

rite est sans doute sa fonction la plus connue ; elle canalise les énergies en leur rendant une forme communicable « qui contribue à l'identification identitaire ». L'auteur en parle sur l'exemple des écrits de Salvador Dalí. Ceux-ci, fort ironiques et grotesques, mettent en marche le jeu rituel sans que l'on sache s'il s'agit d'un simulacre ou non.

Dans le dernier chapitre, l'auteur se penche sur l'aspect cognitif du rite. Comme c'est un acte qui repose sur un système axiologique identique pour une communauté, il exige des objets de croyance. L'auteur s'inspire ici de la pensée de Durkheim selon laquelle il est nécessaire de définir la croyance avant de définir le rite (1968 : 50). Les rites et leur fonctionnement dans le champ littéraire manifestent les croyances et les convictions des auteurs. Par la façon dont ils interprètent des figures de l'imaginaire, ils proposent au lecteur de suivre les mêmes voies interprétatives. Les rites incarnent aussi, selon l'auteur le pouvoir affirmatif et identitaire. Les écrivains disposent du même potentiel. La littérature donc témoigne de ce placement du sujet dans une communauté imaginaire.

Cette étude ne se contente pas de documenter la lecture à travers le motif du rite mais elle intègre également cette lecture à une réflexion poussée sur le fonctionnement même de la ritualité littéraire, élaborée dans une perspective interdisciplinaire. À la fin, l'auteur propose divers prolongements de son analyse toujours dans le contexte de l'époque moderne où l'être humain est menacé par le registre appauvrissant des informations, des publicités ou des slogans. Il faut donc remarquer que la littérature s'oppose à la standardisation de l'imaginaire. Elle renouève la vocation « rituelle » de l'écrivain de s'opposer à la condition moderne qui se caractérise par la perte de sens et la paupérisation de l'imaginaire.

DOROTA NOWAK-BARANOWSKA

Piotr P. Chruszczewski. 2011. *Językoznawstwo Antropologiczne: Zadania i Metody*, Oddział PAN we Wrocławiu, Wrocław 2011. str. 339.

Piotr Chruszczewski's book *Językoznawstwo Antropologiczne: Zadania i metody* [Anthropological Linguistics: Tasks and methods.] makes a relevant and comprehensive contribution to anthropological linguistics and can be considered one of the pioneering steps toward the development of this fledgling discipline at Polish universities. (Prof. J. Fisiak, p. 11, Preface). For that reason, the fact that the book is written in Polish is right and justified.

As the title suggests, the author set himself the objective to present tasks and methods of anthropological linguistics. More specifically, the book aims to define the subject matter of anthropological linguistics, delimit its disciplinary boundaries against other related disciplines and present a number of research perspectives and methodologies that can be used in an anthropological study of language (p. 15). Bearing in mind the complexity of the task, the challenge posed by the daunting vastness of the field and richness of possible methodological tools, Chruszczewski's undertaking undoubtedly deserves a note of credit. One may surely state that the author succeeds well in fulfilling this task. By working at the interdisciplinary crossroads of linguistics and anthropology, Piotr Chruszczewski presents a broad scope of research perspectives to be found in anthropological linguistics and classifies them into four paradigm-based groups. This presentation is characterized by clarity and coherence, which readers will certainly appreciate, and which is necessary in the light of prevalent terminological and disciplinary confusion (cf. Blount 1995).

Anthropological linguistics was born in the late 19th century and developed in the early twentieth century as a subfield of anthropology which focused on language (cf. Blount, 1995, Klein 2006). Crucial in this process were early attempts to document North American Indian languages, their origins, geographical distribution, and genetic and cultural links (pp. 21-31). As remarked by Blount (1995: 1935), "The sheer diversity of Native American societies and the sharp contrasts between them and the Old World origins of early American scholars led to interest in and eventually systematic studies of these societies. American anthropology arose, in fact, as a discipline dedi-

cated principally to an understanding of the origins, distribution, and characteristics of the people and societies who were the original inhabitants of the continent. (Blount 1995) Thus, it is not surprising Chruszczewski opens his book with the quotation from John W. Powell's *Introduction to the Study of Indian Languages* ([1877] 1880 after PCh), which states that "the student of language should be a student of the people who speak the language". I fully agree with this observation as it is virtually impossible to describe language without reference to its users. Yet, one must also take into account multifaceted socio-cultural contexts in which language users are immersed and which determine forms of linguistic behavior and linguistic representations of the world (cf. Prof. A. Szwedek, Blurb). From the very beginning, the author subscribes to this view. While working on the assumption that language is an integral part of culture (p. 15), he commits himself to exploring the relation between man, language and culture.

As far as the book's structure is concerned, the volume consists of three chapters. It starts with Introduction (pp. 15-19), which includes the book's main assumptions, aims and contents, moves on to the presentation of historical background to anthropological linguistics in Chapter 1 (pp. 21-67), then introduces relevant concepts and terminological distinctions, followed by specific case studies in Chapter 2 (pp. 69-90), and illustrates possible paradigms of anthropolinguistic analysis in the final chapter (pp. 91-263), which are summarized in Conclusion. Below I critically discuss the contents in more detail.

