version of Anglo-American policy – just as California is just like the rest of the country, only more so" (274).

From a wider viewpoint, the conclusion seems to be: "In the USA we are presented with perhaps the murkiest of language policies" (278). If we ask why, the answer is this (279):

> The attempts to treat language rights as a civil rights issue, or as a freedom of speech issue, or any of the other rights protected explicitly in the US Constitution and the Bill of Rights have been consistently rebuffed. Simultaneously, the courts have not allowed laws to be passed that single out any particular GROUP, whether it be religious, linguistic or ethnic, for exclusionary or punitive actions. . . . Education and most of the other areas where linguistic rights are demanded remain non-federal rights: states and other jurisdictions are therefore free to pass legislation of various sorts, so long as it does not single out specific groups, and deny them their constitutional rights. . . . Language rights are not among those guaranteed explicitly in the original Constitution, because no linguistic group came to America for linguistic freedom.

The fact is that linguistic rights can ONLY be collective rights.

MICHAEL CLYNE (ed.), *Undoing and redoing corpus planning*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1997. Pp. viii, 520.

Reviewed by KINGSLEY BOLTON
English Department, University of Hong Kong
Pokfulam Road, Hong Kong
hraeklb@hkucc.hku.hk

Clyne has shown great skill in compiling and editing this volume; it contains a wealth of information on language planning and language policies, and will be widely cited in the future. The book contains fourteen case studies, apparently specially commissioned, on corpus language planning from a wide range of societies in a number of global regions: Southeast and East Asia (China, the Philippines, Vietnam), Western Europe (Belgium, Germany, Norway), Eastern Europe (Hungary, Moldavia, Ukraine), the Balkans (the former Yugoslavia), the Middle East (Turkey, Israel, Jordan), Southern Africa (South Africa), and Central America (Nicaragua), as well as the Jewish diaspora (in the case of Yiddish).

In his introductory chapter, Clyne informs us that "the term CORPUS PLANNING was devised by Kloss 1969 to denote changes by deliberate planning to the actual corpus or shape of a language" (p. 1). The term can thus apply to such language-planning processes as "standardization, codification of morphology and spelling, the development of specialized vocabulary, the creation of a new alphabet, and the imposition of certain terms propagating particular attitudes to some groups of people". UNDOING CORPUS PLANNING refers to "relaxing" previously imposed

controls on language, and REDOING CORPUS PLANNING refers to the adoption of new changes to languages. As Clyne points out, most of the present studies "relate to the issue of who owns the language" (3). The overtly political nature of language planning is highlighted by his admission that "corpus planning and replanning are generally motivated by political change" and that the volume includes "contributions on the world's political trouble spots or former arenas of conflict" (498). Many of these areas are troubled by issues of ethnic nationalism, racial and religious hatred, class conflict, war, and genocide. Indeed, the links between language planning and ethnic nationalism existed as early as the 1930s and 1940s, when Heinz Kloss was head of a Third Reich "publications office" on language and ethnicity. During this period, Kloss was an apologist for a number of Hitler's cultural policies (Hutton & Joseph 1998), and was also concerned with the position of overseas Germans in Europe and the US, whom he saw as threatened by the possibility of assimilation (Hutton 1999).

The Asian contributions in this collection are, for the most part, rather low-key. S. M. Lee-Wong's discussion of Chinese address forms focuses on the populist move in post-Mao China away from the use of *tongzhi* 'comrade' as an address form. Andrew Gonzalez's contribution, as detailed and solid as ever in the context of Philippine linguistics, traces the evolution of the national language of the Philippines through its various stages from the 1950s to the present. More clearly problematic is Nguyen Xuan Thu's chapter on "The reconvergence of Vietnamese", which discusses the role of the language planner in the following terms (160):

> In time of war . . . all means to reach a given end, including corpus planning in language used as propaganda tools, may be accepted as good. However, in the post-war period, corpus planners should . . . correct their past language strategies to manage their language problems properly, . . . to cement any damage caused by their previous corpus planning, and . . . to look seriously at issues in language planning such as alphabetization, standardization, codification, modernization . . . in an attempt to consolidate their corpus planning and to enlarge the people's vision of language in the coming decades of the 21st century as well as . . . to enrich their hearts and minds.

