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The music of everyday speech (hereafter MES) is a book for discourse analysts interested in incorporating a theoretically grounded account of sound production, or, prosody, into their research. Readers of Language in Society will find MES to be the first book of its kind. It includes an overview of phonological, discourse analytical, and interactional approaches to the analysis of prosody, as well as model prosodic analyses of the major research areas in discourse analysis. MES is a thorough presentation of how prosodic analysis can inform discourse analysis, unique in its coverage of material, excellence of presentation, and theoretical and analytical depth.

Much of the previous research on prosody in language has focused on defining the patterns of use of intonation in English (Crystal 1969, Bolinger 1986). Wennerstrom’s work consolidates findings from research by these intonational theorists with that of phonologists (Pierrehumbert 1980, Ladd 1996) and more recent work on prosody in conversation (e.g., Couper-Kuhlen & Selting 1996, Ford & Thompson 1996, Schegloff 1998, Wells & Macfarlane 1998). From this broad theoretical and methodological understanding of studies of prosody, the author presents five chapters, each focusing on a specific area within discourse analysis and the ways that incorporation of prosody may add to the investigation of these areas.

After an overview of the contents (Chap. 1), Chaps. 2 and 3 give a complete presentation of the author’s theoretical foundations for the study of prosody in spoken language. Here Wennerstrom displays her wide knowledge of the area of prosody, ranging from work in generative phonology to more discourse- and interaction-based approaches. The author doesn’t directly attempt to make connections between the phonological and the interactionist programs, but her expertise as a phonologist and phonetician is clear from the theoretical rigor in which the analysis of prosody in discourse is grounded. The author has adapted a phonological model of pitch accent from Pierrehumbert 1980 to the analysis.
of prosody in discourse, using iconic transcription conventions from discourse and conversation analysis for the representation of prosody. In this way, she makes a relatively abstract theory accessible to those without a background in phonology. Another theoretical foundation is the author’s use of acoustic analysis and the display of pitch tracks as a check on analytical claims. In this sense, her methods resonate with work in conversational phonetics (Local 1996, Couper-Kuhlen 1996), which has applied auditory and acoustic phonetics to the study of conversation.

After the theoretical background, Chap. 4 discusses how intonation reflects mental representation, works as part of the linguistic system in achieving coherence across oral texts, and indicates given and new information. Although Wennerstrom sometimes follows the pattern of previous phonological research on intonation in using created examples to illustrate theoretical points, her work is notable for, and benefits from, the use of representative examples from her database of talk-in-interaction. This work also benefits from the author’s understanding and use of acoustic analysis to illustrate her analysis and description of pitch movement graphically. In this way, her work gives empirical grounding to earlier theoretical treatments of these same issues (Halliday & Hassan 1976, Chafe 1994).

In the analytical chapters (5–9), Wennerstrom uses “guest” analyses (excerpts from other authors’ published work) for the main analytical discussions. In each chapter, she gives complete background for the issue under discussion and highlights several “unresolved issues” – major questions and problems to be dealt with in future research. I found these sections of each chapter particularly helpful as a way to place the analytical issue dealt with in that chapter as one step in an ongoing research program. The author uses a prosodic lens to reexamine the following areas and incorporates guest analyses for support in chapters on “Discourse markers,” “Speech act theory,” “Conversation analysis,” “Narrative,” and “Second language acquisition.” In this review, I touch on issues from only some of these chapters.

In my own introductory classes, when speech act theory is discussed, students quickly note the absence of nonverbal and prosodic analysis in the classification of speech acts. Wennerstrom’s Chap. 6 shows the importance of the analysis of pitch movement in an empirically grounded speech act framework. She gives the example of a “representative,” the statement they wear those pants all the time, which has a high rising pitch boundary. Such a statement with this high rising pitch is normally classified as an “indirect” command, but from Wennerstrom’s perspective (pitch movement as part of the linguistic system in English) such a phonological pitch movement (rising boundary) is part of the locutionary act. This particular utterance, they wear those pants all the time is not, in its sound context (a rising pitch boundary), an “indirect” command. Rather, the conventional pitch contour gives the utterance the force of a directive. Wennerstrom
calls for more such empirical investigation of speech act theory using such a prosodic lens, and this chapter – with its details on the relationship among interactional pragmatics, implicature, illocutionary force, and intonation – is a good starting point for anyone interested in taking up that call.

Chap. 7, on conversation analysis (CA), includes subsections on the prosodic organization of turn-taking, tone concord (speakers matching pitch level), pitch accent and cohesion, and rhythm as an interactive device. Subsections include summaries of important research since the 1980s on prosody in talk-in-interaction. The guest analysis shows how disruption in rhythm is part of the display of loss of face in Immigration and Naturalization Service interviews.

Even though all CA studies incorporate some degree of prosodic description into their analyses (pitch at the end of turns, timed pauses), there is a need for deeper understanding in CA research of how prosody works throughout a turn and across sequences of turns. Wennerstrom’s understanding of prosody from studies in intonational phonology and discourse analysis is a valuable resource for conversation analysts interested in gaining that understanding. She notes that CA’s focus on micro-level details of turns and sequences of turns in talk-in-interaction make CA research an ideal site for the investigation of prosodic phenomena in talk. I would add that CA’s theoretical stance of grounding analytic claims in participants’ orientation to those claims offers much to the study of prosody in talk-in-interaction. Showing how participants orient to the prosody of the talk gives perceptual and social salience to prosodic analyses.

In Chap. 9, Wennerstrom notes that the study of prosody has important implications for second language (L2) research, especially regarding the production and perception of lectures by international teaching assistants at U.S. universities. English as a Second Language (ESL) textbooks have recognized the difficulty L2 learners may have in achieving target-like prosody and have begun to incorporate larger sections devoted to the teaching of connected speech phenomena.

Previous research studies (including Wennerstrom’s own) are cited that show systematic, qualitative differences in both the perception and the production of prosody by nonnative speakers of English (NNSs). NNSs were given higher ratings on their pronunciation when they used paratones and when they used more native-speaker-like pitch shifts at topic changes. Even studies using different theoretical models found that NNSs tend to use a falling pitch at juncture points in discourse – places where native speakers would use rising pitch to indicate the dependent relationship between two parts of a text.

I have two points of criticism about the graphical representation of pitch. Although this may not fall within the scope of this book, I had hoped to find a discussion of the author’s choice of a scale of absolute Hertz for the representation of pitch instead of a logarithmic scale in “semitones,” which takes into ac-
count how hearers’ perception differs from a physical signal on a scale in Hertz (‘t Hart, Cohen & Collier 1990).

Second, although I find that including pitch tracks helps ensure reliability, allowing readers the most accurate channel to the prosody outside of hearing utterances, the pitch tracks supplied by Wennerstrom may be confusing for someone investigating prosody for the first time. The issue is the conflict between phonological and phonetic representation of pitch height; I mention it here because readers may see a disjuncture between the phonological representations for pitch accent and pitch boundaries (H* – L* and H% – L%, respectively) and the acoustic pitch tracks given, which could cause confusion (cf. 184). The author could have reiterated how the analyst determines H* or L* pitch accent, and how the acoustic representations for H* and L* may not always be transparently “High” or “Low” on a pitch chart.

These criticisms aside, MES is a thorough introduction to the analysis of prosody, well grounded both theoretically and empirically. I recommend this book to discourse and conversation analysts interested in understanding the theoretical underpinnings for the study of prosody in the linguistic system and as a discourse organizing device.
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