In the opening chapter, the author delves deep in describing American and European origins of cultural and linguistic anthropology, tracing them back to the traditions developed in the United States, Germany, France and Great Britain. This is to show the most important aspects of studies of language and culture in the USA and Europe (p. 21). The chapter features well-known linguistic anthropologists, who made a significant impact on the shaping of linguistic anthropology, such as Franz Boas, Edward Sapir, Benjamin Lee Whorf or Wilhelm von Humboldt, but it also devotes some space to other pioneers frequently overlooked, for example, Alfred L. Kroeber. It should be noted that Kroeber laid the foundations of the discipline, delimited its boundaries, and devised an interesting concept of culture (p. 32). Although certain biographical details as well as numerous cross-references and commentaries may sometimes overwhelm uninitiated readers, it is exactly the detail, presented in a straightforward and often entertaining narrative style that some readers may also find engaging (for example, an account of Lewis Henry Morgan's contribution and secret fraternal societies).

After delineating the historical background, the author proceeds to the definition of culture in the next section of the chapter. Drawing inspiration from Alessandro Duranti ([1997] 1999: 27-33), Piotr Chruszczewski offers to define culture primarily as knowledge, with its subsystems of communication, mediation and participation (p. 38). One may consider at this point the author's introduction of the notion of *cultural grammars*, that is a set of rules, which are in fact ethnographic descriptions of members of a given speech community (p. 40). This idea is discussed in more detail in the final chapter.

Further, the author problematizes the concept of culture by referring to leading theorists of culture, such as Claude Levi-Strauss or Clifford Geertz, but he also finds equally important Pierre Bourdieu's notion of *habitus* and Emile Durkheim's concept of *social fact*. The section ends with the presentation of one of the first typologies of the definitions of culture put forward by Kroeber and Clyde Kluckhohn's (1952).

In the second part of the chapter, the author engages in discussing main epistemological, methodological and administrative-organizational problems in the crystallization of the discipline, which German, British and French researchers encountered (p. 49). While in the USA crucial in the inception of linguistic anthropology was Puritans' drive to prepare Native Americans to read the Bible in their own vernaculars, in Europe it is German travelogues of the Enlightenment era that laid the ground for further research into language and culture. They included not only ethnographic information, but also philosophical-anthropological essays which systematized the cultural phenomena under investigation (p. 50). One of the key researchers in the European tradition of anthropolinguistic research was undoubtedly Wilhelm von Humboldt, the author of one of the first statements on the relationship between language and worldview (*Weltansicht*).

All in all, the first chapter has an expository character, that's why some readers may pine for a critical assessment of these early contributions. In addition, a brief summary of the chapter would certainly enhance the structure of the book.

The second chapter's concern is to discuss the main tenets and central concepts of anthropological linguistics. Most notable is the juxtaposition of linguistic relativism (known as the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis) with cognitive universalism, which is classic in general linguistics. What I find equally important is the discussion of terminological distinctions between anthropological linguistics, ethnolinguistics, linguistic anthropology and cultural linguistics. The section briefly cites a few major scholars in the field: William Foley, Ben Blount and also the Polish linguist Janusz Anusiewicz. Anusiewicz (1995) argues that all these disciplines are interested in exploring the relationship between man, language and culture, yet they prioritize each of these units differently. Accordingly, the departure point for anthropological linguists and ethnolinguists is man, for linguistic anthropologists – language and for cultural linguists – culture. Nevertheless, at present the differences between anthropological linguistics and linguistic anthropology have obliterated and these terms are frequently used interchangeably (cf. Blount 1995; Foley 1995). In the next section, the author directs attention to writing as a meaning-generating system and offers an original case study of Scandinavian inscriptions (pp. 85-93). These protobooks of the Viking era reveal the importance rulers and whole communities attached to the documentation of their achievements. As such, these stones can be considered one of the first reservoirs of culture, tradition and political power (e.g. the Danish King Harald's inscriptions).

In sum, the second chapter is written in a clear style, and despite some repetitions (pp. 87-88 and 152), successfully explains the essence of the discipline. One may however wonder why Chapter 2 is so succinct if compared to the other chapters. Perhaps a different chapter division might have been considered in order to balance the overall structure of the volume.

Chapter 3 sets out to put some order in the field of anthropological linguistics by bringing together the core theoretical and methodological approaches to the anthropological study of language. Drawing inspiration from Alessandro Duranti (2003), Piotr Chruszczewski proposes to think of linguistic anthropology in terms of not three but four distinct paradigms, labeled as: (1) documentary, (2) cultural and linguistic, (3) transformational, and (4) communication and discursive. Each paradigm is systematically described in terms of its objectives, view of language, preferred units of analysis, theoretical problems and preferred methods of data collection. These data are neatly compiled into tables.

