BOOK REVIEWS

ROBERT ENGLEBRESTON (ed.). *Stancetaking in Discourse* (Pragmatics & Beyond New Series). Amsterdam, The Netherlands/Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: John Benjamins. 2007. 323 pp. Hb (9789027254085) $142.00/€105.00.

Reviewed by ALEXANDRA JAFFE

Stancetaking in Discourse is an edited volume that grew out of the 10th Biennial Rice Linguistics Symposium held in 2004, organized by Robert Englebretson, and brings together ten articles by a distinguished set of authors. As Englebretson writes in his introduction, the volume seeks 'to explore how it is that speakers (and writers) actively engage in taking stances in natural discourse' (p. 2), adopting an ethnographically informed approach that focuses on stancetaking as social, pragmatic action. Rather than seeking to provide a unified model of stance as social action, the volume is framed as an exploration of the wide variety of phenomena and academic approaches that can be found in this area of research.

Englebretson's introductory chapter first explores the use of the word 'stance' in two corpora of contemporary English: the British National Corpus (BNC) and the Santa Barbara Corpus of Spoken American English (SBCSAE). While small in number, the tokens of 'stance' in these corpora illustrate that stance is used to describe physical, moral and personal positions, that it is public, interpretable, socially indexical and consequential. These findings are corroborated by Englebretson's analysis of collocational evidence in these corpora. The second major section of the chapter contextualizes the chapters in the volume with reference to the themes of *subjectivity*, *evaluation* and *interaction*, briefly reviewing key corpus-based approaches as well as work that focuses on the way that stances in particular interactions are jointly constructed and linked to wider social discourses and identity categories.

The most comprehensive theoretical overview of stancetaking in the volume is Du Bois' chapter, 'The stance triangle'. Du Bois defines stance as

> a public act by a social actor, achieved dialogically through overt communicative means, of simultaneously evaluating objects, positioning subjects (self and others), and aligning with other subjects, with respect to any salient dimension of the sociocultural field. (p. 163)

The *stance triangle* is a graphic representation of the dialogic relationship between the stance object of evaluation (one point on the triangle) and the subjects (1 and 2) involved in spoken or written interaction. Du Bois emphasizes that both of these subjects produce alignments (that is, stance is an intersubjective product of

interaction over time) and that those alignments are scalar, rather than binary. Du Bois proposes the notion of the 'stance differential' (p. 166) to capture the subtle, shifting and sometimes ambiguous calibrations of stance that take place between interactants. His framework is not only attentive to the 'online' co-construction of stance in a given interaction, but also to the 'developmental history of the emergence of the stance' (p. 158) that people bring to bear on their interpretations of a particular utterance. The chapter closes with a consideration of the import of stance as 'an act of evaluation owned by a social actor' (p. 173): stance is 'consequential' because people are held accountable to the stances they take, in reference to systems of sociocultural value. As such, Du Bois suggests that stance is the smallest unit of social action; a fundamental building block of both social convergence and contestation.

Turning to the rest of the chapters, several are corpus-based analyses that explore the various resources speakers mobilize in stancetaking. Susan Hunston's chapter, 'Using a corpus to investigate stance quantitatively and qualitatively' is an especially useful discussion of methodological and theoretical issues related to corpus analyses of stance. On the one hand, Hunston draws on several corpus studies to illustrate the value of quantitative analyses for identifying patterns and generalizations that can be used as the starting (rather than the end point) of analyses of stance and genre. On the other hand, she emphasizes that quantifying stance is problematic 'because there is no simple correspondence between individual words, on the one hand, and stance functions, on the other' (p. 35). Hunston draws on her own work to show that these stance functions can only be identified through qualitative analyses of context, which she treats as complex, cumulative/emergent and intertextual in nature. She also makes the interesting point that phraseology that is not itself strictly evaluative co-occurs with stance markers and contributes to the overall evaluative character of a text. This co-occurrence is productively studied through corpus analysis.

Four chapters take a conversation-analytic approach to spoken corpora that emphasizes the jointly constructed, intersubjective nature of stance and the importance of sequential analysis: Kiesanen, Kärkkäinen, Rauniomaa and Haddington. Kiesanen analyzes data drawn from the SBCSAE, teasing out what Du Bois labels 'stance differentials'. She focuses on the role of *yes/no* interrogatives and tag questions as markers of stance disalignment by story recipients with the claims and evaluations embedded in personal accounts. Her analysis of the recordings in this corpus emphasizes the significance of delivery (voice quality, intonation, tone) as well as timing (pauses, sequence organization, etc.) in the identification of a particular utterance as: (a) a stance marker; and (b) a challenge or act of disalignment. Kiesanen's chapter is a rich illustration of stancetaking as an intersubjective accomplishment, as well as of the way that shared understandings of speakers' accountability for implicit and explicit acts of stance is made visible in interaction.

Kärkkäinen's chapter, also based on SBCSAE data, is an analysis of the epistemic/evidential stance marker 'I guess', which she interprets as 'an

intersubjective stance frame that organizes the stancetaking activity between conversational co-participants' (p. 184). 'I guess' works in two ways. First, by making public and drawing attention to a *shift* in the speaker's reasoning or inferential processes, it functions as a first assessment which invites and makes second assessments relevant. In this way, 'I guess' both projects speaker stance accommodation and invites acts of stance alignment. 'I guess' also draws attention to cohesion and cooperation in talk in its use as a discourse marker signaling a 'stanced' digression or upcoming side sequence.

Rauniomaa addresses the intersubjective nature of stancetaking in her close analysis of the Finnish epistemic stance markers *minun mielestä* or *minusta*, glossed as 'it seems to me/I think'. Drawing on a 34,000-word corpus of spoken Finnish, she shows that these markers do not in themselves reveal specific speaker stances, but like 'I guess' in Kärkkäinen's data, mark the presence of several possible stances, and thus invite and make relevant audience stance uptake. Of particular interest in Rauniomaa's analysis is how speakers use these markers to 'flush out' addressees' stances while leaving their own temporarily undefined. Speakers both respond to others' positions and project/anticipate future stances. Specifically, Rauniomaa shows that *minun mielestä/minusta* function both to project disagreement in a second assessment and mark transition to a first assessment across turns and within an extended turn.

Scheibman's chapter on the use of generalizations in English conversations is an interesting complement to Rauniomaa's and Kärkkäinen's work. Whereas in the former, interactants make stance alignment possible by activating multiple possible stances, Scheibman shows how generalizations highlight the collaborative and interactive aspects of stancetaking. Through the 'weakening of formal and semantic specificity' (p. 116), generalizations index shared or commonly held beliefs and norms and invite broad, interpersonal stance alliances. Using data from the SBCSAE, Scheibman illustrates how conversational participants' evaluative stances expressed through generalizations become jointly held or professed, as well as how individual speakers strengthen their stances through the use of generalizations. She also makes the connection between conversational enactments of stance and wider social processes, noting that ingroup solidarity through generalizations is constructed by othering outsiders. This raises some interesting issues (not explored in this particular chapter) related to the potential for stance attributions to be coercive, rather than collaborative, by raising the 'price' of disalignment.

Haddington analyzes intersubjective stancetaking processes of positioning and alignment in British news interviews. The analysis emphasizes, on the one hand, how news interview questions *project* a preferred next stance for the interviewee and, on the other hand, the complex ways in which interviewee responses react to, and retroactively construct, those projected stances. Of interest is that Haddington's data illustrates the coercive potential of projected stances through generalization. Specifically, when interviewers use third-party generalizations to raise controversial issues, disalignment with these generalizations is made

'costly' or difficult for interviewees because it is framed as going against popular opinion. This is in fact a specific instance of a more general process discussed by Haddington, which is the embedding of presuppositions in interview questions. Haddington explores how interviewees align and disalign with these embedded presuppositions on both discursive and prosodic levels, making the point that what is conventionally labeled 'interviewee evasion' of questions is part of a much more subtle dance of stance calibration in institutionally defined genres of talk.

