

seen as local heroes. Skoggard argues that their main characteristic is in being less inhibited than other people in pursuing their goals, mainly, working hard for their families. Their labor mobilization and manufacturing processes grow out of preexisting social relations based on kinship, community, and gender.

The bulk of the book is rich in ethnographic detail about the operation of the now rather defunct shoe industry and the way tradition and capitalism intertwine. While comparative work is not central to anthropology, the book could have benefited from reference to sociologists G. S. Shieh's study of subcontracting and what he calls "micro-entrepreneurship," and C. K. Lee's work on gender and labor process in two factories in Hong Kong and Shenzhen. At a higher level of theory, Gary Gereffi's research on "global commodity chains" would have enriched the discussion of Taiwan's niche in global production networks.

I found that there are two books struggling for dominance here, one on temple organization and one on subcontracting networks, and the interconnection seemed too much of a stretch, as did the argument, tacked on at the end (though quite interesting) that Yiguan Dao (in which the author was initiated) supplies the functional equivalent of the Protestant Ethic spurring on Taiwan's entrepreneurship. This begs too many counterfactual questions: If there had not been ceremonial circles, Yiguan Dao, etc., how would Taiwan's entrepreneurship (if any) have differed? Do nonbelievers become entrepreneurs of a different sort? Did they pattern their behavior on that of Yiguan Daoists? Is Yiguan Dao prevalent throughout Chinese emigré communities where entrepreneurship is rampant? Does the explosion of township and village enterprises and comparable subcontracting networks on the mainland evince a different kind of entrepreneurship? If the mainland villages did not have comparable ceremonial circles (an empirical question) or Yiguan Dao, what has been the source of their entrepreneurship? I was also surprised by the absence of Taiwanese dialect.

THOMAS B. GOLD
University of California, Berkeley

The Roads of Chinese Childhood: Learning and Identification in Angang. By CHARLES STAFFORD. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995. \$54.95.

The opening of Mainland China to research momentarily eclipsed Taiwan as a desirable site for field study. Now that the novelty has passed, it is fitting that Taiwan should once again be the site for a novel research project: to study the intergenerational patterns of cultural transmission. Charles Stafford, who conducted research in the late 1980s in the fishing community of Angang in southeastern Taiwan, explores how these patterns are manifested in formal and informal social arenas. Specifically, he wants to understand the relationship between these two arenas as they pertain to childhood socialization. Unsurprisingly he finds that the twin arenas are complementary.

His analysis is based on observations of individual interactions and less upon structural restraints. Stafford believes the Chinese perceive their world as a natural phenomenon, which ensures there will be a close relationship between images of the body and morality. Here, the moral order is embedded in an image of the body.

He acknowledges that although there is much attitudinal ambiguity and behavioral variation in the village, he will nevertheless focus primarily on folk ideas “of what should happen, rather than detailed accounts of what does happen” (p. xiv). In this way, the study is an exercise in the construction of a normative or ideal model of Taiwanese culture. He is aware of the limitations of this approach, and cautions that his study of Angang, which has its own unique history and traditions, should not be used as a model for all of rural Taiwan, much less of mainland China.

Angang’s ritual activity, he finds, is organized around a variety of moral maxims that serve “to protect the body-persons of children” (p. 21). One key maxim stands out above the rest. It holds that life is hard and brutal. This notion is often conveyed in the ritual activities which center on the body which is thought to be an inseparable aspect of the moral person. One of the ways the protection (which is regarded as a life-long process) is carried out is not through tough love as much as it is through tough learning. Because it is understood that the child is socially constructed, learning is a critical component of personhood. But learning is never easy. Children have to be toughened up, therefore, to learn to deal with adversity, failure, anxiety, and other obstacles found in life. One of the most important means to this end is corporal punishment. Stafford discovered that physical punishment is often extended for no other reason than just to remind the child that life can be painful and that the mark of maturity is how a person handles diversity. He found that from the family’s perspective, school is not where “children are made Chinese, it is where they express their Chinese values” (p. 30). He concludes that there are two roads, or ways, to becoming a Chinese person: the state-sponsored formal education which strives to prepare individuals for national competition, and the informal family-centered education which focuses on issues of character and style of interaction.

