

University of Massachusetts Amherst

Department of Anthropology

Anthropology 597EF-01 (24811)

Ethnolinguistic Formations

Spring 2013

Instructor: Dr. Jonathan Rosa

Email address: jdrosa@anthro.umass.edu

Office: 204 Machmer Hall

Office hours: Tuesdays, 1:00pm-3:00pm

Course Meetings

Tuesdays, 9:30am-12:30pm, Herter 101

Course Description

The notion that named languages correspond to particular ethno-national groups is so commonsense as to seem mundane. However, it is only through profound historical, political, economic, and cultural contingencies that languages have come to be understood as social identities. In this course, we will interrogate these contingencies by examining the processes through which languages and social groups are rendered mutually recognizable. We will analyze efforts to assert the legitimacy of stigmatized languages, as well as the ways that language is used to legitimate stigmatized groups. We will track the institutional and ideological frameworks that organize language standardization, and the corresponding types of political and economic power that structure so-called regimes of language. Inasmuch as “ethnolinguistic formations” are constituted through ideologies that interpret particular linguistic forms as emblems of group identity, we will also track the ways that linguistic structures are endowed with cultural value. Cumulatively, these efforts will lead to the development of a dynamic semiotic approach to the analysis of ethnolinguistic recognition. Students will also have the option of participating in a 2-credit service-learning attachment focused on language and identity in Holyoke, MA.

Required Texts

We will read the following books in their entirety:

Alim and Smitherman (2012), *Articulate While Black: Barack Obama, Language, and Race in the U.S.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Eisenlohr (2006), *Little India: Diaspora, Time, and Ethnolinguistic Belonging in Hindu Mauritius.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Inoue (2006), *Vicarious Language: Gender and Linguistic Modernity in Japan.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Urla (2012), *Reclaiming Basque: Language, Nation, and Cultural Activism.* Reno, Nevada: University of Nevada Press.

Zentella (1997), *Growing up Bilingual: Puerto Rican Children in New York*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

The other required readings for this course will be uploaded to Moodle in PDF format.

Guidelines and Requirements

1. Discussion facilitations

Each week a group of students will be designated as the discussion facilitators; each student will facilitate discussion during two weeks throughout the semester. For the weeks in which you sign up to facilitate discussion, you are expected to collaborate with your fellow discussion facilitators to develop a set of discussion questions and a creative way in which to guide the discussion. Your group will prepare a handout with your reflections on the reading(s) and your discussion questions. This handout should be approximately 1-2 single-spaced pages; make enough copies to distribute to everyone in the class on the day of your facilitation. Feel free to bring in any audiovisual media to supplement your handout. There is no possible way that you could get to all of the issues covered in the reading, so focus on whatever ideas interest you most.

2. Critical responses to the readings

Throughout the semester you will compose three short critical responses to the readings. The goal of these responses is to identify and evaluate the themes and analytical approaches that emerge from your engagement with the readings and course discussions. These short responses (300-400 words) should compare and contrast at least two readings from a given week. You may also include readings from several weeks. A couple of possible strategies would be to identify and evaluate distinct approaches to analyzing a given topic/theme, or to propose a unifying framework through which to bring seemingly distinct themes/topics together. You will submit the responses in class on the following dates: Week 5 (February 26), Week 9 (April 2), and Week 13 (April 30).

3. Book review

You will select one of the monographs we are reading for this course and compose a book review adhering to the guidelines in the *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*. You must review a monograph that is assigned during a week other than those for which you are designated as a discussion facilitator. You may choose a book from which we are reading a selection or a book that we are reading in its entirety, but the book must be a monograph (i.e. not an edited volume) and your review should cover the entire book. You can find the specific guidelines for this assignment at the end of the syllabus. Your review is due in class the week following our discussion of the book.

4. Final paper

The final paper will focus on a topic of your choice, but must draw on themes from this course to analyze a particular set of language-related practices and/or processes. The paper should be 10-12 pages (double-spaced, Times New Roman font); please include a title, page numbers, a bibliography, and citations in the convention of your choice so long as the format is consistent throughout the paper. In Week 7 (March 12), please come prepared to discuss the final paper

topic during class. This will serve as a collective brainstorming session. You must submit your final paper via email by Friday, May 10 at 5pm.

