this sensitive methodological area; and even then, such areas as instrument construction and research design—including the bringing together of ethnographic and quantitative procedures—will remain without proper coverage. I do not think we can afford to educate yet another generation with no more than a teaspoon of familiarity in the areas of research design and data analysis. By doing so, we foster the continuation of the methodological ignorance that has now plagued a generation of sociolinguistic interest, particularly in societal phenomena.

Even more serious is F’s division of the sociolinguistic enterprise into two separate volumes: this one with virtually no linguistics, and the one to come probably with no sociology. This would be bad enough if all students of the sociolinguistic enterprise were to take a full-year sequence in this area, in which the present text and its presumed sequel could be studied in turn. That would not really be the intellectually most satisfying solution to the problem, which is precisely that of integrating—not separating—the two foci that make up the total sociolinguistic enterprise; but it would be a step forward. As it is, however, there will definitely be many students (indeed, probably a majority) who will study only one of the two texts, and who will therefore inevitably miss half the field. Those whose half-exposure will be restricted to this volume will receive no introduction at all to Hymes, or Labov, or Shuy, or to linguistic and sociolinguistic rules and variables. It remains to be seen what those exposed only to the follow-up volume will need to forgo. I wonder whether it is really necessary to pay that price.

Even if both volumes are studied, and even if they become the modal approach to sociolinguistics (a noteworthy step forward from where most courses are today), the true challenge is to present linguistics and sociology together—in interaction, and in progression from micro to macro. I do not say this out of personal pique. Much of my work is mentioned in the volume under review, and I have almost no complaints against how I am interpreted. However, the major challenge has not yet been joined, either in terms of building systematically from lower-order, face-to-face phenomena to higher-order, long-range, national policy (with a series of units and a set of theories that can tie these levels together), or in terms of the inclusion of either sociological or linguistic theory as such. If linguistic theory is to be presented in Volume II, then where oh where will sociological theory be presented? Can a textbook on society be written with no mention of Comte, Durkheim, Weber, or Parsons?

This volume (and its companion) may well be the best we have for the time being. It represents an improvement on what existed before, but is still far from what sociolinguistics should be.
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Reviewed by Shana Poplack, University of Ottawa

This collection of 15 articles was written or co-authored over a ten-year period (1968–78), which Sankoff characterizes as a transition from the study of the social context of language use toward the study of how the social nature of language can influence its structure. Uniting widely-cited and classic articles with equally valuable though lesser-known ones, the volume provides an excellent overview not only of S’s œuvre, but of the field as a whole. This book represents sociolinguistic scholarship in its broadest sense—incorporating
ideas, methods, and data from areas as diverse as the sociology and politics of language, cognitive anthropology, dialectology, lexicostatistics, pidgins and creoles, bilingualism, functions of language use, discourse analysis, and linguistic variation. As a student and practitioner of anthropological, interactionist, functionalist, and variationist approaches to sociolinguistics, S has culled what is pertinent from each and integrated them into a holistic vision—all the more striking when compared to present trends of increasing fragmentation and dissociation among the subfields generally referred to as 'sociolinguistics'.

Remarkably enough, the papers gathered here are by and large as timely today as they were at the time of writing. Indeed, several introduce or explicate issues which remain very much alive, such as the existence of a syntactic variable, the notion of 'functional equivalence', the process of grammaticalization, and the nature of creolization. Despite S's modest disclaimer (p. 4) with regard to developments in sociolinguistic methodology since the writing of some of the older papers, it is fair to say that this volume contains several papers which have seldom been equalled in nearly a decade of subsequent research—let alone superseded. At least part of the reason is S's felicitous combination of quantitative and qualitative methods of study.

The collection is organized into two sections. The first, 'Language in social and historical space', contains two socio-historical surveys of the linguistic situation in Papua New Guinea, two basically methodological studies of the relationships among Buang and neighboring languages, a paper on the situational determinants of language choice among the multilingual Buang, two analyses of referential variability and social meaning of Buang kin-group terminology, and two programmatic papers on the study of linguistic variation. The second section, 'Studies of particular linguistic variables', treats the internal structure of linguistic variation in three papers dealing with the syntax of Montreal French, and in three about the nature of creolization and discursive influences on grammaticalization in New Guinea Tok Pisin.

