

REVIEWS

Language in Society 34 (2005). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404505210308

KANG KWONG LUKE & THEODOSSIA-SOULA PAVLIDOU (eds.), *Telephone calls: Unity and diversity in conversational structure across languages and cultures*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2002. Pp. 290. Hb \$88.00.

Reviewed by ANNA LINDSTRÖM
Scandinavian Languages, Uppsala University
S-75120 Uppsala, Sweden
anna.lindstrom@nordiska.uu.se

A panel at the 1998 International Pragmatics Conference in Reims provided the impetus for the book *Telephone calls: Unity and diversity in conversational structure across languages and cultures*, edited by Kang Kwong Luke and Theodossia-Soula Pavlidou. Six of its chapters were first presented at that panel. The book covers several languages, including Cantonese, Danish, English, German, Greek, Japanese, Korean, and Persian.

The introductory chapter gives an overview of research on telephone conversations, centered on studies inspired by conversation analysis. The editors start out by noting that telephone data were central in Harvey Sacks's early pioneering work. While acknowledging that "the significance of the telephone call goes well beyond the confines of the telephone line," they observe that Sacks's initial explorations of the rules of conversational sequence were developed from observations of telephone calls (p. 4). Historically, face-to-face conversation has been the primary site for human relations and communication; however, with the emergence of new technology such as the cellular telephone, telephone calls have become "another primordial site for speech communication and fully deserve to be studied extensively and in depth" (5).

In light of the editors' mentioning the increasing importance of the cellular phone around the world, it is surprising that the empirical studies in the book appear to be based exclusively on landline calls. Also, their observation that telephone calls are dyadic events may no longer be applicable; in fact, one of the conversations analyzed in the book involves three participants. In Pavlidou's study of closings, a student from Cyprus has called her parents at home and talks to both of them (example 7, 209). The transcription suggests that both parents are on the phone with their daughter simultaneously. My own experience as someone who studied abroad is that this type of situation is common. That telephone communication services such as conference calls are now offered to private consumers is further evidence that telephone conversations no longer need to be dyadic events.

The editors outline three approaches to research on telephone conversations: the sociological, the methodological, and the intercultural. As they note, these approaches are not mutually exclusive, and the distinctions indeed sometimes seem arbitrary. Schegloff 1968 is cited as an example of a study that centered on telephone conversation as a phenomenon in its own right. However, one might argue that Schegloff's contribution was not primarily to advance our understanding of telephone conversations per se; rather, his study demonstrated how the social organization of sequences allows actors to negotiate entry into a ratified state of talk. The canonical telephone opening sequence described by Schegloff has inspired comparative studies of telephone conversation openings in other languages. One motivation for this line of research has been to explore the cultural scope of Schegloff's description of the opening sequence. Luke & Pavlidou's summary review of these studies highlights results that suggest that the organization of telephone opening is culturally variable. Findings that point to similarities in the interactional organization of opening sequences across cultures and languages are given less prominence.

The book is divided into three parts, the first of which focuses on openings of telephone calls in different languages. Yong-Yae Park's analysis of Japanese and Korean telephone conversation openings addresses self-identification sequences in relation to the presence or absence of background providers and contrastive connectives. Maria Sifianou explores whether the canonical sequence described by Schegloff is applicable to Greek telephone conversation openings. Unlike Sifianou's chapter, the study of Persian telephone conversation openings does not have an explicit comparative focus; Carmen Taleghani-Nikazm describes the linguistic resources Persian speakers use to demonstrate that they regard their co-participant as socially superior. Finally, Gitte Rasmussen & Johannes Wagner show how interactants negotiate language choice in the opening sequences of international business calls.

The second part of the book is entitled "Problem solving, topic management and closing." Its three chapters are not as closely tied to one another as the chapters in the first section. One chapter here focuses on the initiation and introduction of first topics in Hong Kong telephone calls, and this would have fit in well with the studies presented in the first section. In particular, I thought the explicit way in which Hong Kong answerers sometimes pursued the reason for the call contrasted nicely with the orientation toward more implicit practices described in Park's studies of Japanese and Korean data. Lindsay Amthor Yotsukura's chapter is an ethnographic and discourse analytic study of Japanese business telephone conversations. There are interesting parallels between this study and those by Park and Taleghani-Nikazm. Similar to Park, who also analyzes Japanese telephone calls, Yotsukura finds that inferences play an important role in Japanese conversations. Problems were not explicitly mentioned in the beginning of calls; rather, the facts of a case were detailed in a manner that allowed the recipient to infer the nature of the problem. Like the interactants in Taleghani-Nikazm's

corpus of Persian conversations, Japanese business associates deferred to one another within the opening sequence. Pavlidou examines closing sequences in Greek telephone calls between familiars. In contrast with several of the other chapters in the book, this particular study aims at building hypotheses that can describe the structure of closings at the etic rather than the emic level (203). Owing to the paucity of systematic investigations of telephone conversation closings in different languages, Pavlidou is hesitant to make conclusive arguments about cultural variability. However, she suggests that Greek conversationalists are more likely to foreground the relationship aspect of communication within the closing sequence than are members of some other linguistic communities.

