertaking," says Lodge (3). Indeed, is such a history possible? Beyond the problem of data is the question of what kind of unity and community "Paris" or "Parisian French" represents. Anthropologists have frequently been skeptical about the validity of a spatially and sociologically distinct urban entity. This is especially pertinent in the contemporary, globalized, transnational world where cities and societies are increasingly "porous," to use Charles Taylor's term, but surely it was ever an issue in cities such as Paris which to a degree always were "global cities." Speakers of Parisian French have always been a finite but unbounded community. They may be habitually resident in the agglomeration but are certainly not confined to it: There has always been to-ing and fro-ing between town and country and often further afield (e.g. the nineteenth-century army and colonies). The (possibly apocryphal) Lyonnais novelist said only to have left the Croix Rousse once, to be shown the airport, is,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404506230136 Published online by Cambridge University Press

perhaps always was, atypical of the urban dweller. Lodge is aware of this, since he declines to take the story beyond 1950 on the grounds that "subsequent developments in communication and inter-continental migration have transformed Paris in ways that transcend those of the industrial period" (193). But the methodological problem is not confined to a post-industrial, postmodern Paris, even if it may have been less acute in earlier epochs.

Notwithstanding such criticisms, this is an excellent, meticulously documented urban linguistic history, one of the best of its kind. Its limitations largely come with the territory (e.g. the paucity of data), though perhaps Lodge might have thrown his theoretical net wider and been a little less cautious. He should be encouraged to take the story past 1950, though the problem of lack of data is then replaced by the difficulty of managing its abundance and setting boundaries. In many respects the book is a model for others, and similar histories of other European capital and imperial cities – London, Berlin, Rome, Madrid, Moscow – would add considerably to our comparative understanding of the phenomena Lodge discusses.

REFERENCE

Hohenberg, P. M., & Lees, L. H. (1985). *The making of urban Europe 1000–1950*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

(Received 11 October 2004)

Language in Society **35** (2006). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404506230136

PAUL CHILTON, *Analysing political discourse: Theory and practice*. London & New York: Routledge, 2004. Pp. xiv, 226. Hb $125.00, Pb $35.11.

Reviewed by HAILONG TIAN
Tianjin University of Commerce
Tianjin 300134, PR China
thailong@public1.tpt.tj.cn

Analysing political discourse does not merely address issues concerning either politics of language or languages of politics; it offers practical analyses of actual specimens of political text and talk. The discourses analyzed, in both the British and international arenas, include political interviews, parliamentary language, politicians' speeches, and discourses that concern foreigners and religion. The analysis is linguistically oriented, grounded in a theory of language and politics. In this review, I shall first give an overview of the linguistic theory on which the author bases his analysis and then select two actual analyses for illustration. Finally, I shall say a few words about the style of this volume.

The theoretical groundwork constitutes Part I of the volume, which consists of four chapters. Chaps. 1 and 2, "Politics and language" and "Language and politics," respectively, dwell on the role language plays in politics. In chap. 1,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404506230136 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the author emphasizes that doing politics is predominantly constituted in language by recognizing that "however politics is defined, there is a linguistic, discursive and communicative dimension" (p. 4). In chap. 2, the author briefly examines Grice's Cooperative Principle, Sperber & Wilson's relevance theory, and Chomsky's generative linguistics in order to formulate three principles for a cognitive approach to political discourse. The first is that language and political behavior can be thought of as based on the cognitive endowments of the human mind rather than simply as "social practices." The second is that language and social behavior are closely intertwined, probably in innate mechanisms or innately developing mechanisms of the mind and probably as a result of evolutionary adaptations. The third principle is that human linguistic and social abilities are not a straitjacket; rather, language is linked to the human cognitive ability to engage in free critique and criticism (28–29). The following two chapters consider the mechanisms of language in detail, with chap. 3 concentrated on the role of language in the interaction between individuals in social groups and chap. 4 on the representation of state affairs.

Through interaction people signal social roles, boundaries, and bonds. Thus, in the examination of speech acts, communicative cooperation, and implicatures in chap. 3, Chilton attempts to connect these mainstream theories with social and political categories. According to him, "felicity conditions" can be best explained in terms of social, political, and judicial organization. Similarly, the concept of cooperation is likely to require explication in terms of social intelligence. "Even implicatures, which in many respects can be dealt with inside the domain of cognition, nonetheless seems [*sic*] to involve, at least for particularized implicature, a multiplicity of background knowledge that includes social and political values" (42). As a step further, Chilton examines Habermas's validity claims. The Habermasian epistemological framework, he points out, holds that knowledge is not a neutral representation of an objective world "out there," but is realized through language in use, determined by interests. The validity claim of "rightness," for example, partly means that the performing of speech acts is grounded in an implicit claim on the part of the speaker to inhabit a particular social or political role and to possess a particular authority. In this line of argument, Chilton characterizes three strategies by which utterers manage their interests: coercion, legitimization and delegitimization, and representation and misrepresentation.