Although there is rich material here, his decision not to provide an analytical overview contributes to a feel of disjointedness. It reads, as he intended it to, like a series of illustrative moral precepts. I wish he had sought somehow to link these precepts with frequencies of occurrence. Since he wants to construct a normative model, he remains uninterested in exploring the paradox of individuality within a national and community social order.

When he does provide evidence of the relationship between individuality and sociability, his analysis is more insightful. For example, he astutely notes the implicit contradiction that often arises from the parental generation’s preferring a child’s obedience while quietly appreciating his or her unruliness, or the contradiction that arises from wanting to expand one’s “friendship” network while simultaneously also refusing gifts (or the invitation to begin a relationship).

I liked the chapter on “going forward bravely” which explores the multiple forms of identification or reference points used to construct an identity. These range from family to community to nation. The chapter discussing his findings in a Dongbei village is, as he points out, more suggestive than conclusive. He found that childhood, which is an unbounded and openly lived-in experience in Taiwan, is regarded as a more bounded, guarded experience in the northeast. He does not discuss why this is so, or what tangible impact this may have on childhood development other than to conclude that childhood, as experienced in the northeast, differs from that found in Angang. Still, I am glad he included his Dongbei data. It nicely illustrates that there is a range of responses to the meaning of childhood in Chinese society.

Cultural transmission or socialization studies were popular research questions in

the 1960s but have receded in popularity. Recently, there has been an effort in some quarters to reconstitute the study as a broad based approach that seeks to study the relationship between the form in which a message is transmitted and the degree of individuality present. Stafford seems to be unaware of or, if aware, indifferent to some of this literature's findings.

His cultural transmission model is not very sophisticated compared to that used by social psychologists and developed by Barry Hewlett, a cultural anthropologist. If he had borrowed Hewlett's model, his findings would have been more insightful and thus notable. Because his goal is to produce an interpretative and not causal analysis, he is less interested in developing the relationship between national economy, family orientation, and child rearing practices. In effect he, like most ethnographers, concentrates on the subjective domain and not the wider field of structural restraints. The book does raise important questions that have not been previously discussed in China studies. For that, we are in his debt. It will be up to other researchers, however, to build upon and expand his research design to include the influence of father-child interactions, sibling bonds, and peer group associations as well as the mode in which a cultural trait (e.g., one-to-many, few-to-many or one-to-one) is transmitted within the culture. In doing so, studies of Chinese childhood socialization will appeal to an even wider audience.

WILLIAM JANKOWIAK
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Word-Order Change and Grammaticalization in the History of Chinese. By SUN CHAOFEN. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996. xiii, 207 pp. \$39.50.

Sun's book is a welcome addition to the extremely small corpus of materials in English on Chinese historical linguistics. A major aim of the book, according to Sun, is to bring Chinese and its development into mainstream discussions of language change. Corollaries of this aim appear to be: to disprove the theory expounded by Li and Thompson ("An Explanation of Word Order Change SVO > SOV," *Foundations of Language* 12.2 (1974): 201–14) that Chinese is moving from being an SVO language into being an SOV language, and to dispute claims by Lightfoot (*The Language Lottery, Toward a Biology of Grammars* [Cambridge: MIT Press, 1984]) that language change occurs in part in a discontinuous process motivated by nongrammatical factors, i.e., unanalyzable chance. Sun feels the history of grammaticalization in Chinese of certain function words is a counter-example to Lightfoot's contention.

This small and tightly organized book limits itself to tracing the process of grammaticalization for a few of the major prepositions in Chinese, and to three important function words: BA (*bā*), DE (*dé, děi, de*) and LE (*liǎo, le*). Li and Thompson's major evidence in contending that Chinese was changing from SVO to SOV had to do with their claim that prepositional phrases shifted from being generally after the verb to being generally before the verb. This was coupled with the appearance of the BA construction which moved objects to a position in front of the verb. In 1985, Sun, along with Talmy Givón, argued against Li and Thompson's claim by showing that an overwhelming majority of modern Chinese sentences still contained postverbal objects. Sun adds to this proof by showing that BA simply replaced the earlier