The last section of the book centers on theoretical and methodological issues that arise in studies involving comparisons between languages and cultures. Unlike the other contributors, the authors of the last two chapters represent sociology rather than communication, language studies, or linguistics. Several of the empirical chapters of the book seem to promote the idea that the organization of telephone conversations is culturally variable. I was thus surprised that the variationist perspective was not represented in the last section. It would have been useful if the authors of the last two chapters had targeted their observations to the studies presented in the first two sections. Paul ten Have mentions only two of them in passing (245), and Emanuel Schegloff discusses only two of them in some detail.

The breadth of languages covered makes this book attractive to researchers and students who work on other languages than English. However, the binary comparisons to English limit some of the studies. As someone who does not understand most of the languages included in the book, I found it difficult to make observations about the data. There were nevertheless several aspects of the examples that I found intriguing. Yotsukura gives one example (example 7, 146) in which the interactants end the conversation without a goodbye sequence. Although this may not impinge on the main focus of Yotsukura's analysis of how problems are raised and negotiated, I thought it would have been interesting if she had discussed this. Identification and recognition have different implications for callers and answerers, and this point did not seem sufficiently developed in several of the studies. The person who has made the call is likely to have an idea of the limited population of potential answerers for the number dialed. This is illustrated by example three in Rasmussen & Wagner's study, in which the caller's first turn indicates that the person who answered the telephone did not belong to the expected group of answerers (113). For the answerer, on the other hand, the persons who may figure as potential callers are usually much harder to predict, and thus identification of the other party can be a much trickier matter for the answerer than it is for the caller.

Most of the work presented in the book is based on impressive data sets. For example, the findings reported in Sifianou's study were drawn from analysis of nearly 800 telephone conversation openings. However, the authors rarely show

how the specific patterns and features discussed figure in the larger collections. The transcription practices used in some of the chapters make it difficult to track how the sequence unfolded in real time, as it appears that pauses and overlaps are not consistently marked. This book nevertheless highlights the challenges and rewards of exploring social activities and communicative patterns across languages and cultures and will be a valuable resource for scholars in this field.

REFERENCE

Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1968). Sequencing in conversational openings. *American Anthropologist* 70:1075–95.

(Received 1 July 2004)

Language in Society 34 (2005). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404505220304

JANNIS K. ANDROUTSOPOULOS & ALEXANDRA GEORGAKOPOULOU (eds.), *Discourse constructions of youth identities*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2003. Pp. vii, 331. Hb \$105.00.

Reviewed by ADRIENNE LO
Educational Psychology, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
1310 S. 6th St, Champaign, IL 61821
adrienlo@uiuc.edu

Discourse constructions of youth identities is an eclectic collection of 12 papers which examine the language of youth in England, Greece, Turkey, Germany, Sweden, Denmark, and Japan. The authors use various methodologies, including narrative analysis, conversational analysis, sociolinguistics, and Critical Discourse Analysis, to look at the language practices of youth ranging in age from nine years to the early twenties. In addition to studies of spontaneous peer group interaction in schools and youth centers, the volume also includes work on various kinds of expressive culture, focus group interactions, and interviews.

One of the strongest chapters is Peter Auer & İnci Dirimi's piece on the spontaneous acquisition of Turkish by non-Turkish adolescents in Germany. Auer & Dirimi illustrate the complex reasons why adolescents and young adults they surveyed in Hamburg learned to speak Turkish from their peers. They note that these youths, who come from a wide range of language backgrounds, display various kinds of orientations to speaking Turkish. These include speaking it for instrumental purposes to gain access to youth groups and speaking the language among themselves even when no native speakers of Turkish are present, as a kind of orientation to a plurilingual adolescent speech style. Drawing from a rich ethnographic background, Auer & Dirimi locate their subjects on three axes: (i) positive or negative construction of "the Turks"; (ii) orientation to German mainstream vs. subcultural street culture; and (iii) negative or positive orientation to

youth culture. In its careful attention to the various meanings that speaking Turkish indexes, Auer & Dirmi's piece demonstrates that facile generalizations about the subversive and countercultural nature of youth language practices do not always hold true.

A number of the other articles in this collection also examine youth in multilingual contexts, including Werner Kallmeyer & Inken Keim's paper on German-Turkish codeswitching and the use of a local German dialect they call "district talk" by a group of adolescent girls of mixed backgrounds, and Vasiliki Lytra's on teasing and nicknames among Greek/Turkish bilingual fourth-graders. While Kallmeyer & Keim highlight the role of codeswitching and district talk in exacerbating disagreement, Lytra looks at how teasing varies depending on its affective key as playful or hurtful and according to the gender of the participants.