Chap. 1, 'Political power and linguistic inequality in Papua New Guinea', is essentially an account of the introduction of sociolinguistic stratification into a society which, despite the existence of extreme linguistic diversity, had previously suffered relatively little from hierarchical social differentiation. It addresses what S terms one of the major questions of sociolinguistics (p. 5): how social processes manipulate essentially neutral linguistic processes into a system which reflects and reinforces social and power differences. Tok Pisin—the language of colonization, originally associated with authoritarian behavior and considered to be the white man's language—is shown by S to have more recently emerged (via a complex series of social, political, economic, and linguistic processes) as a language of solidarity among New Guineans themselves. But the somewhat surprising spread of Tok Pisin in this integrative function is accompanied by a growing awareness on the part of speakers that, in fact, the relatively inaccessible English language is the instrument of power in their new society. S shows how degree of control of English is reinforcing social stratification in the towns, and she is able to predict that knowledge of English will become increasingly correlated with attributes of power. This is a fascinating dissection of the mechanics of sociolinguistic stratification; it is one of the few convincing documentations available of the essential connections between day-to-day sociolinguistic interaction and society-wide political and social processes.

In Chap. 5, 'Multilingualism in Papua New Guinea', S investigates the implications of extreme language diversity for the study of multilingualism on the macro level. Analysis of a rich variety of historical, ethnographic, and linguistic sources on language distribution in pre-colonial Papua
New Guinea leads her to conclusions somewhat different from those generally current, notably that multilingualism in Papua New Guinea is not just a post-contact phenomenon—particularly if one considers the true sociolinguistic situation, involving a multiplicity of dialects, subdialects or varieties, heightened mutual intelligibility at language and dialect borders, and favorable linguistic attitudes. The second half of the paper is an assessment of the multilingual situation after almost a century of colonial rule, documenting the spread of various regional lingua francas and the three official languages of the country. After examining all the available evidence, S concludes that only a rough estimate of the over-all degree of multilingualism can be provided. This paper is eloquent testimony to the difficulty (rarely acknowledged by linguistic demographers) which is inherent in combining the detailed qualitative picture—obtained from looking at types of multilingualism—with quantitative information on the distribution of official languages.

Chap. 6, ‘Mutual intelligibility, bilingualism and linguistic boundaries’, addresses the problem of how to distinguish the effects of structural similarity from those of foreign language acquisition in assessing intelligibility between closely related speech varieties. A psycholinguistic test devised to determine passive competence (efficiency of information transfer) of speakers of three varieties of Buang reveals, far more clearly than would appear from use of traditional lexicostatistical methods, that mutual intelligibility is not simply a function of degree of linguistic similarity among languages, but also depends strongly on asymmetrical patterns of language contact among speakers of the three varieties. Chap. 7, ‘Wave vs. Stammbaum explanations of lexical similarities’ (co-authored with David Sankoff), is an attempt to assess conflicting diffusionist and family-tree theories of language relationships within a common framework, on the basis of empirical observations. In this, the only paper in the collection with no sociolinguistic content, a predictive model is constructed for each tree, and is fitted to data on Buang and related Austronesian language varieties of northeastern Papua New Guinea. The results show that a family-tree relationship is clearly discernible in the data, but that this model should be modified to allow for a quantifiable rate of diffusion among geographically proximate languages.

Chap. 2, ‘Language use in multilingual societies: Some alternate approaches’, explores several paradigms for analysing code choice in terms of their different analytical goals: prediction, interpretation, or treatment as a sociolinguistic variable. In her work among the Buang, S was early led to reject a deterministic model of language choice, realizing that social and situational variables could not be taken as predictive in the strict sense. She rightly observes (37) that such factors are at best capable of characterizing the types of situations in which particular code choices are likely, but not which code will be used in any particular case. In this respect, they are like variable grammatical rules, which cannot predict a specific realization by any particular speaker. Accordingly, S’s model for code choice defines not only the situations which are appropriate for use of a given code, but also those in which it is the very alternation of codes which is appropriate. In such cases (e.g. formal public meetings), one can predict that code-switching (in the sense of what I would call a discourse mode) will occur, but not which code a speaker might use at any point in time. This early astute observation has, unfortunately, been largely ignored by subsequent researchers on bilingualism.

