

that will need to be considered as we make progress in this domain, a welcome contribution to our field.

REFERENCES

- Amaral, Luís Isías Centeno do. 2003. A concordância verbal de segunda pessoa do singular em Pelotas e suas implicações linguísticas e sociais [Second person singular verb agreement in Pelotas and its linguistic and social implications]. Unpublished PhD dissertation. Porto Alegre, Brazil: Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul.
- Carvalho, Ana Maria. 2004. I speak like the guys on TV: Palatalization and the urbanization of Uruguayan Portuguese. *Language Variation and Change* 16: 127–151.
- Cheshire, Jenny, Paul Kerswill, Sue Fox and Eivind Torgersen. 2011. Contact, the feature pool and the speech community: The emergence of Multicultural London English. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 15: 151–196.
- Eckert, Penelope. 2012. Three waves of variation study: The emergence of meaning in the study of variation. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 41: 87–100.
- Flores, Nydia. 2010. Social variables and Spanish speakers in the U.S.: Data collection concerns. Paper presented at NWAV 39, 5 November, University of Texas at San Antonio, Texas.
- Irvine, Alison. 2005. Defining good English in Jamaica: Language variation and language ideology in an agency of the Jamaican state. Unpublished PhD dissertation. Kingston, Jamaica: University of the West Indies.
- Kobialka, Ewa. 2016. Language identity and social class among Polish migrants in Ireland. In Vera Regan, Chloe Diskin and Jennifer Martyn (eds.) *Language, Identity and Migration: Voices from Transnational Speakers and Communities*. Oxford, U.K.: Peter Lang. 191–216.
- Labov, William. 2015. The discovery of the unexpected. *Asia-Pacific Language Variation* 1: 17–22.
- Nagy, Naomi. In press. Heritage Language speakers in the university classroom, doing research. In Peter Pericles Trifonas and Themistoklis Aravossitis (eds.) *International Handbook on Research and Practice in Heritage Language Education*. New York: Springer.
- Sharma, Devyani and Lavanya Sankaran. 2011. Cognitive and social forces in dialect shift: Gradual change in London Asian speech. *Language Variation and Change* 23: 399–428.

NAOMI NAGY
Department of Linguistics
University of Toronto, Canada
naomi.nagy@utoronto.ca

PETER K. AUSTIN AND JULIA SALLABANK (eds.). *Endangered Languages: Beliefs and Ideologies in Language Documentation and Revitalization*. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press. 2014. xvi + 429 pp. Hb (9780197265765) US\$125.00.

Reviewed by BARBRA A. MEEK

On the cusp of the 21st century, the theorization of language ideologies redefined the field of linguistic anthropology. It also breathed new life into anthropological research on endangered indigenous languages. Up until then, much of the research

on 'small languages' (Dorian 1998) focused on documentation and preservation because of their imminent demise. Following in Dorian's footsteps, Peter K. Austin and Julia Sallabank's edited volume convincingly makes the study of language ideologies imperative to the investigation of such endangered languages. More significantly, they argue that effective language revitalization hinges on an awareness of language ideologies achieved in part through ethnographic research:

We propose that by researching and revealing unconscious language ideologies, and challenging consciously accepted ones, we can demonstrate that it is possible to overcome deeply ingrained beliefs about, for example, the inferiority of a particular way of speaking, the notion that acquiring a language of wider communication necessitates abandoning other languages and dialects, or the assumption that a small language needs to have all the attributes of a larger one. (p. 7)

That is, for the authors, an important step in the process of language revitalization is 'ideological clarification,' a term they borrow from Fishman and the Dauenhauers (1998). Another central term is 'disjuncture,' which the authors use to indicate ideological or conceptual contradictions or conflicts between two entities (pp. 8, 18). They draw on this concept in analyses of ideological differences that may or may not be at the level of awareness for different groups of actors. They locate disjunctures between institutions/governments and local organizations and between vernacular and disciplinary discourses rather than identifying more subtle tensions and discordances that arise community internally. This is not to say that the chapters themselves elide these less obvious ideological misalignments. Lise Dobrin's chapter, for example, elucidates the subtle cultural terrain that has influenced the current Arapesh sociolinguistic situation in Papua New Guinea, revealing a disjuncture in relation to language ideologies but a (con-)juncture in relation to socio-cultural ones. The volume thus proposes to raise awareness of ideological proclivities and presuppositions within endangered language communities, across institutions, and among linguists *and* to diversify the representations of research on language ideologies in endangered language situations. As the different chapters and sections illustrate, they achieve these aims with clarity and precision.

The volume is organized into three sections:

- 'Case Studies: Beliefs and Ideologies in Endangered Language Communities';
- 'Language Documentation and Revitalization: What and Why?'; and
- 'From Local to International: Interdisciplinary and International Views'.

The chapters in the first section present particular cases from around the world (from Papua New Guinea to Ireland), and use a range of methods from ethnography and focus groups to surveys and individual interviews. They explore the particular paradoxes and incongruities that have arisen for each particular language situation, often in relation to policy but also in terms of cultural practice and ideologies. In Chapter 2, by Tadhg Ó hÍfearnáin, for example, the general population supports Irish language maintenance and regeneration, but may not wish to

participate in the process. Peter Austin's chapter (Ch. 6) on the Gamilaraay-Yuwaalaraay situation in Australia emphasizes the need to include outsiders in the language's revitalization. Chapter 4, by Olimpia Rasom, reveals the role of Ladin women in sustaining their 'mother tongue' in Italy but their minimal role in the development of language policy for supporting both Ladin language and culture. Turning to the impact of cultural ideologies, Lise Dobrin's chapter on Arapesh suggests that it is only after complete assimilation that a language can be revived (Jane Hill [personal communication] once made a similar remark). All of these chapters demonstrate how the particular conceptualizations and rationalizations of each case have implications for how language revitalization might be, or should be, undertaken.