Kuniyoshi Kataoka's chapter discusses innovative work on affect and writing. Drawing on a corpus of personal letters written by young women in Japan, Kataoka examines the use of "deformed" letters, unconventional punctuation, and pictorial signs to convey affect. By showing how the same letter writer alters the visual presentation of her writing depending on how close she is to her correspondent, and how punctuation/signs relate to other kinds of interpersonal affect markers like *ne* and *yo*, Kataoka provides a fascinating examination of the creative use of multimodal semiotic resources by youth in Japan.

Although the collection is in part predicated on the assumption that "youth" forms some kind of distinct social category, Tore Kristiansen's essay on the social evaluation of different Danish dialects is one of the few here that consider how youths are differentiated from others. Using variationist methodology, Kristiansen examines how adolescents, teachers, and managers overtly evaluate different dialects of Danish, and then covertly evaluate speakers of those dialects on "competence" and "sociability" scales. In both cases, youths show patterns of evaluation that are distinct from those of their older counterparts.

Although some chapters make links to broader theoretical issues in linguistic anthropology and sociolinguistics, others do not seem so well grounded in contemporary research, especially outside of Europe. In addition, several articles could have benefited from more rigorous copyediting.

In the end, the wide-ranging nature of the chapters in this volume reveal both the strengths and the limitations of considering youth as a category. It is made abundantly clear that youths are never merely youths but are also girls, immigrants, music lovers, students, younger siblings, urban dwellers, and so on, yet one is left wondering what the relevance of youth as a category might be. For example, although several authors touch on the "playful" quality of youth language, or its innovativeness and embrace of the vernacular, it is at times difficult to discern a coherent thread that links their contributions. As I was reading the collection, I found myself wondering what an examination of discourse markers in Swedish adolescent casual conversation was doing in the same volume as a critical discourse analysis of tradition and late modernity in narratives about the

shooting of a Greek Cypriot. At a time when studies of discourse seem increasingly fractured in terms of methodology, Androutsopoulos & Georgakopoulou's volume presents a broadly inclusive portrait of contemporary research on the language of youth.

(Received 12 July 2004)

Language in Society 34 (2005). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404505230300

KATE BEECHING, *Gender, politeness and pragmatic particles in French*. Pragmatics & Beyond New Series. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2002. Pp viii, 246. Hb.

Reviewed by FABIENNE H. BAIDER
French, University of Cyprus, Cyprus, 1678
fabienne@ucy.ac.cy

Kate Beeching's stated purpose is to investigate to what degree men and women differ in the way they render utterances more polite in contemporary spoken French, by means of an in-depth study of the functions and the distributional frequency of four pragmatic particles: *c'est-à-dire*, *enfin*, *hein*, and *quoi*. The analysis is anchored within Robin Lakoff's theory of politeness as described in *Language and woman's place*. On balance, and even though the author herself emphasizes the limitations of her corpus and framework, Beeching should be given credit for having put together a much-needed pragmatic study on gender and the French language.

The book is organized into nine chapters, of which the first three treat preliminaries. The following five chapters present the study. The ninth and last summarizes the findings.

Chap. 1 provides a thorough background to the study of politeness in relation to gender. Having justified the link her study presupposes among the use of pragmatic particles (PP), the phenomenon of tentativeness, and the concept of politeness, Beeching explains the choice of the four PPs under review because they represent "a balanced mechanism" to understand repair strategies on one hand (*c'est-à-dire* and *enfin*) and face-saving strategies on the other (*hein* and *quoi*). Major approaches to politeness are then reviewed: the social norm view, the face-saving view (used in most chapters), and Kerbrat Orecchioni's face-enhancing act, among others. After giving her definition of politeness ("the manner in which human beings attempt to achieve sociability in everyday interactions"), Beeching explains why the measurement of politeness will be based on Lakoff's Rules of Politeness, and how these rules are enacted through selection among the four chosen PPs. Epistemic modality and tag questions are then discussed in detail in relation to usage differences by gender. The chapter ends with a review of French research on the topic of power, status, and language, concluding that most studies agree that women are more polite than men.

Chap. 2 explores the nature of discourse markers and pragmatic particles. The author reviews the many attempts to define these particles and settles for a definition based on nine characteristics: PPs are metalinguistic, multifunctional, a feature of spoken and informal discourse, very frequent, short, not found in utterance-initial position, and do not have a propositional content but have a pragmatic function. There follows a discussion of methodological issues and of the adequate level of detail in description; this allows Beeching to explain her own methodology. The chapter ends with a description of studies that focus on the functions of PPs as markers of reformulation in relation to gender differences and politeness strategies.