Englebretson's data chapter is titled 'Grammatical resources for social purposes'. Taking a functional/usage-based approach to grammar, he argues for the importance of bringing stancetaking into the realm of descriptive grammar, and investigates 'how speakers use the grammatical resources of a language to carry out the activity of stancetaking' (p. 104). Drawing on a corpus of spontaneous Indonesian talk, Englebretson examines how Indonesian speakers use referring expressions and elements of voice to manage identity, epistemicity and positioning. He shows how the choice of first-person singular forms in informal conversation (especially in reported speech) are used to: (a) project greater or lesser stance distance or alignment with the propositional content of an utterance; or (b) project a more or less tough/blunt or outspoken personal stance. In addition to focusing on how stancetaking operates in the construction of more or less durable identities, Englebretson also looks at how epistemic stance markers make relevant a particular element of the speaker's identity. Finally, he explores how the expression of grammatical agency is used as a form of moral positioning.

Johnstone's chapter stands apart from the rest of the work in this volume in its sociolinguistic focus and data. Building on previous work by Eckert, Kiesling and others on the way linguistic variants become linked to social identities through stancetaking, Johnstone analyzes how two speakers in recorded interview deploy both epistemic stance markers and sociolinguistic variables to take up stances *vis-à-vis* 'Pittburghese' as a stance object. In doing so, they simultaneously characterize the nature of that object, as well as take up positions of greater or lesser alignment to the category of competent Pittsburgh dialect speakers. Epistemic stancetaking thus becomes a resource in the performance of identity. It also has consequences for social relationships and authority and, as Johnstone points out, potential longer-term consequences for dialect maintenance and status.

All in all, this volume is a rich, even indispensable reference for those who are interested in the way that stancetaking plays out in, and is consequential for, interaction. Its many chapters drive home the crucial point that stance is one of the primary building blocks of joint social action: stances are taken, projected and retroactively assigned across speaker turns. Stance differentials – the subtle work of alignment and disalignment – are hugely productive focuses for interactional analysis of talk. If there is a limitation of the book, it is its relatively sparser treatment of 'big D' discourse which could focus on the relationship between

stance at the micro-discursive level and, for example, 'systems of sociocultural value' identified in Du Bois' chapter, language ideological formations, or enduring identities/identity categories or stereotypes. Nevertheless, the data and analyses presented, in their method and detail, are a stimulating resource for work that continues to take the stance paradigm forward.

ALEXANDRA JAFFE
Department of Linguistics
California State University, Long Beach
1250 Bellflower Blvd.
Long Beach, CA 90840
U.S.A.
ajaffe@csulb.edu

Reviewed by GREG MYERS

The term *stance* has been used by many linguists in the last twenty years, but it soon becomes clear in scanning any bibliography of the topic that there are different stances on stance, different traditions in which it has taken on different meanings, all within what several writers here call the 'stance family'. Alexandra Jaffe gives a helpful table of some of these traditions in her introduction to this edited volume (p. 6). The anthropological and sociolinguistic articles in this collection focus on stance as an index of identity, an approach that is often traced back to Elinor Ochs (1992). The authors are particularly interested in who is talking (or writing) to whom and what inferences can be drawn from the way they say things. In contrast, studies of stance, modality, evidentiality, or evaluation tend to start with the grammatical categories, as in, for instance, the work of Douglas Biber and Edward Finegan (1988), and try to define their various uses, based on collections of examples. The grammatical studies tend to lead to studies of genre and register, while the more sociolinguistic studies link features to social identities and wider features of context. The grammatical studies have the advantage of pinpointing specific items (such as *I think*) that can then be studied in a range of texts, while the more sociolinguistic studies show the wide range of ways that participants can do stance taking, including accents, gestures, turn-taking styles, and even silences. The contributions to this volume usefully stretched my assumptions about the range of features that can mark stance. Barbara Johnstone finds it in the rhetoric that the Member of Congress Barbara Jordan developed over the course of a career. In Judith Irvine's study, stance is marked by the disfluency in the letters of a 19th-century missionary. For Janet McIntosh it can be indicated by the hesitation and apparent inconsistency with which interviewees respond to a question about their beliefs. The examples

of stance discussed by Robin Shoaps are utterances using moral irony. In Jaffe's own contribution, stance is expressed by language choice, the use of Corsican or French in the classroom. Mary Bucholtz and Scott Kiesling each focus on a single word, *güey* (Bucholtz) or *dude* (Kiesling), as used in the talk of young people. Adam Jaworski and Crispin Thurlow discuss the implicitly evaluative language of travel articles (e.g. *uncrowded*). The stance in Justine Coupland and Nikolas Coupland's analysis is an evaluation of body shape attributed by the writers to the imagined readers of magazine articles and by doctors to older patients in interviews ('you don't like your jiggly arms').

As the range of features indexing stance varies, so does the range of identities indexed. The 'Barbara Jordan style' suggests an authoritative rhetoric in which, for instance, the speaker does not vary what she says to different audiences. The disfluency of Irvine's hapless missionary is interpreted by institutional authorities as drunkenness. The ironies that Shoaps studies can be taken to invoke norms shared by the people she is studying. The code-switching that Jaffe studies relates to the sociolinguistic context of the island and the institutional context of the school and the curriculum. For Bucholtz the use of a popular term of youth language links to popular culture; for Kiesling the use relates to the specific roles and gender identities of speakers in a college fraternity meeting. The evaluative terms that Jaworski and Thurlow study index an elite identity (you don't want to be the kind of person who goes where everyone else goes). The attributions that Coupland and Coupland study involve voicing the views of another person, regardless of whether or not they actually share these ideas about body shape.

By using the term *stance* to describe these indexical links, the writers avoid a simplistic analysis in which the index is the identity. Instead of looking for correlations of features and social categories, they study how speakers and hearer (or writers and readers) use stance as part of interaction. Bucholtz says that her informants 'did not use *güey* because they were male, as correlational approaches to language and gender would argue. Nor did they use *güey* in order to directly construct masculine identity, as many social constructionists would maintain' (p. 165). Instead, the use of this slang word goes with other 'semiotic resources' such as clothes to allow the boys to interact. In this view, you not necessarily talk this way as a reflection of an identity, or to gain an identity; you take on an identity in a particular interaction, or have it imposed on you, or both, and part of that identity may involve using this evaluative term or sociolinguistic marker or word or language or messy handwriting. On the other hand, the writers in this collection also avoid any simplistic sense of self-conscious rhetorical choice of one form or another; as Irvine says, there is a danger that 'the enthusiastic analyst may attribute too much explanatory power to individual agency in conversational interaction' (p. 54).

The main contribution of this volume to other recent work on stance (Clift 2006; Kärkkäinen 2006; Englebretson 2007; Tseronis 2009) is their expansion and problematisation of the context in the immediate situation and in the culture. In her study, Jaffe points out that 'stances are constructed across turns' (p. 123),

and nearly every contributor does look across the conversation, in exchanges of letters (Irvine), whole classroom lessons (Jaffe), motivated stories (Shoaps) or a meeting (Kiesling). The contributors also insist we look at these acts in a wider time-frame. In her introduction, Jaffe talks about the 'trajectories' in which stancetaking occurs, and every chapter in the collection traces a different kind of wider movement in which the indexical act is to be understood – a whole life story in Johnstone's study, a missionary movement in Irvine's, complex family and community relationships in Shoaps', the past and present of a group in Kiesling's. Jaffe says (attributing the point to Jack Dubois) that 'interpreting an act of stance requires knowledge of individual histories of stances both taken and not taken' (p. 19). Dubois and Jaffe are probably right that participants (and analysts) often assume they have such knowledge for practical purposes. Whether they have heard one conversation or a whole lifetime of talk, they imagine the contextual knowledge needed to decide, for instance, if this person is being ironic, or if, for them, an empty beach means a good holiday or a bad one.