What is suggested here is that corpus language planners come in two types: Type One is the STATE PROPAGANDIST, ready to bend the truth or even do "damage" if required to "do his bit" for the war effort; Type Two is the CONCERNED LINGUIST, able to apply his expertise to the knotty problems of language planning. One may be skeptical of Nguyen's assertion that language planners can play both roles simultaneously, even in the service of totalitarian regimes, but his willingness to at least discuss the issue deserves our praise. This central dilemma is ignored in certain chapters of the book, and on occasion the reader is left wondering which role, "state propagandist" or "concerned linguist", the authorial voice is intended to represent.

In many chapters, the voice of the concerned linguist largely prevails. Kas Deprez surveys the history of the Flemish language movement in Belgium; from Norway, Ernst Håkon Jahr discusses the failure of the *Samnorsk* (pan-Norwegian) movement to unite the two standards of Bokmål and Nynorsk; and Clyne discusses the recent sociolinguistic effects of German reunification. The three chapters on the Ukraine (by Alexander Krouglov), Moldavia (by Miklós Kontra), and Hungary (by Marcu Gabinschi) share a common theme – one that parallels developments in Germany: the de-russification of languages that were once part of the Soviet sphere of influence. In such cases, where the politically constructed Newspeak of Communist regimes has been replaced by freer patterns of language use, the concerned linguist will applaud. But these are not the only good causes that have been advanced by the recent "undoing" and "redoing" of corpus planning, as shown by Dirk J. Van Schalkwyk's chapter on eradicating racism in Afrikaans.

In a number of the other chapters, questions of conflict and war dominate. Ran HaCohen presents a refreshingly non-nationalistic and entirely credible view of recent Israeli linguistic politics; he begins by identifying "the inherent link between the Jewish-Arab conflict and modern Hebrew" (390), then goes on to discuss the public discourses of "us" and "them", "armed conflict" and "occupation" (390–98). A paper on a similar theme by two Jordanian sociolinguists, Hassan R. S. Abd-el-Jawad and Fawwaz Al-Abed Al-Haq, reveals a distinct lack of distance between their position and that of HaCohen, but both chapters express great skepticism about the current peace process.

The chapter that caused me most concern was the contribution by Radoslav Katičić on "Undoing a 'unified language': Bosnian, Serbian, Croatian." Katičić's blunt view is "that 'Serbo-Croatian', in spite of steadfastly maintained opinions to the contrary, never was a 'unified language' " (179), and that " 'Bosnian', 'Croatian' and 'Serbian' did not come into being in our days. They have been in existence for centuries now" (190).

Given the thrust of many earlier accounts of the sociolinguistic situation in the former Yugoslavia, this appears to be a lop-sided view at best. Before the disintegration of Yugoslavia and the establishment of three distinct languages, two main varieties of Serbo-Croat were usually identified: the western variety, associated with the Croats and written in the Latin alphabet, and the eastern variety, associated with the Serbs and written in the Cyrillic alphabet. According to Corbett (1987:396),

> [while] considerable differences exist, most of them are not absolute but are a matter of frequency of usage ... The whole question of the status of the two varieties is very sensitive, because of the cultural and political implications. To the outside linguist, the numerous shared features between the two varieties, added to the ease of mutual comprehension, suggest one language with two varieties, and many Yugoslavs concur.

(See also Trudgill 1974:61). Levinger 1994 reports that civil war in Bosnia-Herzegovina in the early 1990s was accompanied, if not preceded, by linguistic differentiation and conflict:

> Ethnic groups started using " languages" (or rather lexemes) which had not been in use in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and even began reviving archaic words which had not been used for some time even in those geographical regions with a majority of a particular ethnic group. (1994:232)

Levinger then argues (ibid.) that "insistence on the use of these separate 'purified' languages was the first instance of 'cleansing' which will unfortunately progress into a drastic, anti-human form of dealing with people of 'other' ethnic origin."