Chap. 3 starts with a review of the available spoken French corpora, noting the difficulty in accessing such corpora. Most of the chapter presents the corpus: the collection of data and its orthographic transcription. The corpus is then described as balanced because it contains an equal quantity of words that has been produced by each gender, three age groups and three levels of education are represented, and a wide range of locations in France has been investigated. For these reasons, the data can provide a reasonable basis for drawing sound conclusions on the relationships among sociological variables (gender, age, sex), the use of the PPs, and politeness.

With chap. 4 the analysis of the corpus as such starts. The chapter reviews the qualitative analysis, promising “an in-depth analysis of the linguistic and extralinguistic factors which pertain in the interviews” (p. 79). The author makes use of Lakoff’s Rules of Politeness – Formality (keep aloof), Deference (give options), and Camaraderie (show sympathy) – in an attempt to classify the interviews according to their style and to determine whether there is a link between type of speaker, topic, and the presence of PPs. Some general conclusions are drawn, among others, an avoidance of PPs when speech is “highly monitored” has been noted; variation in the usage of PPs can be explained by the different faces adopted by the speaker (the more rapport is wanted, the more PPs will be in use); and the class variable may explain the presence of certain PPs, such as *hein* and *quoi* for working-class speakers.

Chaps. 5–8 investigate the functioning of each particle, respectively *c’est-à-dire*, *enfin*, *hein*, and *quoi*. Each chapter combines quantitative and qualitative approaches. They are roughly divided into four parts: a short review of the literature on each speech particle; an attempt to define the pragmatic, semantic and syntactic properties of each particle; a hypothesis regarding the social stratification of the PP; and a conclusion. Within each chapter, an example is allocated on an instance-by-instance basis to a particular function group for each particle, in order adequately to describe each feature employed. Graphs and tables summarize the distribution of each PP according to each variable.

In chap. 5, data confirm the functions of *c’est-à-dire* as identified in dictionaries. As a discourse marker, it flags an upcoming reformulation (explanation, correction, detailing, specification, exemplification) of a previously given infor-

mation. As a hedging expression, in some exceptional cases it attenuates the force of a contradiction or a refusal. Whether for the distribution or for the functions, no striking gender asymmetry is identified, even though women may tend to use it more as a request for information and middle-aged women tend to avoid this particle entirely. In conclusion, *c'est-à-dire* seems to be a marker of educated speech, although younger speakers tend to use it more often.

In chap. 6 the study of the PP *enfin* shows that, although it has ten different functions, it is used mainly as a corrective (and as a self-corrective), which restricts the proposition or downplays an assertion; it then serves to protect the speaker's face. Although no social variable (age, sex, or education) seems to play a significant statistical role, men and women differ in the way they use this PP: Men seem to use it to introduce correction, while women use it more as a discourse marker with its literal meaning 'last'. These findings would, according to the author, weaken Lakoff's (1975) claim that women are more hesitant in their speech. However, they would support Chambers's (1995) claim that women have a natural ability, superior to that of men, to structure their discourse.

According to the data presented in chap. 7, men and women use the PP *hein* to the same extent, whether as a discourse marker or as an emphatic particle. Turn length seems to be a significant variable for use as a discourse marker. However, within a subset of the data, men seem to privilege its hyperbolic-pragmatic function; women tend to use *hein* more as a discursive marker. According to the author, these results would mean that women are more polite because they more often adopt structured speech. Men, in contrast, are analyzed as less polite because the emphatic usage "could be considered to be distancing or adversarial."

Finally, in chap. 8, *quoi*, as utterance terminator, is said to be used as a self-corrective particle and as an indicator of vagueness or uncertainty concerning the adequacy of the information. The usage of *quoi* shows some discrepancies: Its use rises among the middle-aged group (the age of interviewer being mentioned as a possible explanation for a low rate among the younger group) and among the least educated male speakers (perhaps because of covert prestige or as a face-saving strategy). The hypercorrection phenomenon may explain the lower usage among middle-class women than among upper-class women.

In chap. 9, Beeching summarizes the findings of each chapter and concludes that Lakoff's (1975) assertions concerning the non-tentative nature of men's speech are not confirmed. She proceeds to rely on the idea that the gender asymmetrical usages she noted would reflect "biological differences and aptitudes."

This revised and abridged version of Beeching's doctoral dissertation is unique in its focus on the usage of pragmatic particles in relation to gender and politeness in spoken French. This study should then break new ground. Does it fulfil its promise?

The danger in Beeching's gambit in appealing to Lakoff's 1975 book, with all its defects, as the principal standard against which the present study is measured has been described elsewhere (Wouk 2002). More recent works on gender and

politeness have shown that men and women “do” politeness differently within the same culture (see Holmes 1994) and that tentativeness may not be a good measurement for politeness.

Furthermore, pragmatic particles such as *hein* and *quoi* are also frequently linked with emotions. This begs the question whether data obtained in interviews led by an anglophone, unknown to the speakers and not necessarily of the same age group as the interviewee, are likely to allow an accurate description of the PPs under review.

