

## BOOK REVIEWS

MARINA TERKOURAFI (ed.). *Languages of Global Hip Hop*. New York: Continuum, 2010. 351 pp. Hb (9780826431608) \$170.00.

Reviewed by AWAD IBRAHIM

Hip hop, it seems, has (been) moved from the cultural realm to Nationhood. Not only that but it has become a Global Nation. This seems to be a Solomonic truth, at least, in the book under review. If this is so – that is, Hip Hop is a Global Nation – then how does one *become* a citizen of it? What code does one need to make sense of, to decode if you like, its said and unsaid language(s)? In other words, how is this Global Hip Hop Nation (GHHN) formed and how does one become one of its citizens? To answer these intricate questions, Marina Terkourafi invited a ‘crew of hip hoppers’ (i.e. a number of young scholars) who are grabbling with them. The result is her 12-chapter edited volume: *Languages of Global Hip Hop*. Assistant professor of linguistics at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, Dr. Terkourafi starts the volume with a ‘shout out’ (an introduction) that is mostly personal. Narrating her experience with hip hop as a Greek woman growing up in Greece in the 1980s and 1990s and how she entered the ‘global hip-hop puzzle’ (p. 2), she makes the argument that, ‘[i]f we want to understand the current fascination with hip hop by academics and the media alike – let alone the fans – we have to look elsewhere’ (p. 2).

Unfortunately, no coherent answer to this ‘elsewhere’ is offered; instead we are told that: hip hop is intensely political; hip hop artists are outspoken critics of social realities around them, be it gender, race, or otherwise; and, globally, this critique is around dominant cultures and engages local issues of ethnicity, culture, language and power. For Terkourafi, hip hop defies delimitation and definition, and this is ‘not because it is in some way aberrant but exactly because, like other cultural phenomena, trying to reduce it to a set of *sine qua non* parameters is fundamentally misguided in the first place’ (p. 3). This is why, moreover, the debate on what might be called ‘global hip hop authenticity’ has to be reconceptualized. We need to acknowledge the supra-local origins of hip hop, Terkourafi contends, therefore, when looking at form and content, authenticity should be in the plural (authenticities), where ‘keepin it real’ means proudly using ‘national languages’ along with/side ‘regional, immigrant, or minority varieties.’

Dr. Terkourafi concludes her introduction with a reference to Aristotle’s notion of ‘tragedy’ as a ‘third way’ to re-conceptualize the question of authenticity. For Aristotle, tragedy is seen as an imitation, hyperbole, embellished language, an

outlet of emotions (especially of fear and pity) and a contest. These five elements, Terkourafi argues, have

been inherited from African American sounding practices into hip hop as part of its lineage, making them available as a kind of 'generic inheritance' that is able to generate the ever-changing understandings of authenticity that run through and link together all of hip hop – since its early days as dance music in the 1970s through the gangsta rap of the 1990s and through to its multiple transplantations around the globe today. (p. 10)

As someone who is familiar with the hip hop scene, scholarship and pedagogy, I desired more in this introduction. I desired a better contextualization of not only the chapters that followed but an overall, encompassing metaphor. The book reads as a collection of 12 chapters, with no overall organizing theme, except the fact that they are all dealing with 'language.' The book should have been divided into parts, and each part should have dealt with a theme or themes. So, for this review, I am introducing Global Hip Hop Nation Language (GHHNL) as the overall theme of the book, and making the argument that GHHNL is semiotic in nature, not simply linguistic(s). By semiotic, I am talking about the linguistic utterance (i.e. *actually* speaking Arabic, French or Urdu) as well as non-linguistic utterance (i.e. that which does not linguistically utter but speaks so loudly: clothes, hair, body, etc.). Reading this book this way, for me, renders the book more interesting, especially for those outside what might be called 'hip hop sociolinguistics.'

Titled 'Multilingualism, Ethnicity and Genre in Germany's Migrant Hip Hop', the first chapter is by Jannis Androutsopoulos of the University of Hamburg, Germany, where he makes four main arguments and offers a wonderful and comprehensive history of migrant hip hop in Germany. First, rappers of migrant background are using hip hop as a means to express discourses of migration and ethnicity and as a site where immigrant languages are deployed and made use of. Second, when it comes to migrant hip hop in Germany, which language is used as a 'base' (German with some Turkish terms; or Turkish with some German terms) is a symbolic act of audience identification (i.e. paying homage to being German-Turkish for example). Third, in analyzing 15 CD releases (approximately 220 songs), Androutsopoulos argues that the 'base language' tends to be German but the use of migrant languages is systematic and for indexical purposes (i.e. to claim an identity, a language, a heritage). Following this third argument, finally, Androutsopoulos concludes that 'a symbolic use of migrant languages allows artists to make ethnicity claims while targeting a mainstream, monolingual audience' (p. 21). Androutsopoulos's main objective in this chapter is to demonstrate that 'multilingualism in rap lyrics is a complex discourse process that cannot be properly understood without taking generic and institutional factors into account' (p. 21).

In the second chapter, Samira Hassa of the Manhattan College in New York offers a great analysis of the context in which Arabic, English and Verlan are

used and identifies the function of each of these varieties in French rap lyrics. Analyzing four albums (a total of 57 songs), she is able to distinguish between *code-switching* ('the insertion of constituents between sentence boundaries' [p. 47]) and *code-mixing* ('the alternation of codes within the same sentence' [p. 47]). For Hassa, Arabic, English, Verlan and French and their deployment 'fulfill certain roles, represent distinct identities, and depict the social problems of youth in a context of immigration and postcolonialism' (p. 46). Arabic is used to talk about family, religion, identity conflict and cultural heritage; English is for topics related to violence and rebellion; and Verlan is associated with the youth culture in the *banlieu* (representing subalternness). Her overall conclusion is, similar to Androutsopoulos in Germany, 'code-switching plays the role of an identity construction tool and an identity marker for numerous hip-hop artists in France' (p. 45).

In chapter three, Angela Williams of the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign makes a convincing connection between globalization and connective marginalities and argues that hip hop outside the U.S. is already local. Studying four Egyptian hip hop groups (a total of 85 songs) she contends that 'hip-hop culture cannot only be understood as an American cultural import' nor as 'solely the manifestation of an indigenous art form and local expressive traditions' (p. 68). She shows how these four groups construct a local Egyptian hip hop identity through the use of Egyptian Arabic language use and conventions while seeking global audience through the use of English. Ironically, she concludes, English is used here to express resistance against the English-speaking world. 'Through the localization of hip-hop culture,' Williams writes, 'the artists are redefining what it means to be Egyptian in terms of language choice and self expression' (p. 68).

Chapter four is probably one of the most exciting chapters in this book. In it, Sarah Simeziane explores three essential questions (that were originally posed by the most cited scholar in this volume: Samy Alim):

1. 'Just how is that "Hip Hop Culture" has become a primary site of identification and self-understanding for youth around the world?'
2. '... what linguistic resources do youth manipulate, (re)appropriate, and sometimes (re)create, in order to fashion themselves as members of a "Global Hip Hop Nation"?''
3. '... in doing so, what challenges do they face and pose, with distinct, local scenes, which privilege their own often competing, locally relevant categories of identification?' (p. 97).

Through an excellent analysis of language and identity construction in the lyrics of a popular Hungarian Roma (aka gypsy) hip hop group known as *Black Train*, Simeziane shows how this group localizes hip hop through the use of Romani language (the Roma language). In the process, significantly important, they end up 'blackening' themselves (i.e. ally their struggle with African American struggle in particular), and cuttin 'n' mixin 'African American

urban culture' to the point that 'it eventually becomes recognized as a local art form' (p. 97).

Building on Androutsopoulos's earlier work in German hip hop, John T. Littlejohn (University of West Georgia) and Michael Putnam (Pennsylvania State University) produced a provocative chapter on how and why *Migranten* (migrant) hip hoppers would 'flip the script' and use the absolute taboo in Germany – Hitler and the Third Reich – in their hip hop symbolization. Apparently, tentatively argued by the authors, *Migranten* hip hoppers see Hitler as a 'gangsta.' Ouch! Someone gotta study this more!

Chapter six takes us on a totally different direction: South Korean Hip Hop Playas. Examining 68 songs by four major South Korean hip hop (K-hip hop) artists, Jamie Shinhee Lee of the University of Michigan-Dearborn makes the argument that K-hip hop playas are 'keepin it real' by using three different mechanisms:

1. talking about deeply local cultural issues (e.g. ageism, with a lot of R.E.S.P.E.C.T to old people);
2. performing 'meta-hip hop' (that is hip hop about hip hop), which touches on topics such as career, global ambitions and work ethic; and
3. situating K-hip hoppers as 'badasses' who are pirates and who hate military service.

The conclusion of this chapter is significant: hip hop ideology of authenticity – keepin it real – is articulated in K-hip hop, but its meaning diverges radically from how hip hoppers from other cultures understand and practice it.

Franklin L. Hess of Indiana University wrote what I think is the most interesting chapter in this volume. Casting a vertical, deep level of philosophical understanding of hip hop, Hess focuses his analysis on the Greek hip hop group: Imiskoumbria. Making use of such analytic terms as 'mimicry,' 'polyvalent spatiality,' 'global cipa,' 'dust foot philosophy,' 'transcultural flows,' and 'critical philosophy of transgression,' Hess reaches two conclusions. First, a close examination of rap music and hip hop culture, namely that of Imiskoumbria, 'reveals that concretized understandings of the world are already circulating within global hip hop' (p. 167). Second, that the tradition of mimetic resistance to external authority is where the poetics of Greek rap should be placed. Here, Hess concludes,

Imiskoumbria employ a medium non-indigenous to Greek culture – rap music – to both critique and celebrate the arbitrariness of contemporary Greek culture, articulating, in the process, a systemic critique of global power relations as they manifest themselves at a local level. (pp. 170–171)

Chapter 8 by Evros Stylianou (University of Nicosia, Cyprus) repeats a common argument by now in the book: hip hop is local(ized). In the Cyprus case, Stylianou shows that Greek Cypriot dialect, an undervalued and 'inappropriate' variety of the Greek language, is now used in mainstream contexts thanks to the influence

of hip hop. This same argument is taken up in the Norwegian context in chapter 9. In it, Endre Brunstad (University of Bergen, Norway), Unn Royneland (University of Oslo) and Toril Opsahl make a very interesting distinction between 'rural hip hop' and 'urban, multiethnic hip hop.' Hip hop is localized in both cases, they contend; however, in urban hip hop, multilingualism is more prominent and becomes a determining feature; while in rural hip hop code-switching between Norwegian and English is the central feature.