The chapter that contributed most to my own trajectory of stance research was McIntosh's study of the 'narrative self-laminations' of white Kenyans in interviews. McIntosh is sensitive to her own role as anthropological interviewer, eliciting a certain kind of talk from these elderly, wary, but surprisingly candid interviewees. McIntosh picks out all sorts of paralinguistic as well as linguistic features in these interviews, and then places them in the wider trajectories, of the interview as an event, of their lives between two cultures, and also of their class in a changing nation. In one interview, she says, 'the pronoun "I" is endlessly scrutinized and turned over' (p. 85), and McIntosh follows all the variations. It is a good lesson on the kinds of context relevant to stancetaking in a research interview.

I did have reservations about some assumptions that seemed to be shared in the volume. One is the problem I have mentioned earlier: ethnographic studies can demand so much knowledge for proper interpretation ('individual histories of stances taken and not taken') as to block almost any analysis, always asking for still more background. The other problem is a tendency to generalise from the kind of stance one is analysing in a particular data set, and all stance. For instance, I stopped with some puzzlement when Kiesling argues 'stancetaking is where indexicalisation in variation begins' (p. 172), and Jaworski and Thurlow refer to 'the inherent ideological evaluation that underscores all acts of stancetaking' (p. 219). Jaworski and Thurlow also say that stancetaking, like ideology, 'often seeks to obfuscate and obscure itself' (p. 219). These statements are certainly true of some stancetaking, as they show, but I had the sense that they were expanding what was true of their version of stance and their data to embrace the whole field. But evaluation is only one kind of stancetaking, and much stancetaking is offered and recognised explicitly, and identity construction is not always at issue. If the various approaches to stance are a family, it may be a good idea, as with other families, to avoid taking the togetherness too far.

REFERENCES

Biber, Douglas and Edward Finegan. 1988. Adverbial stance types in English. *Discourse Processes* 11: 1–34.

Clift, Rebecca. 2006. Indexing stance: Reported speech as an interactional evidential. *Journal of Sociolinguistcs* 10: 569–595.

Englebretson, Robert (ed.). 2007. *Stance-Taking in Interaction*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands/Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: John Benjamins.

Kärkkäinen, Elise. 2006. Stance-taking in conversation: From subjectivity to intersubjectivity. *Text & Talk* 26: 699–732.

Ochs, Elinor. 1992. Indexing gender. In Alessandro Duranti and Charles Goodwin (eds.) *Rethinking Context: Language as an Interactive Phenomenon*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press. 335–358.

Tseronis, Assimakis. 2009. *Qualifying Standpoints: Stance Adverbs as a Presentational Device for Managing the Burden of Proof*. Utrecht, The Netherlands: LOT.

GREG MYERS
Lancaster University
Department of Linguistics and English Language
Lancaster University
Lancaster LA1 4YL
England
g.myers@lancs.ac.uk

Reviewed by ADAM HODGES

In its first incarnation, *The Soft Power of War* appeared as a special issue of the *Journal of Language & Politics* in 2005 to provide a scholarly response to the public discourse surrounding the war in Iraq. Now compiled as a book, the six contributions in the volume are made accessible to a wider audience. Each chapter explores political and/or media discourses implicated in the justification of war or the imagining of 'international community'.

In 'The language of neofeudal corporatism and the war on Iraq', Phil Graham and Allan Luke problematize how scholars often help reify capitalism, which 'tends to overwrite alternative political economic understandings and analyses' (p. 14). In their chapter, they set out to provide such an alternative understanding, claiming that instead of living within a 'capitalist order', we live in a system best characterized as 'neofeudal corporatism' (see also, Graham and Luke 2003). To be clear, they do not wish to argue that we have returned to the medieval system of feudalism, but to point out the similarities between that system and modern corporatism (as well as to distinguish corporatism from capitalism).

Central to neofeudal corporatism is a militarized public consciousness that supports the maintenance of a professional military class – or in President Dwight Eisenhower's terms, a permanent military industrial complex. Moreover, 'the current expression of feudalism', as Graham and Luke argue, 'is largely discourse-driven, amplified and accelerated by systems of mass mediation' (p. 32). Graham and Luke start with the historical example of the Committee on Public Information during World War I, which was established to 'prepare' the United States for that war. They end by citing the extensive involvement of today's military in Hollywood 'productions designed to inculcate faith in military ideals among the public' (p. 31). As they note, the 'particulars of these general strategies for militarizing bodies politic . . . are achieved by means of the most effective forms of mediation available and enacted by the most legitimate speakers of the day' (p. 31).

Legitimate speakers, of course, include government officials; and Norman Fairclough, in 'Blair's contribution to elaborating a new "doctrine of international community"', analyzes 'doctrinal' speeches given by British Prime Minister Tony Blair before and after the events of 9/11. In these speeches, Blair lays out a new vision of international relations and global security amidst the use of force in Kosovo, Afghanistan and Iraq. The analysis illustrates how the project of re-imaging 'international community' is an ongoing process that 'develops and shifts in response to changing events and circumstances' (p. 51).

Moving from Britain to Spain, Teun Van Dijk, in 'War rhetoric of a little ally: Political implicatures and Aznar's legitimatization of the war in Iraq', focuses his analysis on the political implicatures found in Aznar's speeches to the Spanish parliament. At issue are the pragmatic or contextual inferences derived from this discourse, inferences that require an understanding of both the local political context in Spain and the global context of the impending war against Iraq. Van Dijk discusses the basis for such understandings in terms of 'context models' – that is, the mental models held by participants, which takes into account their knowledge about the current communicative situation as well as the political situation in Spain and the world. The resulting political implicatures represent the 'political "subtext" of the speeches' and define 'the political *functions* of the speech in the political process' (p. 83).

The dialogic context of Aznar's speeches is important for the implicatures to take effect. Through his speeches to the Spanish parliament, Aznar is also speaking to a broader audience in that the media and 'public at large are critically listening' (p. 71). Many of the implicatures in Aznar's speeches are aimed at refuting criticism of him within the public debate over war with Iraq. For example, his emphasis on 'peace' helps refute criticisms that 'Aznar and his government have been widely accused of warmongering' (p. 73). As van Dijk illustrates, Aznar couples 'peace' with 'security'. In presenting the slogan 'peace and security' (*paz y seguridad*) in his speeches, the implicature reads 'peace, *but* security'. As van Dijk explains, this implicature takes the form of an apparent concession. The first part – peace – creates a positive self-presentation 'comparable to the

well-known counterpart in racist disclaimers ("we are not racists")' (p. 78). Here, the positive self-presentation emphasizes that 'we want peace' or 'we are peaceful'. 'The crucial, second part then becomes the essential condition and the principal aim of the discourse' – namely, the thrust of the discourse focuses on security and 'talk of the national security state' (p. 78). This allows Aznar to paint his opposition as unrealistically focused on peace at the cost of security. In contrast, Aznar shows that he is the one working for the best interests of the nation.

In 'The Iraq war as curricular knowledge: From the political to the pedagogic divide', Bessie Mitsikopoulou and Dimitris Koutsogiannis contrast two different sets of pedagogic materials about the Iraq war. The first set of lesson plans, *NewsHour Extra*, comes from PBS. The materials promote critical thinking within a narrow context that 'excludes any discussion about the necessity of the war or its ethics and focuses exclusively on current events' (p. 92). As a result, the lessons promote a type of 'compulsory patriotism' (Apple 2002: 305). In contrast, the second set of lesson plans, *Rethinking Schools*, provides a decidedly anti-war perspective. Through their own perspectival focus, these lessons also operate within a specific (although alternative) context that 'leaves out of discussion any arguments of the opposite side' (p. 95). The authors are not interested in critiquing the materials *per se*, but rather in foregrounding 'their deeper political nature (Gee 1996)' (p. 104). They succeed wonderfully in this aim, exposing how the underlying struggle over different political interests and goals plays out within the design of such lessons. Most importantly, they illustrate how the recontextualization of different political and media discourses within the classroom construe very different pedagogic subjects (including both students and teachers). This chapter's exploration of these issues is particularly critical given the oft-cited role of education in the (re)production of society.