As for the results, Pillon 1987, 1992 came ten years earlier to the same data used by Beeching; her study of conversational behaviors of males and females in spoken French showed that linguistic behaviors differed only slightly. More important, although women appear to have a more hypercorrective attitude toward language, a fact also recorded in Beeching’s data, the preference for standard linguistic forms characterizes the speech of ALL individuals aspiring to rise in the social hierarchy. Therefore, gender does not seem to be THE factor – social position does.

Finally, this book is marred by some editorial errors (a nonexistent chapter 10 is mentioned in the conclusion) as well as misleading statements (FRANTEXT is presented as a database containing literary texts from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, when the texts in fact range from the sixteenth century on). To point out such infelicities may seem like nit-picking; but trivial or not, these inaccuracies in the presentation of information could undermine the book’s value as a reliable reference source.

However, this book will be useful for researchers and teachers in French sociolinguistics, not only because of the scarcity of material investigating correlations among sex, age, education, and linguistic features in contemporary French, but also because of the thorough review of the literature on gender and the French language. In fact, the author rather dismissively notes that most previous studies on gender and the French language are “most introspective, anecdotal or philosophical/feminist in tenor.” Actually, some linguists, feminist or not, may be surprised at the essentialist position adopted by Beeching in explaining male and female discourse preferences by possibly biological features: Let’s not forget that “*on ne naît pas femme, on le devient.*”

REFERENCES

- Frantext* (2002). Analyse et traitement informatique de la langue française, at www.atilf.fr.
 Holmes, Janet (1994). *Women, men and politeness*. London: Longman.
 Lakoff, Robin (1975). *Language and woman’s place*. New York: Harper & Row.
 Pillon, Agnesa (1987). Le Sexe du locuteur est-il un facteur de variation linguistique? *Revue critique, La Linguistique*, 23:35–48.
 ——— (1992). Males’ and females’ conversational behavior in cross-sex dyads: From gender differences to gender similarities. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research* 21(3):147–172.
 Trésor de La Langue Française informatisé (2002). Analyse et traitement informatique de la langue française. At www.atilf.fr

Wouk, Fay (2002). Review of Kate Beeching 2002, *Gender, politeness and pragmatic particles in French*, electronic document at <http://www.linguistlist.org>

(Received 6 July 2004)

Language in Society 34 (2005). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404505240307

LUIS CORTÉS HERNÁNDEZ, *Los estudios del español hablado entre 1950 y 1999: Períodos, disciplinas y corrientes*. Madrid: Arcos/Libros, 2002. 470 pp. + CD-ROM.

Reviewed by F. DANIEL ALTHOFF
Department of English, Humanities and Languages
Southeastern Oklahoma State University
Durant, OK 74701-0609
dalthoff@sosu.edu
and

MARGARITA HIDALGO
Department of Spanish and Portuguese
San Diego State University
San Diego, CA 92182-7703
mhidalgo@mail.sdsu.edu

This book reviews studies that have utilized corpus analysis of oral Spanish, in order to introduce the field of oral discourse. The work focuses on social and contextual varieties, emphasizing an approach that tackles the analysis of linguistic blocks restricted to an interactional unit. The plan of action is explained in chap. 1. Chap. 2 deals with the 1950–1965 period (dialectology and stylistics); chap. 3 discusses the 1966–1979 period and focuses on quantitative studies (social dialectology, sociolinguistics, and developmental psycholinguistics); chap. 4 corresponds to 1980–1989 and deals with discourse analysis; and finally, chap. 5 treats the 1990–1999 period and examines the different types of oral discourse, genre, registers, social dialects, and textual models. The works collected for this study cover 4,241 bibliographical entries that are cross-referenced with the CD-ROM, which displays the bibliography as a Microsoft Word document. The types of analysis are (A) *intraenunciativo*, (B) *enunciativo*, and (C) *superenunciativo*. We believe that by *A*, the author refers to components of the sentence within the sentence or intrasentential; by *B* he may refer to discourse at the level of the utterance, which is the result of the speech act; and by *C* he may refer to the level of the discourse, which is made of turns.

Chap. 2 (“1950–1965: El período de los estudios dialectológicos y estilísticos”) covers studies of spoken Spanish, specifically those about the colloquial register or those associated with research on dialectology and stylistics, which are based on literary data or on casual observation. The bulk of those studies clearly favors the focus on the “*situación real*.” The works of this period are divided into three major trends: dialectology, stylistics, and descriptive-functional. A concern for morpho-syntactic aspects stimulated studies such as the *Proyecto del estudio de la norma culta*. Other works focusing on the *situación real* reveal

their concern with various external factors related to language (e.g., social class, age, gender, personality, style, and even domain). The works of general dialectology resort to a methodology based on the *intraenunciativa*. Stylistics was concerned with affective and associative aspects that integrate the content of the expression with that of the logical reference. The author studies the use of expressive resources such as iteration, ellipsis, hyperbole, and diminutives and augmentatives.