The side of the story to which Corbett and Levinger point is not one that Katičić gives much space to, other than to note:

> all statements here are based on experiences in Croatia ... acceptance of the new state of language policy there corresponds strictly to the acceptance of the independent Republic of Croatia. Only the small minority of the population who do not accept the Croatian state also refuses to accept its language policy ... by making biting and frustrated jokes at the expense of those who overdo the Croatian stylization of their language, by complaining of a pressure to change their language and to adopt an "invented" one. (188)

Having thus expressed an avowedly Croatian perspective, Katičić goes on (ibid.) to decry "the constant denigration of Croatian language attitudes by leftist journalists and other intellectuals in the western media." Clyne's editorial comments seem fully to endorse the Katičić view, even to the rejection of international opinion, commenting:

> the partisian position taken by many linguists all over the world in propagating Serbo-Croatian based on a preoccupation with historical and structural (morphosyntactic) considerations obstructed the recognition of Croatian and Serbian as autonomous languages. (492)

Clyne's endorsement here of what appears to be a propagandist viewpoint is perhaps only explicable by his concerned linguist's attachment to linguistic nationalism. He describes the role of the linguist in language planning as primarily assisting in producing the codex for languages "newly declared and/or defined for purposes of national unity and identity", adding that other issues about the wider responsibility of linguists (whether they actually contribute to the success of corpus planning, or help solve problems) are questions "this volume is not in a position to answer" (491).

Joshua Fishman has recently asserted:

> the terrible ethnocidal occurrences that now plague Serbs, Croatians and Bosnians, as well as the Eastern and Southern European refugees who have fled to

Germany, and Georgians, Armenians and Azeris, among others, are in no way by-products of language maintenance or even of self-determination strivings among ethnolinguistic aggregates (1995:313).

Perhaps; but as a number of the articles in this volume indicate, ethnolinguistic aggression often overlaps with ethnic and racist violence, which to date has claimed 200,000 victims in the former Yugoslavia (Danner 1977). Bogdan Denitch, writing as a sociologist and contemporary historian, laments the impact of ethnic nationalism in the Balkans, noting (1994:200) that "today Yugoslavia is effectively dead. However, it is not clear why a fight for separate states was more logical than a fight for a democratic, multiethnic confederation." As concerned sociolinguists, we may also ask why the cause of linguistic nationalism is often promoted as more logical or more "natural" than the options of multilingualism, diversity, hybridization, or even assimilation. But that would be the theme of a very different book, one that foregrounded a humanist perspective. Languages may just fade away; in the former Yugoslavia, people die.

REFERENCES

Corbett, Greville (1987). Serbo-Croat. In Bernard Comrie (ed.), *The world's major languages*, 391–409. London: Routledge; New York: Oxford University Press.

Danner, Mark (1997). America and the Bosnia genocide. *New York Review of Books* 44:19:55–65.

Denitch, Bogdan (1994). *Ethnic nationalism: The tragic death of Yugoslavia*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Fishman, Joshua A. (1995). Good conferences in a wicked world: On some worrisome problems in the study of language maintenance and language shift. In Willem Fase et al. (eds.), *The state of minority languages: International perspectives on survival and decline* (European studies on multilingualism, 5), 311–17. Lisse, Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger.

Hutton, Christopher (1999). *Linguistics and the Third Reich: Mother-tongue fascism and the science of language*. London: Routledge, to appear.

———, & Joseph, John Earl (1998). Back to Blavatsky: The impact of theosophy on modern linguistics. *Language and Communication* 18:181–204.

Kloss, Heinz (1969). *Research possibilities in group bilingualism*. Quebec: International Center for Research on Bilingualism.

Levinger, Jasna (1994). Language war – war language. *Language Sciences* 16:229–36.

(Received 11 January 1998)

DAVID CRYSTAL, *English as a global language*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997. Pp. x, 150. Hb $9.95.

Reviewed by ROLAND SUSSEX
Centre for Language Teaching and Research, University of Queensland
Brisbane, QLD 4072, Australia
sussex@lingua.cltr.uq.edu.au

The international march of English is one of the leading sociolinguistic phenomena of our times. There have been internationally dominant languages before – religious languages like Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, as well as Sanskrit and Koranic Arabic – and politico-cultural languages, often linked to the religious cultures