Chap. 8, ‘Cognitive variability and New Guinea social organization’, and Chap. 9, ‘Sharing and variability in a cognitive model’, are reprinted from anthropology journals. Both deal with the analysis of social and cultural organization among the Buang, and with the way certain social processes are articulated through referential variability. S presents data showing variation in attribution of kinship affiliation across individuals, as well as on the part of the same individual on different occasions—a situation not unlike the cases of inherent linguistic variation which S reports in Section Two of this book. It seems natural, then, to apply a research strategy analogous to sociolinguistic methodology, based on a probabilistic rather than a deterministic model. Of particular interest in Chap. 9 is the elegant graphical analysis of the connection between perceived garden-plot ownership and perceived clan membership, and the quantitative generalization of the notion of sharedness in culture.

The remaining chapters in Section One are early programmatic statements of the ‘quantitative paradigm’ in sociolinguistic studies, and constitute a natural introduction to the studies of linguistic variation in Section Two. Chap. 3, ‘A quantitative paradigm for the study of communicative com-
petence', remains a classic exposition of the methods and goals of the branch of sociolinguistics frequently referred to today as 'variation theory'. S's concern here is to link the distribution of linguistic features with the broader sociocultural context in which they occur (48) as well as to relate linguistic performance systematically to competence, despite the inherent variability present in performance data. She treats all aspects of the field, from choice of sampling methods to types of analysis, various quantitative models, kinds of linguistic variables, and ways of grouping data and speakers—illustrating the discussion with results of quantitative sociolinguistic studies of Montreal French and Tok Pisin. Several of the theoretical points made—in particular, that variable linguistic performance is a sample of linguistic competence (in itself non-deterministic in nature)—are illustrative of some of the larger issues in the field at the time of writing. Chap. 4, 'Above and beyond phonology in variable rules', was presented at the first Conference on New Ways of Analyzing Variation (N.WAVE). In response to the fact that the majority of early variationist studies were limited to phonological and morphophonemic problems, S calls for an extension of the analytical framework to syntax and semantics.

A striking contrast between Chaps. 3–4 and those in Section Two is the detail of the analysis in the latter. The early data sets from French, e.g. on l-deletion and que-deletion, are relatively unstructured from the linguistic point of view; but the later papers enter into the full intricacies of their topics. Taken together, the chapters in Section Two may be seen as an operationalization or proof of S's claim that the 'extension of probabilistic considerations from phonology to syntax is not a conceptually difficult jump' (92). None of these chapters takes phonological variation as its central theme; rather, they deal with a range of cases of syntactic and morphological variation as diverse as clitic and relative placement, pronoun substitution, auxiliary alternation, and negative particle deletion. Almost every one of these cases of variation proved problematic in terms of ascertaining whether the respective variants were indeed 'alternate ways of saying the same thing', i.e. variants of a variable in the classic sense. The definition or establishment of the syntactic variable is a theme which recurs in much of S's work, but which appears most explicitly in the papers on Montreal French.

Chap. 13, 'Anything you can do' (co-authored with Suzanne Laberge), and Chap. 15, 'The alternation between the auxiliaries avoir and être in Montreal French' (co-authored with Pierrette Thibault), were at the core of the controversy over the syntactic variable (Lavandera 1978, Labov 1979)—which has not yet been resolved, to judge by the continuing succession of scholars proclaiming the discovery of syntactic variation. It comes as no surprise, then, that S has been at the forefront of those seeking to develop methodology for the study of syntactic variation, notably the still under-utilized notion of functional equivalence; this requires only distributional parallels and partial equivalence to establish (see also D. Sankoff & Thibault 1981, Thibault 1982), rather than total equivalence between forms.

Chaps. 13 and 15 show how historically distinct grammatical forms can come to be used as functional equivalents in discourse. S believes (293) that such discourse equivalents may eventually turn into linguistic equivalents. Both papers treat extremely complex cases of linguistic variation, in which the forms in question are simultaneously variants of distinct variables. In Chap. 13, a study of pronoun movement in Montreal French, the impersonal on 'one' is shown to be infiltrating the system of personal pronominal reference, while the personal pronouns tu/vous 'you' are also being used as indefinites. By establishing that all three variants function interchangeably with each other and with other impersonal constructions in semantically empty slots, and by excluding con-
texts in which presence of one variant is categorical, the authors arrive at the ‘variable context’ of *on/tu/vous*: one which may be characterized by the notion of generality. They define a number of independent lexical, morphological, and syntactic indicators of generality, showing how both *on* and *tu/vous* alternate as indefinite referents in the three major classes of ‘general’ contexts which they identify. In addition, detailed analysis of how these pronouns are used by speakers in discourse reveals two pragmatic categories of use, which show preferences for one or the other of the variants. The syntagmatic relationship of the variants to the surrounding discourse also has an effect.