The descriptive-functional studies retrieve the corpus from literary texts. This line of research contributes to descriptive grammar by using the linguistic fact as a point of departure, while the method utilized to approach the corpus is not psychological but functional. Analyses of Mexican Spanish and/or Mexican literature are abundant sources in this line of research. These scholars attempted to contribute to descriptive grammar departing from written texts which imitate the colloquial register and the direct conversation of several subjects. The objective was to verify the data of literary texts or to rectify the former, if needed.

Chap. 3 (“1966–1979: El período de estudios cuantitativos: Dialectología social, sociolingüística y psicolingüística del desarrollo”) begins with the landmark year of 1966, when the limits and methodology of the *Proyecto de estudio coordinado del habla culta de las principales ciudades del mundo hispánico* were established. Key also in this chapter is the appearance of the first psycholinguistic work applied to the acquisition of spoken Spanish. These events came to condition the approaches taken to spoken Spanish during this second period. Yet the most influential studies of the 14 years covered in this chapter were of a quantitative nature, especially those in urban social dialectology arising from the *Proyecto*.

The *Proyecto* provided the impetus and a standardized framework for a widespread and sustained effort in data collection and interpretation. The choice of the “educated standard” (*norma culta*) as the object of study has been criticized for various reasons, but the *Proyecto* and derived studies have provided a wealth of information. Quantitative approaches, carried out systematically and with a duly rigorous methodology, found wide acceptance in the Spanish-speaking world, especially in Mexico and Argentina.

The field of developmental psycholinguistics (language acquisition) makes its first appearance in this chapter owing to the number of empirical studies (43) produced during this period; their quantitative character also lends support to their inclusion here. Topics from the previous chapter (dialectology and stylistics) are revisited as works continued to appear in those domains.

The areas of discourse analysis and pragmatics, introduced at the end of chap. 3, are treated in depth in chap. 4 (“1980–1989: Entre la oralidad y la cuantificación: Estudios de análisis del discurso”). The concept of orality vs. literacy (*oralidad* vs. *escritura*) is key here. Cortés makes it clear that orality and literacy coexist along a continuum, although the Spanish language studies surveyed in this chapter concentrate on the discourse analysis of spoken language corpora.

Cortés points out two Spanish-language theoretical works as being relevant to discourse analysis: that of Lavandera, who demonstrated a broad understanding of speech act theory, cohesion and coherence, presupposition and implicature, and related concepts; and that of Lozano, Peña-Marín, and Abril, who produced a manual of discourse analysis (or in their terminology, text semiotics) that by 1999 had been published in six editions.

The chapter also takes up work in the analysis of conversation, speech act theory, and the ethnography of communication. Cortés continues this chapter by introducing the topic of critical discourse analysis, which will be expanded upon in the following chapter. Finally, he concludes chap. 4 by examining the studies produced between 1980 and 1989 that follow models discussed in previous chapters: “classical” quantitative studies, urban sociolinguistics, variationist studies, developmental psycholinguistics, and stylistics.

Chap. 5 (“1990–1999: Estudio de los distintos tipos de discurso oral: géneros, registros, modelos textuales y sociolectos”) begins with the author’s review and discussion of discourse typology. He found particularly interesting the history of symposia in Spain and Latin America dedicated to discourse analysis as well as a brief discussion and critique of the role of English as the currently dominant (not to say imperial) language of linguistic and scientific discourse, prefigured by the critical discourse analysis of Teun van Dijk. Additionally, the author discusses the emergence of new Spanish-language journals in discourse analysis and cites other “new media” resources such as Internet websites intended to provide Spanish-speaking scholars and researchers with resources and outlets for their ideas in the area of discourse analysis.

A major section of this chapter called “Discurso y pragmática” examines the interrelationship of grammar and pragmatics and attends closely to their complementary nature; there is a bit of advocacy for the term “pragmalinguistics” (*pragmalingüística*) to illustrate this interdependence. Because studies of “courtesy” as a speech act in the Spanish-speaking world occupy the bulk of the literature produced in pragmatics, the author includes comparative studies on bargaining in Nordic and Spanish-speaking countries; customs of courtesy among Mexicans, Swedes, Danes, and Spaniards, etc., and works on attenuation and mitigation.