Chapter 10 returns us to the U.S. where Jennifer Cramer and Jill Hallett of the University of Illinois-Urbana Champaign show how certain regional terms are used in hip hop to index, include and exclude. The authors took hip hoppers from the South and others from the Midwest and compared their lexical use of certain terms. The result is fascinating and worth a careful read. Nappy Roots's use of 'Awnaw' or OutKast's use of 'Southernplayalisticadillacmuzik' have no equivalent in Midwest. These terms are used to index identity and either to include those who know them and/or exclude those who do not.

Surprisingly, we go back to Germany for one more chapter (chapter 11). Looking at German hip hop fan community online, Matt Garley of the University of Illinois-Urbana Champaign shows that these hip hop fans insist on using German and thus indigenize hip hop. At this point, one has to wonder why this chapter was added and in terms of organization, why was it placed there? I wonder because the following last chapter by Cecelia Cutler of the City University of New York, Lehman College, is an excellent semiotic (analyzing both linguistic and non-linguistic utterance) of a VH1 TV show: *Ego Trip's (White) Rapper Show*. This is a show where the next great White rapper was supposed to be discovered. Invoking *indexicality* (the use of certain terms as markers) and *relationality* (where the Self does not exist without the Other), Cutler looks at a White female rapper, Persia, and how she insists on her 'ghettoness.' In the end, Cutler re-problematizes notions of identity, authenticity and representation.

Overall, this is a good volume, which should be read in relation to the recent hip hop sociolinguistics (cf. Alim, Ibrahim, and Pennycook, 2009). But, it lacks: (1) organization; (2) an overall, encompassing and organizing theme; and (3) it certainly needs semiology. Let me begin with the organization. Having a chapter dealing with Germany placed in the middle of two chapters dealing with the U.S. was both odd and symptomatic of the book's disorganization. Moreover, having three chapters dealing with the German hip hop and two dealing with Greek hip hop was never explained. Second, I want to make the argument that Global Hip-Hop Nation Language is a better organizing theme for this book. In her discussion of Androutsopoulos and Scholz's work, Angela Williams refers to seven types of speech acts: self-referential, listener-directed speech, boasting, dissing, place and time reference, identification and representation. For me, knowing these speech acts is the first step in belonging to the Global Hip Hop Nation. It is a necessary first step in becoming a citizen of this Nation. All of the chapters in this volume show the veracity of this statement. Hip hoppers all across the globe may be speaking different languages (Korean, Swahili, Arabic,

Spanish, Cantonese, etc.), but they know how to speak to each other. 'Speaking' here involves an exceptional familiarity with the themes under discussion, be it political struggle, poverty or bodily/sexual desires (among others).

Speaking Global Hip Hop Nation Language requires deterritorialization and reterritorialization of the global and the local. The product of this dialectical relation between the local and the global is a Nation of its own. It is a Nation that is both Global and deeply and proudly Local. It is a Nation that pays homage to the African American contribution to hip hop but also challenges its American-centricity. Quoting Jeff Chang (2007), Jamie Lee put it thus:

hip hop is a lingua franca that binds young people all around the world, all while giving them the chance to alter it with their own national flavor, and its being 'a vital progressive agenda that challenges the status quo' is pointed out as one of the consistent themes across cultures. (p. 139)

As street ethnography, hip hop is a postcolonial art that is building on the imagination and the ingenuity of 'connective marginalities.'

To be so, however, we need to link and broaden our understanding of 'language' to involve the 'spoken' and the 'unspoken' that speaks – the complex semiological media of communication: clothes, body, representation, etc. These, for me, are as crucial – if not more – than what we 'speak.' That part of a deeper complex semiological analysis is missing in this volume. Only in doing this complex analysis, at least for this reviewer, can we take hip hop as a Global phenomenon to a *whole other level* and propose it as a Global Hip Hop Nation with its own Language.

AWAD IBRAHIM  
Faculty of Education  
University of Ottawa  
145 Jean-Jacques Lussier  
Ottawa, Ontario K1N 6N5 U.S.A.  
aibrahim@uottawa.ca

ADAM JAWORSKI and CRISPIN THURLOW (eds.), *Semiotic Landscapes: Language, Image, Space*. London/New York: Continuum. 2010. 320pp. Hb (9781847061829) \$160.00. ELANA SHOHAMY and DURK GORTER (eds.), *Linguistic Landscape: Expanding the Scenery*. New York: Routledge. 2009. 352pp. Hb (9780415988728) \$141.00.

Reviewed by JOSHUA NASH

The study of linguistic landscape (LL) is a relatively new research field straddling several research areas within linguistics. Still in its theoretical infancy, LL is striving to make its mark in applied linguistics with broad ranging and pertinent studies which open up the possible realisations and applications of the field. The two volumes under review, while having their own specific foci, are noteworthy contributions to the wider field of LL.



The main focus of Shohamy and Gorter's book is 'expanding the scenery'. It introduces broader and more diverse views to the discipline based on empirical data obtained from a wide spectrum of sources from around the world. At first glance this appears a reasonable and commendable task; it provides the first multi-authored edited compendium of LL as a canonical exposé of the field and puts forward many suggestions as to what the field in its various possible manifestations may amount to. As a whole, this book takes a broad definition and stance on what LL's relevance is to applied linguistics, sociolinguistics, language planning and semiotic interpretations of language in the public sphere. This is a worthy venture, as any sub-discipline needs to put forward its initial claims, assumptions and research foci in order to lay the foundations for future work. The breadth and eclecticism the editors have attempted to reach have often left the focus of the work as a whole unclear and the research depth and applicability to the field of linguistics somewhat vague at times. This does not, however, detract from the ambitiousness of the editors in managing to synthesise pressing issues in LL across the 20 chapters into a reasonably coherent thread.

The problematic of defining the field of LL and utilising its epistemology and methods beyond 'simply a collection of somewhat disparate methodologies' (p. 25) appears to be a current fundamental weakness of LL. What this existing limitation does provide though is a clear set of possible directions LL could take in order to become not only more recognised within sociolinguistics but also more stringent as a research field in its own right. This is where Shohamy and Gorter's skills as editors to utilize the topics and space in this volume to demonstrate the strengths and weakness of LL lead to support the possibility of more stringent LL methodologies. Topics which receive special attention are Cenoz and Gorter's language economy and LL, Hult's consideration of language ecology and landscape analysis, Pennycook's 'graffscapes' (graffiti landscapes) and Kallen's tourism and LL. Spolsky's assertion that research hitherto in LL has been scattered in various places warrants his concern that LL as a discipline in its own right is still only in its formative years and that this volume is an attempt to define the field and investigate and develop a methodology and theory of LL. He addresses several limitations within the field such as basing conclusions from observing, counting and photographing actual finished signs rather than the production of signs and the political and sociolinguistic background behind their production. The collection of color plates illustrates the aesthetic appeal LL has in appealing to other research areas outside of linguistics including architecture and urban and rural landscape appraisal and management. It is also apparent that Shohamy and Gorter's volume is not only to be read by linguists but is also relevant to language philosophers through to sociologists and city planners.

While the title of Jaworski and Thurlow's volume *Semiotic Landscapes, Language, Image, Space* introduces a more semantic 'semiosis' of a LL, like Shohamy and Gorter's book, this volume takes the study of language and landscape beyond its more traditional foundations in art history and human geography to its more discursive applications and underpinnings in applied

linguistics and the social sciences. *Semiotic Landscapes* (SL) emphasises the utility of the role visual subcultures play in mediating and being mediated by language in the human and natural environment. This is generally seen through the eye of the camera in, for example, identity creation through language in use in signage creation and interpretation. The method SL advocates is similar to LL – the camera, the photograph and the observer are media through which linguistic data is captured and appraisals of landscape are made.

SL presents 13 chapters using varied approaches as a call for us as researchers and individuals not just to be mere consumers of space, place, language, environment and topos but rather to become active observers in the political, social, linguistic and even existential methods institutions use to colonise space and landscape in the modern world. The position taken by authors in SL embraces the changing linguistic and semiotic nature of the world of communication (e.g. Coupland's chapter), of travel (e.g. Sebba's and Piller's chapters) and the ways we as users and utilizers of the power of language and the linguistic landscape of (particularly) urban areas (e.g. Dray's chapter) negotiate space and power relationships through language. A semiotic approach to conceiving space and 'spatialization' enables this volume's inclusive spectrum to consider several differing perspectives, e.g. sociological considerations of nation and language building and anthropological implications of the relationship of language to human geography and spatial relations. This diversity is witnessed in the eclectic nature of the authorship and the topics covered in this volume.

SL furthers sociolinguistic research by showing empirically how speech variation can be linked explicitly to dynamic conceptions of space and place-creation and the relationship between identity, cultural forms and spatial narratives. Like LL as presented in Shohamy and Gorter's volume, SL claims that the meaning and power of semiotic relations between things and people are derived from the speech and environment in which they exist. Where Shohamy and Gorter's volume leads the reader to look deeper into purposeful language use reified through 'langscaping', and while both volumes share a similar epistemology, Jaworski and Thurlow's compendium 'expands the scenery' of LL significantly by claiming that spaces and environments apparently 'vibe' and attract the linguistic and semiotic activities which take place therein, i.e. spaces are 'semiotized' into place through linguistic imaging and imagining. It is this dialectic – the relationship between sign and the space which is signified – which is of importance and relevance to further more conceptual and even esoteric work into LL and SL.

The appearance in this journal of several papers (e.g. Leeman and Modan 2009; Stroud and Mpendukana 2009) and reviews (e.g. Coupland 2008) dealing with topics relevant to LL suggests that LL will play an important role in developing more intricate methodologies and theory creation within applied linguistics in the future. With several streams at international conferences (e.g. the recent Trends in Toponymy series in Edinburgh and various LL presentations



at the International Congress of Onomastic Sciences, 2011, in Barcelona), which have dealt specifically with LL, LL as a research area is in an expansive and experimental stage. These two volumes go a fair way to establishing LL and its related offshoot SL as a worthy sub-discipline of applied linguistics. Because the chapters presented in these two volumes are so diverse and as the authors tackle issues often not considered central to linguistics or sociolinguistics, these works will form a part of the preliminary canon for students and researchers in LL.