Course Schedule

Students are expected to come to class having reviewed all of the readings assigned for a given week.

Week 1 (January 22): Defining Linguistic Collectivities

1. Boas (1911), Introduction, *Handbook of American Indian Languages*, Pp. 5-14. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 40.
2. Hymes (1968), Linguistic Problems in Defining the Concept of Tribe. In J. Helm (ed.), *Essays on the Problem of Tribe*, Pp. 23-48. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press.
3. Gumperz (2001 [1968]), The Speech Community. In A. Duranti (ed.), *Linguistic Anthropology: A Reader*, Pp. 66-73. New York, NY: Wiley Blackwell.
4. Urciuoli (1995), Language and Borders, *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 24:525-546.
5. Silverstein (1998), Contemporary Transformations of Local Linguistic Communities. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 27:401-426.
6. Irvine (2006), Speech and Language Community. In K. Brown (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics 2nd edition*, Pp. 689-698. Oxford: Elsevier.
7. Jackson (1974), Language Identity of the Colombian Vaupés Indians. In R. Bauman and J. Sherzer (eds.), *Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Week 2 (January 29): Constructing Ethnolinguistic Origins

1. Anderson (2006 [1983]), *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (Chapters 1-6), Pp. 1-111. New York, NY: Verso.
2. Wogan (2001), Imagined Communities Reconsidered: Is Print-Capitalism What We Think it is?, *Anthropological Theory*, 1(4):403-418.
3. Woolard (2004), Is the Past a Foreign Country?: Time, Language Origins, and the Nation in Early Modern Spain, *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 14(1):57-80.
4. Silverstein (2000), Whorfianism and the Linguistic Imagination of Nationality. In P. Kroskrity (ed.), *Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Politics, Identities*, Pp. 85-138. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.

Week 3 (January February 5): Differentiation and Emblematicity

1. Irvine and Gal (2000), Language Ideology and Linguistic Differentiation. In P. Kroskrity (ed.), *Regimes of Language*, Pp. 35-84, Santa Fe: SAR Press.
2. Agha (2006), Chapter 5: Regrouping Identity. *Language and Social Relations*, Pp. 233-277. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
3. Das (2008), Between Convergence and Divergence: Reformatting Language Purism in the Montreal Tamil Diasporas. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 18(1):1-23.

4. Rosa, Jonathan (Forthcoming). "Learning Ethnolinguistic Borders: Language and Diaspora in the Socialization of U.S. Latinas/os." In R. Rolón-Dow and J. Irizarry (eds.), *Diaspora Studies in Education: Toward a Framework for Understanding the Experiences of Transnational Communities*. New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing.
5. Park (2010), Images of "Good English" in the Korean Conservative Press: Three Processes of Interdiscursivity. *Pragmatics and Society*, 1(2):189-208.
6. Reyes (2004), Asian American Stereotypes as Circulating Resource. *Pragmatics*, 14(2/3):173-192.

Week 4 (February 12): Regimenting Language and Personhood

1. Gal (2006), Contradictions of Standard Language in Europe: Implications for the Study of Practices and Publics. *Social Anthropology*, 13(2):163-181.
2. Silverstein (1996), Monoglot 'Standard' in America: Standardization and Metaphors of Linguistic Hegemony. In D. Brenneis and R. Macauley (eds.), *The Matrix of Language: Contemporary Linguistic Anthropology*, Pp. 284-306. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
3. Silverstein (1999), NIMBY Goes Linguistic: Conflicted 'Voicings' from the Culture of Local Language Communities. In S. Billings, J. Boyle, and A. Griffith (eds.), *Proceedings from the Panels of the Chicago Linguistic Society's Thirty-fifth Meeting*. 35(2):101-123. Chicago, IL: Chicago Linguistic Society.
4. Silverstein (2003), The Whens and Wheres – As well As Hows – of Ethnolinguistic Recognition. *Public Culture*, 15(3):531-557.
5. Rosa (2010), "They're bilingual...that means they don't know the language": The Ideology of Languagelessness in Practice, Policy, and Theory. In *Looking like a Language, Sounding like a Race: Making Latina/o Panethnicity and Managing American Anxieties*, Pp. 152-175. Ph.D. Dissertation, The University of Chicago. Ann Arbor, MI: ProQuest/UMI. (Publication No. AAT3419689).
6. Lo and Kim (2011), Manufacturing Citizenship: Metapragmatic Framings of Language Competencies in Media Images of Mixed Race Men in South Korea. *Discourse & Society*, 22(4):440-457.