The section of this chapter with the heading “Discurso y tipología” is the longest of the entire book. It includes reviews and commentary on theoretical and empirical works in the individual areas and subareas of: genre (including conversation, debate, presidential speeches, interviews, and other genres such as joking and arguing), registers (colloquial, technical-journalistic, technical-legal, elaborated-literary), text models (narration, argumentation), and sociolect studies. A short review such as this can only hint at the thoroughness, richness, and depth of treatment given by Cortés to each of these fields. It is in this chapter that the most theoretically sophisticated and nuanced examinations of Spanish oral discourse studies are brought to bear. The author navigates skillfully through the subtleties that have emerged in theory and in practice to delineate, as much

as possible, the trends motivating each of the studies cited as noteworthy. He clearly demonstrates a facility for linking antecedent studies with those appearing later, offering ongoing insights that might not be apparent to those less familiar with each of the approaches taken.

The section immediately following the lengthy and detailed “Discurso y tipología” (“Las corrientes cuantitativas: la sociolingüística”) continues the format introduced in previous chapters by examining work that follows earlier models of research (quantitative, sociolinguistics, etc). The last section of the chapter (“El español y su entidad en las gramáticas y en la enseñanza”) is the least successful of the entire work. The author deals with two separate topics that had not found an appropriate place in previous sections of the book: first, the greater or lesser degree of interest that “oral aspects” of Spanish have had, especially in some grammars designed for foreign learners of Spanish, as well as the degree of interest in “oral aspects” of Spanish in the historiography of the language; and second, teaching oral language and commentary on oral texts. Because these topics break so dramatically – almost shockingly – from the thrust of the book in all other areas and chapters, we believe these two final points would have been better excluded from the text altogether.

Apart from this relatively small cavil, however, this book is undeniably a tour de force of scholarship. The richness, thoroughness, depth, and breadth of its scope and sequence are nothing short of breathtaking. The author demonstrates with equal aplomb his facility with description, assimilation, synthesis, application, and criticism, making this a very satisfying reference that will remain important and relevant for years to come. It will be especially useful for those professionals who wish to gain an overview of sociolinguistic and dialectological approaches to Spanish, as well as for those who wish to broaden their knowledge of discourse analysis and pragmatics. We think with particular envy of those current doctoral students in Spanish linguistics who now have such a wonderful resource available to them.

(Received 1 July 2004)

Language in Society 34 (2005). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404505250303

HOLLY M. BARKER, *Bravo for the Marshallese: Regaining control in a post-nuclear, post-colonial world*. Belmont, CA: Thomson/Wadsworth, 2004.
Pp. xv, 172. Pb, \$25.95.

Reviewed by HELEN A. ROBBINS
Anthropology, The Field Museum
Chicago, IL 60605
hrobbins@fmnh.org

The U.S. government tested 67 atomic and thermonuclear bombs in the Marshall Islands between 1946 and 1958, one hundred times more megatonnage than was

detonated at the Nevada test site. While these facts are relatively well known, the numerous and varied effects of these experiments on the Marshallese people are not. Holly Barker's book *Bravo for the Marshallese: Regaining control in a post-nuclear, post-colonial world* addresses the medical, social, economic, linguistic, and psychological impact that America's nuclear testing program had and continues to have on the lives of the Marshall Islanders. Barker bases her discussion on a rich assortment of ethno-historical data that include extensive interviews, fieldwork, and recently declassified documents. Probably the greatest strength of this book is that it gives voice to the radiation survivors. Her ability to convey the survivors' most intimate and tragic experiences with sensitivity and clarity can, in part, be attributed to her 15-year collaborative relationship with the people of the Marshall Islands. Barker frames the ethnographic material within a historical and descriptive discussion that gives context to the narratives and grounds the data. Yet, despite the many strengths of this book, Barker's analysis of the data presented falls short of its promise.

Bravo for the Marshallese is part of a new Thomson/Wadsworth series on applied anthropology, Case Studies on Contemporary Social Issues. The purpose of the series is to provide its readers, primarily high school and undergraduate students, with a working understanding of important contemporary social issues in various world regions, in a format that is both substantive and accessible. Barker's book, with its readable style and structure, fits well with the purpose of this series. Many readers may find her book reminiscent of the series Case Studies in Cultural Anthropology, edited by George and Louise Spindler (published by Holt, Rinehart & Winston), as it not only covers what might be considered anthropological basics but also appears to mirror the format used in that series. The prevalent themes in *Bravo for the Marshallese*, however, focus more on the applied potential of anthropology, sociopolitical issues in light of colonialism, the culpability of the United States and its agents, and the Marshall Islanders' responses to their experiences.