## REFERENCES

- Coupland, Nikolas. 2008. Review of Peter Backhaus *Linguistic Landscapes: A Comparative Analysis of Urban Multilingualism in Tokyo* and Durk Gorter *Linguistic Landscape: A New Approach to Multilingualism*. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 12: 250–254.
- Leeman, Jennifer and Gabriella Modan. 2009. Commodified language in Chinatown: A contextualized approach to linguistic landscape. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 13: 332–362.
- Stroud, Christopher and Sibonile Mpendukana. 2009. Towards a material ethnography of linguistic landscape: Multilingualism, mobility and space in a South African township. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 13: 363–386.

JOSHUA NASH  
 University of Adelaide  
 Napier Building Level 9  
 SA 5005 Australia  
 joshua.nash@adelaide.edu.au

TOVE SKUTNABB-KANGAS and ROBERT DUNBAR. *Indigenous Children's Education as Linguistic Genocide and a Crime against Humanity? A Global View*. Gáldu Čála, Journal of Indigenous Peoples Rights No.1/2010 NO 9520. Guovdageaidnu-Kautokeino, Norway: Gáldu-Resource Centre for the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. 2010. 126 pp. Pb (9788281440494).

Reviewed by MIKLÓS KONTRA

This book has been published by Gáldu, an independent Resource Centre for the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, located in Finnmark County, Norway and funded by two ministries of the Norwegian government ([www.galdu.org](http://www.galdu.org)). The first author, Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, is a sociolinguist and educationist, based in Denmark, about whom Colin Baker wrote that her 'contribution to the survival of minority languages in the world in three decades has been truly unique' (2001: 279). Robert Dunbar is a human rights lawyer, a speaker of and activist for the protection of Scottish Gaelic, based in Aberdeen. These two are a rare and very welcome team, because few are the sociolinguists and lawyers who talk to each other and hence understand the issues in depth that they talk or write about.

Their book provides a global overview of educational policies and practice which may well be regarded as a crime against humanity. The thrust of the book concerns submersion education. The book is partially based on two Expert papers (of which Skutnabb-Kangas and Dunbar were the main authors) for the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, prepared in 2005 and 2008.

Right at the beginning, in the Foreword (p. 5), the authors make clear their standpoint by quoting Archbishop Desmond Tutu of South Africa: 'If you are neutral in situations of injustice, you have chosen the side of the oppressor. If an elephant has its foot on the tail of a mouse, and you say that you are neutral, the mouse will not appreciate your neutrality.'

Some readers of this journal may not be familiar with what 'submersion education' means; for them I quote the authors: 'submersion-type approaches whereby the curriculum is taught exclusively through the medium of the State language and minority children are integrated into classes with children of the majority are not in line with international standards' (p. 25). Such dominant-language medium education oftentimes effectively prevents access to education, 'because of the linguistic, pedagogical and psychological barriers it creates' (p. 11). Submersion education is subtractive: in it children are taught the state/official language at the cost of their mother tongue, hence it is a major causal factor of language shift.

Where is submersion education practiced? Almost everywhere in the world. Skutnabb-Kangas and Dunbar take their examples from:

- Belgium (in 1968 the European Court of Human Rights ruled that the right to education did not include the right to be taught in the language of parents' choice);
- the U.S.A. (Lau v. Nichols, 1974);
- the Czech Republic (the Ostrava Case of 2007);
- Australia (where the Federal Court recently awarded \$64,000 to a 12-year-old boy for future economic losses caused by his school not providing a sign language interpreter);
- Turkey (the Kurds);
- Canadian residential schools for First Nations children (Native American Indians);
- Finnish immigrant minority children in Sweden;
- India (where 'there is a wastage of 92% in the dominant-language school education for the tribal groups', p. 52);
- China (where 'Uyghur kids are now being educated to be qualified slaves who master the Han Chinese language but nothing else', p. 55);
- Norway (where Norwegianisation went hand in hand with the extinction of Saami languages, p. 65); and
- many other countries on all continents.

The positive examples, where the right to mother-tongue-medium education is respected, are much fewer. In Papua New Guinea (850 languages for some six million people) an early-exit transitional program, which is a weak form of mother-tongue based multilingual education, was introduced, i.e. 380 languages were used as the media of education for preschool and the first two grades. Klaus (2003) has shown very positive results. Skutnabb-Kangas and Dunbar rightly state that if Papua New Guinea can do it, 'no other country can claim they do not have the resources to at least start maintaining and developing all their languages' (p. 74).

Why are such forms of education tolerated? After all, the authors convincingly argue that at least some forms of submersion education may constitute crimes against humanity in the legal sense (p. 90). They also cite Thomas and Collier (2002: 7), the largest longitudinal study in the world on the education of minority students, who state that 'the strongest predictor of L2 student achievement is the amount of formal L1 [medium] schooling. The more L1 [medium] grade-level schooling, the higher L2 achievement.' Skutnabb-Kangas and Dunbar also cite Grin's study (2003: 26), according to which 'there are strong [economic] grounds to suppose that protecting and promoting regional and minority languages is a sound idea from a welfare standpoint, not even taking into consideration any moral argument.' The often-heard question of whether states can afford mother-tongue based multilingual education should be asked differently: how can *any* state afford *not* to implement it? Well, several answers are offered: few linguistic majority speakers if any are sensitive to the issues of language deprivation because it is unknown to them; in major debates important for indigenous and tribal peoples, their voices have been more or less completely absent; linguicism is a much more sophisticated way of preventing the use of a language than brutal, open prevention through jailing or torture; governments are aware of the adverse effects of forcing minority children to be educated through the medium of the dominant language, but can successfully claim the opposite; etc.

In the final chapter, Skutnabb-Kangas and Dunbar discuss what forms of education would be consistent with law and research, and offer eight recommendations, of which I mention the first two: (1) the mother tongue should be the main teaching language for the first eight years; and (2) good teaching of a dominant local or national language should include competent bilingual teachers, and the L2 should not be studied as if it were the pupils' L1.

Finally, in my view, this book should be read by linguists who are under-informed or 'neutral' concerning the issues of language survival, including the survival of non-standard varieties of 'safe' languages. It should also be read by sociologists, lawyers, educationists, and, *horribile dictu*, politicians.

## REFERENCES

- Baker, Colin. 2001. Review of Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, *Linguistic Genocide in Education – or Worldwide Diversity and Human Rights?* *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 5: 279–283.
- Grin, François. 2003. Language planning and economics. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 4: 1–66.
- Klaus, David. 2003. The use of indigenous languages in early basic education in Papua New Guinea: A model for elsewhere? *Language and Education* 17: 105–111.
- Thomas, Wayne P. and Virginia P. Collier. 2002. *A National Study of School Effectiveness for Language Minority Students' Long-Term Academic Achievement*. George Mason University, CREDE (Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence). Last accessed at [http://www.crede.ucsc.edu/research/llaa/1.1\\_final.html](http://www.crede.ucsc.edu/research/llaa/1.1_final.html)

MIKLÓS KONTRA

*Department of English Language Teacher Education and Applied Linguistics*  
*University of Szeged*  
 H-6722 Szeged, Egyetem u. 2.  
 Hungary  
 kontra@lit.u-szeged.hu

DOUGLAS BIBER and SUSAN CONRAD. *Register, Genre, and Style*. New York: Cambridge University Press. 2009. 354 pp. Hb (9780521860604) \$71.00.

Reviewed by VIJAY K. BHATIA

*Register, Genre, and Style* is an impressive text-book authored by two well-established scholars in the field. Although the three concepts that are the focus of this book are not easy to deal with, particularly within the scope of a text-book, the authors, nevertheless, have made a very creditable attempt.

The book has been divided into three main parts, in addition to the initial chapter, which opens with an introduction to register, genre, and style as the three fundamental functional varieties of language. Although the introductory chapter mentions and discusses these three kinds of variation in the use of language, often making comparisons across them, the focus seems to be primarily on register. There is also a useful comparison between registers, on the one hand, and dialects, on the other. The authors clearly state the focus of the book in their overview, when they say, ‘... our primary focus is on the analysis of registers, because that perspective can be applied to any text sample’ (p. 25), a statement, one may be tempted to claim, equally applicable to the other two concepts of genre and style, though in different ways and to varying degrees. In fact, all the three concepts representing functional variation have their strong points and equally well have their specific limitations. However, the book makes use of register as the main perspective on functional variation in the use of English language. Situational features of registers have been presented as more basic than the linguistic characteristics, as they rightly point out that language

is always used in specific contexts. Linguistic considerations are seen as the consequence of a specific selection of situational features, though registers, on the surface, invariably differ in terms of their characteristic *distributions* of statistically significant or predominant linguistic features.

Part I of the book focuses mainly on the analytical framework that the authors propose for the analysis of language use as registers, and consists of two chapters; the first one describing situational characteristics of registers, and the second one actually focusing on the analysis of linguistic characteristics, including their functions. Often in some of the chapters, for instance in chapter two, in a section on the identification of registers the authors discuss the role of cultures and claim that 'often members of a culture distinguish two different registers by their communicative purposes' (p. 35), which reminds one of a typical definition of genres in similar terms. This does become somewhat confusing when one is making a distinction between registers and genres. To me it appears to be the consequence of conceptualising register rather too optimistically and ambitiously to cover all possibilities. Another statement that becomes somewhat problematic in this context is the statement on p. 36, which claims that 'effective register analyses are always comparative. It is virtually impossible to know what is distinctive about a particular register without comparing it with other registers'. Such categorical general claims can be problematic, in particular, when dealing with concepts like register, genre, or style, all of which have been variously defined, used, and exploited in earlier studies. The framework for the analysis of situational characteristics typically resembles the Hymesian tradition (Hymes 1974) for the analysis of context of communication, comprising participants, participant relations, channel, setting, communicative purposes and topic.

Chapter three discusses and elaborates on the framework for linguistic analysis of register and is based on three pre-requisites, i.e. a representative sample of texts, quantitative analysis, and a comparative approach. There is also an interesting observation, that register and style markers are pervasive, whereas genre markers normally occur only once in a text. Many people working in genre framework may find this quite puzzling, but one has to see it in the context of the framework proposed in the book, which points out that genre analysis deals primarily with conventions and rhetorical organisation, and register analysis with linguistic realisations. This view once again may create difficulties for those familiar with different genre frameworks. An informative section of the chapter is the one that shows the relationship between situational characteristics of register and its specific functional relationship with linguistic features. The Appendix to this chapter also has a useful list of linguistic features that can be investigated in register analysis. The chapter also introduces corpus linguistics, which forms the basis of analysis of registers in Part II of the book.