NO CLASS ON FEBRUARY 19 – PRESIDENTS' DAY SCHEDULE

Week 5 (February 26): Language Ideologies and the Production of Modernity Part 1

1. Bauman and Briggs (2003), Introduction, *Voices of Modernity: Language Ideologies and the Politics of Inequality*, Pp. 1-18. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
2. Bauman and Briggs (2000), Language Philosophy as Language Ideology. In P. Kroskrity (ed.), *Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Politics, Identities*, Pp. 139-204. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.
3. Silverstein (2010), Society, Polity, and Language Community: An Enlightenment Trinity in Anthropological Perspective. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 9(3):339-363.
4. Errington (1998), Indonesian(s) Development, On the State of a Language of State. In B. Schieffelin, K. Woolard, and P. Kroskrity (eds.), *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory*, Pp. 271-284. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

5. Errington (2000), Indonesian('s) Authority. In P. Kroskrity (ed.), *Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Politics, Identities*, Pp. 205-228. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.
6. Inoue (2011), Stenography and Ventriloquism in Late Nineteenth Century Japan. *Language & Communication*, 31:181-190.

Week 6 (March 5): Language Ideologies and the Production of Modernity Part 2

Inoue (2006), *Vicarious Language: Gender and Linguistic Modernity in Japan*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Week 7 (March 12): Ethnolinguistic Socialization

Zentella (1997), *Growing up Bilingual: Puerto Rican Children in New York*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

NO CLASS ON MARCH 19 – SPRING BREAK

Week 8 (March 26): Racializing Language Part 1

1. Urciuoli (1998), Selections from *Exposing Prejudice: Puerto Rican Experiences of Language, Race, and Class*. Pp. 15-18, 35-40, 107-135. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
2. Hill (1998), Language, Race, and White Public Space. *American Anthropologist*, 100(3):680-689.
3. Roth-Gordon (2011), Discipline and Disorder in the Whiteness of Mock Spanish. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 21(2):211-229.
4. Rosa (Forthcoming), Re-Sounding Embodiments: Joint Processes of Ethnoracial and Linguistic Recognition. In H. S. Alim, J. Rickford, and A. Ball (eds.), *Racing Language, Linguaging Race*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
5. Bailey (2000), Language and Negotiation of Ethnic/Racial Identity among Dominican Americans. *Language in Society*, 29:555-582.
6. Reyes (2011), Racist!: Metapragmatic Regimentation of Racist Discourse by Asian American Youth. *Discourse & Society*, 22(4):458-473.
7. Bloomfield (1927), Literate and Illiterate Speech. *American Speech*, 2(10):432-439.

Week 9 (April 2): Racializing Language Part 2

Alim and Smitherman (2012), *Articulate While Black: Barack Obama, Language, and Race in the U.S.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Week 10 (April 9): Migration, Diaspora, and Mediation Part 1

1. Mendoza-Denton (2008), Chapter 4: Hemispheric Localism: Language, Racialized Nationalism, and the Politicization of Youth. *Homegirls: Language and Cultural Practice among Latina Youth Gangs*, Pp. 101-147. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

2. Shankar (2004). Reel to Real: Desi Teens' Linguistic Engagements with Bollywood. *Pragmatics*, 14(2/3):317-335.
3. Blommaert (2009), Language, Asylum, and the National Order. *Current Anthropology*, 50(4):415-441.
4. Jacquemet (2005), Transidiomatic Practices: Language and Power in the Age of Globalization. *Language & Communication*, 25:257-277.
5. Dick (2011), Language and Migration to the United States. *Annual Review of Anthropology*. 40:227-240.