Chap. 15 examines the variable conjugation by speakers of Montreal French, with both *avoir* and *être*, of verbs requiring the auxiliary *être* according to prescriptive grammars. Elsewhere in the grammar, these auxiliaries have different functions, although no generalized agreement exists as to whether the choice between them conveys an aspectual distinction or the active/stative dichotomy. As in the *on/tu/vous* study, the problem here is to locate the area where *avoir*/*être* variation conveys no differences in meaning—in this case, where both function as auxiliaries. In the most important part of the chapter, the authors painstakingly develop a series of temporal and non-temporal indices, both inside and outside the sentence, to establish the reference point and aspect of the forms in the data. They demonstrate that, in those sentences analysed as focusing on the action rather than an ensuing state, the choice of *avoir* or *être* cannot be given different aspectual readings. Precisely in this context, *avoir* and *être* may be said to constitute two variants of the variable ‘auxiliary’, and the ensuing analysis is limited to these forms.

Chap. 14, ‘The productive use of *ne* in spoken Montreal French’ (co-authored with Diane Vincent), might appear to be a misnomer, since the negative particle in question is so frequently deleted that most observers would claim that it has already completely disappeared from the spoken language. Even most students of linguistic variation would hesitate to treat a phenomenon whose frequency of occurrence barely reaches 0.5%. Yet this paper shows what can be achieved from detailed study of even a small number of examples. The authors believe that a linguistic change may be arrested, even near completion, if the alternation serves some purpose. Careful examination of the sentences in the corpus containing *ne*, used productively, reveals that such is the case here. The majority of these sentences deal with topics which might be expected to occur in formal speech styles. Moreover, speakers who used *ne* even occasionally had a higher ‘linguistic marketplace index’ than those who never did. Thus use of *ne* is available as both a social and a stylistic marker—one plausible explanation for its survival.

The other Montreal French variables are also subject to extra-linguistic conditioning. Choice of auxiliary among Montreal francophones is a strong social indicator, *avoir* being used most frequently by men, by speakers with less education, and by those with low insertion in the linguistic marketplace. The social constraints on pronoun use are less clear; however, a pragmatic effect appears to favor *on* in formulating what the authors refer to as morals or truisms.

The three remaining chapters in the volume, dealing with grammatical variation in Tok Pisin, must rank among the most valuable contributions to the field of creole studies. They are surely among the few which subject their data to systematic and quantitative analyses in order to shed light on the controversial issue of creole genesis. Particularly innovative in S’s work is the controlled scientific comparison of pidgin and creole stages of the same language. Since Tok Pisin is at present in the process of creolizing, fluent L2 (‘pidgin’) speakers—i.e. parents—and native (‘creole’) speakers—i.e. their children—co-exist in many families, permitting investigation of linguistic usage in the two groups. Each of the studies provides empirical evidence that the advent of creole speakers serves to advance tendencies already present in the pidgin, rather than to create sudden and dramatic changes (201).

Chap. 10, ‘On the acquisition of native speakers by a language’ (co-authored with Suzanne Laberge), is an elegant documentation of this process. In examining the widely accepted notion that creolization involves complication of linguistic structure, the authors focus on the apparent change in the status of *(baim)*bai from adverb to future tense marker—hypothesizing that such a
change should be apparent in reduced stress and fixed position, plus obligatory (and redundant) occurrence in appropriate sentences. They find that the creole speakers do indeed stress bai significantly less than the pidgin speakers; for both groups, however, bai is redundant and obligatory, and categorically occupies the pre-VP position after complex NP’s—suggesting that the transition from pidgin to creole is in no way so abrupt as might be concluded from the stock definitions of these terms. Rather, the changes that occur are undoubtedly well underway long before the existence of an appreciable group of creole speakers.