Part II is the most detailed section of the book, comprising chapters four to seven. Chapter four on the analysis of spoken registers is relatively brief and for

most part focuses on casual conversation, which is perhaps most problematic of all spoken registers. It does consider a few other spoken registers from more restricted situational contexts, and more conventionalised service encounters for comparative purposes. Once again, the boundaries between register and genre seem to be blurred. The student activities throughout the book are interesting and very useful aspects of the book, most of which are carefully selected to give further practice to intended readers.

Chapter five analyses several examples of registers, mostly from newspaper and academic contexts. These two registers also make it possible for the authors to take a relatively less problematic comparative view. Within these analyses, there is some discussion of comparative analysis of what some people will identify as genres, in particular the research article introduction, which is analysed both as genre and register. However, from a typical genre perspective in the Swalesian tradition (Swales 1990), the suggested distinctions may appear somewhat blurred and perhaps artificially drawn. The approach adopted in the book justifies this distinction conceptually by considering register classification at different levels of specificity, but the same principle applies to genre as well, which can be posited at various levels of specificity. One may find this overlapping or blurring across register and genre, and perhaps to some extent also style, somewhat puzzling. It might be the case that some readers take the impression that it would have been better to stick to register for the entire book.

Chapter six deals with the issue of historical developments in style, genre, and register in a range of texts, particularly taking illustrations from fictional writing, on the one hand, and research articles, on the other. Fictional genres are less likely to display changes in textual conventions, and hence the genre perspective is more likely to show consistency in textual practices; as a consequence, one can see the analysis of rhetorical conventions in this chapter is much less accessible in fictional genres than in non-fictional genres such as research article introduction. I am not sure if such complexities can be as easily understood as the analysis of registers in the same chapter. Stylistic differences can still be easy to appreciate as is true of register differences, but genre is a different category as the focus is on rhetorical organisation, and hence becomes somewhat problematic when one considers fictional and non-fictional genres for comparative purposes. This is quite true of some of the examples chosen for analysis (p. 145). On the other hand, the historical development of research genres is more convincing, both as genre and register. Analytical differences in registers, presented on pages 165–173, are very revealing and insightful.

Chapter seven then moves to a rather different form of communication, i.e. electronic registers and genres. The chapter provides very interesting and valuable analyses of some of the frequently used electronic forms of communication, some of them not yet well-established as genres, but as registers they give excellent analyses. The chapter is very interesting in this respect, especially confirming some of the general impressions such as the verbal nature



of conversation and e-mails as compared with academic discourse, and disproves the general impression that academic discourse will have more nouns than will e-mail to strangers (p. 187). As far as the genre markers are concerned, the only rhetorical markers that are presented as significant are the opening address and the closing signatures. Thus, where the rhetorical organisation is concerned these genres are still not firmly conventionalised, and hence not easily amenable to the analysis of rhetorical conventions. The chapter, however, is thought-provoking, the analysis displaying interesting relationships between situation and linguistic features.

Part III of the book is devoted to the discussion of more general theoretical issues in the form of chapter eight on 'Multidimensional patterns of register variation' and chapter nine on 'Register studies in context'. Part III is the most insightful and convincing section of the book and perhaps challenging as well, so far as the intended readers of the book are concerned. It offers a multidimensional analysis and comparison of several registers along a number of linguistic features, and is in line with some of the most impressive studies that Biber has published in recent years. This section also shows very convincingly the value of multidimensional corpus analysis of registers along a number of different parameters, especially spoken versus written.

In spite of some of the minor conceptual issues, on the whole, this book is a very valuable contribution to the analysis of registers in its various aspects of situational and linguistic features, especially to multidimensional analysis. Based on a sound theoretical framework for the analysis of registers in their multiple realisations and various other aspects, such as situational, linguistic, as well as functional, the book presents theoretical and practical insights in very accessible language, with effective displays of student activity sections in each chapter to give its intended audiences a very accessible format that combines the theory and practice of corpus-based linguistic analysis, all into one package. It is a very effective tool for all those who are interested in learning corpus analytical tools to investigate functional variation in language use in order to study form-function correlations across a broad range of registers.

## REFERENCES

- Hymes, Dell. 1974. *Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach*. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Swales, John M. 1990. *Genre Analysis: English for Academic and Research Settings*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

VIJAY K. BHATIA  
City University of Hong Kong  
83 Tat Chee Avenue, Kowloon  
Hong Kong  
enbhatia@cityu.edu.hk

LIESELOTTE ANDERWALD. *The Morphology of English Dialects: Verb-Formation in Non-Standard English*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press. 2009. xviii + 221 pp. Hb (9780521884976) \$126.00.

Reviewed by LAURIE BAUER

Despite its title, this book deals with the historical development of verb inflection in English, with a focus on the development of verb forms which are found in the regional dialects of England. It claims to show that dialectal inflected forms of verbs are 'justified' (presumably in historical terms). In this review, I shall give a brief summary of the chapters, and then make some overall remarks about the book.

In Chapter 1, 'Introduction' (pp. 1–16), Anderwald introduces her terminology – all irregular verbs of English are termed 'strong', and these are contrasted with the regular 'weak' verbs – and her fundamental classification of verbs, which is based on that of Quirk et al. (1985), i.e. centring round the identity or non-identity of the three principle parts of the strong verbs. She also introduces the Freiburg English Dialect Corpus (FRED), which she uses for some of her data.

Chapter 2, 'Past tense theories' (pp. 17–48), presents a broad introduction to the way in which irregular verb forms have been or can be tackled theoretically. The review goes from Chomsky and Halle's approach, through the approach of Lexical Morphology, to Pinker's dual route and connectionism, to Natural Morphology, the model that Anderwald prefers.

In Chapter 3, 'Naturalness and the English past tense system' (pp. 49–65), Anderwald develops the classification of the standard forms of verbs within the Quirk et al. system, and finishes with some overview of the types of variation found in dialects. There is little recognition of the variation within standard English(es), or of the major problems of the classification caused by the fact that the identities of the various terms in the three-term paradigm, the patterns of vowel change and the presence of a plusive versus a nasal suffix for the past participle seem to be orthogonally distinct dimensions of classification.

In the next three chapters, Anderwald considers three distinct patterns of inflection. In Chapter 4, '*Sellt* and *knowed*: non-standard weak verbs' (pp. 66–97), it is suggested that the regular verbs found only in non-standard dialects are relics from an earlier period and that, usually, high frequency protects strong forms. It is pointed out that, contrary to the universal predictions of Natural Morphology, there is little evidence of a general shift to weak verbs. There is no focus on causation here: why would *catch* become irregular as recently as the 19th century and why would *blowed* be rejected in the standard? In Chapter 5, '*Drunk*, *seen*, *done* and *eat*: two-part paradigms instead of three-part paradigms' (pp. 98–148), another set of relics is introduced – some of them surprising, except in the so-called Bybee verbs like *string-strung-strung*. These verbs are called Bybee verbs because they have been discussed by Joan Bybee in a number of publications, e.g. Bybee and Moder (1983). The non-standard forms discussed adhere more closely to the weak verb pattern of  $\text{PRES} \neq \text{PAST} = \text{PARTICIPLE}$  than do the standard

forms. In Chapter 6, 'Come and run: non-standard strong verbs with a one-part paradigm' (pp. 149–182), it is suggested that non-standard *come* and *run* may be added to the class of Bybee verbs by virtue of their past and participial forms.

In Chapter 7, 'Conclusion: supralocalization and morphological theories' (pp. 183–197), the weakness of predictions based on universal notions of naturalness is repeated, yet it is concluded that supra-localized non-standard forms are more natural than their standard counterparts, and gain covert prestige if used in the London area (p. 186).

The book finishes with two appendices (a verb classification and a key to the localities used in the Survey of English Dialects), a reference list and an index.

Although the title of the book appears to promise consideration of the morphological principles involved in this area of English inflection, and some insight into the theoretical discussion of variation in this system, these are given disappointingly brief coverage, without new insights. Anderwald's focus is on a detailed historical analysis of the verbs she considers, seeking the sources of the range of forms found. Much of this is fascinating, but the biggest theoretical message that this reader came away with is that each word has its own history (an observation Anderwald attributes to Grimm 1819: xiv).

By studying a relatively small set of verbs that show variation in a small set of varieties of English, it seems to me that Anderwald disregards a lot of variation which would make her study more interesting and exhaustive. Recently, I overheard a young Canadian woman saying 'If you'd phoned me, I so totally would have came.' There is no mention of past participle *came* in this book (unfortunately, I did not hear what the woman concerned used for the past tense of the same verb). Neither is there much (in some instances any) coverage of verbs like *beat*, *bet*, *bite*, *cleave*, *dive*, *heave*, *hide*, *shear*, *shine*, *shit*, *speed*, *spit*, *stride*, *strive*, *tread*, *wake* where there is variation in contemporary English, sometimes within a standard variety, sometimes across varieties. Part of the difficulty here is that corpora tend to be of standard varieties and often miss rare forms. Whatever the reason, there is more going on in the inflection of English strong verbs than we are shown here.

## REFERENCES

- Bybee, Joan and Carol Lynn Moder. 1983. Morphological classes as natural categories. *Language* 59: 251–270.
- Grimm, Jacob. 1819. *Deutsche Grammatik* (volume 1). Göttingen, Germany: Dieterich.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech and Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. Harlow, U.K.: Longman.

Laurie Bauer  
Victoria University of Wellington  
PO Box 600  
Wellington 6140  
New Zealand  
laurie.bauer@vuw.ac.nz

GUUS EXTRA, MASSIMILIANO SPOTTI and PIET VAN AVERMAET (eds.). *Language Testing, Migration and Citizenship*. London: Continuum Press. 2009. 268 pp. Hb (9781847063458) US \$170.00.

Reviewed by YOUNGSHIN CHI and FRED DAVIDSON

*Language Testing, Migration and Citizenship* is an edited volume that depicts sociolinguistic views on language tests, civic integration and citizenship in different countries across the world. Various immigration cases in different countries are explored to, in turn, explain the patterns of immigration and language testing policies in each location. Chapter authors also address the impact of language tests upon integration and assimilation of identity within various countries as well as the reasons for testing for such purposes. The authors explain these cases by investigating the geographic and historical contexts on migration and citizenship in each case.