Week 11 (April 16): Migration, Diaspora, and Mediation Part 2

Eisenlohr (2006), *Little India: Diaspora, Time, and Ethnolinguistic Belonging in Hindu Mauritius*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Week 12 (April 23): Linguistic Nationalism

Urla (2012), *Reclaiming Basque: Language, Nation, and Cultural Activism*. Reno, Nevada: University of Nevada Press.

Professor Urla will be joining us at the beginning of class to discuss her book.

Week 13 (April 30): Ethnolinguistic Multiplicity

1. Woolard (1998), Simultaneity and Bivalency as Strategies in Bilingualism. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 8(1):3-29.
2. Rampton (2011), From 'Multi-ethnic Adolescent Heteroglossia' to 'Contemporary Urban Vernaculars.' *Language & Communication*, 31(4):276-294.
3. Pennycook (2003), Global Englishes, Rip Slyme, and Performativity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 7(4):513-533.
4. Blommaert and Rampton (2011), Language and Superdiversity. *Diversities*, 13(2):1-21.
5. Benor (2010), Ethnolinguistic Repertoire: Shifting the Analytic Focus in Language and Ethnicity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 14(2):159-183.
6. Rosa (2010), "I've got the answer to NUMEROW TRACE": Unaccented Spanglish and Latina/o Ethnolinguistic Enregisterment. In *Looking like a Language, Sounding like a Race: Making Latina/o Panethnicity and Managing American Anxieties*, Pp. 176-220. Ph.D. Dissertation, The University of Chicago. Ann Arbor, MI: ProQuest/UMI. (Publication No. AAT3419689).

Book Review Assignment Guidelines

You will select a book-length linguistic ethnography and compose a review adhering to the guidelines in the Journal of Linguistic Anthropology. You must review a book that is assigned during a week other than those for which you are designated as a discussion facilitator. You may choose a book from which we are reading a selection or a book that we are reading in its entirety, but the book must be a monograph (i.e. not an edited volume) and the review should cover the entire book. Your review is due in class the week following our discussion of the book.

Reviews should be 1200-1500 words and follow the Chicago Manual of Style, with references to other works included in the text of the review, not as a separate reference list. A guide to Chicago style may be found on the AAA website, at http://www.aaanet.org/pubs/style_guide.htm. Please find the Journal of Linguistic Anthropology guidelines called "Book Review Style" copied below. These guidelines show the generally formatting for book reviews including instructions on how to make in-text references. Please make note of the format for the book title, your name and affiliation at the beginning, and then the address at the end. I am also including an example of a book review from a recent edition of the Journal of Linguistic Anthropology.

Book Review Style:

Title of Book in Bold. *Author Name* and *Second Author*[, ed. or eds.] Location: Publisher, year. pp. [e.g., iv + 300pp.]

AUTHOR NAME
Name of University

First paragraph not indented.....

Second paragraph indented

Citations from the book under review are in text with "p/pp.", e.g., (p. 25).

Citations from other sources: in text, omitting city of publication. Where title or author is mentioned in text, you can omit this information in the citation.

[Examples: (*Title in Italics and First Letter in Caps*, Author, Publisher, Year), ("Title of Article in Journal First Letter in Caps," Author, *Name of Journal*, Year: #-#), ("Title of Chapter in Book First Letter in Caps," Author, in *Title of Book First Letter in Caps*, Names of Editors, eds., Publisher, year: #-#)]

Department in University

University

Address [full address, including street, city, state, etc in one line, not separated into parts]

Email

Some questions to consider while reading ethnographies, language-focused and otherwise (adapted from Susan Gal's 2004 seminar "Ethnographies of Language" at the University of Chicago):

1. Argument and contribution

How well is the theoretical argument laid out? Does it encompass the introduction and the more descriptive chapters? Is the argument lean, or does it become repetitive? Likewise, how well is the empirical argument laid out? What does the author see as the relative importance of these kinds of argument? What does the author see as his/her primary contribution?