In 'Computer games as political discourse: The case of *Black Hawk Down*', David Machin and Theo van Leeuwen examine a specific example of the military's collaboration with the entertainment industry, which Graham and Luke allude to in their chapter. The military is not only involved in Hollywood films such as *Black Hawk Down*, a depiction of the 1993 American operation in Somalia, but also in video games where, for example, players take on the role of special operations soldiers involved in the events of Somalia. As Machin and van Leeuwen argue, 'Today's most important and influential political discourses are found, we believe, not in newspapers, and certainly not in parliamentary debates and political speeches, but in Hollywood movies and computer games' (p. 109). Through their multimodal analysis, they illustrate how media such as these contribute to the construction of a militarized culture.

Finally, in 'Spectacular ethics: On the television footage of the Iraq war', Lilie Chouliaraki explores the journalistic choices that allow the BBC to cover the bombardment of Iraq objectively while still taking a side in the conflict. By depicting both the 'sufferer' (i.e. Iraq) and the 'persecutor' (i.e. coalition forces) in non-human terms, the television coverage 'denies the sufferer his/her humanity

and relieves the bomber of his responsibility in inflicting the suffering' (p. 133). For example, the 'sufferer' is presented through a focus on the 'buildings' and 'positions' that are bombed (rather than people), while the 'persecutor' is often erased in passive constructions. As a result, Chouliaraki argues that 'the footage ultimately suppresses the emotional, ethical and political issues that lie behind the bombardment of Baghdad' (p. 133).

In sum, these six papers provide unique and complementary perspectives on the 'soft power' of war. They illuminate the interdependencies that exist between politics and media while providing important insights into the capacity of discourse to construct the world and wield power through consensus rather than physical coercion.

REFERENCES

Apple, Michael W. 2002. Pedagogy, patriotism, and democracy: On the educational meanings of 11 September 2001. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* 23: 299–308.

Gee, James P. 1996. *Social Linguistics and Literacies*. London: Taylor & Francis.

Graham, Phil and Allan Luke. 2003. Militarising the body politic: New media as weapons of mass instruction. *Body & Society* 9: 149–168.

ADAM HODGES
University of Colorado
P.O. Box 0463
Boulder, CO 80306-0463
U.S.A.
adam.hodges@colorado.edu

RICHARD J. ALEXANDER. *Framing Discourses on the Environment: A Critical Discourse Approach* (Routledge Critical Discourse Series). New York: Routledge. 2008. 239 pp. Hb (9780415991230) £65.00/$120.00.

Reviewed by JOSHUA NASH

Ecolinguistics or the field of language ecology is primarily concerned with two major research areas:

1. environmental discourse analysis, often termed eco-critical discourse analysis or the language of ecology and environmentalism; and
2. language ecology and the interactions between humans, mind and environment, often expressed through lexico-grammatical studies of how humans talk about and adapt linguistically to new and foreign environments, i.e. the ecology of language.

Alexander's focus in this volume is with (1) and in so doing takes a strong political position on many pressing contemporary global environmental and social issues. His contribution to current thinking in critical environmental

discourse analysis revises five previously published papers and book chapters covering topics of relevance to traditional matters of environmental discourse. This volume fits well with current trends in environmental discourse analysis (e.g. Harré, Brockmeier and Mühlhäusler 1999; Fill and Mühlhäusler 2001; Garner 2004) by broadening their empirical scope, while not furthering the theoretical cause of ecolinguistics a great deal (see the concluding paragraphs of this review). Alexander's target audience includes linguists, academics concerned with language, discourse and environmental issues, and environmentalists dealing in depth with big business' treatment of environmental issues in the media. At times this volume is heavily political and emotionally written, making quite broad and sweeping claims criticizing the pulls and ploys of business rhetoric.

Chapter 2, 'Integrating the ecological issue', outlines various methodological concerns in a critical discourse analytic approach to environmental issues. Alexander argues for a degree of 'discursive self awareness' arrived at through stringent questioning, healthy scepticism and appropriate linguistic and discursive analytical tools to unpack the seemingly real pieces of fact and truth given to us in various forms of media that avail the common consumer today. A modified diagrammatic representation of Bateson's dynamics of the ecological crisis, with the addition of language as a powerful tool in the web of 'necessary conditions for the destruction of the world' (p. 25), ends the chapter, having argued for language's part in the ecological crisis itself and humans' perception of what the ecological crisis actually is.

The main focus of Chapter 3, 'Ecological commitment in business', is the analysis of texts by 'business people dealing with ecological concern' (p. 27). Alexander analyses a speech by BP's chief executive John Browne to emphasize his main point, viz. that business obfuscates agency and taking responsibility for environmental damage by employing various linguistic means, rather than through a change in action. Analysis of pronouns and semantically loaded lexical items in examples of corporate discourse pose 'language as a site of contestation of environmental issues' (p. 37). This suggests that a concordance approach to critical discourse analysis can give a clear idea of a writer's/speaker's ideological standpoint via linguistic analysis and expose possible contradictions between the interests, actions and language use of business and the economic interests and the demands of environmentalists and society.

Chapter 4, 'The framing of ecology', focuses on the various ways and methods which 'corporate environmentalism' and particularly transnational corporations have adopted to criticize, undermine and even mock environmentalists and the environmental movement. Alexander emphasizes tools such as naturalization, common collocations and meaning negotiation to see a text's inherent and underlying ideologies, assumptions and value judgments. Analysis of process, agency, voice and responsibility are applied to Browne's 826 word text. Textual movement, argumentation methods and shifting/changing of mood are all facets of discourse Alexander alludes to but

unfortunately does not provide enough empirical evidence for. He concludes by suggesting that it is the role of education and educationists to sensitize 'the young generations to those patterns of discourse deemed to be suitable for survival in the social formations for which they are being educated and socialized' (p. 53).

'Talking about "sustainable development"' is the focus of Chapter 5 and it is where Alexander critically analyzes the textual usage in 'sustainable development' by Shell. Alexander argues that his approach to the 'surface ecologization of discourse' (p. 54) looks at the greenwashing of environmental lexicon and semantics by big business. Through various examples he continues to emphasize the now well-established stance that business fuzzes and fudges real action by employing 'purr-words'. Rhetorical devices employed by speech writers to utilize and incorporate eco-buzzwords like 'sustainability' is highlighted as well as arguing for the bleachedness and meaninglessness of much corporate environmental discourse and the powerbase behind defining the meanings of words and meaning negotiation. Alexander's hyperpolitical statements concerning discourse engineering (p. 63), though strong and perhaps well founded in an ecological discourse ethic, could have been more theoretically referenced, less general and sweeping and further justified. This said, it is this type of gusto which is required to push and challenge the current boundaries of an ecological approach to discourse analysis. Finally, he makes the claim that citizens of our current media impounded world are being 'reformulated and re-semanticized' (p. 64) by PR departments and agencies to become lax in their potential demands on business and government. Emotive calls to action in the conclusion of the chapter, claiming that unless we act now and learn to limit the power of organizations and corporations as critical linguists they will continue to overexploiting our resources, are quite pertinent but are not warranted so early on in the study; nor are they required without further theoretical development and greater contextualization.

Chapter 6, 'Wording the world', looks at lexical choices made during the BBC's Reith lectures in 2000 concerning the state of the world's environment and its relationship to business interests. Concordance analysis, calculating words and frequency lists aimed at exposing collocational tendencies and evaluating ideological positions of (the) various speakers, present similar results to the previous chapters in that:

1. speakers' ideologies and positions are made clear in a raw counting of lexical items; and
2. differing semantic values and perspectives for entries are observed.