In the initial chapters, Barker sets the anthropological stage by describing the geography, sociopolitical organization, colonial history, and language of the Marshall Islands, deftly incorporating the history of the U.S. nuclear testing program. She demonstrates how the United States evaluated the islands' history and culture, taking note of the islanders' devout Christianity, the Marshalls' isolated locale, the apparent barrenness of the islands, and the distance from the United States, when officials chose to use these islands as a testing ground. Barker describes how the U.S. government and its agencies (Department of Energy and Brookhaven National Laboratory) systematically disregarded the health and safety of the islanders while choosing not to inform them of the risks involved: "The radiation . . . exposed every atoll in the Marshall Islands to radiation. . . . When radioactive ash fell on the islands . . . people inhaled radiation into their lungs. In areas where fallout was severe, . . . [it] stuck to the coconut oil people use on their skin and hair to keep them soft. Children played with and even ate what

looked to them like snow” (p. 21). The U.S. government also did not warn the Marshallese about the continuing effects of environmental radiation on land and ocean resources. Finally, and particularly disturbing, scientists and medical personnel conducted medical tests without the permission of the Marshallese and monitored the progression of the radiation-caused illnesses. In Project 4.1, the formal name given to this study, the Marshallese exposure was seen as a “scientific opportunity” that apparently did not include treatment. It is not surprising that the Republic of the Marshall Islands believes that the U.S. government considered not only the islands but also the people “expendable.”

One interesting aspect of Barker’s discussion is her description of how the U.S. government has limited its financial (and implicitly its moral) responsibility for cleanup of the islands, ongoing healthcare costs, and compensation for the Marshallese. The United States has created two categories of islands and people: those “exposed” to radiation and those “unexposed.” This legal designation is applied by island, and based on the island of residence during the nuclear weapons testing. According to the government, only four islands were affected: Bikini, Enewetak, Rongelap, and Utrik. Therefore, many Marshallese are considered “unexposed.” This neat legal narrowing leaves out people from the other atolls, excludes those who lived and worked on these particular islands after the tests, and also denies the cleanup crews and their families access to compensation. All of these people have experienced radiological diseases, including a variety of cancers, thyroid diseases, and reproductive abnormalities. Because the “unexposed” eventually suffer the same ill effects as the “exposed,” in a clever twist of logic the U.S. government negates the radiological origin of the diseases experienced by the “exposed” group because they are similar to those experienced by the “unexposed” group. Although these data, in many ways, speak for themselves, Barker misses an opportunity to analyze in depth the U.S. government’s use of language and legal categories. Unfortunately, she does not draw on the extensive literature from legal anthropology and linguistics that would strengthen her critique and deepen her analysis.

In the central chapters of the book, the Marshallese voices are increasingly strong. Barker incorporates extensive quotes that describe the islanders’ experiences and the effects of radiation on their bodies. She conducted approximately 200 interviews with Marshallese from Rongelap, Ailuk, and Likiep, although she draws on only a few in her analysis. Nevertheless, through these chillingly straightforward narratives the reader begins to understand the horrors of their experiences in a visceral way. The descriptions of children born with a wide array of abnormalities, such as missing bones or organs, are particularly heart-rending: the Marshallese use such terms as “octopus”, “jellyfish,” “marlin,” or “clam” babies to describe these short-lived children. Women also describe *kiraap* ‘grape’ births in reference to now prevalent molar or hydatidiform pregnancies.

Ironically, while these chapters are the most emotionally powerful and linguistically significant, they are also the weakest theoretically. Barker’s lack of

success in her analysis of the substantial data is a result of inconsistencies in presentation, a failure to substantiate many of her conclusions, and a shallow application of linguistic theory. She carefully presents lengthy sections from her interviews, first in Marshallese and then with an English translation. Moreover, in parts of the text, she distinguishes between the speakers' use of Marshallese words and of English in order to highlight changes in language use. Unfortunately, she is not consistent, so that at points in her discussion it is unclear whether the survivors are using only Marshallese or Marshallese and English words to describe the deformed babies. Also, a table that lists English loan words used during three interviews is incomplete, as becomes apparent during the reading of the Marshallese quotes. Further, at several points in the book Barker makes assertions about U.S. government policies, yet the quotes from government sources that she uses to support these conclusions come from documents that were written as much as 20 years before the event she is addressing.

Finally, in describing the Marshallese use of what she calls "radiation language," which includes the use of English, Barker argues that this "does not represent a creolization or pidginization of the English language where English language creeps in and replaces a local language, but the evolution of a completely separate language with different meanings" (83). I was not convinced that this was, in fact, a separate language with different meanings. Rather, I think that it would be more fruitful for Barker to examine the use of metaphor, code-switching, and syncretism in her linguistic data as a way to draw out more fully the underlying meanings and themes in survivors' stories.

Despite any reservations I have about her analysis and the presentation of her data, some of which would have been solved by a more careful editorial eye, this is an excellent book for courses on the Pacific islands, colonialism, and globalization, especially in conjunction with the film *Radio Bikini*. It is an important book that tells the stories of the people we have not heard, even though their stories are painful. One has to wonder, especially in light of current events, who were those people who participated in the exploitation and watched the suffering of radiation survivors without doing more than documenting the progression of these diseases, and who attributed the existence of severe birth abnormalities to inbreeding and poor nutrition? Barker's call for more work in applied anthropology among disenfranchised groups is well supported by this book.

(Received 2 July 2004)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.