The book is divided into two sections: case studies in Europe and case studies in four other countries. Following an introductory chapter by the editors, the first section of the book features descriptions of eight European countries or regions, respectively: the Baltic (authored by Gabrielle Hogan-Brun); Sweden (Lilian Nygren-Junkin); the U.K. (Adrian Blackledge); Germany (Patrick Stevenson and Livia Schanze); Belgium (Piet Van Avermaet and Sara Gysen); the Netherlands (Guus Extra and Massimiliano Spotti); Luxembourg (Kristine Horner); and Spain (Dick Vigers and Clare Mar-Moliner). Themes uncovered in these chapters touch on EU enlargement and the increase of migration rates across Europe, consequent issues of immigration, achievement of citizenship, and obstacles to it because of second language deficiency. The second part of the book treats language testing and civic integration in countries outside of Europe: the U.S.A (Tammy Gales); Canada (Lilian Nygren-Junkin); Australia (Tim McNamara); and Israel (Elana Shohamy and Tzahi Kanza). Unlike cases in Europe, these countries have dealt with different issues of civic integration historically and have had a strong role for language testing.

One effect of the book is to compare and to contrast between the EU and 'cases abroad' (to borrow from the title of the second section). This book highlights different patterns of European migrations and civic integration between super-diversity which, in turn, contrasts old immigrants and new immigrants in Europe. This pattern of immigration is somewhat different to that of the United States or Canada because Europe has a much longer history of religious emigration, race relations, and economic immigration.

In all countries discussed in the book, the national language is an influential apparatus in acquiring citizenship. Politicians promote assimilation between nationals and immigrants by introducing language tests in citizenship procedures. To pursue civic integration, some countries are particularly eager to use a language test as leverage to control numbers of immigrants. The United Kingdom is a representative case. Adrian Blackledge (author of the U.K.

chapter) shows how the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) is reflected in a new language-testing regime for citizenship applicants; according to Blackledge, the CEFR does not aid social cohesion but rather presents as a threat to it. Unlike the United Kingdom case, Nygren-Junkin shows that Sweden has policies to emphasize Swedish to new settlers without formal testing as a tool to coalesce citizenship. In Sweden, although the use of language tests is increasing, it is a matter of staying in the country for five years to get permanent resident status.

The book includes cases that reveal debates on migration and citizenship using a national language, and in so doing, the role of testing in such debates. The following two cases exemplify such debates. First, Stevenson and Schanze look into the case of Germany to grasp the relationship between language and integration, and in addition, they examine the tension between local and national levels of policy discourse. After German reunification, several political issues have been invoked. Language was one of them, in particular, with reference to the national language and to its curriculum development and citizenship testing. Stevenson and Schanze describe the political climate changes and the policy changes on testing citizenship and language curriculum development. They also present a case study of language policy in a multilingual school in Berlin to illustrate the tensions between local and national levels of policy. Unlike the German case, Van Avermaet and Gysen show that Belgium has a policy shift due to geographical influences. What made Belgium differ from other cases in the book was that the role of language for integration was different among the various national regions. The Belgian language policy yielded benefit to immigrants but also created structural discrimination among minority groups.

Two relatively minor oversights seem apparent. First, several chapters in the book refer to the CEFR, and perhaps a chapter about that influential framework would have been helpful. Doing so would allow discussion of its consequences. Second, a key question is often left unanswered in most chapters of the book: when testing does play a critical role in national language policies, how do policy makers set the bar (decide a score on a particular test) for immigrants to achieve citizenship? Greater discussion of this point would yield deeper insight into the various countries under discussion.

Perhaps the greatest omission in the book is that it does not dedicate a chapter (or two) to the story of a particular test. Doing so would unpack some influential immigration test and hence aid understanding of the consequences of that particular sample test, of how its eventual use did or did not affect the test's development, and hence, provide some unique and novel view of its broader policy setting – an analysis of this type is what Elatia (2003) calls 'test deconstruction'.

Instead of a chapter about a particular test, the book is arranged by country or region. Why is this? Perhaps it reflects a certain *realpolitik* of language test use in

national settings: the test is seen as a tool, perhaps unquestioned, but typically not itself the focus of enquiry. The test is a part of a larger national organism, as reflected in a powerful analogy in Horner's chapter. She translates a poem cited in a newspaper editorial written in Luxembourgish: 'You may like French or German, but what you must honour is our language because it is the [bone] marrow of the little country of Luxembourg.' She prefaces that quotation with the following remark: '[Q]uestions regarding the nature of language testing are positioned differently than those raised by the opponents of [a language test] requirement because the authors [of letters to the editor in newspapers] do not challenge the validity of the procedure' (p. 162).

The validity of a testing procedure is an important concern to all test developers, and validation involves attending to test consequences. Modern test validity theory takes the consequences of a test as part of the ethical responsibility of the test developer (Messick 1989; International Language Testing Association 2000: Principle 8). We should consider the effects of our tests as we develop them, even building those consequences into the design of actual test items and tasks (Fulcher and Davidson 2007: 144). To us, this is not ever at issue. Whether or not a language tester personally opposes or supports particular language policies, the validity of tests utilized in those policies is always subject to criticism, and that critical analysis must include test consequences. The marrow is always open to debate. Had this book told the story of a particular test, perhaps this ethic would have emerged. As practicing language test developers, at least, we hope so.

## REFERENCES

- Elatia, Samira. 2003. History of the Baccalaureat: A study of the interaction between educational legislation, government policy, and language theory in the national language examination. Unpublished PhD dissertation. Urbana-Champaign, Illinois: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Fulcher, Glenn and Fred Davidson. 2007. *Language Testing and Assessment: An Advanced Resource Book*. London, U.K.: Routledge.
- International Language Testing Association. 2000. *Code of Ethics*. Last accessed at <http://iltaonline.com/> ('Publications')
- Messick, Samuel. 1989. Validity. In Robert L. Linn (ed.) *Educational Measurement* (3rd edition). New York: Macmillan/American Council on Education. 13–103.

YOUNGSHIN CHI AND FRED DAVIDSON  
 Department of Linguistics  
 University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign  
 707 S. Mathews Avenue, room 4080  
 Urbana, IL, 61801  
 U.S.A.  
 ychi1@illinois.edu, fgd@illinois.edu



STAVROULA TSIPLAKOU, MARILENA KARYOLEMOU and PAVLOS PAVLOU (eds.), *Language Variation – European Perspectives II*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands/Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: John Benjamins. 2009. 242 pp. Hb (9789027234858) \$149.00.

Reviewed by NAOMI NAGY

This volume contains 18 papers from the 4th International Conference on Language Variation in Europe, held in Nicosia, Cypress in 2007. The introduction summarizes each article and helpfully categorizes the languages, patterns and linguistic levels examined (p. 2). The range of languages show the current state of language variation study in Europe to be a better match to the 'real world' (where some 6,000 languages are used and at least half the population is bilingual from childhood) than a sample from *Language Variation and Change* and *Journal of Sociolinguistics* volumes representing current North American practices, where few variationist studies investigate languages beyond English, Spanish and French and most look at (presumed) monolingual speakers (Nagy and Meyerhoff 2008a: 8–9, 2008b).

As the Introduction notes, many of these articles exemplify 'the meaningful interchange of ideas between theoretical and field linguistics' (p. 9). A second claim of the Introduction is for 'explicit concern with methodological refinement' (p. 9). While several authors focus on methodological refinement (Hinskens and van Oostendorp on inter-transcriber effects, Joseph on local vs. broader views of dialectology, Moisl on 'noise' in nearly categorical variables, Schwarz and Steck on combining real and apparent time analyses), we see as many methods as variables and little concern with replicating methods to ensure comparability.

The range of approaches is broad: sixteen papers report on an (or several) specific linguistic variable(s), while one (Papapavlou and Sophocleous) reports on linguistic attitudes and one (Moisl) does not specify the 156 variables considered. Six report variants without quantification, nine report raw numbers or percentages, three of these provide significance statistics, and the three others report outcomes of multivariate analyses where the correlation to linguistic and social factors may be understood and the strength of the contributing factors interpreted. This is not meant as a criticism of this volume, still early in its series; as this conference and publication series extend into the future, greater convergence may appear.

I next comment on issues specific to individual papers. The range of comments exemplifies the range of approaches.

Baider investigates practices for referring to male vs. female politicians in French newspapers, e.g. first vs. last name, co-occurrence with various semantic features or in specific syntactic contexts. The analysis compares references to Sarkozy, a well-known male incumbent with a distinctive name and Royal, a lesser-known (at the time of candidacy), female non-incumbent with a more common name. Thus, there are many factors besides sex which could account for

the differences in referring practices. This shortcoming is less serious in the first set of data reported (from an earlier publication), where three male and three female politicians are contrasted. However, these percentages are reported without information about which percentages, if any, differ significantly. Promising areas for future research abound to understand the effects of the 2000 French law requiring an equal number of male and female candidates to stand for each office (p. 27).

Coupé examines double modal constructions in Dutch, contrasting Dutch to English where she says double modals do not appear. Mishoe and Montgomery (1994) cite some twenty studies of multiple modal constructions such as *might could* in Southern American English.

De Vogelaer investigates the applicability of the Transmission vs. Diffusion dichotomy described in Labov (2007) to a morphological variable: gender change in Belgian Dutch. Because of the small number of samples in some cells (cf. p. 76: Table 3), the results are hard to interpret; this leaves it unclear whether the extension from phonology to morphology is appropriate.

Maglara presents age-graded patterns of use of certain suffixes as evidence of language attrition. Two issues arise. First, the youngest age group (10–30) is reported to be all ‘rememberers’ or ‘people who know only a few words,’ while the middle group comprises ‘semi-speakers’ and the oldest group, age 51–80, consists of ‘speakers with full command of the language’ (p. 146–148). From the description it is not clear if this is a representative sample of the population or if older ‘rememberers’ and/or younger fluent speakers exist. Second, speakers change across their lifespan. As a relevant case in point, comparison of the reports of minority language usage across age groups reported by Kattenbusch (1979: 145), Nagy (1996: 84) and Perta (2010: 216) suggests that the children and teens who did not actively use Faetar in one study grew into the fluent adult speakers found in the next study. (Given the small population of Faeto, <800, <100 children and adolescents, many of the same people must have been sampled in the different studies.) Maglara’s youngest age group includes pre-adolescents who may similarly change language use patterns as they become adults.

Moisl reminds us of the need to use data which do not exhibit (near-) categorical trends, illustrating how eliminating variables with sparse data improves his models. This is an elegant illustration except for the (possibly unavoidable) strong correlation between two of the three social factors considered: with one exception, every speaker in the ‘Administrative’ category for Occupation falls in the ‘Additional’ category for Education.

Papapavlou and Sophocleous summarize self-reports of attitude but their methods are not clear enough to determine whether the stimuli consisted of actual speech excerpts or respondents simply reported their attitudes about various groups. There is further confusion in the reported results: it appears that a pattern which is reported ‘impossible’ by the participants on p. 185

is documented on p. 184 (in a sample which the participants on p. 185 heard).