This chapter does much to address a critical reading and ideological unpacking of what at first glance may appear as similar perspectives and stances on environmental issues by influential people from vastly different backgrounds and foci. Power semantics, semantic vagueness and 'semantic engineering' (p. 79) are some of the tools Alexander presents in his analysis. Punchy political statements concerning the differing voices and stances of corporations and non-government

organizations *vis-à-vis* 'connected economies' and the relation between economy and environment once again conclude the chapter on a seething hyper political yet hopeful tone.

Chapter 7, 'Shaping environmental discourse', questions how much ecological and environmental awareness has developed in the media and the world in the past 30 years, again using the Reith lectures as an indicator of ecological progress and/or regression. Alexander questions heavily the role of the media in creating and shaping some of the environmental and humanitarian maladies we currently face in the 2000s. Modern eco-critical discourse analysis is contextualized, with the varying opinions of the Reith lectures and the concept of 'business as usual' in light of minority (alternative) views and majority (corporate) views presented discursively. Alexander argues that 'lexical choices can contribute in some way to potential value shifts' (p. 86), which is not in any way new for an ecolinguistic standpoint, and once again sets out to validate this point using lexical and collocation concordancing. Agency, simplification of complex relations and nominalization are all outlined as methods to generalize and make unspecific the nature of complex and meaning-laden environmental texts. Analysis of the ubiquitous compound 'sustainable development' in the six Reith lectures, especially the perspective of the Norwegian politician Gro Harlem Brundtland who put the term on the political and environmental map in the late 1980s with the Brundtland Report, reveals once again that change and evolution in lexis has not necessarily resulted in change in corporate environmental action, and that semantic negotiation and re-negotiation, rather than doing things, is the norm for big business. Alexander addresses differing agendas in the media associated with political stances in the consumerist age. Specifically, how the voices of big business crowds out critical voices which are often deemed as marginal and minority perspectives. Once again the writer advocates critical awareness creation and employing 'common sense to peer through this mush or smog of ideology' (p. 110). Finally, Alexander makes strong the claim that the validity of environmental discussions and value judgments are played out in, and are adjudicated by, the media, and that access to information and truth is not equitable even after public organizations like the BBC have jumped onto the same bandwagon as commercial mass-media interests.

Chapter 8, 'Resisting imposed metaphors of value', presents an investigation into the language use of a minority voice for 'small' people and the planet by Vandana Shiva. Alexander unpacks the metaphors and hence worldviews of Shiva's Reith lecture and thus her critique of the worldviews and language use of corporate environmentalism. Semantic and metaphor engineering reflecting on the status quo of politicking and definitions of intellectual property and seed theft are all considered from Shiva's perspective. Alexander's analysis is in part a meta-analysis of Shiva's conceptual approach, as well as an evaluation of the previous Reith lectures placed in a contemporary political and academic framework. The contestation of metaphors of value, wealth creation, and theft are all placed and critiqued within the context of modern market capitalism and the

linguistic aspects of its almost total deprecation of all non-economic based points of view. Shiva's alternative voice is given credence via metaphor and lexical analyses, resulting in Alexander validating the semantics of a different voice in the environmental debate, i.e. a non-patriarchal and non-capitalist opinion. The Reith lecture analyses beg complete general transcripts for the individual lectures, at least appendicized, lest the concordances appear decontextualized and almost lifeless to the reader.

Publicity material used by global genetic engineering corporations to sell their agricultural products in the Third World is the analytical focus of Chapter 9, 'Engineering agriculture – who pays the price?' and the concepts of (multinational) agribusiness, cash crops and harvesting as development. Specifically, this chapter exposes the discourse and rhetorical ploys common in the corporate public relations of Monsanto and Pioneer Hi-Bred and how these are related linguistically primarily to lexical features of texts. Collocations, pronouns and euphemistic words are exposed to a critical discourse analysis revealing the methods used by corporations to appear decisive and clear in the wording of their publicity documents to their readership and audience while often obfuscating meaning and clarity as a result. 'Growthism' and 'sustainability' are particularly mentioned as properties of the emphasis on quantity in U.S. farming and in corporate quota and monetary measurement in general. Analysis of any number of other advocates against biopiracy and seed theft in the Third World, such as the environmentalist Satish Kumar, rather than the already analyzed voice of Vandana Shiva would have been welcomed here.

The major claim of Chapter 10, 'Language and Orwell's problem', is that Orwell's problem – i.e. why we know and understand so little when we have so much information available to us (p. 220) – arises in part due to the configuration of the media and governmental and corporate structures in Western democracies. Using the example of the current state of consumerist society and its ability to overload us with stimuli and constant lacking of things like time and money, Alexander sketches an ideology-illuminating and ideology-breaking linguistic analysis of corporate doublespeak. Institutional obfuscation, governmental cover-ups and the proliferation of doublespeak are all critiqued using discursive tools, but for the majority of this lengthy chapter it is not clear what its specific reference to environmental issues is. Alexander's presentation and critique of political propaganda via media discourse and the use of euphemism and Orwellian approaches is convincing and well-founded in the history of ideas in linguistics and twentieth-century politics. Concluding the chapter, Alexander makes some cursory remarks concerning linguistic determinism, Whorfian linguistics and the placement of these concepts, which he argues are important to a critical and holistic linguistics in the context of Hallidayan notions of meaning potential and social semiotics (p. 187).

The conclusion to this study and the final chapter of this volume, 'Concluding obfuscation and disinformation', focuses initially on the 'militarization of rhetoric' (p. 189) and the role of propaganda in war. Once again, the direct

relevance of these issues to environmental matters is not clear, and neither is made clear by Alexander. However, by presenting clear and brave arguments of such pressing issues of our time he is almost excused for this deviation. Using Orwell again and current political theory and practices, Alexander argues that the semantics of 'war' have changed over time; by being and becoming continuous, war is not the same historical creature that was in the past contrasted with 'peace'. The economics of war, power and obfuscation are illuminated using the example of political and social unrest in the Middle East and portrayals and perspectives given by the media machines. One of Alexander's major claims in this chapter and indeed the entire volume is that 'language or discourse is merely epiphenomenon' (p. 197). Ultimately this point of view leads into a firm critique of the basic tenets of modern Western capitalism and exploitation via observing the current military practices of contemporary empires and regimes. Military lexicon, their euphemistic equating to military operations (read 'bombings') and the semantic engineering of names of U.S. military operations are presented critically and against an almost jaded backdrop of the ability for there to be any change to the modus operandi of modern governmental rhetoric and the current tenets of 'power rules' politics.

Overall, Alexander's analyses at first glance seem complex but in reality they are illuminating the already-known and foregone conclusion of environmentalists and ecolinguists: that corporate environmentalism is a simple case of bleaching and the substitution of words for action. It is Alexander's often emotional and uplifting calls for action and awareness creation to educators and academics and their theoretical underpinnings that were welcomed here and could have been more thoroughly examined. These are the phenomena that can take ecolinguistics further, as well as broadening the horizons of ecolinguistics' focus into other fields such as critical discourse analysis. Alexander often does himself a disservice with pseudo-scientific statements of the type 'before the planet sizzles out in a solar storm in a few hundred years' (p. 84). Such statements are at odds with his otherwise well-grounded scientific investigation and with the general scientific and empirical push required of an ecological approach to discourse analysis. Further, one of the major points Alexander emphasizes throughout this volume is that media influence and ideology production and projection are the responsibility of a few, while consumption and potential indoctrination are in the hands of many. Though difficult to validate, Alexander takes this position consistently but does not provide clear research evidence of such production and consumption ideologies and information via the modern media system and its effect on environmental discourse and analyses of this discourse. Finally, the overuse of exclamation marks is also noted as a stylistic criticism.