In the first paradigm the focus is essentially on documentation, description and classification of languages based on their lexicon and grammar. Preferred units of analysis include a sentence, a word, a morpheme, but also texts. The main representatives in this paradigm are Franz Boas, Edward Sapir and Benjamin Lee Whorf, whose ideas are discussed in sufficient detail. What might seem missing in this section are contributions, such as Berlin and Kay's (1969) comparative study of color terminology. Yet, it should be noted that this work doesn't let itself be classified easily due to its antirelativistic stance and as such it is difficult to establish whether it falls better into the first or the second paradigm. (cf. Duranti 2003: 328)

The second paradigm is oriented towards language, culture and mind. It took advantage of new theoretical insights to explore language use in context and introduced new units of analysis, such as speech communities and their communicative competence, speech events, speech acts and genres, as well as language variety and style. A key representative of the second paradigm is Alfred L. Kroeber. Thematic range covers issues, including language change and language contact or language and context. It uses methods commonly found in sociolinguistics, such as ethnography of speaking or interviews, and as such it can be more closely identified with sociolinguistics.

What I found interesting in this section is Chruszczewski's discussion of Adam Fischer's research on Polabian Slavs, Sorbs and Poles. One of the areas of interest for Fischer, for example, was Poles' spiritual culture, abundant in pagan elements in those days. As argued by the author, Fischer in his accounts of Poles and their cultural, social and linguistic behaviours (p. 132), made an early attempt to describe phenomena from the crossroads of ethnography, ethnology, cultural studies, sociology and linguistics.

Another section specifies the nature of creolinguistics (often referred to as contact linguistics, p. 124), and thoroughly examines the relation between creoles and pidgins based on the observations of David DeCamp, Derek Bickerton, Muehlhausler, Sarah G. Thompson and Terrence Kaufman or Mark Sebba (pp. 124-139). The last section features models of language change, as proposed by Jean Aitchison (p. 144) and briefly addresses the phenomenon of language death (pp. 146-150).

The third transformational paradigm is mostly devoted to the documentation and analysis of identity formation, including transformation of persons, institutions and communities, as well as to narrativity and ideology. In the third transformational paradigm the focus is on language as “a social interactional achievement” imbued with indexical values, including ideological ones. The section systematically reviews some of the main aspects of ethnography of speaking from the anthropological perspective (pp. 154-163). Most notable in the third paradigm, however, is Chruszczewski’s proposal to extend Duranti’s model by adding speech community and discourse community as units of analysis (pp. 191-199). According to the author, while exploring the transformation of a particular community, we should start from the description of the community itself. (p. 151) What captured my attention was the section on the Japanese greetings and farewell *aisatsu* (p. 179) and anti-language (Polish prisoners’ cant, p. 184). At the end, Piotr Chruszczewski addresses the issue of linguistic relations of power and dominance, after Roger Fowler (1992). This section leaves an impression of incompleteness. It may be worthwhile to develop it further by referring to the groundbreaking work *Language as Ideology* (1979) by critical linguists Robert Hodge and Gunther Kress.

Finally, the fourth paradigm treats language as a domain that is organised in terms of culture and communication, and organizes these two. In other words, as emphasized by Chruszczewski, it is no longer the documentation of transformation of persons or groups, but the documentation of human communication which takes place because people ‘function’ in different discourses (p. 199).

The fourth paradigm is interested in an anthropological study of communicational grammars of particular discourses. The author elaborates on the concept of a communicational grammar of discourse and proposes to treat it as a set of various patterns of verbal and non-verbal behavior, dependent on the situation and institution in which they occur (p. 204). Next he proceeds to outline various conceptions of discourse, genre and register as found in discourse studies. Essentially, discourse is understood as a dynamic phenomenon, at the core of which are particular texts, embedded in situational, social and cultural contexts (p. 201). The chapter then looks at selected conceptions of context and communication models. A section discussing the most important features of humour and linguistic gender closes the last chapter.

To sum up, although Piotr Chruszczewski’s description of paradigmatic models may seem somewhat complex, the book’s inclusion of case studies and interesting examples (such as the section on linguistics of gender and humour), the presentation of key ideas in bold print and a conclusion which summarizes the main postulates in the form of tables makes it an accessible read even to young researchers.

In conclusion, Piotr Chruszczewski has managed to distil into a single volume the rich traditions of anthropological linguistics, flagging up alternative ways through which language can be explored in relation to culture. The book can provide a highly valuable companion and reference for both students in graduate and post-graduate levels from various fields of anthropology and linguistics who wish to explore the relationship between man, language, and culture. Those already involved in anthropological linguistic research are also invited to expand their perspectives by embracing the discursive-communication paradigmatic model and the methodologies it offers in the study of language and culture. All taken into account, I am convinced that readers will appreciate the diverse and exciting landscape of anthropological linguistics as presented by Piotr Chruszczewski.