Review: [untitled]
Author(s): Greg Urban
Reviewed work(s):
South American Indian Languages: Retrospect and Prospect by Harriet E. Manelis Klein; Louisa R. Stark
Published by: Blackwell Publishing on behalf of the American Anthropological Association
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/678797
Accessed: 24/07/2010 11:50
ligious units” in the United States (p. 196). Other chapters examine these institutions in greater depth. In the final four essays Fishman, writing alone, argues the virtues of ethnic pluralism, drawing interestingly on Herder and Whorf, whom he sees as “heroes of multilingualism” (p. 452).

This volume is an important contribution to the study of ethnicity, because Fishman squarely confronts the ethical and ideological dilemmas that scholarship in this area usually avoids. He attacks those who continue to predict the demise of ethnicity and those who see it as a destructive force. At the same time, he keeps his distance from certain mainstays of ethnic ideology, pointing out that pronouncements about authenticity and unchanging ethnic identities are belied by the record of historical change. In his essays on Whorf he thoughtfully justifies his ethical (and political) defense of ethnic diversity, arguing that humanistic engagement and scientific dispassion are compatible rather than mutually exclusive. However, despite his claims to objectivity (pp. 51–55), some of his assertions are hardly distinguishable from the ideology of the people he studies. Thus, one might question his claim that ethnicity is, like religion and the family, “pan-human” (pp. 3, 517). Indeed, Fishman’s arguments point to the peculiarly modern character of ethnic ideologies, motivated, as Fishman shows, by the revolt against mass society (pp. 508–510) and the search for an authentic self, whether individual or collective. In brief, though Fishman tries to separate his analysis of authenticity, continuity, and the like from the ideological use of such concepts, he is always on the verge of naturalizing ethnicity, presenting it not as a culturally particular ideology but as primordial (p. 496).

From the perspective of linguistic anthropology, these essays are of interest, first, for the light they shed on the relationship between ethnicity and language, and second, for their reconsideration of Whorf. With respect to the first issue, the authors argue that ethnic pluralism has survived and will continue to survive both with and without the survival of ethnic languages. They also argue that language preservation depends on “compartmentalization,” that is, the existence of relatively bounded social domains in which ethnic languages are functionally dominant. In modern societies, however, compartmentalization is difficult to maintain, so that in the United States, for example, groups whose language serves religious purposes (Orthodox Jews, Pennsylvania Germans) have been most successful in preserving it—precisely because American culture respects the separateness of the religious domain (p. 274). On the other hand, the authors believe that ethnic-language schools will be ineffective unless the languages they teach can be used in domains beyond the school, a condition often unmet in American society.

With respect to Whorf, Fishman correctly (in my opinion) explicates what he calls “Whorfianism of the Third Kind” (chap. 15): whatever the fate of Whorf’s hypotheses concerning linguistic relativity and determinism, we have much to learn from his understanding of what the variety of perspectives embodied in worldwide linguistic diversity has to offer humankind.


Greg Urban
University of Texas, Austin

Just as The Languages of Native America (Campbell and Mithun, eds.) takes stock of the Boasian linguistic project for North America, so this volume provides a panoramic overview of research developments in South America. Among its many merits, indeed, is an implicit clarification of the similarities and differences between these two continents.

Klein and Stark organize the 22 papers of this volume into three sections: the lowlands, the Andes, and southern and eastern South America, an organization that reflects earlier linguistic and cultural classifications.

Among seven highland papers, L. Stark’s “Ecuadorian Highland Quechua” reviews research on the history and diffusion of Quechua. It now appears that Quechua actually began its spread from northern not southern Peru, and beginning in 800 A.D. not later, as had been previously thought. Moreover, Stark argues, there are in Ecuador two varieties of Quechua, one associated with this original dispersal and another that came later with the Inca conquest.