Schwarz and Torres Cacoulos both provide clear methods and convincing evidence, suggesting approaches that could be used for other studies.

Zabrodska identifies some problems in applying various models of code-switching to situations where there is ongoing convergence between languages. As she notes, resolving these issues is important because language 'convergence is connected to [code-switching] and via that to language change' (p. 238).

These final comments support my overall evaluation that this is a useful, well-edited book, easy to read and navigate, and with a minimum of typos and a maximum of interesting, innovative articles.

## REFERENCES

- Kattenbusch, Dieter. 1979. Faeto und Celle: Frankoprovenzalische Sprachkolonie in Südtalien. Ein Beitrag zur soziolinguistik. In Schwarze (ed.) *Italienische Sprachwissenschaft*. Saarbrücken, Germany: Tübingen. 135–146.
- Labov, William. 2007. Transmission and diffusion. *Language* 83: 344–387.
- Mishoe, Margaret and Michael Montgomery. 1994. The pragmatics of multiple modal variation in North and South Carolina. *American Speech* 69: 3–29. Last accessed 17 January 2011 at <http://www.jstor.org/stable/455947>
- Nagy, Naomi. 1996. Language contact and language change in the Faetar speech community. Unpublished PhD dissertation. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania, Institute for Research in Cognitive Science. Technical Report 96–08. Last accessed at <http://www.ircs.upenn.edu/library/index.shtml>.
- Nagy, Naomi and Miriam Meyerhoff. 2008a. The social lives of linguistics. In Miriam Meyerhoff and Naomi Nagy (eds.) *Social Lives in Language – Sociolinguistics and Multilingual Speech Communities*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins. 1–17.
- Nagy, Naomi and Miriam Meyerhoff. 2008b. The love that dare not speak its name – the fascination with monolingual speech communities in sociolinguistics. Paper presented at *NWAV 37*, 6–9 November, Houston, Texas. Last accessed 17 January 2011 at [http://projects.chass.utoronto.ca/ngn/pdf/NN&MM\\_monolingual\\_poster.pdf](http://projects.chass.utoronto.ca/ngn/pdf/NN&MM_monolingual_poster.pdf)
- Perta, Carmela. 2010. La varietà francoprovenzale della Puglia: tra mantenimento e perdita linguistica. In Maria Iliescu, Heidi Siller-Runggaldier and Paul Danler (eds.) *Actes du XXVe Congrès International de Linguistique et de Philologie Romanes, vol. I*. Berlin, Germany: De Gruyter. 215–222.

NAOMI NAGY  
 University of Toronto  
 Department of Linguistics  
 4070 Sidney Smith Hall  
 100 St. George Street  
 Toronto, ON M5S 3G3  
 Canada  
[naomi.nagy@utoronto.ca](mailto:naomi.nagy@utoronto.ca)

R. LARRY TRASK. *Why Do Languages Change?* Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press. 2010. 198 pp. Hb (9780521838023) \$85.00 / Pb (9780521546935) \$27.99.

Reviewed by DANIEL R. DAVIS

Robert Larry Trask (1944–2004) was Professor of Linguistics at Sussex University and a specialist in historical linguistics and the Basque language. Robert McColl Millar, who revised the nearly complete typescript of *Why Do Languages Change?* for publication, explains in the Acknowledgments that he has made the minimum necessary corrections, and has retained Trask's voice as the authorial 'I'. The resulting book introduces the non-specialist to language change and to the ways in which historical linguists understand it. The style of the book is personable, pragmatic, accessible, and scholarly.

Each of the eight chapters in the book poses a question from the lay perspective, then gives an honest answer while reframing the question in historical linguistic terms. Trask anticipates the needs and expectations of his audience, and draws them in to an examination of their language myths. At the same time, this method allows him more scope than would appear in a typical introductory textbook: topics such as etymology, onomastics, and spelling receive attention.

Chapter One asks how languages change, and leads the reader from culturally familiar instances of word coinage and disappearance (from *paint* to *rouge* to *blusher* 'cosmetic powder put on the cheeks'), to meaning change (*grammar* vs. *glamour*), grammatical change (the introduction of the progressive passive, and the disappearance of *be* as auxiliary for the perfect of intransitive verbs), and sound change (/r/-dropping; *cot/caught* merger, Northern Cities Shift in the United States, *cat/cut* merger in RP, *wine/whine* merger, and uptalk). By using engaging examples drawn from his own language experiences, Trask lures the reader away from prescriptive reactions toward a simple recognition of the existence and value of language change. In discussing the *wine/whine* merger, he teases the reader with the problem, 'In the space of my own lifetime, I have gone from being a perfectly normal speaker . . . to being a pretentious old fossil' (p. 16). Chapter Two asks why languages are always changing. Trask dispels myths, including appeals to biological genetics, climate, and geography, as well as stadialism (the movement of cultures through a rigidly defined series of stages) and narrowly teleological structural simplification. 'Laziness' is reconceptualized as the convenient shortening of high-frequency forms, reminiscent of time-motion study. Cultural change, emphasis and clarity, language structure, analogy, overt and covert prestige, and ultimately group identity are evaluated as viable factors influencing change.

Chapter Three asks where words come from. Trask demonstrates successful (*batter, battery, battalion*), uncertain (*jazz*), and disproved etymologies (the

'documented' but unsupported electrocuted-moth etymology of *bug* 'problem in a computer program'), returning repeatedly to the evidence provided by regular correspondences, vocabularies of related languages, and written records. The peculiarity of some of the supportable cases (*silhouette*) provides a link to Chapter Four, which explores onomastics. The greater idiosyncrasy of place names requires even more cautious use of documentary evidence and field work, exemplified by a detailed account of Richard Coates' research on the North American origins of the London place name *Pimlico*.

Chapter Five addresses the question of where English comes from. The answer follows familiar pathways, first laying out the 'Island Dialect to World Language' narrative, then going back to proto-Indo-European and alternately tracing the historical movement of peoples and the emergence of specific linguistic features. This is a reasonable account in the space available, but Trask (like many of us) cannot reconcile the forces of military, industrial, political, and cultural hegemony which drive the narrative, with his insistence (p. 105) that, 'There is nothing *providential* [his italics] about the present status of English', and, 'Modern English is not monolithic, of course'. The narrative continues to dominate the way that the story is told, despite recent attempts to break this up (see Milroy 2002).

Chapter Six explains why American English is different from British English. The chapter summarizes prominent lexical, phonological, and grammatical features distinguishing the two varieties, and succeeds in revealing the complexity of individual details (exemplified by *aluminum* versus *aluminium*), as well as general patterns of variation. This chapter handles distinctively American as opposed to British spelling, while Chapter Seven answers the question, 'Why is English spelling so eccentric?' with reference to loanwords and sound change. Both chapters support the idea that variation, while in various ways disturbing to the layperson, constitutes valuable evidence for the linguist.

Chapter Eight anticipates the lay readers' question as to which language is oldest. Trask shows that this question is not answerable: the model assumes that everyone has learned their language from an older person who knows more, forming part of, '... an unbroken chain of learners stretching back to the beginning of human speech ...' (p. 161). With the exception of artificial languages, pidgins, creoles, mixed languages (defined as deliberately created by bilinguals, such as Michif), and sign languages, no language is older than any other. These exceptional languages form a rather large group, and show that the acquisition of language need *not* occur in the social context of an older person who knows more. This narrow sense of acquisition (assuming that language is acquired as a mother tongue) is perhaps the weak link in an otherwise superb book, as it precludes the possibility of identifying and containing the myth of the native speaker.

## REFERENCE

Milroy, James. 2002. The legitimate language: Giving a history to English. In Richard J. Watts and Peter Trudgill (eds.) *Alternative Histories of English*. London: Routledge. 7–25.

DANIEL R. DAVIS  
 Department of Language, Culture, and Communication  
 University of Michigan-Dearborn  
 4901 Evergreen Road  
 Dearborn, MI 48128–2406  
 U.S.A.  
 davisdr@umich.edu

MARKKU HAAKANA, MINNA LAAKSO and JAN LINDSTRÖM (eds.). *Talk in Interaction: Comparative Dimensions*. Helsinki, Finland: Finnish Literature Society. 2009. 317 pp. Pb (9789522221346) €32.00/\$54.87.

Reviewed by IRENE KOSHIK

*Talk in Interaction: Comparative Dimensions* is an edited collection of conversation analysis (CA) research, most of which was originally presented at the International Conference on Conversation Analysis in Helsinki, May 2006 (ICCA-06). This volume was published in the series *Studia Fennica*, whose aim is to promote Finnish research internationally. Therefore much of the research in this collection is based on interactions in languages spoken in Finland, Finnish and Swedish. The volume also includes chapters by plenary speakers of ICCA-06 who study interactions in English and German.

The theme of ICCA-06, and therefore also of this volume, is comparative analysis. As several of the authors point out, all CA research is inherently comparative. It compares different instances of a similar phenomenon to discover how this phenomenon is organized and the social action(s) that it is used to implement. Some CA research is, however, more explicitly comparative. Research on institutional talk, for example, often compares specific institutional practices with those of everyday conversation (Drew and Heritage 1992). More recently, the increasing number of CA studies on various languages has provided a framework for discovering both similarities in dealing with certain interactional problems among different communities, and also differences in the way that resources from different languages are used to solve these problems (Schegloff 2006; Sidnell 2007, 2009). The research in this volume is comparative in the broadest sense. It includes comparisons across different languages, turn designs, interactional contexts, genders, and historical periods.

The first two chapters are introductory and methodological in nature. In the first chapter, Haakana, Laakso and Lindström introduce the field of conversation analysis, the different types of comparative analyses found in CA research, and the studies that make up this volume. In the second chapter,



Arminen describes the methodology of various types of CA research, i.e. single case analyses, research based on a collection of instances of a particular phenomenon, and studies that quantify phenomena previously analyzed via traditional CA methodology. He shows how each of these methodological practices, including single case analyses, incorporates some type of comparison.

The remaining chapters present studies of specific interactional phenomena from a more or less explicitly comparative perspective. Drew's chapter is comparative in the sense that all CA work is comparative. He draws on Gail Jefferson's work pinpointing the positions in which speakers begin talking in overlap with another speaker. Drew provides evidence that participants in overlap are, for the most part, fine-tuning the onset of their talk to aim for a smooth transfer of speakers, even when this does not occur. Most overlaps are therefore not interruptions *per se*, i.e., they are not performed because speakers are interactionally incompetent, inattentive, or rude. Most overlaps are, in fact, cooperative, affiliative actions.