The chapters in the second part demonstrate the importance of ethnography to the study of endangered languages, a methodological move that has only recently gained traction among linguists. In particular, this section focuses on unpacking the assumptions made by those involved in particular contexts of language documentation and/or revitalization and seeks to provide 'ideological clarification' for these particular situations. For example, Yan Marquis and Julia Sallabank, in Chapter 8, reveal some of the tensions that arise around concepts of 'native speaker' and the construction of linguistic expertise such that in the case of Guernesiais, an indigenous language spoken in Guernsey, Channel Islands, its future may be relegated to a static, textual dimension rather than a spoken one. Jane Freeland and Eloy Frank Gómez's chapter (Ch. 9) usefully examines the socio-historical complexity of the Sumu-Mayangna situation in Nicaragua where there are several languages in play. They point out the ways in which such heterogeneity complicates efforts at language revitalization, in this case through the entrenchment of a linguistic hierarchy. Given that challenging this ranking may not be feasible, the authors suggest ways to work with or around such obstacles by raising people's awareness and highlighting positive dimensions such as children's comprehension of Sumu-Mayangna. In a similar vein, James Costa Wilson's chapter (Ch. 10) emphasizes the need for researchers to attend to children and their perceptions of language in language revitalization efforts. Several chapters in this section (DiCarlo and Good; Stebbins; Couzens and Eira) continue to build on these insights by offering different models for conducting linguistic research and for devising linguistic interventions.

The last section contains four chapters (Chs. 16–19) detailing some of the disjunctures that arise in situations of language endangerment and revitalization at different scales of institutionalization. In particular, these final chapters directly tackle the linguistic ideologies, attitudes, and/or beliefs of disciplinary and institutional experts. Grenoble and Whitecloud lay out some of the intellectual differences between Western and indigenous Greenlandic approaches to knowledge. Grinevald and Bert, reflecting on several decades of field research in Nicaragua and France, identify some of the political and ideological differences across a range of 'spheres,' from local and academic to national and international, in order to offer a model for ideological clarification in research. Minasyan's chapter attends to the global sphere and demonstrates the positive impact that United Nation's discourse

has had on raising national and international awareness of language endangerment and the legitimization of revitalization efforts. To conclude this section and the volume, Bernard Spolsky's chapter provides a thoughtful review of the terms and ideologies that define the field of language revitalization and influence its practice(s). He highlights some of the ways in which differences abound in projects of language revitalization (between communities and linguists, between governments and aboriginal groups, between policies and practices, within communities themselves, etc.) and within this heterogeneity he suggests that ideologies offer both a means for change and a method for changing. These are dynamic situations that require dynamic approaches.

The volume offers a range of approaches and methods for understanding processes of language revitalization and for addressing some of the challenges that inevitably beset them. This provides the reader with some useful tools and practical steps for resolving tensions and ideological difference, even though this is not a how-to guide for saving languages. It is a detailed examination of language ideological differences that has two minor oversights. First, while the editors' Introduction (Ch. 1) presents a useful and clear overview of some of the key pieces on language ideologies, the authors overlook the vast literature detailing the conceptual development of the term in relation to its Marxist orientation. For example, Kathryn Woolard in her introduction to the 1998 *Language Ideologies* volume highlights the Marxist undertones of anthropological approaches to the concept. Second, the authors' discussion of disjuncture could make more of a contribution theoretically by engaging with the growing literature on sociolinguistic disjuncture (for example, Irvine 2007) and underscoring the point that the linguistic crisis that in part results from ideological disjunctures (and/or conjunctures) depends greatly upon the context in which they emerge.

Overall, this volume makes several significant contributions to the literature on endangered languages and language revitalization, four of which I will highlight. First, every chapter integrates theory and practice, revealing that engagement is crucial to both the development of theory and its translation into action. Second, this volume brings together vastly different language situations and contexts, expanding the literature's geographic coverage and opportunities for comparison. Third, neither the chapters nor the volume's editors belabor the role of identity in processes of language revitalization. They refreshingly situate identity within a complex of factors that influence language revitalization efforts. Lastly, each chapter makes a strong case for making ethnographic methods a central part of the study of language endangerment and revitalization. The inclusion of ethnography also underscores the relevance of different (linguistic) actors to situations of endangerment and revitalization, especially actors such as children, youth, and women who invariably play a seminal role in the shaping and management of languages.

REFERENCES

- Dauenhauer, Nora Marks and Richard Dauenhauer. 1998. Technical, emotional, and ideological issues in reversing language shift: Examples from Southeast Alaska. In Lenore A.

- Grenoble and Lindsay J. Whaley (eds.) *Endangered Languages: Language Loss and Community Response*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press. 57–99.
- Dorian, Nancy. 1998. Western language ideologies and small-language prospects. In Lenore A. Grenoble and Lindsay J. Whaley (eds.) *Endangered Languages: Language Loss and Community Response*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press. 3–21.
- Irvine, Judith T. 2007. Six impossible things before breakfast: Consistency and contradiction in language ideology. *Proceedings of the Fifteenth Annual Symposium about Language and Society, Texas Linguistic Forum* 51: 1–16.
- Woolard, Kathryn. 1998. Introduction: Language ideology as a field of inquiry. In Bambi Schieffelin, Kathryn A. Woolard and Paul V. Kroskrity (eds.) *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory*. New York: Oxford University Press. 3–50.

BARBRA A. MEEK
Departments of Anthropology and Linguistics
University of Michigan, U.S.A.
bameek@umich.edu