Chap. 4 contains more of Chilton's ideas concerning his cognitive approach to political discourse. He first introduces the term "frame," which is defined as "an area of experience" in a particular culture (51). Then he illustrates the cognitive nature of metaphor by pointing out that the source domains that are innate or required in development provide a source for conceptualization. Another concept the author dwells on is "discourse worlds," the mental space established by coherent chains of propositions in the discourse and entertained by the utterer as "real." He believes that overall discourse coherence is achieved by the recurrence of, and links between, the different referents of the discourse world. As a

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404506230136 Published online by Cambridge University Press

consequence, he develops a device to "filter" out the linguistic expressions that set up the recurring discourse referents and prompt for their thematic roles and relations. Finally in this chapter, Chilton formulates his three-dimensional analytical framework: space (*s*), time (*t*), and modality (*m*). He suggests that discourse is based on the expectation that anyone mentally processing it will locate argument and predicates by reference to points on the three axes *s*, *t*, and *m*. The coordinates are established in the discourse as part of speaker's reality-space, the space that speaker expects hearer to know and accept (60–61). This analytical framework and the strategies characterized in chap. 3 are applied to the analyses of the specimens of political discourse in the following chapters. Here I shall review two actual analyses.

Chap. 7 offers a strategy analysis of political speech given in April 1968 by Enoch Powell, a maverick Conservative politician who presumes an interracial conflict in Britain as a result of excessive immigration. Legitimization functions first in terms of epistemic claims, backed up by lists, statistics, and sources that the speaker presumes the hearer will accept as authoritative. It also functions in terms of deontic claims. In the speech, the speaker seeks to ground his position in moral feelings or intuitions that no one will challenge. His claim of rationality, morality, and veracity guarantees his authority to make assertions about immigration and the behavior of immigrants. The legitimization is a kind of coercion, but some stretches in this speech are strategically designed PREDOMINANTLY to coerce. For example, the utterance "In this country in fifteen or twenty years' time the black man will have the whip over the white man" may induce fear by making truth claims, in the form of predictions, about causal effects. Powell here actually predicts that uncontrolled immigration will cause damaging events. In terms of speech acts, the author points out, Powell is issuing warnings; in terms of contextualized political language use, he is using a coercive strategy insofar as he is (conceivably) causing fear of contingent events and actors involved in them (118). This is emotive coercion, and Powell is also using propositional coercion, which involves different forms of implied meaning and the propositions that hearers are induced to entertain in the course of processing the current discourse. The result is that of "forced inferences"; that is, in reading or hearing Powell, one cannot do otherwise than make certain momentary online assumptions or accept certain implications. As for the representational dimension of language use, the construction of reality by making truth claims about particular configurations of categories and events, Chilton notes that actions, effects, and recipients are not always expressed overtly, but are bundled up inside noun phrases (NPs). The nonspecified agent of a passive construction is also recognized as a covert expression of the speaker's proposition.

Chaps. 8, 9, and 10, which contain analyses of political discourses in the global arena, mostly apply the three-dimensional analytical framework. I shall take the analysis of President Clinton's address on 24 March 1999 as an illustration. The opening sentences of the speech are as follows:

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404506230136 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> My fellow Americans, today our Armed forces joined our NATO allies in air strikes against Serbian forces responsible for the brutality in Kosovo. We have acted with resolve for several reasons. (p. 138)

To analyze the president's representation of the world, the author positions the speaker in the deictic center and other entities (arguments of predicates) and processes (predicates) in relation to him along the axes of space (*s*), time (*t*) and modality (*m*). In terms of *m*, the value for these sentences seem to be "proximate" – that is, actions referred to are asserted as true (and right) without modification. In terms of *t*, they are asserted to have taken place within the mutually understood time zone denoted by "today." As for *s*, the author separates two spaces. In one, proximate forces join more distant but still relatively proximate allies and joint attacks against distant entities (this space is built up by predicate "join" and verbal noun "strike"). The second space is a distant geopolitical area (built up by "brutality"). Two spaces are lexically linked by "responsible for": The syntax of the linguistic expressions (mostly an inferred anaphoric chain) links one of the arguments in the first space to a predication in the second space (140–41; also see Figure 8.1 on p. 141).

Chilton's analysis of political discourse is not concentrated on the metaphor, metonymy, analogy, and transitivity politicians often exploit, as is the case with Beard 2000; rather, the analysis takes a cognitive approach which is different from some linguists' (e.g. van Dijk 2002) as far as political discourse analysis is concerned. This approach, through a novel application of ideas derived from vector geometry, proves effective in the analysis of language in use, and particularly in political discourse, since political actors are always situated with respect to a particular time, place, and social group. Because it is done from a new angle, the approach is formulated in a careful way. In fact, Chilton adopts a moderate style in formulating his ideas. One finds throughout the book phrases like "seem to be" and "this is of course not to say," and even in the concluding chapter, "Towards a theory of language and politics," the author tentatively formulates as many as twelve propositions regarding political discourse instead of offering any real concluding remarks. What this final chapter leaves us with is a platform for the future development of the author's stimulating and sometimes provocative ideas.

REFERENCES

Beard, A. (2000). *The language of politics*. London & New York: Routledge.

van Dijk, T. A. (2002). Political discourse and political cognition. In P. Chilton & C. Schäffner (eds.), *Politics as text and talk: Analytic approaches to political discourse*, 203–37. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

(Received 18 October 2004)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404506230136 Published online by Cambridge University Press