In spite of problems like these, the book presents much information which should be of interest to Austronesianists and general phonologists or historical linguists alike.

Emics and Etics: The Insider/Outsider Debate. Ed. by Thomas N. Headland, Kenneth L. Pike and Marvin Harris. Frontiers of Anthropology Volume 7. Newbury Park: Sage Publications, 1990.

Reviewed by Barbara Dix Grimes
Summer Institute of Linguistics, Indonesia

The terms *emic* and *etic*, coined by the linguist Kenneth Pike in 1949, now appear in English language dictionaries and in the vocabularies of disciplines ranging from anthropology to management to education. As the terms have come to be used in such diverse fields and theoretical paradigms, their increasing popularity has been accompanied at times by an increasing lack of clarity. Recognising this as a potential source of confusion, Thomas Headland led a symposium in 1988 at the Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association to provide an opportunity for dialogue between Kenneth Pike and Marvin Harris, the anthropologist who has employed the notions extensively in his theory of cultural materialism. The book contains most of the papers presented at the symposium and its layout reflects the intended dialogue. Beginning with an introduction by Headland, it then proceeds with four chapters in which Pike and Harris each explain their use of emics and etics and give a reply to the other. In the second section of the book, seven more scholars from various disciplines present their own comments and analyses of emics and etics. The book concludes with Pike and Harris giving a final reply to these essays and to each other.

Pike originally created the terms *emic* and *etic* as an extension of the distinction between *phonetic* and *phonemic*, terms used in reference to the sound system of languages. Wanting to apply this phonological distinction to grammar and larger units of speech such as stories as well as to non-verbal behaviour, Pike deleted the *phon-* (referring to sound) from *phonetic* and *phonemic* and was left with *etic* and *emic*. These terms lay at the core of tagmemics, Pike's theory of language presented among other places in Pike (1967 [first edition 1954]). A contributor to the second part of the book, John Berry, summarises how Pike employed these terms to describe behaviour: 'The etic viewpoint studies behaviour as from outside of a particular system, and as an essential initial approach to an alien system. The emic viewpoint results from studying behaviour as from inside the system.' (Pike 1967:37). Thus, the analyst approaches a new language with a set of linguistic tools available in advance to produce an etic description of the lan-

guage. However, the analyst also seeks to discover how the language works in regards to its own internal system and to describe it from an emic point of view. For Pike both ways of viewing the same data are of value. Because one leads to the other, the two approaches are not mutually exclusive, but interdependent.

Harris first picked up on Pike's notions of emic and etic and applied the concepts to anthropology in Harris (1964). There has been some debate whether Harris was 'misappropriating' the concepts or whether he was justly applying them to a different field for a different method and purpose. Taking the latter view, it can be said that Harris 'reformed' the concepts. Harris (1979) expanded the emic/etic distinction to include 'mental and behavioral qualities' resulting in 'four contrasting modes of ethnographic description'. In the current volume he illustrates these in reference to his well known example of the Hindu cattle complex. The *emics of mental life* describe the Hindu belief 'All calves have the right to life.' The *emics of behavior stream* reflect the Hindu farmers' view of their own behaviour as being such that no calves are ever starved to death. In contrast, the *etics of mental life* state 'Let the male calves starve to death when feed is scarce'. While Hindu farmers may rarely or never verbalise such a statement, it can be inferred from the *etics of the behavior stream* where male calves are in fact regularly starved to death. Over the years there have been various critiques of Harris' model, including by James Lett, a contributor to the second section of this book. Lett criticises Harris' juxtaposition of emic/etic with the mental/behaviour dichotomy, pointing out that emic and etic are epistemological constructs, concerned with the nature of knowledge. It is our understanding or description of the phenomena that is emic or etic, not the phenomena itself. To Lett, 'etics of thought' is an unrealisable domain that cannot be distinguished from the emics of thought. While Harris now acknowledges that he 'had failed to see that the mental/behavioral distinction was not congruent with emics/etics' (p.52), he has strong arguments for why ethnography must offer both emic and etic descriptions. As the example of the Hindu farmers illustrates, emic accounts do not always match up with etic accounts. There can be unintended and non-recognised outcomes of behaviour which emic constructs of culture prevent us from seeing. Harris sees the role of the ethnographer as producing better understanding through 'the persistent juxtaposition of emic and etic versions of social life' (p.57).

The essays in the book's second section are as varied as their authors' disciplines. In addition to James Lett's chapter on the epistemology of anthropology, Robert Feleppa discusses the implications of emic and etic methodologies in anthropology. While much has been made of their differences, Dell Hymes focuses on the similarities Pike and Harris have in their approaches to

emics and etics, noting among other things how they both stress 'accountability to data in context'. Gerald Murray looks at the historical evolution of the concepts and outlines what he sees as the 'adaptive radiation' of scientific paradigms. He also presents what he sees as some of the shortcomings of applying emics and etics in both tagmemics and cultural materialism. John Berry describes his use of emics and etics in cross-cultural psychology, operationalising a three-step sequence in which initial 'imposed etics' are transformed into emics and then through cross-cultural comparison into 'derived etics', namely, features relevant and common to a limited set of cultures. From the field of philosophy Willard Quine considers analogies to the concept of the phoneme that have proven central to anthropology. As he notes, the phoneme is *culture-bound* in a remarkably apt sense of the phrase and the generalised sense of emic is relativity to a culture with a similar analogy being the insider/outsider distinction. Nira Reiss presents a semantic analysis of Pike's and Harris' use of emic and etic considering the underlying 'root metaphors' they use in employing the terms.

While Pike coined emic and etic for tagmemics, as terms referring to modes of analysis and description they are relevant to all social disciplines attempting to understand behaviour and another way of life. From Malinowski's time anthropology has been taken up with trying to understand things 'from the native's point of view' and it is not surprising the terms have found second homes in anthropology and other disciplines. Each discipline will continue to use the terms in their own way for their own purposes, but there is no disagreement over the utility of the concepts. This book makes an important contribution across the disciplines of the social sciences and is a good example of how dialogue can clarify and sharpen ideas. For any who use emics and etics in practice, the book is worth reading.

References

Harris, Marvin. 1964. *The nature of cultural things*. New York: Random House.

_____. 1979. *Cultural materialism: The struggle for a science of culture*. New York: Vintage.

Pike, Kenneth L. 1967 [1954, 1955, 1960]. *Language in relation to a unified theory of the structure of human behavior*, 2nd ed. The Hague: Mouton.