2. Analysis and supporting evidence

What is the relationship between the theoretical apparatus introduced early in the monograph and the analysis in the rest of it? Is there a disjunction between them, or an appropriate fit? Does the evidence that the author supplies fit the theoretical framework within which it is laid out? Is it adequate to support the author's claims? Are there obvious indications of evidence that has been left out? Does the author pursue the argument with appropriate ruthlessness? Are there places where the author becomes evasive?

3. Authority

How does the author establish the authority to speak to the issues discussed in the monograph? How does the author represent his/her field experience within the text s/he is writing? Do you find the author a credible witness to the events and patterns being described and analyzed? What presence does the author establish as ethnographer within the interactions that are being analyzed? Does the author establish a distance between a self-as-ethnographer and a self-as-analyst (and/or some other kind of self, such as member of a particular kind of community of origin), and if so, how? What kinds of literary tropes and conceits are employed in making the analysis believable?

4. Field methods

Did linguistic questions or sociological questions, or both, provide the starting point for the research? What was the principal social unit of study (e.g., individual, social network, community, "society" or "culture," region)? What relationship does the author seek to draw between insider and outsider perspectives, and how are these approached in the conduct of the fieldwork? In the author's research, what relationship is there between such methods as linguistic elicitation, other types of interviewing, text collection and analysis, participant observation, recording of observable behavior (at what level of detail?), collection of demographic statistics, etc.?

5. Technical handling of evidence

How, and to what extent, does the author use technical linguistic arguments to advance claims about society? Does s/he show appropriate command of the methodologies being used? Are these methods mere “tools” in the service of the ethnographic analysis, or does the author move the analytic methods forward in and of themselves, by subjecting them to critical discussion or showing a novel interpenetration between phenomena that are most often called “linguistic” and phenomena that are most often called “social”? (Note that these questions could be reversed: To what extent are an author’s uses of social categories and concepts mere “tools” in the service of a linguistic analysis? How well does the author command the relevant sociological concepts and social theories?) Are more technical aspects of linguistic analysis avoided in the analysis? If they are not avoided, do the more technical arguments help lay out the contours of the argument or do they tend to obfuscate it?

6. Intertextuality

How is the monograph situated in relation to other currents in the discipline(s)? What is the literature on which the author draws, and why? What apparatus does the author use to point the reader to other relevant writing? Is there conspicuously relevant writing that is being omitted? Does the author’s scholarly apparatus tend to help supply supporting arguments, or supply foils for attack, or does it serve as scholarly window dressing? To what extent is the monograph conceived of as a self-contained whole? To what extent is it contextualized by other writing by the author and by the author’s immediate co-workers/collaborators/colleagues? To what extent do the analytical priorities and strategies reflect emphases developed in the area literature?

7. Ethnographic constraints

To what extent do the analytical priorities and strategies reflect ethnographic constraints, including conditions of field research? Does the author use native accounts in the analysis, and if so, how? Are they part of the evidence? Are they part of the analysis? To what extent does the author draw on native interpretive traditions? In which sectors of the community are such interpretive traditions vested? Does the author work through a native field researcher, and if so, how (or can you not tell)? What kinds of social selection are evident in the ethnography? How do gender, race, class, social status, and age play into the selection of “informants”?

8. Textual evidence

Does the author provide specific textual evidence for the analysis? If so, how is it handled? Are texts presented in the native language? What kinds of transcription practices are followed? Do the texts reflect particular kinds of social settings? Do they reflect particular kinds of linguistic registers? Is the author aware of such possible reflections, or is all linguistic evidence treated as equivalent?

9. Community (social unit)

How does the author conceive of the community or social system under study? Are linguistic practices seen as distributed evenly through a community? Who is treated as “experts” or “masters” of language or of particular kinds of linguistic practices? Who is seen as having authoritative opinion about social relations and situations?