Alexander has added a valuable empirical analysis to the ecolinguistic and environmental discourse analysis canon. What he has not done, however, is contribute greatly to, or furthered, the theoretical development of the discipline. As this was not one of his primary objectives he can certainly be excused for this

lack. It does, however, leave a gap for further theoretical development in future expeditions into ecolinguistics and eco-critical discourse analysis. It also provides the base and ground from which these further research bounds into developing ecolinguistics as a discipline in its own right can be made. This volume, thus, will prove invaluable to future research into, and the teaching of, ecolinguistics and critical discourse approaches to environmental issues.

REFERENCES

Fill, Alwin and Peter Mühlhäusler (eds.). 2001. *The Ecolinguistics Reader: Language, Ecology and Environment*. London: Continuum.

Garner, Mark W. J. 2004. *Language: An Ecological View*. Oxford, U.K.: Peter Lang.

Harré, Rom, Jens Brockmeier and Peter Mühlhäusler. 1999. *Greenspeak: A Study of Environmental Discourse*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

JOSHUA NASH
University of Adelaide
Discipline of Linguistics
SA 5005 Australia
joshua.nash@adelaide.edu.au

KENDALL A. KING, NATALIE SCHILLING-ESTES, LYN FOGLE, JIA JACKIE LOU AND BARBARA SOUKUP (eds.). *Sustaining Linguistic Diversity: Endangered and Minority Languages and Language Varieties*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press. 2008. 238 pp. Pb (9781589011922) £26.50/$44.50.

Reviewed by DAVID DETERDING

This book contains fifteen papers that were originally presented at the Georgetown University Round Table Conference in March 2006 (GURT 2006). Some of them focus on a theoretical framework for documenting the status of endangered and minority languages, while others describe practical efforts aimed at maintaining or revitalizing such languages or present an analysis of their current status.

The book is divided into four sections. The first consists of three chapters concerned with theoretical issues concerning endangered languages. The second section has four contributions that document the situation regarding a range of languages. The six papers in the third section consider what steps can be taken to promote language protection. And finally, the last section, entitled 'Afterword', consists of two chapters which reflect on issues regarding language support, in particular suggesting that there can be negative factors which should be taken into consideration.

In the first section, Chapter 1, by Suzanne Romaine, considers three possible approaches for dealing with threatened languages: do nothing; document them; and seek ways to revitalize them. With substantial discussion about the status of the Inuit languages in Canada, she argues that active involvement in protecting

endangered languages is essential. In Chapter 2, Wesley Leonard argues that some languages which are classified as extinct might better be described as sleeping, as it may be possible to revive them; and he describes efforts to revive the Miami language, for although it was sleeping, it is now being spoken once again by some members of the Miami community living in Oklahoma. Chapter 3, by Paul Lewis, considers data that is needed for the standardized documentation of the status of endangered languages, including how information should be coded regarding such things as the number of speakers, their age, the domains of usage, the degree of official support, and the attitudes of people.

The second section, Chapter 4, by Gregory Guy and Ana Zilles, describes how Popular Brazilian Portuguese is disappearing as people gain more education and then tend to adhere more closely to the norms of standard Portuguese, particularly with respect to patterns of plural marking, and they argue that this represents a sad loss of a rich linguistic variety. In Chapter 5, Christine Mallinson documents the complex linguistic alignment of four natives of Texana, a largely black community in the overwhelmingly white Appalachian region of western North Carolina, and she describes how two of the subjects align with black urban culture while the other two identify more with their historical roots in Texana. Chapter 6, by Emily McEwan-Fujita, analyzes efforts to ensure that Scottish Gaelic can function effectively as a language in the office, detailing how new vocabulary is created and sometimes resisted in a Gaelic-language office in Inverness, and also how standard greetings are handled. And in Chapter 7, Nancy Hornberger discusses the concept of the voice of minority language children, particularly Quechua pupils in Peru, Guarani speakers in Paraguay, and Maori children in a total-immersion program in New Zealand. She argues that encouraging these children to use their own heritage language in school is essential in ensuring that they can articulate their own voice.

In the third section, on developing language-maintenance programs, Chapter 8 by Tadhg Ó hIfearnáin, describes the patterns of use of Irish Gaelic in the Múscraí Gaeltacht region near Cork in the south-west of Ireland, particularly showing the results of various language surveys and how these results were used in establishing the extent of the Irish-speaking region. In Chapter 9, Leena Huss describes how provisions for the support and protection of minority languages, particularly Saami, Kven and Tornedaliens, are implemented in northern Norway and Sweden in order to fulfill the commitments of those two countries to abide by the Charter for Regional or Minority Languages that is promoted by the Council of Europe. Chapter 10, by Paul Fallon, looks at how the Blin language has been codified and is being taught in schools in Eritrea. In Chapter 11, Teresa McCarty, Mary Romero-Little, and Ofelia Zepeda consider the status and viability of Navajo, the heritage language with the most speakers among all the native American languages in the United States. Chapter 12, by Joy Peyton, Maria Carreira, Shuhan Wang and Terrence Wiley, looks at the status of the heritage languages of immigrants to the United States, such as Chinese, French, Tagalog, Vietnamese, and Russian. In Chapter 13, Walt Wolfram

discusses efforts to popularize work on dialectal differences, particularly his own work and that of his colleagues in North Carolina in creating videos about the language usage of communities such as the Cherokee and Lumbee tribes. He argues that developing material with a popular appeal is essential for our role as linguists.

In the 'Afterword' section, Chapter 14 by Elana Shohamy discusses the revitalization of Hebrew in Israel, observing that sometimes aggressive efforts to revive and promote the use of an endangered language can undermine the linguistic rights of people, especially those who arrived in Israel speaking German or Yiddish, as they were often severely reprimanded when they tried to continue using their own languages. And in the final chapter, William Labov observes that use of African American Vernacular English (AAVE) can lead to discrimination against people, so although as linguists we generally tend to celebrate diversity and encourage the use of minority languages and dialects, we need to recognize that the continued use of some of these is not necessarily always in the best interest of their speakers.

One thing that is unfortunately missing from this book is an index: given the rich diversity of the material in the volume, its value would have been greatly enhanced if researchers could easily find material on the particular languages or issues they are working on and thereby go to the relevant pages, and it remains a mystery why the relatively simple task of compiling an index was not undertaken.

Something else that is sometimes missing is that occasionally one feels that specific examples would have enhanced the material. This is particularly true for the paper by Lewis on the classification of endangered languages which is rather dry in the absence of a few examples of how the classification that he proposes might actually be implemented. Similarly, although the chapter on the use of Irish Gaelic by Ó hIfearnáin is rich in sociolinguistic data, the comment (p. 120) that verb forms, vocabulary and syntax of the local variety of Irish spoken in the Múscraí Gaeltacht differs significantly from the standard that is promoted in schools would have benefited from an example or two. And in the account by Fallon of the revival of the Miami language, about the only word of Miami we are presented with is *bezon*, meaning 'hello' (p. 25), and it would have been good to see a few more words or phrases, to give us a little of the flavor of the language. Nevertheless, other chapters do contain plenty of linguistic data, for instance providing extensive illustrations of the features of the Blin language in Eritrea, some examples of utterances in Popular Brazilian Portuguese (p. 56), and lots of phrases in Scottish Gaelic to illustrate how the language is used in an Inverness office.

Some of the chapters are illustrated with informative charts and tables. In one case, in the paper on the heritage languages of immigrants in the U.S.A., the key for Figure 12.2 (p. 179) seems to be inverted, apparently suggesting that the numbers of speakers of Arabic, Spanish, Hindi/Urdu, English, and Chinese Mandarin throughout the world are expected to decrease between 1996 and 2050, when surely it must be the other way round; but this is a minor blemish in

the otherwise careful presentation of the data throughout the book. For example, the use of verb forms in Popular Brazilian Portuguese (pp. 60–61), the occurrence of various present-tense verb forms in Black Appalachian English (p. 76), and the percentage of occurrence of some morphosyntactic variables in struggling readers in a range of AAVE communities (p. 230) are all well illustrated with clear charts and figures.