The remaining studies in this volume are more explicitly comparative. Cuper-Kuhlen compares a similar type of affect display in a similar interactional context in two different languages, English and German. She first describes how displays of disappointment in English phone conversations are realized prosodically after the rejection of a proposal, request, or invitation. Displays of disappointment are produced with a set of phonetic and prosodic characteristics that Cuper-Kuhlen calls 'subdued prosody.' This 'subdued prosody' is used on 'rejection finalizers,' i.e. expressions such as 'oh I see' and 'okay,' produced after a rejection and displaying that a rejection will be accepted. Similar prosodic resources can also be used in German interactions with the German rejection finalizer 'oh.' However, this same prosody, which in English can also be used in other sequential contexts to convey sympathy, has not yet been explored in detail for German.

The next two studies compare a set of practices in Finnish and, through a review of the literature, show how these differ from practices that accomplish a similar action in English and/or other languages. Hakulinen and Sorjonen analyze four different Finnish responses to assessments used in the same sequential context to perform somewhat different social actions. Each of these responses agrees with the first assessment by repeating the finite verb, performing a 'same evaluation.' Responses that simply repeat the finite verb imply 'unproblematic and unconditional agreement with the prior assessment' (p. 132). Responses that repeat the finite verb twice are used after assessments that are formulated as self-evident. They express strong agreement. Repetition of the finite verb followed by a subject pronoun implies 'a difference in perspective or experience between participants' (p. 148). Finally, responses consisting of the finite verb plus the Finnish response token *joo* close the topic. Haakana and Kurhila study variations in the design of turns that correct factual information in a prior speaker's talk. They discuss three types of variation – whether, and under which conditions: (1) the turn begins with a plain negator, *ei*, the negator

plus particle *ku[n]*, i.e. *eiku*, or no negation; (2) the turn is constructed as a clause or phrase; and (3) the correction is modulated or unmodulated.

The next four chapters compare a related set of practices in the same language across different types of interactions. Lindström and Lindholm study what they call 'question frames,' i.e. preliminary turn components that project an upcoming interrogative action, in institutional interactions conducted in Swedish. These question frames are used as 'syntactically parenthetical elements preceding, or occasionally following, a clausal unit' (p. 203). Lindström and Lindholm show how these question frames reflect the local sequence (e.g. topic transitions), the activity type, and institutional roles. Ruusuvoori and Voutilainen investigate responses to troubles-telling in three types of Finnish health care interviews: general practice, homeopathy, and cognitive psychotherapy. They describe the interactional trajectories following both affiliating and non-affiliating responses, showing what they reveal about each of the three institutions. Kangasharju compares practices used in aggravated disputes in three different interactions: between a husband and wife at home; between two institutional representatives in an institutional setting; and between two young women in a reality television show. Routarinne compares IRE (initiation, response, evaluation) sequences in two different Finnish pedagogical settings: traditional teacher-fronted math classes, and pair work with an educational computer game in the home. She focuses on students' uptake of instructor's evaluations in each of these settings.

Laakso and Tykkyläinen introduce a different type of comparison: practices within different genders. They compare negotiation practices of two pairs of children in same-sex play. They found that the two girls used explicit verbal negotiation, using the Finnish particle combination *jooko* ('yeah' + Q-CLI) to make proposals. The girls also accepted and rejected proposals verbally. They used the repair particle *eiku* ('no I mean') to express disagreement explicitly. In contrast, the boys made proposals using attention-seeking devices such as *kato* ('look') and *arvaa mitä* ('guess what'), plus multi-modal action. The boys accepted and rejected proposals non-verbally, by either joining the proposed action or ignoring it.

The final chapter by Clayman and Heritage uses quantitative methodology in what they call 'an exercise of applied conversation analysis in a comparative mode' (p. 299). They compare changes in journalists' questions during American presidential news conferences from 1953 to 2000. Their analysis shows that journalists' questions have become more aggressive over time and that two economic indicators, the unemployment rate and the prime interest rate, are both associated with more aggressive questioning.

The research in this volume showcases the breadth of comparative CA work being done within a variety of disciplines, especially in Finland. It contributes to our understanding of how different languages use the linguistic resources available to that language to solve similar interactional problems, how similar actions can be used to do different work in different interactional settings, and how practices of talk might vary across genders and over time. Many of the

authors discuss the benefits of adding an explicitly comparative dimension to CA research. They also point out potential problems, e.g. to what extent and under what conditions are particular social actions comparable across different cultures, settings, participants, and time periods? How much data is sufficient to make these comparisons? Many of these studies are preliminary analyses based on a very limited set of data, as the authors themselves point out. But even these preliminary analyses suggest valuable directions for further comparative CA research.

## REFERENCES

- Drew, Paul and John Heritage. 1992. Analyzing talk at work: An introduction. In Paul Drew and John Heritage (eds.) *Talk at Work*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press. 3–65.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 2006. Interaction: The infrastructure for social institutions, the natural ecological niche for language, and the arena in which culture is enacted. In Nicholas J. Enfield and Stephen C. Levinson (eds.) *Roots of Human Sociality*. New York: Oxford University Press. 70–96.
- Sidnell, Jack. 2007. Comparative studies in conversation analysis. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 36: 229–244.
- Sidnell, Jack. 2009. Comparative perspectives in conversation analysis. In Jack Sidnell (ed.) *Conversation Analysis: Comparative Perspectives*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press. 3–27.

IRENE KOSHIK

Department of Linguistics  
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign  
4080 FLB, 707 So. Mathews Avenue  
Urbana, IL 61801  
U.S.A.  
koshik@illinois.edu

FRANÇOIS GRIN, CLAUDIO SFREDDO and FRANÇOIS VAILLANCOURT. *The Economics of the Multilingual Workplace* (Routledge Studies in Sociolinguistics). New York: Routledge. 227 pp. Hb (9780415800181) \$80.75.

Reviewed by JO ANGOURI

Intended for scholars and general readers, this book draws upon economics and (applied/socio) linguistic research and adopts an interdisciplinary perspective. The book is accessible and practical and opens up a number of interesting and important issues for discussion (such as the actual value of multilingualism in the context of productive activity and the implications of research for language policy).

Multilingualism is 'commonsensically' considered an advantage for the development of employees and companies as a whole, in the globalised economy,

and is indicated as a 'priority' in a number of EU policy documents. However the actual relationship between multilingualism and economic outcomes is rarely problematised and operationalised. The book makes a valuable contribution to the field by showing how and why multilingualism seems to be economically advantageous for individuals, companies and nation states. The book draws systematically and convincingly on two disciplines that often remain insulated, despite a long held interest on both sides for questions that cross their respective borders. It is a highly readable volume and as a linguist I found myself comfortably following the main theories put forward by the authors despite my non-expert knowledge of economics in general and Production Theory in particular.

The book comprises 10 chapters and is organised in three parts. At the beginning of each part a succinct summary of the main aims and objectives of the upcoming chapters is provided which is revisited at the end of each section. The authors also provide a comprehensive appendix including a user friendly explanation of the economic models discussed in the text; as such the book constitutes a useful guide and resource for students and researchers.

The first part, entitled 'The Economic Perspective on Multilingualism' (Chapters 1–4), sets the scene by introducing Production Theory and the analytical framework the authors propose for examining the ways in which language variables affect economic variables. Chapters 2 and 3 provide the reader with a useful review of key literature on language at work. The discussion ranges from Bourdieu's work and research on workplace discourse to quantitative surveys on the foreign language needs of businesses carried out in several parts of the world. The final chapter of the first part of the book covers perhaps the most well known issue in this area of scholarship, namely the relationship between language and earnings. Even though a first read would suggest that multilingual employees seem to earn more than their unilingual counterparts, the authors suggest caution and foreground a range of factors (e.g. tendencies by geographical locations) that need to be included in the equation. Despite the breadth of the research discussed in these four chapters, the authors have managed to produce a highly readable piece of work and to set a clear theoretical background which underpins the following chapters.

The second part, on 'Foreign Language Skills, Foreign Language Use, and Production', comprises four chapters that constitute the 'economics' core of the book. Chapter 5 further clarifies concepts and questions raised earlier. Interestingly, the findings show that, in the dataset examined here, the company's location does not seem to affect language use as much as ownership does. I found this a very interesting finding and perhaps it would be useful to apply the framework to multinational companies where location and ownership do not coincide with national borders (and languages). The authors discuss the methodological challenges in collecting data from businesses where reasons of anonymity affect the data that become available to the researcher (Chapter 6). This complements other research discussing the inherent limitations in carrying out research in any workplace (e.g. Angouri 2010). The authors

make a convincing case for drawing on datasets from Canada and Switzerland and future research could hopefully further contribute to this body of knowledge. The discussion then moves on to the formal relationships between core economic variables and foreign language use (Chapter 7). The authors show that different languages are more (or less) important in different economic sectors. Finally Chapter 8 foregrounds a very important and still under-researched issue, that of the discrepancy between the importance of language skills for businesses and the lack of demand for linguistic skills at the stage of hiring new staff. This alludes to past research in the U.K. where it was shown that only 27.3 percent of U.K. companies refer to foreign language abilities in their job advertisements (Hagen 1993: 23; also Ostarhild 1998). The chapter closes with a useful discussion of work on linguistic audit. Even though the authors have already shown the originality of their approach, I believe a more detailed discussion on how language audits models could complement the framework introduced here, would be useful for the reader.

In the final part of the volume, the authors discuss the implications of their research for policy makers as reflected in the title, 'Policy Implications and Future Prospects' (Chapters 9 and 10). The authors provide here a very good summary of all their main findings (section 9.1 and 10.1) and then move on to discuss the feasibility and usefulness of state intervention with respect to the development of language skills. The question of which languages and at what level, is particularly relevant and one that would need to preoccupy future research. The authors provide concrete examples of how policy makers can devise pragmatic and realistic policies that would maximise the effects of knowledge of languages. Finally the authors conclude their work by providing an excellent framework for further research (section 10.2). I believe both novice and experienced researchers will find this thought provoking.

Despite drawing on a number of studies (and fields), the authors have managed to produce a stimulating and easy to follow interdisciplinary text. It is particularly useful to highlight that multilingualism seems to be a good investment but also that only a basic knowledge of a language may, from an economics point of view, be rather limited in its benefits. Given the current debates in relation to the usefulness and popularity of (foreign) language teaching and learning, I feel research on the economic outcomes of language learning becomes timely. Overall, the book is well written and appropriate for its intended audience. It also paves the way for inter-disciplinary research as linguists and economists would need to work together in order to explore more holistically not only the value of multilingualism for the individual and the society as a whole but also the implications for policy makers and language pedagogy.