10. Audience

Who is the audience for the work? What kind of reader is inscribed in the text, and how? Do the methodologies used in the work invite larger readerships or limit them? How readable is the work, and by whom? What standing does it have as a literary work?

11. Language, culture, social relations

For the author, what are the boundaries of “language” and “the linguistic”? How does the writer conceive the relationship between language and nonlinguistic aspects of culture and social relations? How is language conceived, and how is speaking linked to or distinguished from other aspects of social action? Is silence part of the object of study?

12. Consequences

What are the “real world” consequences of the work? If it is implicated in particular applied practices, what are they? What impact might the author’s view of the people being studied, and their language, culture, and society, have on them? What are the implications of the author’s views of language and social relations for the way we conceive of our own society?

13. Fruitfulness

To what extent does the monograph advance a line of questioning such that either the evidence or the method can be used in other ethnographic settings? Does the work provide sufficient ethnographic richness that it could supply grist for a quite different analytical mill? Does the work inspire new and interesting questions about language and social life? Do you see it as intellectually consequential?

Book Reviews

We Share Walls: Language, Land and Gender in Berber Morocco. Katherine E. Hoffman.
Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2008. xviii + 261.

PAUL A. SILVERSTEIN
Reed College

With *We Share Walls*, Katherine E. Hoffman has written a rich, textured, multisited ethnography of Tashelhit speakers in southwestern Morocco. Bridging subfields of sociolinguistics, ethnomusicology, and political economy, Hoffman explores how competing, gendered language ideologies operate in different ecologies (mountains, plains, urban areas) and in different genres of talk and expressive culture (oratory, song, poetry, radio programming, etc.). She demonstrates how migrant men and Amazigh indigenous rights activists uphold monolingual rural Berber women as icons of an endangered *tamazirt* homeland, and traces the burdens these women thus carry as the fetish objects of authenticity. The book thus offers an important rejoinder to the literature on indigenous movements—and Amazigh ethnonationalism in particular—that all too often relies on a monolithic image of a minority (or minoritized) people struggling for recognition and equality in states dominated by a single ethnic group or a national ideology of ethno-racial homogeneity.

Since the 1960s, Berber language, and the culture it presumably entails, have become objects of self-reflection, nostalgia, and political struggle for a class of mostly male students and intellectuals based largely in urban settings. Activists and artists have innovated new commercial media including cassette recordings of revitalized folksong, music videos, and radio call-in shows. These genres valorize the countryside while attempting to erase the syncretisms and borrowings from Moroccan Arabic that characterize actual everyday talk in rural areas. Such an ideology of “lexical purism” and the concomitant practices of “verbal hygiene” involve the innovation of neologisms and the standardization of syntax as iconic of Berber “self-sufficiency, strength, and rootedness” (pp. 198–202). These efforts effectively mirror a Moroccan nationalist discourse that previously prioritized the Arabization of Morocco, with the activists’ produced Modern Standard Tashelhit essentially calqued on the linguistic forms of Modern Standard Arabic. Such an ideology further stands in marked contrast to the heteroglossia and multivocality of ritual performance in the countryside (particularly in the more markedly bilingual plains) where Arabic song and Tashelhit metadiscursive commentary intercalate. For the putatively monolingual women living in these areas, such patterned bilingualism is simply “our talk” (*awal ngh*), Arabic loan words and all (p. 222).

The gendered dimensions of linguistic practice play out in more than merely symbolic registers. The fetishized monolingualism of rural Berber women by migrant and activist men has material consequences. As Hoffman concludes, “The problem is that language maintenance largely rests on the shoulders of women who are kept, by husbands and fathers, in the mountains and illiterate, to tend their homesteads and fields, to reproduce both children and culture, and to ensure their men’s prosperity” (p. 229). Some of the women Hoffman interviews do share some of the discourse of authenticity, and even explicitly seek to marry into the more socially relaxed contexts of mountain villages where women are the substantial demographic majority for most of the year. But many who live in these areas are more critical, bemoaning their lack of cultural, symbolic, economic, and linguistic capital required to depart for the cities. Drawing on Greg Urban’s frame of “metaculture” and Heidegger’s concepts of “building” and “dwelling,” Hoffman explores how women speak, sing, and materially reproduce *tamazirt* through their back-breaking “hard labor” (*tammara*) plowing fields, gathering wood, drawing water, baking bread, etc. They value *tamazirt* less for its iconization of cultural authenticity, than

for it being occasionally “full” (*‘ammrn*) with family, friends, and cheerful atmosphere (*amarg*), particularly during holidays and marriage celebrations.

