room dynamics and could help to set up a typology of resistance and appropriation that would result in a more informed theory of ELT.

Even though the book dichotomizes the English-teaching world into center and periphery, it does not discuss the existence of various peripheries within the ELT periphery where resistance and appropriation are not even a possibility, mainly because of the educational and institutional practices that limit access to English (Ramanathan 1999). These peripheries consist of those groups who are “typically the most economically and educationally handicapped” (Ramanathan 1999:213).

To conclude, the book is exhaustively researched and well written, though more examples of the ethnographic data would have supported the critical-theoretical perspective advanced in it. Readers might quibble with Canagarajah’s interpretation of the students’ scribbles on the margins – it does take quite a leap of faith and imagination to see sexual drawings as logically related to the students’ resistance to English – but it is certainly an innovative and potentially productive methodological exercise, if used carefully. The book will certainly find an audience among those who wish to learn about ELT beyond “what goes without saying.”
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Red Book on endangered languages.” It ends by making a vow: “We hope this Green Book will be of use to everyone who wants it to be no longer necessary for their language to be listed in the Red Book.”

Indeed, green is the color of grass and treetops, of wood and rainforest; green is the color with which ecological movements identify; green is the color of the spring season, associated with renewal and, why not? – revitalization. In the past two decades, extensive research has been undertaken on language shift and language death, aiming at a better understanding of the linguistic and societal dynamics involved in both. Language attrition deserves special interest too. In the past decade, increasing awareness arose of the extent to what local language loss is actually threatening global language diversity, and scholars, language activists, and opinion- and policy-makers became progressively conscious that decided and concerted efforts in the field of language preservation could not be deferred. Not all linguists are aligned alike with respect to this issue, but I like to think they overwhelmingly share this consciousness. (cf. Ladefoged’s controversial view vs. Hale’s and collaborators’ and Dorian’s in Language 68 [1992] and 69 [1993]. I commented on this controversy in “Els lingüistes i les llengües amenaçades,” Els Marges 50:75–81 [1994].)

In a way, language maintenance stands opposite language shift or language death, but language policies addressed to language maintenance should not be confused with policies addressed to language revival or revitalization. Furthermore, reversing language shift may pursue varied aims, depending on the historical and social context. Properly, the Green Book deals with revitalization cases and efforts. This means that, more often than not, their common aim is the creation of a new generation of more or less fluent speakers of a decaying or fading language. It is my contention that for language revival to succeed somehow, there should remain some basis to act upon – just as there is no revival of fire without live coals among the ashes. This is confirmed by cases such as the most successful example of language revival: Hebrew, which had been retained as a sacred language and even as a language for business. The Ni’ihau community, whose children were the only present-day children to be first-language speakers of Hawaiian (p. 136), is one foundation upon which the revival of this language rests.

Another term in the book title is relevant: “in practice.” This means that the book offers narratives of language revitalization experiences rather than a lot of theoretical or conceptual reflections on it, although these are not missing. Revitalization experiences dealt with in this book are, first and foremost, community-based and community-controlled (51); that is, they proceed from the bottom up, since what is at stake, after all, is a matter of peoples’ self-determination. Communities are the ones to set their goals, to choose their way, to overcome impediments, to try their methods. They may be helped by external specialists to a certain degree, but they are the agents of the enterprise. Of course, revitalization may then become somewhat institutionalized. Also, experience acquired and material elaborated in one case may be useful to another. Thus, the revitalization of
Hawaiian (129–76), inspired by the Maori experience (115–28), is one of the most interesting cases among the range covered by the book. This range includes Native American languages, mainly but not only from the US – whether from the mainland, like Navajo (87–97, 203–15, 389–410), or from islands, like Hawaiian (133–44, 147–76) – as well as Australian (277–82) and other Pacific languages (Maori, 119–28; Hawaiian). Finally, Europe is represented by the Celtic languages Welsh (107–13) and Irish (301–11).

The volume is strongly oriented toward the American experience. The common feature that all the chosen languages share is that they became endangered under the pressure of English, though in several cases after suffering pressure from Spanish, as in the case of the Pueblo languages (63–73, 75–82). In this sense, it was relevant to include a brief description and evaluation of US bilingual education programs during the 1970s and 1980s. These were implemented as a consequence of the Bilingual Education Act (1968) and a series of US Supreme Court decisions. A relatively liberal policy toward minority languages prevailed during this period. At first, bilingual education was aimed at immigrant and Spanish-speaking children, but Native American communities were quick to grasp this opportunity. This meant federal funds for Indian school projects. Bilingual education was controversial: Some saw its goal as “transitional,” and others thought of it as oriented toward language “maintenance” (41–42). Indian communities took it to be a maintenance program, while the federal government hesitated, until finally the transitional view of bilingual education prevailed (68–69). In spite of this merely transitional goal, funding progressively decreased. Some states have recently dropped bilingual education, and others may follow.