## REFERENCES

- Angouri, Jo. 2010. Quantitative, qualitative or both? Combining methods in linguistic research. In Lia. Litosseliti (ed.) *Research Methods in Linguistics*. London: Continuum. 29–48.

- Hagen, Stephen (ed.). 1993. *Languages in European Business: A Regional Survey of Small and Medium-sized Companies*. London: CILT.
- Ostarhild, Edda. 1998. *Careers Using Languages*. London: Kogan page.

JO ANGOURI

Department of English, Linguistics and Communication  
 UWE (University of the West of England), Bristol  
 Bristol, BS16 1QY,  
 United Kingdom  
 Jo.Angouri@uwe.ac.uk

KURT BRAUNMÜLLER and JULIANE HOUSE (eds.). *Convergence and Divergence in Language Contact Situations* (Hamburg Studies in Multilingualism, 8). Amsterdam, The Netherlands/Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 2009. viii + 241 pp. Hb (9789027219282) €75.00/US \$113.00.

Reviewed by HANS HENRICH HOCK

The volume under review grew out of a 2007 symposium at the Hamburg Research Centre for Multilingualism, and like many proceedings volumes features a range of papers, some of which are only tenuously connected with each other. Again, as in many such volumes the editors attempt to provide an overall focus in the Introduction (p. 1–9).

The volume is divided into three parts: Part I focuses on ‘Challenges to accepted views of convergence and divergence in language contact situations’ and features papers by Georg Bossong (‘Divergence, convergence, contact: Challenges for the genealogical classification of languages’, pp. 13–40), Östen Dahl (‘Increases in complexity as a result of language contact’, pp. 41–52), and Kurt Braunmüller (‘Converging genetically related languages: *Endstation* code mixing?’, pp. 53–69). Part II, dedicated to ‘Convergence and divergence in different varieties in written and oral discourse’, contains contributions by Steffen Höder (‘Converging language, diverging varieties: Innovative relativisation patterns in Old Swedish’, pp. 73–100), Karoline H. Kühl and Hjalmar P. Petersen (‘Converging verbal patterns in related languages: A case study from Faro-Danish and Danish-German language contact situations’, pp. 101–124), Viktor Becher, Juliane House and Svenja Kranich (‘Convergence and divergence of communicative norms through language contact in translation’, pp. 125–152), and Robert E. Vann (‘On the importance of spontaneous speech innovations in language contact situations’, pp. 153–181). Part III, on ‘Phonological processes of variation and change in bilingual individuals’ consists of two contributions, one by Susana Cortés, Conxita Lleó and Ariadna Benet (‘Gradient merging of vowels in Barcelona Spanish’, pp. 185–204), the other by Javier Arias and Conxita Lleó (‘Comparing the presentation of iambs by monolingual German, monolingual Spanish and bilingual German-Spanish children’,



pp. 205–233). The volume concludes with an Author Index and Subject Index.

As the titles of the contributions suggest, the issue of convergence and, to a lesser degree, divergence, is addressed from a number of different perspectives. Especially the contributions to Part II offer interesting case studies of contact and its results. Höder investigates the introduction of pronominal strategies in relative clauses of written Old Swedish and attributes it to the influence of Latin. He acknowledges parallel developments in other North Germanic languages, but does not extend his discussion to similar phenomena in English and other West Germanic languages. Köhl and Petersen discuss the influence of Faroese and German on Danish as regards verb semantics, argument structure, and 'morphological realization patterns'. Interestingly, the effects are very similar, even though the bilingual relations are different – Faroese is L1 while in the Danish-minority area of Schleswig-Holstein, German is L2. Köhl and Petersen observe that their findings raise questions about Myers-Scotton's (2002) concepts of Matrix Language and Embedded Language, and they note that the contact in question does not involve shift (something of a corrective note on Thomason and Kaufman 1988). Becher, House and Kranich investigate the role of English scientific discourse on its German counterpart and conclude that the influence is stronger where the two different systems are more similar (sentence connectors) than where they differ markedly (modality marking). The two contributions to Part III likewise offer interesting case studies, of Spanish influence on Catalan and German influence on German-Spanish bilingual children's acquisition of iambs (the bilingual children appear to be German-dominant).

Even though contained in Part II, Vann's paper raises a more general issue, the notion that language-contact innovations originate in spontaneous speech. However, his case studies do not actually offer spontaneous-speech data – as he observes, such data are hard to find. Vann therefore makes a strong plea for the development of spoken-language corpora.

The contributions to Part I can be expected to make the strongest theoretical and methodological claims. Dahl's paper raises the important point that, contrary to widespread views, contact can lead to greater complexity, rather than simplification. He demonstrates his case with the geographical distribution of pre- vs. post-posed definite articles in Scandinavian languages, with some varieties resolving the competition by offering pre- and post-posed articles in complementary distribution. Dahl acknowledges that his finding is not entirely novel, but presents and argues his case well. Braunmüller's contribution presents a variety of interesting examples of code mixing in different Germanic languages. Unfortunately, the presentation is not always transparent, and the relevance of examples is not always made clear.

The article that is presented as the most important and challenging contribution is that of Bossong. Its major thrust is to show that there are challenges of different grades of severity to the appropriateness of the traditional



'genealogical' or 'tree' model of linguistic relationship which operates with the assumption of divergence. According to Bossong, pidgins and creoles, mixed languages such as Michif and Media Lengua, and the 'structural convergence of genetically distant languages' such as Japanese and Korean, and Quechua and Aymara show that 'genealogical linguistics should consider not only divergence, but also convergence' (p. 26). While his presentation up to this point is compatible with the views of traditional comparative linguistics (see e.g. Schmidt 1872, referred to on p. 14, but without reference),<sup>1</sup> Bossong goes on to claim that the tree approach may only work for some language families (p. 30). Following Dixon's 'punctuated equilibrium' model (1997), he goes on to argue for something like a cycle between convergence and divergence, with the proto-languages of traditional comparative linguistics resulting from a punctuating event that disrupts the equilibrium of 'language contact and mutual penetration of languages and language families' (p. 31). Unfortunately, Bossong does not present detailed case studies that support this interesting thought experiment.<sup>2</sup> More important, it is not at all clear that convergence and divergence operate in this cyclical fashion. Consider for instance medieval Romance, with convergence in terms of common syntactic developments (such as the introduction of definite and indefinite articles, and the change from SOV toward SVO via V2), but at the same time considerable divergence as regards phonology.

Except for Bossong and Vann, most of the contributions deal with related, European languages, some closely related (Catalan and Spanish; Faroese or German and Danish), others with more distantly related ones (Spanish and German). A broader range of case studies would certainly have been desirable, especially the curious distinction made by Braunmüller and House that there is a fundamental difference between the results of contact involving related and 'non-related' languages (pp. 1–2). (The former relationship is said to lead to the preference of 'similar or parallel structures', the latter to 'linguistic replication' via 'code copying'.)

Finally, it should be noted that the term 'convergence' is almost invariably understood as the influence of one language on the structure of another; see e.g. the explicit statement by Höder (pp. 73–74, fn. 2). Only in a few places is there an acknowledgment that influence can be a two-way phenomenon; see e.g. Vann's reference to Solé (2001: 85), and especially Bossong's contribution. Gumperz and Wilson's (1971) important demonstration of convergence as a two-way street is only mentioned once in passing (p. 166), without specific reference to their findings. Similarly, it is worth noting that Vann's extensive discussion of Spanish contact linguistics fails to refer to Hill and Hill's 1986 study of Spanish-Mexicano bidirectional syncretism. 'Convergence', thus, for the most part is understood in the same way as the 19th-century notion of (unilateral) 'substratum' (or, in some cases, super- or adstratum) influence. This is regrettable, for at least under conditions of long-standing, non-replacive bilingualism a bidirectional interaction can be expected – even in cases such as English and South Asian languages such as Hindi, structural influence cuts

both ways; see e.g. B. Kachru's (1983) 'Indianization of English' and Y. Kachru's (1989) 'Englishization of Hindi'.

## NOTES

1. Bossong's presentation is apparently misunderstood by Braunmüller and House, who claim that 'traditional comparative linguistics considered phenomena of mutual influence between languages through language contact as . . . exceptions and complications unnecessarily messing up the clear internal laws of the historical development development of genetic language trees' (p. 2; sic).
2. Reference to recent claims of Garrett (2006) regarding the varieties of early Indo-European might have been helpful in this context.

## REFERENCES

- Dixon, Robert M. W. 1997. *The Rise and Fall of Languages*. Cambridge, U.K.: University Press.
- Garrett, Andrew. 2006. Convergence in the formation of Indo-European subgroups: Phylogeny and chronology. In Peter Forster and Colin Renfrew (eds.) *Phylogenetic Methods and the Prehistory of Languages*. Cambridge, U.K.: The McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research. 139–182.
- Gumperz, John J. and Robert Wilson. 1971. Convergence and creolization: A case from the Indo-Aryan/Dravidian border. In Dell Hymes (ed.) *Pidginization and Creolization of Languages*. Cambridge, U.K.: University Press. 151–168.
- Hill, Jane and Kenneth Hill. 1986. *Speaking Mexicano: The Dynamics of Syncretic Language in Central Mexico*. Tucson, Arizona: University of Arizona Press.
- Kachru, Braj B. 1983. *The Indianization of English: The English Language in India*. Delhi, India/New York/Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.
- Kachru, Yamuna. 1989. Corpus planning for modernization: Sanskritization and Englishization of Hindi. *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences* 19: 153–164.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol. 2002. *Contact Linguistics: Bilingual Encounters and Grammatical Outcomes*. Oxford, U.K.: University Press.
- Schmidt, Johannes. 1872. *Die Verwandtschaftsverhältnisse der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Weimar, Germany: Böhlau.
- Solé, Y. R. 2001. *Valores comunicativos y emblemáticos del Español y del Guaraní*. Bogotá, Colombia: Instituto Caro & Cuervo.
- Thomason, Sarah Grey and Terrence Kaufman. 1988. *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley, California/Los Angeles, California: University of California Press.

HANS HENRICH HOCK  
 Department of Linguistics  
 University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign  
 707 S. Mathews Avenue, room 4080  
 Urbana, IL, 61801  
 U.S.A.  
 hhock@illinois.edu