A related theme in S’s work on creoles is the study of ‘grammaticalization’—the process by which discourse markers may eventually come to be grammatical markers. Though this phenomenon is by no means limited to creoles, it is perhaps most easily observable in those languages, as is amply attested in Chap. 11, ‘The origins of syntax in discourse’ (co-authored with Penelope Brown). This is a study of the relativizer ia in Tok Pisin. The paper makes a strong case for the claim that relativization is an instance of much more generalized ‘bracketing’ or focusing devices used to organize information in discourse. It thus provides perhaps the clearest exemplification in the volume of S’s view of grammaticalization: that structures which become part of the grammar of a language must first have had a function in discourse in that language. The detailed syntactic description here of ia-bracketing in relative clauses, cleft sentences, and deictic constructions shows that, although the syntactic functions of the ia-bracketed materials differ, they share an analogous ‘identificational’ function with regard to the referents qualified by ia. Examination of the constructions as actually used in discourse leads the authors to suggest that ia is not specific to a particular syntactic type, but is the property of any parenthetical expression which does identificational work (236). The presence of ia postposed to the noun which it qualifies marks a slot—not always or necessarily exploited—where either speaker or hearer(s) can provide additional clarifying information. While the different syntactic types examined show different patterns of ia-bracketing, it is actually the work done by the parenthetical expression, whether identificational or characterizational (241), which is crucial. The constraints on ia-placement are thus related not only to syntactic structure but also to discourse considerations—a fact which becomes available only through careful study of the sequential context of occurrence of the construction.

The exposition leads naturally to the proposed trajectory for the advent of ia—from its original function as place adverb (‘here’) to use as a deictic or demonstrative, to its present-day use for general bracketing or focusing in relatives, clefts, and topic-comment structures. The combination of interpretive and quantitative techniques in this work, together with its far-reaching results, have made it an important reference not only in pidgin and creole studies and in sociolinguistics, but also in psycholinguistic and acquisition studies and in functionalist syntax.

Chap. 12, ‘Variability and explanation in language and culture: Cliticization in New Guinea Tok Pisin’, also exemplifies S’s ‘functional’ view of linguistic variation: how and to what extent the varied functions of language influence its shape (258). The paper examines the progressive cliticization of Tok Pisin subject pronouns over four historical stages of the language, beginning in 1885 and culminating with S’s own recordings of two generations of speakers. The first shows how, over a twenty-five year period, i- ‘he’ has moved from a strong pronoun, showing only incipient cliticization, to a clitic—losing, in the process, any discourse function of contrast. At a third stage, the beginning of a second wave of cliticization is noted, giving sequences like N + PRO + i + V. It is the pronoun usually found in these constructions which now appears to be serving an emphatic discourse function. In the contemporary data, this construction type is shown to have increased markedly among speakers of both generations, though both show less use of i- in sentences with heavy subjects than had been recorded 40 years previously. In fact, the children (creole speakers) show even less use than the adult pidgin speakers, which might appear to be a reversal of the cliticization process. S cites evidence that this is, rather, a consequence of grammaticalization. As i- becomes more grammaticalized, it becomes an empty marker, and then becomes a candidate for morphophonologically conditioned deletion.

Finally, I would like to point out a contribution of S’s work which is not really explicit in her papers here (though mentioned in the foreword by Dell Hymes), but which is no less important than her methodological, analytical,
and theoretical innovations. Her decision to study Montreal French came at a time when official advertising was informing francophone Montrealers that speaking 'well' (i.e. not like Montrealers) was a prerequisite to self-respect. S and her co-workers' quantitative demonstration of the systematicity of the vernacular, and of its stratified relationship with more normative French, contributed much to the struggle for legitimacy of the Montreal variety. In the same spirit, her ethnographically based conviction of the communicative richness of Tok Pisin led to her successful search for grammaticalization processes in the language. This added a new dimension to the increasing linguistic respectability of a formerly much stigmatized pidgin, now a national language of Papua New Guinea.

The research in this book may be said to exemplify modern sociolinguistics. It grows out of a fundamental interest in minority dialects and colonialized languages—with a concomitant critique of normativism, prescriptivism, and other elitisms. It is characterized by a search for scientific explanation accountable to the data of everyday linguistic interaction. Finally, it represents a sustained and well-considered effort to ascertain where, how, and why sociological and pragmatic considerations impinge on grammatical structure. Indeed, although it is composed of a number of distinct papers, this collection would make an ideal textbook for the serious student of sociolinguistics.
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Reviewed by Chris Corne, University of Auckland

This volume is dedicated to the memory of Jan Voorhoeve (†January 30, 1983), a leading figure of the first generation of postwar creolists. It is a fitting memorial, in spite of an unconscionable delay in publication, imputable entirely to the publisher (in fact, the volume contains a paper by Voorhoeve). This delay, in a field notable for theoretical ferment, is highly regrettable: some of the papers (such as P. Stoller’s contribution) would have had real impact when written, but in 1985 they are slightly ho-hum. Nonetheless, the book contains useful discussion, and is a worthwhile contribution.

If there is another drawback, it is the rather eclectic choice of papers. Han-