Hoffman is at her ethnographic best when she focuses on these social events, when she closely analyzes recorded transcripts of specific speech acts and performances. Her discussion of a mixed-sex gathering (*zerda*) of young men and women in Ida ou Zeddout nicely draws out competing urban (*shshiki* ‘chic’) and rural (*sha’abi* ‘down-to-earth’) valuations of cultural capital that map onto language and gender, and play out in both collectively improvised musical performances and metadiscursive commentary on them (pp. 60–71). Similarly, her analysis of a recorded *tanddamt* (sung poetic duel) between Omar Aznag and Hassan Ben Wakrim, demonstrates the class dimensions of male migration, nostalgia, and morality, as the two singers perform the roles of a merchant and shepherd debating the meaning and significance of tamazirt (pp. 127–134). And her reading of an interview on Radio Agadir about fasting during Ramadan with Dr. Saad Eddin El Otmami (now secretary-general of the Islamist Party for Justice and Development) demonstrates how reliant even the most purified Tashelhit discourse remains on Arabic phrases and formulae (pp. 210–217).

Beyond its explicit focus on language, land, and gender, *We Share Walls* is thus also an ethnography of music, media, and soundscapes. The structure of the book follows a five-part musical score of sorts, with chapters organized under headings of “Prelude,” “Dissonance,” “Consonance,” “Antiphony,” and “Resonance.” Chapter 7 is based around field recordings of collective music-making at an engagement party in Arazan. Hoffman traces genre shifts from Arabic to Tashelhit musical forms and back as the ritual progresses, and even musically notates an extended improvised *rways* performance. She understands these shifts less as structurally determined than as context-dependent, flowing in large part from strains of melody or talk that emerge in the real time performance of ritual. Ethnomusicologists will find much to value and inspire.

Overall, *We Share Walls* is a model for theoretically engaged and empirically nuanced linguistic anthropology. Its ethnographic thickness is a testament to Hoffman’s remarkable level of fieldwork commitment: three and a half years living between three discrete ecological areas; mastery of multiple idioms of Tashelhit and Moroccan Arabic. Arguably the book is overly focused on rural tamazirts, and more perhaps could have been said about the way bilingualism and gendered expression plays out in the town of Taroudant where Hoffman spent a fair amount of her time. But this is but a minor quibble and should not distract from what is really a remarkable ethnography that significantly contributes in both scope and approach to the anthropology of expressive culture in North Africa exemplified by the work of Jane Goodman, Deborah Kapchan, and Philip Schuyler among others. It productively bridges the anthropological literature on place and poetics in the Middle East (e.g., the work of Lila Abu-Lughod, Richard Bauman, and Steven Caton), with a broader theoretical literature on language, gender, and political economy (notably the writings of Paul Friedrich, Susan Gal, Jane Hill, Judith Irvine, Elinor Ochs, and Bambi Schiefflin). Hoffman has accomplished an impressive feat that will generate broad interest for scholars of North Africa and well beyond.

Department of Anthropology
Reed College
3203 SE Woodstock Blvd.
Portland, OR 97202
paul.silverstein@reed.edu

Language Classification: History and Method. Campbell, Lyle and William J. Poser. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008. ix + 536 pp.

JASON D. HAUGEN
Oberlin College

This book by Campbell and Poser (C&P) critically evaluates the history of language comparison and classification with an eye to elucidating the adequacy of current language classification research (and, by implication, the subsequent claims about human prehistory entailed therein). They also seek to establish methodological prerequisites for a firm foundation for future work in this area. C&P demonstrate that the history of language classification is much more complicated (and, indeed, much more interesting) than the commonly received, text-book version