Languages dealt with in the book show different pre-historic and historic depth: Many of them are rooted in a long distant past; further, some Indian languages were written or somehow represented well before the colonial encounter (prototypically, through the Mayan hieroglyphic system). If we take other types of “visual representation of ideas” as the way preliterate peoples recorded their narratives, then Sioux or Navajo ideographic pictures may be considered (242); in the Old World, a variety of Celtic was written in Ogham script in the early centuries CE in Ireland, and after the introduction of Christianity and the roman alphabet in the fifth century, Irish developed a rich literature. Other very old languages, by contrast, were not written until the first half of the 19th century (Hawaiian); the development of Cherokee and Cree syllabaries also date from this period. Documents from the old days may be an aid to modern standardization. As for new writing systems and literacy, a remark must be made beyond their description. Although we Western people are used to thinking of script as something inherent to language and something that may improve language maintenance, the same response is not always found among indigenous communities. They may refuse it, perhaps thinking that it is not right to let strangers know their ancestral language, or they may assign to writing no other domain than school teaching. In some contexts, writing
may not improve language learning, the oral channel being more suitable because of either pedagogical strategies or local linguistic ideologies.

These remarks lead in a natural way to the relevant issue of the relation between language and culture. Three points should be made here. First, insofar as “language is the key to and the heart of culture” (9), school-based revitalization has its shortcomings, for it may be difficult to recover patterns of culture in the schoolroom. Second, traditional cultural practices are to be learned and enacted, but the aim of revitalization is to achieve a language that can function in modern life. Hypertraditionalism is to be avoided. Finally, all this implies that new forms of discourse should be acquired and properly used, be they traditional (storytelling, ceremonial speech, etc.) or modern (essay, political discourse, etc.). In addition, the relationship between claims for language and culture revitalization and claims for land and civil rights go hand in hand.

A great deal of discussion in this volume concerns teaching methods, procedures, and results. Linguistic immersion is seen as one of the most fruitful methods, especially if applied in the preschool phase; in some cases, it is extended beyond the school context and reaches family life or community interaction. The so-called master-apprentice language learning program (217–26), by which a master fluent speaker and a younger learner work together as a team to get language and other cultural knowledge passed on, deserves special mention. In general, the authors emphasize communication-based rather than grammatical methods, and immediate intercommunication in the indigenous language between teacher/master and learner. Establishing community educational programs sometimes demands imagination in order to deal with political or legal impediments (17; 136–37).

Training of teachers is urgent and, among other methods, the master-apprentice methodology has proved promising where practiced (183; 217–26). In other cases, universities (Inuttut and Innu), colleges (Navajo), and special institutes or indigenous associations – in contact with universities – offer teacher-training programs. This is the case with the American Indian Language Development Institute (AILDI), which, developing from the first Yuman Language Institute, soon reached far beyond this language family to include other languages, mainly Tohono O’odham, Hopi, and Western Apache (371–78). Another such effort is the Oklahoma Native American Language Development Institute (ONALDI), which emphasizes Oklahoma languages (378–81). Both institutes emphasize the necessity of heritage language skills and language-teaching skills.

Language itself may be conceived as a survival technology. The first language-based technology is writing, upon which I commented above. The import of the so-called “new technologies” for revitalization efforts is discussed in this book, and examples are presented. The point is highlighted by Hale: As a matter of principle, technology is neutral (277, 282). This assertion cannot conceal that the effect of radio and TV broadcasting has been devastating to endangered lan-
guages, but it reminds us of the extent to which these technologies can help language revitalization. Irish radio stations (300, 304–10) and Welsh TV (111–12) are instances. Video offers new possibilities – for instance, the dubbing of Bambi into Arapaho (293–94). Existing resources on endangered languages on the Web are enumerated and briefly described, and their advantages and limits considered (331–43). Building virtual communities of speakers and strengthening real ones through the use of technology are to be enhanced.

The book is divided into nine parts (Introduction; Language policy; Language planning; Maintenance and revitalization of national indigenous languages; Immersion; Literacy; Media and technology; Training; Sleeping languages). The content of these parts totals 33 chapters by 33 authors, though there is no one-to-one correspondence between authors and chapters. Strategically, one of the editors briefly introduces the reader to the languages on which the following one or more chapters are based. Both Hinton’s and Hale’s introductions to languages are informative not only in terms of location, genetic relationship, cognates, structural features, and current status, but also about its impact on recent debates in language description (e.g., the Navajo system of classificatory verbs), linguistic theory (e.g., the analysis of verbal stems in Maori), or notions in linguistic scholarship (e.g., the contribution of Karuk to the debate on linguistic relativity, or the contribution of Southern Paiute to Sapir’s “psychological reality of phonemes”). Chapters themselves deal mainly with revitalization experiences and/or general issues. Maps make clear the geographical locations of the endangered languages treated. Information on the editors and authors and a useful index of topics close the volume.

Hale’s arguments in favor of language diversity, known from elsewhere, rely both on the linguists’ interest in diachronic linguistic reconstruction and synchronic theoretical linguistics – their outcomes are not the same if certain languages are missing or unknown – and, importantly, on peoples’ right to preserve their particular human inheritance, a shared cultural and verbal knowledge that is scarce human wealth, as water is a scarce and necessary resource for life. If this knowledge gets lost in its natural context, it is lost forever. Increasing professional and public awareness and communities’ involvement in independently emerging revitalization movements around the world offer some reasons for optimism. The Green Book will help these communities to take advantage of one another’s striving for success. The enterprise of compiling the information contained in it testifies to another reason for optimism.

NOTE: After this review was submitted to the editor of Language in Society, I received the sad news of Ken Hale’s passing. I dedicate this review to his memory. May remembering him make us more sensitive to the case for saving endangered languages, and more responsible to our commitments as linguists and social scientists.
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