As one might expect in a book of this nature, most of the papers are strongly sympathetic towards efforts to protect endangered languages. However, a healthy balance is provided by the inclusion of a few that deal with potential pitfalls, particularly the one by Shohamy on the efforts to enforce Hebrew during the early years of the establishment of Israel. While one might observe that the most glaring problems arising out of efforts to enforce the use of Hebrew are faced by Palestinians living in Israel and there is little discussion of their plight, nevertheless this paper offers a valuable reflection of the issues that can be encountered when trying to revitalize a language. In other papers, McEwan-Fujita notes that there can be resistance by speakers of Scottish Gaelic to the use of some unfamiliar words that are being encouraged as part of the emergent standard, such as *agallamhan* 'interview' (p. 87); and Ó hIfearnáin notes similar problems with the promotion of a standard variety of Irish Gaelic (p. 119). And finally, the chapter by Labov argues that not all minority dialects need to be protected as it seems that in many cases the use of AAVE is holding back some speakers, keeping them in their own ghettos and preventing them from benefiting from the full opportunities offered in the society around them. In circumstances like this, how important is it for us to try to encourage the use of a minority linguistic variety such as AAVE?

One other thing that enriches the content of the book is that some of the material can be quite inspiring. For example, it is good to learn about the impressive efforts to promote Blin in Eritrea, despite the poverty of that country and the fact that only about two percent of the population of Eritrea speak Blin (p. 145), about the successful efforts to revive the previously sleeping Miami language, and about the sincere efforts of the authorities in Norway and Sweden to support the heritage languages of their indigenous minorities. It seems that concern about endangered languages does not all need to be doom and gloom.

In conclusion, this book offers a rich range of papers, mostly emphatically sympathetic towards efforts to promote minority languages but also with some healthy words of caution as well. About half of the papers deal with issues in the United States, but maybe this is not too surprising for a conference held in the United States, and U.S.-centrism only occasionally slips through, such as the pronoun use in the discussion of the efforts to 'maintain our economic, political, and national security positions in the world' (p. 181) and concern about 'our national needs' (p. 183) in the paper about heritage languages among immigrants to the U.S.A. In general, the diversity of the material, the inclusion of plenty of varied linguistic data, tables and charts, and the range of viewpoints offered make this a refreshing book that will be enjoyed and valued by many.

DAVID DETERDING
University of Brunei Darussalam
Jalan Tungku Link
Gadong BE1410
Brunei
dhdeter@gmail.com

XABIER ARZOZ (ed.). *Respecting Linguistic Diversity in the European Union* (Studies in World Language Problems, 2). Amsterdam, The Netherlands/Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: John Benjamins. 2008. 269 pp. Hb (9789027228338) €105.00/$142.00.

Reviewed by PIA LANE

Arzoz' edited collection brings to the fore the multilingual landscape of the European Union. As Europe has come to recognise its linguistic diversity as a part of its cultural heritage to be protected and promoted, this book is a timely contribution as it addresses linguistic diversity from several theoretical perspectives.

The stated aim of this publication is twofold: to address the challenge of respecting linguistic diversity within the EU; and to provide an introduction to the issue for those not already familiar with EU law, with particular focus on the potential of the *Charter of Fundamental Rights*. The book consists of two parts: 'Factual and theoretical approaches' – with four articles focussing on general aspects of linguistic diversity from sociolinguistic and sociological perspectives, with particular attention to the European context; and 'Protection of linguistic diversity in EU law' – with five articles all addressing legal aspects pertaining to linguistic diversity within the EU.

The introduction addresses the rise of concern for cultural and linguistic diversity, drawing our attention to two complementary lines of thought underlying this concern: the need for protection of cultural diversity as an ethical imperative; and the unprecedented scale of language death.

As the title of this edited volume indicates, the main topic is how to appreciate/maintain linguistic diversity in the European context. However, this does not include *all* types of contemporary linguistic diversity. Recent immigrant languages are excluded, and thus, linguistic diversity in this context is to be understood at two levels: the European national languages; and the historical minority languages of Europe. In other words, the book deals with languages which have been granted some form of official status and legal protection on the national, regional or local level.

The book addresses many aspects of Europe's linguistic diversity and illustrates that there is a language hierarchy within the European Union: the working languages of the EU; the national languages; and the regional or minority languages. These language categories are used in different domains and institutions and have not been granted the same degree of protection.

Part 1 approaches the issue of linguistic diversity in the European Union from the perspectives of sociology, economics and political science, and this most likely is the part which will be more appealing to sociolinguists. Chapter 1, by Van Parijs, analyses the economic consequences of linguistic diversity and concludes that even though not all forms of linguistic diversity can be expected to have beneficial consequences, this diversity still needs to be preserved because it is part of the pursuit of linguistic justice as equal dignity.

Chapter 2, by Juarasti, Reagan and Tonkin, offers a detailed and useful overview of the approximately 60 spoken languages and 30 sign languages used in the EU. These languages are divided into three categories based on the number of native-speakers (accompanied by a short and to-the-point discussion of the chosen categories):

- languages with more than ten million speakers each;
- languages having between one and ten million speakers; and finally
- languages with less than one million speakers each.

The authors also point out how the size of these language often (but not always) is related to power, distribution and status, and show how European nation states employ different strategies for accommodating or reducing linguistic diversity on the national level and draw our attention to the relationship between the policies on the European and national levels.

Grin's chapter looks at language choices in the EU from the perspective of policy analysis with particular emphasis on the distinction between efficiency and fairness. The goal is to assess the net value (benefits minus costs, both market and symbolic benefits and costs) of each policy option, and determining which policy creates the highest value. When applying this to various language regime options, Grin concludes that there is no superior solution because different regimes may be preferable depending on the chosen evaluation criteria. Therefore, a more detailed analysis of policy alternatives is necessary.

The last chapter of this section addresses how linguistic diversity has come to be seen both as part of and constructing European identity through its inclusion in the European meta-language. Kraus demonstrates how the EU discourse stresses EU's commitment to protecting linguistic and cultural diversity in an attempt to create 'unity through diversity', including the protection and inclusion of Europe's historical minorities and their languages. This contrasts with the *use* of languages within European institutions where English, and to some extent French, dominates. Thus, recognition of Europe's linguistic diversity becomes a symbolic act. Kraus suggests that the notion of 'deep diversity' might be a solution to this dilemma; in the European context seen as 'a shared attachment – as expressed by Union citizenship – to an emerging transnational polity' (p. 98), though it is not obvious what practical measures should be taken in order to achieve this goal.

The second part of the volume focuses on the basics and shortcomings of the legal protection of linguistic diversity within the EU, and will no doubt both be challenging and instructive for readers with a sociolinguistic background.

Hilpold's chapter investigates the relationship between two central concepts, namely EU citizenship and linguistic rights. He uses three court cases to illustrate how the view of EU citizenship has developed, and discusses whether and to what extent this concept can be seen as related to linguistic rights. Hilpold suggests that the legal environment now seems to be far more kindly disposed to linguistic diversity.

Shuibhne examines recent developments in the field of EU law and minority language policy and provides a lucid analysis of the linguistic hierarchy within the EU. EU languages are not equal in all respects, a situation she describes as layers of 'minority-ness'. The article provides an outline of the EU language framework, some policy initiatives and legal evaluation of the framework through the investigation of language practices within European institutions and the analysis of decisions taken by the Court of Justice, concluding that there is a need for linguistic coherence in EU language planning if the linguistic dimension of EU citizenship is to have meaningful substance.