B. Mannheim’s paper, “Southern Peruvian Quechua,” and L. Briggs’s previously published pieces, “The Literature on Aymara” and “Dialectal Variation in Aymara,” complete a general survey of highland dialectology. Regarding the question of genetic affiliation, much recent progress can be attributed to M. J. Hardman, whose research is discussed in her “Aymara and Quechua: Lan-
guages in Contact,” as well as in B. Mannheim’s “Contact and Quechua-External Genetic Relationships.” The central issue is whether Aymara and Quechua are genetically related. Hardman places Aymara in the Jaqi family, which includes Jaquaro and Kawki. Her reconstruction makes it possible to sort out the influence of contact from the role of genetic affiliation. Both Hardman and Mannheim conclude that Jaqi (including Aymara) and Quechua are genetically distinct, and that resemblances between Aymara and Quechua should be attributed to contact.

Supplementing these papers is L. Stark’s “History of the Quichua of Santiago del Estero,” in which she suggests that Quechua was brought to the northwestern corner of Argentina by the Incas prior to the Spanish conquest, but that it persists in some measure because of its association with criollo rather than Indian culture, and because of the erroneous belief that it was introduced by Spaniards after the conquest.

In the vast lowlands of South America are found some 350-400 distinct languages, each spoken by a relatively small number of speakers (from less than 10 to more than 10,000), in varying states of linguistic acculturation (from isolated languages, whose speakers have no direct relations with the encompassing nation-states and no significant knowledge of Spanish or Portuguese, to languages on the verge of extinction).

Most of the papers here are concerned with basic issues (locations, numbers of speakers, degrees of linguistic acculturation, and prospects for survival). They survey the recent literature and say something about genetic classification. This volume, which contains a detailed language index, therefore, makes an excellent handbook for researchers.

The principal geographical-linguistic areas reviewed are the Orinoco-Amazon region (E. Migliazzi), lowland Ecuador (L. Stark), lowland Peru (M. Wise), Argentina (H. Klein), Tierra del Fuego (C. Clairis), and the Paraguayan Chaco (H. Klein and L. Stark). A. Rodrigues’s “The Present State of the Study of Brazilian Indian Languages” is an especially welcome review of research on the 170 or more remaining indigenous languages in that country.

Several of the papers deal with language families rather than geographical areas. K. Kensinger surveys the Panoan family, while M. Durbin’s re-published piece attempts a classification of Carib languages, albeit without a full-scale reconstruction. R. Croese maps out the variability among Mapuche dialects. D. Price’s paper, on dialect diversity in Nam-bikwara with respect to social organizational characteristics and local geography, is of conceptual as well as descriptive interest. The only full-scale family-level reconstruction is I. Davis’s paper on Macro-Jé, originally published in 1968.

The papers reflect progress in the area of genetic classification. Family-level reconstruction, which should in principle orient phylum-level reconstruction, has led to widespread rejection of earlier simplifying schemes, as well as to new speculation about far-flung relationships. While several papers note these developments, A. Rodrigues’s “Evidence for Tupi-Carib Relationships” focuses on interfamily ties. Previous classification schemes separated Tupi and Carib into distinct phyla. Rodrigues, however, marshals evidence, in the form of 121 possible Tupi-Carib cognates, showing that the two families are actually related.

A. Sorensen’s “An Emerging Tukanoan Linguistic Regionality” continues his pioneering work on multilingualism in the northwest Amazonian region. Recent concern with the study of language in its context of use is reflected in other papers as well, especially Price’s “Nambikwara Languages” and Stark’s “History of the Quichua of Santiago del Estero.”

If the Boasian tradition is alive and well in South America, this is due in no small measure to the contributors to South American Indian Languages, and especially to its editors, who individually or jointly are responsible for six of the twenty-two papers presented here. Unlike North America, however, which has yielded up many of its empirical riches, the vast linguistic resources of South America remain largely untapped. Let us hope that the most important contribution of this volume is that it stimulates further research.

**Supplement to the Handbook of Middle American Indians, Volume 3: Literatures. Munro S. Edmonson, ed. (Victoria Reifer Bricker, gen. ed.) Austin: University of Texas Press, 1985. 208 pp. $35.00 (cloth).**

**Nora C. Englund**  
*University of Iowa*

This volume treats a topic that was only briefly and unsatisfactorily introduced in the original Handbook of Middle American Indians: the written and oral literary traditions of Mesoamerica from the classic period to the present. A brief and elegant introduction by