The ambivalences of European integration are addressed in Chapter 7, by Arzoz: the EU is an example of successful supranational integration, yet there is a strong sense of nationhood. The focus of this contribution is Article 22 of the *Charter of Fundamental Rights*, and Arzoz maintains that Article 22 is a minority protection clause, since it addresses the most basic protection needs of minorities. Arzoz debates whether the difference between enforceable acts and principles (i.e. need to be implemented by legislative and executive acts) applies to Article 22, concluding that Article 22 provides cultural, religious and linguistic minorities with an enforceable right to non-interference on the part of the European Union in order to preserve their minority characteristics. He also points out that the inclusion of a reference to linguistic rights in the EU *Charter of Fundamental Rights* can contribute to the awareness and preservation of linguistic diversity within the EU.

The contribution by de Witte also addresses the EU *Charter of Fundamental Rights*, but in this chapter the focus is on the protection of linguistic diversity as addressed in Article 21, with its main emphasis on 'the right to good administration' which prohibits discrimination when implementing EU policies on a number of grounds, including language. De Witte gives an outline of some of the aspects of the *Charter*, pointing out that its scope is restricted to EU institutions whereas Member States are only subject to it when implementing EU law, and that as such Article 21 is a very good introduction to the EU *Charter of Fundamental Rights* for readers who are not familiar with EU law and legal system. In the last part of the chapter, de Witte addresses the implied linguistic dimensions of some of the other rights of the *Charter*, for example freedom of

expression and education, concluding that the implied linguistic content of some of the general rights in the *Charter* could play at least a limited role in the protection of linguistic diversity.

The volume's final contribution, by Milian-Massana, deals with languages that are official in part of the territory of the Member States, defining these as 'languages whose status is recognised by the constitutions of the Member States on part of their territory; and languages which, in accordance with their constitutional order, enjoy official status in part of the territory of the Member States' (pp. 191–192) in contrast to Europe's regional or minority languages whose status is not constitutionally guaranteed. Milian-Massana discusses whether languages that are official only in parts of the territory of Member States are second-class languages, or whether they receive institutional recognition in EU law as they lack an official status within EU law. Milian-Massana argues that languages such as Catalan, Basque and Galician are negatively affected by European integration and should be considered as majority languages for reasons of vitality and number of speakers.

Respecting Linguistic Diversity in the European Union provides a good overview of various types of linguistic diversity in Europe. European Charters and conventions dealing with linguistic diversity have strengthened both the role of the European national languages and also the role and status of Europe's minority languages, Milian-Massana's argument notwithstanding. The book highlights and illustrates the challenges of respecting linguistic diversity within the EU, but the volume does not quite meet its second goal of providing an introduction to the issue for those not already familiar with EU law. It seems that the main audience of this volume is readers who already are familiar with it. If the last part of the book gave an outline of the European legal system and institutions and some more background information in a more systematic manner, a list of abbreviations and a glossary of some technical terms, this shortcoming would have been amended. Also, this is a collection of individual stand-alone articles, not a coherent publication, and there is little dialogue between the contributors and virtually no cross-referencing. The issue would have been more coherent if a summary chapter addressing these multidisciplinary challenges had been included.

Despite these reservations, this is an important publication which provides valuable information and insights to sociolinguists interested in the challenges of linguistic diversity in Europe, particularly the protection of linguistic diversity in EU law.

PIA LANE
Department of Linguistics and Scandinavian Studies
P.O. Box 1102 Blindern
N-0317 Oslo
Norway
p.m.j.lane@iln.uio.no

Vera Regan, Martin Howard and Isabelle Lemée. *The Acquisition of Sociolinguistic Competence in a Study Abroad Context* (Second Language Acquisition). Bristol, U.K.: Multilingual Matters. 2009. 169 pp. Pb (9781847691569) £24.95/ $44.95/€34.95.

Reviewed by Rubén Chacón-Beltrán

This book makes a contribution to the growing literature on study-abroad programs by focusing on the acquisition of sociolinguistic competence in learning a non-native language by means of immersion. Although not a pre-requisite for successful language learning, the year-abroad context is widely held to be the best option for the acquisition of sociolinguistic competence by L2 learners. Sociolinguistic competence is an aspect of Second Language Acquisition (SLA) that has received relatively little attention until recently, in contrast to the acquisition of grammar, for example. Regan, Howard and Lemée aim to fill this gap with this in-depth study of the acquisition of sociolinguistic competence in French by Irish-English speaking university students in France.

Chapters 1–3 discuss the interface between SLA and the context of language acquisition (especially the effect of study abroad on L2 fluency), L2 learners' language skills, previous research on sociolinguistic and contextual approaches to SLA research, a thorough overview of previous work on the acquisition of sociolinguistic and sociopragmatic competences, as well as the acquisition of grammar and lexis. The authors also consider the relationship between learners' proficiency levels on arrival and their linguistic development while abroad. Typically, linguistic 'growth' in earlier research has been observed in terms of speaker fluency, lexical acquisition, and sociolinguistic and sociopragmatic awareness. Some extralinguistic factors that may play a role in building learners' proficiency considered here are motivation, gender and personality.

Chapter 4 presents the general aims, objectives and research questions of the research, which can be summarized as the analysis of learners' acquisition of social dialects in a speech community. The tape-recorded data were collected using a classic Labovian, sociolinguistic interview to elicit spontaneous speech. The data were then analyzed by the Varbrul program using the 'maximum likelihood' method of estimating variation probabilities.

The next four chapters present the findings focusing on four different sociolinguistic variables in L2 French:

a. the acquisition of *ne* deletion (Chapter 5);
b. the variable use of *nous/on* (Chapter 6);
c. the acquisition of /l/ deletion (Chapter 7); and
d. the variable use of future temporal reference (Chapter 8).

The study of the acquisition of *ne* deletion starts by careful observations of its use in French in France and Canada, and then comparing it to its use by L2 learners at various proficiency levels. As expected, the rate of deletion in L2

learners increases considerably after a year abroad, especially in the case of less proficient learners. The investigation of *nous/on* concludes that, in the group studied here, after the year abroad experience, L2 learners' *nous/on* alternation was still considerably below that of native speakers. The acquisition of /l/ deletion appears to have improved in the informants' use of French. Interestingly, female informants deleted /l/ more frequently than males, indicating that L2 female learners follow variation patterns closer to L1 female speakers. In the study of future temporal reference, gender again seems to play a role; results show that female L2 Irish speakers strongly favor the use of the inflected future as opposed to the periphrastic future. Nonetheless, the year-abroad experience proves to be positive in relation to the acquisition of this sociolinguistic variation pattern.

Chapter 9 is devoted to the role of gender in the acquisition of L2 sociolinguistic competence during the year abroad. According to this reviewer, this is the most enlightening aspect of this research as the authors demonstrate how advanced L2 speakers reproduce native-speaker patterns for gender-preferential speech.

Finally, Chapter 10 synthesizes the results of this ambitious study reflecting on the context of L2 acquisition, contact with L1 speakers, the role of gender, and long-term benefits of a year abroad. Some theoretical and practical implications for future research are discussed such as the role of input, group and individual variation, and programmatic and policy issues.

This book provides valuable information about SLA in the study-abroad context, one that is favored by the European Union authorities in their attempt to promote language learning among the citizens of its member states. Over the last decade, exchange programs among university students have not only tried to encourage non-native language learning but they have also attempted to foster mobility within the European Higher Education Area. This book constitutes invaluable endorsement for the study-abroad programs, especially providing convincing evidence for a widely-held belief that spending a year abroad favors L2 speakers' linguistic and sociolinguistic development.

REFERENCE

DeKeyser, Robert M. 2007. Study abroad as foreign language practice. In Robert DeKeyser (ed.) *Practice in a Second Language*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press. 208–226.

RUBÉN CHACÓN-BELTRÁN
Departamento de Filologías Extranjeras y sus Lingüísticas
Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia
28040 Madrid
Spain
rchacon@flog.uned.es